

Planning and Economic Development

Ed Anzek, AICP, Director

From:

Sara Roediger, AICP

Date:

9/29/2016

Re:

Medilodge of Rochester Hills

Preliminary/Final Site Plan - Planning Review #3

The applicant is proposing to construct a 38,455 sq. ft., one story nursing home addition attached to the existing 37,263 sq. ft., two story nursing home, resulting in the same number of beds (126) on nearly 6 acres on the north side of Walton Rd., between Old Perch and Rochdale Rds. The southern portion of the existing nursing home will be demolished and the northern portion remodeled. The project was reviewed for conformance with the City of Rochester Hills Zoning Ordinance. The comments below and in other review letters are minor in nature and can be addressed during final site plan submittal following consideration by the Planning Commission.

- 1. **Zoning and Use** (Section 138-4.300 and 138-8.200). The site is zoned SP Special Purpose District with The FB-2 Flex Business Overlay District. The applicant has opted to develop this site under the SP zoning regulations, which permits nursing homes and assisted living facilities as permitted uses. In addition, assisted living facilities need to be developed in accordance with the requirements of Section 138-4.423 as follows:
 - A. All buildings shall be set back 60 feet from any adjacent one-family residential district or 25 feet from any other zoning district. In compliance, the proposed building addition is setback over 60 feet from the residential districts to the north and west and over 43 feet from the office district to the south. The existing building also meets the setbacks with the exception of the northwest corner of the building, which is setback roughly 57.5 ft. from the north residential district; however this is an existing nonconforming situation that is not being increased.
 - B. The maximum building height shall be 40 feet, except that buildings located within 100 feet of a one family residential district shall have a maximum height of 30 feet. In compliance, the proposed building has a maximum building height of 27 ft. 9 in.
 - C. A type D buffer shall be provided along any one-family residential district or property used for one family residential purpose. A type B buffer shall be provided along any property line adjacent to a zoning district other than one-family. Refer to Section 138-12.300.B for landscaping and buffering requirements. In compliance, D buffer is required to the north and west, B buffer is required from the south and east as outlined in 7. of this review.
 - D. Parking shall be provided at the rate of one parking space for every 2 beds in the facility. In compliance, based on 126 beds 63 parking spaces are required and 94 are proposed. The applicant requests that the Planning Commission permit the parking as shown based on their experience; it is what is necessary for this facility.
 - E. All studio or efficiency units shall have a minimum floor area of 300 sq. ft., one bedroom units shall have a minimum floor area of 400 sq. ft., and 2 or more bedroom units shall have a minimum floor area of 550 sq. ft. In compliance with state regulations, which require 120 ft. for one-bed units and 200 sq. ft. for two beds, and as described by the applicant, the rooms are "considered spacious for the industry." The city requirements are consistent with state requirements for assisted living which have larger rooms. In addition, as noted below, the proposed facility has more than double the required amount of usable common spaces for its residents in various sitting, dining, game, etc.. rooms.
 - F. Common areas (exclusive of corridors, entrance vestibules and hallways) that are incidental to and/or enhance any primary use shall be provided and shall amount to a minimum of 50 square feet per dwelling unit or bed in the facility. Such facilities may include, but are not limited to, recreational rooms, meeting or social rooms, common kitchen areas, exercise facilities, laundry areas, or storage rooms for the use of residents. In compliance, based on 126 beds, 6,300 sq. ft. is required and over double that is provided at 13,517 sq. ft.

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	SP Special Purpose w/ FB-1 Flex Business Overlay	Medilodge of Rochester Hills	Business/Flexible Use 1
North	RCD One-Family Residential Cluster	Vacant, recently approved Andover Woods	One Family Cluster
South	O-1 Office Business w/ FB-1 Flex Business Overlay & R-1 One Family Residential	Doctors offices, Rochdale subdivision	Business/Flexible Use 1 & Residential 2.5
East	O-1 Office Business w/ FB-1 Flex Business Overlay	Professional offices	Business/Flexible Use 1
West	R-2 One Family Residential	Abiding Presence Lutheran Church	Residential 3

2. **Site Design and Layout** (Section 138-5.100-101). Refer to the table below as it relates to the area, setback, and building requirements of this project in the SP district.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Max. Height 2 stories/30 ft.	2 stories/27 ft. 9 in.	In compliance
Min. Front Setback (Walton Rd.) 50 ft.	92+ ft.	In compliance
Min. Side Setback (east/west) 50 ft. each	33+ ft. (east existing) 60+ ft. (west proposed)	Existing building is an existing nonconforming building that is not increasing
Min. Rear Setback (north) 60 ft.	60+ ft. (proposed) 57.5+ ft. (existing)	Existing building is an existing nonconforming building that is not increasing

