

*the storm sewer system. They felt that making sure the salt piles did not go into the storm sewers was something they could control, and it initiated the project. They encouraged indoor storage, but the three-sided storage they had was not good enough, and that was why they had to tarp the piles. Mr. Schroeder asked about the gas pumps. Mr. Davis noted that they were in the fuel island, and they were still used.*

*Mr. Reece remarked that they got the award for the ugliest building of 2012, but he said it was what it was - a salt storage building. He asked the color of the split-face masonry material and siding on the building. Mr. Hoppe said that it would match the existing DPS building. Mr. Reece asked if the doors would be white to match the existing, which was confirmed. Mr. Reece said that relative to the landscaping, he felt it made sense to eliminate the green island and move the trees outside the fence line so there was not a maintenance issue in a highly industrialized space. He thought it would be hard to maintain anything in the island.*

*Chairperson Boswell agreed they should put the trees on the berm given what they were proposing. He reminded that if another applicant came forward with a project, they would make them do something with trees.*

*Mr. Hooper agreed with the comments, and relative to the trees, he maintained that the money should come from the Tree Fund. For the 525-foot area from the west property line to the entrance, he suggested planting about 30, 10 to 12-foot tall evergreen trees staggered 20-feet on center as directed by the Forestry Manager, to provide screening and buffering from the south face of the existing DPS building. He emphasized that those trees would eventually grow and provide adequate screening.*

*Chairperson Boswell asked if anyone disagreed with Mr. Hooper or if there were any other comments. Hearing none, he noted that nothing would be voted on tonight, so the project should be brought back. Mr. Davis confirmed the date of the next meeting, which was eventually scheduled for December 11. He said they could put a hold on the bids to delay the start, and Mr. Reece advised that they could hold the price for 90 days and still have plenty of time to construct.*

**Discussed**

- 2000-0314** Request for Revised Site Plan Approval - City File No. 99-032.2 - Parking lot addition (75 spaces) and restriping at the office building at 633 E. South Boulevard, located on the north side of South Boulevard, west of John R,

zoned O-1, Office Business, Parcel No. 15-35-477-002, Joseph Novitsky, Applicant

*(Reference: Staff Report prepared by James Breuckman, dated October 19, 2012 and Site Plans, prepared by Joseph Novitsky Architecture had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)*

*Present for the applicant were owner Vince Crispignani, 42512 Hayes Rd., Suite 700, Clinton Township, MI 48038 and Joseph Novitsky, Joseph Novitsky Architecture, 1755 Royal Ave., Berkley, MI 48072.*

*Chairperson Boswell mentioned that before they started, he had a couple of items that he was a little bothered by. He spent an hour or hour-and-a-half going over the site trying to figure things out, and it finally dawned on him. There were three drawings in the packet. On the first drawing, several of the light poles were in the wrong position. They looked to actually be six or eight feet from where they were shown on the drawings. Ordinarily, that probably would not bother him that much, except for the problem with the detention pond and the elevations. Also, of the three drawings, the first and the second were labeled S-1. He acknowledged that they were probably minor things, but it made him wonder if there were major things he was not catching.*

*Mr. Novitsky stated that it had been a year-long experience, and it was an interim process to help Mr. Crispignani get 300 employees situated in Rochester Hills. They had a building that would adequately house his employees, but it was radically underparked. They had been working very carefully with Staff to try and accomplish more parking, and the journey had led to a major MDEQ decision, revisions to drawings and additional drawings that had to be put together very quickly in order to meet the requirements of the multitudes of jurisdictions they had to accommodate. He said that he appreciated Chairperson Boswell's comments. They were not going to put in any new lights on this phase. Chairperson Boswell clarified that they were existing lights. Mr. Novitsky explained that they were not touching the existing lights, and they were only adding one as recommended by Staff. He agreed that he did not spend a lot of time checking to see if the surveyors and engineers had ultimately identified the lights accurately, because they were not "messing" with them at all. He was much more concerned about the hard and soft surfacing and the delineation of what were considered wetlands, floodplains and setbacks and the relative elevations as they were changing throughout the County and State jurisdictions. He remarked that it was like chasing a herd of cats, and it had been quite a journey for the last year. They were present for a temporary gesture to get Mr.*

