



Planning Dept Email &lt;planning@rochesterhills.org&gt;

---

**Added to FB Overlay #6**

2 messages

---

**Joni** <joni.r.puckett@gmail.com>  
To: planning@rochesterhills.org

Fri, Aug 12, 2022 at 5:48 PM

>  
> Rochester Hills Planning Commission,  
>  
> We are writing to express our concerns regarding the Flex Business Overlay #6. This parcel is labeled SW of Rochdale & Walton (15-16-204-021 & 022). The actual location of this parcel is SE Rochdale and Walton just to clarify. After attending the Public Open House on Wednesday, August 10, 2022; I would like to share some concerns.  
>  
> The parcels under consideration are currently zoned for office and we request that they remain that way according to the 2018 Master Plan. This plan was created with appropriate due diligence by the elected officials. The aforementioned parcel was allocated for "residential flex office" (page 7). Residential Office areas are defined as "intended to serve adjacent residential areas with limited basic shopping and/or service uses which are not related to the shopping pattern of the citywide or regional shopping centers". This definition is not in line with the potential use of the area should it be renamed as Flex Business Overlay. Section 138-8.200 states that the use of the parcel could include, but not be limited to: a restaurant, bar, hotel/motel residential inn, transit passenger station, etc.  
>  
> On page 76 of the 2018 Master Plan, the "Map 8 - annotated changes to Future Land Use" does not indicate any changes to the Rochdale parcels and that they should remain "residential office flex". Again, because the 2018 Master Plan was created with appropriate due diligence by the elected officials, a change to use as Flex Business Overlay is unnecessary in this residential area.  
>  
> At the open house, the Planning Commission stated that they are not looking at residential streets for the Flex Overlay proposal and only at arterial streets and collector roads and major intersections. This parcel, #6, is accessed only by a residential street; Rochdale Drive South which means it is neither an arterial street, collector road or major intersection. Under the Planning Commissions definition, this parcel should not have been considered for Flex Business Overlay.  
>  
> Allocating a change to Flex Business Overlay for this parcel could also create a traffic challenge. Traffic on Walton currently backs up as you approach the traffic light at Rochdale through the entrance of Rochester High School on school days. This occurs in the morning but notably in the afternoon at the end of the school day. Leaving Rochdale Subdivision at these times of the day is already challenging.  
>  
> The Planning Commission shared that their desire is for Rochester neighborhoods to have walking access to retail shops, restaurants, banking, etc. That privilege is already available in this vicinity. Changing the parcel in question does not add this benefit. It is present in the surrounding area.  
>  
> Thank you for your time in addressing our concerns. We have lived in Rochester for 36 years and value our community.  
> Joni and Guy Puckett  
> 168 Rochdale Drive South  
> [Joni.r.puckett@gmail.com](mailto:Joni.r.puckett@gmail.com)  
> 248-563-1596  
> 313-402-8409  
>  
> Sent from my iPad

---

**Planning Dept Email** <planning@rochesterhills.org>  
To: Joni <joni.r.puckett@gmail.com>

Mon, Aug 15, 2022 at 1:30 PM

Thank you Joni and Guy -

Your comments will be provided to the Planning Commission.

Jennifer

Jennifer MacDonald  
Planning Specialist  
City of Rochester Hills  
1000 Rochester Hills Dr.  
Rochester Hills, MI 48309  
(248) 841-2575 direct  
(248) 656-4660 office

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

Get Email Updates on Gov Delivery  
Join us on Facebook  
Follow us on Twitter  
Sign up for Alerts with Nixle

[Quoted text hidden]



Planning Dept Email &lt;planning@rochesterhills.org&gt;

---

## Flex Business Overlay Proposal

2 messages

Julie Hoensheid &lt;jhoensheid@sbcglobal.net&gt;

Fri, Aug 12, 2022 at 2:43 PM

To: "planning@rochesterhills.org" &lt;planning@rochesterhills.org&gt;

Dear Planning Commissioners,

As 30+ year residents of Rochester Hills, we are writing to express our concern about the proposed Flex Business Overlay, specifically the parcels at 145 and 155 Rochdale, the Office land SW of Rochdale & Walton (15 -16 -204 -021 & -022). The parcels are currently zoned for office, and we believe they should remain that way, without the Flex Business Overlay.

In the 2018 Master Plan, which was carefully planned with extreme due diligence by elected officials, the parcel is marked for "residential flex office" (page 7). From the plan, Residential Office Flex areas are defined as, "*intended to serve adjacent residential areas with limited basic shopping and/or service uses which are not related to the shopping pattern of the citywide or regional shopping centers*". This definition does not align with the potential uses if the area were to be rezoned and added to the Flex Business Overlay. Potential uses, as named in the [Flex Business Overlay Draft](#), Section 138-8.200\* include, but are not limited to: a restaurant, bar, hotel/motel/residential inn, transit passenger station, etc.