3. **Exterior Lighting** (Section 138-10.200-204). A photometric plan showing the location and intensity of exterior lighting has been 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		
Fixtures shall incorporate full cutoff housings, louvers, glare shields, optics, reflectors or other measures to prevent off-site glare & minimize light pollution	31 pole mounted & 9 wall mounted fixtures with full cut offs & flat lenses	In compliance
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	5.8 on-site, 0.4 along ROW & 0.5 along property lines	In compliance, because of the shared drive, this is not required along the east side of the doctors office
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	138 watt, LED fixtures	In compliance
Max. Height 20 ft., 15 ft. when within 50 ft. of residential	15 ft. w/in 50 ft. R zoning, 20 ft. elsewhere	In compliance

4. **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 Assisted Living Facilities: 0.5 spaces per sleeping room=126 beds=63 spaces	94 spaces	Planning Commission may modify requirements based on evidence from applicant that another standard is more reasonable, the applicant has indicated that the site currently has 86 spaces & in their experience is what is needed for this facility		
Max. # Parking Spaces 125% of Min. = 79 spaces				
Min. Barrier Free Spaces 1 + 4% (3.8) BF spaces 11 ft. in width w/ 5 ft. aisle for 76-100 parking spaces = 5 spaces	5 spaces 11+ ft. w/ 5+ ft. aisles	In compliance		
Min. Parking Space Dimensions 9 ft. x 18 ft. (employee spaces) 10 ft. x 18 ft. (customer spaces) 24 ft. aisle (2-way)/15 ft. (1-way)	10+ ft. x 16.5+ ft., 24+ ft. 2- way aisles 20+ ft. 1-way aisles	In compliance, per staff recommendation the applicant reduced the parking space sizes along the north property line to 16 ft. when there is an additional 2 ft. landscaped/sidewalk overhang		
Min. Parking Setback 10 ft. on all sides	10+ ft. on all sides	In compliance		
Loading Space 2 spaces, 10 ft. x 50 ft.	2 spaces 10 ft. x 50 ft.	In compliance		

- a. In an effort to improve pedestrian access, the following items have been provided: a sidewalk into the site off of Walton Rd. to connect to the existing pathway, crosswalk striping when crossing the drive aisle and a bike rack to serve employees and visitors of the site.
- 5. **Natural Features.** In addition to the comments below, refer to the review letters from the Engineering and Forestry Departments and City's wetland consultant that may pertain to natural features protection.
 - a. **Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)** (Section 138-2.204.G) An EIS that meets ordinance requirements has been submitted.
 - b. **Tree Removal** (Section 126 Natural Resources, Article III Tree Conservation). The site is subject to the City's tree conservation ordinance, therefore any healthy tree greater than 6" in caliper must be indicated on the plans. Any regulated tree that will be removed must be replaced with one tree credit. Trees that are dead or in poor condition need not be replaced. A tree survey has been provided indicating that there are 21 regulated trees on-site, of which 9 will be preserved and 13 removed; therefore 13 tree credits are required and are provided onsite.
 - 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 natural feature setbacks.
 - e. Steep Slopes (Section 138-9 Chapter 2). The site does not contain any regulated steep slopes.
- 6. **Dumpster Enclosure** (Section 138-10.311). Two dumpster enclosures are proposed in the rear yard with a CMU enclosure with a brick veneer to match the building and wood gates in accordance with ordinance regulations.

7. **Landscaping** (Section 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 as proposed. This is in addition to the replacement credits required above.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Right of Way (Walton: 477 ft.)	14 deciduous	
1 deciduous per 35 ft. + 1 ornamental per 60 ft. = 14	8 ornamental	
deciduous + 8 ornamental	24 shrubs	
Buffer D (north & west: 1,090 ft.)		
8 ft. width + 2.5 deciduous + 1.5 ornamental per 100 ft. +	44	
continuous green wall = 28 deciduous + 17 ornamental +	41 deciduous	
309 evergreen shrubs (continuous green wall)	8 deciduous (existing)	
Buffer B (docs office: 490 ft.)	32 ornamental	
10 ft. width + 2 deciduous + 1.5 ornamental+ 2 evergreen	14 evergreen trees	
+ 4 shrubs per 100 ft. = 10 deciduous + 8 ornamental +	75 evergreen shrubs	
10 evergreen + 20 shrubs	309 evergreen shrubs	
Buffer B (east: 450 ft.)	(continuous green wall)	
10 ft. width + 2 deciduous + 1.5 ornamental + 2 evergreen	60 shrubs	
+ 4 shrubs per 100 ft. = 9 deciduous + 7 ornamental + 9		
evergreen + 20 shrubs	3,229+ sq. ft.	
Parking Lot: Interior 5% of parking lot + 1 deciduous per 150 sq. ft. landscape	22 deciduous	
area = 3,229 sq. ft. + 22 deciduous	13 evergreen shrubs	
area - 3,229 sq. rt. + 22 deciduous	11 deciduous	
Stormwater (aprox. 810 ft.)	3 evergreen trees	
1.5 deciduous + 1 evergreen + 4 shrubs per 100 ft. pond	28 evergreen shrubs	
perimeter = 13 deciduous + 9 evergreen + 33 shrubs	33 shrubs	Overall the site is deficient
	88 deciduous	11 evergreen trees, however
TOTAL	8 deciduous (existing)	there are more shrubs than
96 deciduous	40 ornamental	required (an additional 116
40 ornamental	17 evergreen trees	evergreen shrubs & 44
28 evergreen	116 evergreen shrubs	shrubs) therefore staff
309 evergreen shrubs (continuous green wall)	309 evergreen shrubs	believes that the intent of
73 shrubs	(continuous green wall)	the landscaping
	117 shrubs	requirements are met

