

NEW BUSINESS

2017-0363 Public Hearing and request for Conditional Use Recommendation - City File No. 17-018 - Premier Academy, a proposed 15,078 square-foot childcare center on 1.6 acres at the southeast corner of Adams and Tienken Rds., zoned R-1 One Family Residential, Parcel Nos. 15-08-100-021 and -022, Paul Dunn, JS Capitol Group, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski dated August 25, 2016 and site plan and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Jeff Schmitz and Paul Dunn, JS Capitol Group, 155 Romeo Rd., Rochester, MI 48307; Angela Elliott, Director Premier Academy, Oakland Township; and Jeff Klatt, Krieger Klatt Architects, 1412 E. 11 Mile Rd., Royal Oak, MI 48067.

Ms. Roediger began with an explanation of general planning policies. She clarified that the request was not for a proposed Rezoning. The property was planned and zoned for residential uses. In residentially-zoned districts, there were compatible, related uses permitted by right, and the Commission had an obligation to approve if all requirements were met. Those uses included agricultural, municipal buildings, schools, libraries and museums, stables and parks. In addition, there were Conditional Uses, which involved a discretionary recommendation by the Planning Commission to the City Council. If warranted, conditions might be added related to the size, hours of operation, etc. The subject request was three-fold. First was the recommendation for the Conditional Use to City Council, and second was a request for a Tree Removal Permit to remove and replace up to 12 trees on site or pay into the City's Tree Fund. She maintained that the City prided itself on preservation of natural features. The third request was for Site Plan Approval. They would hear from Ms. Kapelanski, who would talk about elements of the Site Plan requirements and Mr. Davis, Deputy Director of DPS/Engineering, who would comment on traffic concerns that had been raised. Originally, the Tree Removal Permit notice referenced the project as a private school, however, looking at the plan further, it was determined to be similar to a daycare center, and it was re-noticed as such with a new meeting date. The Conditional Use request was noticed in the Oakland Press 15 days prior and to all surrounding properties within 300 feet, which was the State requirement for public notice. She noted that there had been a lot of questions about retail and rezoning, and she wanted to explain further.

Ms. Kapelanski stated that as mentioned, the request was for a Conditional Use Recommendation, Site Plan Approval and a request for a Tree Removal Permit for the removal and replacement of 12 trees to be replaced on site. She outlined that the site was located on 1.6 acres at the southeast corner of Adams and Tienken and zoned R-1 One Family Residential. The proposal was for a daycare center for 162 students. There would be access off of Tienken only. The access shown off of Adams was specifically for emergency and fire, and it would be gated. The applicant had provided the required stacking space for the center. They were asking for a modification from the parking requirements. 38 spaces were required for a center of its size, and they were proposing 37. They had included a parking study that showed that 37 spaces would be adequate based on their current operation in Oakland Township, and staff supported the modification. She advised that generally, the plan met the applicable regulations noted in the Ordinance. There were some specific conditions listed for daycare facilities, which the plan generally met. The applicants were providing a screen fence along the south property line. Along the eastern property line, deciduous trees were proposed, and they had agreed to look at potentially adding a fence and/or shrubs, depending on what the neighbor preferred. There were several considerations for a Conditional Use outlined in the staff report, and staff recommended approval.

Mr. Davis pointed out that Tienken and Adams roads were both owned by the Road Commission for Oakland County, and the City did not have jurisdiction. The Road Commission would issue a permit if the project continued to go forward. He had looked at some traffic counts for the roads to get an idea of the magnitude of the data. On Tienken just east of Adams, it was estimated to have between 9,100 and 10,000 vehicles daily. They looked at what the Road Commission had provided and also at SEMCOG's data, as the City would not be out doing counts. Adams had significantly more traffic - about 20-22,000 vehicles per day. They also looked at accidents at the intersection. There was an organization called the Traffic Improvement Association (TIA) that provided numbers using police reports. In 2012, there were ten accidents; in 2013, 25 accidents; 2014, 18 accidents; 2015, 13 accidents; and in 2016, there were six. He noted that in 2013, conditions on Tienken were pretty lousy. The City overlaid three sections prior to it being rehabilitated in 2015 by the Road Commission. That might be an indication that improving the roadway for Tienken, which also went into the intersection at Adams, had an effect on making conditions a little better. So far in 2017, there had been seven accidents. He related that it was a little early in the process to typically ask the Road Commission about its review requirements.

Because of all the response about the site, the City had asked them to provide some preliminary comments. They said that they would not require a traffic study. They suggested considering, as part of the permit condition, the extension of the center turn lane for westbound Tienken. If that did not occur, they would probably restrict left turns from Tienken into the site. The applicants had indicated that there would be 162 students and 22 teachers. Conservatively, if every student was dropped off by a parent in a single car, it could be estimated that there would be 184 trips in the morning and in the afternoon. That was approximately a 4% increase to the existing traffic on Tienken.

Ms. Elliott, Director of the Oakland Township facility, stated that the current location had been open since February 2009. They were a private preschool, and they offered classes for students as young as infants through kindergarden. All of the teachers were degreed and certified. They were requesting an expansion of their program, which was currently full in Oakland Township. Their classes were designed to stimulate and engage students through many different activities: fine motor, gross motor, language development, music, movement, baby sign language and staying active in gym and yoga. They provided a well-rounded program to provide a nurturing environment for each of the students. Once they finished the infant/toddler program, they had two types of curriculum. There was a traditional preschool program and a Montessori program. Big goals for those programs were learning to count, recognizing numbers, learning letters and letter sounds, identifying blends, and beginning reading and writing. The same goals were within the Montessori program; the only difference was the teaching style. With Montessori, they offered a pre-primary program for students three to six, which was more of an independent-style learning rather than teacher-directed. The teacher followed the nature of the child and was able to do individual lessons rather than full group. She concluded that all of the students left the program being extremely prepared and ready for elementary school.

Chairperson Brnabic asked if the maximum age was six, which was confirmed. She wanted to verify that, because the Commissioners had received a cover letter dated January 17, 2017 stating that care and education would be provided for students six weeks through 12 years. Ms. Elliott apologized, and said that they did offer a before and after care program during the school year for the local elementary schools. They had about eight students that joined them for after school care. They also had summer camps for older students, but they primarily focused up to six years old.

