



Rochester Hills

Minutes - Draft

Planning Commission

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

Chairperson William Boswell, Vice Chairperson Deborah Brnabic
Members: Gerard Dettloff, Greg Hooper, Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Stephanie Morita,
David A. Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Emmet Yukon

Tuesday, February 16, 2016

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Present 6 - Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, Greg Hooper, David Reece, C. Neall Schroeder and Emmet Yukon

Absent 3 - William Boswell, Nicholas Kaltsounis and Stephanie Morita

Quorum present.

Also present: Ed Anzek, Director of Planning & Economic Dev.
Sara Roediger, Manager of Planning
Alan Buckenmeyer, Acting Director of Parks & Forestry
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2016-0042](#) January 19, 2016 Regular Meeting

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

Aye 6 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 3 - Boswell, Kaltsounis and Morita

COMMUNICATIONS

- A) *Planning & Zoning News dated January 2016*
- B) *Goddard Systems, Inc. Info Sheet Operations*
- C) *Goddard School Anticipated Staff Parking Pattern*

NEW BUSINESS

2016-0035

Public Notice and request for a Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 15-019 - Stonecrest at Rochester Hills, for the removal and replacement of as many as five regulated trees for a proposed 81,073 square-foot senior living facility on 3.5 gross acres, located on the east side of Rochester Road, north of Hamlin, zone R-4, One Family Residential with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay, part of Parcel No. 15-23-300-035, NP Senior Living Development, LLC, Applicant
(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Sara Roediger, dated February 12, 2016 and site plan had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant was Jed Momot, NP Senior Living Development, 5015 N. W. Canal St., Suite 200, Riverside, MO 64150.

Ms. Roediger outlined the project and summarized the requests. She stated that the applicant planned to buy 2.54 acres of the subject parcel to put up a 100 bed, two-story, 81,703 square-foot assisted living and memory care facility. She noted that the proposed site was located on the east side of Rochester Rd., between Hamlin and Avon. The site was zoned R-4, One Family Residential with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay, and it was being developed under the FB-2 standards which required higher standards and other improvements. She noted that there would be off-site improvements to roads to connect to future development north of the site, and that a cross access easement would be required. Bike racks and sidewalks into and throughout the site had been provided to connect to Rochester Rd. and to the future internal road, in addition to a pathway along Rochester Rd. In accordance with FB regulations, an outdoor amenity space had been provided at the northeast corner of the site that would include large boulder outcrops, plantings and benches. Ms. Roediger advised that there would be minor wetland impacts due to construction activities and that a Wetland Use Permit Recommendation was required, for which a motion was included. She mentioned that the applicants had met with the neighbors on November 10, 2015 to conduct an open forum. Neighbors from the Avon Hills and Eddington Farms Subdivisions were invited to learn about the project and have an opportunity ask questions. The applicants stated that the outcome of the meeting was overwhelmingly positive. She said that she would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Momot advised that he would be the project manager, and that the developer managed about 55 other facilities. He stated that it would be a home for the aged. They had to go through the State for licensing Care

Model One, which was the highest level. He also advised that they would have 24-hour staff. He maintained that it would be a very low impact use. 55 rooms would be for assisted living with two stories in the front. It would transition to one story for memory care. There would be a mixture of studios and one and two-bedrooms. He showed the landscape plan and circulation to the north, east and south. He showed a slide of the floor plans and amenities. There would be a movie theatre, spa, salon and other amenities. He pointed out some other projects they had under construction and a showed a sample of the proposed materials and colors. It would be stone masonry with a Craftsman style theme to fit in with the adjacent residential. He said he was available to answer any questions, and he added that they were very excited to be doing a project in Rochester Hills.

Mr. Schroeder asked if the residents would not be allowed to have cars. Mr. Momot responded that it was very rare to have a resident drive - the average age was 84.

Mr. Hooper asked if they were purchasing the property, which Mr. Momot confirmed. Mr. Hooper observed that the grading went outside the limits of the property line.

Ms. Roediger said that the road along the northern border straddled the subdivision. Mr. Hooper asked if there should be a finding or condition regarding working outside the limits, and Ms. Roediger said that the City did have it in writing.

Mr. Hooper asked about connectivity for the whole site and if there would eventually be connection to Eddington Blvd. Ms. Roediger explained that as the site plan evolved, the connection could be made to the north at any time. She commented that the market would handle it, and added that it would be a service drive. Mr. Hooper clarified that when development did occur, a connection would have to be made at that time. He asked if it would always be a private road, which Ms. Roediger confirmed. She added that FB-2 was very restrictive. The construction of the road would be done so that in the future, no one would have to put pavement into the road and develop more than their share.

Mr. Hooper asked about the boulder wall and its limits. Mr. Momot pointed it out in the northeast corner of the parcel. Mr. Hooper had read through the EIS, which stated that the developer would rezone the property. Mr. Momot assured that was not the case, and that it was not necessary with FB-2 zoning, and he agreed to correct the EIS.

Mr. Dettloff asked if it was the first type of project like this in Michigan for the developer. Mr. Momot said it was the second. The first was in Troy across from City Hall. Mr. Dettloff asked if the company was currently in Michigan, and Mr. Momot said not personally, but they came to Michigan. Mr. Dettloff asked if they had done a market analysis, which Mr. Momot confirmed.

Mr. Schroeder said that he could not picture the development in Troy. Mr. Momot clarified that it had not been built yet. Mr. Schroeder asked if there was an easement for the road on the adjacent property.

Mr. Anzek advised that there was. He said that anywhere along the northern border, a road could be continued. Mr. Schroeder questioned whether that should be a condition of approval, and Ms. Roediger offered that it would be requested as part of construction plan submittal.

Mr. Yukon noted that in the staff report, it stated that the applicant had a positive meeting with the residents. He asked Mr. Momot if he could elaborate. Mr. Momot said that the residents were shown a slide show, traffic patterns were explained, and the parking was discussed as were the kinds of services that would be offered. Many thought it was a great looking building. Mr. Yukon asked how many residents were at the meeting, and Mr. Momot said there were nine. Mr. Yukon asked how they got the information to the residents, and Mr. Momot answered that they used a 1,000-foot radius to send a mailer about the informational meeting.

Mr. Yukon said that in the EIS, it talked about the relocation of Eddington Blvd. He asked Mr. Momot if they were comfortable with that. Mr. Momot said they were and would agree to a right in, right out entryway. Mr. Yukon asked Mr. Momot if they had any interest in the properties to the south, and Mr. Momot said that they did not at this time.

Hearing no further discussion to come before the Planning Commission, Mr. Schroeder moved the following, seconded by Mr. Reece:

MOTION *by Schroeder, seconded by Reece, in the matter of City File No. 15-019 (Stonecrest at Rochester Hills), the Planning Commission grants a Tree Removal Permit, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on January 20, 2016, with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following two (2) 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 replace four regulated trees with four tree credits.*

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.*

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

Aye 6 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 3 - Boswell, Kaltsounis and Morita

2016-0036

Public Hearing and request for a Wetland Use Permit Recommendation - City File No. 15-019 - Stonecrest at Rochester Hills, for wetland impacts of up to 6,650 square feet for a proposed 81,073 square-foot senior living facility on 3.5 gross acres, located on the east side of Rochester Rd., north of Hamlin, zoned R-4, One Family Residential with an FB Flexible Business Overlay, part of Parcel No. 15-23-300-035, NP Senior Living Development, LLC, Applicant

Vice Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 7:25 p.m.

Seeing no one come forward, she closed the Public Hearing.

Subsequently, she received a card and reopened the Public Hearing at 7:27 p.m.

