



Rochester Hills

Minutes

Planning Commission

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

Chairperson Deborah Brnabic, Vice Chairperson Greg Hooper
Members: Susan Bowyer, Sheila Denstaedt, Gerard Dettloff, Anthony Gallina, Marvie Neubauer, Scott Struzik and Ben Weaver
Youth Representative: Siddh Sheth

Tuesday, August 15, 2023

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Brnabic called the August 15, 2023 Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., Michigan Time.

ROLL CALL

Present 9 - Susan M. Bowyer, Deborah Brnabic, Sheila Denstaedt, Gerard Dettloff, Anthony Gallina, Greg Hooper, Marvie Neubauer, Scott Struzik and Ben Weaver

Others Present:

Chris McLeod, Planning Manager
Jennifer MacDonald, Recording Secretary

Chairperson Brnabic welcomed attendees to the July 18, 2023 Planning Commission meeting. She noted that if anyone would like to speak on an agenda item tonight or during Public Comment for non-agenda items to fill out a comment card, and hand that card to Ms. MacDonald. She noted that all comments and questions would be limited to three minutes per person, and all questions would be answered together after each speaker had the opportunity to speak on the same agenda item.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2023-0377](#) Draft Minutes 07-18-23

Chairperson Brnabic requested typographical corrections to page 11 and page 22.

A motion was made by Hooper, seconded by Neubauer, that this matter be Approved as Amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 9 - Bowyer, Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik and Weaver

COMMUNICATIONS

None.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Seeing no speaker's cards and no one wishing to speak, Chairperson Brnabic closed public comment.

UNFINISHED 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 8/15/23, Revised Plans (partial set) 8/4/23 and Reviewed Plans and Color Elevations 7/25/23, Applicant's letter dated 7-25-23, Applicant HOA meeting invite and address list, Public Hearing Notice, and Draft PC Minutes for 7/18/23 had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

Chairperson Brnabic introduced this item and invited the applicant forward.

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

Mr. McLeod noted that this is a continuation of the review for the conditional use as well as tree removal permit and site plan approval for the Primrose School, just north of Eddington on the east side of Rochester Road. He explained that based on the Planning Commission comments and staff report comments, the applicant has provided revisions. He pointed out that the tree removal permit and site plan approval lies with the Planning Commission and the conditional use request is a recommendation to City Council.

He reviewed the site and surrounding location, noting that the credit union sits to the south, Cedar Valley to the north, and single family residential to both west across Rochester Road and to the east through Eddington. He stated that the site is zoned single family residential with the FB overlay district, and is being developed under the R-4 district and not through the FB district. He stated that the applicant has gone through a number of site plan reviews and at this point has met the site plan requirements. The plan consists of a 13,500 square foot building which is proposed at the southwest corner of the site, with playground and play equipment right behind to the east and a minor playground area to the south side. He explained that area is proposed to be surrounded by vegetative screening in the form of hedge rows along with tree plantings. He pointed out the proposed detention basin and noted that the applicants are seeking for that to be surrounded by a decorative black wrought iron aluminum fence as it is a requirement from the insurance company since there will be children on site.

He explained that the applicants are proposing to continue the road from Eddington to Cedar Valley to the north. He pointed out the additional stormwater facility that's designed for water quality measures, and noted that it is designed to clean and pretreat the water and be the first line of defense in terms of

stormwater entering the stormwater basin. The stormwater basin then connects into a larger city system going to the south and ultimately to the east.

He reviewed the tree removal permit request, noting that 14 regulated trees are proposed to be removed including five specimen trees; 20 replacement trees are being provided, and 16 are being paid into the City's Tree Fund. He reviewed the overall plantings for the site noting that 101 trees are being planted including 80 deciduous and 21 evergreens. He mentioned the landscaping berm at the far east side of the site and noted that it is actually City property. He stated that the City in the past has allowed for the screening mechanism to be provided on that property and will require the appropriate maintenance and planting agreements that can be handled administratively as a part of the project as it moves forward.

He noted that last month the Commission spent a significant amount of time discussing the architecture of the building. He stated that the applicant has heard the Commission's concerns and has come back with a full brick and masonry facade with the exception of the turret or the architectural element at the front of the building. He commented that from Staff's perspective the applicant addressed the comment of providing additional masonry on the building and provided updated renderings.

Mr. McLeod noted that one point of discussion was screening in terms of light trespass leaving the site for those entering and exiting on an east-west direction, and he explained that the applicant has revised the planting schedule in this particular location and the lights should be screened from view. He added that there is a note on the landscape plan that says those plantings can be adjusted on site should additional screening be necessary.

He reviewed the five standards the Planning Commission will ultimately have to review in making their recommendation.

Chairperson Brnabic asked the applicants if they wished to add anything.

Ms. Klein mentioned that there were some additional images provided including some photographs and details on the playground equipment and asked if she could show them to the Commission.

Chairperson Brnabic responded that they were included in the meeting packet.

Ms. Klein stated that they took the Commission's comments and added masonry, keeping a little bit of the original siding detail for the proper contrast with Primrose's logo and to provide consistency between the various locations. She added that after reviewing the headlight trespass along the proposed extension of the private roadway, they provided site profiles and found some weak points where they rearranged trees and brought some spruce trees to be immediately opposite the entrance and exit to the school. She noted that to make sure that they have some low level screening immediately, instead of putting in small shrubs, they have moved up to a six-foot Spartan juniper bush. She stated that between those and the larger conifers they should have a pretty tight screening hedge the day that they are planted. She added that they will be

happy to work with the City and neighborhood if they need to fill in a few more shrubs as needed. She stated that this is a pretty strong revision and she hopes that all the Commission's comments and concerns have been addressed.

