



Rochester Hills

Minutes

Planning Commission

1000 Rochester Hills Dr
Rochester Hills, MI
48309
(248) 656-4600
Home Page:
www.rochesterhills.org

Chairperson William Boswell, Vice Chairperson Deborah Brnabic
Members: Gerard Dettloff, Dale Hetrick, Greg Hooper, Nicholas O. Kaltsounis,
David A. Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Emmet Yukon

Tuesday, January 15, 2013

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson William Boswell called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Auditorium.

ROLL CALL

Present 8 - William Boswell, Deborah Brnabic, Dale Hetrick, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis, David Reece, C. Neall Schroeder and Emmet Yukon

Absent 1 - Gerard Dettloff

Quorum Present

Also Present: James Breuckman, Manager of Planning
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2013-0005 December 11, 2012 Special Meeting

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Yukon, that this matter be Approved as Presented. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Boswell, Brnabic, Hetrick, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 1 - Dettloff

COMMUNICATIONS

A) Planning & Zoning News dated November 2012

NEW BUSINESS

2010-0346 Public Hearing and request for Final Preliminary Plat Approval Recommendation for Vistas of Rochester Hills (formerly Rochester Meadows), a 47-lot subdivision

located on 22 acres (Parcel Nos. 15-23-201-006, 15-23-201-010, 15-23-201-011 and 15-23-201-012) on the south side of Avon between Rochester and John R, zoned R-3, One Family Residential, Rochester Meadows Real Estate LLC, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Ed Anzek, dated January 11, 2013 and Final Preliminary Plat had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Roy Sera and Jim George, Rochester Meadows Real Estate, LLC, 40680 Garfield, Clinton Township, MI 48036.

Chairperson Boswell advised that if anyone wished to speak on an agenda item, it would be necessary to fill out a card at the back of the Auditorium and turn it in to the Secretary.

Mr. Breuckman stated that the request was more of a procedural issue. The development received Final Preliminary Plat Approval on October 18, 2010. Because the applicant had proceeded toward development construction, had gotten a Land Improvement Permit and received other procedural approvals, the City considered the project in good standing. When the applicant submitted to the State for Final Plat review, they found out that the State had a two-year window after Final Preliminary Plat to submit the Final Plat. Since they missed the window, they had to get a re-approval of the Final Preliminary Plat in order to proceed. The development was well along in the process, and the Construction Plans were in good standing with the Engineering Department, so no changes would be approved from the initially approved Plat with one exception. Lot 11 used to have a separate Tree Conservation area next to it, but all the trees died, which was verified as due to natural causes. That left an open space with nothing in it and it would be ownerless, so the applicant was proposing to combine that area with lot 11 to create a larger lot, and they would be replacing the trees elsewhere. Mr. Breuckman noted that there was a motion along with some findings and conditions in the Staff Report, and he said he would be happy to answer any questions.

*Chairperson Boswell asked Mr. Sera if he had anything to add. Mr. Sera said that he did not, and that Mr. Breuckman had summed it up very well. Chairperson Boswell asked if the Commissioners had any comments at that point, and hearing none, he **opened the Public Hearing at 7:05 p.m.** He asked the speakers to direct any questions to the Chair, and explained that after the Public Hearing, questions would be answered.*

James Coon, 707 Tewksbury Ct., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Mr. Coon stated that he had a few concerns. He said that for the most part,

