

NEW BUSINESS

2023-0321

Public Hearing and Request for Conditional Use Recommendation - File No. PCU2023-0005 - to operate a child care center within the R-4 One Family Residential District at the proposed Primrose School, located on the east side of Rochester Rd. and north of Eddington Blvd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential with an FB Flex Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-23-301-018, Becky Klein, PEA Group, Applicant

(Staff Report dated 7/18/23, Reviewed Plans, PEA group letter 6/23/23, Fishbeck Engineers letter submitted 7/14/23, Development Application, EIS, Mechanical unit screening cut sheet, WRC letter of 2/23/23, Streets review 2/15/23, and Public Hearing Notice had been place on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

Chairperson Brnabic introduced this item noting that it is relative to a conditional use recommendation to operate a childcare center in the R-4 One Family Residential District at the proposed Primrose School located on the east side of Rochester Road north of Eddington Boulevard, Zoned R-4 One Family Residential with an FB Flex Business Overlay. She invited the applicant forward and asked for Staff's report.

Present for the applicant was Dan Harris with 814 Services and Becky Klein, PEA Services.

Mr. McLeod explained that there are three different items on tonight's agenda pertaining to this project, potential site plan approval, tree removal permit, and conditional use recommendation for the Primrose School. He stated that the vacant site is on the east side of Rochester Road just north of Eddington Boulevard, and is an extension of the FB District in this area with the underlying zoning of R-4 One-Family Residential, and stated that it is being proposed to be developed as a conditional use within the R-4 One Family District and not the FB District. The conditional use recommendation will ultimately go on to City Council. He noted where the site is in relationship to the surrounding properties, pointing out the financial institutions to the south that started the realignment of Eddington with this common roadway, and then additional financial institutions and the Cedar Valley multiple family development to the north. He explained that this development proposes to provide the connection between these two areas. To the east and to the west is R-4 One Family Residential. The overlay FB district is on the east side of Rochester Road, and NB Neighborhood Business is to the north.

He noted the connection from Eddington Road, and the current alignment heading northward into Cedar Valley, creating at cross-connection between the two developments. He said there is a two acre area provided for future potential development on the north side of the site, where no specific plans were provided. He commented that at one point in earlier reviews there was a second building that was going to be a swim school; however that was left off of these plans, and he stated that it is his understanding that this is no longer an option for this site. He pointed out the buffering along the east side that is actually on

City-owned property, and he stated that this is consistent with the developments to the south where the City has allowed buffering to occur. He mentioned that the hours of operation for the proposed use appear to now be 6:30 am to 6:30 pm which does comply with the conditional use requirements, which does limit overall hours of operation.

He stated that the site has a number of trees on it, and the applicant is proposing to remove 14 regulated trees and five specimen trees. A total of 20 replacement trees are being planted and 16 will then be paid into the City's Tree Fund. He explained that 80 deciduous trees are proposed to be planted throughout the site and 21 evergreen trees between this site as well as abutting City property that will serve as the buffering between this site and the adjacent residential properties to the east.

He explained that they are requesting to place a fence around their stormwater detention pond, based on the fact that their insurance company is requiring it since it is a children's play area and children will be on the site on a regular basis. The applicant's rationale is that for liability purposes, fencing would need to be provided there; otherwise an underground system would have to be provided if that fencing would not be allowed.

Mr. Harris stated that 814 Services is the developer and the tenant is Primrose Schools, a premier childcare facility. He stated that it has been a pleasure to work with Mr. McLeod and the rest of the planning staff to get to this point.

Ms. Klein stated that the site definitely provides a few engineering challenges with the DTE transmission tower along the north line as well as the need to make connectivity from Eddington Drive at the south to the apartment buildings to the north, and with the shared access drive with the bank. She explained that they have worked with City staff to make this project viable. She commented that it has been a challenge, but she thinks that they have developed something that will work and look aesthetic and will serve the needs of the community well.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that the Planning Department requested additional masonry be added on each façade and she would agree that there is too much siding.

