



Department of Planning and Economic Development

Staff Report to the Planning Commission

October 17, 2014

Barrington Park PUD	
REQUEST	PUD Concept Plan Recommendation
APPLICANT	Gary Shapiro, Agent IAC Barclay, LLC 6689 Orchard Lake Rd., Suite 314 West Bloomfield, MI 48322
LOCATION	Northeast Corner of Auburn and Barclay Circle
FILE NO.	14-012
PARCEL NO.	15-26-376-007
ZONING	O-1, Office Business
STAFF	Sara Roediger, AICP, Manager of Planning

In this Report:

Overview	1
PUD Requirements.....	2
PUD Qualification Criteria	3
PUD Concept Plan.....	5
PUD Concept Plan Recommendation Motion.....	7

Overview

The applicant is proposing a 148-unit Planned Unit Development (PUD) on a 15.6-acre site located on the northeast corner of Auburn and Barclay Circle (east of Rochester Rd.). The site abuts the City's DPS site and Edinshire Subdivision to the east; office buildings to the north; across Barclay Circle to the west is the Hampton Village Shopping Plaza; and to the south is the Wildflower Subdivision and Brooklands Elementary school. The proposed 148 units represent a net density of 9.48 units per acre using the entire area of the site. The applicant is proposing 3-bedroom units in 30 buildings, each with three to six units.

PUD Requirements (Section 138-7.100-108)

The PUD option is intended to permit flexibility in development that is substantially in accordance with the goals and objectives of the City's Master Land Use Plan at the discretion of the City Council. The PUD development shall be laid out so that the various land uses and building bulk will relate to each other and to adjoining existing and planned uses in such a way that they will be compatible, with no material adverse impact of one use on another. The PUD option seeks to:

- Encourage innovation to provide variety in design layout
- Achieve economy and efficiency in the use of land, natural resources, energy and the provision of public services and utilities
- Encourage the creation of useful open spaces
- Provide appropriate housing, employment, service and shopping opportunities

The PUD option can permit:

- Nonresidential uses of residentially zoned areas
- Residential uses of nonresidential zoned areas
- Densities or lot sizes that are different from the applicable district(s)
- The mixing of land uses that would otherwise not be permitted; provided that other objectives are met and the resulting development will promote the public health, safety and welfare

Process Overview

The PUD review process consists of a two step process:

1. **Step One: Concept Plan.** The PUD concept plan is intended to show the location of site improvements, buildings, utilities, and landscaping with a level of detail sufficient to convey the overall layout and impact of the development. The PUD concept plan is not intended to demonstrate compliance with all ordinance requirements, but rather is intended to establish the overall layout of the development, including the maximum number of units which may be developed. This step requires a Planning Commission public hearing and recommendation to City Council followed by review by the City Council.
2. **Step Two: Site Plan/PUD Agreement.** The second step in the process is to develop full site plans based on the approved PUD concept plan and to submit the PUD Agreement. At this time, the plans are reviewed for compliance with all City ordinance requirements, the same as any site plan. This step requires a Planning Commission recommendation to City Council followed by review by the City Council.

Background

The applicant appeared before the Planning Commission on September 16, 2014 to get guidance and input regarding their proposed plans prior to expending a lot of time and money without certainty that the overall layout is acceptable to the City, the minutes from that discussion are attached. The Planning Commission made several recommendations, including that the applicants speak with the neighbors, and appeared receptive to the proposal. The applicant has since met with City staff and MDOT, and held a meeting with neighbors on October 7, 2014.

PUD Qualification Criteria

Section 138-7.102 sets forth the criteria that a PUD must meet. Each of the criterion are listed below in italics, followed by staff comments on the proposed PUD's compliance with each.

