

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2023-0373 Request for Conditional Use Approval to operate a car wash within the CB Community Business District for the proposed construction of a new Clean Express Car Wash located at 10 E. Auburn Rd., on the south side of Auburn Rd., east of Rochester Rd., zoned CB Community Business District with an FB Flex Business Overlay, Clean Express Auto Wash, LLC, c/o Mannik & Smith Group, Inc., Applicant

(Staff Reports dated 5-21-24, 3-19-24, 9-19-23, and 8-15-23, Reviewed Plans dated 5-21-24, 3-4-24, 9-19-23, and 8-15-23, Meijer representative letter of 5-9-24, Culver's representative email of 4-19-24, Traffic Circulation Diagram of 3-19-24, Mannik Smith letters of 5-7-24, and 8-28-23, Public Comment for March 2024, WWRP letter dated 3-6-24, Notices of Public Hearings for 5-21-24, 3-19-24, 9-19-23, and 8-15-23, City Council Agenda Summary and Minutes from 10-9-23, Approved and Draft Planning Commission minutes of 3-19-24 and 9-19-23, Draft Commission minutes of 8-15-23, EIS and updated EIS dated 9-29-23, Applicant's letter dated 7-18-23, Development Application, WRC Letter dated 12-21-22 and Council Draft Resolution had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were John Gaber, WWRP, attorney for Clean Express, along with Jacob Rilett, project manager for Clean Express, and Patrick McKay, corporate counsel for Clean Express.

Chairperson Brnabic introduced this item and asked Mr. McLeod for the Staff Report.

Mr. McLeod stated that this is a continuation of the discussion from two months ago where Clean Express came before the Commission to request an amendment to a previously-approved conditional use. He explained that the entrance to the Meijer site has now been restricted by Meijer to an exit-only to Meijer; and Clean Express is asking to reopen the connection to Culver's to the east. He reviewed the proposed change to the site plan, and recalled that concerns were raised on how traffic would interact with Culver's drive-through lane as well as the maneuvering lane. He stated that the applicants have tried to rectify some of those concerns by restricting turning movements in this particular location; however, this would still be the secondary entrance to this site from the Meijer parking lot through Culver's. He pointed out that the entrance drive to the site itself is a turn-restricted driveway. Those going eastbound on Auburn can enter the site; those westbound on Auburn must either go through Meijer's site through Culver's to this location, or go through the light, turn south, and then ultimately come through the site via Meijer. Meijer has determined since their original proposals that they do not want to grant full access to the applicant, as they had concerns of traffic stacking onto their site. He added that Meijer did not object to providing exit-only onto their drive lane, and they have provided a letter to that effect.

He explained that the remainder of the site remains essentially the same from what the Commission saw previously and from the approved site plan. He

noted that this request is mainly concentrating on how the traffic flow has changed with the change of drive directions and closures. He mentioned that the applicant provided additional traffic analyses, but no full traffic study was included. He stated that Mannik Group basically said that they felt it would make Culver's traffic better based on peak hour traffic by alleviating some of the flow of traffic from their site that would ultimately come out of Culver's onto the car wash site and then directly out onto Auburn Road. He mentioned that Hubble, Roth and Clark (HRC), the City's consulting engineer, provided some commentary which was given to the Commission this evening. HRC's commentary raised some questions in terms of whether or not additional stop signs may be necessary, whether or not traffic queuing might be impaired both on the Culver's site and the car wash site, depending on who gets the right of way coming into that intersection, and whether additional traffic analysis would be necessary for the overall site.

Mr. Gaber explained that they approached Meijer to see if they could get any additional concessions from them as it pertains to access from the south to the north and they are not budging. He pointed out that Culver's received access, but they bought their site from Meijer so the dynamics were different. He stated that they need access from the Culver site for the traffic that is coming from the east to the west, as any traffic coming from south or north can use the Auburn Road entrance without any problems.

He pointed out that they have made the Culver's access one-way because they are concerned about the entry onto the site, and believe that the exit from the site will be fairly seamless and will not have any traffic circulation problems. He added that they have also enhanced the pork chop signage markings on the pavement to ensure that people do not traverse from their site to the Culver's site. He mentioned that he has spoken with Mr. Zielke of Culver's about a revised site plan, and he noted that Mr. Zielke will likely say the people will disregard signage and go where they want. He would agree that there would not be one hundred percent compliance, that this will minimize the risk and make this an acceptable situation where traffic flows as it should and circulation problems will be alleviated.