Furthermore, on page 76 of the 2018 Master Plan, the "Map 8 – annotated changes to Future Land Use" does not indicate any changes will be made to the Rochdale parcels, and that they should remain "residential office flex". Given all the work, research, and analysis that went into the Master Plan, a change to the Flex Business Overlay is not necessary in this residential area.

During the Planning Commission's Open House presentation on 8/10/22, attendees were told that the Planning Commission "was not looking at residential streets for the Flex Overlay proposal, and only at arterial streets & collector roads and major intersections." Parcel 6, (the Office land SE of Rochdale & Walton (15 -16 -204 -021 & -022), is accessed only by a residential road (Rochdale Dr S). It is also not an arterial or collector road, nor a major intersection so by the Planning Commission's definition, it should never have been looked at to be included in the Flex Business Overlay.

In addition to the misalignment to the city's current master plan, we are also concerned about the following:

- Traffic, especially on Walton in between Livernois and Old Perch (on school mornings and after school/work). We are aware that a traffic study has not yet been done and would not be done until something is proposed but the traffic is already backed up, often blocking our intersection, during morning and evening rush hour. The current office zoning means that there are a limited number of cars exiting and entering the office complex during peak hours, something that would most likely change if commercial, restaurant or retail were to be built there instead.
- We are concerned about a disruption of quality of life for residents in the area, including businesses with potentially later hours than the current typical office hours, increased volume/noise, increase of cars on residential streets and increased garbage/odor associated with commercial/restaurant properties.
- The residents of the area already have the option to walk to retail and restaurants, located across the street, at the intersection of Livernois and Walton, and downtown Rochester. Changing the footprint of the area to ensure residents have walking access to these amenities is unnecessary given that it's already an option.
- In the past, our subdivision has made it abundantly clear that we want to remain residential and have spoken out against numerous rezoning attempts. This latest proposal feels like a slap in the face for everything we have already repeatedly voiced.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to our concerns. Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Craig & Julie Hoensheid

[165 Rochdale Dr. S., Rochester Hills, MI 48309](#)

[jhoensheid@sbcglobal.net](mailto:jhoensheid@sbcglobal.net), 248.672.5607

\*-(<https://cms9files.revize.com/rochesterhillsmi/PED/FBMoratorium/DraftFBOrdinance.pdf>)

---

**Planning Dept Email** <[planning@rochesterhills.org](mailto:planning@rochesterhills.org)>

Mon, Aug 15, 2022 at 1:28 PM

To: Julie Hoensheid <[jhoensheid@sbcglobal.net](mailto:jhoensheid@sbcglobal.net)>

Thank you Craig and Julie -

Your comments will be provided to the Planning Commission.

Jennifer

Jennifer MacDonald  
Planning Specialist  
City of Rochester Hills  
1000 Rochester Hills Dr.  
Rochester Hills, MI 48309  
(248) 841-2575 direct  
(248) 656-4660 office

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

Get Email Updates on Gov Delivery  
Join us on Facebook  
Follow us on Twitter  
Sign up for Alerts with Nixle

[Quoted text hidden]



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

---

**Fwd: FB Community Givebacks & Article 12**

2 messages

---

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

Fri, Aug 12, 2022 at 12:09 PM

**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>

Date: Fri, Aug 12, 2022 at 11:02 AM

Subject: FB Community Givebacks &amp; Article 12

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

Hi Sarah,

We hope you are enjoying your Friday.

Two things for you today.

First is that we spoke with Deborah and two other Planning Commissioners at the Open House about adding two formal Green Space specific give backs to the community developer options. They were in favor of the idea and wanted us to approach you about it. The two give backs would be:

-A formal green space conservation easement ( can also be used to connect exist green space properties to one another)

- A direct donation of part of the property (often a undevelopable part) to the city or Six Rivers Land Conservancy as permanently preserved green space

At least two of the properties with the FB designation are priority one natural features and wildlife properties. Give backs of this nature have been discussed prior with developers who have been very open and receptive to these ideas. Formally adding them to the list would allow a meaningful

give back in areas of this kind of sensitive nature and ones that align with the specifics of the area and our community values of Green Space. It would also bring awareness to developers of this option and allow for more flexible and creative planning- all integral to the features of the FB.

This would be in addition to or in replacement of nature trails and nature observation areas as they do not serve the same purposes.

We would like to move ahead with this and wanted to know what would you need from us as a next step to further explore or institute these options?

And a question for you- we wanted to confirm our understanding of article 12 with you. We are looking at section 138-8.602. Using the case of the industrial zoned property on Cloverport, if using the FB it was developed as multi family residential, we wanted to confirm that the landscaping and buffering required would be the same requirements of the underlying industrial zoning? We wanted to verify this with you.

