



Rochester Hills

Minutes - Draft

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: Ed Anzek, Gerard Dettloff, Nicholas O. Kaltsounis,
Stephanie Morita, David A. Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Ryan Schultz

Wednesday, August 1, 2018

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Deborah Brnabic called the Special Work Session to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Auditorium.

ROLL CALL

Present 8 - Ed Anzek, Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis, Stephanie Morita, David Reece and C. Neall Schroeder

Excused 1 - Ryan Schultz

Quorum present.

Also present: Sara Roediger, Director of Planning and Economic Dev.
Kristen Kapelanski, Manager of Planning
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2018-0314](#) July 17, 2018 Work Session

A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Kaltsounis, that this matter be Approved as Presented. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Anzek, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece and Schroeder

Excused 1 - Schultz

COMMUNICATIONS

There were no Communications presented.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

[2018-0095](#) Master Plan Work Session - Giffels Webster

(Reference: Memo, dated July 26, 2018 prepared by Jill Bahm of Giffels Webster and Master Plan documents had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the discussion were Jill Bahm and Eric Fazzini of Giffels Webster, 1025 E. Maple, Suite 100, Birmingham, MI 48009.

Ms. Bahm thanked the Commissioners for having a special meeting. She noted that there would be another work session on August 21st, at which she would have a working draft to review. She went over the items they would discuss, including the three redevelopment sites and some concepts of what might be seen in those locations and housing. She showed a Future Land Use Map (FLU Map) and summarized the changes, including a recommendation to clarify the Flex categories and to add a new residential land use category R5 to accommodate additional housing types. She explained that Residential Office Flex was different from Commercial Residential Flex, and both would be changed from Business Flex. The first would allow just residential and office uses. She asked if there were any comments.

Mr. Reece said that he was struggling to differentiate between Residential 5 and Residential 2.5, noting that the patterns were identical. Ms. Bahm indicated that in Residential 5, the dots were a little closer together, but they could absolutely fix it and change the pattern. Mr. Reece suggested perhaps using a different color. Chairperson Brnabic agreed that changing the color would make it easier to tell the difference than changing the dots.

Mr. Anzek explained that there was a long history of colors associated with certain uses in land use. Yellow was always residential; orange was for more density, and red was commercial. 40 years ago, he was told that the reason why was because people who were color blind could distinguish the intensity of those colors. Chairperson Brnabic remarked that people who could usually see colors could not distinguish those. Mr. Anzek suggested using a simple cross hatch. Ms. Bahm agreed, and said they could keep it yellow but do a little more gradation and make sure it was clearer.

Ms. Bahm noted the three redevelopment sites: Cardinal Landfill or Suburban Softball, the Section 24 landfill site and the Bordine's site. She related that the Cardinal site was about 97 acres, and it contained landfill and non-landfill properties. The current FLU map designation was Regional Employment Center, which anticipated a wide range of

business uses. There was a Consent Judgment placed on the property in 2004, so the City and the property owner were bound by that agreement. The Consent permitted up to 2 million square feet of office, hotel, commercial and research and development uses, with a maximum of 500k s.f. of free standing retail. Commercial could go to 45 feet high, and office and hotel could go to ten stories closer to the freeway, and parking decks could be four stories. Setbacks were 20 feet from Hamlin. It was intended to be a cohesive development. There would need to be remediation, and there was some exchange for that - not requiring some landscape buffers, for example. There was a vision to partially relocate the Clinton River Trail. At the Open House, the parameters for redevelopment were shown, and they asked people what they would like to see there. People did not want to see any more big boxes or medical buildings. They wished to see detached condos or ranch homes with a walkable neighborhood, some institutional uses and live/work. What people were anticipating might not be as much as what was currently permitted under the Consent Judgment. They (Giffels) were trying to think about some redevelopment opportunities that could work within that framework, such as a Clinton River trailhead. They needed to think about how it could be a more cohesive neighborhood with access management. There could be other opportunities for place making elements like plazas or high quality architecture and pedestrian amenities. They thought that there might be workforce housing, giving people the opportunity to live and work within the same campus, which would help mitigate some of the traffic, however, the Consent would need to be modified for that.

Ms. Morita asked if that would also require the parcel to be cleaned to residential standards. Ms. Bahm agreed that it might. It was her understanding that some of the property was non-landfill. Ms. Morita said that there was still methane off-gassing on the site. She noted the development going on north of Hamlin in that area where the costs to clean it up were astronomical. She thought that when the Consent Judgment went through, there was a trade-off, and the reason they got the height for the buildings was because the cleanup they were going to have to do would be so expensive that they would need trade-offs to make the project work. She thought that it would be unrealistic to expect the developer to clean it to residential standards and not have as much density.

Ms. Bahm said that she did not know that they necessarily envisioned any tradeoff in density. It was more about whether workforce housing could be added to the mix. Ms. Morita said that they would have to do additional cleanup, which would require more density to make the project

work. The residents in that area were already struggling with the development going on, so presenting a situation that was not realistic and saying that it would not be so dense, and that the Consent could perhaps change was doing them a disfavor. Ms. Bahm agreed, and she thought that given what the Consent said, it would not be likely that the size of the development would decrease. They were asking how they could mitigate what was allowed and if some of it could be offset, such as the traffic impact, by providing housing on site.

