



500 West Big Beaver
Troy, MI 48084
troymi.gov

FROM THE OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER

June 13, 2022

To: Mayor and City Council Members

From: Mark F. Miller, City Manager
Robert J. Bruner, Assistant City Manager
Beth Tashnick, Office Manager

Subject: City Council Agenda Questions & Answers – 06.13.22

The following are communications that City Administration would like Council to be made aware of. In order to ensure that all questions are received and answered, all City Council Questions should be sent to the CITY MANAGER DISTRIBUTION GROUP e-mail address.

Resident Comments:

From: Ronald Eng <beaueng75@comcast.net>

Subject: E-02 PUBLIC HEARING - PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP JPLN2021-0023) - PROPOSED ECKFORD OAKS ONE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL CLUSTER, NORTH SIDE OF ECKFORD, WEST OF ROCHESTER, SECTION 15, CURRENTLY ZONED R-1B (ONE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT

I am writing this email to you because a Planning Commission Resolution will be presented to you and your fellow Troy City Council members on June 13th. This cluster home development impacts me because I live two houses away (at 749 Eckford Dr) from this proposed residential cluster.

FYI, I expressed three major concerns during the planning commission meeting back in April.

1) NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS: The cluster development will result in a major change in the characteristics and charm of the dirt portion of Eckford Drive. When I moved here some 30 years ago, I was attracted by the dirt road (from Rochester Rd to Tallman Dr), large lots, woods, creek (Houghton Drain) and rural up-North feel. I have a 1.5 acre lot, but a number of properties are 3+ acres in size. The builder's alternate plan (approved by the planning commission) shoehorns 26 cluster units onto the 8.7 acre lot while saving 45% green space. No question why the planning commission liked this over the theoretical parallel plan that was presented.

2) SAFETY CONCERN: The plans call for Eckford Dr that fronts the 8.7 acre property would be paved at the builder's expense. Eckford Dr will now become a major cut through for the neighborhood as it is a straight road from Tallman Dr to the traffic light at Rochester Road. We already have speeding problems and high traffic volumes to contend with today. This 26 unit cluster PLUS another builder (Mondrian)

who bought up properties directly on the opposite side of Eckford will create a significant traffic and safety concern. Please note that we have Leonard Elementary School on Tallman Dr already causing traffic backups onto Eckford. In addition, since there are no sidewalks on Eckford, it has become hazardous at times for me to go for a stroll or walk my dog down Eckford with the number of vehicles and the speeding vehicles present. I would like to see speed bumps or stop signs added on Eckford Drive to control speeding. Also, please note that as planned at this point, there will still be two small portions of the dirt road remaining on Eckford. Starting from the Rochester Rd traffic light to Tallman Dr: over half of Eckford was eventually paved, then a 3 lots section of dirt road, followed by the proposed new paved section paid by the builder, followed by a 1 lot section of dirt road.

3) FLOODING: Eckford Drive homeowners already deal with a high water table and having Houghton Drain and associated floodplain running thru the properties. Years ago, Houghton Drain was always flowing with steady amounts of water like a creek. In the last 3-5 years, Houghton Drain barely flows, runs dry during droughts, and experiences extreme floods during rains. However, many owners, including me, are now experiencing significant occurrences of extended periods of swampy backyards that are not near Houghton Drain. Since last year, parts of my backyard flooded due to storm drain backups, as there are storm drains that are located on the back of my property line running parallel to Eckford. Houghton Drain runs in the front edge of my property. With the builder "tampering" with the topography of the lot and filling in wetlands and building over Houghton Drain & floodplains, I can only image this will drive more storm water and runoff onto the existing Eckford properties.

The planning commission heard from many Eckford residents at the hearing on these issues and more. The planning commission discussed but took no action regarding requesting a traffic study, questioning the floodplain survey, implications of filling in wetlands/building over Houghton Drain, risk of causing more flooding to existing Eckford residents or the safety concerns raised on Eckford. At the end of the day, they were purely focused on selecting the alternate plan versus the parallel plan, approving the builder's variation requests, and nothing else.

