

She said she thought the mix was suitable and also mentioned the higher prices. She was not opposed to the development, indicating that the sides abutting the residential had enough of a buffer, and that it was not backed right up to someone's door. The north side of the development would not impact the adjacent industrial. Regarding traffic, she did not think it would generate any more traffic than what 70+ homes would generate. She thought the proposal could be viable and useful in the community, although the density should not go higher.

Mr. Hooper added that the vehicles the applicant could use - Conditional Zoning or a PUD - could be discussed with Staff, who could determine which would be most appropriate.

Mr. Schroeder indicated that he had been looking for a condo, and that the proposal would be very competitive and needed in the community. He mentioned that the development would attract seniors and there would be less traffic than with a single-family development. He asked if a PUD would be used. Mr. Delacourt said he would look at the building separations, and if there were a reduction in standards from what would normally be allowed in an RM-1, he would probably lean toward a PUD. Mr. Schroeder felt a PUD would allow more flexibility.

Discussed

2005-0366

City File No. 05-005 - Pine Woods Condominiums, a proposed 29-unit site condominium development on 9.5 acres, located on the south side of Auburn, west of M-59, zoned R-4, One Family Residential, Known as Parcel Nos. 15-34-101-012 & -013, Lorenzo Randazzo, applicant.

(Reference: Memo prepared by Derek Delacourt, dated September 2, 2005 had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

The applicant was not required to be present.

Mr. Delacourt stated that about three months ago, he brought a copy of the plan to talk about lot layout and access. The original plan had a connection to Auburn Road and a stub street into the Hazelwood Subdivision and a half 30-foot right-of-way at the southern end to potentially allow connection to Livernois. The plan was sent to MDOT, who had a concern, as did the City's Engineering Department, with a connection to Auburn. When it was discussed at the Planning Commission meeting, they determined that the optimum would be a connection from Hazelwood, a boulevarded entrance off Hazelton. After MDOT's comments, the applicant worked on a design that would eliminate the connection to Auburn, and created a long (over 600 feet), although short-term, dead end. It could eventually be connected to

Livernois. Staff asked the applicant to hold off submitting plans so Staff could contact the Hazelwood Homeowner's Association to see if they would consider the connection to the Hazelwood boulevard drive. Subsequent to meeting with the Association, he received a fax from them (on file in the Planning Department) with some issues about the connection. Staff did not have a final decision about the acceptability of it and was in the process of discussing what to recommend if the connection could not be made to Hazelwood. Access to Auburn would not be allowed, and it was a safety issue with the bridge and speed limit.

Mr. Hooper clarified that he and Ms. Hill were on the Planning Commission when Hazelwood was reviewed, during about 20 meetings. At that time, in lieu of the boulevard entrance, the Commission strenuously advised the developer to acquire the subject property and make a connection to Auburn. He was very surprised that MDOT would now not allow a connection to Auburn. Mr. Delacourt recalled that Staff had paperwork to that effect, including a letter stating that MDOT would allow the connection if a proposal came forward.

Mr. Shumejko explained that the letter was dated in 1990. Since then, MDOT had prepared Access Management guidelines and standards for streets and driveways off major roads. The site access point to the crest of the bridge was insufficient, based upon the current design guidelines. MDOT was adamant about allowing the connection due to the overpass and site distance problems.

Mr. Delacourt added that there were some other problems, including the amount of construction it would take to go to Auburn Road and the existing traffic. He referred to a preliminary plan recommended by Staff. It would require a Cul-de-sac Waiver. The Fire Department had requested the minimum bulb for a fire truck. Staff recommended also that the cul-de-sac should be longer so that if the lots on Livernois were acquired, they could access a double loaded street to Livernois. He would like input from the Commission to see if they felt that was appropriate.

Mr. Hooper opened the public comments at 10:07 p.m.

Michael Mahfet, 3209 Villa Nova Drive, Rochester Hills, MI *Mr. Mahfet stated that he was the Vice President of the Homeowners Association for Hazelwood Hills. They were not opposed to the proposed subdivision. They were approached by the City to have an access from Grand Park Boulevard to connect into the cul-de-sac. They had several discussions and meetings, and based on the safety concerns for fire, ambulance, snowplow, and bus traffic, he felt that would not be safe to travel. They put together a list of discussion points,*

which they faxed to the Planning Department and the developer. It was a way to facilitate things, which they felt would be a winning situation for both parties. They had not received a response to that. They were willing to negotiate and felt there was a way to make things happen from a safety standpoint. They were looking for guidance.

