



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, Julie Granthen, Greg Hooper, Nicholas O. Kaltsounis,
David A. Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Emmet Yukon

Tuesday, October 20, 2015

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson William Boswell called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Auditorium.

ROLL CALL

Present 7 - William Boswell, Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, Julie Granthen, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis and C. Neall Schroeder

Absent 2 - David Reece and Emmet Yukon

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Quorum present.

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

[2015-0391](#) September 15, 2015 Regular Meeting

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

Aye 7 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Granthen, Hooper, Kaltsounis and Schroeder

Absent 2 - Reece and Yukon

COMMUNICATIONS

- A) *Planning & Zoning News dated September 2015*
- B) *Letter from C. Burckhardt dated 10/13/15 re: Auburn Hills Master Plan Amend.*
- C) *Letter from S. Cohen dated 9/17/15 re: Auburn Hills Draft Master Plan Amend.*
- D) *Road Commission Strategic Planning Process Report for 2015*

NEW BUSINESS

2010-0106

Public Hearing and request for consideration of the Second Amendment to the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Agreement - City File No. 04-037.3 - to add an in-ground pool, pool house and cement deck in place of the playset at Harvard Place PUD, a 168-unit apartment complex development on approximately 26 acres, located east of John R, north of School Rd., zoned PUD overlay, Parcel Nos. 15-24-100-009, -010, -018, -019, -028, -029, -037, -038 and -040, based on documentation dated received by the Planning and Economic Development on September 21, 2015, MJC Harvard Place, LLC, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Ed Anzek, dated October 16, 2015 and PUD Amendment had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant was Lou Chirco, MJC Harvard Place, LLC, 46600 Romeo Plank, Suite 5, Macomb, MI 48044.

Ms. Roediger gave a little background of the project, which she noted was currently under construction. The curbs were in and they were putting in infrastructure. The site was zoned R-3, One Family Residential with a PUD Overlay which allowed 168 apartments. While under construction, the applicant decided to make a small modification to install a swimming pool. Originally, the area was planned for a playset, but in talking with residents at other properties, they learned that a pool and pool house would be a nice amenity. She showed an aerial of the overall approved PUD and the area where an office building and playset was planned, and she advised that the pool would in the same area.

Ms. Roediger stated that for any amendment after a PUD was approved, the Ordinance allowed the Planning Commission to determine whether the change would be minor in nature. If so, the Planning Commission could approve it. If it was determined that the change was material in nature, the process included a recommendation to City Council for an amended PUD Agreement. Because the modification did not affect density or anything of that nature, Staff felt that the change was minor and did not change the overall character of the plan. It was up to the Planning Commission to decide. If it was required to go to Council, it would require a Public Hearing, which was noticed in case. She said that she would be happy to answer any questions.

Chairperson Boswell asked Mr. Chirco if he had anything to add, and Mr. Chirco replied that he thought Ms. Roediger did a good job.

Mr. Schroeder asked if the pool would be fenced, and Mr. Chiro said it was required.

Chairperson Boswell asked if the Commissioners thought it was minor or major. Mr. Dettloff thought it was minor, as did the other Commissioners. Mr. Kaltsounis noted that it would be in the middle of the development and was not that noticeable.

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

MOTION *by Schroeder, seconded by Dettloff, in the matter of City File No. 04-037.3 (Harvard Place Apartments PUD), the Planning Commission **approves the Amended Site Plan**, dated received September 21, 2015 by the Planning and Development Department, with the following five (5) findings and subject to the following one (1) condition.*

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 location and design of the pool are will be safe and convenient for pedestrians coming and going to the site.*
- 3. There will be a satisfactory and harmonious relationship between the development on the site and the existing and prospective development of contiguous land and adjacent neighborhoods.*
- 4. The proposed development does not have an unreasonably detrimental, nor an injurious, effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the parcels being developed and the larger area of which the parcels are a part.*
- 5. The proposed amended site plan further promotes the goals and objectives of the Master Plan by offering a variety of housing.*

Condition

1. *Address comments from the City's Engineering Department, prior to final construction plan approval.*

Even though a Public Hearing was not required now, it had been noticed, so Ms. Roediger suggested that Chairperson Boswell should see if anyone from the public wished to speak.

