



Goldberg Companies

Owner Managed Properties

February 27, 2019

Rochester Hills Planning Commission
City Municipal Offices
1000 Rochester Hills Dr.
Rochester Hills, MI 48309

Members of the Rochester Hills Planning Commission:

Thank you for the opportunity to present the site plan for our proposed apartment project, Legacy Rochester Hills. Goldberg Companies, Inc. is excited to transform the Brownfield Site at the corner of Hamlin and Adams into a high-end Class A apartment community, with acres of open space, thoughtful landscaping and best in class design. We believe that Legacy Rochester Hills will be a great addition to the community of Rochester Hills.

As you know, the State of Michigan declared the property to be a Brownfield Site that requires restoration prior to development. We have completed all clean-up activities on the apartment parcel, Parcel A, and have applied for a "No Further Action" letter from the State. We will also be performing significant environmental work on the adjacent parcel, Parcel B. During our investigations of this parcel, we discovered several conditions that have required us to revise our plan, especially with respect to the location and size of the encapsulation area on Parcel B. The approved Brownfield Plan contemplates the possibility of such unforeseeable conditions and allows for adjustments to be made, and we have worked diligently to minimize the changes to the original plan. We believe the revised plan is a good solution to a difficult problem, and we expect to commence the environmental work on Parcel B shortly, in time to complete it this summer. Thereafter, this site will be preserved, with ongoing due care compliance monitoring.

In addition to these efforts, we have met several times with the neighboring residents to discuss their concerns both in connection with our approach to the cleanup, as well as architectural and site elements of our proposed apartment community. As long-term property owners, our goal is to establish a good relationship with our surrounding neighbors and the community as a whole. We have implemented many of the neighbors' suggestions with respect to landscaping, site lines and other aspects of the development, and we will continue communicating with them before, during and after construction. We intend to be members of the Rochester Hills community for many years into the future, and establishing these good relationships is very important to us.

Thank you again for the opportunity to present our site plan to you, with the hope of securing your recommendation to Council for approval. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or comments you may have regarding this submittal or the project in general. Thank you in advance for your time and effort.

Best Regards,



Eric Bell

Principal

MEMO

ASTI Environmental

Date: February 5, 2019, revised March 1, 2019

To: Sara Roediger, City of Rochester Hills
Pam Valentik, City of Rochester Hills

From: Tom Wackerman

Subject: Review of Environmental Aspects of Site Plan for Redevelopment of the Northeast Corner of Hamlin and Adams Roads, Legacy of Rochester Hills, Rochester Hills, Michigan (ASTI files No. 9675-21)

As requested, this memo is a review of the following documents, as amended:

1. *Brownfield Details for Legacy of Rochester Hills, Sheet C-2.1, dated October 12, 2018 with most recent revision January 25, 2019 (Encapsulation Area Details)*
2. *Overall Preliminary Site Plan for Legacy of Rochester Hills, Sheet C-2.0, dated October 12, 2018 with most recent revision January 25, 2019 (Site Plan)*
3. *Letter of February 18, 2019 to Tom Wackerman of ASTI Environmental and Sara Roediger and Pam Valentick at City of Rochester Hills from Brian Westhoff of AKT Peerless titled "Response to February 5, 2019 ASTI Memo, Review of Environmental Aspects of Site Plan for Redevelopment of the Northeast Corner of Hamlin and Adams Roads, Legacy of Rochester Hills, Michigan"*

Background

The areas for remediation in Parcel A (Areas A through D), as originally described in the Brownfield Plan dated April 9, 2018, were enlarged in order to remove urban fill materials as determined by field observations and soil sampling. According to the applicant, the remediation has achieved residential closure criteria for Parcel A soils, based on over 300 soil samples from the excavation areas. The report is being prepared with no firm delivery date.

The area for remediation in Parcel B (Area E) was partially removed as part of the Area C remediation, and additional remediation in Area E is proposed. However, based on test trenches conducted in Parcel B in January of 2019, the presence of "paint waste" and drums, or partial drum fragments, indicates that the extent of PCB and lead impacted waste materials (those materials originally intended to be included in the encapsulation area) may extend further than anticipated when the Brownfield Plan was prepared. As such, the applicant has proposed that the location and size of the encapsulation area (consisting of slurry wall and cap) be enlarged and reconfigured to incorporate portions of Area E. This enlarged encapsulation area (at 1.3 acres) is noted on the Site Plan, and is a modification to the encapsulation area included in the Brownfield Plan (at 1.0 acres). Construction details for both the cover and the encapsulation area walls were provided. According to communications with the applicant's consultant, slurry wall and cap construction will begin in spring of 2019.



