

**City of Rochester Hills
Department of Planning**

**STAFF REPORT TO THE CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION
December 16, 2005**

Sheffield of Rochester Hills Final PUD Review	
APPLICANT	Lombardo Companies 6303 26 Mile Road #200 Washington, MI 48094
LOCATION	Meadowfield Drive, west of Rochester Road
SIDWELL	15-22-226-016
FILE NO.	05-016
ZONING	SP, Special Purpose
STAFF	Derek Delacourt, Planner
REQUEST	PUD Rezoning Recommendation Final PUD Review Recommendation Final Site Plan Recommendation Tree Removal Permit Approval

SUMMARY

The applicant is proposing use of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) process to develop the subject site. The site is located on the north side of Meadowfield Drive, west of Rochester Road. The applicant is proposing 58 attached single-family condominiums, which are designed in four-unit buildings and situated around a motor court in both two- and four-building groupings. The proposed Agreement limits the units to ranch style, two-bedroom, two-garage structures. Site plans and elevations are included in the attached PUD Plan.

The plan is being proposed in conjunction with a land sale and swap City Council approved with the applicant. The applicant would receive the subject site and the City receives 10 acres of property adjacent to the existing Eugene Nowicki Park with the intent of increasing the size of the park and the available parkland in that area of the City.

The applicant appeared before the Planning Commission at a workshop meeting on May 17, to discuss the PUD process and the proposed development. At that meeting the Commission provided input into the use of the process, issues with the submittal and additional information they would like to have presented (refer to attached minutes). The applicant modified the agreement and subsequently received preliminary PUD

recommendation from the Planning Commission (minutes attached) and approval from City Council on September 7, 2005.

FINAL PUD

The applicant is requesting approval of the PUD overlay rezoning, Final PUD approval, Final Site plan Approval, and approval of a Tree removal permit. The plans and PUD agreement have been reviewed by all applicable staff and departments and, subject to conditions, recommended for approval.

PROPOSED USE

The applicant is proposing attached single-family condominium units. The existing, and Master Planned zoning district, Special Purpose, does not expressly permit the proposed use. However, the PUD Ordinance allows the Commission and City Council to allow uses not normally allowed within the zoning district based on defined criteria within the Ordinance if the proposed uses are consistent with the intent of the Master Plan. The Master Plan designation for the subject site is Senior Housing.

The Special Purpose zoning district allows among other uses, as either permitted or conditional, assisted living facilities, nursing homes, hospitals, and low rise housing for the elderly. It is Staff's opinion that even though the proposed PUD is not age restricted the style, design and type of development proposed is consistent with uses allowed in the Special Purpose Zoning District and the Master Planned designation of the site as Senior Housing.

SCREENING AND BUFFERING

The PUD proposes to provide screening of the site from the adjacent commercial to the north and east. Based on the zoning district the site would normally be required to screen from the property to the apartment style use to the west. The preliminary PUD waived the required buffer to the west and instead required screening consistent with the proposed landscape plan included in the PUD. The final site plans and PUD include screening consistent with that plan and has been recommended for approval by the City's Landscape Architect subject to conditions.

CUL-DE-SAC LENGTH

The proposed plans indicate a cul-de-sac length of approximately 900 feet, 300 feet longer than the maximum, 600 feet, allowed without a waiver. The proposed length has been reviewed by both the Fire and Engineering Department; both departments have indicated no issues with the proposed length. The cul-de-sac waiver was granted as part of the preliminary approval.

FINAL SITE PLANS

The Final Site Plans for the proposed PUD have been reviewed and recommended for approval by all applicable City Staff. The Final Site Plans are attached as Exhibit E of the Final PUD Agreement. The Preliminary Site Plans are attached as exhibit C for comparison.

TREE REMOVAL PERMIT

The applicant is proposing to remove 415 regulated trees from the site. The proposed plans indicate 426 replacement credits will be placed on site. No payment into the City's Tree Replacement Fund is required. The City's Landscape Architect recommends approval of the permit subject to conditions.

