

Sept. 18, 2017

City Council Board :

It has come to my attention that there is a proposal before the board to change the zoning on the corner of Tienken and Adams roads from single family housing to allow the building of a day care center.

Please do a traffic study on Tienken and Adams roads before making any decisions. Tienken and Adams already are heavily traveled roads. During morning and evening rush hours, Adams is backed up bumper to bumper from M-59 to Silverbell. Adding the traffic of parents dropping off and picking up children during heavy traffic hours will only make matters worse.

Rochester Adams High School and Van Hoosen Middle Schools are located on the corner of Tienken and Adams. Morning and afternoon traffic will be impacted. We need to keep

the area safe for the students many of whom walk to school and have to cross the intersection.

The impact on traffic from the Blossom Ridge development should also be considered.

Please take these issues into consideration before rezoning.

A traffic study is needed.

Thank you,

Sharon Long

2947 Leyton Ct.

Rochester Hills,

248-895-7921

sharonernstlong@gmail.com



Maureen Gentry <gentrym@rochesterhills.org>

Proposed Preschool Tienken and Adams

1 message

Cheryl Bachleda <bachledac@att.net>
To: Maureen Gentry <gentrym@rochesterhills.org>

Thu, Dec 14, 2017 at 10:21 AM

Dear Ms. Gentry,

I am a resident of Medinah Dr., in the Brookdale Woods subdivision and adamantly oppose a commercial building built on this residential corner.

This project should not be considered out of context of all the development occurring in Rochester Hills and Oakland Township that depend on the Adams and Tienken intersection. The volume of traffic in this area is already beyond the capacity of these roads. The new senior housing complex being developed just one mile north will add additional traffic.

I am concerned my property value will be negatively impacted by the congestion already in this area. Rain tree and Medinah are already being utilized as "cut through" streets by Adams students, Adams parents, and surrounding subdivisions that try to avoid the traffic grid lock in the morning and evening on Adams and Tienken. The amount of traffic and development is negatively impacting the upscale, small town reputation of Rochester Hills.

Please do not allow this property to be changed from the residential status that it should be. There are so many better uses of the property; homes in keeping with the surrounding residential nature or an expansion of the adjoining park land.

Please consider the repercussions of traffic, safety, and quality of life of the residents in this area who purchased homes in a community that values its green space. If we wanted to live in an over developed, traffic nightmare area, we would have moved to Birmingham. Protect our community and its outstanding reputation as a great place to live.

The Adams- Tienken corner already has two large schools and the resulting congestion. Please do not put a third school there. No where else in Rochester or Rochester Hills is there one intersection supporting three schools in addition to all the other traffic.

Sincerely,
Cheryl and Dave BACHLEDA
737 Medinah Dr
Brookdale Woods Subdivion
Rochester Hills.

Sent from my iPad



Maureen Gentry <gentrym@rochesterhills.org>

Fwd: Premier

1 message

Sara Roediger <roedigers@rochesterhills.org>
To: Maureen Gentry <gentrym@rochesterhills.org>

Tue, Dec 12, 2017 at 2:55 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Stephanie Morita** <moritas@rochesterhills.org>
Date: Tue, Dec 12, 2017 at 2:07 PM
Subject: Fwd: Premier
To: Sara Roediger <roedigers@rochesterhills.org>

For the PC packet:

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Jack Carterson <navyjetjack@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Dec 12, 2017 at 1:11 PM
Subject: Premier
To: <moritas@rochesterhills.org>

Please do not move on this project. There are all kind of issues including whether this project is appropriate for single family homes area.

Two story building! Let's get real. Not to mention safety of the children from Adams HS.
Jack Carterson

Sent from my iPhone

--

Steph Morita
City Council Vice President
District 1 Representative

248.841.2463

City of Rochester Hills, Michigan
www.rochesterhills.org-----
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.

#rhmail#

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.

#rhmail#



Maureen Gentry <gentrym@rochesterhills.org>

Fwd: Premier Academy proposal

1 message

Sara Roediger <roedigers@rochesterhills.org>
To: Maureen Gentry <gentrym@rochesterhills.org>

Tue, Dec 12, 2017 at 2:55 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Stephanie Morita** <moritas@rochesterhills.org>
Date: Tue, Dec 12, 2017 at 2:07 PM
Subject: Fwd: Premier Academy proposal
To: Sara Roediger <roedigers@rochesterhills.org>

For the PC packet:

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Teresa Koempel <teresakoempel@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Dec 12, 2017 at 1:38 PM
Subject: Premier Academy proposal
To: <moritas@rochesterhills.org>

Stefanie,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Premier Academy at Adams and Tienken. Our home is in the Thornridge subdivision. I know first hand that the traffic at that corner is already out of control. If this proposal goes through, I know the traffic on Charwood (in our subdivision) will increase with parents using the Michele Ct to pick up their kids. The cars parked there now extend from the court unto Charwood. It will create a huge risk for the children walking home and the children that are being picked up.

I have attended the Planning Meeting and Council Meetings that have discussed this issue, since before Labor Day. I have heard the other issues that have been brought up by my neighbors. I hope that the planning commission will heed their concerns and not pass this proposal.

Thank you,
Teresa Koempel
248.370.9705
teresakoempel@gmail.com

--

Steph Morita
City Council Vice President
District 1 Representative

248.841.2463
City of Rochester Hills, Michigan
www.rochesterhills.org

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.

#rhmail#

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.

#rhmail#



Maureen Gentry <gentrym@rochesterhills.org>

Re: Premier Academy

1 message

TOM Mikoy <tttacdv@comcast.net>

Sat, Dec 9, 2017 at 11:20 AM

To: Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Cc: Maureen Gentry <gentrym@rochesterhills.org>, Sara Roediger <roedigers@rochesterhills.org>, Kristen Kapelanski <kapelanskik@rochesterhills.org>, brookedalewoods@hotmail.com

Hello Planning Dept.

Thanks for the link to see the updated plans. I am curious if any of you opened the drawing and saw how un-readable it is. I guess it is better than nothing but I would think you could post a better document for public to look at and understand.

I am curious if anyone on your team has driven through the Adams and Teinken intersection during the early morning school drop-off times (roughly between 6:45 and 8:15 AM, I believe.) The traffic is VERY heavy to say the least. Normally such development is positive for a community but to cause additional congestion in an already congested area puts this project into a negative light.

I had originally proposed (to Ms. Morita some weeks ago) that this project be considered for the northeast corner of Adams and Hamlin Roads. And just to the east on Hamlin would be other properties on the south side of Hamlin that would be favorable options and would not be a source of driving congestion compared to the currently considered site.

Could you please clarify if the Hamlin Road area are viable alternatives?

And to be clear, I am opposed to this school project moving forward at Adams & Tienken.

Tom Mikoy
tttacdv@comcast.net

On Dec 8, 2017, at 2:03 PM, Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org> wrote:

Good afternoon,

You are receiving this email because you previously commented on or inquired about (via email) the proposed Premier Academy project.

The City's Planning and Economic Development Department wanted to inform you that the Planning Commission will be considering the Site Plan, Tree Removal Permit and Conditional Use Recommendation for the proposed Premier Academy at their December 19, 2017 regularly scheduled meeting. The applicant has submitted updated plans for review and they available on the City's Status of Development Map. Additional information regarding the meeting can be found on the City's Calendar. Staff reports on the updated plans will be finalized and posted by the end of the day on December 15, 2017. Any questions or comments can be directed to the Planning and Economic Development Department at 248-656-4660 or planning@rochesterhills.org.

