



ASSESSING DEPARTMENT
Kurt Dawson, Director

From: Nancy McLaughlin
To: Ed Anzek
Date: 11/17/15
Re: File No.: 15-019
Project: Stonecrest at Rochester Hills Review #1
Parcel No: 70-15-23-300-035 (part of)
Applicant: NP Senior Living Dev LLC

A land division is recommended.



FIRE DEPARTMENT

Sean Canto

Chief of Fire and Emergency Services

From: James L. Bradford, Lieutenant/Inspector
To: Planning Department
Date: January 4, 2016
Re: Stonecrest at Rochester Hills

SITE PLAN REVIEW

FILE NO: 15-019

REVIEW NO: 2

APPROVED X

DISAPPROVED _____

The Rochester Hills Fire Department recommends approval of the above reference site plan contingent upon the following conditions being met.

1. On sheet C-2.3 provide note: The proposed underground water detention system shall be capable of supporting the imposed load of fire apparatus weighing at least 75,000 pounds

Lt. James L. Bradford
Fire Inspector



Planning and Economic Development

Ed Anzek, AICP, Director

From: Sara Roediger, AICP
 Date: 2/4/2016
 Re: **Stonecrest Senior Living
 Preliminary/Final Site Plan - Planning Review #3**

The applicant is proposing to construct an 81,073 sq. ft., two story assisted living and memory care facility, on 2.54 net acres on the east side of Rochester Road, north of Hamlin Road. The project was reviewed for conformance with the City of Rochester Hills Zoning Ordinance. The comments in this and other review letters are minor in nature and can be incorporated into a final site plan submittal for review by staff after review by the Planning Commission.

1. **Zoning and Use** (Section 138-4.300 and 138-8.200). The site is zoned R-4 One Family Residential with The FB-2 Flex Business Overlay District. The applicant has opted to develop this site under the FB-2 zoning regulations, which permits state licensed residential facilities as permitted uses. In addition, assisted living facilities need to be developed in accordance with the requirements of Section 138-4.423 as follows:
 - A. All buildings shall be set back 60 feet from any adjacent one-family residential district or 25 feet from any other zoning district. In compliance, 40 ft. is proposed from the north, 160+ ft. from the east, and 27+ ft. from the south.
 - B. The maximum building height shall be 40 feet, except that buildings located within 100 feet of a one family residential district shall have a maximum height of 30 feet. In compliance, the maximum building height for this site, measured to the midpoint of the roof, is 30 ft. and the proposed building height is 29 ft. 8.5 in.
 - C. A type D buffer shall be provided along any one-family residential district or property used for one family residential purpose. A type B buffer shall be provided along any property line adjacent to a zoning district other than one-family. Refer to Section 138-12.300.B for landscaping and buffering requirements. In compliance, buffers have been provided as outlined in 8. in this review.
 - D. Parking shall be provided at the rate of one parking space for every 2 beds in the facility. In compliance, based on 100 beds 50 parking spaces are required and 57 are proposed.
 - E. All studio or efficiency units shall have a minimum floor area of 300 sq. ft., one bedroom units shall have a minimum floor area of 400 sq. ft., and 2 or more bedroom units shall have a minimum floor area of 550 sq. ft. In compliance, as indicated on sheets SK0 and SK1 which show 345 sq. ft. rooms for studios, 550 sq. ft. for one bedrooms units, and 741 sq. ft. for two bedroom units.
 - F. Common areas (exclusive of corridors, entrance vestibules and hallways) that are incidental to and/or enhance any primary use shall be provided and shall amount to a minimum of 50 square feet per dwelling unit or bed in the facility. Such facilities may include, but are not limited to, recreational rooms, meeting or social rooms, common kitchen areas, exercise facilities, laundry areas, or storage rooms for the use of residents. In compliance, based on 100 beds 5,000 sq. ft. is required and 7,960 sq. ft. is proposed.

Refer to the table below for the zoning and existing and future land use designations for the proposed site and surrounding parcels.

