



Planning and Economic Development

Sara Roediger, AICP, Director

From: Kristen Kapelanski, AICP
Date: 6/23/2020
Re: **Rochester University Townhomes PUD (City File #19-022)**
Final PUD Plan - Planning Review #3

The applicant is proposing a 70-unit owner occupied condominium Planned Unit Development (PUD) on a 7.9 acre site to be split from the existing Rochester University campus located on the north side of Avon, just west of Rochester Road consisting of 13 buildings with four to six units each. The project was reviewed for conformance with the City of Rochester Hills Zoning Ordinance. The comments below and in other review letters are minor in nature and can be incorporated into a final PUD/site plan submittal for review by staff after review by the Planning Commission and City Council.

1. **Background.** This project has received Preliminary PUD and Conceptual Plan approval from City Council on March 16, 2020 following a recommendation from the Planning Commission at their February 18, 2020 meeting with the following findings and conditions; applicable comments from staff are italicized.

Findings:

- a) The proposed PUD Concept Plan meets the criteria for use of the PUD option.
- b) The proposed PUD Concept Plan meets the submittal requirements for a PUD concept plan.
- c) The proposed development should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.
- d) The proposed development is not expected to have an unreasonably detrimental or injurious effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the site or those of the surrounding area.
- e) The proposed development is consistent with the Master Land Use Plan to provide an alternate housing option.
- f) The Planning Commission modifies the density, minimum side perimeter setbacks, minimum building separation for several identified buildings, the garage orientation and the front door orientation requirements, as they will result in a better development layout.

Conditions:

- a) Approval shall only confer the right of the applicant to submit detailed site plans consistent with the layout and at a density not exceeding that shown on the PUD Concept plan. *In compliance, the final plan is consistent with the approved concept plan.*
- b) The site plans, including but not limited to landscaping, engineering, tree removal and setback modification plans will meet all applicable City ordinances and requirements while remaining consistent with the PUD Concept layout plan. *In compliance, the final plan is consistent with applicable ordinances and the approved concept plan.*
- c) The architectural quality of building plans submitted with the site plans and PUD Agreement in step 2 of the PUD process will be equal to or better than that approved with the PUD Concept plan. *The provided elevations are generally the same as those shown as part of the PUD Concept plan approval/submittal.*
- d) Recommendation by the Planning Commission and approval by City Council of an amended PUD Agreement, as approved by the City Attorney, at Final PUD. *In compliance, Rochester University has submitted an amendment to their existing Rochester University PUD to remove the subject parcel.*

- e) Obtain a Tree Removal Permit, Wetland Use Permit Recommendation and Natural Features Setback Modifications at Final PUD Review. *In compliance.*
 - f) Approval of a lot split prior to final approval by Engineering. *In compliance; lot split has been submitted for review.*
 - g) Provide landscape, irrigation and tree fund payment (if necessary) cost estimates in conjunction with Final PUD review. *In compliance.*
 - h) Address comments from applicable City Staff memos, prior to Final PUD submittal. *In compliance.*
 - i) The proposed trail to the detention pond shall be rerouted to stay out of the pond, to be approved prior to Final PUD review and approval. *In compliance; see the Engineering review letter dated June 23, 2020 for additional information.*
 - j) That a written agreement with the church to share access with the parking lot shall be in place prior to Final PUD Review and approval. *In compliance; shared parking agreement submitted for review.*
 - k) That a walking path plan from the church parking lot to the development be submitted prior to Final PUD review and approval. *In compliance; emergency access drive serves as walking path between church parking lot and development.*
 - l) That a no parking plan for Warrior Way and Eagles Way be in place prior to Final PUD review and approval. *In compliance; signage for no parking fire lane will be posted in the appropriate locations throughout the site.*
2. **PUD Requirements** (*Section 138-7.100-108*). The PUD option is intended to permit flexibility in development that is substantially in accordance with the goals and objectives of the City's Master Land Use Plan at the discretion of the City Council. The PUD development shall be laid out so that the various land uses and building bulk will relate to each other and to adjoining existing and planned uses in such a way that they will be compatible, with no material adverse impact of one use on another. The PUD option seeks to:
- Encourage innovation to provide variety in design layout
 - Achieve economy and efficiency in the use of land, natural resources, energy and the provision of public services and utilities
 - Encourage the creation of useful open spaces
 - Provide appropriate housing, employment, service and shopping opportunities

The PUD option can permit:

- Nonresidential uses of residentially zoned areas
- Residential uses of nonresidential zoned areas
- Densities or lot sizes that are different from the applicable district(s)
- The mixing of land uses that would otherwise not be permitted; provided that other objectives are met and the resulting development will promote the public health, safety and welfare

Review Process

The PUD review process consists of a two-step process as follows:

- a. **Step One: Preliminary PUD Plan.** The Preliminary PUD plan is intended to show the location of site improvements, buildings, utilities, and landscaping with a level of detail sufficient to convey the overall layout and impact of the development. The Preliminary PUD plan is not intended to demonstrate compliance with all ordinance requirements, but rather is intended to establish the overall layout of the development, including the maximum number of units which may be developed. This step requires a Planning Commission public hearing and recommendation to City Council followed by review by the City Council.
- b. **Step Two: Final PUD Plan/Site Plan/PUD Agreement.** The second step in the process is to develop full site plans based on the approved Preliminary PUD plan and to submit the PUD Agreement. At this time, the plans are reviewed for compliance with all City ordinance requirements, the same as any site plan. This step requires a Planning Commission recommendation to City Council followed by review by the City Council.

Qualification Criteria

Section 138-7.102 sets forth the criteria that a PUD must meet. Each of the criterion are listed below in italics, followed by staff comments on the proposed PUD's compliance with each.

- a. *The PUD option shall not be used for the sole purpose of avoiding applicable requirements of this ordinance. The proposed activity, building or use not normally permitted shall result in an improvement to the public health, safety, and welfare in the area affected.* The proposed PUD generally meets the applicable requirements of the RM-1 zoning district. The development of attached residential units at this location acts as an effective land use transition between the industrial development to the east and the existing Rochester University campus.
- b. *The PUD option shall not be utilized in situations where the same land use objectives can be accomplished by the application of conventional zoning provisions or standards.* The development of attached housing is not a permitted use in the SP District. While the development generally meets the applicable requirements of the RM-1 zoning district (the more typical location of attached and multi-family housing), there are potentially five variances under conventional zoning that may be required including building separation, side yard perimeter setback, and garage orientation. Through the use of the PUD, the City has the ability to be flexible with regulations in return for development that is above and beyond conventional development.
- c. *The PUD option may be used only when the proposed land use will not materially add service and facility loads beyond those contemplated in the master land use plan. The applicant must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City that the added loads will be accommodated or mitigated by the applicant as part of the PUD.* The Master Plan calls for special purpose uses and the existing Rochester University PUD specifically calls out student housing for up to 300 students to be located on this property. From a utility standpoint, impacts on the City's system would be similar and have been accounted for.
- d. *The PUD shall meet as many of the following objectives as may be deemed appropriate by the City:* The PUD is not required to comply with all of the items listed in this criterion; it is up to the judgment of the Planning Commission and City Council to determine if the proposed development provides adequate benefit that would not otherwise be realized. The applicant has proposed the provision of a missing pathway segment along Avon Road and pathway improvements to better connect the Clinton River Trail to the adjacent Rochester University Campus and the adjacent city-owned greenspace.
 1. *To preserve, dedicate or set aside open space or natural features due to their exceptional characteristics or their environmental or ecological significance in order to provide a permanent transition or buffer between land uses, or to require open space or other desirable features of a site beyond what is otherwise required in this ordinance.* The proposed project contains a centralized open space feature and open space along the perimeter of the development. Open space throughout the development totals 0.47 acres.
 2. *To guarantee the provision of a public improvement that would not otherwise be required to further the public health, safety or welfare, protect existing uses or potential future uses in the vicinity of the proposed development from the impact of a proposed use, or alleviate an existing or potential problem relating to public facilities.* The City is working towards a complete pedestrian network including additional connections to the Clinton River Trail and other community assets. The applicant has proposed the creation and formalization of nature path connections through the existing conservation easement area to the south and from the existing University campus pedestrian network to the Cloverport Green Space Property. This connection would run through the development area and would be an added pedestrian connection that would bolster recreation opportunities along the Clinton River Trail. The applicant previously explored the installation of a traffic signal at the proposed Warrior Way intersection with Avon. The Road Commission for Oakland County (which has jurisdiction over Avon in this location) indicated they would not permit a signal at Avon and Warrior Way. Additionally, the applicant has proposed a paved pathway connection along Avon Road connecting the existing Clinton River Trail pedestrian crossing area to the pathway along Avon Road. This is an important missing gap in the City's system.
 3. *To promote the goals and objectives of the Master Land Use Plan and other applicable long range plans such as the Master Thoroughfare Plan.* The proposed project promotes the following goals and objectives of the Master Land Use Plan:
 - (a) Provide a diverse range of housing options that meet the affordability, maintenance and lifestyle needs of current and future residents.
 - (b) Promote the inclusion of neighborhood parks and gathering spaces within residential developments.
 4. *To facilitate development consistent with the Regional Employment Center goals, objectives, and design standards in the City's Master Land Use Plan.* Not applicable.
 5. *To preserve and appropriately redevelop unique or historic sites.* Not applicable.
 6. *To permanently establish land use patterns that are compatible with or will protect existing or planned uses.* As previously noted, the development of attached residential units at this location is an effective land use

transition between the industrial development to the east and the less intense Rochester University campus to the north and west.

