PUBLIC NOTICE
CITY OF BERKLEY, MICHIGAN
REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Tuesday, October 26, 2021
7:00PM — City Hall Council Chambers
Information: 248-658-3320

CALL TO ORDER
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
ROLL CALL
APPROVAL OF AGENDA
APPROVAL OF MINUTES — Meeting minutes of September 28, 2021
COMMUNICATIONS
CITIZEN COMMENTS

OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS


3. **PUBLIC HEARING**: Matter of holding a public hearing for the Berkley Master Plan.

4. **MASTER PLAN**: Planning Commission to make a recommendation to City Council regarding the Master Plan.

LIAISON REPORTS
COMMISSIONER / STAFF COMMENTS
ADJOURN

Notice: Official Minutes of the City Planning Commission are stored and available for review at the office of the City Clerk. If you would like to attend the electronic Planning Commission meeting, follow the link below or call the telephone number.

Join Zoom Meeting: [https://berkleymich.zoom.us/j/93323204434](https://berkleymich.zoom.us/j/93323204434)
Dial by Phone: 1-312-626-6799
Meeting ID: 933 2320 4434
The minutes from this meeting are in summary form capturing the actions taken on each agenda item. To view the meeting discussions in their entirety, this meeting is broadcasted on the city’s government access channel, WBRK, every day at 9AM and 9PM. The video can also be seen, on-demand, on the city’s YouTube channel: https://www.youtube.com/user/cityofberkley.

PRESENT: Joe Bartus
            Lisa Kempner
            Mark Richardson
            Julie Stearn
            Shiloh Dahlin
            Greg Patterson
            Martin Smith
            Kristen Kapelanski

ABSENT: Daniel Petrosky

ALSO, PRESENT: Molly Patterson, 26736 Wyoming, Huntington Woods
            Nick Appleyard, 26736 Wyoming, Huntington Woods
            Ken Moreland, Architect
            Mike McGuinness, Berkley Downtown Development Authority
            Erin Schlutow, Community Development Director
            Ross Gavin, City Council Liaison
            Daniel Hill, Public Policy Assistant
            Other members of the public

Motion by Commissioner Richardson to excuse the absence of Commissioner Petrosky due to a scheduled conflict. Motion supported by Commissioner Patterson.

AYES: Dahlin, Kempner, Patterson, Richardson, Smith, Stearn, Bartus, Kapelanski
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Petrosky

* * * * * * * *

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion by Commissioner Kempner to approve the agenda. Motion supported by Commissioner Richardson.

AYES: Kempner, Patterson, Richardson, Smith, Stearn, Bartus, Dahlin, Kapelanski
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Petrosky

* * * * * * * *

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Commissioner Patterson to approve the minutes from the regular Planning Commission meeting on August 24, 2021 and supported by Commissioner Stearn.

AYES: Patterson, Richardson, Smith, Stearn, Bartus, Dahlin, Kempner, Kapelanski
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Petrosky
COMMUNICATIONS
City staff provided copies of Planning and Zoning News and a report from the Road Commission of Oakland County, as well as communications related to agenda items and the DDA flyer promoting BOO!KLEY Nights.

CITIZEN COMMENTS
Chair Kapelanski read instructions for public to submit comments during the hybrid meeting. Comments can be made in person and via Zoom.

None.

OLD BUSINESS
None

NEW BUSINESS
1. SP-01-21: 2717 Coolidge Hwy – Façade Change: Nick Appleyard, owner, is proposing a façade change to the existing building at 2717 Coolidge Hwy.

   Community Development Director Schlutow summarized the September 21, 2021 review letter, noting the proposed façade changes to the building. Director Schlutow also summarized the review letters submitted by DPW and DDA. Engineering review by HRC is not required for this project.

   Nick Appleyard, owner, provided color samples to the Planning Commission and explained that they are proposing a brick exterior because it is believed that that is the materials that is currently behind the existing siding.

   Commissioners discussed the proposed exterior changes with the window coverage. It was noted the changes and increased window coverage will be a vast improvement to what is currently on site. Commissioners noted that the window coverage did not meet the minimum coverage requirement by ordinance, but the Planning Commission does have the authority to modify the window coverage requirement, if deemed appropriate. Commissioners were comfortable allowing the proposed window coverage, as it is closer to the minimum 40% coverage than what is currently in place.

   Commissioners discussed the parking requirement, as well as potential for closing the access driveway to make the area safer for motorists and pedestrians.

   Commissioner Patterson motioned to conditionally approve SP-01-21, façade change at 2717 Coolidge Hwy. The Planning Commission determined that the window coverage was acceptable, as well as the proposed color and façade materials.
Conditions to be met, as noted in the staff reports provided by Community Development and the Department of Public Works.

Motion supported by Commissioner Stearn.

AYES: Smith, Stearn, Bartus, Dahlin, Kempner, Patterson, Richardson, Kapelanski
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Petrosky

2. **Master Plan:** Reviewing comments received during required 63-day public comment period.

Community Development Director Schlutow provided a summary of the comments received from neighboring communities, reviewing agencies, Oakland County, RCOC, and Berkley residents.

Director Schlutow also highlighted some of the themes that were received and discussed with the Planning Commission.

The Planning Commission advised staff to provide more detail about the process that would be required for a type of project like the conceptual Greenfield multi-family development, as well as the scale of the structures in keeping with the single-family residential neighborhood.

Chair Kapelanski asked if there were any members of the public who wanted to comment on this agenda item.

William Seaman, 3461 Ellwood, noted that he bought his house in 1972 and that since then, Commissioners have tried to change it. He stated that he would not be happy with a three-story building behind his house. He said that there were apartments nearby.

Joel Ulferts noted his agreement with the wording changes related to the conceptual design on Greenfield. He stated he was concerned about expanding uses in the Coolidge District on the Future Land Use Map.

Director Schlutow provided a summary of the differences between a Zoning Map and Future Land Use Map, as well as a conceptual design and a proposed site plan.

Commissioners noted four items to address in the draft text and clarify language related to the following:
1. Provide detail about the process that would be required for a potential multi-family development on Greenfield Rd, similar to the conceptual plan
2. Add context to the conceptual plan on the desire to keep the residential scale on Ellwood by height and site design
3. Review the document for should v. shall v. may language
4. Provide more information on what will occur during Implementation Stage; specifically, the point for discussions for ordinance amendments for parking, land uses, landscaping, etc.

Commissioners felt comfortable directing staff to make those changes and bring back the updated text at the next month’s meeting.

Motion by Commission Kempner to set the Public Hearing for the draft Master Plan, with the changes noted above. Motion supported by Commissioner Richardson.

AYES: Stearn, Bartus, Dahlin, Kempner, Patterson, Richardson, Smith, Kapelanski
LIAISON REPORTS

Commissioner Kempner attended the DDA meeting and stated that they did not have a quorum. She provided updates on the month’s activities, including Restaurant Weekend, the Night Market, holiday window displays in the DDA, movie nights, Ladies Night Out, Trick-or-Treat Stroll, and Monster Mash.

Commissioner Richardson noted the Environmental Advisory Committee met. They are down two members and another member will be vacating their seat. The Committee received an informal request from City Council for a Sustainability Plan. The intent will include stormwater management, green infrastructure, site design.

STAFF/COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioner Kempner noted that the Ordinance stipulates that a façade change requires a site plan review. She stated that she doesn’t think that is the intent to require a full site plan review for a façade change, so we might want amend for a façade review.

Commissioner Kempner said she attended a training session about parking and how to figure out the required parking for your area. That would require a parking study for your area and not to rely on the books, manuals, or neighboring communities.

Community Development Director Schlutow provided an update about the expansion of temporary outdoor dining, and the intent to look at outdoor dining ordinances, as well as looking at the possibility of permanently closing Griffith at Twelve Mile for a public plaza.

Director Schlutow provided an update on the Vinsetta Garage parking lots, as well as other development projects that will be coming to the Commission in the next couple of months.

Commissioner Smith stated that he had a nice conversation with a few members of City Council and the City Manager about the recent decision to overturn the ZBA decision. He noted that he does not agree with the decision that was made, but the City Council made the decision and it is to be respected.

City Councilmember Gavin appreciated Commissioner Smith’s comments.

Commissioner Richardson likened the decision to the decision and lawsuit related to Vinsetta Garage. He noted that in some respects commissioners are advisors and the elected officials are the decision makers.

Motion to adjourn by Commissioner Richardson. Motion supported by Commissioner Dahlin.

AYES: Bartus, Dahlin, Kempner, Patterson, Richardson, Smith, Stearn, Kapelanski
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Petrosky

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:36pm.
APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW

NOTICE TO APPLICANT: Applications for Site Plan review by the Planning Commission must be submitted to the City of Berkley Building Department in *substantially complete form* at least 30 days prior to the Planning Commission's meeting at which the application will be considered. The application must be accompanied by the data specified in the Zoning Ordinance, including fully dimensioned site plans, plus the required review fees.

The Planning Commission meets the fourth Tuesday of the month at 7:00pm in the Council Chambers at the City of Berkley City Hall, 3338 Coolidge Hwy, Berkley, MI 48072.

---

**TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT:**

I (We), the undersigned, do hereby respectfully request Site Plan Review and provide the following information to assist in the review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>Green Medical Office Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>T. Fought &amp; Assos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
<td>24045 Woodland Dr., Southfield, MI 48034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>248.514.7812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tfoughtarchitectllc@gmail.com">tfoughtarchitectllc@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner(s), if different from Applicant:</td>
<td>2400 Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
<td>1359 Davis Ave, Birmingham, MI 48009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>248.540.8017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:primemanagement@tir.com">primemanagement@tir.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applicant's Legal Interest in Property:** Ownership

---

**LOCATION OF PROPERTY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address:</th>
<th>2400 Greenfield Rd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nearest Cross Streets:</td>
<td>Cataipa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidwell Number(s):</td>
<td>25-18-301-031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated 02.21.2021
PROPERTY DESCRIPTION:

Provide lot numbers and subdivision: Thomas Park Lots 13, 14 & 15

Property Size (Square Feet): 19,950

EXISTING ZONING DISTRICT (please check):

- R-1A
- Local Business
- Coolidge
- R-1B
- Office
- Downtown
- R-1C
- Community Centerpiece
- Industrial
- R-1D
- Woodward
- Cemetery
- RM
- Eleven Mile
- Parking
- RMH
- Twelve Mile

Present Use of Property:
Vacant Land

Proposed Use of Property:
Office

Is the property located within the Downtown Development Authority?  □ Yes  □ No

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Construct a (6) unit office building. (4) Units approx 600 sq. ft. (2) units approx 1200 sq. ft.

Does the proposed project / use of property require Special Land Use approval?  □ Yes  □ No

Does the proposed project require Variance(s) from the Zoning Board of Appeals?  □ Yes  □ No

If yes, please describe Variances required:

Updated 02.21.2021
PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING CHART:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Development</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Gross Floor Area</th>
<th>Number of Parking Spaces On Site</th>
<th>Number of Employees on Largest Shift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attached Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4754</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFESSIONALS WHO PREPARED PLANS:

A. Name: Timothy Fought
   Mailing Address: 24045 Woodland Dr. Southfield, MI 48034
   Telephone: (248) 514-7612
   Email: tfoughtarchitectlic@gmail.com
   Design Responsibility (engineer, surveyor, architect, etc.): Architect

B. Name: Orman Engineering / Alex Orman
   Mailing Address: 5476 Vivian Ln. Waterford, MI 48327
   Telephone: 248.682.6001
   Email: alex@ormanengineering.com
   Design Responsibility: Engineering & surveying

SUBMIT THE FOLLOWING:

1. Fifteen (15) individually folded copies of the site plans, measuring 24" x 36", sealed by a registered architect, engineer, or surveyor.
2. A pdf file of the site plans, submitted to the Community Development Director.
3. Proof of property ownership (title insurance policy or registered deed with County stamp).
4. Review comments or approval received from County, State or Federal agencies that have jurisdiction over the project, including, but not limited to:
   - [ ] Road Commission for Oakland County
   - [ ] MI Dept. of Transportation
   - [ ] Oakland County Health Division
   - [ ] MI Dept. of Environment, Great Lakes & Energy

Updated 02.21.2021
PLEASE NOTE: The applicant, or a designated representative, MUST BE PRESENT at all scheduled meetings, or the Site Plan may be tabled due to lack of representation.

Failure to provide true and accurate information on this application shall provide sufficient grounds to deny approval of a Site Plan Application or to revoke any permits granted subsequent to the site plan approval.

We encourage applicants to make a presentation of the proposed project to the Planning Commission and City Council, as appropriate. To assist in this effort, we have available for your use at meetings a projector, laptop computer and screen. This will allow the Planning Commission and audience to be fully engaged so they can give your project the attention it deserves. Planning Commission meetings are recorded and televised.

PROPERTY OWNER'S APPROVAL: (Initial each line)

I hereby authorize the employees and representatives of the City of Berkley to enter upon and conduct an inspection and investigation of the above-referenced property.

APPLICANT'S ENDORSEMENT: (Initial each line)

All information contained therein is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

I acknowledge that the Planning Commission will not review my application unless all information in this application and the Zoning Ordinance has been submitted. I further acknowledge that the City and its employees shall not be held liable for any claims that may arise as a result of acceptance, processing or approval of this site plan application.

I hereby acknowledge that if engineering or other reviews are required, additional fees must be submitted. Should the review fees be greater than the required minimum, sufficient additional charges will be imposed to satisfy the additional review fees. All fee obligations must be satisfied prior to permit approval.

If an application is withdrawn more than three (3) weeks prior to the meeting date, 90% of the fee will be refunded. If the application is withdrawn less than three (3) weeks prior to the meeting, no refund will be given.
Signature of Applicant

Date

Applicant Name (Print)

8/25/21

Signature of Applicant

Date

Applicant Name (Print)

DAN WINTHAL - TRUSTEE FOR 2400 TRUST

8/25/21

Signature of Property Owner Authorizing this Application

Date

Property Owner Name (Print)

OFFICE USE ONLY

Received 8.26.21, Receipt # Meeting Date Case # PSP-02-21

Fees: Site Plan Review $300 Façade Change: $200 Revision: $100

Engineering TBD

Updated 02.21.2021
QUIT CLAIM DEED

The Grantor(s), William J. Winter

whose address is, 1359 Davis Ave. Birmingham MI 48009

quit claims to 2400 Trust

whose address is 1359 Davis Ave. Birmingham MI 48009

the following described premises situated in the City of Berkley, County of Oakland and State of Michigan:

Lots 13, 14 and 15, THOMAS PARK SUBDIVISION, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Liber 29 of Plats, Page 19, Oakland County Records.

also known as Property Address: 2400 Greenfield Road, Berkley, MI 48072

Sidwell No. 04-25-18-301-031

for the sum of $1.00 EXEMPT UNDER MCL207.505 (5)a & MCL207.526 (6)a.

Dated this 15th day of January, 2021.

Signed by:

William J. Winter

State of Michigan
County of Oakland

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 15th day of January, 2021, by William J. Winter.

