



Rochester Hills

Minutes - Draft

Planning Commission

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

Chairperson Deborah Brnabic, Vice Chairperson Greg Hooper
Members: Ed Anzek, Gerard Dettloff, Nicholas O. Kaltsounis,
Stephanie Morita, David A. Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Ryan Schultz

Tuesday, February 20, 2018

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 7 - Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, Greg Hooper, Stephanie Morita, David Reece, C. Neall Schroeder and Ryan Schultz

Excused 2 - Ed Anzek and Nicholas Kaltsounis

Quorum present.

Also present : Sara Roediger, Director of Planning & Economic Dev.
Kristen Kapelanski, Manager of Planning
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2018-0004](#) December 19, 2017 Regular Meeting

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

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

Excused 2 - Anzek and Kaltsounis

[2018-0028](#) January 17, 2018 Joint Planning Commission and City Council Work Session

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

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

Excused 2 - Anzek and Kaltsounis

COMMUNICATIONS

- A) *Planning & Zoning News dated December 2017, January and February 2018*
- B) *Ordinance Amendment replacement pages*
- C) *Email from S. Beaton, dated 11/29/17 re: Gateway development*
- E) *Letter from HRC dated 2/19/18 re: Updated TIS for Gateway of RH*
- F) *Updated TIS for Gateway of RH dated received February 16, 2018*

NEW BUSINESS

2018-0033

Request for a Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 17-035 - for the removal and replacement of as many as 134 regulated trees associated with Woodland Crossing, a proposed 15-unit site condominium development on five acres on Auburn Rd., east of John R zoned R-4 One Family Residential, Parcel Nos. 15-25-352-017 and -018, MJC Woodland Crossing, LLC, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated February 16, 2018 and site condo plans and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Andy Montelbano, MJC Woodland Crossing, LLC, 46600 Romeo Plank, Macomb, MI 48044; Ralph Nunez, Nunez Design, 249 Park St., Troy, MI 48083; and Shamik Tripathy, Land Development Consulting, 46600 Romeo Plank, Macomb, MI 48044.

Ms. Kapelanski stated that the proposal was for the north side of Auburn between Gravel Ridge and Frankson. It was zoned R-4 One Family Residential, and the project was for 15 units on five acres. Staff recommended approval, as the plan met the applicable regulations. The applicant was utilizing the lot size variation option, for which the standards had been met. Lot 8 would not be developed unless the proposed drive were to connect as a through road. It would currently be used as a T-turnaround. The applicants were required to preserve 37% of the trees and 37.5% were being preserved. 134 replacement trees would be planted on site. She said that she would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Nunez stated that Planning Dept. had done a great job preparing the review. The plan would preserve a buffer on the east and west property lines adjacent to residential. In order to meet the tree credits, they had increased the size of the trees. He noted that the developer had reached

out to try and contact the nine individuals adjacent to the property to show them the plan, and three contacted him.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 7:08 p.m.

Ryan Smith, 1475 Dawes Ave., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Mr. Smith said that he lived just outside the 300-foot boundary for getting noticed about the meeting, and he cared deeply about his neighborhood. He said that preserving 37% of the trees was great, but it was Rochester Hills, and he wondered why they were shooting for just 37%. In high school, he claimed that would be failing. He said that the whole area was one of the oldest parts of the City, and he felt that they should preserve it. He indicated that condos, houses and development were great, but they would be putting a red jelly bean in a bowl full of yellow jelly beans. It was a well-established neighborhood; his house was over 60 years old. He maintained that the new construction would not look anything like the rest of the neighborhood, and it would stick out like a sore thumb. He was not against development, but he thought that it should fit in with the community. There would be a one-way street in and out which, he felt, did not fit the community. If it got approved, he suggested that they should make it look like it had been there for 60 years. He was concerned about the wildlife. He thought that they were putting the horse before the cart, because he noticed a giant excavator on the property before it had been given the okay. That, to him, was a slap in the face of the residents. He ran in the neighborhood, and he reiterated that he cared about his neighborhood. He commented that the developer knocked on nine doors, but he had knocked on 1,200 doors over the summer asking for a vote for City Council, but no one knocked on his door.

Jolene Sternat, 2886 Frankson Ave., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Ms. Sternat thanked her neighbor. She stated that she was a horticulturist and nature lover. She moved from Toronto, and she thought she had a bush lot to the west of her. There would now be 15 units on five acres with traffic and congestion. She said that she was very concerned. She felt that there was enough development in Rochester Hills. She asked when enough was enough. She asked why there could not be more evergreens planted. She asked what a single-family unit was. She stated that she loved Rochester Hills. She had fox and deer in her backyard that would be gone. She maintained that the traffic would be horrible for a lot of them. She could not get out of her driveway in Toronto, and she could not get from her driveway to Auburn unless she left an hour early. She asked how many families would move in. Her neighbor had five acres that he kept nice and neat, and it had been there since Roosevelt was in office.

She thought that there was fencing along the back of the property. There was 33-foot buffer designated for nature and existing trees and then the fence. She wondered if there would be another fence put up. She claimed that there would be an issue with drainage. She said that all she could think about were all the houses, traffic and kids that would be there, and that she might as well go back to the city.

Chairperson Brnabic closed the Public Hearing at 7:14 p.m.

Mr. Hooper stated that the Tree Conservation Ordinance required 37% of the trees to be saved for residential developments, which the developer had met. The Ordinance was put in place in 1988. There was also a responsibility to balance the rights of property owners and the aesthetics of the City and tree preservation. There had to be a balance - someone would not be able to remove everything, and everything could not be preserved. That would be denying a person's property rights. A compromise was the 37% requirement, and it had been in place for 30 years. Some people believed that it had worked well, and some did not. Regarding the wildlife moving on, that situation always arose with new development. The same thing happened when homes were built in places all over the City, including his. Trees were removed to build his house, and he was sure the wildlife had moved on. He pointed out that single-family units were proposed, and the property was zoned for single-family. The City master planned what future development could look like, and the developer had proposed that development according to the Master Plan. The applicants were complying with all the laws and Ordinances of the City. He said that he did not see existing fencing on the site plan. Mr. Montalbano said that he was not aware of any fencing. Mr. Nunez said that the only fencing installed would be the tree protection fencing during construction. Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Hooper moved the following motion, seconded by Mr. Dettloff.

