



# Rochester Hills

## Minutes - Draft

### Planning Commission

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

*Chairperson Deborah Brnabic, Vice Chairperson Greg Hooper*  
*Members: Susan Bowyer, Gerard Dettloff, John Gaber, Marvie Neubauer,*  
*Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, David A. Reece, and Ben Weaver*

---

Tuesday, June 2, 2020

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

---

## CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Brnabic called the Special Meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. She outlined the procedure for the meeting and explained Governor Whitmer's Executive Orders 2020-2021 and 2020-2075 allowing the public meeting to be held virtually.

## ROLL CALL

**Present** 9 - Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, John Gaber, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis, David Reece, Susan M. Bowyer, Ben Weaver and Marvie Neubauer

Quorum present.

Also present: Sara Roediger, Director of Planning and Economic Dev.  
Kristen Kapelanski, Manager of Planning  
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary  
Various staff members present for the CIP presentation

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2020-0206 May 19, 2020 Regular Meeting

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

**Aye** 9 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Gaber, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Reece, Bowyer, Weaver and Neubauer

## COMMUNICATIONS

*There were no Communications presented.*

## PUBLIC COMMENT

*Chairperson Brnabic opened Public Comment at 7:03 p.m. Seeing no*

*one wishing to speak or in the Auditorium and having received no email correspondence, she closed Public Comment.*

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **2020-0199**

Public Hearing and request for Adoption of the 2021-2026 Capital Improvement Plan

*(Reference: Memo and Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), prepared by Deborah Hoyle, dated June 2, 2020 had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)*

*Present for the applicant were Deborah Hoyle, Senior Fiscal Analyst, City of Rochester Hills and various Department Directors.*

*Ms. Hoyle explained that the CIP was based on the City's plans, goals and objectives and covered six years for all types of projects throughout the City. She advised that there were 36 new projects totaling \$58.5 million. The City portion of all projects in the CIP totaled \$156.7 million. She stated that the City would not be able to complete all the projects in the timeframe presented. She added that the CIP helped the City prioritize capital funding within its financial capacity, and they would move projects forward, as they had the funding, in a responsible manner.*

*Ms. Hoyle presented the first new project, which was PK-25A Community Pool for 2026 and estimated at \$5.5 million. It was a project the residents brought forward to partner with the City, because they were interested in having a community pool. She noted that there was not a proposed location or whether it would be an indoor or outdoor. She asked if there were any questions. Ms. Roediger promoted a speaker wishing to comment.*

**Bruce Fealk, 1474 Oakstone Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48306** *Mr. Fealk asked if staff had received the picture he had submitted of a community pool from a location in Madison, Wisconsin, but it was not in the packet. He said that the reason he wanted to show it was because his grandchildren lived there. He noted that it was a city of about 200,000 people. He commented that some of the best times he had spent with his grandchildren had been at that community pool. He considered that since Rochester Hills presented itself as a progressive community, that a community pool would be a tremendous project to have. He realized that other projects in the CIP were more practical, such as roads and other infrastructure, but he believed that having a pool would be great. He grew up in Oak Park with a community pool, and he knew that Troy had one.*

*He said that he envisioned the pool as an outdoor facility. He urged the members to go to Madison's website and look at the "Goodman Pool" so they might envision one in Rochester Hills. He did not know where the project would go; he would leave it up to the City, but he felt that it would be a tremendous project for the City to invest in. He realized that a pool might not be the first thing on peoples' minds as everyone had been locked down at home for several months, but he felt that as they emerged from the virus, that the community would support such a project. He said that they had not been able to complete a feasibility study, but he encouraged the City to make it a part of its long-term plan, and he remarked that he hoped to be around to enjoy it someday.*

*Chairperson Brnabic thanked Mr. Fealk, and she asked how they had arrived at the price tag of \$5.5 million.*

*Mr. Fealk said that it had come about with input from Ken Elwert, the Director of Parks and Natural Resources. Mr. Elwert had helped him fill out the budget numbers, and told him that it had been the first time a resident had come forward with a project. Mr. Fealk said that he tried to get the number from Madison, but they would not share.*

*Mr. Elwert added that the cost was based on his knowledge from running water parks in Lapeer County and developing water parks in East Lansing. The price could be as low as \$2 million or up to a higher number than \$5.5 million, depending on the size and style. The proposed cost had been a rough estimate based on the pictures Mr. Fealk had provided.*

**Cindy Edgar, 3630 Salem Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48306.** *Ms. Edgar stated that she was a new resident, having moved from Shelby Township about a year-and-a-half ago. She had friends in Macomb County who took advantage of the Macomb Rec Center and friends in Grosse Pointe and St. Clair Shores which had their own community centers. She wondered if Rochester Hills could entertain a community pool for its residents like the other cities allowed. She knew of people moving to those other areas, because they had great recreation centers. She felt that it would be a shame to lose out on that comradery, and she felt that it would be great, being new, to have a place to meet people and make friends. She acknowledged that the City had great parks, but she agreed that it would be wonderful to have a pool.*

**Urszula Grabowski, 1740 Old Homestead Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48306** *Ms. Grabowski stated that she wanted to add her support. Her*

family missed having a pool. She knew other cities had pools, and she mentioned Schaumburg, Illinois, and she felt that they added greatly to the feel of community. She wondered if the City might entertain the idea of using Nowicki Park for a pool.

**Karen Elliott, 1582 Kings Cove Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48306** Ms. Elliott noted that she had been a resident since 1974. Previous to that, she owned homes with pools, and she lived in an association with a pool, which she greatly loved. She had lived in six other states, and five of the six had community pools. She knew that the YMCA pool in Auburn Hills was well used, as was the OPC pool. She encouraged them to seriously consider a location and a pool project. She was a retiree and would be willing to help in that respect. She also used to be a real estate agent, and she claimed that it was a huge asset to have access to a pool that did not have to be personally maintained. She concluded that she loved the area, and she would love to see a community pool added to it.

Ms. Hoyle moved to project PK-01H, Bloomer Park: Shelter Restroom Upgrades for 2021 for \$180k. She explained that it would address some ADA compliance issues and add lighting and new paint.

Chairperson Brnabic asked Ms. Roediger and Ms. Gentry to notify her if there were any public comments or communications.