Notary Public,
Acting in Oakland County, Michigan
My commission expires: 06/25/2024

When Recorded Return To: 2400 Trust
1359 Davis Ave.
Birmingham, MI 48009-2075

Send Subsequent Tax Bills To: Grantee

Drafted By: William J. Winter
1359 Davis Ave.
Birmingham, MI 48009-2075

Tax Parcel # 04-25-18-301-031
Recording Fee $
Transfer Tax
Know what's below. Call before you dig.
O.C.R.C. NOTES

A SEPARATE PERMIT IS REQUIRED FOR ALL UNDERGROUND UTILITIES WITHIN THE EXISTING R.O.W.

LANE CLOSURES RESTRICTED TO 9 AM MINS. - 5 PM.

PROPER SIGNING REQUIRED BEFORE ANY WORK IN R.O.W. IS STARTED.

PLACE OBJECTS AT MINIMUM 6 FEET OFF BACK OF CURB OR 12 FEET OFF EDGE OF PAVMENT.

KEEP WORK AREA CLEAN OF DIRT AND DEBRIS.

REPLACE OR RELOCATE ALL UTILITIES.

ADJUST / RECONSTRUCT EXISTING STRUCTURE AS WARRANTED.

FULL DEPTH SAWCUT AND MILL A BUTT JOINT WITH LOCATION/WIDTH AS DIRECTED BY RCOC INSPECTOR.

MATCH AND TIE PROPOSED CURB TO EXITING CURB EPOXY COATED.

#4 BAR REQUIRED.

ANY PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH CURRENT AMERICAN DISABILITIES ACT (A.D.A.) GUIDELINES.

EXCAVATIONS WITHIN A 1:1 INFLUENCE OF THE R.O.W. WILL REQUIRE M.D.O.T. CLASS II BACKFILL COMPACTED TO 95% MAXIMUM DENSITY.
### Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Catalog Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lamp</th>
<th>Light Loss Factor</th>
<th>Wattage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MINW-LED</td>
<td>MINW-LED01-12W-11W</td>
<td>L1 @ 7'</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lithonia</td>
<td>WDGE1 LED P1 40K 80CRI VW</td>
<td>L2 @ 8.25'</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Avg/Min</th>
<th>Max/Min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade @ 0'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.2 fc</td>
<td>11.2 fc</td>
<td>0.0 fc</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

1. SEE SCHEDULE FOR LUMinaire MOUNTING HEIGHT.
2. CALCULATIONS ARE SHOWN IN FOOTCANDLES AT: 0' - 0".
3. LIGHTING CALCULATIONS REQUIRE NEW PHOTOGRAPHIC CALCULATION AND RESUBMISSION TO CITY FOR APPROVAL.
4. MOUNTING HEIGHTS ARE BASED ON GRADE TO FACE OF FIXTURE.

**General Note:**

- The manufacturer and/or architect must determine applicability of the layout to existing or future field conditions. This lighting layout represents illumination levels calculated from laboratory data shown under controlled conditions in accordance with the Illuminating Engineering Society approved methods. Actual performance of any manufacturer's luminaire may vary due to variations in electrical, voltage, distance in lumens, and other variables field conditions. Mounting heights indicated are from grade and/or floor level.

- These lighting calculations are not a substitute for independent engineering analyses of lighting system suitability and safety. The manufacturer and/or architect is responsible for criteria for minimum lighting. Lighting systems must comply with the latest IESNEC standards and local codes.

- Unless exempt, projects must comply with Title 24 regulations outlined in ASHRAE 68.1 2013. For specific information contact a SEI CERTIFIED GROUP at ASHRAE.COM or 734-524-4700.

- For ordering information contact Gasser Bush at QUOTES@GASSERBUSH.COM or 734-366-6700.

- This drawing was generated from an electronic image for estimation purposes only. Layout to be verified in field by contractor.

- Mounting height is measured from grade to face of fixture. Pole height should be calculated as the mounting height less base height.
MEMORANDUM

To: Berkley Planning Commission

From: Erin Schlutow, Community Development Director

Subject: PSP-02-21; 2400 Greenfield – Green Medical Office Center
Construction of new multi-unit office building

Date: October 14, 2021

The applicant, T. Fought & Associates, on behalf of 2400 Trust, is proposing to construct a 4,754 sq. ft. multi-tenant medical office building at 2400 Greenfield Rd, that will include six (6) new medical offices, ranging in size from 564 sq. ft. to 1,200 sq. ft. The existing site is vacant, greenspace area, as noted in the below image.

The property is located on Greenfield Rd., between Oxford and Catalpa. The proposed development will include the construction of the new office building, parking area, dumpster enclosure, redi-wall concrete panels, bike rack, landscaping, and stormwater maintenance.

The subject site is zoned Greenfield District. Professional offices for medical (doctors, osteopaths, chiropractors, psychologists, and psychiatrists) dental and optical, and other similar allied professions are permitted by right in the Greenfield District.

The applicant has noted that the proposed medical office use is not a medical clinic, that would include outpatient and urgent care. If that changes, special land use approval will be required prior to occupancy.

The review and analysis for the proposed medical office includes the land uses, noted above. Other office uses, such as dental, lawyer, engineer, or other similar professions are permitted in the Greenfield District. However, those uses require a different parking standard that has not been considered as part of this site plan application and review.
Zoning / Land Use
The surrounding properties include single family residential, Greenfield Presbyterian Church, and Catalpa Oaks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Occupant</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zoning District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Site</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Greenspace</td>
<td>Greenfield District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>Greenfield District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>R-1D, Single Family Residential District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Greenfield Presbyterian Church &amp; parking lot</td>
<td>Church &amp; parking lot</td>
<td>Greenfield District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Catalpa Oaks</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>R-A, Single Family District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background
In 2016, the City of Berkley Planning Commission reviewed and gave conditional approval of a site plan for the development of a 12-unit apartment building at 2400 Greenfield Rd. Per our records, the multi-family project did not complete all necessary requirements for the Building Department to issue a building permit.

On October 5, 2018, the former Community Development Director sent a letter to the owner that the proposed site plan (SP-01-16) at 2400 Greenfield Rd, for the development of a 12-unit apartment building was declared null and void.

Per Sec. 138-684, site plan approval is valid for a period of 12 months after the date of final approval. If building permit is not procured and construction begun within that time, the site plan approval becomes null and void. The Planning Commission has made amendments to this section to allow for applicants to request an extension of the site plan approval, but in 2018, no time extensions to the site plan approval was possible.

The owner is working with a different architect and has redesigned the site to construct a medical office building, and is presented to you for review.

Notice Requirements
Per Sec. 138-399, plans for the development of any principal permitted use, except a single family detached house, shall be approved by the Planning Commission according to site plan review. In addition, notice shall be mailed at least 15 days prior to the meeting date to all property owners within 300 ft. of the property for which the approval is being considered. This meeting notice requirement is specific to the Greenfield District and does not require a public hearing. A public hearing is not included as part of this request.

Review Procedures
The proposed construction of a new multi-tenant medical office building at 2400 Greenfield Rd requires site plan review and approval by the Planning Commission.

The six (6) standards for granting site plan approval are set forth in Section 138-679 of the Zoning Ordinance. We have reviewed the proposal for the multi-tenant medical office building with respect to these standards and offer the following findings:

1. **The site meets the requirements of this Code.**
   The subject site is located within the Greenfield District, which permits professional offices for medical (doctors, osteopaths, chiropractors, psychologists, and psychiatrists) dental and optical, and other similar or allied professionals by right.

   **Setbacks**
   The proposed structure must meet all setback requirements of the Greenfield District, as noted in Sec. 138-397 of the Zoning Ordinance.

   Please note: The setback standards in the Greenfield District differ from other zoning districts, in that the setbacks are dictated by height of the proposed building and the height or type of land use on the adjacent property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If new development is…</th>
<th>And is next to…</th>
<th>Then required separation is at least</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A building 30 ft or less in height</td>
<td>A single family house</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A parking lot</td>
<td>Any type of building</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A building between 31 and 40 feet in height</td>
<td>A single family house</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A building between 31 and 40 feet in height</td>
<td>A building between 31 and 40 feet in height</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   The above setback requirements do not stipulate how the separation distance is to be measured. As defined in Sec. 138-32, a setback is an open space on the same lot with a main building, unoccupied and unobstructed from the ground upward. This has been measured from the property line to the main structure; but, as shown above, the Greenfield District requires a separation distance. We have reviewed the proposed site plan in two contexts: 1. Separation distance from the property line, similar to the definition of a setback, and 2) Separation distance from the adjacent dwelling or structure.

   The applicant has provided a setback distance for the proposed office building from the north property line, but the plans do not include setback distance from the building to the residential property lines to the east. The submitted plans also do not provide dimensioned separation distances between the proposed structure and residence to the north or residences to the east.

   **North – Adjacent to single family residence**
Based on the scale of the plans, the proposed office building is 23 ft. from the north property line, at its closest distance. The submitted plans show the distance of the proposed office building as 25 ft. from the north property line. This inaccuracy must be corrected on revised plans.

According to the above table, the proposed development is less than 30 ft. in height (18 ft. 4 in.), and has provided more than 15 ft. separation distance from the adjacent residential property line, and an even greater distance to the residence to the north. However, we want to see those dimensions provided on a revised site plan, detailing the setback distances from the property lines, as well as the dwellings, to ensure that the setback standards have been met.

**East - Adjacent to single family residences**
The proposed office building is 14 ft. 8 in. from the east property line, as shown on the site plan. As shown on the aerial image above, the subject property and the residences to the east share a rear property line. Therefore, there is more than 15 feet separation distance between the proposed office building and the adjacent dwelling. However, the separation distance between the proposed structure and the garage at 2399 Ellwood has not been provided. We would want to see those dimensions provided on a revised site plan.

**South – Adjacent to parking lot that serves the Greenfield Presbyterian Church**
The proposed office building is approximately 25 ft. from the south property line. The above table does not include a separation distance between the proposed development and an adjacent parking lot.

The Planning Commission should review the above separation distances carefully. A revised site plan should be submitted, showing the dimensions for all setback distances from the property lines, as well as the separation distances from all adjacent structures.

**Height**
The maximum height of a building in the Greenfield District shall be 3 stories, but not more than 40 ft. The multi-tenant medical office building is proposed to be constructed to a height of 18 ft. 4 in., measured from grade to the top of the parapet. Therefore, the maximum height requirement has been met.

**Lot Coverage**
The Greenfield District does not have a maximum percentage of lot coverage. The subject site is 19,954 sq. ft. (0.46 acres). The proposed 4,637 sq. ft. medical office building will occupy approximately 23% of the lot, leaving the remaining area to be occupied by impervious surface for parking and dumpster enclosure, and some green space for landscaping.

**Parking**
The applicant has proposed 28 parking spaces on the subject site. For medical offices, the parking requirement is:

One parking space per 100 sq. ft. of usable floor area, or ten, whichever is greater.
The multi-tenant office building is not a planned commercial or shopping center, therefore, we would apply the above parking requirement for each new tenant, based on the square footage of each space in the building.

Due to the fact that all proposed uses are to be medical, we propose the following parking requirements for the development. The requirement above notes that ten spaces should be the minimum for a medical office use; however, with all spaces to be used as medical, there is bound to be some gaps in the hours and days of operation. We ask the Planning Commission to review the minimum parking requirement and determine if the below table is appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenant space</th>
<th>Gross floor area</th>
<th>Usable floor area (70% of gross)</th>
<th>Required spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #1</td>
<td>1,200 sq. ft.</td>
<td>840 sq. ft.</td>
<td>8 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #2</td>
<td>571 sq. ft.</td>
<td>399.7 sq. ft.</td>
<td>4 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #3</td>
<td>564 sq. ft.</td>
<td>394.8 sq. ft.</td>
<td>4 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #4</td>
<td>564 sq. ft.</td>
<td>394.8 sq. ft.</td>
<td>4 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #5</td>
<td>571 sq. ft.</td>
<td>399.7 sq. ft.</td>
<td>4 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #6</td>
<td>1,200 sq. ft.</td>
<td>840 sq. ft.</td>
<td>8 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REQUIRED** 32 spaces

The applicant has provided a parking calculation on Sheet C.1, in which the parking requirement has been calculated based on 2,678 sq. ft. of usable floor area. It is unclear how that total was calculated, as the usable floor area is 70% of the gross floor. Sheet A.1 provides the gross square footage of each tenant space and that is the basis for the parking calculation.

The applicant has proposed to provide four (4) bicycle parking spaces to be located at the north end of the building, adjacent to the parking area. The installation of the bicycle parking allows for a parking credit of up to two (2) vehicular parking spaces. This would reduce the parking requirement to **30 parking spaces**. Sheet SP-3 provides a detailed rendering of the proposed “inverted u” bicycle rack.

Per Section 138-267(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, bicycle racks shall be visible from a main entrance of the structure of facility. The proposed location of the bicycle racks shall be visible from one entrance to one of the tenant spaces on the subject site. While other tenant spaces will not have a direct line of sight to the bicycle rack, it is the best location on the subject site. Other areas that may work include behind the building or behind the dumpster enclosure. In each instance, the bicycle rack will be completely obstructed from any main entrance and would not serve the future tenants or any future visitors to the offices. The Planning Commission should review and determine if the proposed location meets this standard.

On Sheet C.1, the proposed plans show six (6) cross-hatched spaces proposed for shared use by the Greenfield Presbyterian Church. The City has not received a signed shared parking agreement from the applicant or the Church. The shared use of six (6) parking spaces with the Greenfield Presbyterian Church, in addition to the proposed off-street parking and bicycle racks,
would satisfy the parking requirement for the multi-tenant office building. **If the applicant cannot provide a signed shared parking agreement, the parking requirement cannot be met. The Planning Commission may grant a parking modification of up to 10% of the parking requirement, provided the applicant has provided sufficient evidence for reasons as to why the requirement cannot be met. The applicant should provide the signed parking agreement or may request the parking modification by the Planning Commission.**

As noted above, the applicant has proposed 28 parking spaces, including eight (8) compact car spaces and two barrier-free parking spaces. The dimensions of the barrier-free spaces have not been provided and should be included on revised plans.

The proposed compact car spaces do not exceed the permitted 30% of the total parking requirement; ten compact car parking spaces are permitted by ordinance. Four (4) spaces are measured 8 ft. x 16 ft., and four (4) spaces are measured 8 ft. x 20 ft. **Revised plans should include details as to how those eight (8) parking spaces are to be signed, “small cars only.”**

2. **The proposed development does not create adverse effects on public utilities, roads, or sidewalks.**

   The proposed development will increase the use and reliance upon public utilities, as well as increase traffic along the roads and sidewalk. **Greenfield Road is under the jurisdiction of the Road Commission of Oakland County and they should provide approval letters of the design and configuration of the development prior to final site plan approval or permits being issued by the City.**

   A traffic sign and light pole exist in the right-of-way near the proposed entrance to the subject site. The traffic sign may be easily moved, but review and approval by RCOC will be required prior to removal or relocation of the sign. The light pole is also of concern, as looks as though it is very near the shared property line with the Greenfield Presbyterian Church. Neither sign or pole were included on the submitted site plan and must be included, with separation distances or plans for removal or relocation of each, on the revised site plan.