MOTION by Hooper, seconded by Dettloff, in the matter of City File No. 17-035 (Woodland Crossing), the Planning Commission **grants a Tree Removal Permit**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on January 9, 2018, with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following two (2) conditions.

Findings

- 1. The proposed removal and replacement of regulated trees is in conformance with the Tree Conservation Ordinance.*
- 2. The applicant is proposing to remove 134 regulated trees and replace with 136 tree credits on site.*

Conditions

1. *Tree protective and silt fencing, as reviewed and approved by the City staff, shall be installed prior to issuance of the Land Improvement Permit.*
2. *Should the applicant not be able to meet the tree replacement requirements on site the balance shall be paid into the City's Tree Fund.*

Chairperson Brnabic noted that there was also a concern raised about drainage.

Mr. Nunez said that their engineer had met with the City's engineers. The City required a rear yard drain. They would leave those areas naturalized, and there would be 30 feet where water would flow. The drainage system would be beyond the homes and in between the preservation to pick up drainage from the various areas.

Ms. Morita asked if the property was unplatted, which was confirmed. She noted that there was an alleyway that appeared to head towards the property, and she asked if they had confirmed that the alley did not continue through the property.

Mr. Tripathy explained that there was a platted subdivision on the east side of the project. The two subject parcels were never platted. They were not doing anything with the alley. The alley was provided with a storm sewer outlet for their property that had been designed by the Oakland County Drain Commissioner's Office. There was a storm sewer outlet by the Fire Station to the east, where they would connect through their detention basin. The alley had nothing to do with their project, and they were not doing anything along the alley. Ms. Morita asked if they were going to connect their storm sewer through the alley or not. Mr. Tripathy said that they would connect to the alley, which also abutted the Fire Station. It was a public alley provided with a storm sewer outlet for the subject property, but they were only connecting the storm sewer to the catch basin.

Ms. Morita asked if it would connect just east of the alley and eventually head towards the manhole in the alleyway, which Mr. Tripathy confirmed. Ms. Morita asked if the properties were formerly historic. Ms. Roediger noted that they were on the potential list. The matter went before Council a year ago, and Council removed them from the list. Ms. Morita asked if the site had archeological finds, but Ms. Roediger did not recall that.

Mr. Schroeder pointed out that they would be adding trees to the site. He

suggested to the residents who spoke that Mr. Nunez could show them the plan and where the trees would be added. Mr. Nunez advised that 22 evergreen trees would be added to buffer the areas on the east and west sides in addition to deciduous trees. Mr. Schroeder indicated that he had lived in Rochester Hills for 55 years and was totally surrounded by subdivisions. He had deer, rabbits, squirrels, birds and skunks in his yard, and they all survived. He added that there was an enclosed County drain where the site would drain.

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

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

Excused 2 - Anzek and Kaltsounis

2018-0034

Public Hearing and request for Preliminary Site Condominium Plan Recommendation - City File No. 17-035 - Woodland Crossing, a proposed 15-unit site condo development on five acres, located on Auburn Rd., east of John R, zoned R-4 One Family Residential, Parcel Nos. 15-25-352-017 and -018, MJC Woodland Crossing, LLC, Applicant

MOTION by Hooper, seconded by Reece, in the matter of City File No. 17-035 (Woodland Crossing, the Planning Commission **recommends approval of the Preliminary Site Condominium Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on January 9, 2018, with the following six (6) findings and subject to the following five (5) conditions.

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 Auburn, thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets. Sidewalks have been incorporated to promote safety and convenience of pedestrian traffic.*
3. *Adequate utilities are available to the site.*
4. *The preliminary plan represents a reasonable street and lot layout and orientation.*
5. *The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.*
6. *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.

Conditions

1. Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, prior to final approval by staff.
2. Provide a landscape performance bond for replacement trees and landscaping in the amount of \$47,213, plus inspection fees, as adjusted as necessary by staff, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit by Engineering.
3. Provide an irrigation plan plus cost estimate with Final Plan submittal.
4. Payment of \$3,000 into the City's Tree Fund for one street tree per unit, prior to the issuance of a Land Improvement Permit by Engineering
5. Submittal of By-Laws and Master Deed for the condominium association along with submittal of Final Preliminary Site Condo Plans.

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

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

Excused 2 - Anzek and Kaltsounis

After each motion, Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously, and she congratulated the applicants.

2018-0035

Request for a Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 17-048 - for the removal and replacement of as many as 157 regulated trees for a proposed 24,542 s.f. office building on 1.4 acres located at the northwest corner of John R and South Boulevard, zoned O-1 Office Business, Parcel No. 15-35-477-007, CP Ventures, LP, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated February 16, 2018 and site plans and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Chris Cousino, CP Ventures, LP, 12955 23 Mile Rd., Shelby Township, MI 48315; Nick Brass, Spalding DeDecker Associates, Inc., 905 South Boulevard E., Rochester Hills, MI 48307; and Kevin Biddison, Biddison Architects, 320 Martin St., Suite 10, Birmingham, MI 48009.

Ms. Kapelanski stated that the proposal was for an office building totaling

approximately 25,000 s.f. on 1.4 acres located at the northwest corner of South Boulevard and John R. It was a fairly straight-forward plan that met all applicable regulations, and staff recommended approval. There were a number of trees identified on site. 30 replacements were proposed, and the remainder of the tree credits would be paid into the Tree Fund. There were a number of utility easements throughout the site and as a result, the applicant was requesting several landscape modifications. They were mostly for the rights-of-way and the perimeter of the parking lot. She said that she was available for any questions.

Chairperson Brnabic had not noticed a recommendation from the Fire Department, and she asked if they had reviewed the plans. Ms. Kapelanski confirmed that they did, and that there were no concerns.

