



Planning and Economic Development

Sara Roediger, AICP, Director

From: Kristen Kapelanski, AICP
Date: 11/27/2018
Re: **Brewster Village PUD (City File #18-015)**
PUD Concept Plan - Planning Review #3

The applicant is proposing a 30-unit owner occupied general condominium Planned Unit Development (PUD) on a 7.31-acre site located on the west side of Brewster, just north of Walton. 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 incorporated into a final site plan submittal for review by staff after review by the Planning Commission.

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

Qualification Criteria

Section 138-7.102 sets forth the criteria that a PUD must meet. Each of the criterion are listed below.

- 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 subject property is presently split zoned as both single family and special purpose, making development under conventional zoning standards challenging. The development of*

smaller general condominium units provides some diversity in housing stock for the community, which traditionally has been developed with larger subdivision and site condominium lots. Additionally, denser development scaled to match the height and size of other single family units in the area acts as an appropriate transition between the single family subdivision to the north and the multiple family senior living to the south.

- 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. *As previously noted, the split zoning on the site makes the application of traditional zoning requirements very difficult; there are potentially several variances under conventional zoning that may be required including front and rear setbacks. 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 residential units at up to 2.8 units per acre for some portions of the property. The proposed residential units are greater than the planned density at 4.19 units per acre, but the Department of Public Services and public safety departments have not expressed a concern regarding impacts to the road system and City utilities. 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 development of a desired land use to provide diversity in housing options in the City and the creation of an appropriate transitional use between multiple family and single family housing.
 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. *While the site does not contain any regulated wetlands or steep slopes, the proposal does require a tree removal permit. The plans indicate the majority of regulated trees will be removed and replaced on site.*
 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 plan includes the provision of a small public plaza including a bike repair station along the Brewster Road path. Additionally, the adjacent Shadow Woods subdivision would benefit from the basin overhaul proposed by the applicant.*
 3. To promote the goals and objectives of the Master Land Use Plan and other applicable long range plans such as the Master Thoroughfare Plan. *The proposed project promotes the following goals and objectives of the Master Land Use Plan and other applicable long range plans:*
 - (a) *Provide a diversity of housing types and sizes to meet the needs of people of different ages, incomes and lifestyles within the community.*
 - (b) *Encourage the mixture of residential types of residential uses that are compatible with the established character of the surrounding neighborhood.*
 - (c) *Provide a safe, efficient non-motorized pathway system that provides links to various land uses throughout the City.*
 4. To facilitate development consistent with the Regional Employment Center goals, objectives, and design standards in the City's Master Land Use Plan. *Not applicable.*
 5. To preserve and appropriately redevelop unique or historic sites. *Not applicable.*
 6. To permanently establish land use patterns that are compatible with or will protect existing or planned uses. *As previously noted, the development of owner occupied general condominium units at the proposed density at this location is a logical use, providing diversity in housing stock for the community and acting as an appropriate buffer between single family and multiple family uses.*
 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. *This parcel is*

key to providing an acceptable transition between the senior living to the south and the single family subdivision to the north. General condominium units are an appropriate choice for that transition.

8. To enhance the aesthetic appearance of the City through quality building design and site development. The applicant has provided proposed elevations that are generally in compliance with the City's building design standards. Scaled elevations should be provided.

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

5. **Zoning and Land Use** (Section 138-4.300 and 138.7.103). The site is split zoned, with the northern portion zoned R-1 and R-3 One Family Residential District and the southern portion zoned SP, Special Purpose; however the applicant is proposing to develop the site with a PUD option. 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
Site	R-1 & R-3 One Family Residential and SP Special Purpose	Vacant	Residential 3 & Multiple Family
North	R-1 & R-3 One Family Residential	Open Space for Shadow Woods Subdivision	Private Recreation/Open Space
South	SP, Special Purpose	Danish Village Senior Living	Multiple Family
East	R-1 One Family Residential	Hitchman's Haven Subdivision	Residential 2.5
West	R-3 One Family Residential & RM-1 Multiple Family Residential	Roanoke Apartments	Multiple Family

