

ROCHESTER PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 6, 2007

Chairperson Bilodeau called the regular meeting of the Rochester Planning Commission to order at 7:30 p.m.

Members Present: Bilodeau, Gassen, Bikson, Briskin,
Johnson, Kingsepp, Lewis.

Members Absent: McGowan, Ketelsen.

Others Present: City Planner, David Birchler; Building Inspector,
Ed Alward; City Attorney, Sarah Cox, and approximately
25 others.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairperson Bilodeau asked if there were any additions, deletions, or corrections to the regular meeting minutes of July 2, 2007.

Motion by Lewis, supported by Briskin, to approve the regular meeting minutes of July 2, 2007, as presented. Yes: Bilodeau, Gassen, Bikson, Briskin, Johnson, Kingsepp, Lewis. No: None. Absent: McGowan, Ketelsen. Motion carried.

PUBLIC HEARING - SPECIAL EXCEPTION - CRITTENTON HOSPITAL PARKING STRUCTURE

Chairperson Bilodeau stated for Planning Commission consideration is a Public Hearing regarding a special exception request for Crittenton Hospital to expand their existing parking deck in the City of Rochester Hills easterly into an existing surface parking lot in the City of Rochester Hills.

Mr. Birchler stated he provided his preliminary review during the July 2, 2007, meeting. They provided enough information to satisfy the requirement for a public hearing.

Mr. Birchler stated prior to making a recommendation regarding the request, we need to receive the following information: Detail regarding the existing/proposed buffer strip adjacent to the east property line, including a verification of the presence of a screen wall and curbing or concrete wheel stops, supplementary landscape plantings for the block between Third and Roselawn; information regarding the colors of the exterior building materials to ensure compatibility with the principal building; receipt of an east elevation drawing; and submission of lighting plan details.

Chairperson Bilodeau opened the Public Hearing.

No comments from the audience.

Chairperson Bilodeau stated we received a letter from one resident, Kay Johnson, 137 N. Alice, who had one concern that the addition to the hospital will not cause any more water problems to her property.

Chairperson Bilodeau closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Gassen asked if there were any problems that have been determined to be attributed to what is happening with development to the west with this particular house.

Manager Johnson stated there was extensive work done to the storm sewer system in that area so the flooding problems experienced previously have been addressed. This development will not cause any additional drainage problems since the site in this area is currently 100% impervious.

Motion by Lewis, supported by Gassen, to approve the special exception request by Crittenton Hospital to expand their existing parking deck in the City of Rochester Hills easterly into an existing surface parking lot in the City of Rochester because the development meets the requirements for special exception requests outlined in Article 26, Sections 2603 and 2604 of the Zoning Ordinance. Yes: Bilodeau, Gassen, Bikson, Briskin, Johnson, Kingsepp, Lewis. No: None. Absent: McGowan, Ketelsen. Motion carried.

SITE PLAN

Chairperson Bilodeau stated for Planning Commission consideration is the site plan for the proposed parking deck.

Mr. Dick Wheaton, architect for the project, was in attendance representing Crittenton.

Mr. Wheaton stated he received Mr. Birchler's comments and is prepared to provide additional information. They did an additional review of the parking and it looks like they will have 429 parking spaces. Each space will be 9 x 18. They have a 30' buffer strip between their property and the residences. They intend to add an additional 55 trees to buffer the parking area from the adjacent residents. They don't intend to have any mechanical equipment at the east end of the structure. They have a lighting plan, and the lights will be less than 1' candle at the property line.

Mr. Wheaton displayed a rendering and pointed out features of the parking structure. The structure will be double the size of the existing parking deck. For traffic flow, instead of driving around the structure, the cars will drive through the structure, so the additional traffic will not affect the neighbors.

Mr. Wheaton displayed a rendering of the site. There is presently a fairly dense buffer strip for residences.

Mr. Wheaton also referred to a rendering of the existing deck. One rendering showed the location of the proposed lights. The lights will be 60' away from the residential area and by the time the lighting reaches the residences, there will be almost no light. There was also a question about the curbing. He displayed a rendering showing the curbing. The new structure will match the existing structure and will be precast deck. The east elevation will be solid, so unlike the existing structure, this will be open only on 3 sides.

Chairperson Bilodeau asked if there are any mechanicals or elevators.

Mr. Wheaton stated there are two towers; the one up front at the northwest corner of the structure will be elevators and stairs. They will tie in with an overhead walkway.