	Zoning	Existing Land Use	Future Land Use
Proposed Site	R-4 One-Family Residential w/ FB-2 Flex Business Overlay	Vacant	Business/Flexible Use 2
North	R-4 One-Family Residential w/ FB-2 Flex Business Overlay	vacant	Business/Flexible Use 2
South	O-1 Office Business w/ FB-3 Flex Business Overlay	Bordines	Business/Flexible Use 3
East	R-4 One-Family Residential w/ FB-2 Flex Business Overlay	vacant	Business/Flexible Use 2
West	R-4 One Family Residential	Avon Hills Village subdivision	Residential 4

2. **Dimension, Design and Building Standards** (Section 138-8.400-402 and 138-8.500-502). Refer to the table below as it relates to the area, setback, and building requirements of this project as proposed in the FB overlay district.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Front Yard Setback (Rochester Rd.) Arterial: 15 ft. min./25 ft. max.	16.57 ft.	In compliance
Front Yard Setback (north) Main: 0 ft. min./7 ft. max.	1-2 ft.	In compliance
Front Yard Setback (east) Minor: 5 ft. min./ 20 ft. max.	84+ ft.	As proposed, the PC would need to modify these setback requirements as described in c. below
Min. Bldg. Frontage Build-To Area (Rochester Rd.) Arterial: 40%	Aprox. 20%	As proposed, the PC would need to modify this requirement as described in c. below
Min. Bldg. Frontage Build-To Area (north) Main: 90%	Aprox. 33%	
Min. Bldg. Frontage Build-To Area (east) Minor: 70%	0%	
Side Yard Interior Setback (south) 0 ft. min./max.	27.36 ft.	In compliance
Max. Height 30 ft./ 2 stories	29 ft. 8.5 in./2 stories	In compliance
Min. Facade Transparency Ground floor, non-residential use: 25% Upper floor, non-residential use: 20%	All facades, all floors: 25%+	In compliance
Building Materials Primary Materials: 60% min. Accent Materials: 40% max.	Primary: cultured stone & textured fiber cement siding & shake: 99%S, 76%W, 88%N, 97%E Accent: fiber cement panels: 1%S, 24%W, 12%N, 3%E	In compliance

- a. As proposed, the site contains a main street that straddles the northern property line to connect to a future north/south road. As the first development in this area, this project will set the stage for future development north of this property. As proposed, the site provides maximum flexibility for a future road traveling north/south to be developed as desired by the property owners to the north to eventually connect to Eddington Blvd.
- b. The proposed building has been designed in accordance with the "Lawn Frontage" building standards identified in Section 138-8.500.D.
- c. The Planning Commission has the ability to modify Flex Business Overlay District regulations upon a determination that the requested modifications:
 - 1) Meet the intent of the FB district.
 - 2) That evidence has been submitted demonstrating that compliance with the standard makes development impractical.
 - 3) Will not make future adjacent development impractical.
 - 4) Is the smallest modification necessary.
 - 5) Will permit innovative design.

3. **Exterior Lighting** (Section 138-10.200-204). A photometric plan showing the location and intensity of exterior lighting has been provided. Refer to the table below as it relates to the lighting requirements for this project.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Shielding/Glare Lighting shall be fully shielded & directed downward at a 90° angle Fixtures shall incorporate full cutoff housings, louvers, glare shields, optics, reflectors or other measures to prevent off-site glare & minimize light pollution Only flat lenses are permitted on light fixtures; sag or protruding lenses are prohibited	19 pole mounted fixtures with full cut offs, side shields & flat lenses	In compliance

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Max. Intensity (measured in footcandles fc.) 10 fc. anywhere on-site, 1 fc. at ROW, & 0.5 fc. at any other property line	4.1 on-site, 1.3 along shared ROW & 0.5 along other property lines	In compliance, because the site is designed with roads straddling the property lines for future connectivity
Lamps Max. wattage of 250 watts per fixture LED or low pressure sodium for low traffic areas, LED, high pressure sodium or metal halide for parking lots	136 watt, LED fixtures	In compliance
Max. Height 20 ft., 15 ft. when within 50 ft. of residential	15 ft.	In compliance