Mr. Schmitz showed a power point. He stated that at any given time, there would be about 22 teachers. The typical day started around 6:30 a.m., but there was minimal activity at that time and very few drop offs. The peak drop off was around 8:30 to 9:00 a.m. Times were staggered throughout the day. Some of the students were in a half-day program, so those pickups would be from 11:30 to 1:00 p.m. Generally speaking, pickups for full days were between 3:30 and 6:00 p.m. He showed a diagram of the current location in Oakland Township, and pointed out that 80% of the families that attended the school lived within a three-mile radius. He noticed that there had been some concerns about the high school and the traffic. He did not think that would be a problem. It was their understanding that the high school classes started at 7:30 a.m., but most of the preschool students would be dropped off around 8:30-9:00 a.m. The high school bell rang at 2:30 p.m., and the preschool had limited activity between 1-3:00 p.m. He felt that there should be little concern about a conflict. There was an indication that they were 1.5 parking spaces short per the Ordinance. They felt that what they were proposing was adequate for their needs due to the small class sizes. Ms. Elliott tracked 15-minute intervals at the Oakland Township location, which was a much larger school. There were no more than 36 cars in the parking lot at any given time. They felt that providing 37 spaces for the subject site was more than adequate. He stated that they would not want to provide a shortage for the parents. They worked very closely with staff over months exploring numerous options. They looked at a single-story building, but the parking did not work. There would be simple circulation for ease of drop off. Everything was designed to accommodate fire vehicles as necessary with an emergency access to Adams. There had been some adjustments to the site plan due to staff comments. There would be a privacy fence along the eastern property line and a bit of a retaining wall and a privacy screen along the south. They added a bike rack. He advised that there would be a total of ten classrooms - five on the first floor and five on the second. There would be a gym adjacent to the outdoor play area. The second floor was for the children 2 ½ and older. He indicated that they understood they were surrounded by single-family residential, and they wanted to respect that. They felt that the building was very traditional with timeless materials, such as brick, cast stone and elements found on a single-family home. The window sizes would be smaller. They also used banding to break up some of the height. He said that he would be happy to answer any questions.

Chairperson Brnabic asked how their letter to the local residents was distributed. Ms. Elliott said that it was mailed. Chairperson Brnabic

asked how long ago, and Ms. Elliott replied that it was the previous Wednesday or Thursday.

Ms. Roediger did not want the Commissioners confused by what was in the packets and what Mr. Schmitz had passed out. Some items had already been included in the packet, and she clarified that the only thing different was a sheet that showed the addition of a fence and bike rack.

Chairperson Brnabic had mentioned during Communications that they had received a lot of correspondence. Ms. Morita had shared emails she received from residents regarding their concerns with the proposal. There were also communications sent directly to the Planning Department. She summarized that the main concerns were the current, heavy traffic conditions on Adams and Tienken and the impact of additional traffic and trips if Premier Academy were developed at the corner; existing traffic from Adams High School and Van Hoosen Middle School; neighborhood streets already experiencing cut-through traffic; safety concerns as a whole about the traffic; concern that it was a Rezoning. She reiterated that the request was for a Conditional Use Recommendation, which permitted childcare centers in residentially-zoned areas. There was a concern about potential drainage problems for Brookdale Woods and environmental concerns. She indicated that the item required a Public Hearing. She asked that each speaker limited comments to three minutes, and advised that all questions would be answered together at the end of the Public Hearing after everyone had the opportunity to speak. She assured that Commissioners, staff and the applicants would take note of all the comments and questions.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 7:30 p.m.

Laura Farchone, 769 Medinah Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48309 Ms. Farchone stated that she was a resident on a cut-through street in the Brookdale Woods neighborhood. She was also a former teacher and a parent who would drop her children off between 6:45 and 7:00 a.m. She had been blessed to be able to stay home with her children and knew what it was like to live on a street between the hours of 7:15 and 9:00 a.m. where there was a "ton" of traffic with teens and other citizens using her street to cut through. It was an annoyance, but it was also a safety concern, because her children walked to the bus stop. In the spring, summer and fall it was not a problem, however, in the winter time with icy roads and snow banks, there was nowhere to walk safely, and they had to share the road with speeding drivers who were not conscious of young children. She was concerned that with the Premier Academy, there would

be increased traffic from even more parents dropping off children, creating more traffic on her street and more of a safety concern for the children. Also, the older children on her street were not bussed, and they walked to the high school and middle school. She asked the Commissioners how they would keep the high schoolers and middle schoolers safe walking to and from school in the morning and afternoon, especially during snowy days and how they would keep her elementary children and other citizens on her street safe with the increased traffic. Perhaps 4% did not seem like a lot at Adams and Tienken, but she maintained that it could be seen, felt and heard on her street, especially when walking to and from the bus stop when people did not considerably share the road. She asked the Commissioners to think about the drivers and the passengers. She did not want them to be the next accident statistic. She asked if there could perhaps be a blinking light at the intersection that was timed like the one farther east on Tienken by the golf course. She felt that would help increase safety for the drivers and also the babies going to and from the school.

Leo Mendez, 774 Medinah Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48309 Mr. Mendez passed out some documents. He wanted to address some of the review comments from staff and the recommendations related to the Conditional Use. He asked about the right-of-way (ROW) requirements. He contacted the Road Commission, and they provided a diagram that illustrated that the ROW dimension currently was 92 feet on Adams and 91 feet on Tienken. He did not understand how it was compliant with a 120-foot ROW. He commented that there was a play of words related to front yard and side yard. When looking at the site plan, the address was on Adams, but the way the building was oriented, it faced Tienken. A front yard setback to Adams was 40 feet, but he felt that the spirit of that was truly for R-1, and the net result would be a building that was 25-feet plus tall that sat 40 feet from Adams. That visual impact to the community would be fortress-like, especially travelling northbound on Adams Rd. coming to the intersection. Another context was coming up Adams at Walton, whether it was the Bush's center or The Village of Rochester Hills and seeing buildings that were roughly the same height that sat back from the ROW 100-120 feet. He stated that the proposed building would be rammed at the intersection and be visually detrimental to the integrity of the neighborhood fabric. He had provided a diagram that identified his personal review comments. He was a design professional and architect, and although they might not be related to a Conditional Use, they were issues of concern. First, the ingress and egress onto Tienken and the conflict that would create with left turns and right turns once entering the sight. With the one-way traffic within the parking lot, there would be

congestion and backup with clients in reverse. Everyone would have to wait for people to back out before they could continue through. Given the north orientation of the building, there would be an ongoing operational nightmare trying to protect against black ice conditions for parents and children. The north orientation would make the building be in a shadow throughout the winter time. The last item was the precedent that would be set for the project. If it went forward, the two adjacent parcels that had 400 feet of frontage and were 1,087 feet deep would have the opportunity for similar project implementation in the future.

