



Rochester Hills
Minutes - Draft
Planning Commission / City Council
Joint Meeting

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

PLANNING COMMISSION

*Susan Bowyer Ph.D., Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, John Gaber,
Greg Hooper, Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, David A. Reece,
C. Neall Schroeder, and Ryan Schultz*

CITY COUNCIL

*David J. Blair, Susan Bowyer Ph.D., Ryan Deel, Dale A. Hetrick,
Stephanie Morita, Theresa Munglioli, and David Walker*

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive, 2nd Floor

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Deborah Brnabic called the Joint Meeting, located on the second floor of City Hall, to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present 13 - Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis, David Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Susan M. Bowyer, Ryan Deel, Stephanie Morita, David Walker, John Gaber, David Blair and Theresa Munglioli
Excused 2 - Ryan Schultz and Dale Hetrick

Quorums present.

Also present: Mayor Bryan K. Barnett
Sara Roediger, Director of Planning & Economic Dev.
Kristen Kapelanski, Manager of Planning
Allan Schneck, Director, DPS/Engineering Services
Paul Davis, Deputy Director, DPS/Engineering
Paul Shumejko, Traffic Engineer, DPS/Engineering
Keith Depp, Project Engineer, DPS/Engineering
Historic District Commission and Study Committee:
Julie Granthen, Vice Chair HDC, Chair HDSC
Katharine Altherr-Rogers, HDC
Darlene Janulis, HDC/Secretary HDSC
Kelly Lyons, HDC/HDSC
Tom Stephens, HDC/HDSC
Charles Tischer, Secretary HDC
Brad Strader and Ann Marie Kerby, MKSK
Colleen Hill-Stramsak, HRC

COMMUNICATIONS

There were no Communications presented.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairperson Brnabic opened Public Comment at 7:04 p.m. Seeing no one come forward, she closed Public Comment

DISCUSSION

2020-0025 Transportation Master Plan Update

(Reference: Letter prepared by Paul Shumekjo, dated January 15, 2020 and power point presentation prepared by HRC and MKSK, consultants had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the consultants were Colleen Hill-Stramsak, HRC, 555 Hulet Drive, Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302 and Brad Strader and Ann Marie Kerby, MKSK, 4219 Woodward Ave., #305, Detroit, MI 48201.

Chairperson Brnabic commented that it was nice that joint meetings had been scheduled consistently for the last three or four years, because prior to that, they had been rather sparse. She thanked Ms. Roediger for organizing the joint meetings. She congratulated Mayor Barnett, Dr. Bowyer and Mr. Hetrick on their re-elections, welcomed the newest City Council members, Ms. Mungoli and Mr. Blair, and noted that Mr. Walker had been officially elected by the residents. She said that she looked forward to a productive meeting.

Ms. Roediger said that it was hard to believe that a year had passed since the groups met downstairs in the Auditorium about adopting the City's Master Plan. She indicated that a very important follow-up as to how they planned for the future of the City was looking at how people got to the places that were planned. One of the recommendations of the Master Plan was to update the Transportation Master Plan (TMP). That project went through the DPS/Engineering and Planning Departments, and it was a good opportunity for them to work together on the long-term vision for the City's transportation network. She introduced the consultants, led by Colleen Hill-Stramsak of HRC and Brad Strader and Ann Marie Kerby of MKSK.

Mr. Schneck said that they were excited to have the process underway and looked forward to getting input from the Planning Commission and City Council.

Ms. Hill-Stramsak advised that she was the Project Manager, and that HRC was working on a lot of the data analysis and the traffic engineering side. Mr. Strader explained that the plan would be taking a lighter, broader approach to all the major corridors in the City. He said that his niche was transportation planning, and he had done other projects in the City in the past. He introduced Ms. Kerby, and said that her specialty was engagement, and she would later talk about the survey results.

Ms. Hill-Stramsak stated that they wanted to make sure they were getting the correct input from the correct players. They had an agency meeting on December 10th with communities bordering Rochester Hills, as well as the Road Commission and MDOT. They talked about their plans for the next five to ten years so those things could be incorporated into the TMP. On January 14, there was a stakeholder group meeting, and there would be a few more of both meetings. They would also be getting public input from as many residents as they could.

Ms. Hill-Stramsak outlined that the consultants would look at the trends, the problem areas, the concerns of the community and where they could best spend the City's money going forward. They would look at the network as a whole and not just at one intersection here or there. They would talk about non-motorized and consider all road users.