Mr. Harris responded that in response to that request, they have increased the amount of masonry quite a bit from the start of the project to now. He explained that they are up over 20 percent on some wall faces of nearly 40 percent, or 39 percent on the portions that are facing Rochester Road. He stated that the issue they are coming to is that they would like to try to preserve the way their building looks as this is their tenant's style. He added that in the interest of architectural appeal, they are having trouble trying to find where additional masonry could go and still provide an aesthetic-looking building given the overall design and intent of the tenant.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that there are plenty of opportunities to add stone or brick accents in between the doors and windows or go higher. She mentioned that there is another school on Auburn near John R that is two story, and their first story is totally brick. She pointed out that the Fifth-Third Bank is a brick

building. She stated that she is not happy with the look of the building, and she is not able to support it because something needs to be added to the building as far as masonry. She commented that she would have liked to have seen a full color rendering of the entire development including proposed landscaping, parking, playground equipment and any other amenities on site. She stated that the rendering provided gives her enough of an idea that there is not enough masonry; and that while the applicant states that this is high-end design, having so much siding on the façade is not considered high-end design. She commented that she does not want it listed as a condition of approval because she wants to see what she is approving and wants an updated façade with more masonry.

Ms. Neubauer stated that she would concur with Chairperson Brnabic. She noted that she looked at their school in Canton where she does not see anything but brick. She noted that while Councilwoman Boyer is not here this evening, she described it perfectly, noting it looks like a pole barn the way it is now and it is not complementing the area around it. She added that if there are plans submitted that include a pool and it is not now part of the project, they need to submit more detailed updated plans beyond a graphic and with exact precise design so the Commission knows what it is voting on. She suggested the applicants look at their school in Canton which is almost brick to the top.

Mr. Harris stated that one of the conditions for conditional use for a daycare in this area is to take into account the abutting residential areas. He pointed out to the east and also across Rochester Road all of the residential areas have siding incorporated into them. He commented that it became challenging as to where to terminate the brick and still have an aesthetic appeal.

Ms. Neubauer suggested that she would go up to that middle line with the brick and around each of the windows and doors at a minimum. She commented that 20 or 25 percent brick on the lower level is just not enough. She stated that it needs to be compared to the commercial buildings around it and they are all brick.

Mr. Harris commented that he appreciates the direction that the Commission is providing, and stated that they were increasing the brick as they were submitting these plans. He asked if full brick would be acceptable.

Ms. Neubauer commented that they would not present an argument if it is full brick. She stated that if they wanted to put some siding in, it should be minimal because even many of the residential houses around there are solid brick.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that she would agree that there would not be an argument if it were full brick.

Mr. Harris mentioned the gable area where the signage would be located.

Ms. Neubauer stated that if that was the only part that would not be brick, she thought that would be acceptable to most of the Commissioners. She commented that she is not an architect and mentioned keeping the stone and a triangle of siding.

Mr. Harris responded that they would like to preserve the architectural trend of a barnyard farmhouse.

Ms. Neubauer stated that trends come and go, and the Commission wants something that is going to stay and be in keeping with the aesthetic of Rochester Hills.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that they could always look at it and decide if they wanted to include some accents, even if going with full brick.

Mr. Dettloff stated that he would agree with what Chairperson Brnabic and Ms. Neubauer have suggested. He asked Mr. McLeod if the traffic engineer has had a chance to review the trip generation comparison submitted on 7/13 from Fishbeck.

Mr. McLeod responded that Traffic did give it a cursory review and Mr. Depp provided an email late today that there was nothing that jumped as objectionable in terms of the numbers provided from the Fishbeck report. He explained that this is a bit of a unique case from the standpoint that this is all internal roadway system and no new driveway is being proposed.

Mr. Dettloff stated that he agreed on the aesthetic discussion, and commented that the applicant would never get an argument about full brick in this community. He expressed appreciation to the applicant for bringing this to Rochester Hills.

Mr. Struzik stated he wanted to comment on some of the positive aspects of this project. He pointed out that they will be filling in the pathway gap on Rochester Road which is a busy road in terms of cars and speed, and has a lot of pedestrians on it. He commented that this will be one step closer to having a completed pathway from Hamlin to Avon. He noted that the connection of Eddington to the north is a very positive aspect of this project and will give some of those businesses and apartments to the north the opportunity to make a left turn out onto Rochester Road with the assistance of a traffic light and would use the property as a cut-through to the light. He mentioned that stormwater management will be an improvement, and he noted that he read that the water flows from west to east, and right now it flows naturally and the improvement would be that it will be collected and put into a pond as opposed to free-flow. Another positive is that no new driveway is proposed on Rochester Road, a huge plus for this project, and this is something they like to avoid if possible. He added that it will be great to have a new childcare option in the city.

