

# STONEFIELD

August 7, 2023

City of Rochester Hills  
Planning & Economic Development  
1000 Rochester Hills Drive  
Rochester Hills, MI 48309

**RE: Site Plan Review # 4  
Proposed Car Wash  
City File #22-043 Section #30  
JNRNB2022-0012  
PSP2023-0012  
Parcel ID: 15-30-302-031  
2737 South Adams Road  
City of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan**

To whom it may concern:

Our office is submitting documents on behalf of the Applicant to address comments contained within the Site Plan Review of the plan set dated 6/30/2023 submitted on 6/30/2023. Please find the following items enclosed:

ITEM DESCRIPTION	DATED	COPIES	PREPARED BY
Combined Plans Civil Site Development Plans Architectural Plans & Elevations Canopy Plans	07-27-2023 07-28-2023 01-13-2021	Electronic	Stonefield Engineering & Design REB Architects Sonny's
Architectural Renderings	05-10-2023	Electronic	REB Architects
Landscaping & Irrigation Cost Estimate	05-05-2023	Electronic	Stonefield Engineering & Design
Approved Color Selections	05-10-2023	Electronic	REB Architects
Flow Tests	10-04-2021	Electronic	City of Rochester Hills
Geotechnical Report	02-05-2023	Electronic	G2 Consulting Group
USDA NRCS Soil Report	02-07-2023	Electronic	USDA

**The following is an itemized response to the comments contained within the Site Plan Review #4  
Comments received 7/21/2023:**

Cover Page:

- Comments relative to Due Care Plan and LIP submittal contained within the applicant response letter of June 30, 2023 must be adhered to, including any additional environmental comments that may arise as a result of the review of such documents.

**Stonefield Response: Noted. Due Care Plan has been authorized and is to be provided during LIP / construction plan review.**

STONEFIELDENG.COM

607 SHELBY STREET, SUITE 200, DETROIT, MI 48226 248.247.1115 T. 201.340.4472 F.

2. The applicant needs to submit a Land Improvement Permit (LIP) application with engineer's estimate, fee and construction plans to proceed with the construction plan review process.

**Stonefield Response: Noted. Land Improvement Permit submitted 7/29/2023.**

Demolition Plan:

1. 40% of regulated trees outside of building envelope (building footprint and accessory structures) need to be preserved.

**Stonefield Response: Variance is being requested as noted on Sheet C-2 on the "Tree Mitigation Requirements" table. The majority of the regulated trees on site are an invasive species, Tree of Heaven, also listed on the City of Rochester Hills Prohibited Tree List.**

2. Although several of the trees on site are non-native species; the current ordinance still considers these regulated when 6" or greater and need to be factored into replacement / preservation percentage.

**Stonefield Response: Variance is being requested as noted on Sheet C-2 on the "Tree Mitigation Requirements" table. The majority of the regulated trees on site are an invasive species, Tree of Heaven, also listed on the City of Rochester Hills Prohibited Tree List.**

3. 2 permanent benchmarks will need to be established prior to construction.

**Stonefield Response: Plans already noted that new benchmarks are to be reestablished. Note has been added to Sheet C-2 to further clarify that this must occur prior to construction.**

Site Plan:

1. Crosswalk should not come in to the radius and/or approach of Forester Blvd. Crosswalk must be perpendicular to road and a receiving ramp at Forester Blvd is required for the crosswalk to be ADA compliant.

**Stonefield Response: Crosswalk has been shifted to provide a perpendicular connection outside of the driveway radius. ADA compliant receiving ramp provided. See Sheet C-3.**

2. Detailed plans for the crosswalk and pushbutton/signal coordination will need to be approved by RCOC and the City prior to construction plan approval.

**Stonefield Response: Crosswalk and push button/signal coordination approvals to be obtained by RCOC Traffic Department prior to construction plan approval. Note has been added to the Site Plan on Sheet C-3. Plans with the realigned crosswalk have been resubmitted to RCOC on 8/1/2023. Fleis & Vandenbrink has been hired to perform the crosswalk push button and signal coordination design. Design to be submitted to RCOC for approval upon completion.**

3. Copy the RCOC permit review to the City as soon as received. As of 7.19.23 the RCOC stated the permit is under review still and they were going to send the Applicant the review letter next week. At the least we need to see RCOC's review comments before recommending Site Plan approval. If there a no major comments, we feel it would be reasonable to approve the Site Plan and further details would be handled in the Construction Plan review stage.

**Stonefield Response: RCOC has no objections to the plans (RCOC spoke with Keith Depp indicating such on 7/25/23). Plans with the realigned crosswalk were resubmitted to RCOC on 8/1/23.**

4. Is a detail intended to be provided on grading plan? Nothing is shown. Response letter indicates C-14 and detail is provided there. Also see engineering comment relative to wall.