the applicants had been very speedy in their work, and they had addressed most of the concerns, but there were still a few left. He said that the gabion basket wall looked terrible. He felt that it would look better if it were replaced with field stones or removed completely. The emergency overflow was filled with broken concrete for riprap, and he stated that it did not look very good. He reiterated that another type of stone would be more appealing to the eye. He passed around some pictures, and said that there was a concern about standing water being on both sides of the wall. He pointed out that the original plan called for water on one side and on the other side, it was supposed to be dry. There was about six inches of water on the shallow side of the wall and on the south side of wall, it was supposed to come up to the bottom of the pipe that connected the two, and the pipe was about eight-inches above the water. The deep part of the water was designed to be about four feet deep, and with a half-an-inch of rain, it came up eight inches, so it got deep pretty fast. They dug in his backyard for the sewer, and the land was still pretty soggy and did not seem to be draining properly. The developer said they would take care of that in the spring, but he wanted to make sure it was in the record. Mr. Coon mentioned that the covered grate on the overflow manhole was not fastened down; it was just setting on it, and there were bolts that were not tightened down. He remarked that at least one worker used it as a latrine. Another thing he brought up was that there was a barrier at the end of the road where it joined the new subdivision. The barrels were taken down, and there was just a pile of snow there. Cars were driving around that on peoples' lawns. He would like to see more barrels put up or that the barrier be taken down completely so the residents in that area did not have people making ruts in the lawns.

Warren DeGrendel, 695 Tewksbury Ct., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 *Mr. DeGrendel said that his home backed up directly to the retention pond. He said that on the 13th of last month, shortly after the wall was set up inside of the pond, he came to the City and brought some pictures and some concerns about the view of it outside his back window and from his deck. He was looking for some suggestions at that time for some enhancements to make it look a little bit more aesthetic, similar to what was in front of City Hall's pond, rather than having an industrial wall in his backyard. He was at the meeting to find out if there had been any thoughts regarding the wall and if there were any implementations that could be done to either cosmetically make it look better or eliminate it completely. That was his main concern.*

Stevie Morris, 1276 Pembroke Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 *Ms. Morris said that their property abutted up to what once was a dead end,*

which was now no longer a dead end. She had voiced her concerns over the project in the past to the developers, to City Council, to the Planning Commission and to the Engineering Department. Her main concern, now that she had re-voiced it again in November and she had not received a response about it, was about the gabion wall that was constructed. She was not sure if anyone had gone to look at the detention basin. She stated that it was hard enough for them to wrap their heads around what was going in right next to their homes with a constant two feet of standing water at all times. All of a sudden in November, the wall appeared, which was basically made of big hunks of concrete enmeshed in a wire that looked like chickenwire. She said that it was an eyesore, to say the least. She talked with Tracey in Engineering (Balint), who told her that there were no other gabion wall detention basins in the City of Rochester Hills. Ms. Morris indicated that there was a guinea pig going in at the end of their street. Safety was a huge issue with the wall, especially with the constant standing water. She did not see what would stop kids from walking on the wall and falling in. She said that nothing had been addressed as far as safety, and that it was not just the wall. She recommended that everyone go and look at the wall. While it might look good on paper, and she knew that all the sediment was supposed to be stopped within the concrete in the wall, she stressed that people needed to see what it looked like. On four sides of the basin, there were huge piles of concrete, as well as the wall; and there was a big drain on one side, which she did not believe was fastened down properly. She stated that it should be in an industrial area, and that, in a nutshell, it should never have gone into a residential area, and it was a major concern. She said that she would highly recommend that they reviewed it before they approved the Final Plat.

Seeing no one further who wished to speak, Chairperson Boswell closed the Public Hearing at 7:13 p.m.

Chairperson Boswell spoke to Mr. Sera and said it appeared that all three people brought up the pond and the wall. He asked Mr. Sera what was going on there.

Mr. Sera explained that they purchased the property with the plans and the engineering drawings approved and in place. They did not have any hands on with the actual design of the project prior to purchasing it. It was all pre-approved. Everything they had built was done exactly according the City specs and the blueprints. The materials they used were approved by the City Inspector, Fred Dick, and the Engineering office. As far as the grate not being fastened down, their contractor was just going

through the finals and going through every structure with the inspector, and they had it off so it could be accessed, so that was why it was loose. He believed that was finished last week, and it should be fastened as of now. As far as how the gabion baskets were designed, he knew there was some water on the dryer side of the pond, due to the fact that Oakland County required a filter to keep sediment out of the pipes. That would retain a little bit of water so it seeped slowly through the filter before it left the site. Regarding the opposite side, the elevation was shot where the outlet pipe went through the wall and it was verified through the Oakland County Drain Commission, which also approved the construction process.

