





Jennifer MacDonald <macdonaldj@rochesterhills.org>

---

**Fwd: Discussion of Rezoning of Parcels #15-15-429-026. #15-15-429-027 and #15-15-405-004 from industrial to single family residential**

1 message

---

**Sara Roediger** <roedigers@rochesterhills.org>

Fri, Sep 30, 2022 at 11:08 AM

To: Chris McLeod <mcleodc@rochesterhills.org>, Jennifer MacDonald <macdonaldj@rochesterhills.org>

For the next PC meeting

**Sara Roediger, AICP**

Planning and Economic Development Director

direct 248.841.2573

[roedigers@rochesterhills.org](mailto:roedigers@rochesterhills.org)

dept. 248.656.4660

[planning@rochesterhills.org](mailto:planning@rochesterhills.org)

[www.rochesterhills.org](http://www.rochesterhills.org)



----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Pam and Andy Krupp** <[pamandandy22@yahoo.com](mailto:pamandandy22@yahoo.com)>

Date: Fri, Sep 30, 2022 at 9:54 AM

Subject: Discussion of Rezoning of Parcels #15-15-429-026. #15-15-429-027 and #15-15-405-004 from industrial to single family residential

To: [roedigers@rochesterhills.org](mailto:roedigers@rochesterhills.org) <[roedigers@rochesterhills.org](mailto:roedigers@rochesterhills.org)>

Cc: [scottl@rochesterhills.org](mailto:scottl@rochesterhills.org) <[scottl@rochesterhills.org](mailto:scottl@rochesterhills.org)>

Hi Sara,

Can you please also forward to the Planning Commission- thank you!

Pamela Bratton Wallace

[168 Cloverport Ave.](#)

[Rochester Hills, Michigan](#)

248-651-4439

RE: Discussion of Rezoning of Parcels #15-15-429-026. #15-15-429-027 and #15-15-405-004 from industrial to single family residential

Friday September 30, 2022

Dear Planning Commission, Planning Department and City Councilors Deel and Bowyer,

I hope this finds you all enjoying your day.

I wanted to make a moment to touch base again about the potential rezoning of the above Cloverport properties to R4 (single family) and the discussion at the Planning Commission meeting on 9/20/22.

**First with regards to the zoning of the property:**

If there is a development option utilized for the properties, I would like to share my support for R4 single family zoning.

As you know Council President Ryan Deel made the motion to rezone the properties to R4. This action was based on the stated beliefs that R4 is the best use of the properties, in the most harmonious alignment with the existing neighborhood, the city's Master Plan and that R4 zoning will provide the new owners access to their property. I concur with these statements. Additionally as many of you may know, the property is also a designated priority one natural features and wildlife habitat with very sensitive natural features- thoughtful, appropriate development and density are going to be essential here. R4 zoning begins to address this, while industrial, multi family do not within this type of dynamic and setting.

Also extremely important is that the zoning be a straight R4 zoning with no PUD or future allowance of a higher density development. As noted prior, a higher density development is not appropriate for the properties/area. The city has stated publicly on several recent occasions that they are moving away from the use of PUD's because of multiple abuses and difficult/unintended development outcomes. A PUD would allow for accommodations and workarounds to existing ordinance including the tree and steep slope ordinances that directly apply to these properties. If you recall from the 9/20 Planning Commission meeting, the PUD conversation began with an inquiry from Matt Able one of the new owners about what Pulte did on the Rochester University property. The Pulte development utilized a long standing PUD which ultimately permitted a waiver of environmental ordinance that resulted in the loss of approx. 700 trees, the destruction

of ordinance protected steep slopes and other environmental damage to the area. At a time where we are looking to now develop our most sensitive properties and a time of elevated public awareness and interest in properties with natural features that abut existing residential neighborhoods, we need to be our most skillful and thoughtful with our planning. The city is under no obligation to over accommodate for a development and should not set the difficult precedence of doing so. A PUD designation under these circumstances speaks to that and introduces questions of giveaways to developers that allow them to maximize profits and overdensify their properties at the expense of recognized priority environments and long established neighborhoods.

