

Whereas, in addition, the City sponsored two Public Forum Workshops on February 10, 2011 and February 17, 2011; key recreation provider stakeholders were contacted, and the City's website published the dates of the open forums. Residents were encouraged to comment by email and letters, which were incorporated into the Plan; and

Whereas, the City prepared a survey for all residents to participate in to provide opinion as to quality, maintenance, operations and deficiencies of the City's Parks system and the survey was made available on the City's website; and

Whereas, a presentation was made to the Planning Commission on March 1, 2011 and plans to present the Master Plan to the City Council on March 21, 2011; and during the March 1, 2011 Planning Commission meeting, a public hearing was conducted to receive public input on the proposed Plan; and

Whereas, the Parks and Forestry Department of the City of Rochester Hills, with assistance from the Planning and Economic Development and MIS Departments has developed a proposed Rochester Hills 5-year Parks and Recreation Master Plan which includes all of the factors mentioned above; and

Whereas, this Plan meets the requirements of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources as the document which must be filed with that agency if the City is to be eligible for State and Federal recreation grants; and

Whereas, the Planning Commission of the City of Rochester Hills has reviewed the Parks and Recreation Master Plan and finds itself in accord with the basic plans and strategies outlined in that document.

Resolved, that the Planning Commission of the City of Rochester Hills, in keeping with and as an element of the Master Land Use Plan, does adopt the Rochester Hills 2011-2015 Parks and Recreation Master Plan and directs that this Plan, along with a copy of this Resolution, shall be filed with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG).

Chairperson Boswell stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously. The matter will go to City Council on March 21, 2011.

DISCUSSION

- 2011-0099** Present conceptual plans for McDonald's, located on Rochester Road, north of Avon. Frank Martin, Dorchen/Martin Associates, Inc., applicant
(Reference: Memo prepared by Ed Anzek, dated February 25, 2011, and packet from Frank Martin of Dorchen/Martin Associates, had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant was Frank Martin, Dorchen/Martin Associates, Inc., 29895 Greenfield Rd., Suite 107, Southfield, MI 48076, and William

Saputo, Jr., owner of McDonald's, 808 S. Rochester Rd., Rochester Hills, MI 48307

Mr. Anzek recalled that last fall, there was a fire at the McDonald's on Rochester Road, which caused significant damage to the interior. The owner, Mr. Saputo, had determined that it would be knocked down and rebuilt in the hopes of upgrading the facility. Staff had discussed some of the improvements that could be made. Parking was an issue, and he noted that the updated Zoning Ordinance allowed the Planning Commission to modify the requirements, and he thought it would be a good idea to bring the matter forward for a discussion.

Mr. Martin, architect for the project, stated that his firm had done most of the McDonald's around the State and had for the past 25 years. They went through the Zoning Ordinance and put together a Site Plan for Staff's review, and some of the challenges of rebuilding came up. The current McDonald's was about 35 years old, with the traditional two curb cuts and a play place. He had included photos of similar new McDonald's in the packet and a concept for the play area. Some of the major improvements would be to minimize two curb cuts into one, which would allow customers to circle the site, which was being promoted in all new sites if they could. It would be quite an improvement, and they talked with Staff and MDOT about positioning the entry. Another possibility was the opportunity to have an access to the north road that leads to Lifetime Fitness, which would help the flow of traffic on Rochester. The new building would be all ADA compliant, have a new dining décor, and have an interactive play area. Mr. Saputo had been involved with McDonald's for many years and had stores in other communities.