Mr. Harris stated that he would like to compliment their engineer, Ms. Klein and PEA Group, and the architects. He commented that they pulled together these modifications very quickly for this evening, and he thanked staff for providing direction. He noted that they did hold the HOA meeting last night, and mentioned that three letters bounced back with one labeled no-such-number, one unable to forward, and one as no mail receptacle.

Chairperson Brnabic asked how many people showed up to the meeting.

Mr. Harris responded that he did not have a sign-in sheet, but approximately 15 people came out of 300 invitations. He explained that there was a mix of happy approvals and a lot of questions. He noted that a lot of the questions were covered during the last Planning Commission meeting, and were about stormwater and traffic.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that she noticed that 251 notices were sent out including 10 different streets and she commended the applicants for reaching out to the entire neighborhood so they were informed and had the option to attend the meeting, ask questions and express concerns.

Mr. Harris commented that he had a couple of young families that expressed an interest in walking to the school. He expressed thanks to HOA President Dr. Lisa Winarski for her help to facilitate the mailing list.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that she was impressed with their efforts in sending out beyond the immediate surrounding homes. She commented that she thinks they did an excellent job addressing the Planning Commission's concerns and the building facade has a much nicer appearance with the brick and stone accent design. She mentioned that the color pictures and illustrations provided of the playground equipment and amenities create a much better big picture of the building and property setup surrounding it, including the site profile for the headlights that could have affected one home. She stated that she did not have a problem with approving the wrought iron fencing for the stormwater detention area as it was stated that it is required by insurance and it is a school for preschool-aged children and serves as an extra safety measure. She noted that the Planning Department recommended adding crown-type molding along the top of the facade and asked if they would have an objection to that.

Mr. Harris commented that if that would be like a cornice he did not think that would be a problem. He stated that he would just have to ask his architect how to do it.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that if Mr. Harris did not have a problem with it, it could just go down on the record that they would move forward with that. She stated that she totally supports what they are doing and is glad that they addressed all of the concerns and questions everyone had.

Ms. Neubauer stated that she thought that the applicants did a really good job taking the Commission's notes, and the fact that they came back in one month was remarkable. She noted that there were some comments last time as to whether more childcare is needed, and she stated that she knows that there are waiting lists for childcare facilities in Rochester Hills. She thanked the applicants for taking their notes and changing the facade and she would have no problem supporting the project with the additional condition that Chairperson Brnabic mentioned.

Mr. Struzik stated that he thinks that they had a pretty solid plan last time with just a few gaps in it; and the applicants have taken the feedback and addressed it and a much better plan is the result. He stated that he appreciated everyone's hard work to do the quick turnaround to be here this evening.

Dr. Bowyer stated that while she was not in attendance last time, she understood that they had a good conversation regarding the look of the building; and it really looks a lot better than what was originally submitted. She thanked the applicants for being willing to work with those homeowners that might be affected by the lights. She noted that there were a couple of emails regarding the retention/detention pond and making sure that the stormwater stays on site, and she pointed out that they have both the bioswale and the detention basin and she feels like that should take care of it. She stated that she does not have any other concerns, but would thank the applicants for continuing to work with staff and the residents.

Mr. Weaver thanked the applicants for having a good dialogue with the Commission last month to get the project to where it is now. He commented that he likes the elevations and how the lights will affect neighboring buildings. He asked if the Spartan juniper was correctly placed under an Adirondack crabapple as the crabapple tends to be lower branching. He suggested they be offset a bit with the crabapples set back a bit and the junipers placed toward the curb. He stated that he supports the fence around the detention basin and he would much rather see it than risk an accident with a child. He noted that he thought the drainage would actually help the neighbors.

Ms. Denstaedt stated that she would echo what everyone is saying and what they have done is impressive. She expressed appreciation for the applicants reaching out to the HOA, and echoed Ms. Neubauer's comments regarding a need for childcare. She stated that she was excited to see this coming as it would help bring people back into the office.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that this item requires a public hearing, opened the public hearing, and began calling those who turned in speaker cards. She noted that an email was received from Lorraine McGoldrick expressing concerns for the drainage in the area.

Dr. Lisa Winarski stated that she liked the plan and it is a good addition to what could possibly go there. She stated that her only concern was drainage as there is already flooding in the wetlands that used to go to four homes and now goes to eight homes. She commented that the City does not seem to want to

do anything and noted that she has put \$3,000 worth of dirt in her backyard to raise the property along with a thousand dollars of sod and raising sprinklers and it still floods. She asked what the City could do to help it not flood more due to an increase in structures.

Chairperson Brnabic asked if Dr. Winarski was commenting on the general increase in development and was not opposed to the this development.

Dr. Winarski responded that she was not opposed; however, every addition to the stormwater makes it worse. She noted that her concerns were to put pressure on the City to do something about it.

John Tenny, 2724 Emmons Ave., stated that he did not see a daycare as a good idea at this time as there are two daycares at John R and Auburn and just into Troy on John R that had to close because there was not enough to keep them open. He pointed out a daycare was just constructed in the Brooklands and one at Tienken and Adams, and wondered what would happen if the daycare fails. He asked about overhead and parking lot lighting. He asked if they were bringing soil in to plant the trees as there is clay there that does not absorb water.