6. **Site Layout** (Section 138-5.100-101 and Section 138-7.104). Refer to the table below as it relates to the area, setback, and building requirements for this project. Although a PUD is proposed, for comparison purposes, the current residential zoning designations are shown.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Max. Density R-1 = 1.7 units per acre = 12 units R-3 = 2.8 units per acre = 22 units	Up to 4.19 units per acre = 30 units	Not in compliance, can be modified as part of PUD
Min. Lot Area R-1 = 20,000 sq. ft. R-3 = 12,000 sq. ft.	N/A - Individual lots are not proposed	
Min. Lot Width R-1 = 100 ft. R-3 = 90 ft.	N/A - Individual lots are not proposed	
Min. Front Setback R-1 = 40 ft. R-3 = 30 ft.	Min. 20 ft.	Not in compliance, can be modified as part of PUD
Min. Side Setback (each/total) R-1 = 15/30 ft. R-3 = 10/20 ft.	20 ft. between unattached units	In compliance
Min. Rear Setback 35 ft.	15 ft.	Not in compliance, can be modified as part of PUD
Max. Height 2.5 stories/30 ft.	Scaled elevations needed	

7. **Natural Features.** In addition to the comments below, refer to the comments and review letters from the Engineering and Forestry Departments that pertain to natural features protection.
 - a. **Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)** (Section 138-2.204.G) An EIS has been submitted for the project.
 - b. **Tree Removal** (Section 126 Natural Resources, Article III Tree Conservation). The site is subject to the city's tree conservation ordinance, and so 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. A tree preservation plan has

been included. 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 minimum of 37% of regulated trees on site must be preserved for all single family developments. The plan indicates 11.7% (31 trees) of the 265 regulated trees on site will be saved. The remaining 234 regulated trees to be removed and will be replaced on site. **The minimum percentage of trees to be preserved can be modified as part of the PUD.**

- c. **Wetlands** (*Section 126 Natural Resources, Article IV Wetland and Watercourse Protection*). The site contains four wetland areas not regulated by the City or the MDEQ. No wetland use permits are required. See the October 24, 2018 letter from ASTI for further detail.
 - d. **Natural Features Setback** (*Section 138-9 Chapter 1*). The plan indicates that approximately 450 linear feet of natural features setback area (primarily consisting of mowed lawn) will be impacted. See the October 24, 2018 letter from ASTI for further detail.
 - e. **Steep Slopes** (*Section 138-9 Chapter 2*). The site does not contain any regulated steep slopes.
8. **Landscaping** (*Section 138-12.100-308*). Refer to the table below as it relates to the landscape requirements for this project. This information is provided to aid the applicant in preparation of step two site plan submittal.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Street Trees Min. 1 deciduous per lot	0 deciduous	The city shall plant street trees in the ROW after construction of the project is complete, the applicant shall pay \$216.75 per lot to account for this planting
Right-of-Way (Brewster: 615 ft.) 1 deciduous per 35 ft. + 1 ornamental per 60 ft. = 18 deciduous + 11 ornamental	11 deciduous (4 existing) 0 ornamental	Infrastructure and corner conflicts prevent plantings – payment to be made to tree fund in lieu
Buffer B (West adjacent to RM-1: 257 ft.) 10 ft. + 2 deciduous per 100 ft. + 1.5 ornamental per 100 ft. + 2 evergreen per 100 ft. + 4 shrubs per 100 ft. = 10 ft. + 6 deciduous + 4 ornamental + 6 evergreen + 11 shrubs	10 ft. 6 deciduous (3 existing) 4 ornamental 6 evergreen 12 shrubs	In compliance

- a) A landscape planting schedule has been provided including the size of all proposed landscaping. A unit cost estimate and total landscaping cost summary, including irrigation costs, for landscape bond purposes has been provided.
 - b) If required trees cannot fit or planted due to infrastructure and corner clearance 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) A note has been provided on the landscape plan that states that all landscape areas must be irrigated and that watering will only occur between the hours of 12am and 5am.
 - 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.
9. **Architectural Design** (*Architectural Design Standards*). Proposed building elevations have been submitted. While some elevations include front entry garages, the applicant has made efforts to emphasize the pedestrian entrance and generally enhance the façade. Individual homes will be reviewed under a separate permit issued by the Building Department.
10. **Entranceway Landscaping and Signs.** (*Section 138-12.306 and Chapter 134*). A note should be included on the plans stating all signs must meet the requirements of *Section 138-12.306* and *Chapter 134* of the City Code of Ordinances and be approved under separate permits issued by the Building Department.