3. **Pedestrian and vehicular areas are designed for safety convenience, and compliment adjacent site design.**

   The site plan shows one ingress/egress onto Greenfield Road. The parking area dead ends in a T-configuration, which allows for the motorists in the northernmost spaces sufficient space to back out and leave the parking area. The two-way maneuvering lane is 24 ft. wide and meets the minimum distance for two-way traffic. We recommend the drive aisles to be painted with direction arrows, as well as stop signs and painted with a stop bar at the egress onto Greenfield Road.

   The parking area is proposed to be asphalt and the pedestrian walkways are proposed to be concrete. **We recommend the painting pedestrian crossing signs along the concrete walkway from the south of the building to the adjacent shared lot, so as to indicate a safe walking area for motorists.**
It appears that the parking area has been designed with a six (6) inch curb. It is not clear that the curb is to be installed around the entire parking perimeter. The six-inch curb should be installed around the entire parking area. Revised plans should show the six-inch curb. Bumper blocks should not be installed on the site.

The ingress/egress is in close proximity to the ingress/egress for the Greenfield Presbyterian Church. The proposed site plan does not include a distance from one access aisle to the other. This must be reviewed carefully with RCOC to ensure that there are no dangers in located two drive aisles in such close proximity. We recommend the applicant to review and provide dimensions and consult with RCOC to ensure safety and compliance with separation standards.

4. **Site design, architecture, signs, orientation, and materials are consistent with the city’s master plan objectives and the design of the neighboring sites and buildings.**

**Building Design**

The applicant is proposing to construct the multi-tenant medical office building designed with hardi plank lap siding, metal coping, Colorado stacked stone, and glass windows. The use of horizontal siding is minimal on the front façade of the building, but it is used as the dominant material along the east elevation, which will face the residential neighborhood. The applicant should provide material and color samples of the façade materials.

Section 138-398 notes specific building requirements within the Coolidge District. The Planning Commission may revise these requirements, if the commission determines that the standards for site plan approval have been met.

(a) **All development in the Greenfield District (except single family detached houses) shall front and have primary access from Greenfield.**

The development has one method of ingress/egress to Greenfield Road. The front of the building shall face Greenfield Road.

(b) **Developments that face Ellwood shall be residential in character.**

The proposed development will not face Ellwood.

(c) **The planning commission may require screening including masonry walls up to 6 feet in height, decorative fencing or landscaping.**

The site plan notes the installation of a six (6) foot high screen wall to separate the residential properties to the north and east.

Sheet SP-3 includes details for a simulated brick face Red-Wall paneled screen wall. The brick face panels measure 6 ft. 8 in. from grade to top of panel. The proposed design for screening is not appropriate and should not be considered as sufficient permanent screening for the residential neighbors. We do not recommend this material to be approved. The applicant should revise the plans and show the wall to be constructed of masonry materials or decorative fencing, maximum six (6) feet in height, measured from grade.
(d) The first floor elevation of a building that fronts a street shall be composed of a minimum of 30 percent and maximum 80 percent windows. When there is a choice between a major thoroughfare and a minor street, the elevation that faces the major thoroughfare shall be considered the front.

The applicant has provided a percentage of window covers, as shown on Sheet A.1.

Below is a summary of the minimum and maximum window coverage that is required by Ordinance per tenant space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenant space</th>
<th>Façade Wall Area</th>
<th>Minimum/Maximum Window Coverage</th>
<th>Window Coverage Proposed (w. Door)</th>
<th>Percentage Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #1</td>
<td>464 sq. ft.</td>
<td>139 sf – 371 sf</td>
<td>70 sf (window only) 100 sf (with door)</td>
<td>15% (window only) 22% (with door)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #2</td>
<td>220 sq. ft.</td>
<td>66 sf – 176 sf</td>
<td>33.3 sf (window only) 63.3 sf (with door)</td>
<td>15% (window only) 29% (with door)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #3</td>
<td>220 sq. ft.</td>
<td>66 sf – 176 sf</td>
<td>33.3 sf (window only) 63.3 sf (with door)</td>
<td>15% (window only) 29% (with door)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #4</td>
<td>220 sq. ft.</td>
<td>66 sf – 176 sf</td>
<td>33.3 sf (window only) 63.3 sf (with door)</td>
<td>15% (window only) 29% (with door)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #5</td>
<td>220 sq. ft.</td>
<td>66 sf – 176 sf</td>
<td>33.3 sf (window only) 63.3 sf (with door)</td>
<td>15% (window only) 29% (with door)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #6</td>
<td>464 sq. ft.</td>
<td>139 sf – 371 sf</td>
<td>70 sf (window only) 100 sf (with door)</td>
<td>15% (window only) 22% (with door)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The façade of the building does not meet the minimum window coverage percentage by total area, or by individual tenant space. The applicant has included less window coverage in order to provide for space for window awning and wall signage.

The Planning Commission should determine if the reduction in window coverage is appropriate. The applicant should be prepared to discuss if additional window area may be provided on the building façade facing Greenfield Road.

(e) The building elevation that fronts a street shall contain an entrance. The entrance shall access the first floor of the building. When there is a choice between a major thoroughfare and a minor street, the elevation that faces the major thoroughfare shall be considered the front.

Each proposed tenant space has been designed so as to have front entry access that will face Greenfield Road.

Signage

The site plan includes references to wall signs for each tenant, as well as a monument sign at the entrance to the subject site. All signs will require a separate sign permit to be submitted and
reviewed by the Building Department. Signage is not approved as part of the site plan approval process.

Mechanical Equipment

The submitted site plan does not provide any details as to the location of any mechanical equipment. The applicant should include the location of any and all mechanical equipment on site. If any equipment is proposed to be located on the roof, screening must be provided to ensure the equipment is not visible from street view.

5. **Landscaping, lighting, dumpster enclosures, and other site amenities are provided where appropriate and in a complementary fashion.**

Landscaping

The submitted landscaping plan shows deciduous and evergreen trees along the north property line. The applicant should review and revise the landscaping plan and consider the location of the driveway for the property to the north in proximity to the Alberta Blue Spruce trees along the north property line. Without noting a distance from the property line or the driveway, it is not possible to determine if the proposed location will be safe for the neighbor.

The landscaping plan does not provide any enhancements to the site. There is open area along all property lines to provide vegetation and plantings that will enhance the site. It is recommended that the applicant revise the plans to include more landscaping to enhance the subject property. Method of irrigation of all plantings must be included on the revised plans.

Lighting

The proposed illumination plan does not meet the maximum allowable footcandles throughout the site and at the residential property line. Per Sec. 138-223(c), lighting of off-street parking areas shall not exceed an intensity of five footcandles. As shown on the Photometric Plan, illumination levels along the rear of the building, facing east, exceed five footcandles and register as high as 11.2 footcandles.

Per Sec. 138-143(b)(2), the level of lighting shall not exceed 0.5 footcandles at any residential property line or 1.0 footcandles at any nonresidential property line. As shown on the Photometric Plan, the illumination levels along the east property line exceed 0.5 footcandles.

The applicant must revise the photometric plan in compliance with all applicable exterior and parking lot lighting ordinances.

Dumpster Enclosure

The applicant has noted the dumpster enclosure is to be located along the south property line and shall be accessible by tenants by way of a concrete walkway.

The enclosure will be constructed of a masonry wall on three sides, with cedar wood vertical slats. The masonry walls must be constructed of masonry material. A simulated brick face panel will not be acceptable. Additionally, we recommend an alternate material for the dumpster gates.
While cedar wood vertical slats look appealing, they do not last with the harsh Michigan weather and are prone to damage. The revised plans should include an alternate material for the dumpster enclosure gates.

The enclosure should be maximum 6 ft. in height and should be amended on revised drawings.

6. **Site engineering has been provided to ensure that existing utilities will not be adversely affected.**

We defer to the comments and recommendation of the City Engineer and Department of Public Works.

**Summary and Recommendation**

Due to the number of comments received herein and the review letters provided by DPW and HRC, as well as the preliminary letters from Road Commission of Oakland County, we recommend the Planning Commission postpone this site plan request to allow for the applicant to review and revise the plans and incorporate the necessary changes and provide additional information.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you.

Cc: Matthew Baumgarten, City Manager  
Victoria Mitchell, City Clerk  
John Staran, City Attorney  
Derrick Schueller, DPW Director  
Eddie Zmich, HRC  
Pete Kelly, Fire Marshal  
Matt Koehn, DPS Director  
Tim Fought, tfoughtarchitectllc@gmail.com  
Alexander Orman, alex@ormanengineering.com  
Prime Management, primemanagement@tir.com
Memo

To: Erin Schutlow, Community Development Director (via email)
Cc: Kim Anderson, Community Development (via email)
    Shawn Young, DPW Foreman (via email)
    Eddie Zmich, HRC (via email)

From: Derrick Schueller, DPW Director

Date: October 15, 2021

Subject: Proposed Medical Office Building
Plan Review #1
2400 Greenfield

We have reviewed the plans provided by Community Development on October 4 and prepared by T. Fought & Associates and Orman Engineering. Please find below our comments:

1. The site plans will be reviewed by the City's engineering consultant, Hubbell, Roth & Clark (HRC). Among other things, HRC will review the storm water calculations and grading.

2. Greenfield Road is under the jurisdiction of RCOC. Oakland County requirements for site access and right-of-way layout can be significant and may alter the overall layout. The applicant shall share feedback received from the County and/or a plan approval letter. The proximity of the two drive approaches may be an issue.

3. Due to the volume of information, we recommend creating separate sheets for the demolition plan and engineering site plan.

4. Per the Design MISS DIG utility maps previously provided to the applicant, the existing water main is under the Greenfield curb line not east of the combined sewer as shown on the current drawings. Connections to this main will require a lane removal and should be indicated as such on the demolition plan. The natural gas distribution line shall also be shown on the drawings and is in close proximity to the existing water main.

5. The City Fire Marshal will provide feedback on fire suppression and fire hydrant coverage. Note the applicant may need to facilitate a hydrant flow test in the area to verify system pressures and flows.

6. The existing public sewer label shall be changed from “Sanitary” to “Combined” both on the topographic survey and on the site plan.

7. A stormwater maintenance agreement shall be prepared and finalized as part of the site plan review process. An agreement template, as approved by the City Attorney, is attached here for applicant use. The applicant will be responsible for developing the three (3) exhibits referenced in the agreement.

8. Given the impacts to Greenfield Road, a separate traffic control plan shall be added to the plan set.

9. Note the Community Development Department will review the striping plan for verification of number of stalls required, sizing, handicap considerations and general site circulation.

10. The City will compute the storm water fixed charges at a later date to reflect the change in pervious/impervious surface. This calculation will be reflected on a future quarterly utility bill.

Feel free to call with any questions or concerns. Thank you.

Attachment
AGREEMENT FOR
STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE

This Agreement is made on ________________, by ___________________, ("Developer"), a
(corporation, limited liability company, partnership) whose address is ________________;
and the CITY OF BERKLEY (the "City"), whose address is 3888 Coolidge Hwy, Berkley, MI 48879.

WHEREAS, Developer owns and proposes to develop the Property described in attached Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, the proposed development of the Property will alter the natural flow of surface and storm
water drainage; and

WHEREAS, Developer has proposed, and the City has approved, a storm water management system (the
"System") as described and depicted in the plan attached as Exhibit B; and

WHEREAS, the parties will benefit from the proper operation, use, and maintenance of the System and
enter into this agreement to provide for the same.

THEREFORE, the parties agree:

1. Use of the System:

Components of the System, including any and all water conveyance, detention and water quality
treatment facilities and devices, pumping system, storm sewer pipe, catch basins, manholes, end-
sections, ditches, swales, open water courses and rip-rap, shall be used solely for the purpose of
conveying, detaining and treating storm and surface drainage on the property until such time as: (i) The
City determines and notifies Developer or Developer’s successors, grantees or assigns, in writing, that
it is no longer necessary to convey, detain or treat the storm and surface drainage; and (ii) An adequate
alternative for conveying, detaining and treating storm and surface drainage has been provided which
is acceptable to the City and which includes the granting of any easements to the City or third parties
as may be required or necessary for the alternative drainage system.

2. Maintenance:

A. Developer shall be responsible for the proper maintenance, repair and replacement of the System
and all parts thereof as detailed in the Maintenance Plan attached as Exhibit C.
B. Proper maintenance of the System shall include, but is not limited to: (i) Removing accumulated sediment, trash and debris from the detention basin and at inlet pipes; (ii) Managing deleterious vegetative growth; (iii) Maintaining storm sewer, structures, end-sections and safety features; (iv) Controlling the effects of erosion; (v) Inspection and cleaning of the water quality treatment device; (vi) Inspection of inlet and outlet pipes for structural integrity; (vii) Inspection and replacement of riprap at inlet pipes; (viii) Inspection and cleaning of the storm sewer and catch basins upstream from the detention basin; (ix) Inspection and replacement of stone around the outlet pipe; and (vi) Any other maintenance that is reasonable and necessary to facilitate and continue the proper operation and use of the System.

3. **Action by City:**

If, at any time, Developer or Developer’s successors, grantees or assigns neglect or fail to properly maintain the System or any part thereof, the City may notify Developer or Developer’s successors, grantees or assigns. The notice shall be in writing and shall list and describe maintenance deficiencies and demand that they be corrected within thirty (30) days.

The notice shall further specify a date and place for a hearing to be held at least fourteen (14) days after the date of the notice before the City Council, or such other board or official as the City Council may designate. At the hearing, the City Council (or other designated board or official) may affirm or modify the list and description of maintenance deficiencies and, for good cause shown, may extend the time for the deficiencies to be corrected.

Thereafter, if the maintenance deficiencies are not corrected within the time allowed, the City may undertake the necessary corrective actions, and the City may maintain the System for up to one (1) year. Such maintenance of the System by the City shall not be construed to be a trespass or a taking of the Property, nor shall the City’s actions vest in the public any right to enter or use the Property. Thereafter, if Developer or Developer’s successors, grantees or assigns do not properly maintain the System, the City may, after providing similar written notice, schedule and hold another hearing to determine whether the City should maintain the System for another year, and subject to a similar notice, hearing and determination, in subsequent years.

In the event the City determines an emergency or public nuisance condition caused by or relating to the System threatens the public health, safety or general welfare, the City shall have the right to immediately and without notice enter the Property and undertake appropriate corrective action.

4. **Charges:**

The City shall charge to the current owner of the Property the cost of maintenance or other corrective action undertaken by the City under this agreement, plus a ten percent (10%) administrative fee. If not timely paid, the City may place the charges on the City’s tax roll, which charges shall be a lien on the Property and shall be collectable and enforceable in the same manner general property taxes are collected and enforced.

5. **Notice:**

Any notices required under this agreement shall be sent by certified mail to the address for each party set forth below, or to such other addresses as such party may notify the other parties in writing:

To ________________________________:

______________________________
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To the City:

City Manager
City of Berkley
3888 Coolidge Hwy
Berkley, MI 48879

6. **Successors and Assigns:**

This agreement shall bind and inure to the benefit of the parties and their respective successors, grantees and assigns. The benefits, burdens, rights, obligations and responsibilities hereunder shall run with the land and shall bind all current and future owners of the Property and any divisions thereof.

