

## tWELVE MILE CROSSING AT FOUNTAIN WALK NEW RETAIL BUILDING <br> SP 12-26

cityofnovi.org

## 12 MILE CROSSING AT FOUNTAIN WALK - NEW RETAIL BUILDING SP12-26

Consideration of the request of Cahen Architectural Group for recommendation to the City Council for Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan approval. The subject property is located in Section 15, at 44275 Twelve Mile Road, south of Twelve Mile Road and west of Donelson Drive, in the RC, Regional Center District. The subject property is approximately 67.2 acres and the applicant is proposing to add a 57.793 retail building with associated parking and landscaping near the center of the existing 12 Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk development.

## Required Actlon

Recommend approval/denial of the Preliminary Site Plan, Phasing Plan and Stormwater Management Plan.

| REVIEW | RESULT | DATE | COMMENTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Planning | Approval recommended | 06/04/12 | - Zoning Board of Appeals variances for loading zone and dumpster location required. <br> - Clity Council approval of the Shared Parkling Study required. <br> - Applicant submitted a phasing plan atter staff and consultant reviews were completed. More detailed reviews of the phasing plan will be required with future site plan submiftals. <br> - Minor items to be addressed at the time of the next plan submittal. |
| Engineering | Approval recommended | 06/01/12 | Items to be addressed at the time of the next plan submittal. |
| Traffic | Approval recommended | 05/29/12 | - Clity Council waiver of new Traffic Impact Study recommended. <br> - Items to be addressed at the time of the next plan submittal. |
| Landscaping | Approval recommended | 06/04/12 | - Planning Commission waiver for bullding foundation landscape area requlred. Applicant should provide additional foundation landscaping at the front of the bullding or In the parking lot Islands. <br> - Minor items to be addressed al the time of the next plan submittal. |
| Façade | Approval recommended | 05/30/12 | - Section 9 façade walver recommended for the overage of EIFS on all facades. <br> - Applicant must submit the required sample board. |
| Fire | Approval recommended | 06/06/12 | Traffic islands and curb layouts should be revised to allow for fire truck turning radiuses of 50 ' outside and $30^{\prime}$ inside on next plan submittal. |

## Motions

## Approval - Preliminary Site Plan

In the matter of 12 Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk - New Retail Building, SP 12-26, motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary Site Plan, subjecl to the following:
a. Zoning Board of Appeals variances for the loading zone and dumpster locations in the exterior side yard;
b. City Council approval of the Shared Parking Study;
c. City Council waiver of an updated Traffic Impact Study;
d. City Council waiver of building foundation landscaping provided the applicant provides additional landscaping along portions of the building frontage or within the parking lot islands;
e. Section 9 façade waiver for the overage of EIFS on all facades which is consistent with the previously granted façade waivers for the center;

1. The applicant revising the plan to comply with the requirements of the Fire review letter;
g. The conditions and items listed in the staff and consultant review letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan submittal; and
h. (additional conditions here if any)
for the following reasons...the plan is otherwise in compliance with Arlicle 17, Article 24 and Article 25 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.

## Approval - Phasing Plan

In the matter of 12 Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk - New Retail Building, SP 12-26, motion to recommend approval of the Phasing Plan, subject to the following:
a. All facades of the anchor tenant building identified as Phase 2 must meet the standards of the façade ordinance or any waivers that are granted. The applicant musi provide a note on the plans to indicate compliance with this condition;
b. The area identified for Phases 2 and 3 shall be maintained as landscaped greenspace until construction on the respective phases begins;
c. A portion of the pathway totaling at least $5^{\prime}$ width and included in Phases 2 and 3 along the proposed building frontages shall be installed with the construction of Phase I;
d. Loading zone screening consisting of landscape materials approved by staff shall be installed along the south side of the existing loading zone in the area where Phases 2 and 3 are currently shown within one year of the completion of Phase 1 if construction on Phases 2 and 3 has not begun;
e. Any additional concerns identified by staff being addressed on the Final Site Plan submittal; and
f. (additional conditions here if any)
for the following reasons...The plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 17, Article 24 and Article 25 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.

## Approval - Stormwater Management Plan

In the matter of 12 Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk - New Retail Building, SP 12-26, motion to recommend approval of the Stormwater Management Plan, subject to:
a. The condifions and items listed in the staff and consultant review letters being addressed on the next plan submittal; and
b. (additional conditions here if any)
for the following reasons....(because it is otherwise in compliance with Chapters 11 and 12 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.)

Denial - Preliminary Site Plan
In Ihe matter of 12 Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk - New Retail Building, SP 12-26, motion to recommend denial of the Preliminary Sife Plan, for the following reasons.. (because it is not in compliance with the Ordinance.)

## Denlal - Phasing Plan

In the malter of 12 Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk - New Relail Building, SP 12-26, motion to recommend dental of the Phasing Plan. for the following reasons... (because it is not in compliance with the Ordinance.)

## Denlal - Stormwater Management Plan

In the matter of 12 Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk - New Retail Building, SP 12-26, motion to recommend denial of the Stormwater Management Plan, for the following reasons... (because it is not in compliance with Chapters 11 and 12 of the Ordinance.)

## PLAN REVIEW CENTER REPORT

June 4, 2012

## Planning Review

Twelve Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk New Retail SP12-26

## Petitioner

Cahen Architectural Group

## Review Type

Preliminary Site Plan

## Property Characterlstics

- Site Location:
- Site Zoning:
- Adjoining Zoning:
- Current Site Use:
- Adjoining Uses:
- School District:
- Site Size:
- Plan Date:

44275 Twelve Mile Road, South of Twelve Mile Road and west of Donelson Drive (Section 15) RC, Regional Center
Norlh: OS-1; East: RC; West: OST; South: I-96 right-of-way Existing 12 Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk shopping center
North: Vacant, Bank, Office Park; East: Shopping Center; West: Office Park; South: I-96 right-of-way Novi Community School District
67.2 acres

04-24-12

## Project Summary

The subject property is within the existing 12 Mile Crossing at Fountoin Walk shopping center south of Twelve Mile Road and west of Donelson Drive. The applicant is proposing to add a 57,793 square foot retail building including a larger tenant space (approximately $30,000 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$.), a restaurant tenant space and six smaller general retail tenant spaces. The new building would be located near the center of the existing development and also include the addition of 224 parking spaces and associated landscaping.

## Recommendation

Approval of the preliminary site plan is recommended. The applicant should submit plans for Final Site Plan approval once the appropriate approvals are granted by the City Council.

## Ordinance Requirements

This project was reviewed for conformance with the Zoning Ordinance with respect to Article 17 (RC Regional Center District), Article 24 (Schedule of Regulations), Article 25 (General Provisions) and any other applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. Items in bold below must be addressed by the applicant.

1. Loading Zone Location: All loading zones in the RC District must be located in the rear yard. The plan shows the loading zone in the exterior side yard. The appllcant should seek a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals for the proposed loading zone location. Slaff would support this variance.
2. Dumpster Localion: All dumpsters must be located in the rear yard. The plan shows the two dumpsters in the exterior side yard. The appllcant should seek a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals for the proposed dumpster locations. Staff would support this variance.
3. Parking: The applicant has provided a Shared Parking Study indicating approximately 4,017 parking spaces are needed to accommodate the center's proposed mix of uses; 4,077 spaces have been provided. The City's traffic consultant has reviewed the study and has found it to be
acceptable. City Councll approval of the Shared Parking Study is requlred after a review and recommendatlon by the Planning Commission.
4. Cily Council Consideration and Approval: Section 1703.4 of the Zoning Ordinance requires all proposed plans in the RC District on parcels over 4 acres be approved by the City Council after a review and recommendation by the Planning Commission.

## Response Letter

A letter from eilher the applicant or the applicant's representalive addressing comments in this and other review letters is required prior to appearing before the Planning Commission and with the Final Site Plan submittal.