Ms. Morita noted that Hamlin was a four-lane road that was underutilized. It was built to handle the amount of traffic assuming the site was developed. She understood that people did not want more traffic, but that was more for Adams. The traffic to that site would be more from getting on and off M-59. She stated that she just wanted to be realistic with the residents. She did not want to say that the traffic would be reduced, and that people should not expect anything more than what had been agreed to under the Consent. They still had to take into account the extra costs that would come from having to clean it up to a higher standard.

Mr. Hooper stated that he did not think residential was appropriate for the site at all. He recalled years ago when REI bought the property, they proposed a development with a big box Target. The recession hit, and that never went anywhere. Brownfield tax credits were a major consideration for the project, and they went away with the whole project.

Mr. Kaltsounis recalled that the developer's plan was to remediate the 35-foot area around the outside first. They would leave the middle as it was and remove 35 feet of refuge and build four feet underground and four feet above. That was how they got to 8-10 feet in height. They would put parking in the middle. He agreed that if someone put in residential, the cost would be increased, and everything would have to be removed.

Mr. Anzek maintained that the Consent called for a total removal, not a build-on-top scenario with pilings. There would have to be a major amendment to the Consent for that to occur. With a total removal, someone could clean it to residential standards, but the cost of the total removal would push it into the Class A Office arena. When they went through the second submittal with the Target center, they showed a couple of outlying restaurants along Hamlin. Their representation to the City was that they needed to put in something to generate cash in order to do the remediation. They were proposing to remove dirt for the buildings, but the parking lot would be on landfill. The City at the time said to prove that would be viable, and it never went that far. He noted that another

reason for the height was that the Cardinal Landfill was approximately 70 feet deep. Once the stuff was removed, it would be near equal grade with M-59, which would have been the ideal location to start a 10-12 story building. They envisioned a hotel/conference center. They were working closely with Oakland University at the time to market off of that. He still believed that residential would be difficult. Very little of the land was actually not landfill; it was peripheral stuff along the edge that REI picked up during the acquisition process. He agreed with Mr. Hooper that residential was out the window, and he did not see that happening. He would love to see a total cleanup, but the price would probably be close to \$60-70 million.

Mr. Schroeder asked if they had heard anything from the developer lately. Mr. Anzek believed that the City's Economic Development Manager met with them every six months or so. He believed that she got inquiries from industries and business about the site, and she always worked with the owner. The developer was sitting on it until the right thing came along.

Ms. Roediger agreed that she and Ms. Valentik met with Schostak, who owned the property, fairly regularly. Schostak was always entertaining offers and trying to work different deals. Any type of development for the property would take some time because of the cleanup process. The people they had gotten the furthest with ended up going elsewhere due to the timing. It was a good location with visibility from M-59, and as land got more and more scarce, it would take the right company. Mr. Anzek said that he hoped that the research being done with burning refuse in landfills and turning it into a bio-diesel product would reach a breakthrough. That could make the buried material of some value.

Ms. Bahm said that they wanted to try to make the development at least a little nicer for the community and the people who worked there. She showed some similar-sized examples with retail and office around the country. They had more amenities such as open space, connection to trails and landscaping. One corporate park had side amenities such as a basketball court, outdoor exercise equipment, picnic shelters and bike racks close to a trail. They also brought some examples of place making, such as public art, plazas, street furnishings for pedestrians, street trees and interesting landscaping. She showed a mixed-use area in North Carolina with a lot of activity in a small area. It included a hotel, cinema and community center. One place had a unique bike parking garage and another had a parking deck with ground floor retail. She said that they could work on the details that went along with the Consent Judgment.

Mr. Anzek thought that what Ms. Bahm was showing was spot on. He thought that they should plan the site for high-end office with support commercial and very little retail. He would like to get away from the 500k s.f. in the Consent, because they could see how it was not doing well across Adams. He stated that the City should just hold its ground. He claimed that the beauty of a land use plan was that if someone came up with a better idea, the City could always accept it. If it allowed too much, however, they might get something they did not want to see go on the site. He thought that office was appropriate with its exposure to M-59, and hopefully, that market would come along strong enough that all the dirt could be removed.

Mr. Hooper noted that the City always had a low vacancy rate in light industrial. He asked about research, office and high-tech for the location. He thought it would be perfect there. Mr. Anzek advised that the Consent Judgment did call for 40% of the land area for R&D research and industrial-type operations. Closer to M-59, there would be larger offices and conference center(s). Mr. Hooper thought that the demand was there for light industrial and high-tech businesses. Mr. Anzek considered that Oakland University would probably run out of land in the not too distant future. They would be looking for space for some of their research and engineering operations. He agreed that they should expand the use potential to include those that Mr. Hooper had recommended.