Chairperson Boswell opened the Public Hearing at 7:10 p.m. Seeing no one come forward, he closed the Public Hearing.

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

Aye 7 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Granthen, Hooper, Kaltsounis and Schroeder

Absent 2 - Reece and Yukon

Chairperson Boswell stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously.

2004-0868

Request for Amended Site Plan Approval - City File No. 02-013.2 - Ahmadiyya Muslim Community Center, to allow the height of the Minaret to go up to 54.8 feet (originally approved at 50 feet), located at 1730 W. Auburn, east of Crooks, zoned R-4, One Family Residential, Parcel No. 15-28-300-026, Aamir M. Butt, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Sara Roediger, dated October 16, 2014 and amended Site Plan had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Aamir M. Butt and Mansoor Qeshi, Ahmadiyya Community Center, 1730 W. Auburn, Rochester Hills, MI 48309 and Chris Hornbeck, Hornbeck & Associates, 900 W. University Dr, Suite L, Rochester, MI 48307.

Mr. Anzek related some history of the project, noting that when it was approved in 2006, the applicants self-imposed a height restriction of 50 feet. They now had funding and would like to make it 4.8 feet higher and increase the diameter about 3.5 feet. Because of the self-imposed limitation, Mr. Anzek did not feel he was permitted to go forward administratively, which he would have normally done because there was no height restriction for places of worship. He asked for a revised site plan for construction of the minaret to take to the Planning Commission. He felt that it was fairly straight forward, and he said that he would be happy to answer any questions.

Chairperson Boswell asked the applicants if they had anything to add, and they declined.

Mr. Kaltsounis recalled when the applicants were before the Commissioners previously and he had reviewed the Minutes about the 50-foot requirement. He did not think there was much of a difference between 50 and 54 feet. He asked if the 54 feet was to the top of the spire.

Mr. Hornbeck said that it was to the very tip of the spire or finial. To the top of the dome was approximately 50 feet, so the finial made up the extra feet. That element was the only portion of the structure that extended above 50 feet. Mr. Kaltsounis asked why it could not have been scaled down. Mr. Hornbeck said that one thing that was very important with a minaret was the authenticity of the look of it traditionally. They wanted to get a proper look that was consistent with historical structures. They wanted to be able to get that top stone that flared out up and above the adjacent roof. There needed to be a certain degree of separation so it could be properly constructed and flashback onto the existing structure. That would influence where that line occurred, which would form the base for the arched openings and the decorative band above. To take everything and squash it down would create a lot of intricacies that were not favorable.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that there was a discussion previously that there would be no call to prayer or speakers, and he asked if that was still the case. Mr. Queshi said that was correct. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if there would be a ladder in the minaret that went up to the balcony area. He did not see one on the plans.

Mr. Hornbeck said that it had been discussed for maintenance purposes, since there would not be a door into the minaret except for a small access panel at the base for housekeeping. He felt that it might be beneficial to build the minaret with a ladder attached on the inside, because there would be no way to get one in after the fact. If something broke on the inside and someone needed to go up to repair it, putting in a ladder during construction would be prudent. They would like to be able to reserve the right to do that.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that he appreciated that it was still about 50 feet, and going a few feet higher was not a big issue in his eyes. It was part of the spire. There was a church down the street that had one 70 feet high. He liked the limestone, which he did not see on the rest of the facility.

Mr. Schroeder agreed that it was pretty straight forward, and hearing no other comments or concerns, he moved the following, seconded by Mr. Dettloff.

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Dettloff, in the matter of City File No. 02-013.2 (Ahmadiyya Muslim Community Center Minaret), the Planning Commission **approves the amended site plan for the Minaret**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on October 7, 2015, with the following three (3) findings and subject to the following one (1) condition.

