

## NEW BUSINESS

**2024-0604** Request for Preliminary One Family Residential Detached Condominium Recommendation for the Cambridge Knoll Condominium development, a proposed development of sixteen (16) detached single family residences on approximately 4.7 acres of land located at 165 and 185 E. Avon Rd., Parcel Nos. 15-14-351-020 and 15-14-351-058, located on the north side of Avon Rd. and east of Rochester Rd., zoned R-3 One Family Residential with the MR Mixed Residential Overlay; Mark Gesuale, Wolverine Building Company, Applicant *(Staff Report dated 12-10-24, Reviewed Plans, PEA letter of 10-28-24, Nunez Design letter of 10-28-24, Environmental Impact Statement, Development Application, Streets Review dated 11-25-24, WRC letter dated 7-12-24, and Public Meeting Notice had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)*

*Present for the Applicant were Mark Gesuale, Wolverine Building Company, Jim Polyzois, and Ralph Nunez, Nunez Design.*

*Chairperson Brnabic introduced this item noting that it is a proposed development of 16 detached single family residences on approximately 4.7 acres of land located at 165 and 180 E. Avon Roads, north of Avon and east of Rochester Road, zoned R-3 One Family Residential with the MR Mixed Residential overlay. She invited the applicants to the presenters' table.*

*Ms. Roediger noted that she would be filling in for Mr. McLeod as he was traveling and unable to get back in time. She commented that she made this presentation four years ago when Cambridge Knoll first came to the community, and it is a project that she is very familiar with. She explained that the request is for a single family condominium development on five acres on the north side of Avon, just east of Rochester Road, and displayed an aerial that referenced the development as it related to the surrounding neighborhoods. She pointed out that this site and the site to the west and south all have the MR overlay, which allows for some diversity in housing products and perhaps internal smaller setbacks but larger external setbacks along the periphery of the property.*

*She added that the MR overlay tries to provide a diversity of housing stock options within the community without increasing density, keeping density similar to the surrounding neighborhoods. She mentioned that they are around 2,000 square feet with a price range starting in the mid-\$500s. She commented that this seems to be how all housing starts out as and people can go up as much as they like. She stated that they are proposing a unique exercise path for the community instead of a community square, and it is almost a linear park along the property's edge that allows for some gathering area and for some community health within the neighborhood.*

*She noted the MR overlay requires a minimum of 10 acres of land to develop, but it also allows the Planning Commission to modify or allow a variance from that requirement if they believe that the development is appropriate with the surrounding uses and meets all of the standards for conditional uses. She*

*noted that staff feels that because the site has single family uses around it and more intense uses closer to Rochester Road, this is a great transitional use between the traditional single family neighborhoods and Rochester Road. She pointed out that there is technically a green belt landscape modification request. However, they are short three deciduous trees, but are over on their evergreen trees, having more trees that required. She noted that this was actually a conscious decision when the development came before the Commission previously, as those trees are meant to be a buffering and screening and were placed intentionally where the road tees to block some backyards from headlights. She mentioned that the plan provides a potential connection to the west, if that property were to ever redevelop, to continue the flow naturally onto that property in the future.*

*Ms. Roediger explained that the elevations are consistent with the other developments that Mr. Polyzois' team has developed in the community, which are very heavy on masonry and brick elevations. She mentioned that she is aware of the discussion regarding the need for ranch style homes, and believes that these are all meant to be ranch units with perhaps an option for an upper story if desired. She commented that this is a lot of what has been discussed with the Planning Commission, in not providing the 4,000 square foot homes and moving toward the 2,000 square foot single story home. She stated that relative to landscaping, Mr. Nunez has worked with the community and knows the City's ordinances in terms of what is required. She pointed out where the landscape modification is requested to replace deciduous trees with evergreen trees to help buffer backyards.*

*She stated that the plan is substantially the same as it was four years ago, and noted that Mr. Polyzois had gotten pretty far down the line in terms of getting permits before the plan expired. She added that the plan modifications are because of updated stormwater requirements and other engineering and agency changes.*

*Mr. Nunez noted that the slight modifications to the previous plan included an additional fire hydrant and three crosswalks. He mentioned that the biggest hurdle was the increase to retaining 40 percent of the current trees and the tree survey had been redone because of the age of the project along with the death of a few trees which succumbed to natural causes. He added that the "wellness walk" was created to allow people to walk for exercise and noted that four-times around the development is one mile; and there is exercise equipment appropriate for seniors to allow them to sit and talk, exercise, and stretch along the way. He noted that there was a request from Planning to move mailboxes that were toward the front of the development farther in to minimize any conflict with traffic.*

*Chairperson Brnabic noted that the Commission did receive a couple of letters from Terry and DiAnn Ralston, 180 E. Avon Road. She commented that she knew that they had a concern in 2020 with headlights, and had assumed that there had been a resolution. She noted that looking at the emails, it does not look like there is a resolution.*

