



Rochester Hills

Minutes - Draft

Planning Commission

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

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

Tuesday, March 20, 2018

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

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

Excused 1 - Ed Anzek

Quorum present.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2018-0091](#) February 20, 2018 Regular Meeting

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

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

Excused 1 - Anzek

COMMUNICATIONS

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

[2018-0047](#) Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 95-044.2 - Gateway of Rochester Hills, a proposed mixed-use development consisting of a 4-story, 108-room hotel and a two-story commercial building with 11,037 s.f. retail, 6,047 s.f.

restaurant with outdoor seating and 11,856 s.f. of office on the second floor, located at the northwest corner of Rochester and South Blvd., zoned B-3 Shopping Center Business with an FB-3 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-34-477-015, Gateway Properties - Rochester Hills, LLC, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated March 16, 2018 and site plans and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Eugene D'Agostini, Gateway Properties - Rochester Hills, LLC, 38700 Van Dyke Ave., Suite 200, Sterling Heights, MI 48312; Jim Butler, PEA, Inc., 2430 Rochester Ct., Suite 100, Troy, MI 48083; Scott Bowers, Bowers and Associates, 2400 S. Huron Parkway, Ann Arbor, MI 48104; and Carlos Santia, Traffic Engineering Consultants, Inc., 35890 Monterey Dr., Clinton Twp., MI 48035. Ms. Lia Michaels, HRC, 555 Hulet Dr., Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302 was also present as the City's traffic consultant.

Ms. Kapelanski recapped that the project had been postponed at the February 20, 2018 meeting, and her report had highlighted the changes since that time. The dumpster was moved from the rear of the site. The hotel was now primarily brick. The Planning Commission was interested in cross access with Boylard, however, this would not be feasible because of the grade differential. There was a question about notification, and the applicants had submitted documentation showing their efforts in contacting the adjacent neighbors. The City also sent notices to the adjacent residents about the meeting, as requested by the Planning Commission. The applicants were requesting several modifications under the FB-3 zoning, which could be granted by the Planning Commission. There were several changes made to accommodate traffic, and she turned it over to Ms. Michaels, the City's traffic consultant.

Ms. Michaels advised that in a previous review, HRC had suggested that the main driveway on Rochester Rd. be converted to a right in, right out to address some safety concerns, and the developer had made that change. A right turn lane for exiting Rochester Rd. to the development was also added. Another suggestion was that the northern most driveway have a left and a right turn lane to help exiting traffic, since the other driveway was converted to right in, right out only. That had also been completed. HRC was also asked to explore the possibility of dual lefts on eastbound South Boulevard to Rochester Rd. After review, they found that while there was a significant amount of turning traffic there, adding dual lefts would negatively impact the overall operation of the intersection. With dual lefts, there would also have to be a protected left turn phase, which would take away some of the timing for the through

movements. They also found that while the development would add some traffic, it would not add a significant amount of left turning traffic to justify the need for dual left turn lanes. It was also discussed with the Road Commission. The Road Commission had recently modernized and upgraded the signal. At that time, they had not considered dual lefts, and they would most likely agree that they were not needed now.

Chairperson Brnabic asked the applicants if they had anything to add. Mr. Butler felt that staff had answered most of the questions from the previous meeting, and he offered to answer any other questions.

Chairperson Brnabic questioned the number of handicap spaces. The plan stated that 26 handicap spaces were proposed, but she only counted 14. She questioned why they were not all shown on the Plan. Mr. Butler advised that the total included those for proposed buildings and those for the medical office building. Chairperson Brnabic pointed out that the medical office was an existing building, and the new development was required to have 15 spaces, so they were short one handicap space. Ms. Kapelanski said that there were some excess spaces, so she was sure the striping could be adjusted accordingly to provide an extra space. Mr. Butler agreed.

Chairperson Brnabic mentioned that the color rendering for the hotel was not totally accurate. The Eldorado and Oyster on the canopy area looked gray, and the building was not projecting the material identified on the colored rendering.

Mr. Bowers explained that it was the way the shadow hit the colors on the 3-D model. Chairperson Brnabic did not think it resembled the proposed colors at all. Mr. Bowers said that the three grays were different variations. Chairperson Brnabic did not think the colors coordinated very well, but she indicated that it was her opinion.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if a condition could be added stating that there would be no direct lighting of the outside of the facility. Mr. D'Agostini proposed that all lighting on the east elevations of the commercial building along Rochester be permitted. He thought that the hotel folks would want the same for their east elevation to attract some attention from the road. He said that he could appreciate not wanting to have a glow on the west elevation or creating light pollution. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the City had requirements about lighting the front of a building. Ms. Kapelanski agreed that the City had exterior lighting requirements, where cutoff fixtures down cast lighting was required. There was nothing that

prohibited the façade of a building having a lightpack that was cast down. The applicants were proposing some lightpacks on the building at 20 feet high, which was permitted. Mr. Kaltsounis said that he was concerned about up lighting, especially for the hotel. He was not as concerned about the front of the plaza. Ms. Kapelanski asked if he was concerned about all four sides of the hotel or just the sides visible to the residents. Mr. Kaltsounis agreed just the sides visible to the residential area. He said that wall packs that shined down would be ok. He did not want to see lights that went upward and would light the whole building. Ms. Kapelanski stated that would not be permitted.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that she had not received any speaker cards. She asked if there was anyone who wished to speak.

Mark Metcalf, 3841 Orchardview, Rochester Hills, MI 48307. *Mr. Metcalf stated that he was one of the five adjacent property owners. Back in October, the D'Agostinis were very gracious in inviting him and the other property owners to meet to go over the proposed plan. They offered everyone adjacent the opportunity to meet with them. The neighbors talked to them about putting up a wall, because they had some security concerns about the hotel, and they were open to that idea. They were very open to anything the neighbors wanted to talk about. They did not feel the applicants needed to reach out, but they did, and they wanted to get their concerns addressed. The singular concern he had was having people coming from the hotel into their yards. If there was a wall, it would prevent that. He said that he just wanted to let everyone know that the applicants were very forthcoming about trying to talk to all the neighbors and making sure any concerns were addressed.*

Mr. D'Agostini agreed that they met with the adjacent property owners to discuss their concerns. He knew that the wall was a concern, because they did not want cross traffic both from the hotel and from people in the neighborhood who currently cut through to get to the party store on Rochester Rd. They would be receptive to putting up a wall or fencing acceptable to the City and the homeowners. There were some large trees to be considered that they had planted when they initially built the office building. He thought that a continuous footing for a wall might injure the pine trees. He did not want to summarily say they would put up a wall without considering that, but they were receptive to whatever solution the City deemed appropriate.

Chairperson Brnabic thanked the applicants for listening to the Planning Commission's concerns and suggestions at the last meeting.

Mr. Reece had noticed that in some instances, there was a reference to brick veneer and in others a reference to brick. He asked if there was a difference. Mr. Bowers stated that it would all be full brick - not cut or glued.

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

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Dettloff, in the matter of City File No. 95-044.2 (Gateway of Rochester Hills) the Planning Commission **approves the Site Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on March 6, 2018, with the following ten (10) findings and subject to the following six (6) conditions.

Findings

- 1. The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that all applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as other City Ordinances, standards, and requirements, can be met subject to the conditions noted below.*
- 2. The proposed project will be accessed from Rochester and South Boulevard, 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. The vehicle and on-street parking zones are modified upon the Planning Commission's determination that they meet the intent of the FB district and will permit innovative design.*
- 4. The front yard arterial, front yard minor and side yard perimeter setbacks are modified upon the Planning Commission's determination that they meet the intent of the FB district.*
- 5. The minimum building frontage build-to areas for Rochester and for the east/west drive between the existing medical and proposed retail/restaurant and the minimum facade transparency are modified upon the Planning Commission's determination that they meet the intent of the FB district and are the smallest modifications necessary.*
- 6. The requirements for a "Shopfront" building design including a the*

required building setback, off-street parking location and 'building bay width' are modified upon the Planning Commission's determination that they meet the intent of the FB district and are the smallest modifications necessary.