## Chapter 26.5

Chapter 26.5 of the City of Novi Code of Ordinances generally requires all projects be completed within two years of the issuance of any starting permit. Please contact Sarah Marchioni at 248-3470430 tor additional information on starling permits. The applicant should review and be aware of the requirements of Chapter 26.5 betore starting construction. The applicant has indicated phasing is proposed for the project but all elements will be completed within two years. Phasing is not required for projects to be completed in two years or less. If there is a possibility that the constructlon will extend beyond two years, the applicant should indicate phasing approval is requested and provide a plan sheet titled phasing and graphically depicting the proposed phase lines.

## Pre-Construction Meeting

Prior to the start of any work on the site, Pre-Consiruction (Pre-Con) meetings must be held with the applicant's contractor and the City's consulting engineer. Pre-Con meetings are generally held after Stamping Sels have been issued and prior to the start of any work on the site. There are a variety of requirements, fees and permits that must be issued before a Pre-Con can be scheduled. If you have questions regarding the Pre-Con or to schedule a Pre-Con, please contact Sarah Marchioni [248.347.0430 or smarchioni@cityofnovi.org] in the Community Development Department.

If the applicant has any questions concerning the above review or the process in general, do not hesitate to contacl me at 248.347 .0586 or kkapelanski@cityofnovi.org.

Planning Review Summary Chart
Twelve Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk New Retail
SP12-26
Plan Dated: 04-24-12

| Item | Required | Proposed | Meets <br> Requirements? | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Master Plan | Regional Commercial | Regional Commercial | Yes |  |
| Zoning | RC | RC | Yes |  |
| Use (Sec. 1701) and 1702) | Regional and Community shopping centers, Retail businesses, Sit-down restaurants | 57,493 sq. ft. retail center | Yes |  |
| Building Height (Sec. 2400) | Maximum 45 feet | $27^{\prime}$ | Yes |  |
| Building Setbacks (Sec. 2400) |  |  |  |  |
| Exlerior Side (north) | 100 feet | 200 feet + | Yes |  |
| Exterior Side (east) | 100 feet | 200 feet + | Yes |  |
| Exterior Side (west) | 100 feet | 200 feet + | Yes |  |
| Exterior Side (south) | 100 feet | 200 feet + | Yes |  |
| Parking Selbacks (Sec. 2400) |  |  |  |  |
| Exterior Side (north) | 20 feet | New parking proposed is interior to the site. | N/A |  |
| Exterior Side (east) | 20 feet |  |  |  |
| Exterior Side (west) | 20 feet |  |  |  |
| Exterior Side (south) | 20 feet |  |  |  |
| Number of Parking Spaces (Sec. 2505) | Shopping Centers grealer than 600,000 sq. ft.: 1 <br> space/222 sq. ft. <br> If the combined GLA of restaurant, cinema, and entertainment uses exceeds $20 \%$ of the total GLA for the shopping center, a shared parking study is required. | 4,077 spaces | Yes | Shared Parking Study Indicates that approxImately 4,017 parking spaces are required to accommodate the proposed mix of uses for the entire center. See the traffic review lefter for additional information. <br> Clty Council approval of the |


| Item | Required | Proposed | Meets Requirements? | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Any single use over 30,000 <br> square feet and within a shopping center shall have its portion of the parking requirement calculated from the appropriate standards for the use, if one exists. <br> See attached parking review chart for parking requirements and comments |  |  | Shared Parking Study after Planning Commission recommendation is required. |
| Parking Space Dimensions (Sec. 2506) | 9' $\times 19^{\prime}$ parking space dimensions and 24 ' wide drives for $90^{\circ}$ spaces. <br> 9' $\times 17^{\prime}$ parking space dimensions permitted wilh a $4^{\prime \prime}$ curb | $\begin{aligned} & 9^{\prime} \times 19^{\prime} \text { and } 9^{\prime} \times 17^{\prime} \\ & \text { parking space } \\ & \text { dimensions and } 24^{\prime} \\ & \text { wide drives. } \end{aligned}$ | Yes | Applicant should indicate 4" curbs where 17' spaces are proposed. |
| Barrier Free <br> Spaces <br> (Barnier Free <br> Code) | 20 accessible spaces plus one for each 100 spaces over 1,000; 1 in 6 spaces must be van accessible <br> $20+31=51$ spaces required ( 17 spaces must be van accessible) | 92 accessible spaces <br> (27 van accessible) | Yes |  |
| Barrier Free Space Dimensions (Barnier Free Code) | $8^{\prime}$ wide with a $5^{\prime}$ wide access aisle [ 8 ' wide access aisle for van accessible) | 8' wide with an 8' wide access aisle for van accessible and $8^{\prime}$ wide with a $5^{\prime}$ wide access aisle for accessible | Yes |  |
| Barrier Free Signs [Barrier Free Design Graphics Manual) | One barrier free sign is required per space. | Barrier free signs shown. | Yes |  |
| Loading Spaces (Sec. 2507) | 10 square feet per front foot of | 6,639 sq. ft. provided in the exterior side | No | Appllcant should seek a Zoning |

SP12-26 Twelve Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk New Retail

| Ifem | Required | Proposed | Meets Requirements? | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { building }=526 \times 10 \\ & =5,260 \text { sq. } 11 \text {. } \end{aligned}$ <br> All loading shall be in the rear yard or interior side yard if double fronted lot. | yard. |  | Board of Appeals varlance for the loading zone locatlon. Siaff would support this variance. |
| Loading Space <br> Screening (Sec. 2302A.1) | In the RC District. view of loading and waiting areas must be shielded from rights of way and adjacent properties. | Proposed loading will be screened by an existing building. | Yes |  |
| Accessory <br> Structure <br> Setback- <br> Dumpster <br> (Sec. 2503) | Accessory siructures should be setback a minimum of 10 feet from any building unless structurally attached to the building and setback the same as parking from all property lines; in addifion, the structure must be in the rear or interior side yard. | Dumpsters located in the exterior side yard and setback appropriately from the building and properly lines. | No | Applicant should seek a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals for the dumpster location. Staff would support thls varlance. |
| Dumpster <br> (Chap. 21 <br> Sec. 21-145) | Screening of not less than 5 feet on 3 sides of dumpster required, interior bumpers or posts must also be shown. Enclosure to match building materials and be at least one foot taller than height of refuse bin . | Details provided meeting ordinance requirements. | Yes |  |


| Item | Required | Proposed | Meels <br> Requirements? | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Exterior Signs | Exterior Signage is not regulated by the Planning Department or Planning Commission. |  | - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Please contacl } \\ & \text { Jeannie Niland } \\ & 248.347 .04381 . \end{aligned}$ |
| Exterior Lighting <br> (Sec. 251)) | Photometric plan and exterior lighting delails needed at final site plan. | Lighting plan will be required with Final Site Plan submittal. | N/A |  |
| Sidewalks (City Code Sec. 11276(b)) | An $8^{\prime}$ wide sidewalk shall be provided along Twelve Mile Road as required by the City's Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan. <br> Building exits must be connecled to sidewalk system or parking lot. | Existing concrete walk along 12 Mile Road to remain. | Yes |  |
| Misc. Items | Proposed Patio <br> Phasing Indicated |  | , | Outdoor seating musi meet be approved by the Building Ofticial. See Sec. 2524 of the Zoning Ordinance for outdoor sealing regulations. <br> A note on Sheet 4 references a phasing plan but notes all work will be completed within 2 years. A phasing plan is not required If work will be completed within 2 years. See plan revlew lefter for additional information. |

Prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, (248) 347-0586 or kkapelanski@cityofnovi.org