Thank you,
City of Rochester Hills
Planning and Economic Development Dept.

www.rochesterhills.org

Get Email Updates on Gov Delivery
Join us on Facebook
Follow us on Twitter



Maureen Gentry <gentrym@rochesterhills.org>

Fwd: Proposed Premier Academy at Tienken and Adams

1 message

Sara Roediger <roedigers@rochesterhills.org>
To: Maureen Gentry <gentrym@rochesterhills.org>

Wed, Oct 18, 2017 at 3:02 PM

For the next PC packet that involves this matter.

Sara Roediger, AICPDirector
Planning and Economic Development
p. 248.841.2573 direct
p. 248.656.4660 department
f. 248.841.2576
roedigers@rochesterhills.org
planning@rochesterhills.org
www.rochesterhills.org

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Stephanie Morita** <moritas@rochesterhills.org>
Date: Wed, Oct 18, 2017 at 2:52 PM
Subject: Re: Proposed Premier Academy at Tienken and Adams
To: Brian Roback <broback61@gmail.com>
Cc: Bryan Barnett <barnettb@rochesterhills.org>, Paul Davis <davis@rochesterhills.org>, Mark Tisdell <tisdelm@rochesterhills.org>

Brian:

Thanks for providing your insights and point of view. This project has not yet received approval from Planning Commission because additional information was requested.

Because this matter has not yet come back before Planning Commission, the City does not yet have any more information for consideration from the applicant than what was previously provided.

If, and when, the applicant does present revised plans it will go before the Planning Commission for review.

I will forward your comments to staff to ensure they are included in the Planning Commission packet for this item.

Steph MoritaCity Council Vice President
District 1 Representative

248.841.2463

City of Rochester Hills, Michigan
www.rochesterhills.orgOn Wed, Oct 18, 2017 at 2:26 PM, Brian Roback <broback61@gmail.com> wrote:To correct my typo of my previous letter, I have been a resident for **30 years**, not 3.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Brian Roback** <broback61@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Oct 18, 2017 at 2:20 PM
Subject: Proposed Premier Academy at Tienken and Adams
To: barnettb@rochesterhills.org, davis@rochesterhills.org, moritas@rochesterhills.org, tisdelm@rochesterhills.org

I am writing in regard to the proposed Premier Academy at Tienken and Adams Rd.

I have been a resident of the Judson Park subdivision on the northwest corner of the intersection for 3 years.

I have seen a continual increase in the traffic at the intersection as is to be expected with the continued growth of the area.

As a result I have also seen a continued increase in the amount of "cut-through" traffic in our neighborhood.

This has been a continuing issue in our Home Owner's Association meetings with no resolution.

I have had children attending Brewster Elementary, Van Hoosen Middle School and Rochester Adams High School from 1995-2008 and from 2012 to the present and continuing to 2026.

I have never been able to let my children walk to school because of the dangerous situation of vehicles cutting through our neighborhood in the morning to avoid the Tienken / Adams intersection.

Our subdivision does not have sidewalks or streetlights.

Currently we have a student population of 1567 students at Adams, and 850 students at Van Hoosen that are serviced by this intersection.

Now it is planned to have another 162 students serviced by parents dropping them off and picking them up during rush our and directly feeding in and out of that intersection.

This is in addition to the increase in traffic that will result of the retirement community opening up 1 mile north.

Tienken was also recently reconstructed, and measures were taken to help traffic flow including a longer left turn lane and longer right turn lane. These small improvements have done almost nothing to alleviate the overabundance of traffic at this corner.

Also, the flippant remarks from the owner of the Premier Academy Jeff Schmitz are insulting.

"We don't want to get the community upset for no reason," Schmitz said. "The question is traffic. At the high end, (the increase would be) 4 percent. And those moms and dads dropping off their kids are on the road anyway. They don't go 5 miles out of their way (for daycare)."

Yes those vehicles are on the road anyway, but not necessarily travelling through this intersection. Also, people do indeed go out of their way for daycare if necessary. Both of these remarks are unsubstantiated and insulting to my intelligence. Besides it is not only the increase in traffic, but the complication of additional cars entering and leaving Premier Academy. Right now, I cannot exit a right turn in the morning from Potomac to Tienken without somebody being courteous and letting me in.

Schmitz said he disputes residents who are worried that the intersection will not be safe. "I have three kids myself," he said. "With my kids in the car, I am the safest driver in the world."

Again a totally useless statement with no relevance to the increase in traffic and complexity of exiting and entering the roadways very near this intersection.

WHAT I WANT TO KNOW IS:

1. Was cut-through traffic measured in Judson Park? I highly doubt it.
2. Is the study taking into account the increase in cut-through traffic in Judson Park?
3. What is the estimated increase in cut-through traffic in Judson Park.
4. What is the city planning to do to address this?

I personally think that this development is ill conceived, and does not take into account the additional hardship to the traffic congestion for nearby residents, and ignores the increase in danger to the children of Judson Park due to increased traffic of non-residents.

I urge you to **PLEASE** vote down this development, and any other that would increase the traffic and complexity of the Tienken/Adams intersection.

Brian Roback
Judson Park resident

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.

#rhmail#

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.

#rhmail#



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Citizen committee recommends denial of Premier Academy proposal

1 message

joe diluca <dil1641j@gmail.com>

Thu, Dec 14, 2017 at 1:14 PM

To: Stephanie Morita <moritas@rochesterhills.org>, mccardellj@rochesterhills.org, hetrickd@rochesterhills.org, tisdelm@rochesterhills.org, planning@rochesterhills.org

Cc: Thomas Koempel <tckoempel@gmail.com>, Leo Mendez <lvm218@gmail.com>, Terry Stephens <exitteachin@yahoo.com>, Charles Slattery <clslatte@msn.com>, Marylou Head <headmarylou@gmail.com>, Alicia Grifka <Grifka94@comcast.net>, Gerard <welshygb@yahoo.com>, John Leichtman <johnleichtman@gmail.com>, Terry S <terry@equatoris.com>, Joe DiLuca <dil1641j@gmail.com>, Pablo Fraccarolli <pablo@fraccarolli.com>

From Joe DiLuca - a member of the above Citizen Committee ---

FYI and FWIW, the last paragraph is my opinion.

We are citizens of the City of Rochester Hills. We have legitimate concerns regarding the proposed Premier site. We get that the entire east side of Adams Rd, Tienken to University, is ripe for development. We are not a modern day version of the 19th century Luddites. We get that more development means more tax revenue. We get that more tax revenue means better services, parks, options, and opportunities for and in our city. In general, why Oakland County is not involved to improve the road issue FIRST before said development is quizzical.

This Proposal specifically though, is rife with deficiencies. These deficiencies are multi-layered. There are safety concerns, traffic concerns, and the seemingly pedestrian concerns of trash removal, water drainage and commercial supply delivery ability. There are aesthetic concerns. There are structure size and proportion questions. Near as I can tell, these concerns and others have been shared with this body.

And then there's this: Perception is Reality. This august body, frankly, has been giving us the perception that they are paying lip service to our concerns, patting us on the head, winking to each other all the while moving full speed ahead on this proposal.

Please address appropriately and make the proper decisions.