Chairperson Boswell was certain that Engineering had been out there, and that everything was fine as far as they were concerned, but looking at the picture passed around, he saw a problem. There was a wall with water on both sides, and he stated that it was not supposed to be designed that way - it was supposed to be dryer on one side.

Mr. Breuckman said that unfortunately, he could not answer Engineering questions. Chairperson Boswell said that he understood.

Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Sera if he had gone through the final construction inspection. Mr. Sera said they had gone through most of the items for final acceptance and completed everything on the list so far. Mr. Schroeder said that the piles looked excessive. Mr. Sera said that he believed that the piles of stone were riprap they had to put around the outlet structures, and it was actually shredded limestone. There was riprap around the inlets to the pond so the ground did not erode around the inlets. Mr. Schroeder said he saw that in the pond, but he felt there was excess. Mr. Sera said that along the southerly side of the pond, there was an emergency access gravel road. That was also according to the plan, so the City's vehicles could drive there and check the outlet and make sure nothing was being blocked. Mr. Schroeder said that there was a pile of stones in the photo. Mr. Sera agreed there was down at the very end. He said that was the emergency overflow structure. If the pond had a 100-year rain, there was a swale they cut in the rear yards and it would go over the rocks and go to the proper drain (Rewold). Mr. Schroeder asked if there was any growth - sod or grass. Mr. Sera said they had mulch blankets on it currently. There was seed, which was dormant now, but in the spring they hoped it would come up. They were going to plant some trees along the pond as part of their landscape plan.

Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Sera if he could meet with the residents to

address their concerns. Mr. Sera said he could, and that he spoke to them on a daily basis when he was out on the site. Mr. Schroeder suggested that they could put some stone on the sides and top to make it appear more natural, although he did not know if that was practical. Mr. Sera thought that the type of material they put in had to be porous for the water to go through. He said he would talk with the Engineering Dept. to see what they could do about it. Mr. Schroeder asked if the pipe that was addressed was the overflow pipe. Mr. Sera said that there was overflow rock on top of the ground and there was also an outlet pipe which had a grate on top that was loose for some time because people still needed to get in and out there. Mr. Schroeder said there was a white pipe sticking out in the pond. Mr. Sera agreed that it went through the basket. They shortened it up last week, and it only stuck out a little bit now. It used to stick out ten feet on each side, and now it only stuck out a few feet. Mr. Schroeder indicated that the pond would look better with growth. He said that he could appreciate the concerns about the gabion, and suggested that they try to dampen the appearance. He asked the Chair about some of the other concerns.

Chairperson Boswell responded that Mr. DeGrendel was concerned about the view from his backyard, but Chairperson Boswell believed there would be some trees going in. Mr. Sera confirmed that there were some trees shown on the landscaping plan to be planted in the vicinity of the pond - around the border. He did not believe they could plant trees where the access road was. Mr. Schroeder asked if it would be a pine tree or similar to block the view. Mr. Sera did not have the plan with him. He claimed that the leaves were off the trees that were currently there, so there was more of a view of the pond now than would be in the summer. He offered to plant spruce trees if that was required. Mr. Schroeder reiterated that Mr. Sera should meet with the neighbors and consider bushes to supplement and help the situation. He explained for the neighbors that ponds were wet ponds, and they were designed to have a lower level of water for sediment. The purpose was to clean the water before it went into the drains. As they were constructed now, they helped clean up the lakes, and that was why the pond was designed that way. He asked if the dry side was like a filter fabric. Mr. Sera said that there was an actual pipe sticking up with a stone filter around it with real small, fine stones. The pipe had holes in it, and it let the water to the outlet in a lot slower fashion. It was a soil erosion device that the County made them put in. Mr. Schroeder noted that it was a high maintenance item. Mr. Sera agreed that it was something that needed to be maintained. Mr. Schroeder asked how long it had been in service. Mr. Sera advised that it had been installed in the last month. Mr. Schroeder suggested that the water might