7. **Recording of Agreement:**

This agreement shall be recorded at the Oakland County Register of Deeds.

By: _______________________________

Its: ______________________________

CITY OF BERKLEY

By: _______________________________  Matthew Baumgarten, City Manager

STATE OF MICHIGAN

:\ss

COUNTY OF ________

This agreement was acknowledged before me on __________, by _________________________________

_____ of ________________________________ on behalf of the ________________________________.

__________________ Notary public
__________________ County, Michigan

My commission expires: ________________

STATE OF MICHIGAN

:\ss

COUNTY OF OAKLAND

This agreement was acknowledged before me on __________, by Matthew Baumgarten, City Manager, of the City of Berkley, on behalf of the City.

__________________ Notary public
__________________ County, Michigan

My commission expires: ________________

Drafted by:
John D. Staran, Esq.
2055 Orchard Lake Road
Sylvan Lake, MI 48320

When Recorded Return to:
City Clerk
City of Berkley
3888 Coolidge Hwy.
Berkley, MI 48879
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To: Erin Schlutow  
From: Pete Kelly  
RE: Modified Greenfield Office Building Plan Reviews  

Erin;  
10-15-21  

Per our discussion, I have reviewed the modified plans for the “twin” office buildings proposed for 2400 and 3462/3478 Greenfield and approved them, but with a question remaining. One building has back (east side) doors for all suites and the other does not. While the size of the suites doesn’t require a second means of egress, occupant safety is obviously enhanced with that feature, especially with vehicle traffic and parking in front of the only means of egress in the building lacking the rear doors.  

Respectfully,  

[Signature]  
Pete Kelly
October 19, 2021

City of Berkley
3338 Coolidge Highway
Berkley, Michigan 48072

Attention: Ms. Erin Schlutow, Community Development Director
Mr. Matthew Baumgarten, City Manager

Re: Proposed Medical Office Building
2400 Greenfield Road
Engineering Site Plan – Review No. 1
City of Berkley, MI

Dear Ms. Schlutow and Mr. Baumgarten:

As Consulting Engineers for the City of Berkley, and in accordance with your request, we have completed the Engineering Site Plan review of the proposed subject development for compliance with the City of Berkley’s engineering and site plan requirements. The plans were prepared by T. Fought & Associates, Inc., with the engineering site plan created by Orman Engineering of Waterford, Michigan. The plans have an issue date of September 24, 2021 and were received by our office on October 4, 2021 via email. The proposed project scope includes the construction of a multi-unit medical office building and parking lot to be constructed across three (3) existing vacant lots. The site is located on the Greenfield Rd between Oxford and Catalpa. We hereby offer the following comments:

General:

1. The proposed compact car spaces must have signage clearly stating them as such. These signs must be included in the plans.

2. A Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC) permit will be required for proposed work within the Greenfield Road right-of-way as well as for construction signage.

3. A soil erosion permit will likely be required from the Oakland County Water Resources Commissioner (OCWRC). If a soil erosion permit is required, it must be obtained, and a copy of the approved permit provided to the City prior to commencing construction. Regardless of whether a permit is required, the City will require silt fence to be installed around the perimeter of the site, filter fabric installed in nearby catch basins, and a temporary maintenance aggregate/mud mat constructed for access to and from the proposed site.

4. A sequence of construction including estimated lane closure durations must be added to the plans.

5. A geotechnical investigation must be performed in order to evaluate the proposed storm detention system. The soil logs from that investigation must be shown on the plans, including the elevation of the groundwater table, soil types encountered, and the written report indicating the design recommendations or comments on the proposed stormwater collection system.
6. For the purposes of clarity, it is recommended that the Demolition Plan and proposed Engineering/Site Plan be shown on two (2) separate plan sheets. Further, both the Demolition and Engineering/Site Plan sheets must show all removal and proposed quantities including pavement, curb, sidewalk/ramp, utilities, trees, and landscape features.

7. The City may require additional sections of existing curb and gutter and sidewalks along Greenfield Road to be removed and replaced as part of the proposed project in order to address the current deteriorated conditions and will defer comment to the City.

**Water and Fire Protection Services:**

1. Permits may be required from the Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE) and from OCWRC for the installation and connection of the new water main service.

2. The plans must include calculations for the new Residential Equivalent Unit (REU) value of the proposed (building) structures. These calculations must also support that the proposed water service is sufficiently sized for the new REU values.

3. The plans indicate a proposed water main connection to the existing water main in the Greenfield Road right-of-way (ROW). The City’s Department of Public Works (DPW) requires a tapping sleeve, valve, and well be used for this connection. The plans must reflect this type of connection. Proposed finished grades for gate wells must be provided as well.

4. Where the water service connection is proposed the existing pavement cross-sections will need to be sawcut, removed, and replaced in kind. The plans must indicate the pipe bedding and type of backfill to be used in the street excavation areas for the new pipe installation. Further, the pavement restoration will be as per RCOC and as previously mentioned, an RCOC permit will be required.

**Storm Drainage and Detention/Sanitary Sewer:**

1. The type of cover to be utilized on the proposed drainage structures must be indicated on the plans. Restricted covers may need to be utilized if required by the City’s DPW being that the City’s sewer system is combined. The Applicant must inquire directly with the DPW. Efforts must be made to avoid overtaxing the system with additional drainage from the development.

2. Details of the outlet control structure and the connection to the existing combined system must be shown on the plans.

3. The plans indicate detention calculations for a 100-year storm for the proposed development. The provided volume calculations show a 48” HDPE pipe length of 364 feet. Dimensions and/or additional details of the underground pipe system must be added to the plans. In addition, the proposed storm sewer layout, including diameter and length, must be clearly indicated on the site plans.

4. The developer will be required to complete a perpetuity maintenance agreement with the City for the proposed private stormwater systems. The Applicant must contact the City DPW regarding this item prior to commencing construction.

5. Detail sheets for the proposed storm sewers must be provided with structures, covers, pipe requirements/cross sections and connection/tap details in accordance with City and County Standards. In addition, shop drawings for the said appurtenances will be required to be reviewed by the City and HRC.
6. Inverts of the proposed storm sewer (utility profile) must be added to the plans to confirm positive drainage through the site to the detention system and to the combined sewer connection.

7. The proposed sanitary lead diameter and material is not indicated. The diameter of the sanitary lead as well as calculations showing that this size is adequate for the proposed development must be shown on the plans.

8. The proposed sanitary lead must include a new connection (TwisTee sewer saddle, as per the City DPW, or approved equal).

**Recommendation:**

Based on our aforementioned comments, we do not recommend approval of the proposed Site Plan at this time. The plans must be revised to address all of the above comments, and two sets resubmitted to the City of Berkley for further review.

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please contact the undersigned.

Very truly yours,

HUBBELL, ROTH & CLARK, INC.

Edward D. Zmich  
Project Manager

Mitch Stark  
Review Engineer

EDZ/mas

pc: City of Berkley; Mr. Derrick Schueller, Mr. Shawn Young  
HRC; R. Alix, File  
Orman Engineering; Alexander Orman  
T. Fought & Associates; Timothy Fought
September 17, 2021

Orman Engineering LLC
Attn: Alexander Orman, P.E.
5476 Vivian Lane
Waterford, MI 48327

RE: R.C.O.C. PRELIMINARY PLAN REVIEW
LOCATION: 2400 GREENFIELD ROAD, CITY OF BERKLEY
PROJECT NAME: PROPOSED MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING

Dear Mr. Orman:

At your request, the Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC) has completed a preliminary review for the above referenced project. Enclosed you will find one set of plans with our comments in red. All comments are for conceptual purpose only and should be incorporated into detailed construction plans. Below you will find a listing of the comments generated by the RCOC review:

A) Proposed driveway location is acceptable. However, the owner of property must obtain letter of encroachment from adjacent property owner (#2312 Greenfield Rd) or relocate drive.

B) Remove or relocate all fixed objects prior to excavation. Fixed objects shall be no nearer than 6 feet from back of curb.

C) Any pedestrian facilities shall be constructed in accordance with current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) guidelines.

D) Pavement cross section shall consist of a minimum 9 inches of MDOT 35-P concrete, with epoxy coated rebar lane and curb ties over a suitable base, as determined in the field by RCOC.

E) Excavations within a 1:1 influence of the roadway will require MDOT Class II backfill compacted to 95% maximum density.
Once the comments above are addressed, plans should be submitted to this office with completed RCOC permit application(s) Form 64a, signed by the owner (or his agent), three sets of plans (per application, 5 for signal permit) and the appropriate application fee(s).

All future correspondence related to the above referenced project will be sent to the address provided by the applicant. Separate applications will be required for:

a) Drive approach
b) Utility connections

Upon receipt of the appropriate application packet, RCOC will provide a more detailed review. Please contact this office at (248) 858-4835 if you have any questions, or if we may be of further assistance.

Respectfully,

Simon Yousif, P.E.
Permit Review Engineer
Department of Customer Services

SS/mac
Enclosure
Know what's below
Call before you dig.

ENGINEERING
PROPOSED MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING
1334 2400 Greenfield Rd.
City of Berkley, Oakland County, MI 48072

Orman Engineering, LLC
5476 Vivian Lane
Waterford, MI 48327
phone: 248.682.6001
e-mail: alex@ormanengineering.com

LANE CLOSURES
INSTRUCTIONS TO
KEEP ROADS CLEAN
OF DIRT AND DEBRIS
REMOVE OR RELOCATE FIXED OBJECTS PRIOR TO EXCAVATION

9 INCHES OF M.D.O.T. 35-P CONCRETE OVER SUITABLE BASE
SOURCE: RCOC PERMIT, RULES, SPECIFICATIONS & GUIDELINES (RULES 6.8.2)

A SEPARATE PERMIT IS REQUIRED FOR ALL UNDERGROUND UTILITIES WITHIN THE EXISTING R.O.W.

9" CONCRETE SIDEWALK THRU THE APPROACH IS REQUIRED
LOWER EXISTING SIDEWALK ON BOTH SIDES OF APPROACH TO MEET ADA COMPLIANCE AS PER MDOT DETAIL "R-29-I" ATTACHED
RAMPS & SIDEWALKS MUST MEET ADA SPECIFICATIONS
FULL DEPTH SAWCUT AND/OR MILL A BUTT JOINT, WITH LOCATION/WIDTH AS DIRECTED BY RCOC INSPECTOR
HAND DIG AROUND ALL UTILITIES
9" 21AA AGGREGATE MATCH AND TIE PROPOSED CURB TO EXISTING CURB, EPOXY COATED #4 BAR REQUIRED

"PROPER SIGNING" IS REQUIRED BEFORE ANY WORK IN R.O.W. IS STARTED
LANE CLOSURES RESTRICTED TO 9-3 MON - FRI

KEEP ROADS CLEAN OF DIRT AND DEBRIS
FIXED OBJECTS TO BE MINIMUM 6 FEET OFF BACK OF CURB OR 12 FEET OFF EDGE OF PAVEMENT
REMOVE OR RELOCATE FIXED OBJECTS PRIOR TO EXCAVATION
ADJUST/RECONSTRUCT EXISTING STRUCTURE AS WARRANTED
OBTAIN LETTER OF ENCROACHMENT FROM ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNER OR RELOCATE DRIVE

SOURCE: R.C.O.C. PERMIT RULES, SPECIFICATIONS & GUIDELINES (RULE 6.1.2)
APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW

NOTICE TO APPLICANT: Applications for Site Plan review by the Planning Commission must be submitted to the City of Berkley Building Department in substantially complete form at least 30 days prior to the Planning Commission’s meeting at which the application will be considered. The application must be accompanied by the data specified in the Zoning Ordinance, including fully dimensioned site plans, plus the required review fees.

The Planning Commission meets the fourth Tuesday of the month at 7:00pm in the Council Chambers at the City of Berkley City Hall, 3338 Coolidge Hwy, Berkley, MI 48072.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT:
I (We), the undersigned, do hereby respectfully request Site Plan Review and provide the following information to assist in the review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>Green Office Suites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>T. Fought &amp; Assos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
<td>24045 Woodland Dr., Southfield, MI 48034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>248.514.7612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tfoughtarchitectllc@gmail.com">tfoughtarchitectllc@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner(s), if different from Applicant:</td>
<td>North Green Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
<td>1359 Davis Ave., Birmingham, MI 48009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>248.540.8017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:primemanagement@tfr.com">primemanagement@tfr.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant’s Legal Interest in Property:</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOCATION OF PROPERTY:

| Street Address:     | 3462-78 Greenfield Rd.                         |
| Nearest Cross Streets: | 12 Mile Rd.                                    |

Updated 02.21.2021
PROPERTY DESCRIPTION:

Provide lot numbers and subdivision: Ellwood Heights Lots 51, 52 & 53

Property Size (Square Feet): 17,250 (Acres):

EXISTING ZONING DISTRICT (please check):

☐ R-1A  ☐ Local Business  ☐ Coolidge
☐ R-1B  ☐ Office  ☐ Downtown
☐ R-1C  ☐ Community Centerpiece  ☐ Industrial
☐ R-1D  ☐ Woodward  ☐ Cemetery
☐ RM  ☐ Eleven Mile  ☐ Parking
☐ RMH  ☐ Twelve Mile

Present Use of Property:
residential

Proposed Use of Property:
office

Is the property located within the Downtown Development Authority?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Construct a (6)-unit office building.

Does the proposed project / use of property require Special Land Use approval?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

Does the proposed project require Variance(s) from the Zoning Board of Appeals?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

If yes, please describe Variances required:

Updated 02.21.2021
PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING CHART:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Development</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Gross Floor Area</th>
<th>Number of Parking Spaces On Site</th>
<th>Number of Employees on Largest Shift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attached Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4645</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFESSIONALS WHO PREPARED PLANS:

A. Name: Timothy Fought
   Mailing Address: 24045 Woodland Dr, Southfield, MI 48034
   Telephone: (248) 514-7612
   Email: tfoughtarchitectlc@gmail.com
   Design Responsibility (engineer, surveyor, architect, etc.): Architect

B. Name: Orman Engineering / Alex Orman
   Mailing Address: 5476 Vivian Ln, Waterford, MI 48327
   Telephone: 248.882.8001
   Email: alex@ormanengineering.com
   Design Responsibility: Engineering & Surveying

SUBMIT THE FOLLOWING:

1. Fifteen (15) individually folded copies of the site plans, measuring 24" x 36", sealed by a registered architect, engineer, or surveyor.
2. A pdf file of the site plans, submitted to the Community Development Director.
3. Proof of property ownership (title insurance policy or registered deed with County stamp).
4. Review comments or approval received from County, State or Federal agencies that have jurisdiction over the project, including, but not limited to:

   ☐ Road Commission for Oakland County
   ☐ MI Dept. of Transportation
   ☐ Oakland County Health Division
   ☐ MI Dept. of Environment, Great Lakes & Energy

Updated 02.21.2021
PLEASE NOTE: The applicant, or a designated representative, MUST BE PRESENT at all scheduled meetings, or the Site Plan may be tabled due to lack of representation.