Ms. Hoyle noted PK-01I, Bloomer Park: Office Water Hook-up for 2021 for \$78k. The site currently was on a well system, and the well had arsenic and chloroform. The office was not open to the public; there was a health and safety concern for the employees who worked there.

Next was PK-01J, Bloomer Park: Stone Building Upgrades for 2021 for \$360k. The project would add heat to the kitchen and restrooms, add ADA upgrades and lighting in the restrooms, and the improvements would be for year-round use of the building. Next was PK-16C Yates Park: Playground Development for 2021 for \$360k. She noted that Yates was the fourth busiest park, and it did not have a play structure. Next was PK-24A, Veterans Memorial Pointe: Gazebo Replacement for 2021 for \$175k. Mr. Kaltsounis asked how old the gazebo was, and Mr. Alan Buckenmeyer, Manager of Parks, advised that it was 25 years old.

Ms. Neubauer asked if the Yates playground would have an area specifically for kids with disabilities or for those who could not use a regular playground structure. Mr. Buckenmeyer said that it was planned to be universally accessible. Ms. Neubauer was asking about things like

*a swing for a wheelchair. Mr. Buckenmeyer said that they did not put wheelchair swings in public playgrounds, but there would be swings that transferred out of a wheelchair that could be used.*

*Ms. Hoyle moved to DPS projects. The first was FA-04E, Fleet Services Garage Ventilation for 2021 for \$25k. She explained that there was no air conditioning in the bay areas, and it got very hot and stuffy. Next was FA-04F, Catch Basin in DPS Wash Bay for 2021 for \$72k. It would be to install a larger catch basin to catch dirt and debris washed from City cars in the elements. Next was FA-06B, Cemetery Columbarium II for 2021 for \$70k. The current columbarium was getting filled, and there needed to be a plan in place for another.*

*Chairperson Brnabic asked if the current one was at or near full capacity. Ms. Tina Barton, City Clerk said that it was about 40% full currently. The top two rows, which were the most expensive, were selling out the fastest. They wanted a plan in place to be able to start promoting it, and the new columbarium's location would add symmetry to the cemetery. Mr. Reece asked how old the current columbarium was, and Ms. Barton advised that it was about three years old.*

*Mr. Kaltsounis asked about the Garage Ventilation project wondering why it was not named an air conditioning project. Mr. Gary Nauts, Facilities Supervisor, said that it would be ventilation for air flow for the bays. It was not air conditioning; the air handlers would rotate the air so it was not so stagnant. Mr. Kaltsounis clarified that it would not be air conditioning with a compressor and evaporator, etc., and acknowledged that \$25k would be pretty cheap for air conditioning for such a big area.*

*Ms. Hoyle next mentioned FA-10B, Citywide Parking Lot Replacements for 2021-2026 for \$7.8 million. Next was FA-10C, Citywide Roof Replacements for 2021-2025 for \$1.752 million. Chairperson Brnabic asked the timeframe for replacements, for example, for Spencer Boathouse, how often the roof was replaced, or if it was just determined by inspection. Mr. Nauts said that a roof usually lasted about 25 years, and most of those on the list were coming to the end of their useful lives.*

*Mr. Scott Cope, Director of Building and Facilities, advised that they had done a first-time study of all the City building roofs. They wanted to have a routine schedule for maintenance and replacements. They felt that it would be a good idea to plan ahead for larger expenses in the future. They had a reputable roofing company evaluate the life expectancy of each roof and determine what repairs could be made to stretch those out.*

*Ms. Hoyle moved to road projects, noting first MR-02K, Hamlin Road (east of Adams to Crooks) for 2021 at a little over \$4 million. It was the stretch in front of Innovation Hills and the new Legacy project, and it was badly in need of attention. Next was MR-05H, Adams Road Widening (Hamlin to Walton Blvd.) for 2020-2026, and the City's share would be \$5.1 million. She advised that it was a Road Commission project, and the City's portion would be 10%. There was a preliminary engineering study done in 2018.*

*Mr. Dettloff noted that some of the property along Adams was owned by Oakland University, and he asked if the Road Commission would have to obtain easements from them.*

*Ms. Roediger responded that the study had been in partnership with Oakland University, the Road Commission and the City. She indicated that OU was at the table as part of the discussions, and they were very interested in seeing the road widened. She agreed that easements would be needed, but she advised that OU was already on board.*

*Mr. Weaver asked how wide they would go, noting that there were some residential areas fairly close to the road on the east side. Ms. Roediger said that they were looking at a combination of items, including widening areas to a five-lane road, roundabouts and having portions with narrow medians. They would have to do further study, including an environmental assessment.*

*Ms. Hoyle noted MR-11B, Rochester Industrial Drive Extension for 2025 for \$232k. There was a small, private driveway that connected to Rochester Industrial Drive that the City would like to pave and put to public road standards. Next was MR-15D, Butler Road Rehabilitation for 2021 for \$956k. Next was MR24D, Brewster Road (Walton Blvd. to Dutton) for 2024 at \$1.3 million and then MR-29B, John R Rehab (Avon to Auburn) for 2021 at \$3 million.*

*Mr. Kaltsounis asked if Brewster Road would be a rehabilitation, which Ms. Hoyle confirmed. He asked if the word rehab could be added. Mr. Weaver mentioned Butler Road and asked if it was currently all unpaved, and if the project was to pave it. Ms. Roediger clarified that it was paved.*

*Mr. Paul Davis, Deputy Director of DPS/Engineering agreed that it was all paved to the border of Auburn Hills where there was a traffic calming circle. Mr. Weaver asked what kind of improvements would be made, and*

*Mr. Davis clarified that it would be a rehabilitation.*

*Dr. Bowyer mentioned the Rochester Industrial Dr. upgrade and noted the RH Research Park project the Commission had recently approved with a new loop road. She wondered if that had been taken into account, as well as the Auburn Pharma project, and if the portion of Rochester Industrial Dr. they wanted to upgrade would be there after the other road was done. She asked if the timeframe for Rochester Industrial was not until 2025 because they wanted to wait until the two new projects were completed.*

*Mr. Davis explained that the subject portion of Rochester Industrial Dr. was to bring it up to public road standards. It was paved when they reconstructed Rochester Industrial Dr. and acted like a back door for the Fire Department. He agreed that it would change quite a bit when the site plans for the above projects advanced to construction, but they did not want to reconstruct it, since the pavement was so new, until later.*

*Mr. Keith Depp, Traffic, mentioned that if any of the parking lots could be included in their annual programs it would help with quantities of scale. He noted that Butler Rd. was mill and fill for about 70% of it, and just west of Adams would be a reconstruct, because it was in terrible shape.*

*Ms. Hoyle talked about MR-36D, Hampton Circle Rehabilitation for 2023 at \$2.1 million, MR-61, Drexelgate Rehab (Livernois to Dancer) planned for 2025 at \$698k, and the last major road project MR-62, Old Perch Rehabilitation for 2021 at \$1.1 million.*

*Mr. Kaltsounis knew that there was a program for subdivision roads, but he did not see it in the 2021 CIP. He asked if that had not been updated. He asked if they could get economies of scale for the projects just mentioned.*

*Mr. Davis agreed that there was an annual road rehabilitation project for asphalt and concrete. They felt that the projects were big enough to bid on themselves. Wherever possible, they tried to package projects to get a decent amount of bidders. The asphalt and concrete projects would be bid separately from the others above.*

*Ms. Hoyle moved on to water and sewer projects, first noting SS-14, Sewer Truck Dewatering/Disposal Pad for 2021 for \$259k and SS-24B, Sewer Televising Equipment for 2021 at \$115k. She noted that the current equipment was nine years old and had been requiring more and more repairs and maintenance, and it would become the backup*

equipment. Next was WS-12B, PRV Upgrade Program for 2025 at \$175k. The City had 30 Pressure Reducing Valves, and the project would upgrade them. She talked about all the water main replacements: WS-20B, E. Nawakwa Road Water Main Replacement for 2025 at \$312k; WS-23 B, University Hills Subdivision Water Main Replacement for 2024 at \$6.7 million; and WS-46B, RC-01 Improvements for 2024 at \$150k. She noted that the Great Lakes Water Authority had four feeds that the City got its water from, and RC-01 was down at the southwest corner of South Blvd. and Livernois. She continued with WS-48, Stratford Manor Townhouses Water Main Replacement for 2025 at \$1.4 million; WS-50, Rochester Knoll Subdivision Water Main Replacement for 2022 at \$3.2 million; WS-51, Oakwood Park Condos Water Main Replacement for 2025 at \$1.062 million; WS-52, Knorrwood Hills Subdivision Water Main Replacement for 2025 at \$2.2 million; WS-53, Hampton Plaza Water Main Replacement for 2025 at \$800k; WS-54, Fairwood Villas Condos Water Main Replacement for 2024 at \$703k; WS-55, Eyster's Avon Gardens Subdivision Water Main Replacement for 2025 at \$1.093 million; WS-56, Charles Hamlet & Woodside Apts. Water Main Replacement for 2025 at \$1.6 million; WS-57, Grosse Pines Subdivision Water Main Replacement for 2021 at \$3.1 million; and concluded with WS-58, Dequindre/Avon Roundabout: Water & Sewer Relocation for 2021 at \$150k. She said that the last one was a Road Commission project. They were planning to put in a roundabout where the City had utilities in the right-of-way, which would have to be relocated at the time of the project.

Chairperson Brnabic believed that there was a policy, but she asked if there was a comprehensive street lighting plan with the CIP. Mr. Davis said that there had been discussions in the past, but for some reason, it had never gone forward. He said that they could certainly resurrect and update it, if there was a desire from the Planning Commission. The last direction was that it was not to go forward, because there was not consensus. Chairperson Brnabic asked if he recalled why there was not support to move forward. Mr. Davis thought that people were just opposed to lighting the streets in Rochester Hills. He noted that in Troy, the boulevard in Crooks was lighted throughout, and when it got to Rochester Hills, lighting had not been incorporated. He advised that the roundabouts were lit, and otherwise, it was lit at intersections mainly, but there was not consistent roadway lighting throughout the corridor. He felt that it was an old policy, similar to how, at one time, sidewalks were not encouraged. They were now, so lighting could change, but Engineering had not been directed to incorporate lighting with road projects. Chairperson Brnabic said that personally, she would like to see that move

forward. She thought that the new Auburn Rd. corridor looked very nice. She maintained that she did not like light pollution, but she felt that Rochester Hills was kind of a dark city. She would like to see street lamps and street lighting. She asked if any Commissioners had an opinion in that regard.

Mr. Hooper remembered that it was in the CIP about ten years ago. The Commissioners wanted to standardize lighting throughout the City. It moved to Pending Projects then dropped off. He felt that it was a combination of funding and other priorities in the budget. Chairperson Brnabic had wondered if funding was a concern. Mr. Hooper did not think that there would be any harm having it in the Plan, but he did not feel that there was much of a desire to implement it City-wide.

Mr. Reece recalled that it had come up about three or four years ago, and there was just not an appetite for it. He thought that Mr. Hooper's recollection was correct.

Chairperson Brnabic asked if there were any further comments regarding the CIP. Mr. Reece mentioned the community pool. He recognized that it was planned out to 2026, but they did not have a site or know the size. He felt that there should be a feasibility study first to try to determine that information. He thought that the ultimate question would be whether it should be a capital improvement project or a millage. He supported setting aside money for a feasibility study, but to reserve \$5.5 million for a community pool that did not have a location or size was a little too far out for his taste.

Mr. Gaber thought that the pool was a great concept. He remembered when he was on City Council 20 years ago, and a community center with a pool was in vogue then, but there was not enough support for it. Part of the reason was because there were a lot of private facilities in town that provided that type of amenity. He mentioned Lifetime Fitness, Heart of the Hills and apartment and condo pools as alternatives. He did not think that anyone would disagree that it would be a good community gathering spot, but they had to prioritize, and the City had a lot of amenities that cities like Troy did not have. There were parks and rivers and trails other communities did not have, and a lot of those were used as gathering places. While a pool would be ideal, he did not think it would be a "be all end all," because the City had alternatives.

Mr. Gaber claimed that they had not talked about pathways, and he thought that they were very important to the community. He noted that

*pathways were included in the CIP further back, and there were some improvements and new pathways to be constructed. He asked if there would be pathways installed when they did the roundabouts at Avon and Dequindre. He felt that they would really be needed, as there were not many there. There was a lot of pedestrian traffic in that area, and from a safety and convenience standpoint, if it was not part of the road project, he maintained that it should be, or it should at least be in the Plan for consideration.*

*Mr. Gaber asked if the Plan was developed before the corona virus pandemic. He knew that there would be a crunch in State shared revenue and less ability for the City to receive funding for a lot of the projects. While the dollar amounts would not change, the timing would. He wondered if any consideration had been given to how the potential decrease in funds coming in would be incorporated into the timing for the projects to get done.*

*Ms. Hoyle confirmed that the CIP was developed before everything was shut down. She had been scheduled to come before the Planning Commission in April. She agreed that the timing for projects was going to change. Most would not happen in the timeframe for which they were originally submitted because of budget reasons. They had been meeting with various departments for the budget kick-off, and they were pushing projects out as the budget allowed. As the revenues came in, and they saw the actual hit, things would be shifted around even more.*

*Mr. Gaber asked if it was fair to say that the prioritization was still correct; the timing might just fluctuate. Ms. Hoyle stated that was correct. She noted that for certain projects, like roads, only road money could be used, whereas some of the facilities projects had to contend with other departments for the same pot of money. Some projects would come forward sooner because of the funding source.*

*Regarding the pathway question, Ms. Hoyle said that the City did have a pathway project in the CIP. It was from two years ago, for the Yates pathway, and it had been pushed back, because they knew that the Road Commission was doing something. They did not want to construct the pathway and then have to tear it out. She was not sure of the exact scope, but she said that there was a project in the CIP for a future year. Mr. Gaber asked if pathways would be constructed as part of the RCOC project.*

*Mr. Davis said that they usually had a couple of projects looking towards*

*the future to incorporate pathways. The first one would be the roundabout project by the RCOC. There was a development called Redwood also coming, and they were coordinating the pathway at the intersection of Avon and Dequindre with the Road Commission to make sure it went in at the appropriate time. There was also a 96" water main project that had been moving forward by the Great Lakes Water Authority. It was in Dequindre Rd., went through both of the Dequindre/Avon intersections and headed north on Dequindre north of 23 Mile. It was a very large project that was in the design phase. It would take about a year for that. The pathway project Ms. Hoyle was talking about was for two sections incorporated with that. Their intent was to have the Great Lakes Water Authority include it with their project and have it constructed towards the end of the water main work. The hope was that the City of Rochester would continue the Dequindre Rd. pathway north in their community on the west side of Dequindre. The timeframe could be adjusted, because they were also sensitive to Yates Cider Mill and the impact of the water main project. First, the roundabout project would happen then the water main, and he claimed that the pathways would be much better after all that.*

*Ms. Roediger suggested that they could move the community pool into Projects Pending. That would keep it on their radar but not assign an actual year. Mr. Gaber felt that would make sense.*

*Mr. Hooper noted that he had been on the subcommittee for the CIP, so most of his questions had been answered. Regarding the community pool, he remembered facing it 25-30 years ago, before Lifetime Fitness came, which eliminated the need for the pool. He agreed that a feasibility study would definitely be needed, and he supported moving it to Pending. He pointed out that all the street lighting projects they had been talking about for the last eight years were in Projects Pending. They had an annual pathways plan, PW-01A, which was always in the CIP and the Local Street Improvements, LS-01 at \$5 million per year which was in the CIP every year.*

*Mr. Kaltsounis said that he was very thankful that residents had come to present for the CIP, which had been the first time he had seen it. He mentioned Spencer Park, which had its own lake and beach, where people gathered. His daughter did not like lakes, so he could understand the desire for a pool. He thought that they owed it to the residents to put more information in the CIP about their plan. There were some pictures of the pool that had not been included. He said that unfortunately, there was just a dollar amount on the screen without a plan. He liked the idea*

of moving it to Pending. He agreed that there had to be a feasibility study.

Mr. Weaver thought that the pool was a good idea, but he agreed that a feasibility study needed to be done first. They could not assign a budget amount without a location or all the other background information they might need. He agreed with Mr. Kaltsounis, and said that he was really appreciative that the residents came forward with the idea. He indicated that was great to be in a community where residents were aware and were willing to come forward with ideas at a meeting.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 8:08 p.m. She confirmed with Ms. Gentry that there had been no email communications received and with Ms. Roediger that no one wished to speak.

Chairperson Brnabic agreed that it was nice that residents were involved. She said that it was rare to see someone submit a project, although many residents might take an interest in the yearly CIP. She also agreed about needing a feasibility study, which it seemed as if a majority on the Commission would like to see, and about moving it to Projects Pending.

Ms. Roediger said that she spoke with Mr. Elwert, and they were working on a feasibility study for a spray park and water inflatables at Spencer Park, and they could add a component for a feasibility study for a community pool.

Chairperson Brnabic closed the Public Hearing at 8:10 p.m.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that the CIP in the State of Michigan started with Rochester Hills many years ago. It gave the Planning Commission a chance to lay out a plan for several years out for different projects that Council could approve or not. He said that it was great having public input. He recalled perhaps one time years ago when a citizen offered a project. He thanked the residents who came to comment about the pool. Hearing no further discussion, he moved the following:

**MOTION** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission Approves the Capital Improvement Plan that has been proposed for the years 2021-2026. The Rochester Hills Planning Commission has determined the following:

**WHEREAS**, the Municipal Planning Act, Act 285 of Public Acts of 1931, as amended, requires the Rochester Hills Planning Commission to

*annually accept a Capital Improvement Plan for the benefit of the health, safety and welfare of the community as those criteria relate to the physical development of Rochester Hills; and*

***WHEREAS***, *the Rochester Hills Fiscal Office has consulted with the City's professional staff who carry out the business of planning for and providing for the present and future needs and desires of the citizens of Rochester Hills; and*

***WHEREAS***, *the Capital Improvement Plan is meant to consider the immediate and future needs and goals of Rochester Hills, as identified by the public, City Boards and Commissions, and the Mayor's staff, in light of existing projects and plans and anticipated resources; and*

***WHEREAS***, *the Capital Improvement Plan is a flexible document, necessarily meant to be reevaluated and amended each year, to project into the six succeeding years, and further amended as needed to address practical realities as they relate to policies and philosophies of relevant Boards, the City Council and the Mayor's office; and*

***WHEREAS***, *the Capital Improvement Plan is a guide and forum to aid the Rochester Hills Mayor's Office and the Rochester Hills City Council in making decisions regarding the physical development and infrastructure maintenance of the City and determining what, if any, resources can or should be available to carry out City Council's policies and budgetary decisions; and*

***WHEREAS***, *the components of the Capital Improvement Plan have been subject to a public hearing, public review, and committee reviews over the course of several months and a duly noticed full public hearing held on June 2, 2020; and*

***WHEREAS***, *the components of the Capital Improvement Plan were arrived at through a point system using variables that included, among other things, whether the project has begun, funds committed, sources of funds, prior City Council decisions, Planning Commission or administrative recommendations and decisions; and*

***WHEREAS***, *it was determined that project PK-25A Community Pool should be moved to the Projects Pending section of the CIP so that a feasibility study can be completed and more information can be provided.*

***RESOLVED***, *that the Capital Improvement Plan presented for review on*

*June 2, 2020, is adopted by the Rochester Hills Planning Commission on June 2, 2020.*

***BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED***, that this Plan should be published and attested to according to law.

**A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, that this matter be Adopted. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye** 9 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Gaber, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Reece, Bowyer, Weaver and Neubauer

*Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously. She thanked Ms. Hoyle for the nice presentation and thanked all City staff that came to answer questions.*

**2020-0200**

Request for approval of a Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 19-042 - for the removal and replacement of as many as 48 trees for North Row Development, a proposed 20-unit apartment development on 2.4 acres, located on Old Orion Ct., west of Rochester, zoned R-1 with an FB-1 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-03-476-016, Kevin Baird, North Row, LLC, Applicant

*(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated May 27, 2020, Site Plans and Elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof).*

*Present for the applicant were Kevin Baird, North Row, LLC, 720 Kimberly Dr., Troy, MI 48098; Jeff Klatt, Krieger Klatt Architects, 2120 E. 11 Mile Rd., Royal Oak, MI 48067 and Brett Buchholz, Nowak & Fraus Engineers, 46777 Woodward Ave., Pontiac, MI 48342.*

*Ms. Kapelanski advised that the applicant was proposing to construct a 20-unit, multi-family development on just under two-and-a-half acres on the west side of Old Orion Ct. The site was zoned R-1 with an FB-1 Overlay, and she noted that the applicant was utilizing the Flex Overlay to develop. The plan was generally in compliance with all Ordinance requirements with one exception. The applicant was seeking a 10-foot modification of the side yard setback along Maplehill. She advised that a Tree Removal Permit was required for the removal of 48 trees, for which all replacements would be paid into the Tree Fund. The site contained one wetland and one watercourse regulated by the City and EGLE. ASTI had reviewed the impacts and had recommended approval of the plan, the Natural Features Setback Modifications, and the Wetland Use Permit. She summed up that all staff had recommended approval subject to some minor plan modifications.*

*Mr. Klatt introduced their team. He noted that since the discussion last year, they had invited 25 local neighbors to an open house on August 7, 2019. There were 10-12 people in attendance, and he felt that it had been a good conversation. He pointed out that they had modified the design from the last time they met with the Commission. They felt that the style was more harmonious with the single-family homes in the area. He thanked staff for their guidance throughout the project.*

*Mr. Klatt explained that they were proposing five individual buildings on the site, each with four units at a 4,100 s.f. footprint. They felt that having one large building would be out of scale and look more massive. Separating the buildings also allowed the units more daylight. He showed a slide of the wetland area, and said that it drove moving the buildings and drive to the northeast. There would be two means of ingress/egress connected by an internal street lined with trees with on-street parking. He maintained that they met the parking requirements with 1.5 spaces per unit. Each unit would have a parking space within a garage and one in each driveway, and there would be ten on the street for a total of 50. Per the Ordinance, they were required to provide an amenity area for the residents, and they were proposing a seating area, BBQ, bike racks and fire pit under a pergola. There would be arbor vitae around it to screen. The primary entrances to the buildings would be on Old Orion Ct. There would be covered entries, balconies and porches. Each resident would have access from the garage as well and would be able to come to the front of the units between buildings using sidewalks. There would be onsite detention. He agreed that they were proposing a 15-foot side yard setback on the north, but he felt that they were providing good screening. He showed the floor plans, noting that the second floor units would be slightly larger. He talked about the elevations, which he claimed were a little more modern but still followed traditional forms and shapes. He thought that the roof lines were interesting and would break up the massing. He said that they were open to any questions.*

*Chairperson Brnabic asked Ms. Gentry if any communications had been received, and none had, but Ms. Roediger saw a person wishing to speak.*

**April Massimino, 291 Maplehill Rd., Rochester Hills, MI 48306** *Ms. Massimino had heard that there would be ten extra street parking spaces, and she asked if any of those would be on Maplehill. Mr. Klatt responded that they would all be within the development. Ms. Massimino asked if there would be an exit onto Maplehill. Mr. Klatt said that there would be. At one time, they discussed having a pork chop with right out only, but that had been eliminated at some point. The intent was for people to turn*

*right to go to Old Orion Ct. The Fire Department had requested connectivity with two egress points. Ms. Massimino was concerned about traffic backing up at the stop sign at the end of Maplehill, noting that there was another development coming at the end of the dead end. She had hoped that the two exits would have gone onto Old Orion Ct. She also hoped the tree removal would not be approved, because many neighbors would have to see the apartments. She had moved to Maplehill because it was a dead end, but now there would be condos at one end and apartments at the other. She hoped that the trees could all stay.*

*Mr. Gaber felt that it was a great design with beautiful-looking buildings that would add a lot of character to the area. He liked the architecture. He mentioned FB-1 zoning, noting that there was no density requirement and as long as a project met the Ordinance, a site could be as dense as possible. He thought that the proposed project was as dense as it could be for the site, and he thought that it would look nicer with just four buildings rather than five. He had a difficult time approving a modification that allowed a density that could not technically fit on the site without it. He thought that it was over extending what the purpose was of FB zoning, and he wondered if the project could be moved ten feet to the south. He re-stated that he had difficulty approving the requested modification, and he also thought that parking would be tight. He asked Mr. Klatt if he could give an overview of what the project would look like from Old Orion Ct.*

*Mr. Klatt said that there was a lot of green space in front, but it was not their property - it was right-of-way. He said that the buildings would be set back quite a bit from Old Orion Ct. Regarding density, he pointed out that they could have achieved more density if they placed everything in one large building.*

*Mr. Gaber asked what plantings would be in front of the residences. Mr. Klatt asked Ms. Kapelanski if she could pull up the landscape plan.*

*Mr. Kaltsounis brought up parking. He asked about the length of the driveways, observing that there were no vehicles shown there. He mentioned a neighboring city that had a similar development, for which the design had made some people upset. He had driven by and taken photos of pickups that were too long for the driveways and stuck out over the road.*

*Mr. Klatt claimed that there would be ample space for a vehicle to fit in the driveway. Ms. Kapelanski was looking for a drawing with dimensions, but*

*in the meantime, she had put up the landscape plan, which showed the plantings on Old Orion Ct. Ms. Roediger pointed out sheet C1-A, Emergency Vehicle Access plan, which showed 20.6 feet from the face of the building to the edge of the walkway, which was five feet wide. Mr. Kaltsounis thanked the applicants for adding the radii for the fire trucks.*

*Mr. Kaltsounis pointed to the lighting plan, which showed footcandles higher than zero at the lot line, and he thought that zero was required. Ms. Kapelanski believed that they were in compliance, and she said that she would check.*

*Mr. Klatt referred to parking, and noted that 30 spaces were required, and they had 50. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if they had done similar developments. Mr. Klatt advised that they had designed others. He mentioned one in Ferndale that he said was much tighter. He said that some communities were reducing requirements down to 1.3 per unit. Mr. Kaltsounis considered that it was a multi-family development, and he said that families usually had more than one person. He personally thought that the City's parking requirement was too light, but he acknowledged that it was something for the Planning Commission to discuss in the future.*

*Mr. Gaber mentioned the reduced setback on Maplehill Rd., and he asked if the trees planted along there would all be deciduous. He felt that there should be an enhanced, dense screen there, and that they should mix in some evergreens, noting that it would look bare in the wintertime. He agreed that providing spacing between the buildings would allow a better development.*

*Ms. Roediger had observed that along Maplehill, there would be a combination of Crab Apple and Ginko trees as well as some shrubs. She thought that there might a visibility concern having evergreens so close to the pathway. Mr. Gaber said that he would still like the applicants to work with staff to screen the area well with a mixture of deciduous and evergreens as a condition of approval.*

*Mr. Reece said that his company was working with the applicant on a project, and he asked to be recused.*

*Mr. Kaltsounis noted that he had a Ginko tree in his front yard which was put in the same time as the Maples in his backyard. The Maple trees were massive and offered a lot of screening. The Ginko was the last tree to bloom, the first tree to drop leaves, and it was no bigger than it was when installed.*

*Mr. Weaver agreed with Mr. Kaltsounis about Ginkos, and he also thought that some evergreens should be incorporated there. He said that he liked the look of the buildings, but he agreed with Mr. Gaber that it seemed a little jam packed. He thought that the reduced setback was a little self-inflicted, but the applicants were handling it nicely. He liked the look as opposed to having one large building. He really liked the architecture and the materials. He would like to see a little more natural look to the plantings along Orion Ct. Otherwise, he thought that the applicants had done a good job, and he was impressed with how the project had a neighborhood feel.*

*Ms. Kapelanski had looked at the photometric plan, and the project was in compliance. One-half footcandle at the property line was allowed for this type of development.*

*Dr. Bowyer said that the buildings looked very nice, and she liked the way they were laid out. She did feel that it was very dense, though. She wondered if staff was working on the FB and parking Ordinances, and if the Commission should not approve projects until they were fixed. Regarding the enhanced landscaping being discussed, she definitely felt that it should cover the amenity area as well. If she lived there, she would rather see greenery than the roadway. She suggested enhancing that area for the residents and for the people driving by.*

*Ms. Roediger said that the FB Overlay had been in place since about 2011, so it was not a new Ordinance. During the Master Plan update last year, a lot of the discussion was about creating different types of housing. Ms. Kapelanski was working on some amendments, and parking was one of them, and in terms of the FB Overlay, it could be open for discussion, but it was consistent with the recent Master Plan.*

*Dr. Bowyer suggested that parking in the FB district could be looked at, because more than two people could be living in an apartment. That could cause a problem for the residents of Maplehill if people parked there in the future. She would like to see that worked on sooner than later, as it had been mentioned several times. She wanted to make sure that developments had amenities or green spaces for people to congregate, and it was nice that the proposed development had it, but she wondered when there would be an Ordinance requirement. She clarified that the proposed site plan would not go before Council, and Ms. Roediger added that the Wetland Use Permit would go to Council.*

*Chairperson Brnabic agreed that they should take a look at the parking standards. She realized that the FB Overlay had been created for a reason, but she did not think that its purpose was to allow high density developments across the City. When they went through the Master Plan, they picked areas for diversity. They developed R-5 to fit areas sporadically. FB in the past was used for larger developments, and perhaps to lessen setbacks, but she thought that using it for the projects they were seeing was a problem, and there was a problem with the parking. She would like the parking looked at and to have a review of the FB Overlay standards.*

*Chairperson Brnabic asked if the balconies were there just to provide an aesthetic look. Mr. Klatt believed that they were three to five feet and could be walked on. Chairperson Brnabic had observed that one of the plans identified them at a foot-and-a-half. She did not think that would be functional, and she thought it would have been nice to have them, because the first floors provided a patio. Mr. Klatt agreed that they were more Juliette balconies to primarily get taller glass on the second level, but he said that they could be extended a couple of feet to be more functional. Chairperson Brnabic agreed that it would be a nice amenity.*

*Mr. Hooper also felt that the balconies had to be a minimum of three feet, if not more. He asked for clarification about the balconies in the rear, which were seven by seven feet with a roof overhang. Mr. Hooper considered how they would be enclosed, and claimed that they would be pretty dark locations. He asked if there were only nine spruces planned for the entire project, and was told eight. He noticed that they were all back by the detention pond. He asked if they could be relocated along Maplehill and have the Lindens put by the pond. Ms. Kapelanski advised that three evergreens were required around the pond, so they would have to stay. Mr. Hooper suggested that more evergreens would be needed along Maplehill to have greenery year-round. He brought up parking, for which, he recalled, the Commission had been dealing with forever. He did not know what the right number was - 1.5, 1.3 or 1 per unit. He owned a condo in Dearborn that his son used with 80 units and 120 parking spaces. Half of the units were rented and half owned, and he indicated that the parking lot had never been full in the 16 years they had owned it. In that case, 1.5 spots per unit would be more than adequate. He realized that it depended on the mix of people, and he agreed that if a family lived there, there could be more cars. He said that he was not opposed to another parking study, but he did not want to go back to the sea of asphalt levels. He said that he thought that the architecture was great, and he definitely supported it. He thought that it provided a different type of*

*housing in the community which was needed. They just needed to add some year-round greenery and widen the balconies.*

*Ms. Gentry had received an email in the Planning Dept. email from Sue Marus, 250 Maplehill Rd., which she read into the record, and it was placed on file.*

*Mr. Dettloff thought that it was a great-looking development, and he thanked the applicants for bringing it before the Commissioners. He asked what the rent structure would be. Mr. Baird said that the lower units, at 1,250 s.f., would be about \$2,200 per month. The upper units, at 1,650 s.f. would be \$2,600 per month.*

*Mr. Gaber wanted to make sure that if the balconies were extended that it did not take away from the aesthetics of the project, and that it did not have any detrimental impact to the first floor units underneath. Mr. Klatt thought that they would look very attractive and provide good covering for the first floor patios.*

*Mr. Kaltsounis said that he definitely liked the style and look of the development. He agreed with Dr. Bowyer about the density issue with FB. He knew that FB had been around since 2011, but they were now seeing it used. Things were getting tighter and tighter, and they were now rethinking what they did. He would like to see FB re-reviewed, especially for the parking, and he knew that there was data out there for parking. Hearing no further discussion, he moved the following:*

***MOTION*** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, in the matter of City File No. 19-042 (North Row Development), the Planning Commission ***grants a Tree Removal Permit***, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on April 3, 2020 with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following two (2) conditions.

*Findings*

- 1. The proposed removal and replacement of regulated trees is in conformance with the Tree Conservation Ordinance.*
- 2. The applicant is proposing to remove 48 regulated trees with 74 tree credits paid into the City's Tree Fund.*

*Conditions*

- 1. Tree protective and silt fencing, as reviewed and approved by the City*

*staff, shall be installed prior to issuance of the Land Improvement Permit.*

2. *Payment into the City's Tree Fund of \$16,040.00 prior to temporary grade being issued by Engineering.*

**A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, that this matter be Granted. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye** 8 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Gaber, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Bowyer, Weaver and Neubauer

**Abstain** 1 - Reece

**2020-0201**

Public Hearing and request for a Wetland Use Permit Recommendation - City File No. 19-042 - for impacts to approximately .094 acre related to construction activities for North Row Development, a proposed 20-unit apartment development on 2.4 acres located on Old Orion Ct. west of Rochester, zoned R-1 One Family Residential with an FB-1 Flexible Overlay, Parcel No. 15-03-476-016, Kevin Baird, North Row, LLC, Applicant

*Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 9:21 p.m. Ms. Roediger saw no one raising a hand or calling, and Ms. Gentry had received no further emails, so Chairperson Brnabic closed the Public Hearing.*

*Mr. Weaver mentioned the comments some of the residents had about traffic on Maplehill. He did not know if the development would increase traffic on that street, since it was a dead end, but he wondered if the applicants could post a right turn only sign at the exit to Maplehill. Ms. Roediger agreed that they could work with Engineering on that, and it was made a condition of approval of the Site Plan.*

**MOTION** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, in the matter of City File No. 19-042 (North Row Development) the Planning Commission **recommends to City Council approval of a Wetland Use Permit to temporarily and permanently impact approximately .094 acre to construct the outdoor amenity area, site access drive and parking lot, portions of buildings B, C, D and E and the boulder retaining wall based on plans dated received by the Planning and Economic Development Department on April 3, 2020 with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following five (5) conditions.**

**Findings**

1. *Of the .35 acre of wetland area on site, the applicant is proposing to impact approximately .094 acre.*

2. *Because the wetland areas are of low ecological quality and are not a vital natural resource to the City, the City's Wetland consultant, ASTI, recommends approval.*

Conditions

1. *City Council approval of the Wetland Use Permit.*
2. *Show wetland impacts in square feet, prior to final approval by staff.*
3. *If required, that the applicant receives and applicable EGLE Part 303 Permit prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
4. *That the applicant provides a detailed soil erosion plan with measures sufficient to ensure ample protection of wetlands areas, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
5. *That any temporary impact areas be restored to original grade with original soils or equivalent soils and seeded with a City approved wetland seed mix where possible and implement best management practices, prior to final approval by staff.*

**A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye** 8 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Gaber, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Bowyer, Weaver and Neubauer

**Abstain** 1 - Reece

2020-0203

Request for approval of Natural Features Setback Modifications - City File No. 19-042 - for impacts of up to 450 linear feet for construction activities related to North Row Development, a proposed 20-unit apartment development on 2.4 acres, located on Old Orion Ct., west of Rochester, zoned R-1 with an FB-1 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-03-476-016, Kevin Baird, North Row, LLC, Applicant

*Ms. Massimino came on again to speak regarding Mr. Weaver's comment about the sign. She recalled that when they met for a discussion about the project last year, Mr. Klatt had said that there would be a sign. She clarified that the neighbors were not as concerned with traffic going west on Maplehill; they were more concerned with traffic backing up at the stop sign at Old Orion Ct.*

**MOTION** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, in the matter of City File No. 19-042 (North Row Development), the Planning Commission **grants natural features setback modifications** for 446 linear feet for permanent impacts to construct the access drive and detention pond, based on plans dated received by the Planning and Economic Development Department

on April 3, 2020 with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following two (2) conditions:

Findings

1. *The temporary impact to the Natural Features Setback area is necessary for construction activities.*
2. *The proposed construction activity qualifies for an exception to the Natural Features Setback per the ASTI Environmental letter dated February 20, 2020, which also states that the areas are of low ecological quality and function and offer little buffer quality.*

Conditions

1. *Work to be conducted using best management practices to ensure flow and circulation patterns and chemical and biological characteristics of wetlands are not impacted.*
2. *Site must be graded with onsite soils and seeded with City approved seed mix.*

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

**Aye** 8 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Gaber, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Bowyer, Weaver and Neubauer

**Abstain** 1 - Reece

2020-0202

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 19-042 - North Row Development, a proposed 20-unit apartment development on 2.4 acres located on Old Orion Ct., west of Rochester, zoned R-1 One Family Residential with an FB-1 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-03-476-016, Kevin Baird, North Row, LLC, Applicant

**MOTION** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, in the matter of City File No. 19-042 (North Row Development), the Planning Commission **approves the Site Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on April 3, 2020, with the following six (6) findings and subject to the following six (6) conditions.

Findings

1. *The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that all applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as other City Ordinances, standards, and requirements, can be met subject to the conditions noted below.*

2. *The proposed project will be accessed from Maplehill Rd. and Old Orion Ct. thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets.*
3. *The Planning Commission waives the site yard setback to the north requirement of 25 feet to 15 ft, finding that it meets the intent of the FB Ordinance.*
4. *The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.*
5. *The proposed development will not have an unreasonably detrimental or injurious effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the site or those of the surrounding area.*
6. *The proposed development offers another type of housing as outlined in the Master Plan.*

#### Conditions

1. *Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, prior to final approval by staff.*
2. *Provide a landscape bond for landscaping and irrigation, plus inspection fees, as adjusted as necessary by staff in the amount of \$69,905.00 to be posted prior to temporary grade certification being issued by Engineering.*
3. *Payment into the City's Tree Fund of \$16,040.00 prior to temporary grade certification being issued by Engineering.*
4. *Applicant to submit a revised landscape plan replacing deciduous trees with extra evergreen screening along Maplehill Rd. and the outdoor amenity area, avoiding Ginkos, and move some evergreens from the detention pond to Maplehill and replace with deciduous, to be approved by staff prior to final approval.*
5. *Juliette balconies shall be a minimum of three feet in depth.*
6. *Place right turn only sign at entrance to Maplehill Rd., prior to obtaining a temporary C of O.*

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

**Aye** 8 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Gaber, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Bowyer, Weaver and Neubauer

**Abstain** 1 - Reece

*After each motion, Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously. She congratulated the applicants on moving forward with their development. Mr. Hooper thanked them for their investment.*

## **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

*Ms. Roediger mentioned the City Council meeting the previous night. Staff had been working with other departments and Mr. Staran to create a temporary COVID Special Event Permit. A lot of communities were allowing expanded outdoor operations as businesses were trying to reopen. With all of the required social distancing and people's comfort level about being indoors, Council passed three resolutions that would allow expanded outdoor dining, outdoor usage for any business and for temporary signage through the end of the year. They also waived the fees associated with those reviews and had committed to an expedited 48-hour review. She felt that it had been a very good meeting.*

*Ms. Roediger noted that Oakland County had prepared small business re-opening tool kits. The City received 350 of the kits to assist with distribution to local businesses. Ms. Valentik, Economic Development Manager, had been coordinating with the Chamber, the County and the Mayor's office to make sure the businesses got those free resources. The kits included touchless thermometers, spacing signage, sanitizers, gloves and other things businesses would need to re-open.*

*Ms. Roediger noted that Cambridge Knoll, a 16-unit site condo development, would be coming before them at the June 16th meeting. They were hearing a lot of resident opposition, and they had been in communication with Mr. Jim Polyzois, the applicant. He was getting in touch with the neighbors and there would be an update. That was the only thing on the agenda (shortly after withdrawn).*

*Dr. Bowyer asked how large the property was, and Ms. Roediger advised that it was about five acres. Chairman Brnabic wondered if Rochester University Townhomes was not ready. Ms. Kapelanski said that the Final*

*PUD had been submitted, and she was waiting to hear back from Engineering and Fire. She hoped that they would be on the July agenda.*

*Mr. Kaltsounis brought up Saddlebrook Orchards on Auburn Rd. It seemed like they were having a problem with the retention pond filling up. He asked if staff knew anything about that. Ms. Roediger said that Mr. Boughton from Engineering could not make the meeting, so they would follow up with him. Mr. Kaltsounis explained that the basin seemed to be fed by a spring and was constantly being filled and pumped out into the drains in the street. He knew that developments were supposed to handle their own water, but they were constantly pumping the water out.*

*Mr. Dettloff gave kudos to the City Council for passing the resolutions to fast track some requests to help businesses. He asked how the Health Department would play into that, and if they would be on the same page. Ms. Roediger said that every review outside of the City's jurisdiction would still have to meet all those regulations. Someone would still have to follow the State law for liquor licensing, for example. Mr. Dettloff asked if the Health Department would not weigh in on any type of outdoor seating requirements. Ms. Roediger thought that they would for a food truck, or if food was being prepared outside, but the Ordinances related more to the service. Mr. Dettloff said that he asked, because he had talked with a few restaurant owners in Rochester. They said that when the Governor allowed them to open, the Health Department took a couple of weeks to review. He hoped that the Health Department would not bog things down with any red tape.*

*Ms. Kaltsounis wondered if hair stylists would have to cut hair outside, and he thought that they might have to think about that. Ms. Roediger said that the Ordinance for outdoor use stated that any office or personal service uses could request to have an outdoor element to their businesses. They would have to submit a plan to the City to make sure that there would be no negative impacts to neighboring businesses.*

## **NEXT MEETING DATE**

Chairperson Brnabic reminded the Commissioners that the next Regular Meeting was scheduled for June 16, 2020 (subsequently cancelled).

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission and upon motion by Mr. Kaltsounis, seconded by Mr. Reece, Chairperson Brnabic adjourned the Special Meeting at 9:41 p.m.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

All ayes

\_\_\_\_\_  
Deborah Brnabic, Chairperson  
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Secretary