Thank You.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joe DiLuca



Maureen Gentry <gentrym@rochesterhills.org>

Fwd: Please Vote no on Premier Academy

1 message

Stephanie Morita <moritas@rochesterhills.org>
To: Planning Staff <planningdept@rochesterhills.org>

Thu, Dec 14, 2017 at 10:55 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Carol Facca <cafacca@icloud.com>
Date: Thu, Dec 14, 2017 at 10:30 AM
Subject: Please Vote no on Premier Academy
To: <moritas@rochesterhills.org>

My family has lived in the Hawthorn subdivision for over 25 years. I have seen the traffic build-up off Adams Rd. increase so much that at times it is almost impossible to turn left out of my subdivision. This land should not be used for any public facility but for residential housing. The Blossom Ridge development at Adams and Dutton is already increasing the population and traffic problems. Please do not add another problem. Deny this request- keep Rochester Hills beautiful- not commercial!

Sincerely,
Carol Facca
[2956 Woodford Circle](#)

Reasons to deny Conditional Land Use or Site Plan Approval for Premier Academy at Adams and Tienken

Given the history and data with respect to traffic volumes at this intersection, the 2008 RH Master Thoroughfare Plan already documented this intersection roadway to be beyond capacity. It would seem prudent to require an updated traffic study to be conducted to further reveal and validate conditions today and impacts due to Premier Academy. Any comparison to their current facility is irrelevant given the vast difference in traffic volumes, site size, site orientation and site access. The site design characteristics will substantially increase safety concerns for pedestrians, school kids, fitness enthusiasts, local residents and daily commuters by increasing vehicular/ pedestrian conflicts when cars try to enter and exit site. The crosswalk conditions at the driveways will pose safety concerns due to vehicles trying to beat vehicles to enter or exit site with pedestrians and school kids for Adams High School and Van Hoosen Middle School being of secondary concern, especially in the dark winter morning hours.

The added vehicle interactions to enter and exit this site will pose increased traffic conflicts and congestion at an intersection already recognized and documented to be beyond capacity in terms of traffic volumes.

The added traffic burden of this project to this intersection will negatively impact surrounding residents and subdivisions with increased U-turn driveway actions and increased neighborhood traffic volumes ("cut throughs") for people that choose to avoid this intersection. This will occur at

morning and afternoon peak use times further increasing safety issues for kids awaiting bus pick up and drop offs within surrounding neighborhoods.

The 2-story building designed at nearly 17,000 SF is much larger than any other surrounding houses, yet it is only required to comply with R-1 One Family Residential set-back requirements. This places a grossly oversized building too close to Adams Rd. given the building is more in scale with commercial retail buildings found at Busch's or The Village of Rochester Hills where they are set back more like 100' – 120' from the ROW (Right-of-Way). Nothing about a +/- 40' tall cupola and hip roof feature relates to any surrounding homes nor is this harmonious in any way.

If approved for Conditional Land Use, this project will set a precedent for the +/-10AC parcel to the south zoned R-1 One-family Residential District, to be used in a manner other than the applicable zoning. In other words, future applicants will claim a "Hardship" is imposed upon them due to the business nature of Premier Academy, thus the land cannot be developed in a residential capacity opening the door for some other "business" use with additional traffic burdens and non-residential building types.

The interpretation of the ordinance with respect to the "front yard setback" provides for the side of the building to face Adams Rd. given the address is Adams Rd. as this appears to manipulate the intent of the Ordinance. It has to be presumed the intent of the R-1 One-Family Residential zoning ordinance mandates front yard setbacks for the fronts of buildings (houses), not sides of buildings. The side and rear views of this building are very unattractive and visually imposing on the Adams Rd. view corridor.

The neighbor to the East will be negatively impacted by this project abutting their property due to continued vehicular traffic and head-in parking facing their house. One would expect the property value to decrease as well.

The parcel south of this project in consideration of future use will likely be un-able to be developed as any residential type use due to the commercial nature of this project type. The negative impact will then result in a future non-residential use being pursued due to precedent and a perceived "hardship". Such future development will further burden traffic issues, diminish the overall character of the surrounding area as future "commercialization" will take over. This is not consistent with the Rochester Hills Master Land Use Plan.

The site design characteristics will substantially increase safety concerns for pedestrians, school kids, fitness enthusiasts, local residents and daily commuters by increasing vehicular/ pedestrian conflicts when cars try to enter and exit site. The crosswalk conditions at the driveways will pose safety concerns due to vehicles trying to beat vehicles to enter or exit site with pedestrians and school kids for Adams High School and Van Hoosen Middle School being of secondary concern, especially in the dark winter morning hours.

The added vehicle interactions to enter and exit this site will pose increased traffic conflicts and congestion at an intersection already recognized and documented to be beyond capacity in terms of traffic volumes.

The added traffic burden of this project to this intersection will negatively impact surrounding residents and subdivisions with increased U-turn driveway actions and increased neighborhood traffic volumes ("cut throughs") for people that choose to avoid this intersection. This will occur at morning and afternoon peak use times further increasing safety issues for kids awaiting bus pick up and drop offs within surrounding neighborhoods.

The internal project site circulation is comprised of three different parking/ circulation conditions consisting of: one-way single loaded angled parking, implied one-way curb side drop-off pick up and two-way head in 90 degree or angled. This parking layout will be problematic given it requires too many decisions to be quickly made in order to effectively park and navigate this site. It is my professional opinion many design professionals would agree this site layout; parking layout or circulation is not designed to minimize traffic conflicts on adjacent streets and promotes safe and efficient traffic circulation with the site.

The material composition of cast stone, brick veneer and standing seam metal roof are comparable and compatible building materials found within the surrounding neighborhood. Other than that, nothing else demonstrates design harmony with respect to surrounding homes. Again, this building resembles something that would be found within the Busch's property as commercial retail buildings.

Where most surrounding homes are 1,800 Sf to 3,000 Sf on average, this project as a 2-story 17,000 Sf building type is generally 5-6 times larger than any home in its proximity. This is not harmonious with the surrounding neighborhood.

The multi-directional one-way/ two-way site circulation with angled and head-in parking and circular drop-off lane will be problematic for ease of use for the customer, this will result in traffic congestion within the site with the potential for unsafe vehicle stacking onto Tienken Rd. If compared to their Snell Rd. location, the access into and out of the site is not burdened by traffic volumes found at this location and the site is much larger providing two-way drive isles and 90 degree head-in parking throughout.

At the eastern head-in parking field the striping defining parking stalls does not meet the ordinance requirements for stall depth at 18'-0". These stalls are striped at 16'-6". If they were striped per ordinance, the entry drive on Tienken Rd. would be partially blocked by approximately 1'-6" given the current proposed entry drive location. Even if restriped or not, full size SUV's would be hazardous as they would partially block the flow of traffic exiting onto Tienken Rd. At this eastern edge location, the 4-5 parking spaces closest to Tienken Rd. would be limited in use and access as vehicles trying to exit onto Tienken Rd. would block these spaces.

With respect the impact upon streets, public schools and sidewalk/ bicycle paths, safety will be greatly compromised at the drive-way access onto Tienken Rd. at the student/ pedestrian walkway. Any students walking/ riding bicycles to or from school will have increased safety risks when crossing this entry drive as any customer pulling into this lot will first be paying attention to any oncoming vehicular traffic and not look for the pedestrians crossing the entry drive. Vehicles will accelerate into the driveway and site to avoid oncoming vehicular traffic. And depending on the time of year, such as now, it will be dark during the morning hours when kids are going to school and less visible.

Today, Adams Rd. floods near the proposed Adams Rd. entry drive, and the existing residential site is roughly 3'-5' below the intersection. This project will require raising the site grading to establish the building footprint as well as replacing lawn area with asphalt for parking. What measures have been taken to reduce or eliminate flooding on Adams Rd. as this project will have an impact on that condition? And what impacts to the surrounding eco-system will be realized when the natural flow of water is eliminated to the surrounding wetlands as it is currently fed by natural swale and ditches from this site?