10448 Citation Drive, #100
P.O. Box 2160
Brighton, Michigan 48116
Phone: 810.225.2800 Fax: 810.225.3800

Review of Site Plan

In general, soils will be removed from two areas in Parcel B (the north and east areas on the Site Plan), and the encapsulation area will be moved to the south to incorporate impacts identified in the southern portion of Area E. As indicated on the Site Plan, portions of Area E will still be excavated and removed for off-site disposal (the east area as indicated in yellow). In addition, new excavations will be conducted north of the encapsulation area (the north area as indicated in green) and these materials will be removed for off-site disposal. The removal and off-site disposal of the soils from the north excavation area is a change from the submitted site plan, which originally indicated that these soils would be placed in the encapsulation area, and was modified by the February 18 letter.

The original intent of the Brownfield Plan was that excavation in Area E would be conducted until "paint waste" was encountered and then that waste would be included in the encapsulation area. With the proposed revisions, both the north and east excavation areas will be excavated as indicated regardless of the materials encountered. These areas will then be backfilled with clean soils. This therefore better defines the boundaries of the final encapsulation area.

Two types of walls for the encapsulation area are included in the Encapsulation Area Details: a compacted clay barrier wall for areas adjacent to excavations, and a slurry wall for all other areas. Both walls will be to a depth of 36 to 50 feet below the cover, and in all cases will penetrate a minimum of two-feet into the underlying native clay. The walls will be a minimum of 2-feet thick and will be constructed to a permeability of 10^{-7} cm/sec. The construction details indicate that an approved alternative could be used, but details are not provided and approval should be required by the City.

The cover construction details on the Encapsulation Area Detail drawing indicate the installation of a two-foot thick compact clay cover with 10^{-7} cm/sec permeability, overlaid with a flexible membrane liner, 2-feet of protective soils, and 6-inches of top soil and seed. The construction details indicate that an alternative geo-synthetic liner with a 10^{-7} cm/sec permeability may be substituted for the clay cover and flexible membrane liner, and the insert drawings list the geo-synthetic liner rather than the compact clay with liner originally proposed.

In all cases the cover will extend two feet beyond the slurry wall, as originally proposed. Along the eastern property boundary the location of the slurry wall will include all identified PCB impacts that exceed direct contact criteria (specifically sampling locations EB-36 and EB-37) within the encapsulation area because the slurry wall will be two feet west of the property boundary. This will require that a 14-foot area be cleared of trees and de grubbed on the City Park property to accommodate the installation equipment as indicated in the Site Plan. Tree removal and replacement, as well as final grading of the City Park property impacted by this activity, are detailed elsewhere.

Two vents will be installed on the cover. Per the site plan, and subsequent discussions with the applicant's consultant, each vent opening will be approximately 6-inches above the cover with a 12-inch slotted stack, and will be enclosed in a decorative housing (this is a change from the February 18 letter). Each vent will be connected to a lateral pipe to capture gases generated by the encapsulated waste materials.

Once completed, the adequacy of the excavation and encapsulation will be determined by the MDEQ through review and approval of a Documentation of Due Care Compliance report for Parcel B. Procedures for operation and maintenance of the cover, slurry wall and ventilation system will be included in that report.



10448 Citation Drive, #100
P.O. Box 2160
Brighton, Michigan 48116
Phone: 810.225.2800 Fax: 810.225.3800

Recommendations:

Encapsulation of a 30% larger area does not impose any additional risk or use restrictions for Parcel B. Relocating the encapsulation area to the south will contain more of the impacted materials, and will move the encapsulated materials further from the adjacent residences.

Removal of materials from the northern area will allow installation of trees and landscape in that area that would not be permitted if that area included a cap. In addition, it will provide clean fill for the installation of the utilities, and move impacted materials further away from the residential developments to the north. Installation of the storm sewer in this area will still include waterproofing seals and gaskets as described in the 381 Work Plan. The area south of the encapsulation area that was identified as being previously remediated can now be used to install landscaping along Hamlin Road.

Because of the contents of the encapsulated waste materials, the limited soil gas data, and the location of the vent openings at 6-inches above grade, the proposed vents should be sampled quarterly to determine actual emissions of methane and volatile organics, and to monitor odors. This sampling plan will be included in the Documentation of Due Care Compliance for Parcel B and should be conducted until a sufficient understanding of landfill gas conditions and venting is provided. In the event that the concentration of any constituent, or the identified odors, is unacceptable for park use, as determined by the MDEQ, vent redesign and possibly control should be required to remove vapors from the breathing zone. Please note that the monitoring proposed in the February 18 letter does not fulfill this objective and was modified by an email dated March 1st that changed to quarterly monitoring in the vents.