Mr. Brader recalled that past plans looked at future projections and where the congestion would be and about widening and other priorities. The proposed plan would address how to maintain the system and focus on hot spots and non-motorized areas and how to manage the system rather than expand the system. It would be a little bit different planning approach than before. The other plans had lots of computer modeling of future forecasts. They had a pretty good understanding of the hot spots and travel patterns. The foundation for the TMP was the Master Plan. They looked at the goals in the Master Plan, which were the basis for updating the TMP. There was a survey done for the Master Plan, and one of the most heard about areas for improvement were traffic and congestion. The intent was that when they were done, the TMP would become part of the Master Plan. Since the last two TMPs, the future of transportation had changed. In 2000, the Plan probably did not talk about autonomous vehicles or the future of mobility such as e-scooters, and that would be looked at. They had been hearing from the field that people did not need to do anything, because autonomous vehicles were going to change everything rapidly. That would probably happen around 2050, but they had to build in some flexibility, and they wanted to make sure that

when they built something that they were providing the flexibility to accommodate the changes in mobility over the next 20-40 years. He advised that the process would take about 12 months, and they were in month four. They were finishing the data collection and evaluation. They would move into the next phase of focusing on the hot spots and looking at scenarios and alternatives and coming up with concepts of what the right-of-way should be for different types of corridors. The last third of the project would be refining the draft plan and going through the adoption process, which they hoped to complete in the fall of 2020.

Ms. Hill-Stramsak next presented some maps that showed crashes, volume to capacity ratio comparison, road conditions (she noted that for a City the size of Rochester Hills, the road conditions were much better than many other cities in the area) and the pathway system. The hot spot map looked at crashes. Rochester Rd. was one of the biggest hot spots for crashes, which was expected because of the heavy traffic. Adams and Walton was another hot spot. That area was being studied jointly with the City, Oakland University and the Road Commission.

Ms. Mungoli asked if the crashes measured vehicle to vehicle, and if deer crashes had been taken out. Ms. Hill-Stramsak agreed that was correct.

Ms. Hill-Stramsak referred to the map for volume to capacity ratio, for which volume had been collected for the roadways from various sources, including the City, RCOC, MDOT and SEMCOG, and it showed the growth rate from 2020 to 2040. SEMCOG had a long-range model to 2040, and they wanted to see what SEMCOG anticipated for traffic growth in Rochester Hills. It was surprising to her that it was a small growth rate, and there were only two segments that got worse. She noted that it was also based on the number of lanes on a roadway. One area that had gotten worse was Dequindre from M-59 to Auburn, and there was a plan to widen Dequindre in the next couple of years, which had already been funded. The next map showed nonmotorized facilities and where there were gaps and where they were proposed. The next map showed a few of the new developments and what was in process, and they would account for those projects.

Ms. Morita asked why they were not looking at what was happening outside the borders of the City, such as in Rochester and Troy. Mr. Strader advised that SEMCOG had a large model that looked at the whole area and at all community development. Surrounding traffic was built into the model. Their maps just showed the City's boundaries, but

everything outside was built into the model. Ms. Morita asked if the existing conditions map, showing proposed projects, could show everything that was going on outside the City's borders. Ms. Hill-Stramsak agreed that it would be included in the maps.

Mr. Strader added that they were looking at best practices applications. One of those was access management, which dealt primarily with driveways to commercial businesses along the major corridors. A lot of studies had shown that more driveways caused more crashes and congestion. They would look at opportunities to get driveways farther from signalized intersections and show the right spacing between driveways and align them across from each other. He recalled that an access management plan had been done for Rochester Rd. about ten years ago with recommendations to improve access and reduce crashes, and they would look at that again.

Mr. Strader said that another best practice had to do with design innovation. One of those was roundabouts, and he pointed out that Rochester Hills had one of the first in the State. They were not always the right answer everywhere, but they were looking for the right locations for them for safety and improving traffic flow. He maintained that they reduced crashes. He noted that medians also had a lot of benefits for reducing crashes and improving traffic flow. They required more right-of-way and were more expensive to maintain, however. Landscaping along the edge of the road could also influence speed. He indicated that they were looking forward to having a Plan that looked to new technology and new design approaches to solve problems.