4. **Street Design Standards and Parking** (138-11.300-308, Section 138-8.600 and Article 12). Refer to the table below as it relates to the street design, and parking requirements of this project as proposed.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Min. # Parking Spaces Assisted Living Facilities: 0.5 spaces per sleeping room=100 units=50 spaces	57 spaces	In compliance
Max. # Parking Spaces 125% of Min. = 63 spaces		
Min. Barrier Free Spaces 4 BF spaces 11 ft. in width w/ 5 ft. aisle for 51-75 parking spaces	4 spaces	In compliance
Min. Parking Space Dimensions 9 ft. x 18 ft. (employee spaces) 10 ft. x 18 ft. (customer spaces) 8.5 ft. x 22 ft. (parallel) 24 ft. aisle (two way)/ 12/15 ft. (one way)	10 ft. x 16+ ft., 8.5 ft. x 22 ft. (parallel) 24 ft. aisles	In compliance
Min. Parking Setback 10 ft. on all sides	10+ ft.	In compliance
Main Street Design (along north property line)		
Total Right-of-Way 76 -100 ft.	76 ft.	In compliance
Vehicle Zone 20 – 50 ft. width w/ 2-4 traffic lanes, 10 - 11 ft. wide, optional left turn lane & median	22.5 ft. w/ 2 traffic lanes	In compliance
On-Street Parking Zone Parallel (8 ft.) or angled (10 ft.)	Parallel spaces 8 ft. in width	In compliance
Pedestrian Zone (south side only) 2.5 ft. edge area, 3.5- 6 ft. furnishings area, 6-8 ft. walkway area, 0-2.5 ft. frontage area	2.5 ft. edge 4.5 ft. furnishings 6 ft. walkway 5+ ft. frontage	In compliance, with exception of frontage area, the PC would need to modify this requirement as described in 2.c. above
Street Tree Requirement 35 ft. o/c in tree grates	Refer to 8. below	
Minor Street Design (along east property line)		
Total Right-of-Way 58-76 ft.	76 ft.	In compliance
Vehicle Zone 20 - 22 ft. width w/ 2 traffic lanes, 10 -11 ft. wide, optional left turn lane	23 ft. w/ 2 traffic lanes	In compliance, with exception of vehicle zone width, the PC would need to modify this requirement as described in 2.c. above
On-Street Parking Zone Parallel (7-8 ft.)	Parallel spaces 8 ft. in width	In compliance
Pedestrian Zone (west side only) 2.5 ft. or lawn edge area, 3.5- 6 ft. or lawn furnishings area, 5-8 ft. walkway area, 2- 3 ft. frontage area	2.5 ft. edge 4.5 ft. furnishings 6 ft. walkway 125+ ft. frontage	In compliance, with exception of frontage area the PC would need to modify this requirement as described in 2.c. above
Street Tree Requirement 35 ft. o/c in tree grates or lawn	Refer to 8. below	