7. *Off-street parking areas have been designed to avoid common traffic problems and promote safety.*
8. *The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.*
9. *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.*
10. *The proposed development will bring additional employees and a new hospitality venue, restaurant and retail and office businesses to Rochester Hills.*

Conditions

1. *Provide a landscape bond for landscaping/trees in the amount of \$137,082, plus inspection fees, as adjusted as necessary by staff, prior to temporary grade certification being issued by Engineering.*
2. *Continue to work with the City's engineering consultant, HRC, to satisfactorily address the Traffic Impact Study concerns and incorporate any recommended improvements to provide safe access to the site.*
3. *Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, prior to final approval by staff.*
4. *The developer shall work with City staff on the feasibility of a six-foot tall, double brick faced wall along the west property line that meets Ordinance requirements, and avoids removing existing trees, to be approved by staff prior to final approval.*
5. *Add one handicap parking space, prior to final approval by staff.*
6. *Change references where indicated to read "full brick" rather than brick veneer, prior to final approval by staff.*

Mr. Hooper commended the applicants for making improvements from the last submittal where there were zero improvements to the traffic, which added a decel lane and no left turns for the southern entrance, and widened the northernmost entrance to provide left turns out. He did not agree that dual lefts at South Boulevard would degrade the traffic.

Mr. Reece agreed with Mr. Hooper about the traffic, and thought the consultant's comments were short sighted. He asked what drove the palette selection of colors for the hotel. He asked if it was a Fairfield standard - hopscotching the colors.

Mr. Bowers agreed that it was a brand standard for Fairfield. Mr. Reece said that he appreciated the fact that it was switched to brick, and that they got rid of a lot of the siding, and he was not sure what the other Commissioners felt about the palette, but he was not wild about it. Unless the renderings were not a true indication, he would prefer a different palette. The Oyster gray looked almost pink, as did the Toledo gray. He thought it would stick out like a sore thumb. He did not see a lot of effort being made to blend in with the character of the community, and as an architect, he did not like the selection at all.

Mr. Bowers said that he would not like pink, either. He stated that it was not pink. He thought it just printed that way. Mr. Reece said that it was what the Commissioners had to go on. He asked Mr. Bowers if he had samples. Mr. Bowers did not bring samples.

Chairperson Brnabic had also stated that the way the materials looked, it was not very appealing. She would think they would want an attractive look for the hotel.

Mr. Dettloff stated that he supported Mr. Kaltsounis' amended motion (added the last three conditions).

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

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Schroeder and Schultz

Nay 1 - Reece

Excused 1 - Anzek

Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed seven to one.

NEW BUSINESS

2018-0089 Public Hearing and request for Conditional Use Recommendation - City File No. 17-050 - for the sales and service for consumption of alcoholic beverages on site at RH House, a proposed redeveloped 4,411 s.f. restaurant on 2.19 acres at 2630 Crooks, on the west side of Crooks, south of M-59, zoned REC-I Regional Employment Center - Interchange, Parcel No. 15-29-427-037, Mike Pizzola, Designhaus Architecture, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated March 16, 2018 and site plans and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Mike Pizzola and Joe Latozas, Designhaus Architecture, 301 Walnut Blvd., Rochester, MI 48307.

Ms. Kapelanski stated that the request was for approval of a new restaurant with a conditional use recommendation to allow consumption of alcohol on the premises. She noted that the site was zoned REC-I Regional Employment Center - Interchange, and it was formerly a Ya-Ya's Chicken. The applicants were proposing small building additions, an outdoor seating patio and an updated façade. There were three areas where additions were proposed totaling 1,100 s.f. There would be landscaping added in the rear of the property. There was currently a drive-through that would be removed. The site was subject to the Tree Conservation Ordinance, but no regulated trees would be removed.

Chairperson Brnabic asked if the applicants had anything to add. Mr. Latozas said that the owner wanted them to create a redeveloped restaurant that was higher-end, family dining. They came up with a design that was meant to be noticed driving by. The building would be brought closer to Crooks about 10 feet to give it more of a presence, which had been an issue with the previous restaurants. He felt that it was an attractive building, and it would have a mix of stone, metal panel with cooper color and dark painted EIFS with some wood-like material. He said that they would be happy to open it to questions.

Mr. Dettloff asked if they would tear down the whole building and rebuild. Mr. Latozas said that they would leave the main structure, and they would tear off the front façade. The rear kitchen and main dining area would stay intact. They would dissect a couple of walls. Mr. Dettloff asked the existing square-footage of the building, and Mr. Latozas said that it was about 3,300 s.f. Mr. Dettloff asked if the owner had secured a liquor

license, and Mr. Latozas advised that he was in the process.

Mr. Schultz asked if it was a new venture for the applicant. Mr. Latozas said that the owner currently had a restaurant near the corner of Auburn and Crooks. called Antonio's Café. Mr. Schultz asked if they would be moving that operation, and Mr. Latozas said that he would keep both.

Mr. Hooper said that he read the Environmental Impact Statement which said that the hours of operation would be 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. He questioned those hours having a liquor license, and asked if it would be breakfast to mid-dinner. Mr. Latozas said that it would be open until 10:00 p.m. Mr. Hooper clarified that the EIS was incorrect.

Mr. Hooper said that the building appeared to have a lot of glass on the east and north elevations, which was confirmed. He commented that it was definitely different. He said that he was not the architect of the group, but he thought the building would definitely stand out. Mr. Latozas agreed that was the plan. Mr. Hooper referenced the photometric plan, and it showed the outside lighting to be all pole mounted. He asked what would be on the building or if it was all indirect lighting that gave the presentation of the building. Mr. Latozas said that there would be indirect or accent lighting to light the bottom of the soffit.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 7:42 p.m. Seeing no one come forward, she closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that when he first saw the proposal, he was somewhat floored by the modern look, but he liked the use of materials and how it looked. He had to look a couple of times to see that the drive-through was being removed. He hoped that was a trend that would continue. He thought that it was a well done re-use of the current property, and he moved the following, seconded by Mr. Hooper.

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, in the matter of City File No. 17-050 (RH House) the Planning Commission **recommends** to City Council **Approval** of the **Conditional Use** for the sales and service for consumption of alcoholic beverages on site, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on January 31, 2018, with the following seven (7) findings.

Findings

1. *The proposed building and other necessary site improvements meet*

or exceed the standards of the zoning ordinance.

2. *The proposed use will promote the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance.*
3. *The proposed building has been designed and is proposed to be constructed, operated, maintained, and managed so as to be compatible, harmonious, and appropriate in appearance with the existing and planned character of the general vicinity, adjacent uses of land, and the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the use.*
4. *The proposal should have a positive impact on the community as a whole and the surrounding area by further offering jobs and another dining option.*
5. *The proposed development is served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage ways, and refuse disposal.*
6. *The proposed development should not be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to

existing or future neighboring land uses, persons, property, or the public welfare.*
7. *The proposal will not create additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services that will be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.*

Mr. Reece asked if the uplighting would be on a timer or be on all night. Mr. Latozas advised that it would be on a timer and only be on during hours of operation. Mr. Reece confirmed that staff was o.k. with it, and Ms. Kapelanski said that with the roofline, it really would not shine up into the sky.

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

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

Excused 1 - Anzek

2018-0090

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 17-050 - RH House, a proposed 4,411 s.f. restaurant on 2.19 acres located on the west side of Crooks, south of M-59, zoned REC-I Regional Employment Center - Interchange, Parcel No. 15-29-427-037, Mike Pizzola, Desighnaus Architecture, Applicant

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, in the matter of City File No. 17-050 (RH House), the Planning Commission **approves the Site Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on January 31, 2018, with the following five (5) 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 by an existing driveway, 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.*

Conditions

1. *City Council approval of the Conditional Use.*
2. *Provide a landscape bond in the amount of \$7,855.00, plus inspection fees as adjusted as necessary by staff, for landscaping and irrigation, prior to temporary grade certification being issued by Engineering.*
3. *Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, prior to final approval by staff.*

4. *Revise the Environmental Impact Statement to adjust hours of operation, prior to the City Council meeting.*

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

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

Excused 1 - Anzek

Chairperson Brnabic stated after each motion that the motion had passed unanimously, and she congratulated the applicants. Mr. Hooper thanked the applicants for their continued investment in Rochester Hills.

2018-0049

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 17-044 - Candlewood Hotel, a proposed four-story, 89-room hotel proposed for an outlot on the east side of the Meijer property located at Rochester and Auburn Roads, zoned B-3 Shopping Center Business with an FB-3 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-35-100-056, Rochester Hills Property, LLC, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated March 16, 2018 and site plans and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Jim Butler, PEA, 2430 Rochester Ct., Suite 100, Troy, MI 48083 and Richard Atto, Atto Construction, 2150 Franklin #B, Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302. Ms. Michaels from HRC was also in attendance for this project.

