

Ms. Vaara said that she was not sure. It was still being reviewed, as far as she knew. She added that the public education part of the new permitting process had not changed, and according to the DEQ, it would not change. Those requirements were still in place, which was essential. They were discussing changes in rules and regulations for the elicit discharge and elimination plans, stormwater pollution prevention plan and so on.

Mr. Kaltsounis commented that there were no glaciers or mountains with snow feeding the rivers, so he wondered how the Clinton River was fed naturally, other than stormwater.

Ms. Vaara responded that groundwater recharge was certainly a part of it, as was rainwater. The area was lake controlled, so in the spring and fall the River was a little deeper and more flashy. The best time to kayak would be in the spring. There were very low flows in the summertime, and that was due to some of the lake controls that were upstream. In the summer, the stream suffered because there was not enough precipitation, although the past summer was better and good for the environment because there was more rain. The temperature increased and flow decreased causing the River to suffer in the summer. They were concerned about that for the Paint Creek, because it was the only cold water fishery in southeast Michigan and was recognized by the DNR as such. That was constantly being monitored for flow and temperature.

Hearing no further comments, Chairperson Boswell thanked Ms. Vaara for her presentation. Ms. Vaara thanked Rochester Hills for supporting the CRWC.

This matter was Discussed

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 2007-0324** Request for Recommendation of an Extension of the Tentative Preliminary Plat Until May 17, 2010 - Rochester Meadows, a 47-lot subdivision development on approximately 22 acres, located east of Rochester Road and south of Avon, zoned R-3, One Family Residential, Rochester Meadows LLC, applicant.
- (Reference: Memo prepared by Derek Delacourt, dated October 16, 2009 had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)*

Present for the applicant was Joe Check, representing Rochester Meadows LLC., Shelby Township, MI 48317.

Mr. Check summarized that the request was for an Extension of the original approval of the Preliminary Plat, until May 17, 2010, for Rochester Meadows Subdivision. He stated that they were finalizing the engineering plans; they had obtained Sanitary Sewer, Water and Drain Permits; and they were putting the finishing touches on the Final Preliminary Plat.

Chairperson Boswell asked Mr. Delacourt if he anticipated any major changes to the upcoming Plat.

Mr. Delacourt did not believe that there would be major changes. He noted that the City's Engineering Standards had changed since the Preliminary Plat was designed. Staff would have brought the matter forward sooner, but they wanted to have an Extensions Policy in place first, whereby an applicant would be required to bring a Plat into conformance with the new requirements prior to getting an Extension. It was decided that an applicant would be required to provide a letter indicating that they understood there was a change to the standards. Prior to the matter going forward for any additional steps, the applicant would have to bring the Plat in for a revised review. The letter for Rochester Meadows was submitted, the Extensions Policy was finalized, and the applicant understood the requirements. Mr. Delacourt added that there would probably be some changes, but not major ones, and the applicant might be required to come back in the future with a revised Plat.

Mr. Schroeder moved the following motion:

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Yukon, in the matter of City File No. 99-011 (Rochester Meadows Subdivision), the Planning Commission recommends a one-year Approval of an Extension of the Tentative Preliminary Plat until May 17, 2010.

Mr. Dettloff asked Mr. Check what he saw out in the marketplace. Mr. Check said that it was still a very difficult market, but they were confident enough to get the plans approved and the underground work in, and he felt the market would come around in the next year or so. They were prepared to finish the subdivision, and they wanted to do so in 2010. Mr. Dettloff concurred that it was encouraging.

Chairperson Boswell called for a voice vote.

A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Yukon, that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 1 - Klomp

DISCUSSION

2009-0393 Discuss proposal for northeast corner of Hamlin and Livernois; Signature Associates.

(Reference: Memo prepared by Derek Delacourt, dated October 16, 2009 had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Chileshe Mulenga and Kathy Wilson, Associates, Signature Advisory Services, One Towne Square, #1200, Southfield, MI 48076 and Brian Iseler, 1921 S. Livernois, Rochester Hills, MI 48307-3369, owner of one of the parcels under discussion.

Mr. Delacourt recalled that several years ago, the Planning Commissioners looked at a request for a Rezoning to O-1 (Office) for the subject parcels, which was not supported by the Master Land Use Plan, and recommended denial. The matter did not progress further. Recently, Staff was approached with a request to again discuss the potential for O-1 zoning. He summarized that there had been changes to the economy, a change to the intersection at Hamlin and Livernois, and that the City had updated its Master Plan. Staff and the applicant felt there was merit to re-evaluate the matter, and the applicant wanted to get input from the Planning Commission. The applicants represented both property owners, and they were considering a Rezoning to O-1 from single-family residential. They submitted a basic Site Plan, although they did not have a user, to see if the parcels could be reasonably developed under the O-1 district. There would obviously have to be some issues worked out and a complete set of plans submitted.

Chairperson Boswell asked Mr. Delacourt to explain what the Master Plan showed for the parcels.

Mr. Delacourt replied that the Master Plan identified the parcels to be Single-Family Residential with a Mixed-Residential overlay, which would allow flexibility in the type of residential, including senior living and would allow several other uses.

Chairperson Boswell noted that the parcels were bordered on the north