Tanmay Kulkarni, 1710 Farnborough, Rochester Hills, MI 48307 *Mr. Kulkarni said that his only concern was that there was an attempt to build on a wetland. He stated that his sump pump was always running. He asked how the excess water would be managed and who would be responsible for building on a wetland.*

Mr. Momot advised that there would be an underground detention system, so there would be less water released than it did currently. He was very comfortable that there would not be any flooding, and there would be minimal impacts to the wetlands. He also did not foresee any excess water flow.

Mr. Kulkarni thought that the boulder wall would impact the water on his side of the property and the flooding. Mr. Momot explained that the

boulder wall would level the developer's side. Mr. Kulkarni asked if the City Engineers agreed with that. Ms. Roediger said that the storm water would be retained on site and would be handled in an underground system on the applicant's property. She stated that the City Engineers were comfortable with the detention system for the site.

Mr. Kulkarni asked if the wetland would be totally removed for future development. He stated that it would be an environmental disaster. He asked if people to the north would be able to build on the wetlands.

Mr. Anzek advised that building on a wetland was a process. The environmental consultant had stated that it was a low quality wetland, and it was suggested that it might be filled and that a proper drain could be put in to carry the water to the Honeywell Drain.

Vice Chairperson Brnabic closed the Public Hearing at 7:33 p.m.

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Yukon, in the matter of City File No. 15-019 (Stonecrest at Rochester Hills) the Planning Commission **recommends City Council approves a Wetland Use Permit** to temporarily and permanently impact approximately 6,650 square feet for the construction of the proposed drive and site grading, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on January 20, 2016, with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following four (4) conditions.

Findings

1. Of the approximately 1.12 acres of City-regulated wetlands on site, the applicant is proposing to impact less than one-third.
2. The wetland areas are of medium to low ecological quality and should not be considered a vital natural resource to the City.

Conditions

1. City Council approval of the Wetland Use Permit.
2. If required, that the applicant receives all applicable DEQ permits prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.
3. That the applicant provides a detailed soil erosion plan with measures sufficient to ensure ample protection of wetlands areas, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.
4. That any temporary impact areas be restored to original grade with original soils or equivalent soils and seeded with a City approved wetland seed mix where possible, prior to final approval by staff.

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

Aye 6 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 3 - Boswell, Kaltsounis and Morita

2016-0037

Request for a Natural Features Setback Modification - City File No. 15-019 - Stonecrest at Rochester Hills, for impacts to approximately 458 linear feet of natural features setback for a proposed 81,073 square-foot senior living facility on the east side of Rochester, north of Hamlin, NP Senior Living Development, LLC, Applicant

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Dettloff, in the matter of City File No. 15-019 (Stonecrest at Rochester Hills), the Planning Commission **grants Natural Features Setback Modification** for the permanent impacts to as much as 458 linear feet of natural features setbacks associated with the construction of the proposed drive and site grading, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on January 20, 2016, with the following two (2) findings.

Findings

1. *Natural Features Setback Modifications are needed to construct a portion of the road and for site grading.*
2. *The Natural Features Setbacks are of low ecological quality and the City's Wetland Consultant, ASTI, recommends approval.*

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

Aye 6 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 3 - Boswell, Kaltsounis and Morita

2016-0038

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 15-019 - Stonecrest at Rochester Hills, a proposed 81,703 square-foot senior living facility on Rochester Rd., north of Hamlin, NP Senior Living Development, LLC

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Yukon, in the matter of City File No. 15-019 (Stonecrest at Rochester Hills), the Planning Commission **recommends that City Council approves the Site Plan** based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on January 20, 2016, with the following six (6) findings and subject to the following eight (8) 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 have a cross access easement to a road to the north to Eddington Blvd. in case of future development. Access has been designed to promote safety and convenience of vehicular traffic within the site. Walkways 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 safety.*
4. *The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.*
5. *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.*
6. *The Planning Commission has determined that proposed plan meets the required criteria for a modification to the FB district requirements and therefore approves the requested modifications from the FB dimension and design standards for front yard setback, building frontage build to area, and street design pedestrian and vehicle zones as described in this report to allow for programming and function of the building.*

Conditions

1. *Provide all off-site easements and agreements for approval by the City prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
2. *Provide a landscape bond in the amount of \$166,000 for landscaping and replacement trees, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
3. *Provide an irrigation plan and cost estimate, prior to final approval by staff.*
4. *Payment of \$3,200 into the tree fund for landscaping deficiency of deciduous and evergreen trees, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
5. *Approval of all required permits and approvals from outside agencies.*
6. *Compliance with the department memo comments, prior to final approval by staff and Building Permit Approval.*
7. *Provide a recorded use agreement and cross access easement between the applicant and the owner of the adjacent property to the north, prior to final approval by staff.*
8. *Revise the Environmental Impact Statement as discussed, prior to final approval by staff.*

Regarding Condition seven, Mr. Anzek said that staff would make sure that they talked with the City Attorney, because the road was designed under the FB-2 standards. It was not just to service the subject facility, but would be made available for cross through traffic either on to Bordine's or from Bordine's to the site and to points northward. It was not just a dual use; it would be for any potential future users as well.

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

Aye 6 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 3 - Boswell, Kaltsounis and Morita

After each motion, Vice Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously.

2016-0034

Public Notice and request for a Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 15-006 - Bloomer Woods, for the removal and replacement of as many as 280 regulated trees for a proposed 30-unit residential development on 12.8 acres, located on the east side of John R, north of Avon, zoned R-3, One Family Residential with an MR, Mixed Residential Overlay, Parcel No. 15-13-301-058, Lombardo Homes, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Sara Roediger, dated February 16, 2016 and Preliminary Site Condominium Plan had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Greg Windingland, Lombardo Homes, 51237 Danview Technology Ct., Shelby Township, MI 48315; Donald Westphal, Donald C. Westphal Associates, 71 N. Livernois, Rochester Hills, MI 48307 and Gregory Bono from Community Engineering and Surveying, 6303 26 Mile Rd., Suite 110, Washington, MI 48094.

Mr. Roediger advised that the project was for a new single-family, detached site condo development on 12.8 acres on the east side of John R north of Avon. Sample elevations had been provided, and the applicants were proposing a mix of 30 one and two-story homes. There were requests for a Wetland Use Permit and Preliminary Site Condominium Plan Recommendation to City Council and for a Tree Removal Permit and Natural Features Setback Modifications. She noted that the wetlands were on the northern end of the property by the open space, which abutted the County drain just north of the property. There would be 280 regulated removed and replaced trees on site. The project had gone through multiple reviews, and all staff had recommended approval or recommended approval with minor conditions.

Mr. Windingland from Lombardo Homes said that he did not have a presentation, but the project was fairly straight forward. He said that he would be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. Hooper asked if they held a meeting with the neighbors. Mr. Windingland advised that in late October they mailed a letter to abutting property owners and to those across John R, as they did with all new developments. The neighbors were invited to the Rochester Hills Library on December 1st. They showed a conceptual site plan, introduced themselves and talked about their intentions for developing the property. They were prepared to address any concerns, but unfortunately, only one gentleman showed up.

Mr. Westphal added that he had a conversation earlier in the day with the owners of the Mobile Home Park to the east. He explained the buffer plantings, and based on that, the owner did not feel he needed to be at the meeting.

Mr. Hooper felt that the development looked nice and appropriate for the neighborhood. He felt that the price point of the homes would improve the surrounding property values.

Mr. Reece asked if the price point was identified in the packet. Mr. Windingland said that it was in the Environmental Impact Study. Mr. Reece asked the range, and Mr. Windingland said that they expected that by the time the lot premiums, amenities and tile upgrades, for example, had been determined, they anticipated that the homes would transact at around \$350k and up.

Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Hooper moved the following, seconded by Mr. Schroeder:

MOTION *by Hooper, seconded by Schroeder, in the matter of City File No. 15-006 (Bloomer Woods Site Condominiums), the Planning Commission grants a Tree Removal Permit, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on January 15, 2016, with the following three (3) findings and subject to the following two (2) conditions.*
Findings

- 1. The proposed removal and replacement of regulated trees is in conformance with the Tree Conservation Ordinance.*
- 2. Of the 449 regulated trees onsite, 169 will be saved, resulting in a 37.6% preservation rate*

3. *The applicant is proposing to replace 280 regulated trees with 280 tree credits.*

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.*

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

Aye 6 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 3 - Boswell, Kaltsounis and Morita

2016-0033

Public Hearing and request for a Wetland Use Permit Recommendation - City File No. 15-006 - Bloomer Woods, for wetland impacts of up to 14,370 square feet associated with the construction of a proposed 30-unit residential development on 12.8 acres, located on the east side of John R, north of Avon, zoned R-3, One Family Residential with an MR Mixed Residential, Parcel 15-13-301-058, Lombardo Homes, Applicant

Vice Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 7:50 p.m. Seeing no one come forward, she closed the Public Hearing at 7:50 p.m.

MOTION *by Hooper, seconded by Reece, in the matter of City File No. 15-006 (Bloomer Woods Site Condominiums), the Planning Commission recommends City Council approves a Wetland Use Permit to temporarily and permanently impact approximately 14,370 square feet for the construction of several units, a portion of the proposed road, two culverts and a portion of the storm sewer detention pond, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on January 15, 2016, with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following four (4) conditions.*

Findings

1. *Of the approximately 1.39 acres of City-regulated wetlands on site, the applicant is proposing to impact a little over one-quarter.*
2. *The wetland areas are of medium to low ecological quality and should not be considered a vital natural resource to the City.*

Conditions

1. *City Council approval of the Wetland Use Permit.*
2. *If required, that the applicant receives all applicable DEQ permits prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
3. *That the applicant provides a detailed soil erosion plan with measures sufficient to ensure ample protection of wetlands areas, prior to*

issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.

4. *As noted on the plans, that any temporary impact areas be restored to original grade with original soils or equivalent soils and seeded with a City approved wetland seed mix where possible, prior to final approval by staff.*

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

Aye 6 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 3 - Boswell, Kaltsounis and Morita

2016-0039

Request for Natural Features Setback Modifications - City File No. 15-006 - for impacts to approximately 1,075 linear feet for Bloomer Woods, a proposed 30-unit site condominium development on 12.8 acres located on the east side of John R, north of Avon, Lombardo Homes, Applicant

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Yukon, in the matter of City File No. 15-006 (Bloomer Woods Site Condominiums), the Planning Commission ***grants Natural Features Setback Modification*** for the temporary and permanent impacts to as much as 1,075 linear feet of natural features setbacks associated with the construction and grading of several units, the proposed road and the storm sewer detention basin, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on January 15, 2016, with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following one (1) condition.

Findings

1. *Natural Features Setback Modifications are needed to construct several units, a portion of the road and the detention basin.*
2. *The Natural Features Setbacks are of low ecological quality and the City's Wetland Consultant, ASTI, recommends approval.*

Condition

1. *Add a note indicating that Best Management Practices will be strictly followed during construction to minimize the impacts on the Natural Features Setbacks.*

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

Aye 6 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 3 - Boswell, Kaltsounis and Morita

2016-0032

Public Hearing and request for Preliminary Site Condominium Plan Recommendation - City File No. 15-006 - Bloomer Woods, a proposed 30-unit

development on 12.8 acres, located on the east side of John R, north of Avon, zoned R-3, One Family Residential with an MR Mixed Residential Overlay, Parcel No. 15-13-301-058, Lombardo Homes, Applicant

Vice Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing for the Preliminary Site Condominium Plan at 7:53 p.m. Seeing no one come forward, she closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Hooper, in the matter of City File No. 15-006 (Bloomer Woods Site Condominiums), the Planning Commission recommends that City Council approves the Preliminary One-Family Residential Detached Condominium plan based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on January 15, 2016, with the following five (5) findings and subject to the following six (6) conditions.

Findings

1. *Upon compliance with the following conditions, the proposed condominium plan meets all applicable requirements of the zoning ordinance and one-family residential detached condominium.*
2. *Adequate utilities are available to properly serve the proposed development.*
3. *The preliminary plan represents a reasonable street layout.*
4. *The Environmental Impact Statement indicates that the development will have no substantially harmful effects on the environment.*
5. *Remaining items to be addressed on the plans may be incorporated on the final condominium plan without altering the layout of the development.*

Conditions

1. *Provide all off-site easements and agreements for approval by the City prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
2. *Provide a landscape bond in the amount of \$51,323 for landscaping, replacement trees, plus an irrigation plan and cost estimate, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
3. *Payment of \$6,000 into the tree fund for street trees, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
4. *Approval of all required permits and approvals from outside agencies.*
5. *Compliance with the department memo comments, prior to Final Site Condo Plan Approval and Building Permit Approval.*
6. *Submittal of By-Laws, Master Deed and Exhibit B's for the condominium association along with submittal of Final Preliminary Site Condo Plans.*

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

Aye 6 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 3 - Boswell, Kaltsounis and Morita

After each motion, Vice Chairperson stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously. Mr. Hooper thanked the applicants for their investment in Rochester Hills.

2016-0040

Public Hearing and Request for Adoption of the 2016-2020 Parks and Recreation Master Plan

(Reference: Memo prepared by Alan Buckenmeyer, Acting Director of Parks & Forestry and Sara Roediger, Manager of Planning and Draft Master Plan had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Alan Buckenmeyer, Acting Director of Parks & Forestry and Sara Roediger, Manager of Planning, City of Rochester Hills.

Ms. Roediger advised that a Parks and Recreation Plan (the Plan) was needed because the MDNR regulated the Plan and required one to be on file every five years to be eligible for any type of grant funding. She noted that the current Plan expired on December 31, 2015. She explained that the Plan was a guide for the City for any operated recreational facilities and programs - similar to the Master Land Use Plan but targeted for the parks in the City. The contents of the Plan were largely outlined by State law. It consisted of a community description, administrative structure, an inventory of all of the facilities, a detailed public involvement effort, and stated goals and objectives, all of which supported an action program for the next five years. The mission statement of the Parks and Forestry Department was revisited, and stated that it would provide recreation for as many people as possible and preserve the natural environment, which was also very prominent in the Plan. There was a natural features inventory done by Dr. Niswander of Niswander Environmental included in the Plan as well.

Ms. Roediger stated that the community description updated the demographic social characteristics, and the ages and household compositions of the people who lived in Rochester Hills were a component. Out of all the households in Rochester Hills, only 33% had

children. She indicated that it might be surprising, because people thought of Rochester Hills as being very family-oriented, but the type of households that existed actually included quite a lot of seniors and people without school age children. She pointed out a chart which showed the breakdown of preschools, school aged, family forming, middle aged and senior aged residents. Not all of those in the family forming group were having children. The Plan listed the types of programming and types of facilities being developed and who the audience was for the facilities.

Ms. Roediger referred to the section on administrative structure, which was the obligatory section that outlined the organizational chart and who the providers were. The City partnered with a number of agencies, including RARA, the OPC and the Paint Creek Trailways Commission. Those agencies provided programs for the City that the City did not. She added that the budget and funding for those providers was also included.

