



Planning and Economic Development

Sara Roediger, AICP, Director

From: Kristen Kapelanski, AICP
Date: 1/27/2020
Re: **Rochester Hills Research Park (City File #18-021)**
Preliminary PUD Plan - Planning Review #6

The applicant is pursuing the development of a campus at the existing EEI Global site on approximately 25 acres on the west side of Livernois Road, south of Avon. The campus would include the two existing buildings on site, with the inclusion of an addition at one of those along with three additional buildings and an interconnected roadway and pedestrian system. Proposed uses include warehouse/production and office/research. The project was reviewed for conformance with the City of Rochester Hills Zoning Ordinance. The performance standards detailing requirements for odors, noise, hazardous substances, etc. listed in *Section 138-10.310* shall apply to all industrial uses. The comments below and in other review letters are minor in nature and can be incorporated into a final site plan submittal for review by staff after review by the Planning Commission.

1. **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

Review Process

The PUD review process consists of a two-step process as follows:

- a. **Step One: Preliminary PUD.** The Preliminary PUD 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 Preliminary PUD 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.
- b. **Step Two: Final PUD/Site Plan/PUD Agreement.** The second step in the process is to develop full site plans based on the approved Preliminary PUD 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.

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 intent of the REC-W zoning district; however variations are proposed for site design that necessitate the use of the PUD. The development of an office/industrial campus with pedestrian connectivity and 'lifestyle' features in mind provides some diversity in employment center development within the City.
- 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 desired intent of the REC-W zoning district, there are potentially a number of variances under conventional zoning that may be required. 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 Regional Employment Center uses on the site, which contemplates all of the uses proposed. The Engineering Department will conduct a full review of public utility and service needs during step two site plan review.
- 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 proposed open space on the site, food truck shelter area and trail connections.
 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 identifies open space throughout the site as well as a sheltered food truck area and two connections to the Clinton River Trail.
 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.* The proposed road connection between Rochester Industrial Drive and Horizon Court would provide an alternative route that diverts vehicles from the Hamlin/Livernois intersection and provides more direct access to businesses in the 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. *Promote the mix of commercial, office and industrial uses in a way that fosters collaboration and business growth, while creating a desirable environment for the local workforce.*
 - b. *Promote the use of accepted traffic calming and access management techniques that make all travel safe and efficient.*
 - c. *Provide a safe, efficient non-motorized pathway system that provides links to various land uses throughout the city that gives residents choice about their modes of travel.*
 4. *To facilitate development consistent with the Regional Employment Center goals, objectives, and design standards in the City's Master Land Use Plan.* The proposed development accomplishes a number of the design objections outlined in the M-59 Corridor Study for this area of the Rochester Industrial Park.
 - a. A road connection between Rochester Industrial Drive and Horizon Court would be established.
 - b. Existing and proposed buildings have been designed to integrate seamlessly with one another on a shared campus.
 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 proposed development of an office/warehouse campus is in line with master plan recommendations for the property.
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.* Not applicable.
8. *To enhance the aesthetic appearance of the City through quality building design and site development.*
 Elevations have been provided that show buildings composed of primarily warm toned brick with metal accents and significant amounts of glass.

2. **Preliminary PUD Plan (Section 138-7.105).** The following items must be submitted as part of the Preliminary PUD plan submittal:
 - a. Any deed restrictions or restrictive covenants associated with the property.
 - b. A written statement explaining in detail the applicant's full intentions under the PUD option including the type of dwelling units or uses contemplated and resulting population, floor area, parking and supporting documentation, including the intended schedule of development.
 - c. Written verification from the owner of the property that the applicant is authorized to pursue a PUD.

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 Preliminary PUD.

3. **Zoning and Use (Section 138-4.300).** The site is zoned REC-W Regional Employment Center - Workplace which permits warehouse/production operations and office/lab/research uses. Additional standards may apply depending on the specific type of production facility proposed. Refer to the table below for the zoning and existing and future land use designations for the proposed site and surrounding parcels.