ASSESSING
Laurie Taylor, Director

From: Nancy McLaughlin
To: Sara Roediger
Date: 8/10/18
Re: Project: Brewster Village PUD, Review #1
Parcel No: 70-15-08-376-015 & 15-08-331-041
File No.: 18-015 BESC TBD
Applicant: Robertson Brothers Homes

A combination of the parcels is required.



FIRE DEPARTMENT

Sean Canto

Chief of Fire and Emergency Services

From: William A. Cooke, Assistant Chief / Fire Marshal
To: Planning Department
Date: November 19, 2018
Re: Brewster Village PUD

SITE PLAN REVIEW

FILE NO: 18-015

REVIEW NO: 3

APPROVED X

DISAPPROVED _____

The Fire Department recommends approval of the above reference site plan contingent upon the following conditions being met:

1. Provide documentation, including calculations that a flow of 2000 GPM can be provided.
IFC 2006 508.4
 - Fire flow data can be obtained by contacting the Rochester Hills Engineering Department at (248) 656-4640.

William A. Cooke
Assistant Chief / Fire Marshal



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

From: Jason Boughton, AC, Engineering Utilities Coordinator
To: Kristen Kapelanski, AICP, Manager of Planning
Date: November 29, 2018
Re: Brewster Village, City File #18-015, Section #8
Site Plan Review #3

Approved

Engineering Services has reviewed the site plan received by the Department of Public Services on November 15, 2018 for the above referenced project. Engineering Services **does** recommend site plan approval with the following comments:

General

1. Relocate the proposed utilities to maintain 10 feet of horizontal separation between existing and proposed utilities.

Grading

1. Revise the grading plan as needed to maintain drainage on site near the southeast property corner.

Traffic/Pathway/Sidewalk

1. On plan sheet L-1, show the required CITY pathway and roadway sight distance lines per the attached sight distance details. Please remove contour lines and make the landscape plan less cluttered for the sight distance lines. Also, include note that ***"Irrigation shall not broadcast onto CITY pathway"***.

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

JRB/md

c: Allan E. Schneck, P.E., Director; DPS
Tracey Balint, P.E., Public Utilities Engineering Mgr.; DPS
Paul G. Shumejko, P.E., PTOE, Transportation Eng. Mgr.; DPS
Keith Depp, Project Engineer; DPS File

Paul Davis, P.E. City Engineer/Deputy Director; DPS
Scott Windingland, Engineering Aide; DPS
File



PARKS & NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT
Ken Elwert, CPRE, Director

To: Kristen Kapelanski, Planning Manager
From: Matt Einheuser, Natural Resources Manager
Date: November 19, 2018
Re: Brewster Village PUD - Review #3
File #18-015

Forestry review pertains to right-of-way tree issues only.

Consider planting other shade tree species other than Red Maple (*due to popularity, red maples have been overplanted*).

Other Comments.

37% of regulated trees need to be preserved, which is currently not the case (as shown in the tree replacement summary calculations).

Copy: Maureen Gentry, Economic Development Assistant



FIRE DEPARTMENT
Sean Canto, Fire Chief

From: Vince Foisy
To: Planning Dept.
Date: November 28, 2018
Re: Brewster Village - 18-015 - Section #8 - Review #1

NOT APPROVED

The street names submitted on the drawings stamped received by Planning on 11/14/18 have been reviewed as follows:

The following name(s) is/are Approved:

Prefi x	Street Name	Suffi x
	Rosemond	Ct
	Mulberry	Ln

Be advised when resubmitting a new street name for Rosemond. As designed this will need to be a Court West of the proposed Sheffield, and a Lane/Street East.

The following name(s) is/are Not Approved:

Prefi x	Street Name	Suffi x
	Langdon	St
	Village	Way
	Sheffield	Ln

NOTE: Requests must not be, Like, Similar and or Sound alike names to ones already approved

To speed your review process up I recommend that you contact me by fax or Email with proposed names prior to your re-submittal:

Email: foisyv@rochesterhills.org

If you have any further questions please contact me at 248.841.2709

VINCENT B. FOISY
Communication Systems Administrator

October 24, 2018

Ms. Kristen Kapelanski
Planning Manager
Department of Planning &
Economic Development
City of Rochester Hills
1000 Rochester Hills Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309

**Subject: File No. 18-015 - Brewster Village PUD;
Wetland Use Permit Review #2;
Plans received by the City of Rochester Hills on
October 15, 2018**

Applicant: Robertson Brothers Homes

Dear Ms. Kapelanski:

The above referenced project proposes to develop approximately 7.2 acres of land into a Planned Unit Development (PUD). The site is located along the west side of Brewster Road, south of Tienken Road and north of Walton Boulevard. The site includes four wetland areas not regulated by the City of Rochester Hills or the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ).