Michelle Merritt, 793 Medinah Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48309 Ms.

Merritt noted that she was a long-term resident who had already raised children and had lived through the cut-through, dragnet on Medinah when Squirrel was blocked until it was opened. She asked them to take that into consideration regarding the traffic. She said that she agreed with all the traffic comments. She added that the high school also had sports. It was all day, every day. There were three educational facilities. She did not think that the after care for the 12 year-olds was counted in the numbers. Whether it was the proposed business or any other business, she would prefer to see homes. She wanted to see more voters and more children in her neighborhood to go to the schools that were already there. She felt that the tax dollars from homes would go a lot further than business taxes. The cutoff and drag-netting through Medinah was a sticking point to her. She did not want to see her property value go down because of the aesthetics. She stood shoulder to shoulder with her neighbors on how strongly they felt about it. She did not receive any notice and learned at the last minute. She found it very invasive, and she did not think that they were included. She was very disappointed in her local City for not including them. It was their homes and their children and their safety. A lot of them owned their homes, and they had been down the road with the children, and she knew what the young moms were talking about. She felt devalued as a homeowner. She indicated that there was nothing against the team and education. She felt that it was a beautiful plan, but she felt that it should be a beautiful plan in a quieter area.

Michael Zebrowski, 793 Medinah Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48309 Mr.

Zebrowski wanted them to understand that he was for early childhood development, and he liked what Premier had presented. He echoed the concerns of those that spoke before him. His street was a cut-through from Tienken to Raintree. During the early part of the day from the beginning of the school day to the end of the school drop off period, Medinah experienced a great influx of high speed traffic. For those who

had driven it, they were familiar with the modified S curve at the southern end. That provided two significant blind spots, one going north and one going south. With the speed of some of the younger drivers, it had caused serious accident concerns. Several years ago, a young driver in an SUV lost control at the south end of the S curve and flipped the vehicle. It was at night, and the house at which the accident occurred had two young boys. Had that been during the day, it could have resulted in another statistic. He lived in a young, vibrant neighborhood, and there were a lot of young children. His primary concern was safety. Even though there would only be a 4% traffic increase, it would occur primarily during two discreet parts of the day. Those parts of the day also coincided with higher traffic patterns and using Medinah as a cut-off. He asked what could be done to guarantee and improve the safety of the children that lived on Medinah as well as the residents, the bikers, the walkers and joggers. He maintained that it was a beautiful street, and they wanted to keep it a safe street.

Steve Yuhasz, 2736 Broadmoor Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48309 Mr. Yuhasz stated that he was greatly troubled over the proposed development to be implemented at the corner of Adams and Tienken. While he had no objections to any person selling property or building a school, he did not think it should be implemented at the corner with the current amount of vehicular and pedestrian traffic that crossed the intersection daily. He maintained that the roads were simply not wide enough to handle it, which was especially true during rush hour when northbound traffic on Adams backed up south of the traffic lights at Raintree and Powderhorn almost to Walton Blvd. It created a hazard for those trying to get in and out of their subdivisions under current conditions. With the high school diagonally across the street, the stakes would be even higher for students. He asked the Commissioners to take that into consideration before approving the project. Their safety, quality of life and health were more valuable than any tax dollars gained. He asked them to please vote no on the proposed development and thanked them for their time and consideration.

Tom Koempel, 3393 Charlwood Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48309 Mr. Koempel stated that he and his wife opposed the project because of the already overloaded traffic on Adams and Tienken. His daughter had attended the middle school and the high school, and he had sat in the traffic, crawling down Adams to take her to school. He had crawled up Adams in evenings coming home. He said that it would get worse in a week when school started. The project would only add to the congestion. He understood the comment about staggered arrivals in the morning, but

he would contend that until they knew the composition of the clients, they would not know how many kids would be dropped off during the school rush hour. He claimed that it would be extended with Oakland University starting at 8:00 a.m. He had sat through traffic trying to get past the University, and he felt that had to be considered as well.

John Leichtman, 2788 Tallahassee Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48306

Mr. Leichtman noted that he lived in the Judson Park Subdivision on the northeast corner of Tienken Adams. His house was located on the corner of Tallahassee and Potomac, and Potomac was a direct cut-through from Tienken to Adams. They had a number of commuters cutting through to avoid the intersection already. Tallahassee Dr. was also a cut-through, particularly for students during the school year in order to avoid the traffic on Tienken. They drove from Brewster to Tallahassee to the high school. He invited anyone on the Planning Commission or City Council to visit his house to see how many cars came down his street at a high rate of speed. A 4% increase in traffic going straight through the intersection might not be that big of a deal, but they were also talking about people turning left into the site and turning back onto Tienken. Mr. Davis had said that the Road Commission would not approve the plan unless the center turn lane was extended. That indicated to him that they did not think it might be a good idea. He walked his kids to Brewster Elementary on nice days. It took just one car to create an accident. He did not need more people going through his subdivision racing to get to school or work or to drop off their kids at the proposed daycare. He felt that the building was going on a plot of land that was too small, as indicated by the fact that the applicants did not have the correct number of parking spaces. He stated that clearly, the project was something that the City wanted, otherwise, the residents would have heard about it before so late in the game. The City had done the minimum amount required to get the information to the citizens in time for them to be able to comment. He understood that they met the requirements, but that was not in the spirit of what the community stood for and what the City Council should stand for. They knew it was a controversial project, and it should have been vetted before it went for a vote. He knew that it was a tough subject for a lot of people, and he understood that the Commissioners were in a tough position. He asked them to consider everything before they voted. All the people showed up for the meeting with only people 300 feet away from the proposal getting letters. He stated that was ridiculous. It impacted everyone along the Adams corridor - Walton to Silverbell, at a minimum, and from Brewster past the high school along Tienken. He insisted that there was zero effort to contact those people. He asked them to please consider that going forward and before they voted.