Mr. Cousino felt that staff had done a good job in reviewing and summarizing the project. The applicants were excited about the project, and they would own the building. They were partnering with the proposed tenant who was looking forward to locating his offices in Rochester Hills.

Mr. Biddison stated that they felt the building would be a great addition to the corner. The building was simple in materials - brick and glass with canopies at the three entrance points. There would be a couple of exterior stairs and interior parking for the executives. The building would have a lot of natural light based on the amount of glass proposed. He said that he would be happy to answer any questions and then passed around a material board.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that the property was subject to the Tree Ordinance, and that they would totally be clearing the site but replacing zero trees. She realized that had a lot to do with utility easements, but she observed that none of the required plantings could be met except for the parking lot interior. The minimum parking front setback required was 35 feet, and they were proposing ten. An applicant generally had to meet the perimeter landscaping requirements to qualify for a reduction. She asked if the utility easements were that intense, or if the building was perhaps a little too large for the property.

Mr. Cousino said that it was a combination of a few things. One was the size of the property at 1.4 acres. A majority of the regulated trees were centrally located, so to be able to design around them was very difficult. 90% of the trees were Black Locust, which were of fair quality according to their Landscape Architect. The easements to the north did play a factor in not being able to place the trees. They tried to do as much as they

could with the scope they had to deal with.

Chairperson Brnabic said that her concern was the lack of replacement landscaping. Mr. Cousino said that they tried to get the biggest bang for the buck by putting them within the site. That was preferred in lieu of paying into the Tree Fund, but there really was not more space to put in any more replacement trees.

Mr. Schroeder said that his concern was having 69 parking spots for 40-50 employees plus customers. He did not feel that the parking was adequate.

Mr. Cousino said that parking was discussed with the tenant. With the nature of his business, the tenant was comfortable with the proposed parking. Mr. Schroeder felt that the site was overbuilt. Mr. Biddison pointed out that the parking exceeded the Ordinance. He agreed that the tenants were more than comfortable with the number of spaces. Mr. Schroeder asked if it was true that the parking met the Ordinance standards, and Ms. Kapelanski agreed.

Mr. Hooper noted that it was a key corner coming into the City. In the past, when Crooks and South Boulevard was developed, the applicant installed a gateway/welcome City sign (City-designed). He asked if there was any interest in having a City sign on the corner.

Mr. Cousino stated that there was no opposition. He said that he would welcome having further discussions on how that could be worked out. Mr. Hooper said that he was interested to know if the applicants would be willing to put up the sign. He suggested that they could view what was done at Crooks and South Boulevard. He wanted to further identify that it was Rochester Hills that people were entering. He would not want to take anything away from the building, but rather, identify the City.

Ms. Morita asked if it was a Preliminary or Final Site Plan. Ms. Roediger advised that there was one Site Plan review for commercial projects.

Mr. Schroeder asked why there were overhead doors at the rear (north side) of the building. Mr. Biddison said that was for the interior parking. Mr. Schroeder clarified that those spaces were not part of the 69 he mentioned, and that there were 75 total.

Mr. Schultz noted that sidewalks were shown that stubbed to the subject property lines and curb ramp along South Boulevard. He asked who was

responsible for installing the pathway. Ms. Kapelanski explained that it would be installed as part of a future road project along South Boulevard. Mr. Biddison said that they were working with the County to coordinate the pathway installation.

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

MOTION by Dettloff, seconded by Schultz, in the matter of City File No. 17-048 (South Blvd. Office Development), the Planning Commission **grants a Tree Removal Permit**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on January 16, 2018, with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following two (2) conditions.

Findings

1. The proposed removal and replacement of regulated trees is in conformance with the Tree Conservation Ordinance.
2. The applicant is proposing to replace up to 157 regulated trees with 30 tree credits on site and pay 127 tree credits into the City's Tree Fund.

Conditions

1. Tree protective and silt fencing, as reviewed and approved by the City staff, shall be installed prior to issuance of the Land Improvement Permit.
2. The tree replacement requirements that cannot be met on site require payment into the City's Tree Fund at a rate of \$216.75 per tree.

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

Aye 6 - Dettloff, Hooper, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

Nay 1 - Brnabic

Excused 2 - Anzek and Kaltsounis

Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed six to one.

2018-0036

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 17-048 - for a proposed 24,542 s.f. office building on 1.4 acres located at the northwest corner of John R and

South Boulevard, zoned O-1 Office Business, Parcel No. 15-35-477-007, CP Ventures, LP, Applicant

Mr. Hooper asked the applicants if they would agree to a condition about coordinating the pathway work with the Road Commission, and if the Road Commission did not install it by the time of issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicants would. Mr. Cousino agreed, and maintained that they would. They had already discussed it with the County and staff.

MOTION by Hooper, seconded by Reece, in the matter of City File No. 17-048 (South Blvd. Office Development), the Planning Commission **approves the Site Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on January 16, 2018, with the following six (6) findings and subject to the following four (4) conditions.

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 South Boulevard, thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets. Paths have been incorporated to promote safety and convenience of pedestrian traffic.*
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 and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as 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 proposed project is expected to bring 40-50 jobs during business hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.*

Conditions

1. *Address all applicable comments from other City departments and*

outside agency review letters, prior to final approval by staff.

2. *Provide a landscape performance bond for replacement trees, landscaping and irrigation in the amount of \$91,222.00, plus inspection fees, as adjusted as necessary by staff, prior to temporary grade certification being issued by Engineering.*
3. *Applicant shall review with staff the funding and installation of a City gateway entrance sign at the southeast corner of the site, prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.*
4. *Applicant to coordinate with the Road Commission for Oakland County for completion of the pathway on the southern and eastern property lines. If not completed by the Road Commission, the applicant will complete the pathway prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.*

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

Aye 6 - Dettloff, Hooper, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

Nay 1 - Brnabic

Excused 2 - Anzek and Kaltsounis

Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed six to one. Mr. Hooper thanked the applicants for their investment in Rochester Hills, and Mr. Schroeder commented that it was a good-looking building.