The notes on the Encapsulation Area Details, drawing C-2.1, indicate that an alternative cover may be used for the encapsulation area (Section 02510 K), and the insert drawings reference this alternative cover. The February 18 letter indicates that the applicant intends to use the alternative geo-synthetic clay cover. This will provide equivalent encapsulation and is acceptable.

Please contact me if you have any questions, or need additional information.



10448 Citation Drive, #100
P.O. Box 2160
Brighton, Michigan 48116
Phone: 810.225.2800 Fax: 810.225.3800



Planning and Economic Development
Sara Roediger, AICP, Director

From: Kristen Kapelanski, AICP
Date: 1/30/2019
Re: **Legacy of Rochester Hills (City File #17-043)**
Site Plan - Planning Review #4

The applicant is proposing to construct a 359-unit, multi-family development on the northeast corner of Hamlin and Adams Roads. The project was reviewed for conformance with the City of Rochester Hills Zoning Ordinance and the Consent Judgment governing development of the site. The comments below and in other review letters are relatively minor in nature and can be incorporated into a final site plan submittal for review by staff after review by the Planning Commission.

1. **Background Information:** Goldberg Companies, the applicant, submitted concept plans and began working with City staff in March of 2017 on new development plans for the property. This site is and was previously regulated by a consent judgment and brownfield plan. In order for the applicant to develop the property as presented, both the judgment and the brownfield plan had to be amended. A number of meetings were held with City staff to review the proposed concept plan and the new brownfield plan, with enhanced environmental cleanup efforts over what was previously approved for the property.

The updated plans were presented to the City Council in two closed sessions in December of 2017. Goldberg Companies were very responsive to the comments made by staff and the City Council and continued to modify and improve the plans based on those meetings. The City Council considered the amended consent judgment on February 5, 2018 where additional input was provided to the applicant. The applicant revised the plans and the City Council approved the amended consent judgment on April 23, 2018 to allow for the construction of up to 368 luxury apartments on the site.

At that same April 23, 2018 meeting, the City Council also considered and approved a new brownfield plan for the property. The brownfield plan reconfigured the existing parcels on the site into Parcel A and Parcel B. Parcel A contains all of the proposed residential development and amenities. Parcel B will be maintained as natural open space with a small portion near Hamlin Road next to Innovation Hills Park being developed with an outdoor exercise equipment area for use by the general public. An area of greater contamination on Parcel B will be encapsulated below grade to prevent the migration of contamination in this area that cannot be effectively removed. This area of Parcel B is referred to as the 'encapsulated area' on the site plan.

Per the consent judgment, the Planning Commission's review shall be limited to determining whether the site plan package submitted is consistent and in substantial compliance with the judgment and approved conceptual plans. This includes compliance with ordinance requirements not specifically amended by the judgment and the approved concept plan. Final site plan approval lies with the City Council.

2. **Zoning and Use** (Section 138-4.300). The site is zoned R-3 One Family Residential District Residential but is subject to a consent judgment as previously noted. Refer to the table below for the zoning and existing and future land use designations for the proposed site and surrounding parcels.

	Zoning	Existing Land Use	Future Land Use
Proposed Site	R-2 One Family Residential	Vacant	Residential 3
North	R-2 One Family Residential	Single family homes	Residential 3
South (across Hamlin Rd.)	R-3 One Family Residential (Consent Judgment) & ORT Office, Research & Technology	Vacant	Regional Employment Center
East	R-3 One Family Residential	Innovation Hills	Park/Public Open Space
West	R-3 One Family Residential	Single family homes	Residential 3