- a. The plans show off-site improvements including roads and associated retaining wall and detention. A letter dated December 8, 2015 signed by both the applicant and the owners of the property has been provided affirming that these lands are permitted to be developed as shown. Cross access easements as illustrated in the letter must be provided during construction plan review.
 - b. Sheet C2.0A depicts the site converting access into a right-in, right-out only access on Rochester Rd. that will be required if/when a connection is made internally to Eddington Blvd.
 - c. In an effort to improve pedestrian circulation, a bike rack and sidewalks into and throughout the site have been provided to connect to Rochester Rd. and to the future internal road, in addition to the pathway along Rochester Rd.
5. **Outdoor Amenity Space** (Section 138-8.601). All developments in the FB districts shall provide outdoor amenity spaces with a minimum area of 2% of the gross land area of the development, or roughly 3,075 sq. ft. for this project. A space has been provided at the northeast corner of the site, abutting Rochester Rd. that will include large boulder outcrops, plantings, and benches meeting ordinance requirements.
6. **Natural Features.** In addition to the comments below, refer to the review letters from the Engineering and Forestry Departments and City's wetland consultant that may pertain to natural features protection.
- a. **Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)** (Section 138-2.204.G) An EIS that meets ordinance requirements has been submitted.
 - b. **Natural Features Setback** (Section 138-9 Chapter 1). A 25 ft. natural features setback is required from any wetland or watercourse, and 458 linear feet of setback are proposed to be impacted therefore a natural features setback modification is required. Refer to the ASTI review letter dated January 27, 2016 for additional information.
 - c. **Steep Slopes** (Section 138-9 Chapter 2). The site does not contain any regulated steep slopes.
 - d. **Tree Removal** (Section 126 Natural Resources, Article III Tree Conservation). The site is subject to the City's tree conservation ordinance, therefore any healthy tree greater than 6" in caliper must be indicated on the plans. Any regulated tree that will be removed must be replaced with one tree credit. Trees that are dead or in poor condition need not be replaced. A tree survey has been provided indicating that four healthy regulated trees on-site (all along the southern property line) will be removed; therefore four tree credits are required and two 3" caliper trees (2 credits each) are being proposed.
 - e. **Wetlands** (Section 126 Natural Resources, Article IV Wetland and Watercourse Protection). The site contains regulated wetlands that are connected to the Honeywell Ditch, a regulated stream which will be both temporarily and permanently impacted and therefore a wetland use permit will be required. Refer to the ASTI review letter dated January 27, 2016 for additional information.
7. **Dumpster Enclosure** (Section 138-10.311). Two dumpster enclosures are proposed in the side yard, to be screened with a gate and masonry block wall to match the building in compliance with ordinances.
8. **Landscaping** (Section 138-8.602 and 138-12.100-308). A landscape plan signed and sealed by a registered landscape architect has been provided. Refer to the table on the following page as it relates to the landscape requirements for this project as proposed.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Right of Way (Rochester: 250 ft.) 1 deciduous per 35 ft. + 1 ornamental per 60 ft. = 7 deciduous + 4 ornamental	7 deciduous 4 ornamental	Plan is deficient by 7 deciduous & 12 evergreen, but is over by 2 ornamental & 3 shrubs, equating to a deficiency of 16 trees, which the plans indicate will be contributed to the tree fund (\$3,200)
Front Yard in FB District (Rochester: 250 ft.) Arterial: 10 ft. width + 2 deciduous + 4 ornamental + 12 shrubs per 100 ft. = 5 deciduous + 10 ornamental + 30 shrubs	5 deciduous 12 ornamental 33 shrubs	
Front Yard in FB District (north: approx. western 190 ft.) Main: None	None	
Front Yard in FB District (east: 250 ft.) Minor: 5 ft. width + 3 ornamental + 8 shrubs per 100 ft. = 8 ornamental + 20 shrubs	8 ornamental 20 shrubs	
Interior Street Trees (north: approx. 400 ft.) Main: 1 deciduous per 35 ft = 12 deciduous	7 deciduous	

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Interior Street Trees (east: 250 ft.) Minor: 1 deciduous per 35 ft = 7 deciduous	2 deciduous	
Buffer D (north: 615 ft.) 8 ft. width + 2.5 deciduous + 1.5 ornamental+ 5 evergreen + 8 shrubs per 100 ft. = 15 deciduous + 9 ornamental + 31 evergreen + 49 shrubs	30 deciduous 3 deciduous (existing) 22 ornamental 44 evergreen 94 shrubs	
Buffer D (east: 250 ft.) 8 ft. width + 2.5 deciduous + 1.5 ornamental+ 5 evergreen + 8 shrubs per 100 ft. = 6 deciduous + 4 ornamental + 13 evergreen + 20 shrubs		
Buffer B (south: 615 ft.) 10 ft. width + 2 deciduous + 1.5 ornamental+ 2 evergreen + 4 shrubs per 100 ft. = 12 deciduous + 9 ornamental + 12 evergreen + 25 shrubs		
Parking Lot: Interior 5% of parking lot + 1 deciduous per 150 sq. ft. landscape area = 2,545 sq. ft. + 17 deciduous	5,893 sq. ft. 17 deciduous	
Parking Lot: Perimeter (facing Rochester Rd: aprox. 110 ft.) 1 deciduous per 25 ft. + 1 ornamental per 35 ft.+ continuous shrub hedge = 4 deciduous + 3 ornamental + 43 shrubs	4 deciduous 3 ornamental 43 shrubs	
TOTAL	75 deciduous 3 deciduous (existing) 49 ornamental 44 evergreen 190 shrubs	