2018-0047

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 95-044.2 - Gateway of Rochester Hills, a proposed mixed-use development consisting of a 4-story, 108-room hotel and a two-story commercial building with 11,037 s.f. retail, 6,047 s.f. restaurant with outdoor seating and 11,856 s.f. of office on the second floor, located at the northwest corner of Rochester and South Blvd., zoned B-3 Shopping Center Business with an FB-3 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-34-477-015, Gateway Properties - Rochester Hills, LLC, Applicant
(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated February 16, 2018 and site plans and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Eugene D'Agostini, D'Agostini Companies, 38700 Van Dyke Ave., Suite 200, Sterling Heights, MI 48312; Jim Butler, PEA, 2430 Rochester Ct., Suite 100, Troy, MI 48083; Cheryl Bohren, NORR Architects, 150 W. Jefferson Ave., Suite 1300, Detroit, MI 48226;

and Jake Bolyard, Bolyard Lumber, 3770 S. Rochester Rd., Rochester Hills, MI 48307.

Ms. Kapelanski showed a rendering for the proposed, two-story mixed-use building. She advised that behind that building, a four-story, 108-room hotel was proposed. The applicants had elected to develop under the FB-3 provisions and had incorporated several elements of that district. In particular, in the center of the site was the public amenity required. There were a number of requirements for the FB-3 district. The applicant was meeting most of those but was requesting a number of modifications. Those modifications included setback, frontage build-to, façade transparency for the hotel, building primary materials, the shopfront design for the setback, building base for the front mixed-use building and the off-street parking location for that building (shopfront requires rear, off-street parking or parking underneath a building), and the vehicle and on-street parking requirements for a minor street. They were considering the center drive as a minor street, which would require on-street parking and a certain vehicle zone width. Staff did recommend approval, however, the Engineering Dept. did not recommend approval as currently submitted, which was in regards mostly to the traffic study. The applicant submitted a revised traffic study the previous Friday. The City's traffic consultant, HRC, looked at it and provided a response letter. The major concerns were with a reduced level of service at the main Rochester Rd. driveway and also with potential crash issues. HRC felt that there were still improvements needed to improve the level of service, to reduce delay and to address the crash issues. They recommended that the main Rochester Rd. drive, which was existing, be modified to be a right-in, right-out only. They also recommended that the proposed Rochester Rd. drive, closest to Bolyard Lumber be designed to provide a dedicated right and left turn lane. She noted that the site had cross access behind the existing medical building. Potential visitors to the Gateway site could access the hotel and the mixed-use building from that location. She said that she was available for any questions.

Mr. Butler passed out some additional information to the Commissioners, which was placed on file for the record. He stated that from the initial study session in November, there were comments they had taken to heart. A traffic study was completed. He referred to the overall plan, which proposed a mixed-use development with two buildings - a retail/office building that was closest to Rochester Rd. and a four-story hotel. Connecting those two buildings was the spine of the project. It provided a sidewalk from Rochester Rd. through the retail building and through a public open space to eventually arrive at the hotel. It was a little

different design than they had shown in November. The next page was an image of the retail/office building from Rochester Rd. and then one with a closer view of the front of the building. There would be outdoor seating and walking areas. He showed the rear of the building, which would have a lot of glass. There would be a lot of landscaping in the public space. He then showed the hotel from Rochester Rd. from the corner of the site and a perspective from the existing driveway they would reconfigure (the minor street). He had handed out a rendering of the proposed materials. There would be brick, stack stone, metal panel and cement board with glass areas.

Ms. Bohren showed a material board for the mixed-use building. It would be fairly simple and traditional with stone, brick and glazing. They wanted to maximize the glazing on the facades to meet the transparency requirements.

Mr. Butler noted their traffic consultant's study, and the conclusions were that no improvements would be needed. Mr. Butler acknowledged that there was traffic in the area, which functioned at a level D. Their consultant spoke with the RCOC, and they appeared to be accepting of the results. The applicants understood where HRC was coming from and their concerns. They would like the opportunity to continue working with the City's consultant and theirs and the RCOC to come to a consensus on what needed to be done, if anything.

Mr. Hooper asked about the front yard arterial setback from Rochester Rd., noting that the building would be quite a ways back. He said that staff would prefer that the building be pulled closer to Rochester Rd. He asked if that was because staff was opposed to the parking in front.

Ms. Roediger said that when the FB Ordinance was written, staff wanted buildings pushed as close to the road as possible. She gave an example of the southwest corner of Rochester and Auburn, where the Starbucks and the Pet Supply store were. There was one row of parking in front of them, so the applicants were being consistent with development along the corridor, but it would require a modification from the Ordinance. Ms. Roediger added that the proposal would also be consistent with the southeast corner of Rochester and Auburn, in front of Verizon and DiBella's restaurant.

Mr. Hooper noted that the front yard minor setback for the east/west drive between the medical building and the proposal was 40 feet to the retail building, but staff wanted it lessened. He asked why 40 feet was not a

good idea.

Ms. Roediger explained that the existing driveway would be converted into a minor road. They were trying to force the Ordinance onto an existing driveway, and it was hard to retrofit the driveway. They tried to apply the principals that made the most sense. To follow the strict letter of the regulations, there would have to be on-street parking, etc. They tried to dress up the driveway as much as possible to make it feel like an entrance road coming in.

Mr. Hooper referred to the side yard setback for the northern most building being 80 feet. He asked if that was to provide parking in that area, that is, in lieu of 25 feet, if they pushed it to 80 feet to provide parking. Ms. Kapelanski stated that was correct.

Mr. Hooper asked if they had the calculation for the building frontage build-to area on Rochester Rd., which was required to be 40%. Mr. Butler said that he did not have a calculation. Mr. Hooper asked if it was way off or if it was borderline. Ms. Kapelanski said that she did not think it came close to meeting the requirement. A modification would most definitely be needed, but she did not know the exact percentage.