Brian Kirksey, 425 Sunlight, Rochester Hills, MI 48309 Mr. Kirksey agreed with the sentiment of the other people that there seemed to have been a lack of public disclosure and communication on the issue. He pointed out that the corner had been the scene of many of the City's bad decisions. There were water reservoirs, oil drilling and now a traffic issue. He did not know what else the City planned to put on the corner, but he said that he could guarantee that it would be a bad idea. He lived in Shadow Woods, and he was also located next to a local cut-through called Powderhorn Ridge, which appeared to be the interstate of traffic congestion. He pointed out that the elementary school started later. Even though the bell might ring at Adams and Van Hoosen at one time, the bell rang later at Long Meadow, Brewster and Munson. There was a continual amount of traffic in the area beyond the high school and middle school. They also had cross country teams that ran down Tienken and Adams. There were football, basketball and soccer games. He said that the list went on and on for the amount of activities that happened at the high school. He ran in the area every morning, and the cars stretched from Adams and Tienken all the way to Brewster, if not all the way to Brookwood. He said that it might only be 4%, but it was 4% at one specific time, not stretched across an entire day. He asked how people would turn left out of the facility, if he could not even turn left out of Shadow Woods at 4 p.m. The people using the school would be 1,000 feet closer to Adams High School and traffic that backed up to Brewster already. He asked how frustrated the parents would be trying to turn left out of the facility. He asked what bad decisions those people would make because they were frustrated. He asked the Commissioners to leave the corner alone and leave it as residential. He said that there were already enough problems. If they wanted to do everyone a favor, they should figure out a way to expand Adams and Tienken. There was not enough room for the cars already there. All the people on the cut-through streets had expressed that it was not going to make matters any better. As a real estate person who had usually sat at the table during his career, he said that he did not understand how there was a good business plan for the people that would be using the facility. He maintained that the traffic nightmare would only make them angry.

Alicia Grifka, 537 Rolling Green Circle N., Rochester Hills, MI 48309

Ms. Grifka stated that she shared the same concerns of the predecessors about the use and the traffic. She did not feel that the site was conducive to commercial development, due to its small size. They were trying to cram six pounds into a five pound sack. The storm water was a big issue to her. They were proposing to put in an underground detention system,

which did not bother her other than the fact that they had called for a pump chamber. Pump chambers needed electricity during a storm. In that area, they tended to lose power more often, and they had to deal a lot with generators. She said that generators were great, but they needed to be supervised. If they lost power when the school was not occupied, there was no way to guarantee that the generator would go on, and there could be a flooding issue. She did a calculation as to what there was currently, and there was about 6,300 square feet of black top and roof, and they would be changing the amount of water. They would generate 3.4 times the amount of water, because they would be swapping landscaping with roofing and paving, and it did not fit on the site. Regarding the use, she felt that it would only be serving a small percentage of people in the area. According to the Mid-America advertisement for the sale of the property, it said that there were 3,200 homes in a one-mile radius, and they would maybe serve 150 families. That was barely 5%. She asked how they could say that it was something the area needed. If the radius was expanded to three miles or five miles, the percentage would drop to less than 1% of the people served in the area. It would negatively impact the other 99% of the people there, whether it was the cut-throughs or the increase in traffic. There were two homes there currently that had maybe ten trips a day, and that would be raised to several hundred trips. She stated that was a huge impact; much more than the 4% Mr. Davis had mentioned.

Beth Tilove, 769 Snowmass, Rochester Hills, MI 48309 *Ms. Tilove commented that everyone had such good things to say. Regarding the cut-through issue, which impacted all of them in the area, she asked them to remember that people only cut-through because the intersection already took too long. If the problems were made worse at the intersection, the cut-through traffic would be increased. She stated that Premier Academy was a fantastic school. She had spoken to people who had children there, and it was an excellent business. She was a little concerned for the customers. They had heard a lot of people saying that they had witnessed the traffic backing up. The answers seemed to say not to worry about it, and that it was not a problem. She said that it was not the increase in the number of cars; it was the increase in the number of people trying to make left turns specifically. She did not think that they should throw numbers around or slough things off. She believed that the proposed driveway would be directly over the drive of the gentleman to the east. She suggested asking him whether he could turn left out of his driveway during rush hour. She said that perhaps she was completely wrong, and maybe he would say that there was no problem. On the other hand, if he said that he could not turn left at 5:00 p.m., they would know*

where the problem lied, and there would be a more direct problem to solve. She thought that the school had an obligation to its clients. People trying to turn left into the school would be in the southbound turn lane. People would not even be able to get to the light. People trying to turn left out of the school, during rush hour, would not be able to get across the turn lane to get onto Tienken, and that might upset the clients. She felt that the City had an obligation to the neighborhoods and the commuters. She hoped that they could find out if it was truly going to be a problem and hopefully, solve it.

Michelle Gibbons, 619 Timberline, Rochester Hills, MI 48309 Ms.

Gibbons stated that she lived on Timberline, which was another cut-through. She noted that other citizens had mentioned how hard it was to turn left, and she stated that it was impossible to turn left out of their sub onto Tienken in the mornings. Besides the traffic, she had also heard citizens talk about safety. She was most concerned about the pedestrians and especially the students who rode bikes to school in the pitch black morning. They headed east on Tienken, and there was a proposed bend in the sidewalk at the driveway. It looked like there planned to be a 21-inch pine tree there, and she was very concerned about the visibility between the kids riding bikes and people coming in and out of the facility. She hoped that if the plan went forward that at least something would be thought about the safety and better lighting, or perhaps the tree needed to come down.

Pablo Fraccarolli, 1263 Cobridge Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48306 Mr.

Fraccarolli thanked the Commission members for their service to the community and for making Rochester Hills a great place to live and raise their families. He also thanked the citizens who came to the meeting. It was obvious to him that the community cared about the matters being discussed. It was a busy time of the year with families trying to squeeze in a vacation and getting ready for the new school year. Many could not attend, and some were angry about the process and poor communication. They felt excluded from the issues that were important to them, especially since the proposal was near its final stages. That implied that the applicant and the City had been working on it for months if not years. The citizens were not engaged, because the City was not engaging them. He said that he realized that the laws were complied with for notification requirements, but the proposal affected more than people within 300 feet. The applicant presented that 80% of their students would come from within a three-mile radius. He believed that it was the City's responsibility to properly engage the community at large, especially for decisions that could potentially affect the character of their neighborhoods. He

subscribed to the public meeting notice email list the City offered, but he did not find out through that system. A neighbor notified him that he had stumbled upon the information a week or two ago. After reviewing the proposal in detail, he did not feel that the proposed business and building fit the residential character of the immediate area. When he moved to this corner of Rochester Hills, he did his homework. The surrounding area was all R-1. He remarked that he was surprised to learn that there was a loophole in the zoning rules. He asked them to please honor the spirit of the City's Master Plan that called for the future use of the area to be residential. He believed that an engaged community was a healthy community, and he felt that they could certainly do better.