And because we never know which way the wheels of life will ultimately turn, we hope you would also be in support of a green space option for the property should it arise. Both the Cloverport and Childress Green Space Properties had approved site plans on them prior to their purchase as community Green Space. These properties provide a link between the Rochester University Green Space Conservation area, The Cloverport/Childress Green Spaces and the Beekeeper property which is owned by Claire and Bob Levy and is currently being considered for Green Space preservation by the city. The area forms part of the Clinton River Corridor comprised of high priority natural features properties. The Greenway was the main vision of our green space efforts at both the city and county level in the early 2000's.

Some info on the Green way: [https://www.oakgov.com/advantageoakland/resources/Documents/Maps/gi\\_PlanningForGreenRiverCorridors.pdf](https://www.oakgov.com/advantageoakland/resources/Documents/Maps/gi_PlanningForGreenRiverCorridors.pdf)

### **Revisiting discussion from the Planning Commission meeting on 9/20/22:**

-At the Planning Commission meeting on 9/20 Matt Able of Skyline Properties one of the owner/investors of the above noted properties and his colleague asserted that:

-They had no idea the property was being considered for zoning changes- they had just found out the Friday prior to the Planning Commission meeting

-That they had absolutely no idea that there were any issues at all about accessing the property off of Cloverport

-That the city and Planning Department had given them verbal approval for their storage unit and access off of Cloverport as an appropriate use

-That they have spent a great deal of money on the property and this project based on the "go ahead" from the city

-That the neighbors haven't seen the plans, don't understand the impacts and that they wouldn't even see the proposed storage unit from their homes/properties.

**In my follow up comments I shared with Planning Commission :**

**Regarding Possible Zoning Changes:**

-The new owners were aware of the FB moratorium and that the city was looking into FB and other possible zoning changes for the properties. Property owners were notified in writing and this was on record at the city. Matt Able was in attendance of the May 17th Planning Commission/Planning Department work meeting where FB zoning changes were discussed in relationship to the expressed properties as were the long standing issues with the properties.

**Regarding Access Issues:**

-The property was purchased with full knowledge that the property had no access- this had been discussed at:

\*Meeting with Owner/Investor Matt Able, Owner/Investor Richard Stephens & Cloverport neighbors on December 27, 2021. This meeting ended with the understanding that there would need to be a legal determination via the city attorney about access before our talks went further.

\*The Planning Department- in many conversations with the new owners and with different neighbors regarding the property and its status, Planning shared that access and that legal right had not been determined or established. These conversations took place prior to purchase in May 2022 and since then with the neighbors.

\*Matt Able was told by Planning Director Sara Roedigers (minutes link below) at the May 17th 2022 Planning Commission/Planning Department work meeting that legal determination of Cloverport access was not established and still a matter of discussion.

(Minutes from May Meeting: <https://roch.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=960036&GUID=D928D576-5D3A-4651-B156-171C17FD2370> )

-The property has had well known and long standing issues with access and development and that is why it has not been developed.

**Regarding Time/Money Investment:**

-The city Planning Department has told Cloverport neighbors on many occasions (most recently on Wednesday September 21, 2022) that they have not seen, discussed or received any new concept plans,

formal plans nor have they been in any further conversations with the new owners regarding the property.

**Regarding City Responsibility:**

-The city has told neighbors on many occasions in our discussions beginning in December 2021 that they are not responsible if a potential property owner does not do their homework and chooses to overspend for a property (based on the cities own valuation of the property) or buys a property that is landlocked or in a zoning change and that they (the city) have no obligation to accomodate beyond what the owner has by right with regards to the property. In this case the new owners are longtime professional buyers/investors for a higher profile investment group that took a calculated risk on the purchase of these properties in full knowledge of the dynamics involved. They have been purchasing/accumulating a number of properties in the immediate area and have been in contact with the prior owner and other nearby property owners for years.