Mr. Martin noted that the Zoning Ordinance required landscape buffers adjacent to the streets and adjacent to the south property line. Presently, the parking lot was right on the northerly property line, and there was no landscaping. On the south side, there was about seven feet of landscaping. In order for them to position the building so there could be fire truck maneuverability, which had already been approved by the Fire Department, they could add seven feet of landscaping along the north property line, but there was a ten-foot requirement. The south required ten feet, and they were showing five to six feet. To supplement that deficiency, they would add plantings not required by the Ordinance. They believed the additional seven feet on the north side would be more beneficial than putting it on the south side. There would be dual drive thru lanes, similar to what was there now, but in a slightly different configuration. They would have adequate stacking. Typically, drive-thru

traffic accounted for 75% of the traffic. They would provide 44 parking spaces, and the Ordinance required 50. People that used the play area came with more people in their cars, and they believed that with 95-100 seats in the store, they were comfortable offering 44 spaces. McDonald's was comfortable with the seating to parking ratio, and if owners could not provide parking, Mr. Martin indicated that they would not have customers. They were in the process of finalizing the Site Plans, and they felt this would be a great opportunity to share some of the improvements that could be made.

Chairperson Boswell clarified that McDonald's was satisfied with the parking, and he asked if they had a minimum requirement. Mr. Martin said that in a store that was not a playland, it ranged from a parking space per two seats to two-and-a-half seats. That would come very close for a traditional store. There were some stores that had 60-70 seats with only 35-38 parking spaces, but the drive-thru traffic was high. About 80% of McDonald's' daily business was breakfast and lunch. McDonald's looked at all the statistics, and Mr. Martin said that he would not be comfortable presenting it if it did not meet their requirements.

Chairperson Boswell asked if they would lose parking if there were to be a connection to the road to the north. Mr. Martin said that in his other design, there would be a net loss of one space. Chairperson Boswell added that one tree would also be eliminated.

Ms. Brnabic asked how many stacking spaces there would be at the drive-thru. Mr. Martin advised that there would be 16 cars in the lane, from the window closest to Rochester. From the order points, there would be ten. He noted that there would be a cash window and a presenter's window with space between them. Ms. Brnabic asked if they met the minimum requirement for the loading area. She noted two employee parking spots there, which Mr. Martin said would be designated for management. The loading zone would be 10 x 40 feet. He advised that McDonald's received deliveries from one vendor. They delivered three times a week, and they stayed about an hour to an hour-and-a-half. They could be scheduled at non-peak times. They were looking at doing palletized deliveries, where the order would be shrink-wrapped on pallets for the crew to unload, which would reduce delivery time. Ms. Brnabic asked what the delivery hours were currently. Mr. Saputo said that it was done at 10:30 p.m., but the company was flexible, and that could be changed.

Ms. Brnabic asked the maximum number of employees for any given

shift. Mr. Saputo replied that it was 23 during the peak in the summertime. Ms. Brnabic pointed out that he was only providing eight parking spaces for employees. Mr. Saputo said that many people car-pooled, a lot were dropped off, and some couples shared a car. Ms. Brnabic said they would almost have to because there were so few spaces, and she asked if they overflowed into customer parking. Mr. Saputo said that with the current set up, they did not, but the majority of their usage was in the back spots. Ms. Brnabic asked the current count for parking. Mr. Saputo believed it was 47. Ms. Brnabic asked how long he had been the owner, and he said he bought it three years ago. Ms. Brnabic asked if he owned other stores, and Mr. Saputo advised that he owned one at Walton and Adams, and he bought one at 21 Mile and Van Dyke in January. His father owned seven and his sister owned three. Ms. Brnabic was not sure that parallel parking would be used for regular cars; she thought they would be more for trucks or for vehicles with a trailer. If someone could pull right into a space like that they would, but she did not think most people would want to parallel park. She recognized that the applicant, as a business owner, felt the parking would work based on the 75% drive-thru traffic and if there was inconvenient parking for customers, that they could go elsewhere. Mr. Martin noted some owner operators with stores that boomed with customers, and they had employees make arrangements to park at nearby local businesses. They would pick up the employees and bring them to the stores. He agreed that customers were the most important feature. They wished the site was larger, but they were trying to improve what they had.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if there would be 23 employees at one time or if it was total. Mr. Saputo said it would be at one time during the peak summer rush. Mr. Martin reminded that a lot of hours were attributed to part time employees. Mr. Kaltsounis asked how much seating was in the current restaurant, and Mr. Martin said 76. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if there were 47 parking spaces for those seats, which was confirmed. Mr. Martin said that the current play place only had four seats because it was small. The proposed play place would be the width of the store and have 16-20 seats. It would be more convenient for families, and there might be fewer cars. Mr. Kaltsounis asked why the store would be 1,000 square feet larger. Mr. Martin answered that over the years, McDonald's' menu had changed drastically. They had over 100 menu items. The older McDonald's had 100-125 seats, and the kitchens were about one-third of the building. The kitchens were now two-thirds of the building. The restrooms were larger now, and the freezers were larger, so they did not have to have deliveries every day. Mr. Kaltsounis asked how much square footage the extra 25 seats took. Mr. Martin said they figured