Jim McClelland, 3326 Palm Aire Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48309 Mr. McClelland said that his family had been residents of Rochester Hills since 1985. He lived in the Brookdale Woods Subdivision. During that time, they had seen an exponential increase in the traffic with obvious peaks both morning and night on Tienken and Adams. His concern about approving Premier Academy at the intersection was that it would be an irrevocable change to the residential character of the intersection. It was a congested intersection during the morning and afternoon peak times. Another 90 to 100 cars entering Tienken just east of the Adams and Tienken intersection to drop off and pick up children would exasperate the situation. He could not turn left at peak times using Medinah onto Tienken. He could not turn left onto Adams. He could sometimes turn right off of Medinah. Right onto Adams was controlled. He left at 9:45 a.m. that morning, and he sat for a long time south of the light until finally there was no traffic on Tienken that wanted to go southbound on Adams. The right turn only situation out of the proposed Academy would also spawn further cut-throughs and disruptions to traffic flows in the surrounding subdivisions. If someone wanted to go west on Tienken and could not turn left, they would have to get back there somehow. If they wanted to go north on Adams they would turn right, go up Brewster, take some other street over and interfere with the Adams traffic. Those that wanted to go southbound on Adams would have to go right and south on Brewster to Powderhorn. The right turn solution was a non-starter to him.

Margaret Huggard, 3286 Aquinas Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48309 Ms. Huggard noted that she had lived in Rochester Hills for 34 years. She raised her kids and worked and dropped them off at daycare. On Adams, if someone were to ask her where to go, she would say that no one could get there from her area. In the fall when there was football practice or when there were plays or school activities, the vans were lined up for

miles with parents not letting their kids walk to school. She did not have bus service in Brookdale Woods. Aquinas was another cut-through street. When they were rebuilding the roads, people cut through Aquinas to get to Medinah. She asked them to think about all the subs that had been built since the schools were first put up. She said that people had to see it to understand. She thanked the City for the bike paths, but when it was icy, they were not safe. The children walked in the road when it snowed, and people went 40-60 mph. The kids were on the street, and there would be more cars and congestion at the corner. She thought that daycares and preschools were fabulous, but not at that corner. It needed to go to a place that was not as occupied or highly developed.

Barry Boardman, 2915 W. Tienken Rd., Rochester Hills, MI 48306 Mr. Boardman said that he and his wife had lived in Rochester Hills for 34 years. He had an opportunity to see what had happened at Adams and Tienken over those years looking out his kitchen window. He heard the fire engines, the police cars and the crashes. He picked up pieces from the collisions. Before he had an 80-foot oak tree cut down by the City, one of the cars missed his house and hit the tree. Coming home from his job at VW in Auburn Hills, if he came home from 3-5 p.m., he would be stuck in traffic for about 45 minutes to an hour in the summer. In the winter when it snowed, traffic backed up to Tienken and Adams. His concern was the kids attending the preschool and their parents. He did not think the parents would realize what they were in for. The traffic was unbelievable, and it was scary. He knew, because he had to make a left turn onto Tienken to get into the world, and it was difficult now. When the snow and fog came, it would be really difficult. He asked them to please rethink the school. He thought that the building looked like a factory, similar to the one at Tienken and Rochester. It was a residential area, and he stated that they did not need a facility that looked like that. He did not mind the school, but he did mind the traffic and the problems the people would have trying to go to work or coming home. He agreed with the people who said that they were not informed early enough. Someone could have knocked on his door six months ago and told him what was happening. He should not have found out three days before that there would be a new facility on the corner. He thought it was a great neighborhood and a great area to live. It was peaceful, but it would not be peaceful once all the traffic started. He did not want his home value to go down, and he did not want to have anyone in front of his house being carted away in an ambulance. There were high school kids with very powerful cars, and it sometimes looked like a race track. They tried to beat the light. He asked them to please reconsider.

Cameron Evans, 1452 Royal Crescent St., Rochester Hills, MI 48306

Mr. Evans said that he lived north of Tienken between Brewster and Livernois. He stated that he supported the proposal, and then he asked if they were surprised, because he was actually not present to support the proposal. He claimed that there would not be one person who lived anywhere near the intersection who would support the proposal. He did not think that they were in a difficult position, and he felt that it was a simple decision. He indicated that there were many other places besides Adams and Tienken that the "fine" institution could build another school three miles away from their existing location in Oakland Township. He asked if the Rochester Community Schools were asked for feedback. If so, he would like to know what that feedback was, and if not, he would like to know why that important stakeholder was not asked for its input. There were zero crossing guards for the kids at the intersection. There was no crossing guard that sat north of Van Hoosen where the light was. With the darkness in the winter and fall, it was a major issue. As to the accident report that was cited, he wanted to know if it was for accidents just in the intersection or if it expanded a half mile each way. He could count far more than ten accidents per year where people ran into the back of each other. The parking lot sounded like a Disney Land ride. People could just come in and go around a little turn style and make a left onto Tienken. It took him five minutes in the afternoon, and he lived a mile and a half away from the intersection, to make a left onto Tienken out of his subdivision. If he needed, he would go left out of the facility. If he had to wait five minutes, he would not care. He asked what that would do to the turn style of people dropping off and picking up kids and backing out onto Tienken Rd. Construction had not been talked about, and he wondered what effect lane restrictions would have on the traffic. He stated that traffic was outrageous. He was glad they sent someone to monitor every fifteen minutes at the current parking lot and to look at their intersection. He was shocked that they did not make that same effort to live at the Adams and Tienken intersection and see what it was like day in and day out for people trying to get around their wonderful community and trying to take care of their family, as well as for emergency vehicles that needed. He had been in Rochester Hills for 24 years, and it was the first time he had ever felt compelled to come to a meeting. He asked them to vote no.

Paul Kesman, 1739 Snowden Circle, Rochester Hills, MI 48306

Mr. Kesman said that he lived in Adams West Subdivision, just north of the intersection. He remarked that Mr. Evans stole his thunder about construction. He was not sure when construction would start if it went through and how long it would take. If it started tomorrow or next August, it would cause havoc at the intersection. Sometimes it took four or five light

changes to turn left onto Tienken coming out of his sub. Regarding the accidents, he had seen a number of them in front of his sub where cars hit each other, about ¼ mile north of the intersection. He understood the early drop off and pickup. His son was in the marching band, and their practice started at 6:30 a.m. In the winter, there were a lot of people heading south on Adams by 6:00 a.m. heading into work. His son had trouble getting out of the sub at 6:30 a.m. to get to practice, so that was something else he felt the Commission should consider.

Chairperson Brnabic thanked everyone for sharing their comments and concerns. She asked the applicants if they had any response.

