



Rochester Hills

Minutes - Draft

Planning Commission

1000 Rochester Hills Dr
Rochester Hills, MI
48309
(248) 656-4600
Home Page:
www.rochesterhills.org

Chairperson Deborah Brnabic, Vice Chairperson Greg Hooper
Members: Ed Anzek, Gerard Dettloff, Nicholas O. Kaltsounis,
Stephanie Morita, David A. Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Ryan Schultz

Tuesday, April 17, 2018

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Deborah Brnabic called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Auditorium.

ROLL CALL

Present 8 - Ed Anzek, Deborah Brnabic, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis, Stephanie Morita, David Reece, C. Neall Schroeder and Ryan Schultz

Excused 1 - Gerard Dettloff

Quorum present.

Also present: Sara Roediger, Director of Planning & Economic Dev.
Kristen Kapelanski, Manager of Planning
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2018-0147](#) March 20, 2018 Special PC Work Session

A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Hooper, that this matter be Approved as Presented. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Anzek, Brnabic, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

Excused 1 - Dettloff

[2018-0148](#) March 20, 2018 Regular Meeting

A motion was made by Hooper, seconded by Reece, that this matter be Approved as Presented. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Anzek, Brnabic, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

Excused 1 - Dettloff

COMMUNICATIONS

- A) *Planning & Zoning News dated March 2018*
- B) *Letter from T. Loughrin dated 4/13/18 re: Brewster Duplex discussion*
- C) *Email from R. Bosler dated 4/13/18 re: Candlewood Hotel at Meijer*
- D) *Notice of Public Hearing from City of Rochester dated 4/25/18*

NEW BUSINESS

2018-0127

Public Hearing and Request for Adoption of the 2019-2024 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

(Reference: Memo prepared by Joe Snyder dated April 17, 2018, memo prepared by Sara Roediger dated April 13, 2018, CIP Draft document and CIP power point for the new projects had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

City staff present for the request were Alan Buckenmeyer, Manager of Parks; Sean Canto, Fire Chief; Scott Cope, Director of Building; Paul Davis, Deputy Director of DPS/Engineering, Ken Elwert, Director of Parks and Natural Resources; Deborah Hoyle, Sr. Financial Analyst; Sara Roediger, Director of Planning and Economic Development and Allan Schneck, Director of DPS/Engineering

Ms. Roediger stated that as the Planning Commission knew, the City had an extensive CIP process that had been developed through the years. She felt that it was coveted by many other communities. The CIP called for projects each year, and there was a policy group, made up of Planning Commissioners, City Council members and other staff that reviewed and ranked the projects. The CIP required a Public Hearing before the Planning Commission. Throughout the last couple of years, staff had tried to find the most efficient way to communicate the new projects. Ms. Hoyle had prepared a power point that summarized each of those, and staff members for the projects were present to answer any questions.

Ms. Hoyle showed a broad map of all the CIP projects, including those that had been approved. There were 21 new projects for a City total of \$18.5 million. All the projects in the CIP totaled \$107.3 million City share. Since the last CIP, seven projects had been completed; one had been deleted; and two had been deferred to pending. She noted that a big section of the CIP was for public works - water, sewer, local and major roads.

Ms. Hoyle referenced LS-15: Bolinger Street Paving (SAD) for construction in 2020 with a \$112k City share; LS-17: Michelson Paving

(west of John R) (SAD) for construction in 2020 with a \$196k City share; and LS-18: Runyon Road Paving for 2023 at almost \$268k. She noted that it included Runyon, Van Hoosen and a portion of Washington Rd. Next was MR-16C: Auburn Road Rehabilitation (Rochester Road to Culterton) for 2019 at \$1.180 million which would coincide with the Auburn Road Corridor Study.

Ms. Morita brought up LS-18 (Runyon Road Paving). She felt that before it got into the CIP, that it needed to go to City Council to review. She pointed out that with the City's SAD policy and for residents who would not have to contribute to paving, they could potentially run into an issue they were not expecting with the other two SADs. She would like it looked at by Council and avoid running into an equal protection issue that could be raised by some of the people who were getting charged for paving.

Ms. Roediger informed that LS-18 was related to another project on the list for a pathway. It came about from some complaints about not having accessible pathways in that area. It started out as a pathway gap and through the discussions at City Hall and also with the City of Rochester, they felt that if the City was going to install a pathway with drainage improvements, that it made sense to pave the road as well. In discussions with Pat MacKay, Director of the Museum, there was a desire to pave the entrance area because of the traffic from some of their special events.

Ms. Morita said that she understood, but she stated that the project could have some unintended consequences to the City with the other two SADs. She would like John Staran to weigh in, and if he said it was good to go, then it was, but if he did not, they needed to know that before they moved forward.

Ms. Hoyle moved to MR-26G: Livernois Reconstruction (Avon Road to North of Walton Blvd.) for 2019 at \$675k. She remarked that as people knew, it was a pretty bad stretch of roadway. Next was SS-09: Livernois Sanitary Sewer Extension for 2022 at \$200k.

Mr. Kaltsounis believed that there was supposed to be a temporary fix done to Livernois in the next couple of months. He asked if that was included in the cost. Mr. Schneck said that staff had been communicating with the Road Commission regarding the ride quality along Livernois. They had scheduled a more major type of maintenance. They would mill out the joints and put hot mixed asphalt in them, and that should hold the road together until 2019 when it was reconstructed. Mr.

Kaltsounis asked if there would be a cost to the City, and if it should be in the CIP. Mr. Schneck advised that the road was under the jurisdiction of the Road Commission, so it would be their expense. Mr. Hooper thought that the Mayor said they were working with the Road Commission to pre-fund the project to move it ahead. Mr. Schneck explained that at the last Oakland County Federal Aid Committee meeting, the Road Commission was awarded \$3.9 million in Federal aid to reconstruct Livernois in 2021. They all knew that it would not last until then. In order to advance construct the project, the Road Commission asked the City to fund the Federal portion in 2019. When those funds became available (\$3.9 million) in 2021, they would come back to the City. He would be before Council asking for approval to enter into an agreement with the Road Commission for the design of Livernois this year.

Ms. Hoyle noted SS-11: Oakland Macomb Interceptor Drain Improvements for 2023 at almost \$6.5 million, which was an ongoing project. The City had recently been notified that the projects listed were potential future costs. They wanted it in the CIP because they knew the costs were coming, although they were not sure which year(s).

Mr. Schroeder believed that the City had quite a fund balance with the Drain Commission at the County, and he asked if that was still there. Ms. Hoyle agreed that there was some money there, but not for the subject project. Those funds were for drain maintenance and not for the construction of the Interceptor Drain improvements. Mr. Schroeder said that years ago, the City used some of that money towards new drains, so there probably was not much left.

Mr. Davis thought that the word "drain" was causing some confusion. It was not a storm water drain; it was a sanitary sewer project. They called it the Oakland Macomb Interceptor Drain, which was actually a drainage district, and it was related to the Clinton Oakland Sanitary Sewer System that left Oakland County and went into the Macomb Interceptor. It was all sanitary sewer work and not for storm water such as Mr. Schroeder was referring.