Section 138-8.602 Landscaping and Buffering All landscaping requirements of Article 12 shall apply in the FB overlay district

Thanks and we appreciate your help. Have a wonderful weekend,

Andy & Pam

-----  
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.

#rhtml#

---



Planning Dept Email &lt;planning@rochesterhills.org&gt;

---

## FB Moratorium -- Feedback

1 message

---

**MATT FUHRMAN** <mfuhrman222858@comcast.net>  
To: "planning@rochesterhills.org" <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Tue, Aug 16, 2022 at 6:15 PM

**Attn:** City of Rochester Hills, Planning Commission, City Council Members

**From:** Matthew Fuhrman ([155 Cloverport Ave, Rochester Hill Mi, 48307](#)) Parcel 15-15-429-044

**Subject:** Proposed FB Overlay - (Adding) Parcel 15-15-429-026 and Parcel 15-15-405-004

I am requesting that the following two Parcel be remove from the Parcels to be Added to Flex Business Overlay

**Parcel (15-15-405-004)**

- Remove due to it being currently part of the Cloverport GREENSPACE parcel, I am sure this is a typo

**Parcel 15-15-429-026**

Remove from list of Parcels to add to FB Overlay for now and allow more time to assess the impact of an FB overlay being added sensitive, nature rich part of the city that includes Clinton River Bluffs, Greenspace and one of the older city subdivision that is not ready for the additional traffic and noise that could occur with an FB overlay zoning.

The current FB Moratorium shows that the city is also concern with how the current FB overlay is working try to remove some parcels that do not make sense and update some requirements to help obtain the original intent of the FB overlay which are really designed for business areas not sensitive green space or single-family neighborhoods

Why the rush to add nature sensitive Parcels to FB when more time should be spent to get it right. The City of Rochester Hill has made Greenspace along the Clinton River a priority, it is something that share with future generation of Rochester Hill residents.

**Yawkey-Chapman Factor** (Subdivision that has 9 - R4 lots backing up to this Parcel 15-15-429-026)

- Platted in the early 1900, narrow streets (dirty road one way traffic with street parking) no sidewalks
- Clinton River Greenspace on the north and west end of the neighborhood
- Traffic / Safety Issue – Rochester Schools bus pickup/drop-off site on Rochester Road due to safety issue with driving down street

Lily Saari <lilysaari@gmail.com>  
To: Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Mon, Aug 15, 2022 at 1:56 PM

Hi Jennifer,

Thank you for bringing this to my attention. Below is the text from the letter.

Dear Planning Commission,

We are writing to express our concern about the proposed Flex Business Overlay, specifically the parcels at 145 and 155 Rochdale, the Office land SW of Rochdale & Walton (15 -16 -204 -021 & -022). The parcels are currently zoned for office, and we believe should remain that way in order to align to the 2018 Master Plan, and ensure our city has appropriate development in appropriate places.

In the 2018 Master Plan, which was carefully planned with extreme due diligence by elected officials, the parcel is marked for "residential flex office" (page 7). From the plan, Residential Office Flex areas are defined as, *"intended to serve adjacent residential areas with limited basic shopping and/or service uses which are not related to the shopping pattern of the citywide or regional shopping centers"*. This definition does not align with the potential uses if the area were to be rezoned and added to the Flex Business Overlay. *Potential uses, as named in the Flex Business Overlay Draft, Section 138-8.200\** include, but are not limited to: a restaurant, bar, hotel/motel/residential inn, transit passenger station, etc.

Furthermore, on page 76 of the 2018 Master Plan, the "Map 8 – annotated changes to Future Land Use" does not indicate any changes will be made to the Rochdale parcels, and that they should remain "residential office flex". Given all the work, research, and analysis that went into the Master Plan, a change to the Flex Business Overlay is not necessary in this residential area.

During the presentation at the 8/10/22 Open House, attendees were told that the Planning Commission "was not looking at residential streets for the Flex Overlay proposal, and only at arterial streets & collector roads and major intersections." Parcel 6, (the Office land SE of Rochdale & Walton (15 -16 -204 -021 & -022)), is accessed only by a residential road (Rochdale Dr S). It is also not an arterial or collector road, nor a major intersection so by the Planning Commission's definition, it should never have been looked at to be included in the Flex Business Overlay.