**Stonefield Response: The guide rail detail is Detail #7 on Sheet C-14. As confirmed with Engineering Department, the retaining wall design is to be provided during LIP / construction plan review. G2 Consulting has been hired for the retaining wall design and design plans will be submitted to the Engineering Department upon completion.**

#### Grading Plan:

1. Flush curb ('FC') for accessible route to public sidewalk.

**Stonefield Response: Additional Flush Curb (FC) spot shot has been added to the plans. See Sheet C-4.**

2. Retaining walls over 4 feet in height will need to be structurally designed with calculations, then reviewed and approved by the City's consultant during the construction plan phase.

**Stonefield Response: As confirmed with Engineering Department, the retaining wall design is to be provided during LIP / construction plan review. G2 Consulting has been hired for the retaining wall design and design plans will be submitted to the Engineering Department upon completion.**

#### Stormwater Management Plan:

1. Provide a 2 foot inlet with 12-inch pipe due to the area it is servicing.

**Stonefield Response: 2 FT Nyoplast inlet and 12" pipe has been proposed. See Sheet C-5.**

2. Storm Sewer Outlet will need RCOC approval.

**Stonefield Response: Note added to plans that RCOC approval is required for storm tap. Plans were submitted to RCOC for stormwater review on 8/1/23.**

3. How does this relate to the calculations on sheet C-17? Update as needed.

**Stonefield Response: Basin volume shown on Sheet C-5 was incorrect, volume has been updated to reflect the correct proposed basin volume shown on Sheet C-17.**

## Stormwater Management Plan:

1. On sheet C-17 it states HSG: B which is consistent with the City's GIS soil layer. Verify with soil borings and revise as necessary to be consistent throughout the site plan set.

**Stonefield Response: Soil Type has been updated to HSG 'A' throughout the plan set consistent with the USDA NRCS Soil Report. See Sheet C-6.**

2. Provide soil borings and perk tests to verify the depth of the proposed detention pond will not interfere with ground water table and see if infiltration is obtainable.

**Stonefield Response: Geotechnical Report was previously provided including infiltration rates and ground water table. See again attached Geotechnical Report. Groundwater was not encountered in the 15 FT deep borings. Per G2 Consulting "Infiltration on an adversely impacted site such as the subject property would be considered exacerbation of contamination. G2 would advise not to have that type of design for the stormwater on this project."**

## Utility Plan:

1. Utilize the proposed water main connect 50 feet to the west, instead of additional connection off the water main. Verify with fire department on the location of the fire hydrant.

**Stonefield Response: As discussed with the City Engineer, the hydrant is to remain as proposed. A new connection to the water main is not proposed. This is a relocation of the existing hydrant utilizing the current existing tap to the main.**

## Fire Protection Plan

1. In order to obtain site plan approval, a flow test is required to evaluate the capabilities of the water supply. This can be obtained by contacting the Rochester Hills Engineering Department at 248-656-4650.

**Stonefield Response: Flow Tests were provided to Walter Murphy by Jason Boughton on 7/26/23 and Walter Murphy indicated that he does not have any concerns with the flow test and approves the site plan.**

## Construction Detail C-17

1. Infiltration is not waived. Revise to incorporate into the overall storm sewer design, unless the soil borings with perk test show differently.

**Stonefield Response: Per G2 Consulting "Infiltration on an adversely impacted site such as the subject property would be considered exacerbation of contamination. G2 would advise not to have that type of design for the stormwater on this project." Jason Boughton was provided with this information, is in agreement with G2, and a note has been added to the stormwater calculations on Sheet C-17 satisfying this comment.**

2. Revise the control structure to incorporate this into the overall storm sewer management plan or provide a reason why this standard is not being met.

**Stonefield Response:** Per G2 Consulting “Infiltration on an adversely impacted site such as the subject property would be considered exacerbation of contamination. G2 would advise not to have that type of design for the stormwater on this project.” Jason Boughton was provided with this information, is in agreement with G2, and a note has been added to the stormwater calculations on Sheet C-17 satisfying this comment.

A-2:

1. As noted in response letter windows are a part of new concepts for Whitewater. It is unclear as to why these facades cannot be updated to provide additional windows.

**Stonefield Response:** Additional windows are not part of the latest WhiteWater prototype design. The proposed windows and building elevations meet all consent ordinance requirements. Upon review of the consent judgement there is no indication of a minimum glazing requirement. Additional windows are not required.

2. All building mechanical equipment shall be screened from view with appropriate architectural treatment.

**Stonefield Response:** All building rooftop mechanical equipment is screened from view with the proposed architectural parapet walls. For clarity, a note has been added to the elevations on Sheet A-2 stating “All building mechanical equipment shall be screened from view with appropriate architectural treatment.”

S0.1

1. Color match building.

**Stonefield Response:** All enclosures are to match the building materials. Notes have been added to Sheet S0.1 calling for all enclosure materials to match the proposed building.

Renderings

1. Doors were to be glass?

**Stonefield Response:** Two of the three overhead doors are proposed to be glass as shown on the elevations. The colored renderings have been updated to reflect this.

---

Should you have any questions regarding the submission items or responses above please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Regards,



J. Reid Cooksey, PE  
Stonefield Engineering and Design, LLC



Erin McMachen  
Stonefield Engineering and Design, LLC