



Rochester Hills

Minutes - Draft

Planning Commission

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

Tuesday, April 16, 2019

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Present 8 - Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis, Stephanie Morita, David Reece, C. Neall Schroeder and Ryan Schultz

Quorum present.

Also present: Sara Roediger, Director of Planning and Economic Dev.
Kristen Kapelanski, Manager of Planning
Deborah Hoyle, Fiscal Department
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2019-0160 March 19, 2019 Regular Meeting

A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Hooper, that this matter be Approved as Presented. The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

COMMUNICATIONS

There were no Communications presented.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairperson Brnabic opened Public Comment at 7:03 p.m. Seeing no one come forward, she closed Public Comment.

NEW BUSINESS

2019-0116 Public Hearing and Request for Adoption of the 2020-2025 Capital Improvement Plan

(Reference: Memos prepared by Joe Snyder and Sara Roediger, dated April 16, 2019 and April 12, 2019 and draft 2020-2025 CIP had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the City was Deborah Hoyle of the Fiscal Department.

Ms. Hoyle advised that there were 24 new projects located all over the City, and the City portion totaled almost \$20 million. She noted that 16 projects were completed last year; three were deleted; and four were deferred to pending. The first projects:

Fire Station 1 Carports proposed for 2021 for a total of \$256k.

Fire Station 1: Training Tower Gas-Fired Prop planned in 2020 for approximately \$200k.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that she had no objection to the purchase of the prop, but she wondered, with the volume of calls the firefighters and paramedics had to respond to on a daily basis, how likely it would be that members would have time to train while on duty. The CIP stated that it would eliminate costs for overtime.

Fire Chief Canto explained that the reason they requested it was that Oakland Community College had multiple gas fired props, and that was where they would be limiting overtime. They were not able to take people to the OCC fire training center while on duty, so they had to pay overtime to send people there. They currently trained on a regular basis using their training tower, and one of the benefits of that was that it was in the center of the City. If they got busier and started having multiple incidents, the units were right in the City and available to respond.

Next projects discussed:

Mobile Lift Columns for the Fleet Department planned for 2020 at a cost of \$70k.

Auditorium/Media Equipment Replacement Schedule, an ongoing project from 2020-2024 with a continuing cost totaling \$160k.

Electronic Document Management System proposed for 2021 with full implementation by 2023 for \$430k. It would be for document scanning and indexing to comply with the City's retention schedule.

Trailer Mounter Generator for 2020 for \$125k, which would replace two generators that were purchased in 1979 and 1980.

Ms. Hoyle moved to road projects:

Industrial Drive Sanitary Sewer Extension, a Local Development Finance Authority (LDFA) project for 2024-2025 at a cost of \$468,750.

Ms. Morita stated that she did not support the addition of the above project into the CIP until the road was constructed according to City standards prior to its acceptance by the City, at which time those property owners could pay to put in their own sanitary sewer and storm sewer, as required of any other development in the City. At that point, the City could look at maintaining it and spending LDFA funds. She saw no reason to treat those property owners any differently than any other property owner in the City who wanted to have the same work done. When there was a new development in the City, the developers were required to pay for their own water and sewer. She did not agree with spending tax dollars on something like that and treating the property owners any differently. She was opposed to it being included in the CIP.

Mr. Hooper asked the driving force behind the project. Ms. Roediger responded that in the past year, the LDFA had worked on identifying projects to spend their funds. The LDFA had previously not identified any large projects; it was more of responding to opportunities as they arose, such as the JENOPTIK property and the pathway on Technology. When the LDFA reviewed its original plan and the M-59 Corridor Study done in 2009, the projects had been identified. The LDFA wanted to invest funds in a way that incentivized development of underutilized properties in the LDFA. She noted that the LDFA was a fairly small segment of the community, and it focused on property south of M-59. They were limited geographically on properties LDFA dollars could be spent, and there were a couple of projects in the CIP that the LDFA had voted to prioritize and spend money.

Mr. Hooper summarized that they could spend the money now and incentivize property so a developer would come or wait for a developer to come in and then put in the sanitary sewer.

Mr. Schroeder asked if they did not spend the LDFA monies if they would lose them. Ms. Roediger said that the LDFA could sunset in 2024. The MEDC had recently come down more stringently on the City asking for a plan of how the LDFA would spend its money. The LDFA had been more reactive than proactive, and the MEDC did not really like that the City was sitting on money that the LDFA could be spending, and they were encouraging the City to spend it. If the money was not spent and the LDFA ended, the money would be lost. Mr. Schroeder pointed out that it was not that far away.

Ms. Hoyle listed the water projects:

Advanced Metering Infrastructure for 2024 for \$1,250,000.
Bellbrook Water Main Replacement Project for 2022 with construction in 2023 for \$890,625.
Ascension Providence Rochester Hospital Water Main Improvement Project for 2022 and 2023 for \$1,093,750.
London Bridge Water Main Replacement for 2022 with construction in 2023 for \$1,406,250.
Judson Park Subdivision Water Main Replacement Project for 2023 for \$4,031,250.
RC-02 Improvements for 2022 for \$437,500.
Tienken Road Water Main Project for 2022 for \$113,750.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that it seemed as if there were a lot more water main projects in the CIP than in past years. He asked if the City had evaluated the cause of why so many were being changed and what they were doing to their standards to improve them so it did not happen again.

Ms. Balint of DPS/Engineering explained that they were just starting water main replacements. It was based on the rates, and she noted that they were fortunate in Rochester Hills, because they were minimal. It was based on size, material and age. They were being proactive in the replacement of the water mains. Tienken Road Water Main was a small one, and it would create an additional loop for the pressure districts in case there was a break on that system. The others were more replacement.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked about the subdivision water mains. Ms. Balint said that they had a six-inch water main, which was no longer warranted or approved through state standards. The City no longer put those in, and that was why they were being replaced. They looked back at the age, size and material, and it was based on six-inch. They would still see subdivisions that had a mix of six and eight-inch mains, all being replaced with eight-inch or ten-inch HDP, which was equivalent to eight-inch. Mr. Kaltsounis asked the estimated lifespan for the new pipes, and Ms. Balint responded that it would be 40-50 years. The ones being replaced were from the 1970's or early 1980's.

Mr. Schroeder emphasized that it was an excellent program, and something that should be done to keep up with the maintenance of the water main. Most cities had let it go, and they had whole systems that needed replacing. By doing what they were, they would get rid of leak and break problems and out of date pipes. He felt that every city should have a similar program.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that some Dequindre Rd. projects were pending, but she wondered if there had been an update on the Dequindre Rd. reconstruction between Auburn and South Blvd. Mr. Davis advised that the Road Commission project was scheduled for year 2020. They were still in the process of finalizing some right-of-way concerns and the design. A little north of Auburn, the project would start necking down at Dawes and return to existing conditions there.

Ms. Hoyle discussed Park projects:

Borden Park Office Relocation scheduled for 2020 at \$1,125,000.

Compact Loader for 2021 for \$60,000.

Fraize Mower for 2020 for \$40,000.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the Fraize Mower was for cultivating sod. Mr. Buckenmeyer of the Parks Dept. explained that it was used for leveling and dethatching, and it got rid of dead material on top. It was not for removing sod, but it would get down to the roots, and then it was seeded. It was a way of renovating sports fields quickly - in a matter of weeks as opposed to six months and longer. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if it was something that could be rented. Mr. Buckenmeyer said that they could not; they were very popular on the west coast and in the south, but they had been looking, and they were not in the Midwest yet.

Next was the Rochester Road Pathway at M-59 for 2020-2021 for \$1,110,000. That would make a connection over the M-59 bridge. Infra-Red Aerial Photography was scheduled for 2021 for \$65,000.

