



Rochester Hills

Minutes - Draft

Planning Commission

1000 Rochester Hills Dr
Rochester Hills, MI
48309
(248) 656-4600
Home Page:
www.rochesterhills.org

Chairperson William Boswell, Vice Chairperson Deborah Brnabic
Members: Gerard Dettloff, Greg Hooper, Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Stephanie Morita,
David A. Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Emmet Yukon

Tuesday, March 15, 2016

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairperson Deborah Brnabic called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. in the Auditorium.

ROLL CALL

Present 7 - Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis, Stephanie Morita, David Reece and C. Neall Schroeder

Absent 2 - William Boswell and Emmet Yukon

Quorum present.

Also present: Ed Anzek, Director of Planning and Economic Dev.
Sara Roediger, Manager of Planning
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2016-0091](#) February 16, 2016 Regular Meeting

A motion was made by Hooper, seconded by Schroeder, that this matter be Approved as Amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece and Schroeder

Absent 2 - Boswell and Yukon

COMMUNICATIONS

- A) *Planning & Zoning News dated February 2016*
- B) *Letter from B. Savidant, dated Feb. 29, 2016 re: Proposed Troy Master Plan*
- C) *Email from T. Watson, dated Mar. 14, 2016 re: 2860 and 2880 Crooks Rd.*

NEW BUSINESS

2016-0092

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 15-016 - Star Batt Buildings, two proposed commercial/office buildings totaling 28,538 square feet, including Building A at 11,999 square feet and Building B at 16,539 square feet on 3.54 acres located between Avon Industrial and M-59 on the west side of Crooks (part of the Star Batt Condominium), zoned B-3, Shopping Center Business, Parcel Nos. 15-29-276-011 and -013, Star Batt, Inc., Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Sara Roediger, dated March 11, 2016 and site plans had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Steve Stolaruk, Star Batt Inc., 1928 Star Batt, Rochester Hills, MI 48309 and Peter D'Aleo, D'Anna Associates, 1055 South Boulevard E., Suite 200, Rochester Hills, MI 48307.

Ms. Roediger summarized that the request was for site plan approval of two single-story, multi-tenant buildings in the B-3 zoning district. The buildings (Buildings A and B) were spec and totaled 28,538 square feet. The site plan was reviewed by all applicable departments and was recommended for approval with some conditions as noted in the staff report. The applicant had provided colored elevations for consideration, but no tenants had been identified yet. She added that any potential tenant would have to comply with the uses permitted in B-3. She advised that there would be two driveways off of Avon Industrial. She pointed out the recently built Taco Bell property on Crooks, which was adjacent to the subject project. There was a curb cut off of Crooks, which was under the jurisdiction of the Road Commission, and they had limited access to the Taco Bell site from the proposed site because of the turn movements on Crooks. If the site were to be connected, the Road Commission would insist upon a right in right out only driveway, and the applicant did not wish to pursue that option. There was some discussion about cross access to the car wash to the east and the bowling alley to the west. Staff met with the applicant and the neighboring property owners, and there was no interest on behalf of anyone to provide cross access. Ms. Roediger did not feel that there would be much benefit from cross trips recognizing the types of uses they were. People usually went to the car wash for a car wash, for example, and they were both destination sites. Staff recommended the continuation of the sidewalk interior to the site. When the Taco Bell site was developed, a sidewalk was created to the subject property. The applicant proposed a sidewalk along the frontage of Avon Industrial, but staff continued to recommend an interior connection to the sidewalk that existed. The site showed a future phase which was not part

of the current review. That portion was south of the Taco Bell, and the applicant proposed a building site in the future, but the plans showed how circulation would connect and how parking would be an extension of the current site plan if pursued in the future. The applicant was requesting approval for Buildings A and B only. She said that she would be happy to answer any questions.

Vice Chairperson Brnabic asked the applicants if they had anything to add. Mr. D'Aleo noted that the connection of the sidewalk between Avon Industrial to the Taco Bell site was not shown because the owner was concerned that it would disturb the car wash. The owner had agreed to install it, however.

Mr. Kaltsounis noted that the proposed building site to the south was cross hatched, and he confirmed that it would not be part of their review. He noticed that part of the building was outside of the cross hatch. Ms. Roediger agreed, and said that the intention was to build Buildings A and B only. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the applicant owned the property, which was confirmed. He asked if there would just be a curb line, noting that there were some details for paths shown that cut in at the very south. He wondered if there would be details laid out to allow it to happen or if there would just be a piece of property with a curb. Ms. Roediger assumed that the applicant would pave up to the edge of the future parking. It would probably be a seeded lawn area that would be open space.