*Mr. Polyzois responded that they met at their house several times previously*

*and proposed arborvitaes, and these are depicted on the plan.*

*Ms. Roediger noted that she, the applicant, and engineering had been at the property multiple times after the original approval to try to determine the best way to screen their home from the private road. She commented that she thinks the applicant has proposed to screen as much as possible as the site will allow. She stated that they actually have a double entrance driveway where the road comes out, and while it was suggested to close one of the drives to allow for screening, the owners are not in favor of closing any of their driveway. She explained that the proposal is to put in giant arborvitaes to provide screening from the front windows of the home. She noted that it is just a matter of getting agreement from the homeowners, which has been something that the applicant has been diligently working toward.*

*Mr. Polyzois added that leading up to satisfying all of the conditions for permits, he reached out to the homeowners and copied the Planning Department so they understood that he was making the effort and trying to engage them early on to install screening before any work was done; however, he could never get a response. He stated that when the time comes, they will install it.*

*Chairperson Brnabic stated that it seems that the Department has been out, the applicant has been out, and they have reached out to the homeowners with emails; and the letter received is not telling the same story.*

*Mr. Nunez confirmed that they had been out to the site and surveyed it, and he noted where the vegetation would be planted. He pointed out that they originally wanted the berm that is planted illegally in the right-of-way further west and was done without permission; and engineering told them that they cannot do that. He noted that they researched the giant arborvitaes and stated that they grow between three to five feet per year; and in two years' time they would be tall enough to screen the whole area.*

*Chairperson Brnabic stated that it seems that everyone has reached out and tried to come to the best reasonable solution; and she commented that she is comfortable because she knows that they have been working with these people several years ago and have reached out multiple times.*

*Mr. Polyzois responded that he wanted to plant first to avoid any hassle or aggravation during construction, but could never get a response to his emails.*

*Ms. Roediger confirmed that she has been in contact with the homeowners a number of times and they are just not happy with the development. She commented that in terms of a solution, she is not sure that there is any alternative that could be done.*

*Chairperson Brnabic noted that she had one speaker card, and invited Nandakumar Mohanappa Lotlekar to speak.*

*Mr. Lotlekar, 888 Hadley Road, noted that the public hearing notice states that 33 regulated trees would be removed and asked if any of the trees on his property will be removed for the development. He expressed concern over the*

wildlife on the property and what would happen to them during construction if they would come onto his lot.

Mr. Polyzois responded that they could not cut trees down on other properties. He added that he cannot guard against wildlife moving, and commented that it is nature. He stated that they could come onto his property now.

Mr. Weaver stated that he liked the idea of trying to block off the neighbors across the street, and fully supported planting before starting construction to give them a chance to grow. He asked how the giant arborvitae would tolerate salt. He suggested that there might be a more tolerant shrub to use as a buffer to the arborvitae.

Mr. Nunez noted that the proposed plantings are behind the existing shrubs, which are in the right-of-way. He noted that this was the intention working with engineering.

Mr. Weaver questioned the mailboxes, and asked if there might be individuals blocking the road if they all came home from work at the same time. He commented that he did not see it as a big problem, but was just an observation.

Mr. Nunez responded that the idea is to get people out of their cars to walk. He noted that it was about 30 feet from the future right-of-way and thought it was a good location.

Mr. Struzik asked how big the average condominium will be. He asked if they were the same group that developed Berkshire Ridge.

Mr. Polyzois responded that there are two architectural plans, one at 1,854 square feet and one at 1,992 square feet. He noted that they did not have involvement with Berkshire Ridge; however they developed Brampton Park, Crestwyk Estates, and Sanctuary at River's Edge.

Mr. Struzik noted that this development reminds him a lot of Berkshire Ridge near his home, and stated that the larger ranch is a housing option in demand. He commented that he loves the walking path and dedicated pedestrian infrastructure that is not alongside the vehicle infrastructure, and stated that it will make the community unique. He noted that he would love to see the connecting road utilized at some point if the property to the west redevelops in a similar fashion.

Ms. Denstaedt stated that she had read some of the minutes from the last meetings, and commented that they had the opportunity to talk to the neighbors. She asked if anything was sent back out about the fact that they were coming back.

Mr. Polyzois responded that he did not go to the neighbors this time around as the plan did not really change from what he had before and he had dropped off letters last time.

Ms. Denstaedt asked what the work hours would be for construction.