have frozen and blocked the drainage. It was supposed to drain through the gabion wall through the stones as a filter. When it got to the structure, the stones acted as a finer filter. Mr. Sera said that he was not sure that either side was supposed to be exactly dry at all times. He suggested that it might be dry in July or August if there was not a lot of rain.

Mr. Schroeder stressed that Mr. Sera should get together with the residents and someone from Engineering to address the concerns. He noted that right after construction, it reasonably would not look that good.

Mr. Coon said that the plans for the pond called for the bottom of the pipe that went through the walls and the invert of the discharge to be at about the same level. He believed that the bottom of the shallow part of the pond should be at that level. That meant that there would normally be no standing water in the second part unless it rained. If it rained, it was supposed to fill up with water, and the extra settling was supposed to be done then. It was not supposed to have standing water in it. Looking at the original plans, the bottom of the pond should be at the same elevation as the inlet pipe and the discharge pipe, but he maintained that it was not set up that way right now.

Mr. Sera said that was because the soil erosion measure was there to treat the water. He believed that Oakland County required 70-80% of the homes to be built and then the SO-2 filter was removed from the site. Mr. Schroeder said that there was a soil erosion requirement by the Oakland County Water Resources Commission that burlap should be put on so that the water drained through the burlap and caught the silt. The problem now was that it was winter, and the minute that burlap got any silt or moisture, it froze, and the water backed up. It was one of the consequences. Mr. Coon said that it was full of water before it froze. He believed that the bottom of the pond, the shallow part, was six to eight inches below where it should be because there was six to eight inches of standing, clear water in it at all times. He stated that should normally be dry. Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Sera if they checked the grades. Mr. Sera answered that the pond had been certified by a licensed Engineer. Someone from the Oakland County Water Resources Commission came out and also verified the pond, and everything had been constructed properly.

Mr. Coon said that it was not shown on the plans that way. The plans showed that the bottom of the pond was at the level of the discharge invert. It would drain during rainstorms and the second pond should drain. Mr. Schroeder did not have that plan, and he said they could not

second guess it without seeing it.

Mr. Sera said he would be more than happy to meet with Engineering and Mr. Coon.

Ms. Brnabic stated that she would definitely want Mr. Sera to meet with the residents. She felt there were some very valid concerns expressed. Standing water was brought up, and it was mentioned that the basin was designed for four feet, but someone said there was eight feet of water in there. She asked for an explanation regarding that. Mr. Sera said that there was definitely not eight feet of water. The gabion basket was not even eight feet tall. The basket was only four feet tall. Ms. Brnabic said there also seemed to be much concern about the cosmetic look of the wall. She noted that it was right next to the residents. She was not sure what they could do, but she thought it would be good to have a conversation concerning wall enhancement. She felt it would be good to bring Engineering out with all the questions that had been raised. She realized that there had been approvals, but the residents seemed to have enough of a concern. They were seeing one thing, and the developer was seeing another. She would like the situation re-evaluated. Another question was raised about the barrels as a barrier. There was a concern that they were not all the way up or that they should all be taken down.

Mr. Sera said that they originally had some orange barrels blocking the new road from people driving on it, since it had not yet been fully dedicated to the City. The contractor had finalized his work and was removing his materials from the site. After the snow, they pushed the snow up blocking the old sub from the new sub, but there were a lot of residents from the old sub that wanted to take a shortcut to Avon, so they had been using the new road through the course of construction. His workers never went through the existing sub. The snow was just about all melted, and people should be able to drive on the new concrete and go out to Avon without any barriers.