Mr. Rilett explained that not actually having a connection operationally precludes them from being able to do a formal full traffic study, and he stated that they looked at the trip generation manual for a car wash in this type of environment as well as what they could infer from expected traffic from the Culver's site. He stated that they determined that even with fairly conservative estimates, the construction of the car wash would cause more traffic to leave Culvers at peak hours and to no longer exit south into Meijer, which is a congested area already; and he stated that this would relieve that area. He commented that the amount of traffic traveling through their drive aisle and into Meijer's Culver's connection on the south of the Culver's site would be decreased. He noted that the main concern that might be brought up would be at the exit of their building and the exit lane onto Auburn Road, and whether it would handle that amount of traffic or result in gridlock concerns. He noted that Auburn Road is a two-lane road right after a stoplight at the intersection, and it is very easy to make a right turn out of there and they do not expect any long backups or significant stacking in that exit lane that would be problematic. He

added that the car wash has an automatic stop system in the event that it might back up; and also they have an outdoor employee at all times and that will be part of their duties. He mentioned that these peak hour issues are only happening a couple of times a year on peak Saturdays in the winter, and most of the time this traffic would be negligible.

Mr. Gaber mentioned that when Culver's was developed in 2016, the City was facilitating its cross access management policy, and fewer curb cuts on main roads were preferable. He noted that Culver's was required by the City to provide a cross access easement to the Stone Stop to benefit the Stone Shop and any other redevelopment of that parcel, a full cross access is shown on the Culver's site plan that was approved, and Culver's recorded the cross access easement. He quoted from the 2016 approval, noting that the City required there be a cross access agreement and shared access as a condition of the approval; and he continued reading from the easement language that there was a 24-foot wide perpetual non-exclusive easement over, through, and across the parking lot for the sole purpose of permitting ingress and egress of vehicles, and he noted that it would run with the land and be binding upon successors and assigns. He pointed out that the proposed car wash building was flipped from the east side to the west side at the request of the Commission to minimize traffic concerns, the Commission approved the site plan in September and recommended conditional use approval. He stated that they believe they have legal entitlement to the cross access with Culver's by virtue of the condition imposed by City approval. He requested that the Commission approve it with one-way access from Culver's to the car wash parcel, and ask that the conditional use request be moved on to City Council.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing and noted that there was one speaker card, and called Andrew and Vicki Zielke forward.

Andrew Zielke, 4564 Oakhurst Ridge, Clarkston, stated that Culver's is not a typical drive-through and all their food is made to order. He explained that they pull their cars forward and some of those cars end up in the main aisle of the parking lot. He expressed concern of the safety of cars traveling through their lot to the car wash, and he noted that when people have opened the entrance, cars drive faster through the lot to get to Auburn Road. He stated that they have disabled or mentally challenged food runners and customers walk through their lot. He added that they have DoorDash and online ordering and have cars coming in, backing in and out and it is a safety concern. He commented that their sales have doubled since 2016 and suggested that adding the car wash might affect their future growth and impede safety.

Vicki Zielke, 4564 Oakhurst Ridge, Clarkston, explained that drive-through sales are 60 percent of their business, so it is important to consider traffic flow. She stated that she does not want her runners hurt by someone going to the car wash, and added that much of their clientele is older with walkers and canes.

Mr. Zielke noted that they do not serve food at their window and have cars pull through to the other side as fast as they can serve them.

Ms. Zielke stated that they have one entrance and have made it work, and

asked why the car wash cannot make it work with what they have.

Ms. Neubauer stated that she was glad Mr. Gaber read the easement language into the record and commented that this puts the Commission in a tough spot because they had asked for a neighborly solution. She asked if there was a solution possible between Meijer and Culver's and the car wash.

Mr. Gaber responded that they have explored it with Meijer to the extent that they can, and Meijer does not want to try any traffic mitigation devices and does not want traffic there. He commented that they are happy that Culver's is successful; however, they did make a commitment to get approval and it appears they are reneging on it. He stated that his clients have some legal rights involved.

