



Rochester Hills

Minutes - Draft

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: Gerard Dettloff, John Gaber, Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Stephanie Morita,
David A. Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Ryan Schultz

Monday, October 28, 2019

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Deborah Brnabic called the Special Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Auditorium.

ROLL CALL

Present 6 - Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis, David Reece and C. Neall Schroeder

Excused 3 - Stephanie Morita, Ryan Schultz and John Gaber

Quorum present.

Also present: Sara Roediger, Director of Planning & Economic Dev.
Kristen Kapelanski, Planning Manager
John Staran, City Attorney
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

COMMUNICATIONS

There were no Communications presented.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairperson Brnabic opened Public Comment at 7:03 p.m. Seeing no one come forward, she closed Public Comment.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2019-0447 Request for Recommendation of the Third Amendment to the PUD Agreement - City File No. 98-047.5 - City Apartments Garageports, to replace approved carports with garageports, located near the southeast corner of Rochester and Tienken at City Walk, zoned B-2 General Business with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay and governed by a PUD, Parcel No. 15-11-103-012, Designhaus Architecture, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated October 28, 2019, Amended PUD Agreement and site plans and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Francesca Schovers, Designhaus Architecture, 301 Walnut Blvd., Rochester, MI 48307 and Dominic Moran, Aragona Properties, 37020 Garfield Rd., Suite T-1, Clinton Township, MI 48036.

Ms. Kapelanski recapped that the items had been postponed at the last meeting, where the Planning Commission had provided comments for the applicants to consider. She advised that City Apartments were under construction, which had been approved with carports. The applicants were now requesting to build garageports instead, which would generally be in the same location with one slight adjustment. She noted that additional plantings had been shown, a colored landscape plan had been provided delineating deciduous and coniferous trees, and that materials and colors had been revised. There was added language in the Hold Harmless Agreement (HHA) as requested. Some Commissioners had storm water concerns, and a cross section had been prepared to illustrate the topography at the back.

Ms. Schovers agreed that they had made the changes recommended. She talked about the location of the originally approved carports and showed the changes on the east and south property lines. She discussed the easements for sanitary and water main and the limitations they proposed in the area of the garageports. They had discussed masonry versus metal at the last meeting. She maintained that masonry was not an option due to the existing easements and landscape buffers. They had provided more information about the buffers. She advised that they had gotten in touch with a neighbor on Courtland who allowed them to take pictures from her property, which had a fence. Ms. Schovers pointed out that the evergreens were on the City Walk side. She showed slides with views from the neighbors to the east and what they could see. She said that it was very well screened, and the landscape buffer did what it was supposed. She showed the view from the school side, and said that the buffer could not be seen through. She talked about the berm, which was not at a consistent height, and the minimum was three feet wide, which was the worst-case scenario on the east property line. The elevation ranged a bit from the residences to the parking lot grade. The berm came up almost half way on the garageports and ranged from three to six feet along the east property line. They took a couple of aeriels to show the difference between the types of trees, and she maintained that the majority were large evergreen trees. She added that they would not be utilizing the neighbors' evergreens for screening.

Ms. Schovers next showed the revamped garageports. She agreed that the materials had been changed as suggested by the Commission. They added a banding at the top that was more of a galvanized metal, and that same metal was on the building, so it would tie everything together. She showed a material chip of the darker color, which was a bronze to match the existing garages and parts of the brick on the building. They added evergreen screening on the side of the garageports. They bumped the "columns" out a little to give them more dimension. She showed a picture of a typical garageport on a different site. There had been a question about whether people could store things in a garageport, but the picture showed that only a car could be stored. She claimed that they functioned great at the other location. There would be a light in the garage door opener. She recapped that they added plantings on the north side of the east garageports; they included the colored landscape plan that showed the additional trees being proposed; they revised the HHA, and all appropriate parties had approved the Agreement; materials on the garageports had been adjusted to provide a more in-depth, visual interest and to mimic the building style and materials; a gutter system had been added to the rear side of each garageport as a preventative measure for storm water drainage; they provided a view from the adjacent properties showing that full landscape screening coverage was still there; and Aragona properties attempted to speak to all the adjacent property owners, but only one was home the several times they tried. They believed that the garageport system and design was an extra measure of buffer between City Apartments and the residents. It would completely screen headlights from the vehicles on the east and south property lines, greatly reduce any noise, and it would work with the existing landscape buffer to provide privacy for the adjacent residents. She said that she would be happy to discuss anything further.