3. **Site Layout and Access** (Section 138-5.100-101 and 138-5.200). Refer to the table below as it relates to the area, setback, and building requirements for the site. Per the judgment, the site is generally subject to the development requirements of the RM-1, Multiple Family Residential district. Specific deviations have been noted in the judgment and are noted in the table below.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Parcel Area/Lot Width 0.5 acres/150 ft.	28.23 acres/1,302 ft.	In compliance
Density 3 bedroom: 6,400 sq. ft./unit = 6,400 x 71 = 10.4 acres 2 bedroom: 6,000 sq. ft./unit = 6,000 x 148 = 20.4 acres 1 bedroom: 5,600 sq. ft./unit = 5,600 x 140 = 18 acres Total area required = 48.8 acres	22.49 acres (net) 28.23 acres (gross)	In compliance - Deviation part of consent judgment
Min. Perimeter Front Setback abutting major thoroughfare (west: Adams) 50 ft.	West property line (Adams): 50 ft. South property line (Hamlin): 90 ft. East property line: 275 ft. North property line: 100 ft.	In compliance
Min. Perimeter Side Setback abutting major thoroughfare (south: Hamlin) 50 ft.		
Min. Perimeter Side Setback (east) 30 ft.		
Min. Perimeter Rear Setback (north) 30 ft.		
Min. Building Separation Front to Rear – 60 ft. Rear to Rear – 60 ft. Side to Side – 30 ft. Corner to Corner – 30 ft.	Front to Rear – 50 ft. Rear to Rear – 50 ft. Side to Side – 10 ft. Corner to Corner – 10 ft.	In compliance - Deviation part of consent judgment
Min. Floor Area 3 bedroom: 850 sq. ft. 2 bedroom: 700 sq. ft. 1 bedroom: 600 sq. ft.	3 bedroom: 1,559 sq. ft. 2 bedroom: 1,268 sq. ft. 1 bedroom: 830 sq. ft.	In compliance
Unit Mixture Max. 30% 1 bedroom units = 359 x .3 = Max. 108 one bedroom units	140 1 bedroom units	In compliance – Deviation consistent with the concept plan included as part of consent judgment
Front Door Orientation 75% of main entrances on front façade 6 ft./36 sq. ft. porch required	Front entrances provided – minimal porches provided	In compliance – Deviation part of consent judgment
Garage Orientation Max. 25% garage doors at or in front of front bldg. wall	Garage door locations vary – consistent with consent judgment concept plan	In compliance – Deviation part of consent judgment
Max. Height Bldgs. 1, 2, 3 & 4 – 2 stories/30 ft. Bldgs. 5, 6 & 7 – 4 stories/60 ft. Carriage Bldgs. – 2.5 stories/35 ft.	Bldgs. 1, 2, 3, & 4 - 2 stories/29 ft. 11.5 in. Bldgs. 5 & 6 – 4 stories/50 ft. 10 in. Bldg. 7 – 4 stories/51 ft. 9 in. Carriage -2.5 stories/27 ft. 5 in.	In compliance
Street Design Street connections to adjacent neighborhoods in residential districts required	No connections to adjacent neighborhood provided	In compliance – Deviation part of consent judgment

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Pedestrian Circulation 5 ft. sidewalks connecting parking, public walks & recreation areas to bldg. entrances 6 ft. sidewalks along collector roads in development 8 ft. pathways along streets adjacent to development	Walkways provided	In compliance
Recreation Areas 5% gross area = 61,484 sq. ft. (Min. 5,000 sq. ft./4:1 length to width ratio)	66,150 sq. ft. provided	In compliance

4. **Access and Parking** (138-11.300-308, Section 138-8.600 and Article 12). Refer to the table below as it relates to the street design, and parking requirements of this project as proposed.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Min. # Parking Spaces 2 or fewer bedrooms – 1.5 per dwelling unit + 0.2 visitor spaces $288 \times 1.5 + 288 \times 0.2 = 490$ spaces 3 or more bedrooms – 2 per dwelling unit + 0.25 visitor spaces $71 \times 2 + 71 \times 0.25 = 160$ spaces 650 spaces required for entire site	713 parking spaces	In compliance
Max. # Parking Spaces 125% of Min. = 812		
Min. Barrier Free Spaces 5 + 2% of parking provided = 20 BF spaces 11 ft. in width w/ 5 ft. aisle for 500-1,000 spaces	20 parking spaces	In compliance
Min. Parking Space Dimensions 10 ft. x 18 ft. 24 ft. aisle (2-way)/15 ft. (1-way)	9 ft. x 16 ft. (with 2 ft. overhang)	In compliance – consistent with the concept plan and ordinance requirements allowing for reduced width for low turnover parking spaces
Min. Parking Setback 15 ft. on all sides Max. 50% required front yard Max. 75% required rear yard	15 ft. + Max. 23.5% (Hamlin – front yard) Max. 0% rear	In compliance