7. *To provide alternative uses for parcels that can provide transitions or buffers to residential areas and to encourage redevelopment of sites where an orderly transition or change of use is desirable.* The site is generally surrounded by the Rochester University campus, with an existing parking field for the University to the west and University open space near the Clinton River to the north. Existing industrial uses (including a self storage facility and Lifetime Fitness) are directly to the east and a portion of the southern property line is bordered by a church. The proposed project will serve as a buffer between the more intense land uses to the east and the less intense university uses to the west. Additionally, the proposed use is less intense and less dense when compared to the originally contemplated use of the property as the site for student apartment housing.
 8. *To enhance the aesthetic appearance of the City through quality building design and site development.* Proposed elevations suggest quality building design conforming to the City's Architectural Design Standards.
3. **Preliminary and Final PUD Plan (Section 138-7.105).** Written verification from the owner of the property that the applicant is authorized to pursue a PUD and any deed restrictions or restrictive covenants associated with the property has been submitted as part of the Preliminary PUD submittal. The Planning Commission and City Council should only be evaluating the major elements of the development such as density, layout, and building design with the understanding that the details will be reviewed during step 2 of the process, with the burden being on the applicant to maintain compliance with the overall layout and density approved with the Preliminary PUD. The Final PUD is generally in compliance with the approved Preliminary PUD.
 4. **Rochester University PUD and Proposed Parcel.** The area to be developed is currently part of the Rochester University PUD, which indicates student housing in 6 buildings for up to 300 students. The existing PUD will need to be modified to remove this portion of land as part of the Final PUD process for the proposed Rochester University Townhomes PUD. Additionally, a lot split will need to be approved through the City Assessor's office removing this proposed parcel from the overall Rochester University parcel.
 5. **Zoning and Land Use (Section 138-4.302 and 138.7.103).** The site is zoned SP, Special Purpose District, however the applicant is proposing to develop the site with a PUD option. This site is included as part of the current Rochester College PUD. See below the table for additional information. For purposes of this review, the proposed plan was reviewed in accordance with the requirements of the RM-1 Multiple Family Residential district. Refer to the table below for the zoning and existing and future land use designations for the proposed site and surrounding parcels.

	Zoning	Existing Land Use	Future Land Use
Proposed Site	SP, Special Purpose	Vacant	Special Purpose
North	SP, Special Purpose	Vacant (part of Rochester University Campus)	Special Purpose
South	SP, Special Purpose	Rochester Church of Christ	Special Purpose
East	I, Industrial with FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay	Self Storage, Lifetime Fitness, Vacant	Commercial Residential Flex 2
West	SP, Special Purpose	Rochester University Campus	Special Purpose

6. **Site Layout (Section 138-6.100-104 and Section 138-7.104).** Refer to the table below as it relates to the area, setback, and building requirements of the RM-1 district.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
<p>Max. Density: 6,400 sq. ft. per unit = 10.3 acres required</p> <p>Regulated wetlands areas shall be counted for density computations on the basis of only 50% of such land</p>	7.9 acres	Not in compliance. This standard has been modified as part of the PUD.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Min. Lot Standards 0.5 acre area/150 ft. lot width	7.9 acres/279 ft.	In compliance
Min. Front Perimeter Setback (Warrior Way) 50 ft.	100 ft. +	In compliance
Min. Side Perimeter Setback (north/east/west/south) 30 ft. + 1 ft. for each 10 ft. building length > 40 ft. along adjoining property lines = East: 38 ft. West: 40 ft. South: 40 ft. North: 30 ft.	East: 30 ft. West: 24 ft. South: 24 ft. North: 24 ft.	Not in compliance on all sides. This standard has been modified as part of the PUD.
Min. Rear Perimeter Setback (north) 30 ft.	30 ft.	In compliance
Min. Building Separation Front to Side: 45 ft. Front to Front: 50 ft. Front to Rear: 60 ft. Rear to Rear: 60 ft. Rear to Side: 45 ft. Side to Side: 30 ft. Corner to Corner: 30 ft.	Front to Side: 66 ft. Front to Front: 66 ft. Front to Rear: N/A <i>Rear to Rear: 36 ft. (Bldgs. 39-42 & 23-27)</i> <i>Rear to Side: 32 ft. (Bldgs. 33-38 & 28-32)</i> Side to Side: 30 ft. Corner to Corner: 60 ft.	Two of the standard separation requirements are not met (<i>identified in italics</i>), the City has the ability to decrease the building separation as part of the PUD option and this standard has been modified as part of the PUD.
Min. Floor Area 3 or more bedroom: 950 sq. ft.	1,860 sq. ft.	In compliance
Max. Height 2.5 stories/30 ft.	2.5 stories/ 25 ft.	In compliance
Architectural Details Walls visible from a street or residential uses shall include windows and architectural features similar to the front facade of the building All buildings shall have pitched roofs, which may include functional dormer windows and varying lines customary with gable or hip style roofing.	Provided elevations indicate pitched roofs. Windows are included on all sides of the buildings	In compliance
Garage Orientation Max. 25% of garage doors may be located at or in front of the front building wall of the building, with all other garage doors being located at least 10 ft. behind the front building wall of the unit or facing the side or rear of the unit	100% of garage doors are located in the front of the buildings	Not in compliance – this standard has been modified as part of the PUD
Front Door Orientation Min. 75% of the main entrances to the individual dwellings shall be located on the front façade of the building & shall include a front porch or stoop that is at least 6 ft. in width & depth with a min. area of 36 sq. ft.	100% of front doors are located on the front facade of the buildings, front stoop minimum 19.8 sq. ft.	Front stoop area not in compliance. This standard has been modified as part of the PUD.
Vehicular Circulation Street connections shall be provided to adjacent neighborhoods in residential districts Ingress & egress from the public streets shall be designed to minimize congestion & interference with normal traffic flow	There are no existing residential neighborhoods to connect into Applicant is working with Engineering to minimize impact to public streets	In compliance or working with City to comply