*Crispignani's employees installed, and they would petition the State to actually adequately handle their request. He asked the Commissioners to please bear with them; they would make sure that before they were done, the documents would be well pressed.*

*Chairperson Boswell noted that he was on the Commission 12 years ago, and he remembered the property well, and he understood Mr. Novitsky's frustration. He stated that it was frustrating 12 years ago, and was just as frustrating today, especially dealing with bureaucracies. He said that he was nothing, if not a capitalist, and he loved the idea of more jobs coming into town. He did not want to stand in the way of that, but it bothered him that there were some mistakes on the drawings. If he was looking at drawings and had to make decisions based on some that had mistakes, he just wanted to make sure there were not other mistakes he was missing. However, he saw no reason not to proceed, and reiterated that he was well aware of the property.*

*Chairperson Boswell asked Mr. Breuckman if he had anything to add, and Mr. Breuckman said that he wanted to let the applicant describe what the proposal was and the journey they had been through with the wetland delineation.*

*Mr. Novitsky showed the proposed drawing, and advised that they wanted to accommodate 300 employees' cars for a call center. They hired the best wetlands expert they could, Brooks Williamson. Mr. Novitsky stated that he was a delight to work with, and he had a wealth of knowledge he respected. He had asked Mr. Williamson if it was something they could achieve, and Mr. Williamson told him that they certainly could. He visited the site, and said it was achievable, but he told Mr. Novitsky that he would not believe the process. They talked with the Planning Department Staff, whom Mr. Novitsky said had been fabulous to work with. They discussed the wetlands, and it seemed like there were a lot of people who had a say about the property, except the landowner. The Planning Department said that they had some latitude, by Ordinance, regarding the setback. There could be relief from the 25-foot wetland buffer setback. They were told they could make smaller parking spaces (restripe). They would just touch the 25-foot setback at the very north and middle portions. On the east side, there was a detention pond to collect the water from the site. When it ultimately filled during a heavy rain, the water spilled into a pipe and into the creek. It was a very effective settling pond. The water could not just spill into the creek until it got to the height of the stack. By that time, it would be measurably deep, and the siltation pond would be a wonderful mechanism to protect the runoff from the site. They surveyed the site to*

determine exactly how and what would be built relative to what was permitted. The space to the east was outside any restricted area in terms of its responsibility and/or elevation. It was simply flat land that had to be mowed. They needed it, and they could put 22 cars there without moving any lightpoles. They would just move the dumpster. On the south side, if they pushed into the 25-foot setback for a little bit, they could get an additional 30+ cars, and with the inclusion of the pocket at the north, they could get an additional 75 cars. They would be pushing into a reasonable proximity to where they could move the three locations Mr. Crispignani was running and consolidate them in Rochester Hills into one facility. They were still 40 spaces short. They needed to go back to the State and ask them to go through the entire process all over again. They would be displacing a circle of about 12 feet of wetland. He could not really tell where it was. The State knew, but he did not. He saw woodlands, not cattails and what he would perceive as wetland. The State had asked them to connect the lower area, which he showed with hatch marks on the plan, and the microspot in the middle of the area they were trying to redo. The entire south edge would be used for mitigation purposes, and they were giving ten to one in perpetuity. That would give the building the amount of parking it needed to perform to its intended capacity and would give Mr. Crispignani a chance to move in 300 employees and consolidate his business. Mr. Novitsky said that they would like the Commission's help to see what they could accomplish before the weather turned. He noted that a Building Permit had been issued some time ago, and they were in desperate need of parking spaces.

Ms. Brnabic said that she also visited the site, and she estimated the current parking to be about 125. She asked for the actual number. Mr. Novitsky said that there were 155 spaces. Ms. Brnabic said that she had counted about 125. Mr. Novitsky said that could be true; they increased the number by inherently restriping them, so he agreed that Ms. Brnabic might be right. Ms. Brnabic clarified that they would be creating additional spaces that did not interfere with the wetlands, but she questioned how they could get 300 by what she saw, understanding that they would restripe.