Chairperson Brnabic asked Mr. McLeod to address the landscaping requirements.

Mr. McLeod responded that the site would have some grade changes for plantings, and mentioned that the City requires a two-year maintenance bond. He stated that the trees will typically take within a two-year period, and the City will have assurances that those trees will make it at the two-year point. If they do not make it, the developer will have to replace those trees.

He pointed out that there is a photometric plan included with the site plan that has gone through a number of reviews and iterations and the plan complies with City requirements. He mentioned that the City has a requirement that says during off hours and nighttime hours the lights must turn off other than if they are needed for security purposes.

Seeing no further public comment, Chairperson Brnabic closed the public hearing.

Mr. Hooper stated that the applicants addressed all of the concerns raised at the previous meeting. He noted that as far as any increase in flooding or discharge of stormwater, an agricultural rate exists now and it would not be greater than that. He pointed out that if there is an issue with the ponds, the City's Engineering Department is responsible to check into that and address any concerns. He noted that Mr. McLeod has already addressed concerns regarding warranties for the trees. He stated that there is a demonstrated need for additional daycare facilities in the community, and the City has received correspondence reflective of that in the past.

He moved the motion in the packet for recommending conditional use approval. It was seconded by Ms. Neubauer.

After a roll call vote, Chairperson Brnabic announced that the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Hooper moved the motion in the packet to approve the site plan, adding additional condition number 4 of providing crown moldings on top of the facade as approved by staff, and condition number 5 that the junipers will be offset for the purposes of screening the headlight glare, for the strict purpose of providing enhanced viability of the plantings as approved by staff. That motion was seconded by Ms. Neubauer.

After a voice vote, Chairperson Brnabic announced that the motion for site plan approval passed unanimously.

Mr. Hooper moved the motion in the packet to approve the tree removal permit. That motion was seconded by Ms. Neubauer.

Following a voice vote, Chairperson Brnabic announced that the motion for the tree removal permit passed unanimously. She congratulated the applicants, noting that the project will move on to City Council regarding the conditional use approval.

Mr. McLeod noted that the targeted date for City Council would be August 28. He stated that he would verify this with the applicants tomorrow. He commented that it is shaping up to be a very heavy agenda, so Staff will have to work with the Clerk's Office to ensure that they can get on that agenda.

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

Aye 9 - Bowyer, Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik and Weaver

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. PCU2023-0005 (Primrose School), the Planning Commission recommends to City Council Approval of the Conditional Use to allow a child day care facility on the parcel 70-15-23-301-018 (S. Rochester Road), based on plans received by the Planning Department on July 25, 2023, with the following findings.

Findings

1. The use will promote the intent and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The site has been designed and is proposed to be operated, maintained, and managed so as to be compatible, harmonious, and appropriate in appearance with the existing and planned character of the general vicinity, adjacent uses of land, and the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the use.
3. The proposal will have a positive impact on the community as a whole and the surrounding area by further offering child day care options along with additional job opportunities.
4. The proposed development is served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, water and sewer, drainage

ways, and refuse disposal.

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

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

Conditions

1. City Council approval of the Conditional Use.

2. The use shall remain consistent with the facts and information presented to the City as a part of the applicant’s application and at the public hearing (as may be amended by this motion).

3. That the use obtain, operate and comply with all State licensing and requirements pertinent to child care facilities.

4. If, in the determination of City staff, the intensity of the operation changes or increases, in terms of traffic, queuing, noise, hours, lighting, odor, or other aspects that may cause adverse off-site impact, City staff may require and order the conditional use approval to be remanded to the Planning Commission and City Council as necessary for re-examination of the conditional use approval and conditions for possible revocation, modification or supplementation.

[2023-0322](#)

Request for Site Plan Approval - File No. PSP2023-0009 - to construct a new 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 Hooper, seconded by Neubauer, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 9 - Bowyer, Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik and Weaver

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. PSP2023-0009 (Primrose School), the Planning Commission approves the Site Plan, based on plans received by the Planning Department on July 25, 2023, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions.

Findings

1. The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that all applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as other City Ordinances, standards, and requirements, can be met subject to the conditions noted below.

2. The proposed project will be accessed from the cross connection with Eddington Boulevard and have access to the traffic signal at S. Rochester Road, thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets. In addition, the site will also provide additional cross connections with the development to the north.

3. Off-street parking areas have been designed to avoid common traffic problems and promote customer safety.
4. The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.
5. The proposed development will not have an unreasonably detrimental or injurious effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the site or those of the surrounding area.
6. The location of the stormwater detention basin fencing is appropriate given the proposed use of the site.

Conditions

1. Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, prior to final approval by staff including all comments noted on the site plans and staff reports contained within the Planning Commission packets (as may be amended by this motion).
2. Provide appropriate planting and maintenance agreements for plantings on City property as may be necessary.
3. Provide a landscaping bond in the amount of \$144,147.25 based on the cost estimate for landscaping and irrigation (as adjusted reflecting the updated landscaping plans), plus inspection fees, as further adjusted as necessary by staff prior to temporary grade certification being issued by Engineering.
4. Provide crown moldings on top of the facade as approved by staff.
5. The junipers for the purposes of screening the headlight glare are to be offset to provide enhanced viability of the plantings as approved by staff.