Mr. Fazzini moved to the Hamlin/Avon landfill area. The description was a mix of landfill and non-landfill properties designated on the FLU map as landfill and industrial with flexible anticipated uses. He pointed to the areas with a high, medium, low and unlikely potential for development. The southwest corner was known as Stan's Trucking or Six Star, and it was considered the most significantly environmentally challenged area. It had a long history of landfill activities going back to 1937. Waste operations ceased in 1981, and the area was covered with two feet of clay. Emergency methane remediation was installed on site 26, which was owned by the City and was monitored bi-weekly. It was found to have reduced methane concentration along Parke St. In 2014, a rezoning request was submitted and denied to develop the site as a 77-acre, 490-unit manufactured home park. The applicant's environmental analysis stated that the municipal waste on the site was 30-35 feet deep over most of the site, and there was gradual sinking, and ventilation of land was a primary concern. East of that site was the Kingston landfill and Sandfills 1 and 2. Kingston was originally a sand and gravel extraction site with legal landfilling beginning around 1970. Testing done in 2000

indicated elevated levels of metal and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Testing done in 2001 on the Sandfill parcels also indicated elevated levels exceeding residential criteria. The south half of the landfill area between School and Hamlin was considered low to unlikely to be developed due to the historic landfill issues. He felt that there might be other opportunities for the area. In that area was the Helen V. Allen Park, which was formerly part of the Sandfill area. There was a potential linkage to Borden Park south of Hamlin that might be possible depending on navigating the Ladd Drain, a small pond and the Kingston pit. Comments received at the Open House supported the use of the entire landfill area as green space and recreation. Because of the complexity and the unknowns with the area, and because there were several historic landfills, the thought was that they should be more conservative about potential uses rather than dictate uses that would involve buildings. There were also concepts suggested relating to energy use which were becoming more popular with former landfill sites, including methane gas collection, greenhouses, solar farms and wind energy. He felt that the current MLUP was fairly broad for the area. There was an open-endedness just calling it Landfill Planning, which could lead to some uses the City might not want.

Chairperson Brnabic mentioned that there was also a trucking facility proposed at the corner of Hamlin and Dequindre, but residents spoke loud and clear about their concerns about that type of facility and road use near a residential area.

Ms. Bahm agreed, and said that one of the challenges of the site was that when people thought about landfill and redevelopment, they thought about industrial uses. She said that it was not a highly industrial area, and she could see why residents were concerned about a trucking facility. There could be certain high intensity uses that were mitigated from noise and traffic and sound and odor, but that did not seem as if it would be one of them. Some of the concepts they showed, even with the energy production, were quiet uses. Wind and solar were relatively quiet. She was not sure if methane gas production was loud, but she did not anticipate that it would be. Those were things that were useful and productive that did not seem as if they would have a significant impact on the surrounding parcels.

Mr. Reece noted the comment about the area not being highly industrial, but to the east it was fairly industrial going down Hamlin. His struggle with the site always had been why he would want to take his family or kids to a parklike setting, knowing it was so heavily contaminated. He asked if

Giffels had a history of landfills that had been converted to such uses and their success. Ms. Bahm said that they had found some examples, although they had not personally worked on them, around the country where landfill sites had been converted. She reminded that the whole area was not landfill, and she thought that they should be more specific about directions for redevelopment.

Chairperson Brnabic asked if they had any idea of how extensive the cleanup would be to have a park that a lot of people visited where they were exposed to the area. She knew that there were different standards for cleanup for different uses. Ms. Bahm said that she did not.

Ms. Bahm showed a picture of a landfill in Atlanta covered with solar panels which generated enough power for 225 homes. Mr. Hooper thought that was intriguing. He could not see some of the other suggested uses. He did not think an amphitheater would work. He did not think any indoor facility would work. There was settlement of the land and the chance of methane gas to consider. He stated that residential was out. He liked the idea of the solar park. Mr. Reece added that they were seeing it more often. Mr. Hooper said that it was more efficient and less expensive. Mr. Reece said that the problem with solar parks was the storage and distribution, which was the most expensive part. If they did not have that in place, they were not really feasible. He thought that it was a big enough and open site, and it might very well work for something like that.

Mr. Schroeder noted a golf course in Troy on South Boulevard that was on two old landfills. For about a year, they took all the dirt from other developments going in and covered and graded the area. They put so much dirt on it that the pressure forced the gas out the vents. After a while, that went away, and the settlement was done, and it was very successful.

Mr. Anzek had thought that the trucking depot was an interesting concept. The Brownfield Redevelopment Authority was interested in seeing it developed. It was unfortunate that so many residents who lived south of the site opposed it. The trucking depot could have gone directly across Dequindre and located, and the residents still would have had all the truck traffic. He noted that there was quite a bit of truck traffic now due to the gravel pit on the east side of Dequindre by the gun club. He kept his motor home out there, and he constantly saw gravel trains coming out of there. They were looking at an additional \$750k of elements that the trucking depot would have had to put in to protect itself from things

migrating through the ground. All the water and sewer lines would have had to be encapsulated, and it would have gotten very expensive. He considered that storage might be the only viable thing as far as a structure for the area.