In addition to the misalignment to the city's current master plan, we are also concerned about the following:

- One of the office buildings on one of the parcels in question is Lily's place of work and is currently used for mental health therapy. That current use along with the other local businesses operating there already benefits our community. Without a specific plan as to what may replace it, it is difficult to determine if rezoning the parcel for another use would add equal value.
- We are also concerned about commercial uses that could add significant traffic (especially in the evening and weekend) into our neighborhood's entrance, creating new safety concerns. Our neighborhood does not have sidewalks and there are many children and dog-walkers in this area already sharing the road with cars.
- In our opinion, a good flexible-business zoning plan should have well thought out transitions between commercial and residential parcels, with respect to noise, safety, and appeal. It does not seem like the setback listed in the Flex Business Overlay Standards or the Summary of Proposed FB District Changes is nearly large enough. There also does not seem to be any prohibition against adding a busy parking lot right up to our neighbor's property line. Adding a requirement that at least one place of interest (like a row of trees) to separate the building or parking lot from residential zoning would alleviate



some of the issues caused by zoning commercial parcels immediately next to residential ones, as well as enhance the natural look of the land for many years to come.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to our concerns. We do love living here in Rochester Hills and take pride in our community. We appreciate the time and energy that went into creating the 20 year Master Plan, and do not see any need to change what has already been included in that plan. Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Ian Fitzner and Lily Saari

[146 Rochdale Dr. S.](#)

[ianefitzner@gmail.com](mailto:ianefitzner@gmail.com)

517-505-4755

[lilysaari@gmail.com](mailto:lilysaari@gmail.com)