Here are 2 additional items that I would like to emphasize:

a) The parallel plan presented (which supposedly), builder has the right to build without planning board approval is a theoretical plan that calls for 21 condo units that covers most of the 8.7 acre property, including most of the floodplain and wetlands on the property. It saved very little green space and wiped out nearly all of the 500+ trees on the property. The builder's primary motive was to get approval of his alternate plan of cluster units and saving 45% green space, but still filling in portions of wetland and building a number of units over Houghton Drain, wetlands, and the floodplain. The topographic floodplain survey that was used and presented to the planning commission was created by an engineering survey company hired by builder, not the topographic floodplain map posted on the City of Troy GIS that is from FEMA/DEQ/EGLE. How can a private survey from the builder be used to drive decisions by the planning commission.

b) The builder intends to have basements in all the units. I understand that there may be limitations or regulations governing the topography/elevation for having the basement floor be at least 1 foot above the top of the floodplain. Don't quote me on this, but something I heard. Obviously, if this is true, the basement would have to be above the ground level or the builder would need to re-grade the lots to add 8+ feet of elevation.

For your reference, here is the planning commission resolution and I attached the submitted site plan from the builder. Thank you for your consideration in recognizing the issues and concerns that I and my fellow Eckford residents have with this proposed development. It should be rejected by City Council and

sent back to the planning commission to ensure the proper impact studies and revisit what is best for the City of Troy.

Lastly, I also voiced a concern with the noise that comes from the DPW yard. My backyard backs up to the DPW and we deal with a lot of noise pollution from the DPW at all hours of the day or night, including: truck/frontloader reverse (backup) beepers, dump trucks unloading, loud rumbles and banging sounds, etc. There is an earth berm built up along the property line but it is insufficient to shield or muffle the noise coming from the DPW yard. Our house is about 300 feet from the back property line. Note, the proposed cluster unit development will have several condos that are even closer to the DPW yard than we are.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

From: David Hamilton

Subject: Agenda

E-02 - Eckford

1.)

What recourse is available to residents if they have issues with water drainage from this development in the future?

Answer: Scott Finlay, Deputy City Engineer

As part of the detailed engineering review, the design engineer must demonstrate that the proposed improvements do not block storm water from traveling through the site from upstream and detain storm water that falls on the proposed site, releasing it back into the city storm sewer at controlled rate as not cause issues downstream. The storm sewer and detention that will be constructed with the proposed development will be in easements to the City, the City will be responsible to maintain in the future.

2.)

Can more detail be provided on the detention pond that will be used (regional detention facility) ? Why was this option provided? What will the developer be contributing to it? Will this require any cost (either financial or by giving up land) to the City?

Answer: Brent Savidant, Community Development Director

The option was provided because there is benefit to the City in providing one regional detention basin for numerous projects, rather than one detention basin for each project. In addition, there is an opportunity to create an amenity for City residents. The developer(s) will pay for the cost of the construction of the detention basin. The regional basin would involve City property that already includes a small regional detention basin. The City is utilizing the services of an Engineering consultant to conceptually design the regional detention basin to determine feasibility.

3.)

What is the cost of the bike path if the city had to develop it themselves?

Answer: Kurt Bovensiepe, Public Works Director

In general, the Troy Tail without crossing any wetlands or bridges needed to go over drains it cost \$200 a linear foot. This does not cost any land acquisition or costs for easements.

4.)

Eckford residents are concerned with cut-through traffic already, even before this development. I know Council has discussed speed humps as a potential mitigation option, and city staff did not prefer it. What can we do to help mitigate residents' concerns with this?

Answer: William Huotari, City Engineer

Speeding and cut through traffic are common concerns from residential areas. Traffic calming measures, like speed humps, are typically requested as a mitigation measure.

The City follows the Road Commission for Oakland County (residential streets only) procedure that looks at 85th percentile speed greater than or equal to 35 mph and traffic volumes in excess of 1,000 vehicles per day as the minimum for consideration for traffic calming measures (see attached "*RCOC Operating Instruction No. 12, Rev #1 (Speed Humps)*").

A speed study is the first step in any type of request relative to concerns of excessive speed. A speed study can also be used to better inform our Police Department Traffic Safety Unit of specific times of day or days of the week if excessive speeds are found.

Our traffic consultants have several locations that they are currently working on, but typically counters are placed within about two weeks from the date of the request and they record volumes/speeds for 7 days. The data is then reviewed by our consultant and forwarded back to the city. The study is then shared with the resident(s) who made the request and further discussion takes place to determine what the next step(s) might be.

Speed humps are paid for by residents (there is only one in the City and is located on Walnut Hill, just north of Wattles and east of Adams). Most streets would require multiple speed humps as they need to be placed at 200'-500' intervals to be effective.

5.)

What would the maximum home square footage/size be under the 21 unit parallel plan, given R-1C zoning?

Answer: Brent Savidant, Community Development Director

The Parallel Plan shows typical building footprints of approximately 2,000 square feet. If these were 2 story units, they would be 4,000 square foot homes. Keep in mind, the building envelope would permit significantly larger footprints than 2,000 square feet. The developer could build up to 30% lot coverage. In R-1C, assuming a 10,500 square foot lot, this would be a 3,150 square foot footprint.

From: Ellen C Hodorek
Subject: Agenda Questions

E-02 PUBLIC HEARING - PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP JPLN2021-0023) - PROPOSED ECKFORD OAKS ONE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL CLUSTER, NORTH SIDE OF ECKFORD, WEST OF ROCHESTER, SECTION 15, CURRENTLY ZONED R-1B (ONE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT

Residents have observed flood water retention in their yards following major storms in recent years, and they are understandably concerned about the possibility of exacerbating this situation. Was the City aware this is happening? Can you help us understand (either via written response here or during the presentation tonight), how the regional detention system, grading limits, and perhaps other factors will impact stormwater management? Related, the City engineering, DPW, etc., continue to play a role in finalizing the details of the site planning, (whether the developer proceeds with an approved cluster plan or by right), correct?

Does the City do any coordination with the school district to help manage traffic levels/flow during peak hours on school routes? Specifically, has that happened with this one?

Answer: William Huotari, City Engineer

The Troy School District establishes bus routes. The City has not to date, that I am aware of, been involved in establishing or modifying school routes.

The cluster development proposes 26 units and is anticipated to generate 22 new trips in the AM peak hour and 28 new trips in the PM peak hour. This equates to approximately one (1) vehicle every 2-3 minutes during the peak hour, per the OHM traffic memo (attached). OHM traffic representatives will be at the Council meeting tonight to discuss traffic concerns.

Answer: Brent Savidant, Community Development Director

Regarding stormwater: The applicant seeks Preliminary Site Plan Approval. If this is granted, the applicant will then have his Engineer prepare detailed Final Site Plan drawings to address all Engineering issues, including stormwater. The plans will be reviewed by City Engineering to ensure that the development does not negatively impact neighboring properties. This is the process for all residential developments, be it a One Family Cluster or a by right development.

Regarding decks: The applicant seeks setback relief for a number of decks. None of the waivers sought back up to a residential neighbor EXCEPT Unit 15, which backs up to the residential property to the east. The building envelope is located 40 feet from the rear property line. The applicant seeks to construct the deck 12 feet into the required setback. The deck would be located 28 feet from the rear property line. The deck would be located approximately 83 feet from the northeast corner of the neighboring home.

Answer Part 2: Kurt Bovensiepe, Public Works Director

There have been 4 service requests in 2022 related to storm water issues on Eckford from Tallman to Rochester Road, 2 in 2021, and none in 2020. Most of the concerns are related to the ditch along Eckford and some have been concerns with rear yard drainage. The rear yard drain issues have been identified as private property issues where the homeowner has changed the landscape or grade

preventing the water from running off to the drain. The lots proposed to be developed will address the development and cause the water to be captured into the designed system. I would expect to see an improvement to the overall drainage abutting the development as it will have to follow our current standards with detention. The proposal is to direct all drainage to a regional detention pond within the DPW property than will release the storm water at a controlled rate through the county drainage, which mostly is contained in underground pipes.