	Zoning	Existing Land Use	Future Land Use
Proposed Site	REC-W Regional Employment Center-Workplace	EEl Global	Workplace
North	O-1 Office Business	Kosnic & Murphy Dental	Workplace
South	REC-W Regional Employment Center - Workplace	Vacant, Air and Liquid Systems and RH Fire Station	Workplace
East (across Livernois)	R-4 One-Family Residential	Single Family Residential	Residential 4
West	R-2 One-Family Residential	Avon Nature Center	Park/Public Open Space

4. **Site Design and Layout (Section 138-6.600-602).** Refer to the table below as it relates to the area, setback, and building requirements of this project in the REC-W district.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Max. Height 42 ft.	42 ft.	In compliance
Min. Front Setback 10 ft.	39 ft.	In compliance
Min. Side Setback 25 ft.	33 ft.	In compliance
Min. Rear Setback 30 ft.	39 ft.	In compliance

5. **Exterior Lighting (Section 138-10.200-204).** A photometric plan showing the location and intensity of exterior lighting must be provided. Refer to the table below as it relates to the lighting requirements for this project.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Shielding/Glare Lighting shall be fully shielded & directed downward at a 90° angle	Cut sheets provided	In compliance

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Fixtures shall incorporate full cutoff housings, louvers, glare shields, optics, reflectors or other measures to prevent off-site glare & minimize light pollution Only flat lenses are permitted on light fixtures; sag or protruding lenses are prohibited		
Max. Intensity (measured in footcandles fc.) 10 fc. anywhere on-site, 1 fc. at ROW, & 0.5 fc. at any other property line	Photometric data provided	In compliance
Lamps Max. wattage of 250 watts per fixture LED or low pressure sodium for low traffic areas, LED, high pressure sodium or metal halide for parking lots	Max. 217	In compliance
Max. Height 20 ft.	Max. 20 ft.	In compliance

6. **Parking, Loading and Access (138-11.100-308).** Refer to the table below as it relates to the parking and loading requirements of this project.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Min. # Parking Spaces Warehouse: 1 space per 1,700 sq. ft. + 1 space per 350 sq. ft. of office = 148,760 sq. ft./1,700 = 88 spaces Office: 1 space per 350 sq. ft. = 270,440 sq. ft./350 = 773 861 spaces required	605 spaces	See a. below – It is recommended the applicant provide additional information on building uses and need for reduced parking prior to the Planning Commission meeting
Max. # Parking Spaces 125% of Min. = 1,076 spaces		
Min. Barrier Free Spaces 5 BF spaces + 2% - 11 ft. in width w/ 5 ft. aisle for 500-1,000 parking spaces = 18 spaces	18 spaces	In compliance
Min. Parking Space Dimensions 9 ft. x 18 ft. (employee spaces) 10 ft. x 18 ft. (customer spaces) 24 ft. aisle 8 ft. x 22 ft. (parallel) 12 ft. aisle	10 ft. x 18 ft. 24 ft. aisle 8 ft. x 22 ft. 12 ft. aisle	In compliance
Min. Parking Front Setback 10 ft.	28 ft.	In compliance
Min. Parking Side Setback 10 ft. from adjacent non-residential 10 ft. from adjacent residential zoning	10 ft. from non-residential 25 ft. from residential	In compliance
Min. Parking Setback from Bldgs. 5 ft.	5 ft.	In compliance
Street Design Internal streets to be designed with sidewalks, on-street parking and bldgs. located along proposed streets	Internal street proposed with frontage buildings, on-street parking and pathways	In compliance
Loading Space 1-3 spaces required for each bldg.	Loading space provided for all warehouse buildings	In compliance

- a. **The Planning Commission/City Council have the ability to modify the minimum parking requirements as part of the PUD.**
- b. Significant pedestrian features, connections and networks have been proposed. This includes two connections to the Clinton River Trail, an employee plaza, a food truck central with covered shelter and open space.

7. **Natural Features.** In addition to the comments below, refer to the review letters from Engineering and Forestry Departments that may pertain to natural features protection.

- a. **Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (Section 138-2.204.G)** An EIS consistent with ordinance regulations has been submitted.