10-12 square feet per person. Mr. Kaltsounis noticed that the grass would be removed, and he asked if the current retention was adequate. Mr. Martin said they had been dealing with the Engineering Department about the existing detention pond to the northwest of the site. When they go to the single drive and with the added grass in the back, he was not sure they would decrease the amount of grass. Mr. Kaltsounis thought they would in the front. Mr. Martin said he did not calculate it, but he felt they would be very close.

Mr. Kaltsounis summed up that there were 47 parking spots and 25 more seats and 23 employees. He felt they would need additional spots. He acknowledged that it would affect business if people could not find a place to park, but he thought people would keep looping until they found one, which was a safety concern. Every time parking had been tight in a facility they approved, it turned out to be less than they wished. He was skeptical about the parking. Mr. Martin said he appreciated the concern, and if they had the opportunity to have more, they would. He knew that Mr. Saputo would do everything he could with his staff regarding parking to find a solution.

Mr. Yukon asked if the side-by-side drive-thru design took into consideration the amount of traffic on Rochester Rd. and how long it took to get out onto Rochester. He asked if there was a concern there would be excessive stacking or queuing. Cars would loop around trying to find parking; cars would be queuing, trying to get onto Rochester, either right or left, and cars would be turning into the facility. He asked if any traffic studies had looked at that.

Mr. Saputo said that they originally went to a double drive-thru, because it gave two points of entry and two cars were ordering at once to speed things through. They now could get four cars along the side of the restaurant, and with the new restaurant, they would be able to get an extra car in between the pay window and the food window. According to the McDonald's study, the average it took was two-and-a-half minutes from the time a car got food until it drove off. Mr. Yukon asked about site distance on Rochester, noting the hill on Rochester Rd.. He was concerned about traffic trying to exit the site. Mr. Saputo said there was a little bit of a problem on the very peak days, but he thought it was because of the double cuts. They would like to do a spillway onto the private road. Mr. Yukon asked if he felt confident that the parking lot and stacking lanes could support the traffic in the area. Mr. Saputo said that he had to trust what McDonald's went by. They were investing \$1.6 million in the new location, as was he, and they believed it would last 20 years.

Mr. Yukon referred to the northerly access road to Lifetime Fitness, and he asked if there could be overflow and cause traffic problems. Mr. Saputo said that to the south, there was a five-foot section of grass and the UPS gentleman parked there. They had quite a few carpoolers that brought large groups that also parked there, and it had not been a problem. He had approached the person who owned the mall next door, but he had not been too receptive. They would continue to work on that.

Mr. Martin indicated that the access to the north would not necessarily be an opportunity to try to gain customers from Lifetime, but to be able to get to and from the site. A lot of communities had cross access easements, and McDonald's would sign their portion. Mr. Yukon asked how long the new building design had been in use, and Mr. Martin said it was over the last four years. The mansard roofs were gone, and he stated that the buildings had been very successful. The customers enjoyed the wi-fi and flat screens and the different seating configurations. Mr. Yukon referred to page C-1 of the Site Plan, under parking notes. There was a question mark under useable floor area. Mr. Martin said he had just not plugged it in. He said that oftentimes, planners used useable floor area to compute parking, but Rochester Hills did not, and he assured that he would add it before coming back.