Ms. Kapelanski stated that the applicant was seeking approval of a Tree Removal Permit and Site Plan for a Candlewood Hotel on an outlot at the existing Meijer on the south side of Auburn, east of Rochester. It was currently zoned B-3 Shopping Center Business with an FB-3 Flexible Business 3 Overlay, and the applicant was proposing to develop the site under the FB-3 standards. It would be a four-story, 89-room hotel. There would be an access drive from Auburn, and after a traffic analysis, the applicant was proposing a right turn lane on Auburn in order to improve traffic conditions. The Planning staff review had mentioned some concerns regarding the circulation around the Meijer site. Staff was concerned that patrons entering off of Rochester Rd. would follow the natural progression of the roadway and end up going behind the Meijer through the loading area to access the hotel. Directional signage was recommended to help patrons navigate the area. One regulated tree was proposed to be removed, which would be replaced onsite. She noted that

the elevations were primarily brick. The applicant was asking for several modifications from the FB standards, which the Planning Commission could approve if they felt that certain criteria were met. Specifically, they were for the frontage build to area, the façade transparency and the lawn frontage design requirements. The latter did not allow parking in front of a building. The applicant was also seeking a modification of the required parking. For FB, 125 spaces were required, and 98 were proposed. The applicant needed to provide evidence that less parking was required based on demand on a typical day, which was provided, but a parking study was not. She turned it over to Ms. Michaels.

Ms. Michaels stated that after discussions with the traffic department, there were some concerns about the driveway and the need for a right turn lane for vehicles entering from Auburn. The applicant did provide a right turn lane, and they were still in discussions about the length and width. They felt that it could be shortened to keep the pathway away from Auburn. HRC also wanted to see the entire driveway approach rehabilitated. Currently, there was a little bump where people tended to slow down entering the site. One of the safety concerns was about people going across Auburn from one driveway to the other. They asked for reinforcement that through movement was not allowed by using signs and pavement markings to encourage people exiting the driveway onto Auburn to turn right or left. Regarding internal circulation, they would like to see the stop sign eliminated in the driveway at the first intersection south of Auburn.

Mr. Butler stated that Ms. Kapelanski did a good job explaining the project. Regarding the modifications, he indicated that it was somewhat of a unique parcel. It did not have road frontage on either Rochester or Auburn, so the access would be through an easement. One of the modifications was for the frontage build to area. They could not meet that under any circumstances, because they did not have frontage. Related to transparency, 70% would be a challenge given the hotel use. For parking, he maintained that the Ordinance (Section 138-11.204) required 1.1 parking spaces per room, and they met that requirement. He offered to provide letters from other users and the hotel company, but they felt that they were meeting the standard for hotels. As part of the City's review, they made some modifications to the landscaping. Staff was concerned because the hotel would abut an existing berm, and they were going to reinforce the berm. The parking area was about five feet from the property line. Pursuant to the FB requirements, they were moving it another five feet west and adding landscaping. The building would be 137 feet from the property line. He stated that there was 65 feet of a flag

property that was zoned FB, so they did not directly abut a residential district (actually four homes were affected). Adding those together made it 200 feet from the residentially-zoned property. He said he would be happy to answer any questions.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Comments at 7:55 p.m. She advised that each speaker would have three minutes, and that all questions would be answered after all speakers had an opportunity to raise questions or concerns.

Mary Beth Johnson, 3136 Primrose, Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307

Ms. Johnson stated that the traffic congestion on Auburn made it very difficult for drivers to turn left (west) out of their subdivision, and there had been many accidents at the intersection. She claimed that adding a hotel to the Meijer parking lot on top of the recent addition of the condos in the same area would make the intersection even more dangerous to navigate. She said that Rochester Hills' homeowners deserved the ability to turn safely out of their subdivision. Brooklands Elementary was directly connected to her sub, where young children walked to and from school, and she felt that they should not be put at risk. Crime related to nearby businesses already overflowed into her sub. She had witnessed shoplifters being pursued in her sub, which she said was terrifying. The addition of the hotel had the potential to increase those types of situations. She read a quote from a magazine called *Police Patrol*: "Unfortunately, it is very easy for a small hotel to slip into a spiral that will make it seedy and crime-ridden. Once a hotel gains a troublesome reputation, it attracts a wide variety of criminal elements that drive out legitimate businesses. The absences of legitimate businesses present more opportunity for disorder, and soon a local police department has to deal with a whole neighborhood enveloped in different types of crime." She suggested that the hotel might start off as a Marriott, but the City had no assurances that it would not be purchased by a less reputable company in the future. The Wildflower homeowners already experienced noise and light pollution as a result of the development in their area, and she stated that it would only worsen with the addition of a hotel. She found it hard to believe that there was a demand for a hotel in the parking lot, as there were hotels on Crooks and Adams. It was disturbing to her that the hotel was planned to be four stories high, which would be an eyesore looming over the neighborhood. She was not clear whether or not the people on the top floor would have visibility into their backyards and the homes of those who lived on Primrose. She asked if the Commissioners would approve the plan if it was in their backyards. She had been a resident of Rochester Hills for over 22 years and had watched the

development of what felt like every open land and piece of parking lot in the City. The public's perception of the Commission was that it rubber stamped all development requests. She said that they should read the posts on the Rochester Facebook page, some of which stated that Rochester Hills had become an overbuilt and congested City. She asked if that was worth the reputation of the Commission and what it wanted for Rochester Hills. She hoped not, and she asked them to start to change the perception by rejecting the proposal for the hotel in the Meijer parking lot. She asked them to let the rejection of the request be evidence that the City thoughtfully reviewed and made decisions based on what was best for the citizens and not just its tax revenue.

Mark Johnson, 3136 Primrose Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Mr.

Johnson thanked the Commissioners for letting them express their opinions about the development. He said that it was new to them up until several weeks ago. He understood that the Planning Commission had to balance the interests of developers, the City and the residents to best serve all parties. The creation of buffer zones between commercial and residential development was key to having a vibrant City and residents who felt like they had a safe place to live. If they looked at other hotels in the area and what they abutted, it was a business park, storage facilities or other businesses. The proposed hotel literally was three first downs out of a backyard. The pictures showed the roofs of the homeowners who were in the room. The hotel would literally be in their backyards, and it would be four stories tall. A single-story development, like the Power House Gym, had been concealed with a berm and thoughtful planning by the Commission to require a brick wall, a nice façade and trees. They might quibble about how the berm was maintained, but overall, it had done a nice job of separating and creating a buffer zone. A four-story hotel was not concealable at 30 yards. It was an example of putting a commercial development far too close to residential properties, which were clearly visible from any guest staying at the hotel. He stated that it was not a reasonable use of the property or development in the City.

Adrienne Przybysz, 3120 Primrose Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307

Ms. Przybysz said that hers was the eighth house from Auburn. She stated that she was very much against the project. She did not feel that it belonged anywhere near a neighborhood with children and schools. There was an elementary, nursery and middle school very close. Her biggest concern was crime. The hotel would tower over the subdivision with anyone able to look into their lives for an extended period of time. It was an extended stay hotel, so for 30 days, someone could lurk through their neighborhood and find out how they came and went. She said that

she was not naïve enough to think that only wholesome people would stay there. She feared kidnappings in the future. She mentioned that she had almost been kidnapped as a child, so she knew what it felt like. It was very frightening to live like that, and the fear lasted a lifetime. She feared that there could be drug related things like prostitution. She reiterated that a hotel did not belong by people in a neighborhood. There was also the terrible congestion problem and road rage on a daily basis coming out of the subs. It was not quality of life in Rochester Hills. She reiterated that she was very much against it.

John Przybysz, 3120 Primrose Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Mr. Przybysz said that he knew the developer had other hotels in the area. One was by the Tech Center in Warren and not near housing. The other was in Troy on Civic Center Dr., which led to City Hall. There was also no housing. He asked why they would want to horseshoe in a building that was 50 ½ feet high. He asked the Commissioners if they would live next to that or if they would like it in their backyards. He said that no one would want to live next to a wall that was as high as four stories. He remarked that a single-story would be acceptable, but four stories “no way.”