Ms. Brnabic said that she would like to see a condition that the applicant meets with the neighbors. Chairperson Boswell had written one down that he wanted to discuss with Mr. Breuckman first.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that he would be interested to hear the condition. Chairperson Boswell read a fourth condition:

“That the applicant meets with residents and Engineering on site to determine the construction and adequacy of the pond.” He questioned

whether residents meant everyone or just the three that came to the meeting. Mr. Schroeder felt that it should be with the three that came (and were adjacent). Chairperson Boswell said a problem with that was that people had lives, and they had to set that meeting up. One person might be in town and another might be working. It could be a tough thing to arrange. He asked Mr. Breuckman if he had any suggestions.

Mr. Breuckman agreed that it might be difficult to coordinate - people worked during the day. He suggested that they could ask the residents who were present about their availability. Mrs. Coon from the audience said that if the City set a meeting, they would be there. Mr. Breuckman advised that they would typically schedule a late afternoon meeting.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that he was never a fan of a gabion basket wall. He asked what would happen in 15 years if it corroded and who would be responsible. Mr. Breuckman said that it would be the responsibility of the Homeowner's Association to maintain it. Mr. Kaltsounis referred to the comment that it was the first gabion detention wall in Rochester Hills. As a Planning Commission, it was their job to recommend to City Council that what they were seeing on the plans matched what they previously approved, whether they voted yes or no. When it came to the drains and engineering, he had learned that they might have a potential aesthetic situation with this new type of drain setup that they needed to consider, not for this development, unfortunately, but for developments going forward. The Planning Commission's job now was to give a recommendation to City Council as to how the plat related to what they originally approved several years ago. City Council would be a different situation. They were more flexible with their determination and votes. The residents were doing a good job bringing it to the Planning Commission's attention, and going forward, if he saw a gabion wall proposed, he would be careful about where they put it. He liked Chairperson Boswell's condition, and he would like to add that "the performance of the wall be judged." They needed to make sure the performance of this type of system was there. The developer could plant trees to help with the look. However, for the task at hand, the Commission was presented with what Staff and Engineering came up with.

Mr. Coon indicated that what was built was not on the plans. Chairperson Boswell instructed that he had given the members of the audience ample time to speak, and although he might let someone come to the mike, there would be no back and forth from the audience. Mr. Kaltsounis explained to Mr. Coon that was why they would add a condition about performance and making sure it was performing well. It was a situation

that was out of their hands, and the Commission's job was to make sure that what was in front of them was what was previously approved. He reminded that it was a recommendation to City Council, which was the Commission's task. He moved the following motion with added conditions:

MOTION *by Kaltsounis, seconded by Yukon, in the matter of City File No. 99-011 (Vistas of Rochester Hills), the Planning Commission recommends to City Council Approval of the Final Preliminary Plat, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on June 22, 2010, with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following five (5) conditions.*

Findings:

1. *The Final Preliminary Plat is consistent with the street and lot layout of the previously approved Final Preliminary Plat.*
2. *The Final Preliminary Plat conforms to all applicable City ordinances, standards, regulations, and requirements.*

Conditions:

1. *Provide cash bond in the amount of \$11,058.00 for transplanting trees, prior to Final Plat Approval.*
2. *Provide a performance guarantee in the amount of \$116,856.00, as adjusted if necessary by Staff, to ensure the proper installation of replacement trees and other landscaping, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
3. *Payment by the applicant of \$9,400.00, as adjusted if necessary by Staff, for one street tree per lot. Such payment to be provided prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
4. *That the applicant is to meet with residents and the City's Engineer(s) and City's Landscape Consultant on site to determine the conformance, appearance and performance of the pond and the possibility of planting screening on the north edge of the access drive. This meeting is to occur prior to the application being brought before City Council.*
5. *Replace rip rap on the access drive with turf block to bring the drive*

within conformance with the drawings.