- b. **Tree Removal** (*Section 126 Natural Resources, Article III Tree Conservation*). The site is subject to the city's previous tree conservation ordinance. Any healthy tree greater than 6" in caliper that will be removed must be replaced with one tree credit. Trees that are dead or in poor condition need not be replaced. The removal of any regulated tree requires the approval of a tree removal permit and associated tree replacement credits, in the form of additional plantings as regulated in the Tree Conservation Ordinance or a payment of \$216.75 per credit into the City's tree fund. A tree preservation plan has been provided indicating the removal of 134 regulated trees, 125 of which will be replaced on site and 9 of which will be paid into the tree fund.
 - c. **Wetlands** (*Section 126 Natural Resources, Article IV Wetland and Watercourse Protection*). The site does not contain any regulated wetlands.
 - d. **Natural Features Setback** (*Section 138-9 Chapter 1*). The site does not contain any regulated wetlands.
 - e. **Steep Slopes** (*Section 138-9 Chapter 2*). The site appears to contain some regulated steep slopes. Refer to the engineering review letter for additional information.
 - f. **Equipment Screening** (*Section 138-10.310.J*). All heating, ventilation and air conditioning mechanical equipment located on the exterior of the building shall be screened from adjacent streets and properties.
8. **Dumpster Enclosure** (*Section 138-10.311*). Dumpsters are indicated on the plans. Screening to match the proposed building elevations has been provided.
 9. **Landscaping** (*138-12.100-308*). A landscape plan, signed and sealed by a registered landscape architect, has been provided. Refer to the table below as it relates to the landscape requirements for this project.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Buffer D (west: 1,284 ft.) 8 ft. width with solid green wall + 2.5 deciduous + 1.5 ornamental per 100 ft. = 8 ft. with solid green wall + 32 deciduous + 19 ornamental	8 ft. with green wall 38 deciduous (6 existing) 19 ornamental	In compliance
Buffer D (north: 246 ft.) 8 ft. width with solid green wall + 2.5 deciduous + 1.5 ornamental per 100 ft. = 8 ft. width with solid green wall + 6 deciduous + 4 ornamental	6 deciduous 4 ornamental Solid green wall	In compliance
Right of Way (Livernois Rd.: 1,535 ft.) 1 deciduous per 35 ft. + 1 ornamental per 60 ft. = 44 deciduous + 26 ornamental	70 existing trees to remain	Existing vegetation can meet the requirements of the ordinance at the discretion of the Planning Commission
Parking Lot: Interior 5% of parking lot + 1 deciduous per 150 sq. ft. landscape area = 12,440 sq. ft. + 83 deciduous	32,860 sq. ft. 83 deciduous	In compliance

- a. A landscape planting schedule has been provided including the size of all proposed landscaping and irrigation, along with a unit cost estimate and total landscaping cost summary, for landscape bond purposes.
 - b. If required trees cannot fit or planted due to infrastructure conflicts, a payment in lieu of may be made to the City's tree fund at a rate of \$216.75 per tree. Existing healthy vegetation on the site may be used to satisfy the landscape requirements and must be identified on the plans.
 - c. All landscape areas must be irrigated. This has been noted on the landscape plan, and an irrigation plan must be submitted prior to staff approval of the final site plan. A note specifying that watering will only occur between the hours of 12am and 5am has been included on the plans.
 - d. Site maintenance notes listed in *Section 138-12.109* have been included on the plans.
 - e. A note stating "Prior to the release of the performance bond, the City of Rochester Hills must inspect all landscape plantings." has been included on the plans.
10. **Phasing**. Given the size of the proposed campus, phasing seems appropriate. The applicant has indicated the connection to Horizon Court will be completed first along with landscape areas that will be unaffected by building construction. Buildings (including adjacent parking, pathways, etc.) will be completed based on tenant demand.
 11. **Architectural Design** (*Architectural Design Standards*). Detailed elevations have been provided. Elevations have been provided that show buildings composed of primarily warm toned brick with metal accents and significant amounts of glass. The proposed buildings appear to be designed in accordance with the City's Architectural Design Standards.
 12. **Signs**. (*Section 138-10.302*). A note has been included on the plans that all new signage must meet *Chapter 134* of the City Code of Ordinances and be approved under a separate permit issued by the Building Department.