George Willard, 3199 Primrose Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Mr. Willard noted that he was the President of the Homeowner’s Association for Wildflower. He thought that it was clear how the subdivision and the major stakeholder’s felt about the development. There were three subdivisions represented - Barrington Park, Country Club Village and Wildflower. Wildflower was impacted the most, because it would be in their backyards. All three subs had discussed the proposal, and there was a significant objection. They had an online group they posed a question to about how they wanted the board to go forward. There were 233 homes in the sub, and there were 156 members in the Facebook group. 78 people answered and stated that they objected. Zero said they supported it. The poll turned out to be unnecessary as his personal email and cell phone began to explode once people starting finding out about the development. He said that as President of the HOA, the sub was not the type to complain. He did get complaints every day about miscellaneous problems, such as complaints ongoing about the horrible status of the streets in the sub, speeding in the sub, traffic that prevented ingress and egress and the non-compliance from previous developers that promised to make sure they would keep landscaping, policing, trash, etc. up to date. He understood that the Commission did not have anything to do with the first two he mentioned, however, the traffic and the non-compliance of developments was absolutely why they were there. In

the 12 years that he had lived in Wildflower, he had seen a low traffic car dealership replaced with a high traffic Lowe's; a 200-unit senior living facility added on green space; a low traffic gas station and car dealership replaced by an unbelievably high traffic strip mall with a McDonald's and a Star Bucks; a 200-unit townhome development and its traffic; the Goddard School and its traffic; a Culbert's restaurant and its traffic; and a high traffic strip mall added to the Meijer parking lot where there was nothing.

Monique Willard, 3199 Primrose Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Ms. Willard said that she had lived in the subdivision for over 10 years. The traffic and crime were very prevalent in the community. She stated that she was opposed to the building of the hotel, and she wanted her concerns noted.

Maysum Haddad, 343 Jonathan Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Mr. Haddad said that he lived at the corner of Primrose and Jonathan in the Wildflower Subdivision. He lived with his wife, two kids and a dog, and traffic alone had been extremely tough for him to deal with. He moved in just over two years ago, and they had been very excited about the sub. They came from a condo in Rochester Hills, so he had been a resident for over 15 years and was in Troy before that. They did not have sidewalks at the condo, and he was excited about having sidewalks for safety. The safety was three times worse with sidewalks. His kids had almost been hit by cars playing basketball in the driveway. He said that he was extremely against the proposed development. He did not think it would do the City any favors or justice. He thought of Big Beaver for buildings like that where there would be high rise developments surrounding it. They were constantly dealing with traffic leaving both sides of the subdivision, and there was constant cut-through. Because it would be a four stories high, long-term hotel, he could not agree more about the safety of his children and someone staying there. They knew, with everything going on in the country, about how the bad guy watched people and took notes and looked for unlocked cars and house doors. That was the new thief - he was not busting the windows, he was babysitting your lifestyle. He feared that, just as his neighbors did, and it made him feel unsafe. When he thought about Rochester Hills being in the top ten best places to live in America, he felt that the development would take them down, and they would not be in the top ten after that. He did not want to see a tall building or a hotel. If it was not a hotel, he would still not want to see a four-story building. He claimed that within a mile or two, there were no four-story hotels. He ended asking them to "please" not develop the hotel near their subdivision.

Geoff Hegger, 3490 Everett Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Mr. Hegger said that he was the President of Country Club Village's HOA, and they just became aware of the development in the past week. Earlier in the meeting, a hotel was approved on the south side of M-59. They were now saying that another hotel was needed in the area. He did not see the business to support two hotels in the area - especially an extended stay hotel. He traveled a lot for his job, and hotels were not in neighborhoods. They were near businesses. He agreed that traffic was very congested on Auburn and about the safety of the children.

Betty Merritt, 3104 Primrose Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Ms. Merritt said that she was not notified by the City of the proposed development, but she was notified about the Meijer curbside pickup window, which was further away. She asked why she was not notified. Her son played in the backyard, and she asked if people in a four-story hotel would be staring down at her son. That concerned her. She would have no privacy. She asked about the noise and the fact that the Meijer parking lot was used by the police to monitor traffic that cut through from Rochester to Auburn. She asked about having a traffic study for people crossing through from Rochester to Auburn through the Wildflower Subdivision. She claimed that it had been done for Country Club Village. She asked about the two arrests that had been made by the berm, where she had seen criminals apprehended. She asked about the death that occurred to someone going across from Office Max to the Meijer parking lot. She stated that traffic was a problem. She asked why they found out less than a week ago, and stated that she was not in favor of the development.

Richard Bosler, 399 Daylily Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Mr. Bosler thanked the Commissioners. With respect to building a four-story, 89-unit hotel, he stated that it should not be approved. The structure would negatively impact the properties to the east, where there were 233 homes, and there were other surrounding subdivisions. He felt that the structure would be too high. The traffic in and out of Meijer was already continuous. With the addition of Culver's and all the strip malls at Rochester and Auburn, the City was being overbuilt. He asked which Commissioners would like the proposed development in their backyards with all the transient nature. As a homeowner, he was against the proposal. There were enough hotels at Adams Marketplace and at Crooks. The proposed hotel should be down by the Marketplace. He stated that they did not need a hotel on every entrance into Rochester Hills. He added that he intended to send a written response to the Planning Commission.

Yvonne Patten, 3424 Vardon, Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Ms. Patten said that she had lived in the Wildflower Sub for 22 years. She stated that the Rochester and Auburn intersection was extremely over populated with businesses, restaurants and stores, and it was very dangerous to proceed in and out of their sub. She said that she feared for the drivers starting to drive, because it was very stressful trying to get in and out of the neighborhood on a daily basis. She stated that the hotel was a definite “no” for them. They did not want to see it in their area, and she did not feel that Rochester Hills needed it. There was another hotel planned at Rochester and South Boulevard, and she wondered why there was a need for two hotels. Safety, crime and the overall congestion were concerns. She asked them to “please” not develop the hotel.

Lawrence Benavides, 3088 Primrose Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Mr. Benavides said that he had lived in Wildflower for 15 years., and he was against the development. He had twin boys that went to school at Brooklands, which was about 300 feet from the proposal. He did not understand how it could be built so close to an elementary school. He asked if that was okay. He agreed that the traffic was horrible, and if they put in the hotel, it would cause more problems. At Meijer, there were always police in and out. There would be a transient population with a hotel, which would add more problems. He did not think the police would want it. If it was allowed, he would not believe that it could be there.

Darryl Owczarek, 3547 Hogan Circle, Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Mr. Owczarek said that he lived in Country Club Village, and he was also on the board. He had been there almost nine years, and the previous 13 he was in the Hampton area. He thought that it was ironic that they were at a Planning Commission meeting and for the last 21 years, nothing had been done to improve traffic safety on Rochester and Auburn. There was a lady unfortunately killed in the past year going from Meijer to Kohl’s. There was a car flipped on John R over the summer. He stated that it was a shame the Planning Commission, the City Council and the Mayor were not looking at current problems. They needed to take the citizens of the community into consideration. Everyone had mentioned congestion, crime and a long-term stay hotel, and he asked if they would check to see if there were child predators or sex offenders staying there. He did not think so. He stated that they needed to take the 500 families represented in the subdivisions into consideration and think about that. He asked them to “please” not approve the hotel that did not belong in the area.

Martha Suleskey, 3512 Primrose Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Ms. Suleskey said that she had lived in Rochester Hills for 24 years. She

moved to the community for the safety of her children and also because the subdivision was connected to the Brooklands Elementary school. Before All Seasons was built, it was going to be a hotel. The residents came to the City, and they were told that there would not be a hotel, because it was too close to the elementary school. They were now requesting a hotel which would be even closer to it. The sidewalk was connected to the school in her sub. She found it appalling, with everything that was happening in this day and age and Rochester Hills promoting education and safe community living, that a four-story building would be put in a parking lot that was smaller than the area where they were willing to build another four-story hotel less than a mile or two away. She asked what industry was in the area to even make an extended stay hotel necessary in Rochester Hills. Rochester and M-59 was supposed to be a gateway to the community. Everyone would have to look at a hotel. She asked if Troy had a hotel at their gateway on Rochester. She answered by saying that they did not; they had a beautiful sign and entranceway so that people coming into the City would know it was Troy. When someone crossed over from Troy to Rochester, it did not look very nice, and people would see a hotel when they came into Rochester Hills. She commented that it was appalling, and she was sad that it was how things were going to go. She asked if they were going to wait until a child was taken from the elementary school and then re-evaluate a four-story hotel, or wait until there was another deadly accident. She asked what it would take for a community to come together. They all paid taxes and took care of their houses, and they loved Rochester Hills. She asked why they would build a hotel right next to residential areas. She stated that she was really disappointed, and she hoped they would re-evaluate what they were doing to the City.