- a. If required trees cannot fit be planted due to infrastructure conflicts, a payment in lieu of may be made to the City's tree fund at a rate of \$205.50 per tree.
- b. An irrigation plan must be submitted prior to staff approval of the final site plan.
- c. The total landscaping cost on sheet L03.02 needs to be updated per the last round of revisions, as it increased by \$1,475 for a total of \$194,759.
- 8. **Architectural Design** (*Architectural Design Standards*). Elevations for the addition have been provided that depict a building consisting of masonry materials, including brick and stone veneer, with lap fiber-cement siding and asphalt shingles. The existing building consists of CMU that will be painted and will get a new brick veneer central area (where the existing building is being demolished). Staff recommends having building material/color samples available for the Planning Commission meeting.
- 9. **Signs.** (Section 138-8.603). A proposed monument sign is indicated on the plans. A note has been added to the plans that states that all signs must meet Section 138-8.603 and Chapter 134 of the City Code of Ordinances and be approved under a separate permit issued by the Building Department.



CHIGAN

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

From:

Jason Boughton, AC; Engineering Utilities Coordinator

To:

Sara Roediger, Manager of Planning

Date:

September 30, 2016

Re:

Medilodge of Rochester Hills Addition and Renovation, City File #80-186.3, Section #9

Site Plan Review #3

Engineering Services has reviewed the site plan received by the Department of Public Services on September 16, 2016 for the above referenced project. Engineering Services does recommend site plan approval with no comments.

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

JRB/bd

c: Allan E. Schneck, P.E. Director; DPS Tracey Balint, P.E., Public Utilities Engineer; DPS Sheryl McIsaac, Office Coordinator; DPS Sandi DiSipio; Planning & Development Dept. Paul Davis, P.E., City Engineer/Deputy Director; DPS Paul Shumejko, MBA, MS, P.E., PTOE, Transportation Engineer; DPS Keith Depp, Staff Engineer; DPS



Parks & Forestry

Ken Elwert

To:

Sara Roediger

From:

Gerald Lee

Date:

September 29, 2016

Re:

MediLodge of Rochester Hills

Review #3

File No. 80-186.3

Forestry review pertains to public right-of-way (r/w) tree issues only.

No additional comment at this time.

GL/cf

cc:

Sandi DiSipio, Planning Assistant

Maureen Gentry, Planning Assistant



FIRE DEPARTMENT

Sean Canto

Chief of Fire and Emergency Services

From:

James L. Bradford, Lieutenant/Inspector

To:

Planning Department
September 26, 2016
Medilodge of Rochester Hills

Date: Re:

SITE PLAN REVIEW

FILE NO: 80-186.3

REVIEW NO: 3

APPROVED X

DISAPPROVED_____

Lt. James L. Bradford Fire Inspector



BUILDING DEPARTMENT

Scott Cope

From:

Craig McEwen, Building Inspector/Plan Reviewer

To:

Sara Roediger, Planning Department

Date: Re:

September 26, 2016 MediLodge of Rochester Hills – Review #3

Sidwell:

15-09-401-003, -005

City File:

80-186.3

The site plan review for the above reference project was based on the following drawings and information submitted:

Sheets: A00.00, A00.03, C00.00, C01.00, C01.01, C02.00, C03.00, C04.00, C05-00, C06.00, C07.00, C08.00, C09.00, L03.00, L03.01, L03.02, L03.03, L03.04, A01.00, A01.01, A03.00, A03.01, A06.00, A06.01 and PE-1

Approval recommended. All previous comments have been addressed.

If there are any questions, please call the Building Department at 248-656-4615. Office hours are 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday.





Ken Elwert

To:

Sara Roediger

From:

Gerald Lee / Gerry Pink

Date:

October 13, 2016

Re:

Griffin Claw Brewery

Review PC Conditions

File No. 16-012

Forestry review pertains to public right-of-way (r/w) tree issues only.

Landscape Plan, Sheet L-2

The Redbud, in the traffic island, in the driveway at Crooks needs to be at least 10' from the pathway or deleted.

The trunk of the Red maple on the south side of the private sidewalk leading to the Crooks pathway needs to be shown completely out of the 15' corner clearance triangle. The triangle also needs to be shown.

The proposed Kentucky coffeetrees (4), adjacent to the proposed sidewalk along Star Batt, are acceptable as replacement trees for the four r/w trees being removed, if shown with at least 25' on center spacing.

GL/cf

CC:

Sandy DiSipio, Planning Assistant Maureen Gentry, Planning Assistant