JRB

DPS/Engineering
Allan E. Schneck, P.E., Director

From: Jason Boughton, AC, Engineering Utilities Specialist
To: Kristen Kapelanski, AICP, Planning Manager
Date: January 16, 2020
Re: Rochester Hills Research Park, City File #18-021, Section 21
Preliminary PUD Review #6

Approved

Engineering Services has reviewed the site plan received by the Department of Public Services on January 10, 2020, for the above referenced project. Engineering Services **does** recommend site plan approval due with the following comment:

General

1. Provide soil borings for the project throughout the site to determine the ground water elevation and existing soils.

The applicant needs to submit a Land Improvement Permit (LIP) application with engineer's estimate, fee and construction plans to proceed with the construction plan review process started.

JRB/au

c: Allan E. Schneck, P.E., Director; DPS
Tracey Balint, P.E., Public Utilities Engineering Mgr.; DPS
Scott Windingland, DPS Aide; DPS
Keith Depp, Project Engineer; DPS
Jenny McGuckin, Right of Way/Survey Technician; DPS

Paul Davis, P.E. City Engineer/Deputy Director; DPS
Paul G. Shumejko, P.E., PTOE, Transportation Eng. Mgr.; DPS
Chuck Keller, P.E., ckeller@rcoc.org
Scott Sintkowski, P.E., ssintkowski@rcoc.org
Adele Swann, Technician, Utilities; DPS

I:\Eng\PRIV\18021 Rochester Hills Research Park\Eng Prelim PUD 6_1-16-20.docx



FIRE DEPARTMENT

Sean Canto

Chief of Fire and Emergency Services

From: William A. Cooke, Assistant Chief / Fire Marshal
To: Planning Department
Date: August 9, 2019
Re: Rochester Hills Research Park

SITE PLAN REVIEW

FILE NO: 18-021

REVIEW NO: 4

APPROVED X

DISAPPROVED _____

The Rochester Hills Fire Department recommends approval of the above noted project as the proposed design meets the fire and life safety requirements of the adopted fire prevention code related to the site only. Thank you for your assistance with this project and if you have any additional questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

William A. Cooke
Assistant Chief / Fire Marshal



PARKS & NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT
Ken Elwert, CPRE, Director

To: Kristen Kapelanski
From: Matt Einheuser
Date: July 30, 2019
Re: Rochester Hills Research Park - Review #4
File #18-021

Approved; no comments at this time.

ME/ms

Copy: Maureen Gentry, Economic Development Assistant



ASSESSING
Laurie Taylor, Director

From: Nancy McLaughlin
To: Sara Roediger
Date: 10/30/18
Re: Project: Rochester Hills Research Park Review #1
Parcel No: 70-15-21-276-013
File No.: 18-021 BESC18-0174
Applicant: Greg Ezzo, Designhaus Architecture

No comment.



BUILDING DEPARTMENT
Scott Cope

From: Mark Artinian, Building Inspector/Plan Reviewer
To: Kristen Kapelanski, Planning Department
Date: April 22, 2019
Re: Rochester Hills Research Park – Review #2
1400 S Livernois Rd
Sidwell: 15-21-276-013
City File: 18-021

The Building Department has reviewed the revised site plan approval documents received by the Planning Department on April 5, 2019 for the above referenced project. Our review was based on the Zoning Ordinance, the 2015 Michigan Building Code and ICC A117.1 -2009, unless otherwise noted.

Approval is recommended.

The following issues should be addressed with the documentation provided for Building Permit review:

G003:

1. Building 4 does not require an area increase per the information provided but if an increase is noted, please use Equation 5-2 in Section 506.2.3.

S100:

2. Per a phone conversation with Francesca of DesignHaus (4/23/19), the Building 2 Expansion shall be type IIB construction in lieu of type VB construction indicated. Please indicate this accordingly.

A101-A105:

3. Revise the square footage for Building 3 at the Building Data Chart per the dimensions noted for the building on sheet A104.

C201:

4. The access aisle in between the proposed food truck central area and the entrance at Building 5 shall be marked per ICC A117.1-2009, Section 503.3.4.

C202-C203:

5. Remove the angled lines (triangular shape) from within the curb ramps. The curb ramp shall be a straight slope with flares at the sides. Refer to the details provided on sheet C400.

Should the applicant have any questions or require addition information they can call the Building Department at 248-656-4615.