Tom Polisick, 3571 Joshua Rd., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Mr.

Polisick had lived in his home almost 24 years. When they moved in, it was a quiet sub. They took out the dealership and put in Lowe's, they put the strip center in, they widened M-59, and MDOT decided the residents did not need a wall, and now they could not sleep at night with windows open. The hotel would add more noise and traffic. There were traffic jams on Auburn, and it backed up from one light to the next. He said that a four-story hotel would be a mistake going in their backyards, and he hoped the Commissioners had the wisdom to vote it down.

Bianca Asmar, 3151 Goldenrod Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Ms.

Asmar said she was a mother and a resident in Rochester Hills. The major concerns for her was that sex offenders could stay for an extended period of time so close to an elementary school. Per Michigan law, sex

offenders could not be 1,000 feet from a school. She stated that it was the wrong development and the wrong place. She said that she strongly disagreed with the construction of a hotel, not only as a resident but also as a mother.

Chairperson Brnabic thanked everyone who took the time to come out and share their opinions, and she emphasized that the Commissioners did like to hear from the public and surrounding neighbors. She said that a few people brought up that they had not been notified. She asked if the Planning Department notified the HOA groups by email.

Ms. Roediger responded that the hotel was permitted by right in the FB-3 zoning district. The four-story height was the maximum for the district. Whenever a use being proposed met the use and height requirements, no notification was required to surrounding properties. The request for curbside pickup at Meijer was a conditional use because of the drive-through, and that required notification to properties within 300 feet. The Tree Removal Permit was required to be noticed to people adjacent to the subject parcel, and there were four. Chairperson Brnabic noted that Ms. Roediger had answered the question about whether the development was lawful. Ms. Roediger advised that there were no regulations about spacing between a hotel and a school. The FB-3 district required a 125-foot setback from a four-story building abutting a residential district. That was an increase over the normal setbacks in that district. It was the City's policy to notify adjacent HOAs if the information was on file with the City.

Mr. Atto thanked people for coming, noting that they respected everyone's opinion. He sat on a Planning Commission in another city, and he heard concerns about developments. He personally had to try to balance the rights of the property owners with the concerns of the neighbors. The applicants had tried very hard to do everything according to the Ordinance and the laws. It would be a multi-million dollar development, and that mattered because if it was the type of use that would attract crime and criminals, no one would want to invest large sums of money for a negative operation. The operators were family-owned, and there would be family members at the site. They would operate it to the best of their ability and within the current laws. He had offered to meet with one of the HOAs to see if some of the concerns could be addressed, but he realized that everyone was against it. In their opinion, it was a logical use. They chose Rochester Hills because it was a safe and growing community, and they wanted to be a part of it. They did not want to cause a negative impact. They expected it to be very positive, and hoped the Commission

understood why they proposed what they did. He had proposed a storage facility in front of Troy's Planning Commission that turned out to be extremely quiet and an asset to the neighborhood. He heard that people could store bomb making materials, because someone had just done that. He they did not want to bring a criminal element. He thought that it would be a good, clean, manageable development, and it would be a big investment. The owners would want to make sure that it was operated in such a way so as to not have negative things.

Mr. Dettloff asked about the site selection process. He asked if the applicants had supporting documentation that showed there was a need or void for the hotel, given the fact that one was approved a mile away.

Mr. Atto said that he did not have anything with him, but there had been feasibility studies done. The major franchisors would not allow their name to be put on a facility that did not meet certain requirements such as circulation and design. If, through the studies, the owners did not think there was a market for the product, they would not put their name on it. The lending community would have even more stringent requirements, and if there was no market, the owners would not be able to finance. The owner would have a huge investment but would not want to take a huge risk. Mr. Atto stated that there was a serious investment and market study to get to the point they were.

Mr. Dettloff asked if he knew who conducted the market study, but Mr. Atto did not. Mr. Dettloff confirmed that it was a franchise. He asked if the owner had other facilities and experience with a similar operation. Mr. Atto clarified that it would be their fourth hotel. A gentleman in the audience said that the market study was done by Hotel Investment Services.

Mr. Schultz stated that the Commissioners were not there to judge a business case. When one of the speakers asked why they would put a hotel next to another one, it was not the Commission's purview. They could not ask McDonald's why they were next to Burger King, for example. He felt that it was important for the Commissioners to digest what staff brought forward and the context of what was being proposed in a greater scope. For him, putting a building of that scale directly adjacent to residential was something he was having a lot of heartburn with. If the character of the existing development already was 50 feet, and people bought their homes adjacent to it that would be one thing. If it was approved, they would be putting in something he felt was completely out of context with the area. A case example was the new mini-storage in

Troy where everything around it was typical, one-story retail. He completely supported form based codes, because he felt it was necessary for the City to be flexible with development. With the proposal being directly adjacent to homes and traditionally one scale retail, it did not fit the context model for him. He indicated that was where he stood, and that was his overall stance with the project.

Mr. Atto said that they truly were trying to understand and respect that opinion. He said that he owned the self-storage property in Troy and was unsuccessful in trying to develop it. He sold it at a loss. When he purchased it, there was a height limit of 40-45 feet. The City of Troy modified its Ordinance, and during the time he owned the property, it changed from 45 feet to 75 feet. He did not even know about it until after it was built. He asked how a City could do that without notifying the property owner. He was making that point because a City had rules and regulations. They had to rely on the fact that if Rochester Hills had a zoning district that allowed certain things and they complied, they thought they were doing what the City wanted. If the City thought the hotel should not be four stories high, and they were relying on what was in the Ordinance, he thought they did not have the same vision. They were not asking for a variance, and they tried to comply with the rules. He believed that the Meijer building was close to 40 feet.

Mr. Schultz said that he respected that. He was a real estate developer, and he developed the two buildings adjacent to the garden center of the Meijer. He understood about playing within the rules and being cognizant of change in a community. He stressed that Meijer was not 40 feet high, and that context was important for him. He understood there was a book of rules to abide and be able to ask for everything, but the Commission was there to make decisions based on the application. He was not saying someone could not ask for things but sometimes, the Commissioners had to use context.

Ms. Morita mentioned that she was at the site a lot, and the internal circulation was horrible in terms of getting from one end of the shopping center to the other. The traffic exiting onto to Rochester Rd. at the light by Lowe's was constantly stacked way past the left turn lane. There were all kinds of traffic problems inside the site. Her concern was adding more traffic to what was already there in an area that was already over-congested. She was also concerned, because there were not enough parking spaces proposed. Depending on the time of the year, the parking lot could be almost filled. There were other outlots, including a Culver's. There was additional space on the west side that had been

filled. Parking was becoming more difficult. She traveled a lot for business. She understood that the hotel brand had decided they wanted a hotel next to Meijer, but if she had a choice between staying in a hotel in a Meijer parking lot right next to the loading dock versus another site, it would not be the site she would choose to stay. She did not find it attractive, and it would concern her as a business traveler right next to a Meijer with people in and out 24 hours a day. She would be concerned about parking her car there overnight. She also had some problems with the site plan itself. She did not like the location of the trash dumpster. She stated that it should be next to the Meijer building, not next to the residences. She would like to see them take a look at reworking the internal circulation on the entirety of the site, including making improvements in extending the left turn lane at the light to Rochester Rd. She understood that Good Will owned the entire site, and she did not think the applicants would be buying the land for the hotel. She was not sure if they were doing a land lease. She asked if they currently owned the property, and Mr. Atto said that there was a purchase agreement, so it would be owned. Ms. Morita asked if they would be creating a site condo. She pointed out that there was no road access, so they could not get a lot split from Assessing. Mr. Atto said that they would not have the right to internally change the traffic for the whole site, but the hotel site would be owned separately, and parking would be designated for the hotel. He claimed that they had done some things that would improve the traffic.

Mr. Butler noted that they had conversations early on about the lot split. There would be an access easement coming off of Auburn that would allow it. Ms. Morita asked if they would not have frontage on Auburn, and Mr. Butler agreed that they would not. Ms. Morita pointed out that they would be creating a keyhole parcel, and Mr. Butler explained that it would be considered a secondary route.