5. **Exterior Lighting** (Section 138-10.200-204). A photometric plan showing the location of exterior lighting has been provided. Refer to the table below as it relates to the lighting requirements for this project.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Shielding/Glare Lighting shall be fully shielded & directed downward at a 90° angle Fixtures shall incorporate full cutoff housings, louvers, glare shields, optics, reflectors or other measures to prevent off-site glare & minimize light pollution Only flat lenses are permitted on light fixtures; sag or protruding lenses are prohibited	Building sconces full cut off Pole fixtures full cut off	In compliance
Max. Intensity (measured in footcandles fc.) 10 fc. anywhere on-site, 1 fc. at ROW, 0.0 at residential property lines & 0.5 fc. at any other property line	Photometric data provided	In compliance
Lamps Max. wattage of 250 watts per fixture LED or low pressure sodium for low traffic areas, LED, high pressure sodium or metal halide for parking lots	Max. wattage 133	In compliance
Max. Height 15 ft. per consent judgment	Approx. 14 ft.	In compliance

6. **Natural Features.** In addition to the comments below, refer to the review letters from the Engineering and Forestry Departments that pertain to natural features protection.
- a. **Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)** (*Section 138-2.204.G*) An EIS has been submitted that meets ordinance requirements.
 - b. **Wetlands** (*Section 126 Natural Resources, Article IV Wetland and Watercourse Protection*). The site does not contain any regulated wetland areas.
 - c. **Natural Features Setback** (*Section 138-9 Chapter 1*). The site does not contain any natural features setbacks.
 - d. **Steep Slopes** (*Section 138-9 Chapter 2*). The site does not contain any regulated steep slopes.
 - a. **Tree Removal** (*Section 126 Natural Resources, Article III Tree Conservation*). The site is subject to the city's tree conservation ordinance, and so any healthy tree greater than 6" in caliper that will be removed must be replaced with one tree credit. Trees that are dead or in poor condition or those that have been removed as part of the environmental cleanup efforts need not be replaced. A tree preservation plan has been included. The removal of any regulated tree requires the approval of a tree removal permit and associated tree replacement credits, in the form of additional plantings as regulated in the Tree Conservation Ordinance or a payment of \$216.75 per credit into the City's tree fund. The plan indicates 204 trees on site will be removed with approximately 153 regulated trees to remain. A total of 33 deciduous trees 3 inches in diameter (equaling 66 replacement credits) and 69 evergreen trees 10 feet in height (138 replacement credits) will be replaced on site equaling the required 204 replacement credits. Eight regulated trees along the shared property line with Innovation Hills Park will need to be removed as part of the construction of the slurry wall associated with the encapsulation of Parcel B and the applicant will pay into the tree fund to mitigate these removals. **The cost per tree is \$216.75. The plans indicate \$205.5. This should be updated accordingly.** Regulated trees removed as part of the environmental cleanup are not required to be replaced per the Consent Judgment and are not included as part of the tree removal permit request.
 - e. **Preserve/Encapsulated Area.** Plans have been sent to ASTI, the City's environmental consultant, to ensure compliance with the approved environmental clean-up plans. There are several outstanding issues/questions regarding the environmental clean-up on Parcel B. See the review letter from ASTI updated March 1, 2019.
7. **Dumpster Enclosure** (*Section 138-10.311*). A trash compactor and dumpster is proposed in the eastern yard. Screening details to match the buildings have been provided.
8. **Landscaping** (*Section 138-12.100-308 and Section 122-304(7)*). Refer to the table below as it relates to the landscape requirements for this project.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Right of Way (Hamlin: 1,408 ft.) 1 deciduous per 35 ft. + 1 ornamental per 60 ft. = 40 deciduous + 23 ornamental	40 deciduous 23 ornamental	In compliance
Right of Way (Adams: 754 ft.) 1 deciduous per 35 ft. + 1 ornamental per 60 ft. = 22 deciduous + 13 ornamental	22 deciduous 13 ornamental	In compliance
Parking Lot: Interior 5% of parking lot + 1 deciduous per 150 sq. ft. landscape area = 10,600 sq. ft. + 71 deciduous	17,909 sq. ft. 71 deciduous	In compliance
Parking Lot: Perimeter (Hamlin 1,318 ft.) 1 deciduous per 25 ft. + 1 ornamental per 35 ft. = 53 deciduous + 38 ornamental + continuous shrub hedge w/in 100 ft. of ROW	32 deciduous 38 ornamental Shrub hedge	In compliance – 21 deciduous placed elsewhere on site because of corner clearance conflicts
Parking Lot: Perimeter (Adams 485 ft.) 1 deciduous per 25 ft. + 1 ornamental per 35 ft. = 19 deciduous + 14 ornamental + continuous shrub hedge w/in 100 ft. of ROW	19 deciduous 14 ornamental Shrub hedge	In compliance
Stormwater (376 ft.) 6 ft. width + 1.5 deciduous + 1 evergreen + 4 shrubs per 100 ft. = 6 ft. width + 6 deciduous + 4 evergreen + 15 shrubs Basins shall be designed to avoid the need to perimeter fencing.	6 deciduous 4 evergreen 18 shrubs	In compliance
North Property Line Screening	Replacement plantings	See a. below