Mr. Kaltsounis indicated that with the job the Commissioners had when it came to changes, such as the proposed, they had to be very careful. He mentioned the precedent rule with regards to the first proposal, and that the next day, someone else could show up with the same type of design. He stated that the changes definitely made it more appealing. He had also considered the locations of the garages being in the back, and a lot of it would be obscured. He thanked them for the work they had done with the screening, and he indicated that the garageports were a big improvement over what was first shown. They did not look like a 40-foot container any longer. He move the following motion.

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Dettloff, in the matter of City File

No. 98-047.5 (City Apartments Garageports PUD), the Planning Commission **recommends** that City Council **approves** the Third Amendment to the PUD Agreement, dated received July 3, 2019, with the following five (5) findings.

Findings

1. The proposed amended PUD agreement is consistent with the proposed intent and criteria of the PUD option.
2. The proposed amended PUD agreement is consistent with the approved Final PUD plan.
3. The amended PUD agreement will not create an unacceptable impact on public utility and circulation systems, surrounding properties, or the environment.
4. The proposed amended PUD agreement promotes the goals and objectives of the Master Plan as they relate to providing varied housing for the residents of the City.
5. The proposed agreement provides for an appropriate transition between the subject site and existing land uses to the east and south of the property.

Mr. Hooper recalled that the last time the applicants were before them, he had supported the project. They had obviously made some changes, and it was an improvement, and it was even better than before. He felt that it would be a very good amenity for the project, and he knew that garageports were popular. He presumed that they would allow the owner to increase the rents.

Chairperson Brnabic also thought that they did a good job with the alterations and with how they presented the visuals for the added landscaping. She felt that all the Commissioners' concerns had been addressed adequately and thoroughly.

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Dettloff, that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting. The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

2019-0448

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 98-047.5 - City Apartments Garageports, to replace approved carports with garageports, located near the southeast corner of Rochester and Tienken at City Walk, zoned B-2 General

Business with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay and governed by a PUD, Parcel No. 15-11-103-012, Designhaus Architecture, Applicant

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Dettloff, in the matter of City File No. 98-047.5 (City Apartments Garageports PUD), the Planning Commission **recommends** that City Council **approves** the **Site Plans**, dated received October 24, 2019 by the Planning and Development Department, with the following five (5) findings and subject to the following three (3) 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 location and design of driveways providing vehicular ingress to and egress from the site will promote safety and convenience of both vehicular and pedestrian traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets.*
3. *There will be a satisfactory and harmonious relationship between the development on the site and the existing and prospective development of contiguous land and adjacent neighborhoods.*
4. *The proposed development does not have an unreasonably detrimental, nor an injurious, effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the parcels being developed and the larger area of which the parcels are a part.*
5. *The proposed PUD plan promotes the goals and objectives of the Master Plan by offering a variety of housing.*

Conditions

1. *City Council approval of the Third Amendment to the PUD Agreement.*
2. *Hold Harmless Agreement to be signed by the Mayor and applicant and recorded at Oakland County.*
3. *Address all applicable comments from city departments and outside agency review letters, prior to final approval by staff.*

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Dettloff, that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting. The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

After each motion, Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously. Mr. Hooper thanked the applicants for their patience.

2019-0413 Request for Recommendation of an Ordinance to amend Chapter 138 Zoning of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Rochester Hills to replace the C-I Commercial Improvement District with the BD Brooklands District with review of accompanying changes to the Sign Ordinance.

2019-0414 Request for Recommendation of an Ordinance to rezone various parcels on Auburn Rd. from Culbertson to Dequindre from CI Commercial Improvement District and/or B-5 Automotive Service Business and/or B-2 General Business District with a FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay to a new district: BD Brooklands District

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

NEXT MEETING DATE

Chairperson Brnabic reminded the Commissioners that the next Regular Meeting was scheduled for November 19, 2019.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission and upon motion by Mr. Kaltsounis, seconded by Mr. Reece, Chairperson Brnabic adjourned the Special Meeting at 8:24 p.m.

Deborah Brnabic, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission