

NEW BUSINESS

- 2011-0216 Request for Revised Conditional Land Use Recommendation (Public Hearing) - City File No. 89-153.9 - Proposed patient tower at the southeast side of the existing Crittenton Hospital Medical Center building, Parcel No. 15-15-101-003, zoned SP, Special Purpose, Crittenton Hospital Medical Center, applicant.
(Reference: Staff Report prepared by James Breuckman, dated May 3, 2011, and Site Plans prepared by Harley Ellis Devereaux had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Monte Oberlee, Crittenton Hospital Medical Center, 1101 University, Rochester, MI 48307; and Ron Herzog, Harley Ellis Devereaux, 26913 Northwestern Hwy., Suite 200, Southfield, MI 48033-3476.

Mr. Anzek advised that Crittenton was proposing an eight-story tower addition, but the initial stage would be six stories. The applicants had identified a slight encroachment in the northeastern portion of the tower that went approximately 25 feet into the play space of the church property. They sought a Variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA), which was granted. There had been three Site Plan reviews, and he recalled that the applicants were in front of the Planning Commission for a discussion at the February 22, 2011 Special Meeting. At the ZBA meeting regarding the Variance, there were some concerns by residents to the south regarding landscaping. Mr. Oberlee had met with the neighbors after the meeting, and he felt that any concerns had been addressed.

Mr. Oberlee reiterated that they were present to seek approval for the eight-story tower addition. There was a component of the building that was eight stories, but the majority of the building would be six at the beginning.

Mr. Herzog stated that most of the information in the Site Plans was a refinement from the previous version. They took comments from various departments in the City and made minor changes. He noted that the fuel tank used to be in the area by the truck turnaround, which became problematic from a structural standpoint and had to be moved. It was now in front of trees on the Rochester Hills side. The air cool chillers, emergency generator and oxygen tanks were still in the same general locations. They refined the wall that blocked the view of those three components; they added bollards at the exit from the building to protect the occupants as they left; and they narrowed the truck turnaround to

maintain the greenery that was already there on the north side of the truck turnaround. They were able to save that. They added some arbor vitae along the berm to block the view from the neighbors to the east, and they added three canopy trees. He noted that they had been able to secure permits from the Building Department for the oxygen tank relocation.

Mr. Oberlee said that while it was not a requirement for the project, they met with the Hidden Hills folks several weeks ago, and told them they would be planting trees along the southern boundary. They were in the process of getting the trees from a place in Fenton and would have 70-80 trees delivered soon. They would work with the Hidden Hills folks as to where to locate the trees. The Hidden Hills residents had agreed to provide watering for the trees because Crittenton's irrigation did not go to the back property line.

Mr. Herzog showed a rendering of the exterior elevation looking north from the south. It showed how the existing building design was integrated into the new patient tower. He noted that it was critical to get the elevator floors in to the eighth floor at this point, in anticipation of the last two floors. He showed the connecting link from the patient tower to the existing tower. There was a green roof planned between the two buildings, which the patients could view from above. He concluded that everything else was the same.

Chairperson Boswell opened the Public Hearing at 7:15 p.m.

Mary Holden, 1090 Willow Grove Ct., Rochester Hills, MI 48307. *Ms. Holden stated that she lived in Hidden Hills, right behind the parking structure put in a few years ago which, she said, was made with a lot of promises. They had been there since 1977, and she indicated that it once was a beautiful area. Today she was having a real problem selling her home. She was turned down two or three times because the wall that was promised did not go far enough, so their view was of the parking lot. There were no trees, and they were told Crittenton would add pine trees, which they did, but they were so far apart they did not do anything for the view. She was concerned that she heard talk about adding trees, but she could only look back at how they let her down when they were supposed to do the wall. It was not supposed to allow them to always look at the parking lot. She hoped they would reconsider and do something more about that, so she would not lose any more real estate value. She stated that it was hard enough to sell anything, and the situation had made it much worse.*

Kay Johnson, 137 N. Alice, Rochester Hills, MI 48307. Ms. Johnson said that she lived at the back corner of the hospital. Her concern was that in 2004/2005, her basement flooded twice, and she wondered where the sewage would dump from the new building. The City was kind enough to put in a large detention pond, but she wondered if the stormwater would come into Rochester or into Rochester Hills. She also was concerned about the trees. Before the retention pond was put in, the back corner was solid woods. They were scrub trees, but she did not see the hospital or have problems with lights from the parking garage. She wondered where the trees would go around the retention pond.