Failure to provide true and accurate information on this application shall provide sufficient grounds to deny approval of a Site Plan Application or to revoke any permits granted subsequent to the site plan approval.

We encourage applicants to make a presentation of the proposed project to the Planning Commission and City Council, as appropriate. To assist in this effort, we have available for your use at meetings a projector, laptop computer and screen. This will allow the Planning Commission and audience to be fully engaged so they can give your project the attention it deserves. Planning Commission meetings are recorded and televised.

PROPERTY OWNER’S APPROVAL: (Initial each line)

I hereby authorize the employees and representatives of the City of Berkley to enter upon and conduct an inspection and investigation of the above-referenced property.

APPLICANT’S ENDORSEMENT: (Initial each line)

All information contained therein is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

I acknowledge that the Planning Commission will not review my application unless all information in this application and the Zoning Ordinance has been submitted. I further acknowledge that the City and its employees shall not be held liable for any claims that may arise as a result of acceptance, processing or approval of this site plan application.

I hereby acknowledge that if engineering or other reviews are required, additional fees must be submitted. Should the review fees be greater than the required minimum, sufficient additional charges will be imposed to satisfy the additional review fees. All fee obligations must be satisfied prior to permit approval.

If an application is withdrawn more than three (3) weeks prior to the meeting date, 90% of the fee will be refunded. If the application is withdrawn less than three (3) weeks prior to the meeting, no refund will be given.
Signature of Applicant  
8/25/21  
Date  

TIMOTHY J. FOUGHT  
Applicant Name (Print)  

Signature of Applicant  
Date  

Applicant Name (Print)  

(Trustee for North Green Trust) 8/26/21  
Signature of Property Owner Authorizing this Application  
Date  

DAN WALLER  
(Trustee for North Green Trust)  
Property Owner Name (Print)  

OFFICE USE ONLY  
Received 8/26/21  
Receipt #  
Meeting Date  
Case # PSA-03-21  

Fees:  
Site Plan Review $2300  
Facade Change: $200  
Revision: $100  
Engineering TBD  

Updated 02.21.2021  
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QUIT CLAIM DEED

The Grantor(s), William J. Winter

whose address is, 1359 Davis Ave. Birmingham MI 48009

quit claims to North Green Trust

whose address is 1359 Davis Ave. Birmingham MI 48009

the following described premises situated in the City of Berkley, County of Oakland and State of Michigan:

Lots 52 and 53, ELLWOOD HEIGHTS SUBDIVISION, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Liber 23 of Plats, Page 19, Oakland County Records.

also known as Property Address: 3478 Greenfield Road, Berkley, MI 48072
Sidwell No. 04-25-07-355-014, 04-25-07-355-013
Lot 52
Lot 53

for the sum of $1.00 EXEMPT UNDER MCL207.505 (5)a & MCL207.526 (6)a.

Dated this 15th day of January, 2021.

Signed by:

[Signature]

William J. Winter

State of Michigan
County of Oakland

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 15th day of January, 2021, by William J. Winter.

Notary Public
Acting in Oakland County, Michigan
My commission expires: 08/25/2024

When Recorded Return To: North Green Trust
1359 Davis Ave.
Birmingham, MI 48009-2075

Send Subsequent Tax Bills To: Grantee

Drafted By: William J. Winter
1359 Davis Ave.
Birmingham, MI 48009-2075

Tax Parcel # 04-25-07-355-014, 04-25-07-355-013
Recording Fee $
Transfer Tax

OK
QUIT CLAIM DEED

The Grantor(s), William J. Winter dba PRIME
whose address is, 1359 Davis Ave. Birmingham MI 48009
quit claims to North Green Trust
whose address is 1359 Davis Ave. Birmingham MI 48009
the following described premises situated in the City of Berkley, County of Oakland and State of Michigan:

Lot 51, ELLWOOD HEIGHTS SUBDIVISION, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Liber 23 of Plats, Page 19, Oakland County Records.

also known as Property Address: 3462 Greenfield Road, Berkley, MI 48072
Sidwell No. 04-25-07-355-015

for the sum of $1.00 EXEMPT UNDER MCL207.505 (5)a & MCL207.526 (6)a.

Dated this 15th day of January, 2021.

Signed by:

[Signature]
PRIME, by William J. Winter

State of Michigan
County of Oakland

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 15th day of January, 2021, by William J. Winter dba PRIME.

Notary Public,
Acting in Oakland County, Michigan
My commission expires: 08/25/2024

When Recorded Return To:
North Green Trust
1359 Davis Ave.
Birmingham, MI 48009-2075

Send Subsequent Tax Bills To:
Grantee

Drafted By:
William J. Winter
1359 Davis Ave.
Birmingham, MI 48009-2075

Tax Parcel # 04-25-07-355-015
Recording Fee $ __________
Transfer Tax

[Signature]
Notary Public

[Signature]
Notary Public

[Signature]
Notary Public
Proposed:
OFFICE BUILDING
3462-3478 Greenfield Rd.
Berkley, MI 48702

Owners:
GREEN TRUST
1359 Davis Ave.
Birmingham, MI 48009

Architect:
T. FOUGHT & ASSOCIATES LLC
24045 Woodland Dr.
Southfield, MI 48076
P: (248)514-7612
Project No. T2021014
Know what's below. Call before you dig.
Hardie Plank

Face Stone
MINW-LED

Construction:
- Housing and Reflector: aluminum die-cast
- Lens: polycarbonate
- Driver: LED

Description:
- Not to scale

ORDERING INFORMATION

Example: MINW-100-LED-DUC-4-B-23-15A

Description | Symbol | Avg | Max | Min | Avg/Min | Max/Min
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Grade | + | 0.9 fc | 1.6 fc | 0.4 fc | 2.3:1 | 4.0:1
Sidewalk | + | 0.9 fc | 1.6 fc | 0.4 fc | 2.3:1 | 4.0:1

Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Catalog Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lamp</th>
<th>Lumens</th>
<th>Light Loss Factor</th>
<th>Wattage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| L1 | 7 | | L1 LIGHTING INDUSTRIES, INC. | MINW-100-LED-DUC-4-B-23-15A | 50W, 50W LED MAX SCIENCE DIFFUSED LENS | L1D | 2040 | 0.9 | 12.5

General Note:
1. SEE SCHEDULE FOR EXACT MOUNTING HEIGHT.
2. LIGHTING SCHEDULES ARE A NEW PHOTOMETRIC CALCULATION AND SUBMISSION TO CITY FOR APPROVAL.
3. LIGHTING ALTERNATIVES REQUIRE NEW PHOTOMETRIC CALCULATION AND SUBMISSION TO CITY FOR APPROVAL.

THE ENGINEER AND/OR ARCHITECT MUST DETERMINE APPLICABILITY OF THE LAYOUT TO EXISTING / FUTURE FIELD CONDITIONS. THIS LIGHTING LAYOUT REPRESENTS ILLUMINATION LEVELS CALCULATED FROM LABORATORY DATA UNDER CONTROLLED CONDITIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH ILLUMINATING ENGINEERING SOCIETY APPROVED METHODS. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE OF ANY MANUFACTURER'S LIGHTING MAY VARY DUE TO VARIATION IN ELECTRICAL, VOLTAGE, CIRCUIT LOADS IN LUMPS, AND OTHER VARIABLES UNDER CONSTRUCTION. MOUNTING HEIGHTS INDICATED ARE FROM GRADE AND/OR FLOOR UP.

THESE LIGHTING CALCULATIONS ARE NOT A SUBSTITUTE FOR INDEPENDENT ENGINEERING ANALYSES OF LIGHTING SYSTEM SUSTAINABILITY AND SAFETY. THE ENGINEER AND/OR ARCHITECT IS RESPONSIBLE TO REVIEW FOR ELECTRICAL CODES AND LIGHTING QUALITY COMPLIANCE.

UNLESS EXPLICTLY PROPOSED, LIGHTING CONTROLS REQUIREMENTS DEFINED IN AASHO 60.1. 2013. FOR SPECIFIC INFORMATION CONTACT CHA CONSTRUCTION GROUP AT 900@GASSERBUSH.COM OR 734-586-6700.

FOR ORDERING INQUIRIES CONTACT GASSER BUSH AT QUOTES@GASSERBUSH.COM OR 734-586-6705.

THIS DRAWING WAS GENERATED FROM AN ELECTRONIC IMAGE FOR ESTIMATION PURPOSE ONLY. LAYOUT TO BE VERIFIED IN FIELD BY CONTRACTOR.

MOUNTING HEIGHT IS MEASURED FROM GRADE TO FACE OF FIXTURE. PILE HEIGHT SHOULD BE CALCULATED AS THE MOUNTING HEIGHT LESS BASE HEIGHT.
MEMORANDUM

To: Berkley Planning Commission
From: Erin Schlutow, Community Development Director
Subject: PSP-03-21; 3462 - 3478 Greenfield – Office Building
Construction of new multi-unit office building

Date: October 14, 2021

The applicant, T. Fought & Associates, on behalf of North Green Trust, is proposing to construct a 4,644 sq. ft. multi-tenant office building at 3462 and 3478 Greenfield Rd, that will include six (6) new offices, ranging in size from 602 sq. ft. to 1,105 sq. ft. The proposed development will be located on three existing parcels, two of which are occupied with single family homes and are currently vacant. The parcels will be combined prior to construction of the proposed development.

The property is located on Greenfield Rd., north of Twelve Mile Rd.

The proposed development will include the construction of the new office building, parking area, dumpster enclosure, redi-wall concrete panels, bike rack, landscaping, and underground stormwater detention.

The subject site is zoned Greenfield District. Professional offices are permitted by right in the Greenfield District.

The review and analysis for the proposed office building includes land uses for business and professional offices, such as lawyers, engineers, architects, or other similar professions. This includes the parking analysis, which is different from a medical or dental office use.

Medical or dental offices are permitted in the Greenfield District, but due to conversations with the architect that the development would be for the use of professional offices, as listed above, medical and
dental office uses have not been considered as a potential land use as part of this application.

Zoning / Land Use

The surrounding properties include single family residential, Berkley Coney Island, multiple family residential, retail, drive through restaurant, and other commercial uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Occupant</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zoning District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Sites</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>Greenfield District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Multiple Family Residential</td>
<td>Greenfield District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>Greenfield District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Berkley Coney Island</td>
<td>Restaurant &amp; parking lot</td>
<td>Greenfield District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West (City of Southfield)</td>
<td>Smokers Only; Wendy's</td>
<td>Retail, Drive Thru</td>
<td>B-3, General Business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice Requirements
Per Sec. 138-399, in the Greenfield District, plans for the development of any principal permitted use, except a single family detached house, shall be approved by the Planning Commission according to site plan review.

In addition, notice shall be mailed at least 15 days prior to the meeting date to all property owners within 300 ft. of the property for which the approval is being considered. This meeting notice requirement is specific to the Greenfield District and does not require a public hearing. A public hearing is not included as part of this request.

Review Procedures
The proposed construction of a new multi-tenant medical office building at 2400 Greenfield Rd requires site plan review and approval by the Planning Commission.

The six (6) standards for granting site plan approval are set forth in Section 138-679 of the Zoning Ordinance. We have reviewed the proposal for the multi-tenant medical office building with respect to these standards and offer the following findings:

1. **The site meets the requirements of this Code.**
   The subject site is located within the Greenfield District, which permits professional offices by right.

   **Setbacks**
   The proposed structure must meet all setback requirements of the Greenfield District, as noted in Sec. 138-397 of the Zoning Ordinance.
Please note: The setback standards in the Greenfield District differ from other zoning districts, in that the setbacks are dictated by height of the proposed building and the height or type of land use on the adjacent property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If new development is…</th>
<th>And is next to…</th>
<th>Then required separation is at least</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A building 30 ft or less in height</td>
<td>A single family house</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A parking lot</td>
<td>Any type of building</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A building between 31 and 40 feet in height</td>
<td>A single family house</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A building between 31 and 40 feet in height</td>
<td>A building between 31 and 40 feet in height</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above setback requirements do not stipulate how the separation distance is to be measured. As defined in Sec. 138-32, a setback is an open space on the same lot with a main building, unoccupied and unobstructed from the ground upward. This has been measured from the property line to the main structure; but, as shown above, the Greenfield District requires a separation distance. We have reviewed the proposed site plan in two contexts: 1. Separation distance from the property line, similar to the definition of a setback, and 2) Separation distance from the adjacent dwelling or structure.

The applicant has provided a setback distance for the proposed office building from the north property line, but the plans do not include setback distance from the building to the residential property lines to the east. The submitted plans also do not provide dimensioned separation distances between the proposed structure and residences to the north, residences to the east, or the commercial property to the south.

North – Adjacent to multiple family residential
The proposed office building is 7 ft. 3 ½” from the north property line, measured at its closest distance. The submitted plans show the separation distance of the proposed office building from the north multiple family residential building as 17 ft. 11 ½”. However, based on the scale provided, the separation distance from the proposed office building to the multiple family residential building is approximately 20 ft. The plans should be revised to show the correct separation measurements and resubmitted for Planning Commission review.

According to the above table, the proposed development is less than 30 ft. in height (18 ft. 4 in.), and has provided less than 15 ft. setback from the north property line, but more than 15 ft. separation distance from the multiple family residential building. The above table does not take into consideration a new development less than 30 feet and next to a building other than single family residential.

East - Adjacent to single family residences
The proposed office building is 12 ft. from the east property line, as shown on the site plan. As shown on the aerial image above, the subject property and the residences to the east share a rear property line. Therefore, there is more than 15 feet separation distance between the...
proposed office building and the adjacent dwelling. However, the separation distance between the proposed structure and the garages at 3461, 3477, and 3493 Ellwood have not been provided. We would want to see those dimensions provided on a revised site plan.

South – Adjacent to parking lot that serves the Berkley Coney Island
The proposed office building is approximately 25 ft. from the south property line. The above table does not include a separation distance between the proposed development and an adjacent parking lot.

The Planning Commission should review the above separation distances carefully. A revised site plan should be submitted, showing the dimensions for all setback distances from the property lines, as well as the separation distances from all adjacent structures.

Height
The maximum height of a building in the Greenfield District shall be 3 stories, but not more than 40 ft. The multi-tenant office building is proposed to be constructed to a height of 18 ft. 4 in., measured from grade to the top of the parapet. Therefore, the maximum height requirement has been met.

Lot Coverage
The Greenfield District does not have a maximum percentage of lot coverage. The subject site is 17,250 sq. ft. (0.40 acres). The proposed 4,644 sq. ft. office building will occupy approximately 26.9% of the lot, leaving the remaining area to be occupied by impervious surface for parking and dumpster enclosure, and some green space for landscaping.

Parking
The applicant has proposed **17 parking spaces** on the subject site. As noted above, the analysis for the parking requirement was conducted for use of business and professional offices. For office uses, the parking requirement is:

One parking space per 225 sq. ft. of usable floor area.