Mr. Hooper noted that on sheet L-1, improvements were shown to the excepted parcel, but he wanted to confirm that it would not be part of the packet. Ms. Roediger agreed, and said that there were some communications with the Landscape Architect after the plans were submitted, and staff would work with him to clarify the limits. They would not be building in the triangle until the future. Mr. Hooper said that when it did come back, he would like to see details for the boulder wall. Mr. Hooper agreed with the summation, and the applicant had agreed, about adding the pedestrian access from Avon Industrial to the internal connection.

Mr. Schroeder said that the floor plans showed only one bathroom in each building of five units. Mr. D'Aleo said that it was just shown as an example of one unit. Depending upon the layout and how it would be divided, they would install bathrooms in each. Mr. Schroeder clarified that the plumbing would be available to the building.

Mr. Kaltsounis thanked the applicants for not putting in a drive-thru, which

he lamented the Commissioners had seen a lot of late. He referred to the row of 11 parking spaces east of Building B that had islands at the north and south ends. There was a detail showing a double line at the east end of the parking spots. He wondered if someone could drive over the lines or if there would be parking blocks. He could imagine cars pulling into the drive. Ms. Roediger thought that there should be a designated curb. The islands on the north and south would be curbed, landscape islands. She believed that there would be a curb to separate the line of travel from the parking. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if there could be an issue if cars went over the curb into the street. Ms. Roediger said it would not be any different than any other parking that had bumper blocks, which were there to stop cars. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if there would be fire trucks going over, and Ms. Roediger disagreed. She advised that the vehicular lanes met all turning radiuses and widths for fire trucks.

Mr. Anzek mentioned a good example at University Square at Walton and Adams where there was a "stop by paint." At the north parking line, it was painted, and there was a dual drive in both directions north of it. It was very well self-policed. He used that center frequently, and cars were very respectful of the painted area, and it was also beneficial for snow plowing. Mr. Kaltsounis would like to see the details - whether it would be painted or have a curb. Mr. Anzek suggested that it could start with paint, and if there was a problem, they could add a curb. Mr. Kaltsounis suggested that he would make that a condition of approval.

Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Kaltsounis moved the following, seconded by Mr. Schroeder:

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schroeder, in the matter of City File No. 15-016 (Star Batt Buildings), the Planning Commission **approves the Site Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on February 12, 2016, with the following five (5) findings and subject to the following six (6) conditions.

Findings

1. The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that all applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as other City Ordinances, standards, and requirements, can be met subject to the conditions noted below.
2. The proposed project will be accessed from Avon Industrial, thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic on adjoining streets.
3. Off-street parking areas have been designed to avoid common traffic

- problems and promote safety.*
4. *The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.*
 5. *The proposed development will not have an unreasonably detrimental or injurious effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the site or those of the surrounding area.*

Conditions

1. *Addition of a sidewalk into the site off of the Avon Industrial Dr. pathway to connect to the sidewalk at the Taco Bell development.*
2. *Work with staff to finalize the landscape plan in accordance with ordinance requirements.*
3. *Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, prior to final approval by staff.*
4. *Provide a cost estimate for the landscaping, plus inspection fees, as adjusted as necessary by staff, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit for this development.*
5. *Provide an irrigation plan and cost estimate, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
6. *Add detail for the 11 parking spaces east of Building B showing paint or curbs, to be approved by staff prior to final approval.*

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schroeder, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece and Schroeder

Absent 2 - Boswell and Yukon

Vice Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously, and she thanked the applicants.

2016-0115

Request for a Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 99-027.2 - Fox Automotive, for the removal and replacement of as many as seven regulated trees associated with the demolition of a building and construction of a two-story, 25,697 square-foot building addition to create a 39,035 square-foot joint Toyota and VW dealership on 5.1 acres located at 755 S. Rochester Rd. at the southeast corner of Rochester Rd. and Arlington Dr. (north of Avon), zoned B-3, Shopping Center Business, Parcel No. 15-14-351-060, John Fox, Applicant
(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Sara Roediger, dated March 11, 2016 and site plans had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were John Fox, Fox Automotive, 755 Rochester Rd., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 and Peter Stuhlreyer, Designhaus, 301 Walnut, Rochester, MI 48307.