248-805-3367

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

-----

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#

Timestamp	First Name	Last Name	Property Address	List any area or specific properties	Comments regarding the location to the FB	Comments regarding the land uses permitted in the FB District	Comments regarding the site regulations (setbacks, height, etc.)	General comments on the Flex Business (FB) Overlay
8/11/2022 20:49:59	Diana	Pagnani	135 Rochdale Dr. S	145 & 155 Rochdale Dr. S				We are in close proximity to the properties above. We are vehemently against these properties being added to the flex business plan. These properties are in a residential neighborhood being accessed on a residential street. Currently these are being used for office use. We tolerate the garbage blowing into our yards from open dumpsters, fences in disrepair and higher traffic volumes because these buildings were already there. There are enough vacant retail and commercial buildings in our area now. We do not believe these 2 properties need to be added to the flex business plan and should remain zoned residential office. As 50 year plus residents of Rochester Hills we don't believe we need another coffee shop, submarine sandwich store or pharmacy on our street we already have more in the area than we want now. We noticed other residential areas being removed from the flex business plan which leads us to wonder why 2 in our neighborhood are being added to it.
8/11/2022 22:45:14	Pat	Bismack	2926 S Livernois Road	70-15-28-479-089 Gas station of the south west corner of Livernois & Auburn Rd				1. Can the existing FB properties be grandfather under the current FB requirements? 2. The gas station on the south west corner of Livernois & Auburn has requested to rebuild/remodel their existing business. Therefore, it is very unlikely that we can acquire any addition parcels to meet the new 2 acre requirement. Can we request to change our entire property, 70-15-28-479-090 to FB?
8/10/2022 16:20:06	Sara	Gedda	455 West Maryknoll Rd.	Too many tree cut down on Walton.	Please stop over crowding. Destroying the look of Rochester Hills.	To generous and to developers. Make them pay for new road development, lights etc. . Less height! More green. No more cutting old trees.	Too high, too much and keep the the same.	Will research more. Unhappy with current direction.
8/10/2022 15:53:20	Horst	Reinhardt	117 Cloverport Ave	FB overlays in and around the historic Yawkey Chapman neighborhood	Thank you so much for listening to the residents and taking a second look at the green space behind our neighborhood. Its a small swatch of land that best kept as is.	Thanks again for taking a hard look at the use of the land in and around the historic Yawkey Chapman neighborhood. If the land cannot be retained as the green space or wild life preserve that it is now I fully support the decision to re-zone to R4 as proposed by the city councilmen at one of the working meetings I attended.	Thank you for taking a look and trying to improve the development that we have in the city-- especially since it seems like every last piece of green space, especially along Rochester Rd, is being torn up for yet another storage place or strip mall. I like to increased setbacks and the "community" space idea.	As leaders of our community it is essential the you have the back of the residents and keep development inline with what is best for the current-- many lifelong-- residents. We all have invested significant time and money into our community to make it the best it can be. I invested over \$500,000 into Rochester myself by building my home here. I hope you take into consideration all the investment of all the residents not only up and down Rochester Road but all over the city when you consider business development. Please do not allow for over development this area. Green space is almost impossible to get back once it is gone.
8/10/2022 12:03:04	Julia	Hieser	123 Rochdale Dr S	145 & 155 Rochdale Dr S	I will be submitting a separate email to the planning@ email address after attending tonight's open house.		I am interested in additional information about the setbacks for residential.	I would like to know how residents impacted have been engaged in the process and feedback thus far.
8/7/2022 20:45:26	Ron	Peckens	60 Cloverport Ave					Why are we adding the following lots 15-15-429-026 & -027 to the FB overlay? This is a land locked property. You would be granting a new land owner the ability to move forward with unlimited plans.
8/1/2022 17:18:48	Susan	Mason	308 Shellbourne					wanting to receive future emails
8/1/2022 16:11:55	Ron	Peckens	60 Cloverport Ave					Your information states that a portion of Industrial land south of Cloverport (15-15-405-004*) will be added to the FB overlay. Isn't that property already part of the existing Cloverport Greenspace?
3/25/2022 6:44:31	Kevin	Baird	Vacant- Approximate address 2442 S. Rochester Rd (just North of 2448 S. Rochester Rd)					I would like to see this location maintained as a FB district being located right on a high traffic stretch of Rochester Rd. Allowing for smaller scale commercial along the Rochester Rd frontage with 2-3 story multi family or senior housing behind would be my preference in this location.  Density is a requirement for projects to be feasible given the high costs of development and building. Simplifying the street type/setback/entrance requirements is a good idea. Thank you.
3/21/2022 18:04:49	Ron	Peckens	60 Cloverport Ave					I fully support the 6 month Moratorium. I believe the FB was originally done hastily, this should give the Planning Committee and Council time to properly evaluate properties where the FB makes sense and properties where the FB do not make sense and should be removed from the overlay.
3/21/2022 17:23:17	Horst	Reinhardt	117 Cloverport Ave					Thank you so much for looking into the flex business overlay zoning and considering a moratorium. I think it is prudent to take a pause and review if this type of zoning mechanism is working as intended. It is not unusual for developers to take advantage of zoning that the City may not have envisioned or is good for its residents. In my case, to allow a home to be torn down in a historic neighborhood to create an access road to a light industrial park behind residential homes seems to be one of those unintended consequences. Please approve this short pause and allow the planning commission to do a thorough review of the FB overlay zoning. Thank you.
3/18/2022 20:14:31	Paul	DeRubeis	2633 Hickory Lawn Road, Rochester Hills, MI, USA					Thank you for making progress on a long overdue plan to curtail the explosive growth in our city that will far outweigh our infrastructure. It seems of late, some members of the RH Administration and Planning Commission are more interested in the added tax dollars development will bring instead of these how developments will affect the quality of life in our fair city.
3/10/2022 13:21:16	Thomas	Rose	3081 S Livernois Rd, Rochester Hills, 48307					My property, zoned R-4, has had businesses attached on our North boundry since the 1940s and 50s with no issues. Properties to our South were all residential. In the early 1980s those neighbors and other properties have been purchased by the people who built the Mosque and all their houses removed. We have been approached to sell but have not been ready to leave this location yet.  Our house was built by my father when I was born and I purchased it from him when he retired and moved. With the change in the area my wife and I realize the next owner will want to change direction since there is no longer any neighborhood. This place is ideal for business because of its location and 200' frontage on Livernois. My Wife and I had lobbied City Hall since before Flex Business Overlay came into being. We were always counting on having a business take over when we left the property.  As changes to various neighborhoods around the city become unsuitable for their current designation, some method must remain available to redesignate their application. Reviewing the FB is definitely necessary but removing it from consideration might hinder future planning in some instances.  Thank you for your time. Respectfully, Thomas and Cornelia Rose
8/12/2022 20:28:44	Joni	Puckett	168 Rochdale Drive South	Added to the FB Overlay - District (#6)	It is listed as being Office land SW of Rochdale & Walton - it is in fact SE of Rochdale & Walton	The land is zoned for office. The attempt is to change the parcel to Flex Business	At the August 10 Open House, the Planning Committee stated they were not looking at residential streets for the Flex Overlay and only at arterial streets and collector roads and major intersections. Parcel 6 is only accessed by a residential road - Rochdale Drive South	Residential Office Flex areas are intended to serve adjacent residential areas with limited basic shopping and/or service uses which are not related to the shopping pattern of the citywide regional shopping centers. This definition does not align with the potential use of this parcel were it to be rezoned and added to the Flex's Business Overlay under Section 138-8.200