Ms. Roediger advised that over 1,000 acres of parkland was inventoried. That consisted of seven community parks, which served the entire City; three neighborhood parks; and four special use parks, which were essentially natural features preservation, including the Museum and the Pine Trace Golf Course. There were two linear parks - the Paint Creek Trail and the Clinton River Trail were the most heavily used in the City. There were also multiple green space properties that the City was acquiring to preserve natural features. All of the above made up the over 1,000 acres of parkland for which the City was responsible.

For the public involvement process, there was a 30-day public review period. The Plan was published on the City's website, and copies were available throughout the City, including at the Library, RARA, and at the OPC. There was a public opinion survey on the website, and Administration was pleasantly surprised to see 541 survey responses in that 30-day period. With social media and an online survey, the City received much more involvement than it ever had over the past traditional planning process. Ms. Roediger and the Parks & Forestry staff worked with the Mayor's office on the social media outreach (Facebook and Twitter) and over 25,000 people were reached. There were a number of comments and much feedback.

The result of all the public involvement had been summarized into six bullet points. The Clinton River and Paint Creek Trails were the two most commonly used parks and, as such, walking and biking trails ranked as the number one facility people thought more money should be spent on

in the future. In terms of new facilities, many people would like to see a splash pad or water park and a dog park. Natural features preservation and open space remained a priority for many. In terms of how the City could get more people involved in parks in the future, the comment was reiterated that more walking and biking facilities, not just paving, but restrooms, parking, etc. to enhance the walking and biking experience were needed. Better maintenance was mentioned, more diversity in programming and special events and more restrooms were the most cited improvements to increase people's participation in parks and programming events in the future. Over half of the respondents said they would support a millage dedicated to preserving those types of improvements. One quarter were unsure, so that meant that only one quarter said no, which was very good to support a millage moving forward.

Ms. Roediger related that all the analysis ended with goals and objectives. All the recommendations and goals of the Plan were to maintain and enhance all of the existing facilities while developing innovative new park facilities; to improve upon the pathways and connectivity in the City; to provide diverse programming; and to preserve significant natural features in a fiscally responsible fashion. All of the recommendations in the Plan fell into one of six main categories, which were outlined in the action program. That was a five-year plan for how to spend future money. The recommendations were ambitious, totaling over \$5.8 million, plus \$480k of annual funds, which were built into the City's budget. The \$480k included pathway installations, ADA compliance, playground upgrades and other items. She stressed that the costs were not anticipated to be funded solely by taxpayer money. It was to be funded by grants, and she reiterated that the purpose of the Plan was to be eligible for grants and private donations. The City was ambitiously looking at how it could attract outside money and perhaps use City funds as a match, in addition to money in the Capital Improvement Plan, Green Space funding and the General Fund.

Going through the action plan, Ms. Roediger said that it was important to note that the order was not set in stone. If funding became available for a dog park before it was planned, the City would apply for grants, even if it was not planned for four more years. She explained that it was a very fluid action plan for when money became available.

Ms. Roediger had outlined the priorities for funding over the next five years in the Plan, and a common thread was Riverbend Park. There was recently a presentation by Design Team Plus for Riverbend Park, and a plan for it was recently adopted by City Council. The recommendations

were broken down into different elements, and the City planned to begin implementing elements as funding became available. Other key recommendations for funding included storm water improvements that were introduced as part of the Lawrence Tech Watertowns presentation earlier this year. It was also done for Yates Park and Borden Park. The City was working on Watertowns to improve access to the Clinton River through kayak launches at the Avon Nature Center and at Yates Park. Other enhancements included the Paint Creek Trail resurfacing, which was planned for 2018, as well as ongoing improvements to the pathways system and improvements at Borden Park to the office, maintenance yard and the roller hockey rink.

Ms. Roediger advised that after the Public Hearing, the Planning Commission could make any suggestions or modifications to the Plan, and it was staff's hope that it would be adopted at the meeting. She also advised that a Public Hearing was scheduled at City Council on February 22, 2016, when Council would see the presentation and make any desired modifications. The Plan would then be submitted to the DNR, although the City was already at work applying for various grants to implement the Plan and bring the recommendations to fruition. Ms. Roediger further advised that the effort was done fully in house by the Parks Department, the Mayor's Office and the Planning Department. She said she would be happy to answer any questions.

Vice Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 8:08 p.m.

Martin Krueger, 781 Snowmass Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48309. Mr. Krueger thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak. He said that his interest was in Nowicki Park, which was basically unimproved green space currently. He lived in the subdivision to the east (Shadow Woods). He claimed that all of the parks in Rochester Hills were top notch, and he had had favorable experiences with the parks he used. He had no doubt that whatever the City did with its properties, whether maintaining green space or improving parks, it would be done in a very professional, positive way. Regarding Nowicki Park, from the current Plan, there were a lot of sports-type activities being planned. One that concerned him the most was a soccer field that looked as if it abutted the property lines for the people in Shadow Woods. He had expressed his concern to Mr. Buckenmeyer that some consideration should be given so that people did not park in his subdivision and cut through properties to get to activities more easily than trying to fight the fight on Adams Rd. or park in a lot. When multiple soccer games were going on at Spencer Park, for example, he observed that people parked all over the place and

boxed people in. He wanted to make sure that the subdivision was not used for overflow traffic from Adams and that people were not parking on the subdivision street. He would also like some consideration for noise and disruption in the field. He thought that perhaps quieter activities like a walking park could be set closer to the property line and the more busy activities, like soccer and baseball, could be put closer to Adams Rd. He suggested that a berm or fence might be required as part of the planning. He concluded that he had a high regard for what Mr. Buckenmeyer and his department did with the parks.

Ioan Ghitas, 1949 Alsdorf, Rochester Hills, MI 48309. *Mr. Ghitas said that he grew up in the City, and he maintained that it had been a privilege and a pleasure living and raising his family in Rochester Hills. He noted that he was a delegate, and he walked the neighborhood to make his intention about running for different offices known. He noticed while walking was that there was a large deficiency in his area. Between South Boulevard and Auburn and Livernois and Crooks, there was a square mile that only had a middle school and a church with an open area for sports, but there were no parks in the whole mile. He said that he was surprised to learn that only 33% of the households had children. He also noticed that people used strollers to go down the street, but there was no place to walk a baby to a park. He said that his neighbors had two large dogs, and they walked them in the street, because there was no place for pets to go. Because there were no parks in the whole square mile, he and his sons had to go north to get to a park or go to a park in Troy. It had become a burden for him since he had kids because there was nothing in his area. He had a bike rack, because the only way to go biking was to leave the City and go to Troy or Birmingham. He said that another thing different with his square mile was that there were no commercial buildings - it was all residential. He said that he would like the City to consider adding something in his area.*

Vice Chairperson Brnabic closed the Public Hearing at 8:18 p.m.

Mr. Anzek said that in response to Mr. Ghitas, the City was always looking for opportunities to provide more service. He did not want to get into any specifics, but one of the most popular grants the MDNR gave was for park acquisition. There were a lot of costs and other things the City had to consider. They would not only have to buy the land, but it would have to be developed, maintained and operated as well. He believed that the City was pro-active in seeking parkland where there were deficiencies.

Mr. Schroeder said that as far as Nowicki Park, he would recommend that

during the planning, the City looked at berms, trees or bushes between the Park and the subdivision.

Mr. Buckenmeyer replied that Nowicki was in the Plan as a concept. The concentration for development right now was Riverbend Park. Before they did anything to Nowicki, the City would do a Master Plan and invite all the neighbors for input. Some of things in the concept could change or even disappear. Something could be added, after hearing ideas for a dog park or a community garden. At some point, the City hoped to develop the Park, but there would be a lot of opportunity for public input before a final plan was in place.