Mr. Anzek said that he agreed with Mr. Fazzini about the landfill area having been defined too broadly and vaguely in the 2013 Master Plan. They were trying to send the message that anything could be allowed, as long as someone could make it work, and it fit to the City's standards. They did not determine how that would be translated into something quantifiable, however. Mr. Anzek still felt that there might be opportunities for a very large indoor soccer field lining Dequindre. There were people in the past who had presented concepts that worked. Staff met with the City's environmental folks who said that those fields could work pretty well if vented correctly at the top. He would like the generalities in uses that they had in 2013 tightened, because staff could be presented with something that they did not want. He thought that the solar panels would work well, especially something like an experimental field for the local universities. He noted that cleanup standards for residential was mentioned. Residential was based on the average amount of time someone spent on a property. If it was ten hours or more, a property would have to be cleaned to residential standards. He reminded that the area was owned by many different people.

Ms. Bahm said that they were not thinking of the site for a single-purpose redevelopment, but something that could incorporate, such as active recreation and active energy generation. She commented that perhaps they could get all the kids on treadmills and generate some electricity. They were trying to think of ways to interact those two things with more of a focus.

Mr. Dettloff thought that he recalled a facility in Wixom that was a multi-use sports complex that was built on an old landfill. Ms. Bahm said that there was a soccer facility in Wixom, and it was possible. Mr. Anzek mentioned Jimmy John's Stadium in Utica which was built on a landfill. He said that it could happen, but there might be a concern about opening the door to all the potentials. He suggested that they could write the goals and objectives in such a way that they could be used to say no or yes.

Ms. Morita noted that her son had specifically asked that the City open a venue for a minor league hockey team. Ms. Bahm said that they were trying to think of different things, like a skate park. She asked if they were headed in a reasonable direction, thinking about a wide variety of active

recreation. Mr. Anzek thought so, but reminded that anything would be subject to the environmental sensitivities of the site. If people read and understood that there were problems with some of the sites, they should know that the City was willing to work with them if what they proposed was appropriate.

Ms. Bahm next discussed the Bordine's site. She summarized that it contained a plant nursery and retail operation. The current FLU map designated the site as Business Flex 3. Anticipated uses were a mixture of large scale retail-commercial, attached and multiple-family residential, senior housing, office, schools and civic uses, but no single-family detached residential was planned. In 2007, a site plan was proposed for the site that included some four-story buildings, 300k s.f. of retail space, 84k s.f. of nursery, a theater and 72 dwelling units. It had been created in a walkable format that was very pedestrian-oriented, somewhat like The Village of Rochester Hills. That plan did not proceed past the concept point. When they shared the concepts for the site at the Open House, people were generally supportive. Other people wanted to see single-family residential and some low density and low traffic uses. An alternative redevelopment concept included adding more housing and perhaps allowing some attached and detached single-family homes, more in line with Flex 2. The non-residential buildings could be put closer to Rochester and Hamlin with the housing in the back. They might consider possible on-street parking on Hamlin to slow the traffic and make it more walkable. They would really like to be able to start connecting the four quadrants of the intersection, and she felt that perhaps they could come up with some additional design guidance through the Master Plan and make the four corners more walkable.

Ms. Bahm showed some concepts of buildings pulled right up to the roadway and some with a couple of bays of parking in front of them. She showed examples of some detached, cottage style homes. They were very small, compact homes that tended to be built around a common green area to facilitate a sense of community. That could add more housing in a smaller format and be geared toward empty nesters who liked to walk. They wanted to get some feedback from the Commissioners in terms of the additional housing and in trying to make the area more walkable.

Mr. Dettloff asked Mr. Bordine if he recalled the total cost to do the project, but he did not.

Chairperson Brnabic called on Mr. Bordine to speak.

Corey Bordine, 1035 N. Dearborn, #14E, Chicago, IL 60610 Mr.

Bordine said that he did not remember the total cost, but he claimed that it was significant. He felt that some of the comments presented made sense, but he was surprised to hear others. He was happy to hear that people at the Open House liked what they saw. He knew that people in Rochester Hills liked housing and less traffic, but he acknowledged that was everywhere. He said that he did not live in Rochester Hills any longer, but he absolutely called it his home. He spent the weekend at his mom's house, where she had been for almost 49 years by Meadowbrook Elementary School. The purpose for him coming to the meeting was to support what was now called Commercial Residential 3, which had been Business Flex 3. He still thought that there would be some use for the property that would have a strong commercial component. It was loud and clear 12 years ago when they were before the Commissioners that there had to be some type of a community attraction. They tried really hard at something, and good or bad, the great recession happened. They did get inquiries on the property, for which he was not at liberty to talk about. They absolutely believed that the Business Flex 3 still made sense for all the stakeholders. By stakeholders, he meant the landowners, the community and the people who would live and work in and around the site. They wanted to make sure their voices were heard about maintaining the Master Plan as it was, and they looked forward to being in front of the Commission with some substance in the future.

Kim Bordine Reynolds, 1473 Werth Dr., Rochester, MI 48306 Ms.

Bordine Reynolds elected not to speak, but she wanted to acknowledge her presence with her brother, and she thanked the Commissioners for having them. She looked forward to a development in the future.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked Mr. Bordine how concerned he was about the (shop by) mail business and what it might do to his big box stores. He asked if it was something the Commissioners should consider in the Master Plan.