ROW (Right-of Way) setback requirements on Adams Rd. is not met in consideration of the proposed 120' ROW. Once the proposed ROW is implemented, the building will be roughly 26' from the ROW.

The R-1 front yard setback requirement (40'-0") should be based upon the proposed Adams ROW (Right-of-Way). The intent of the ordinance is that the fronts of buildings comply with this requirement. In the case of the Premier Academy submission, the side of the building faces the front yard. This is due to the applicant choosing the Adams Rd. address as a result of combining two parcels with two front yards or two fronts. While technically this may be permissible, it is not the intent of the ordinance to have the side of a building serve as what appears within the front yard setback. The end result is an illegal placement of a building that is out of scale and physically imposing on the surrounding R-1 One Family Residential area and an unsightly addition to the Adams Rd. corridor.

This building design or planning is not compatible or harmonious with existing character of the general vicinity given the aesthetic and scale of the surrounding residential context.

The natural environment will likely be negatively impacted due to natural topography and water flow that feeds the adjacent wetlands being eliminated by the new building footprint and asphalt parking lot.

The night time visual impact to this location will not be harmonious due to security lighting on this building and within the parking lot area. Although foot-candle levels vary around the building and within the surface lot, the difference from what is there today will be drastic.

The existing roadways at this intersection were identified as being used by vehicles beyond capacity over 10 years ago. This project does nothing to improve conditions that continue to worsen due to ongoing residential development to the north where traffic volumes increase daily.

This project will add another 800-1,000 additional vehicular conflict interactions per day at this site/ intersection location for those entering and exiting the site during peak hours. Regardless of assumed increase traffic volumes, any increase in additional vehicle interactions at a location already used beyond capacity is hazardous by contributing to unsafe traffic conditions and further exasperating already intolerable vehicular congestion.

Other locations within the City better serve and provide for safe site access, better parking, and settings more suitable for the current design in order to be harmonious with its surroundings. Everything about this project is excessive with respect to site density, irregular parking/ circulation, building scale, etc. It appears economics are at play here relative to the cost of land and that of maximizing the financial return. If that were not the case, the applicant would have downsized and changed the design of the project based on previous Planning Commission Comments. None of that occurred.

--

Steph Morita

City Council Vice President
District 1 Representative

248.841.2463

City of Rochester Hills, Michigan

www.rochesterhills.org

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.

#rhmail#



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Premier plan violations

1 message

Jamie Hilliard <jdhillia@gmail.com>
To: planning@rochesterhills.org

Thu, Dec 14, 2017 at 9:56 AM

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed Premier Academy at 974 Adams Rd. I have great concerns with the proposed drainage plans as well as the set back from the front yard (a current ordnance violation).

Furthermore the traffic analysis fails to address the danger to pedestrians during peak hours as well as several new developments that are currently being built and have yet to have an impact on traffic.

The neighboring citizens are well aware of the plans and have educated themselves about this issue. We have support from experts in the community on this matter and will be voicing our concerns at the 12/19 Planning Commission Meeting.

I look forward to seeing you at the 12/19 meeting to discuss this issue.

Jamie Hilliard

Sent from my iPhone



Maureen Gentry <gentrym@rochesterhills.org>

Fwd: Premier Academy

1 message

Stephanie Morita <moritas@rochesterhills.org>
To: Planning Staff <planningdept@rochesterhills.org>

Thu, Dec 14, 2017 at 11:03 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Kristine Marcuz <tinamarcuz@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Dec 14, 2017 at 11:01 AM
Subject: Premier Academy
To: <moritas@rochesterhills.org>

Please consider the negative impact this building will have on area residents and commuters traveling this region. The Adams corridor is already a traffic quagmire, particularly at school starting and ending times. More students possibly on foot as well as an increase in car traffic spells potential disaster. Certainly there are better locations that Premier could access.

Regards

Kristine Marcuz

Oakland Township resident

Sent from my iPhone

--

Steph Morita

City Council Vice President

District 1 Representative

248.841.2463

City of Rochester Hills, Michiganwww.rochesterhills.org

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.

#rhmail#

December 14, 2017

City of Rochester Hills

1000 Rochester Hills Dr.

Rochester Hills, MI 48309

Re: Premier Academy Conditional Land Use and Site Plan Approval(s)- Planning Commission meeting dated December 19, 2017 agenda item **2017-0363**

City Council members/ Planning Commissioners et al:

Given the continued opposition by many within the Adams Rd. and Tienken Rd. intersection corridor and abroad, I respectfully submit to you some additional considerations relative to the criteria necessary to be met for City Council and Planning Commission to issue Conditional Land Use and or Site Plan approval for Premier Academy at this site location. **For the record, I am opposed to this project at this site location and request it to be denied Conditional Land Use or Site Plan Approval.**

However, before I present those considerations below, I want to emphatically share I am all for development, progress, and enhancing the communities in which we live. As a design architect licensed in Michigan and Arizona and member of the American Institute of Architects, Urban Land Institute, International Council of Shopping Centers and NCARB Certified, as well as having and currently serving on a variety of non-profit boards as well as Commissions in various cities; I have had the privilege to design a multitude of projects throughout the US, Canada, and Brazil as these clients have been real estate developers, private institutions, individuals and my last 6 years have been on the Ownership side of such projects as a real estate developer.

In those 30 plus years of experiences, one thing I have come to learn is that any design idea or project as conceived and represented is done so via renderings, blue prints (drawings), or 3-D models. However, the biggest failure I have witnessed is the realization that every line drawn on a plan or elevation is a symbol that represents something physical, be it a building, a material a sign, a wall, a unique feature, etc. Often, those "lines" are truly over looked as all get consumed by the "idea" of a project and that of the "pretty pictures" failing to address the impact of those lines with respect to the result and the adverse impact it poses on the physical environment be it visually, physically, and ultimately psychologically.

The comments I offer below are based upon my vast experiences as a design professional, my concern as a resident for not only my own personal interest, but equally for the safety of those members of my community and Premier Academy customers and how they will be negatively impacted by such a project at this location.

I have selected specific sections of the Ordinance under Standards for Site Plan Approval and Standards for Conditional Land Use Approval that list requirements that must be met for such approvals. These sections **appear bold** and I present additional considerations provided in **"italic text"** based on professional experience. Additionally, for your convenience, I've attached a summary of comments at the end of this letter minus the sections of the Ordinance sections for simpler reference.

I have no doubt Premier Academy is a top tier service provider that serves its customers to the highest degree possible. However, in consideration of their site selection, I believe better locations within our City can provide a safer location for residents, customers and can be better served by roadway systems with better capacity, better site access and better site circulation, with much less negative impacts on surrounding neighbors, neighborhoods and daily commuters.

Respectfully submitted,

Leo Valentino Mendez, Jr., AIA

774 Medinah Dr.

Rochester Hills, MI 48309

248.520.9800

lvm218@gmail.com

Section 138-2.203 Standards for Site Plan Approval

The following criteria shall form the basis upon which a site plan is reviewed and approved, approved with conditions, or denied:

A. Adequacy of information and compliance with Ordinance requirements. The site plan includes all required information in a complete and understandable form that provides an accurate description of the proposed uses, structures and site improvements. The site plan complies with all applicable Ordinance requirements, including but not limited to minimum floor space, height of building, lot size, yard space and density.