Mr. Dunn said that with respect to extending the turn lane down Tienken, it had been suggested by the Road Commission. It was fairly common in developments to add lanes. They believed that 90-95% of their families currently enrolled at Premier Academy had two people working. They would still be traveling, whether they stopped at Tienken and Adams or somewhere else. They did not feel there would be people getting up in the morning just to drop their kids off. It would be a main thoroughfare into work for people. They did not believe that they would be adding traffic - they would be adding a stopping point for people dropping off their children.

Chairperson Brnabic closed the Public Hearing at 8:23 p.m.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that he had not originally caught whether or not the plan had been sent to the Road Commission to review and if they had approved extending the turn lane. If not, he asked when the approval would happen.

Mr. Davis advised that it was a little early for the Road Commission to respond, but at the City's request, they did complete an initial review. He did not have something in writing, but the City just received an email, which he read: "We did not require a study, we just commented that inbound left turns would be prohibited if the left turn lane was not extended." He was not sure if there would be other conditions or permit requirements. They would do a thorough permit review, and the City would eventually receive written comments. Typically, their feedback would come after the (PC) meeting. His department had not gotten into construction plan review yet.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that one of his heartaches as a Planning Commissioner, when it came to roads that were not owned by the City,

was that the changes to help the area would be limited, because they would have to wait for another entity. He was curious about the applicant's will to extend the turn lane or to prohibit left turns onto Tienken.

Mr. Dunn said that they would be supportive of working with the Road Commission to do both. They were shocked when they asked them what their ten-year plan was for Adams and Tienken. They did not have one. He had worked with the City staff for several months trying to figure out what would happen at the intersection. They finally got some feedback from Oakland County saying that they had no future plans for changing the intersection or corner. He said that he was all for extending the turn lane. Mr. Kaltsounis clarified that Mr. Dunn would be fine with that knowing how much more it would cost over requiring right in right out onto Tienken. Mr. Dunn said that he did not think that it would cost too much to extend the center turn lane and add a decel lane.

Mr. Kaltsounis noted that Mr. Davis said his department had not reviewed the construction plans. Mr. Davis explained that DPS had reviewed the site plan and provided comments, which had been addressed. As was typical of any project that came before DPS, they not only made comments during the site plan phase, but eventually there would be a second round of construction plans that would be reviewed. There was a comment earlier about storm water detention. At the site plan level, the City would want an idea of what was proposed, but the applicant did not have to provide all the detailed calculations until the construction plan phase. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the City had ever authorized a pumping station. Mr. Davis said that it was not often. There were detention basins that used pumping facilities for emptying, but it was not a preference. The preference was an open basin with a restricted outlet. That was easier for an applicant to maintain and easier for the City to ensure that the volume required was restored. That would be more difficult with an underground basin. There had been plenty of sites approved with underground detention. They would discourage a pumped underground basin, and they would work with the applicant to find another way to avoid a mechanical item that could fail. Mr. Kaltsounis agreed that gravity was a bit more reliable than electricity and mechanical means.

Mr. Kaltsounis noted that the property was zoned R-1 and master planned Residential 2.5. As stated, a daycare center required a Conditional Use, and that included findings. One of the findings was that "The proposed development is served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage ways, and refuse disposal." He commented that the applicants heard

loud and clear about the streets in the area, and he questioned whether that finding was being met. He said that he would like to hear from the other Commissioners. He mentioned that his mom had a daycare center. He heard about kids being dropped off between 8-9:00 a.m. He reminded that Chrysler was right down the street, and they started at 7 or 8:00 a.m. At his mom's daycare center, everyone was dropped off between 6:30 and 8:00 a.m. There were about 30 kids, and it was the same age group. He did not agree about dropping off between 8-9:00 a.m., because he did not know anyone who started work after that. He stated that it would definitely conflict with school times, and people would be fighting the same traffic. He also had a concern about how the traffic at the intersection could affect the business, because people could not get in and out.

Mr. Dettloff agreed that there was a definite echoing of concerns from an historical standpoint that some of the surrounding streets had been used as cut-throughs. He asked Mr. Davis if, in the past, he had ever seen any requests from residents in those areas for some type of traffic calming. He asked if there had been any involvement by the Oakland County Sheriff's Office and if Mr. Davis had any stats he could share.

Mr. Davis advised that the City had a traffic calming program in existence. There had been a number of subdivisions that had taken advantage of it. There was one sub further north on Adams on the east side where speed humps were installed to address cut-through traffic concerns. He could see people on Medinah or other streets that had been mentioned being candidates. Anyone was able to come to the City and contact him or Mr. Schneck and make a request. There was a procedure, and it started with a traffic study where tubes were placed across the road and data was gathered about the speed and volumes of vehicles. If the speeds were at least six mph higher than the posted limit, a street would be a candidate for speed humps. There was a map available on the City's website that showed the locations. It was a 50-50 program. The City would cover 50% for qualifying subdivisions, and that would eventually be wrapped into an asphalt repair program. The City would recommend a series of speed humps, and they would make sure that the residents adjacent to them were supportive. There were oftentimes when the City had been asked to contact the Sheriff's Department and direct them to see if a deputy should be located to try to enforce speed limits. It was effective, but demanding, on the department's staffing. A lot of times, they found that the speeding within the subdivisions was being done at the same time they were trying to respond to accidents on the major roads, so they could not always be there. If

someone targeted a time and narrowed it down, the Sheriffs tried to do the best they could to respond.

Mr. Hooper asked to see an overall map including the adjacent streets the residents had mentioned. He specifically wanted to see where Medinah and Judson Park were. He said that he could see existing traffic using Potomac. Medinah was farther to the west, and he was trying to envision, if the facility moved forward, how using it would impact the proposed development. He recalled that 30 years ago, the residents did not want Adams widened at all. A two-lane road was what they wanted, and there was zero interest in improving capacity on Adams. The Road Commission owned Adams, and he did not see anything happening in the near future. He agreed that since the City had already spent quite a bit of money improving Tienken, that there would be no improvements to capacity there in the next 10-15 years either. Regarding development, if someone owned land, they had an inherent right to develop that property according to the Ordinances of the City. The laws said that it was R-1 zoning, which allowed the childcare center as a Conditional Use. A church or a daycare facility could be developed there, among other things. With the amount of potential traffic for the development, it would appear that during the peak hour in the morning, that there would be about 200 vehicle visits from 7-9:00 a.m., using the existing, larger facility as a reference point. Mr. Davis had indicated 2,500 to 3,000 cars at the peak time, so less than 200 cars would be added to that. They did not know whether people using the facility would make a left or a right turn out. He agreed that the majority of the people using the facility would be neighbors of the people in the room. The developer said that if the Road Commission required an improvement to Tienken, they would not be opposed. There was a comment about the height of the building, which was 25 feet. He considered that two-story homes had an average peak height of at least 25 feet, and some were 35 feet. The Commissioners had faced that before with other developments' homes being 35 feet, although smaller in size.