Mr. Reece asked what it would be used for. Mr. Davis indicated that it was kind of an "if come" type of project. If the storm water utility moved forward with the City, they would need infra-red aerial photography in order to determine the percentages throughout the City per parcel for imperviousness or to see the paved areas so the cost to distribute storm water utility could be spread based on the recent pictures.

Ms. Hoyle discussed Industrial Drive Road Paving, which would be a shared cost through the LDFA in 2024 with the LDFA share of \$220,000.

Ms. Morita said that she spoke to Mr. Staran about the project. Industrial Drive was a private road that would have to be dedicated to the City first. It did not have the regular width of a public right-of-way. She indicated that she could appreciate the fact that the LDFA had an idea about spending tax dollars on things, but it was not a publicly-owned street.

Until such time as it was, and it was in a condition where the City could accept it, she did not think the City had any business spending tax dollars, or even contemplating spending tax dollars on it. It was the same road where the sanitary sewer line was proposed. She noted that there was another project to be discussed on Leach, which was a public road, but it was partially residential. For other gravel roads in the City, there was an SAD policy. There was a reason the City adhered to that policy - so every property owner in the City was treated the same. The LDFA would be giving preference to certain property owners based on where they were located, and she did not want to get into that situation.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if Industrial was ten years old. Mr. Davis advised that it was very old. He thought that Mr. Kaltsounis was probably thinking about Marketplace Circle, which was new. Industrial Drive was a dead end road that had been connected to Old Adams. It went east-west between Old Adams and Marketplace Circle.

Ms. Hoyle continued:

Leach Rd. Paving, the LDFA project Ms. Morita had mentioned. It was set as an SAD, coming from the LDFA for 2021 with the LDFA share at 40% of \$520,000.

Austin Ave. Improvements scheduled for 2020 for \$1,110,000.

Old Adams and Forester Reconstruction, an LDFA project scheduled for 2020 for \$1,150,000.

Mr. Hooper asked if Austin Ave. was an LDFA-funded project. Ms. Roediger advised that it was not, and that that section of Austin was not within the LDFA.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked the traffic count on Old Adams. Ms. Roediger explained that it was a site that the City had amended a Consent Judgment for a future headquarters of KOSTAL Kontakt. The traffic count would be drastically different than it was currently. Mr. Kaltsounis clarified that there was a potential development coming to the corner with access through the stoplight.

Ms. Hoyle discussed the last project, Waterview Reconstruction, another LDFA project for 2020 for \$2,500,000 and asked if there were any questions. Mr. Kaltsounis wondered if they were not looking at adding sidewalks to Waterview. Ms. Roediger stated that they were. Mr. Kaltsounis said that he had gone down that road many times and almost hit people walking in the street. Ms. Roediger said that Waterview had been identified through the Engineering Dept.'s annual maintenance

program. They knew that they wanted to reconstruct it in a few years, so it was pulled out of maintenance and put in the CIP for the road and a sidewalk. Mr. Davis clarified that it would be a sidewalk, not a pathway. A sidewalk was five feet wide and concrete, and the adjacent property owners had responsibility for maintenance. Pathways were eight feet wide and asphalt, and it would be the City's responsibility to maintain through the mileage.

Mr. Kaltsounis stated that he agreed with Ms. Morita about the roads that were private. He suggested that more thought needed to go into who would pay for what. He commented that he would love the City to pave his driveway, but it was private. He said that he would pull the items LR-19 and SS-12. Ms. Morita mentioned LR-20 (Leach Rd). She said that she understood that LR-20 was a public road, and it was proposed to go forward as an SAD, which was fine as long as the property owners submitted the petition and followed the same procedures as anyone on a gravel road did. To her, the bigger issues were LR-19 and SS-12. LR-19 was currently a private road that did not meet City's standards for width. SS-12, sanitary sewer extension would be down a private roadway. Normally, the City required developers to pay for that.

Ms. Roediger asked, if the Commissioners wanted to consider removing those projects, which the LDFA felt strongly should be in the CIP, that they be put into pending projects. That way, they would not be identifying a year. There were things that would have to happen first. They would not spend money on a private road, but she thought it would be a good idea to have them in as a long-term plan in the CIP.

Ms. Morita stated that she respectfully disagreed with that. She felt that once they were put into the CIP, they would be put into process and continue to be considered, but she maintained that they should not be considered. If the owners wanted to go through the process and have the road built to specifications so that it was acceptable to the City under normal circumstances, at that time, they could be put into the CIP.

Mr. Davis remarked that he was not trying to sway the Commission either way, but he wanted to add some additional information for consideration. The City would typically put in utilities before a road was paved under an SAD. They would not pave a road and then go back and try to put in something deep like a sanitary sewer, and the sanitary sewer for Industrial would be deep. The City had done utility extensions that were not developer funded in the past. He agreed that a lot of the water and sewer the City owned had been built by developers and turned over to the City

through subdivisions or built by private developers and turned over. There were a number of situations in the past where the City had extended sewer and water. The most recent example, in terms of economic development, was an extension on South Blvd. between John R and Dequindre. The whole stretch on the north side of South Blvd. had been vacant, however, a lot of development came after the City did that. He acknowledged that the City had extended water and sewer less than it had received dedicated utilities, but he thought that it could be a consideration. He did not think that it was precedent setting to move forward extending sewer or water if it was needed. Years ago, they had studied extending water and sewer in Section 1. One of the City's policies was to remove people from septic systems. Section 1 might become a priority for the City to extend water and sewer at some point.

Mr. Hooper considered that it did not hurt to put it in pending. It would always come down to City Council funding. Council would determine whether something was going to be funded or not. Regarding economic development, he pointed out Auburn Rd. The City was going to put \$6 million into that as an incentive for new development. He thought that was a key reason why they would want to get utilities in place, as Mr. Davis had indicated. He did not think there would be any harm putting it into pending. He asked if there were other projects the LDFA had considered. There could be some in the future considering the sunset in five years.

Ms. Roediger explained that the LDFA went through a thorough process to identify projects for the road system, the infrastructure, etc. It was a fairly small district, and the City had invested in Waterview and Technology, but they were limited. She felt that they could come up with additional projects, but they would need to go back to the LDFA and brainstorm as to what the priorities were. Some of the projects identified that were not selected were more of the streetscape type, such as retrofitting sidewalks, signage or marketing. The LDFA really wanted to prioritize ways to incentivize redevelopment of Leach Rd., and paving it seemed to be the number one project for that area. There really were not any other opportunities like that in the LDFA district. They could look at projects other than infrastructure, but the infrastructure projects identified had been thoroughly looked at for economic development for the next five years or so.

Mr. Schroeder stated that Leach Rd. had been a problem for a long time. There had been heavy maintenance costs because it was a gravel road. He would consider doing Leach Rd. and paying for it. It was a sore thumb and an eyesore. He stressed that they had to do something to clean it up,

because it looked so bad, so he would recommend doing that project.

Ms. Morita agreed with Mr. Schroeder that it was an eyesore, but she reiterated that the property owners on that road should follow the same process as owners on any other road in the City. If they wanted that gravel road paved, they needed to come to the Engineering Dept., get a petition signed and submitted, and then it could get into the CIP in the normal course of an SAD project. She did not want to foist a 60% responsibility for the paving on the adjacent property owners if they did not want it. That was what would happen with an SAD situation. When the City had previously paid for water and sewer extensions, the roads had all been private rights-of-way. For the projects that were not public rights-of-way, they would be extending into private property, which was the big differential. She pointed out that there was actually \$12 million going to Auburn Rd., and it was a road that needed to be rebuilt, and the City would do the water and sewer at the same time, but it was public property.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that when it came to the two projects, LR-19 and SS-12, he would like to see a sunrise in that area before they made a decision about what to do going forward. He would like to see how future developments looked, and he suggested that they could perhaps look at it in a year. He felt that the area was very different from Auburn Rd. It was more of a gray area where they might need to do something different. He said that he would use Leach Rd. more if it were paved. He used to work on Waterview, and Leach made life a lot easier for a lot of people. He used to live on a road where petitions were offered, and the residents had to pay for the road. He commented that Leach was very special, and he would love to see it paved and to use it. He agreed with comments about redeveloping Leach Rd., because it had a tie-in that was different.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 7:42 p.m. Seeing no one come forward, she closed the Public Hearing.