## Parklng Revlew Summary Chart

Twelve Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk New Retail
SP12-26
Plan Dated: 04-24-12

| Item | Required | Proposed | Meets <br> Requirements? | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Parking Spaces (Sec. 2505) | Shopping Centers greater than 600,000 sq. ft.: 1 <br> space/222 sq. ft. Remaining <br> 429,781 sq. ft. / <br> 222 sq. ft. $=1,936$ <br> spaces required <br> (If the combined GLA of restaurant, cinema, and entertainment uses exceeds $20 \%$ of the total GLA for the shopping center, a shared parking study is required. <br> (Restaurant, cinema and entertalnment uses equal $24 \%$ of total GLA - Shared Parking Study Required) <br> Any single use over 30,000 square feet and within a shopping center shall have its portion of the parking requirement calculated from the appropriate standards for the use, if one exists. 2,647 spaces (plus spaces for theater employees) required for uses over $30,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. | 4,077 spaces | Yes | Shared Parking Study indic ates that approximately 4,017 parking spaces are required to accommodate the proposed mix of uses for the entire center. See the traffic revlew lefter for additional Information. <br> City Councll approval of the Shared Parking Study after Planning Commlssion recommendation is required. |


| Item | Required | Proposed | Meets Requirements? | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4,583 spaces (plus spaces for theater employees) required for entire center |  |  |  |
| Parking Requirement Calculations - Uses Over 30,000 sq. ff . |  |  |  |  |
| Dick's Sporting Goods | Retail: ) <br> space/200 sq. ft. <br> 41,700 sq. ft. / 200 <br> $=209$ spaces <br> required | 4,077 spaces for entire center | Yes-See above |  |
| M-Bar-Go | Dance Hall: 1 space/2 people allowed under maximum occupancy <br> 2,000 people / $2=$ 1,000 spaces requlred |  |  |  |
| Emagine Theater | Theater: 1 space/3.4 seals plus 1 for every 2 employees <br> 3,377 seats $/ 3.4=$ 993 spaces + park\|ng tor employees |  |  |  |
| Powerhouse Gym | Health Facility Greater than 30,000 sq. tt.: 1 space/9 memberships <br> 4,000 anticlpated full membership / $9=445$ spaces |  |  |  |


cityofnovi.org

# PLAN REVIEW CENTER REPORT 

June 1, 2012

## Engineering Revlew

## Twelve Mile Crossings at Fountain Walk New Retail SP12-26

## Petitioner

Cahen Archilectural Group, Architecl

## Revlew Type

Preliminary Site Plan and Storm Water Management Plan

## Propenty Characterlsilics

- Site Location: 12 Mile Crossing al Fountain Walk
- Site Size: 5 acres
- Plan Date: April 24, 2012


## Prolect Summary

- Construction of an approximately 57,493 square-foot building and associated parking. Site access would be provided by existing access points off of public roadways.
- Water service would be provided by an 8 -inch extension from the existing water main to the south of the proposed development. A domestic lead and two (2) fire leads would be provided to serve the building, along with one (1) additional hydrant.
- Sanitary sewer service would be provided an B-inch extension off of the existing sanitary sewer.
- Storm water would be collected by a single storm sewer collection system and discharged into the existing detention basins located S. of West Oaks within the ITC property.


## Recommendation

Approval of the Prellminary Site Plan and Prellminary Storm Water Management Plan is recommended.

## Comments:

The Preliminary Site Plan meets the general requirements of Chapter 11, the Storm Water Management Ordinance and the Engineering Design Manual with the following ltems to be addressed at the time of Final Site Plan submittal (further engineering detail will be required at the lime of the final sile plan submiltal):

Addillonal Comments '10 be addressed prior to the Final Site Plan submiltall:

## Genera)

1. The Cily standard detail sheets are not required for the Final Site Plan submittal, They will be required with the Stamping Sel submittal.
2. Revise line weights, lypes, shaping and annotation to differentiate between proposed and existing condilions.
3. Provide parking lot lighting locations on plan set.

Water Main
4. Provide specificalions and details for all building leads and fire department connections including pipe diameter, type, and location.
5. Consider relocating the fire hydrant $S$. of 'Tennant $F$ ' away from any landscaping plantings.
6. Three (3) sealed sets of revised utility plans along with the MDEQ permif application (1/07 rev.) for water main construction and the Streamlined Water Main Permil Checklisl should be submitled to the Engineering Department for review, assuming no further design changes are anticipated. Utility plan sets shall include only the cover sheet, any applicable utility sheets and the standard detail sheets.

## Sanitary Sewer

7. Provide specificalions and delails for all bullding leads and connections.
8. Provide a profile for the proposed sanitary sewer extension.
9. Revise the uflity plan to include a monitoring manhole between the proposed sanitary sewer and ail of the proposed building leads.
10. Revise the slope of the proposed sanitary sewer to a minimum of $1 \%$ between $\$ \$ 302$ and $\$ \$ 301$ where grade is available. If grade is prohibillve, revise the slope to a minimum of $0.6 \%$.
11. Five (5) sealed sets of revised utility plans along with the MDEQ permit application (11/07 rev.) for sanitary sewer construction and the Streamlined Sanitary Sewer Permit Certification Checklist should be submitted to the Engineering Department for review, assuming no further design changes are anticipated. Utility plan sets shall include only the cover sheet, any applicable utilly sheets and the standard detall sheets. Also, the MDEQ can be contacled for an expedited review by their office.

## Storm Sewer

12. Provide a profile for the proposed storm sewer detailing all structures and their assoclated sumps.
13. Provide specifications and delails for all roof drains and connections including pipe diameter, type, and location.

## Storm Water Management Plan

14. The Storm Water Management Plan for this development shall be designed in accordance with the Storm Water Ordinance and Chapter 5 of the new Engineering Design Manual.
15. Verify that the impervious area accounted for in the original site is greater than or equal to the proposed impervious area.
16. Provide elevalions to verifying that the existing forebays/detention basins are functioning with an operating capacity as designated in the original site plan for Fountain Walk. If the existing system does not meet the original design capacity, revise the storm water management plan accordingly.
17. If modification is required to expand or adjust the existing detention areas a lemporary construction easement may be required and must be in compliance with the existing easement (L. 21150 P. 626).
18. Revise the soil boundary adjacent to Future Outlot \#2 to refleci the border between soils 108 and 118 .

## Paving \& Grading

19. Denote the extent of grading between the proposed development and the exisling siructures N . of the sile and provide match grade elevalions.
20. Provide grading elevations and slopes for the 'flat walk' and it's associated transilions adjacent to the van accessible parking spaces across from Tenant ' D '.

## The following must be submilted at the time of Final Sile Plan submilial:

21. A letler from either the applicant or the applicant's engineer must be submitted with the Final Site Plan highlighting the changes made to the plans addressing each of the comments listed above and indicating the revised sheets involved.
22. An itemized construction cost estimate must be submitted to the Community Development Department at the time of Final Site Plan submittal for the determinalion of plan review and construction inspection fees. This estimate should only include the civil sile work and not any cosis associaled with construction of the building or any demolition work. The cost estimate must be llemized for each utility (water, sanitary, storm sewer), on-site paving, right-of-way paving (including proposed right-of-way), grading, and the storm waler basin (basin construction, control structure, pretreatment structure and restoration).

## The following must be submilted at the time of Stamping Set submiltal:

23. A draft copy of the maintenance agreement for the storm water facilities, as oullined in the Storm Water Management Ordinance, must be submitted to the Community Development Department with the Final Site Plan. Once the form of the agreement is approved, this agreement must be approved by City Council and shall be recorded in the office of the Oakland County Register of Deeds.
24. A draft copy of the 20 -foot wide easement for the water main to be constructed on the site must be submitted to the Community Development Department.
25. A draft copy of the 20 -foot wide easement for the sanilary sewer to be constructed on the site must be submitted to the Community Development Department.

## The following must be addressed prlor to construction:

26. A pre-construction meeting shall be required prior to any site work being started. Please contact Sarah Marchioni in the Community Development Depariment to selup a meeling (248-347-0430).
27. A City of Novi Grading Permit will be required prior to any grading on the sile. This permit will be issued at the pre-construction meeting. Once determined, a grading permit fee must be paid to the City Treasurer's Office.
28. A Soil Erosion Control Permit must be obtained from the City of Novi. Contact Sarah Marchioni in the Community Development Department (248-347-0430) for forms and information.
29. A permlt for water main construction must be obtained from the MDEQ. This permit application must be submitted through the City Engineer after the water main plans have been approved.
30. A permit for sanitary sewer construction must be obtained from the MDEQ. This permil application must be submilled through the Cily Engineer after Ihe sanitary sewer plans have been approved.
31. Construction Inspection Fees to be determined once the constuction cost estimate is submitted must be paid prior to the pre-construction meeting.
32. A storm water performance guarantee, equal to 1.5 times the amount required to complete storm water management and facilities as specified in the Storm Water Management Ordinance, must be posted at the Treasurer's Office.
33. An incomplete site work performance guarantee for this development will be calculated lequal to 1.5 times the amount required to complele the sile improvements, excluding the storm water facilities) as specified in the Performance Guarantee Ordinance. This guarantee will be posled prior to

## Englneering Review of Prellminary Slte Plan

TCO, al which time it may be reduced based on percentage of construction completed.
34. A street sign financial guarantee in an amount to be determined (\$400 per traffic control sign proposed) must be posted at the Treasurer's Office.