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Developer shall supplement existing landscaping to provide coverage to the residences to the north during all seasons	concentrated along the north property line to provide additional screening	

- a. The judgment included provisions for plantings on the 13 properties directly abutting the proposed development. **The applicant should provide an update on the strategy and communication thus far with those 13 homeowners to address this provision.** While the majority of the northern buffer has been supplemented with additional plantings, the northeastern corner was previously not well planted. Since the last submittal, plantings have been added to this section of the northern buffer and to the 'notched area' in the section of the buffer as well. Additionally, a berm has been included bordering the encapsulation area.
- b. A landscape planting schedule has been provided that includes the size of all proposed landscaping, a unit cost estimate and total landscaping cost summary, including irrigation costs, for landscape bond purposes.
- c. If required trees cannot fit be planted due to infrastructure conflicts, a payment in lieu of may be made to the City's tree fund at a rate of \$216.75 per tree. This does not apply to required screening landscaping.
- d. All landscape areas must be irrigated. This has been noted on the landscape plan. A note specifying that watering will only occur between the hours of 12am and 5am has been included on the plans.
- e. Site maintenance notes listed in *Section 138-12.109* have been included on the plans.
- f. A note stating "Prior to the release of the performance bond, the City of Rochester Hills must inspect all landscape plantings." has been included on the plans.

9. Architectural Design (Architectural Design Standards).

- a. Renderings of the proposed building elevations have been provided as part of the application. Building walls reviewed under the RM-1 provisions visible from a street or other residential use shall include windows and architectural features similar to the front façade of the building, including, but not limited to awnings, cornice work, edge detailing or other decorative finish materials. All buildings shall have pitched roofs, which may include functional dormer windows and varying lines customary with gable or hip style roofing. Standing seam metal roofing is prohibited. The provisions of the RM-1 District regarding architectural design have been met.
- b. Per the consent judgment, building elevations shall be Tudor style with a partial fieldstone front façade. Proposed elevations are Tudor in design and include a partial fieldstone façade. Materials are generally consistent with the judgment.

10. Gateway Feature. As part of the approved judgment, the applicant is required to construct a 'gateway feature' at the corner of Adams and Hamlin Roads. The plans indicate a landscaped plaza including decorative pavement, signage and a water feature. A raised planting bed surrounding the proposed signage also serves as a seating wall. **The City logo should be incorporated into the larger signage.**

11. Exercise Equipment. As part of the approved judgment, the applicant is required to construct an outdoor exercise area on Parcel B adjacent to Innovation Hills Park. This will be open to the public. An area for this feature has been identified on the plans and a detail of proposed equipment has been provided. A pedestrian connection has been added ending at the Innovation Hills property line.

12. Entranceway Landscaping and Signs. (*Section 138-12.306 and Chapter 134*). A note has been included on the plans that states that all signs must meet the requirements of the City and be approved under separate permits issued by the Building Department.



ASSESSING DEPARTMENT
Laurie Taylor, Director

From: Nancy McLaughlin
Date: 10/16/18
Re: File No.: 17-0435
Project: Legacy of Rochester Hills Review #1
Parcel No: 70-15-29-101-022 & 023
Applicant: LRH Development LLC

No comment.



BUILDING DEPARTMENT
Scott Cope

M I C H I G A N

From: Mark Artinian, Building Inspector/Plan Reviewer
To: Kristen Kapelanski, Planning Department
Date: January 3, 2019
Re: Legacy of Rochester Hills – Review #3
Hamlin / Adams
Sidwell: 15-29-101-022, -023
City File: 17-043

The Building Department has reviewed the site plan approval documents dated December 21, 2018 for the above referenced project. Our review was based on the Zoning Ordinance, the 2015 Michigan Building Code and ICC A117.1 -2009, unless otherwise noted.

Approval is recommended.

The following issues should be addressed with the documentation provided for Building Permit review:

Code Analysis:

1. Indicate the National Electric Code year as 2014.
2. Provide full, separate code analysis for both Buildings 7A & 7B.
3. Label the floors in the Building 7 code analysis as noted on the floor plans (Lower thru Third).
4. Verify allowable square footage used for Building 7A, S-2 use.
5. Verify allowable square footage used for Carriage Buildings, U use.