Ms. Roediger advised that staff had been working with the applicant for the past few months. She noted that the site currently had two separate buildings - a Toyota dealership and a Volkswagen dealership. The Toyota dealership was the northernmost building that was at the corner of Arlington and Rochester Rd. It was a nonconforming building, and it blocked some line of sight turning off of Arlington Dr. The applicant would demo that building and add on to the Volkswagen building. She explained that the property was zoned B-3, Shopping Center Business with an FB-3 Overlay, and that the FB Overlay did not allow automotive dealerships, so the project was being developed under the B-3 standards. She advised that the applicant went before the Zoning Board of Appeals the previous week and received a Variance to allow parking of vehicles in the front yard. She showed elevations of what the finished project would look like. It would function as one building for both brands, and there would be a joint service area for Toyota and VW. In terms of the site plan, seven regulated trees would be removed, and the applicant would pay the tree credits into the City's Tree Fund. She worked with the applicant to keep the existing trees along Arlington. Staff had requested, and the applicant was adding a sidewalk to connect to the pathway on Rochester Rd. to the neighborhood to the east. She mentioned a finding in the motion regarding the side yard setback request. The Planning Commission had the ability to waive the requirement based on the surrounding properties. The Shelton dealership was to the south up to the property line on Rochester Rd., and there was another dealership to the north. Staff felt it was a reasonable request as the applicant was adding a sidewalk, and staff recommended waiving the side yard parking setbacks for the site. She concluded that staff recommended approval with some conditions, as the plan generally met all applicable regulations, and that she would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Stuhlreyer summarized that the Toyota dealership was in a nonconforming position on the northwest corner of the site, and it had become generally obsolete. The Toyota corporate office had been interacting with Mr. Fox and attempting to come up with a new, more customer-friendly environment for the Toyota dealership. Mr. Fox had been interacting with the City to try to make the building less nonconforming. Mr. Stuhlreyer commented that it took a lot of work to get Volkswagen and Toyota to appreciate a conjoined dealership where the

service drop-off and service areas were combined, but the showrooms and the entrances would be separate with their own identities. They felt that it was a win-win situation. There were some points of relief they were asking, in terms of storage and display of cars and for the setback waiver to make the project work. He added that most important was flow, safety and the customer feel.

Mr. Fox indicated that Mr. Stuhlreyer had done a good job in spelling out some of the trials and tribulations they had in getting things approved through both manufacturers. There would be one large rectangle to handle both brands' service and parts departments. There would be two portals in the front that would represent the two showrooms for new cars. On the north side of the building would be lanes where customers would pull in for service.

Mr. Hooper said that he did not have an issue waiving the setback requirements for parking, and he thought it was a good move to add the sidewalk. He noticed that the chain link fence along Arlington would be removed, and he asked if it would be replaced. Mr. Fox said that if they removed the chain link fence, they would need to put cement stantions in to prevent theft, but he thought the Ordinance required them to have a chain link fence. Ms. Roediger advised that a fence was not required. Mr. Hooper commented that he did not need to see a fence. Mr. Fox said that he would have to look at the pros and cons and make a decision. Mr. Hooper reminded that it would be part of the site plan, so they would need to know.

Mr. Hooper recalled that about 13 years ago when the VW dealership was built, he had talked about removing the barb wire, which was done. He observed that for presentation purposes driving down Arlington, that it would be a good idea to remove the barb wire from the Chevy dealership fence. It was not tied to the masonry wall behind it, and it did not provide any security. People could just jump over the swing gates on the driveway if they wanted. He did not think that the barb wire served any purpose at all. Mr. Fox responded that he did not even know there was barb wire there, and he did not have a problem removing it. Mr. Hooper noted that the chain link fence behind the Toyota and VW dealerships had barb wire as well. It abutted residential, and he did not know if it was for security, but the fence was so old that the trees behind it were pushing the fence. Mr. Hooper asked if there was a real need to have the barb wire there, noting that he was not trying to infringe on their security for the vehicles. Mr. Fox said that he would look at it, but he felt that there was more of a security issue with the residential behind it. They had issues in

the past with kids and vandalism, so he thought they might want to leave it the way it was. Mr. Hooper said that he would appreciate at least removing the barb wire along Arlington and replacing it with cement stantions. Mr. Fox mentioned that behind the Chevy dealership, about every six feet there was a cement pole to prevent people from stealing a car and driving it off the lawn.

Mr. Hooper asked if they would mirror the stantions that were already out there for the Chevrolet dealership, and Ms. Roediger agreed. Mr. Hooper suggested a condition that staff received a detail of the stantions as part of the plan.