Mr. Hooper asked about the minimum building frontage area for the east/west drive between the existing medical building and the restaurant. 70% was required, and the plan was not even close. Ms. Kapelanski agreed. Mr. Hooper asked about the minimum façade transparency. Ms. Kapelanski said that the modification was really needed for the hotel building. The FB-3 Ordinance had standards for residential and non-residential uses. A hotel was kind of a unique use, in that it was technically a non-residential use, but it operated much like a residence would in terms of the need for privacy. Staff was fine with the modification requests for the façade transparency for the hotel. Mr. Hooper agreed that they would not want to add more glass area to the hotel rooms on the first floor.

Mr. Hooper said that he would defer commenting about the building materials, and let the "resident architect" Mr. Reece weigh in. Regarding the mounting height of the light fixtures, he asked if they were 15 or 20 feet. Ms. Bohren believed that they were at ten feet, although it could be 12. Mr. Hooper said that it seemed rather low. Ms. Kapelanski said that the mounting heights that were missing were for the hotel. They could be at 15 feet if they were within 50 feet from residential or 20 feet at the most, and that would need to be clarified in a future submittal. Mr. Hooper felt

that would be a key one, especially for the western façade of the hotel.

Mr. Hooper said that the vehicle zone parking looked like it was in compliance. Ms. Kapelanski said that the vehicle zone was trying to retrofit the existing drive. There would be a center landscaped median, which was not permitted, and they would need a modification. Mr. Hooper confirmed that no one would be backing into the center, which Ms. Kapelanski agreed was not a concern.

Mr. Hooper asked about the on-street parking zone, which he did not think was applicable. He asked if there was any on-street parking. Ms. Kapelanski said that was why they needed a modification; on-street parking was typically required.

Mr. Hooper said that at the meeting in November, he supported the concept. He wanted to see the hotel pushed as far back from the residential as possible. It was stated then that the applicants wanted a four-story hotel, and there were concerns about the residents. He asked the applicants if they had met with the residents and what the results were.

Mr. D'Agostini claimed that the residents were glad that there was concern for their opinions. They were receptive, and there was a friendly gathering at Bolyard Lumber. The residents had been concerned because currently, people cut through their backyards to get to Rochester Rd. They voiced a desire to have a fence, which was something that would have to be vetted with the City. Other than that, they were pleased to see what was being offered.

Mr. Hooper asked how many people were in attendance. Mr. D'Agostini said that five people attended. Mr. Hooper said he assumed that everyone on the west side was targeted. Mr. D'Agostini agreed that a notice was sent to everyone that backed up to Bolyard and the subject property.

Mr. Hooper had stated that he did not want to see a drive-through, and one was not proposed. He commented that the elephant in the room was traffic. The traffic was not good there, as everyone was aware. They all lived in the City and knew the issues. He maintained that to make the project work, there had to be some traffic improvements. To propose a plan with zero traffic improvements was shocking to him. There had to be some improvements to mitigate a development that would add to an existing, known problem. He stressed that it was ridiculous for a traffic report to be issued with a conclusion statement that the proposed

development would have little or no impact on the adjacent roads. His issue was the traffic, and he reiterated that something would have to be done. If it was nothing, he would have a real problem. He was not opposed to development, but he emphasized that there had to be something.

Mr. Bolyard said that for the number of years they had been there, it had been pretty easy for cars and trucks to get in and out. After the light was added at M-59, it really helped and released a lot of turmoil getting in and out. They had 48-foot semis going in and out, and he claimed that it was relatively easy, even during rush hour. They had not seen accidents in front of their building, and they had a fair amount of traffic coming in and out on a daily basis with big trucks. He understood that Rochester Rd. was busy, but that was during certain times.

Mr. Hooper responded that the applicant's traffic consultant said that the existing conditions on Rochester and South Boulevard were at Levels D, E and C, and that with no improvements when future traffic was added, Level E went to a D. That proved to him that the study should be discounted immediately. He suggested that the majority of the traffic would be exiting left to go to M-59, especially the hotel traffic. The traffic report showed a 102-second delay when making a left out of the site, and there would be an additional 70-80 cars at peak hour making a left. He stated that it would not be a good situation for people to make a left from the existing east/west drive. He believed that the safe and smart thing to do would be to go onto South Boulevard and make a left onto Rochester Rd. When the secondary recommendation from HRC said to make it a right-in, right-out only, he felt that was okay, but it did not do anything to improve left turns onto South Boulevard and Rochester Rd. It was his opinion, and he was in construction and had been on the Planning Commission for almost 20 years, that there had to be some improvements made in the left turn capacity. He added that to say that nothing had to be done was being unrealistic.

Mr. D'Agostini said that he did not necessarily disagree. He could only tell from the empirical evidence from living with the existing developments at the office building and Bolyard Lumber. They built the office building on the corner 20 years ago, and he agreed with Mr. Bolyard that the experience had not been that bad. He acknowledged that Rochester Rd. was heavily trafficked. He appreciated the concern, and they would certainly work with the RCOC and the City's consultant to come up with the right answers. He thought that the fact that the development was at the corner, and they had accessibility to South

Boulevard and Rochester would help alleviate the problem. It was a busy community and a busy road, and he recognized that they would be bringing more traffic.

Mr. Hooper mentioned that the City had seen another development recently that was miniscule compared with the applicant's development, and that developer was putting in significant improvements to the roads for their traffic. He stated that it was not uncommon. Mr. D'Agostini said that he would defer to the experts, but they were amenable to understanding and working with everyone.

Chairperson Brnabic asked what method the applicants used to notify the neighbors, and if the meeting was held after the concept plan was presented to the Commissioners in November. Mr. D'Agostini said that it was before. Chairperson Brnabic clarified that they had not met with the neighbors since the concept meeting. Mr. D'Agostini said that they met with the neighbors in anticipation of the concept meeting. They wanted to get any feedback they might have had. He believed that they did a mailing to notice people about the gathering, and they met at Bolyard Lumber in the conference room, trying to make it as convenient as possible. He claimed that there was really no negative feedback whatsoever, other than having kids trespass through their yards, which had nothing to do with the proposed development. Chairperson Brnabic asked if the neighbors had seen the final proposal. Mr. D'Agostini felt that they really had, because the concept plan was very similar.