Mr. Hooper asked if he was a proponent of a connection at the boulevarded entrance. He said they were, but not for free because it would cause a tremendous amount of tear-up and hassle for them to redo the Master Deeds, the common area and the boulevard. They put together a list of things to discuss with the builder and the City, as a way to facilitate that.

Mr. Hooper indicated that the City would act as a possible go-between. Mr. Mahfet said that if it did not happen, they would not be comfortable with the proposal as it was laid out. The cul-de-sac would be 1,300 feet from the entrance at the back part of their sub, or almost a mile from Hazelton to get to someone at the end of the cul-de-sac, and they found that to be very uncomfortable.

Mr. Delacourt agreed Staff offered to be a go-between and could help with the Bylaws or getting an access easement and during the construction phase. However, items listed by Hazelwood, including the cost of the property, retention pond improvements, and maintenance agreements would have to be negotiated between the Association and Mr. Randazzo (applicant) directly. Mr. Hooper said that the City could not force something to happen, but they could help facilitate things, if possible.

Mr. Mahfet said that the proposal put forward was not in the best interest of his subdivision, which had 35 homes. There would be a tremendous amount of traffic through his subdivision, where children played. Mr. Hooper said the Commission would not disagree, and that making the connection to the boulevard would be the preferred method. Mr. Mahfet referred to the list the Association generated and said there was nothing on there that was not directly impacted by the input of a new subdivision. They asked for modifications to the retention pond because once all the cement and people were added, the pond would get deeper, have more runoff and they would not want to pay the price for squeezing in 29 homes.

Mr. Hooper remarked that the same argument could have been made about the Hazelwood subdivision when it was going in.

Mr. Schroeder asked if there had been discussion about tying into the boulevard, which was confirmed, and said it made sense. He indicated

that the developer would be responsible for doing that. Mr. Mahfet said they had sent the developer a fax and called several times but had not heard anything. Mr. Delacourt said he spoke with the developer, who said he was willing to do what was required to pay for and build the connection. Mr. Schroeder asked if he had tried to acquire the private property for the connection through to Hazelwood. Mr. Delacourt said it was in question, and that there had been several meetings. Mr. Schroeder asked about the two lots on Livernois and if there had been discussion with the owners. Mr. Delacourt thought the applicant had talked with those homeowners, but he was not aware of the price. Mr. Mahfet said they had talked with the homeowners and they were told that they were not interested in selling at any time in the near future, so the connection to Livernois was probably about five to ten years out. Mr. Hooper said that someone living near Hazelwood said the same thing five years ago. Mr. Mahfet said they had two connections, however, because it was a horseshoe they put in the double boulevard. Mr. Delacourt advised that the Fire Department and Engineering had both reviewed the plan and recommended approval on the length of the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Schroeder clarified that there would be a bubble at the end of the cul-de-sac and that one lot would be unbuildable until the connection could be made. Mr. Shumejko said the applicant would consider having an emergency access off of the cul-de-sac in the interim, and not building on a lot, until the connection to Livernois was made. Mr. Delacourt said the applicant could lose another lot temporarily for the emergency access to Auburn. The Fire Department said they would not ask for that, however.

Mr. Schroeder asked where the detention pond would be. Mr. Delacourt said it would be between lots 21 and 22. Mr. Mahfet stated that all the water ran into his subdivision into a detention pond on the east side of the street. Mr. Delacourt noted that when the Hazelwood pond was sized, it was done to hold the water for both subdivisions. There was a large stormwater problem now by the mosque.

Ms. Hill directed her comments to Mr. Mahfet, and indicated that the Association said they were looking out for the best interests of the proposed development. She felt that for the best interests of the existing Hazelwood development, and so it did not get traffic down Villa Nova and Grand Park to the proposal, the best solution would be to have access off the boulevard entrance. It would make the best sense for the City overall. Originally they thought there would be access to Auburn, but with the potential for the bridges to be rebuilt over M-59, and the extra traffic, she understood MDOT not allowing access to Auburn. It would not be safe at all. The proposed cul-de-sac, with potential access

to Livernois, was certainly a viable means. They heard the Fire Department did not have a problem; obviously it would have to come to City Council for a Waiver for the length. She thought that the Hazelwood Association should come to the table and work with the City and developer to create an access which would lessen the impact to their subdivision.