Chairperson Boswell also noted that the Commissioners had received a letter from Rudy Ziehl of Hidden Hills, which spoke mainly about the trees for the south side. Chairperson Boswell advised that the letter would be entered into the Minutes and placed on file.

Chairperson Boswell closed the Public Hearing at 7:18 p.m. He said there appeared to be concerns about the trees on the eastern side.

Mr. Oberlee reiterated that they had a large truckload of trees coming for the south boundary. He had been at Crittenton eight years, and he did not know about promises about a wall. In the meeting he had with Mr. Ziehl and several others recently, Crittenton committed to buying a lot of trees and to working with the neighbors to figure out exactly where they wanted them planted. The trees would be five to six feet high, and they planned to put some around the retention pond. He said there was a question about the stormwater in the back, and he said that it was the City of Rochester that initiated the retention pond project. While the hospital agreed to let them have the land for that, it was their project. The hospital put over \$1 million into that work as well. The fact that there were not trees replaced around the back was something that came up during the Rochester meetings, when Crittenton received Site Plan Approval. They told the residents that they were getting trees, and that they would put some around the pond. It was this year's commitment to trees, and they would monitor it.

Chairperson Boswell referred to stormwater runoff, and asked if they were adding impervious surface. Mr. Oberlee said they were not. The building's proposed location had mostly all hard surface, so in the calculations, and with the green roof and remaining planting areas, it was a wash. The water was being managed in the new plan the way it currently was.

Ms. Brnabic said that she was glad that Crittenton worked with its neighbors in a timely fashion to try to iron out problems. They had said they were committed to adding trees on the southern side as the budget allowed, but she questioned if they could project a timeframe. Mr. Oberlee said that all he could not say was when the truck delivery would happen, but the trees were ordered. It would be any time, and there would be three different kinds of pine trees to get a more natural look.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that in the three or so times that Crittenton had been before the Commission, there were issues with the back lot. He asked if Crittenton would be willing to make the delivery of the trees a condition of approval. Mr. Oberlee said he would resist that, because it really had nothing to do with the project. He felt that they were working really hard to be reasonable neighbors. When there was a public meeting, issues came up, and they heard about them then. He had given his card to at least a dozen people in the complex, and invited them to call with any issues. He thought tying the trees to the project would be counter to what they had said from the beginning - that they would work with the neighbors.

Mr. Kaltsounis added that he felt the process of bringing the applicants to the Planning Commission early made it a lot nicer. They ironed out a lot at the beginning. They had concerns, but Crittenton did a good job of moving along and taking care of things. Hearing no further discussion, he moved the following motion:

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Brnabic, in the matter of City File No. 89-153.9(Crittenton Hospital Medical Center South Tower Addition), the Planning Commission **recommends** to City Council **Approval** of the **Revised Conditional Land Use**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on April 15, 2011, with the following seven (7) findings.

Findings

1. The proposed Tower addition and other necessary site improvements meet or exceed the standards of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The existing and expanded 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 hospital, the general vicinity, adjacent uses of land, the natural environment, and the capacity of

public services and facilities affected by the land use.

4. *The proposal should have a positive impact on the community as a whole and the surrounding area by further meeting the medical needs of people in the area.*
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.*

Chairperson Boswell said that the applicants mentioned bringing in plans on April 28, 2011. He asked if the date in the motion should change. Mr. Anzek said that it was the electronic plans that were brought in on April 28.

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

Aye 6 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis and Reece

Absent 3 - Hetrick, Schroeder and Yukon

2011-0046

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 89-153.9 - Proposed South Tower, Crittenton Hospital Medical Center, applicant.