Mr. Bolyard had asked the residents what they would like for the buffer - a wall or tall trees - and they wanted a wall. Mr. D'Agostini said that the neighbors were glad that the applicants met with them, and flattered that they were concerned about their thoughts. They liked what was shown, and the only gripe was neighborhood kids cutting through to get to the party store on the east side of Rochester Rd.

Mr. Schroeder said that he totally agreed about the traffic problems. He did not believe that there was a lot that could be done except to make Rochester Rd. a boulevard and eliminate left turns. He did not think a roundabout would be desirable or practical. He agreed that they had to do something. He suggested that the applicants should at least put in right turn lanes to the entrances to get cars out of the traffic and slow them down. He would require right turn lanes at all the driveways if he could, and he asked the applicants if that would be acceptable.

Mr. D'Agostini said that he would hate to make any rash conclusions.

One thing that he had learned was that traffic engineers brought a lot of considerations into play. If people were forced to make a right turn but they needed to go left, they would have to figure out how, whether it was a U-turn or to turn left on South Boulevard and left on Rochester. Mr. Schroeder said that he was talking about a decel lane. If someone was turning from the roadway into the driveway, the main road would be slowed. If there was a decel lane, cars could get by without slowing. When he was the City Engineer in Troy, he always made that a requirement. He offered to work with their consultant. He also felt that a more decorative brick wall would be better than a fence, and if he lived there, he would prefer that. He asked if there would be a cross access easement with the building to the south, which was confirmed, but he observed that there was nothing shown on the plans.

Mr. D'Agostini did not know if it was shown on the plan, but he advised that they owned the office building and would retain it. There would be a cross access easement, and it could be a condition of approval if the Commission wished.

Mr. Butler said that the development would be condo-ized, so there would be reciprocal easements. Mr. Schroeder asked if there would be any need for a cross access easement with Bolyard Lumber. Mr. Bolyard remarked that Mr. D'Agostini would not give him one, but he did not think he really needed one. He had asked his shipper about turning right or left, and he said that they went 50% right and 50% left on Rochester Rd. to make deliveries, which he thought should be taken into consideration.

Mr. D'Agostini reiterated that the light at M-59 had alleviated a lot of the conflict, and Mr. Bolyard agreed that it had been a tremendous help. It was fairly easy for semis or cars getting out to go north or south, even during the busy times.

Mr. Schroeder said that he would prefer if they could make right turn lanes a requirement. Mr. D'Agostini said that they hoped to get the RCO's input and their traffic engineer's input before a final decision was made.

Mr. Reece agreed with Mr. Hooper's comments about traffic. He thought that a large percentage of people staying at the hotel would want to access M-59 or go north to Oakland University. He did not see a significant reason why a large percentage of people would want to go south on Rochester Rd. Without having some form of agreement in place about the road improvements, he did not know how he could approve anything. They could take a vote or postpone until the

applicants had an opportunity to meet the parties involved with the traffic. Regarding the elevations, particularly for the hotel, he asked if Fairfield was driving them and dictating the materials and amount. He thought that the amount of fiber wood siding was unacceptable. In a community like Rochester Hills at a prominent intersection, he stated that it was unacceptable to have a building that was 80% fiber siding.

Mr. Koza of Group Ten Management explained that Marriott drove that. The prototype for Fairfield hotels was actually all EIFS, but they thought a better material was fiber cement siding. The area it was being placed was cantilevering over the first floor, so structurally, it could not hold anything besides EIFS or a fiber cement product. Mr. Reece disagreed. Mr. Koza said that it could if he wanted to spend an extra \$2 million, which would not be economical for the brand. Mr. Reece said that he was an architect and a builder, and he knew differently. He would not approve the elevation as it was. Mr. Koza said that it would make the project uneconomical. He reminded that it was not a high-end, luxury hotel. Mr. Reece responded that the Commissioners would have to live with it in their City. Mr. Koza said that if there was an alternative that would suffice, he would be happy to look into it. He thought that fiber cement siding would meet what the City was looking for in terms of product, quality and longevity. He thought that EIFS had come a long way. It was a drainable system, and he would have preferred EIFS, but he knew that the City did not look fondly upon it. Mr. Reece said that it was not a long-term building product for Michigan. Mr. Koza claimed that some lasted 20 years. At that point, they would re-skin and re-do it. Mr. Reece said that from an elevation standpoint, he could not accept it with so much siding.

Chairperson Brnabic asked Mr. Reece what he recommended. Mr. Reece thought that a lot more masonry was needed. As proposed, it was essentially all wood fiber siding. Mr. Bolyard asked Mr. Reece if he would accept hardy siding. Mr. Reece said that it would be the same material. Mr. Bolyard contended that the hotel would be in the back and away from the road, and people would not be able to see much of it. He questioned if people would be able to notice it much. Mr. Koza added that it was in compliance, and he had not known that it was an issue. Mr. Hooper pointed out that it still had to be approved by the Planning Commission.

Ms. Morita had noticed a trash dumpster on the northwest corner of the site about 50-60 feet from a residence. She asked if that was correct, and Mr. Butler said that it would be 60 feet. Ms. Morita asked if they would be willing to move it farther away from the residential area. She remarked that the neighbors might like the applicants now, but they would not like

them very much when trash was being picked up near their backyard at 6:00 a.m. five days a week.

Mr. Butler pointed out that the homes fronted on Orchard View, and they had significant backyards. 60 feet of the buffer area would also be preserved. Ms. Morita said that if someone was slamming down a trash container at 6:00 in the morning 60 feet away, it would wake everyone up in that house. It was one of the bigger issues she faced as a Council member - neighbors next to commercial developments that were upset because of when the trash was getting picked up and how often. She was just asking if the applicants would be willing to move the location of the dumpster farther east. Mr. Butler said that the dumpster would actually be located in excess of 120 away and would sit lower than the homes, but he would look at it.