He stated that he agrees with the feedback Chairperson Brnabic and Ms. Neubauer gave about the siding, noting that in the neighborhood to the east there are quite a few homes that have a significantly higher percentage of brick than the proposed structure.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that this item requires a public hearing, and noted that she had several speaker cards.

Michael Corless, 1590 Farnborough, stated that his property is immediately adjacent to this property on the corner of Farnborough and Eddington. He noted that the cut-through traffic means a lot more traffic immediately behind his home, which he is not necessarily in favor of. He mentioned that he sees a line of plantings and they have a berm there now that when they did the realignment of Eddington. He noted that there were a significant amount of plantings as a buffer and he was curious what was on the east side of the plan for the road that cuts through. He asked about the retention pond, and commented that if it fills with water they would have to put up with mosquitoes. He mentioned that the property was once part of the Ferry Seed Farm, and asked if there might be contaminants in the area that have to be remediated. He commented that any runoff from west to east may move disturbed contaminants downhill, affecting people living adjacent to the property. He expressed that he was upset about the removal of all of the trees on the corner.

Vito Pampalona, Vito Anthony, 1235 N. Main, Rochester, stated that he is the broker that worked on the property for almost two years, and represents the sellers. He commented that they have had many inquiries and have sat down with a number of developers and what is presented today is by far the best use they have seen. He stated that this is really good for the community and the residential that surrounds it and a lot of families will take advantage of this. He commented that he believed that he is sure that they will be up for a bit of an elevation tweak.

John Tenny, 2724 Emmons Ave., asked what the market for daycare is, noting that there was one about a quarter mile away. He commented that he did not feel that there was a market for this kind of structure.

Dr. Lisa Winarski, stated that she had concerns about the style of building, and commented that it seems like every time a new building comes in, it looks cheaper and cheaper. She noted that she appreciated the comments on keeping the aesthetics with the surrounding areas. She asked where the stormwater would be hooking up to, and mentioned that Eddington Farms has ongoing litigation with the City of Rochester Hills regarding stormwater in their subdivision, and she stated that she does not know how this can go forward until that litigation is resolved. She asked about the traffic engineering information and noted it is not included in the packet. She mentioned headlights and stated they would go into the homes. She commented that a chain link fence around the stormwater drain would not be pleasing to anyone and asked if the elevation of the property would be raised. She stated that the developer should have a conversation with the Eddington Farms neighbors, and expressed concern regarding the play structures. She noted that Holy Family South was not allowed to have play structures.

Mark Kellenberger, 814 Services, 1695 Twelve Mile, Berkley, stated that he wanted to support Mr. Harris, noting that they were coming looking for direction tonight and did not have the design guideline. He stated that it is pretty evident that a brick structure would be much more attractive and agreeable from the City's perspective and they can absolutely do that. He asked if they could move forward with a conditional approval and they would have no issue with adding brick to the elevation.

John Przybysz, 3120 Primrose Ave., stated that he lives behind Meijer and noted that a developer came in there, and sold their property, and he asked if they were planning on selling this property when they were done with it. He stressed that this is residential property that should not be rezoned and he stated that this is about business and money and is not to the benefit of the residents.

Mr. Harris stated that he would like to address some of the comments. He noted that walkability is something that Planning and other City staff have stressed to them. He commented that having a daycare and a convenient traffic light will allow residents to safely walk, bike and use anything other than a car to make that journey. He stated that walking kids to school in the morning will be good exercise and will be positive. He stated that stormwater typically cannot leave a site and must be contained onsite and discharged appropriately, and in this case they are doing a good job because they are limiting the amount of underground storage and everything is surface draining. He pointed out that it runs through the grass, through a concrete pipe to the detention pond, and then to outlets to the south in a controlled structure. He stressed they will follow all the OCWRC standards as well as additional City requirements.

He added that they have come to the understanding that the brick building is the way to go. He commented that he is not aware of any stormwater litigation, and asked if Planning had any information. He noted that they did a Phase 1 Environmental and it did not indicate any contaminants on the site. He addressed questions regarding headlights, and commented that there are already plantings on the residents' side of the berm and they are supplementing the plantings in existence in addition to having the berm. He noted that there is a play structure plan.