Additionally, all new developments with “floodplain” must obtain a permit from EGLE. The floodplain elevation on either side of the new development (upstream and downstream) cannot be raised more than one tenth of a foot (1.2 inches). Troy has adopted the new regional standard for detention, requiring storm water storage for a 100-year storm, this is over and above the 100-year flood plain that already exists onsite. Drainage upstream and downstream should be improved with the new onsite drainage system and required detention.

Am I correct that the deck setback deviations are for units that do not back up to/encroach on a neighboring residence?

Answer: Brent Savidant, Community Development Director

It should be noted, decks for single family homes may project up to 15 feet into a required rear yard, up to a distance of 25 feet from the rear property line. In other words, if this were a by-right development the proposed projection would be permitted.

From: Ann Erickson Gault

Subject: Cluster development considerations

Can you please refresh my memory of the factors Council should consider when deciding whether to approve a cluster development?

Answer: Lori Grigg Bluhm, City Attorney

Chapter 39, Section 10.04 I provides:

Standards for Review.

1. Review. In reviewing any application for a Cluster Development, the Planning Commission shall identify and evaluate all factors relevant to the application, and shall report its findings in full, along with its recommendations for disposition of the application, to the City Council.
2. Findings. The applicant shall demonstrate that through the use of the Cluster option, the development will accomplish a sufficient number of the following objectives, as are reasonably applicable to the site, providing:
 - a. Long-term protection and preservation of natural resources, natural features, and open space of a significant quantity and/or quality in need of protection or preservation, and which would otherwise be unfeasible or unlikely to be achieved absent these regulations.
 - b. Innovative and creative site design through flexibility in the siting of dwellings and other development features that would otherwise be unfeasible or unlikely to be achieved absent these regulations.
 - c. Appropriate buffer and/or land use transitions between the Cluster development and surrounding properties.

- d. A compatible mixture of open space, landscaped areas, and/or pedestrian amenities.
 - e. Sustainable design features and techniques, such as green building, stormwater management best practices, and low impact design, which will promote and encourage energy conservation and sustainable development.
 - f. A means for owning common open space and for protecting it from development in perpetuity.
 - g. Any density bonus is commensurate with the benefit offered to achieve such bonus.
 - h. The cluster development shall be adequately served by essential public facilities and services, such as: streets, pedestrian or bicycle facilities, police and fire protection, drainage systems, refuse disposal, water and sewage facilities, and schools. Such services shall be provided and accommodated without an unreasonable public burden.
 - i. The architectural form, scale, and massing shall ensure buildings are in proportion and complementary to those of adjacent properties and the selected building materials are of high, durable quality. The garage shall not be the dominant feature of a residential building.
-

From: Ann Erickson Gault

Subject: Cluster development considerations

Also, I am wondering what, if anything, the City can do when a property owner makes changes to their property that causes increased water intrusion or retention on adjoining properties.

Answer: Scott Finlay, Deputy City Engineer

As part of the detailed engineering review, the design engineer must demonstrate that the proposed improvements do not block storm water from traveling through the site from upstream and detain storm water that falls on the proposed site, releasing it back into the city storm sewer at controlled rate as not cause issues downstream.



**ROAD
COMMISSION
OPERATING
INSTRUCTION**

BOARD OF COUNTY ROAD COMMISSIONERS
OAKLAND COUNTY

EFFECTIVE DATE:
DECEMBER 8, 2008

NUMBER:
12, REV # 1

PREPARING ORGANIZATION:
TRAFFIC SAFETY
DEPARTMENT

SUPERSEDES
NUMBER 12
DATED 11-1-2006

SUBJECT:

INSTALLATION OF SPEED HUMPS

I. PURPOSE:

To establish guidelines for the installation of speed humps on subdivision streets.