Ms. Hoyle noted WS-38: Springhill Subdivision Water Main Replacement for 2022 at \$5.3 million. Next was WS-39: Meter Test Bench Replacement for 2019 at \$205k, which would replace obsolete equipment. Next was PW-13: Runyon Road Pathway for 2023 at \$367k. It would be for Runyon, Van Hoosen and Washington and would provide access for the Museum and to the schools. Next was PK-05G: Parks' Tennis & Pickle Ball Court Rehabilitation for 2022 at \$900k. It was an

ongoing project scheduled out for future years. FA-02J: City Hall Compound Gate needed replacement to function properly. Next was FA-05B: Van Hoosen Dairy Bar Generator for 2019 at \$72k. There was a very small generator there, but they needed a larger one to power the whole building. She continued with FA-05C: Van Hoosen Museum Schoolhouse Siding for 2019 at \$72k; FA-07C: Citywide HVAC Maintenance & Repairs for various years at \$1.179 million. It was also an ongoing project. Many of the buildings had units that needed replacement over the next few years. FA-07D: Energy Management Systems for 2024 at \$180k was also ongoing. In the 2019-2024 time period, there were two the City would like worked on - at the DPS Garage and Fire Station #1. Next were FA-12A: Sheriff Substation Water Heater for 2021 at \$31k and FA-13M Fire Station #1 Concrete Approach Replacement for 2020 at \$190k for the area right in front of the bays. Ms. Hoyle referenced FA-13N: Fire Station Bay Heaters for 2020 at \$108k for Fire Stations #1, #3 and #5.

For the latter project, Mr. Reece asked if that work should have been a part of the renovation program for the fire stations. He asked why they would add them now rather than when the stations were approved and renovated. Mr. Cope explained that the renovations for the stations did not include the heaters because the bays had not been done. He agreed that if they had planned a little better they could have included them at that time, but two years ago, they felt they were in good shape. They recently started having problems with them.

Ms. Hoyle concluded with IS-04H: Scott Sight Thermal Imaging Camera for 2019 at \$155k. The new technology for the cameras fit right in a mask, where currently they were hand held. It was much safer for the fire fighters and victims. She asked if there were any questions.

Hearing none, Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 7:19 p.m.

Lisa Winarski, 194 Bedlington, Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Ms. Winarski asked if the plastic on the tennis courts would be removed. Ms. Hoyle agreed that the plan was to rehabilitate them with asphalt. Ms. Winarski asked if the plastic would be replaced, and Ms. Hoyle advised that it would not.

Chairperson Brnabic closed the Public Hearing at 7:20 p.m.

Hearing no further comments, Mr. Schroeder moved the motion in the

packet, supported by Mr. Hooper.

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Hooper, that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission Approves the Capital Improvement Plan that has been proposed for the years 2019-2024. The Rochester Hills Planning Commission has determined the following:

WHEREAS, the Municipal Planning Act, Act 285 of Public Acts of 1931, as amended, requires the Rochester Hills Planning Commission to annually accept a Capital Improvement Plan for the benefit of the health, safety and welfare of the community as those criteria relate to the physical development of Rochester Hills; and

WHEREAS, the Rochester Hills Fiscal Office has consulted with the City's professional staff who carry out the business of planning for and providing for the present and future needs and desires of the citizens of Rochester Hills; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Improvement Plan is meant to consider the immediate and future needs and goals of Rochester Hills, as identified by the public, City Boards and Commissions, and the Mayor's staff, in light of existing projects and plans and anticipated resources; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Improvement Plan is a flexible document, necessarily meant to be reevaluated and amended each year, to project into the six succeeding years, and further amended as needed to address practical realities as they relate to policies and philosophies of relevant Boards, the City Council and the Mayor's office; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Improvement Plan is a guide and forum to aid the Rochester Hills Mayor's Office and the Rochester Hills City Council in making decisions regarding the physical development and infrastructure maintenance of the City and determining what, if any, resources can or should be available to carry out City Council's policies and budgetary decisions; and

WHEREAS, the components of the Capital Improvement Plan have been subject to a public hearing, public review, and committee reviews over the course of several years and was duly noticed in the Oakland Press for a full public hearing on April 2, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the components of the Capital Improvement Plan were arrived at through a point system using variables that included, among

other things, whether the project has begun, funds committed, sources of funds, prior City Council decisions, Planning Commission or administrative recommendations and decisions; and

RESOLVED, *that the Capital Improvement Plan presented for review on April 17, 2018, is adopted by the Rochester Hills Planning Commission on April 17, 2018; and*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, *that this Plan should be published and attested to according to law.*

Mr. Kaltsounis thanked staff and everyone on the committee for another great job. Every year, the CIP gave them a great idea of the future and how to plan for it. City Council could pick and choose, but it set the table for them quite well. He asked how many projects were received from the public. Ms. Hoyle said that there were none. It was put out there and they were hoping, but they did not get any recommendations.

Chairperson Brnabic agreed with Mr. Kaltsounis and said that everyone did a great job of putting the CIP together. She had a request regarding the new projects pages. Several years ago, she had asked that the page be slightly enlarged, because she did not think they should need a magnifying glass to read it. She asked if the print could be enlarged before it was printed, and Ms. Hoyle said that it definitely could.

A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Hooper, that this matter be Adopted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Anzek, Brnabic, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

Excused 1 - Dettloff

2018-0144

Public Hearing and request for Conditional Use Recommendation - City File No. 18-003 - First State Bank, a proposed 6,100 s.f. bank with drive-through on 1.31 acres located east of Rochester, north of Eddington Blvd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-23-300-039, Eugene Lovell, First State Bank, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated April 13, 2018 and site plans and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Eugene Lovell, President, First State Bank, 24300 Little Mack, St. Clair Shores, MI 48080, Robert Kirk, Kirk, Huth, Lange & Badalamenti, 19500 Hall Rd., Suite 100, Clinton Township, MI 48038 and Andrew Dahaner, Stucky Vitale Architects, 27172 Woodward

Ave., Royal Oak, MI 48067.

Ms. Kapelanski stated that the applicant was proposing a bank with drive-through. It would be at the newly realigned Eddington Blvd. and Rochester Rd. The site was being developed under the FB-2 provisions. A two-story bank was being proposed fronting on Rochester Rd., and entrances would be from old and new Eddington Blvds. The drive-through was proposed at the rear of the site, and it required a Conditional Use Permit. A Tree Removal Permit was required to remove 32 trees, and the applicant would pay into the Tree Fund to mitigate the removal. There was an area for future development (phase 2) shown. It was for informational purposes only and was not proposed for any type of approval. There was an open space area proposed in the northwest corner of the site to coordinate with the new City open space on a portion of Eddington that was closed. The applicant was requesting a number of modifications under FB. The minimum building frontage build-to area and front yard minor setback for the Eddington frontages, the minimum façade transparency and an allowance to have the entrance in the rear of the building had been requested. The applicant had noted that those conditions could not be met because of bank operations. They were also requesting some landscape modifications for a deficient number of trees due to utility and corner clearance conflicts. Staff recommended approval, and she said that she was available for any questions.

Chairperson Brnabic asked Mr. Lovell if he had anything to add. Mr. Lovell related that First State Bank was originally headquartered in Macomb County. It was a community bank with about 12 branches in Macomb County. The proposed would be their first in Oakland County, and they were excited about the opportunity to do business in Rochester Hills.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 7:31 p.m.

Lisa Winarski, 194 Bedlington, Rochester Hills, MI 48307 *Ms. Winarski had a concern regarding the entrance onto Eddington to the east. Ms. Kapelanski said that the area she was referring to was the circulation for the site and not an entrance. Ms. Winarski asked to be shown the entrances, which Ms. Kapelanski pointed out.*

Ms. Roediger explained that the site included a future phase. The applicants were only proposing to develop the front half of the site. The new north/south road that connected the old and the new Eddington was to the east, and the internal drive was in the middle of the property. There

would not be an entrance to the bank from the east.