*Mr. Polyzois responded that they would be standard working hours and there would not be pounding hammers on Sunday or early Saturday morning. He added that it is difficult to get workers to come on weekends and he does not anticipate much weekend work.*

*Ms. Denstaedt stated that she loved what she saw, and commented that the Commission just had a Master Plan worksession and talked about connectivity, exercise and health.*

*Mr. Dettloff commented that the Commission thought it was a great project in 2020 and continues to do so, and he thanked the applicants for their commitment and investment in the City.*

*Mr. Hetrick stated that the plan has been substantially unchanged from the last time it was approved in Planning Commission and City Council, and noted that screening for the neighbors was included in the approved plan last time. He stated that it was supported then by the Commission and Council and he sees no reason to not support it today.*

*Mr. Struzik moved the motion in the packet to recommend approval of the preliminary condominium plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hooper.*

*After calling for a roll call vote, Chairperson Brnabic noted that the motion passed unanimously.*

*Mr. Struzik moved the motion in the packet for granting the tree removal permit. Mr. Hooper seconded the motion.*

*After calling for a voice vote, Chairperson Brnabic announced that this motion passed unanimously. She congratulated the applicants.*

**A motion was made by Struzik, 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, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

**Excused** 1 - Neubauer

**Resolved**, in the matter of City File No. PSC2024-0002 Cambridge Knoll Condominium, the Planning Commission recommends approval of the Preliminary One Family Residential Detached Condominium Plan, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on November 4, 2024, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions.

**Findings**

1. The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that the proposed development will promote the intent and purpose of the ordinance, as well as other City Ordinances, standards, and requirements; and those requirements can be met with the exception of the acceptable modifications shown below and subject to the conditions listed below.
2. The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that the proposed development

will be designed, constructed, operated, maintained and managed so as to be compatible, harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing or planned character of the general vicinity, adjacent uses of land, the natural environment, the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the land use, and the community as a whole. The proposed project will be accessed from Avon Road, thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjacent roadways. The preliminary plan represents a reasonable street, building and lot layout and orientation.

3. The development will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as major roadways, streets, police and fire protection, drainageways, refuse disposal, and utilities.

4. The proposed development will not be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to existing or future neighboring uses, persons, property or the public welfare.

5. The proposed development will not create additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services that will be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.

6. The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development onsite as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity and act as a transitional use from the nonresidential development to the west and the residential development to the east.

7. The proposed modification to the landscape buffer required along the eastern property line has been found acceptable since the number of evergreen trees proposed, which are in excess of the ordinance requirements, exceeds the number of deciduous trees that are deficient and the resultant effective screening will be greater than the Zoning Ordinance requirements.

8. The proposed reduction in the required amount of land area to utilize the MR Mixed Residential Overlay District has been found acceptable due to the limited number of units and overall consistency of land use to the east and the presence of nonresidential uses to the west, which allows the MR Mixed Residential Overlay District to be utilized as a logical transition of land uses.

### **Conditions**

1. Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, including the Fire Department Streets review, prior to final detached condominium approval.

2. Provide a landscape bond in the amount of \$92,738, plus the cost of inspection fees, as adjusted by staff as necessary, prior to the preconstruction meeting with Engineering.

### **2024-0605**

Request for Tree Removal Permit Approval to remove 33 regulated trees and 17 specimen trees, and to provide 59 required replacement trees on site and to pay the remaining 67 required replacement trees into the City's Tree Fund for the Cambridge Knoll Condominium development, a proposed development of sixteen (16) detached single family residences on approximately 4.7 acres of land located at 165 and 185 E. Avon Rd., Parcel Nos. 15-14-351-020 and 15-14-351-058, located on the north side of Avon Rd. and east of Rochester Rd., zoned R-3 One Family Residential with the MR Mixed Residential Overlay; Mark Gesuale, Wolverine Building Company, Applicant

**See Legislative File 2024-0605 for Discussion.**

**A motion was made by Struzik, seconded by Hooper, that this matter be Granted.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

**Excused** 1 - Neubauer

**Resolved**, in the matter of File No. PTP2024-0006) (Cambridge Knoll Condominium Tree Removal Permit) the Planning Commission grants a Tree Removal Permit (PTP2024-0006),

based on plans received by the Planning Department on November 4, 2024, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions:

**Findings**

1. The proposed removal and replacement of regulated trees is in conformance with the City's Tree Conservation Ordinance.
2. The applicant is proposing to remove 33 regulated trees and 17 specimen trees, and provide 59 replacement trees onsite, with the remaining trees to be paid into the City's Tree Fund.
3. The applicant has increased the size of plantings in certain areas of the site to reduce the number of replacement trees required and to provide additional plantings and screening onsite above and beyond ordinance requirements.

**Conditions**

1. Tree protective fencing, as reviewed and approved by the City staff, shall be installed prior to temporary grade being issued by Engineering.
2. Provide payment, equal to the current required fee for replacement trees, along with any additional fees associated with such, into the City's Tree Fund for the remaining 67 trees identified on the site plan.