Findings

1. *The site plan demonstrates 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 improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.*
3. *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.*

Condition

1. *Address Fire Department review comments from memo dated 10/13/15.*

Prior to the vote, Chairperson Boswell called up a member of the audience who had turned in a card.

Donna Rorabaugh, 2965 Alexander Ave., Rochester Hills, MI 48309.

Ms. Rorabaugh wished to reaffirm that there would be no call to prayer. She had attended the original site plan review in 2006, and the applicants made a promise then that they would not have that, and she wanted to make sure it would be maintained with the modified structure. She asked why a community center would require a minaret. If it was a religious center, she stated that it should be called a mosque. She asked if the center could provide a point of contact for the neighbors. Previously,

when she had an issue, she called the City, and the City told her to contact the police. She did not think there was a need for that type of escalation.

Chairperson Boswell maintained that there would be no call to prayer. He asked if there was a reason it was not called a mosque. Mr. Queshi advised that their intent was that it was always a community center. One of the structures was a multi-purpose gym which was open to the public. They had blood drives. The front area was used for prayers, but their gatherings and meetings were more for a community center.

Chairperson Boswell stressed that the Commissioners always asked applicants to make sure that they kept in contact with neighbors and inform them of what was going on. He thought that it would be a very good idea to have someone that the neighbors could call to respond to questions. He suggested that they meet with the neighbors. Mr. Butt promised that he would do that, and he said that he would give his contact information to Ms. Rorabaugh.

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

Aye 7 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Granthen, Hooper, Kaltsounis and Schroeder

Absent 2 - Reece and Yukon

Chairperson Boswell stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously.

2015-0388

Public Hearing and request for Conditional Use Recommendation - City File No. 15-015 - to be allowed to sell alcoholic beverages for on-site consumption accessory to a permitted use at MOD Pizza, located at 3058 S. Rochester Rd., Rochester Hills, MI 48307, zoned B-3, Shopping Center Business, part of Parcel No. 15-34-227-046, TSFR Pizza, LLC, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Ed Anzek, dated October 16, 2015 and associated application documents had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Eric Eggan, Honigman, Miller, Schwartz and Cohn, LLP, 222 North Washington Square, Suite 400, Lansing, MI 48933 and Jake Schostak and Ryan Jones, Schostak Brothers, which was involved in the construction.

Mr. Anzek noted that in August, the applicants had filed for a Conditional Use permit with the intent of having beer and wine for consumption on premise. He advised that there would be no sales of hard liquor. Mr.

Eggan agreed, and said that they were asking for a Class C Liquor License which would permit beer, wine and liquor, but they were only intending to serve beer and wine.

Mr. Anzek said that with new businesses coming to town with a liquor license, there was a recently adopted Ordinance for a Conditional Use process. The Planning Commission would hold a Public Hearing to see if there were any objections in the neighborhood and make a recommendation to City Council. Mr. Anzek believed that this was the last space to be leased in the center.

Mr. Anzek advised that all property owners within 300 feet of the subject location were notified, and Staff did not receive any comments, and no cards were turned in to speak. He added that it was a fairly straight forward request.

Chairperson Boswell asked the applicants if there was anything they wished to add. Mr. Eggan said that they supported Staff's recommendation and hoped it would be approved. They looked forward to opening and being a respected member of the business community.

Mr. Dettloff asked if they were obtaining an escrowed license. Mr. Eggan agreed. They were buying a license that came from Lyon Township, which had been held by a gentleman who had the license primarily for catering but never used it.