8/12/2022 22:44:04	Ian	Fitzner	146 Rochdale Dr S	15-16-204-021 &-022 (SE corner of Rochdale and Walton)	I am concerned about the possibility of what may be developed and constructed if the FB1 zone is expanded. I very close to the property and will be directly affected. I don't see how changing the zoning of the specific parcels aligns with our previously published Master Plans. Part of the office space there currently is used for mental health therapy which undeniably benefits the community. It is difficult to be okay with a blanket zoning change without knowing of what might ultimately be constructed in the location.	I am concerned about commercial uses that would add significant additional traffic (especially in the evening and weekend) into our neighborhood's entrance, since our neighborhood does not have sidewalks. There are many kids and dog-walkers in this neighborhood and we have reasonable safety concerns.	A good flexible-business zoning plan should have well thought out transitions between commercial and residential parcels, with respect to noise, safety, and appeal. It does not seem like the setback listed in the Flex Business Overlay Standards or the Summary of Proposed FB District Changes is nearly large enough. There also doesn't seem to be any prohibition against adding a parking lot right up to our neighbor's property line. Adding a requirement that at least one places of interest (like a row of trees) to separate the building or parking lot from residential zoning would alleviate some of the issues caused by zoning commercial parcels immediately next to residential ones.	
8/13/2022 12:38:36	Lily	Saari	146 Rochdale Dr S	FB-1 (Corner of Walton Blvd and Rochdale Dr S)	This district is in the center of an established business district and near a high school, which means there is a high volume of traffic and exposure to any properties in the vicinity. The businesses that are currently using the space support the retail spaces and restaurants in the area and if they were to be removed, it could create competition for local businesses that may not be able to keep afloat and take necessary services like medical, financial and educational out of the area and move them to where they may not be as accessible.	Offices near a residential area have worked well for the space as the high traffic times occur mainly on weekdays during general working hours when many people who live in homes around the parcels are either working or in school, limiting the foot traffic by residents. If a high traffic business such as a restaurant was put in that space, the traffic would continue into evenings and weekends when residents are home and more likely to be outside, causing increased safety concerns given there is no sidewalk separating the roads from the driveways.	This location is at the front of a residential area and the current separation is a fence in between the backs of the businesses and the side yard of the first residential driveway. If a high traffic business such as a restaurant or a retail site were to replace the current buildings as part of the rezoning process, it could limit the size of the parking lot based on the 50ft requirement. There is also a natural green space that exists between the homes and businesses that creates valuable curb appeal for both the businesses and the homes that could be altered based on the FB permitted sites.	While adding new opportunities for growth in the community is necessary and often successful, without a clear proposal of what change the rezoning could bring, it is difficult to form an opinion on if this change will be beneficial to the community and the residents who will be most impacted. The current setup of housing offices in the space has brought necessary services to the community and the impact of rezoning will also affect those businesses using the space who have been established there for years
8/16/2022 17:34:05	Joel	morris	144 Orchardale	Corner of Walton and Rochdale with Dentist office/ Medical Plaza	Proposed Flex Rezoning is in Direct conflict with Subdivision Bi-Laws that Supersedes			Why were all of the Homeowners Part of the Rochdale Neighborhood Not Advised to the Rezoning as this would effect everyone entrance and exit to the Sub potentially
3/1/2022 9:40 AM	Jeremy	Olstyn	152 Cloverport Ave.					Given the upcoming proposed moratorium on FB zoned development proposals, potential development in our neighborhood, as well as future discussions regarding FB zoning in general, the Cloverport Neighborhood would like to add our thoughts to the process. Please see the attached pdf in consideration of the adjustments that could be made to FB zoning and the positive impact it would have on our neighborhood and the Rochester Hills area as a whole.