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 Hooper, seconded by Neubauer, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 9 - Bowyer, Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik and Weaver

Resolved, in the matter of File No. PSP2023-0009 (Primrose School) the Planning Commission grants a Tree Removal Permit (PTP2023-0007), based on plans received by the Planning Department on July 25, 2023, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions:

Findings

1. The proposed removal and replacement of regulated trees is in conformance with the

City's Tree Conservation Ordinance.

2. The applicant is proposing to remove 14 regulated trees and 5 specimen trees, and provide 20 replacement trees, and plant an overall total of 101 trees (replacement plus required trees) onsite.

Conditions

1. Tree protective fencing, as reviewed and approved by the City staff, shall be installed prior to temporary grade being issued by Engineering.

2. Provide payment, equal to the current required fee for replacement trees, along with any additional fees associated with such, into the City's Tree Fund for the remaining 16 trees identified on the site plan.

NEW BUSINESS

2023-0373

Public Hearing and Request for Conditional Use Recommendation - File No. PCU2023-0007 - to operate a car wash within the CB Community Business District for the proposed construction of a new Clean Express Car Wash located at 10 E. Auburn Rd., on the south side of Auburn Rd., east of Rochester Rd., Parcel No. 15-35-100-003, zoned CB Community Business District with an FB Flex Business Overlay, Clean Express Auto Wash, LLC, c/o Mannik & Smith Group, Inc., Applicant

(Staff Report dated 8/15/23, Reviewed Plans, Applicant's Letter, Development Application, Environmental Impact Statement, Water Resources Commission letter of 12/21/22 and Public Hearing Notice had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

Present for the applicant were Craig Van Bremen, Express Car Wash Concepts, Kyle Wrentmore, Mannik Smith Group, and counsel for the applicants, John Gaber, Williams, Williams, Rattner and Plunkett PC.

Chairperson Brnabic introduced this item and invited the applicants to introduce themselves. She asked Mr. McLeod to present the staff report.

Mr. McLeod explained that this is a conditional use request along with a request for site plan and tree removal permit approval for the site located on the south side of Auburn just east of Rochester Road, the former Stone Shop. He noted that Community Business is being used as the underlying zoning district, and the FB overlay is not being used for this site. He reviewed the aerial photograph, noting Meijer, and Culver's immediately to the east, the future Bank of America as well as the oil change facility located at the southeast corner of Auburn and Rochester Roads. He mentioned that Commercial Residential Flex 3 is the future land use master plan designation for all of the sites in the surrounding area. He noted that there was a cross connection proposed that is currently in place with Culver's as well as a future cross connection to the oil change facility. He reminded the Commission that this was a discussion that also occurred with Bank of America that ultimately all of these sites would be linked together through cross access. He pointed out that there was a directional entrance to the site, and Traffic has signed off in terms of the overall

entrance coming to and from the site via Auburn. There is also a cross connection to Meijer's parking lot to the south of the site that would almost act as an escape lane, and he mentioned that no one will utilize that because at that point they would have already paid to go through the car wash facility.

He pointed out the vacuum locations, noting that the applicant is providing vacuum locations/parking spaces along the east side of the building as a double usage of the parking spaces, and he commented that this is not uncommon for car wash uses. Regarding tree preservation, he pointed out that most of their tree preservation happens along the west side of the site and the south part of the site, in between the two driveways. He noted that Staff originally raised some concerns regarding the potential of cross traffic in this particular location, and he reviewed on-site potential movements. He commented that if the site becomes heavily trafficked on a Saturday morning or getting ready for a holiday, it could provide conflict. He added that Traffic has signed off, while Planning raised this concern.

He mentioned that the perimeter landscaping requirement has not been met and would require a waiver from the Planning Commission. He noted that they are providing the right-of-way landscaping, and the hedge row as required from the perimeter landscaping, but the additional required trees have not been provided at this point. He stated that the applicant is aware of that and hopefully will address that as a part of their presentation tonight. He explained that there are 23 trees currently on the site, six trees are not regulated due to either being dead or dying, and two regulated trees are proposed to be removed, which are relative to the tree removal permit.

He reviewed the elevations, noting that they are a combination of brick as well as synthetic wood siding on the facade, and a rather slim profile as seen from Auburn Road. The building follows the property and is elongated going deep into the site. He mentioned that Planning Department comments include the need to screen the vacuum units as much as possible. He added that in terms of plan reviews additional fencing might be an option to provide more of a physical barrier to help provide some screening from public view. He reviewed the west and east elevations, noting that there is a mix of glass and brick as well as wood facade.

He reviewed the five standards for consideration for conditional use recommendations.

Mr. Gaber reviewed how they believe that the applicant has met the conditional land use requirements. He thanked Mr. McLeod for working to get them on this agenda and stated that they have some timing constraints. He stated that they believe this proposal promotes the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance as it is both Master Planned and zoned to be commercial in this area, and he noted that the new Community Business zoning allows for car washes at this location. He stated that they believe that the renderings, elevations with the brick and wood facade and windows, and other architectural features are compatible and harmonious with the existing uses and facilities in the area. He noted that there are adequate utilities in the area to service the facility. He mentioned that they provide environmental features that are good for the area and noted that they

recycle most of the water used through the wash, use biodegradable soap, and from a stormwater standpoint they pretreat it with a oil/grease separator or interceptor before it goes into the system. He stated that the use is not detrimental to the surrounding area as this area is designed and used for automotive-related businesses with the oil change to the west, the Bank of America's drive-through and Culver's, which has a busy drive-through. He noted that the right-in and right-out only will limit traffic conflicts on Auburn Road, and the driveway location was put as far east on the site as possible to stay away from the Rochester Road intersection and the entrance to the oil change center. He reviewed the cross access with Culver's and Meijer and in the future with the oil change center if that would change or become developed.