- a. *The PUD option shall not be used for the sole purpose of avoiding applicable requirements of this ordinance. The proposed activity, building or use not normally permitted shall result in an improvement to the public health, safety, and welfare in the area affected.* The proposed PUD generally meets the applicable requirements of the RM-1 zoning district, and in many cases greatly exceeds minimum requirements. The development of owner occupied attached single-family residential units at this location is an ideal land use transition between the single family residential neighborhoods east and south of the site and the more intense retail, office and institutional uses north, west and east of the site. In response to concerns from the residential neighbors to the east, the applicant has shifted the buildings to the west, providing a 35 foot natural buffer (15 ft. more than the required 20 ft. buffer), and a 67 foot setback to the closest building (25 ft. more than the required 42 ft. buffer).
- b. *The PUD option shall not be utilized in situations where the same land use objectives can be accomplished by the application of conventional zoning provisions or standards.* While the development generally meets the applicable requirements of the RM-1 zoning district, there are potentially five variances under conventional zoning that may be required including density, maximum height, building separation, parking setback and maximum amount of parking. Through the use of the PUD, the City has the ability to be flexible with regulations in return for development that is above and beyond conventional development.
- c. *The PUD option may be used only when the proposed land use will not materially add service and facility loads beyond those contemplated in the master land use plan. The applicant must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City that the added loads will be accommodated or mitigated by the applicant as part of the PUD.* The Master Plan calls for small scale professional offices along Barclay Circle, while the applicant is proposing attached residential units. While both uses serve as good transitional land uses, the proposed project will likely result in significantly less traffic, with the proposed attached condominiums yielding less than 900 daily trips while a medical office on this site could be expected to generate over 4,000 trips daily. In terms of impacts to the City utilities, the demand on public water and sewer will likely increase with the proposed development over what could be developed under current zoning and the applicant will need to work with Engineering to determine if any upgrades to the system are necessary to accommodate the proposed project.
- d. *The PUD shall meet as many of the following objectives as may be deemed appropriate by the City:*
The PUD is not required to comply with all of the items listed in this criterion; it is up to the judgment of the Planning Commission and City Council to determine if the proposed development provides adequate benefit that would not otherwise be realized. In this instance, it may be the development of a desired transitional land use, additional amount of open space/parks, the high quality of the proposed architecture, or another factor.
 1. *To preserve, dedicate or set aside open space or natural features due to their exceptional characteristics or their environmental or ecological significance in order to provide a permanent transition or buffer between land uses, or to require open space or other desirable features of a site beyond what is otherwise required in this ordinance.* The proposed project contains 2.46 acres of open space in six parks throughout the site, which is over triple the 0.78 acres of open space which is required.
 2. *To guarantee the provision of a public improvement that would not otherwise be required to further the public health, safety or welfare, protect existing uses or potential future uses in the vicinity of the proposed development from the impact of a proposed use, or alleviate an existing*

or potential problem relating to public facilities. An off-site pathway that connects the project to Hampton Circle north of the parcel is proposed. In response to neighbors concerns about the pathway, the applicant has shifted the proposed pathway to the west side of the pond. Staff continues to recommend this non-motorized connection to improve walkability in this area.

3. *To promote the goals and objectives of the Master Land Use Plan and other applicable long range plans such as the Master Thoroughfare Plan.* The proposed project promotes the following goals and objectives of the Master Land Use Plan and other applicable long range plans:
 - (a) Provide a diversity of housing types and sizes to meet the needs of people of different ages, incomes and lifestyles within the community.
 - (b) Provide amenities such as neighborhood parks and open space areas in residential areas.
 - (c) Provide visually attractive residential development.
 - (d) Encourage some higher density development at appropriate locations.
 - (e) Provide a safe, efficient non-motorized pathway system that provides links to various land uses throughout the City.
4. *To facilitate development consistent with the Regional Employment Center goals, objectives, and design standards in the City's Master Land Use Plan.* Not applicable.
5. *To preserve and appropriately redevelop unique or historic sites.* Not applicable.
6. *To permanently establish land use patterns that are compatible with or will protect existing or planned uses.* As previously noted, the development of owner occupied attached single-family residential units at this location is an ideal land use transition between the single family residential neighborhoods east and south of the site and the more intense retail, office and institutional uses north, west and east of the site. The proposed PUD is utilizing both existing mature vegetation and proposed plantings abutting the existing single family homes to the east to enhance the transition between the uses. Further, the additional residents will help support the existing commercial and office businesses in the area.
7. *To provide alternative uses for parcels that can provide transition or buffers to residential areas and to encourage redevelopment of sites where an orderly transition or change of use is desirable.* The site is surrounded by a wide variety of uses, from single family neighborhoods and small-scale office to large-scale shopping centers and institutional uses, with dense multiple family development to the north. The proposed project will serve as a land use buffer between the more intense land uses to the west and single family to the east and south. As mentioned above, the proposed buffer along the east property line takes advantage of existing mature vegetation combined with proposed plantings to provide ample screening between the properties. Some of the neighbors have indicated the desire for a masonry wall along the property line, and the applicant has agreed to install a vinyl chain link fence if desired by the City. Staff has concerns regarding the installation of a wall, and to a lesser degree a fence as a 20 foot drain easement exists along the east property line and it is the City's policy to not permit permanent structures and their associated footings within easements for maintenance purposes. Further, the installation of either of a wall or fence will require the removal of existing mature vegetation, that in staff's opinion serves the purpose of screening and buffering the two uses in an effective manner.
8. *To enhance the aesthetic appearance of the City through quality building design and site development.* Initial sketches proposed as part of the original submittal suggest quality building design, however additional information must be provided that ensures the buildings will conform to the City's Architectural Design Standards. Ivanhoe, the developer of the proposed project has won various awards for the quality of their previous developments. The proposed project will