Mr. Anzek said that he heard that MOD meant "Made on Demand." Mr. Schostak said that was correct.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the team had owned a liquor license in the past. Mr. Eggan agreed that they had. TSFR had a related entity called TSFR Apple Venture, LLC, which owned most of the Applebees in the State of Michigan. They had been operating for the last three years. Mr. Kaltsounis presumed that MOD was a franchise of Applebees, which Mr. Eggan confirmed. Mr. Eggan added that they had two additional MOD locations which had already been licensed and were operating - one in Livonia and one in Northville Township. They felt that they were experienced, and they trained people well to handle the sales of alcohol.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if a background check was done on the applicant when applying for a liquor license. He did not necessarily mean a criminal check, but just to see if the applicant had held liquor licenses in the past and if so, how they were handled. Mr. Anzek advised that it was

all handled at the State level by the Liquor Control Commission.

Mr. Eggan agreed that there was a detailed process. Not only the applicant, but the owner and individual members were subjected to a background investigation to make sure they were suitable to hold a license in Michigan. They had gone through it, and the Liquor Control Commission had already approved a license for this location, subject to the community's approval. Mr. Kaltsounis noted that it happened before it came to the City.

Chairperson Boswell opened the Public Hearing at 7:29 p.m. Seeing no one come forward, he closed the Public Hearing.

Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Kaltsounis moved the following. He asked if they should add a condition about not allowing liquor. Mr. Anzek did not believe that was necessary. He reminded that the license they had allowed it, but they did not wish to do so.

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schroeder, in the matter of City File No. 15-015 (MOD Pizza) the Planning Commission **recommends** to City Council **Approval** of the **Conditional Use** to allow alcoholic beverage consumption on site, based on documents dated received by the Planning Department on August 31, 2015, with the following six (6) findings and subject to the following one (1) condition.

Findings

- 1. The expanded use will promote the intent and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance.*
- 2. The proposed building has been designed and is proposed to be constructed, operated, maintained, and managed so as to be compatible, harmonious, and appropriate in appearance with the existing and planned character of the general vicinity, adjacent uses of land, and the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the use.*
- 3. The proposal should have a positive impact on the community as a whole and the surrounding area by further offering jobs and another dining option.*
- 4. The proposed development is served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire*

protection, water and sewer, drainage ways, and refuse disposal.

5. *The proposed development should not be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to existing or future neighboring land uses, persons, property, or the public welfare.*
6. *The proposal will not create additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services that will be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.*

Conditions

1. *That all State requirements be met for the outdoor seating area and that the fencing be decorative such as a wrought iron style.*

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schroeder, that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Granthen, Hooper, Kaltsounis and Schroeder

Absent 2 - Reece and Yukon

Chairperson Boswell stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously.

2015-0392

Public Hearing and request for Preliminary Planned Unit Development and Concept Plan Recommendation - City File No. 15-001 - Brampton Parc Condominiums PUD, a proposed 12-unit residential development on 2.96 acres, located on the east side of John R between Hamlin and School Rds., zoned R-4, One Family Residential, Parcel No. 15-24-301-052, 1459 John R, LLC, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Sara Roediger, dated October 16, 2015 and PUD Site Plans had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Mark Gesuale and Jim Polyzois, 1459 John R LLC, 14599 Technology Dr., Shelby Twp., MI 48315 and Ralph Nunez, Design Team Plus, 975 E. Maple, Suite 210, Birmingham, MI 48009.

Ms. Roediger noted the request for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) concept plan. The applicants had been in front of the Planning Commission informally earlier this year to pose the idea. She advised that the site was 2.93 acres, located on the east side of John R between Hamlin and School Rds. The property was currently zoned R-4, One

Family Residential, and the applicant wished to construct six, two-unit duplexes. The PUD process was two-fold; the concept plan would be reviewed and recommended by the Planning Commission to City Council. The concept plan showed the layout - the number of units, the road and detention - and the second or final step would also be in front of the Planning Commission for a recommendation to City Council. All the details would be ironed out at the final stage, although a lot of information was submitted by the applicant at the concept stage. She showed a sample elevation. She had worked with the applicants on the building footprints and elevations to create recessed garages and to enhance the human element of the house rather than focusing on the garage.