Based upon the table of required site plan information, it appears the following is not provided for within this site plan submission and would appear technically incomplete at fulfilling the submission requirements mandated by the ordinance:

1. Buildings located within 100 feet of any property line. - *Residence to the East is not shown. It is well within 100' of property line.*
2. Existing and proposed right-of-way lines and the centerline of adjacent roads. - *Staff review indicates the proposed project meets the following requirement: Such facilities shall be located on major thoroughfares with an existing or proposed ROW (Right-of-way) of 120'. Additionally, the facility shall be on a corner lot or directly abut nonresidential zoning on at least one side, and such zoning shall be on the same of the major thoroughfare. Adams Rd. ROW is proposed to be 120', today the ROW on Adams Rd. is not 120'. Based on RCOC ROW maps the Adams. Rd. ROW is approximately 92'. The building setback requirement is established by the ROW. At today's ROW location, the building is setback 40' from the ROW from the existing ROW and not that of the Proposed 120'. Implementation of the future 120' ROW will locate this building +/-26' from the ROW. Given this placement, the physical building as proposed will be non-compliant with the required setback condition and any consideration of "grandfathering" this for future consideration will negatively impact this area visually, physically and pose a variety of safety issues with respect to limited view triangle capacity for safe ingress/ egress at the proposed Adams. Rd. driveway, etc.*
3. Location, outside dimensions, setback distances and proposed uses of all site improvements. - *No required front yard or side yard set back dimensions are provided or noted within this submission.*
4. Locations and dimensions of access points, including deceleration or passing lanes and distances between adjacent or opposing driveways and street intersections. - *Curb cuts dimensions for entry drives from major intersection are not provided.*
5. Other information as requested by the Planning and Development Director, Planning Commission, or City Engineer to verify that the site and project are developed or improved in accordance with the spirit and intent of this ordinance and the City's Master Plan. Such information may include use or environmental impact assessments, traffic impact studies, market analyses and evaluations of the demand on public facilities and services. The Planning and Development Director may also require that information listed in this table be submitted even if the table indicates that the information is not required for the particular type of review. - *Given the history and data with respect to traffic volumes at this intersection, the 2008 RH Master Thoroughfare Plan already documented this intersection roadway to be beyond capacity. It would seem prudent to require an updated traffic study to be conducted to further reveal and validate conditions today and impacts due to Premier Academy. Any comparison to their current facility is irrelevant given the vast difference is traffic volumes, site size, site orientation and site access.*

B. Site design characteristics. All elements of the site design are harmoniously and efficiently organized in relation to topography, parcel configuration, adjacent properties, traffic operations, adjacent streets and driveways, pedestrian access, and the type and size of buildings. The site is designed in a manner that promotes the normal and orderly development of surrounding property for uses permitted by this ordinance.

1. *The site design characteristics will substantially increase safety concerns for pedestrians, school kids, fitness enthusiasts, residents and daily commuters by increasing vehicular/ pedestrian conflicts when cars try to enter and exit site. The crosswalk conditions at the driveways will pose*

safety concerns due to vehicles trying to beat vehicles to enter or exit site with pedestrians and school kids for Adams High School and Van Hoosen Middle School being of secondary concern, especially in the dark winter morning hours.

2. The added vehicle interactions to enter and exit this site will pose increased traffic conflicts and congestion at an intersection already recognized and documented to be beyond capacity in terms of traffic volumes.
3. The added traffic burden of this project to this intersection will negatively impact surrounding residents and subdivisions with increased U-turn driveway actions and increased neighborhood traffic volumes ("cut throughs") for people that choose to avoid this intersection. This will occur at morning and afternoon peak use times further increasing safety issues for kids awaiting bus pick up and drop offs within surrounding neighborhoods.
4. The 2-story building designed at nearly 17,000 SF is much larger than any other surrounding houses, yet it is only required to comply with R-1 One Family Residential set-back requirements. This places a grossly oversized building too close to Adams Rd. given the building is more in scale with commercial retail buildings found at Busch's or The Village of Rochester Hills where they are set back more like 100' – 120' from the ROW. Nothing about a +/- 40' tall cupola and hip roof feature relates to any surrounding homes nor is this harmonious in any way.
5. If approved for Conditional Land Use, this project will set a precedent for the +/-10AC parcel to the south zoned R-1 One-family Residential District, to be used in a manner other than the applicable zoning. In other words, future applicants will claim a "Hardship" is imposed upon them due to the business nature of Premier Academy, thus the land cannot be developed in a residential capacity opening the door for some other "business" use with additional traffic burdens and non-residential building types.
6. The interpretation of the ordinance with respect to the "front yard setback" provides for the side of the building to face Adams Rd. given the address is Adams Rd. as this appears to manipulate the intent of the Ordinance. It has to be presumed the intent of the R-1 One-Family Residential zoning ordinance mandates front yard setbacks for the fronts of buildings (houses), not sides of buildings. The side and rear views of this building are very unattractive and visually imposing on the Adams Rd. view corridor.

C. Site appearance and coordination. Site elements are designed and located so that the proposed development is aesthetically pleasing and harmonious with adjacent existing or future developments. All site features, including circulation, parking, building orientation, landscaping, lighting, utilities, common facilities, and open space are harmonious and coordinated with adjacent properties.

1. The neighbor to the East will be negatively impacted by this project abutting their property due to continued vehicular traffic and head-in parking facing their house. One would expect the property value to decrease as well.
2. The parcel south of this project in consideration of future use will likely be un-able to be developed as any residential type use due to the commercial nature of this project type. The negative impact will then result in a future non-residential use being pursued due to precedent and a perceived "hardship". Such future development will further burden traffic issues, diminish the overall character of the surrounding area as future "commercialization" will take over. This is not consistent with the Rochester Hills Master Land Use Plan.

F. Vehicular access and circulation. Drives, streets, parking, site access and other vehicle-related elements are designed to minimize traffic conflicts on adjacent streets and promote safe and efficient traffic circulation within the site.

1. *The site design characteristics will substantially increase safety concerns for pedestrians, school kids, fitness enthusiasts, residents and daily commuters by increasing vehicular/ pedestrian conflicts when cars try to enter and exit site. The crosswalk conditions at the driveways will pose safety concerns due to vehicles trying to beat vehicles to enter or exit site with pedestrians and school kids for Adams High School and Van Hoosen Middle School being of secondary concern, especially in the dark winter morning hours.*
2. *The added vehicle interactions to enter and exit this site will pose increased traffic conflicts and congestion at an intersection already recognized and documented to be beyond capacity in terms of traffic volumes.*
3. *The added traffic burden of this project to this intersection will negatively impact surrounding residents and subdivisions with increased U-turn driveway actions and increased neighborhood traffic volumes (“cut throughs”) for people that choose to avoid this intersection. This will occur at morning and afternoon peak use times further increasing safety issues for kids awaiting bus pick up and drop offs within surrounding neighborhoods*
4. *The internal project site circulation is comprised of three different parking/ circulation conditions consisting of: one-way single loaded angled parking, implied one-way curb side drop-off pick up and two-way head in 90 degrees or angled. This parking layout will be problematic given it requires too many decisions to be quickly made to effectively park and navigate this site. It is my professional opinion many design professionals would agree this site layout; parking layout or circulation is **not** designed to minimize traffic conflicts on adjacent streets and promotes safe and efficient traffic circulation with the site.*

G. Building design and architecture. Building design and architecture relate to and are harmonious with the surrounding neighborhood with regard to texture, scale, mass, proportion, materials and color. Proposed buildings shall comply with the City’s building design guidelines.