Mr. Schroeder asked if the settlement had stopped at Helen Allen Park. Mr. Buckenmeyer said that it was like a "brick" out there and it was not settling at all. Mr. Schroeder indicated that it was the landfill that was continually settling.

Mr. Dettloff asked if usage and permit fees would be staying the same for the next five years. Mr. Buckenmeyer said that he could not guarantee the next five years, but for the current year at least they would. He announced that the Parks Department had hired a new Director who would be starting in about a week who had not even had a chance to look at anything yet. Mr. Dettloff said that it was great that the City did the Plan in house, noting that it saved a lot of money. Mr. Buckenmeyer joked that Ms. Roediger had not submitted her bill yet.

Mr. Hooper said that looking at the five and ten-year plan, he did not see anything for Nowicki Park, so it did not seem as if anything would be done for the foreseeable ten years. Mr. Buckenmeyer reiterated that the City's main focus was Riverbend. They hoped to have that done in five years. If that went quicker, they would be able to move on to Nowicki. In response to the Mr. Ghitas' comment about proximity to parks, Mr. Hooper pointed out the Pine Trace Golf Course off of South Boulevard, Avondale Park on the south side of Auburn, west of Crooks, and to the northeast was Wabash Park. He said that it was true that in the immediate area there were no parks. He agreed with Mr. Anzek that there had to be a willing seller and a willing buyer in order to get to the right price to move forward. He believed that there were opportunities in that area.

Mr. Reece said that he came home one night recently, and he saw a beautiful fireworks display going on he hoped was in Rochester Hills, but it was in Utica. It appeared that they held a fairly large winter festival. That made him curious about how much use Thelma Spencer Park got in

the winter time. He asked if people were there skating and ice fishing. Mr. Buckenmeyer said they did when there was good ice, but this year had not been conducive. Mr. Reece asked if there were any comments from residents about having more of an outdoor ice arena. He assumed they relied on the ice on Carter Lake, so if the weather was bad, it could not be used.

Ms. Roediger said that in the packet, there were updated pages with full results of the survey. She had highlighted the main comments, but in Appendix C, there were results of a couple of open-ended questions such as "What type of facilities would you like to see?" There were comments about cross country skiing, and an ice skating rink was brought up by eight people (question 10). Mr. Reece asked Mr. Buckenmeyer if Utica just set up a temporary rink for its festival or if it was permanent throughout the wintertime. Mr. Buckenmeyer said that there was one area that had a Magic Square, which was a concrete square with curb that water was put in and if it froze, people skated and if not, it was a puddle. Mr. Reece said that he was talking about one right where the new baseball diamond was going up. Mr. Buckenmeyer said that it was a temporary rink. Mr. Reece suggested that the City needed a winter carnival.

Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Hooper moved the following, seconded by Mr. Schroeder:

MOTION by Hooper, seconded by Schroeder, the Planning Commission hereby adopts the 2016-2020 Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update as presented at the Planning Commission meeting on February 16, 2016 with the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the City of Rochester Hills has undertaken a planning process to determine the recreation needs and desires of its residents during a five year period covering the years 2016 through 2020, and

WHEREAS, the City of Rochester Hills began the process of developing the Rochester Hills Parks and Recreation Master Plan in accordance with the most recent guidelines developed by the Department of Natural Resources and made available to local communities, and

WHEREAS, residents of the City of Rochester Hills were provided with a well-advertised opportunity during the development of the draft plan to express opinions, ask questions, and discuss all aspects of the parks and recreation plan, including the opportunity to take a public opinion survey; and

WHEREAS, the public was given a well-advertised opportunity and reasonable accommodations to review the final draft plan for a period of 30 days. and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on February 16, 2016 by the Planning Commission at Rochester Hills City Hall to provide an opportunity for all residents of the planning area to express opinions, ask questions, and discuss all aspects of the Rochester Hills Parks and Recreation Master Plan, and

WHEREAS, the City of Rochester Hills has developed the plan as a guideline for improving recreation and enhancing natural resource conservation for the City of Rochester Hills.

WHEREAS, after the public hearing, the Planning Commission voted to adopt the Rochester Hills Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

RESOLVED that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby adopts the Rochester Hills 2016-2020 Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

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

Aye 6 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 3 - Boswell, Kaltsounis and Morita

2016-0059

Public Notice and request for a Tree Removal permit - for the removal and replacement of as many as 100 regulated trees for the properties at 1544 and 1600 West Hamlin, located on the north side of Hamlin between Livernois and Crooks, zoned ORT, Office Research & Technology, Parcel Nos. 15-21-376-010 and -011, City of Rochester Hills, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Ed Anzek, dated February 12, 2016 and Tree Survey had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant was Ed Anzek, Director of Planning and Economic Development, City of Rochester Hills.

Mr. Anzek advised that the City purchased the referenced property in the late 1990's for a joint operation with DPS and Rochester and Avondale Community Schools. The consortium began to fall apart after the land was acquired, and a new DPS facility was built on Auburn. Rochester Community Schools built a maintenance facility just northeast of the subject property.

Mr. Anzek said that he was requesting a Tree Removal Permit for the property because the City was marketing it, and there was a potential user. Part of the deal included that the City's Local Development Finance Authority (LDFA) would contribute so many dollars to prep the site. Under State law, there were things the LDFA could fund as long as the City owned the property. If the City sold it, it could not spend money on

the site except for public infrastructure. The City had a tree survey done by HRC, which was one of the City's engineering consultants. Ms. Roediger and Mr. Anzek walked the site, and determined that about 100 trees would be the right amount to make the site developable. It might be necessary to cut more in the future after a site plan was prepared. They also confirmed the dead trees identified in the survey. The trees were basically on the eastern parcel, which was old farmland. He added that the western parcel held the former Letica manufacturing building, which was demolished using LDFA funds to make the site more attractive to a potential user. Staff was seeking bids to remove the trees and do general site cleanup. There was some old farm fencing along the property lines that would also be removed. He indicated that if the potential deal should fall through, the site would be more marketable, which was what the LDFA had wanted to do for several years. He said that he would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Hooper asked Mr. Anzek if he anticipated removal in March or April. He mentioned it because the DNR had a ruling about bats and protecting the species during a certain time of the year and restricted tree removal. Mr. Anzek agreed, and he felt that the work would have to be done in March to be ahead of the restriction. The City might be in the middle of negotiations - he noted that the Purchase Agreement was going to Council on February 22nd. Staff was working diligently with the company, because it would be an excellent company for the site. It would be a good friend to the neighbors to the north and a great opportunity for the City. Mr. Anzek explained that the quarantine on the removal of trees during the roosting season was because of Indiana and Long Eared Northern Bats.

Mr. Schroeder asked if the work would include grading and seeding the property. Mr. Anzek did not believe so. They would not do seeding, because they expected a site plan shortly thereafter. He said that there might be some limited grading they could do with LDFA monies. They would be putting up soil erosion fencing as part of the tree clearing to protect the site. Mr. Schroeder agreed that the work would allow the site to look better.

Seeing no further discussion, Mr. Hooper moved the following motion, seconded by Mr. Yukon:

MOTION *by Hooper, seconded by Yukon, in the matter of City File No. 16-002 (1544-1600 W. Hamlin Rd. Property), the Planning Commission grants a Tree Removal Permit, based on plans dated received by the*

Planning Department on January 15, 2016, with the following four (4) findings and subject to the following two (2) conditions.