Mr. Bordine said that in full disclosure, he did not own any part of the operating company, Bordine's Nursery, any more. The land was owned by BIC, and he and his sister were still owners of the land. They did not sell their interest in the operating company because they thought the retail environment was going down, and they had to get out of the business. He did a lot of consulting within the retail space, and he stated that good retailers would be around forever. He did not think that the retail environment overall was dying; it was an ebb and flow that happened throughout history. What was happening was a little of the culling of the

herd. There would be some consolidation, but there were some dynamite retailers out there that would be around in 20 years. He was surprised when he saw that the Master Plan was a 20-year outlook. Ms. Roediger clarified for him that the City was always looking out, but the Plan was revisited legally every five years. 20 years from now, people might sell robots from a store or there might be landing pads for self-driving cars. It was evolving quickly, and he was not sure what would happen. He reiterated that good, quality retailers would always be in need, and any retailer that could connect directly with the community would be around even longer.

Mr. Dettloff asked that whatever the future held if the Commissioners could assume that there would always be a presence of Bordine's on that site. Mr. Bordine said that he could not personally guarantee that. When he proposed the previous development, he co-managed the operating company and did so until 2012. When he was in front of the Commissioners and talked about the site, he said that it would absolutely be there to stay and be an anchor of the development. That was part of the deal with Kirco. They would actually have co-owned part of the development to ensure that the nursery would always be there. He did not have any knowledge that Bordine's wanted to leave, either.

Mr. Anzek asked how many acres the site had, and was told 35. Mr. Anzek said that they were all talking about the potential to do a live/work/play/walk/shop/go to the theater or office in the same location. He noted that the underlying zoning was still B-3. If someone came in and handed Bordine's a big check to put a Walmart there, it would be allowed under the zoning. He asked if it was possible or legal to eliminate B-3 from the site and just keep the Flex zoning. Ms. Bahm asked if he was suggesting a City-initiated rezoning. Mr. Anzek agreed, if the owners supported that. The City might be able to say no to a big box it did not want. He wondered if it was the time to eliminate B-3, because it even allowed car lots or other things they did not necessarily want. The corner was premier, down to the corner restaurant having been named the Gardens of Rochester Hills, which had been more supportive of the City than Bordine's in a way. The City was generally excited about it as a lifestyle center, and if that was what they wanted, he wondered what they could do to make sure that was what they got.

Ms. Bahm felt it was a great question. Everything they had heard about what people were looking for at the corner - less traffic, more variety in housing choices and places they could feel connected - supported a concept for redevelopment that pointed to Mr. Anzek's suggestion as an

option. Mr. Anzek did not know if that was going into spot or exclusionary zoning, so they might think about also doing it for other sites where they would like to see similar development. He felt that it was the stage to come up with a rationale and reason for what they felt was right for the corner based on public input, surveys and so on. He said that hopefully, the owners would agree to just having the flexible zoning.

Mr. Kaltsounis believed that at the last meeting they discussed the Master Plan, there were several areas proposed to be cleaned up, and he felt that the corner could fall under that category. Mr. Fazzini said that when they looked at the intersection analysis, the intersection stood out as having a lot of strengths for walkability. There was dense residential to the southeast and southwest. Along the north side of Hamlin, there was good depth of ownership, so if they were going to orient pedestrian improvements east/west along Hamlin, which was a City road, it would be beneficial having that depth of ownership and common ownership. The northeast quadrant of Hamlin and Rochester was the most walkable census tract in the entire City based on the walk score value. There were strengths for doing something pedestrian friendly. He asked about the history of The Village of Rochester Hills approval.

Mr. Hooper said that there was a long, contentious history with that site. Mr. Anzek said that there was a ten-year lawsuit dating back to the early 1990's. They settled on a strip center, but they could not lease it. After struggling with it for a year, the owners hired Bob Gibbs, who moved things around and shifted buildings and came up with the design for The Village. Before it was even dry, they had it 85% leased. It had been zoned for commercial on the northern ten-acre parcel. The City revoked that zoning and made it residential, and the owners sued, because they were working on a plan with Saks, who owned Parisian, to put a store there. That was how the lawsuit started. It was a revoking of a commercial zoning to a residential one, and it was in court for ten years.

Mr. Bordine's recalled that there was a lot of public outcry against The Village, and no one wanted it there. People now wanted to live by there. He had friends who lived behind it who walked there. Mr. Anzek agreed, and said that after about a year, he saw a for-sale pamphlet from someone who had been a critic of the center that said that the house was within walking distance of The Village.

Mr. Bordine said that most of the time he agreed with Mr. Anzek, but he did not want to say that the owners would absolutely be supportive of changing the B-3 designation. His understanding of the direction of the

Master Plan with the Flex 3 allowed for the maximum flexibility, acknowledging that it was on Rochester and Hamlin. It was a commercial use area, and it made sense that there should be a strong commercial presence at the site. He would have to go back to his family and have something in writing to be able to say that there would be support for a change in zoning.