He mentioned Mr. McLeod's comment regarding perimeter landscaping and commented that there really is not any other area on the site where they could provide trees for that purpose, and would be requesting a waiver for nine trees. He stated that they would offer to pay into the tree fund as a condition to approve that benefit.

Mr. Van Bremen queued up a video explaining their company, how they are great neighbors, and partner with local charities for fund raising.

After the video was played, Mr. Van Bremen stated that the video sums up who Express Wash Concepts is, and explained that it was founded in 2009 by John Rauch in Columbus, Ohio. He stated that they expanded to 31 units in Columbus and have continued to grow, and are now in Hampton Roads, Virginia, Cleveland, Ohio, Pittsburgh Pennsylvania, and have now expanded to 90 units. He noted that their expansion has been the result of their site development capabilities and ability to select the right sites and right areas, and their quality operations. He added that they take care of their employees and pay better than average wages and provide career paths. He noted that they are a membership-based business and 70 percent of their customers are members.

He noted that when selecting a site, they look at population, demographics, vehicle counts, and retail traffic. He pointed out that there are 65,000 people within three miles of the site, and 149,000 cars within five miles of the site. He stated that they need about 4,000 members in order for the site to be successful, and mentioned that they impact the community in a great way. He noted that they are environmentally friendly and provide a great service to the community.

Mr. Wrentmore stated that they have gone through a couple of revisions and reviews with staff, and they think they have addressed the majority of the comments to the best of their ability. He noted that the remaining comments will be addressed during their final engineering and final design. He confirmed that the landscaping waiver would be required. He mentioned that they reduced from originally a two-stack lane design to provide more buffer on the west and the east and provide more clearance and additional space for plantings. He added that they are providing a little bit more interior landscaping as well, and worked very closely with the Fire Chief to ensure he was satisfied with ingress and egress lanes. He noted that they are trying to clean up the two or three

outstanding items and would continue to work with staff.

Chairperson Brnabic asked what the membership fee would be.

Mr. Van Bremen responded that it is \$34.99 for the top package per month.

Ms. Neubauer noted that they received a couple of emails regarding the history of the site as the former Stone Shop including one from the Tiffany Dziurman, President of the Rochester-Avon Historical Society; and the emails stated that it would be important to the community to have some kind of commemorative item outside of the development noting the history of the Stone Shop. She asked if this would be something they would consider.

Mr. Van Bremen responded that it would be great if they could work with the Historical Society to figure out the best way to represent that.

Ms. Neubauer suggested that the applicant could get in contact with Ms. Dziurman and work on some way to commemorate the property and its history. She asked if the updated photometric plan was submitted to Planning, and noted that there was a denial for three reasons: no updated photometric plan submitted, a modification of the landscaping as noted on the site plan, and a revised landscape cost estimate including the cost of irrigation.

Mr. Wrentmore responded that they can comply with those at final, noting that a revised landscape estimate was included. He noted that the irrigation plan was not finalized because they were going through the landscape waiver discussions with staff. He stated that they will include that plan.

Ms. Neubauer mentioned the screening for the vacuum system and asked if that was what they were asking for the waiver for, or if it was for the other portion of the site.

Mr. Wrentmore responded that it would be for the additional nine trees on the revised landscape plan for the central vacuum unit. He noted that they did add a couple more shorter hedgerows because that was all the room they had to add. He commented that it was discussed between them regarding putting up a screening wall or moving it to the south.

Ms. Neubauer responded that she has difficulty getting past the fact that these items aren't submitted or included with tonight's information. She commented that while they stated that they are under a time constraint, she is not sure without the full information submitted how to proceed. She stated that she was glad they are willing to work with the Historical Society, but she believes that having those gaps filled would be appropriate before the Commission moves on.

Dr. Bowyer stated that she likes the building and the brick. She asked if they will have hand towel drying or if it would be all automated.

Mr. Van Bremen responded that he hoped their dryer would do the job and there wouldn't be a need for hand drying.

Dr. Bowyer noted that hand drying usually slows them up. She thanked the applicants for agreeing to work with the Historical Society and would hope that they would keep a few of those bricks when they take down the building. She commented that she liked the right-in and right-out. She noted that her biggest problem is that she has never seen a car wash where when they are going in they would cross over outgoing traffic and stated that it would conflict immediately with traffic going out. She suggested that they could flip the site plan so that when pulling in on the right they would go right into the stacking lane. She added that the crossing over could be a problem on busy days for the person exiting because he is now blocked by people stacked up to get in. She noted that car washes are busy in the city and especially with the connectivity to Meijer this will be great.

Mr. Wrentmore responded that their first meeting with staff and their pre-planning meeting was 12-15 months ago and they had a couple of iterations that mirrored the site working with Mr. Depp in Traffic, and accommodating the cross-traffic easements and shared access and potential future development. He stated that it was at the request of Traffic to flip the site to this orientation, and they went through five or six iterations even prior to their initial submittal with Mr. McLeod, and Mr. Depp and had several calls with them. He stated that right now from a traffic standpoint this is the safest and most efficient with the additional signage that they are going to have including stop signs on the west and eastbound traffic and then directional signage for the vacuums and queue lanes for the carwash. He noted that Mr. Van Bremen can speak to staffing up on those busy days to provide directions to folks waiting and coming in and out of the vacuum stalls.