Findings

1. *The Local Development Finance Authority has approved funding for tree removal as an eligible LDFA expense to prepare the property for sale.*
2. *The proposed removal and replacement of regulated trees is in conformance with the Tree Conservation Ordinance.*
3. *Of the 144 regulated trees onsite, 44 will be saved, resulting in a 31% preservation rate.*
4. *The applicant is proposing to replace 100 regulated trees with 100 tree credits or payment 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.*

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

Aye 6 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 3 - Boswell, Kaltsounis and Morita

2016-0057

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 15-022 - Rochester College Field House, a proposed 23,432 square-foot athletic field house on Rochester College's 76-acre campus, located on the north side of Avon, between Livernois and Rochester Rds., zoned SP, Special Purpose with a PUD, Planned Unit Development Overlay, Parcel No. 15-15-451-008, Jaymes Vettraino on behalf of Rochester College, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Sara Roediger, dated February 12, 2016 and site plan had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant was Jaymes Vettraino, Rochester College, 800 W. Avon, Rochester Hills, MI 48307 and Dan Jerome, French Associates, 1600 Parkdale, Rochester, MI 48307.

Ms. Roediger advised that the project was part of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) approved in 2006 for the College. That outlined the future plans for expansion of the campus, and some athletic components were involved. She noted that staff had worked with the applicant over the last several months, and the plan had met with all applicable regulations of the approved PUD, and all reviewers had approved. She showed the overall site plan of the campus, a colored elevation and where the proposed building would be located, and said that she would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Vettrano thanked staff for their guidance through the process. In reviewing the project, staff was very helpful throughout to get some options they had not considered in the original design. He stated that the College was very interested in the facility being a community investment project right on Avon. It would be a signature building for the campus and signify a new day for the College to say it had its own fieldhouse. He felt that it was a larger calling card. They also believed that it would enhance Avon. There would be a nice facility for the community both as an attraction to bring more events to campus and for the City to promote the college environment. He said that he would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Yukon asked if they would be removing a soccer field or if the building would be put on one of the soccer fields. Mr. Vettrano said that was correct; they would be building on one of the practice fields. The College utilized an indoor soccer field primarily for most of its soccer needs.

Mr. Yukon noted the oval driveway, and he asked if they found it a challenge to park cars in the oval. Mr. Jerome explained that the drive was actually worked out with the Fire Department to provide access for its ladder truck. Mr. Yukon observed parking stalls in the oval. Mr. Jerome agreed there would be parking inside the oval and around the perimeter on the north and east sides. Mr. Vettrano added that it would be one-way angled parking.

Mr. Schroeder asked if there would be a paved section of road going into the driveway. Mr. Jerome agreed it would all be paved. Mr. Schroeder asked if the drive from Avon was paved. Mr. Jerome said it was an existing drive onto Avon, which was already paved.

Mr. Dettloff asked if the funding was all in place. Mr. Vettrano informed that they were currently still in the fund raising portion of the campaign. A considerable amount was in place, but they were still looking for

donations. The College had the funding aligned for a groundbreaking at the end of April. Mr. Dettloff asked the timeframe for construction, and Mr. Vettrano said it would be approximately ten months. Mr. Dettloff remarked that they would be giving the O-Rena a little competition.

Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Schroeder moved the following, seconded by Mr. Dettloff:

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Dettloff, in the matter of City File No. 15-022 (Rochester College Field House), the Planning Commission **approves the Site Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on January 21, 2016, with the following six (6) findings and subject to the following three (3) conditions.

Findings

1. The 2006 PUD Agreement and Master Plan for the College envisioned the proposed athletic facility.
2. 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.
3. The proposed project will be accessed from Avon, thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets. Walkways have been incorporated to promote safety and convenience of pedestrian traffic.
4. Off-street parking areas have been designed to avoid common traffic problems and promote safety.
5. The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.
6. 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.

Conditions

1. Provide a landscape bond for replacement trees in the amount of \$55,350 plus inspection fees, as adjusted as necessary by staff, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit for this development.
2. The college will proceed with design and approvals for the installation of the pathway along Avon Rd. to fill the gap on the College's property within three years of completion of the field house.

3. *Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, prior to final approval by staff.*

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

Aye 6 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 3 - Boswell, Kaltsounis and Morita

2016-0041

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 15-018 - Goddard School, a proposed 10,992 square-foot school on .95 acre, located at the southeast corner of Auburn and Graham, west of John R, zoned B-2, General Business with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-35-226-001, Swapna Chada, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Sara Roediger, dated February 12, 2016 and site plan had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Sandeep Chada, 2685 Hickory Grove, Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302; Bill Mosher, Apex Engineering, 2959 Rambling Way, West Bloomfield, MI 48302; and Kevin Brandon, BMK Design, 208 South Alice Ave., Rochester, MI 48307.

Ms. Roediger stated that staff had been working with the applicants for over a year. She advised that the property was being developed with an FB-2 Overlay with an almost 11,000 square-foot, two-story child care learning center, which was permitted by right in the district. After many iterations, staff recommended approval, as the plan met all applicable regulations. She showed pictures of the elevations, and noted that the building would primarily be brick. There were very specific requirements in the FB-2 standards in terms of building architecture, amenity space, landscaping and setbacks. Of note, the applicants were proposing an amenity space at the corner of Graham and Auburn, and there would also be an outdoor gathering space by the sidewalk where it entered the site. Ms. Roediger felt that space would be very much used by parents, students and employees. All of the outdoor play areas were planned as required, and Fire had approved the parking and turning criteria. She said that she would be happy to answer any questions.

Vice Chairperson Brnabic asked Mr. Chada if he had anything to add. Mr. Chada did not have a presentation, but he informed that Goddard Schools were a nationwide franchise. They had been in existence for over 25 years, and there were approximately 425 schools. There was one in Lake Orion, Oxford and Canton and in a couple other locations on the

west side of the State. He stated that he would be at the school; he was a trained neuroscientist and educator, and his wife was in information technology. He noted that the owner was usually present at the schools to take care of any issues and to handle the building. He added that there would also be a Director on staff.

Mr. Yukon said that the staff report stated that the school did not permit car drop-offs, and he asked the reason.

Mr. Chada responded that it was a safety issue. It was done that way at all the Goddard Schools. The primary reason was that they would like whoever was dropping off children to walk them into the school and sign them in.

Mr. Yukon said that in looking at the parking lot layout, it appeared that it would be very compressed. It seemed like there would be a lot of activity with cars pulling in and out, cars parking and children and parents getting out of vehicles trying to get to the building.

Mr. Chada had prepared a graph showing how the drop-offs would work. He clarified that most parents would not come at the same time. They would come from 7-9 a.m. and pick up between 4-6 p.m. The graph showed the number of spaces available at any given time. Because of the staggered starts, each spot would be used for about five minutes and then turn over. He had been to a few of the schools in the area, and he did not observe a mad rush. Mr. Mosher added that the majority of the employees came during non-drop-off hours. Goddard had developed the graph for all its sites. Mr. Brandon said that most employee parking would be based in the south parking lot. Mr. Mosher indicated that it was differentiated on the site plan by employee and parent drop-offs. Mr. Yukon asked if the spots designated in the front of the building were for parent drop-offs, which was confirmed. He asked the hours of operation and was advised 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. He asked if staff would arrive around 7:00 a.m. Mr. Chada said that a new shift would come every fifteen minutes, and each member would work eight hours. Mr. Mosher added that the graph showed how many employees would be there each half hour, and the majority would be there between 10:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. Mr. Yukon asked if it would be a year-round operation, which Mr. Chada confirmed.

Mr. Schroeder asked if private schools were subject to all local regulations. Mr. Anzek agreed it was different than public schools. Mr. Schroeder said that he did not see a lot of detail for the play areas. He

asked if there would be fences and adequate paths for the children to get to the play areas. Mr. Chada advised that there would be approximately 8k square feet of play space, separated into a toddler area to the north and a southern pre-school play area. Mr. Schroeder pointed out that below that it said Play School Area, and Mr. Chada said that it was another play area for the kids. Mr. Schroeder noted that there was a street right next to it, and he wondered if there was a fence. Mr. Chada said that there would be a fence around the whole property, including the Auburn side. Mr. Mosher said that the road Mr. Schroeder was referring to was the neighbor's driveway, and it would be relocated. Mr. Chada advised that there would be a six-foot fence.