Ms. Neubauer stated that she loves Culver's in the community and what they do for the developmentally disabled. She asked Mr. Gaber if he received the information from HRC.

Mr. Gaber responded that he had not received it yet, and had received a voicemail from Mr. McLeod a couple of hours prior.

Ms. Neubauer noted that Mr. Nicita of HRC made some notes that there are easements in place which may take precedence and both parties should agree to have the cutover or it should not be done. She commented that it might be desirable to rotate the site 180 degrees to have access from the Meijer lot.

Mr. Rilett responded that he did not believe Meijer would approve that, as it was more a matter of the connection itself and not how the site was oriented, and there would be a higher chance of spilling out onto their drive aisle from a connection on that side greater than with the cross access connection at Culver's.

Ms. Roediger noted that staff did have some informal conversations with Meijer to try to find some type of arrangement that would work, and it was very clear that Meijer's concerns were about having a backup flow onto their ring road as it does sometimes with Culver's.

Mr. Rilett added that they approached Meijer with an expanded widened drive aisle in an effort to get up to five cars that it would hold and Meijer representatives were still not willing to entertain that idea.

Ms. Neubauer noted that there were suggestions for additional signage to be installed at the Meijer driveway off of Auburn guiding users.

Mr. Rilett noted that they would be on board with that.

Ms. Neubauer asked if speed bumps would be an option to reduce liability at the applicant's expense and with Culver's agreement.

Mr. Rilett stated that he would be open to that; however, could not propose work on Culver's property as a part of the submission.

Ms. Neubauer stated that she does not want to see anyone's business suffer; however, it puts the Commission in a difficult situation when they have contradicting reports from traffic studies and engineering. She noted that there is an easement.

Mr. Rilett responded that the vast majority of the safety and traffic concerns would be the case no matter what is developed on the property due to the geometry of where the connection is and where the exit drive has to be.

Ms. Neubauer noted that there was a conditional approval from Traffic and Engineering with some comments, and it would behoove the applicant to look at any conditions that were put into place and to perhaps discuss getting speed bumps and additional signage to figure out what to do to keep people safe.

Mr. Rilett stated that one of their conditions was that the cross access be closed temporarily if it becomes problematic, which they would be open to. He added that this would go hand in hand with their suggestion that because they have an outdoor employee with traffic management as a part of their duties, in a high peak situation that can be closed at any time; and Culver's traffic would function the way it normally does during that time.

Ms. Neubauer stated that she wanted to be very clear for the record that this is a conditional use and is not something given by right, even though there is an easement. She stated that if there is ever an issue, enforcement would come in from the City and withdraw the conditional use. She commented that this is the same discussion they had with Starbucks.

Mr. Gaber responded that there is also due process too, and they cannot just write a ticket and close them off and just say that they cannot conduct business. He stated that they would address whatever the concerns are. He added that if it is a possibility that they had to close the access off or whatever the City recommends to resolve the problem, by accepting the condition they would be bound by it.

Ms. Neubauer stated that she thinks that the applicant's experience with Rochester Hills is that the City is a good faith actor so due process would not be an issue.

Mr. Struzik stated that he would echo Ms. Neubauer when it comes to the legal right and that it will probably weigh heavily in any vote or decision made. He asked how wide the exit from the Culver's site is in the latest revision.

Mr. Rilett responded that it was reduced to one lane, approximately 12 or 14 feet wide, in an effort to prevent cars from ignoring the one-way requirements and trying to access Culver's from the car wash site.

Mr. Struzik suggested a change to the parking spots to facilitate exiting traffic and still allow a couple of spots for their drive-through that would not block the exit.

Mr. Rilett responded that he thought it would result in a loss of too many of Culver's normal parking spaces.

Ms. Zielke stated that she would be interested in seeing what that drawing would look like.

Mr. Struzik commented that he was trying to come up with a creative solution; however, they have a site where they have given up certain rights to the neighboring property and developed knowing that those rights would be given up. He stated that he wanted to find a win-win solution where everyone is happy; however, at the end of the day those with the legal rights are going to win. He asked if Culver's was opposed to traffic calming devices such as speed bumps.

Ms. Zielke responded no, as long as they were smaller.