Please coniact Adargwayne at (248) 735-5648 with any questions.


[^0]
# SUBJECT: Twelve Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk - New Retail, SP\#12-26, Traffic Review of Preliminary Site Plan \& Shared Parking Study 

Dear Ms. McBeth:

At your request, we have reviewed the above and offer the following recommendation and supporting comments.

## Recommendation

We recommend approval of the preliminary site plan and shared parking study, subject to the items shown below in bold being satisfactorily addressed by the final site plan.

## Project Description

What is the applicant proposing?
I. The applicant, Cahen Architectural Group, is proposing to a 57,493 -s.f. strip retail building on a 5-acre vacant lot within Twelve Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk (see attached aerial photo). Immediately south of the new building will be a new 224 -space parking lot intended to serve existing small shops to the south as well as the new shops.

## Shared Parking Study

Does the shared parking study show that there will be adequate parking for the overall site?
2. We have reviewed the shared parking study prepared for the applicant by Diffin-Umlor \& Associates (DUA) and dated April 30, 2012. This study was required by City planning staff since the Zoning Ordinance would require 313 parking spaces for the new retail space, or 89 more than are being proposed.
3. The DUA study examines the overall center as it would exist upon completion of the proposed new building. The overall center would consist of 643,390 s.f., including 267,143 s.f. ( $41.5 \%$ ) of existing vacant space and 51,243 s.f. ( $8.0 \%$ ) of "proposed" vacant space. Evaluating the expanded center as individual free-standing retail, restaurant, and entertainment uses, the Zoning Ordinance is said to require a total of 5,017 parking spaces. A total of 4,077 parking spaces will, instead, actually be available.
4. The DUA study has applied the Institute of Transportation Engineers "Shared Parking Planning Guidelines" with minimal documentation. A table showing the percentage of peak parking occupancy by part of the week (weekday $v$. weekend) and several-hour time period is included, but there is no discussion of potential seasonal variation in parking demand. This should be a matter of some concern here, as parking demand for both retail uses and theaters (such as Emagine) experience significant peaks in late December.
5. We recommend that the next time a shared parking study is needed for this location, the applicant's consultant apply the Urban Land Institute Shared Parking Model. The second edition of that model (dated 2005) is available as an easily applied Excel spreadsheet, and it assesses time variations in parking demand by land use, season, part of week, and hour.
6. We consider the DUA shared parking study acceptable mainly due to one very specific aspect: it has modified the ITE methodology to account for the assumption that the ordinance parking requirement for the M-Bar-Go "dance hall" - 1,000 spaces - should not be considered applicable until the 9 p.m. hour that it opens and stores within the center close. Disregarding the small amount of potential time overlap in the parking for these dissimilar uses, the ordinance parking requirement would effectively become 4,017 spaces, or 60 more than will be available upon completion of the site plan now proposed.

## Trip Generation \& Traffic Study

How much traffic would the proposed development generate? Is a traffic impact study required?
7. Trip generation at a shopping center is normally forecasted using non-linear equations predicting more trips per 1,000 s.f. for smaller centers than for larger centers (mostly due to customers visiting several stores on a single trip into/out of the center). Given that the proposed new building will be a relatively small portion of a much larger existing center, and the fact that that larger center also includes several entertainment venues, it is impractical to forecast the amount of additional traffic the new building may generate. We are confident, however, that the access design - which was originally developed and previously evaluated for a different retail configuration on the subject 5 acres - will continue to operate satisfactorily. Hence, the Planning Commission should waive the requirement for a new traffic impact study.

## Vehicular Access Locations

Do the proposed driveway locations meet City spacing standards?
8. Not applicable.

## Vehicular Access Improvements

Will there be any improvements to the abutting road(s) at the proposed driveway(s)?
9. Not applicable.

## Driveway Design and Control

Are the driveways acceptably designed and signed?
10. No. Several refinements are needed to assure access by large trucks, as follows:
a. At the west end of the 30 - ft -wide drive along the south building façade, the $15-\mathrm{ft}$ radius on the building pad should be increased to 20 ft , and the adjacent opening should be widened to 34 ft from the now-proposed 30 ft (narrowing the south end island to the City minimum of 8 ft and retaining the associated 15 -ft semicircular rounding).
b. At the corresponding location at the east end of the preceding drive, both proposed 15 - ft curb radii should be enlarged to $\mathbf{2 0} \mathrm{ft}$.
c. The east end of the one-way service drive north of the new building should be flared out to facilitate easier turning by the City's largest fire truck. Specifically, the end island adjacent to Tenant $H$ should be narrowed so that the opening relative to the Chuck E Cheese pad is $\mathbf{2 2} \mathbf{f t}$ wide rather than 18 ft , and the radius on both sides of the opening made the $\mathbf{2 5} \mathbf{f t}$ now proposed only on the south side. Adjustments to the proposed pedestrian ramps may be necessary to maintain adequate landing sizes.

## Pedestrian Access

Are pedestrians safely and reasonably accommodated?
11. No. Existing or proposed ADA-compliant pedestrian ramps (including but not limited to detectable warning surfaces) need to be shown at the following locations:
a. At both ends of both crosswalks near the southeast corner of the new parking lot.
b. At both ends of both crosswalks at the approximate midpoint along the south side of the site (directly south of new Tenant C).
c. At both ends of both crosswalks near the southwest corner of the new parking lot.
d. At each end of all three "flat walks" adjacent to proposed new barrier-free parking spaces (presumably MDOT Type $P$ ramps, to reach the pavementlevel sidewalk, which would also require an effective parking stop, such as a 4-inch high bumper block straddling the two adjacent spaces in each group). (On a related note, the grading plan should show elevations to the nearest 0.01 ft , not the nearest 0.1 ft .)

