



Rochester Hills

Minutes - Final

Planning Commission

1000 Rochester Hills Dr
Rochester Hills, MI
48309
(248) 656-4600
Home Page:
www.rochesterhills.org

Chairperson Deborah Brnabic, Vice Chairperson Greg Hooper
Members: Gerard Dettloff, John Gaber, Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Stephanie Morita,
David A. Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Ryan Schultz

Tuesday, October 15, 2019

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Deborah Brnabic called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Auditorium.

ROLL CALL

Present 9 - Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis, Stephanie Morita, David Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Ryan Schultz and John Gaber

Quorum present.

Also present: Kristen Kapelanski, Planning Manager
Paul Davis, Deputy Director, DPS/Engineering
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2019-0439 September 17, 2019 Regular Meeting

A motion was made by Hooper, seconded by Schroeder, that this matter be Approved as Presented. The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

COMMUNICATIONS

A) Letter from R. Berry re: 3400 Crooks Land Division Appeal

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairperson Brnabic opened Public Comment at 7:05 p.m. Seeing no one come forward, she closed Public Comment.

NEW BUSINESS

2018-0426 Public Hearing and request for Preliminary Planned Unit Development and Site Plan Recommendation - City File No. 18-022 - Redwood at Rochester Hills, 119 single-story, ranch style rental units with attached garages on 29.96 acres

located near the southwest corner of Avon and Dequindre, zoned R-3 One Family Residential with a MR Mixed Residential Overlay, Parcel No. 15-13-476-005, Redwood USA, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated October 10, 2019 and Preliminary PUD plans and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant was Richard Batt, Redwood USA, LLC, 7510 East Pleasant Valley Rd., Independence, OH 44131.

Ms. Kapelanski outlined that the applicant was proposing 119 ranch-style units wrapping around the corner of Avon and Dequindre. She noted that the property was zoned R-3 with an MR Mixed Residential Overlay, and the development had been reviewed under the MR standards. The applicant was proposing a PUD to facilitate the development, and a number of modifications had been requested. The proposed density was slightly over what was permitted; the perimeter rear yard setback in one area was deficient by ten feet; the size of the front porches was deficient by eight feet; the minimum percentage of required design features had not been provided; the minimum percentage of windows and doors was deficient by four percent; and the proposed exterior finish exceeded the allowable amount of siding. Regarding the public benefit required as part of a PUD, the applicant was proposing a monetary contribution for improvements in the area. Currently, a roundabout was in the design phase by the Road Commission for the intersection of Avon and Dequindre. Some major water main improvements were planned as well, which might require the replacement of a pressure reducing vault (PRV) near the intersection. Staff felt that it would be beneficial to complete the pathway connection around the corner of Avon and Dequindre, which would not include the frontage of the subject property. Given the ambiguity of the design of the intersection, it was hard to pinpoint what the optimal benefit would be, whether it would be the sidewalk connection or the relocation of the PRV, so the applicant had committed \$100k towards those public improvements. She noted that Mr. Paul Davis, Deputy Director of DPS/Engineering was present. She suggested that for a condition, as Mr. Staran had advised, the Planning Commission should specifically mention the PRV and/or the pathway at the corner that the money could be put towards. She pointed out that there were a number of findings noted in Section 138-7.102 of the Zoning Ordinance that would be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council as part of the PUD request.

Mr. Davis provided a little more information than what pertained to the Redwood development so the Commissioners could have an idea of the