Ms. Winarski said that she had been concerned about busses. Eddington was originally not supposed to have been realigned for commercial use; it was supposed to be realigned for Eddington Farms. She also had a concern about what trees on old Eddington would be removed, if any. She noted that there were some big pines. She asked about street lighting on old Eddington Blvd. Her biggest concern was where the storm water would drain. She asked if it would drain to what was redeveloped on the street, which would drain to the wetlands or if they would tie it into an existing system.

Mr. Danaher noted that he was not the engineer, but regarding trees, the project was realigning the three roads on the south, east and north, including the reconnection at the closed Eddington. The project would plant a number of trees on all four sides of the property and also internally. He was not sure how many trees would be saved, but they would replant larger trees on the roadway edges. Regarding retention, the entire project would have onsite retention under the parking lots. Day one of property use would contain below grade retention for both the current and the future use, so they would have capacity in the system. There should not be concerns about draining off to the roadways, because they had to contain it onsite.

Mr. Schroeder said that Ms. Winarski had been concerned about the trees on the property not being developed at this time. Mr. Danaher said that it would stay lawn for the most part. Any trees there were not planned to go away as part of the bank project. The new areas for retention would happen in the east part, including under the drive lane that divided the current and future uses.

Chairperson Brnabic pointed out that the applicant was proposing to remove 32 regulated trees. Ms. Roediger said that Ms. Winarski was referring to the evergreen trees near the entrance of the old Eddington, and it appeared that they would be removed as part of the plan.

Chairperson Brnabic noted a question about street lighting. Ms. Roediger asked Mr. Davis to come forward. She said that the realignment was done last year, and they were still working out the final list items. Part of that was working with DTE on the lights along old Eddington.

Mr. Davis advised that the plan was to eventually replace the existing

lighting. There was lighting on old Eddington that the Homeowner's Association previously owned, and the City had taken over that lighting contract. Eventually, when the area got redeveloped, the City would put in an updated style of lighting, but it would be a future project. As far as storm water drainage, he said that underground detention was proposed for the site. The storm water would be directed to underground piping, and it would be held there temporarily, and then it would be discharged at a controlled rate. He asked Mr. Danaher if the outlet went to the north of the property or the south. If it went to the north, it would continue along old Eddington into the subdivision, and if it went to the south where new Eddington was, it would continue towards the wetland area east of the property.

Mr. Danaher said that it would connect to the south. Mr. Davis concluded that it would connect into some of the new storm drainage constructed as part of realigning Eddington, and it would go towards the wetland area.

Ms. Winarski stated that there was a significant amount of flooding in the wetlands because of Stonecrest Senior Living and poor planning. It was a 90k s.f. building that dumped off into the wetlands. Her house happened to be the most affected along Bedlington, because it sat at the lowest point. She mentioned that her house was the last one to be built in Eddington Farms because of some DEQ issues. She had a huge concern about all of the proposed properties dumping off into the wetlands. The topography of the land went lower towards the wetlands, and it went lower towards the houses. Stonecrest raised the property 15 feet if not more, and all of the drainage sloped down into the wetlands. She stated that the wetlands could not handle it. The water came almost to the foundation of her house. She maintained that having another property drain off into the wetlands was unacceptable.

Chairperson Brnabic closed the Public Hearing at 7:42 p.m.

Mr. Danaher stated that the site did not slope in the direction that was mentioned. There was an entire greenfield site that sloped from the top of the site to the southeast. Undeveloped, the water was shedding directly off of the property. The current plan would contain all the rain water into an underground system and hold it so that it would be distributed and managed and not just dumped into an open area. If they did nothing, the problem would not change. He pointed out that the way the site would be developed and engineered, it would bring nearly \$200k of underground retention that would help the situation that was there.

Mr. Davis related that the City was working with Ms. Winarski to address her concern. It had been ongoing, and they would continue to work with her. He had contacted the MDEQ to see what ability the City had to do work within the wetland area. Until they heard back, they were not sure what could be done. There was a process the City was following. As far as the subject and future developments, the outlet was toward the wetland area. It always had been; the natural flow went there and water from Stonecrest went there. If there was a problem as a result of anything, the City would address it and get it fixed.

Mr. Hooper said that related to the storm drain outlet and development, sheet C-5 showed that underground detention was proposed. A statement had been made that nothing would be done in the future phase area, but he said that was really not true, because they were proposing to put in the underground detention system there. He asked if the bank owned the second parcel, which was confirmed. He clarified that it was one parcel, but it would be sized to encompass both areas. Should the bank be approved, the site plan also included underground detention for the future phase.

Mr. Hooper referred to sheets A1.1 and A1.2, and he asked where the teller windows were. He asked if it was a new concept. Mr. Danaher agreed that it was for the bank. They just finished a project in Macomb to realign them to a pod-type scenario. It was a more hospitable way of approaching a bank and more like a hotel where it was a one-on-one transaction between a banker and a customer. There were two components within the lobby that were built in that had cash recycling. It was meant to be a new way of banking, and it was happening throughout the credit union industry and at other banking institutions. Mr. Hooper asked if the two pods would be four locations to handle four customers at a time. Mr. Danaher said that was correct.

Mr. Hooper noted drawing C-9 which showed two drive-throughs. Looking at the geometry, he did not think it would work. If he drove his truck through one, he would not make it.

Mr. Danaher said that there would be one drive-through ATM lane and one teller lane. There were two teller tube systems in the drive lane built in for redundancy. There were times the tubes were down and times when they worked. The goal was to have one always operating at all times. Mr. Hooper said that the third lane was a bypass lane. He said that for the one closest to the bank, he did not think a truck could make the turn. He noted that his question came from a situation at the Rochester Hills

Library. The way it was built, someone could never make the turn and would scrape the building. Bumpers got ripped off, and the teller window was picked off. They rebuilt the building and pushed the extension out and got rid of the turn, because no one could make it. He was concerned that the bank's drive-through would not work for a truck or larger vehicle.

Mr. Danaher responded that their engineers had tested it with turning clearances for a typical vehicle, and the lanes all met the requirements. He said that they could take it back to their team to make sure and verify that the clearances would work. Mr. Hooper said that if he got to the box location, he would have to open his door to get to it. He would have to be away from the building. Mr. Danaher said that the lanes approaching were just striped spaces. The curbed area was at the actual tube stations. The painted lines were meant to help keep people in their lanes, and there was no curb to mount to make a larger turn. The City had a requirement for stacking that was more than their customers saw at the branches typically. They were showing the worst case scenario for stacking. Mr. Hooper thought that there would be two teller positions open at all times. If only one was open, there would be stacking.

Mr. Kaltsounis brought up the future phase to the east. He said that he did not like seeing the words "proposed two-story," because that was not being proposed with the plan. He suggested saying "proposed building" instead. He pointed out that an approval of the plans should not be an approval for a two-story building on the future phase. If something came in the future, someone could state that the Commissioners approved two-stories previously. He asked why the underground detention basin had to go underneath the east property. He asked why it could not go under the area being developed for the bank. The east side of the property had been before the Commissioners many times with different developments and/or changes. He was concerned that they were touching a property that did not need to be. He would love to see the group of trees in the back kept. If the underground retention was added there, those trees would have to be removed. He asked if it could be put underneath the bank and kept away from the rear of the property and left as it was.

Mr. Danaher said that they would still have to connect at the southern corner where the existing manhole was. He agreed that they could look at moving the underground system to the west. He indicated that the engineering was not complete, but they wanted to show the intent. Their engineers were ready to work with the City to make sure they got it right. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if they would agree to a condition whereby the

applicant would work with City staff to propose a plan to move the underground system to the west with the intention to save as many trees as possible on the future phase.