## Parking and Circulation

Are parking spaces appropriately designed, marked, and signed? Can vehicles safely and conveniently maneuver through the site?
12. Parking spaces adjacent to curb and gutter have been designed and dimensioned to lip of gutter. Since the effective parking space actually extends to the face of curb instead, such spaces are approximately 1.5 ft wider and/or longer than necessary, and will result in unnecessary construction cost and impervious surface. The applicant's engineer should consider reducing the size of such parking spaces to meet and not exceed the City's minimum standards. If this is done, a note should be added to the plan indicating that "the dimensions of all parking spaces (both width and length) are referenced to the face of curb, face of walk, or center of paint stripe (as applicable)."
13. Proposed symmetric parking lot end islands scale 34 ft long, back-of-curb to back-of-curb. To provide the 3 -ft setback called for by Zoning Ordinance Section 2506.13, these islands should be shortened to 32 ft .
14. To simplify the maneuvering required by a garbage trucle approaching the rear dumpster enclosure, that enclosure should be rotated at least 6 degrees counterclockwise (i.e., so a truck can approach the east dumpster without having to "jog" around the northwest corner of Chuck E Cheese's recent building expansion).
15. The treatments actually to be applied in the field for the rear unloading area need to be specified on the plan. Any crosshatching should be done in yellow, with a spacing no closer than 4 ft on-center (potentially wider given the long area to be marked). Also, NO PARKING LOADING ZONE (R7-6) signs should be proposed at appropriate locations not exceeding a spacing of 75 ft .
16. The east-pointing pavement arrow proposed near the east end of the rear service drive should be shown solid and indicated as white in color, and a comparable arrow should be proposed (centered in the drive) $\mathbf{l 7 5} \mathrm{ft}$ to the west.
17. All STOP signs should be labeled with the MMUTCD sign code (RI-I). In addition to the six locations now proposed, STOP signs should be indicated at each end of the 30 - ft wide drive along the south building façade, and at the east end of the one-way rear drive.
18. To comply with the MMUTCD, an ALL WAY (RI-3P) sign must accompany each of the four STOP signs proposed at the south-central intersection.
19. To comply with the MMUTCD, stop bars proposed to accompany STOP signs should be white, a minimum of 12 " wide, and placed 4 ft in advance of a marked crosswalk. Stop bars are not currently labeled with a color, and they are shown too close to marked crosswalks.
20. Signing at the east end of the one-way rear drive should be revised to include:
a. A west-facing STOP (RI-I) sign, back-to-back with an east-facing DO NOT ENTER (R5-I) sign, on the south side of the drive near the point of curvature.
b. Two ONE WAY (R6-I L facing north and R6-IR facing south) signs, back-toback on the north side of the drive no more than 6-8 ft behind the northsouth curb.
21. In the General Notes appearing on sheet 4, the 2011 edition of the MMUTCD should be cited specifically, since some sign codes have changed from the preceding edition. Also, the phrase "all other marking may be white or yellow" must be deleted, since the MMUTCD offers no such option. On a related matter, a phrase should be added indicating that "the marking of non-barrier-free parking spaces shall be white."
22. The Sign Table on sheet 4 should now indicate nine (not six) STOP signs, all 24" $\times 24$ " in size; four ALL WAY signs (now code R3-IP); two ONE WAY signs (one R6-IL and one R6-IR); six VAN ACCESSIBLE signs labeled with their new (2 0II) code-R7-9P; and the requisite numbers of NO PARKING LOADING ZONE and NO PARKING FIRE LANE signs. The unused RIGHT TURN ONLY sign should be deleted from the table, and the footnote revised to replace "CURRENT" with "2 0II."
23. The detail sheet needs to be revised as follows:
a. The Handicap Parking Stall detail should include a dimension "Minimum 2 ft" between the sign panel and back of curb. Also, the words "place along face of building" are too specific and should be deleted.
b. The Handicapped Parking Sign detail should resemble as well as be labeled as a I2"x I 8 " R7-8 "RESERVED PARKING [wheelchair symbol] ONLY" sign (the current reference to the International Symbol of Accessibility may suggest the old blue sign containing only the ISA; alternatively, a sometimes-proposed version of the R7-8 containing a double-headed arrow in lieu of the word ONLY may be incorrectly envisioned).
c. The supplemental sign should resemble and be labeled as the 6" $\times 12$ " R7-8P VAN ACCESSIBLE sign specified in the 201I MMUTCD (fla as the R7-8a, the only color choice now being green legend on a white background.)
d. Given the cited size of the R7-8P, the minimum height to the bottom of this sign should be changed to the more desirable (and entirely feasible) 6'-3'.
e. The 4" pipe proposed as a base for each handicapped sign should be painted highway yellow.

Sincerely,
BIRCHER ARROYO ASSOCIATES, INC.


Rodney L. Arroyo, AICP
Vice President


William A. Stimpson, P.E. Director of Traffic Engineering


Area Proposed for New Strip Retail Building - Twelve Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk


## PLAN REVIEW CENTER REPORT

June 4, 2012
Preliminary Landscape Review
Twelve Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk New
Retail SP\#12-26

## Petifloner

Cahen Architectural Group

## Review Type

Preliminary Site Plan

## Propenty Characteristics

Site Location: 44275 Twelve Mile Road, South of Twelve Mile Road and west of Donelson Drive (Section 15)
Site Zoning: $\quad$ RC, Regional Center
Adjoining Zoning: North: OS-1; East: RC; West: OST; South: 1-96 right-of-way
Current Site Use: Existing 12 Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk shopping center
Adjoining Uses: North: Vacant, Bank, Office Park; East: Shopping Center; West:
Office Park; South: 1-96 right-of-way
School District: Novi Community School District
Site Size: $\quad 67.2$ acres
Plan Date: $\quad 04-24-12$

## Recommendation

Approval of the Preliminary Site Plan for Twelve Mlle Crosslng at Fountain Walk New Retail SP\#12-26 is recommended. Please address the concerns noted below upon subsequent submittal.

## Ordinance Considerallons

Adjacent to Residential - Buffer (Sec. 2509.3.a.)

1. The project property is not adjacent to residentially zoned property.

Adjacent to Public Rights-of-Way - Berm (Wall) \& Buffer (Sec. 2509.3.b.)

1. No alterations are proposed or required along the public rights-of-way. No landscape modifications are proposed in this area.

## Streel Tree Requirements (Sec. 2509.3.b.)

1. No alterations are proposed or required in regard to Street Trees.

## Parking Landscape (Sec. 2509.3.c.)

1. Calculations have been provided for the required Parking Lot Landscape Area per Ordinance requirement. The Applicant is required to install a total of 6,440 square feet of Interior Parking Lot Landscape Area. The Applicant has met this requirement.
2. Eighty six (86) Parking Lot Canopy Trees are required and have been provided. Please relocate the proposed canopy trees such that the trees are not directly adjacent to proposed curbs. In addition, a tree in the central parking lot island appears to have been misplaced within the sidewalk. Please adiust.
3. Perimeter Parking Lot Canopy Trees are required at one per 35 LF . The Applicant has met this requirement.

## Building Foundation Landscape (Sec. 2509.3.d.)

1. A 4 ' wide landscape bed is required along all building foundations with the exception of access points. The Applicant must provide these minimum 4' wide beds in all frontage areas with the exception of access points. Ralsed beds would be a good opportunity and would allow for greater health and protection of the plantings. A waiver would be required if these foundation bed plantings were not proposed. Staff would not support the walver. Please note that the Applicanl has also proposed multiple raised planter beds to allow for greenery along the frontage walkways for additional seasonal plantings.
2. An area 8 ' wide multiplied by the length of building foundations is required as foundation landscape area. Due to the high access required for both pedestrians and vehicles, it is not possible to install all the required building foundation landscape directly at the building. The Applicant has provided additional interior parking lot landscape area that may be used to account for a porlion of the foundation landscape requirement if these interior islands are sufficiently landscaped with a combination of trees, shrubs, perennials and groundcover. A waiver is required for placing the bullding foundalion landscape area in an alternate location. Staff would support the waiver with the condition that the Applicant provides addilional landscape plantings within the proposed parking lot islands.
3. Subcanopy tree species and perennial grasses are proposed in tree wells along the south face of the proposed building. While the number and locations of these plantings are acceptable, these planting selectlons should all be altered to canopy tree specles in order to meet the intent of the ordinance. Larger tree wells may be warranted. A waiver would be required if these perimeter trees are not provided. Staff would not support the walver.

## Plant List (LDM)

1. The Plant List meets the requirements of the Ordinance and Landscape Design Manual.

## Planting Detalls \& Notations [LDM]

1. Planting Details and Notations meet the requirements of the Ordinance and Landscape Design Manual.

## Irrigation (Sec. 2509 3.f.(b)(b))

1. All landscape areas are required to be irrigated. A note has been provided stating that the existing irrigation system will be appropriately modified in the area of the addition.

Please follow guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance and Landscape Design Guidelines. This review is a summary and not intended to substitute for any Ordinance. For the landscape requirements, see the Zoning Ordinance landscape section on 2509 ,

Landscape Design Manual and the appropriate items in the applicable zoning classification. Also see the Woodland and Wetland review comments.