Ms. Morita said that she also had the same concerns as other Commissioners. She did not like the fact that they were missing some information they still needed. She would like to see finished plans so they were not guessing as to what was or was not required or what conditions might be needed. She would like to see the trash location moved away from the west property line as far as possible. She knew they said they could not get a connection with Bolyard, but she would like to see it, because she agreed that it was not that hard to turn left out of Bolyard. She thought that the closer someone was to the intersection at South Boulevard and Rochester, it got more difficult. There would be cars stacking in the left turn lane to turn left onto eastbound South Boulevard. She would also like to see the HRC recommendations incorporated into the plans before any approvals were made. She would prefer to have the cross access easements that Mr. Schroeder mentioned provided to staff so they knew that there would not be an issue in the future. If she had to decide on the plan as it sat with the information she had, she would not be able to act favorably. She asked the applicants if they would be willing to get the rest of the needed information, incorporate the HRC recommendations, and look at what Mr. Reece mentioned regarding the façade and come back.

Mr. D'Agostini thought that some of the issues could be handled with conditional approval. He appreciated the concern about the elevations and materials. He wanted to talk with the hotel people and discuss some possibilities before the meeting was concluded. He stated that a very strong indicator of the left turn lane accessibility had been the historical existence of the office building on the corner. There had really not been any difficulty with left turns out of that side. He thought that the problem

would not be as big as people thought. The light at the freeway and the fact that people were stopping at the intersection helped the left turn traffic make its way onto northbound Rochester.

Ms. Morita said that she appreciated that point of view, but as a resident and someone who had visited the after-hours care at that building at 11:30 p.m., making a left turn out of there could be problematic, especially closer to the light when there were people turning right and left and heading north on Rochester Rd. Even at 11:30 p.m., she would go onto South Boulevard as opposed to turning left onto Rochester Rd., because it was safer. HRC knew the City very well, and if they were making traffic recommendations, she would tend to err on those. She did not want a hotel going in where people not from the area did not know the traffic. They would turn left out of there and get killed. As the plans sat without the additional information, she could not approve them.

Mr. D'Agostini said that it sounded like the completion of the traffic process was a concern. The materials proposed for the hotel were a concern. He felt that they could satisfy the dumpster issue and figure out a good spot for it. Ms. Morita added that there were a few things noted in the staff report that were missing, such as the height of the lamps on the hotel that needed to be provided. Mr. D'Agostini said that he would not hesitate to postpone the matter for 30 days. He asked if they could get on the next available meeting and hopefully by that time, they would have all the concerns addressed. Ms. Morita said that she really appreciated it.

Mr. Bolyard asked if they were looking for strictly brick and stone on the hotel with some wood siding. Mr. Reece said that he would like to see a better blend. It appeared to have between 70 and 80% fiber cement siding. Mr. Bolyard asked what percentage of siding he would like. Mr. Reece joked that he would be happy to submit a fee schedule to design it. Mr. Bolyard said that he just wanted to bring back something he would want. Mr. Reece said it was hard to say; perhaps 50-50. Mr. Bolyard asked if the Commissioners were familiar with lexan panels and what they thought. Mr. Reece asked in what percentage on the building. He did not like the amount of siding on the building, and he was asking them to come back with a better elevation, and something more representative of what the Commissioners expected to see in the City.

Chairperson Brnabic asked if they wished to postpone to a date certain or just postpone until the improvements were completed. Mr. D'Agostini said they would like to be on the next meeting, and they felt that there would be adequate time to vet the issues and address all the concerns.

Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Hooper moved to postpone, seconded by Ms. Morita.

MOTION by Hooper, seconded by Morita, in the matter of City File No. 95-044.2 (Gateway of Rochester Hills) the Planning Commission **postpones** the request for **Site Plan Approval** until the March 20, 2018 Planning Commission meeting.

A motion was made by Hooper, seconded by Morita, that this matter be Postponed. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

Excused 2 - Anzek and Kaltsounis

Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously, and that she was looking forward to seeing the next submittal.

2018-0005

Accept 2017 Annual Report for the Planning and Economic Development Department

Ms. Roediger said that preparing an Annual Report had been something staff had been meaning to do for a while. The Planning Act required cities to do an Annual Report of the Planning Commission's activities. Staff did not feel that the Planning Commission alone gave a complete picture of all the department's activities, which included the Zoning Board of Appeals, the Historic Districts Commission and all the other boards. Ms. Kapelanski did the lion's share of the work. The Report was a year in summary, looking at the different site plans and other projects, as well as economic development efforts. There was a snapshot into the priorities for the upcoming year, as well. She said that staff welcomed any input; otherwise, they were asking the Planning Commission to accept the Report and send it to City Council for review. She advised that the Report was required as part of the MEDC's Redevelopment Ready Communities (RRC) process. It would be coming annually.

Mr. Hooper said that it was a good job, and Chairperson Brnabic added that it was nice to have the review. Mr. Dettloff asked if the City was RRC certified. Ms. Roediger said that at the February 26th Council meeting, the MEDC was coming to present recommendations. The City was going through an evaluation period, and pending Council action to proceed, she hoped that the City would become certified this year.

MOTION by Hooper, seconded by Reece, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby **accepts the 2017 Annual Report** for the Planning and Economic Development Department at its February 20, 2018 meeting and forwards it to City Council for review.

A motion was made by Hooper, seconded by Reece, that this matter be **Approved**. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

Excused 2 - Anzek and Kaltsounis

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

2018-0037

Request for recommendation of a Planning Commission representative to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a one-year term to expire March 31, 2019.

MOTION by Hooper, seconded by Dettloff, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby **recommends to City Council that Deborah Brnabic** shall serve as its representative on the Zoning Board of Appeals for a one-year term to expire March 31, 2019.

Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

Excused 2 - Anzek and Kaltsounis

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The current CIP Policy Team members were Mr. Hooper and Mr. Schroeder, and both expressed an interest in serving again. Chairperson Brnabic advised that the first meeting would be March 20 at 2:00 p.m. Ms. Morita disclosed that she also sat on that committee as the City Council representative.