Ms. Morita asked the applicants if the facility in Oakland Township was tax exempt, and Mr. Dunn advised that it was not. Ms. Morita asked if it had one floor or two. Mr. Dunn said that it was one floor. Ms. Morita said that her understanding of childcare facilities was that when there were children under a certain age, they had to have a direct access to the exterior. The site plans showed no exits for the second floor, and children on the second floor would be ages 2 ½ to six. Mr. Schmitz said that they would lose a lot of space with a two-story school because of the stairwells and elevator. They would have to adhere to the building code that

required a totally non-combustible facility. The design showed CMU exterior walls with a precast floor on the second floor and metal cold form steel trusses on the roof. Ms. Morita said that she understood that, but she reiterated that there were no exits for the second floor to the exterior. Mr. Schmitz said that there were two stairwells and an elevator. Ms. Morita said that was inside the building, but there were no exits from the second floor directly to the outside. Mr. Dunn said that per their understanding, it was not a requirement. That would be required for ages 2 ½ and under, and on the first floor, there was a direct access from each classroom to the exterior. The children above were three to six. Ms. Elliott noted that their young pre-school would be ages 2 ½ to three, and that was on the first floor. Mr. Dunn added that it was the same design that was approved for the Goddard School by John R and Auburn.

Ms. Morita asked Mr. Dunn if he would be willing to agree to a no left turn onto Tienken if the plan was approved. Mr. Dunn asked if she meant as opposed to extending the turn lane. Ms. Morita said that she meant in general - no left turn out of the property onto Tienken. Mr. Dunn said that he would probably agree, but he thought that there were some better ways. They could go to the County and work with the City's engineers to come up with a better solution. Instead of having a fire access only to Adams, he suggested that there could be a decel lane for right in right out for Adams, which would speed up that traffic, and have a right turn only onto Tienken. Ms. Morita asked if they would reroute the traffic. Mr. Dunn responded that instead of what they had in front of them and based on listening to the community, and he considered that they made some good points, he thought that they could add a decel lane off of Adams into a right turn in where the fire access was currently shown and make Tienken a right turn out only as well. He knew that some studies would have to be done. He was a little disappointed that the Road Commission gave zero feedback. Ms. Morita said that she understood the issue with the Road Commission. She had been meeting with them for the last four years on safety issues on Adams Rd. Residents along Adams in various areas had trouble making left turns. They had problems trying to get lights installed or decel lanes put in. She realized that it was a process. The problem the applicants had was that they were one mile north of Walton and Adams where Oakland University was and where there was a lot of traffic. The process also required the ability to work with the University. There were three actors involved - the City, the University and the Road Commission. Trying to make improvements along Adams had been difficult, as Mr. Shumejko, the City's Traffic Engineer, could attest. They had been successful in extending some of the right turn lanes in certain locations and agreement to widen certain areas, such as at

Tienken. Those small victories were far and few between. The applicants were at a very busy intersection. As a mother, her concern was the parents with young children. If they were turning left in or left out, it would be a recipe for disaster. Sooner or later, something would happen. As a Planning Commissioner, she was concerned about approving something she knew would end up with someone getting hurt. That was her primary concern. If the applicants were willing to go back and make some changes and look at the circulation in the site and propose changes that were safer, it would be a lot more palatable. With a sleep deprived mother coming in at 6:30 in the morning to drop off her infant and trying to make a left turn at that intersection, it could end badly. After hearing from the residents, she understood that it was a lot for the applicants to deal with. She thanked the residents for coming out, and said that the Commissioners always appreciated hearing from them. She encouraged them to talk to Mr. Davis about the issues in their subdivisions with speeding. As it pertained to the proposed property, and she understood that there were crazy teenagers driving on Medinah in the morning, she did not see how that sleep deprived mother, going to the proposed daycare over another one, would make that huge of a difference, but it could, and she understood the fears. If the applicants were willing to explore different traffic routes and discuss some of the traffic issues a little more fully with Oakland County to see if a resolution could be reached or if some improvements could be made, she would be happy to be part of the process. Her concern with the plan, and she commented that preschools were great and necessary, was that the way it was laid out currently, someone would get hurt. She asked what week the traffic study was done for the Oakland Township site. Ms. Elliott said that it was done during a peak time when school was in session. Mr. Dunn said that it was during a colder month, because the summertime died down. Ms. Elliott said that a lot of the teachers brought their children to the school in the summer. Ms. Morita confirmed that they had never had problems with parking and stacking at that site. She asked how long of an average wait time there was when cars pulled out of that site to turn left. Mr. Dunn said that it was zero. Ms. Morita said that because of the traffic backups they would have at the proposed location at the times the parents came, there would be cars stacked on the site waiting to get out. Mr. Dunn said that would not happen if it was right in right out only. Ms. Morita said that based on the plan the Commissioners had, she could see cars stacked in the parking lot waiting to get in and out, and a cluster of cars would be unable to get in and out and unable to get in and out of spaces. She asked the applicants if they would be willing to come back with a different plan for the traffic and meet with Oakland County. Mr. Dunn said that they would be happy to meet with the County. He felt that the issue would be

seeing if the Fire Marshall would accept a right in off of Adams and creating a decel lane there. They could prohibit left turns onto Tienken during certain hours. Ms. Morita said that she would be willing to consider that. She asked staff if the applicants would have to come in with another plan.

Ms. Roediger said that if the Planning Commission decided to postpone, the applicants could come back with a modified plan and continue the same application.