Reviewed by: David R. Beschke, RLA

Financial Requirements Review

| Item | Amount | Verified | Adjustment | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Full <br> Landscape <br> Cost Estimate | $\$ 52,178$ |  |  | Includes street trees. <br> Does not Include Irigatlon costs. |
| Final <br> Landscape <br> Review Fee | $\$ 782.67$ |  |  | $1.5 \%$ of full cost estimate <br> Any adjustments to the fee must be pald In full <br> prior to stamping set submiltal. |

Financial Requirements (Bonds \& Inspections)

| Item | Require <br> d | Amounl | Verified | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Landscape <br> Cost Estimate | YES | $\$ 64,378$ |  | Does not include street trees. <br> Includes irigation. |
| Landscape <br> Financial <br> Guaranty | YES | $\$ 96,567$ |  | This financial guarantee is based upon $150 \%$ of the verified <br> cost estimate. For Commercial, this leller of credit is due <br> prior to the issuance of a Temporary Cerlificate of <br> Occupancy. <br> For Residential this is letter of credit is due prior to pre- <br> construction meeting. |
| Landscape <br> Inspection Fee <br> (Development <br> Review Fee <br> Schedule <br> $3 / 15 / 99)$ | YES | $\$ 3,862.68$ |  | For projects up to $\$ 250,000$, this fee is $\$ 500$ or $6 \%$ of the <br> amount of the Landscape cost estimate, whichever is <br> greater. <br> This cash or check is due prior to the Pre-Construction <br> meeting. |
| Landscape <br> Administration <br> Fee <br> (Development <br> Review Fee <br> Schedule <br> $3 / 15 / 99)$ | YES | $\$ 579.40$ |  | This fee is $15 \%$ of the Landscape Inspection Fee. <br> This cash or check is due prior to the Pre-Construction <br> meeting. |
| Transformer <br> Financial <br> Guarantee | YES | $\$ 500$ |  | $\$ 500$ per transformer if not included above. <br> For Commercial this letter of credit is due prior to the <br> issuance of a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy. <br> For Residential this is letter of credit is due prior to pre- <br> construction meeting. |
| Slreet Tree <br> Financial <br> Guaranty | NO | $\$ 0$ | NO | $\$ 0$ |
| Street Tree <br> Inspection Fee | NO | $\$ 0$ | NO tree. |  |



May 30, 2012
City of Novi Planning Department
45175 W. 10 Mile Rd.
Novi, MI 48375-3024
Re: FACADE ORDINANCE - Facade Review - FPreliminary S.P.
Twelve Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk New Retail, SP12-25, \& ZCM12-13
Façade Region: 1, Zoning District: RC, Building Size: 58,500 S.F.

Dear Ms. McBeth;
The following is the Facade Review for Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval of the above referenced project based on the drawings prepared by Cahen Architecture Group, dated $4 / 27 / 12$. The percentages of materials proposed for each façade are as shown on the table below. The maximum percentages allowed by the Schedule Regulating Façade Materials (AKA Façade Chart) of Ordinance Section 2520 are shown in the right hand column. Materials in non-compliance with the Façade Chart, if any, are highlighted in bold.

|  | South <br> (Front) | East | West | Norlh <br> (Rear) | Ordinance Maximum <br> (Minimum) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brick | $43 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $100 \%(30 \%)$ |
| EIFS | $\mathbf{4 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 \%}$ | $25 \%$ |
| Split Fcaed CMU | $8 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Flat Metal (Trim) | $1 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Spandrel Glass | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Standing Seam Metal | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $25 \%$ |

As shown above the percentage of EIFS exceeds the maximum amount allowed by the Façade Chart on all facades.

The areas of EIFS are delineated using interesting joint patterns and are nicely integrated into the overall design of the building. A significant percentage of the EIFS is used to form ornamental cornices, arches and other features that enhance the building's design. It should be noted that a sample board as required by Section 2520.4.d of the Façade Ordinance was not provided at the time of this review. The drawing notation that colors are intended to match existing materials used within the development does not meet the intent of the sample board requirement.

Recommendation - It is our recommendation that a Section 9 Waiver be granted for the overage of EIFS on all facades. This recommendation is contingent upon the applicant providing a sample board illustration colors that are consistent with Section 2520.2 of the Façade ordinance.

## Notes to the Applicant:

1. Inspections - The City of Novi requires Façade Inspection(s) for all projects. Materials displayed on the approved sample board will be compared to materials delivered to the site. It is the applicant's responsibility to request the inspection of each facade material at the appropriate time. This should occur immediately after the materials are delivered. Materials must be approved before installation on the building. Please contact the Novi Building Department's Automated Inspection Hotline at (248) 347-0480 to request the Façade inspection.
2. Roof Appurtenances - The drawings indicate that all roof appurtenances are fully screened using the building parapets. It is the applicant's responsibility to coordinate parapet and roof equipment heights to maintain full screening.

If you have any questions regarding this project please do not hesitate to call.
Sincerely,



CITY COUNCIL
Mayor
Bob Gatt
Mayor Pro Tem
Dave Staudt
Terry K. Margoils
Andrew Mutch
Justin Fischer

## Wayne Wrobel

Laura Marie Casey

Clty Manager
Clay J. Pearson
Director of Publlc Safety
Chlef of Pollce
David E. Molloy
Director of EMS/FIre Operatlons Jeffery R. Johnson

Deputy Chief of Pollce
Thomas C. Lindberg
Assistant Chlef of Pollce
Victor C.M. Lauria

June 6, 2012

TO: Barbara McBeth, Deputy Director of Community Development
RE: Twelve Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk - New Retail
SP\#: 12-26 \& ZCM 12-13

## Project Description:

New 57,493 GSF retail building on existing 5 acre lot within existing development.

## Comments:

1. The proposed traffic islands and curb layouts to the West \& East, main approach lanes, will not allow for Fire Truck turning radiuses of 50 ' outside and $30^{\prime}$ inside.

## Recommendation:

The above site plan has been reviewed and will need modifications before final site plan review can be approved. Item above can be addressed at final review.

Sincerely,

Andrew Copeland - Inspector/CFPE
City of Novi - Fire Dept.
cc: file

Novi Public Safety Administration 45125 W. Ten Mile Road Novi, Michigan 48375
248.348 .7100
248.347 .0590 fax

SHARED PARKING STUDY

## difinsumlatcom

April 30, 2012

Barbara E. McBeth, AICP
Deputy Director - Community Development
City of Novi
45175 W. Ten Mile Road
Novi, MI 48375

Re: Parking Study Summary
Fountain Walk Development

Dear Mrs. McBeth:

We would typically compile traffic data, site observations, and write a lengthy report justifying the need for a parking reduction for a commercial facility of this size, but due to the current $45 \%$ vacancy rate at the facility most of the information we would typically provide isn't relevant. The information provided in this summary along with the attached calculation tables should provide a clear picture of the existing conditions and provide the frame work for evaluating parking at the facility as new tenants are added in the future.

## Existing Condition:

The existing facility is made up of a mixture of commercial, retail, restaurants, bars, night clubs, movie theater, and other entertainment uses. The movie theater and other entertainment uses currently exceed $20 \%$ of the total leasable space within the development requiring a parking study per zoning ordinance requirements. The existing facility is approximately 580,000 square feet and currently has 3853 existing parking spaces. No traffic congestion currently exists due the current vacancy rate. The site currently has 5.0 open acres of land which was previously planned and developed as a 116,425 square foot building with no additional parking spaces located at the middle of the site. There is also two outlots along 12 Mile Road which are currently undeveloped accounting for an additional 4.0 acres of vacant open space.

## Proposed Condition:

The owner is proposing to add an additional 57,493 square foot building mostly made up of smaller tenant uses. The proposed development area is located on the 5.0 open acres located in the middle of the property. The owner if proposing to add an additional 224 parking spaces to service both the new building and the existing smaller tenant uses located south of the development area. There is currently no existing parking immediately adjacent to these existing smaller vacant building areas which make these areas very difficult to lease. The construction of the additional parking during phase 1 of the proposed development will alleviate this problem.

## Method Used:

The Institute of Transportation Engineers "Shared Parking Planning Guidelines" Parking Occupancy Rates table was used to determine the initial parking occupancy rates for the site. This table defines the percent of the basic minimum parking needed during each time period for shared parking Monday thru Friday and Saturday \& Sundays as shown below.

