



Department of Planning and Economic Development

Staff Report to the Planning Commission

August 10, 2012

Harvard Place	
REQUEST	Planned Unit Development Concept Plan Approval Recommendation
APPLICANT	MJC Harvard Place, LLC 46600 Romeo Plank Rd., Suite 5 Macomb, MI 48044
AGENT	Mr. Lou Chirco
LOCATION	Northeast corner of John R and School
FILE NO.	04-037.2
PARCEL NOS.	15-24-100-009, -010, -018, -019, -028, -029,, -037, -038, -040
ZONING	R-3 One Family Residential with PUD Overlay
STAFF	Jim Breuckman, AICP, Manager of Planning

In this Report:

Summary.....	1
PUD Process.....	2
Standards for PUD Concept Plan Review (Section 138-7.105.A).....	2
PUD Concept Plan Review Considerations.....	2
PUD Concept Plan Motion.....	3

Summary

The proposed Harvard Place development is a modification to the existing Oakville Estates PUD that was approved by the City in 2007. Following the economic downturn, MJC Harvard Place LLC purchased the properties in 2011 and is now seeking to modify the PUD.

Mr. Chirco met with the Planning Commission on December 6, 2011 to discuss a concept plan for the PUD (see attached minutes from that meeting). The existing Oakville Estates PUD contains 122 one-story condominium units in 2-4 unit buildings.

The current applicant is proposing to modify the PUD to permit 168 units in 12-unit stacked flat buildings. The proposed units will be approximately 1,450 square feet in area with attached two-car garages. It is the applicant's intention to lease the units in the near term, with the intent to sell them as condominium units in the future as the market continues to improve. The applicant has built other developments of this type throughout the region, including one in Rochester at Dequindre and Parkdale. Site plans and elevations are included in the attached PUD concept plan.

PUD Process

Approval of a PUD involves a two-step process:

1. **PUD Concept Plan.** The first step is PUD concept plan review during which the Planning Commission and City Council review the layout plan to determine if the site meets the requirements to use the PUD option, and that the proposed site layout is acceptable to the City. If the concept plan is approved the applicant may then submit for site plan and final PUD approval using the normal procedures applicable to site plans.
2. **Final PUD Review and Approval.** The detailed PUD Agreement is prepared and submitted with the site plans for final PUD review and approval. The site plans and PUD Agreement must be consistent with the approved PUD concept plan.

Standards for PUD Concept Plan Review (Section 138-7.105.A.3)

There are three criteria for the Planning Commission to regard in the discretionary decision of a PUD concept plan. They are:

1. The proposed PUD promotes the land use goals and objectives of the City.
2. Applicable provisions of this chapter shall be met.
3. There is, or will be at the time of initial development, adequate means of disposing of sanitary sewage and supplying the development with water, and the road system and stormwater drainage system are adequate.

PUD Concept Plan Review Considerations

1. **Conditions of Approval.** The applicant is proposing to retain all of the applicable conditions of approval in the existing Oakville Estates PUD agreement. Notable conditions include dedication of right-of-way, contributing to the paving of School Road, and extending the roadside pathway from the north boundary of the site to the John R/School Road intersection.
2. **Development Layout.** The proposed Harvard Place PUD does include more units than the existing PUD, but it also makes more efficient use of the land by stacking units which provides for much larger buffers from the perimeter property lines and preserves many more of the existing trees on-site.

Setbacks in the proposed Harvard Place PUD are 100+ feet from the north and west property lines, 60+ feet from the east property line, and 40 feet from the south property line. This compares with 30-35 foot setbacks from all property lines in the existing Oakville Estates PUD.

A further difference is that the garage doors are located on the sides of the building in the proposed Harvard Place PUD, while the existing Oakville Estates PUD had all of the garage doors facing the street. This difference will create an improved streetscape appearance in the development.