Mr. Lovell said that he had no problem with that at all. Mr. Kaltsounis suggested that they could leave the removal number at 32 and perhaps change it later. Ms. Roediger thought that everyone understood that the intent was to try to relocate the underground detention to minimize tree removal. Mr. Kaltsounis added that there was a very nice group of trees that he would like to keep. He was not saying that it would never be developed. Mr. Lovell said that they would want an attractive place for their customers, the bank and the community. Mr. Kaltsounis maintained that it would really help them to keep trees.

Mr. Danaher explained that the future development was shown initially to spur the engineering and make sure the site was designed for underground detention for full build out. They did not know what it would eventually be. They showed another two-story building to handle the density for the FB-2 Overlay. There was discussion early on as to whether they should leave it or not, but the main intent was to show that there were future plans, and the engineering would be done up front. They would be making the investment today. Mr. Kaltsounis considered that they might decide to put in something else.

Ms. Morita said that it was hard to tell from the plans what improvements and where curb cuts would go in old Eddington Blvd. She asked the applicants to describe what they intended to do in that area. Mr. Danaher confirmed that she was talking about the northwest corner in the vacated Eddington. Ms. Morita corrected that it was not vacated. Mr. Danaher agreed that it was not vacated, but there were plans that were not a part of their contract that the City was working on with Nowak and Fraus.

Ms. Roediger explained that the City was not vacating the right-of-way; they were creating a park area. Mr. Danaher said that there was not a road there today, and the improvements being done to the site were not part of the bank project. They were aligning the new pathways along Rochester Rd. and providing connections to it, but they were not doing the renovations to the Eddington Park. Ms. Morita said that the preliminary site plan showed a concrete curb to be removed. Mr. Danaher agreed, and said that there would be a new connection back to the east out of the north drive. Ms. Morita said that it showed that in the center of the lot on the north side, the bank would be removing a concrete curb to get to the old Eddington Blvd. Mr. Danaher said that was correct, and they would

install a new curb so there would be a full connection. Ms. Morita asked if they would be doing anything else on old Eddington. Mr. Danaher said trees and sidewalks. Ms. Morita asked if that would be inside the road right-of-way itself or not. Mr. Danaher said that inside of the road right-of-way, they would do the curb ways to finish the connection to the north. It would be completed with bollards so someone could not drive into the park. Those details would have to be finalized, but their intention was to complete the road so people could safely navigate to the north and get back out onto Eddington to go east. Ms. Morita asked Mr. Davis if his department had taken a look at it. She pointed out that it was the City's road.

Mr. Davis believed that Ms. Morita was asking if the applicants were going to plant any trees or construct a sidewalk in the City's road right-of-way for old Eddington or if the work would be done on the their property. Mr. Danaher said that the sidewalk on the north property line leading from the roadway all the way to the east would be new, and it was on the City's property. If the City did not want them to do it, they would not, but the intent was to finish the sidewalk and make the area walkable. Ms. Morita said that she appreciated that, and she thanked them for coming and building in the City. However, she thought a condition should be added that anything that occurred in the City's right-of-way, which included the old Eddington Blvd. needed to get proper approval from the City. That included curb cuts, trees and sidewalks.

Mr. Anzek advised that the City had a process for issuing permits for curb cuts, driveway aprons and so on. He did not feel a condition was necessary. Regarding the objection to a future two-story building, he actually found two-stories to be more of a positive than a negative statement. Two-stories was closer to meeting the objectives of the FB-2 Overlay district to shrink the footprint, go vertical, and have less parking and impervious surface. There were 15 spaces required and 25 proposed. In the objectives of FB-2, the City wanted to make a development look seamless, and that would include the future building. He assumed that it would continue under the bank's ownership because of the retention, and he asked if that was correct.

Mr. Lovell said that was their intent. Mr. Anzek asked if they would be the landlord of the future building, which Mr. Lovell confirmed. Mr. Anzek reiterated that he preferred noting two-story, because it gave the message that the City supported it. It was o.k from his perspective that it be part of the record. Regarding the parking, he asked if it could be sharable with cross access.

Mr. Lovell said that at first blush, he did not see why they would not want to encourage that, and he could foresee few situations where that could be problematic. Mr. Danaher said that they knew 15 spaces were not enough to support the branch function. They would build the spaces to serve the needs of the building, and the goal was to make the whole site walkable with shared parking. They did not want to build any more parking than was necessary. When the next use came into play, they would look at it closely with Planning, and make sure they were providing the minimum number of spaces to support both sites. Mr. Anzek stressed that movement back and forth between the bank and whatever happened in the future building should be comfortable and safe with crosswalks and defined areas.

Mr. Anzek mentioned the public amenity at the northwest corner, and said that he did not see a detailed drawing of what would happen there. He also noticed a curb in the wall on sheet C-6. He asked if that was intended to create a bench seating for pedestrian traffic on Rochester Rd. or if it was perhaps an easement for signage. Mr. Danaher said that the triangle area was being shown for clear vision at the corner. The goal in the radial area was that it would be a similar type function of what was happening on the opposite corner of Eddington. The hope was that it would be set up for artwork and benches and other things for a park-like setting. Mr. Anzek said that another objective should be to get as many trees planted along the streets as possible, although he realized that there were water and sewer conflicts.

Mr. Reece said that he appreciated the development. He asked if the intent of the façade was to mimic some of their other buildings so people would recognize it was a First State Bank. Mr. Lovell said that it was something they would like to work to develop for each of the branches, but it was a new design for the bank. They had undertaken, with the other branches, to develop signage that would mimic the appearance. If they were to build additional branches, they would develop buildings that looked like the proposed.

Mr. Reece said that he liked the geometry and the materials, but he would like it more if the building was further north by the dealerships. He believed that at one point in time, this area along Rochester Rd. was supposed to be part of a PUD with symmetry with the architecture. The Fifth Third Bank was to the north and north of that was another brick building with copper colored roofs. He was not suggesting that those should be mimicked, but the applicants proposed champagne-colored

metal siding and limestone. He thought that was a pretty stark contrast with anything in the immediate area up and down Rochester Rd. If the rest of the Commissioners were o.k. with it, he would acquiesce. The intent at one time was to get everything aligned from a design perspective. He thought the proposed building was very attractive, but he was not sure it fit in with the area. He suggested perhaps just changing the stone to a more natural color.

Mr. Danaher said that their goal initially was to use natural, earth tone materials. The limestone would be natural. Mr. Reece observed that there was limestone and metal panel. Mr. Danaher said that the metal panel would be a warm champagne color, similar to what was on a Comerica Bank. They knew that an aluminum raw metal, which was what they were using for the storefront colors on other branches, was not the right fit, so they were using a warmer range of aluminum to try to make it align with the brand and fit the site. They were trying to use long lasting, natural materials that were high quality but low maintenance.

Mr. Reece indicated that he had no issues with the materials. It was more the palette with the surrounding area. Mr. Lovell said that they did not want to give an impression that they were not amenable to making changes to suit the desires of the Commission. Mr. Reece said that he appreciated that, and if the rest of the Commissioners were o.k., he would let it go. He asked if staff was comfortable with the up-lighting on the front façade. Ms. Kapelanski said that there was a note in the planning review stating that fixture B would have to be changed so the building was not up-lit. Mr. Reece said that he really did like the building a lot; he was just concerned about the location.