broader context of improvements that would happen in the area. He agreed that they were a little uncertain as to where the public improvements would be utilized, but there were a few options they could look at. He advised that there were two large projects in the works for the area. One would be administered by the Road Commission, and it would involve the replacement of the existing Avon Rd. bridge over the Clinton River. It would involve construction of the roundabout at the westerly intersection of Avon and Dequindre. The project was scheduled to start in November 2021. They had a kickoff meeting that morning about doing the design for the project. The schedule could be affected because the City of Rochester intended to do work along Rochester Rd. at the Romeo/Rochester intersection. Their plan was to be under construction in 2022, which would be in conflict with the bridge project. Working with MDOT and the City of Rochester, they would have to try to figure out how the projects could move forward at the same time and how an acceptable detour route would work. It would involve shutting down Rochester Rd. to one lane in each direction and once the bridge was removed, shutting down Avon Rd. The traffic going to John R would be the (unreasonable) option for both of those projects. There was a larger project that would involve replacement of a 96" water main by the Great Lakes Water Authority. That project would take a couple of years for construction, and they were looking to secure the services of a design engineer for the project, and it would take about a year to design. That project would likely go after the City of Rochester's project, but it would be in the same area and be very destructive. A lot of time, residents might complain that they worked with other agencies on purpose to tear up the whole City at one time. In this case, it might be preferable if they could do that, because it would be five years of impact in the area with the Great Lakes Water Authority and the Road Commission projects and the Redwood development, assuming it moved forward. With the Road Commission project, pathway was planned to be constructed with the roundabout because of the proximity to the Yates Cider Mill and pedestrian demands throughout all times of the year. He stated that it would be important for both projects for the City to take the opportunity and really make an improvement to the pedestrian facilities with pathways. As part of the Redwood project for the PUD public benefit, they had talked about possibly having pathway constructed. He claimed that it would not make sense if the Road Commission project just came in and tore it up. They did not know exactly what the project schedule was, and he added that the concept was very conceptual. The roundabout could go even further west of the intersection. They were trying to provide some distance between the bridge and the roundabout. It was not very desirable to have those two items in close proximity. Because of the timing of the project, it was likely

that Redwood would go forward first and be in a position to build pathway, and they would not want that to happen. That was why a donation was suggested. The City had a PRV vault. Some of the proposed pathway for the Road Commission project was going through the small property the City owned. They had talked about relocating the PRV onto some property that could be provided by the Redwood development through an easement. At one time, they had talked about Redwood constructing that in lieu of pathway. A contribution could be used towards that project or pathway. There had been talk about trying to take the opportunity to extend pathway west along Avon. There would be a matching contribution for the pathway built on the bridge, and the Road Commission would look to the City to cover the cost. There was even talk about trying to improve a connection, once they had pathway in the area, to Bloomer Park. The public benefit could be towards the Park. They would like to specifically identify the project the donation would be tied to, but he suggested that there might be other options out there other than pathway and the PRV, although it could be used for either of those.

Ms. Morita asked the purpose of the PRV and why the City would want to relocate it. Mr. Davis said that they would relocate it because it would be in conflict with the pathway and some of the road alignment and by shifting it further to the west, it would potentially be too close to the traffic along Dequindre. It was an important piece of infrastructure for the City's water system. They had a 36" water main east of Dequindre and a 30" west along Avon and a 16" that connected into the 36" currently. There were high pressures coming out of the 36" that were feeding into the 16" and to lower those pressures, they would construct a PRV and reduce them down to a more acceptable pressure for the distribution system. Pressure that was too low was bad, but pressure that was too high, above 100 lbs. per square inch, was poor for people's homes and businesses. Ms. Morita said that regardless of when the road got done, she asked if they would want the PRV to be relocated anyway. Mr. Davis replied "maybe." It would depend on the Road Commission's final configuration as to where the roundabout would be. The PRV had been on the west side of Dequindre for many years, and it had been o.k. Depending on how far west they shifted the proposed roundabout from the current intersection, it could be in conflict. They were just not sure yet, because they had not started detailed design for the road configuration. Ms. Morita said that the County was moving the road over the City's asset. She asked who would be responsible for moving the PRV. Mr. Davis said that the Road Commission had indicated that they felt it would be the City's responsibility, but he would argue that. Before, the area was shown as right-of-way for Dequindre, but it was actually a parcel that was deeded

to the City. Since it was the City's parcel, he felt that it would be a utility relocation that should be included in the project cost for the Road Commission. However, they had not gotten far enough to determine whether they needed to make that argument or not.

Mr. Batt related that Redwood Living developed single-story, ranch, attached apartments. They started in business in 1991, and they were based in Cleveland, Ohio. They currently had 13,000 units and a significant presence in southeast Michigan. They were in a number of cities in Macomb, Oakland and Wayne County. They had over 2,500 units in metro Detroit. The closest to Rochester Hills was Shelby Township. They operated strictly by their core values, the first one being that they did one thing really well - single-story, attached ranch rentals. He maintained that they were very disciplined in what they did. They operated in seven, soon to be eight, states, and they have had success in every state. Their residents were primarily empty nesters (2/3 to 3/4). The residents that were not empty nesters were typically young professionals who were attracted to peace and quiet. They had very strict leases and did background checks and credit checks. If someone had an issue, there was no lease. If people were a problem in the community, they were removed. The management took care of everything. They cut the grass and plowed the snow on their private roads. If someone needed help changing a light bulb or had a heavy package, they would help. If someone could not take garbage out, they would do it. They had a full time, onsite community manager and an onsite maintenance person and most often, they lived in the neighborhood. Their residents typically came from within a three-mile circle. There were people who wanted to stay in the community and age in place.

Mr. Batt said that the interiors were a key to a lot of their success. Typically a two-bedroom, two-bath rental home was about 1,000 s.f. Their bread and butter units were about 1,200 s.f. It was more like a home with larger rooms, a private patio and attached two-car garage. Their units were FHA and ADA compliant. The floor plans were open, with vaulted ceilings. He referenced a site plan showing the wetlands they were preserving. He noted that the different unit types were color coded. All the homes facing the main roads had rear garages. Some units had sun rooms. He showed pictures of the various units, and said that it was good for people to have choices. They understood the situation about the public benefit, having had a number of conversations with the Road Commission.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 7:30 p.m. and

advised that everyone would have three minutes, and that all questions would be answered after the speakers were finished.

Dennis Hayden, 51172 Dequindre Rd., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 *Mr. Hayden noted that he lived across the street from the development. He said that it was very disappointing to him as a neighbor that there was never any consideration for their peace and quiet and what they might have discussed prior to the development. He thought that \$100k was inadequate to address the public benefit. There had been seven recorded crashes in front of his property, with three fatalities, in the past ten years. He had been to the City, and he was directed to the Road Commission and then back to Rochester Hills, at which point he was told that the signage and the speed limit had been properly engineered. He thought that a guardrail should be part of the package, since there would be an influx of traffic directly across the street from him. They had talked about having a pathway on the left side of the roundabout at Avon and Dequindre, but he did not hear anything about the right. He asked if there would be one there as well. He had a big concern about lighting by the curve. It took skill to get out of his driveway, and less experienced people coming out of the proposed complex would experience some hardship as well. He felt that further planning for the development was in order to take into consideration the surrounding neighbors. They did not want headlights glaring into their window when people exited the neighborhood. He thought that there were more things that had not even come under the radar yet.*

Richard and Christine Stuhlsatz, 51170 Dequindre Rd., Shelby Township, MI 48315 *Mr. Stuhlsatz said that the entranceway would be right by the only two homes in the area. He asked if everyone was aware that there was a landfill adjacent to the subject property. He stated that the traffic on Dequindre was constantly bumper to bumper, and adding the development would only make the problem worse. He asked if everything was on cement, with no basements, which was confirmed. Mrs. Stuhlsatz asked how close the orange units would be to the road. Their main concern was the traffic shining into their front windows, and she felt that the construction of the units needed looking into.*

Pedro Cabalum, 1755 E. Avon Rd., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 *Mr. Cabalum said that his dad owned the corner property between Redwood and the roundabout. He asked if he would be required to put up a fence. They had a farmer who sold vegetables on the corner seasonally. They had a rental house, and the road would come close. He said that the driveway would be hard to get out, and he asked if there would be a stop*

sign to let his tenants out. He put in a water line to the house, and he asked if that would be replaced, depending on where the PRV would be. He did not think the house would attract too many tenants. He did not think the farmer would stay, either, because the traffic would affect his business. He asked if they would be required to put in walls to keep it quiet.

Xiong Vang, 50870 Dequindre, Shelby Township, MI 48317 Mr. Vang said that his house was just south of the subject property. He agreed with the two other neighbors that the traffic was horrible. He saw the infrastructure work on the roundabout. It backed up all the way to Auburn, and he questioned what they planned for the roads. He said that his other questions had been answered.

Chairperson Brnabic noted the question about the possibility of a guardrail being installed. Mr. Batt thought that it was a broader question than just about traffic in the area, which encompassed a number of concerns. Traffic in the area was managed by the Road Commission. They were proposing a number of improvements to the area and requiring a number of improvements from Redwood, such as an excel and decel lane in and out of their neighborhood. With the improvements, he felt that the ball needed to stay in the professionals' court.

Mr. Davis agreed that Avon and Dequindre were under the jurisdiction of the Road Commission for Oakland County. They would approve a permit as part of the development for any road work. It would be up to them whether to install a guardrail or not. As with many traffic items, there were certain warrants that needed to be met, and they had the final decision about what was put on their roadways.

Chairperson Brnabic brought up the question about whether a pathway was planned for the right side of Dequindre. Mr. Davis said that was a low priority and probably not likely. Dequindre was a boundary road for Oakland and Macomb County. Although they had a couple of homes south of Avon on the east side of Dequindre, a pathway extension probably would not serve much in the future.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that the Commissioners were aware that the property was adjacent to a landfill. She noted that there were several questions in regards to headlight glare from traffic, and she asked Mr. Batt if he could respond. Mr. Batt said that where they would come in and out of the community was determined by the Road Commission. To be a good neighbor, they would be willing to donate some landscaping to

those homeowners to block whatever lighting might come their way.

Chairperson Brnabic noted a question about the water valve. Mr. Davis said that the question was whether the future work on the PRV would affect the existing home. He said that there was already a PRV out there. They would construct a new one out of the way of future improvements for the roads or pathway. They would maintain the existing PRV until the new one was built. There might be a short period of time where they were cutting over the existing water system from the old lines to the new vault, and then they would abandon the old vault. There might be a minimal disruption, but it would be similar to how they did the booster station at Tienken and Adams. They built the new one and transferred everything over and then abandoned and demolished the old structure.

Mr. Batt mentioned some general commentary about the level of traffic they might produce. They kept statistics for that. In a typical neighborhood, there were 1.7 residents per unit and 1.5 cars per unit. It was a lot less than they might expect. They had gone to each market in southeast Michigan and chosen seven of their neighborhoods and did traffic counts. Their addition to traffic during peak times was minimal, because the vast majority of their residents were empty nesters.

Mrs. Stuhlsatz came forward again and said that 119 units was over the allowable amount for the area. She asked why they would approve that. There were several other modifications being asked, and she questioned why the City was agreeing to something against its own regulations. Chairperson Brnabic explained that the applicant was using a Planned Unit Development.

Ms. Kapelanski responded that the density allowed was 3.45 units per acre, and they were proposing 3.97. She mentioned the question about whether or not there would be a fence around the corner at Avon and Dequindre, and she said that one was not proposed, but significant landscaping was shown.

Chairperson Brnabic complimented Mr. Batt on his responses and acknowledgement to City staff, which she felt had been done well. There was a request the last time he was before them for additional brick or stone, especially on the front facades. She had not noticed any change, and it varied between 5-13% at the highest. She asked if there was a plan to increase. Mr. Batt remembered talking about that issue. They were trying to achieve a balance of keeping rentals affordable and keeping up the appearance of the neighborhoods. He had suggested that the

Commissioners should take a ride through some of their other neighborhoods. They were not currently proposing anything additional. Chairperson Brnabic said that it was her opinion that it should be increased. She understood he was trying to balance things, but she believed that the facades would benefit from more stone or brick, especially being at a prominent corner. She had hoped that colored renderings were included. She went to the Shelby location last year, and she had noticed a variety of colors. She asked if that was still the plan, which Mr. Batt confirmed. Chairperson Brnabic asked if the colors were standard, and Mr. Batt agreed, and said that they would be somewhat muted, but with some life.

Chairperson Brnabic closed the Public Hearing at 7:49 p.m.

Mr. Gaber felt that they were at a little bit of a disadvantage. He had not seen colored renderings, but he wanted to understand those better. He did not think that the black and white elevations did the development any justice. It looked like there were long expanses of a building with a solid roof line and garages off the front, but black and white did not really paint the picture. He noted that the big expanses that ran from one set of attached units to the other were broken up with some dormers in the roofline. Mr. Batt agreed, and he said that due to the topography, there would be some steps in some of the buildings to break up the roofs. Mr. Gaber asked if there was a difference in the roof height, elevations and rooflines throughout all the units. Mr. Batt said that it would be basically the same from one side to the other except for the units that had steps. Mr. Gaber observed that some brick and stone was proposed for a couple feet from the grade to the windows. He thought that looked good. He asked the square footages for the various units. Mr. Batt said that the Forestwood and the Meadowood were 1,300 s.f.; the Capewood was 1,700 s.f.; the Willowood was 1,400 s.f.; and the Haydenwood was 1,300 s.f. They were all two bedroom, two bathroom units. Mr. Gaber asked if they had an idea of the price points. Mr. Batt said that the smaller units would be \$1,800 and the larger would be \$2,200. Mr. Gaber had observed that the sides of some units were pretty close to the road, and about ten units had side entry garages. There were sidewalks throughout. He asked what they did for guest parking. It did not look as if there was any accommodation for that. Mr. Batt said that there were a few spaces of guest parking, and when they got into final engineering, they would try to add more. Every unit had a two-car garage and two parking spaces in the driveway. Mr. Gaber said that he would also be interested in seeing a colored landscaping plan. He said that he would like to understand the deviations being requested, and why Mr. Batt felt that they were

necessary.