Hearing no further comments, Mr. Schroeder moved the following motion. Ms. Morita said that she would second it if the maker of the motion would amend it to remove LR-19 and SS-12 and place LR-20 into Projects Pending. Mr. Schroeder agreed with amending the motion.

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Morita, that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission Approves the Capital Improvement Plan that has been proposed for the years 2020-2025. The Rochester Hills Planning Commission has determined the following:

WHEREAS, the Municipal Planning Act, Act 285 of Public Acts of 1931, as amended, requires the Rochester Hills Planning Commission to annually accept a Capital Improvement Plan for the benefit of the health, safety and welfare of the community as those criteria relate to the physical development of Rochester Hills; and

WHEREAS, the Rochester Hills Fiscal Office has consulted with the City's professional staff who carry out the business of planning for and providing for the present and future needs and desires of the citizens of Rochester Hills; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Improvement Plan is meant to consider the immediate and future needs and goals of Rochester Hills, as identified by the public, City Boards and Commissions, and the Mayor's staff, in light of existing projects and plans and anticipated resources; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Improvement Plan is a flexible document, necessarily meant to be reevaluated and amended each year, to project into the six succeeding years, and further amended as needed to address practical realities as they relate to policies and philosophies of relevant Boards, the City Council and the Mayor's office; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Improvement Plan is a guide and forum to aid the Rochester Hills Mayor's Office and the Rochester Hills City Council in making decisions regarding the physical development and infrastructure maintenance of the City and determining what, if any, resources can or should be available to carry out City Council's policies and budgetary decisions; and

WHEREAS, the components of the Capital Improvement Plan have been subject to a public hearing, public review, and committee reviews over the course of several years and a duly noticed full public hearing on April 1, 2019; and

WHEREAS, the components of the Capital Improvement Plan were arrived at through a point system using variables that included, among other things, whether the project has begun, funds committed, sources of funds, prior City Council decisions, Planning Commission or administrative recommendations and decisions; and

WHEREAS, it was determined that projects LR-19 Industrial Drive Road Paving - LDFA and SS-12 Industrial Drive Sanitary Sewer Extension - LDFA should be removed from the CIP, and LR-20 Leach Road Paving -

LDFA should be moved to Projects Pending; and

WHEREAS, *it was determined that projects LS-19 Industrial Drive Road Paving - LDFA and SS-12 Industrial Drive Sanitary Sewer Extension - LDFA should be removed from the CIP, and LS-20 Leach Road Paving - LDFA should be moved to Projects Pending.*

RESOLVED, *that the Capital Improvement Plan presented for review on April 16, 2019, is adopted by the Rochester Hills Planning Commission on April 16, 2019; and*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, *that this Plan should be published and attested to according to law.*

A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Morita, that this matter be Approved. The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously. Subsequent to the meeting, Fiscal advised that the LR numbers should have been LS.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

occupi [2019-0065](#)
aodd

Request for Preliminary Planned Unit Development and Conceptual Site Plan Recommendation - City File No. 18-016 - Rochester Hills Trio, a proposed mixed use development consisting of residential units, office and retail space on 5.77 acres located at the northeast corner of Auburn and Livernois Rds., zoned B-1 Local Business with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay and RM-1 Multiple Family Residential with an FB-1 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-27-351-009, Designhaus Architecture, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated April 12, 2019 and site plans and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Peter Stuhlreyer, Greg Ezzo, Joe Latosis and Mike Pizzola, Designhaus Architecture, 301 Walnut, Rochester, MI 48307 and Fred Haddid, OYK Engineering, owner.

Ms. Kapelanski stated that the applicant was proposing a mixed-use development located at the northeast corner of Livernois and Auburn. The property was zoned B-1 and RM-1 with the FB Overlay over both districts. A PUD was proposed to facilitate the development, consisting of 125 residential units in two three-story buildings and a two-story building at the corner for commercial and office uses only. There had been a

number of modifications requested, including for the height, the front yard arterial setback, the parking setback and the front yard landscaping. The building design entrance transparency had been updated since the last meeting. The applicants were closer to compliance with the Ordinance standards, but a modification was still required. She noted that the matter had been considered and postponed at the February 19 Planning Commission meeting. There had been several issues raised, but the engineering issues raised had been satisfactorily addressed (storm water issues), and there were two outstanding. The first was the proposed right in, right out drive on Auburn. It was the City's contention that a right in only was the only access that should be permitted because of significant safety concerns. Auburn Rd. in that location was under the jurisdiction of MDOT, which had concurred with the City's opinion. The second outstanding issue had to do with the renderings and elevations of the rear portions of the garages on the retaining wall. The applicant had provided views from the adjacent property.

Mr. Stuhldreier recalled a question about the tree deficiency, and he advised that they would pay for eight trees into the City's Tree Fund. He would get into more detail about the rear garages being used as a screen wall and a retaining device in some cases. He indicated that he was at a loss about the façade transparency, which he thought they had figured out. He felt that there was some confusion about the commercial façade being on the residential buildings and the live/work studios and the blend not working out, but they were entirely willing to work out the façade issues, which he felt were very close. He agreed that they were asking for relief for the parking setbacks.

Mr. Stuhldreier said that there was a question about the garages and how they were stepped down because of the grading of the parking lot that was on a slope. They wanted to assure that it was common practice. There was a six-inch fall between each garage door and 12 feet from the center of each garage. Only on the north line was there a problem. He did not think that it would be anything that would strike anyone as troublesome. The roofs would step down about five or six times, and the doors would step down, each slab about four to six inches. Going further east on the property, the parking grade was flat. At the highest grade in the northeast corner of the property, they created terraces and bowed the wall down towards the natural woods to the north and east and softened the edge. The garage wall would be buried in some cases by the grade, and in some cases flush and in others, outside of the grade by several feet. The higher the wall, the further away from the property line (about five feet in the corner).

Mr. Stuhlreyer talked about the water course in the center, which was the flow way across the site. It terminated on the northeast where their outlet pipe would be, which would outlet the detained retention onto the property to the east where it went currently. He asked if there were any questions.

Chairperson Brnabic asked Mr. Stuhlreyer to put up the colored renderings. She noted that they were proposing a water feature and a piece of art, but it was somewhat difficult to see on the plans. Mr. Stuhlreyer said that in the U-shaped building, there would be a feature that was not part of the storm water feature. It would be a self-contained water feature between the arms of the larger building. It would be a small waterfall that would navigate the grade between the two-story and the three-story portion. Chairperson Brnabic said that she did not see anything showing the proposed artwork. Mr. Stuhlreyer believed that the art sculpture would go in the gazebo area, but he did not think they had anything commissioned for the art. They would be happy to come back to show what they had selected. Chairperson Brnabic suggested that it would be a good idea.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that she had a concern with the use of a PUD with the high density proposed. Even though there would be a water feature and an art sculpture, she did not think that was enough to offset the density. She said that the building on the corner was not objectionable. They were projecting that the average rent for the apartments would be \$1,800+ and affordable. She maintained that there were plenty of apartments in the City that were more affordable. She was concerned that they wished to use a PUD, but they were not proposing enough of a public benefit. She did not think that PUDs should be used for everything, and she did not see where the proposal was offering something that stood out that the community needed.. She reiterated that she was concerned with the high density.

Mr. Schroeder asked if the garage on the east end would be five feet above grade. Mr. Stuhlreyer asked if he meant before the floor slab of the garage from the backside, which was confirmed, and he answered that it would be roughly five feet. Mr. Schroeder considered that it could be built within the one-foot offsite. Mr. Stuhlreyer said that they could do that, and they were going to pursue an offsite construction easement with the neighbor.