II. INFORMATION:

There have been an increasing number of instances where vehicular traffic utilizes subdivision streets, in order to bypass congested intersections, avoid gravel roads or take advantage of a short cut. In addition, this same traffic, as well as residents that reside within the subdivision, often travels at speeds that significantly exceed the residential speed limit.

The installation of speed humps is increasingly being used as a method to deter speeding and "cut through" traffic. Speed humps are raised pavement sections that are between 3 to 4 inches in height and approximately 14 feet in length. When designed properly and installed in warranted locations, speed humps have been proven to reduce vehicle speeds and/or "cut through" traffic on subdivision streets.

In order for speed humps to be warranted, the 85th percentile speed must be equal to or greater than 35 miles per hour. In addition, the following criteria should be considered:

1. Traffic volumes in excess of 1000 vehicles a day, which includes a minimum of 25% "cut through" traffic.
2. Acceptable vertical and horizontal curvature.
3. Pavement width less than or equal to 40 feet.

In order to ensure consistency for speed humps which are installed on subdivision streets under its jurisdiction, the Road Commission for Oakland County establishes the following procedure:

DIRECTIVE TYPE	PREPARING ORGANIZATION	EFFECTIVE DATE	NUMBER	PAGE
OPERATING INSTRUCTION	TRAFFIC SAFETY DEPARTMENT	DECEMBER 8, 2008	12	2 OF 3

III. PROCEDURE:

Responsibility

Action

Traffic-Safety Department Staff

1. Upon receipt of a written request from the homeowners association or interested residents of the area, shall meet with representatives from the subdivision, the Township, and local law enforcement, for the purpose of discussing the traffic concerns, along with the various countermeasures available, including the requirements for the installation of speed humps.

Traffic-Safety Department Staff

2. If it is agreed that speed humps are a potential countermeasure of interest, shall conduct the necessary traffic studies to determine whether or not the traffic speeds, volumes and "cut through" traffic, meet the above criteria for the installation of speed humps.

Traffic-Safety Department Staff

3. Shall hold a follow-up meeting with the representatives from the previous meeting to discuss the results of the traffic studies and whether or not the speed humps are warranted.

Note: If speed humps are warranted, the RCOC shall also provide cost estimates and proposed acceptable locations for the speed humps.

Traffic-Safety Department Staff

4. Shall inform the residents and the Township that to move forward with the installation of warranted speed humps, the following must be submitted to the Road Commission:
 - a. A Petition agreeing to the installation, to be signed by at least 75% of the homeowners on the subject segment of street(s) with the proposed speed humps; and
 - b. An appropriate Township Board Resolution supporting the installation of the speed humps.

DIRECTIVE TYPE	PREPARING ORGANIZATION	EFFECTIVE DATE	NUMBER	PAGE
OPERATING INSTRUCTION	TRAFFIC SAFETY DEPARTMENT	DECEMBER 8, 2008	12	3 OF 3

Note: The "subject segment" of street(s) shall be the segment determined by the Traffic-Safety Department staff as being significantly impacted by the proposed speed humps.

- Traffic-Safety Department Staff 5. Upon receipt of the above information, shall give the subdivision/homeowners authorization to proceed to have the speed humps designed by a consultant and constructed by a contractor, subject to review and approval by the RCOC Traffic-Safety and Permits & Environmental Concerns Departments, through the RCOC permit process.

Note: At its option, the RCOC may elect to construct the speed humps. In either event, the cost of installation (which includes signs and pavement markings as necessary) and, as appropriate, the removal of speed humps, will be at the subdivision's expense.

- Traffic-Safety Department Staff 6. Future maintenance costs of the speed humps, including the pavement markings, will be the responsibility of the subdivision. The RCOC will be responsible for the maintenance of the associated signs.

- Traffic-Safety Department Staff 7. Following installation, shall conduct follow-up traffic studies to determine the effectiveness of the speed humps.

Approved by: _____

Managing Director

12/2/08

Date