Mr. Hetrick asked if they would move people into the building with phase one of the parking lot or if they would have to wait until phase two was done. Mr. Crispignani said that they planned to bring in 125-150 employees as soon as they got occupancy, which they were in the process of going through currently. Mr. Hetrick said that there was some information about tree removal in the report, and he wondered if they had

*talked with Staff about trees being removed to an existing woodland and about tree credits and so forth, and whether the applicants had agreed to it. Mr. Novitsky confirmed that they had.*

*Mr. Yukon asked if he could assume it was a 24-hour call center. Mr. Crispignani said that it would not be. They were in the health care sphere, and they handled the Blues nationally. Their clients were in Michigan, New Jersey and Minnesota with Blue Cross and Blue Shield. They were currently in contract negotiations with operations in Montana, Illinois, Massachusetts and Florida, and that was why they were trying to get as much parking as they could. The operation would be from 8:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m. If they had some west coast work, they might be there until 9:00 p.m. Mr. Yukon suggested that if they had a 24-hour call center, they could rotate the employees. Mr. Crispignani said that everything was inbound; they handled the Federal and State Employee Program for New Jersey, for example. If people had a question about their Blues plan, they would call one of the Michigan call centers. Mr. Yukon asked if a call came at 6:00 p.m. if it would be routed to another location. Mr. Crispignani said that it would basically be done at 6:00 p.m. The Blues were only open until 5:00 p.m., and they were open until 6:00 p.m. for Minnesota.*

*Mr. Schroeder said that he sympathized with their plight. He noted that he had worked with Mr. Williamson for many years when he started out, and he was a very good person. Mr. Schroeder said that he did not see a problem with mitigating. He appreciated that they were coming to Rochester Hills, and he said that he would like to see what they could do to help them. Mr. Crispignani said that the intent was not just to bring the employees, but to make this location the corporate headquarters. The company did have facilities outside of the State, but they were trying to expand as much as they could within the State. The way things looked with the negotiations, the building would be full quickly, and they might be looking for other locations. HIPPA laws prevented their work from going overseas.*

*Mr. Schroeder asked if there were any plans to expand the building. Mr. Novitsky said they would not be able to get enough parking. Hearing no further comments, Mr. Schroeder moved the following motion, seconded by Mr. Hetrick:*

***MOTION*** by Schroeder, seconded by Hetrick, in the matter of City File No. 99-032.2 (633 E. South Boulevard Parking Lot), the Planning Commission **approves the Revised Site Plan** based on plans dated

received by the Planning Department on October 11, 2012, with the following five (5) findings and subject to the following five (5) conditions.

Findings

1. *The revised site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that all applicable requirements the Zoning Ordinance, as well as other City ordinances, standards, and requirements, can be met subject to the conditions noted below.*
2. *The proposed parking areas will be accessed by required aisle way widths, thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic within the site.*
3. *The proposed landscaping and tree replacements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.*
4. *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.*
5. *The additional parking will serve the tenants of the building.*

Conditions

1. *Revision to the plans to address DPS/Engineering comments in a manner which does not increase the developed area of the site beyond what is shown on the plans dated 10-10-12. Any increase in the area of development will require Planning Commission approval at a future meeting.*
2. *Addition of 4 trees proximate to the parking area to meet the interior parking lot landscaping requirements for the new pavement area, and revision to the proposed tree plantings to provide for a one-to-one replacement of trees to be removed (min. 2" caliper replacement trees).*
3. *Revision to the landscape cost estimate shown on the plans to account for the revised replacement and landscape tree planting list.*
4. *Provision of a bond for tree replacement based on the revised landscape cost estimate prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
5. *City inspection and approval of replacement tree locations and tree protection fencing prior to any tree removal or land balancing occurring on-site.*

**Approved**

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

**Absent** 1 - Kaltsounis