

December 19, 2018

Sara Roediger, Planning & Economic Development Director  
City of Rochester Hills

Sara,

I wanted to provide a summary of the MLUP concerns I presented at last night's Public Hearing. I'm sure you have the sense of my concerns, but it's extremely difficult to provide information on multiple issues in three minutes.

I certainly understand the commission wanting to have a time limit on comments. However, with the matter being a 5-year plan and a very limited number of speakers, I feel the commission needs to be more lenient with the 3-minute rule. Five minutes would certainly have worked for an issue of this import.

I did go back and review page 62 regarding *Preservation and Sustainability Goals*, however I still feel this does not provide the same emphasis placed on Preservation as past MLUPs. More emphasis seems to be placed on preserving our natural environment.

As far as the inclusion of the new R5 zoning category, I am not necessarily opposed, but believe that the Andover Wood property/development has been wrongly placed into the R5 designation. Here is my reasoning:

Of the six parcels designated R5, 2 are existing mobile home parks, 2 are vacant parcels and the remaining 2 are Streamview and Andover Woods. Unless one feels that Streamview is ready to be redeveloped or contains 4-6 units per acre, I'm not sure why it's R5. And, Andover Woods with an approved site plan of 42 units on 26 acres is 1.6 per acre. It truly does not meet the criteria for R5 other than walkability. The unit size doesn't appear to be that small and I'm not sure they are comparably priced to manufactured housing.

Sargent's Crossing, the cluster condos directly to the northeast is R3 as is the Valley Stream subdivision with high #300,000 to \$500,000 homes. The other 3 developments besides Streamview and Andover Woods with prior "One Family Cluster" designation are Rochelle Park (now R4), Sanctuary (now R3) and Summit Ridge (now R2).

I believe the appropriate and consistent designation for the Andover Woods parcel is R3. To open the door to any possibility of a mobile home development in this location or the Streamview location makes absolutely no sense for Rochester Hills.

If the R5 zoning category remains for the 2 vacant parcels and 2 mobile home parks, so be it or move all four to Multiple Family and add verbiage to allow the type of development desired under the proposed R5 designation. It seems odd to me to create this category for basically 2 undeveloped parcels (manufactured housing was under Multiple Family).

Just an aside regarding empty nesters looking for smaller more affordable housing — The majority of older residents staying in their current homes can afford smaller homes (1,800 - 2,400sqf) ranch style homes, but there are few to be found in this community. And, most single family homes built in Rochester Hills have no first floor master. Thus, seniors are staying put. Part of the complaint being heard regarding affordability is having to pay higher taxes for a similarly priced smaller home (uncapped tax on a new home). Many seniors have had their home for 10-30 years, enjoying increased value with relatively low taxes. Thus many make the

decision to remain in their existing home with home care. Others stay until they need assisted living. Rochester Hills has quite a number of these facilities. Most seniors are not looking for “tiny homes.” If they are, Rochester Hills has those independent living facilities, from low to high - American House to Blossom Ridge and more.

The last concern I expressed was the Residential Office Flex designation for the southwest corner of Rochdale. I found the number of speakers regarding this matter extremely interesting. As I mentioned before, I feel this corner should remain residential. (The owner truly misspoke regarding light and traffic. That corner was totally dark when I drove by last night, and the home faces Rochdale sitting back a distance from Walton). Many other single family residential parcels abut Walton and there is no real benefit to creating an intrusion into the existing neighborhood.

Of the 750, more or less, residents who responded to the new MLUP, the consensus seemed to desire maintaining the natural features of the city, not increasing density and traffic. As a 41 year resident who has made a residential investment in this city for a third time, I feel we need to maintain, enhance and promote our best features. One cannot be everything to everyone and expect be a premier place to live, work and play.

Again, I appreciate your time and effort in providing good planning direction for Rochester Hills.

Sincerely,

Melinda Hill

PS Sara, I hope you will share this with the consultants and commissioners.