The multi-tenant office building is not a planned commercial or shopping center, therefore, we would apply the above parking requirement for each new tenant, based on the square footage of each space in the building.

Due to the fact that all proposed uses are to be office uses, we propose the following parking requirements for the development. Given the proposed land use for all tenants is to be office use, there is bound to be some gaps in the hours and days of operation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenant space</th>
<th>Gross floor area</th>
<th>Usable floor area (70% of gross)</th>
<th>Required spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #1</td>
<td>1,056 sq. ft.</td>
<td>739 sq. ft.</td>
<td>3 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #2</td>
<td>606 sq. ft.</td>
<td>424 sq. ft.</td>
<td>2 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #3</td>
<td>602 sq. ft.</td>
<td>421 sq. ft.</td>
<td>2 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #4</td>
<td>602 sq. ft.</td>
<td>421 sq. ft.</td>
<td>2 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #5</td>
<td>606 sq. ft.</td>
<td>424 sq. ft.</td>
<td>2 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #6</td>
<td>1,105 sq. ft.</td>
<td>773 sq. ft.</td>
<td>3 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REQUIRED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>14 spaces</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the professional office uses for each tenant space, the parking requirement has been met.

The applicant has proposed to provide four (4) bicycle parking spaces to be located at the north end of the building, adjacent to the parking area. Sheet SP-3 provides a detailed rendering of the proposed “inverted u” bicycle rack.

Per Section 138-267(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, bicycle racks shall be visible from a main entrance of the structure of facility. The proposed location of the bicycle racks shall be visible from one entrance to one of the tenant spaces on the subject site. While other tenant spaces will not have a direct line of sight to the bicycle rack, it is the best location on the subject site. Other areas that may work include behind the building or behind the dumpster enclosure. In each instance, the bicycle rack will be completely obstructed from any main entrance and would not serve the future tenants or any future visitors to the offices. The Planning Commission should review and determine if the proposed location meets this standard.

As noted above, the applicant has proposed 17 parking spaces, including six (6) compact car spaces and one barrier-free parking space. The dimensions of the barrier-free spaces have not been provided and should be included on revised plans.

The proposed compact car spaces exceed the permitted 30% of the total parking requirement; only 5 compact car parking spaces are permitted by ordinance. Plans must be revised to comply with only five (5) spaces to be used for compact car. Additionally, revised plans must include details as to how the compact parking spaces are to be signed, “small cars only.”

2. *The proposed development does not create adverse effects on public utilities, roads, or sidewalks.*

The proposed development will increase the use and reliance upon public utilities, as well as increase traffic along the roads and sidewalk. Greenfield Road is under the jurisdiction of the Road Commission of Oakland County and they should provide approval letters of the design and configuration of the development prior to final site plan approval or permits being issued by the City.
3. **Pedestrian and vehicular areas are designed for safety convenience, and compliment adjacent site design.**

The site plan shows one ingress/egress onto Greenfield Road. The parking area dead ends at the north of the property, and does not provide space for the northernmost parking space to back out without potentially driving up the curb or damaging landscaping. *This should be reviewed with potentially adding a T-configuration to provide sufficient space for the motorist to back up.*

The two-way maneuvering lane is 24 ft. 6 in. wide and meets the minimum distance for two-way traffic. We recommend the drive aisles to be painted with direction arrows, as well as stop signs and painted with a stop bar at the egress onto Greenfield Road.

It appears that the parking area has been designed with a six (6) inch curb. It is not clear that the curb is to be installed around the entire parking perimeter. The six-inch curb should be installed around the entire parking area. *Revised plans should show the six-inch curb. Bumper blocks should not be installed on the site.*

The parking area is proposed to be asphalt and the pedestrian walkways are proposed to be concrete.

The submitted site plan does not include the existing masonry wall along the south of the property, nor the ingress/egress to Berkley Coney Island. The close proximity of the existing and proposed driveway is of concern. The proposed site plan does not include a distance from one access aisle to the other. This must be reviewed carefully with RCOC to ensure that there are no dangers in located two drive aisles in such close proximity. *We recommend the applicant to review and provide dimensions and consult with RCOC to ensure safety and compliance with separation standards.*

4. **Site design, architecture, signs, orientation, and materials are consistent with the city’s master plan objectives and the design of the neighboring sites and buildings.**

**Building Design**

The applicant is proposing to construct the multi-tenant office building designed with hardi plank lap siding, metal coping, face brick, and glass windows. The use of horizontal siding is minimal on the front façade of the building, but it is used as the dominant material along the east elevation, which will face the residential neighborhood. *The applicant should provide material and color samples of the façade materials.*

During review, the Fire Marshal noted that there is one point of entry for each tenant space. It is unclear why rear access doorways have not been included on the elevation page, but rear entry should be considered as part of the overall project. Rear doorways allow for emergency exits, as well as a pathway to remove and transport office garbage to the dumpster enclosure. Otherwise, it will be necessary for the tenant to exit through the front door with any waste products. This is not ideally suited, if there are clients or visitors in the office. *We recommend the applicant to review the elevation pages to include rear doorways.*
Section 138-398 notes specific building requirements within the Coolidge District. The Planning Commission may revise these requirements, if the commission determines that the standards for site plan approval have been met.

(a) *All development in the Greenfield District (except single family detached houses) shall front and have primary access from Greenfield.*
   The development has one method of ingress/egress to Greenfield Road. The front of the building shall face Greenfield Road.

(b) *Developments that face Ellwood shall be residential in character.*
   The proposed development will not face Ellwood.

(c) *The planning commission may require screening including masonry walls up to 6 feet in height, decorative fencing or landscaping.*
   The site plan notes the installation of a six (6) foot high screen wall to separate the residential properties to the east. The screen wall should be extended to separate the multiple family residential building from the office building, or provide landscaping screening between land uses.

   Sheet SP-3 includes details for a simulated brick face Red-Wall paneled screen wall. The brick face panels measure 6 ft. 8 in. from grade to top of panel.

   The proposed design for screening is not appropriate and should not be considered as sufficient permanent screening for the residential neighbors. We do not recommend this material to be approved. The applicant should revise the plans and show the wall to be constructed of masonry materials or decorative fencing, maximum six (6) feet in height, measured from grade.

(d) *The first floor elevation of a building that fronts a street shall be composed of a minimum of 30 percent and maximum 80 percent windows.*
   When there is a choice between a major thoroughfare and a minor street, the elevation that faces the major thoroughfare shall be considered the front.

   The applicant has provided a percentage of window covers, as shown on Sheet A.1.

   Below is a summary of the minimum and maximum window coverage that is required by Ordinance per tenant space.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenant space</th>
<th>Façade Wall Area</th>
<th>Required Minimum/Maximum Window Coverage</th>
<th>Proposed Window Coverage (w. Door)</th>
<th>Proposed Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #1</td>
<td>422 sq. ft.</td>
<td>127 sf – 338 sf</td>
<td>61.3 sf (window only) 91.6 sf (with door)</td>
<td>14.5% (window only) 21.7% (with door)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #2</td>
<td>229 sq. ft.</td>
<td>69 sf – 183 sf</td>
<td>30 sf (window only) 60 sf (with door)</td>
<td>13% (window only) 26% (with door)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #3</td>
<td>229 sq. ft.</td>
<td>69 sf – 183 sf</td>
<td>30 sf (window only) 60 sf (with door)</td>
<td>13% (window only) 26% (with door)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #4</td>
<td>229 sq. ft.</td>
<td>69 sf – 183 sf</td>
<td>30 sf (window only) 60 sf (with door)</td>
<td>13% (window only) 26% (with door)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #5</td>
<td>229 sq. ft.</td>
<td>69 sf – 183 sf</td>
<td>30 sf (window only) 60 sf (with door)</td>
<td>13% (window only) 26% (with door)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant #6</td>
<td>422 sq. ft.</td>
<td>127 sf – 338 sf</td>
<td>61.3 sf (window only) 91.6 sf (with door)</td>
<td>14.5% (window only) 21.7% (with door)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The façade of the building does not meet the minimum window coverage percentage by total area, or by individual tenant space. The applicant has included less window coverage in order to provide for space for window awning and wall signage.

The Planning Commission should determine if the reduction in window coverage is appropriate. The applicant should be prepared to discuss if additional window area may be provided on the building façade facing Greenfield Road.

(e) The building elevation that fronts a street shall contain an entrance. The entrance shall access the first floor of the building. When there is a choice between a major thoroughfare and a minor street, the elevation that faces the major thoroughfare shall be considered the front.

Each proposed tenant space has been designed so as to have front entry access that will face Greenfield Road.

Signage
The site plan includes references to wall signs for each tenant, as well as a monument sign at the entrance to the subject site. All signs will require a separate sign permit to be submitted and reviewed by the Building Department. Signage is not approved as part of the site plan approval process.

Mechanical Equipment
The submitted site plan does not provide any details as to the location of any mechanical equipment. The applicant should include the location of any and all mechanical equipment on site. If any equipment is proposed to be located on the roof, screening must be provided to ensure the equipment is not visible from street view.
5. **Landscaping, lighting, dumpster enclosures, and other site amenities are provided where appropriate and in a complementary fashion.**

Landscaping

The submitted landscaping plan shows one area of evergreen trees proposed in the southeast corner of the subject site.

The landscaping plan does not provide any enhancements to the site. There is open area along all property lines to provide vegetation and plantings that will enhance the site. It is recommended that the applicant revise the plans to include more landscaping to enhance the subject property. Method of irrigation of all plantings must be included on the revised plans.

Lighting

The proposed illumination plan does not meet the maximum allowable footcandles at the north residential property line. Per Sec. 138-143(b)(2) – The level of lighting shall not exceed 0.5 footcandles at any residential property line or 1.0 footcandles at any nonresidential property line.

As the north property line is shared with multiple family residential, the 0.6 footcandle measurement near the proposed bicycle rack, exceeds the maximum allowed on a shared property line.

A revised photometric plan should be submitted to show all illumination levels in compliance with applicable ordinances.

Dumpster Enclosure

The applicant has noted the dumpster enclosure is to be located along the south property line. As noted above, the only method of access to the enclosure is from the front doorways of each tenant space. It is recommended the applicant review and include rear access for each space, as well as a concrete walkway for tenants to access the dumpster enclosure in all weather conditions.

The enclosure will be constructed of a masonry wall on three sides, with cedar wood vertical slats. The masonry walls must be constructed of masonry material. A simulated brick face panel will not be acceptable. Additionally, we recommend an alternate material for the dumpster gates. While cedar wood vertical slats look appealing, they do not last with the harsh Michigan weather and are prone to damage. The revised plans should include an alternate material for the dumpster enclosure gates.

The enclosure should be maximum 6 ft. in height and should be amended on revised drawings.

6. **Site engineering has been provided to ensure that existing utilities will not be adversely affected.**

We defer to the comments and recommendation of the City Engineer and Department of Public Works.
Summary and Recommendation
Due to the number of comments received herein and the review letters provided by DPW and HRC, as well as the preliminary letters from Road Commission of Oakland County, we recommend the Planning Commission postpone this site plan request to allow for the applicant to review and revise the plans and incorporate the necessary changes and provide additional information.
If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you.

Cc: Matthew Baumgarten, City Manager
    Victoria Mitchell, City Clerk
    John Staran, City Attorney
    Derrick Schueller, DPW Director
    Eddie Zmich, HRC
    Pete Kelly, Fire Marshal
    Matt Koehn, DPS Director
    Tim Fought, tfought@architectllc@gmail.com
    Alexander Orman, alex@ormanengineering.com
    Prime Management, primemanagement@tir.com
MEMO

To: Erin Schlutow, Community Development Director (via email)
Cc: Kim Anderson, Community Development (via email)
     Shawn Young, DPW Foreman (via email)
     Eddie Zmich, HRC (via email)

From: Derrick Schueler, DPW Director

Date: October 15, 2021

Subject: Proposed Office Building
Plan Review #1
3462-3478 Greenfield

We have reviewed the plans provided by Community Development on October 4 and prepared by T. Fought & Associates and Orman Engineering. Please find below our comments:

1. The site plans will be reviewed by the City’s engineering consultant, Hubbell, Roth & Clark (HRC). Among other things, HRC will review the storm water calculations and grading.

2. Greenfield Road is under the jurisdiction of RCOC. Oakland County requirements for site access and right-of-way layout can be significant and may alter the overall layout. The applicant shall share feedback received from the County and/or a plan approval letter. The proximity of the two drive approaches may be an issue.

3. A parcel combination will be required as part of this project. We defer to Community Development on the process and procedure for joining parcels.

4. Due to the volume on information, we recommend creating separate sheets for the demolition plan and engineering site plan.

5. Consistent with the current City demolition process, all existing sewer laterals must be removed at the public main with no stubs remaining (not capped at the property line). This shall be shown on the demolition plan and will require a lane removal. The applicant is responsible for verifying the private lateral connections to the public line- note the lateral connection for 3462 Greenfield may be connected to the WRC sewer. The applicant shall have a licensed plumber video the existing laterals to accurately depict on the plans.

6. Per the Design MISS DIG utility maps previously provided to the applicant, the existing water main is under the Greenfield curb line. Connections to this main will require a lane removal and should be indicated as such on the demolition plan.

7. The City Fire Marshal will provide feedback on fire suppression and fire hydrant coverage. Note the applicant may need to facilitate a hydrant flow test in the area to verify system pressures and flows.

8. The existing public sewer label shall be changed from “Sanitary” to “Combined” on the topographic survey.

9. The new sewer lateral connection will require a lane removal and shall be reflected on the demolition plan and site plan. Same applies to the detention outlet and connection to existing manhole in the travel lane.

10. The size of the new water service shall be indicated on the site plan.
11. A stormwater maintenance agreement shall be prepared and finalized as part of the site plan review process. An agreement template, as approved by the City Attorney, is attached here for applicant use. The applicant will be responsible for developing the three (3) exhibits referenced in the agreement.

12. Given the significant impacts to Greenfield Road, a separate traffic control plan shall be added to the plan set.

13. Note the Community Development Department will review the striping plan for verification of number of stalls required, sizing, handicap considerations and general site circulation.

14. The City will compute the storm water fixed charges at a later date to reflect the change in pervious/impervious surface. This calculation will be reflected on a future quarterly utility bill.

Feel free to call with any questions or concerns. Thank you.

Attachment
AGREEMENT FOR
STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE

This Agreement is made on _____________, by ________________, (“Developer”), a (corporation, limited liability company, partnership) whose address is ___________; and the CITY OF BERKLEY (the “City”), whose address is 3888 Coolidge Hwy, Berkley, MI 48089.

WHEREAS, Developer owns and proposes to develop the Property described in attached Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, the proposed development of the Property will alter the natural flow of surface and storm water drainage; and

WHEREAS, Developer has proposed, and the City has approved, a storm water management system (the “System”) as described and depicted in the plan attached as Exhibit B; and

WHEREAS, the parties will benefit from the proper operation, use, and maintenance of the System and enter into this agreement to provide for the same.