Should the applicant have any questions or require addition information they can call the Building Department at 248-656-4615.



DPS/Engineering
Allan E. Schneck, P.E., Director

SRB

From: Jason Boughton, AC, Engineering Utilities Specialist
To: Kristen Kapelanski, AICP, Manager of Planning
Date: February 5, 2019
Re: Legacy of Rochester Hills, City File #17-043, Section #29
Site Plan Review #4

Approved

Engineering Services has reviewed the site plan received by the Department of Public Services on January 25, 2019 for the above referenced project. Engineering Services does recommend site plan approval with the following comments:

Storm Sewer

1. Provide a storm sewer design for the offsite parcel to the east (Innovation Hills Park) to be able to handle a 100-year storm event of the discharge at the east property line. Coordinate with the City of Rochester Hills consultant for the proposed park, Hubbell, Roth & Clark Inc., to provide a design that meets the storm sewer requirement and is aesthetically pleasing to the design of the park.
2. Revise the storm sewer behind Building #4 to maintain 10-foot horizontal separation between other utilities and the proposed building.

Traffic/Paving

1. Identify the required traffic signal modifications that will be necessary as part of proposed development, including pedestrian traffic signal heads. Detailed traffic signal plans will need to be submitted by a MDOT prequalified traffic signal design engineer (MDOT prequalified traffic signal design consultant listing is attached for reference). This will directly impact the location and type of drives allowed off Hamlin Rd near the cross-over. The owner has stated that this study is currently underway.
2. There are concerns with the exiting traffic movements onto Hamlin Rd from the westerly drive approach that will need to be addressed. Namely, overlapping exiting turning movements from the proposed Hamlin Rd drive approach with those vehicles exiting the existing Hamlin Rd cross over directly to the west. There are several ways to account for this:
 - a. Construct the westerly drive approach as a right-out only.
 - b. Possibly incorporate "split phasing" into the traffic signal design simulation model. This would need to confirm that the traffic progression along Hamlin Rd will not be impeded and/or compromised.
 - c. Other proven strategies/suggestions?
3. Upon completion of the traffic signal study, it is recommended to coordinate a meeting with RCOC, CITY, and owner to address the proposed driveway location along Hamlin and to review the existing traffic signal hand holes/manholes as they appear to be in direct conflict.

Pathway/Sidewalk

1. NA

The applicant will need to submit a Land Improvement Permit (LIP) application with engineer's estimate, fees and construction plans to get the construction plan review process started.

JRB/md

Attachment: Traffic Signal Vendor List

c: Allan E. Schneck, P.E., Director; DPS
Tracey Balint, P.E., Public Utilities Engineering Mgr.; DPS
Paul G. Shumejko, P.E., PTOE, Transportation Eng. Mgr.; DPS
Ken Elwert, CPRE, Director; Parks & Natural Resources

Paul Davis, P.E. City Engineer/Deputy Director; DPS
Scott Windingland, DPS Aide; DPS
Keith P. Depp, Project Engineer; DPS
File

I:\Eng\PRIV\17043 Legacy Rochester Hills\EngSite Plan Review 4.docx



FIRE DEPARTMENT
Sean Canto
Chief of Fire and Emergency Services

From: William A. Cooke, Assistant Chief / Fire Marshal
To: Planning Department
Date: February 12, 2019
Re: Legacy of Rochester Hills

SITE PLAN REVIEW

FILE NO: 17-043

REVIEW NO: 4

APPROVED X

DISAPPROVED _____

The Fire Department recommends approval of the above reference site plan contingent upon the following conditions being met:

1. Relocate the FDC to the east exterior wall of the northwest carriage unit.
2. Relocate the FDC to the south exterior wall of the southwest carriage unit.

William A. Cooke
Assistant Chief / Fire Marshal



PARKS & NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

Ken Elwert, CPRE, Director

To: Kristen Kapelanski, Planning Manager
From: Matt Einheuser, Natural Resources Manager
Date: January 29, 2019
Re: Legacy of Rochester Hills - Review #4
File #17-043

Forestry review pertains to right-of-way tree issues only.

No comments at this time

Copy: Maureen Gentry, Economic Development Assistant

ME/ms



Civil Engineers | Land Surveyors | Landscape Architects

experienced. responsive. passion for quality.