Parking Occupancy Rates

| 0ros | $\sqrt{1195}$ | $\sqrt{145}$ | $\sqrt{M_{1}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { S71 } 61 \\ & \text { SvMn } \end{aligned}$ | Sहा48 <br> sun |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8hme99in | $601 \mathrm{mlRm}$ | 42mi9m | $89 \mathrm{~m} 9 \mathrm{gm}$ | 9015 4 2m | 1Rambint |
| Residential | 60\% | 100\% | 100\% | 80\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Office/ Warehouse <br> /Industrial | 100\% | 20\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% |
| Commercial | 90\% | 80\% | 5\% | 100\% | 70\% | 5\% |
| Hotel | 70\% | 100\% | 100\% | 70\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Restaurant | 70\% | 100\% | 10\% | 70\% | 100\% | 20\% |
| Movie Theater | 40\% | 80\% | 10\% | 80\% | 100\% | 10\% |
| Entertainment | 40\% | 100\% | 10\% | 80\% | 100\% | 50\% |
| Conference/Convention | 100\% | 100\% | 5\% | 100\% | 100\% | 5\% |
| Institutional (nonchurch) | 100\% | 20\% | 5\% | 10\% | 10\% | 5\% |
| Institutional (church) | 10\% | 5\% | 5\% | 100\% | 50\% | 5\% |

We found that when we ran our calculation using this table that the results did not accurately model the parking patterns we anticipated at the site. We found that the M-Bar-Go night club approximately 40,700 square foot extension of the Lucky Strike $\backslash$ Liquor Store is only open on Friday and Saturday nights from 9:00pm to 2am. When the ordinance required parking for this single use is combined with all the other standard uses within the table the resulting peak parking during evening hours all week long are not realistic. We therefore expanded the table to include a 6 pm to 9 pm and 9 pm to 2 am time periods. We also separated out Friday, Saturday, and Sunday to better establish parking use trends at the site. This modification to the table
allows us to accurately show the effects bars and night clubs which typically have peak hours of operation after 9 pm don't conflict with parking for the other uses that are typically closing up or are nearly vacant after 9 pm . The resulting percentage table and peak parking calculations can be found in tables 1.0 and 2.0 attached to this memo.

## Parking Summary:

Our parking calculation summarized in table 2.0 show the ordinance required parking for the existing and proposed uses to be 5017 spaces with peak parking occurring on Friday and Saturday in the evening from 6 pm to 9 pm . The peak parking was calculated to be 3681 spaces a reduction of 1336 spaces. The 3681 spaces are 396 spaces less than the 4077 spaces shown on the proposed site plan. It should also be noted that the 444 required spaces for the existing Power House Gym seems high. We rarely see stand alone gyms of this size with more than 200 parking spaces.

Due to the current vacancy it makes it very difficult to determine with any certainty if this site is over parked and what the true parking reduction should be. As stated earlier there is currently no parking congestion nor is any anticipated provided the future tenants of this facility resemble the mixture of uses shown in Table 2.0. The parking conditions at this site should be reevaluated in the future either before occupancy permits are granted for future tenants or municipalities often grant special use permits to site requesting parking reductions which are reevaluated on an annual or bi-annual basis.


| TABLE 1.0 |
| :--- |
| Parking Occupancy Rato Percontagos |

TABLE 20
Parking Occupency Ratos
Tenant or Une

| Tenant or Une | Usore Clasatitamion | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Grona Lonasble } \\ \text { Aroa } \\ \text { (Sa. Ft.) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Maylmum Oesupanty \# of Paople | Colculatod Required Purking \# Spaces | Monday -Thuraday | Monday - -7urnay | Monday - Thunady | Monasy - Yruraday | Friday a saturday Gmm.5pm | Fiday \& Saturday 6prrtocm | Friday \& Saturday Epm-2am | Fricany a saturday 2am-am | Sunday <br> 8am-5.pm | Sunday <br> Gam-9pm | Sunday <br> Apm-2nm | sunday <br> $2 \mathrm{~mm}-5 \mathrm{am}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Amentan Homo Finmoss | Commarclal /Restal | 11,600 |  | 52 | 47 | 42 | 26 | 5 | 62 | 42 | 18 | 3 | 62 | 37 |  | 2 |
| Dick's Sporting Goods | Commarclal / Resial | 4, 1,700 |  | 188 | 169 | 150 | 9 | 19 | 188 | 150 | 56 | 9 | \% 8 | 131 | $\bigcirc$ | 8 |
| Fathly of Pots | Cormmerctal/Retala | 1,538 |  | 7 | , | 8 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Exising Vacant Remint | Commertial / Relial | 267, 123 |  | 1203 | 1083 | 8es | 002 | 120 | 1203 | 063 | 361 | 60 | 1203 | 842 | $\infty$ | 54 |
| Proposout Vneman Retalt | Commmeriol/Reibla | 51.243 |  | 231 | 208 | 185 | 115 | 23 | 231 | 125 | 69 | 12 | 231 | 182 | 12 | 10 |
| Buthrio Whid Wings | Regituram | 6788 | 359 | 97 | 68 | 97 | 29 | 10 | ${ }_{88}$ | 97 | 29 | 19 | ${ }^{89}$ | 97 | 19 | 18 |
| Cold Stione Cramerey | Rosiouram! | 1505 |  | 22 | 15 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 16 | 22 | 5 | 4 | 15 | 22 | 4 | 4 |
| Soodiko Japamase Romauurm | Rostivirn! | . 7303 |  | 104 | 73 | 104 | 31 | 10 | 3 | 104 | 31 | 21 | 7 | 104 | 21 | 21 |
| Hiodem | Resitionam | 4200 | 201 | 80 | 42 | 0 | 18 |  | 42 | 60 | ${ }^{18}$ | 12 | 42 | 60 | 12 | 12 |
| Indo Furution | Romiluiam | . 1539 | 65 | 65 | 45 | 65 | 19 | 6 | 46 | 65 | 19 | 13 | 45 | 65 | 13 | 13 |
| Rolo Mexican Bistio | Rorimuma | basco | 287 | 8 | 65 | 93 | 26 | 8 | 65 | 93 | ${ }^{28}$ | 19 | 85 | 03 | 18 | 18 |
| Proposod Vactant wio Oricoor Smating | Romaumem | 85235- |  | 14 | ${ }^{3}$ | 118 | 36 | 12 | 83 | 118 | 36 | 24 | 83 | 119 | 24 | 24 |
| Bart Loule | Ramatauran | 19188 | 387 | 159 | 6 | 158 | 159 | 18 | 127 | 158 | 169 | 32 | 127 | 159 | 80 | 16 |
| M-Bar-Go | Dencan hall | 10,700 | 2000 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1000 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lucky Striketilauor Storm | Bowitirg Alove | 20.000 | 440 | 100 | 40 | 100 | 0 | 10 | so | 100 | 100 | 20 | 80 | 100 | 50 | 10 |
| Emajino Noul Theater | Thamior | $\cdots$ Tezss. | 3700 | 795 | 318 | 138 | 557 | 80 | 630 | 795 | 705 | B0 | 636 | ${ }^{7} 9$ | 398 | 80 |
|  | Entorainment | 18535 - | 704 | 722 | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 222 | 133 | 22 | 178 | 22 | 111 | 22 | 178 | 178 | 22 | 8 |
| -Gimot's Solon \& Day Spa | Emamamment | 2974 |  | 13 | 5 | 13 | 8 | 1 | 11 | 19 | 7 | 1 | 11 | 19 |  | 1 |
| -Pawnetouse Gym | Enionainmex | 58930 | 1100 | 4 | 178 | 44 | 287 | 48 | 356 | 444 | 222 | 4 | 356 | ${ }^{358}$ | 4 | 18 |
| -Punting Euga Fun Cantars Tola! | Ennomanmmer | -955\% |  | $\frac{43}{5017}$ | 17 | 43 | $\frac{26}{268}$ | - 502 | $\stackrel{34}{3494}$ | ${ }_{3}^{43}$ | $\frac{29}{3088}$ | 4 | $\frac{34}{3494}$ | ${ }^{34} 129$ | ${ }_{7} 9$ | $\frac{2}{32}$ |
| Tolal |  | ${ }^{183090}$ |  | 5017 | 2815 | 3532 | 2158 | 502 | 3494 | 3081 | 3089 | 1800 | 3994 | 3389 | 785 | 322 |