Mr. Hooper noted that he went out to view the pond (day of the meeting). It was true that Engineering designed it as a gabion wall filter system for pretreatment and final treatment of the storm water for the subdivision. It appeared that there was at least a two-foot area for the siltation to settle out before it filtered through the gabion wall. They lowered the secondary part. He believed that it was lower as designed to take up more siltation that would occur as storm water runoff went into the catch basin and to the pond. The silt would be contained onsite before it headed to the County drain. There was a statement made about the gabion wall being a first time situation. He stated that was not true. GMF Robotics had a gabion wall installed along the Clinton River. The Road Commission just installed a gabion wall at the northwest corner of Hamlin and Crooks. There were various places throughout the City that had a gabion wall. As far as a gabion wall installed for a detention pond, it might be accurate that it was the first time, but as far as being used in the City in the past, there had been a number of gabion walls installed in the past thirty years. He said that he would not be concerned about them falling apart.

Mr. Hooper said that when reading the plans, it said that there would be a 12-foot gravel access drive with turf block. When he viewed it, he saw a drive with riprap on it. That was not according to the plans, and he stated that it had to be removed and replaced with turf block. There were statements about screening or tree planting. The way it was designed, the gravel access drive was installed right to the property line and there was no room to install some buffering trees there. He talked with Mr. Breuckman about some options. Mr. Schroeder had mentioned possibly installing bushes or trees. Since there was no room on the new sub's property to screen the pond from the neighbors, an option could be to allow some bushes or trees to be installed on the easement on the neighbors' property. That would be subject to the developer agreeing to something like that. Short of that, the way it was designed, there was no room. Knowing what they know now, he indicated that they probably should have moved everything to the north and made room to install some type of screening on the new subdivision property. Regarding securing the overflow manhole, he observed that it was a simple task. When they held the on-site meeting, they could make sure it was secured. As far as removing the barriers, if the streets were not yet accepted by the City, he could see where someone would go on the grass behind the curb and snow that was piled up at the end of the road. If the City accepted the streets, he felt that they might as well open it to the existing subdivision and eliminate the barrier.

Chairperson Boswell advised that he modified the fourth condition to have Engineering determine conformance and performance of the pond, which were also concerns. He added a fifth condition to replace the riprap with turf block to bring the access road within conformance of the drawings. Mr. Kaltsounis and Mr. Yukon said they would amend the motion.

Mr. Hetrick clarified that the pond had been approved by Oakland County as built and met the drawing specifications. Mr. Sera said that was correct. Mr. Hetrick said that Mr. Hooper suggested that the meeting could include adding landscaping, which was the other issue. Chairperson Boswell stated that they could meet with the neighbors, but the only option would be to put the screening on the neighbor's property. Mr. Hetrick proposed that they could add spruce rather than maple trees to improve the view.

Mr. Schroeder said that it was possible to add plantings - bushes and trees - on the top of the slope on the neighbors' side. The plan showed a steep slope and a flat slope. They could put some trees on the slope next to the road. Regarding the barricade on the road, the street should be barricaded and closed until construction was done, otherwise, there would be construction traffic going into the existing subdivision. The construction traffic could enter from Avon, and it would be a good idea to keep the road closed until construction was done. Mr. Sera commented that it was the other way around. The homeowners were coming onto the construction site.

Mr. Reece agreed with Mr. Schroeder about the landscaping. He thought that just north of the access drive, there was a possibility of adding a line of evergreen trees on the slope of the pond to create screening. He suggested that when Engineering went out, that the City's Landscape Consultant could also go. He felt that there was some room to add trees, and he believed it would take care, from a visual perspective, of a significant portion of the neighbors' concerns. If there was not enough room to keep the trees alive, they might want to consider having the developer talk to the neighbors about adding trees on their property. If they did not want them, they would have to live with what was there. If there was no room to put them on the slope, that was how it would have to be. They had to work together to get an amicable solution for everybody. He also agreed with Mr. Schroeder in terms of putting a barricade across Pembroke unless the residents really wanted to cut through the construction site. Until the roads were accepted by the City, he would

recommend that the road be barricaded. The construction workers would have one ingress/egress point, and they would be stopped from going into the existing sub until the work was done. Mr. Reece indicated that only being one month into winter, it would probably be better to stay out of the new sub, because there would be a lot of mud tracked in.