WRC
WATER RESOURCES COMMISSIONER

Jim Nash

November 2, 2018



Kristen Kapelanski
City of Rochester Hills
1000 Rochester Hills Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309

Reference: **Rochester Hills Research Park, CAMS #201801295**
Part of the NE ¼ of Section 21, City of Rochester Hills

Dear Ms. Kapelanski,

This office has received one set of plans for the Rochester Hills Research Park Project to be developed in the Northeast ¼ of Section 21, City of Rochester Hills.

Our stormwater system review indicates that the proposed project will not have an involvement with any legally established County Drain. Therefore, a storm drain permit will not be required from this office.

The water system is operated and maintained by the City of Rochester Hills and plans must be submitted to the City of Rochester Hills for review.

The sanitary sewer is within the Clinton Oakland Sewage Disposal System. Any proposed sewers of 8" or larger may require a permit through this office.

Any related earth disruption must conform to applicable requirements of Part 91, Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control of the Natural Resource and Environmental Protection Act, Act 451 of the Public Acts of 1994. Applications should be submitted to our office for the required soil erosion permit.

Please note that all applicable permits and approvals from federal, state or local authorities, public utilities and private property owners must be obtained.

If there are any questions regarding this matter, please contact Dan Butkus at 248-858-2089.

Sincerely,



Glenn R. Appel., P.E.
Chief Engineer

GRA/DFB





Board of Road Commissioners

Ronald J. Fowkes
Commissioner

Gregory C. Jamian
Commissioner

Eric S. Wilson
Commissioner

Dennis G. Kolar, P.E.
Managing Director

Gary Piotrowicz, P.E., P.T.O.E.
Deputy Managing Director
County Highway Engineer

Department of
Customer Services
Permits

2420 Pontiac Lake Road
Waterford, MI 48328

248-858-4835

FAX
248-858-4773

TDD
248-858-8005

www.rcocweb.org

November 21, 2018

City of Rochester Hills
Attn: Kristen Kapelanski
1000 Rochester Hills Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309

RE: R.C.O.C. PRELIMINARY PLAN REVIEW 18P0047
LOCATION: S LIVERNOIS RD, CITY OF ROCHESTER HILLS
PROJECT NAME: ROCHESTER HILLS RESEARCH PARK

Dear Ms. Kapelanski:

At your request, the Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC) has completed a preliminary review for the above referenced project. Enclosed you will find one set of plans with our comments in red. All comments are for conceptual purpose only and should be incorporated into detailed construction plans. Below you will find a listing of the comments generated by the RCOC review:

- A) Relocate all fixed objects prior to excavation. Fixed objects shall be no nearer than 6 feet from back of curb or 12 feet off edge of pavement.
- B) Any pedestrian facilities shall be constructed in accordance with current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) guidelines.
- C) Drive approach should include a detail M curb line with concrete spillway to provide controlled drainage across the driveway.
- D) Pavement cross section shall consist of a minimum 2 inches of MDOT 4C HMA, over 3 inches of 3C, over 4 inches of 2C, or 9 inches of MDOT 35-P concrete, with epoxy coated rebar lane and curb ties over a suitable base, as determined in the field by RCOC.
- E) Existing 12 inch concrete pipe shall be extended to the south under the new drive approach.
- F) The road rights of way shall be ditched/graded to provide positive roadside drainage across the property frontage.
- G) Excavations within a 1:1 influence of the roadway will require MDOT Class II backfill compacted to 95% maximum density.
- H) Adjust/reconstruct existing structure as warranted.



Kristen Kapelanski
November 21, 2018
Page 2

Once the comments above are addressed, plans should be submitted to this office with a completed RCOC permit application(s) Form 64a, signed by the owner (or his agent), three sets of plans (per application, 5 for signal permit) and the appropriate application fee(s).

All future correspondence related to the above referenced project will be sent to the address provided by the applicant. Separate applications will be required for:

- a) Drive approach & Road improvement
- b) Utility connections

Upon receipt of the appropriate application packet, RCOC will provide a more detailed review. Please contact this office at (248) 858-4835 if you have any questions, or if we may be of further assistance.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott Sintkowski". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above the printed name.

Scott Sintkowski, P.E.
Permit Engineer
Department of Customer Services

SS/mac
Enclosure