Mr. Dettloff asked Mr. Chada if he was purchasing the land, and Mr. Chada agreed he was under contract to purchase. Mr. Dettloff asked if Mr. Chada would have ownership in the building or if it would be a combination of ownership/management. Mr. Chada said that they had obtained financing to build the school and to purchase the land. They would own the building and the franchise rights to run the school for the foreseeable future. They were only waiting for a building permit after site plan approval. Mr. Dettloff asked if everything was being done under the Goddard School standards. Mr. Chada agreed, and they were also following the State's childcare regulations. Mr. Dettloff asked if all the Goddard Schools' building designs were the same. Mr. Chada said that they were not the same; it depended on the location. The design they came up with had a lot to do with the requirements of FB-2 zoning. There were some transparency requirements. They made the north façade (facing Auburn) look more retail in nature so it would fit in better with any future development on Auburn. Mr. Brandon said that they wanted to maintain the schoolhouse look, while still respecting the Overlay district. Mr. Dettloff asked about the building materials. Mr. Brandon said that the main level would have red brick and above that would be a fiber cement product. It was not hardy; it was a larger cement fiber product with 3 x 5-foot panels. The top portion would be a darker gray. Mr. Dettloff indicated that he would defer to Mr. Reece regarding the building materials.

Mr. Hooper wondered if the six-foot high fence was white vinyl, which Mr. Brandon confirmed. Mr. Hooper said that someone could not even see the building looking in from the north because of the fence. Mr. Brandon explained that the Auburn Rd. fence would be wrought iron with brick piers every 12 feet all the way to the eastern property line. Mr. Hooper asked where the white vinyl fence would be. Mr. Brandon said it would be along other sides of the property.

Mr. Schroeder asked the applicants if they had met with the adjacent property owners about the fence. Mr. Chada said that he had several conversations with the owner to the south. The property owner on the east did not live at the property, which was a rental property, and Mr. Chada talked with him although not specifically about the fence.

Mr. Hooper clarified that someone would be able to see the building from Auburn with a black, wrought iron fence. He asked the radius of the target market area. Mr. Chada said that the demographics included 2.6 to 3 miles. Mr. Hooper asked the cost per student per year to attend. Mr. Chada said that it had not been completely set, but it would be around \$900-1000 per student per month. Mr. Hooper asked if the nearest Goddard School was in Lake Orion. Mr. Chada said that there was one in Lake Orion and also one in Macomb. There were several others that were the closest. Mr. Hooper had read in the EIS that they felt that Kindercare was a competitor. Mr. Hooper said that he did not see that. Mr. Chada said that they just listed other schools in the radius. He did not see it as a direct competitor. There was a school called Primrose, which was not in the area that was a competitor. There were some other schools, but he did not consider them direct competitors.

Mr. Reece said that he also had a concern about the parking. The model in the graph was good information, but he questioned if it was based on a standard for Goddard Schools throughout the area, with the same staggered times and parking spots. He was concerned about the parking lot working when they were at the maximum of 140 students. He asked if staff would call a couple of the other Goddard Schools in the communities to see how their parking and drop-off worked. He indicated that there were not a lot of spots, and he realized there could be two children per car, but he was concerned as to how well the parking would flow. It would be dead-end parking in terms of movement. If there were no spots open, there was no through-put for the parking, and people would have to back out of the drive and wait for another spot to open. Mr. Yukon added that bad weather could affect it as well. Mr. Reece said that in theory, things might work, but he would still like staff to look into it. Mr. Chada said that he checked with the owner in Canton, who had been in operation for eight years and had about 150 students. The Director at that location said that they used seven to eight spots for parent drop-off, and the other spots were for special events. They never had an issue with waiting because of the quick turnaround for each spot and the staggered times. He said that he would be happy to get a letter from the other owner. Mr. Reece asked what would happen when there was a special event that a lot of people

would attend. Mr. Chada said that if that happened, he might contract the location, because they would not have enough space for parents, children and guests. He might rent another building to host a special event. Mr. Reece did not think there was anyone on the Planning Commission that wanted to see an overparked site; on the other hand, the residents down Graham Dr. did not want to see cars lined up with people waiting to get onto the site. Mr. Chada explained that the building was not designed for an auditorium type of set up. If they did have some kind of larger event, there would be many places in the City he could rent. Mr. Reece noted that he was also talking about general pick up and drop-off, and he asked staff to confirm things with other Goddard Schools in the area.

Relative to the elevations, Mr. Reece said that he liked the west elevation. He asked if the slides shown were representative of the color scheme. Mr. Brandon said it was pretty close. Mr. Reece asked if the top band would also be fiber cement panel. Mr. Brandon agreed, noting that it would just be a darker color (charcoal gray). He said that it did have a black tone to it, but it was gray. Mr. Reece asked if there would be the same panel on the ground floor above the window. Mr. Brandon agreed, and said it would be like a slat/screen over the window. Mr. Reece asked if the main entrance would be on the west side, which Mr. Brandon confirmed. Mr. Reece said that his personal preference would be to see something similar to what was depicted on the west elevation on the north elevation facing Auburn. He felt that from an advertising and recognition standpoint from the road, Mr. Chada would want the name seen. It would be hard to see on the west elevation unless someone was going east on Auburn. Mr. Chada said that there would be double-sided signage. Mr. Reece understood that; he would just like to see the west elevation duplicated on the north. He suggested that the massing could be repeated. To him, the north was the primary elevation for people driving up and down Auburn. He was fine with the other elevations, and he did not have a big issue with the materials, but he said that he would like to see the real color for the black band. He suggested that the applicants could bring a sample for Ms. Roediger to take a look at. He offered to look at the samples, too. Mr. Reece stated that the Commissioners always encouraged applicants to bring the actual materials so they could get a better feel rather than just looking at a colored rendering. He said that he was not looking for a big change, but just something to help depict the north elevation a little better. If he were to drive by it, he would never guess it was a school at all.

Mr. Chada said that his direction to Mr. Brandon was to not make it like a school so much because of the future use of Auburn. They felt that it

would be more acceptable to the City.

Mr. Yukon asked for an idea of what type of security there would be for the children, noting that Auburn was a very busy road. He was sure that when they were in the play area there would be employees watching them.

Mr. Chada said that there would be a six-foot fence along the whole perimeter of the building. The children would have no access to the roads, including the parking lot. With or without staff, they would not have access to Auburn, to the neighbors' property to the east or south or to Graham. The children would all be under age six, and he felt that a six-foot fence would be very adequate. He noted that it was not the busiest location for a Goddard School. The one in Canton was on Canton road, which was five lanes and very busy. Mr. Yukon reiterated that Auburn Rd. was also very busy. Mr. Mosher reminded that per Ordinance, the school had to be on a major thoroughfare. Mr. Chada said that the school in Lake Orion was also right on Silverbell and the one in Macomb was on Hayes. He said that there were plenty around the country that were located on very busy roads. Mr. Mosher believed that there were security cameras also. Mr. Chada explained that there would only be a classroom or two outside at one time, and they were always supervised. Mr. Yukon said that he was more concerned about a young child walking through the building and out of the building. He asked if they were supervised inside of the building also. Mr. Chada agreed. Mr. Yukon said that he was still concerned about Auburn Rd. Mr. Chada said that was a great point. In the beginning, they had talked about all the security, and it was almost as if they would be "jailing" the kids.