Regarding the site plan, Ms. Roediger advised that the site was not subject to the City's Tree Conservation Ordinance, but tree preservation was one of the reasons they went to a PUD option. The proposed plan would save 45 % of the regulated trees. All staff reviews recommended approval of the conceptual plan with the exception of Fire, which had a few comments. The applicant had provided a response which said that they could meet all the requirements of the Fire Department, and they were comfortable addressing those as part of the next step. She said that she would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Nunez indicated that the City did an excellent job of reviewing the project. When they first came to the City, they looked at R-4 zoning. They could possibly get nine lots with a straight, conventional road. With R-4 zoning, the developer would have been entitled to remove all the trees, and that was not at all what the developer wanted to do. They looked at several iterations, and Staff recommended evaluating the condition of the trees. Their forester went out and rated the trees, and they adjusted the plan. He talked about the stormwater issues, and they worked with Engineering to do proper swales along the back to preserve trees. The pavement width was reduced using a private road. He pointed out a seating area by the detention basin for walkers. They also went from a Type B to a Type C Buffer and added substantial plantings along all sides.

Mr. Schroeder asked if the road had been narrowed. Mr. Nunez agreed, and said that it would be similar to what they did with the Enclaves. There would be pavement with a carriage walk so emergency vehicles would have 27 feet for vehicles around the cul-de-sac per the Fire Department. Mr. Schroeder indicated that it would create a problem with on-street parking. Mr. Nunez agreed, and noted that there would be two-car garages with two spaces in the driveways, four additional spaces in the

development north of the detention basin, and around the cul-de-sac, there was excess pavement on the inside where there would be room for three more cars. There was a possibility of parking on one side of the pavement which they could sign. Mr. Schroeder maintained that residents and guests would be parking in the street.

Mr. Schroeder noted that the sidewalk seemed to end at the seating by the detention pond, and there did not seem to be a sidewalk between unit 12 and the seating node. Mr. Nunez said that because of the stormwater detention size and capacity and the need for additional plantings there, they felt that it was more important to have room for trees. The sidewalk did terminate at the seating area, and they provided a connection for 11 and 12 to access John R. Mr. Schroeder recommended that "no parking" signs should be placed on the hydrant side.

Chairperson Boswell opened the Public hearing at 7:45 p.m.

Sunny Kay, 1435 John R, Rochester Hills, MI 48307. Ms. Kay stated that she lived directly north of the subject property. She asked how many bedrooms there would be, the number of stories, the setback from her lot line and John R, whether John R would be widened, the percent of owner-occupied units and whether there would be a school bus stop on John R or in the development.

Raymond Anderson, 1480 Gravel Ridge, Rochester Hills, MI 48307. Mr. Anderson stated that he was not in favor of the development. His property was on the east side of the site. If it went through, and he said that he was not going to argue with anyone, he would like to see a five-foot high brick wall just like the one around the subdivision at Hamlin and John R so he could keep intruders off his property.

Chairperson Boswell closed the Public Hearing at 7:47 p.m.

Mr. Nunez responded to Ms. Kay's questions. He advised that the setback between the back of the buildings and the north, east and a portion of the south property lines was 30 feet. The setback from John R was also 30 feet. He believed that the intent of the development was geared more towards age-restricted housing, so he did not believe that there would be a school bus stop. There would be one story with an attic with the capability to have rooms in the attic. The plans showed a first floor master suite and one other bedroom. The basement could be finished with another bedroom or a game room.

Mr. Polyzois added that if a consumer would like, bedrooms could be added on the second floor and one first floor bedroom could convert to a den. There would be no more than three bedrooms. He anticipated that all the units would be owner occupied, because the price point would not afford renting them out. The people he had spoken with were looking to buy.

Mr. Schroeder asked the price point, and Mr. Polyzois advised that they would be in the mid-\$300k range.

