



## Department of Planning and Economic Development

Staff Report to the Planning Commission

May 13, 2016

### Sanctuary in the East Condominiums PUD

<b>REQUEST</b>	PUD Concept Plan Recommendation
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Dan MacLeish, MacLeish Building, Inc. 650 E. Big Beaver, Suite F Troy, MI 48083
<b>LOCATION</b>	East of Sanctuary Blvd., north of South Blvd.
<b>FILE NO.</b>	89-114.2
<b>PARCEL NOS.</b>	15-32-476-011, -002, -005, -006, -009, 15-32-477-009, -016
<b>ZONING</b>	R-4 One-Family Residential
<b>STAFF</b>	Sara Roediger, AICP, Manager of Planning

#### *In this Report:*

Overview .....	1
PUD Review Process.....	2
PUD Qualification Criteria.....	2
PUD Concept Plan.....	3
PUD Concept Plan Recommendation Motion.....	4

#### **Overview**

The applicant is proposing a 14-unit Planned Unit Development (PUD) on a 4.57-acre site located east of Sanctuary Blvd. and north of South Blvd. The site is next to the Sanctuary in the Hills Condominiums to the west; to the north is Deerfield Elementary; to the south is City-owned property the applicant is proposing to purchase a portion of to use as the detention pond; and to the west are homes. The site, and those to the north, east and south are zoned R-4 One Family Residential. The condos to the east are zoned RCD, One Family Cluster. This project is planned as an extension of Sanctuary in the Hills, with the possibility of joining the former's Association.

The applicant is proposing 2,600 square-foot homes at prices starting at \$475,000, accessed off of a 27 ft. wide private road cul-de-sac located on the east side of Sanctuary Blvd. There is a paper road running north and south through the parcels that the applicant has applied to vacate through the City. The proposed 14 units represent a net density of 3.06 units per acre. The applicant was before the Planning Commission on May 19, 2015 for a discussion and to get guidance and input. Please refer to those minutes for details of the discussion.

#### **PUD Review Process**

##### *Process Overview*

The PUD review process consists of a two step process:

1. **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. At this step, a Public Hearing will be held at the Planning Commission meeting, followed by a recommendation to City Council.
2. **Site Plan/PUD Agreement/Tree Removal Permit/Wetland Permit.** 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. Again, the Planning Commission makes a recommendation to City Council, and the project will need a Wetland Use Permit Recommendation, Tree Removal Permit and Natural Features Setback Modifications at Final review.

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. Use of the PUD option is intended to encourage innovation and 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; and provide appropriate housing opportunities. The PUD option can permit a different use not permitted in a zoning district and permit densities or lot sizes that are different from the applicable district.

The Planning Commission and City Council should be evaluating the major elements of the development such as density, layout, and building design with the understanding that more details will be reviewed during step two 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. Many site plan issues have been addressed at this stage; please refer to the Planning Department memo dated May 10, 2016 for details of the proposed PUD.

## **PUD Qualification Criteria**

---

Section 138-7.102 sets forth the criteria that a prospective PUD must meet. Each of the criterion have been met as summarized in the Planning Department memo dated May 10, 2016.

It is up to the judgment of the Planning Commission and City Council to determine if the proposed development provides some benefit that would not otherwise be realized. In this instance, it might be in this instance; it may be the development of a desired land use to provide diversity in housing options in the City. The applicant has completed most of the work necessary for site plan approval and has had preliminary discussions with many city departments, so there is some degree of confidence that the layout will meet the various ordinance requirements as commented on in the staff review letters.

### *Proposed PUD Concept Plan*

1. **Site Layout.** The site has been designed with an internal cul-de-sac with seven, two-unit duplexes. All building setback requirements associated with the MR zoning district have been met or exceeded with the exception of the rear perimeter and rear interior setbacks. The minimum east rear perimeter setback required is 60 feet and 20 is proposed; the minimum rear interior setback required is 35 feet, and 20 feet is proposed. The city has the ability to determine the minimum perimeter setback as part of the PUD option. The applicant has met or exceeded the buffer zone widths and planting requirements to help address screening for adjacent properties. The proposed setback of 20 feet for the side and 35 feet for the rear is consistent with the largest side and rear yard setback in the one-family residential districts. The existing homes to the east are at least 70 feet from the site's east

property line.