- a. If required trees cannot fit be planted due to infrastructure or spacing conflicts, a payment in lieu of may be made to the City's tree fund at a rate of \$200 per tree, which equates to \$3,200 for this site.
 - b. An irrigation plan must be submitted prior to staff approval of the final site plan.
9. **Architectural Design** (*Architectural Design Standards*). The proposed building is generally designed in accordance with the City's Architectural Design Standards. The building consists of a mixture of cultured stone and textured fiber cement siding and shake, with fiber cement panels as an accent and an asphalt shingle roof. Staff recommends having building material/color samples available for the Planning Commission meeting.
 10. **Signs.** (*Section 138-8.603*). A proposed monument sign is indicated on the plans. A note has been added to the plans that states that all signs must meet *Section 138-8.603* and *Chapter 134* of the City Code of Ordinances and be approved under a separate permit issued by the Building Department.



From: Craig McEwen, Building Inspector/Plan Reviewer *CPH*
To: Sara Roediger, Planning Department
Date: February 1, 2016
Re: Stonecrest at Rochester Hills
Sidwell: 15-23-300-035 (part of)
City File: 15-019

The site plan review for the above reference project was based on the following drawings and information submitted:

Sheets: C-0.0, 1.0, 2.0, 2.0A, 2.1, 2.3, 3.0, L-1, T-1, G-1, G-2, SK0, SK1, SK6, SK7

Approval recommended based on the following items being address on the permit documents or next submission.

Section references are based on the Michigan Building Code 2012.

Civil Drawings

1. Accessible parking including parking and access aisle surface slope details:
 - a. Indicate the proposed surfaces slopes of accessible parking spaces and their access aisles. Provide sufficient point elevations on the plan at the perimeter of such spaces to clearly verify the provisions of ICC A117.1-2009, Section 502.5 have been satisfied (1:48 max slope).
2. Exterior accessible route including slope details -
 - a. Provide sufficient grade information (point elevations) on the plans along the proposed accessible route/routes to verify compliance with the requirements of ICC/ANSI A117.1-2009, Section 402.
 - b. Provide details (as applicable) of the following components along the proposed accessible route/routes to verify compliance with ICC/ANSI A117.1-2009:
 - i. Door maneuvering clearance and ground surface slope per Section 404.
 - ii. Curb Ramps per Section 406.
3. Indicate the required accessible loading zone per Section 1106.7.2. Provide details on size and surface slopes with sufficient point elevations to comply with A117.1 Section 503.4.
4. Provide sufficient grade information on the plan to verify compliance with Section 1804.3 for site grading away from the building (2% minimum).

Architectural Drawings

1. The building has multiple uses (B, A-2, I-2, S-1, S-2) and as a result has more than one Occupancy Classification. Please list all Occupancy Classifications in the code summary.
 - a. Identify if these mixed uses are to be considered, accessory, separated, non-separated or combination of all three. See Section 508.

If there are any questions, please call the Building Department at 248-656-4615. Office hours are 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday.

Mailing Address:
P.O. Box 2160
Brighton, MI 48116-2160800 395-ASTI
Fax: 810.225.3800

www.asti-env.com

January 27, 2016

Sara Roediger
Department of Planning and
Economic Development
City of Rochester Hills
1000 Rochester Hills Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309-3033

**Subject: File No. 15-019 Stonecrest at Rochester Hills;
Wetland Use Permit Review #3;
Plans received by the City of Rochester Hills on
January 20, 2016**

Applicant: NP Senior Living Dev., LLC

Dear Ms. Roediger:

The above referenced project proposes to construct one building for use as a senior living facility on approximately 4.5 acres of land. The site is located along the east side of Rochester Road, north of Hamlin Road, and south of Avon Road. The site includes wetland and a watercourse regulated by the City of Rochester Hills and likely the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ).