Mr. Schultz said that he went through the elevations to compare them with some of the floor plans. A couple of times in the past, the

Commissioners had seen a situation where the balconies were not shown in a consistent fashion, or they were shown one way in the rendering and ended up differently in a set of construction documents. They became a Juliet balcony, when they were supposed to be projections. He felt that the clarity on the plans was a little lacking where the elevations, in rendered form, did not necessarily match what they were in floor plan form. He wanted to make sure that before the next step, they had clarity. One isometric rendering showed the building with a Juliet balcony, but in the floor plans, it was shown as a projection. That had led to a lot of frustration in the past for the Commission, so he wanted there to be consistency, so they knew what they were getting.

Mr. Stuhldreier advised that they were working off of the architectural drawings. The floor plans and elevations were more advanced than normal at this stage of site plan approval. They could condition approval on the architectural drawings. Mr. Schultz said that they just did not want to give an approval and have the applicant come back six months later stating that costs had become an issue, and they wished to do a different balcony than was approved. He thought that it would also be helpful if the Commission could see a section view cut through the property as to what the neighbors to the north would look at with respect to the back of the garages. He advised that he was a developer, and he knew how things could be tweaked so a model looked convenient for an argument. He needed to see a section view to see what the back of the garage would look like. If it got obscured by the berm, then it did, but at this point, he did not think that they had all the cards in front of them to make a fair decision. He would like to see it broken up into a carport/garage/carport/garage to break up the massing. It felt like mini-storage the way it looked.

Mr. Kaltsounis had pulled up pictures to see the architectural drawings and to take a closer look at the balconies. The cross section layout showed a balcony that protruded, but on another drawing, it just called out an aluminum railing. He thought that the drawings needed to be updated to help with their final decision when it came to the balconies. He wanted to make sure that things were documented. The plans did not call for balconies, and that was something he would prefer. If something was not called out, it would not happen in his experience. The note said "prefinished aluminum railing system" with no details of a protrusion or anything about the structure. He did not want to get into a same problem that had happened in the past. Mr. Latosis stated that they designed all the balconies to be occupy-able. Mr. Kaltsounis outlined that he would like notes and cross sectional views and details for the balconies.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that Chairperson Brnabic had questions about the density, and he said that he was back and forth about that. He felt that the materials and the colors were stunning. He assumed they were expensive and would set the project apart from anything in the City. He would approve a PUD with the materials shown, because it was over and above what they would typically get. However, the garages were an absolute no go for him. He remarked that they had storage units in the City that looked better than the garages. He would regret driving down Auburn Rd. for the next 20 years and seeing a wall 30 feet tall, and he stated that he could not do it.

Mr. Stuhlreyer pointed out that the back wall of the garage was ten feet. Mr. Kaltsounis said that the City would not even allow a wall that high. He looked at a rendering where it looked as if they had a suspended parking lot. He did not see a ten-foot wall. Mr. Stuhlreyer said that with 30 to 50-foot trees in the woods, they would not be caught off guard. They had to look at the grades to understand that it modulated its way around the site. He pointed to a garage that would be buried with a six-foot wall in the back. It went to a 16-foot wall and back to where the parking lot almost met grade. The site dropped significantly, and the roofs would stay about the same height, so that the three-story buildings were really the loss of the ground and not the rising of the roof. The carports in the apartment development would block most of the back of the garages, and there would be landscaping and trees. He had not seen any resistance from the apartment community. Chairperson Brnabic wondered how much of an awareness that community had about the project, indicating that Mr. Stuhlreyer could not say that there was not resistance if there was no awareness.

Mr. Kaltsounis reiterated that they needed more details, commenting that he was horrified about the garage. He stated that it needed to be broken up or have some kind of feature. He felt that they were taking a beautiful project and ruining it. He said that there had been a lot developers before the Commission that had shown different elevations from the neighboring properties. To him, it looked like a 30-foot wall, but he just did not know, and he needed to see the numbers. There was a beautiful development finished with garages, which did not appeal to him at all. He did not want to look at the wall from Auburn. He said that he looked forward to hearing from the other Commissioners.

Ms. Morita asked Mr. Stuhlreyer to put up page S-100. She said that she was trying to figure out how far back from the lot line the garages were. It

looked as if the building on the far east was about seven feet, three inches from the lot line at the southern portion and six-and-a-half feet at the northern portion. She could not tell how far from the lot line Building E was or if Building D was right on the lot line. Mr. Stuhlreyer said that Building D was right on the lot line. Ms. Morita asked how they proposed to maintain the back side of that building if they did not own the property behind them. Mr. Stuhlreyer said that it would be a solid brick wall, and it would only pitch towards their (applicant) side so there would be no exposure of weather or storm water. It would be very similar to building a brick wall on a property line for screening. There would be no maintenance of the other side of the brick wall. Ms. Morita asked if it would be black brick with black grout. She pointed out that grout occasionally needed to be repaired, and she wondered how they would do that repair if they could not even legally get onto the property. Ms. Morita said that she lived in a brick house, and she had three bricks shatter over the winter that needed to be replaced. She pointed out that there would be a wall with a roof on it. If they could stand on their side of the property and rebuild a wall, that would be one thing, but they would have a building in the way. She asked if they would take down the entire garage in order to get to the back wall. Mr. Stuhlreyer said that if there was a problem with the back of the brick wall, there would have to be an agreement with the neighboring property owner. Ms. Morita asked if they had contacted the owner to see if he would be amenable to an easement to allow maintenance to be done. Mr. Stuhlreyer said that it was something for the developer to do.

Ms. Morita noted that City Council liked PUDs, because the City got a tradeoff of sorts, such as some type of amenity or increased quality. Contrary to Mr. Kaltsounis, she did not particularly like the look of the project. She did not think it fit in with the area. It was very modern and atypical for the other buildings in the area, especially the apartments to the north. She thought that it would stick out, and not really in a good way. She understood the quality of the materials, but she asked what else the City would get. Mr. Stuhlreyer said that when they started discussing the project with the City in 2018, they talked about the FB-2 and what it meant from a 30,000-foot view. It was to bring a more walkable area and something that would engage with pedestrians moving east and west and north and south. By moving the buildings close to the property lines and having end caps and using each of those bookends to provide some sort of light retail, commercial function and live/work studios, there would be connection to sidewalks with a business entry. People walking by would get engaged with the building as opposed to at an apartment complex looking at a parking lot. They provided three pauses along the

pedestrian connection. The first was at the restaurant/retail building end cap, the second was the large, landscaped water feature and the third was the gazebo with the sculpture. That connectivity was what FB was all about. They had to ask for relief to not be as close to the road with the retail because of the Fire Department's road. The PUD and the public benefit were intertwined in the conception of the planning of the project. He understood that it was not as traditional of a building, but he felt that it had the appropriate line of massing and materiality, combining a soft suburban yet commercial edge.

Ms. Morita asked if it was still his position that without the right turn out at the west side of the property that the project would not be successful. Mr. Stuhlreyer said that it was their position that the right turn out was less safe than forcing the blending of commercial traffic with the residential components of the project. Ms. Morita commented that he did not answer the question. Mr. Stuhlreyer thought that the project would be much better off, as most of the intersections in town, with a right out, and not worrying about something being 450 feet away based on MDOT's standard. Ms. Morita asked if it was his position that if they did not have the right turn out that the project could still be a success. Mr. Stuhlreyer felt that it would still be a success, and they were still going to work with MDOT and negotiate, regardless of the outcome.