Mr. Hooper asked Mr. Fox if he would be willing to remove the fence along with the barb wire on the Chevy side, realizing that it was not part of the submitted site plan. Mr. Fox said that would add an extra cost to add cement stantions on the Chevy side.

Mr. Schroeder asked if it was difficult to get the two dealerships to agree to the joint use. Mr. Fox remarked that it was very much like oil and water. There were two years of negotiations.

Mr. Kaltsounis noted that the stantions on the Chevy side went to the front lobby, not all the way down the street. Regarding the barb wire and the fencing, he observed that evergreen trees on Arlington were actually going right through it. He suggested that they could try to tidy that area.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked what could be done about the rear elevation of the building that the neighbors would look at. He asked if there was a different color or brick they could add or an accent band. He felt that the back of the building looked like a jail wall.

Mr. Fox said that anything additional would add to the cost, and he pointed out that their view would be much nicer when the building was completed. The current building was built in 1955. Mr. Kaltsounis noted that there was some distance and there were trees, but the building would be closer. Mr. Stuhlreyer said that the screening was quite robust, and there was a wood fence and trees. He did not think the neighbors would get a solid view of the back of the building very often because of the visual interference.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the City would still require the Scion sign shown on in the submittal (Scion had gone away per Mr. Stuhlreyer). Mr. Anzek advised that signs were decorative in nature and were controlled under a

separate Ordinance, which was not part of the Zoning Ordinance. Signs were never an issue for the Commission.

Mr. Kaltsounis noted that a lighted front around the Toyota sign was proposed. It was hard to tell from the plans what would be lighted and what would not be. He knew that the Taco Bell on Livernois had a lighted purple area behind it. He thought that as technology changed, the Planning Commission might need to take up the matter of lighted fronts of buildings. Ms. Roediger asked if he was talking about the actual elevation, which Mr. Kaltsounis confirmed. He referred to sheet A-200, which talked about a backlit panel white. He assumed that was not one panel but the entire front panel. He was not sure if he liked lit panels on buildings or not, and they were starting to see a lot of them.

Mr. Anzek said that it was somewhat of an aesthetic call. The Taco Bell did present their lit façade as part of their renderings. He said that it was not an issue for him when it was done tastefully.

Mr. Stuhldreier advised that the façade did not change colors or blink, and it was not colorful. During the day it would be white and during the night, it would glow gently. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the whole middle portion that was raised with the words Toyota and Fox would be a lit panel. Mr. Stuhldreier agreed.

Mr. Reece noted there was a retaining wall shown along Arlington. It looked like it would run east down Arlington about 2/3 of the site, and he asked if it then ended. It was hard to tell how far it would actually run along Arlington. He wondered why there was a retaining wall there. There was a note at Arlington and Rochester Rd. that talked about a retaining wall with railing 30" plus or minus maximum height. He suggested that if there was a retaining wall there, there would not be a need to put in concrete stantions to keep people from driving off.

Mr. Stuhldreier advised that the retaining wall would be higher towards Rochester Rd. and it would dissipate with the grade. He stated that it was not major and only about knee high at its highest. Mr. Reece asked if there was a section cut for the wall and what the materials would be. Mr. Stuhldreier said that it would match the other Fox Automotive retention wall across the street, which was much higher. It would be Versa-Lok - a gray block. Mr. Reece suggested having a detail prepared for staff approval.

Mr. Reece asked if the block wall on the east elevation would be painted.

Mr. Stuhldreier agreed it would be a painted block. Mr. Reece asked if it would be a standard CMU rather than split face CMU, which Mr. Stuhldreier confirmed.

Mr. Hooper said that further to the lighting, something similar was done at Jo-Ann Fabrics. There was a band of a solid color on top. He did not object to what the applicant was proposing. Mr. Reece agreed that along Rochester Rd. it would be fine

Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Schroeder moved the following, seconded by Mr. Reece:

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Reece, in the matter of City File No. 99-027.2 (Fox Automotive Addition and Renovation), the Planning Commission grants a Tree Removal Permit, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on February 22, 2016, with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following two (2) conditions.