Mr. Van Bremen stated that they were trying to accommodate what Traffic was saying and this is why they ended up with this site plan.

Dr. Bowyer asked if Traffic worries about just what is going on on Auburn Road or whether they were worried about traffic going in and out of Meijer's parking lot. She stated that there is no way that it is right to have cross conflicting traffic at the entrance at Auburn Road and it would cause an accident. She stated that she cannot see where that mirrored image would not be better unless Traffic came and spoke on why it would not be.

Mr. McLeod stated that he did not want to speak for Traffic, but he thought that they were realistically looking more so from the standpoint that ideally the driveway alignment should be pushed as far away from Rochester Road as possible. He noted that Traffic generally looks more toward the outward impact of the site versus the interior impact. He stated that generally what they are looking for is how far the driveways can be separated from the existing driveway at the oil shop and Rochester Road, while not pushing it too close to the driveway at the east. He noted that in doing that, there are some potential internal conflicts that have occurred.

Dr. Bowyer stated that she thinks it would be detrimental to their business to continue with this plan.

Mr. Gaber responded that their thought, as they went through and analyzed it,

was that this issue could be dealt with using internal signage.

Dr. Bowyer stated that this is not going to work and people are just going to come in and go, unless there is a stoplight.

Mr. Gaber stated that there are stop signs on both the east and west, and the north-south traffic has the right of way. He noted that there is a large stacking lane.

Mr. Wrentmore interjected that it was almost 25 cars.

Mr. Gaber stated that there would be signs on both sides that are very clear to indicate where traffic flow is.

Dr. Bowyer asked what would happen if they had those 25 cars and are stacked up almost onto Auburn Road, and that person would now not get out as the cars would be backed up.

Mr. Gaber stated that one of the features of this site that is beneficial is that there is access all over and also cross access with Meijer. He noted that if someone sees that the site is full, it is their believe that they would drive around to Meijer and come in from the south.

Mr. Wrentmore stated that in some of the iterations with Planning and Traffic, they had at one point eliminated the access to the south for a couple of various reasons, but put it back to provide that relief valve for those busy days and provide an escape lane.

Dr. Bowyer stated that she thinks that while having that connectivity to Meijer is great, and even though they say that there will be stop signs, she feels that it will be congested.

Mr. Wrentmore stated that he would disagree, and noted that they were trying to accommodate what the City was recommending.

Dr. Bowyer stated that she would have to have a strong argument from Traffic, but she would rather see the mirrored image and would totally support the mirrored image going forward. She commented that she could not support this right now unless Traffic could come back and tell her something different. She stressed that they have said no to other drive-throughs because of that exact same thing, and commented that if she is not going to approve that for a drive-through for someone, she is not going to approve it for something like this. She stated that she is looking at the safety of the residents and the conflicting traffic coming through in a very small area.

Mr. Struzik asked how the free vacuums work and whether they would be available to anyone regardless of whether or not they are spending money to get a car wash. He stated that he would concur with concerns raised by Mr. Yazbeck and Ms. Dziurman about the historical nature of the site and would hope that when they do get to the point of approving this they could include a condition possibly to create a historical marker and maintain it. He added that

he would hope that they could make available the materials to the Historical Society if they wanted to preserve some of those materials on the site. He noted that the history of the Stone Shop is very interesting.

He explained that he lives 700 feet from Mr. T's Auto Wash and stated that while it is not loud, he hears the drying equipment. He asked if their equipment was any different. He noted that it was indicated that it was all self-contained and insulated, and asked if it was any different than a normal car wash. He pointed out that at this site, the closest house is about 800 feet away on the other side of Rochester Road, and Rochester Road is noisy, so he would be pretty surprised if the closest house could hear the dryer kick on unless it were being run in the middle of the night. He stated that while the current site may have some historical significance, it is an eyesore that is getting worse each day, things are overgrown, and the building has broken windows. He commented that he likes the idea of redeveloping the site into something different.

He added that he likes the right-in and right-out and thinks it is the best and only choice for the site. He stated that he shared Dr. Bowyer's concern about the potential for conflict and safety concerns for the site, but the major concern he sees is that once the site locks up it will be difficult to convince an otherwise paying customer to leave and go around the other way. He commented that he does not like the idea of creating a potential to reduce Auburn Road to one lane causing backups onto Rochester Road. He concurred with Dr. Bowyer's perspective that flipping the site may make more sense and it may warrant a further discussion with the City's Traffic staff to see why they felt differently. He added that he felt this would become a major entrance and exit for Culver's and will create a potential for lockup within the Culver's site. He commented that he liked the way the building looks and thinks it compliments the other businesses nearby.

Mr. Gallina stated that he was impressed with the company and their organization, and loves the sustainability of it and reuse of water and use of biodegradable soaps. He commented that the design looks great, and mentioned that he has had the opportunity to frequent a number of newer build car washes in Macomb County and they are designed similarly. He stated that the biggest thing for him is the traffic and commented that he agrees with Dr. Bowyer. He asked if there was any way to flip the site and stated it would be optimal. He expressed concern that whether it was flipped or not, it might cause backups that would cross over to Culver's. He asked if someone were coming in the back entrance whether there would be room for the vehicle to merge.