Mr. Zielke stated that he did talk to Mr. Gaber about turning the car wash around and having the entrance and exit into the Meijer parking lot and closing down the Auburn Road access.

Ms. Zielke suggested looking at the median where the fire hydrant is and suggested it be widened or gotten rid of to add additional parking spaces.

Ms. Roediger responded that Meijer has already indicated that they would not allow an entrance off their interior, so turning the site around is not an option on the table.

Mr. Rilett noted that their original plan had the building flipped the other way and the City had considered that more problematic than the connection now proposed.

Ms. Roediger referred to an aerial view and suggested that it is being suggested that on the north end instead of having it go straight across, having a loading area where people would wait after the fact. She commented that this could be something that may help cars but it would be for a maximum of two cars. She stated that this might be of very minimal help.

Discussion ensued about ways to straighten out the access to potentially get two cars that could stack there.

Mr. Struzik asked if the drive-through traffic typically queues on the inside toward the building and commented that he was looking for a solution that is more appealing.

Ms. Roediger asked how many cars typically stack at peak time and are waiting with number tents for their food to be delivered to their car.

Mr. Zielke responded it could be more than six and could have 10 to 15 just in the lot. He noted that the runners are going all over the parking lot trying to find numbers and there is no rhyme or reason where people park. He added that people typically pull past the spot and back up, and noted that there is extra traffic coming in from DoorDash and online orders.

Ms. Roediger commented that there are operational things that they could work on with Culver's to better manage how some of this is done. She stated that she did not know if the applicant is willing to consider reorganizing the curb cut to gain two parking spaces to help in terms of having an orderly area to wait. She suggested just making the north cut straight across and shifting the sign.

Mr. Rilett stated that it is something they would consider; however, they could not make proposals for Culver's property. He added that they do not know the underground for that portion of the site and whether there would be utility concerns.

Mr. Gaber stated that they would accept a condition to work with staff and see if that could be facilitated.

Ms. Neubauer stated that the applicant has already said he would be agreeable to putting in lower speed bumps and bumping out the access to give extra spaces. She commented that it looks like the only obstacles would be the sign being moved and if there might be a fire hydrant issue. She stated that the applicant is assuming all of the costs for doing this for something that they have a legal argument for, to try to make this more of a neighborly exchange. She asked if the applicant would be agreeable to those conditions.

Ms. Zielke asked if there was a way that they could get two rows of cars at the concrete pad where the park benches are.

Ms. Roediger responded that there is a green belt required and that was a public amenity space that was a required part of Culver's site. She suggested that if the Planning Commission finds these conditions are acceptable, they can add a condition that the applicant works with Staff prior to going to City Council so they can update Council on what has been resolved between the owners of both properties. She stated that the option may be seen as a solution but it could be cost prohibitive, and this needs to be known before going to Council.

Ms. Neubauer moved the motion in packet to recommend the conditional use approval with the added conditions stated on the record to work with staff regarding bumping that curb out to be straight, moving the sign, and adding the speed bumps.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that it would be at the applicant's expense.

Ms. Neubauer stated that they have to work with Staff to find out what is cost prohibitive and what is reasonable. She noted that now they are saying to someone that they have a legal right to develop something and they have to pay for someone else's burden, which does not sound fair. She commented that she understands safety concerns; however, the whole thing became a problem when Meijer said yes and then backed out.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Dettloff.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that the concern is that this is a conditional use; and

while she understands that they are saying they have a right to the legal easement, no business should be penalizing another business. She stressed that she would rather see them work something out with Culver's so they feel more comfortable with what is happening. She added that they have a legal easement, but the Planning Commission has to look at the requirements for conditional use. She stated that she would hope that something works out before they get to Council.

Mr. Struzik stated that he hopes that they are able to come up with a better solution. He asked if the motion is worded in a way that they still get to go forward with the plans as presented tonight, as it is already a result of many compromises. He stated that he thinks they should be allowed to move forward.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that Clean Express will try to work this out with Culver's and Staff, and it will then move to City Council for final approval.

Mr. Hooper read Condition 3 from the preprinted motion, and noted the conditions that were being added. He asked to rephrase the condition regarding exploring straightening the north curb line and relocating the hydrant and Culver's sign at the applicant's expense as approved by staff. He asked the applicant if they were okay with all of the additional conditions. The applicant nodded.