Mr. Schroeder strongly suggested that the applicants got a private traffic organization to do a traffic study. They did not have all the facts and figures, and everyone's concerns were about traffic. He had been in the business for 50 years, and there were no funds, because people would not vote for the money. The Legislature would not allocate the money. There were not enough dollars to do a small percentage of what had to be done. The County had no plans for Adams and Tienken, and he looked at the traffic counts and the accidents, and what the applicants had to compete with would not even get them on the board for funding. The State kicked the can down the road, and it would not happen. The problem was everywhere. Speeding in subdivisions was standard everywhere. In Troy, they had an extensive traffic program, and they had studies of the traffic areas. The police would set the times and give tickets, and there would be a second wave of people coming and complaining because they were picking on them, and they felt the police had better things to do. 94-98% of the tickets were given to the residents of the subs. The average speed was 35+ in subdivisions. The State statute said that it had to be 25 mph, and he remarked that it was unrealistic. People did not drive 25. People drove 35-40 mph in the subdivisions. He reminded that citizens objected to widening Tienken. It was a no-win situation. He stated that the infrastructure in the country was terrible - the water, sewer and roads - and the road funds were running out. The State could not print money like the Federal Government. The people voted against increasing taxes. The City went through a very beneficial time when the gravel roads were done, and they got a good portion of the County road funds. They were not getting those any more. Rochester Hills was on top of its water, sewer and storm. Cities like Flint and Detroit were a disaster. He used to work in Detroit, and if people saw the pipes, they would not drink the water. Things needed to be done, but the taxpayers were not willing to pay for them. He said that people had a right to develop their property and the right for access to the roads. Whoever had jurisdiction could not deny people access. They could put restrictions on the access, but they could not deny it.

Mr. Reece stated that he liked the development, but he felt that it was too large for the property. He lived off of Tienken, and the issue with traffic at the intersection was a nightmare. If it was a one-story development and smaller school with a better site plan that allowed different access in and out of the site, he would be much more amenable about going forward. For him, a two-story building with 162 students on that site was too much.

Mr. Kaltsounis noted that he had been on the Planning Commission for many years, and he had seen how developments worked out. There was one on the corner of Auburn and Crooks that had a right in right out. He said that the right in right out became a left turn in on many occasions. With right in right out for the proposed development, someone would have to go for miles to get back to the west. It worked in certain places, but if proposed, it would be close to the intersection and there would be a long way or short way. He said that he could not say yes to the development unless, at minimum, the left turn lane was extended. He could see the traffic still being tough. He discussed several possibilities for the motions. He said that they could recommend denial to City Council of the Conditional Use and postpone the other two motions, pending Council approval. If the developer chose, the matters could be postponed until they were ready to re-submit. Personally, having owned a daycare center, he would recommend that the applicants really determined whether people could easily get to and into the building. He felt it would be very detrimental. He asked the applicants which direction the Commission should take.

Mr. Dunn stated that they had to develop something on the property. They would come back with a new plan for extending the center left turn lane down Tienken. Mr. Kaltsounis reminded that there were a few other things as well. He moved the following, seconded by Mr. Reece:

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, in the matter of City File No. 17-018 (Premier Academy) the Planning Commission hereby **postpones** the request for **Conditional Use Recommendation** to allow a childcare center in the R-1 district until the applicant completes studies of the traffic and meets with the Oakland County Road Commission and City staff regarding ingress and egress for the property and the City's Engineering staff reviews the pumping station to possibly eliminate it and relocate the storm water system.

Mr. Anzek said that they were kind of second guessing what the Road Commission was going to decide. Rather than suggest an extension of the center lane or other things, the applicants needed to have the

meeting and find out. The Mobil station at Walton and Adams was willing to close the northern driveway on Adams while maintaining left turns out of the southern one. No one liked that idea, because it always seemed to be backed up there. The matter was tabled until they met with the Road Commission and the City's engineers and came up with a condition that there would be a trial and error for a year allowing full turning movements for the southern drive to show that it did not have problems. He suggested postponing the matter until the applicants had an opportunity to sit down with the Road Commission, the City's engineers and the Fire Department, if necessary, to find out the best access for the business. They might say that there would be too much traffic, and that the development would have to be downsized, as Mr. Reece suggested. They might say that the traffic could be easily handled. Those questions were difficult for the Planning Commission to answer, and he would like those answers before he voted.

Mr. Reece asked if the Road Commission would even review it without the Planning Commission approval of the plan. Mr. Davis said that they would if the City asked to meet and go over the project in detail.

Mr. Anzek said that he would not require a traffic study, but let the Road Commission determine if one was needed. He thought that a traffic assessment could add six months. Mr. Davis said that traffic studies were sometimes used to estimate potential trips. The applicants had indicated how many students and teachers would attend using conservative numbers. His assumption was one parent would drop one kid off, but if there were several kids, the numbers could be reduced. He was not sure what more value a traffic study would provide. There were assumptions such as having half the traffic going west and half east on Tienken, but he did not know if a traffic study would get more detailed than that.

Chairperson Brnabic asked the applicants if they agreed to the postponement, which they confirmed, and she called for a vote:

Voice Vote:

Ayes: All
 Nays: None
 Absent: Schultz

MOTION CARRIED

- 2017-0338** Request for a Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 17-018 - for the removal and replacement of as many as 12 trees associated with Premier Academy, a 15,078 square-foot childcare center on approximately 1.6 acres located at the southeast corner of Tienken and Adams, zoned R-1 One Family Residential,

Parcel Nos. 15-08-100-021 and -022, Paul Dunn, JS Capitol Group, Applicant

Postponed

2017-0339 Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 17-018 - Premier Academy, a proposed 15,078 square-foot childcare center on approximately 1.6 acres located at the southeast corner of Tienken and Adams, zoned R-1 One Family Residential, Parcel Nos. 15-08-100-021 and -022, Paul Dunn, JS Capitol Group, Applicant

Postponed

Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously. Mr. Hooper advised that everyone who filled out a card would be notified when the matter returned, and if someone did not speak but wished to be notified, that an address should be provided to Ms. Gentry. Chairperson Brnabic thanked the applicants and wished them good luck. She felt that it would be an excellent school for young children.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2015-0308 Request for Site Plan Approval - Innovation Hills - City File No. 17-015 - City-owned park totaling 112 acres, located on the north side of Hamlin, east of Adams, zoned R-2, One Family Residential, Parcel Nos. 15-20-300-005 and 15-29-101-020, Ken Elwert, Director, Parks and Forestry Department, City of Rochester Hills, Applicant.

(Reference: Documents prepared by Parks and Forestry and Ralph Nunez, Nunez Design had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Ken Elwert, Director of Parks and Forestry, City of Rochester Hills and Ralph Nunez, Nunez Design, 249 Park Street, Troy, MI 48083.

Mr. Elwert related that the Tree Removal Permit was approved in June, and that the Site Plan had been postponed pending further information. He had submitted a memo detailing various elements, including an administrative staff review addressing conditions placed on the Site Plan. He noted that tree surveys had been submitted - a 2016 tree survey for the parking lot and playground area and a tree survey for the community water feature area. They finished an aerial of the 29 trees taken down