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
All interior roads, drives & parking areas shall be hard surfaced & provided with curbs & gutters Roadway drainage shall be appropriately designed such that stormwater from the roadway will not drain onto the adjacent lots	All interior roads & parking areas are paved with curb & gutter Applicant is working with Engineering to ensure appropriate stormwater measures	
Pedestrian Circulation 5 ft. wide concrete sidewalks shall be provided to connect parking areas, public sidewalks & recreation areas to building entrances 6 ft. wide concrete sidewalks shall be provided along streets within the development Sidewalks or 8 ft. wide asphalt pathways shall be provided along streets adjacent to the development	Sidewalks proposed throughout	In compliance
Parking On-street parking shall count towards the minimum parking requirement; min. circulation lane width 16 ft. & parking stalls shall min. width of 8 ft. & min. length of 22 ft. Off-street parking spaces must be screened from view of any public road, pedestrian path, or adjacent single family residential dwelling unit Off-street parking lots may occupy up to 50% of a required front yard & 75% of a required rear yard, provided the parking lot is located a min. 15 ft. to a perimeter property line	On-street parking not provided Off-street parking has not been included except for those areas in unit driveways	Generally in compliance
Recreation Areas Passive or active recreation areas (including but not limited to seating areas, playgrounds, swimming pools, walking paths) shall be provided at a ratio of at least 5% of the gross area of the development=0.4 ac. recreation areas Min. 5,000 sq. ft. for each area & the length to width ratio of each area shall not exceed 4:1 Located centrally & conveniently to be physically & visibly accessible to residents & shall not be located within any required yard setbacks or building separations	0.47 acres of open space Gazebo/community feature provided in center of development	In compliance
Utilities All multiple-family dwellings shall be connected to the public sewer & public water system	All units are connected to public sewer & water	In compliance

a. Please note that the inclusion of the deck/sunroom in the setback calculation has led to a slight decrease in the perimeter side yard setback on all sides. This was shown as a feature on the Preliminary PUD plan but was not previously included in the setback.

7. **Parking.** (Section 138-11.100-308). Refer to the table below as it relates to the parking requirements for this project.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Setback from Residential Uses Private roads, private drives & off-street parking areas, including maneuvering lanes, shall not be permitted within required yards in the RM-1	N/A	Not adjacent to residential uses or zoning

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
district where the adjacent property is zoned one-family residential		
Cross Access Wherever feasible, cross-access connections between adjacent parking lots, or a future connection when no adjacent parking lot exists but can reasonably be expected to be constructed on an adjacent parcel at a future date are required	Emergency secondary access proposed to adjacent church – stub street provided	No other reasonable opportunities present for cross access
Min. # Parking Spaces Multiple family 3+ bedrooms: 2 spaces per unit + 0.25 visitor spaces per unit = 158 spaces required	140 spaces (garages) 140 spaces (garage approaches) 280 spaces total	In compliance - Shared parking has been established with adjacent church

8. **Natural Features.** In addition to the comments below, refer to the comments and review letters from the Engineering and Forestry Departments that pertain to natural features protection.