Mr. Saputo said that McDonald's corporate realized that \$1,500/hour was the max they could do in the buildings. Instead of him coming up with a two-kitchen platform, they were expanding the menu in different parts of the day. They moved to a 24-hour operation in the last couple of years. They were trying to grow the snack part of the operation. McDonald's realized that people did not eat three square meals a day; they did more grazing. People might stop before and after the lunch period, and the products were meant to bring in people. The burger category was shrinking, and lines moved more quickly. The lineup was healthier, which he hoped was good for the Lifetime people.

Mr. Dettloff believed the newest McDonald's was in Troy at Big Beaver, and Mr. Martin agreed, and said that his office did that approval. Mr. Dettloff wished the applicants good luck, and he thought that a lot of people probably missed the restaurant. He asked the time frame from tear down to reconstruct. Mr. Martin believed that it would take about 75 days after approvals. Mr. Dettloff commented that the current Staff was a nice mix, and that it was great that they supported a lot of students.

Mr. Reece asked when the improvements to Rochester Road would take

place. Mr. Anzek said that it was scheduled for 2012, and they would tear up downtown Rochester. Mr. Reece clarified that there were no plans for widening Rochester in the area of the McDonald's, noting that would significantly impact the front entry if there were. Mr. Martin said they followed the Master Thoroughfare Plan's 180-foot right-of-way, so there was an extra 15 feet of setback.

Mr. Reece asked if there was any feedback about how the new Taco Bell was operating, and he recalled that the Commission had similar concerns about parking and the drive-thru and how it would all work there. Mr. Anzek said he had not gotten direct feedback, but he had spoken with the builder, who said it was very successful. Mr. Saputo added that it was number one in the State. Mr. Reece said he tended to believe that McDonald's knew its business relative to parking, and he trusted that Mr. Saputo would not be part of an investment that kept customers away because of parking. He mentioned that he stopped at the McDonald's at Rochester and Long Lake. It seemed as if there was a push away from traditional seating. Parking had been significantly reduced, and the restaurant was geared more towards drive-thru traffic. People had to drive all the way to the back for available parking. It was a dangerous situation to try to find safe access into the store, especially for a parent with four kids or an elderly person. He strongly recommended that when they came for Site Plan approval that the back third of the angled parking had an additional crossing point for people to get out of the major influx of traffic and safely over to the sidewalk. He agreed with Ms. Brnabic that not many people would use the parallel parking on the south side.

Mr. Reece asked if they thought that people who came from Lifetime would use the drive-thru primarily. Mr. Saputo agreed. Mr. Reece presumed that they would have to make the whole loop around, because they would not be able to get into the queuing lanes. He noted that Mr. Saputo had talked with the neighbor to the south about parking, and realized that it had not been very successful. Mr. Saputo said they were miles apart on the price. Mr. Reece stated that the lot was never filled, and he felt it would be a better opportunity for employee parking. Mr. Saputo said that the owner of Antonio's Pizza approached him about some of the décor inside the current McDonald's, and Mr. Saputo was going to give him some things and try to strike a deal to use some of his spots. Mr. Martin said they would check into options for employee parking.

Mr. Reece indicated that he was less concerned about landscaping at this location and more interested in having a safe site. He asked where they

would push the snow when it was plowed. Mr. Saputo said that was a good question, and he informed that they try to get it up onto the grassy areas - all the corners. Mr. Saputo said that he plowed between 2:00 and 6:00 a.m. Mr. Reece asked Mr. Saputo if he would be using parking bumpers for the angled parking, and he said he would not. Mr. Reece asked if there would be concrete curb and gutter, which was confirmed. Mr. Reece thought that the elevations were an improvement over what was currently there.