1. *The material composition of cast stone, brick veneer and standing seam metal roof are comparable and compatible building materials found within the surrounding neighborhood. Other than that, nothing else demonstrates design harmony with respect to surrounding homes. Again, this building resembles something that would be found within the Busch’s property as commercial retail buildings.*
2. *Where most surrounding homes are 1,800 Sf to 3,000 Sf on average, this project as a 2-story 17,000 Sf building type is generally 5-6 times larger than any home in it’s proximity. This is not harmonious with the surrounding neighborhood.*

H. Parking and loading. Off-street parking lots and loading zones are arranged, located and designed to accommodate the intensity of proposed uses, minimize conflicts with adjacent uses, enhance the character of the neighborhood, and promote shared-use of common facilities by adjoining properties.

1. *The multi-directional one-way/ two-way site circulation with angled and head-in parking and circular drop-off lane will be problematic for ease of use for the customer, this will result in traffic congestion within the site with the potential for unsafe vehicle stacking onto Tienken Rd. If*

compared to their Snell Rd. location, the access into and out of the site is not burdened by traffic volumes found at this location and the site is much larger providing two-way drive isles and 90-degree head-in parking throughout.

2. At the eastern head-in parking field the striping defining parking stalls does not meet the ordinance requirements for stall depth at 18'-0". These stalls are striped at 16'-6". If they were striped per ordinance, the entry drive on Tienken Rd. would be partially blocked by approximately 1'-6" given the current proposed entry drive location. Even if restriped or not, full size SUV's would be hazardous as they would partially block the flow of traffic exiting onto Tienken Rd.
3. At this eastern edge location, the 4-5 parking spaces closest to Tienken Rd. would be limited in use and access as vehicles trying to exit onto Tienken Rd. would block these spaces.

K. Impact upon public services. The impact upon public services will not exceed the existing or planned capacity of such services, and adequate public services (including but not limited to utilities (water, sanitary & storm sewers, county drains, natural gas, electricity and telephone), streets, police and fire protection, public schools and sidewalks/bicycle paths) are available or provided to the site, and are designed with sufficient capacity and durability to properly serve the development. Refer to Section 138-2.205 for specific engineering requirements.

1. With respect the impact upon streets, public schools and sidewalk/ bicycle paths, safety will be greatly compromised at the drive-way access onto Tienken Rd. at the student/ pedestrian walkway. Any students walking/ riding bicycles to or from school will have increased safety risks when crossing this entry drive as any customer pulling into this lot will first be paying attention to any oncoming vehicular traffic and not look for the pedestrians crossing the entry drive. Vehicles will accelerate into the driveway and site to avoid oncoming vehicular traffic. And depending on the time of year, such as now, it will be dark during the morning hours when kids are going to school and less visible.

L. Drainage and soil erosion. Drainage systems, stormwater facilities, and soil erosion, sedimentation and dust control measures are arranged, located and designed to promote shared-use of common facilities by adjoining properties. Adjoining properties, public rights-of-way and the capacity of the public storm drainage system will not be adversely affected by stormwater runoff and sedimentation.

1. Today, Adams Rd. floods near the proposed Adams Rd. entry drive, and the existing residential site is roughly 3'-5' below the intersection. This project will require raising the site grading to establish the building footprint as well as replacing lawn area with asphalt for parking. What measures have been taken to reduce or eliminate flooding on Adams Rd. as this project will have an impact on that condition? And what impacts to the surrounding eco-system will be realized when the natural flow of water is eliminated to the surrounding wetlands as it is currently fed by natural swale and ditches from this site?

Chapter 3 Conditional Use Approval

Section 138-2.300 Intent

Conditional uses are uses that serve an area, interest or purpose that extends beyond the borders of the City, create particular problems of control in relation to adjoining uses or districts, may have detrimental effects upon public health, safety or welfare, or possess other unique characteristics that prevent such uses from being classified as principal permitted uses in a particular zoning district.

This chapter is intended to provide a consistent and uniform method for review of conditional use applications, ensure full compliance with the standards contained in this ordinance and other applicable local ordinances, and state and federal laws, achieve efficient use of the land, minimize or prevent adverse impacts on neighboring properties and districts, protect natural resources and facilitate development in accordance with the land use objectives of the Master Plan and any sub-area or corridor plans.

Section 138-2.302 Standards for Conditional Use Approval

For decisions on conditional uses referred to in subsection (a) of this section and in all other instances in this ordinance where discretionary decisions must be made by a board, commission or official, including decisions on site plans, the requirements and standards as particularly set forth in this ordinance concerning the matter for decision shall be followed, and such discretionary decision shall also be based upon the findings that the conditional use will:

A. Promote the intent and purpose of this ordinance.

- 1. ROW setback requirement on Adams Rd. is not met in consideration of the proposed 120' ROW. Once the proposed ROW is implemented, the building will be roughly 26' from the ROW.*
- 2. The R-1 front yard setback requirement (40'-0") for this project should be based upon the Proposed Adams ROW . The intent of the ordinance is that the fronts of buildings comply with this requirement. In the case of the Premier Academy submission, the side of the building faces the front yard. This is due to the applicant choosing the Adams Rd. address because of combing two parcels with two front yards or two fronts. While technically this may be permissible, it is not the intent of the ordinance to have the side of a building serve as what appears within the front yard setback. The result is an illegal placement of a building that is out of scale and physically imposing on the surrounding R-1 One Family Residential area and an unsightly addition to the Adams Rd. corridor.*

B. Be designed, constructed, operated, maintained and managed so as to be compatible, harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing or planned character of the general vicinity, adjacent uses of land, the natural environment, the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the land use, and the community as a whole.

- 1. This building design or planning is not compatible or harmonious with existing character of the general vicinity given the aesthetic and scale of the surrounding residential context.*

2. *The natural environment will likely be negatively impacted due to natural topography and water flow that feeds the adjacent wetlands being eliminated by the new building footprint and asphalt parking lot.*
3. *The night time visual impact to this location will not be harmonious due to security lighting on this building and within the parking lot area. Although foot-candle levels vary around the building and within the surface lot, the difference from what is there today will be drastic.*

C. Be served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainageways, refuse disposal, or that the persons or agencies responsible for the establishment of the land use or activity shall be able to provide adequately any such service.

D. Not be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to existing or future neighboring uses, persons, property or the public welfare.

The following comments are combined for C. and D. above:

1. *The existing roadways at this intersection were identified as being used by vehicles beyond capacity over 10 years ago. This project does nothing to improve conditions that continue to worsen due to ongoing residential development to the north where traffic volumes increase daily.*
2. *This project will add another 800-1,000 additional vehicular conflict interactions per day at this site/ intersection location for those entering and exiting the site during peak hours. Regardless of assumed increase traffic volumes, any increase in additional vehicle interactions at a location already used beyond capacity is hazardous by contributing to unsafe traffic conditions and further exasperating already intolerable vehicular congestion.*

E. Not create additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services that will be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.

1. *Other locations within the City better serve and provide for safe site access, better parking, and settings more suitable for the current design to be harmonious with its surroundings. Everything about this project is excessive with respect to site density, irregular parking/ circulation, building scale, etc. It is obvious economics are at play here relative to the cost of land and that of maximizing the financial return. If that were not the case, the applicant would have downsized and changed the design of the project based on previous Planning Commission Comments. None of that occurred. In fact the building façade got simplified (less articulated/ less attractive) and the site has increased in size demonstrating the applicant is not in any way motivated to be a "good neighbor". In this case, this project at this location is all about the financial return. What no one has demonstrated to any of this community is how this project would **not be detrimental to the economic welfare of this community.***

The City Council shall grant the requested approval only upon determination of compliance with the standards in this subsection. In granting the requested approval, the City Council shall impose such requirements or conditions as it deems necessary to protect the public interest of the City and the surrounding property and to achieve the objectives of this ordinance.