- a. **Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)** (Section 138-2.204.G) An EIS has been submitted for the project.
- b. **Tree Removal** (Section 126 Natural Resources, Article III Tree Conservation). The site is subject to the city's previous tree conservation ordinance, and so any healthy tree greater than 6" in caliper that will be removed must be replaced with one tree credit. Trees that are dead need not be replaced. A tree preservation plan has been included. The removal of any regulated tree requires the approval of a tree removal permit and associated tree replacement credits, in the form of additional plantings as regulated in the Tree Conservation Ordinance or a payment of \$216.75 per credit into the City's tree fund. The applicant has identified 702 regulated trees to be removed and replaced. All trees will be replaced either on site or on the adjacent Rochester University campus. It should be noted that the plan indicates the 'development area' and includes an area proposed to be protected by a conservation easement. This will be outside of the proposed parcel lines of the townhome area but within the proposed development area of the project.
- c. **Wetlands** (Section 126 Natural Resources, Article IV Wetland and Watercourse Protection). The site contains two wetland areas regulated by the City and EGLE. One is of low quality and the other is of high quality. Impacts to the high quality wetland (Wetland 5) should be minimized to the greatest extent possible. Wetland use permits are required. See the April 29, 2020 letter from ASTI for further detail.
- d. **Natural Features Setback** (Section 138-9 Chapter 1). The Natural Features Setback will be impacted by the proposed development. Impacts have yet to be quantified. See the April 29, 2020 letter from ASTI for further detail.
- e. **Steep Slopes:** There are several areas of steep slopes on the site. See the Engineering review letter dated June 23, 2020 for additional information.

9. **Landscaping** (Section 138-12.100-308). Refer to the table below as it relates to the landscape requirements for this project. This information is provided to aid the applicant in preparation of step two site plan submittal.

Requirement	Proposed	Staff Comments
Buffer D (east: 605 ft.) 25 ft. width (or 8 ft. with wall) + 2.5 deciduous + 1.5 ornamental+ 5 evergreen + 8 shrubs per 100 ft. = 25 ft. width + 15 deciduous + 9 ornamental + 30 evergreen + 48 shrubs	25 ft. wide 15 deciduous 9 ornamental 30 evergreen 48 shrubs	In compliance
Stormwater (656 ft.) 6 ft. width + 1.5 deciduous + 1 evergreen + 4 shrubs per 100 ft. = 6 ft. width + 10 deciduous + 7 evergreen + 26 shrubs	6+ ft. width 11 deciduous 7 evergreen 29 shrubs	In compliance

- a) A landscape planting schedule has been provided including the size of all proposed landscaping. A unit cost estimate and total landscaping cost summary, including irrigation costs, for landscape bond purposes has been provided.

-
- b) If required trees cannot fit or planted due to infrastructure and corner clearance conflicts, a payment in lieu of may be made to the City's tree fund at a rate of \$216.75 per tree. Existing healthy vegetation on the site may be used to satisfy the landscape requirements and must be identified on the plans.
 - c) A note has been provided on the landscape plan that states that all landscape areas must be irrigated. A note has been included that watering will only occur between the hours of 12am and 5am.
 - d) Site maintenance notes listed in *Section 138-12.109* have been included on the plans.
 - e) A note stating "Prior to the release of the performance bond, the City of Rochester Hills must inspect all landscape plantings." has been included on the plans.

10. **Architectural Design** (*Architectural Design Standards*). A proposed building elevation has been submitted that emphasizes the garage door as the majority of the front façade which is not the most desirable design option. The City's *Architectural Design Standards* emphasizes this point in *Section 3.2.2 Hierarchy of Massing* which states that "the location of the main body of the house and the human entrance should be easily distinguished. The car entry shall not be the most notable element of the building massing." As part of the PUD development option, the development should encourage innovation to provide variety in design layout and staff encouraged the applicant to consider alternative building footprints that minimize the garage doors and focus more on the human entrance. The applicant has indicated that due to the natural features constraints of the site, they are not able to re-orient the garage location and this deviation has been included in the PUD Agreement. Individual buildings will be reviewed under a separate permit issued by the Building Department.

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



ASSESSING DEPARTMENT
Laurie A Taylor, Director

From: Laurie Taylor
To: Sara Roediger
Date: 04/29/2020
Re: Project: Rochester University Townhomes/The Groves
Parcel No: 70-15-15-451-008
File No.: 19-022 BESC 19-0022
Applicant: Pulte Homes of Michigan LLC

Plans should depict where the easement boundary lies in relationship to the easterly boundary of parcel 15-15-451-009 and the barn and silo on this parcel.



PARKS & NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

Ken Elwert, CPRE, Director

To: Kristen Kapelanski, Planning Manager
From: Matt Einheuser, Natural Resources Manager
Date: April 21, 2020
Re: The Groves (fka. Rochester University Townhomes) Review#1 Final PUD
File #19-022

Forestry review pertains to right-of-way tree issues only. Approved, based on this review.