Ms. Morita did not think the hotel would be harmonious in an area of all one-stories. They were talking about putting a four-story in the middle of everything. She found it problematic that the current owner of the property would not retain ownership, because in order for it to work, she felt that the entire site needed to be improved. If the hotel did not have control over the circulation for the rest of the site, she maintained that it would not get better; it would get worse. She realized the distances from the building to the property line had been provided, but she wanted to know the distances from the building to the homes themselves. She was having difficulty with the fact that there was no wall being proposed around the site. If people pulled in at 11:00 p.m. with the way the parking was set up, they would shine headlights into the backs of people's homes. She would like to see

some type of opaque barrier to prevent that. The parking spaces ran north-south, but she could not tell how far from a home they would be. They did align with the backs of the homes, and vehicles could push light into the homes late at night.

Mr. Atto said that with respect to the traffic, the secondary road would help the situation, and he felt that the traffic for the hotel would be acceptable and manageable. Regarding to the lights, they had no objection to an opaque wall or fence. They wanted to work with the community. There was a berm with a lot of landscaping, and they would add a lot more. They thought that headlights could be mitigated.

Ms. Morita said she was trying to express that even if she could support the project, she did not have enough information to do so. She did not feel the hotel fit in with the FB Overlay intent to have a more harmonious site that worked together as a whole. As the site was originally planned, it was one parcel, and they were talking about splitting it off. It was originally one project. It seemed like the hotel would be a different project, and that was not how she looked at the site. She had to look at the entirety of the site and the properties around it. They did approve another hotel down the road, but next to that was a two or three-story office building and a lumber yard to the north, and that particular corner was different. She did not think the proposed hotel was a good fit with the FB district, and she did not think it followed the intent of the Ordinance. It was not harmonious with the surrounding developments. She had not even gotten to the neighborhood, which was a whole other issue. When they took into consideration that it would be right next to a neighborhood, depending on how close the hotel would be to the homes, she found that concerning. The other hotel had provided a greater setback than what was required. The distance from that hotel to the homes was substantial. The homes had large backyards, and that was something she took into consideration. The proposed hotel would be much closer to the adjacent homes than the last project. She did not think the project would fit in as well as the other hotel, and she did not think it took into consideration the proximity and the height of the building to the adjacent buildings. There was also not enough parking for what they wanted to do. It was the proverbial 800 lb. gorilla where they wanted to put something on a site that was too small for it.

Mr. Atto thought that when the Ordinance was created, not everything could have been anticipated. He gave large retailers going out of business as an example. Some communities were reducing parking requirements, because people were going to be using alternative

methods of transportation. None of the large hotel brands in today's market would put their names on something if it was not a certain number of stories. Even though the Commissioners thought it might be out of context, he suggested that perhaps they had not anticipated what was coming in the future when they approved the district. He noted that Southfield redid its parking Ordinance because they anticipated that people would be driving less.

Ms. Morita said that she appreciated that, but she knew what things looked like today. If the building went up, it would not fit in with the character of the rest of the site.

Mr. Butler said that the City's parking Ordinance had a standard for hotels, and they were meeting that standard. It was 1.1 spaces per room. There were 89 rooms, and they proposed 98 parking spaces, so the standard would be met. FB had a certain standard, but for a hotel use, they met the parking. Regarding the setback, the hotel at its closest would be 135 feet from the property line. There was another strip of land zoned FB that was 65 feet. The homes had 35-foot rear yard setbacks, so from the closest point of the hotel to the backyard, it would be about 235 feet. The plan for the Gateway project was 125 feet from the property line, and the closest house was 125 feet. So it was 250 feet versus 235 feet.

Ms. Kapelanski said that the applicant was developing using the FB district standards, which required 125 parking spaces. That was based on a standard for nonresidential uses, which a hotel would fall under. The standard the applicant mentioned was for hotels, and that would have applied had the site been developed under B-3. The site did not meet the parking standards under the FB provisions.

Ms. Roediger commented that someone could not pick and choose between regulations. If they developed under B-3, a four-story hotel would not be permitted, so they could not really even discuss that. She mentioned that based on some of the concerns staff had and some emails received, she had prepared a motion to deny, if the Planning Commission decided to go in that direction.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that one of the challenges for Planning Commissioners was that they were faced with the decision about denying the right to develop if the Ordinances were followed. The applicants were requesting modifications to the FB Overlay. As someone who, many years ago, was on the committee who reviewed the FB standards when they were introduced, it was not what he had intended. A lot of people on

that committee envisioned development with flexibility in certain areas that was harmonious with the surroundings, not just a drop in. Hearing no further discussion, he moved the following

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, in the matter of City File No. 17-044 (Candlewood Hotel @ Meijer), the Planning Commission **denies the Site Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on March 2, 2018 with the following nine (9) findings.

Findings

1. *The proposed project does not meet the stated intent and spirit of the Flex Business District which is “foster vital, lively, and sustainable development that creates an imageable neighborhood identity...” and to institute form-based regulations that permit greater design and use flexibility by in a way that “may be comfortably and naturally accommodated.” This project does the opposite and rather than be compatible, it threatens to transform the character of the area and the adjacent neighborhood.*
2. *The proposed project does not meet the stated intent and spirit of the Flex Business District to create proper physical form defined in the Zoning Ordinance as including a mixture of land uses in close proximity, streets that serve the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists and motor vehicles equitably; development that provides places for informal social activity and recreation; and building frontages that define the public space of streets. The proposed layout does not create a public space for social activity or recreation that is likely to be utilized by area pedestrians and/bicyclists given the building’s far proximity from Auburn and Rochester Roads. The proposed building does not help to define the public space of nearby streets.*
3. *Because of its location in the interior of the site, on the service side of an existing retail building, and farther from the state trunk line (Rochester Road) to the west contributes to congestion on the site, and concerns about funneling traffic through the Meijer site rather than direct access from Rochester Road and are therefore not considered to be satisfactory and harmonious with the existing development on-site or in the adjacent vicinity.*
4. *The proposed improvements do not have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity because of the access*

concerns associated with hotel patrons traversing the loading area of the Meijer site to access the proposed hotel as detailed in the planning review letter.

5. *The overall massing and height of the hotel will dominate this portion of the site and is out of character with the remainder of the site and adjoining properties.*
6. *The on-site drives, streets, parking, site access and other vehicle-related elements are not designed to minimize traffic conflicts with the curbside pickup and loading areas of the existing Meijer and reduces the safety and efficiency of traffic circulation around the existing building. The presence of a gate across the entrance to the circular access drive furthers this.*
7. *The hotel will overwhelm the existing users of the site as it relates to the operations of the Meijer, and will be detrimental and unattractive feature that belongs - if at all - along the Rochester Road portion of the site, not the eastern interior of the site nearest the neighborhood.*
8. *The requested modifications do not enable innovative design. Rather the proposed project is being proposed to be built on an existing site that was not developed under the Flex Business District in a manner that creates a number of access, operational, and aesthetic concerns.*
9. *The applicant has not demonstrated that modification of the parking requirements is warranted based on their submitted materials and does not provide the required amount of parking.*

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: *Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder, Schultz*
 Nays: *None*
 Absent: *Anzek*

2018-0048

Request for a Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 17-044 - for the removal and replacement of as many as 14 regulated trees in conjunction with the development of an 89-room Candlewood Hotel proposed for an outlot on the east side of the Meijer property at Rochester and Auburn Roads, zoned B-3 Shopping Center Business with an FB-3 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-35-100-056, Rochester Hills Property, LLC, Applicant

MOTION *by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, in the matter of City File No. 17-044 (Candlewood Hotel @ Meijer), the Planning Commission*

*denies the request for a **Tree Removal Permit**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on March 2, 2018 because the site plan does not meet the required conditions for approval*

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

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

Excused 1 - Anzek

Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motions had been denied. She apologized, and Mr. Atto thanked the Commission for its consideration.

Chairperson Brnabic called for a ten minute break at 9:10 p.m.

2018-0092

Request for Planned Unit Development Agreement Recommendation - City File No. 17-013 - Crestwyk Estates PUD, a proposed 16-unit attached and detached condominium development on 4.4 acres, located on the east side of John R between School and Hamlin roads, zoned R-4 One Family Residential, Parcel Nos. 15-24-301-077 to -081, M2J1, LLC, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated March 16, 2018 and site plans and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Jim Polyzois, M2J1, LLC, 14955 Technology Dr., Shelby Township, MI 48315 and Ralph Nunez, Nunez Design, 249 Park St., Troy, MI 48083.

Mr. Kaltsounis recused himself, stating that Mr. Polyzois was under contract with his father for property outside of Rochester Hills, and he was on the board for that property.