Mr. Hetrick asked the Zielkes if everyone going through the drive-through receives a ticket or if some receive their order and leave immediately.

Mr. Zielke responded that everyone gets a number at the window, unless it is just a drink or something.

Mr. Hetrick commented that the safety factor would not change regardless of whether there is cross access or not. He noted that the potential benefit is that people do not always have to leave directly into the Meijer parking lot and could leave through the cross access and exit. He noted that adding some of the safety features such as speed humps or otherwise would benefit Culver's regardless. He stated that some of these compromises would actually put them in a better spot in terms of protecting their employees.

Mr. Zielke responded that he would disagree, noting that their runners go all over the property to deliver orders.

Mr. Hetrick reiterated that the compromise adds safety features that would put Culver's in a better spot.

Additional discussion ensued regarding the cars that would be going through Culver's parking lot to enter the car wash site.

Mr. Gaber stated that the trip generation analysis showed that the number of cars that would exit Culver's through the Auburn Road curb cut cross access is greater than the number of cars that would enter Culver's to go to the car wash; therefore, it would alleviate some of the congestion of people coming south on the Culver's site to exit Culvers because it would be a relief valve on the north

side to exit to Auburn Road. He stressed that if the conditional use somewhere runs aground, there are remedies.

Mr. Dettloff stated that this is a tough one and safety is a major concern; however, there is legal precedent that has been established. He asked when the peak times were at Culver's and whether it varies from week to week.

Mr. Zielke responded lunch and then four to nine for dinner. He noted that on the weekends it is pretty much all day.

Mr. Rilett noted that the car wash hours are 7 am to 9 pm Monday through Saturday, and perhaps 8 am to 6 pm on Sunday.

Mr. Dettloff asked if they had encountered a similar situation at any of the other locations. He commented on the safety factor, noting that no one can control human nature.

Mr. Rilett responded that he has only worked on a few of these but there are 90 locations in several states, and most sites are not that involved. He stressed that they have a curbed pork chop and a landscape boulder so no one can hop the curb, signage and striping, and have reduced the two-way existing connection stub down to one. He stressed that they have done everything that could possibly be done short of installing a gate. He stated that their peak hours would be similar, and people would be accessing the car wash when they are already on the road. He added that it is also very seasonal and is much more winter-based.

Mr. Dettloff stated that he loves out of the box ideas which really demonstrates that the Commission is trying to work to make this a win-win situation. He asked if there was a consideration to bring in some type of security or direct traffic.

Mr. Gaber responded that they have up to six employees and there is someone who is designated to do that if necessary.

Mr. Rilett stated that during standard operating hours there are three employees on site, two inside and one outside; and during peak hours it goes up to four to six.

Ms. Denstaedt stated that she would echo everyone's safety concerns. She asked what the summers look like.

Mr. Rilett responded that it would not be as high as winter hours but still would be relatively high.

Ms. Denstaedt stated she would ask the Zielkes if they are busier in summer or winter, stating she would wonder if it would off-set the timeframes.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that it seems like both parties are willing to try to work on this. She mentioned condition number 4 in the motion, and stated that she can understand that there is a legal easement, but noted that there are also conditional use requirements to follow. She commented that she is glad there

are conditions being added, and if it a safety issue, that the access is closed down. She noted that there was a previous discussion that the car wash could not survive without the access.

Mr. Gaber countered that the cross access would be used for people coming from the east to westbound. He noted that it would be a limited portion of the traffic.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that if she had a membership knowing all of the facts, she would be going around the Meijer ring road, out to Rochester Road, making two rights and coming into the car wash, and it would take a few more minutes to take that path.

Mr. Rilett stated that their goal for pushing for the cross access was to keep traffic away from the Rochester Road and Auburn intersection. He stressed that it causes a bigger burden on the area and Meijer's drive and is just not necessary.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that people will have to option to go out to Rochester Road anyway, and commented that she is torn. She commented that she hopes that if something does happen where there seems to be a lot of accidents, she would want to see the access shut down.