Corporate Office: 2430 Rochester Court • Suite 100 • Troy, MI 48063
t: 248.689.9090 • f: 248.689.1044 • www.peainc.com

March 1, 2019
PEA Project No: 2017-037

Ms. Kristen Kapelanski, AICP
City of Rochester Hills
Planning Department
1000 Rochester Hills Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309

**RE: Site Plan Review #4
Legacy Rochester Hills
City File #17-043
NEC Hamlin and Adams Roads
Rochester Hills, Michigan**

Dear Ms. Kapelanski:

This office is in receipt of your review letters regarding the subject development:

- Planning and Economic Development, dated 1/30/19
- ASTI Environmental, dated 2/5/19
- DPS/Engineering, dated 2/5/19
- Parks & Natural Resources Department, dated 2/29/19
- Fire Department, dated 2/12/19
- Additional comments received from the Clinton River Valley No. 1 Subdivision
- Additional comments received at meetings with City staff and neighborhood meetings

Please note the following revisions and clarifications in response to the review letter comments:

Planning and Economic Development:

1. Tree removal – the cost per tree for replacement will be updated as requested.
2. Please refer to separate memo by AKT Environmental for responses to the preserve/encapsulation area comments.
3. Landscaping – GCI will provide the \$3,000 to each homeowner upfront for them to spend as they see fit.
4. Architectural Design – based on recent comments, a minimum water table of approximately 2 feet has been maintained throughout all buildings, resulting in minimal revisions to elevations of building 1-4 and 5. Dormers above the clubhouse on the north side of building 6 have been removed.
5. Gateway Feature – it is GCI's policy not to incorporate other logos directly into its property branding. Therefore, GCI has proposed the City's logo on the elevated pillar of the gateway feature along the right-hand side.

ASTI Environmental:

1. Please refer to separate memo by AKT Environmental for responses to the preserve/encapsulation area comments.

Fire Department:

1. The FDCs will be relocated as requested on the construction plans.

DPS/Engineering:

Storm Sewer:

1. The off-site storm sewer design will be submitted to the City for review and permit. PEA has been coordinating with the City as well as HRC, the city's consulting engineer for the work on the Innovation Hills property.
2. The storm sewer behind Building #4 will be revised as requested on the construction plan submittal.

Traffic/Paving:

1. PEA is currently in discussions with a traffic consultant regarding the Hamlin Road signal work. A meeting with the City and RCOC will be scheduled once the analysis and design is further along. Comments from the City and RCOC will be addressed on the construction plans.
2. A Land Improvement Permit (LIP) application will be submitted with the construction plans for review and approval by the City's Engineering Department.

Additional City and Neighborhood Comments:

1. In response to an email from Lynn Loebis regarding 4-story buildings. This was agreed to as part of the amended consent judgement agreement.
2. The northern drive approach on Adams Road was eliminated due to traffic concerns by the neighborhood to the north.
3. A berm was added near the northeast corner of the site to help direct overland overflow stormwater east to the City's park property.
4. The encapsulation area was reduced in size and additional trees were added on the eastern parcel.

If you should have any questions or require any additional information, please feel free to contact this office.

Sincerely,

PEA, Inc.



Rachel L. Smith, PE, LEED AP, CFM
Associate | Project Manager



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Legacy of Rochester Hills

1 message

KEITH & LYNN LOEBS <lloeb@wideopenwest.com>

Mon, Jan 7, 2019 at 12:11 PM

To: planning@rochesterhills.orgCc: moritas@rochesterhills.org

I am unable to attend the neighbor's meeting on Jan 9th or the Planning Commission meeting on January 15th.

I want my feelings on this development made known to the Planning Commission.

On the tree removal - Already a vast amount of trees have been removed due to the Brownfield remediation. The developer should not remove any more trees. Their estimate of 205 will basically clear the entire property of any trees. These are old growth trees of 40+ feet in height. By removing any more trees the landscape of the area will be devastated and remove any visual barriers to the adjoining neighborhood.

On the site plan (which has not been posted as of the day I received the draft agenda) - A four story building at one of the the highest points in Rochester Hills is totally out of character of the area.

Back when Fanuc came into the area great efforts were made to limit the visibility of the buildings to the neighbors and street view. This should be a major consideration for this development. Two story buildings at the maximum along Hamlin and one story in the areas that abut the residences on Portage Trail Drive is what would be the least impact. A four story building will tower over the mature trees in this single family residential area and be an eyesore.

I suggest the commission drive south on Adams road towards Hamlin and visualize the view they will create if they approve a four story structure. No amount of landscaping will ever effectively block these buildings from anyone's view.

Respectfully,

Lynn Loeb
2845 Portage Trail Dr
Rochester Hills, MI 48309
248-4058-7147

--

--

WOW! Homepage (<http://www.wowway.com>)