2. **Density.** The proposed density results in 3.06 units per acre, while the ordinance has a maximum density of 4.25 units per acre for the MR district (plans show that 3.4 units is required and will need to be revised).
3. **Natural Feature Preservation.**
  - a. The 25 ft. natural features setback has been identified on the plans which indicate that a number of setback modifications will be required as proposed as part of the site plan and PUD agreement review and approval. As recommended by ASTI, the city's wetland consultants an 18" boulder retaining wall has been provided along the boundary of the wetlands along units 2, 3 and 14 to prevent unplanned impacts to the wetlands. Refer to the ASTI review letter dated April 27, 2016 for additional information.
  - b. The site is not subject to the City's tree conservation ordinance; however as part of the PUD development option, natural feature preservation is encouraged. A partial tree survey has been provided, however a full tree survey is required as part of step two site plan review of the PUD. The plans indicate that 32 trees greater than 6" in caliper will be removed, and 12 trees will be preserved, however it is not clear if the three trees labeled 130 will be kept or removed and the landscape plan indicates that 15 trees will be preserved.
  - c. There are 0.68 acres of State and City regulated wetlands, and the applicant will need a Wetland Use Permit to temporarily and permanently impact 0.08 acres (at Final review). A wetland conservation easement is being planned to save wetlands and provide 0.23 acre of open space in the floodplain area towards the south/middle of the development. ASTI recommends the removal of the access drive along Sanctuary Blvd, which would eliminate 0.02 acres of permanent wetland impact. Refer to the ASTI review letter dated April 27, 2016 for additional information.
4. **Landscaping and Open Space.** A fairly extensive landscape plan has been provided that depicts buffer zones and street tree landscaping that meets or exceeds the requirements. The project provides 0.23 acres of open space with a fire pit, benches and a wood chip path along the south property line, as well as two benches near the entrance of the development use by its residents.
5. **Building Design.** The proposed design emphasizes the garage door as the majority of the front façade which is not the most desirable design option as the car entry shall not be the most notable element of the building massing. Staff has encouraged the applicant to consider alternative building footprints that minimize the garage doors and focuses more on the human entrance, however, the applicant has supplied a letter (included) giving a reason he feels the design as proposed is integral.
6. **Sidewalks.** As part of the PUD and in accordance with the city's Complete Streets Policy to improve pedestrian access, a sidewalk into the site should be provided off of Sanctuary Blvd. A sidewalk is proposed at the entrance of the development to connect to the sidewalk on the other side of Sanctuary Blvd., however the sidewalk does not extend into the site as has been recommended by staff. A sidewalk could be waived as part of the PUD agreement, however, staff does not recommended that the Planning Commission waive this requirement.
7. **Engineering Comments.** The applicant continues to work with Engineering in response to the review letter dated April 28, 2016, and several comments can be addressed during construction plan review and others prior to Final Plan submittal and are unlikely to affect the layout.
8. **Fire Comments.** If not yet completed, the applicant is required to obtain a fire flow test prior to Final Plan review

## **PUD Concept Plan Recommendation Motion**

---

Should the Planning Commission find that the proposed PUD concept plan meets the qualifying criteria for a PUD, staff offers the following motion to recommend approval to the City Council.

**MOTION** by \_\_\_\_\_, seconded by \_\_\_\_\_, in the matter of 89-114.2 (Sanctuary in the Hills East Condominiums PUD), the Planning Commission **recommends** that **City Council approve** the PUD Concept plans dated received April 13, 2016, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions.

### *Findings*

1. The proposed PUD Concept plan meets the criteria for use of the Planned Unit Development option.
2. The proposed PUD Concept plan meets the submittal requirements for a PUD concept plan.
3. The proposed development should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.
4. The proposed development is not expected to have an unreasonably detrimental or injurious effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the site or those of the surrounding area.
5. The proposed development provides adequate benefit that would not otherwise be realized including the development of a desired land use to provide diversity in housing options in the City.

### *Conditions*

1. Approval shall only confer the right of the applicant to submit detailed site plans consistent with the layout and at a density not exceeding that shown on the PUD Concept plan.
2. The site plans, including but not limited to landscaping, engineering, tree removal and wetland use/buffer modification plans will meet all applicable City ordinances and requirements while remaining consistent with the PUD Concept layout plan.
3. The architectural quality of building plans submitted with the site plans and PUD Agreement in step 2 of the PUD process will be equal to or better than that approved with the PUD Concept plan.
4. Recommendation by the Planning Commission and approval by City Council of a Wetland Use Permit and submittal of an MDEQ Wetland Permit at Final PUD review, with the plans to address comments from ASTI's letter dated April 27, 2016.
5. Approval of a Tree Removal Permit by Planning Commission at Final PUD review.
6. Recommendation by the Planning Commission and approval by City Council of a PUD Agreement, as approved by the City Attorney, at Final PUD review.
7. Address comments from the Engineering memo dated April 28, 2016 applicable to Final PUD submittal and any minor outstanding staff comments prior to Final Site Condo Plan submittal.
8. The addition of a sidewalk along the south side of the proposed road to connect to the wood chip path.
9. Work with the Engineering Department to find an alternative access to the detention pond that removes the access drive off of Sanctuary Blvd.
10. Approval of the vacation of Grant Rd. by City Council, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.

---

Attachments: PUD Conceptual Site Plans dated received 4/13/16: Utility Plan, Sheet 1; Grading Plan, Sheet 2; Detention Basin Calculations & Details, Sheet 3; Boundary and Topographic Survey, Sheet 4; Soil Borings, Sheet 5; Wetland Impact Plan, Sheet 7, prepared by Fenn & Associates, Inc.

Assessing memo dated 8/5/15; Building Dept. memo dated 10/5/15; Fire Department memo dated 10/9/15; Engineering Services memos dated 10/16/15 and 4/28/16, Parks and Forestry memo dated 7/27/15; ASTI Environmental Letter dated 4/27/16; Letter from MacLeish Building, dated 9/22/15; Letter from P. Davis, DPS, dated 3/21/16; Planning Dept. memo dated 5/10/16; EIS; Planning Commission Minutes dated 5/19/15; Public Hearing Notice

---

i:\pla\development reviews\1980s\1989\89-114.2 sanctuary in the hills 2\pc mtg. 5-17-16\concept plan staff report 5-17-16.docx