Copy: Maureen Gentry, Economic Development Assistant

ME/ms



BUILDING DEPARTMENT
Scott Cope

From: Mark Artinian, Building Inspector/Plan Reviewer
To: Kristen Kapelanski, Planning Department
Date: April 24, 2020
Re: The Groves (Rochester College Townhouses) – Final PUD Review
800 W. Avon Rd.
Sidwell: 15-15-451-008
City File: 19-022

The Building Department has reviewed the Final PUD documents received April 16, 2020 for the above referenced project. Our review was based on the City of Rochester Hills Zoning Ordinance, and the 2015 Michigan Residential Code unless otherwise noted.

Approval is recommended.

The layout of units and grading of the site appears to be consistent with previous approval items noted on previous Building Site Plan reviews. Please indicate the following information on the building permit documents for each unit:

1. The residential units shall be reviewed using the following code analysis:
 - a. Code: 2015 Michigan Residential Code (2015 MRC)
 - b. Use and Occupancy: Residential R-3
 - c. Construction Type: VB
2. Each unit shall be considered a separate building and shall be separated by no less than a 2-hour fire-resistant-rated assembly per the 2015 MRC, Section 302.2.
3. The roof construction shall be per the 2015 MRC, Section 302.2.2.

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



FIRE DEPARTMENT

Sean Canto

Chief of Fire and Emergency Services

From: Lee Mayes, Captain / Assistant Fire Marshal
To: Planning Department
Date: June 22, 2020
Re: The Groves (fka. Rochester University Townhomes)
Review #3 Final PUD

SITE PLAN REVIEW

FILE NO: 19-022

REVIEW NO: 3

APPROVED X

DISAPPROVED _____

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

1. It is noted the construction type of the 6 unit buildings will be Type 5A construction, while all other buildings will be Type 5B. Since the construction type of the 6 unit buildings now have been identified, the required fire flow for this type of building is as follows:

6 Unit Buildings – Construction type 5A – Up to 20,280 square feet – Fire flow of 2,500 GPM, requires 3 fire hydrants, with the average spacing of 450 feet.

Since the required fire flow has decreased due to the change of the construction type from 5B to 5A, fire suppression systems are no longer a requirement in the 6 unit buildings in order to meet fire flow requirements. However, we do highly recommend keeping these systems in place as fire sprinkler systems are highly reliable and are proven to be cost effective. Also, it is unknown if the Michigan Building Code will require fire sprinklers in these 6 unit buildings or if the developer is choosing to keep them. In the case that the fire sprinkler systems will remain in place, the FDC locations are approved as shown on sheet 31. If the fire suppression system are intended to be kept in the project, then no further site plan changes are required and sheet 31 can be approved as submitted.

2. If the fire suppression systems are intended to be removed from the project, then please remove notes 5 and 6 from sheet 31.

Lee Mayes
Captain / Assistant Fire Marshal



FIRE DEPARTMENT
Sean Canto, Fire Chief

From: Vince Foisy
 To: Planning Dept.
 Date: July 14, 2020
 Re: The Groves (FKA:Rochester University Townhomes) - Section #15 - Review #4

APPROVED

The street names submitted on the drawings stamped received by Planning on 07/9/2020 have been reviewed as follows:

The following name(s) is/are Approved:

Prefi x	Street Name	Suffi x
	Warrior Way	Dr
	Denali	Dr
	Strawberry	Dr
	Hummingbir d	Dr
	Peppermint	Dr

NOTES: > Street names approved as DRIVES

- If in the Future Warrior Way drive is connected around to the driveway that comes out to W. Avon road, the roadway then will be required to be re labeled as Warrior Way Circle, and the school will be responsible for all needs and costs for the re naming.

The following name(s) is/are Not Approved:

Prefi x	Street Name	Suffi x

NOTE: Requests must not be, Like, Similar and or Sound alike names to ones already approved

To speed your review process up I recommend that you contact me by Email with proposed names prior to your re-submittal:

Email: foisyv@rochesterhills.org

If you have any further questions please contact me at 248.841.2709

MEMO

[Subject]

[Date]

Page 2

VINCENT B. FOISY
Communication Systems Administrator

cc: File h:\data\



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

JSB

From: Jason Boughton, AC, Engineering Utilities Specialist
To: Kristen Kapelanski, AICP, Planning Manager
Date: June 23, 2020
Re: Rochester University Townhomes 'The Groves', City File #19-022, Section 15
Final PUD Plan Review #3

Approved

Engineering Services has reviewed the site plan received by the Department of Public Services on June 11, 2020, for the above referenced project. Engineering Services **does recommend** Final PUD approval with the following comments:

Storm Sewer

1. Provide 2-foot sumps for structures SP and SP2 instead of the 1-foot sumps as shown.

Grading

1. The retaining walls being proposed behind Units 43-64 and the wetland impact #3 needs to be structurally engineered due to the height exceeding 4 feet. A steep slope permit will need to be approved by Planning Commission as part of the overall development.