Mr. Schultz indicated that he fell somewhere in between Ms. Morita and Mr. Kaltsounis regarding the buildings. He did think that the materiality and massing created a new language for the community, because there was not the same type of product mix. To go full apartment building such as that to the north was probably not appropriate and would not fit. He felt that it was good that they were creating new language. He thought that it would get him over the hump regarding the garages if they varied the materials and deviated from the dark brick. He thought that breaking it up with a brick patterning or doing some long board might help break up the long expanse which felt somewhat prison-like. They should cut as many sections as they could to the back side of the property and give the Commissioners a realistic view of what would happen there. If the berm obscured it, it did, and they were telling the truth. The story did not tell itself at this point, and he thought that they needed a few more answers.

Mr. Stuhlreyer said that he understood. In defense of the garage design, he remarked that it was the foil. It was either a big, black brick wall with a bunch of carports or a set of long garages. There would be trees surrounding them and beautiful buildings. He agreed that the garages were backdrop and not heavily detailed. Mr. Shultz stated that he liked

black, glazed brick, which had been done on buildings before. What was proposed was something close to that, but the starkness in the renderings was probably what was putting most of the Commissioners on edge. It was tough to sell materials using SketchUp, which did not necessarily render true to form. He concluded that the more detail the better.

Mr. Hooper said that he fell in line with Mr. Shultz. He referred to sheet C-2.01 and the southeast corner. The top of wall was 822 and bottom of wall was 815, so the wall was seven feet tall with a ten-foot garage on top of that. There would be a 17-foot tall wall at the southeast corner at Auburn Rd. Going north along the wall, the garage stayed ten feet, but the wall went from seven feet to ten feet to eight feet to 11 feet to ten feet, and then there was a step down in the northeast corner that dropped to six feet. At its worst case, the wall was 21 feet high. Traveling west down Auburn Rd., he did not think there was vegetative screening that would screen. There was no berm there. The existing grades dropped, and it fell away. Mr. Stuhlreyer agreed that it fell away from the street, which Mr. Hooper claimed was worse. There was not a berm to hide anything, and the grade continuously fell to the east. He added that along the north property line, the wall was six feet in the corner and went to eight-and-a-half feet to seven feet to two feet to a foot. It went to nothing at the road that cut through to the apartments to the north. From the apartment road to the west, someone would see a ten-foot garage, but to the east, there was a lot of massing to the wall. He felt that there had to be something to break it up, and vegetation would not do it. He suggested getting an easement from the neighbors to plant screening trees on their property in addition to adding something to break up the view. He referred to a rendering of the northeast corner looking west. Mr. Stuhlreyer said that was exactly the worst case scenario of the situation, which they broke down with a terrace. Mr. Hooper said that was where it dropped to a ten-foot garage going west. He said that vegetation next to the wall did not exist, but they were trying to show it. Mr. Stuhlreyer claimed that it was a tree and shrub area. Mr. Hooper asked if it was 20 feet tall, which Mr. Stuhlreyer did not believe. Mr. Hooper said that was his concern. He was trying to look for options and to work with the applicants, and he asked if there was something they could do to reduce the visual impact of the wall.

Mr. Hooper mentioned the request for relief from some FB standards. He did not have a problem with paying into the Tree Fund for the eight trees. He understood the parking lot setbacks. The issue would be maintenance and whether they could get an easement from the neighbors to the east and north to do work. The applicants said that they

could work out the building transparency issues with staff. It came down to the road - the western entrance in and out. MDOT owned the road and stated that they would not allow right in right out, and the City agreed. That sounded like a done deal to him, but if they were able to get MDOT to change its mind, then so be it, however, MDOT did not want it, and staff did not want it.

Mr. Stuhldreier said that they understood, but he sat in a meeting where MDOT allowed it, and they shook hands and left. Mr. Hooper said that something changed, so they had to get back to whoever that was. The Commissioners could not tell the people who owned the road that they had to allow something they did not want. It was not their argument to make. He said that he really liked the project, but there were a couple of things that needed to be improved to make it a better project.

Mr. Reece felt that the summary of comments were pretty spot on. Ms. Morita's comment about the PUD and what the City was getting was that in reality, it was the owner getting the benefit of the PUD. He did not see the project as being particularly walkable in that part of town, other than for people coming from the apartments over to a restaurant. There was not a lot to make people want to walk up and down Auburn Rd. He did not see the City gaining a lot from the development. He thought that it was nice, although in his opinion, it was a little overbuilt. The bigger problem was the entry at the west end of the site and how that was worked out. Without that, it would really make it a congested in and out with the volume of single-family units and the retail. The tree line shown on the east was not realistic. The reality was that the applicant would have to cut in at least a ten-foot road to build the wall. Any trees up against the wall would be gone and need to be replaced. Any of the foundation work that would have to be done would go into the root structure of those trees, and they would most likely die. In the wintertime, people would look at a black wall. Most of those trees were deciduous and would lose leaves, so all someone would see in the winter going down Auburn Rd. would be the wall. He thought that Mr. Schultz' comments were good. There were a lot of benefits to the development, but the Commissioners needed to see more detail. They had to get the balconies worked out, and they had to be clear that what was shown was what they would get. They wanted to make sure that the applicants would not come back with changes to the colors, and something had to be done with the garages. The way they were currently depicted was not acceptable to him. The Commissioners were willing to work with the applicants, but they needed to do something about the stark walls. He stated that was not Rochester Hills, although he realized that changes were coming in the City. He mentioned the dentist

building at Hamlin and Livernois. In his opinion, now that it was built, it looked like it had been dropped from the sky, and it did not belong there. He felt that it was horrendous-looking. He was afraid that they would kick themselves if the garages were approved as shown. The colors and the breakup of the renderings for the buildings were acceptable, but the garages were a show stopper for him.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that a PUD was a request and not an automatic given when a developer applied. Ms. Roediger agreed. She continued that as the applicant indicated, they had been talking about the project for quite some time. Initially, when the project was brought forth, the City was going through its Master Plan process. In terms of the types of uses the City wanted in certain locations, they discussed that it would be a truly integrated, mixed-use project. They discussed affordability and creating a variety of housing options. The Planning Commission had struggled with the balance of creating different types of housing and keeping it affordable with density. A lot of communities dealt with trying to get the right mix of housing at a price point that was affordable without overdeveloping a site. Staff thought the proposal was a worthy project because of the mixture of uses and amenities. They had not touched too much on the walkability of the area, but they had an injury report for pedestrians trying to cross the subject roads. There were people who walked to the IAGD to the south, and there was an injury, because there was a gap in the pathway system at the intersection. There were requests to improve the walkability in the area because of the IAGD, and there were also schools not too far away.

Chairperson Brnabic considered that walkability could be created under the current zoning without going the PUD route. Ms. Roediger agreed. Chairperson Brnabic asked what the gain was for the developer applying for a PUD versus using the current zoning to develop. Ms. Roediger said that it was the height and the mixture of uses. The underlying zoning would not allow residential, office and commercial uses. Chairperson Brnabic said that the commercial would face Livernois, and the apartments would face Auburn, so the projects could be done under the current zoning. She asked if the height was the only thing that could not be done under the current zoning, which was confirmed.

Mr. Kaltsounis was not sure about all the iterations staff had seen, but he did not think that the Planning Commission had seen many. They had just asked for more detail, and they were asking for more again. At the last meeting, there were no renderings for the garages. They thought that there would be a problem with the height and grades. They discussed the

balconies not being defined, talking with the neighbors and getting those approvals in place. There was an assumption of communication with the neighbors, but he asked if anyone had been notified besides the apartment complex owner.

Mr. Haddid said that he did talk with the owner who knew what was going on and what was planned. It was his understanding that the owner even came to the City, but Ms. Roediger said that she had not talked with him. Mr. Kaltsounis said that the Commissioners needed more details and iterations. He recommended postponing the matter to give the applicant time to sort out the issues raised as well as the issue with MDOT. He felt that there were a lot of loose ends and too many questions with the concept.