Mr. Schultz followed up with Mr. Kaltsounis' suggestion about moving the retention basin. He thought that would allow the applicants to have more flexibility when they came in for phase two, and it would keep the trees. He suggested that they might want to push the future building to the far west property line. Instead of spending \$150k to move the detention, he thought that it made more sense to put it in the parcel to be developed first. Mr. Lovell said that he had no objection to that.

Mr. Danaher said that there would be some engineering with that. The grade changed eight feet over the short distance of the Rochester frontage. They wanted to make sure that ADA was accommodated. That was one of the reasons for the location of the entry. They wanted to make sure it was accessible on all four sides. He indicated that the eight-foot grade differential was challenging.

Mr. Anzek stated that he liked the building very much. He thought that the geometry was different, and he thought it would be attractive. He agreed that in 2003, there was an overall PUD approved for the site that included the Fifth Third Bank down to the senior housing project. Every building and façade was designed so it worked together. That went aside when the PUD went aside, and the site was rezoned to allow flexibility. He thought the building would be attractive at the corner, but he would be concerned how the second building would complement and work with it. Mr. Danaher said that they would want to have complementary materials, but not match exactly. They would not try to create a campus of identical buildings. Mr. Anzek suggested that there could be a series of different textures.

Chairperson Brnabic clarified that the building would be 6,100 s.f. She noted that the EIS Summary stated that it would be 5,100 s.f. , and she asked if that could be corrected.

Mr. Kaltsounis remembered when the property first came before the Commission in 2003. The developer at the time showed easels with poster boards from one end of the room to the other. They said that it was the vision for Rochester Rd. There had been a lot of churn, and it was interesting to see how development in the area was turning out with the banks, the apartments and the senior living facility. Hearing no further discussion, he moved the following, seconded by Mr. Reece.

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, in the matter of City File No. 18-003 (First State Bank) the Planning Commission **recommends** to City Council **Approval** of the **Conditional Use** to allow a drive-through at a bank in the FB-2 district, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on March 21, 2018, with the following seven (7) findings.

Findings

- 1. The proposed drive-through and other necessary site improvements meet or exceed the standards of the zoning ordinance.*
- 2. The expanded use will promote the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance and Master Plan.*
- 3. The proposed drive-through has been designed and is proposed to be constructed, operated, maintained, and managed so as to be*

compatible, harmonious, and appropriate in appearance with the existing and planned character of the general vicinity, adjacent uses of land, and the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the use.

4. *The proposal should have a positive impact on the community as a whole and the surrounding area by offering another financial institution with the convenience of drive-through banking and add 15-20 jobs.*
5. *The proposed development is served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage ways, and refuse disposal.*
6. *The proposed development should not be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to existing or future neighboring land uses, persons, property, or the public welfare.*
7. *The proposal will not create additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services that will be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.*

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Anzek, Brnabic, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

Excused 1 - Dettloff

2018-0145

Request for a Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 18-003 - for the removal and replacement of as many as 32 trees associated with the development of a First State Bank, 6,100 s.f. with drive-through on 1.31 acres, located east of Rochester, north of Eddington Blvd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-23-300-039, Eugene Lovell, First State Bank, Applicant

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schroeder, in the matter of City File No. 18-003 (First State Bank), the Planning Commission **grants a Tree Removal Permit**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on March 21, 2018, with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following three (3) conditions.

Findings

1. *The proposed removal and replacement of regulated trees is in*

conformance with the Tree Conservation Ordinance.

2. *The applicant is proposing to remove 32 regulated trees and pay into the City's Tree Fund.*

Conditions

1. *Tree protective and silt fencing, as reviewed and approved by the City staff, shall be installed prior to issuance of the Land Improvement Permit.*
2. *Should the applicant not be able to meet the tree replacement requirements on site the balance shall be paid into the City's Tree Fund at a rate of \$216.75 per tree.*
3. *City staff shall review and approve the applicant's plan to delay the removal of trees on the east side of the proposed future phase two development.*

Mr. Anzek said that the first time Mr. Kaltsounis read the motion, he thought he said that no tree removal could be done on the east side. Where the retention facility was located would be an engineering driven issue. He wanted to make sure staff had flexibility. Mr. Kaltsounis said that they would be given the approval for the 32 trees; it would just be delayed if the retention could be moved.

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schroeder, that this matter be Granted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Anzek, Brnabic, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

Excused 1 - Dettloff

2018-0146

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 18-003 - First State Bank, a proposed 6,100 s.f. bank with drive through on 1.31 acres located on east of Rochester, north of Eddington Blvd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-23-300-039, Eugene Lovell, First State Bank, Applicant

MOTION *by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schultz, in the matter of City File No. 18-003 (First State Bank), the Planning Commission **approves the Site Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on March 21, 2018, with the following nine (9) findings and subject to the following six (6) conditions.*

Findings

1. *The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that all applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as other City Ordinances, standards, and requirements, can be met subject to the conditions noted below.*
2. *The proposed project will be accessed from Eddington Blvd., thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets. Paths and bike racks have been incorporated to promote safety and convenience of pedestrian traffic.*
3. *Off-street parking areas have been designed to avoid common traffic problems and promote customer safety*
4. *The minimum building frontage build-to area for Eddington New - south, the front yard minor setback for Eddington New - east, the minimum building frontage build-to area for Eddington New - east, the front yard minor setback for Eddington Old - north, the minimum building frontage build-to area for Eddington Old - north and the width of the planting area along Rochester Road are modified based upon the Planning Commission's determination that they meet the intent of the FB district.*
5. *The maximum height is modified based upon the Planning Commission's determination that the building is set back at least 100 feet from any single family residential district and because the property has 180 feet of Rochester Rd. frontage (100 ft. required).*
6. *The principal entrance to the building does not face a street; however, the applicant has indicated that due to bank security concerns, the site can only have one entrance which has been position toward the parking area and the Planning Commission waives this requirement along with the minimum façade transparency finding that evidence has been submitted demonstrating that compliance with the standard makes development impractical for the organization's operations.*
7. *The proposed development will improve a vacant parcel with the addition of a bank, and should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the vicinity.*

8. *The proposed development will not have an unreasonably detrimental or injurious effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the site or those of the surrounding area.*
9. *The relocation of Eddington and the Master Plan have anticipated this type of development, eliminating the need for a curb cut onto Rochester Rd.*

Conditions

1. *Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, prior to final approval by staff.*
2. *Provide a landscape cost estimate for landscaping and irrigation, plus inspection fees, as adjusted as necessary by staff, and posting of bond prior to temporary grade certification being issued by Engineering.*
3. *Payment into the City's Tree Fund for any trees that are not replaced onsite in the amount of \$216.75 per tree.*
4. *The developer shall work with City staff to revise the location of the underground retention storage facility to the area being developed on the west side of the property. The intention is to save as many trees as possible on the east side of the property.*
5. *Changes to the City-owned property (the right-of-way of old Eddington Blvd.) must be reviewed and approved by City staff.*
6. *City staff shall review and approve the drive-through lane to ensure that large pickups, SUVs and cars can efficiently maneuver through the lanes. Any changes shall be approved by staff prior to final approval.*

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schultz, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Anzek, Brnabic, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

Excused 1 - Dettloff

After each motion, Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously, and she congratulated the applicants. Mr. Hooper thanked them for their investment in Rochester Hills. Ms. Roediger noted that the Conditional Use Recommendation would be

forwarded to City Council for the May 7, 2018 meeting.