Mr. Hetrick asked the number of cars that could go through the drive-thru with the current configuration. Mr. Martin said he was not sure, but it was less than 16. The old building was wider, so the stacking lane did not wrap on the north side as much. Mr. Hetrick said that for 75% of the business (drive-thru), there would be better traffic flow, and it should alleviate some of the problems on Rochester Rd. Mr. Saputo said that the internal configuration would also make things quicker. Mr. Hetrick remarked that the supply chain and the process McDonald's went through were fantastic. He asked about the impact if they had to put in the required parking. Mr. Martin said they physically did not have room to add more cars. Mr. Hetrick imagined that it would be a non-starter for the business. Mr. Martin said that if the in and out remained the way they were, he could get more cars on the site, because there would be an opportunity to park in the front. The fallback to that was no circling, and it was better to have one curb cut. Mr. Hetrick observed that the demographics of the selling environment had changed. There were more people coming throughout the day versus at certain blocks of time, which, from McDonald's' perspective, would suggest that the number of people in the restaurant would be down at any one time, but the volume per day would still be there. The number of cars in the parking lot would be less, but they would still generate the volume. Mr. Saputo agreed. Mr. Hetrick concurred that the look and feel of the new place was far better than the old style.

Ms. Brnabic said she was glad they would look at options for overflow parking for the employees. She absolutely agreed with Mr. Reece about a second crossway. She looked at the plan trying to see how people would walk, and she found that it would be a dangerous situation, which she had experienced at other places. She agreed with the solution Mr. Reece had proposed. She referred to page 1 of 1, which talked about a discrepancy with the survey. She asked if that would be rectified before they came back. Mr. Martin explained that it had nothing to do with their site. It had to do with a monument that was a quarter mile away. It was used to legally get someone to a corner of the site, but it was a surveying

discrepancy that had no affect on how the site was being used or how big it was. It was a technicality, and they were trying to get a resolution.

Ms. Brnabic said that it stated that the dumpster encroached in the neighboring parking lot. Mr. Martin explained that the new one built would not encroach. Ms. Brnabic noted that there was a slight discrepancy on Sheet C-1 for parking. Mr. Martin apologized that it was just a math error, and confirmed that it would show 44 spaces.

Mr. Hooper mentioned the great series of questions from the Planning Commissioners, and he was pleased that they had been so thorough. He commended the applicant and appreciated his reinvestment in the community. He indicated that he did not have an issue with the reduction in the landscaping. Regarding the parking, he echoed the the fact that McDonald's knew its business, and if there was not enough, they would lose sales. He agreed that the idea to share parking with the neighbors should be pursued to see if it could work. If the employees could be moved to offsite parking, it would free spots for customers, which he felt would be good to implement. He wholly supported the access to the Lifetime Fitness drive. He could see people exiting that way, avoiding Rochester Rd. and going out to Avon. He strongly recommended that they try to work on that agreement. He asked if they explored making the Lifetime drive the main access to the site. Mr. Martin said that typically, when McDonald's looked for real estate, they wanted access to a major road. About 80% of the customers bought impulsively - it was not a destination point. McDonald's tried to locate where there was traffic, residences and commercial businesses. If there was an easy way of getting in, there was more likelihood of getting customers. An access off of a secondary road would not be as appealing. They did not look at that as an option, and they did not know if they could use their drive. Mr. Hooper noted how busy it was to try to turn left out of McDonald's because of the constant conflicts. Regarding lighting, he recalled an experience with the Burger King on Crooks. He assumed McDonald's would not increase the intensity of the lighting. Mr. Martin said they were proposing LED lights. There would be very low footcandles at the pavement, but the amount of light perceived would be greater than what a metal halide offered. The fixtures would be faced downward, and he did not feel there would be an issue with the lighting. Mr. Hooper asked if they would be shoebox fixtures, and if the intensity would be five footcandles or less. Mr. Martin said they ranged from three to four on the ground, and the poles would be 24 feet high. Mr. Hooper recalled that Burger King had intensities of over 10. He welcomed Mr. Saputo, and thanked him for doing business in Rochester Hills.