3. **Engineering Items.** Per the DPS/Engineering staff report, there are a few engineering issues that must be worked out during the site plan process when more detailed plans are developed. These issues, notably the detention pond sizing and peak sanitary sewer flows, could potentially impact the number of units that are developable on the site. Engineering is comfortable with the plans at a concept level, with the understanding that a reduction of units may be necessary to meet the detailed design standards.
4. **Tree Preservation.** The proposed PUD preserves 707, or 54% of the 1,301 on-site regulated trees. The previous PUD preserved 202, or 15.5% of the 1,317 on-site regulated trees. Note that a few trees have died in the intervening 5 years.

The larger tree preservation is a major benefit from an environmental perspective, and also provides much stronger buffering along the north, east, and west property lines. Environmental benefit is a qualifying criteria for using the PUD option.

5. **Landscaping/Tree Removal.** The proposed landscaping is generous, and meets the buffer requirements.
 - a. The applicant should clarify where the 58 replacement tree credits are coming from in the calculation on Sheet LA-1.0. This may be resolved as part of the site plan approval process if the PUD concept plan is approved.
 - b. Landscaping should be provided in the grass areas on the sides of the building between the sidewalk and the parking areas. This landscaping may consist of a hedge to help buffer the parking and garage areas from the street. This may be resolved as part of the site plan approval process if the PUD concept plan is approved.
6. **Wetlands and Natural Features.** This proposal continues the wetland setback modification from the wetland adjacent to the detention pond, as provided for in the original PUD.
7. **Buildings.** The proposed buildings are attractive, and will consist of 2 and 3 bedroom units with 2 car garages on the endcaps of the buildings.
8. **Entrance Signs.** The entrance sign details on Sheet LA-1.6 show vinyl fencing as the primary material. Vinyl fencing may be appropriate as an accent material, but the entrance signs should take more durable materials as the primary material. Brick or stone are the most commonly used examples within the community. This may be resolved as part of the site plan approval process if the PUD concept plan is approved.

PUD Concept Plan Summary

The proposed concept plan increases the number of units from 122 to 168, but the corresponding improvements in tree preservation, quality design of the structures, and reduction in street infrastructure help to counterbalance the increase in density.

PUD Concept Plan Motion

MOTION by _____, seconded by _____, in the matter of City File No. 04-037.2 (Harvard Place PUD), the Planning Commission **recommends** to City Council **approval/denial** of the **modified PUD Concept Plan** based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on July 30, 2012, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions.

Findings

1. The revised PUD significantly increases the amount of preserved natural features.
2. The PUD as proposed provides a transitional use between industrial and landfill uses to single family residential uses.
3. The PUD represents an aesthetic improvement over the previously approved PUD for the site.

Conditions

1. Concept plan approval is for up to 168 units, with the understanding that a reduction in units may be necessary to meet engineering design requirements.

2. Addressing all comments in City Department review letters in the PUD Agreement and/or site plan, whichever is most appropriate.

Reference:	Preliminary PUD Site Plans dated received by the Planning Department July 30, 2012 (Preliminary Site Plan, Drawing No. 01, prepared by Land Development Consulting Services, Inc.; Overall Tree Preservation Plan, Sheet T-1.0; Tree Preservation Plan – North, Sheet T-1.1; Tree Preservation Plan – South, Sheet T-1.2; Tree Survey List ‘A’, Sheet T-2.0; Tree Survey List ‘B’, Sheet T-2.1; Overall Preliminary Landscape Plan, Sheet LA-1.0; Preliminary Landscape Replacement Plan – North, Sheet LA-1.1; Preliminary Landscape Buffer Plan – North, Sheet LA-1.2; Preliminary Landscape Replacement Plan – South, Sheet LA-1.3; Preliminary Landscape Buffer Plan – South, Sheet LA-1.4; Preliminary Unit, Playground & Pocket Park Landscape Plan, Sheet LA-1.5; Preliminary Entrance Elevations & Fence Details, Sheet LA-1.6; Specifications & Details, Sheet LA-2.0, prepared by Design Team, Ltd..
Attachments:	Building Department memo dated 08/03/12; Fire Department memo dated 08/07/12; DPS/Engineering memo dated 08/10/12; and PC Minutes dated 12/06/11