MOTION by Dettloff, seconded by Schroeder, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby **appoints Greg Hooper and C. Neall Schroeder** to serve on the CIP Policy Team for 2018.

Voice Vote:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Absent: Anzek, Kaltsounis

MOTION CARRIED

ANY FURTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Reece asked if the Gateway project was NOT required to have a Public Hearing, which was confirmed by Ms. Roediger. She noted that Tree Removal, Conditional Use and Wetland Use Permits were not required, and the use was permitted by right. Mr. Reece said that perhaps he was a little skeptical, but he could not believe that not one neighbor had an objection to a four-story hotel in their backyard. Chairperson Brnabic had thought the same thing. Mr. Reece said that he did not think the Commissioners were that naïve. There were people who came to meetings to speak about much simpler matters.

Ms. Roediger said that as part of the City's efforts to be transparent and reach as many people as they could, one of the internal policies now was that whenever there was a site plan of any kind, staff would provide an email notification to the surrounding Homeowner's Association if there was one on file. There was not one for the adjacent subdivision. They looked for all the projects, including Woodland Park and South Boulevard Office.

Mr. Reece said that his other concern was that they would be kind of opening Pandora's Box with a four-story hotel in the City. He thought that they needed to set a reasonable tone from an architectural standpoint. If Mr. Kaltsounis was there, he would still be going on about the "siding monster." Mr. Reece was looking at the future, and he knew there were more coming. Once one came in, they would have a much harder time saying no.

Ms. Morita agreed. She noted that there was a four-story Woodspring Suites at Adams Marketplace. She disliked the appearance, which looked like a 1950's courthouse - it was very plain and not attractive. Mr. Reece agreed, and reminded that it was a Consent Judgment. Ms. Morita said that it came back to Council for an amendment, and she disliked the changes, because they were taking it from a building that had some architectural interest to something that was a block. Mr. Reece said that to him, it was a completely different and much more appropriate location for that use than on Rochester Rd.

Ms. Morita asked if staff could send letters to the adjacent neighbors for the next meeting. Ms. Roediger said that they could, but her hesitation was about where to draw the line and how they could treat that project differently than the next. Ms. Morita said that it came up at Council, so she was asking them to consider it a Council member request to

specifically mail an informational letter to the adjacent property owners. Ms. Roediger indicated that it could be precedent setting, and there could be questions about when they sent mailings and when not. Mr. Schroeder thought that it would be best if it came from the developers.

Mr. Dettloff asked if anyone was familiar with hotel row in Troy. He drove it yesterday, and there was an explosion of hotels, which were not attractive. Mr. Reece agreed that they were downscaled. Mr. Schultz said that it was a matter of taste. The Holiday Inn Express at Adams Marketplace was all brick, but he felt that it looked terrible. It came down to having more diversity of materials.

Ms. Morita asked if there was a sign up at Hamlin and Adams about the proposed redevelopment of that property. Ms. Roediger said that signs were only required for Rezonings and Conditional Uses. Hamlin and Adams was permitted by right. Ms. Morita said that it would be hard to explain to the neighbors that there were signs for certain types of developments but not others. Ms. Roediger said that if something was permitted by right by zoning, a sign was not required. There were no cities that required them that she knew.

Mr. Schultz said that the City could not hold everyone's hand. People had to do their homework. If someone bought a home next to an adjacent lot, research had to be done. Ms. Morita agreed, but she said that there was a lot of pushback on Council from people who claimed that they did not know about something. It would sometimes be easier to just send a letter, and then people would have been informed. For the Hamlin Adams project, even though the City did not have to specifically notify the adjacent homeowners, they were all sent a letter, and it made the process a lot easier, because they were part of the process. She was just suggesting that the people by Gateway should be advised. She would rather have them be included as a part of the discussion as opposed to them being upset later, because they did not get a letter.

Ms. Roediger reminded everyone that as part of the Master Plan process, they would be having some work sessions starting in March. The March meeting would start at 6:00 p.m., and Giffels Webster would be present to talk about the Master Plan. That would occur for the next six or so meetings.

Mr. Dettloff asked how many more responses had been received for the survey. At the joint meeting, there were about 230. Ms. Roediger advised that staff had its bi-weekly conference call the next day with

Giffels. The last time they talked, it was at 350 responses. There were still some marketing to be done.

Chairperson Brnabic asked if the meetings would be indefinite, and Ms. Roediger advised that it would be for the next five or six meetings, and that the Plan should be adopted in September or October.

Mr. Dettloff asked about the Concord Hotel and what else was coming. Ms. Kapelanski said that staff had not heard anything since they cancelled. Ms. Roediger said that there were a number of plans coming forward. The Oakridge Dental Office was coming back. The Planning Commission had been impressed that the applicants were not overdeveloping the site, but they now wanted to split the site and develop half of it initially for the dental office. There was another four-story hotel coming at the back (east) of the Meijer site at Auburn and Rochester. There was a Final PUD for Crestwyk (16 units) coming and a restaurant for the former Ya-Ya's site on Crooks. Also, a First State Bank was proposed for the corner of the newly realigned Eddington Blvd. Mr. Dettloff asked if Meijer had abandoned the idea of a gas station, and Ms. Roediger said that she had not heard anything since she came to the City. Chairperson Brnabic said that she could not imagine a hotel on the Meijer site, as it was so busy. Ms. Roediger noted that it would be behind the TCF bank.

Mr. Dettloff mentioned that Silver Spoon was leaving and going into the Mama Mia's site in Rochester. The owners sold the property. Ms. Roediger agreed that after the owners got Site Plan Approval, they sold the site. She had not seen new plans, but they had discussions about residential for that property.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Chairperson Brnabic reminded the Commissioners that the next Regular Meeting was scheduled for March 20, 2018, starting at 6:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission, and upon motion by Mr. Reece, seconded by Mr. Hooper, Chairperson Brnabic adjourned the Regular Meeting at 8:55 p.m.

Deborah Brnabic, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Secretary