Timestamp	First Name	Last Name	Property Address	List any area or specific properties	Comments regarding the location to the FB	Comments regarding the land uses permitted in the FB District	Comments regarding the site regulations (setbacks, height, etc.)	General comments on the Flex Business (FB) Overlay
8/11/2022 20:49:59	Diana	Pagnani	135 Rochdale Dr. S	145 & 155 Rochdale Dr. S				We are in close proximity to the properties above. We are vehemently against these properties being added to the flex business plan. These properties are in a residential neighborhood being accessed on a residential street. Currently these are being used for office use. We tolerate the garbage blowing into our yards from open dumpsters, fences in disrepair and higher traffic volumes because these buildings were already there. There are enough vacant retail and commercial buildings in our area now. We do not believe these 2 properties need to be added to the flex business plan and should remain zoned residential office. As 50 year plus residents of Rochester Hills we don't believe we need another coffee shop, submarine sandwich store or pharmacy on our street we already have more in the area than we want now. We noticed other residential areas being removed from the flex business plan which leads us to wonder why 2 in our neighborhood are being added to it.
8/11/2022 22:45:14	Pat	Bismack	2926 S Livernois Road	70-15-28-479-089 Gas station of the south west corner of Livernois & Auburn Rd				1. Can the existing FB properties be grandfather under the current FB requirements? 2. The gas station on the south west corner of Livernois & Auburn has requested to rebuild/remodel their existing business. Therefore, it is very unlikely that we can acquire any addition parcels to meet the new 2 acre requirement. Can we request to change our entire property, 70-15-28-479-090 to FB?
8/10/2022 16:20:06	Sara	Gedda	455 West Maryknoll Rd.	Too many tree cut down on Walton.	Please stop over crowding. Destroying the look of Rochester Hills.	To generous and to developers. Make them pay for new road development, lights etc. . Less height! More green. No more cutting old trees.	Too high, too much and keep the the same.	Will research more. Unhappy with current direction.
8/10/2022 15:53:20	Horst	Reinhardt	117 Cloverport Ave	FB overlays in and around the historic Yawkey Chapman neighborhood	Thank you so much for listening to the residents and taking a second look at the green space behind our neighborhood. Its a small swatch of land that best kept as is.	Thanks again for taking a hard look at the use of the land in and around the historic Yawkey Chapman neighborhood. If the land cannot be retained as the green space or wild life preserve that it is now I fully support the decision to re-zone to R4 as proposed by the city councilmen at one of the working meetings I attended.	Thank you for taking a look and trying to improve the development that we have in the city-- especially since it seems like every last piece of green space, especially along Rochester Rd, is being torn up for yet another storage place or strip mall. I like to increased setbacks and the "community" space idea.	As leaders of our community it is essential the you have the back of the residents and keep development inline with what is best for the current-- many lifelong-- residents. We all have invested significant time and money into our community to make it the best it can be. I invested over \$500,000 into Rochester myself by building my home here. I hope you take into consideration all the investment of all the residents not only up and down Rochester Road but all over the city when you consider business development. Please do not allow for over development this area. Green space is almost impossible to get back once it is gone.
8/10/2022 12:03:04	Julia	Hieser	123 Rochdale Dr S	145 & 155 Rochdale Dr S	I will be submitting a separate email to the planning@ email address after attending tonight's open house.		I am interested in additional information about the setbacks for residential.	I would like to know how residents impacted have been engaged in the process and feedback thus far.
8/7/2022 20:45:26	Ron	Peckens	60 Cloverport Ave					Why are we adding the following lots 15-15-429-026 & -027 to the FB overlay? This is a land locked property. You would be granting a new land owner the ability to move forward with unlimited plans.
8/1/2022 17:18:48	Susan	Mason	308 Shellbourne					wanting to receive future emails
8/1/2022 16:11:55	Ron	Peckens	60 Cloverport Ave					Your information states that a portion of Industrial land south of Cloverport (15-15-405-004*) will be added to the FB overlay. Isn't that property already part of the existing Cloverport Greenspace?
3/25/2022 6:44:31	Kevin	Baird	Vacant- Approximate address 2442 S. Rochester Rd (just North of 2448 S. Rochester Rd)					I would like to see this location maintained as a FB district being located right on a high traffic stretch of Rochester Rd. Allowing for smaller scale commercial along the Rochester Rd frontage with 2-3 story multi family or senior housing behind would be my preference in this location.  Density is a requirement for projects to be feasible given the high costs of development and building. Simplifying the street type/ setback/ entrance requirements is a good idea. Thank you.
3/21/2022 18:04:49	Ron	Peckens	60 Cloverport Ave					I fully support the 6 month Moratorium. I believe the FB was originally done hastily, this should give the Planning Committee and Council time to properly evaluate properties where the FB makes sense and properties where the FB do not make sense and should be removed from the overlay.
3/21/2022 17:23:17	Horst	Reinhardt	117 Cloverport Ave					Thank you so much for looking into the flex business overlay zoning and considering a moratorium. I think it is prudent to take a pause and review if this type of zoning mechanism is working as intended. It is not unusual for developers to take advantage of zoning that the City may not have envisioned or is good for its residents. In my case, to allow a home to be torn down in a historic neighborhood to create an access road to a light industrial park behind residential homes seems to be one of those unintended consequences. Please approve this short pause and allow the planning commission to do a thorough review of the FB overlay zoning. Thank you.
3/18/2022 20:14:31	Paul	DeRubeis	2633 Hickory Lawn Road, Rochester Hills, MI, USA					Thank you for making progress on a long overdue plan to curtail the explosive growth in our city that will far outweigh our infrastructure. It seems of late, some members of the RH Administration and Planning Commission are more interested in the added tax dollars development will bring instead of these how developments will affect the quality of life in our fair city.
3/10/2022 13:21:16	Thomas	Rose	3081 S Livernois Rd, Rochester Hills, 48307					My property, zoned R-4, has had businesses attached on our North boundry since the 1940s and 50s with no issues. Properties to our South were all residential. In the early 1980s those neighbors and other properties have been purchased by the people who built the Mosque and all their houses removed. We have been approached to sell but have not been ready to leave this location yet.  Our house was built by my father when I was born and I purchased it from him when he retired and moved. With the change in the area my wife and I realize the next owner will want to change direction since there is no longer any neighborhood. This place is ideal for business because of its location and 200' frontage on Livernois. My Wife and I had lobbied City Hall since before Flex Business Overlay came into being. We were always counting on having a business take over when we left the property.  As changes to various neighborhoods around the city become unsuitable for their current designation, some method must remain available to redesignate their application. Reviewing the FB is definitely necessary but removing it from consideration might hinder future planning in some instances.  Thank you for your time. Respectfully, Thomas and Cornelia Rose
8/12/2022 20:28:44	Joni	Puckett	168 Rochdale Drive South	Added to the FB Overlay - District (#6)	It is listed as being Office land SW of Rochdale & Walton - it is in fact SE of Rochdale & Walton	The land is zoned for office. The attempt is to change the parcel to Flex Business	At the August 10 Open House, the Planning Committee stated they were not looking at residential streets for the Flex Overlay and only at arterial streets and collector roads and major intersections. Parcel 6 is only accessed by a residential road - Rochdale Drive South	Residential Office Flex areas are intended to serve adjacent residential areas with limited basic shopping and/or service uses which are not related to the shopping pattern of the citywide regional shopping centers. This definition does not align with the potential use of this parcel were it to be rezoned and added to the Flex's Business Overlay under Section 138-8.200