ASTI has reviewed the site plans received by the City on October 15, 2018 (Current Plans) for conformance to the Wetland and Watercourse Protection Ordinance and the Natural Features Setback Ordinance and offers the following comments for your consideration. Please note that ASTI has not reviewed a draft PUD agreement between the applicant and the City prior to publication of this wetland review.

COMMENTS

1. **Applicability of Chapter (§126-500).** The Wetland and Watercourse Protection Ordinance is applicable to the subject site because the subject site is not included within a site plan which has received final approval, or a preliminary subdivision plat which received approval prior to January 17, 1990, which approval remains in effect and in good standing and the proposed activity has not been previously authorized.
2. **Wetland and Watercourse Determinations (§126-531).** This Section lists specific requirements for completion of a Wetland and Watercourse Boundary Determination.

- a. This review has been undertaken in the context of a Wetland and Watercourse Boundary Determination previously completed by the applicant's wetland consultant. The applicant's wetland consultant (BWA Consulting) completed a wetland delineation on February 22, 2018 as detailed in a BWA Consulting's wetland delineation letter report dated February 26, 2018, which was submitted to the City for review. ASTI inspected the wetland delineation on August 14, 2018 and agrees with the flagging and the depiction of the on-site wetlands on the Current Plans.

No City-regulated wetlands are present on the property. All on-site wetlands on-site are less than two acres in size, none are within 500 feet of a inland lake, stream or pond as defined by Part 301, Inland Lakes and Streams, and none of the on-site wetlands are of significant ecological value or a valuable natural resource to the City; none of the on-site wetlands are regulated by the City.

The on-site wetlands are not regulated by the DEQ per a DEQ Wetland Identification Report dated July 23, 2018, which was supplied to the City for review.

- b. City Wetland Quality Assessments**

The on-site wetlands are very small and total 0.113 acres (4,922 square feet) and are of very similar ecological character. The on-site wetlands were forested wetlands that exhibited dominant vegetation such as the common native species of green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*) and cottonwood (*Populus deltoides*). Tree cover was moderate and individuals ranged in size of approximately 3 inches diameter to 15 inches in diameter. Tree canopy coverage varied from approximately 30%-60%. Woody understory vegetation was thick and was dominated by the invasive species of glossy buckthorn (*Frangula alnus*). Herbaceous cover was sparse and sporadic and was dominated by the invasive species of reed canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea*). Scattered areas of soil piles were observed in close proximity to the on-site wetlands. However, no obvious signs of detrimental contaminants were observed within the on-site wetlands other than common residential waste. Wetland A was dominated by native species, but did exhibit significant amounts of invasive species. The observed tree, shrub, and herbaceous layers within the on-site wetlands have very low potential to provide anything but limited habitat for common suburban wildlife. The on-site wetlands are not contiguous to any watercourses or water bodies and very small.

Therefore, they offer little ability to detain significant amounts of storm water or ground water recharge. Based on these factors, it is ASTI's opinion that the on-site wetlands are of low ecological quality and should not be considered a valuable natural resource to the City.

3. **Use Permit Required (§126-561).** This Section establishes general parameters for activity requiring permits, as well as limitations on nonconforming activity. This review of the Current Plans has been undertaken in the context of those general parameters, as well as the specific requirements listed below.
 - a. No City- or DEQ-regulated wetlands are present on the property. Neither a Wetland Use Permit from the City or a Part 303 permit from the DEQ are required to impact the on-site wetlands.
 - b. The applicant proposes to perform maintenance to the detention pond on the adjacent property to the north in assumed cooperation with the adjacent land owner and the City. Maintenance is to be in the form of dredging the detention basin to original construction design elevations per plans from City records. This work is exempt from the City's Wetland and Watercourse Protection ordinance provided that: (1) a prior written notice is given to the City Engineer and written consent is obtained from the City Mayor prior to work commencing; (2) the work is conducted using best management practices (BMPs) to ensure flow and circulation patterns and chemical and biological characteristics of wetlands are not impacted; and (3) such that all impacts to the aquatic environment are minimized.