Mr. Van Bremen responded that their sites are always staffed with at least two people, and usually three during busy times. He stated that most of the time it would be okay and they are not running stacks out to the car. He noted that when they are busy staff is supposed to be at the kiosk 100 percent of the time to manage traffic flow.

Mr. Dettloff stated that he thinks it is a good proposed use for the site, but definitely agrees with his colleagues about their concerns the way the plans exist now. He stated that he would support it if these issues were addressed.

He asked if they have any other facilities in the metro Detroit area.

Mr. Van Bremen responded that this is one of the first in Metro Detroit, and explained that they are working through 10 sites that are in various phases of approvals in the area. He noted that they invest heavily in the markets they are going into and want to be a permanent fixture for that unlimited pass they have to allow customers to use it all around their metro area.

Mr. Dettloff asked if it would be similar to their competitor just north on Rochester Road in that it would be a tiered membership where different packages will cost different amounts.

Mr. Van Bremen confirmed it would, and then noted that they could always be a retail customer instead and buy one wash as well.

Mr. Dettloff asked how many kiosks would be on site and if it would be full service.

Mr. Van Bremen responded that there would be two kiosks and is not full service. He noted that there is an RFID reader and if they are a member the gate automatically pops up, and that is how they can process so many cars so quickly.

Mr. Dettloff stated that he cannot tell how many people he sees using the competitor's vacuums and then pulling back out and he commented that he could not see a way to prevent that. He asked if they had an option on the parcel or owned it, and how many jobs they would create.

Mr. Van Bremen responded that they will have an interest in the property. With respect to jobs, he stated that this particular site will have probably between eight and 12 employees and salaries range from an assistant store manager making around \$45,000 and tier up from there. He stated that the site manager will probably make between \$70,000 to \$75,000. He noted that there would be a lot of hourly staff to support them. He mentioned that as they start to build more units in the market, they will have an area manager on top, running three or four stores each.

Mr. Dettloff thanked the applicants for having an interest in Rochester Hills. He stated that he knows Ms. Dziurman well and she is great to work with, and he is happy to hear that they will consider doing something from a historical standpoint.

Mr. Van Bremen confirmed that they will try to figure out something creative beyond just signage, and might be able to integrate it as a part of their building.

Mr. Weaver stated that he agrees that it is a great location and is adjacent to another auto-only business, and it is great to hear that they are shaking up the playing field. He stated that he was curious about a price point because he knows the car wash about 300 yards away is \$10 a wash for the low one. He concurred with Dr. Bowyer about crossing over and while he understands that they will have internal signage, if it becomes complicated, their competitor is 300

yards up the road with a very easy in and easy out. He pointed out that Jax does have two stacking lanes and backs out onto Rochester Road, and he has been frustrated many times maneuvering round there. He stated that he would support flipping the site over and thinks the Commission needs to have a conversation with Traffic as to what is more important, potential traffic issues down the roadway or shared access across these sites. He asked for confirmation of their price points, stating that Jax's may change based on location but is \$9, \$10 or \$12.

He noted that he supports their willingness to look at historical questions, and would not support taking stone from the existing building as it does not look great and looks like it is concrete. He suggested perhaps doing something similar in style to their rendering and noting that they showed a gray brick on the bottom and could perhaps become a stacked stone look that is on the face of the building to pay homage to the existing site.

Mr. Weaver stated that he did not have any issue with their contributing to the Tree Fund rather than jamming nine more trees onto the site, and commented that he has been asked to jam more trees onto a site before and ended up having to replace all of them as well as others because trees need room to grow and if they are packed in too tightly, they don't. He commented that he would rather see the money go somewhere else in the community via the Tree Fund rather than cramming it onto this site.

Mr. Van Bremen responded that the lowest membership is \$20, the middle of the road is \$30, and the second highest is \$36. He noted that they just added ceramic, which is a different product, so their top tier is now \$40.

Mr. Weaver asked what it would be for a non-member.

Mr. Van Bremen responded it would be \$22 for the very top with the ceramic wash and then \$18, \$12, and \$7.

Ms. Denstaedt stated that she would echo everyone's sentiments regarding concerns with the backup and stacking. She stated that their competitors to the north have backed up onto Rochester Road many times, and also back up the left turn lane. She asked how long the car wash would take for a car to go through and how many cars per hour.

Mr. Van Bremen responded it would be approximately three minutes, and they typically run about 120 cars per hour.

Ms. Denstaedt expressed concerns regarding backup from the entrance from Meijer and noted that she did not know how to merge those cars in and not get those waiting in line upset. She stated that some changes need to be made for those types of situations and that the flip should be considered.

Ms. Neubauer noted that one of the benefits that the applicants have is that Mr. Gaber is a former Planning Commissioner who knows how to request a special meeting, which a lot of the Commissioners would be willing to do since they want to accommodate whatever time restraints the applicants are under. She

stressed that it would be important for Traffic to be here and with what is missing from the Planning Department's review that they have requested to be submitted, the Commission would then have a full and complete picture of what they are proposing. She added that they could speak to the Historical Society and perhaps have a rendering of whatever they would be doing to commemorate the history. She stated that speaking for herself, she would be willing to come back on a special date to accommodate what they need to have done within their time constraints. She noted that the building or the business is not the issue and she would love to have them. She commented that she appreciates their candor.