THEREFORE, the parties agree:

1. **Use of the System:**

Components of the System, including any and all water conveyance, detention and water quality treatment facilities and devices, pumping system, storm sewer pipe, catch basins, manholes, end-sections, ditches, swales, open water courses and rip-rap, shall be used solely for the purpose of conveying, detaining and treating storm and surface drainage on the property until such time as: (i) The City determines and notifies Developer or Developer’s successors, grantees or assigns, in writing, that it is no longer necessary to convey, detain or treat the storm and surface drainage; and (ii) An adequate alternative for conveying, detaining and treating storm and surface drainage has been provided which is acceptable to the City and which includes the granting of any easements to the City or third parties as may be required or necessary for the alternative drainage system.

2. **Maintenance:**

A. Developer shall be responsible for the proper maintenance, repair and replacement of the System and all parts thereof as detailed in the Maintenance Plan attached as Exhibit C.
B. Proper maintenance of the System shall include, but is not limited to: (i) Removing accumulated sediment, trash and debris from the detention basin and at inlet pipes; (ii) Managing deleterious vegetative growth; (iii) Maintaining storm sewer, structures, end-sections and safety features; (iv) Controlling the effects of erosion; (v) Inspection and cleaning of the water quality treatment device; (vi) Inspection of inlet and outlet pipes for structural integrity; (vii) Inspection and replacement of riprap at inlet pipes; (viii) Inspection and cleaning of the storm sewer and catch basins upstream from the detention basin; (ix) Inspection and replacement of stone around the outlet pipe; and (vi) Any other maintenance that is reasonable and necessary to facilitate and continue the proper operation and use of the System.

3. Action by City:

If, at any time, Developer or Developer’s successors, grantees or assigns neglect or fail to properly maintain the System or any part thereof, the City may notify Developer or Developer’s successors, grantees or assigns. The notice shall be in writing and shall list and describe maintenance deficiencies and demand that they be corrected within thirty (30) days.

The notice shall further specify a date and place for a hearing to be held at least fourteen (14) days after the date of the notice before the City Council, or such other board or official as the City Council may designate. At the hearing, the City Council (or other designated board or official) may affirm or modify the list and description of maintenance deficiencies and, for good cause shown, may extend the time for the deficiencies to be corrected.

Thereafter, if the maintenance deficiencies are not corrected within the time allowed, the City may undertake the necessary corrective actions, and the City may maintain the System for up to one (1) year. Such maintenance of the System by the City shall not be construed to be a trespass or a taking of the Property, nor shall the City’s actions vest in the public any right to enter or use the Property. Thereafter, if Developer or Developer’s successors, grantees or assigns do not properly maintain the System, the City may, after providing similar written notice, schedule and hold another hearing to determine whether the City should maintain the System for another year, and subject to a similar notice, hearing and determination, in subsequent years.

In the event the City determines an emergency or public nuisance condition caused by or relating to the System threatens the public health, safety or general welfare, the City shall have the right to immediately and without notice enter the Property and undertake appropriate corrective action.

4. Charges:

The City shall charge to the current owner of the Property the cost of maintenance or other corrective action undertaken by the City under this agreement, plus a ten percent (10%) administrative fee. If not timely paid, the City may place the charges on the City’s tax roll, which charges shall be a lien on the Property and shall be collectable and enforceable in the same manner general property taxes are collected and enforced.

5. Notice:

Any notices required under this agreement shall be sent by certified mail to the address for each party set forth below, or to such other addresses as such party may notify the other parties in writing:

To ____________________________:
To the City:  

City Manager  
City of Berkley  
3888 Coolidge Hwy  
Berkley, MI  48879

6. **Successors and Assigns:**

This agreement shall bind and inure to the benefit of the parties and their respective successors, grantees and assigns. The benefits, burdens, rights, obligations and responsibilities hereunder shall run with the land and shall bind all current and future owners of the Property and any divisions thereof.

7. **Recording of Agreement:**

This agreement shall be recorded at the Oakland County Register of Deeds.

By: ____________________________  

Its: ____________________________  

CITY OF BERKLEY  
By: ____________________________  

Matthew Baumgarten, City Manager

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
:SS  
COUNTY OF __________  

This agreement was acknowledged before me on __________, by ____________________________ on behalf of the ____________________________.  

_________________________ Notary public  
County, Michigan  
My commission expires: ____________

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
:SS  
COUNTY OF OAKLAND  

This agreement was acknowledged before me on __________, by Matthew Baumgarten, City Manager, of the City of Berkley, on behalf of the City.  

_________________________ Notary public  
County, Michigan  
My commission expires: ____________

Drafted by:  
John D. Staran, Esq.  
2055 Orchard Lake Road  
Sylvan Lake, MI 48320

When Recorded Return to:  
City Clerk  
City of Berkley  
3888 Coolidge Hwy.  
Berkley, MI 48879
To: Erin Schlutow  
From: Pete Kelly  
RE: Modified Greenfield Office Building Plan Reviews  

Erin;  

Per our discussion, I have reviewed the modified plans for the “twin” office buildings proposed for 2400 and 3462/3478 Greenfield and approved them, but with a question remaining. One building has back (east side) doors for all suites and the other does not. While the size of the suites doesn’t require a second means of egress, occupant safety is obviously enhanced with that feature, especially with vehicle traffic and parking in front of the only means of egress in the building lacking the rear doors.

Respectfully,

Pete Kelly
October 19, 2021

City of Berkley
3338 Coolidge Highway
Berkley, Michigan 48072

Attention: Ms. Erin Schlutow, Community Development Director
Mr. Matthew Baumgarten, City Manager

Re: Proposed Office Building
3462-3478 Greenfield Road
Engineering Site Plan – Review No. 1
City of Berkley, MI

Dear Ms. Schlutow and Mr. Baumgarten:

As Consulting Engineers for the City of Berkley, and in accordance with your request, we have completed the Engineering Site Plan review of the proposed subject development for compliance with the City of Berkley’s engineering and site plan requirements. The plans were prepared by T. Fought & Associates, Inc., with the engineering site plan created by Orman Engineering of Waterford, Michigan. The plans have an issue date of September 24, 2021 and were received by our office on October 4, 2021 via email. The proposed project scope includes the demolition of two (2) residential homes, driveways, garages, a shed, and all other accessory site features, and construction of a multi-unit office building and new parking lot. The project encompasses redevelopment of the two (2) lots with existing houses as well as one (1) existing vacant lot (which partially houses a shed). The proposed new development is located on east side of Greenfield Road, north of 12 Mile Road. We hereby offer the following comments:

General:

1. The proposed compact car spaces and ADA parking space must have signage clearly stating them as such. These signs must be included in the plans.

2. A Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC) permit will be required for proposed work within the Greenfield Road right-of-way as well as for construction signage.

3. A soil erosion permit will likely be required from the Oakland County Water Resources Commissioner (OCWRC). If a soil erosion permit is required, it must be obtained, and a copy of the approved permit provided to the City prior to commencing construction. Regardless of whether a permit is required, the City will require silt fence to be installed around the perimeter of the site, filter fabric installed in nearby catch basins, and a temporary maintenance aggregate/mud mat constructed for access to and from the proposed site.

4. A sequence of construction including estimated lane closure durations must be added to the plans.

5. A geotechnical investigation must be performed in order to evaluate the proposed storm detention system. The soil logs from that investigation must be shown on the plans, including the elevation of the groundwater table, soil types encountered, and the written report indicating the design recommendations or comments.
on the proposed stormwater collection system.

6. For the purposes of clarity, it is recommended that the Demolition Plan and proposed Engineering/Site Plan be shown on two (2) separate plan sheets. Further, both the Demolition and Engineering/Site Plan sheets must show all removal and proposed quantities including pavement, curb, sidewalk/ramp, utilities, trees, and landscape features.

7. The City may require additional sections of existing curb and gutter and sidewalks along Greenfield Road to be removed and replaced as part of the proposed project in order to address the current deteriorated conditions and will defer comment to the City.

Water and Fire Protection Services:

1. Permits may be required from the Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE) and from the OCWRC for the installation and connection of the new water main service.

2. The plans must include calculations for the new Residential Equivalent Unit (REU) value of the proposed (building) structures. These calculations must also support that the proposed water service is sufficiently sized for the new REU values.

3. The plans indicate a proposed water main connection to the existing water main in the Greenfield Road right-of-way (ROW). The City’s Department of Public Works (DPW) requires a tapping sleeve, valve, and well be used for this connection. The plans must reflect this type of connection. Proposed finished grades for gate wells must be provided as well.

4. Where the water service connection is proposed, the existing pavement cross-sections will need to be sawcut, removed, and replaced in kind. The plans must indicate the pipe bedding and type of backfill to be used in the street excavation areas for the new pipe installation. Further, the pavement restoration will be as per RCOC and as previously mentioned, an RCOC permit will be required.

Storm Drainage and Detention/Sanitary Sewer:

1. The type of cover to be utilized on the proposed drainage structures must be indicated on the plans. Restricted covers may need to be utilized if required by the City’s DPW being that the City’s sewer system is combined. The Applicant must inquire directly with the DPW. Efforts must be made to avoid overtaxing the system with additional drainage from the development.

2. Details of the outlet control structure and the connection to the existing combined system must be shown on the plans.

3. The plans indicate detention calculations for a 100-year storm for the proposed development. The provided volume calculations show a 48” HDPE pipe length of 315 feet. Dimensions and/or additional details of the underground pipe system must be added to the plans. In addition, the proposed storm sewer layout, including diameter and length, must be clearly indicated on the site plan.

4. The developer will be required to complete a perpetuity maintenance agreement with the City for the proposed private stormwater systems. The Applicant must contact the City DPW regarding this item prior to commencing construction.

5. Detail sheets for the proposed storm sewers must be provided with structures, covers, pipe
requirements/cross sections and connection/tap details in accordance with City and County Standards. In addition, shop drawings for the said appurtenances will be required to be reviewed by the City and HRC.

6. Inverts of the proposed storm sewer (utility profile) must be added to the plans to confirm positive drainage through the site to the detention system and to the combined sewer connection.

7. The existing sanitary sewer leads must be properly abandoned via a spot liner or another DPW approved method.

8. The proposed sanitary lead diameter and material is not indicated. The diameter of the sanitary lead as well as calculations showing that this size is adequate for the proposed development must be shown on the plans.

9. The proposed sanitary lead must include a new connection (TwisTee sewer saddle, as per the City DPW, or approved equal).

Recommendation:

Based on our aforementioned comments, we do not recommend approval of the proposed Site Plan at this time. The plans must be revised to address all of the above comments, and two sets resubmitted to the City of Berkley for further review.

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please contact the undersigned.

Very truly yours,

HUBBELL, ROTH & CLARK, INC.

Edward D. Zmich
Project Manager

Mitch Stark
Review Engineer

EDZ/mas
pc: City of Berkley; Mr. Derrick Schueller, Mr. Shawn Young
HRC; R. Alix, File
Orman Engineering; Alexander Orman
T. Fought & Associates; Timothy Fought
September 17, 2021

Orman Engineering LLC  
Attn: Alexander Orman, P.E.  
5476 Vivian Lane  
Waterford, MI 48327

RE: R.C.O.C. PRELIMINARY PLAN REVIEW  
LOCATION: 3462-3478 GREENFIELD RD, CITY OF BERKLEY  
PROJECT NAME: PROPOSED OFFICE BUILDING

Dear Mr. Orman:

At your request, the Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC) has completed a preliminary review for the above referenced project. Enclosed you will find one set of plans with our comments in red. All comments are for conceptual purpose only and should be incorporated into detailed construction plans. Below you will find a listing of the comments generated by the RCOC review:

   A) Proposed driveway location is acceptable. However, RCOC Traffic and Safety Department preferred to move the approach to the north as far away from the intersection.
   B) Remove or relocate all fixed objects prior to excavation. Fixed objects shall be no nearer than 6 feet from back of curb.
   C) Any pedestrian facilities shall be constructed in accordance with current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) guidelines.
   D) Pavement cross section shall consist of a minimum 9 inches of MDOT 35-P concrete, with epoxy coated rebar lane and curb ties over a suitable base, as determined in the field by RCOC.
   E) Excavations within a 1:1 influence of the roadway will require MDOT Class II backfill compacted to 95% maximum density.
Once the comments above are addressed, plans should be submitted to this office with completed RCOC permit application(s) Form 64a, signed by the owner (or his agent), three sets of plans (per application, 5 for signal permit) and the appropriate application fee(s).

All future correspondence related to the above referenced project will be sent to the address provided by the applicant. Separate applications will be required for:

a) Drive approach  
b) Utility connections

Upon receipt of the appropriate application packet, RCOC will provide a more detailed review. Please contact this office at (248) 858-4835 if you have any questions, or if we may be of further assistance.

Respectfully,

Simon Yousif, P.E.  
Permit Review Engineer  
Department of Customer Services

SS/mac  
Enclosure
TO: Berkley Planning Commission

FROM: Ben Carlisle, AICP
Megan Masson-Minock, AICP

DATE: October 21, 2021

RE: Draft Master Plan for Public Hearing

We hope this memo finds you and your family healthy, happy, and safe! We are looking forward to joining you for the public hearing on the Master Plan on Tuesday, October 26. Per your instructions, we have updated the draft Master Plan. A comprehensive list of changes by chapter is attached to this memo. However, we wanted to note the following substantial additions to the Master Plan Draft.

**Should versus Shall versus May**

At the September 28, 2021, meeting, the Planning Commission suggested that City staff and consultants review the draft Master Plan text for all references, “should,” “shall,” and “may.” Members of the Planning Commission felt that there were instances within the text in which the wrong verb had been used and the text should be reviewed.

Since that meeting, city staff and consultants have reviewed each instance in which “should”, “shall”, and “may” were used, and discussed if it was used appropriately. In the course of those discussions, it was determined that there were a few instances in which an alternate verb was deemed more appropriate. Those changes have been made within the text in the following manner:

- “Should” is used in most instances throughout the draft text since the Master Plan is a guiding document. The purpose of the plan is to show a path of what would be welcome in the City; what “should” occur within the community.

- It was discussed and agreed upon that “may” was to be used very rarely within the draft text, as it does not convey a sense of authority.

- “Shall” is also used rarely since it does not provide any flexibility, dictating compliance requirements with the text. As has been discussed throughout the text, the Master Plan is a guiding document that provides the legal framework to create ordinances and policies. In those respective ordinances and policies, “shall” would be used more frequently, in order to convey the authority of compliance. After the Master Plan has been adopted, ordinances will be amended and policies will be drafted that will include requirements for building and site design, parking, signage, and more.
Greenfield Concept Plan

Per the Planning Commission’s request on September 28, 2021, a new page of text has been added, found on page 58 on the Master Plan draft for the public hearing. The new copy goes into further detail about how this plan is conceptual and the process that would be required for it to become a reality. In keeping with the visual style of the document, a text box detailing the step-by-step process was added.

Implementation Introduction

As requested by the Planning Commission, the introductory text for the Implementation Chapter, on page 77 of the Master Plan draft for the public hearing, was further expanded. The new text further explains responsibilities for implementation and the process for updating of the implementation matrix, particularly at the time of the required five-year review of the Master Plan.