include similar elements such as extensive landscaping, pathways, benches, attractive streetscape details and entryway features.

PUD Concept Plan

In this case, the applicant has completed some of the work necessary for site plan approval and has had preliminary discussions with many City departments, so there is some degree of confidence that the layout will meet the various ordinance requirements as commented on in the staff review letters.

The Planning Commission and City Council should only be evaluating the major elements of the development such as density, layout, and building design with the understanding that the details will be reviewed during step 2 of the process, with the burden being on the applicant to maintain compliance with the overall layout and density approved with the PUD Concept Plan.

1. **Site Layout.** The site has been designed with a central private loop road that is fronted on both sides with the proposed buildings or associated park space. All building setback requirements associated with the RM-1 zoning district have been met or exceeded. Three potential site layout modifications from the ordinance are required as illustrated on the proposed concept plan as follows:
 - a. **Density.** The proposed density results in 9.48 units per acre, whereas the ordinance requires 6.81 units per acre for the RM-1 district. The City has the ability to increase the density as part of the PUD option, if it finds that the proposed project meets the intent of a PUD. At the September 16, 2014 Planning Commission meeting the topic of density was briefly discussed. As a point of reference, staff has provided the following approximate densities for various multiple family developments in the City as a comparison for the Planning Commission and City Council to consider.

Project	Units per acre	Project	Units per acre
Mill Stream Village	3.69	Lake Village of Rochester Hills	9.62
Regency Park	5.34	Great Oaks	11.41
Meadowfield	6.33	Oaks at Hampton	12.51
Harvard Place	6.46	Waltonwood at Main Senior Living	19.81
King's Cove	6.61	Avon Hills	20.03
Hampton on the Green	7.56	Essex at Hampton	30.00
Proposed Barrington Park PUD	9.48	Northridge	40.66
		Waltonwood at University Senior Living	57.72

- b. **Building Separation.** The front to side building separation between buildings 7 and 8 is proposed at 44 ft., while a minimum of 45 ft. is required. The buildings should be shifted to meet this requirement unless a modification from this requirement is granted as part of the PUD.
 - c. **Building Height.** Information on building height has not been provided. The applicant shall confirm that the buildings will meet the 30 ft. maximum building height, unless a modification from this requirement is granted as part of the PUD.
2. **Parking.** The minimum parking requirement for the project is 335 spaces, 2 spaces per unit plus 0.25 visitor spaces per unit. A total of 686 parking spaces are proposed, including 2 garage spaces and 2 garage approach spaces per unit. In addition, in response to concerns about having adequate visitor spaces, the applicant has proposed 94 spaces spread throughout the development, primarily as on-street parking spaces, for visitor parking. Two potential parking requirement modifications from the ordinance are required as illustrated on the proposed concept plan as follows:

- a. **Number of Spaces.** The ordinance requires a maximum of 419 spaces for this project; however the City has the ability to allow additional parking as part of the PUD option, recognizing the need for additional visitor parking is a common concern when residents have gatherings.
 - b. **Setback from Residential Uses.** A 35 ft. setback for the maneuvering lane abutting the R-4 district to east is proposed, whereas a 42 ft. side yard perimeter setback is required in RM-1 when abutting an R-4 district based on the proposed building length of building 1. The length of building 1 could be reduced to reduce the setback to 35 ft., thereby eliminating the need for the modification or the City has the ability to decrease setback requirement as part of the PUD option. The applicant has exceeded the buffer zone width and planting requirements to help address screening concerns along this property line.
3. **Landscaping and Open Space.** A conceptual landscape plan has been provided that depicts buffer zone and street tree landscaping along with 2.46 acres of parks and open space provided in six parks/pocket parks throughout the development. These parks provide both passive and active recreation areas and include amenities such as pathways, benches, trellises, planters, and dog waste stations. Staff will work with the applicant to ensure that all landscape requirements are met, if not exceeded, particularly as they apply to the buffer zone along the east property line abutting the existing residential homes.
4. **Building Design.** The proposed buildings should be designed to meet the intent of the Architectural Design Standards. Initial sketches proposed as part of the original submittal suggest compliance with quality materials, pitched roofs, the use of dormers and architectural accents, however additional information must be provided.
5. **Vehicular Circulation.** The applicant is proposing to provide an access drive off of Auburn Road, and a boulevarded entrance off of Barclay Circle, with a new crossover on the existing island on Barclay Circle. Per the Planning Commission's comments an initial Traffic Impact Study was prepared by HRC, professional transportation engineers that includes updated traffic volumes and expected trip generation. The applicant is working with Engineering and MDOT to minimize traffic impacts to the existing road system, and will finalize details related to improvements to the signalization at Barclay Circle and Auburn and the need for a center left-turn lane on Auburn, based on the submittal of a final Traffic Impact Study. As previously mentioned, the proposed project will likely result in significantly less traffic, with the proposed attached condominiums yielding less than 900 daily trips while a medical office on this site could be expected to generate over 4,000 trips daily
6. **Pedestrian Circulation.** A comprehensive sidewalk system throughout the development connecting buildings, parking, recreation areas and public sidewalks along Barclay Circle and Auburn Road is proposed. In addition, as part of the public benefit associated with the requested PUD, the applicant has proposed an off-site pedestrian connection to Hampton Circle to the north. Originally proposed on the east side of the existing pond, the applicant has shifted the pathway to the west side of the pond in response to neighbors concerns about the pathway. Staff continues to recommend this non-motorized connection to improve walkability in this area.
7. **Engineering Comments.** The applicant continues to work with Engineering in response to their review letters dated October 17, 2014, particularly to adequately address concerns regarding sanitary sewer capacity.
8. **Fire Comments.** The fire review dated October 16, 2014 recommends approval is contingent upon a future technical review addressing comments contained in their review letter.

PUD Concept Plan Recommendation Motion

Should the Planning Commission find that the proposed PUD concept plan meets the qualifying criteria for a PUD, staff offers the following motion to recommend approval to the City Council.

MOTION by _____, seconded by _____, in the matter of 14-012 (Barrington Park PUD), the Planning Commission **recommends** that **City Council approve** the PUD Concept plans dated received September 22, 2014, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions.

Findings

1. The proposed PUD Concept plan meets the criteria for use of the Planned Unit Development 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.

Attachments: PUD Conceptual Site Plans dated received 10/13/14: Cover Sheet, Sheet CP-1 prepared by Ziemet Wozniak; Concept Site Plan, Sheet CP-2, prepared by Felino A. Pascual and Associates; Grading and Drainage Plan, Sheet CP-3, Utility Plan, Sheet CP-4 prepared by Ziemet Wozniak; Landscape Plan, Details, Sheet CP-5, prepared by Felino A. Pascual and Associates; Topographic Survey, Sheet CP-6 and Boundary Survey, Sheet CP-7, prepared by Ziemet Wozniak.

Planning memo dated 10/16/14; Assessing memo dated 9/23/14; Building memo dated 9/23/14; DPS/Engineering memos (3) dated 10/17/14, 10/17/14 and 9/26/14; and 9/26/14 Fire memo dated 10/16/14; Letter from WRC dated 10/6/14; Invitation to Homeowners for 10/7/14; and Prelim. PUD PHN.