Mr. Anzek said that he realized that his suggestion might not be something they could even do. It would limit their options and potentially increase their revenue, but the whole Flex option was to be different and creative. They could add small roads that ran through rather than putting in a big 60-foot right-of-way with giant setbacks. The whole Flex idea was to try to get people to spend money in the stores and restaurants and enjoy the mixed-use. He just knew that with straight B-3 zoning, someone could come in with one big footprint. Mr. Bordine's noted that the whole property was not B-3. Half of it was zoned R-1. Mr. Anzek said that even half of 35 acres was plenty big enough for a giant box retail.

Mr. Reece referred to the image with the building right up to the road, and said that he did not see that as a viable alternative for the site. Ms. Bahm said that their idea was that perhaps those buildings would front on Rochester and Hamlin, and the buildings would be brought closer to the corner. The challenge regarding walkability was getting people from one side of Rochester to the other. Mr. Fazzini added that the Rochester right-of-way was significantly narrower north of Hamlin. Ms. Bahm showed an image where the buildings were set back further from the roads. They were trying to make things fit in with the context, and it might help turn the other corners into something more identifiable for the City rather than having separate developments on each corner.

Mr. Reece said that he also believed it was important that it should fit in with the rest of the area, and there was nothing like the first image (right up to the road) along Rochester Rd. Ms. Bahm asked if it was the height and mass, and Mr. Reece agreed.

Mr. Hooper recalled that when The Village was conceived and built, that lifestyle center was the second one in the nation. He believed that the first was in Ohio, and The Village was modeled after that. There were a lot of shops and very few restaurants, but now there were predominately restaurants and fewer shops. He thought that Amazon had done a number on the shops. He understood Mr. Bordine's point that great retail would be around, but he remarked that his wife never bought anything on line and now she bought everything on line. He did not think he would

either, but he remarked that he was not really helping the local stores himself. He thought that it would depend on what the mix was for the lifestyle centers. Ms. Bahm said that she tended to agree with Mr. Bordine about retailing. From what she understood and read about the changes in the marketplace, she did not see retail going away completely, either. People still wanted to touch things and have that shopping experience. She stated that it was definitely changing. The challenge for them was to be as open and flexible with their ideas about uses and spaces as they could be. They should be thinking about smaller, 2,500 to 5,000 s.f spaces rather than big boxes. They could have different uses, such as civic and schooling mixed in. They wanted to try to bring people together in a way that was meaningful for them.

Mr. Hooper said that he understood, but he indicated that thinking long-term, reality spoke for itself, and The Village was morphing into primarily restaurant uses and not as much shopping. He was not sure what would happen with Carson's. Ms. Bahm said that they should think about those spaces and how they could be reused. Mr. Hooper said that his company was involved with four of the new 1 million s.f. Amazon warehouses in Michigan - all within 25 miles. He maintained that it was here to stay. Ms. Bahm asked if he was seeing multiple-story industrial warehousing, but he had not. Ms. Morita said that she had seen those for CVS. They had multi-story for bringing in product and then shipping it to their stores. Mr. Hooper said that there was no question technology was changing, and they had to think about what could be built that would last. Ms. Bahm added that it might not matter what a use was as long as it supported an environment.

Ms. Morita said that she like the idea of adding in the residential component. She felt that it gave the flexibility the City was looking at for homeowners that did not necessarily want a yard to mow. She believed that the retail there would need to support that, such as coffee shops and smaller retail that people would stop at on their way home from work.

Mr. Anzek mentioned the original Bordine's concept where it showed a green courtyard in the north central part of the site. There was a road access shown that was very close to the one built by Stonecrest. That was done to have cross access to all the properties along Eddington. Hopefully, any concept that came forward would recognize that and use it with a flexible development.

Ms. Bahm moved to population and housing. She stated that SEMCOG's population projection for 2040 for Rochester Hills was 79,399. In 2010, it

was just under 71,000. Households were projected to increase to 32,000 by 2045. Many of those would be people living alone. They looked at areas designated for residential in the City, as well as some of the Flex areas. They had estimated about 1,000 acres of total developable land, which could hold about 1,700 dwelling units. She felt that they should think about whether there was a need to increase density to accommodate the additional households projected in the City. She wondered if there were any areas in the City the Commissioners thought were appropriate to begin thinking about increasing density or if things were pretty good, and they should wait until the next Master Plan review.

Ms. Morita asked Ms. Bahm if Giffels had looked at the City's strategic plan. Ms. Bahm said that they had, but had not studied it. Ms. Morita said that one of the items in the Plan that was new was to explore housing options, especially for lower-priced housing. She felt that Council would be supportive of taking a look at density in places in the City where different types of housing could be accommodated to fit different needs. There were a lot of people in their homes who would like to stay in the community but could not afford to move into a condo because they were just as expensive as their four-bedroom, 2 ½ bath home. The City needed some more options for those people. She related that her mother-in-law moved up from Tucson two years ago and did not buy in the City, because she could not find anything she was willing to pay, so she chose Grand Blanc. Ms. Morita knew that there were a lot of people who wanted to age in the community, and they loved the OPC. They were trying to keep the older folks in the City, but they were struggling to find something. She thought that the image of the multi-family residential above the small retail in a walkable situation was ideal for a lot of people. It kept them in the community, but they would not have the responsibility of mowing lawns and cleaning gutters. She would like to look for those places and encourage them. There were also millennials who might want to buy a less expensive home that also did not want to have to mow a lawn. She felt that there was a high demand, but the City did not have enough stock.