Mr. Davis said that he had just heard that Mr. Haddid had talked with the adjacent property owners. He stated that there would be a private street that connected to a private street. The development to the north had rights to cross the subject property to get to Auburn Rd. He was often asked, years after developments were in place and the developers were gone, how something happened and why something had not been foreseen. He asked what would prevent the traffic from Trio going through the apartment complex. He asked Mr. Haddid if he had talked to them about that and if they were okay with that. He asked if an amendment could be in place so the Trio traffic could drive through the apartment's roads. There was a legal document in place so that the apartment traffic could use Trio's roads, but he had not heard anything about the other way around. As far as the storm water, they had approved the calculations, and detention volumes had been provided, and the outlet direction all made sense. He had also wanted to see some discussion with the apartment owner on how the route would go through their property. He indicated that it seemed as if it would be pretty harmless, but the City had a problem across the street that was of the same nature. When the Mosque developed, there was a natural water course and when the calculations were run, it showed that the existing amount of water was consistent with .2 CFS per acre allowed to be discharged from a detention basin. They had years of problems with that, because of a property owner who said that all the shallow concentrated flow was concentrated into a pipe and discharged right at his property line and carved out a ditch through his property. There was the same potential with the subject development. If the adjacent property owner and the applicant were okay with that, he would be. He wanted to hear that communication, not that someone came to City Hall, and said he had seen the plans. That was not enough. It needed to go to the next level where there was something

in writing about the flow and about going on his property to repair some bricks or planting some trees on the adjacent property for screening. He suggested having a meeting between MDOT and the City and the applicant to talk about the west entrance, but as it stood, it was a right in only that had been approved. Regardless of what might have happened in a previous meeting that was where it stood.

Mr. Haddid stated that they had a long meeting with the adjacent owner. They met in his office and showed him the plans and discussed sharing the wetland for detention. He said that the neighbor was planning to expand, so he came to the City to discuss the option of expanding. They had talked with the neighbor about the wall, the garages, the three-story building and everything. Mr. Davis said that having a written document for the Commission in support was a lot different than hearing that a meeting was held. Mr. Haddid did not know if that was needed, since the other owner did not come to the Public Hearing. He saw what was planned and did not have a problem, so Mr. Haddid questioned why a letter was needed. Mr. Kaltsounis said that there was a term in his industry called "industrial amnesia." If the traffic from the proposed development impeded on the other owner's property, and he decided to come after Mr. Haddid for road repairs, and they started going back and forth, it would just protect Mr. Haddid in the future. To avoid industrial amnesia, the Commission made sure that things were well documented. They had recent experiences of things not being well documented that made trouble for people. He reiterated that it was just to protect Mr. Haddid, and it was a good thing to do. He said that it would avoid pain and lawsuits in the future. He would not just trust anyone's word, and he would be much more comfortable seeing something in writing. Mr. Haddid wondered if his project would be a no go if the owner did not want to write a letter, but he said that he would try.

Mr. Schultz said that for projects of this scale, he thought that the Commission needed to talk a little more in detail about a phasing situation. He guessed that the project would potentially be \$30-50 million, but there could be an economic swing during some of the development, and things might not get developed. He felt that it would help to have a phasing document in the PUD Agreement that stated that certain things would happen first, and afterwards other phases could happen, especially with a project of that size. He indicated that if they had to have another meeting with the neighbor to be a good neighbor and document things, it would be a \$50 million insurance policy. He stated that the more meetings the better.

Chairperson Brnabic said that she agreed exactly. She re-expressed her concern with the project. She had seen a lot of PUDs come before the Commission over the years. There always had been a benefit and something that would be a plus for the community. She was leery when someone applied for a PUD where she could not see the benefit stand out. It boiled down to three stories. If developers wanted that, and that was the vision of the City for the future, she thought that they should have further discussions about rezoning. She did not like the concept of everyone using a PUD. A PUD stood for something; it was not just an ordinary way to develop. They would have more control with a PUD, but they should not be a dime a dozen. That was her concern, and they were using a PUD to get three stories, and the benefit was not standing out. They had seen a lot of PUDs where the benefit to the community stood out, and she did not feel that the proposed was one. She did not support the project the way it was.

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Dettloff, that in the matter of City File No. 18-016 (Rochester Hills Trio), the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby **postpones** the request for **Preliminary Planned Unit Development Recommendation** until such time as the applicant can provide details as discussed, including details and cross sections for the wall, the balconies, the entrance by the intersection on Auburn and getting approvals in writing from the neighbor about the wall, the drainage and traffic into the apartment complex.

Chairperson Brnabic asked the applicants if they agreed with the postponement. Mr. Stuhlreyer summarized that by the next meeting, they should have had a conversation with the neighbor, and provide clarification of the balcony locations and detail of the balconies and a redesign of the garages, with the understanding that the board understood that no matter what they did with the brick wall, there would be a brick wall on the property line, whether it had a garage attached or not, and even if it was just a standard six-foot wall, it would be 13 feet. That was just a condition of how the site balanced whether it was fourteen townhomes or the proposed project. He added that a brick wall on the outside had that unfortunate scenario.

Mr. Dettloff asked about Mr. Davis' recommendation to meet with MDOT, the City and the applicants. Mr. Stuhlreyer said that they would have to speak with their legal counsel to see what the strategy would be moving forward with MDOT, and they would have an answer at the meeting. They might very well take the right out off. Regarding the drainage, they would address it again and show that measures had already been taken to not

have the pipe discharge onto the adjacent property at all. There was a six-foot gravel spillway on the applicant's property, and they had even more property before it got off the property line. The creation of a ditch was unlikely, but they would further detail that and bring it back for discussion.

Mr. Hooper said that for the garages, they should break the wall up, add screening, obtain an easement agreement with the neighbor, and soften the eastern wall somehow. He understood what Mr. Stuhlreyer was saying, and that the wall was a wall because of the detention system and the grade being raised, but they still had to soften the impact. Mr. Stuhlreyer said that they would have a discussion with the neighbor to see how he felt about it. There were options that would not benefit him. Carports with lights under them being higher than the wall would not be good for them. A wall that had materials that had to be maintained on their side just to break up the massing might not be good for them. The neighbor meeting would determine a lot of the design approach.

Mr. Kaltsounis emphasized that the neighbors were also the hundreds of thousands of people that drove down Auburn Rd., and he was one of them. Mr. Stuhlreyer said that he would do a better job of showing how the wall would impact people visually coming down the road. Mr. Kaltsounis recommended getting a picture before the trees got leaves.

Mr. Schroeder asked if there was a chance of building the berm against the wall on the neighbor's property or putting a wall in between the applicant's and the neighbor's roadway (a second berm and more trees) to break it up. Mr. Stuhlreyer felt that more trees would be appropriate but not to change the way the water flowed. They would try to show that better from the neighbors' point of view. He felt that they could add trees, including perhaps the eight trees they were paying into the Tree Fund.

Mr. Shultz suggested to Mr. Ezzo to do a ready rock wall with the garages on top of that so that there were two entirely different materials instead of having a poured, concrete wall with brick face.

Voice Vote:

Ayes: All
Nays: None
Absent: None

MOTION CARRIED

Chairperson Brnabic called for a break from 8:55 p.m. to 9:05 p.m.

NEW BUSINESS

2019-0161 Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 19-013 - Auburn Rd. Parking Lots, two new parking lots to be constructed north of Auburn west of Dequindre, one on Emmons and one between Harrison and Eastern, as part of the Auburn Rd. Corridor Project, zoned R-4 One Family Residential, Parcel Nos. 15-25-456-033 and 15-25-458-040, City of Rochester Hills, Applicant
(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated April 12, 2019 and site plans and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Ms. Roediger advised that staff had been working on the Auburn Rd. Corridor project and as part of that, they had developed the City's first municipal parking lots. The City had been working with the consultants, OHM Advisors. She introduced Mark Loch and Ben Weaver who were present to answer any questions. Mr. Davis was also present for questions. She noted that as with a lot of public improvement projects, there was a site plan for approval.