Ms. Kerby noted that they had reviewed the public opinion survey the City put out in 2019. Traffic congestion was the top concern. About half of the respondents believed that some of the major roads in the City could be widened to help address congestion. Adams and Livernois were the top choices for potential widening. Most respondents had indicated that they liked roundabouts. Many respondents liked walking and biking on the trails - that was actually what they liked best about living in Rochester Hills. 12% of respondents indicated that one of the top issues was a lack of public transportation. Prior to the meeting, the consultants had asked the meeting attendees to fill out a survey of the same questions the stakeholders had filled out a few weeks ago. She talked about the stakeholder versus the joint meeting survey results. The first question related to top priorities for transportation. Congestion was again number one for both groups. Roads and infrastructure and funding were also top concerns, and public transit was the lowest concern. They wanted to

gauge the need for more pathways in the future. It was almost completely supported, and no one said that they did not support adding and improving pathways in the City. Regarding support for exploring fixed bus service along select major corridors, there were kind of opposite reactions between the stakeholder and joint meeting groups. About 55% of the stakeholders either supported or were neutral about the topic and about 50% of the joint meeting attendees did not support exploring the topic at all.

Ms. Mungoli asked who made up the stakeholder group. Ms. Kerby said that some from the joint meeting were part of that group. There were also residents and committee members, totaling about 14 people. Ms. Mungoli considered that some people at the joint meeting actually took the survey twice. Ms. Morita asked if the stakeholder group did not include the entirety of Planning Commission and City Council. Ms. Kerby related that it was a few members from each, for a total of 14-15 in the stakeholder group.

Ms. Kerby mentioned the next question from the survey addressing traffic congestion, which asked how people felt about roundabouts, and she advised that there had been mostly support. The last question asked the best way to address traffic congestion. It was even between the two groups, with most people saying that roads and intersections should be widened to add capacity. The rest of the answers were tied, indicating that other modes of travel should be encouraged, such as walking, biking and transit; that living with congestion was a tradeoff for living in Rochester Hills; and that short term improvements should be considered until future technology was implemented.

Ms. Hill-Stramsak explained that at the stakeholder meeting, they put four maps around the room and asked people to use four different "dot" categories to rate any location in the City someone felt there were problems. A blue dot represented congestion/traffic; a red dot was safety; orange was where a roundabout should go; and green was for non-motorized connections. They would be handing out a similar exercise to the group at the end of the meeting. The map showed that Walton and Adams was flagged as a safety issue. Dequindre and Avon popped up in every category. It was brought up that there were not any facilities for bikes on Auburn over M-59, and that the pedestrian way was pretty narrow. At both John R and Hamlin and Avon and John R, multiple people wanted roundabouts. She emphasized that there had to be balanced traffic flows in all directions to have a roundabout, which they would look at.

Ms. Hill-Stramsak said that for the next steps, they would gather as much information as they could from the meeting and the exercise. They would look at alternatives and do a data analysis, and they would gather more community input. They would bring some draft recommendations back for more comments.

Vice President Bowyer asked if MDOT or other agencies had any plans for Rochester Rd. or Adams or elsewhere. Ms. Hill-Stramsak related that MDOT did not have anything for Rochester Rd. She only knew of the project on Dequindre from Auburn to M-59 and the two roundabouts on Avon.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that future transportation needs and self-driving cars had been mentioned, and he asked their thoughts about self-driving cars. Mr. Strader said that the general feeling had been that there was great promise, and they would reduce congestion, but now the feeling was that it would probably not reduce congestion, and there would be the same or more travel. However, the thought was that those vehicles would be very well spaced, and more cars would get through an intersection instead of having people watching their phone and not going through in time.

Ms. Hill-Stramsak added that it depended on how a vehicle was deployed. If it was for public transit and moving larger groups of people, it could help a lot.

Mayor Barnett said that the subject of autonomous vehicles always piqued his interest. He felt that there were a lot of other benefits they would bring, including mobility equity to a lot of people who did not have it, such as seniors and the disabled community. He stated that he had never heard anyone say that it would not be until 2050, and he had spoken with a lot of experts. He would not want the TMP to be based on the idea that it would not be something normalized until 2050. He talked with industry experts and a lot of other Mayor colleagues where small tests in Arizona and other places were being done. Mr. Strader claimed that people from Ford, Tesla and the Institute of Transportation Engineers, etc. gave dates from 2045 to 2053. Mayor Barnett said that he respectfully disagreed. He had heard from other leaders that by 2030, they should be well on the way. He wanted to make sure that Rochester Hills was prepared for it.

Mr. Strader said that his company was working on the redesign of Campus Martius through Cork Town with Ford mobility people. They

were talking about making that a smart corridor and test bed for autonomous vehicles. He and Ms. Hill-Stramsak were working on Mound Rd. to make it into a super smart street. They had both worked Ann Arbor, which had the smartest technology of any community in Michigan. All of those experts had said the same thing. Things were advancing rapidly, but a lot of the infrastructure was not ready for it, and the enthusiasm had been subdued.