MOTION *by Kaltsounis, seconded by Dettloff, in the matter of City File No. 89-153.9 (Crittenton Hospital Medical Center South Tower Addition), the Planning Commission **approves** the **Revised Site Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on April 15, 2011, with the following findings and subject to the following six (6) findings and eight (8) conditions.*

Findings

1. *The revised 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 addition will be accessed by existing driveways, thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets. Walkways have been incorporated to promote safety and convenience of pedestrian traffic.*

3. *Off-street parking areas have been designed to avoid common traffic problems and promote safety.*
4. *Because of the design and landscaping, 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 nor an injurious effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the site or those of the surrounding area.*
6. *The improvements will allow Crittenton Hospital to expand the valuable services it provides to the community.*

Conditions

1. *City Council approval of the Revised Conditional Land Use.*
2. *Tree Protection Fencing must be installed, inspected, and approved by the City Staff prior to issuance of the Land Improvement Permit for this development.*
3. *Provide a landscape bond for replacement trees in the amount of \$34,296.45 prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit for this development.*
4. *Appropriate approvals from the Oakland County Water Resources Commissioner must be obtained prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit for this project.*
5. *Address comments from Public Services memo dated April 25, 2011 prior to Construction Plan Approval.*
6. *Address comments from Fire Department memo dated April 26, 2011 prior to Construction Plan Approval.*
7. *Provide Legal Description on Site Plan, per Assessing Dept. memo dated March 29, 2011.*
8. *Motion by Kaltsounis, seconded by Branbic, to change the date to April 28, 2011 for the two previous motions.*

After conferring with Ms. Gentry, Mr. Anzek advised that the April 28, 2011 date for receiving the plans was correct. There were some minor changes made that included the bollards the Fire Department requested. He suggested a motion to reflect the corrected date, and the motion sent to Council would reflect the April 28 date. Chairperson Boswell clarified that Condition six for the Fire Department was still valid, and Mr. Anzek advised that there were still some minor things to address.

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Brnabic, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission approves changing the dates for plans dated received in the two previous motions for Crittenton Hospital Medical

Center from April 15 to April 28, 2011, which will be forwarded to City Council as such.

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

Aye 6 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis and Reece

Absent 3 - Hetrick, Schroeder and Yukon

Chairperson Boswell stated for the record that the motions had passed unanimously and he wished the applicants good luck.

2011-0099 Request for Conditional Land Use Recommendation (Public Hearing) - City File No. 73-175.2 - to construct two drive-throughs along with the proposed demo and rebuild of the existing McDonald's on Rochester Road, north of Avon, Parcel No. 15-15-476-020, zoned B-2, General Business, Frank Martin, Dorchen/Martin Associates, Inc., applicant.

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by James Breuckman, dated May 3, 2011 and Site Plans, prepared by Frank Martin, had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant was Frank Martin, Dorchen/Martin Associates, Inc., 29895 Greenfield Rd., Suite 107, Southfield, MI 48076 ; Michael Kazarian, Construction Manager at McDonald's, 1021 Karl Greimel Dr., Brighton, MI 48116; and William Saputo, owner of McDonald's at 808 S. Rochester Rd., Rochester Hills, MI 48307.

Mr. Breuckman stated that there were four requests. He recalled that the applicant had been before the Commission once to hear about any issues, and he thought it would be best to let them talk about what they had done, where they were at and to respond to some of the issues from a month ago.

Mr. Martin noted the great feedback they received from the Commission when they were before them last month. In getting that feedback, they believed they addressed all of the items the Commissioners brought up. He pointed out a small change to the Buffer Modification motion. The Staff Report mentioned that on the south side there was 1.5 feet of landscape, but it should have been 3.75 feet. He indicated that they were anxious to move forward. The construction plans were in to Engineering, and they also had plans into the Building Department for review. They believed that they had been sensitive to the items brought up by Staff, including the pathway in front and in maintaining clearances. They were still going to provide easements for the walkway.