8/12/2022 22:44:04	Ian	Fitzner	146 Rochdale Dr S	15-16-204-021 &-022 (SE corner of Rochdale and Walton)	I am concerned about the possibility of what may be developed and constructed if the FB1 zone is expanded. I very close to the property and will be directly affected. I don't see how changing the zoning of the specific parcels aligns with our previously published Master Plans. Part of the office space there currently is used for mental health therapy which undeniably benefits the community. It is difficult to be okay with a blanket zoning change without knowing of what might ultimately be constructed in the location.	I am concerned about commercial uses that would add significant additional traffic (especially in the evening and weekend) into our neighborhood's entrance, since our neighborhood does not have sidewalks. There are many kids and dog-walkers in this neighborhood and we have reasonable safety concerns.	A good flexible-business zoning plan should have well thought out transitions between commercial and residential parcels, with respect to noise, safety, and appeal. It does not seem like the setback listed in the Flex Business Overlay Standards or the Summary of Proposed FB District Changes is nearly large enough. There also doesn't seem to be any prohibition against adding a parking lot right up to our neighbor's property line. Adding a requirement that at least one places of interest (like a row of trees) to separate the building or parking lot from residential zoning would alleviate some of the issues caused by zoning commercial parcels immediately next to residential ones.	
8/13/2022 12:38:36	Lily	Saari	146 Rochdale Dr S	FB-1 (Corner of Walton Blvd and Rochdale Dr S)	This district is in the center of an established business district and near a high school, which means there is a high volume of traffic and exposure to any properties in the vicinity. The businesses that are currently using the space support the retail spaces and restaurants in the area and if they were to be removed, it could create competition for local businesses that may not be able to keep afloat and take necessary services like medical, financial and educational out of the area and move them to where they may not be as accessible.	Offices near a residential area have worked well for the space as the high traffic times occur mainly on weekdays during general working hours when many people who live in homes around the parcels are either working or in school, limiting the foot traffic by residents. If a high traffic business such as a restaurant was put in that space, the traffic would continue into evenings and weekends when residents are home and more likely to be outside, causing increased safety concerns given there is no sidewalk separating the roads from the driveways.	This location is at the front of a residential area and the current separation is a fence in between the backs of the businesses and the side yard of the first residential driveway. If a high traffic business such as a restaurant or a retail site were to replace the current buildings as part of the rezoning process, it could limit the size of the parking lot based on the 50ft requirement. There is also a natural green space that exists between the homes and businesses that creates valuable curb appeal for both the businesses and the homes that could be altered based on the FB permitted sites.	While adding new opportunities for growth in the community is necessary and often successful, without a clear proposal of what change the rezoning could bring, it is difficult to form an opinion on if this change will be beneficial to the community and the residents who will be most impacted. The current setup of housing offices in the space has brought necessary services to the community and the impact of rezoning will also affect those businesses using the space who have been established there for years
8/16/2022 17:34:05	Joel	morris	144 Orchardale	Corner of Walton and Rochdale with Dentist office/ Medical Plaza	Proposed Flex Rezoning is in Direct conflict with Subdivision Bi-Laws that Supersedes			Why were all of the Homeowners Part of the Rochdale Neighborhood Not Advised to the Rezoning as this would effect everyone entrance and exit to the Sub potentially
3/1/2022 9:40 AM	Jeremy	Olstyn	152 Cloverport Ave.					Given the upcoming proposed moratorium on FB zoned development proposals, potential development in our neighborhood, as well as future discussions regarding FB zoning in general, the Cloverport Neighborhood would like to add our thoughts to the process. Please see the attached pdf in consideration of the adjustments that could be made to FB zoning and the positive impact it would have on our neighborhood and the Rochester Hills area as a whole.