Ms. Klein addressed several comments. Regarding drainage, she stated that Rochester Road sits at a higher elevation than most of the site, and then there is a drop between this site and the subdivision to the east. She reviewed the drainage for the property, noting that there is an S-shaped bioswale that is at a split in the existing berm, and noted that all the water from this site is currently draining through that split in the berm and entering a catch basin in the subdivision. She explained that they are not changing the onsite grade and are working with existing grades as much as they can so as not to raise or lower anything dramatically. All the water that used to flow into that area will be run through one of two bioswales, the S-shaped one mentioned, and a second one that runs between the rows of parking. She stated that those act as a primary detention system and are also a very eco-friendly way of cleaning the stormwater before it gets into the main detention pond. The pond is bean-shaped at the southeast corner of the site, and the water will be held in that over time and released slowly. The outlet for that is an existing structure in Eddington Boulevard. She stated that she thinks it may improve things for the neighbors to the east because the water will not be dumping into their storm system and will be in a controlled basin that goes into the City system in the street. She added that regarding mosquitoes, the pond and bioswales are designed to drain dry; they will hold water for 24 to 48 hours depending on how intense a given storm is, but over time that water will either soak into the ground

or drain through the outlet system and the basins will be dry until the next storm. They should not be big mosquito generators.

She stated that in terms of traffic, it will add some traffic to the neighborhood and most of it will happen between the hours of about 6:30 and 9 am, and then again in the afternoon around 3 to 6 pm; but this is a much lower impact than a lot of things that could go into the site. She commented that any kind of store or restaurant would generate more trips. She noted that with the differential between the elevation of this site and the neighbors, the ground floor windows will probably not get hit by much headlight activity. She stated that considering second floor windows, there is an existing berm and line of trees there, and their landscaping will be in addition to the existing buffer trees, creating a fairly thick belt of foliage. She commented that it would be up to the developer for a coordination meeting with the neighbors.

Mr. Harris noted that 101 trees and 200 shrubs are being proposed, with different levels of canopies and foliage to alleviate higher and lower headlights.

Ms. Klein added that regarding fencing around the play yard and pond, it will not be ugly chain link and will be a high quality wrought-iron look, ornamental safety fence. She stressed that the fence around the pond is to satisfy insurance requirements and provide an extra level of safety for parents to ensure their child won't get hurt.

Chairperson Brnabic asked who the point of contact would be to speak with the neighbors.

Mr. Harris responded that it could be his office.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that they always recommend a new developer speak with the neighbors and oftentimes they have questions that can be remedied. She requested that they make an offer to talk to the neighbors, even if it is contacting the homeowners' association, perhaps set up a meeting.

Mr. Harris agreed with that request.

Chairperson Brnabic asked if someone looked at the trees and berm from the perspective of headlights.

Ms. Klein responded that they have not done a site profile.

Chairperson Brnabic recommended that they do that, and stated that she would like to know that if headlights are for some reason coming through and neighbors are concerned or complaining, it would be dealt with appropriately.

Mr. Harris stated that he is trying to think of an opaque way to screen and stated that without going to something that is very manmade, vegetation is their best bet along with the berm. He noted that if there is a gap in plantings or an issue, there is a maintenance bond that will be on the plantings and it could be alleviated appropriately.

Ms. Klein commented that usually 80 percent opacity in a vegetative screen is considered good and typically that is aimed for about two years after the plantings are in place to allow them to get mature enough to provide screening.

Chairperson Brnabic commented that if it is actually only certain houses affected, they might consider larger plantings as nobody should have to wait two years if headlights are coming in their windows.

Mr. Harris stated that it is pretty evident where that area would be right in the intersection of where the north-south and east-west is occurring. He noted that they can take a look at those plantings again.

Mr. McLeod stated that with Planning Commission and resident concerns, a hedgerow planted at that point could maybe be reconfigured to push slightly further east and perhaps change the type of juniper proposed to an upright juniper and carry them a little further to the south, to fully cover that drive.

Ms. Klein stated that there is a taller species of dense hedge forming plants that could potentially be used, and that they will rearrange those to make sure it is tighter and covers that entire opening, and will be a species that will provide year-round screening.