Staff recommends that the proposed agreement and plans meet the requirements for Final PUD approval. The proposed Final PUD is consistent with the development agreed to by the City for utilization of the process. The proposed Final PUD has been reviewed by all applicable departments within the City and is recommended for approval or approval with conditions. Subject to any changes or conditions recommended by the Planning Commission Staff recommends approval of the following motion:

RECOMMENDATION

MOTION by _____, seconded by _____, in the matter of City File No. 05-016 (Sheffield PUD), the Planning Commission **recommends** that City Council **approve** the rezoning of the subject parcel to a PUD overlay district and approve the Final Planned Unit Development Agreement dated received by the Planning and Development Department December 12, 2005 based on the following findings and subject to the following conditions:

Findings:

1. The proposed Final PUD is consistent with the proposed intent and criteria for utilization of the PUD Process.
2. The proposed Final PUD is consistent with the Preliminary Approval for utilization of the process and the Preliminary PUD plan.
3. The proposed plan has not been utilized to avoid applicable requirements of the City's Ordinance. The proposed use is consistent of the intent of the Special Purpose Zoning District.

4. The proposed plan will not add facility loads above those contemplated by the Master Plan. The proposed use is less intense than several uses allowed in the Special Purpose District.
5. The proposed plan promotes the goals and objectives of the Master Plan.
6. The proposed use is consistent with existing and future land use patterns.
7. The proposed plan provides appropriate transition between the existing land uses surrounding the property.
8. That utilization of the PUD process allows the City additional controls to ensure quality building design and site development.

MOTION by _____, seconded by _____, in the matter of City File No. 05-016 (Sheffield PUD), the Planning Commission **grants a Tree Removal Permit**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on December 12, 2005, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions.

FINDINGS:

1. The proposed removal and replacement of regulated trees on-site is in conformance with the Tree Conservation Ordinance.
2. The applicant is removing 415 regulated trees from the site.
3. The applicant is proposing to locate 426 replacement credits on-site.
4. No payment into the City's tree Fund is required.

CONDITIONS:

1. Provision of a performance guarantee in the amount of \$102,345.00, as adjusted if necessary by the City, to ensure the proper installation of replacement trees. Such guarantee to be provided by the applicant prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.
2. That the Landscape Calculations and Plant Schedule shall be adjusted to conform with the corrections identified in the City Landscape Architect's Memo dated December 15, 2005.

MOTION by _____, seconded by _____, in the matter of City File No. 05-016 (Sheffield PUD), the Planning Commission **approves** the **Site Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on December 12, 2005, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions.

FINDINGS:

1. The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that all applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as other City ordinances, standards, and requirements can be met subject to the conditions noted below.
2. The 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. Automobile parking areas have been designed to avoid common traffic problems and promote safety. Further, deferred parking spaces have been identified on-site for future consideration.
4. 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.
5. The proposed development does not have an unreasonably detrimental, nor an injurious, effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the parcel being developed and the larger area of which the parcel is a part.

CONDITIONS:

1. That any remaining engineering issues identified in HRC letter dated November 28, 2005 be addressed prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit
2. That the Landscape Calculations and Plant Schedule shall be adjusted to conform with the corrections identified in the City Landscape Architect's Memo dated December 15, 2005.
3. Provision of a performance guarantee in the amount of \$76,765.00, as adjusted if necessary by the City, for the proposed buffering/general landscaping and provision of a performance guarantee in the amount of \$15,950.00, as adjusted if necessary by the City, for the parking island trees. Such guarantees to be provided by the applicant prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.

4. Appropriate approvals from the Oakland County Drain Commissioner, the Road Commission for Oakland County, and the Michigan Department of Transportation are obtained prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit for this project.

References: PUD Agreement dated received December 1, 2005; Planning Commission Minutes dated May 17, 2005, June 21, 2005 and August 2, 2005; HRC Ltter dated Nov. 28, 2005; Planning and Development memo dated Dec. 15, 2005; Fire Department memo dated Dec. 13, 2005; Building Department memo dated July 28, 2005; Assessing Department memo dated Aug. 24, 2005; OCDC Letter dated Aug. 1, 2005; Notice of Public Hearing; Notice of Tree Removal Permit.