Summary of above Comments

Reasons to deny Conditional Land Use or Site Plan Approval for Premier Academy at Adams and Tienken

1. Given the history and data with respect to traffic volumes at this intersection, the 2008 RH Master Thoroughfare Plan already documented this intersection roadway to be beyond capacity. It would seem prudent to require an updated traffic study to be conducted to further reveal and validate conditions today and impacts due to Premier Academy. Any comparison to their current facility is irrelevant given the vast difference in traffic volumes, site size, site orientation and site access.
2. The site design characteristics will substantially increase safety concerns for pedestrians, school kids, fitness enthusiasts, local residents and daily commuters by increasing vehicular/ pedestrian conflicts when cars try to enter and exit site. The crosswalk conditions at the driveways will pose safety concerns due to vehicles trying to beat vehicles to enter or exit site with pedestrians and school kids for Adams High School and Van Hoosen Middle School being of secondary concern, especially in the dark winter morning hours.
3. The added vehicle interactions to enter and exit this site will pose increased traffic conflicts and congestion at an intersection already recognized and documented to be beyond capacity in terms of traffic volumes.
4. The added traffic burden of this project to this intersection will negatively impact surrounding residents and subdivisions with increased U-turn driveway actions and increased neighborhood traffic volumes (“cut throughs”) for people that choose to avoid this intersection. This will occur at morning and afternoon peak use times further increasing safety issues for kids awaiting bus pick up and drop offs within surrounding neighborhoods.
5. The 2-story building designed at nearly 17,000 SF is much larger than any other surrounding houses, yet it is only required to comply with R-1 One Family Residential set-back requirements. This places a grossly oversized building too close to Adams Rd. given the building is more in scale with commercial retail buildings found at Busch’s or The Village of Rochester Hills where they are set back more like 100’ – 120’ from the ROW (Right-of-Way). Nothing about a +/- 40’ tall cupola and hip roof feature relates to any surrounding homes nor is this harmonious in any way.
6. If approved for Conditional Land Use, this project will set a precedent for the +/-10AC parcel to the south zoned R-1 One-family Residential District, to be used in a manner other than the applicable zoning. In other words, future applicants will claim a “Hardship” is imposed upon them due to the business nature of Premier Academy, thus the land cannot be developed in a residential capacity opening the door for some other “business” use with additional traffic burdens and non-residential building types.
7. The interpretation of the ordinance with respect to the “front yard setback” provides for the side of the building to face Adams Rd. given the address is Adams Rd. as this appears to manipulate the intent of the Ordinance. It has to be presumed the intent of the R-1 One-Family Residential zoning ordinance mandates front yard setbacks for the fronts of buildings (houses), not sides of buildings. The

side and rear views of this building are very unattractive and visually imposing on the Adams Rd. view corridor.

8. The neighbor to the East will be negatively impacted by this project abutting their property due to continued vehicular traffic and head-in parking facing their house. One would expect the property value to decrease as well.

9. The parcel south of this project in consideration of future use will likely be un-able to be developed as any residential type use due to the commercial nature of this project type. The negative impact will then result in a future non-residential use being pursued due to precedent and a perceived "hardship". Such future development will further burden traffic issues, diminish the overall character of the surrounding area as future "commercialization" will take over. This is not consistent with the Rochester Hills Master Land Use Plan.

10. The site design characteristics will substantially increase safety concerns for pedestrians, school kids, fitness enthusiasts, local residents and daily commuters by increasing vehicular/ pedestrian conflicts when cars try to enter and exit site. The crosswalk conditions at the driveways will pose safety concerns due to vehicles trying to beat vehicles to enter or exit site with pedestrians and school kids for Adams High School and Van Hoosen Middle School being of secondary concern, especially in the dark winter morning hours.

11. The added vehicle interactions to enter and exit this site will pose increased traffic conflicts and congestion at an intersection already recognized and documented to be beyond capacity in terms of traffic volumes.

12. The added traffic burden of this project to this intersection will negatively impact surrounding residents and subdivisions with increased U-turn driveway actions and increased neighborhood traffic volumes ("cut throughs") for people that choose to avoid this intersection. This will occur at morning and afternoon peak use times further increasing safety issues for kids awaiting bus pick up and drop offs within surrounding neighborhoods.

13. The internal project site circulation is comprised of three different parking/ circulation conditions consisting of: one-way single loaded angled parking, implied one-way curb side drop-off pick up and two-way head in 90 degrees or angled. This parking layout will be problematic given it requires too many decisions to be quickly made to effectively park and navigate this site. It is my professional opinion many design professionals would agree this site layout; parking layout or circulation is not designed to minimize traffic conflicts on adjacent streets and promotes safe and efficient traffic circulation with the site.

14. The material composition of cast stone, brick veneer and standing seam metal roof are comparable and compatible building materials found within the surrounding neighborhood. Other than that, nothing else demonstrates design harmony with respect to surrounding homes. Again, this building resembles something that would be found within the Busch's property as commercial retail buildings.

15. Where most surrounding homes are 1,800 Sf to 3,000 Sf on average, this project as a 2-story 17,000 Sf building type is generally 5-6 times larger than any home in it's proximity. This is not harmonious with the surrounding neighborhood.

16. The multi-directional one-way/ two-way site circulation with angled and head-in parking and circular drop-off lane will be problematic for ease of use for the customer, this will result in traffic congestion within the site with the potential for unsafe vehicle stacking onto Tienken Rd. If compared to their Snell Rd. location, the access into and out of the site is not burdened by traffic volumes found at this location and the site is much larger providing two-way drive isles and 90 degree head-in parking throughout.

17. At the eastern head-in parking field the striping defining parking stalls does not meet the ordinance requirements for stall depth at 18'-0". These stalls are striped at 16'-6". If they were striped per ordinance, the entry drive on Tienken Rd. would be partially blocked by approximately 1'-6" given the current proposed entry drive location. Even if restriped or not, full size SUV's would be hazardous as they would partially block the flow of traffic exiting onto Tienken Rd. At this eastern edge location, the 4-5 parking spaces closest to Tienken Rd. would be limited in use and access as vehicles trying to exit onto Tienken Rd. would block these spaces.

18. With respect the impact upon streets, public schools and sidewalk/ bicycle paths, safety will be greatly compromised at the drive-way access onto Tienken Rd. at the student/ pedestrian walkway. Any students walking/ riding bicycles to or from school will have increased safety risks when crossing this entry drive as any customer pulling into this lot will first be paying attention to any oncoming vehicular traffic and not look for the pedestrians crossing the entry drive. Vehicles will accelerate into the driveway and site to avoid oncoming vehicular traffic. And depending on the time of year, such as now, it will be dark during the morning hours when kids are going to school and less visible.

19. Today, Adams Rd. floods near the proposed Adams Rd. entry drive, and the existing residential site is roughly 3'-5' below the intersection. This project will require raising the site grading to establish the building footprint as well as replacing lawn area with asphalt for parking. What measures have been taken to reduce or eliminate flooding on Adams Rd. as this project will have an impact on that condition? And what impacts to the surrounding eco-system will be realized when the natural flow of water is eliminated to the surrounding wetlands as it is currently fed by natural swale and ditches from this site?

20. ROW (Right-of Way) setback requirements on Adams Rd. is not met in consideration of the proposed 120' ROW. Once the proposed ROW is implemented, the building will be roughly 26' from the ROW.