Next Steps

The remaining process for the Master Plan is:

- **Planning Commission Public Hearing:** A formal public hearing must be held by the Planning Commission. At this point, the Planning Commission could ask for changes to be made.
- **Planning Commission Recommendation:** The Planning Commission makes a recommendation to the City Council.
- **City Council Approval:** The City Council is the approving body for the Master Plan.

Thank you again for your time and the opportunity to be part of the Master Plan process! We look forward to seeing you next Tuesday evening.

Yours Truly,

---

CARLISLE/WORTMAN ASSOC., INC.

Benjamin R. Carlisle, AICP, LEED AP
Principal

Megan Masson-Minock, AICP
Planner
Berkley Master Plan 2020: Chapter by Chapter Changes
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Overall:
- Change draft date in footer to “October 2021”
- Update page numbers in Table of Contents
- Globally, search and replace for the following:
  - Change “11 Mile” to “Eleven Mile”
  - Change “11-Mile” to “Eleven Mile”
  - Change “12 Mile” to “Twelve Mile”
  - Change “12-Mile” to “Twelve Mile”

Executive Summary:
1st Round
- Pg. 4: End of first paragraph. “It is the framework to guide land use policy decision that will guide the known present into an unknown future.”
- Pg. 4: Mission statement – “…preserve residential neighborhoods…”

2nd Round
- Pg. 4: Second to last line in left hand column should read, “policy decisions that will guide the known present”
- Pg. 4: 1st line in right hand column should read, “The Master Plan is centered on the City’s Vision,”
- Pg. 4: Under “Vision” the 1st line should read, “Berkley will be a thriving 21st Century”
- Pg. 5: 1st sentence in left hand column should read, “The document is also based on Berkley’s history, existing land use, current demographics and previous planning efforts.”
- Pg. 5: Left hand column, 2nd bullet, 2nd line should read, “construction of larger, 21st Century buildings,”

Background
1st Round
- Pg. 4: End of first paragraph. “It is the framework to guide land use policy decision that will guide the known present into an unknown future.”
- Pg. 4: Mission statement – “…preserve residential neighborhoods…”
- Pg. 9: Webinars & Walking Tours – last sentence, amend “happened” for “occurred”
- Pg. 13, first sentence: Change “1932, Berkley became a city in order to lower taxes…”
- Pg. 14, third paragraph: Change "The early 20th century design, has not allowed..." by removing the comma to “The early 20th century design has not allowed…”
- Pg. 15: Rewrite “Vacant Land is Scarce” paragraph to:
  - “Only 6.6 acres of the 1,655.6 acres of Berkley is vacant, leaving little room for new development. Some are owned either by the City (parcel on the south side of Oxford, next to Oxford Park) or the school district (surrounding the maintenance shop). Other vacant properties are along the corridors of Greenfield and 12 Mile or in neighborhoods just north of 11 Mile.”
- Pg. 17: Change “…are just over 12% of the existing housing” to “are just over 12% of the existing housing stock”
- Pg. 19: “Data from Zillow in the 2019...” to “Data from the 2019...”
• Pg. 18: Change "Though slightly more than 7% of the population are minorities" to “While minorities are a small percentage of Berkley’s population,...”
• Pg. 20: Change Last sentence of first paragraph under “Increased Demand for Housing Other Than Single Family Home” to reads as “…was important or very important to plan for housing for the disabled.”
• Pg. 20: Change last sentence in second paragraph under “Decrease in Demand for Office Space” to read as, “In the 2019 Community 360 Metrics Report, business services at non-commercial sites, located mostly in neighborhoods, accounted for the largest group - 30 entities - in a single Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code.”

2nd Round
• Pg. 12: Under “Founding of Berkley & Building Boom”, the first sentence should read, “The 1910’s brought significant growth to the area”
• Pg. 13: Under “Post World War II”, the first sentence should read, “In the 1940’s, suburbanization and the post-war”
• Pg. 13: Left hand column is taller than the right hand column – may be an extra paragraph return...
• Pg. 13. 2nd sentence in right hand column should read, “In the 1970’s, the City joined Oakland County’s Twelve Towns combined relief sewer, now known as the George W. Kuhn Drain, which linked to a regional system.”
• Pg. 14: Left hand column, second paragraph, 3rd line, should read “21st Century”
• Pg. 14: Left hand column, third paragraph, 1st line should read, “The early 20th Century design has not allowed”
• Pg. 14: 2nd line in “Challenges” text box should read, “for 21st Century buildings”
• Pg. 15: Left hand column, last sentence under “Vacant Land is Scarce” should read, “Other vacant properties are along the corridors of Greenfield and Twelve Mile or in neighborhoods just north of Eleven Mile.”
• Pg. 18: Third line in 1st paragraph under “Population Stable but Aging” should read, “20th Century. The population then stabilized in the”

Vision, Mission and Values
1st Round
• Pg. 23: Add descriptions to captions of photos as follows top to bottom:
  • Field trip at summer camp through City Parks & Recreation.
  • Conversion of street to outdoor seating in summer 2020.
  • Berkley Days Fair at night. Source: Brandon Alger
  • Freeze tag at summer camp through City Parks & Recreation.

2nd Round
• Pg. 22: Under “Vision” the 1st line should read, “Berkley will be a thriving 21st Century”

Future Land Use
1st Round
• Pg. 24: Middle of 5th paragraph. Change “Future Lane Use Map” to “Future Land Use Map”
• Pg. 24: End of 5th paragraph. Change to “The graphic on the following page describes the differences between...”
• Pg. 25: delete the period at the end the following bullet points:
• Third bullet point in “Master Plan” box
• Last bullet point in “Future Land Use” box.
• Last bullet point in “Zoning Map” box

• Pg. 28: delete the period at the end the following bullet points in the “A Rezoning or Map Amendment is”:
  - Left hand column, 2nd bullet point
  - Right hand column, 1st bullet point
  - Right hand column, 2nd bullet point

• Pg. 29: Delete period at the end of the final bullet point, “Duplexes in existing locations, with further study on changing zoning to allow additional duplexes”.

• Pg. 30: Replace panorama photo with jpeg titled “page 30”.

• Pg. 33: Change the first sentence under “Why” to read as, “The High-Density Multiple Family category preserves existing multiple family buildings that serve the residential needs of individuals or households wanting or needing an apartment with central services.

• Pg. 33: Change the second sentence (should to shall) under “How” to read, “However, the City shall evaluate whether current regulations would allow a 21st century high-rise if Oxford Towers would ever need to be replaced or renovated.”

• Pg. 34: Delete period at the end of the last bullet point in the left hand column, “Duplexes, townhomes, and multiple family buildings that follow the design guidelines in the Corridors chapter”

• Pg. 34: Last bullet point under “How” Change to “…addition of duplexes and attached single-family housing.” Family is spelled incorrectly.

• Pg. 36: first sentence under “Where”...seems like something is missing after “Downtown, Woodward, and Eleven Mile…”

• Pg. 36: “Where”, delete the first two sentences and replace with the following text: “This future land use category is limited to high-traffic corridors outside the Downtown, in the following locations:”

• Pg. 37: Replace panorama photo

• Pg. 38: Change “used” to “use” in first bullet point under “What” to read, “The parcel or parcels in question are adjacent to a property zoned for mixed use or commercial uses with frontage on 12 Mile, 11 Mile, Coolidge, or Woodward.”

• Pg. 38: first paragraph under “What” changes to “Single-family uses and associated zoning are expected to remain until a rezoning request comes as part of a proposed development plan. The graphic on page 28 shows the multi-step process that would need to occur.”

• Pg. 38: last bullet under “What” change last phrase of the last sentence to “in the graphic below”

• Pg. 39: Move “Service and retail” to the second list “The following land uses may be added to the corridor.

• Pg. 39: Remove period from end of “Restaurants and bars” under “The following land uses may be added to the corridor:”

• Pg. 39: The last sentence under “How” has a verb change to read, “Programs, such as a façade improvement program, shall accompany policy changes to kick start redevelopment of this area.”
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- Pg. 40 – Seems like there is an extra space in the first sentence between “to” and “accommodate”
- Pg. 40 – first sentence, add comma to change to “…including, but not limited to, …”
- Pg. 40 – Bullet point make place of worship plural by changing to “places of worship”

2nd Round
- Pg. 24: Left hand column, second paragraph, 1st line should read, “In the Future Land Use Map, the Master Plan”
- Pg. 24: Left hand column, third paragraph, second line should read, “and identified on the Future Land Use Map classify”
- Pg. 33: Under “How”, the 2nd to last line should read, “would allow a 21st Century high-rise if Oxford Towers”
- Pg. 44: 1st line under “Neighborhood Buffers” should read, “Due to its early 20th century design, Berkley”
- Pg. 30: Change source of panoramic photo on bottom to “Source: City of Berkley”
- Pg. 37: Change source of panoramic photo on bottom to “Source: City of Berkley”
- Pg. 38: Under the first bullet point under “What”, change 12 Mile to Twelve Mile and 11 Mile to Eleven Mile. Again, my mistake in cut and paste text.
- Pg. 40: Change first line under “Why” to read “The intent of this category is to accommodate”

Neighborhoods
1st Round
- Pg. 44: Remove period from end of item 5 in the “Why Infill Houses are Bigger than a Bungalow?” text box
- Pg. 44: Last sentence of second paragraph under “Neighborhood Buffers”: capitalize Corridors Chapter
- Pg. 45: Change last sentence under “Consult with builders and developers as well as the community” to read as, “Builders and developers can share market and financing aspects of real estate, bring real world experience, and identify unknown issues.”
- Pg. 46: Change the first sentence under “City Services” to read, “Residents continually praised the quality of City services in interviews, focus groups and the 2020 Community Survey.”
- Pg. 46: Second paragraph under “City Services” to read, “In addition to traditional services, Berkley sees its communications with residents as an essential service, especially to neighborhoods. The City uses a variety of platforms, from paper to digital, to continually engage residents. Building relationships and social capital is as vital to vibrant neighborhoods as is well-maintained homes and streets.”
- Pg. 47: 1st phrase in second sentence under Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU’s): remove “a” before plural mother-in-law suites and granny flats so it reads “Also known as mother-in-law suites and granny flats,”
- Pg. 49: second sentence under “Universal Design”, repeated ‘the’ to be removed so it reads “Through education and policy changes, municipalities have promoted Universal Design, defined by the National Association of Home Building as “the design of products and environments to be
usable by all people, to the greatest extent possible, without the need for adaptation or specialized design”.

- Pg. 49: Change second paragraph under “Universal Design” so universal is spelled correctly and capitalized, “The City should undertake the following to promote Universal Design in Berkley:”
- Pg. 49: Change the verb in the beginning of the third sentence in “Residential Universal Design Education” to read, “Several education methods may be used, such as …”
- Pg. 50: Add period to last bullet in “Universal Design Strategies” text box so it reads, “Accessibility-enhanced bathroom, including a walk-in-or roll-in shower or tub.”
- Pg. 51: Change the last sentence under ”Accessible Medical Facilities” so the sentence reads, “Medical facilities should be located near where neighborhoods meet the commercial corridors, as appropriate.”
- Pg. 51: first sentence change to “The 2020 Parks and Recreation Plan includes action items to “
- Pg. 51: third sentence under “Social and Cultural” – “The Parks and Recreation Plan, the Downtown Plan and the Corridors Chapter of this Master Plan include recommendations for physical improvements and policy changes to improve the sense of place in these areas.”
- Pg. 51: Add image for “Gallup Park Playground” with caption, “The playground shown above in Gallup Park in Ann Arbor is an example of an inclusive design.”

2nd Round
- Pg. 44 – End all sentences in text box with a period.

Corridors 
1st Round
- Pg. 53: Change the last two sentences under “Offer Transportation Choices” to read as, “The creation of “transit nodes” on corridors is an economic development tool to increase foot traffic and economic activity at key intersections. A transit node has wider sidewalks and more intensive development (i.e., taller buildings built to edge of the sidewalk) at transit stops. Nodes should be implemented on Twelve Mile Road, Coolidge Highway, and Woodward Avenue.”
- Pg. 56: Add period to last sentence in “Recommendations” text box so it reads, “Relaxing parking requirements is appropriate when other parking options may be possible – municipal parking lots or shared parking – such as in the Downtown.”
- Pg. 56: Last bullet point, add -s after space
- Pg. 56 – Text box last sentence; add “not” so it reads “Relaxing parking requirements is appropriate when other parking options may not be possible –…””
- Pg. 57: Add “on” into 2nd bullet point in “Greenfield Road Residential” text box so it reads, “Buildings located on Greenfield may be taller, though not to exceed 3 stories in height.”
- After page 57: create a new page with the text
- Pg. 57: second sentence under Greenfield, delete extra comma after sentence so the sixth line reads “retail uses. There are a variety of land uses”
- Pg. 57: Delete last sentence (A full description of the process and design guidelines can be found in the Appendix) in Greenfield text.
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- Pg. 59: Delete “should be” in 2nd bullet point in “11 Mile Design Guidelines” text box so it reads, "Pedestrian crosswalks must meet accessibility standards and be well marked."
- Pg. 62: Delete “should be” in 2nd bullet point under “Public right of way (ROW) enhancements” text box so it reads “Pedestrian crosswalks must meet accessibility standards and be well marked.”
- Pg. 63: First sentence under “Woodward” – change to “…one of the most studied and planned corridors in southeast Michigan.”
- Pg. 63: Add period to the first bullet point under Study Recommendations
- Pg. 67: Change caption of top photo in left hand column to “Repurposed street for outdoor dining in 2020.”

2nd Round
- Pg. 56: Change sentence in text box under “Change parking regulations” to read “Relaxing parking requirements is appropriate when other parking options, such as municipal parking lots or shared parking, may not be possible.”

Systems
1st Round
- Pg. 69: The heading of “Infrastructure” in the left hand column needs to be bold font to match other headings.
- Pg. 69: Replace “Twelve Towns” with “George W. Kuhn Drain, formerly known as Twelve Towns,”
- Pg. 69 – Examples of Green Infrastructure – change sentence to: “The following examples of green infrastructure on a small and medium scale were shared during the Green Infrastructure webinar that was part of the community engagement efforts.”
- Pg. 72 – Add period to last bullet point on the page
- Pg. 72: Add image of bicycle parking
- Pg. 75: Change sentence under “Increase Green Infrastructure” to read as, “As discussed in the Infrastructure section of this chapter, the City can integrate green infrastructure in all levels of development and infrastructure improvements.”

2nd Round
- Pg. 70: Add the photo below with the caption “Green infrastructure in a parking lot” and 2nd line in caption “Source: Presentation on Green Infrastructure Webinar”
- Pg. 70: Delete “at the end of the paragraph under “Examples of Green Infrastructure”
- Pg. 73: Add period to last bullet point on the page so it reads, “Incentives of zoning flexibility where sustainable building and site design features, transit amenities, public art, open space, green roofs or “cool roofs”.
- Pg. 73: Add period to second bullet in list under “Develop Plans and Policies to Increase Energy Efficiency” to read “A stand-alone Sustainability or Climate Action Plan.”

Implementation
1st Round
- Pg. 76: New text added for Implementation introduction