Findings

- 1. The proposed removal and replacement of regulated trees is in conformance with the Tree Conservation Ordinance.*
- 2. The applicant is proposing to replace seven regulated trees with seven tree credits.*

Conditions

- 1. Tree protective and silt fencing, as reviewed and approved by the City staff, shall be installed prior to issuance of the Land Improvement Permit.*
- 2. Should the applicant not be able to meet the tree replacement requirements on site the balance shall be paid into the City's Tree Fund.*

A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Reece, that this matter be Granted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece and Schroeder

Absent 2 - Boswell and Yukon

2000-0184

Request for Revised Site Plan Approval - City File No. 99-027.2 - Fox Automotive, a two-story, 25,697 square-foot building addition to create a 39,035 joint Toyota and VW dealership on 5.1 acres located at 755 S. Rochester Rd. at the southeast corner of Rochester Rd. and Arlington Dr. (north of Avon), zoned B-3, Shopping Center Business, Parcel No. 15-14-351-060, John Fox, Applicant

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Dettloff, in the matter of City File No. 99-027.2 (Fox Automotive Addition and Renovation), the Planning Commission **approves the Site Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on February 22, 2016, with the following eight (8) findings and subject to the following eight (8) conditions.

Findings

1. *The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that all applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as other City Ordinances, standards, and requirements, can be met subject to the conditions noted below.*
2. *The proposed project will be accessed from existing driveways on Rochester Rd. and Arlington Dr., thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic on adjoining streets. The addition of a sidewalk along Arlington Dr. improves non-motorized access in the area.*
3. *Off-street parking areas have been designed to avoid common traffic problems and promote safety.*
4. *The Zoning Board of Appeals granted a variance on March 9, 2016 to allow parking in the right-of-way front yard setback along Rochester Rd.*
5. *The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.*
6. *The proposed development will not have an unreasonably detrimental or injurious effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the site or those of the surrounding area.*
7. *The Planning Commission waives the parking lot landscape requirements along Rochester Rd., finding that the proposed landscape plan, including the preservation of existing trees along Arlington Dr., protects the character of the residential neighborhood and ensures compatibility with the surrounding and nearby land uses.*
8. *The Planning Commission waives the setbacks along the south and north sides of the property upon determining that the setbacks are not needed due to the compatibility with the adjacent property and the fact that the applicant plans to install a sidewalk to connect to the existing residential neighborhood and to preserve existing trees along Arlington.*

Conditions

1. Provide a landscape bond in the amount of \$7,400 plus inspection fees, as adjusted as necessary by staff, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit for this development.
2. Provide payment into the City's Tree Fund for trees that cannot be replaced on site in the amount of \$1,400, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.
3. Provide an irrigation plan cost estimate, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.
4. Add low perennials and/or shrubs along Rochester Rd. to provide some visual interest along this roadway, to be approved by staff prior to final approval.
5. Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, prior to final approval by staff.
6. Replace chain link fence along Arlington Dr. with cement stantions, the detail to be provided to staff prior to final approval by staff.
7. Remove the barb wire fence along Arlington Dr., prior to final approval by staff.
8. Provide staff with cross sections for the retaining wall located on Arlington and Rochester Rd., to match the wall at Bill Fox Chevrolet, prior to final approval by staff.

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Dettloff, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece and Schroeder

Absent 2 - Boswell and Yukon

After each motion, Vice Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously. Mr. Hooper thanked Mr. Fox for his continued investment in Rochester Hills.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

2016-0111

Request for Recommendation of a Planning Commission representative to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a one-year term to expire March 31, 2017.

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Reece, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby recommends to City Council that Deborah Brnabic shall serve as its representative on the Zoning Board of Appeals for a one-year term to expire March 31, 2017.

A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Reece, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece and Schroeder

Absent 2 - Boswell and Yukon

ANY FURTHER BUSINESS:

Ms. Roediger had provided an email from a prospective applicant (Ms. Watson) who came to the City and was interested in purchasing the properties at 2860 and 2880 Crooks Rd. She currently operated a small scale assisted living facility. The Ordinance would define it as assisted living, which would be permitted by right in RM-1 and the SP districts and was a Conditional Use in B-2, B-3 and the REC-M districts. Ms. Watson did not want to purchase the property unless she knew she could construct the facility she wanted. The property was zoned O-1, Office Business, which did not permit senior housing, and there was O-1 to the north and south.