Mr. Rilett stated that they are attempting to demonstrate with the theoretical traffic counts that the net amount of traffic coming through the Culver's drive aisle should be going down. The safety concern comes from the speed of cars coming through there that would be mitigated by the speed bumps and the safety issue would be greatly diminished and does not seem to be any greater than the existing condition on the site.

Chairperson Brnabic called for a roll call vote. After the vote she noted that the motion passed unanimously. She asked the Commission to move on to the Site Plan request.

Mr. Hooper moved the motion in the packet to approve the site plan, noting that conditions were added to the conditional use motion. The motion was seconded by Mr. Struzik.

After calling for a voice vote, she announced the motion passed unanimously. She asked Mr. McLeod when this would be scheduled for City Council's agenda.

Mr. McLeod stated that normal protocol would take it to June 10, but as these conditions needed to be hammered out prior to appearing at Council, along with the appropriate reviews, it would be later than that.

Mr. Gaber noted that their first step will be for their engineers to contact the City Planning and Engineering Departments to see what type of constraints they need to overcome.

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

Aye 8 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick and Struzik

Excused 1 - Weaver

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. PCU2023-0007 (Clean Express Carwash), the Planning Commission recommends to City Council **Approval** of the **amended Conditional Use** for a car wash facility at 10 E. Auburn, on Parcel No. 70-15-35-100-003, based on plans received by the Planning Department on April 17, 2024, with the following findings.

Findings

- A. The use will promote the intent and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance.
- B. The site has been designed and is proposed to be operated, maintained, and managed so as to be compatible, harmonious, and appropriate in appearance with the existing and planned character of the general vicinity, adjacent uses of land, and the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the use.
- C. The proposal will have a positive impact on the community as a whole and the surrounding area by further offering additional car cleaning options along with additional job opportunities.
- D. The proposed development is served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, water and sewer, drainage ways, and refuse disposal.
- E. The proposed development, with the revised driveway and cross connection configurations, will not be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to existing or future neighboring land uses, persons, property, or the public welfare.
- F. The proposal will not create additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services that will be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.

Conditions

- A. City Council approval of the Conditional Use.
- B. The use shall remain consistent with the facts and information presented to the City as a part of the applicant's application and at the public hearing.
- C. If, in the determination of City staff, the intensity of the operation changes or increases, in terms of traffic, queuing, noise, hours, lighting, odor, or other aspects that may cause adverse off-site impact, City staff may require and order the conditional use approval to be remanded to the Planning Commission and City Council as necessary for re-examination of the conditional use approval and conditions for possible revocation, modification or supplementation.
- D. Submit for Staff review revised plans showing the straightened northern curb line of the drive through to allow for additional parking spaces on the Culver's property, and to relocate the existing hydrant and ground sign as necessary, at the applicant's expense,

as approved by Culver's and City Staff.

E. Adding speed bumps on the Culver's property at the applicant's expense, as approved by Culver's and City Staff.

2023-0374

Request for Site Plan Approval - File No. PSP2022-0032 - to construct an approximately 3,677 sq. ft. car wash building with associated exterior cleaning stations for Clean Express Car Wash, located at 10 E. Auburn Rd., on the south side of Auburn Rd., east of Rochester Rd., zoned CB Community Business District with an FB Flex Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-35-100-003, Clean Express Auto Wash, LLC, c/o Mannik & Smith Group, Inc., Applicant

See discussion under Legislative File 2023-0373.

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

Aye 8 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick and Struzik

Excused 1 - Weaver

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. PSP2022-0032 (Clean Express Carwash), the Planning Commission approves the amended Site Plan, based on plans received by the Planning Department on April 17, 2024, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions.

Findings

A. 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.

B. The proposed project will be accessed from E. Auburn Road via a directional drive but will also provide a cross connection with the abutting sites to the west (future), east (ingress only) and south (egress only), thereby promoting current and future safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets.

C. Off-street parking areas and revised driveway and cross connection configurations have been designed to avoid common traffic problems and promote customer safety.

D. The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.

E. 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. All original comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters remain applicable.

2. Provide a landscaping bond in the amount of \$70,700 based on the cost estimate for landscaping and irrigation (as adjusted reflecting the updated landscaping plans and cost estimates), plus inspection fees, as further adjusted as necessary by staff, prior to temporary grade certification being issued by Engineering.