Traffic/Roads

1. NA

Pathway/Sidewalk

1. NA

Legal

1. Parcel descriptions on cover sheet do not match what was submitted with the land division.
2. Make sure legal descriptions match and bearings/distances are consistent throughout plans.
3. Easement provided for the emergency access is 20' wide but the plans show a 25' wide easement.
 - a. Easement is shown incorrectly on sheet L-1.
4. Proposed parking agreement area (Exhibit "C") is not shown on plans.
5. Pedestrian Pathway easement (Exhibit "A") is not shown on plans.
6. Show sidewalk easement on the Rochester College parcel on plans.
7. Verify courses in the access road easement. There are discrepancies between the drawing and description.
8. Clearly define easement boundaries for the "access and utility easement area" on plans.
9. Sanitary easement provided does not match plans. Separate easements will be needed for on-site, off-site sanitary, and vacation of existing sanitary easement.
10. All easements will go through a formal review once construction plans have been approved.

The applicant has started the construction plan review process with a second construction set of plans were reviewed and comments sent back on June 16, 2020 and a preconstruction checklist was created for this project.

JB/kc

c: Allan E. Schneck, P.E., Director; DPS
Paul Davis, P.E. City Engineer/Deputy Director; DPS
Paul G. Shumejko, MBA, M.S., P.E., PTOE, Transportation Eng. Mgr.; DPS
Tracey Balint, P.E., Public Utilities Engineering Mgr.; DPS
Keith Depp, Project Engineer, DPS

Jenny McGuckin, Right-of-way/Survey Technician; DPS
Scott Windingland, DPS Aide; DPS
Chuck Keller, P.E., ckeller@rcoc.org
Scott Sintkowski, P.E., ssintkowski@rcoc.org
File

I:\Eng\PRIV\19022 RU Townhomes aka The Groves\EngFinalPudReview3_062320.docx

July 9, 2020

Ms. Kristen Kapelanski
Department of Planning and
Economic Development
City of Rochester Hills
1000 Rochester Hills Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309

**Subject: File No. 19-022 – The Groves
(fka Rochester University Townhomes PUD)
Wetland Use Permit Review #1.1;
Revised Plans received by the City of Rochester Hills on
April 28, 2020**

Applicant: Pulte Homes of Michigan LLC

Dear Ms. Kapelanski:

The above referenced project proposes to construct 70 residential units on one parcel totaling approximately 7.9 acres of land. The site is located along Avon Road, east of Livernois, and west of Rochester Road. The site includes wetland regulated by the City of Rochester Hills and likely the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE).

ASTI has reviewed the revised site plans received by the City on April 28, 2020 (Revised Plans) for conformance to the Wetland and Watercourse Protection Ordinance and the Natural Features Setback Ordinance and offers the following comments for your consideration.

COMMENTS

1. **Applicability of Chapter (§126-500).** The Wetland and Watercourse Protection Ordinance is applicable to the subject site because the subject site is not included within a site plan which has received final approval, or a preliminary subdivision plat which received approval prior to January 17, 1990, which

approval remains in effect and in good standing and the proposed activity has not been previously authorized.

2. **Wetland and Watercourse Determinations (§126-531).** This Section lists specific requirements for completion of a Wetland and Watercourse Boundary Determination.

- a. This review has been undertaken in the context of a Wetland and Watercourse Boundary Determination completed on the site by the Applicant's wetland consultant, Atwell, LLC on April 30, 2019. ASTI confirmed this wetland delineation in the field on May 20, 2019.

Two wetlands were identified within the Project Area: Wetland 3 (formerly Wetland 4) and Wetland 4 (formerly Wetland 5); both of which are regulated by the City and likely EGLE. Portions of Wetlands 3 and 4 are proposed to be impacted by this project.

Wetland Quality Assessments

Two wetlands were identified on the property. Quality assessments are as follows:

Wetland 3

Wetland 3, located in the west-central portion of the property, is forested wetland comprised of vegetation dominated by the native species of silver maple (*Acer saccharinum*), cottonwood (*Populus deltoides*), and American elm (*Ulmus americana*). The shrub layer of Wetland 3 consisted of the native species of gray dogwood (*Cornus racemosa*) and the invasive species of glossy buckthorn (*Frangula alnus*). Herbaceous vegetation within Wetland 3 was generally absent at the time of ASTI's inspection. Canopy within the on-site portion of Wetland 3 was estimated at approximately 50%, and trees were generally young with some moderately mature individuals. Mean vegetation cover within the entirety of the on-site portion of Wetland 3 was estimated at approximately 60% with an approximate total native species cover of 85% and approximate invasive species cover of 15%. Exposed and active groundwater seeps and surface water was observed throughout this wetland on the day of ASTI's site inspection. Wetland 3 provides direct surface water detainment enhancing water quality prior to entering the Clinton River to the west/northwest through a natural forested wetland system to the west of the Property. Soils within Wetland 3 were comprised of sandy clay and muck and appeared to be relatively undisturbed. The vegetation within

Wetland 3 is dominated by native species with very little invasive species. Wetland 3 provides some of the last remaining natural water filtration and detainment functions in close proximity to the Clinton River near the property and should be considered an important natural resource of the City per the City's Wetland and Watercourse Protection Ordinance.