Additionally, ASTI recommends the applicant confirm with the DEQ that this work does not require a Part 303 permit prior to commencing any dredging activities.

4. **Use Permit Approval Criteria (§126-565).** This Section lists criteria that shall govern the approval or denial of an application for a Wetland Use Permit.
 - a. No DEQ-regulated wetlands are present on the property. All on-site wetlands on-site are less than two acres in size, none are within 500 feet of a inland lake, stream or pond as defined by Part 301, Inland Lakes and Streams, and none of the on-site wetlands are of significant ecological value or a valuable natural resource to the City; none of the on-site wetlands are regulated by the City. Thus, neither a Wetland Use Permit from the City or a Part 303 permit from the DEQ are required to impact the on-site wetlands.

5. **Natural Features Setback (§21.23).** This Section establishes the general requirements for Natural Features Setbacks and the review criteria for setback reductions and modifications.
- a. Should the City accept the applicant's proposal to develop the subject property as a PUD, subject to final review and approval as part of the site plan review process, the on-site Natural Features Setback regulations can be waived by the City at its discretion. The applicant should note that upon the request of the City, ASTI will re-evaluate any Natural Features Setback impacts if the City does not waive Natural Feature Setback regulations.

The Current Plans indicate that approximately 450 linear feet of Natural Features Setback will be permanently impacted from the proposed development. All Natural Features Setback areas on-site are generally comprised of mowed lawn areas. The dominant species observed in these areas were planted grasses such as annual grass (*Poa annua*) and Kentucky blue grass (*Poa pratensis*). Scattered shrubs such as the invasive species of glossy buckthorn and autumn olive (*Elaeagnus umbellata*) were also present. Scattered trees such as the common native species of cottonwood and box elder (*Acer negundo*) were also observed. Tree and shrub canopy was estimated to be approximately 10% or less. The Natural Features Setback areas on-site are of poor floristic quality and appear to be maintained and/or controlled by mowing and other vegetative maintenance activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

ASTI recommends the City approve the Current Plans.

Respectfully submitted,

ASTI ENVIRONMENTAL



Kyle Hottinger
Wetland Ecologist
Professional Wetland Scientist #2927



Dianne Martin
Director, Resource Assessment & Mgmt.
Professional Wetland Scientist #1313



CITY OF ROCHESTER HILLS
1000 Rochester Hills Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
ROCHESTER HILLS PLANNING COMMISSION**

REQUEST: In accordance with the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act, PA 110 of 2006, as amended, and Section 138-1.203 and 138-7.105 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Rochester Hills, a Public Hearing is required to review the application for a Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) and conceptual Site Plan Recommendation for Brewster Village Condominiums, a proposed 30-unit residential development on 7.3 acres, identified as Parcel Nos. 15-08-376-015 and 15-08-331-041 (City File No. 18-015).

LOCATION: West side of Brewster, north of Walton Blvd.

APPLICANT: Tim Loughrin
Robertson Brothers Homes
6905 Telegraph Rd., Suite 200
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48301



DATE OF PUBLIC HEARING: Tuesday, December 18, 2018 at 7:00 p.m.

LOCATION OF PUBLIC HEARING: City of Rochester Hills Municipal Offices
1000 Rochester Hills Drive
Rochester Hills, Michigan 48309

Information concerning this request may be obtained from the Planning Department during regular business hours from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, or by calling (248) 656-4660. Written comments concerning this request will be received by the City of Rochester Hills Planning Department, 1000 Rochester Hills Drive, Rochester Hills, Michigan 48309, prior to the public hearing or by the Planning Commission at the public hearing. The plans can also be found at rochesterhills.org, city government, maps, planning & economic dev., development projects. The recommendation will be forwarded to City Council after the Public Hearing.

Deborah Brnabic, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

NOTE: Anyone planning to attend the meeting who has need of special assistance under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is invited to contact the Facilities Division (248-656-2560) 48 hours prior to the meeting. Our staff will be pleased to make the necessary arrangements.