Ms. Kapelanski went over the requests. She noted that the property was zoned R-4 One Family Residential, and that the applicant had proposed a mix of 16 attached and detached units. The Preliminary PUD had been approved by City Council on December 11, 2017. Staff recommended approval of the Final PUD with minor conditions, as the project met applicable regulations. There were two wetlands that ran through the center of the site. The applicant had made significant efforts to preserve as much of Wetland A, the higher quality wetland, as possible. Wetland B, which was a low quality wetland, would be filled. ASTI Environmental

reviewed the proposal, and had indicated that the impacts had been minimized and recommended approval of the Wetland Use Permit. Ms. Kapelanski said that she was available for any questions.

Chairperson Brnabic asked the applicants if they wished to add anything. Mr. Nunez felt that the City staff had done a great job. He thanked all the departments for working with them and their consultants to make sure that the project met and exceeded the City's expectations. He said that they would be happy to answer any questions.

Chairperson Brnabic referenced the PUD Agreement, page 3, number 2 b., last line and she read, "Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein, the developer shall have no obligation to further develop all or any portion of the property." She did not have a problem with the developer not having an obligation to start the development, but she objected to the wording "any portion of" the property. The Agreement stated that a residential family project would be developed, consisting of four buildings, each containing two attached residential units and eight detached residential units for a total of 16. If there had been a problem with marketing or the economy, and the applicant was showing good faith, the City would work with the applicant, so she felt that was covered. There was a completion timeframe - three years from the date that Building permits were issued, so the Agreement stated a commencement and finish date.

Mr. Polyzois suggested that he could remove the section. Chairperson Brnabic asked if "any portion of" the property would be removed, and Mr. Polyzois agreed.

Mr. Reece asked if there were any changes to the Final versus the Preliminary from December. Ms. Kapelanski said that unit seven was shifted slightly to the rear of the property to accommodate some utilities and required landscaping. That was discovered as the applicant began to work through the engineering details. It was shifted five feet closer to units eight and nine. Mr. Reece asked the distance between seven and eight, and Mr. Nunez advised that it was 15 feet. He said that there had also been concerns with site line visibility for the pathway and vehicular traffic. They did not want to lose plant material. They also added a side entry to the duplex units. That changed the elevation slightly for units eight, eleven, fourteen and three.

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

MOTION by Hooper, seconded by Dettloff, in the matter of City File No. 17-013 (Crestwyk Estates PUD), the Planning Commission **recommends** that City Council **approves** the PUD Agreement dated received December 18, 2017 with the following five (5) findings and subject to the following four (4) conditions.

Findings

1. *The proposed Final PUD is consistent with the proposed intent and criteria of the PUD option.*
2. *The proposed Final PUD is consistent with the approved PUD Concept Plan.*
3. *The PUD will not create an unacceptable impact on public utility and circulation systems, surrounding properties, or the environment.*
4. *The proposed PUD promotes the goals and objectives of the Master Plan as they relate to providing varied housing for the residents of the City.*
5. *The proposed plan provides appropriate transition between the existing land uses surrounding the property.*

Conditions

1. *City Council approval of the PUD Agreement.*
2. *The appropriate sheets from the approved Final Plan set shall be attached to the PUD Agreement as exhibits, including the building elevations.*
3. *Page 3, 2b. last sentence, remove "any portion of" the property, for City Attorney review and approval, prior to going to City Council.*
4. *All other conditions specifically listed in the Agreement shall be met prior to final approval by staff.*

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

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

Abstain 1 - Kaltsounis

Excused 1 - Anzek

2018-0093

Public Hearing and request for a Wetland Use Permit Recommendation - City File No. 17-013 - Crestwyk Estates PUD, for impacts up to approximately 12,000 s.f. for a proposed 16-unit condominium development on 4.4 acres, located on the east side of John R between School and Hamlin Roads, zoned R-4 One Family Residential, Parcel Nos. 15-24-301-077 to -080., M2J1, LLC, Applicant

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 9:39 p.m. Seeing no one come forward she closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION by Hooper, seconded by Schroeder, in the matter of City File No. 17-013 (Crestwyk Estates PUD), the Planning Commission **recommends** that City Council **approves a Wetland Use Permit** to impact approximately 12,000 square feet for the construction of several units, a portion of Crestwyk Lane and the detention pond, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on January 30, 2018, with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following three (3) conditions.

Findings

1. *Of the approximately 18,000 s.f of City-regulated wetlands on site, the applicant is proposing to impact approximately 12,000 s.f., which is mostly for Wetland B.*
2. *Wetland B is of low quality and function, 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.*

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

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

Abstain 1 - Kaltsounis

Excused 1 - Anzek

2018-0094

Request for Natural Features Setback Modifications - City File No. 17-013 - Crestwyk Estates, for impacts to approximately 1.552 linear feet for a proposed 16-unit condominium development on 4.4 acres, located on the east side of John R between School and Hamlin Roads, zoned R-4 One Family Residential, Parcel Nos. 15-24-301-077 to -080, M2J1, LLC, Applicant

MOTION by Hooper, seconded by Schroeder, in the matter of City File No. 17-013 (Crestwyk Estates PUD), the Planning Commission **grants Natural Features Setback Modifications** for the permanent impacts to as much as 1,552 linear feet of natural features setbacks associated with the construction activities around Wetlands A and B, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on January 30, 2018, with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following one (1) condition.

Findings

1. *Natural Features Setback Modifications are needed for construction activities around Wetlands A and B.*
2. *The Planning Commission has the ability to waive the natural features setback modifications as a part of accepting the site being developed as a PUD.*

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

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

Abstain 1 - Kaltsounis

Excused 1 - Anzek

2017-0521

Request for Final Planned Unit Development (PUD) Site Plan Recommendation - City File No. 17-013 - Crestwyk Estates, a proposed 16-unit attached and

detached condominium development on 4.4 acres located on the east side of John R between School and Hamlin Roads, zoned R-4 One Family Residential; Jim Polyzois, M2J1, LLC, Applicant

MOTION by Hooper, seconded by Schroeder, in the matter of City File No. 17-013 (Crestwyk Estates PUD), the Planning Commission **recommends that City Council approves the Site Plan**, dated received January 30, 2018 by the Planning and Economic Development Department with the following five (5) findings and subject to the following five (5) 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 location and design of the driveway providing vehicular ingress to and egress from the site will promote safety and convenience of both vehicular and pedestrian traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets.*
3. *There will be a satisfactory and harmonious relationship between the development on the site and the existing and prospective development of contiguous land and adjacent neighborhoods.*
4. *The proposed development does not have an unreasonably detrimental, nor an injurious, effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the parcels being developed and the larger area of which the parcels are a part.*
5. *The proposed Final Plan promotes the goals and objectives of the Master Plan by providing an alternative housing option.*

Conditions

1. *City Council approval of the Final Site Plans.*
2. *Provide a landscape bond in the amount of \$119,029.00, plus inspection fees, for landscaping and irrigation, as adjusted as necessary by the City, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit by Engineering.*
3. *Provide Master Deed with Exhibit B to the Department of Public*

Services/Engineering for review and approval prior to the Engineering Department issuing Preliminary Acceptance of any site improvements.

4. Payment of \$3,200 into the tree fund for street trees prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit by Engineering.

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

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

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

Abstain 1 - Kaltsounis

Excused 1 - Anzek

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

2017-0322

Request for approval of a Revised Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 17-020 - for the removal and replacement of as many as 35 trees for Oakridge Dental Center, a proposed 3,000 square-foot dental office on 2.2 acres located at the northeast corner of Hamlin and Livernois, zoned O-1, Office Business, Parcel No. 15-22-351-002, Christian Unverzagt, M1/DTW, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated March 16, 2018 and site plans and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Christian Unverzagt and Thomas Affeldt, M1/DTW, 1938 Franklin St., #204, Detroit, MI 48207 and Dr. Samir Obeid, Oakridge Dental, 1959 S. Livernois, Rochester Hills, MI 48307.

Ms. Kapelanski recapped that the site had been approved in August 2017 by the Planning Commission for a 5,000 s.f. dental office building on 2.26 acres located at the northeast corner of Hamlin and Livernois. The new proposal was for a 3,000 s.f. dental office. The owner was going to apply to split the lot into two parcels - Parcel A would contain the dental office and parking, and Parcel B would be for future development. A Revised Tree Removal Permit was being requested to remove and replace 35 trees onsite. Staff recommended approval, as the project met the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance. She mentioned that there had been a Conditional Rezoning of the site in 2010. That required maintaining 30% of the trees, and that condition was being met, and it

would also apply to the future development of Parcel B. She said that she was available for any questions.