Mr. Blair said that he had had hundreds of conversations about traffic in talking to residents. He started to place drivers into one of three groups: The residents who wanted to live in the community; the group that needed to get to and from work or to their families outside of the City; and the third group that used the City's streets but neither lived or shopped in it. He said that he was astonished at how many driver fell into that last category. He recently moved his office to Auburn Hills, and he took Walton Blvd. east from Opdyke all the way through Rochester Hills to Main St. He wondered how much data there was about which drivers were filling those buckets - especially the east/west commute. The north/south streets, such as Brewster and Old Perch got clogged up with traffic. He wondered how they could collect the data to figure out who was clogging the roads and at what time of day. He thought that there had to be ways to use a drone or satellite to figure that out.

Ms. Hill-Stramsak responded that SEMCOG's model included a lot of that data. They did a transportation analysis of different zones and people going from one zone to another. She said that they could look into that model to see how much was through travel.

Mr. Kaltsounis noted that he was in automotive and worked with high performance cars. When there were problems with autonomous vehicles, the next steps were taken to make things better and better. He would agree with the Mayor about 2030, because if he saw a problem with an engine, for example, he would fix it as soon as possible to get it on the market. He thought that it would be faster than everyone thought, because the issues would get fixed.

Ms. Hill-Stramsak passed out the exercise, for which people would mark up a map with symbols which signified areas of congestion, safety improvements needed, driveway consolidation, and non-motorized connections and roundabout locations needed. If people had general ideas they wished to vet with the group, those could be emailed to her.

Mr. Reece said that earlier, they talked about balance relative to

roundabouts. He asked if Rochester Rd. was considered an unbalanced road for them. Ms. Hill-Stramsak responded that most of the cross streets did not have as much traffic as Rochester Rd., so they would end up with three-lane roundabouts, similar to the one at 18 ½ and Van Dyke.

2020-0028

Historic District Survey Options

Ms. Roediger advised that both the HDC and the HDSC had a lot of discussion about their roles involving new and existing districts. She related that the City was CLG certified with the State, and there had been a lot of effort over a decade ago to become certified. As part of the status, there was a requirement to have annual reviews and evaluation. She introduced Kristine Kidorf, the City's historic preservation consultant, who would discuss some options the boards had been pursuing to maintain certification. The HDC took its direction from City Council, and staff felt that it was a good opportunity for everyone to come together to get a sense of where they wanted to focus resources in the future.

Ms. Kidorf explained that Rochester Hills was a Certified Local Government. There were 30 throughout Michigan, and six were in Oakland County. She explained that being a CLG allowed the City to apply for grants from the State Historic Preservation Office, to receive technical assistance to promote historic neighborhoods, and it could be an important planning tool for community development. The City could also request visits from the State Historic Preservation Office Architect or Archeologist if there were specific concerns. She advised that the City was certified through the State Historic Preservation Office in partnership with the National Parks Service. It meant that Rochester Hills was focused on promoting historic preservation at the grassroots level and demonstrated a commitment by the local officials to preserve historic resources. In order to maintain the status as a CLG, it required the continuous survey and inventory of historic resources throughout the City. The last survey was done in 2002. At that time, there were some recommendations for additional survey, for which the City never took action. Under the CLG program, she explained that the City was monitored every four years by the State Historic Preservation Office. The State had been lax, because there was not a CLG coordinator, so it had been about eight years since the City was monitored. In 2018, the State picked back up again. Their only comment with the City's status was that it had not kept up with the surveying that was required. The State requested that the City came up with a survey plan for the next four years. The HDC drafted a survey plan with several options, most of which came

out of the 2002 recommendations. The top three survey opportunities included resurveying the Winkler Mill Pond Historic District. That historic district had a lot of new construction, and if Council recommended, as a result of that survey, the boundaries could be reduced to eliminate some of the newer houses. The second priority was to look at the subdivisions north and south of Auburn in the Brooklands, mostly because of the investment the City had been making in the commercial area, to determine if there was any historic value in those areas. Finally, there had been a potential list of historic properties that Council had dealt with on and off. There were 12 properties that could be surveyed to determine whether or not they should be designated historic.

Ms. Morita recalled that Council eliminated the potential list. Ms. Kidorf agreed that it was not an official list any longer. It was just 12 properties that might or might not have historic value. Ms. Morita maintained that Council chose to not recognize the list any more.

Mr. Gaber asked if those properties were identified in the 2002 survey as needing further study. Ms. Kidorf confirmed that 12 remained.