ASTI has reviewed the site plans received by the City on January 20, 2016 (Current Plans) for conformance to the Wetland and Watercourse Protection Ordinance and the Natural Features Setback Ordinance and offers the following comments for your consideration.

COMMENTS

1. **Applicability of Chapter (§126-500).** The Wetland and Watercourse Protection Ordinance is applicable to the subject site because the subject site is not included within a site plan which has received final approval, or a preliminary subdivision plat which received approval prior to January 17, 1990, which approval remains in effect and in good standing and the proposed activity has not been previously authorized.
2. **Wetland and Watercourse Determinations (§126-531).** This Section lists specific requirements for completion of a Wetland and Watercourse Boundary Determination.

- a. This review has been undertaken in the context of a Wetland and Watercourse Boundary Determination previously completed by the applicant's wetland consultant, which was confirmed in the field by ASTI on November 17, 2015. The on-site wetland is directly connected to the Honeywell Ditch, which is a regulated stream under Part 301, therefore making the on-site wetland regulated by the City and likely the DEQ. It is ASTI's opinion that the on-site wetland is of low-quality, floristically and in function. ASTI did not inspect the wetland boundaries outside what is shown within the project area on the Current Plans. The applicant should be advised that wetland delineations are only considered valid by the DEQ and the City for a period of three years.
3. **Use Permit Required (§126-561).** This Section establishes general parameters for activity requiring permits, as well as limitations on nonconforming activity. This review of the Current Plans has been undertaken in the context of those general parameters, as well as the specific requirements listed below.
 - a. A DEQ Part 303 and a Part 301 Permit and a Wetland Use Permit from the City are required for this project as proposed on the Current Plans. Once applicable permits are obtained from the DEQ by the applicant, they must be submitted to the City for review. A letter from the Oakland County Water Resources Commissioner (OCWRC) stating that the portion of the Honeywell Ditch associated with the project is not an Oakland County Drain and is thus, not under the jurisdiction of the OCWRC, was submitted in a previous review. This is to ASTI's satisfaction.
 4. **Use Permit Approval Criteria (§126-565).** This Section lists criteria that shall govern the approval or denial of an application for a Wetland Use Permit. The following items must be addressed on a revised and dated Wetland Use Permit application and additional documentation submitted for further review:
 - a. A sheet depicting all wetlands and watercourses on-site and all impacts to on-site wetlands and watercourses is required. All wetland impacts are shown on the Current Plans to ASTI's satisfaction.
 - b. The on-site wetland north and south of the Honeywell Ditch is shown to ASTI's satisfaction on the Current Plans within the project area.
 - c. The Current Plans show that 1,760 square feet of permanent wetland impacts will result to the wetland in the northern portion of the site from the construction of a portion of the proposed drive and site grading. The wetland proposed to be

impacted is of low ecological quality and the impacts are minor. Therefore, ASTI recommends the City allow for a Wetland Use Permit for these impacts. However, these areas of wetland impacts are in very close proximity to the Honeywell Ditch. To ensure no further impacts occur to the on-site wetland or the Honeywell Ditch as a result of development in this area, ASTI previously recommended a retaining wall or some similar structure be constructed along the edge of the proposed grading limits, which would minimize any unplanned impacts to the on-site wetland and Honeywell Ditch in this area. The Current Plans show a retaining wall in the northern portion of the area of wetland impacts, which is to ASTI's satisfaction.

- d. The Current Plans show that approximately 4,890 square feet of temporary wetland impacts will result to the wetland in the northern portion of the site from site grading activities. The wetland proposed to be impacted is of low ecological quality and the impacts are temporary and minor. Therefore, ASTI recommends the City allow for a Wetland Use Permit for these impacts. However, these areas of wetland impacts are in very close proximity to the Honeywell Ditch and best management practices must be followed to ensure no unplanned impacts to the Honeywell Ditch or adjacent wetland will occur as a result of these activities. Any temporary impact areas must be restored to original grade with original soils or equivalent soils and seeded with a City-approved wetland seed mix. This is noted on the Current Plans to ASTI's satisfaction.
- e. The Current Plans note that no impacts to the Honeywell Ditch or adjacent wetland will result from the proposed directional drilling associated with the proposed water main connection in the northeastern portion of the site. This is to ASTI's satisfaction. However, the applicant is advised that a DEQ permit will still be required for the directional drilling.

