

Drafter:

History of Legislative File

Ver- sion:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
1	Planning Commission	05/03/2011	Recommended for Approval	City Council Regular Meeting			Pass
2	City Council Regular Meeting	06/06/2011					

Effective Date:

Text of Legislative File 2011-0216

Title

Request for Revised Conditional Land Use - Proposed patient tower at the southeast side of the existing Crittenton Hospital Medical Center building, zoned SP, Special Purpose, Crittenton Hospital Medical Center, applicant

Body

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills City Council hereby approves a Revised Conditional Land Use for a patient tower for Crittenton Hospital Medical Center, City File No. 89-153.9, Parcel No. 15-15-101-003, zoned SP, Special Purpose, based on plans dated received by the Planning and Economic Development Department on April 28, 2011 with the following findings:

Master Continued (2011-0216)

Findings:

1. The proposed Tower addition and other necessary site improvements meet or exceed the standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

2. The existing and expanded use will promote the intent and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance.

3. The proposed building has been designed and is proposed to be constructed, operated, maintained and managed so as to be compatible, harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing and planned character of the hospital, the general vicinity, adjacent uses of land, the natural environment and the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the land use.

4. The proposal should have a positive impact on the community as a whole and the surrounding area by further meeting the medical needs of people in the area.

5. The proposed development is served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage ways and refuse disposal.

6. The proposed development should not be detrimental, hazardous or disturbing to existing or future neighboring land uses, persons, property or the public welfare.

7. The proposal will not create additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services that will be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.