Ms. Kapelanski advised that there were several dimensional ones, but most had to do with the design features and architecture. The perimeter rear yard setback by unit 119 was deficient by ten feet (southwest corner). The entrances and the porches were almost all deficient by about eight square feet. The front porch was required to be 30 s.f., and they were providing a minimum of 22 s.f. For design features, 10% was required. That included columns, cornices, pediments, articulated bases, etc. Some of the facades did contain those features, but some contained none. That was mainly for the rear portions. The windows and doors required only applied to those areas facing Avon or Dequindre. There was one unit facing Dequindre that was deficient by 4%. The exterior finishes were considerably over on the amount of siding. 33% was the maximum allowable amount, and in some of the elevations, they showed close to 100%. They were providing the brick and stone beltline, and trying to keep the product slightly more affordable. Staff was willing to work with the applicant on that. She added that there were about ten to fifteen units over the allowable density.

Mr. Batt responded that relative to some of the deficiencies, it was a very difficult site. There were a lot of wetlands and a lot of slope. They worked with staff to move units around and lose units to stay within slope and wetland setbacks. He claimed that Rochester Hills had more restrictions than most other places. Mr. Gaber asked the distance between the exterior of the homes and the edge of the property along Dequindre. Ms. Kapelanski said that they showed a 30-foot setback to the right-of-way, plus the road. They met the 20-foot requirement.

Mr. Dettloff said that Mr. Batt had mentioned a presence in Oakland, and he asked if it in was Commerce Twp. and White Lake. Mr. Batt added Wolverine Lake and Orion. Mr. Dettloff asked if those were completed or under construction. Mr. Batt advised that only White Lake was under construction - the rest were completed. Mr. Dettloff asked if they each had a comparable amount of units, and Mr. Batt said that they varied. Orion only had 77 units. Commerce had 96, Wolverine Lake had 188 and White Lake had 150. Mr. Dettloff asked if the completed were at 100% occupancy. Mr. Batt believed so. They managed to 95%, which was standard in the apartment industry. He remarked that if they had no vacancies, they were not charging enough rent. Mr. Dettloff asked if the rent structures were comparable in those communities. Mr. Batt said that rents were a little lower, which was reflective of differences in median income.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked Mr. Batt how many conversations he had with the neighbors. Mr. Batt said that they had not had any. Mr. Kaltsounis was fairly certain he was asked that the last time he was there. Mr. Batt said that it was an oversight on their part, and he agreed that the issue had been discussed. Mr. Kaltsounis stated that there needed to be visits with the neighbors, which was always recommended by the Commissioners. He noted unit L by Dequindre. He saw that it had a reservoir right off the back door. PUDs had to have a benefit for the City, and putting a reservoir two feet from a back door was unfair for the people who would live there. Mr. Batt said that he might find that objectionable, but there were a lot of tenants who paid premiums to live in that situation. Mr. Kaltsounis asked the depth of the pond - he thought it was about 16 feet. Mr. Davis said that the City did not allow that, and generally basins were not deeper than four feet. Mr. Kaltsounis said that even if it was eight feet, the City would require a fence. They did not want anyone falling in. Mr. Davis did not think those basins were fenced, but that would be reviewed during construction plan review. Mr. Kaltsounis said that he did not want to set a precedent at ten feet, or to put one right off the back of a house. Mr. Batt said that they would make sure it worked.

Mr. Paul Furtaw, Engineer, said that it would be designed in accordance with the City's engineering standards to eliminate the need for a fence. He agreed that they would work with staff. He also agreed that Redwood found success and people were attracted to that feature. Mr. Kaltsounis said that he wished there was more space between the home and the pond. He said that he was very sensitive about water issues, because he had a river that ran into his basement. He replaced water pumps all the time, and he had water issues all the time. Mr. Batt reminded that the units would be on slab. Mr. Kaltsounis wondered if they were going to put in a fountain in the reservoir or make the water blue. Those were the kinds of things that happened in his sub. Mr. Batt said that they hired pond a maintenance company, and there were no smelly ponds, or people would not rent there.