DISCUSSION

2018-0152 Brewster Place Duplex Condominiums, a proposed 32-unit development on 7.3 acres located north of Walton, west of Brewster, zoned SP Special Purpose, R-1 and R-3 One Family Residential, Robertson Brothers Homes, Applicant
The item had been postponed at the request of the applicants.

2018-0151 Brookland Park Lofts, a mixed-use commercial and residential development located near the northeast corner of Auburn and John R, 77 loft apartments and 12,200 s.f. of ground floor retail space with outdoor plaza seating for a restaurant and professional uses, plus 20,000 s.f. of outdoor recreational space that includes a dog park, children's jungle gym and all-season sports court, zoned B-2 General Business with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay on a portion, InvestaFind, Applicant

(Reference: Memo prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated April 13, 2018 and site plan had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Mark and Katrina Barishaj, managing members of Investafind. Mr. Barishaj stated that they were luxury, family-owned builders, and they had managed apartment buildings for over 20 years. They had also participated in different developments across all five major counties in southeast Michigan. It was their first venture in Rochester Hills, and they were very excited.

Ms. Kapelanski stated that the proposed development wrapped around the northeast corner of John R and Auburn and did not include the property at the corner. The site was 5.6 acres with a variety of zoning districts. The applicant would like to pursue a PUD. They had tried to incorporate several features of the Flex Overlay. Two three-story buildings composing 77 loft-style, luxury apartments and 12,200 s.f. of ground floor retail located closest to Auburn and a recreation area near John R were proposed. She had not performed a full review for conformance with the Zoning Ordinance. If developed as a PUD, she advised that modifications to the Zoning Ordinance would be permitted. Mr. Barishaj pointed out that when the project was outlined, FB-1 was mentioned, but it was actually FB-2.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the office plaza on Auburn would be removed,

which was confirmed.

Ms. Roediger noted that the applicants came to the office asking what the City's thoughts were about the proposed project. In terms of the types of redevelopment along the Auburn Rd. corridor, particularly as it related to the Brooklands area, staff felt it would be compatible with what the plan called for. They wanted to bring it before the Commissioners to get some initial thoughts. It was the type of development staff was increasingly seeing in terms of missing middle housing. There were a lot of single-family homes in the community, and a lot of proposed developments were providing other housing options. The proposed project would incorporate a mixture of uses and walkable areas, and they wanted to see what the Commissioners thought about this type of development at the proposed location.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that she had a concern with three-story buildings backing up to one-story, ranch homes. She did not think that would fit in with the area, and the Commissioners did have to consider the surrounding area. She did not have as much of a concern with the retail and mixed-use off of Auburn. She liked the fact that some open space would be offered as well as a dog park. She reminded that to use a PUD, an applicant would have to offer something that would not normally occur. There would have to be some perks for the community, because a PUD could not be used to avoid the current zoning.

Mr. Barishaj claimed that was their intention. He indicated that the entire area was being changed. The bungalows and one-story homes were going to be two-story homes (he gave Woodland Crossing as an example). There were other lots in the area where homes were being torn down and new homes were being put up, and that had been done for the last ten years, because land was still relatively cheap in the area. He agreed that for the last 50 years, the homes had been single-story, but in the last ten, it had definitely changed. They thought that anywhere two-story homes were being built, three-story commercial could be accommodated. Chairperson Brnabic agreed that there were two-story homes, but the proposal had three-story buildings backing up to one-story ranches.

Mr. Kaltsounis commented that the layout was intriguing. He was also concerned about three-stories, because there were no three-stories in the area. What had been irking him with some new developments was that people put up two-stories, and then they maxed out the height of each floor and the roof peaks to get noticed. He said that he could see that

happening with the proposed buildings. If they came with two stories, he would not mind it. He thought that the overall layout of the development was what FB-2 should be, and the City was trying to utilize a lot of the spaces left. He suggested that they had to be cautious with a six-foot high masonry wall around the property with regards to drainage to the neighboring properties and to determine if the neighbors would like a wall. Typically, the City did not recommend walls unless the neighbors asked for one.

Mr. Barishaj said that some of the neighbors did come forward and express an interest in a wall. Their main issue was trash blowing in from the commercial buildings, which they currently had. They would like a wall to block the homes. Mr. Kaltsounis said that if there was a wall, they had to make sure about the drainage so there were no problems. He had owned a property where a wall was put in for a bank, and the drainage went from the bank straight down the wall and turned the neighbors' yards into a pond.

Mr. Anzek commented that his biggest regret was that they had not secured the vacant parcel zoned B-2 to the west. He felt that it would be great if they could obtain that. He was glad to see the type of design proposed. He knew that the parcel where the apartment buildings were shown was in the middle of a block that had been impossible to develop or promote, and he was glad to see that someone was trying. He thought that they had done some very good concepts. The fact that the buildings were shown on the inside and the parking on the outside closer to the residents would allow more distance for the height factor. He thought that would help mitigate the three-story versus two-story argument. A bigger thing to think about was that directly across Auburn was a liquor store. Around that store was another large tract of vacant, L-shaped land. Whatever happened at the northeast corner could very much set the appropriate thing to do across the street. He thought that the combination of apartments, office and retail was perfect. He did not have an issue with three stories on Auburn or the other side. The parking would create about 90 feet of separation from the property line to the vertical wall. He indicated that it went to the quality of the design. A three-story building could be attractive or not. He said that he would be curious to see the design, because a well-designed, three-story building could look a lot better than a one-story poorly designed building. He liked the mixed-use, and he knew how hard it was to assemble properties, and he said that he would like to see the final development.

Mr. Barishaj thanked Mr. Anzek. Regarding the three-story, the height

they were proposing would be a 40-foot building and typically, other three-story townhomes that were being built in the area, especially Barrington Park could be 33 to 36 feet. Their building would not more than seven feet taller. He did not think the height would be much different than other townhomes in the area. If it went to a two-story, the footprint would increase, which was going on with Cedar Valley. Their footprint was about 27.5 feet versus his 18.9, so there was more open space, because they could go a little more vertical. He noted that they did try to get the B-2 piece, but they could not. He disclosed that there was a possibility of their development increasing if they could acquire the home directly to the north on John R.

Mr. Anzek said that he did not want to get into a debate, and their proforma might dictate 77 units, but making it fit was what the Commissioners were concerned about. He was not sure what the price point was targeted at or what was built into the business model to make the development work, but if they knew some of the other rents the City was getting for apartments, they could probably get by with 40 units. He commented that there were some crazy rents being charged for apartments in the 750-1000 s.f. range. The Commissioners had to consider what would happen on the northern vacant parcel and what the tenants would be looking at - if it would be the back of a strip center or something else. He would like to see it developed all at the same time.

Mr. Schultz said that he had to commend the applicants on some of the conceptual design elements. He pointed out to the Commissioners that they had just approved a four-story hotel that was closer to single-family residential in the same fashion. The parking in the residential back yard was a nice step down, and he appreciated that. The parcels were tough to deal with, so he commended them on the assemblage. If it all was developed as B-2 with a Flex Overlay, there could be another shopping center, and that would be what the neighbors had to look at. He thought that it was a somewhat softer use, and he really liked the layout.

Mr. Barishaj noted that they had been in talks with the owner of the B-2 property. The owner also developed a property at John R and Avon, and he wanted to do a small format retail project again. He had a tiny liquor store at Avon and John R, and the lot was about the same size.