Ms. Watson had asked what the chances were of rezoning the properties. Ms. Roediger advised that the Master Plan showed Regional Employment Center for most of the area. It called for office uses along Crooks Rd. Ms. Watson wondered why she could not put senior living there, noting the lower traffic impacts, compatibility with the residential houses behind the properties and the wetlands at the rear of the property. She felt that it would be a less intense use than what was permitted. Staff advised Ms. Watson that it was not consistent with the Master Plan, and they did not like or not like the idea, so they wanted to run it by the Planning Commission. Ms. Roediger advised that it would not be a large, two or three-story facility, and it would have 20-30 individuals. The pictures made it look like a single-family home, and she suggested that a Conditional Rezoning might be a consideration. She maintained that it was just a discussion item so staff could give Ms. Watson some direction.

Ms. Roediger did feel that it would be a good use for unutilized property without being too intense in terms of traffic. It seemed like it would be a reasonable transition of the area with shopping to the south and the employment center to the north. If the City wanted to maintain it as office, that also seemed like a reasonable transition. Ms. Roediger did not want to encourage Ms. Watson to go down an expensive, lengthy process if the Commissioners wanted to keep it as office.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked how feasible it would be to develop the facility with the wetlands. Ms. Roediger said that the question of the quality of the wetlands would come into play, and the Engineering Dept. did not feel

that the whole area was true wetlands. Mr. Kaltsounis thought a home like that would stick out like a sore thumb. He felt that a better place would be on the west side of the shopping center by the intersection. He felt that it was a tough one. If the zoning had to be changed, the City would be stuck with what was allowed. Mr. Kaltsounis commented that his opinion was indifferent to negative. He lived in the area, and he would see it all the time, and he did not think it would flow the way they planned.

Mr. Hooper believed that the wetlands took up at least half of the property, so it would be a challenge. He did not think that the proposal would fit in this location at all. He remembered approving a PUD about eight or nine years ago at Crooks and South Boulevard where a Chase Bank was built and the property to the north was approved for senior housing that he thought would be a better location.

Mr. Anzek said that project was reactivating. He had met with two prospective applicants, one of whom wanted to build exactly what was approved and one who wanted to modify the building. Mr. Hooper suggested that he would rather see senior housing there than in the middle of office zoning on Crooks.

Mr. Anzek noted that the subject parcels were on the edge of REC zoning. People said there was a glut of office, but he maintained that there was not in Rochester Hills. The offices just north of CK Diggs had been so successful that they had to go to underground detention to increase parking. The only reason the greenhouse to the north of the subject parcels had not been redeveloped was because the owner was asking a lot for the property. The two office strips to the south were full, and he felt that the City would need office space.

Mr. Reece agreed that it was not the appropriate location for senior housing, and he felt that eventually someone would come along who would want the whole piece.

Ms. Morita said that she would be in favor of seeing the parcels developed as office. She knew from looking at office prices in the area that there was definitely a need for smaller office space, and it was needed in that area. She felt that it would be a good area for office, especially abutting residential. She reminded that if a continuing care facility went in, there would be more trash pick ups and other types of services than office would have.

Mr. Dettloff asked Mr. Anzek if he had suggested alternate locations to

Ms. Watson, but he had not. Ms. Roediger felt that the Crooks and South Blvd. location would be too big for Ms. Watson's scale or budget. Mr. Anzek said that the owner of that site went quiet with the recession, but the level of interest was picking up. There were six or seven projects in the pipeline for senior and assisted living, and he wondered if the City was reaching a threshold where they needed to visit that question. People wanted to stay in Rochester Hills when they became empty nesters, and kids moving in wanted to bring their parents, so there was a demand. He noted that 95% of the Fire Dept. calls were to the senior living facilities. He offered that he and Ms. Roediger would evaluate the question of how much senior living they needed based on the population.

Mr. Hooper questioned whether they should ask City Council to authorize some money to hire a consultant to do a study for senior housing. Mr. Anzek agreed that they probably did. Mr. Hooper mentioned Stonecrest, the facility at Crooks and South Blvd. and the others on South Blvd. that had gone in recently or were planned. Mr. Reece mentioned Plante Moran Cresa which specialized in senior living facilities. Mr. Dettloff said that before they spent any money, he suggested visiting the One Stop Shop through the County. He thought it might be worth it to see what was going on at the County level.

Ms. Morita cautioned going with certain consultants. She knew some of them were definitely pro-business and construction. She felt they would need to find a firm that did not have a vested interest in seeing more of those facilities.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Vice Chairperson Brnabic reminded the Commissioners that the next Special Meeting was scheduled for March 22, 2016.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission and upon motion by Mr. Kaltsounis, Vice Chairperson Brnabic adjourned the Regular Meeting at 8:11 p.m.

Deborah Brnabic, Vice Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Secretary