Mr. Kaltsounis brought up the \$100k. The City typically always had somewhere the money needed to go, and it was typically into the development. He saw a dog park proposed, sidewalks up against the road and a sparsely walkable community without any amenities to even sit down. Mr. Batt said that they had to consider who their residents were. The majority came from single-family developments that did not have those things - pools, fitness centers - so they would buy those services or use the senior center the community provided. Mr. Kaltsounis explained

that he was talking about a small park where someone could sit. His in-laws would like to move into something smaller, and they liked to walk. He did not see that access for the proposed development. He said that the \$100k needed to get back into the development. Mr. Batt said that he was okay with that. Mr. Kaltsounis asked the number of feet between buildings S and U, and Mr. Batt related that there was 50 feet. Mr. Kaltsounis took exception to the way the back of the buildings looked. He would like to see renderings of the backs. Some views just showed siding without trim around the windows or anything to break up the rooflines. He saw something different in Mr. Batt's presentation than in the packet, and it needed to be included in the packet. He had looked a photos of the Canton development, and he said that he wished that was being proposed. If they had those types of sections, with pergolas and different features to break up the walls, it would be much better. He stated that the Canton development was beautiful. The proposed development was thrifed, and that was not for Rochester Hills. He thought that the Canton site should be the benchmark, and it definitely looked high class.

Mr. Hooper went by the Shelby Township location earlier, and he showed some photos on the overhead along the main road. There were some relief elements. It showed the backs of the units, but there was some full brick interspersed. He showed a close up of one that faced the main road, which had masonry every third place. Throughout the development, the back of the houses looked like an army barracks. He said that he understood the economics, but all the rears of all the units, except for those that faced the street looked like that. He felt that they could do better. He had noticed that there was maybe a foot difference between the units. They had uniformed grading, like on a plateau, and they had said that the pond would be shelved, but he stated that it really was not the case. He suggested that they could break up the rooflines, add different pitches or angles on the roofs and add masonry to the siding. The demand for a ranch unit was huge in Rochester Hills, and he felt that it would be an immediate seller. There would be no problem leasing the units. They just had to improve the appearance and quality to fit Rochester Hills. As far as the items not in conformance, he was okay with a little more density if they could get less siding and more masonry, the porches were okay, and they could add some more columns and cornices to match their other units, and he was fine with the \$100k public benefit, and that it qualified for the PUD.

Chairperson Brnabic said that the Commissioners did not have any examples of what had been presented, with full brick. She agreed that the development was lacking. She understood affordability, but there was a

line.

Mr. Schultz said that he would give the benefit of the doubt regarding the pond. The stage water elevation was three feet deep. The contours were not misleading, but the water elevation would not come to the back of the patio. He also had an aversion to the backs of some of the buildings, especially compared with some of their other products. He said that the Canton location had units with pergola elements, more mature landscaping, more fenestration and things going on. All those things helped to soften the barrack look.

Mr. Batt said that he appreciated the comments and direction. He felt that they would have to reassess the affordability issue. There were things they could do that would impact rents, and Rochester Hills could stand higher rents. That was not where they were headed, but he indicated that they could head that way.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that he would like to move to postpone. There had been a lot of comments, and they had people to talk to and amenities to look at, and they knew the direction the Commission was looking to go.

Chairperson Brnabic asked Mr. Batt if he agreed to the postponement, which he did.

Mr. Gaber said that he would like to see more colored renderings of the front and the back as opposed to just black and white. In addition, he would like to see a colored landscape plan.

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, in the matter of 18-022 (Redwood at Rochester Hills PUD), the Planning Commission **postpones** the recommendation of the Preliminary PUD plans dated received August 27, 2019, until the applicant can address the changes requested and resubmit.

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, that this matter be Postponed. The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously, and that they looked forward to seeing them again.

2019-0447

Public Hearing and request for Recommendation of the Third Amendment to the PUD Agreement - City File No. 98-047.5 - City Apartments Garageports, to replace approved carports with garageports, located near the southeast corner of Rochester and Tienken at City Walk, zoned B-2 General Business with an