Mr. Dettloff asked if the hours of operation were dictated through corporate or the owner's decision. Mr. Saputo said that corporate pushed it, but he accepted any challenge from McDonald's. They looked favorably on owners trying to grow the business every part of the day. Mr. Martin asked if only the drive-thru would be open 24 hours. Mr. Saputo agreed. Mr. Dettloff asked what percentage of the business came between 2:00 and 6:00 a.m., and Mr. Saputo informed that it was under 10%.

Ms. Brnabic clarified that there were currently 76 seats in the restaurant and that the new building would have 95-100. She thought it was a good idea to have more seating for customers, even though they expected more drive-thru traffic, in case there happened to be a full house.

Mr. Scot Beaton, 655 Bolinger, Rochester Hills, MI 48307. Mr. Beaton said that he had lived within walking distance of the McDonald's for about 15 years, and that parking was not an issue for him. He thought Mr. Reece's comments were perfect; if the applicants could work something out with the neighbors it would be great. He claimed to have coined a term a long time ago, called "cartoonitecture," and said there was a lot of bad cartoonitecture out there, but that luckily, the applicants seemed to have gotten it right. If he wanted to eat a burger in a place that looked like it was built in the Bahamas, he would go there. Hall Road was an excellent example of it. Every imaginable "cartoonitecture-type" building was up and down that strip. He agreed that McDonald's had done a good job keeping the elevations at a low roar, and he thought it was a good-looking building. He asked if they would comply with the Sign Ordinance and if the sign would be a seven-foot monument sign. Mr. Martin said that the sign that was there would have to come down, and they would have to comply with what was required for signage. Mr. Beaton said he would rather not see a tall pole sign. Mr. Martin said there would be restrictions for what they could do. Mr. Beaton concurred that there had been great conversation, and he wished the applicants good luck with their endeavors.

Mr. Anzek advised that the City was taking the lead on coordinating the cross access with Lifetime Fitness. They were doing research, and they might not have it available by the time of Site Plan approval, but they could add it as a condition. Staff was pleased there would be one driveway and circulation on site. Staff viewed it as an opportunity to do something better, and they had suggested that since some things might not meet the Ordinance, that the applicants should come for a discussion.

He reminded that there were provisions in the Ordinance for the Commission to modify the buffer and parking requirements if it was shown it could work responsibly. He noted that there would also be a Conditional Land Use Recommendation and Approval required for the drive-thrus.

Mr. Reece asked if the Commissioners could see a quick sketch of what the parking layout would look like if the cross access was worked out with Lifetime, which Mr. Martin agreed he would provide.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

2011-0100 Recommendation of Planning Commission Representative to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a one-year term to expire March 31, 2012.

Ms. Brnabic accepted the nomination as the Planning Commission representative to the Zoning Board of Appeals for another year.

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, the Planning Commission recommends to City Council that Deborah Brnabic be its Representative to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a one-year term to expire March 31, 2012.

Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting

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

Absent 1 - Schroeder

Any Further Business

Ms. Brnabic wanted to get the Commission's thoughts about issues she perceived with handicap parking. The City now used the State Construction Code to determine handicap parking, which she felt probably regarded minimums. She recalled that she had expressed a concern when Taco Bell was in for review. She indicated that there were eight-foot van accessible spaces, but that did not consider the outside spaces. Until people experienced the situation personally, they could not realize the inconvenience and lack of safety. She referred to sheet C-4 for McDonalds, which only showed two, eight-foot handicap spaces. Her car was six feet wide, and with the doors opened, was almost ten. If there was a handicapped person in the passenger seat that used a walker or wheelchair, that person had to open the door all the way to get out. The door would go into the space next to the car, becoming a safety issue. She suggested that they should have an open space next to the handicap