Mr. Reece emphasized that they should give the pond a little bit of time because it was the worst time of the year to go out and critique construction. It was a mess, and he felt it had to be revisited in the spring to see how it performed in the rainy season, which would be the true test. The Engineer for the developer had to shoot grades and per the as-built drawings by Oakland County and the City, it had to be built per the specifications. If it was not, it would not be accepted, and would have to be corrected. He asked that the City be given the opportunity to do the homework. He said that Mr. Kaltsounis was correct; they were kind of stuck between a rock and a hard place in terms of the process for this particular development, but they wanted to keep the residents and the developer happy and work toward a solution. They always told developers that before they even came before the Planning Commission, they should have met with the neighbors, because the neighbors would either make life miserable or make it very easy for them. He suggested that they meet and work out a solution. They were not talking about a lot of money to make it right and make everyone happy. He cautioned the developers that they did not want bad publicity when they were trying to sell the homes, and that would happen if the neighbors were not happy.

Ms. Brnabic said that she would like to see the meeting occur with the developer, the Engineer and the neighbors before the matter went before City Council. The results of this meeting would be presented to Council.

Mr. Schroeder pointed out that most subdivisions had a rear yard drain about six feet off the property line. He reminded that they should consider that when planning for anything on the residents' property.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairperson Boswell read the motion with the additional conditions listed above.

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Yukon, that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Boswell, Brnabic, Hetrick, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 1 - Dettloff

Chairperson Boswell stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously.

2013-0017 Request for Planned Unit Development (PUD) Pre-Application Sketch Plan Review - South Boulevard PUD, proposed for one parcel of land totaling approximately ten acres, located on South Boulevard, between Adams and Crooks, Parcel No. 15-31-400-018, zoned R-4, One-Family Residential, Bill Mosher, Applicant

(Reference: Memo prepared by James Breuckman, dated January 10, 2013 and concept PUD plan and letter from Bill Mosher dated received January 10, 2013 had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant was Bill Mosher, Apex Engineering Group, 560 Whims Lane, Rochester MI 48306; and Mark Gesuale, Wolverine Building Co., 21872 23 Mile, Macomb, MI 48042.

Mr. Breuckman advised that the request was for a Planned Unit Development Pre-Application Sketch Plan Review. It would normally be called a Concept Plan Review if it was the first step in the PUD process, but that was not the request. Typically, Staff would work with applicants to get the plans in ship shape before bringing them before the Commissioners. Sometimes with a PUD, with requested changes to density, layout, units and other things, it was difficult for Staff to always know what should or should not be brought forward. For that reason, the Sketch Plan was placed on the Agenda for the Commissioners' preliminary comments.

Mr. Breuckman continued that the property was surrounded by Pine Trace Golf Course. He noted that his memo listed some comments he felt the Commissioners might want to consider during the review and turned it over to Mr. Mosher.

Mr. Mosher advised that they had a preliminary meeting with the Planning Department. Subsequently, they spoke with the Fire and Engineering Departments. They wanted to introduce the site to the Commissioners to get input, because it was a unique site. It was irregular in shape, and there were wetlands, woodlands and only 80 feet of frontage on South Boulevard. There was a 450-foot neck to get into the property, and it was zoned single-family. In doing some preliminary market analyses, the developer has chosen to pursue a multi-family development. They did not know at this point if it would be a duplex or triplex-type project. The Sketch submitted for the meeting showed