Mr. Kaltsounis commented that the City was a victim of its success. The developer who was before them at the last meeting was offering site condos for \$450-500k for 2,300 s.f. The property fit in the framework of what they allowed developers to do. He asked if they had to change that framework if they wanted to make areas denser to give people an opportunity to buy a less expensive house. He did not think they should go in the direction they were suggesting unless they looked at the framework, and he felt that it was the time to do it.

Ms. Morita agreed that they should take a look at the overall structure. They were getting projects in that were \$500k each, and what the City needed was 1,200 to 1,500 s.f. projects under \$200k to make it palatable to people who were trying to downsize.

Ms. Bahm pointed out that there was not a lot of vacant land in the City. They might have to go up, and she questioned whether the community would be receptive to that. She thought that those were the kinds of questions they could ask at the next Open House. They could offer some visual images, such as showing one house per acre, five per acre, ten and higher. They could show different heights and let people give some input. Ms. Morita felt that would be a great idea. The reactions she was getting from a lot of the neighbors at Hamlin and Adams were that they wished the apartments that were going in were going to be condos, because they would have bought. It was in the right location and the right size. They were one-story with elevators. The people who lived in the City were not opposed to moving into a complex like that if it kept them close to their families. Squeezing in next to something that was already developed was the problem.

Mr. Kaltsounis noted the two concepts they saw off of Auburn. The one by Auburn and John R was going to ask astronomical rates for the apartments. He would be curious to know, after the meeting with the residents, what they thought of developments like that.

Mr. Anzek said that he was not sure how they would change the framework. He agreed that the City had created a demand. Their residential land was expensive. Before the recession, it was going for \$160k per acre for R-3 zoning. It was still probably in the six figures. He said that housing was based more on the value of land than the structure. Unless they found a way to make things cheaper, he was not sure what the answer was. He thought it was something to explore. He thought that tiny houses were fun to look at, but he said that he could never live in one. He remarked that he could barely live in his motor home. He asked Ms. Bahm if they had ever come across a neighborhood or subdivision of tiny houses. Ms. Bahm believed that there was one in Detroit. Mr. Fazzini said that Cass Community Housing was doing a homeless housing development using tiny houses.

Ms. Morita said that they were building those homes as rent-to-own in order to provide ownership to people who otherwise could not afford to do so. She and her husband had been involved in that project. The

authority had purchased a lot of vacant lots, and they were putting tiny homes on them.

Ms. Bahm mentioned accessory dwelling units, and she wondered if that was something they wanted to look at (for example, mother-in-law units). She said that they could ask about that at the Open House as well. Mr. Anzek felt that was a great idea. Ms. Bahm said that it did not mean that it would have to be throughout the whole City. Mr. Anzek said that the problem was that if the mother-in-law passed, the accessory structure could become a rental unit. Ms. Bahm wondered why that was necessarily bad. Mr. Anzek said that it was a question for the Planning Commission and City Council to see if they were willing to start accepting tenant housing in a neighborhood of ownership. It would be a big change for a lot of the neighborhoods. Regarding tiny houses or density, if they were going to offer that type of affordable housing, he felt that it was o.k. for them to be smaller and in a more dense area. The cost of the land would get spread over five or six sales. Ms. Bahm showed some images around the country of tiny homes. One development was of micro apartments in New York. They were 300-600 s.f. People were choosing to live in them, because they could have the amenities they wanted and do other things with their time.

Mr. Dettloff considered that Rochester Hills was not the only community facing that issue. He said that he would be curious to learn from their experience whether other communities similar to Rochester Hills that had gone through it had solutions. He asked if there were any communities nearby that had come up with any solutions. Ms. Bahm said that the City of Brighton had a downtown area where there was a desire for more people to live closer. People wanted to downsize and loved their downtown area, and there was an opportunity to provide a much more dense residential development within walking distance of downtown, and Giffels was helping them through a rezoning process to create a new district that allowed for much higher density. Mr. Dettloff asked about the price points. Ms. Bahm said that they were \$1,500 to 1,800 per month for rentals, which was above average. Mr. Dettloff said that it was difficult to find developers to do those kinds of projects, because the tendency was to go where the money was. Ms. Bahm said that they saw a lot of communities that discussed it but ultimately decided to not do anything.

Mr. Dettloff felt that posing the questions, showing examples and learning from other communities would be very valuable. He recalled that it was not that long ago that Brighton's downtown was not a destination. He remarked that it was on fire. Ms. Bahm agreed that people wanted to be

there. She thought that community was embracing what was coming in terms of development. She knew that there were other communities that were trying to identify where that made sense. Rochester Hills did not have transit, and some of the examples of more dense housing she had shown had been near transit. She offered that the City did have the trail system, which was an opportunity for people. She suggested that they could tie in some of the housing with work places and retailing and use non-motorized transportation to make denser housing a viable option.

