

Mr. Gassen asked if the fence area is a 6'-8" ornamental fence. Is that requirement through licensing?

Mr. Oberlee stated I believe that height exceeds the required amount. It's a fence they use for day care centers with narrow slats and openings.

Mr. Gassen stated receipt of brochure information might be helpful.

Mr. Gassen stated the trash enclosure looks like it has a gate for security purposes. It might be helpful to have information on the gate material.

Mr. Gassen stated you show a mechanical well on the roof. Do you have any condensing units in the fence area or play area.

Mr. Oberlee stated I believe it is all on the roof.

Motion by Lewis, supported by McGowan, to approve the site plan for a 24-hour childcare facility - 871 Oakwood - Crittenton Children's Choice Childcare subject to review of the Operational Plan as it relates to parking, details on the fence and gate materials, and subject to final engineering approval.

Mr. Gassen asked if Mr. Oberlee knew what the gate material is.

Mr. Cohee stated we have submitted 8-1/2 by 11 drawings that showed the elevation of the material.

Mr. Oberlee asked if it was steel or aluminum.

Mr. Cohee stated it is aluminum and power coated.

Mr. Gassen stated regarding the landscape breaks from the parking lot to the building; you may want to add a few more because of the convenience to use them for patrons to get to the building.

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

#### SETTING DATE - PUBLIC HEARING - CRITTENTON HOSPITAL - PARKING DECK

Chairperson Bilodeau stated for Planning Commission consideration setting a date for a Public Hearing on a request for Special Exception from Crittenton Hospital to expand their existing parking deck easterly into an existing surface parking lot in the City of Rochester.

Mr. Birchler stated at your request, consistent with established Planning Commission policy, we have completed a Preliminary Report regarding the above application as a prelude to your scheduling a public hearing on the Special Exception application. Our preliminary comments include:

- 1) The proposed structure is an expansion to the east of the existing south parking structure on the Crittenton Hospital site, which will cross the boundary line between the City of Rochester and Rochester Hills. The expansion includes 3.37 acres in the City of Rochester located in the P-1 zoning district.
- 2) Per the site plan, the structure will contain approximately 455 spaces and will be located roughly 61 feet west of the east property line in the City of Rochester.

- 3) Section 2404 of the Zoning Ordinance includes review requirements for Off-Street Parking facilities. The following requirements apply:
- a) Site plan approval is required.
  - b) Parking dimensions shall be 9'X18' with up to 25% of the spaces designated as 9'X16' if necessary.
  - c) Adequate ingress and egress shall be provided by clearly limited and defined drives. The access to the site is not proposed to change with the addition of the parking structure, which will replace existing surface parking spaces.
  - d) Parking spaces will be setback from abutting residential districts. A minimum setback of 3' (buffer strip) is required from the rear lot line of the abutting residential district to the east. The site plan does not identify any alterations to the existing surface parking area along the east property line. This requirement appears to be met based on the site plan submitted. (As noted in comment h below, a 4-story parking structure requires substantially more than the minimum 3-foot buffer strip when it adjoins a residential neighborhood).
  - e) The buffer strip is required to be landscaped and concrete wheel stops or curbing shall be required. Based on the photos included on Sheet C-100 of the site plan it is clear that there is existing landscaping and mature vegetation within the buffer strip. It is difficult to determine whether the required curbing or wheel stops have been provided from the site plan and photos presented. A note with the pictures provided on the site plan states that "Majority of existing berming and landscape screening to remain". Detail regarding the existing conditions and any proposed changes should be provided by the applicant to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission. We note that supplemental plantings may be appropriate to ensure proper screening for the homes between Third Street and Rose lawn.
  - f) Wherever a parking lot of four (4) or more spaces adjoins or is across the street from a residential district, screen wall shall be constructed in accordance with Article 28. It is unclear whether the required screen walls are in place to screen the existing surface parking area. Since the screen wall would do little to screen the structure, we recommend supplemental landscape plantings be submitted for review.
  - g) The off-street parking lot shall be provided with asphalt or concrete or other approved parking surface. The existing parking lot is paved in accordance with City standards. The proposed parking structure will replace some the existing surface parking area.
  - h) Parking decks and/ or structures may be permitted to satisfy off-street parking regulations when located in other than a residential or office district. All parking decks and /or structures shall require Special Exception Approval by the Planning Commission. During consideration of the Special Exception, the Commission shall ensure that the following standards are met, in addition to the general requirements of Article 26:

1. Where a parking deck or structure is located on property immediately abutting a residential zone, it shall be set back from the common lot line a distance equal to the height of the structure. Per Sheet A-200 the east elevation of the structure is 47'-4" with the stair tower extending to a maximum height of 56'-3". The setback from the R-4 zoning district is 61'-10" therefore this requirement has been satisfied.
  2. The entire area between a parking deck or structure and an abutting residential zone shall be landscaped a depth of 15 feet from the common lot line. Although no landscape plan has been submitted an existing buffer strip appears to meet this depth requirement. This should be verified by the applicants. (Refer to our recommendations in 3e and 3f above).
  3. No equipment installed as part of a parking structure shall generate noise levels above 65 dBA at the lot line abutting a residential district or use. There is no indication that equipment meeting this standard would be installed as part of this project. A statement to this effect could be added as a condition of special exception approval for clarification purposes.
  4. The side of a parking deck or structure that faces a residential district shall have a finished appearance by the application of face brick or an equivalent material approved by the Planning Commission. Sheet A-200 notes that the structure will have precast concrete spandrels with brick infill. There is no detail regarding the color of the materials proposed, however it is intended to match the existing parking structure on the site. The applicant should provide a rendered east elevation to permit the Planning Commission to verify compliance.
  5. Lighting fixtures and equipment for a parking deck or structure shall be designed so as not to cause glare or otherwise illuminate an adjoining residential district. No detail regarding the proposed lighting fixtures and or changes to the existing parking lot lighting was supplied. A cut-sheet with specifications would assist the Planning Commission in evaluating the proposed lighting. Full cut-off fixtures shall be used in accordance with the standards of Section 2306 of the Zoning Ordinance; a photometric plan shall be submitted to demonstrate that the foot-candles meet the requirements of Section 2306 B.
  6. Where a parking structure directly abuts a residential district, the Planning Commission may limit the hours of operation, where necessary, to provide protection to nearby residences. Limitations on hours may not be feasible due to the nature of the use.
- 4) A new one-way traffic lane is proposed near the south side of the parking structure on the city owned portion of the property. The parking bay depth of 38 feet will accommodate circulation into and out from these spaces.

Mr. Birchler stated we believe that the information provided satisfies all content requirements for purposes of scheduling a hearing. Prior to issuing a recommendation regarding the request, the applicants shall provide the following for Planning Commission consideration:

- Detail regarding the existing / proposed buffer strip adjacent the east property line. Include verification of the presence of a screen wall and curbing or concrete wheel stops, supplementary landscape plantings for the block between Third and Rose lawn.
- Information regarding the colors of the exterior building materials to ensure compatibility with the principal building. Include a rendered East elevation.
- Submission of lighting plan details as noted above.

Motion by Gassen, supported by Lewis to set the date for a Public Hearing on a request for Special Exception from Crittenton Hospital to expand their existing parking deck easterly into an existing surface parking lot in the City of Rochester for Monday, August 6, 2007, at 7:30 p.m. Yes: Bilodeau, Gassen, McGowan, Bikson, Briskin, Ketelsen, Kingsepp, Lewis. No: None. Absent: Johnson. Motion carried.

SITE PLAN - 401 MAIN STREET - OSTERIA ANDIAMO

The petitioner was not in attendance.

Mr. Birchler stated the above applicant seeks your approval of a minor façade alteration to replace existing windows on the Main Street frontage. Our review indicated the following:

- 1) The installation of a "NANA" wall system which includes new accordion style windows is intended to permit the restaurant to open the front windows to allow for an open air atmosphere within the upgraded Bar section of the restaurant. The proposed window system is planned in conjunction with interior alterations to the restaurant facility.
- 2) No change is proposed to the existing footprint of the building. Per the site plan there is no change to the permitted occupant load of the building.
- 3) According to sheet A-4 of the site plan a new awning is proposed to match the existing awning on the Main Street frontage. There was no information regarding signage on the proposed awning. Business names and or logos are permitted provided that the awning complies with the sign requirements of Section 2204. Any sign of more than six square feet of surface area requires Planning Commission review and approval.

Mr. Birchler stated based on our review, we recommend approval of the site plan for the new windows at 401 Main Street, subject to an assurance from the applicant that restaurant operations will be confined within the building footprint and not expand out onto the public right of way.

Mr. Birchler stated this is a pretty easy site plan. They are just replacing windows. The only reason it had to come to Planning Commission was because of cost. There was no significant change to the building by this NANA wall system. We had one of these proposed before, but it was not installed. It actually allows the windows to be opened to the street. Our only concern is