Mr. Mahfet said he was not sure what Ms. Hill was asking. Ms. Hill said the Association made a number of statements indicating that if the developer were willing to go along with the things they wanted to have done that it would help his subdivision. She began to emphasize that whether he did or did not, and Mr. Mahfet cut her off at that point and said that it would be a win-win situation for both subdivisions if they were to make that entrance happen. They had come to the table and had more than half a dozen conversations with Staff. They also tried to contact the developer with a list of discussion points. That was all they had done. He said he did not know how to make it any easier for him other than coming to the table with a list of discussion points.

Ms. Hill said she was glad they had come to the table with some discussion points. She agreed that the developer would be responsible for his detention. The pond that was created in Hazelwood was done to make sure it could handle all of the flow across all of the properties. The City created the boulevard entrance and it was quite contentious and went on for quite awhile. They required it so there would be access to the homes for the Fire Department and EMT. Mr. Mahfet said they made the decision based on having access to Auburn Road, which they would no longer have. Ms. Hill corrected that they made the decision because they did not have the access to Auburn. She hoped the Hazelwood Association would definitely sit down and look at a compromise that would work, without making excessive demands, because she felt it would benefit them, as well as the developer, and reduce the amount of traffic that would run through Hazelwood. Mr. Mahfet said they had not made any demands. He said she was putting words in their mouths. Ms. Hill said she was not trying to do that - she simply hoped they would all come to the table and talk about things because she felt the connection would reduce excessive traffic in Hazelwood. Mr. Mahfet agreed they thought so, too.

Mr. Reece asked if Ms. Hill was referring to a connection to Grand Park Boulevard on the south, thereby entering the proposed development on the south. Mr. Mahfet said they had put the drawings together and have had several discussions and they were waiting for the developer to call them.

Mr. Hooper said that the Commission would strongly encourage the

developer to make the connection at the boulevard if that could be worked out. Mr. Delacourt wanted to know if the longer cul-de-sac would be preferred to the shorter one if there were not an agreement between the developer and the association. Mr. Hooper said it would be if it were acceptable to the Fire Department. Mr. Delacourt said that Staff had spoken many times with both sides and he was not sure there was a resolution to that issue.

Mr. Schroeder asked if the boulevard was a dedicated City road. Mr. Delacourt said it was a public road, but there was not enough right-of-way to connect. To make the connection through the common area, it would require approval of the Association. To connect, it would probably have to clip a single unit, which would require the approval from the unit's owner, and more negotiations. Mr. Hooper asked how much property from that owner would be required. Mr. Shumejko said about 15-20 feet. Mr. Reece asked if there was a residence there, which was confirmed. Mr. Delacourt said he was not overly optimistic the deal would be worked out for the connection, and he wanted to provide direction to the applicant about how to proceed.

Discussed

2005-0578

Beaumont Center for Health & Fitness, a proposed 79,300 square-foot fitness and medical offices facility to be located on South Boulevard between John R and Dequindre, zoned O-1, known as Parcel Nos. 15-36-452-004 and -009, Beaumont Services Company, L.L.C., applicant.

(Reference: Memo prepared by Deborah Millhouse, dated September 2, 2005 had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Mr. Reece recused himself from the discussion, advising that Beaumont was one of his clients.

Present for the applicant was John Rogers, Beaumont Facilities Development, 44201 Dequindre Rd, Troy, MI 48098.

Mr. Anzek stated that Beaumont had a concept meeting with the City to develop a three-story office building along South Boulevard. The proposed site was immediately west of the three-story medical building recently completed. The City identified the concern that the proposed use was not expressly permitted in the Ordinance. Beaumont was proposing a rehab center and a fitness center, including lap pools and workout equipment. After people would receive physical therapy they could become members of the fitness center. He noted that a fitness center was permitted in the I-1 district. Rather than suggesting a rezoning of the parcel, Staff wanted input from the Commission to see if fitness centers could be part of medical therapy, perhaps as an