Mr. Unverzagt said that he did not have anything to add about the Revised Tree Removal Permit (first on the agenda), but they would be happy to answer questions. Chairperson Brnabic asked if he would like to comment about the Revised Site Plan. Mr. Unverzagt said the entryway and parking area would generally be the same. The strategy was generally the same, using the northwest corner of the site to locate the dental office. They reduced the overall square footage of the building from 5,000 s.f. to 3,000 s.f. and tried to optimize it within Parcel A. They had worked very closely over the last several months with the Planning Dept.

Chairperson Brnabic commented that the building had an entirely different look from the first plan. Mr. Unverzagt said that at the meeting in August, they said that they did not have a signature style, and that their projects were an outcome of the unique conditions of a site. The conditions changed, and they re-approached it, and they were still just as excited about it.

Mr. Schroeder asked if the site would use the same access as Parcel A. Mr. Unverzagt said that they worked with Planning to anticipate that someone could come in through that access point but through a cross access agreement, someone could pass through Parcel A and use an access to Hamlin. They preliminarily discussed having a right in, right out turn approach on Hamlin to further compliment the site. Mr. Schroeder indicated that they would not want any more driveways. He appreciated the fact that they were participating in the operating of the road.

Mr. Reece asked if the skin of the building had changed. Mr. Unverzagt said that previously, it was clad predominately in fiber cement with glazing. There would now be full brick and wood accents. There would be wood cladding on the entryway on the northeast corner. Mr. Reece asked it would be all white. Mr. Unverzagt advised that it would be a warm, off-white color. It was a masonry-based mineral paint, which was a natural product that allowed the brick to breathe. The masonry would be painted. Mr. Reece asked the life cycle of the paint, and Mr. Unverzagt said that it had a 20-year life span before it had to be retreated, which exceeded a normal painting application. Mr. Reece asked if the intent was for the mortar joints, beds, head and side joints to be painted the same color, which was confirmed. Mr. Schultz clarified that they would be painting a

brick, not a concrete masonry unit.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that he was bummed out. When they were before the Commissioners previously, there was a great building and great concept, and he loved it. It had a slight Vegas hotel look, but now it was down to a box. He understood that it was what it was, because he was working on a project, and he knew how the numbers worked. He said that that there were a lot of references to Parcels A and B. He asked if their intent was to split them and sell one off. Mr. Unverzagt said that the plan with the dental office was to minimize the area it needed on Parcel A so they could ensure the success of the dental office and to set up future potential for another project to happen on the other site.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that the last time, they talked about giving people a nice wooded area to look at when they were getting their teeth pulled. They were now talking about having two buildings instead. Mr. Unverzagt said that the area to the east would remain open, and there would be some setback between any parking. They did some studies that any future building might position itself closer to Hamlin to separate the two. There might be a complimentary sized building, and it could be more of a campus. They had a very expressive form previously, and he thought they had really tried to ensure that the new office did not look like a standard box. They used architectural expression; the entryway would be recessed, and there would be some larger openings for the doctor's and staff's entrances on the east. There would be a more varied window configuration that would come alive when someone walked through the office. At certain moments, someone would be able to see out through more than one window at a time. It was much more compact and optimized. They were doing about 95% of what they were in the previous project. There was one fewer operatory room, but otherwise, they had been able to accommodate all of the programmatic requirements of the original project in 3,000 s.f.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that he understood, and he could appreciate the challenges. There was a new challenge in front of the Commissioners with the possibility of the lot split. That was something they had to consider, and what potentials there could be. He said that he would like to hear what other Commissioners thought about it.

However, hearing no further discussion, Mr. Kaltsounis moved the following, seconded by Mr. Hooper.

MOTION *by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, in the matter of City File*

No. 17-020 (Oakridge Dental Center), the Planning Commission grants a Revised Tree Removal Permit, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on March 1, 2018, 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 conditions of the Conditional Rezoning and Ordinance.
2. The applicant is proposing to replace up to 35 regulated trees with 35 tree credits on site.

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 Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, that this matter be Granted. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Excused 1 - Anzek

[2017-0335](#)

Request for Revised Site Plan Approval - City File No. 17-020 - Oakridge Dental Center, a proposed 3,000 square-foot dental office on 2.2 acres located at the northeast corner of Hamlin and Livernois, zoned O-1, Office Business, Parcel No. 15-22-351-002, Christian Unverzagt, M1/DTW, Applicant

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the paint was titanium dioxide or another mineral. The applicants were not sure, but they said that the paint could be dyed. Mr. Affeldt noted that it would be a soft off-white, not a bright color. Mr. Kaltsounis then moved the following, seconded by Mr. Schroeder.

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schroeder, in the matter of City File No. 17-020 (Oakridge Dental Center), the Planning Commission **approves the Revised Site Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on March 1, 2018, with the following seven (7) findings and subject to the following two (2) 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 site was conditionally rezoned in 2010 to O-1 Office in anticipation of the proposed type of use.*
3. *The proposed project will be accessed from Livernois north of the roundabout, thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets. Paths 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 for the school visitors.*
5. *The Planning Commission has approved a modification for an increase in the number of parking spaces determining that applicant's statement of why more parking is needed is valid.*
6. *The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.*
7. *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. *Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, prior to final approval by staff.*
2. *Provide a landscape performance bond for replacement trees, landscaping and irrigation in the amount of \$28,763.00, plus inspection fees, as adjusted as necessary by staff, prior to temporary grade certification being issued by Engineering.*

Ms. Morita mentioned that there was a Conditional Rezoning. She asked staff to explain it, what it was based on and the conditions placed.

Ms. Roediger responded that the Conditional Rezoning was done many years ago. It was not done last August. The CR talked about right-of-way in terms of the roundabout being constructed, and it included the types of uses, stories and square-footage. The previous and the current project met all the conditions. Ms. Kapelanski added that it was done in 2010, and the only condition that applied was keeping 30% of the regulated trees.

Mr. Reece remembered when the applicants came the first time, and the Commissioners were excited about the building and the design. He indicated that the Commissioners were fairly conservative. He had to admit that he was really struggling with a couple of the elevations. The fact that the building was square did not bother him as much, but for the south elevation for people driving down Hamlin, all they would see was a stark white wall with windows popped in, and that was it. He was fine with the site plan, but the elevations were troubling to him. He reminded that it would be on a very prominent corner of the City, and they had just talked about a hotel that looked like it was plopped out of the sky on the site. That was what part of the elevations looked like to him. He understood that it was a little bit of a statement, design-wise, and he was willing to stretch his design comfort zone, but it was pretty stark. If it was on Rochester Rd. it might be different, but it would be mostly surrounded by residential. With the tone of the masonry in those subdivisions, he did not see the proposed building in that area. He wondered if they might consider working with staff on some design concepts. It was not something he wanted to see design-wise at that corner.

Mr. Unverzagt suggested that elevations were always tricky, in that they were flat, two-dimensional views. He thought that oftentimes, buildings were given a singular elevation that was thought of two-dimensionally and at the expense of the other elevations. They had worked really hard to think about the building in the round to understand that people would always see more than one view at a time. There were north, east, west and south views. Some would be predominant for a client to the dental office and for others, hopefully in the future, if there was more development on the site. They tried to think about it as a spatial experience where the building was complimentary to its site. There was a large growth of trees on the northern line and trees on the eastern border that existed that the building would act in contrast. It was meant to be well thought out and considerate, and they tried to use good materials.

Mr. Reece agreed, and said that those point were all valid. The question

was whether it really fit within the context of the community. Mr. Unverzagt said that one-quarter mile down, there was a giant, all gray warehouse building. Mr. Reece pointed out that it was in an industrial park.

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

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Schroeder and Schultz

Nay 1 - Reece

Excused 1 - Anzek

Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed seven to one. She thanked the applicants and advised that they were approved.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

NEXT MEETING DATE

Chairperson Brnabic reminded the Commissioners that the next Regular Meeting was scheduled for April 17, 2018 beginning at 7:00 p.m. with a Master Plan Work Session starting first at 6:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission and upon motion by Mr. Kaltsounis, seconded by Mr. Hooper, Chairperson Brnabic adjourned the Regular Meeting at 9:56 p.m.

Deborah Brnabic, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Secretary