



October 4, 2019

Ms. Kristen Kapelanski, AICP
Manager of Planning
Planning and Economic Development
City of Rochester Hills
1000 Rochester Hills Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48039

RE: Proposed Redwood PUD Development in the Southwest Quadrant of Avon and Dequindre
City File #18-022, Parcel No. 15-13-476-005
Response to Outstanding Review Comments

Ms. Kapelanski,

Please find enclosed thirteen (13) sets of 11"x17" plans dated August 27, 2019 for the proposed Redwood development at the corner of Avon and Dequindre.

The applicant acknowledges comments received from City Departments in memos received via email on Friday, September 13, and offers the following responses to these comments.

ASTI – Responses to comments included in email letter from ASTI to Ms. Kapelanski dated 8/5/19:

- Comment 3e: The Applicant should be aware that any unplanned temporary or permanent wetland impacts on-site will require immediate restoration and will be subject to City inspection and potential EGLE corrective actions.
- Response: The Applicant acknowledges this requirement.

- Comment 3f: Final plans must show a detail of the proposed retaining wall and signage for City review.
- Response: The Applicant acknowledges this requirement. Additional details will be included in the final plans.

- Comment 3g: The Current Plans show two 12-inch storm sewer pipes emptying into Wetland E; one from Detention Pond 1 and one from Detention Pond 3, and one 12-inch storm sewer pipe emptying into Wetland A from Detention Pond 2. These actions will require a Part 303 permit from EGLE, which must be obtained and submitted to the City for review.
- Response: The Applicant acknowledges that a Part 303 permit from EGLE will be required. Application for the Part 303 permit will be submitted pending approval of the Concept Plan.

DPS/Engineering – Responses to comments included in Memo from Mr. Boughton, AC to Ms. Kapelanski dated 8/21/19:

Sanitary Sewer

- Comment 1: An offsite sanitary sewer easement will need to be obtained from the owners of parcel #15-13-476-004 to provide this development with an outlet for sanitary sewer.



- Response: The Applicant acknowledges that an easement on County property will be required. The Applicant has previously approached the County concerning this easement and the County was receptive to the concept. Negotiations and specifics concerning the easement will commence upon approval of the Concept Plan.

Water Main

- Comment 1: The exact area, size, and design of the PRV vault will be part of the construction plan phase of the project.
- Response: The applicant acknowledges this and will work with City Staff on the final design pending approval of the Concept Plan.

Storm Sewer

- Comment 1: Revise pipe slopes throughout to be between minimum and maximum allowable per the City of Rochester Hills Engineering Design Standards.
- Response: Storm sewer calculations will be updated as part of the final design to correspond to minimum and maximum allowable pipe slopes.
- Comment 2: Provide a primary overflow at the 100-year elevation unrestricted for detention pond 4.
- Response: The final plans will include a primary overflow at the 100-year elevation for Detention Pond 4.

Grading

- Comment 1: Raise the finish grade and finish floor of building M to provide more freeboard buffer for the adjacent wetland detention being proposed.
- Response: Please note that the finished floor of Building M is set more than one-foot above the back-to-back 100-year water elevation. That being said, the Applicant acknowledges the City's comment and will work with City Staff to modify the elevation.

Traffic/Pavement

- Comment 1: Awaiting approved RCOC ROW use permit and acknowledged by the developer. Provide a note on plans to this affect. Please note PUD approval will not be accepted until RCOC permit is received.
- Response: The Applicant acknowledges that final approval will not be granted until the RCOC Permit is secured. An interim note will be added to the plans indicating this requirement.
- Comment 2: The right-in/right-out may need to be defined better to discourage motorists from entering/exiting incorrectly. MDOT detail GEO-680- B on sheet 4 of 6 may apply. Again, we are reviewing the plans in conjunction with RCOC roundabout plans and do not anticipate any conflicts between the two related drive locations. This comment will remain until complete but does not affect conditional approval.
- Response: The Applicant acknowledges this.
- Comment 3: The road and pathway sight lines at each approach should be shown on the Landscape plans (which were not included in plan set). The sight lines must be unobstructed, per details, by any existing or proposed objects (CITY detail attached).
- Response: The final Landscape Plans will include sight line information.



Pathway/Sidewalk

- Comment 4: A CITY ROW use permit will be required for the proposed pathway work, acknowledged on previous submission. Provide note on plans to this affect. This comment does not affect conditional approval.
- Response: The Applicant acknowledges that final approval will not be granted until the City ROW Use Permit is secured. An interim note will be added to the plans indicating this requirement.

DPS/Engineering – Responses to comments included in Memo from Mr. Dave, PE to Ms. Kapelanski dated 10/2/19:

- Comment: We recommend that the Planning Commission consider requiring the following for their PUD approval:
 - Request that the developer provide a \$100,000.00 donation to the City that will be used towards a public improvement in the vicinity of Avon and Dequindre. The donation could cover cost towards a pathway, PRV construction or possibly another public improvement expense in this area.
 - The Redwood developer grant an easement on their property that sufficiently provides coverage for a relocated PRV and water main alignment. The easement should also be able to provide direct access to Dequindre Road.
- Response: The Applicant is committed to providing the \$100,000 donation to the City in support of the proposed public improvements. The Applicant is further committed to granting an easement to the City to accommodate the relocated PRV, assuming that said easement does not inhibit development on the property as generally described in the plans submitted. Please note that Sheet C110 of the plans has been updated to indicate the commitment to provide an easement to the City for the PRV.

Fire Department – Responses to comments included in Memo from William Cooke to Ms. Kapelanski dated 6/27/19:

- Comment 1: A flow test is required prior to final site plan approval.
- Response: The Applicant acknowledges this requirement. The Applicant will work with City Staff to obtain the flow test upon approval of the Concept Plan.

Sincerely,

BERGMANN ASSOCIATES

Paul Furtaw, P.E.

cc: Richard Batt, Redwood
Enclosures