Chairperson Brnabic asked if the traffic study will be available for a member of the public.

Mr. McLeod suggested that individual leave an email. He noted that the study came in too late to amend the packet; but by all means any resident is welcome to that information.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that she believed all the questions were answered. She stated that regarding comments whether they would sell the property or if it is the best use of the property; she would assume that if the developer did not feel that there was a market for the school, there would not be an investment in it.

Ms. Neubauer stated that she is aware that most of the daycares in Rochester Hills have a waiting list, so there is a demand for it. She commented that it is an ongoing discussion among the moms in Rochester Hills. She stated that with respect to ongoing litigation, unless there is a direct injunctive order provided to the Planning Commission, they have nothing to do with that.

Mr. McLeod noted that as they go through their administrative reviews, Engineering has been a part of each review and they have not raised any questions or any issue with how the stormwater is being proposed. He stated that if some form of stoppage or injunctive relief comes through, that may impact things; however, as of now, Engineering has been reviewing this step-by-step and have not said anything to the contrary.

Ms. Neubauer stated that it was asked that they just move forward with the condition of extra brick being used, and she is not comfortable with that at this point. She commented that she would want more specific detailed renderings of

every inch of the development, including the fence being used, the brick being used, and how it would work. She asked if the fire hydrant issue was resolved.

Ms. Klein responded that it couldn't be done in this packet, but they did work out a location for the fire hydrants that satisfied the Fire Marshal. It would be in the next set.

Ms. Neubauer asked that before they return to the Commission, they have a meeting with the neighbors. She stated that she would rather postpone than move forward with conditions.

Mr. Struzik concurred with Ms. Neubauer's comments. He clarified that this is not a rezoning, but a conditional use and the proposal has nothing to do with changing the zoning of the property. He stated that while Holy Family Regional South was mentioned as not having a playground, he stated that it has two and they abut residential areas and are not fenced off. He noted that this playground would be fenced off and usable during their business hours.

Mr. Weaver stated that he is happy to hear bantering back and forth about landscape changes. He stated that with regard to headlights, there is an arborvitae hedge that looks like it is right at the end of the driveway and assuming that it will be maintained it will help immensely. He suggested instead of deciduous trees at the end of the driveway that some larger evergreens be proposed that will do wonders for blocking headlights. He noted that the fencing proposed is a typical standard black aluminum fencing, two rails at the top and circles in the middle, which is something seen around the neighborhood and the community. He noted that there is seed mix proposed for the detention basin and asked if there was any maintenance plan for that because it tends to take two to three years to fill in and grow.

Ms. Klein responded that the bioswales will be seeded with a natural regional bioswale mix, wildflowers and native grasses for this area of Michigan which will form the bulk of the filtering. She mentioned that pond will have a pond seed mix which will typically take about six months to establish. While that is ongoing, whoever has the landscaping contract will be responsible for watching it, adding plugs as needed and fixing any erosion areas.

Mr. Weaver stated that if the contractor on board is willing to go out and spot treat weeds, that would be perfect. He asked if the gap in the existing berm is intended to be filled.

Ms. Klein responded that there will be some earth moving in that area and the gap would effectively go away. She noted that there are two separate bioswales that will both go into the detention pond. The S-shaped one grabs the water from the north half of the site and the one in the middle of the parking area collects all the water off of the pavement and takes it into the pond.

Mr. Weaver asked if the soils are known. He commented that on Auburn Road the very same thing was done to catch storm runoff, but down there a significant amount of sand helped infiltration.

Ms. Klein responded that they have not done the infiltration testing yet, and mentioned that Oakland County stormwater requirements now include a component of infiltrating some of the water. She stated that this will have to be met during the engineering phase, and their tentative plan is to use those bioswales as infiltration beds. She stated that they will be getting the soils tested. She stated that if it comes back less than desirable they will wind up putting some filter fingers down in there creating more surface area for infiltration.