Mr. Reece stated that all the comments were valid to a degree, although not all of them had approved the four-story hotel in people's backyards. He thought that Mr. Anzek's comments about the massing and the architecture were important. He was not wild about a three-story

apartment complex in a one-story residential area. How the architecture presented itself, the massing and breaking up some of it from two to three-story would make it more appealing. He did like the layout, and he thought that it was well thought out and planned. If he were a resident in the area abutting the property, he would think about people looking down from the third story, and that was an issue. If it was done with some thought and some quality architecture, it might be able to be pulled off. He asked if the intent was that there would be retail on the ground floor and two-stories of apartments above. Mr. Barishaj said that was correct. Mr. Reece asked if they felt that there would be adequate parking to serve the needs of all the units.

Mr. Barishaj said that for the most part, there would be. They were also exploring the possibility of putting some parallel parking in front of the retail, so they could align with the rest of the Auburn corridor redevelopment. They were also looking at putting a couple of spots near the recreation area, so if members from outside the complex wanted to use it, they would be able to park where their children were playing. There was the possibility of acquiring the adjacent property, which would increase the number of parking spots. They might even be able to work in some carports.

Mr. Reece asked the expectation in the recreation area, and if it would just be an open park. Mr. Barishaj agreed that it would be an open park. There would be a structure for BBQs and an all season's sports court. There would be a children's jungle gym. They expected a lot of the tenants to be older millennials who had younger children, and they would like to provide some space for them. Mr. Reece asked if there were no plans for a pool, which Mr. Barishaj confirmed. He added that the all season's sports court would be for basketball, tennis, volleyball and a roller hockey rink all in one.

Mr. Hooper stated that he supported the concept. He felt that retail along Auburn would be an appropriate place. The entrance drive on John R was shown immediately adjacent to Gravel Ridge. He was not sure how that would work with people pulling out of the development and making a left and those making a right from Gravel Ridge. He thought there could be conflicts. He asked if they could get access from Gravel Ridge if it were improved. He indicated that he would support that rather than having side by side entry/exit roads.

Mr. Barishaj advised that they had a meeting the night before with some of the neighbors. That was a concern of theirs. He was looking at the

possibility of flipping Building A so it was facing Gravel Ridge and putting the entrance more towards John R so there would be one fluid street all the way through to the second or third building. If they did parallel parking, someone could enter in if they were headed east or west. He claimed that it would be best if they flipped the building and opened an entrance closer to John R.

Mr. Hooper suggested that Gravel Ridge could be improved to hold the main entrance into their property. Mr. Reece asked if they would have to extend the sidewalk that would make parallel parking in front of the retail. Mr. Hooper agreed it would make it a challenge, depending where the sidewalk was. Mr. Hooper said that it was just something to explore. He did not think Engineering would approve it as it was with the potential traffic conflicts. He asked if the site was subject to the Tree Conservation Ordinance. Ms. Kapelanski did not recall offhand. (It was later confirmed that it would be). Mr. Barishaj advised that there were very few trees.

Mr. Hooper considered that they would still have to work out the detention, which he assumed would be underground. As far as the concept, there would be details that needed to be worked out, but he supported it.

Chairperson Brnabic clarified that they notified residents and held a meeting. Mr. Barishaj agreed that there had been one the previous evening. Chairperson Brnabic asked how they were notified and how many attended. Mr. Barishaj said that they sent out about 20 letters to the surrounding properties and to those across Auburn, John R and Gravel Ridge, and about six people showed. They were predominately individuals from the single-family zoning. They were concerned about apartments in their backyards. Chairperson Brnabic asked if there were any other concerns expressed. Ms. Barishaj said that they brought up having higher taxes. She said there was a stigma with apartments, and they tried to alleviate that stigma and reassure them that with new apartments, there would be people paying higher rents than a mortgage. Mr. Barishaj said that in terms of the overall design, nothing was brought up besides pushing Building A closer to Gravel Ridge so the entrance could be closer to John R. There was the concern about someone making a right out of Gravel Ridge and someone making a left out of the complex. He reiterated that moving the building would probably be best.

Chairperson Brnabic said that it seemed that there was support with a few concerns, so she hoped the applicants had taken a note of those. She asked if residents would be notified again once they moved into the site plan stage. Mr. Barishaj said that with the potential of adding the parcel to

the north and a third building, there would definitely need to be a second neighborhood meeting.

Chairperson Brnabic concluded that the applicants had received input from the Planning Commission, and she thanked them.

Discussed

2018-0153

Proposed PUD/Mixed Use Development on approximately six acres at the northeast corner of Auburn and Livernois (two-story retail corner building with apartments above and 2 three-story multi-family apartment buildings), zoned RM-1 Multiple Family Residential with an FB-1 Flexible Business Overlay and B-1 Local Business with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay, Designhaus Architecture, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated April 13, 2018 and site plan and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Peter Stuhldreier and Mike Pizzola, Designhaus Architecture, 301 Walnut, Rochester, MI 48307 and Fred Haddid, OYK Rochester, LLC, 1888 W. Tahquamenon Ct., Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302, owner.

Ms. Kapelanski stated that the new proposal was for six acres at the northeast corner of Auburn and Livernois. It was a property the Planning Commission took a look at about six months ago. There was a mix of zoning, and the applicant would like to proceed with a PUD. They had tried to incorporate some of the FB Overlay features. There would be three buildings, two of which would be three-story, and one would be two-story. The two-story building would be closest to the corner. There would be 120 apartment units with some ground floor retail. She noted that the drive back to the existing apartments to the north would remain open for those residents. Staff had not reviewed the plan for conformance with the Zoning Ordinance, but she was available for any questions.

Mr. Stuhldreier indicated that they had submitted a pretty rough sketch that had been refined a few times since they met with staff to discuss ideas. The project would have about 140k s.f. total. They believed that it would park fine, with 120 apartments and 20k s.f. of retail. He wanted to talk about the benefits in terms of the aesthetic advancement for the area. He put up a diagram for the overhead projector that showed active interiors and common space activity for the apartment buildings. He said that it was a big part along Auburn Rd. As one walked along the sidewalk, they would be confronted with activity on the ground floor, not just lower level apartments. There would be live/work suites with storefronts on the

ground floor, a gym for the apartments, an assembly area, a pond, a deck and so on. By the time someone got to the commercial building, it would be entirely retail on the ground floor with some lobbies to get to the second floor of apartments. He noted that the property descended almost 20 feet from west to east. Their request was to have a two-story building on the corner where there used to be a gas station and four curb cuts. One of the problems he saw since working in the area was that the region did not have great retail spaces. It was because the buildings were not high enough, and people were not interested - they wanted a taller space. The other residential buildings would be three stories, but they would descend into a valley. The neighboring properties were commercial and apartments.

Mr. Stuhlreyer advised that there would be some public spaces. They would provide parking for use of the public pocket park. The park would confront the assembly area, one of the live/work studios and connect back to the retail to the west and apartment building to the east. They tried to create not just a driveway that would lead back to the apartment complex to the north but a more activated access boulevard with some garden style apartments along the boulevard. He maintained that it would be a very dynamic apartment complex and a good mix for the corner. He had been seeing a lot of Auburn Rd. development, and he thought that the proposal would be an important lead in to the future of Auburn Rd. By using some of the Overlay ideas and other standards for multi-family, he felt that they were on the right track. They were mostly asking for relief for three stories. He asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Reece asked if there was a big change in elevation from the development down to the apartments. Mr. Stuhlreyer said that they had not graded it, but each of the buildings would have some elevation change. From west to east, it would go down. Mr. Reece asked about going from south to north into the existing apartment complex. Mr. Stuhlreyer believed that the subject site was above it. There would have to be a full re-grade, so he did not think it would be as dramatic as it seemed. They would be using garages as part of the screening between the two developments. They would confront their carports at that point. Mr. Reece observed that they would be away from the apartments quite a bit. Mr. Stuhlreyer said that he drove the site, and it felt like it was higher to the south.