Ms. Kapelanski advised that comments were sent to OHM, mostly having to do with deficient landscaping and being short one barrier free parking space in the Harrison Ave. parking lot. OHM sent revised plans after the fact, they had not been included in the packet because the review letters would not have made sense. They were able to fit in the landscaping and adjust things to accommodate a barrier free space.

Mr. Davis indicated that there had been a lot of activity in the area recently. They were still relocating some of the utility poles. Detroit Edison had relocated all the new poles, but the wires were still being moved. There were a couple of cable companies and AT&T also being relocated. Consumers Energy was installing two new gas mains. The existing six-inch on the north side of Auburn was being abandoned, and some of the cross street tie-ins were being abandoned for a new six-inch on the north side and a new two-inch on the south side. They received a demolition contract for the homes on the parking lots. The contractors were going through the abatement process, because there was some asbestos material. They were on track for the homes to be demolished in two days. There was another contractor doing the alley and the parking lot paving. The contract was recently awarded by Council, and it was with a company the City had dealt with for many years for its asphalt projects and rehabilitation projects. Recently, the contract to rebuild Auburn Rd. had been opened. It was running through MDOT, because there was federal funding involved, and the bid was let by MDOT. Iafrate

Construction was the low bidder. Mr. Davis stated that the project was on schedule and moving along. Last Saturday, the alley contractor, Pro-Line Asphalt, started work and removed at least one of the walls behind Pizza One on the north.

Chairperson Brnabic asked how many parking spaces were in each of the parking lots. Ms. Kapelanski advised that the Emmons lot included 20 spaces, and the Harrison lot would have 90. Chairperson Brnabic said that because the fencing system was included, she was curious because they would be public parking lots, and she wondered about future maintenance. She asked if any thought had been given as to when and how often it might be done.

Mr. Davis responded that fencing had been a pretty significant item for the project, not only for the parking lots but to provide a consistent demarcation between the commercial district on Auburn and the residents on the other side of the alleys. They looked at the type of fencing, and they quickly ruled out a wooden fence that might require maintenance. They went with a composite fence that would be more maintenance-free and attractive. The fence would be similar to the vinyl fencing on Livernois north of Avon, but it should be a little more durable and fade resistant. They would still determine the final color. The one they picked should balance the cost and the maintenance responsibilities, and they thought that it would be acceptable to the adjacent residents. Chairperson Brnabic thought that it looked like very nice fencing. She still questioned how often maintenance would have to occur. Mr. Davis said that the City owned the fencing on Livernois, but they only went out when it got damaged. They had not done any large scale replacement, and it had been in place about 20 years. The one for the parking lots would be a little closer to plowing activities. They had done some graffiti removal on Livernois, but nothing significant.

Mr. Davis asked Mr. Weaver and Mr. Loch from OHM Advisors to come forward. He noted that they had been the consulting engineers who designed the alley and road plans and would be involved during construction.

Mr. Weaver confirmed that the fence was not vinyl but a composite made by Trex, which was popular with decking. It was thinner than a standard deck board and came in a groove that sat in a frame. They liked it because it was able to be power washed. If it got spray painted, if it could be taken care of within the first 24-48 hours, there was a cleaner that should work. It was readily available through the manufacturer or through

a number of suppliers, including Home Depot and Lowe's. The fence was not something they would buy and have to replace in ten years. Throughout the whole corridor renovation process, it was one of the options presented to the residents and business owners in the area, and they all liked it. It was also relatively inexpensive. Chairperson Brnabic hoped that there would not be a lot of graffiti.

Mr. Schroeder asked how detention would be handled on the lots. Mr. Davis explained that the project was pretty unique in how it would handle storm water. There would be over 40 rain gardens along Auburn Rd. There would be some dry well structures in the parking lots that would encourage infiltration into the ground. In that part of the City, it would be very attractive to utilize existing soil conditions, which were very good for infiltrating storm water. They did not have a lot of that in the City. They would not have a detention basin or detention being provided on top of the parking lot. They had worked with Oakland County's Water Resources Commission which had reviewed the plans and determined that in addition to the detention, there should be some water quality units. There was a 72-inch pipe to the County drain.

Ms. Morita said that it was her understanding that there would be a gathering area park with a splash pad by one of the parking lots. There would be huge canopies made out of metal and sculptural trees that reminded her of something from Dr. Seuss. She thought that the fencing they were proposing seemed a little provincial compared with what was being done in the neighboring park. She asked what thought had gone into the overall look of the area in relation to what the fence would look like in proximity to a pretty modern park. She asked if they would be doing Trex fencing in a vertical fashion rather than horizontal. She asked if they had looked at modernizing the look of the fencing, so it would match what was going on in the area with all the redevelopment they were planning to spend a lot of money on.

Mr. Weaver said that the fence was shown vertically. He spoke with the manufacturer, and they could do it horizontally, however, there were some warranty implications. There would be a support bracket on the bottom to help hold the panels in place. If they were turned at 90 degrees to be horizontal, the lower support panel would not function as well. There were some other custom options. Given that it was a public area, and there was potential to have it damaged on occasion, Trex seemed to be the better alternative. Ms. Morita asked if they had looked at doing something a little higher quality, such as brick. Mr. Weaver said that they did discuss other options, although brick was never discussed because of price.

They anticipated brick to be two to three times as much. Ms. Morita said that when they were looking at spending hundreds of thousands of dollars for the canopies and the sculptural trees, she did not understand why they would short the entire look of the area with a fence that might not fit. She did not think that the Planning Commission was getting the benefit of what the park would look like with Trex fencing right behind it. She did not think it would match. She asked if there was something else that would be a better fit with the look of the park.

Mr. Weaver said that they liked the look of the fence. They weighed other options, but they kept coming back to the proposed because of maintenance and cost and how it looked. Ms. Morita asked if the life span of a brick wall would be longer, to which he agreed. She asked the difference in life span for each. Mr. Weaver said that brick would last two or three times longer. Ms. Morita considered that for a product that would last three times as long, they would spend two to three times as much. She questioned why they would not spend the tax dollars on something that would last longer as opposed to putting in a product that would not. Mr. Weaver stated that there would be a 25-year warranty. Ms. Morita said that they would have to spend \$300,000 in 25 years for a new fence. Mr. Weaver said that a warranty being 25 years did not mean it would just crumble in 25 years. Ms. Morita said that she had had some difficulties with certain aspects of the Auburn Corridor Plan, especially considering the escalating costs for a project that was originally supposed to cost about \$6 million. If they were going to spend \$15 million on the project, she did not want to cheap out on a fence. That made absolutely no sense to her. She understood that there were some restrictions on footings and being able to put a brick wall next to a neighboring property, but she maintained that they were things that could get worked out with an easement. Looking at the overall look of the project, she would like to see something that would be appropriate for what they were spending their money that would last. She did not want the City to have to pay to put up a new fence in 25 years or even have to replace significant sections.

Mr. Loch said that there was the impression that it was a cheap fence. He stated that there were much cheaper options out there. He was afraid that a brick wall might cost a lot more than they thought - one half to one million dollars more. Ms. Morita said that they did not have that option before them. The Planning Commission had seen some of the plans, but they did not have the benefit of looking at what the park would look like with the fence behind it. She thought that they needed to see the whole thing if they were going to spend \$300,000 on a splash pad and more on the other items and then put Trex fencing behind it. She wondered how it

would all look together. She did not think that the initial renderings had Trex fencing behind it.