5. **Natural Features Setback (§21.23).** This Section establishes the general requirements for Natural Features Setbacks and the review criteria for setback reductions and modifications.

- a. The current plans now show the Natural Features Setback area on the north and south side of the Honeywell Ditch and all Natural Features area are labeled as such. Moreover, all impacts to Natural Features Setback areas are stated in linear feet. This is all to ASTI's satisfaction.
- b. The Current Plans indicate that 458 linear feet of Natural Features Setback will be permanently impacted in the northeastern portion of the site from the construction of the proposed drive and site grading. The Natural Features

Setback in this area is of low ecological quality and ASTI recommends the City allow for a Natural Features modification for these actions.

- c. The Current Plans note that no impacts to any Natural Features Setback will occur as a result of the proposed directional drilling associated with the proposed water main connection in the northeastern portion of the site. This is to ASTI's satisfaction.

RECOMMENDATIONS

ASTI recommends the City approve the Current plans on the condition that the appropriate DEQ permits, as detailed in Comment 3.a, are obtained and submitted to the City for review.

Respectfully submitted,

ASTI ENVIRONMENTAL



Kyle Hottinger
Wetland Ecologist



Dianne Martin
Director, Resource Assessment & Mgmt.
Professional Wetland Scientist #1313



DPS/Engineering
Allan E. Schneck, P.E., Director

From: Jason Boughton, AC *JRB*
To: Sara Roediger, Manager of Planning
Date: January 26, 2016
Re: Stonecrest at Rochester Hills, City File #15-019, Section #23
Site Plan Review #3

Engineering Services has reviewed the site plan received by the Department of Public Services on January 21, 2016 for the above referenced project. Engineering Services **does** recommend site plan approval with the following comments:

Sanitary Sewer

1. Update the sanitary sewer basis of design to use a peaking factor of 4.0

Traffic

1. It is understood that a grading easement is being pursued by the owner regarding the physical road connection to Bordines. However, the physical connection needs to be shown on the plans with any necessary grading easements.
2. Prior to LIP issuance the requirement should be revised to "Upon the completion of the realignment of Eddington Boulevard with Drexelgate Parkway and the installation of a traffic signal, **the owner of Parcel "A" associated with tax parcel 15-23-300-035** shall reconstruct the existing full access drive approach to a right-in/right-out within 90 days." Also, this language must be adopted into the deed restrictions or similar document prior to LIP issuance.

The applicant will need to submit for a Land Improvement Permit (LIP) application with engineer's estimate, fee and construction plans to get the construction plan review process started.

JRB/jf

c: Allan E. Schneck, P.E., Director; DPS
Paul Davis, P.E., City Engineer/Deputy Director; DPS
Tracey Balint, P.E., Public Utilities Engineer; DPS
File

Paul Shumejko, MBA, MS, P.E., PTOE, Transportation Engineer; DPS
Keith Depp, Staff Engineer; DPS
Sheryl McIsaac, Office Coordinator; DPS
Sandi DiSipio; Planning & Development Dept.

i:\eng\priv\15019 stonecrest at rochester hills\eng site plan review 3.doc



DPS/Engineering
Allan E. Schneck, P.E., Director

From: Michael Taunt / Survey Tech
To: Sara Roediger, Manager of Planning
Date: January 11, 2016
Re: Stonecrest at Rochester Hills, City File #15-019, Section #23
Legal Review #2

RE: site plans received December 23, 2015

Sheet C-1.0

Please reconcile west property line and 75' 1/2 ROW.

Provide legible copy of Liber1179 P15 O.C.R. (Reference: Note on plat of Eddington Farms sheet 1 "DEEDED TO M.S.H. COM BY E.M.R.R., 5-24-39 L1179 P15 to 27 INCLUSIVE OAKLAND COUNTY RECOREDS")

*Does the applicant intend to split parcel 15-23-30-035 to create Parcel "A"?