Mr. Kaltsounis noted that as with the previous concept at John R, the Commissioners always had to look at what surrounded a property and how something blended in. A couple of months ago, a developer came

before them with another Barrington Park-type development for the site, and it was not appealing. He asked Mr. Haddid if he owned all the property, and he answered all but the Speedway, which was under contract.

Mr. Kaltsounis thought that the proposed development would be a ways from the apartment complex and not overshadow it, which made it a little easier to envision three stories. He liked the flat roofs, because they did not show an imposing height. He thought that they were implementing a really great style. He asked if it would be a PUD, which was confirmed, and he cautioned that the Commissioners would be critical about the selection of materials. He told them not to come on meeting day asking for approval of a vinyl siding monster. They saw that from a different developer, and it was denied. The Commissioners approved buildings because of the materials and how they looked. That was how a PUD worked.

Mr. Haddid said that he would want quality, and he agreed with Mr. Kaltsounis. Mr. Kaltsounis thought that it was a perfect use of FB-2, and he looked forward to it in the area. He felt that it would be harmonious. He remarked that he liked it, and he usually did not like things first off.

Ms. Morita showed the site from google maps from her screen. She said that when it first came across her desk, she thought it looked familiar. Her recollection was that there was a drainage issue on the site. There was a lot of green without any trees. She asked if there were wetlands they had to factor into their plans and how they would deal with them. She asked if they were regulated and how big they were.

Mr. Stuhlreyer did not believe they were regulated, and they felt that they could relocate what they needed. He indicated that the aerial Ms. Morita showed went far beyond the edge of their site. Ms. Morita said that there was a culvert, and Mr. Stuhlreyer agreed that there was a drain that went through the middle of the site. Ms. Morita asked if they would have to move the drain for the water to go around the buildings and get it to another area to be retained. The plan provided did show any retention areas. Mr. Stuhlreyer put up a drawing showing a pond, which would be half of the retention. Ms. Morita clarified that it was not a pool. Mr. Stuhlreyer agreed, and said that they would have some underground storage which would be discharged slowly.

Ms. Morita indicated that she liked the look of the plan, and she thought it would fit well in the area. She said the fact that they were willing to use a

former gas station and turn it into residential was very brave, and she hoped it worked out.

Mr. Anzek pointed out that the retention as shown did not really have any capacity. After a rain/drought situation, the pond would be a lot lower, and he was not sure how attractive that would be. He would like it kept as an active fountain, because he did not think it would have much capacity. Regarding Ms. Morita's questions, the site was under consideration in the late 1990's for a townhome development, and the wetland identified at that time was about four feet wide and ran across the frontage. It was basically a drainage ditch. A few years ago someone was looking at the site who had a very reputable wetland consultant who said that it had all dried up, and there was nothing regulated. If they were going to modify the drain and keep it natural, he felt that would be great. He said that he liked the design of the apartments. The way they were designed, it made a three-story look like a two-story by darkening the third story. He was glad to see a total incorporated development along the corridor. The gas station had been extremely difficult to redevelop on its own. The northeast part made it very tight with the setback requirements. There had been several Variances granted to try to enable the corner to be developed, which still existed. He thought that the market was right. It went back to the discussion the Planning Commission had about five years ago where they were looking to intensify the nodes of major arterial roads. The proposed project would fit in very well with that and be a nice entry to the apartments to the north. He wished Mr. Haddid well going forward, noting that he had worked with him on other parcels in the City.

Mr. Stuhldreier mentioned that Mr. Haddid went way out of his way to try to assemble the gas station property with the other piece. Mr. Anzek said that he had heard from many people how difficult it was to work with Marathon.

Mr. Reece commented that he liked the development. He did not want to sound hypocritical as to the earlier proposal, but he thought the subject site was more appropriate for three stories. He would like to see a cross section throughout the site from south to north. He was a little worried about the buildings towering over the apartments in the back, but he believed that they were far enough away to be less of a concern. The architecture made them look more like two-story buildings, particularly with the flat roof. If the project went forward, he asked them not to come back requesting a change in the elevations. He said that it was a great use for a dirty, dead corner that had been that way for a long time, and it was a good opportunity.

Mr. Hooper thought that the fact that the elevation dropped lent itself to a three-story where only two stories would be seen. He noted that the previous concept had 55 townhouse units on one 4.85-acre parcel, and the applicants were proposing 120 apartments on two parcels totaling about 5.6-acres. He thought that when they got into the details, it might affect things. He believed that there was a City-regulated wetland that ran through the property which would have to be rerouted to make things work. He stated that he was all for the retail on the corner, but they would have to see how everything shook out after landscaping and detention and wetland relocation were considered.

Chairperson Brnabic asked the applicants if they had any further questions for the Commissioners. Mr. Stuhlreyer said that he did not think so. They knew that it was a long road with many more steps. They did not know if it would end up with 120 or 90 units. They came to get an initial reaction and some marching orders, and they would see what was brought back. The next time the Commissioners saw something, it would be far more developed. He assured that there would not be vinyl siding, and that they would not ask for material changes.

Mr. Anzek said that it was nice the way the boulevard entrances were designed, but he did not think that would be enough. He knew that MDOT did a right turn lane for westbound Auburn going north onto Livernois. He wondered if that could be redesigned so the development had a right in only to the parking. The parking lot at the very eastern side might be right in, right out only for the two one-way movements. It was an MDOT road, so he was not sure how they would weigh in, but he thought that for the retail to be successful, they might need a little more than what was shown for Livernois.

Mr. Stuhlreyer asked if they would consider parallel parking along the street. Mr. Anzek said that he would, but he did not think MDOT would. It was done at Barclay Circle with Barrington Park, and the City's engineers did not like it because the street trees that were planted blocked the view. The speed limit was 45 on Auburn, and they might consider a service road in and one out rather than just having open parking. Mr. Stuhlreyer said that they did discuss the mosque and the turning lanes, and they contacted their traffic engineers, and they were trying to coordinate efforts. They were on board with the widening, and there was plenty of room in their plan to give a little. Mr. Anzek thought that access would become key for any tenants that wanted to be there in the commercial area. He suggested that it might just take some tweaks. He thought it was a good

use for difficult land.

Chairperson Brnabic summarized that everyone had given feedback, and she thanked the applicants for coming, and they looked forward to a nice development. Mr. Stuhlreyer said that they appreciated the feedback.

Discussed

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Roediger reminded the Commissioners about the Master Plan Open House scheduled for April 23, 2018 from 4:30 to 7:00 p.m. at Rochester College. It would be in the auditorium behind the theatre. Giffels Webster would lead the Open House, where people could come and go. There would be two brief presentations. She said that they would appreciate any of the Commissioners who could to help work the stations. She asked them to encourage people to attend. The survey would be up through the end of the month. There was an art contest for children, and they really needed more entries. It was for photography, poetry, drawing, etc., and they had to be of the City of Rochester Hills. There were over 700 results for the survey, and it would end fairly soon. At the next work session, Giffels Webster would give an update about the public involvement and to present some preliminary recommendations for comment.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Chairperson Brnabic reminded the Commissioners that the next Regular Meeting was scheduled for May 15, 2018 beginning with a Master Plan Work Session at 6:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission and upon motion by Mr. Kaltsounis, seconded by Mr. Reece, Chairperson Brnabic adjourned the Regular Meeting at 9:20 p.m.

Deborah Brnabic, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Secretary