Wetland 4

Wetland 4, located in the southern portion of the Property, is an emergent portion of a larger forested wetland system to the east of the Property. Wetland 4 was dominated by Phragmites (*Phragmites australis*). Wetland 4 appears to detain and conduct small amounts of storm water from precipitation events; no surface water or ground water was observed. Wetland 4 appears to be the result of adjacent site development to the west and south. Soils were comprised of sandy loams and appeared relatively undisturbed. The on-site portion of this wetland is dominated by invasive species, which reduces its potential to provide significant natural resource functions. Therefore, it is ASTI's opinion that Wetland 4 is of low ecological value and function and should not be considered an important natural resource to the City.

3. **Use Permit Required (§126-561).** This Section establishes general parameters for activity requiring permits, as well as limitations on nonconforming activity. This review of the Revised Plans has been undertaken in the context of those general parameters, as well as the specific requirements listed below.
 - a. On-site wetland boundaries appear to be shown accurately and labeled consistently the Revised Plans. The applicant is advised that wetland delineations are only considered valid by the City and EGLE for a period of three years past the completion date.
 - b. All wetland on the site is regulated by the City and likely EGLE. Wetlands 3 and 4, as shown on the Revised Plans, are both portions of the same, larger wetland system to the west that exhibits a direct hydrological connection to the Clinton River and are, thus, regulated by the City and likely EGLE. The Revised Plans indicate both Wetlands 3 and 4 are regulated.
 - c. ASTI observed multiple discrepancies in the wetland impact amounts for on-site wetlands on former plans. The Revised Plans now show all impacts to on-site wetlands correctly and consistently throughout the plan set.

- d. The Revised Plans show that 317 square feet of Wetland 3 will be permanently impacted from the construction of an access road and associated grading. Although Wetland 3 should be considered an important natural feature to the City, the impacts to Wetland 3 are small. Moreover, these impacts are minimized by the implementation of a retaining wall structure at the impact area of Wetland 3 as shown on the Revised Plans. A structure of this sort will help ensure that the remaining portion of Wetland 3, both on- and off-site, will be protected from unintentional impacts in the future. The Revised Plans also include a typical drawing of the proposed retaining wall structure. All this information is to ASTI's satisfaction. The Applicant is advised the final approval of the type and material of the proposed retaining wall structure is subject to final approval by the City.
 - e. The Revised Plans show 2,857 square feet of Wetland 4 will be permanently impacted from the construction of an access road and associated grading. Wetland 4 is of low quality on-site, the proposed impacts are minor, and natural drainage processes will not be adversely affected by the proposed impacts. Moreover, these impacts as proposed should not necessarily compromise the functions of the off-site portion of Wetland 4. Therefore, ASTI recommends the City allow for a Wetland Use Permit for the impacts proposed to Wetland 4 in this area.
4. **Use Permit Approval Criteria (§126-565).** This Section lists criteria that shall govern the approval or denial of an application for a Wetland Use Permit. The following items must be addressed on a revised and dated Wetland Use Permit application and additional documentation submitted for further review:
- a. A Wetland Use Permit from the City and likely an EGLE Part 303 Permit are required for this project as proposed. Once an EGLE permit is received by the applicant, it must be submitted to the City for review prior to construction.
5. **Natural Features Setback (§21.23).** This Section establishes the general requirements for Natural Features Setbacks and the review criteria for setback reductions and modifications.
- a. Should the City accept the Applicant's proposal to develop the subject property as a PUD, subject to final review and approval as part of the site plan review process, the on-site Natural Features Setback regulations can be waived by the City at its discretion. The Applicant should note that upon the request of the City, ASTI will re-evaluate any

Natural Features Setback impacts if the City does not waive Natural Feature Setback regulations. The Revised Plans do not show any Natural Features Setback areas, but do indicate that approximately 400 linear feet of Natural Features Setback will occur as a result of the project.

RECOMMENDATION

ASTI recommends the City approve the Revised Plans.

Respectfully submitted,

ASTI ENVIRONMENTAL



Kyle Hottinger
Wetland Ecologist
Professional Wetland Scientist #2927



Dianne Martin
Vice President
Professional Wetland Scientist #1313