Ms. Rodiger said that as Ms. Morita indicated, they were still working on the details for the Emmons Rd. plaza and the median gateway treatments and the roundabout artistic elements as a future phase three they would be going out for bid in the next month or so. They would bring the plaza plans in front of the Planning Commission in the summer for review. There had been a lot of discussion about tying the themes together. The thought was that the alley was behind the buildings, and they were trying to respect the residential character of those homes. There would be a small restroom/storage building in the plaza, which initially was going to be more modern, but they had added residential character in keeping with the neighborhood. There had been some concerns about the artistic elements in the roundabouts, but they would be in Auburn Rd. The fencing would be behind the alleys, so there was not really close proximity of the artistic features in Auburn and the alley abutting the residential. She understood the concern and making the entire corridor smooth. Ms. Morita asked about the red canopies going into the plaza. Ms. Roediger said that they had been removed, and there would just be three in the roundabouts. There would be something with a fabric material not metal. Ms. Morita said that she was having difficulty picturing everything together.

Mr. Davis explained that the majority of the fencing had already been bid and planned with the alley paving contract. It had already been decided, awarded and construction had started. The fencing around the parking lots could change if needed, but they were moving forward with the alley fencing (over 3,000 feet of fencing) which would be Trex.

Chairperson Brnabic asked the speaker to come forward.

Paul Boulanger, 2025 Mapleridge Rd., Rochester Hills, MI 48309 Mr. Boulanger knew that the project was pretty far along. He asked if they were required to put in a roundabout. He was curious about the location of the roundabout and why it was there. He was curious about how many times people had parallel parked in the area, because he had not seen any in the area. He was concerned about that, because he claimed that parallel parking took time. Also, it was the route used by ambulances to the hospital. He would hate to be a person in the back of the ambulance that was held up by someone trying to parallel park.

Mr. Loch advised that there were two roundabouts planned - one at

Harrison and one at Gerald. The locations were picked for certain reasons. The roundabouts would allow a left turn. There would be a median planting area that would prohibit left turns from eastbound traffic to the opposite side street. There were only two locations people could do that, and it would be at the roundabout locations. The Harrison one would be a big traffic generator with the restaurant, and the Gerald location had a gas station where they negotiated so fuel trucks could get in and out. The roundabouts were added for traffic calming. They wanted to bring the speeds down for walkability and safety. Regarding parallel parking, he was not sure there was any in the area, but people would get used to it. There would be parking behind the buildings if they were not comfortable with it. Regarding the EMT vehicle issue, he believed that had been vetted with the Police and Fire Departments, and they were comfortable with the design.

Chairperson Brnabic asked if the parallel parking spaces were elongated. She knew that when the project started a few years ago, there had been discussion about that and about people getting in and out of those spaces. It was said that it was going to be considered, and she wondered if it had happened. Mr. Loch said that typical parking spaces were 9 x 18, and parallel parking spaces would be 22 feet long.

Mr. Boulanger asked who ordered the traffic to be calmed. Most of the time, he heard that calming the traffic was done by the businesses, because they thought it would get them more business. People would notice the stores. He said that there was a way around that. He knew people in advertising that could make a place purposeful for people traveling by. They would not want people taking their eyes off the road. He had seen in some cities where they calmed the traffic, and they lost the traffic because people cut through subdivisions. They would not go where it was 25 m.p.h. He stated that roads were built because people wanted to get out of the City - not get into more traffic. He did not understand the idea of calming traffic except for pedestrians to cross safely. Mr. Loch agreed that was the main point. Mr. Boulanger thought that there were some parks there already, and Mr. Loch said that there was a school in the area. Mr. Boulanger said that he would like them to think about roads as a way of expediting traffic getting from one spot to another. When people had trouble crossing in Detroit in the 1950's, which took about two hours, they built the Davison. People lived in the suburbs and worked in Detroit, and they did not come out for the traffic or calm traffic. They came out to have a place away from it all. He was concerned about the ambulances going to the hospital on Dequindre.

Ms. Roediger responded that when the study began in 2016, there was an unsafe situation with cars backing into the road and undefined non-motorized transportation. There was an effort to improve the safety of the corridor for parking, vehicles, pedestrian and bicycles and to try to create a place in the Brooklands community. There was existing suburban strip development, and the idea was to create a node in the Brooklands and build upon the existing infrastructure to create something different. She understood that roads were originally designed to get people to and from, and they were trying to get people to and from places in multiple modes of transportation. The City embarked on a comprehensive study and follow-up implementation plan to improve the area for everyone in the area.

Mr. Kaltsounis pointed out that the footcandles were not a zero at the property lines, which would shine onto the neighbors. He asked if it had to be zero. Ms. Kapelanski said that it was 0.5, and it was in compliance.

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

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, in the matter of City File No. 19-013 (Auburn Rd. Parking Lots), the Planning Commission ***approves the Site Plan***, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on March 15, 2019 with the following six (6) 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 proposed project will be accessed from Emmons, Harrison and the alley north of Auburn thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets.*
- 3. Off-street parking areas have been designed to avoid common traffic problems and promote safety for the school visitors.*
- 4. The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory relationship with 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.*
6. *The parking lots are an important component of the Auburn Rd. corridor improvements to enhance the shopping, dining and business related activities in the corridor.*

Condition

1. *Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, prior to final approval by staff.*

Mr. Reece asked if the City had talked with the neighbors and gotten any feedback relative to the lot locations. He felt that Trex was a good solution. He would love to see a brick wall, but the City could not pay that kind of money. Trex was a durable product, and he was okay with the fencing.

Ms. Roediger advised that she and Mr. Davis walked all the properties abutting the alley many times. They spoke with the homeowners immediately abutting the parking lots specifically, and there were no issues. Mr. Davis said that oftentimes, there were angry people with every project they did. He was amazed how supportive the people had been about the project. They were very happy it was being done in the City. There would be tree removals, and people would be temporarily inconvenienced until the fencing could be installed, but it was surprising how supportive people had been

Mr. Weaver added that at the public meeting a week ago, people had no problem when they were shown pictures. Mr. Reece stated that he really liked the weekly updates from OHM about the project. He said that they provided a lot of information, and he commended them for doing it.

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, that this matter be Approved. The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

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

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Roediger mentioned that last year, the Planning Commission was

asked to attend a workplace violence training seminar that was put on by the City. All City staff went through the training, and it was offered to the boards and commissions. There was now a follow-up training called De-Escalation Training. Staff had gone through that, and they were finalizing dates for when City Council and the Planning Commission could attend. They were looking at the two Council meeting dates in May, but once it was scheduled she would forward it to the members. It was intended to provide guidance on how to handle angry customers and meeting attendees and how to de-escalate the situation.

Ms. Morita asked if the training would be tailored to members on a public board. The last training was more geared toward safety issues for staff but not necessarily for someone sitting at the dias. She did not think they should get the same presentation that was given to staff. Ms. Roediger said that she would make sure to forward that comment. Ms. Morita asked if they could get a report as to what came out of the last training. Ms. Roediger believed that would be part of the training to advise what methods had been implemented as a result of the initial workplace violence training. Ms. Morita said that she had not really seen anything involving the Council chambers.

Chairperson Brnabic said that she missed the first one, so she was looking forward to it. Ms. Roediger said that a video was provided for people who missed it.

Mr. Kaltsounis said he had noticed that the church, where the Bebb Oak was located, was up for sale. He knew that the City was working on updating the Tree Conservation Ordinance, and he wondered if they might be able to take the tree down. Ms. Roediger said that she could not imagine how the City would, in any way, allow that. Mr. Kaltsounis asked how that could be prevented. Ms. Roediger said that depending on how the property developed, if there was any kind of discretionary review involved, that tree would be a main consideration. When staff met with anyone interested in developing, they identified the key points, so how to preserve that tree would be at the top. Parks and Natural Resources was working with Mr. Staran on the language, and the goal was to have something before the Commissioners by July.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Chairperson Brnabic reminded the Commissioners that the next Regular Meeting was scheduled for May 21, 2019.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission and upon motion by Mr. Kaltsounis, seconded by Mr. Reece, Chairperson Brnabic adjourned the Regular Meeting at 9:50 p.m.

Deborah Brnabic, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Secretary