**Regarding Neighbors Understanding of Proposal:**

- The neighbors are in full understanding and aware of the storage unit concept plans and the potential neighborhood impacts. Concept plans were provided to neighbors by Richard Stephens and Matt Able prior to our meeting on December 27, 2021(**attached below**)

In prior comments to both the Planning Commission and Council, I have shared that our community is at a tipping point with regards to the balance between preserving what is best in our community and new/re-development. This shaping of our community is being done one decision at a time. I hope you will be able to support R4 zoning for these properties as it provides the skillful balance of allowing access and profitability for the new owners as well as maintaining continuity with the existing neighborhood while addressing the unique needs that present with the development of our most sensitive natural areas.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration,

Pamela Wallace

-----

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.

#rhmail#



**2021.12.07\_Cloverport Storage (2) (1).pdf**

462K



Jennifer MacDonald &lt;macdonaldj@rochesterhills.org&gt;

---

**Fwd: 49 Cloverport Ave and its adjoining properties**

1 message

Sara Roediger &lt;roedigers@rochesterhills.org&gt;

Wed, Oct 5, 2022 at 3:29 PM

To: Jennifer MacDonald &lt;macdonaldj@rochesterhills.org&gt;, Chris McLeod &lt;mcleodc@rochesterhills.org&gt;

For the file.

**Sara Roediger, AICP**

Planning and Economic Development Director

direct 248.841.2573

[roedigers@rochesterhills.org](mailto:roedigers@rochesterhills.org)

dept. 248.656.4660

[planning@rochesterhills.org](mailto:planning@rochesterhills.org)[www.rochesterhills.org](http://www.rochesterhills.org)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Gigi Colombini** <[gigi@iforhope.com](mailto:gigi@iforhope.com)>

Date: Mon, Oct 3, 2022 at 8:28 AM

Subject: [49 Cloverport Ave](#) and its adjoining propertiesTo: <[roedigers@rochesterhills.org](mailto:roedigers@rochesterhills.org)>, <[deelr@rochesterhills.org](mailto:deelr@rochesterhills.org)>, <[bowyers@rochesterhills.org](mailto:bowyers@rochesterhills.org)>, <[scottl@rochesterhills.org](mailto:scottl@rochesterhills.org)>Good morning, My name is Gigi Colombini and I live at [201 Cloverport Ave](#).

I would like to let you all my thoughts on the subject named properties as I have lived on this street since 2005. I have raised my 3 children here, -one was actually born in our home. This neighborhood has been a place we have cared for and loved for quite some time and hope that it can remain an ideal place for families to raise children, live with nature and enjoy all that Rochester Hills has to offer in our little paradise on Cloverport.Ave.

My 1st choice for the property located at [49 Cloverport Ave](#) and the adjoining properties just to its south would be that it become a Green Space. As it is still a recognized Priority 1 Natural Features and Wildlife Habitat property which is connected to existing Green Space property it is a very desirable piece of land for that purpose. It is also connected to the Beekeeper property which is being considered for Green Space designation and can create the Clinton River corridor which has been envisioned by the City of Rochester Hills and Oakland County since the early 2000s. So much good can come from this choice.

My second choice would be to support an R4 designation on the properties as long as there are NO development workarounds such as a PUD, or FB. Anything that would supersede ordinances designed to fully protect the current ordinances that our city has put in place to reflect the values of our community from too much development and causing damage to the environment we live in.

R4 does allow

- access to the current land locked property
- allows the investor to be profitable



- allows the city to realize its vision which is expressed in the master plan
- allows for an appropriate level of development for sensitive natural features
- and is in harmonious alignment with the adjoining neighborhood.

All making this the most appropriate decision for any development of the existing property.

The people who bought the property are professional property investors and were fully aware of the circumstances when they purchased the property. It was a calculated risk, but not one we, nor the city, need to be at the effect of so the developer can realize more profit.

Thank you for considering all of this as you move forward with decisions regarding my neighborhood.

Gigi Colombini

--

Electronic mail is not secure, may not be read every day and should not be used for urgent or sensitive issues

**Gigi Colombini, LMSW**

*Institute for Hope and Human Flourishing*

**Owner - Psychotherapist - Suicidologist**

Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304

[iforhope.com](http://iforhope.com)

248-259-6290 - C

248-872-7772 - O

-----

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.

#rmail#



Jennifer MacDonald <macdonaldj@rochesterhills.org>

---

## Fwd: Rezoning Parcels #15-15-429-026. #15-15-429-027 and #15-15-405-004 To Single Family Residential

1 message

---

**Sara Roediger** <roedigers@rochesterhills.org>  
To: Jennifer MacDonald <macdonaldj@rochesterhills.org>

Wed, Oct 12, 2022 at 4:42 PM

FYI, for the next meeting..

**Sara Roediger, AICP**  
Planning and Economic Development Director  
direct 248.841.2573  
[roedigers@rochesterhills.org](mailto:roedigers@rochesterhills.org)  
dept. 248.656.4660  
[planning@rochesterhills.org](mailto:planning@rochesterhills.org)  
[www.rochesterhills.org](http://www.rochesterhills.org)



----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Pam and Andy Krupp** <[pamandandy22@yahoo.com](mailto:pamandandy22@yahoo.com)>  
Date: Wed, Oct 12, 2022 at 11:49 AM  
Subject: Rezoning Parcels #15-15-429-026. #15-15-429-027 and #15-15-405-004 To Single Family Residential  
To: Sara Roediger <[roedigers@rochesterhills.org](mailto:roedigers@rochesterhills.org)>

Hi Sara,

I hope your day is going well!

Can you please also forward this letter to the Planning Commission too?

Thanks,

Andy

Andrew Krupp

168 Cloverport Ave.

Rochester Hills, Michigan

248-651-4439

October 12, 2022

RE: Rezoning of Parcels #15-15-429-026. #15-15-429-027 and #15-15-405-004 to single family residential

Dear Planning Commission, Planning Department, City Council President Ryan Deel and Councilor Susan Bowyer,

I am writing to continue the discussion about the potential of rezoning the properties noted above to R4 single family zoning.

If the property is to be developed, I support R4 single family zoning. My first choice for the property and I believe the most appropriate, continues to be green space preservation as part of The Clinton River Corridor.

An R4 re-zoning addresses many of the long standing issues with the development of the property that have persisted for years. It would allow access, profitability, it would create a development more compatible with the existing neighborhood and priority natural environment and at a density that would maintain neighborhood and environmental safety. It is exactly the kind of step the city needs to be taking as we consider problem solving for the strongest outcomes, as we develop and redevelop our remaining properties. In addition to better outcomes, in taking steps like this, the city will also ultimately have a lot more support from the residents for new developments and redevelopments if they have working examples of the city striking the right balance between existing neighborhoods, development and our remaining natural areas. This has always been important to Rochester Hills residents but it is growing even more important now as our remaining properties decrease. In the case of the noted properties, the city itself has long recognized the best use for development as single family residential R4- as noted in our Master Plan.

I am not in support of maintaining industrial zoning or rezoning to multi-family or PUD as each presents a continuation of the myriad of problems and undesirable impacts that the R4 zoning very easily and effectively resolves.

I was present at the 9/20/22 Planning Commission meeting and did hear the comments of the new owners of the property suggesting a lack of awareness and fairness about the possible rezoning discussion and process. It is important to note that the new property owners were fully aware of all the circumstances and the risks of their recent purchase of these properties and had been duly informed by the city and the neighborhood residents prior to its purchase. The new owners are from a prominent investment group that has done business in the area for years. They were not unaware of the risks involved in their purchase and it cannot be the city's nor the residents responsibility to over compensate them in any way for a risk on a purchase they knowingly and quite consciously took.

Thankfully the city has a great deal of agency, subjectivity and flexibility in this matter and can use it's legal rights and discretion to shape the kind of balances and desirable outcomes in this case; which would also reflect the kind of outcomes the community wants and needs to see at this juncture and moving forward with our development and redevelopment projects.

Thank you,

Andrew Krupp

-----

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.

#rhmail#