21. The R-1 front yard setback requirement (40'-0") should be based upon the proposed Adams ROW (Right-of-Way). The intent of the ordinance is that the fronts of buildings comply with this requirement. In the case of the Premier Academy submission, the side of the building faces the front yard. This is due to the applicant choosing the Adams Rd. address because of combining two parcels with two front yards or two fronts. While technically this may be permissible, it is not the intent of the ordinance to have the side of a building serve as what appears within the front yard setback. The result is an illegal placement of a building that is out of scale and physically imposing on the surrounding R-1 One Family Residential area and an unsightly addition to the Adams Rd. corridor.

22. This building design or planning is not compatible or harmonious with existing character of the general vicinity given the aesthetic and scale of the surrounding residential context.
23. The natural environment will likely be negatively impacted due to natural topography and water flow that feeds the adjacent wetlands being eliminated by the new building footprint and asphalt parking lot.
24. The night time visual impact to this location will not be harmonious due to security lighting on this building and within the parking lot area. Although foot-candle levels vary around the building and within the surface lot, the difference from what is there today will be drastic.
25. The existing roadways at this intersection were identified as being used by vehicles beyond capacity over 10 years ago. This project does nothing to improve conditions that continue to worsen due to ongoing residential development to the north where traffic volumes increase daily.
26. This project will add another 800-1,000 additional vehicular conflict interactions per day at this site/ intersection location for those entering and exiting the site during peak hours. Regardless of assumed increase traffic volumes, any increase in additional vehicle interactions at a location already used beyond capacity is hazardous by contributing to unsafe traffic conditions and further exasperating already intolerable vehicular congestion.
27. Other locations within the City better serve and provide for safe site access, better parking, and settings more suitable for the current design to be harmonious with its surroundings. Everything about this project is excessive with respect to site density, irregular parking/ circulation, building scale, etc. It is appearing economics are at play here relative to the cost of land and that of maximizing the financial return. If that were not the case, the applicant would have downsized and changed the design of the project based on previous Planning Commission Comments. None of that occurred.



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Premier Academy

2 messages

Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Fri, Dec 8, 2017 at 2:03 PM

To: Maureen Gentry <gentrym@rochesterhills.org>

Cc: Sara Roediger <roedigers@rochesterhills.org>, Kristen Kapelanski <kapelanskik@rochesterhills.org>

Bcc: Beth Tilove <btilove@gmail.com>, Bridget Donohoe <bld2888@yahoo.com>, Caren Stajninger <carenstajninger@gmail.com>, Carl Robinson <carlkarenrobinson@sbcglobal.net>, Catherine Buckmaster <fourbucksandchange@wowway.com>, Cec Vettraino Strine <ilymtoc@aol.com>, Cheryl Bachleda <bachleda@att.net>, Cheryl Lenzion <cheryl2799@sbcglobal.net>, Donna Learmont <doctortv16@gmail.com>, "E. McClelland" <elmcclelland@sbcglobal.net>, Eric Bennett <bennttz@gmail.com>, Gina Stevens <ginadstevens@hotmail.com>, Hayley Leichtman <hayleyleichtman1@gmail.com>, Jennifer Bayer <jennifer.bayer@jdpa.com>, Jerry Romito <gjromito@aol.com>, Joe DiLuca <dill1641j@gmail.com>, John Carterson <jsc10@icloud.com>, John Leichtman <johnleichtman@gmail.com>, Karen MacKay <karenamackay@icloud.com>, Kay Welsh <kgwelsh@wowway.com>, Leo Mendez <LMendez@taubman.com>, Marge Huggard <margehuggard@icloud.com>, Mary Beth Stewart <stewartatfrochester@gmail.com>, mchung <mchung3207@wowway.com>, Michelle Gibbons <mgibbons7183@wowway.com>, Patty Kaczowski <pattykacz@me.com>, Rakesh Ray <rayrax@gmail.com>, Steve Yuhasz <steve@yuhasz.org>, Terry Stephens <terry@equatoris.com>, Thomas Braun <tmbraun43@gmail.com>, Tom Miloy <tttadv@comcast.net>, Tom Stephens <trs789@yahoo.com>

Good afternoon,

You are receiving this email because you previously commented on or inquired about (via email) the proposed Premier Academy project.

The City's Planning and Economic Development Department wanted to inform you that the Planning Commission will be considering the Site Plan, Tree Removal Permit and Conditional Use Recommendation for the proposed Premier Academy at their December 19, 2017 regularly scheduled meeting. The applicant has submitted updated plans for review and they available on the City's [Status of Development Map](#). Additional information regarding the meeting can be found on the City's [Calendar](#). Staff reports on the updated plans will be finalized and posted by the end of the day on December 15, 2017. Any questions or comments can be directed to the Planning and Economic Development Department at 248-656-4660 or planning@rochesterhills.org.

Thank you,
City of Rochester Hills
Planning and Economic Development Dept.

www.rochesterhills.org

[Get Email Updates on Gov Delivery](#)
[Join us on Facebook](#)
[Follow us on Twitter](#)
[Sign up for Alerts with Nixle](#)

TOM Mikoy <tttadv@comcast.net>

Sat, Dec 9, 2017 at 11:20 AM

To: Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Cc: Maureen Gentry <gentrym@rochesterhills.org>, Sara Roediger <roedigers@rochesterhills.org>, Kristen Kapelanski <kapelanskik@rochesterhills.org>, brookedalewoods@hotmail.com

Hello Planning Dept.

Thanks for the link to see the updated plans. I am curious if any of you opened the drawing and saw how un-readable it is. I guess it is better than nothing but I would think you could post a better document for public to look at and understand.

I am curious if anyone on your team has driven through the Adams and Teinken intersection during the early morning school drop-off times (roughly between 6:45 and 8:15 AM, I believe.) The traffic is VERY heavy to say the least.

Normally such development is positive for a community but to cause additional congestion in an already congested area puts this project into a negative light.

I had originally proposed (to Ms. Morita some weeks ago) that this project be considered for the northeast corner of Adams and Hamlin Roads. And just to the east on Hamlin would be other properties on the south side of Hamlin that would be favorable options and would not be a source of driving congestion compared to the currently considered site.

Could you please clarify if the Hamlin Road area are viable alternatives?

And to be clear, I am opposed to this school project moving forward at Adams & Tienken.

Tom Mikoy
ttacdv@comcast.net

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.

#rmail#



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Premier Academy proposal

1 message

Barbara Minbiole <barbaraminbiole@hotmail.com>

Thu, Dec 14, 2017 at 12:57 PM

To: "planning@rochesterhills.org" <planning@rochesterhills.org>, "moritas@rochesterhills.org" <moritas@rochesterhills.org>, "mccardellj@rochesterhills.org" <mccardellj@rochesterhills.org>, "hetrickd@rochesterhills.org" <hetrickd@rochesterhills.org>, "tisdelm@rochesterhills.org" <tisdelm@rochesterhills.org>

Please vote AGAINST the Conditional Use or Site Plan approval for Premier Academy on the basis of the CEPC 27 point analysis. Now that Moceris is building Blossom Ridge one mile away and Adams road is already congested with Adams High School and Van Heusen Middle School traffic, adding the Academy traffic around the same time is dangerous. Frustrated drivers who cannot penetrate the congestion will make mistakes that will lead to extra accidents and harm to them, the preschoolers and the pedestrian children. Other less volatile properties are available in the city.

My husband and I appreciate your service to our community and thank you for your careful consideration of this matter.

Barbara and Craig Minbiole

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10