Vice Chairperson Brnabic had received one card, and she called the speaker forward.

Carolyn Vanderhoof, 3646 Everett, Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Ms. Vanderhoof said that she was a neighbor abutting Graham in Country Club Village. Her neighborhood had 258 houses, so it was very large and busy. She did not see how the school would be able to access Graham to get onto Auburn. She remarked that the intersection at 9:00 a.m. and at 4:00 p.m. was crazy, and it was very hard to get out onto Auburn. She said that she and other neighbors were very concerned about letting the applicants have access to their neighborhood. People would cut through her neighborhood, endangering their children. It was a very heavily populated, family neighborhood, with ranges all the way from babies to high school kids. She felt that they needed to be very concerned about the traffic for cars, children and the safety of everyone.

Mr. Mosher said that they had developed four or five site plans for the site. He felt that it was one of the least intense uses for the Flex Overlay district. He claimed that there could be a 7-Eleven right there. Auburn was an MDOT road, and they had asked for direct access to Auburn and were flatly denied due to the proximity of Graham. The only way to get access to the property was from Graham, which was a public road. A lot of communities wanted their type of use at an intersection for access management, and there were two exit lanes on Graham - one east/west and one from Auburn. Goddard was actually pleased about that situation for the school.

Mr. Chada said that he was made aware of the situation by a gentleman named Jeff in the Primrose Subdivision. Mr. Chada was not able to meet with the board of Country Club. Jeff advised him to go and spend a couple of hours in the evening, because he maintained that it was tough to sometimes make a left onto Auburn from the subdivision. Mr. Chada walked around from 4-6 p.m. on a Monday or Tuesday. He did not see any cars waiting to make a left. There was a 5 or 10 second delay (at the most 20 seconds). A stretch of cars would come, and then there was a 20-30 second period where someone could go left and then another stretch of cars would come. There was a gap so people could make a left. Because of the staggered nature of their operation, he did not see where there would be 10 cars leaving the school at one time. He felt that the entrance would be safer for the children. He said that they saw themselves as a value asset for the subdivision to have a preschool and day care center where children could be dropped off on the way to work. He felt that it would be a great asset for the community.

Ms. Vanderhoof said that she had lived there for 10 years, and she was a stay at home mom, and there were times she sat there for three or four minutes waiting to get onto Auburn. She went out at very random hours, and it was still difficult at times to get out. She said that she would love the City to look into the traffic situation further.

Mr. Hooper had looked at the trip count, and it showed 102 trips per day. Mr. Mosher thought it would be more like 300. Mr. Hooper said that he counted them. Mr. Mosher said that a study across the nation had generated two or three trips per student. The study Mr. Hooper was looking at was for employees, but it did not include the drop-offs. Mr. Hooper considered that for a typical residential subdivision, there would be 12 trips per day, so for 250 homes there would be 3,000 trips for the subdivision, and the school would have 1/10 of that. The subdivision had

three access points. Mr. Mosher said that some of the people using the school would probably live in the subdivision, and they would not have to go out onto Auburn. Mr. Hooper said that he did not see a traffic issue for Graham. He commented that a property owner had a right to develop, and he asked if the City should deny someone because there was a concern about traffic.

Mr. Hooper felt that a bigger concern that Mr. Reece and Mr. Yukon brought up regarded the parking and staggering people coming in to drop off. If it were three or four minutes as contemplated, then maybe it would not be that big of an issue. If 20 cars showed up at one time and they were jockeying for position, he could see an issue.

Mr. Chada said that he wished to put everyone at ease. He noted that the franchise had been around for 25 years. He went to the Canton location all the time, and although there might be issues, not once was parking brought up. The owner in Canton had 37 parking spaces, and all of them were rarely used. The Director said that usually seven to ten spaces were used for a regular drop-off. The rest were there for employees and special events. Each one was used for about five minutes, because the parents needed to get in and out quickly.

Mr. Mosher mentioned that they would be eliminating five stacking spaces, which he acknowledged was up to the discretion of the Planning Commission. Because they were allowing people to park, they were able to dedicate more spaces for parking instead of having a drop-off area. People would figure out how it worked. He believed that they met the Ordinance requirements except for the five stacking spaces, which would have been in the drive aisles. They worked with staff for over a year, and that was the program for Goddard and its over 400 sites. Mr. Hooper said that he lived off of Hamlin, and he saw it every morning and night at the school. Parents were backed up onto Hamlin trying to get at the front drop-off spot.

Vice Chairperson Brnabic mentioned that on page 12 of the EIS, it stated that Troy Beaumont was located within six miles of the site, but she believed that it was much less - perhaps 2.5 miles. Mr. Mosher said that he would revise it.

Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Schroeder moved the following, seconded by Mr. Reece:

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Reece, in the matter of City File

No. 15-018 (Goddard School), the Planning Commission **approves the Site Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on January 20, 2016, with the following seven (7) findings and subject to the following four (4) 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 Graham, thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets. Walkways 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 safety.*
4. *The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.*
5. *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.*
6. *The Planning Commission has determined that proposed plan meets the required criteria for a modification to the FB district requirements and therefore approves the requested modifications from the FB dimension and design standards for front yard setback, building frontage area build to area, and minimum façade transparency as described in this report to allow for a better development on the site.*
7. *Based on evidence submitted by the applicant, the requested reduction from 5 to 0 stacking spaces is justified due to the nature of the school's operations. Should the uses change or expand, this modification may be reconsidered.*

Conditions

1. *Provide a landscape bond for replacement trees in the amount of \$35,495 plus inspection fees, as adjusted as necessary by staff, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit for this development.*
2. *Address all applicable comments from other City departments and*

- outside agency review letters, prior to final approval by staff.*
3. *That staff talked with the City of Canton about the parking for its Goddard School, prior to final approval by staff.*
 4. *That staff reviewed the north elevation and that the applicants provided a material color board, prior to final approval by staff.*

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

Aye 6 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 3 - Boswell, Kaltsounis and Morita

Vice Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously, and she wished the applicants good luck. Mr. Hooper thanked Mr. Chada for his investment in Rochester Hills.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Anzek stated that staff wished to give an advance of what was being proposed for the City-owned property on Hamlin (coming to the March 22 Special PC Meeting). He said that there would be three phases of development. The first would be for 100,000 square feet; the second was for 50,000 square feet on the north end of the building; and the third would be a mirrored building to the left of the site. It was a company that would ultimately employ 400 people with an average salary of \$90k, and salaries would range from \$65 to \$150k. It was a very sophisticated, R&D manufacturing company with limited production. He maintained that someone could take what the company produced in a week out of the building in the trunk of a car. The company worked at the sub-micron level - at almost white room type of operations. The company specialized in metrology, lasers and optics. They would be consolidating three divisions into the Hamlin Rd. site. There was one already in town, and the others would be coming from Brighton and Livonia. There would be two other divisions remaining in Florida.

Mr. Dettloff asked about the job creation. Mr. Anzek said that initially, they would grow to 225 and then when phase three came in, it would be up to 400. They had outgrown their existing building. Mr. Anzek felt that it would be a beautiful building, and that the City could not ask for a better tenant with a neighborhood directly to the north across the Trail. It would not be a noisy operation, and the service (warehousing and manufacturing) would be along the eastern side. He noted that the public would find out more information the following day when the sale of the

property was published on the Council agenda.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Vice Chairperson Brnabic reminded the Commissioners that the next Regular Meeting was scheduled for March 15, 2016.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission, and upon motion by Mr. Reece, seconded by Mr. Schroeder, Vice Chairperson Brnabic adjourned the Regular Meeting at 9:29 p.m.

Deborah Brnabic, Vice Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Secretary