Chairperson Boswell asked if there would be any modifications to John R. Mr. Nunez said that they would be required to put in a decel lane from the south and north of the site. Mr. Polyzois noted the request for a brick wall, but he thought that would take away from the spirit of the site plan. He pointed out that the backyards of the three adjacent homes to the east had a lot of trees and vegetation, which also served as a buffer to his site. He felt that a brick wall would defeat the purpose of trying to preserve trees.

Chairperson Boswell asked to see a drawing of the vegetation. Mr. Nunez showed an overall aerial showing the relationship of the site with the home to the north. There were two homes and a vacant lot to the east, and he believed that a third home was being proposed. He said that there would be a considerable distance from the homes to the east to the homes in the development. They were saving the existing trees in the northeast corner, and they would be more than happy to work with the adjacent neighbor to the east to make sure that the proposed evergreen material created a proper, more intense buffer.

Mr. Schroeder asked if there was any possibility of putting a small, one to three-foot berm in the area with trees on top. Mr. Nunez said that there were a number of existing trees, and they tried to get the drainage swale correct. Where there were no trees, there might be a possibility of putting in a berm, but he would be concerned that the water would displace onto the adjacent property. He offered that they could look at that, and they wanted to make sure they stayed away from the drip lines of the existing trees. He added that the evergreens would be a minimum of ten feet high, and they had enough plant material in the overall buffer to make sure they could accommodate proper screening.

Mr. Schroeder asked if there were any utilities in that area. Mr. Nunez advised that the sanitary would go out toward John R. There was an overhead utility line that ran north/south through the property. There were

no rear yard utilities, and they would be able to grade without having to put storm drains along the back.

Mr. Hooper mentioned the screening for the east property line, and said that he was not a fan of walls, and he preferred a landscape screen. The applicants proposed three deciduous trees, 11 evergreen trees, five ornamental trees and 17 shrubs for the east property line. If they could, he suggested increasing the quantity of evergreens to provide year-round green vegetation and to fill in the spots so it was a visual obstruction from the neighbors to the east. Mr. Polyzois said that they would do that anyway, because there was a big satellite dish, and he would like to screen that from his residents. Mr. Hooper said that it was good they were using ten-foot trees, and he suggested that they should be staggered, with staff approval, to provide more visual screening with the existing vegetation. He said that he supported the concept plan, and he felt that it was a needed commodity in the community for the aging population, and he felt that it would be very popular for the 55-plus crowd.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked Mr. Hooper if he would like a condition about the additional screening, which was confirmed. Mr. Kaltsounis believed that vegetation would be taken out with a wall. Staff could work with the applicant to get a better screen. He noted that the applicants had been before the Commissioners quite a bit recently, and they had brought a lot of nice developments to the City. This, however, was the tightest he had seen. He had to consider the narrower road, the sidewalks and density and how it would all work. He had looked throughout the City at all the developments that were similar, and if there was a place for this type of development, he did think it would be in this area. The site might not be harmonious in many other areas, but with the nearby apartments going in, he thought that things would work out. Hearing no further discussion, he moved the following, seconded by Mr. Schroeder:

MOTION *by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schroeder, in the matter of 15-001 (Brampton Parc Condominiums PUD), the Planning Commission recommends that City Council approves the PUD Concept plans dated received September 11, 2015, with the following four (4) findings and subject to the following seven (7) conditions.*

Findings

- 1. The proposed PUD Concept Plan meets the criteria for use of the PUD option.*

2. *The proposed PUD Concept Plan meets the submittal requirements for a PUD concept plan.*
3. *The proposed development should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.*
4. *The proposed development is not expected to have an unreasonably detrimental or injurious effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the site or those of the surrounding area.*