Ms. Densteadt noted that the trip generation comparison listed the times as six to six, with morning peak traffic going from six to a blank time am. She echoed the Commissioners in wanting to see a meeting with the neighborhood.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that she is sure the applicant has taken notes on the discussion, with comments and concerns of what the Commission wants to see. She noted that she wants to be clear that commissioners would like to see full color renderings of the entire development, including the proposed landscaping, parking, playground, AC equipment, and any other amenities that would be on site. She noted this would include addressing the question on fencing, with an actual photo of what they are proposing to use. She added that they would like to see an exact depiction of the updated façade of the building from every elevation.

Ms. Klein asked if it is typical that developers come in with a 3-D rendering of the whole site.

Chairperson Brnabic responded yes. She stated that oftentimes even if it is included in the packet, a lot of them will do full pages so that there is a perspective of every elevation, perhaps two to a page, and then a page of the development itself from a different view, so they are seeing what is being proposed for landscaping, shrubs, and amenities. She stated that they would like to see the playground proposed as well to have a good perspective of what they are going to approve. She noted that they are moving toward a motion to postpone so that the applicant can work with the concerns, so that for the next meeting everything should be okay to move forward. She noted there is support for the project, however there are some concerns and things that need to be changed.

Mr. Harris asked for clarification of the site renderings and whether they are needed for the entire site or just the buildings.

Chairperson Brnabic responded that it should be something larger and adding building material to get a better closeup look. She stressed it would be a drawing.

Ms. Neubauer suggested that they could stop into the Planning Department to look at other plans that have been submitted for a better example. She noted that it is not saying that it has to be 3-D, but has to be a visual of each side of the building, the playground equipment, and the plantings going in there.

Mr. McLeod stated that a lot of different developments provide 3-D renderings

with today's architectural programs, and stated that the department can provide several different examples of what has gone before the Commission in the past. He stated that he could email them tomorrow. He noted that they have colored drawings of each façade, and snippets or cutouts of materials. He commented that based on what is being described tonight, that will need to be upgraded in terms of amenities.

Chairperson Brnabic commented that they would like to know from a perspective what they would see in pulling in the front entrance. She stated that she would like to see the drawings on a larger scale to see the details more clearly. She commented that Ms. Neubauer had an excellent suggestion of contacting Mr. McLeod. She asked if they had any questions.

Mr. Harris asked about the tree removal permit and some of the other items.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that as they are moving to postpone everything right now, they would not move forward to vote on anything.

Mr. Dettloff asked if the owners would lease to the Primrose.

Mr. Harris responded that they would develop this for the Primrose and they would be the operator.

Mr. Dettloff noted that the owners are referenced in the application as 814 services.

Mr. Harris responded that their tenant is Primrose, a corporate entity that has many childcares and is trying to expand into Michigan.

Mr. Gallina concurred with the previous comments. He noted that updated renderings and visuals would help the Commission and the neighbors have a better understanding. He commented that hopefully with updated renderings and meeting with the neighbors they will be able to answer all of the questions and concerns.

Chairperson Brnabic asked for a motion to postpone all three items. The motion to postpone all three items relative to this request was made by Ms. Neubauer, seconded by Mr. Struzik. After a voice vote, Chairperson Brnabic noted that the motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Struzik, that this matter be Postponed. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Bowyer

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby postpones the Request for Conditional Use Recommendation for the Primrose School development until further notice, to allow the applicant to come back with notes, corrections and updates.

building for Primrose School, located on the east side of Rochester Rd. and north of Eddington Blvd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential with an FB Flex Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-23-301-018, Becky Klein, PEA Group, Applicant

See Legislative File 2023-0321 for discussion.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Struzik, that this matter be Postponed. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Bowyer

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby postpones the Request for Site Plan Approval for the Primrose School development until further notice, to allow the applicant to come back with notes, corrections and updates.

2023-0323

Request for Tree Removal Permit Approval - File No. PTP2023-0007 - to remove fourteen (14) regulated trees and five (5) specimen trees and provide twenty (20) replacement trees with the sixteen (16) remaining trees to be paid into the city's Tree Fund for Primrose School, a proposed child care center located on the east side of Rochester Rd. and north of Eddington Blvd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential with an FB Flex Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-23-301-018, Becky Klein, PEA Group, Applicant

See Legislative File 2023-0321 for discussion.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Struzik, that this matter be Postponed. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Bowyer

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby postpones the Request for Approval of a Tree Removal Permit for the Primrose School development until further notice, to allow the applicant to come back with notes, corrections and updates.