Mr. Struzik commented that before everything was a subscription, people would just get a car wash here and there and pay for it out of pocket. He stated that if someone was heading up John R and saw that Mr. T's was backing up to John R, they might continue on home instead. But if they had already paid for that car wash they would queue up because they want to get their money's worth. He pointed out that they said that 70 percent of their business is subscription-based, so that would lead to an increased likelihood of people having a willingness to queue up, and it generates a bit more concern.

He stated that as they indicated that the backside or south side would also insert cars into the queue, he would quickly recognize that it would be probably the shorter line and would go there. He commented that this would work great if Culver's weren't there, and noted that the Culver's already queues up onto that road and will be competing for space on the private road through the Meijer lot.

Mr. Weaver noted that he forgot to mention that comments from Planning regarding plant height and spacing had not been addressed and he wanted it on record that he would like to see those comments addressed.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that a conditional use request requires a public hearing, and although she knows that they are moving forward to postponement, because the hearing was advertised and a few people wanted to speak, she would open the public hearing. She noted that Mr. Yazbeck had sent an email but was here to speak.

Thomas Yazbeck, 1707 Devonwood Drive, stated that while he does not have any special connection to the site, he is concerned about the historical items and is so glad to hear that they are willing to work on that. He stated that he would echo the Commissioners' comments about the amount of queuing being concerning. He noted that there are not just car users in the area but would be public transit coming in the future as well. He added that it is walking distance to some residential sites and he would not like to see the site as a drive-through.

John Tenny, 2724 Emmons Ave., asked why it has to be rezoned, noting that Jax is one-quarter mile north, and Mr. T's is one mile to the east. He expressed concern that it was being shoehorned into this location and commented that his wife has a hard time getting their truck into Mr. T's.

Chairperson Brnabic responded that the property is not being rezoned and because of the drive-through status it is considered a conditional use and

requires it to come before the Planning Commission and City Council. Seeing no more individuals wishing to speak she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Neubauer asked if Mr. Gaber would like to request a postponement.

Mr. Gaber responded that he thought they need a postponement to be able to button up these issues and look at the suggestion of reversing the building. He commented that unfortunately that is something that will require a lot of engineering and they would not be able to just flip it and change everything so it may take time. He mentioned that they try to have benefits to the city of access points and cross access. From a conceptual standpoint it makes a lot of sense and generally works. He stated that sometimes the benefits and costs have to be balanced and maybe for a site like this it does not make sense for cross access from the west. He commented that whatever goes here is close to Auburn Road and may have conflict points and you may be able to deal with them in different ways. He stated that he is suggesting that trying to satisfy all of the objectives of the City may not always be in the ultimate best interest of the layout of the site and the way it operates. He asked if the City would consider making any adjustments based on those types of concerns given its policy.

Ms. Neubauer stated that with the postponement request, this would be something to discuss with the City because ultimately the whole reason for the request for cross access or limiting cross access is safety. She stated that this is something to discuss with Engineering, and when they come back Traffic should be here so that they can get a more comprehensive idea. She made a motion to postpone all three items. The motion was seconded by Mr. Struzik.

After calling for a voice vote, Chairperson Brnabic stated that the motion passed unanimously. She stated that they look forward to the applicants coming back addressing the concerns and the layout.

Mr. Gaber thanked the Commission for the offer of the Special Meeting.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that after Mr. Tenny spoke she should have addressed his comment regarding the drive-through. She explained that it is a conditional use to permit a car wash in certain locations, which must be reviewed and recommended for approval by Planning and then move on to City Council.

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

Aye 9 - Bowyer, Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik and Weaver

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby postpones the request for Conditional Use Recommendation to allow the applicant to address Planning Commission comments and concerns including site layout.

[2023-0374](#)

Request for Site Plan Approval - File No. PSP2022-0032 - to construct an approximately 3,677 sq. ft. car wash building with associated exterior cleaning stations for Clean Express Car Wash, located at 10 E. Auburn Rd., on the

south side of Auburn Rd., east of Rochester Rd., zoned CB Community Business District with an FB Flex Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-35-100-003, Clean Express Auto Wash, LLC, c/o Mannik & Smith Group, Inc., Applicant

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

Aye 9 - Bowyer, Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik and Weaver

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby postpones the request for Site Plan Approval to allow the applicant to address Planning Commission comments and concerns including site layout.

2023-0375

Request for Tree Removal Permit Approval - File No. PTP2023-0009 - to remove two (2) regulated trees and to provide two (2) replacement trees with a total of 21 trees to be provided for Clean Express Car Wash located at 10 E. Auburn Rd., on the south side of Auburn Rd., east of Rochester Rd., Parcel No. 15-35-100-003, zoned CB Community Business District with an FB Flex Business Overlay, Clean Express Auto Wash, LLC, c/o Mannik & Smith Group, Inc., Applicant

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

Aye 9 - Bowyer, Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik and Weaver

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby postpones the request for Tree Removal Permit Approval to allow the applicant to address Planning Commission comments and concerns including site layout.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. McLeod noted that Staff is working on a potential draft for the keeping of chickens, but it was not ready for tonight's meeting. He commented that depending on the schedule for next month, it might be presented for September.

NEXT MEETING DATE

- September 19, 2023

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission and upon motion by Neubauer, seconded by Denstaedt, Chairperson Brnabic adjourned the Regular Meeting at 8:43 p.m.

*Deborah Brnabic, Chairperson
 Rochester Hills Planning Commission*

Marvie Neubauer, Secretary