[^1]| Tename or Une | Unos Clasaiticalion | Grous Lemabie Ane (SQ. F.). |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ambrican Homa Filines | Commercial / Reran |  |
| Diek's Sportiog $3000 \%$ | Commercta/ / Reral |  |
| Familv of poos | Commerelat / Retall |  |
| Exationg Vacom Relail | Commetciat Rerail |  |
| Propobed Vacant Rotil | Commercial/ Retall |  |
| Buffalo Wild Winps | Pestaurant |  |
| Cole Stone Croamery | Rosutcurant |  |
| Gotiliko Jepanepe Risesinuent | Restauram |  |
| Hoolert | Retemume |  |
| indo Furion | Restaurant |  |
| Rojo Mexicean Bliafo | Rentauram |  |
| Propasad Vrceant w/ Ouldoor Sealing | Restsoutant |  |
| Bar L,avie | Remituram |  |
| M-Aet-Co | Danco Mall |  |
| Lueky Sinkeidhauct Story | Bowiling Aliey |  |
| Emagine Novi Theatio | Thester |  |
| Chuck E Choesa's | Entertatmmert |  |
| Gjato's Salon \& Doy Sp: | Enlertainmom! |  |
| Pawemoumo Givm | Enleriammem! |  |
| Puruing Edga Fum Coniere | Enterialinmem! |  |
| - Maximum Snin. Maximum Occudency. 2 number of employeo data was provided be the O |  |  |
| - Sherea Pamino Pranning Guldelinas | of Transportalion $E$. | eors stemderct OC |


diffin-umlor.com

June 13, 2012

Barbara E. McBeth, AlC<br>Deputy Director - Community Development City of Novi<br>45175 W. Ten Mile Road<br>Novi, MI 48375<br>\section*{Re: Preliminary Site Plan Approval Review Response - Twelve Mlle Crossing At Fountain Walk New Retail}

## Dear Mrs. McBeth:

Comments listed below directly correspond to the June 4,2012 review comments provided by the City's consultants for the preliminary approval of the above mentioned project.

## Planning Review Response

1. The applicant is seeking a variance for the proposed loading zone location.
2. The applicant is seeking a variance for the proposed dumpster location.
3. No Comment,
4. No Comment.
5. A phasing plan is enclosed with this response letter. A full size phasing plan shall be provided with the Final Site Plan submittal. It is the Owner's intent to build the proposed parking lot area this year to help facilitate the lease of the existing building spaces south of the project area. The Owner will build the new buildings as leases agreements are signed with tenonts for this space.

## Enpineering Review Response

1. City Standard Detail sheets will be provided with the Stamping Set submittat.
2. Plans will be revised to better differentiate between existing and proposed utilities as recommended.
3. Parking lot lighting will be provided with the Final Site Plan submittal.
4. More specifics and details for the water system will be provided on the utility plan for the Final Site Plan submittal.
5. Fire hydrant placement is predicated on where the architect can place the fire department connection. Landscaping can be adjusted once we have a final approved location of the fire department connection and hydrant location.
6. Design plans for the water system permit will be provided after Final Site Plan approval.
7. More specifics and details will be provided on the utility plan for the Final Site Plan submittal.
8. Sanitary sewer profiles will be provided on the utility plan for the Final Site Plan submittal.
9. We can discuss the monitoring manhole location. It would seem to me that this is one building which would require one monitoring manhole and everything upstream of the monitoring manhole would remain a private service lead. You could potentially have eight separate services to each tenant space and it wouldn't be practical to have eight monitoring manholes.
10. Slopes will be revised as noted if possible.
11. Design plans for the sewer system permit will be provided after Final Site Plan approval.
12. Storm sewer profiles will be provided on the utility plan for the Final Site Plan submittal.
13. More specifics and details roof drain connections will be provided on the utility plan for the Final Site Plan submittal.
14. Storm water design will comply with Chapter 5 of the new Engineering Design Manual.
15. We will double check the originally approved impervious area shown on the plans.
16. We will provide an as-built topographic survey of the existing detention system and verify the capacity for the Final Site Plan submittal.
17. Required easements and permits will be will be submitted if modifications to the existing detention system are needed.
18. We will revise the soil boundary as requested.
19. Grading and paving limits will be shown on the Final Site Plan submittal.
20. More detailed grading as requested will be provided on the Final Site Plan submittal.
21. A letter outlining changes shall be submitted with the Final Site Plan submittal.
22. The construction cost estimate shall be submitted with the Final Site Plan submittal.
23. A draft copy of the storm water maintenance agreement will be submitted with the Final Site Plan submittal.
24. A draft copy of the water main easement shall be submitted with the Stamping Set submittal.
25. A draft copy of the sanitary sewer easement shall be submitted with the Stamping Set submittal.
26. Items $26-34$ outlined in the engineer's review comments shall be completed prior to the start of construction.

## Traffic Review Comments

1-9. Items 1-9 of the Traffic Consultants review do not require revisions to the plans or comments to be addressed.
10. We agree with the traffic consultant's findings items a.-c. and will revise on the Final Site Plan submittal.
11. We agree with the traffic consultant's findings items a.-d. and will revise on the Final Site Plan submittal.
12. The curb and gutter adjacent to parking spaces shall be revised as requested.
13. Parking lot islands shall be revised as requested.
14. The dumpster shall be rotated as requested.
15. Detail pavement marking and signage shall be shown on the Final Site Plan submittal.
16. Pavement marking revisions requested shall be shown on the Final Site Plan submittal.
17. The additional stop signs and notes shall be provided on the Final Site Plan submittal.
18. The additional signs shall be provided on the Final Site Plan submittal.
19. Stop bars shall be detailed out on the Final Site Plan submittal.
20. Additional signs and orientation at the one-way drive shall be revised on the Final Site Plan submittal.
21. The note on sheet 4 shall be revised as requested.
22. The sign table on sheet 4 shall be revised as requested.
23. The revisions to the detail sheet shall be provided on the Final Site Plan submittal.

## Landscape Review

## Parking Landscape:

1. No comment.
2. Trees locations shall be revised as requested on the final Site Plan submittal.
3. No comment.

Building Foundation Landscape:

1. 4' wide landscape beds shall be provided along the building frontage areas. We will work with staff determine the appropriate size, location, and planting theme of the beds. It is important to the Owner that the landscape bed design be flexible and may need to be adjusted based on each future tenant's access needs and window visibility. No waiver is being requested for this item at this time.
2. The Owner would like to request a waiver from the $8^{\prime}$ wide building foundation requirement. We have provided additional landscape area within the parking lot to account for the required building foundation area. We will work with staff to provide the appropriate number of additional trees, shrubs, perennials, and groundcover to meet the intent of this requirement.
3. Canopy trees shall be provided as required. No waiver is being requested or this item.

## Fire Department Comments

1. The radiuses will be revised as needed to meet the fire truck turning requirements outlined In the fire inspector's review letter.

Other comments listed shall be addressed by the owner or architect. We hope the information provided is helpful with expediting the review process, and we look forward to continuing working with staff on this project. If there are any questions, or if any additional information is needed please let us know.

Respectfully submitted,

## Diffin-Umlor and Associates



Matthew A. Biffin, P.E.
Principal

Date: June $18^{\text {th }}, 2012$
Barbara E. McBeth, AICP
Deputy Director - Community Development
City of Novi
45175 West Ten Mile Road
Novi, MI 48375

## RE: Preliminary Site Plan Approval

Review Response - Twelve Mile Crossing At Fountain Walk New Retail

## Dear Mrs. McBeth:

The following are our responses to the June $4^{\text {th }}, 2012$ review comments provide by the City's consultants for the preliminary approval of the New Retail Building at Twelve Mile Crossings at Fountain Walk Shopping Center.

Building Façade Review Response:

1. A materials sample board shall be provided.
2. Roof Appurtenances: The design intent is that the rooftop equipment shall be screened from view.

Sincerely,
CAHEN ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, PC


Scott A. Boduch, R.A.
Project Manager - Architect
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[^0]:    cc: Ben Croy, Engineering
    Brian Cobun, Engineering
    Kristen Kapelanski, Communlty Development Department rina Glenn, Water \& Sewer Depl.

[^1]:    
    