Chairperson Bilodeau asked the distance from the tower with the elevator to the property line.

Mr. Wheaton stated about 300'.

Chairperson Bilodeau asked if they are proposing to have generators.

Mr. Wheaton stated no. We will also be integrating our salt bins inside.

Mr. Kingsepp stated if there are currently trees along the property line now, where will the new landscaping be going.

Mr. Wheaton stated there are a few bare spots. We will fill them in trees. He has a list of trees if you would like to see it.

Mr. Kingsepp asked about maintenance. Will you replace any trees that die?

Mr. Wheaton stated within the first couple of years.

Mr. Kingsepp asked if they can make it five (5) years.

Mr. Wheaton stated we will do whatever is requested.

Mr. Kingsepp stated the lighting will not affect the residents, correct?

Mr. Wheaton stated it will not. The light at the property line will be under 1' candle.

Mr. Gassen stated the two areas where we will need to see more information was landscaping and lighting. Since we will only be giving preliminary approval, we would just need to see lighting placement and where the trees will be located on the property when the plan comes back.

Mr. Wheaton stated he has that information with him this evening.

Mr. Gassen stated considering that you will be coming back, we would need to see the requested information at that time.

Motion by Gassen, supported by Kingsepp, to issue preliminary approval of the site plan for Crittenton Hospital to expand their parking deck in the City of Rochester Hills easterly into an existing surface parking lot in the City of Rochester subject to receipt of lighting and landscaping plans that include details on the actual locations for the tree plantings and a lighting plan showing the locations and details of the proposed lighting.

Mr. Kingsepp stated he would like to include the guarantee of replacement for the trees for five (5) years.

RESTATED MOTION

Motion by Gassen, supported by Kingsepp, to issue preliminary approval of the site plan for Crittenton Hospital to expand their parking deck in the City of Rochester Hills easterly into an existing surface parking lot in the City of Rochester subject to receipt of lighting and landscaping plans that include details on the actual locations for the tree plantings including a provision that any trees or shrubs that die within five (5) years will be replaced, and a lighting plan showing the locations and details of the proposed lighting.

Mr. Briskin asked in this type of approval between two (2) cities, do we get a copy of what Rochester Hills approves?

Manager Johnson stated the process is that they will go to Rochester Hills to

get their final approval. They will come back here after they receive approval from Rochester Hills. If there are any changes on the Rochester Hills side that might affect us, this Commission will be able to see those changes. If these changes affect what we approved, we will be provided with the details of the changes. At least this way, Rochester Hills knows that our community is satisfied, but the plan will also have to come back here after approval by Rochester Hills.

Mr. Gassen asked if the petitioner is aware of any security issues that may be occurring in the existing garage.

Mr. Wheaton stated he is not aware of any. There is a security camera system throughout the existing garage.

Chairperson Bilodeau asked if there be a security system in the new garage.

Mr. Wheaton stated yes.

Chairperson Bilodeau asked if they were providing for limited access or will it be an open deck.

Mr. Wheaton stated it will be open. It is not gated.

Chairperson Bilodeau called for roll.

Yes: Bilodeau, Gassen, Bikson, Briskin, Johnson, Kingsepp, Lewis. No: None.
Absent: McGowan, Ketelsen. Motion carried.

SITE PLAN - 135 SOUTH STREET - KEVMARK PROPERTIES

Chairperson Bilodeau stated for Planning Commission consideration is a site plan for a new building at 135 South Street - Kevmark Properties.

Mr. Birchler stated the above applicant is seeking approval of a new 8,000 square foot two story light manufacturing facility on .44 acres located on the north side of South Street. The property under consideration is zoned I-2, Industrial 2 and is located south of the Clinton River. Our review indicated the following:

- 1) Light manufacturing is a principal permitted use in the I-2, Industrial 2 district.
- 2) The site plan reflects the required minimum front setback of 25 feet from South Street. All front, side and rear setbacks have been met.
- 3) Gross floor area for the building is 8,000 square feet, requiring 16 parking spaces per the industrial square footage standards. Seventeen parking spaces have been provided. The number of employees per shift should be provided to ensure that the proper parking standard has been applied.
- 4) Despite its location near the Clinton River, the .44-acre property does not appear to include any land adjacent to the banks of the waterway; therefore it appears a landscaped stabilization zone is not required. There appears to be at least 40' of Lot 43 that extends behind (north of) Lot 42. The applicant should clarify the physical relationship between the 2 lots, as well as the ownership of Lot 43.