Conditions

1. *Approval shall only confer the right of the applicant to submit detailed site plans consistent with the layout and at a density not exceeding that shown on the PUD Concept plan.*
2. *The site plans, including but not limited to landscaping, engineering, tree removal and wetland use/buffer modification plans will meet all applicable City ordinances and requirements while remaining consistent with the PUD Concept layout plan.*
3. *The architectural quality of building plans submitted with the site plans and PUD Agreement in step 2 of the PUD process will be equal to or better than that approved with the PUD Concept plan.*
4. *Recommendation by the Planning Commission and approval by City Council of a Wetland Use Permit and submittal of an MDEQ Wetland Permit at Final PUD review, with the plans to address comments from ASTI's letter dated September 17, 2015.*
5. *Recommendation by the Planning Commission and approval by City Council of a PUD Agreement, as approved by the City Attorney, at Final PUD review.*
6. *Address comments from applicable City Staff memos, prior to Final PUD submittal.*
7. *Add landscaping to provide a visual screen along the east property line, to be approved by staff prior to final approval.*

Chairperson Boswell asked the applicants if they had met with the neighbors. Mr. Polyzois replied that he and his partner had spoken with

three. Chairperson Boswell reminded that the Commission would like them to please try to meet with as many as they could.

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schroeder, that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Granthen, Hooper, Kaltsounis and Schroeder

Absent 2 - Reece and Yukon

Chairperson Boswell stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously. He asked Ms. Roediger when the matter would go to City Council, and she advised that it would probably be November 9th.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Nunez thanked everyone who was able to attend the workshop for a Riverbend Park presentation. He suggested that people who could not attend could stop by the Planning Dept. where he had left the pictures and maps presented.

Mr. Kaltsounis mentioned that he had done a photo shoot at the Park over the weekend. He got a lot of great pictures with the fall leaves, and the Park showed very well. There were some areas that needed to be cleaned up, but it was a great area to do a photo shoot. Mr. Nunez agreed that every time he went, there was something else to see because it was such a beautiful site. He felt that the elements (phases) they were proposing would make it something the City would be very proud of. Mr. Kaltsounis said that he took pictures of the fall colors and of people riding through the Park, and he would share them with the City and Mr. Nunez. He commented that word was getting around. Mr. Nunez agreed, and said that when he was there, he would stop people and ask if they lived in the neighborhood, and a lot said no - they had heard about it. He added that there were people of all ages going to the Park.

Mr. Schroeder asked how the dot survey went. People had been asked to put a green dot by a concept they liked on the boards (or red, if not liked). Mr. Nunez said that they knew there would be opposition to some things, but for the most part, what they proposed had been very successful. Mr. Schroeder asked if there was anything in general that everyone liked. Mr. Nunez said that the things that got the most opposition were the bridge, waste receptacles and dog stations, but for the most part, people liked everything. They liked the addition of a water feature at the front versus doing a dry detention basin, and he was working on that. Another

negative was pickle ball for seniors, but there were other areas in the City that had active recreational areas for that.

Mr. Kaltsounis had also noticed that detention ponds got red dots, remarking that they were elements the City required as part of a facility. Mr. Schroeder said that a pond could be wet and easily incorporated as part of a park. Mr. Nunez advised that there would be a certain area for storm water, which would be released properly to the wetlands.

Mr. Dettloff asked if the bird's nest or something else got the most votes. Mr. Nunez agreed the bird's nest did.

Any Further Business

Mr. Anzek noted that it was Mr. Hooper's last meeting as a Planning Commissioner. His term was up on City Council the beginning of November. On behalf of staff, Mr. Anzek said that it had been great working with Mr. Hooper, and he thanked him for his leadership. He did not want to see him go, and he said that hopefully, he would be re-appointed in the future. That consensus was shared by all. Mr. Dettloff jokingly asked if they could do a write in for Planning Commission. Mr. Kaltsounis asked Mr. Hooper how many years he had served, and Mr. Hooper related that he had been on since 1999. Mr. Hooper said that he loved serving on the Planning Commission, and he would very much like to be back on.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Chairperson Boswell reminded the Commissioners that the next Regular Meeting was scheduled for November 17, 2015.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission and upon motion by Mr. Kaltsounis, Chairperson Boswell adjourned the Regular Meeting at 8:12 p.m.

William F. Boswell, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Nicholas O. Kaltsounis
Secretary