Mr. Anzek said that it seemed like there were some areas that were tapped out for sewer capacity. He thought that with existing built areas where they were looking to re-densify, they might have to start with questions about infrastructure rather than having it follow a plan. If they were looking at a five-acre tract of land with a lot of tiny houses, they would have sewer needs. Ms. Roediger agreed that they could look at that more with Engineering. The only area she heard a concern about it was along John R which needed some upgrades. Mr. Anzek knew when they did the Consent Judgment for the Cardinal Landfill, there were sewer limitations there already, and there would have to be some type of rerouting of sewer at a significant cost. If they tried to intensify that with residential, there could be a problem.

Mr. Hooper said it could be guaranteed that the auxiliary units Ms. Bahm had mentioned would turn into Air Bnbs. Ms. Bahm said that language could be written so that was not permitted. Mr. Hooper reminded that there would be enforcement issues. Ms. Bahm agreed that it would involve some administration and enforcement. Mr. Hooper said that would be a tough one for him. He said that the problem was land costs. He did not think that a two-bedroom, two-bathroom for \$200k would exist in Rochester Hills. In downtown Rochester, south of Second St., there were really nice units in six stories that were over \$500k. He said that he was curious if the City Apartments (Tienken and Rochester) were rentals. Ms. Roediger said that they were still under construction. A couple of units originally filled quickly, but she believed that they would be for lease. Mr. Hooper said that he was curious about the demand. The owner was offering higher amenities at a higher price point. He felt that the only inexpensive housing would be the manufactured home communities, and he did not think it was feasible for someone to build new, attractive, two-bed, two-bath condos for \$200k in Rochester Hills.

Ms. Morita stated that she would not be in favor of mother-in-law suites behind a house. She felt that would be a nightmare waiting to happen in terms of enforcement and deed restrictions in a neighborhood. People

might not understand when it was allowed by Ordinance but not allowed by a subdivision's deed restrictions. She asked Ms. Roediger if that type of housing mix could be looked at as part of the Auburn Road Corridor Plan to see if it could be encouraged as part of that redevelopment.

Ms. Roediger said that she and Ms. Kapelanski talked about amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to accommodate the Auburn Road project. The Study recommended mixed-use, and the corridor had the FB-2 Overlay. There could be a mixture of uses, but it was capped at two stories. Some developers for that corridor were looking at projects higher than two stories. She wondered if there would be consideration for something higher in that area. They could see how the corridor was going to redevelop, and they had to look at parking requirements, height, uses and setbacks. She felt that it would be its own district.

Ms. Morita did not think two stories would be enough for redevelopment in that area. She thought that they would need three, and they would need a new district. She suggested that perhaps they should be discussing it as part of the Master Plan process. Ms. Roediger felt that the Master Plan could definitely start planting the seeds. Ms. Morita felt that it would be a great place for it. She reminded that it was being redeveloped so it would be walkable.

Ms. Bahm advised that they would have a working draft at the next meeting. They wanted to get the Commissioner's feedback before the Open House on Sept. 13th. If all went well in early fall, they would meet with the Planning Commission and City Council to approve distribution of the Plan to the reviewing bodies as required by the State law. In mid to late fall, they hoped to do the Public Hearing and planned adoption.

Chairperson Brnabic asked Ms. Bahm if she felt that an hour time line would be enough for the draft review. She stated that it was important and warranted a lot of discussion. She felt that it was good that they had a separate meeting which provided that, whereas previously, they met from 6-7 p.m. with people standing outside the door for the regular meeting at 7:00 p.m.. She suggested that they might need another separate meeting to discuss the draft.

Ms. Bahm said that they would have the meeting on August 21st, the Open House and another meeting scheduled in September. She agreed that they would need at least an hour and a half. Ms. Roediger said that it would be up to the Commission. There had been comments about starting at 6 p.m. There were two items on the August agenda, so it could

potentially go fairly quickly, and they could put the Master Plan discussion after those on a regularly scheduled (7 p.m.) meeting. Chairperson Brnabic did not consider that a problem. Mr. Dettloff said that he would be o.k. with it as well.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that he highly recommended the Commissioners taking a trip to Troy. They were doing some intriguing things off of Big Beaver with townhomes. There was also a development at Square Lake and Livernois where they had packed a significant amount of townhomes up against the road on a site with no parking. It was very dense, but he thought it was quite interesting.

Mr. Anzek noted that they did not talk about goals and objectives. He thought that they were fine as written. He thought that the structure was fine. He agreed with the approach of explaining that a goal was unattainable and that an objective was something quantifiable and measureable, and an action step was even more specific. That was exactly the way he thought it should work.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no further business to come before the Commissioners.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Chairperson Brnabic reminded the Commissioners that the next meeting was scheduled for August 21, 2018.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Commissioners and upon motion by Mr. Kaltsounis, seconded by Mr. Reece, Chairperson Brnabic adjourned the Special Work Session at 8:55 p.m.

Deborah Brnabic, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Secretary