Sheet C-2.0

*Site improvements outside Parcel "A" will require appropriate easements.

Sheet c-3.0

*Provide easement agreements and exhibits in recordable form for water main.

*Provide storm system maintenance agreement and exhibits in recordable form.

* Note: carryover from review #1, the applicant has acknowledged comments and intends to address the issue during construction document phase.



To: Sara Roediger
From: Gerald Lee
Date: February 1, 2016
Re: Stonecrest at Rochester Hills
Review #3
File No. 15-019

Forestry review pertains to public right-of-way (r/w) tree issues only.

Landscape Plan, Sheet L-1

The applicant needs to show the 15' corner clearance triangle, with the apex of the triangle on the east (private) side of the pathway and the driveway intersection, on both sides of the driveway. The base line of the triangle needs to extend from curb to curb. Several trees and shrubs, on each side of the driveway, will need to have their locations adjusted or be deleted.

Please call if you need additional clarification (248-656-4673).

Please add an additional sentence to the City of Rochester Hills Tree Planting Restrictions: Trees must be planted at least 15' away from curb or road edge where the speed limit is more than 35 mph. Please see below for the current wording of the entire statement:

Prior approval is required to plant any tree or shrub on the public right-of-way. All trees and shrubs must be planted at least 10' from the edge of the public road. (Trees must be planted at least 15' away from curb or road edge where the speed limit is more than 35 mph.) Shade trees and shrubs must be planted at least 5' from the edge of the public walkway. Evergreen and ornamental trees must be planted at least 10' from the edge of the public walkway. No trees or shrubs may be planted within the triangular area formed at the intersection of any street right-of-way lines at a distance along each line of 25' from their point of intersection. No trees or shrubs may be planted in the triangular area formed at the intersection of any driveway with a public walkway at a distance along each line of 15' from their point of intersection. All trees and shrubs must be planted at least 10' from any fire hydrant. Shade and evergreen trees must be at least 15' away from the nearest overhead wire. Trees must be planted a minimum of 5' from an underground utility, unless the city's Landscape Architect requires a greater distance.

Prior to the release of the performance bond, the City of Rochester Hills Forestry Division needs to inspect all trees, existing or planted, to identify any that pose a hazard to the safe use of the public right-of-way. Forestry may require the developer to remove, and possibly replace, any such trees.

These requirements are incorporated into the plan.

GL/cf

cc: Maureen Gentry, Planning Assistant



WATER RESOURCES COMMISSIONER

Jim Nash

RECEIVED

November 30, 2015

DEC 1 2015

Ms. Sara Roediger, Manager of Planning
Planning and Economic Development
City of Rochester Hills
1000 Rochester Hills Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309

PLANNING DEPT.

Reference: **Stonecrest at Rochester Hills**
Part of the Southwest ¼ of Section 23, City of Rochester Hills

Dear Ms. Roediger:

This office has received one (1) set of plans for the referenced project which were submitted for review.

Our review indicates that the proposed project has no direct involvement with any legally established County Drain under the jurisdiction of this office. Therefore, a storm drainage permit will not be required from this office. However, the project does lie within the Rewold and Honeywell Drainage Districts and runoff shall be restricted to 0.2 cfs/acre. It shall be the responsibility of the local municipality, in their review and approval of the site plan, to ensure compliance with their runoff and detention requirements.

The sanitary sewer is within the Clinton-Oakland Sewage District System. Proposed sewers of 8" or greater will require City approved construction plans be submitted to this office.

Please note that, permits, approvals or clearances from federal, state or local authorities and public utilities and private property owners must be obtained as applicable.

Related earth disruption must conform to applicable requirements of Part 91, Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control of the Natural Resource and Environmental Protection Act, Act 451 of the Public Acts of 1994. **An application for the required soil erosion permit shall be submitted to this office.**

If there are any questions regarding this matter, please contact Paul Gibbs at 248-858-1329.

Sincerely,

Glenn R. Appel, P.E.
Chief Engineer

GRA/pg