Vice Chairperson Hooper asked what was going on with the former O'Neill Pottery property on Crooks. There had been an applicant in front of the Planning Commission for a discussion about a proposed senior living facility. Ms. Kapelanski advised that she had not heard anything further since that time. Ms. Roediger added that the house had been demolished, and the barn remained a historic resource that had to be preserved.

Mr. Gaber asked about resurveying the existing Winkler Mill historic district and what that would accomplish. The boundaries appeared to be too large because there was new construction, but the new constructions were not contributing resources. He asked if they were governed by the HDC, so that if someone wanted to add a deck, for example, the HDC would have to give permission. Ms. Kidorf agreed. Mr. Gaber asked if they were taken out if they would be totally unregulated by the HDC's jurisdiction, which Ms. Kidorf confirmed. She said that when the district was designated, it had all been vacant land. The HDC reviewed all of the new construction, and it was still currently under its jurisdiction.

Ms. Mungioli questioned the benefit to the City for having a CLG designation. She asked if they knew how many grants had been received or how it drew people into the City who wanted historic homes. She asked if it could help resale value and what the intrinsic and the actual value of

the designation was.

Ms. Kidorf responded that it would allow the City to apply for grants. She believed that Van Hoosen Farm applied for a grant for the school, but she was not sure if other grants had been received. Ms. Mungoli asked if staff could find that out. She wondered if the designation helped promote the City and brought in new homeowners. Ms. Kidorf said that it was not quite that straight forward; the State Historic Preservation Office and the National Parks Service both recognized that Rochester Hills valued its historic properties. The City valued historic resources through its Ordinance and programs at Van Hoosen Farm and school. Ms. Mungoli asked if there was a cost to maintain the designation, and Ms. Kidorf advised that there was not, other than to do a survey. Ms. Mungoli asked if the dollar amount outlined in the staff report was the cost of maintaining the CLG. Ms. Kidorf agreed, but added that they were very rough estimates.

Mr. Kaltsounis commented that it broke his heart every time he saw an historic building get torn down. He heard about a lot of homes that had been demolished. He asked what they were doing to prevent those homes from being demolished. He wondered if there were changes needed in order to hold onto what they had.

Ms. Kidorf said that there were a couple of houses that came out of the 2002 survey that had been recommended for delisting, because they did not have the historic value that was originally thought in 1974. To her knowledge, no houses that were designated had been demolished, except for the Dunn property mentioned (Crooks Rd.). That house had deteriorated well beyond repair. She claimed that the only way to protect properties was to designate them.

Mr. Dettloff asked if there were any financial incentives available for historic preservation. Ms. Kidorf said that there were not currently - the City would have to enact such a program, such as a revolving loan program. There had been a State Historic income tax credit, but Governor Snyder eliminated it in 2011. Mr. Dettloff knew that it was available on a Federal level for income producing properties, and Ms. Kidorf agreed, and said that it was really the State that would benefit locally designated properties.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that she had lived in the community for 40 years and had watched many City Council meetings. She saw owners who had their properties designated as historic over the years without their

permission, which had caused a lot of hardship for them. She stated that they had to consider that. If someone purchased a property that was designated historic, there was an obligation by the owner to keep it up. She did not think that a property should be designated without the agreement of the owner. She had seen where people could not sell their properties, because someone else did not want the obligation, or they had experienced a financial hardship themselves over the requirements. She realized that it was only the exterior that was regulated. She recalled when Stiles School had expressed a financial hardship as to some of the requirements. She also brought up Twist Drill, when the owners came before the Planning Commission. The owners were upset because they could not sell, and they pleaded to Council to have the designation removed. She said that she totally supported historic preservation, but she thought that the owner had to be in agreement with designation before it moved forward.

Mr. Gaber said that City Council had shown, over a number of years that it valued the ability of people to do what they wished with their properties. He said that it was a difficult regulation. The State Act allowed communities to restrict properties on a discretionary basis. He could not recall any other type of law that allowed that in Michigan. He knew that zoning applied to all properties, but historic designation was discretionary at the decision of City Council. The sentiment had been to ensure that personal property rights were preserved, and the balance the community had struck in recent years was that while they valued historic resources, they were trying to cooperate with people and look for more of a voluntary program to establish historic resources. He thought that the first survey option had merit, so if properties were not historic, they would not be subject to the regulations, and people would not have to go before the HDC when they wanted to do something with their property. He felt that it made sense to spend money for that purpose. He did not see the value in surveying the Brooklands. He did not know why the City would want to survey properties to see if there was historic value in that area. It was stated that the goal was to see if, for post World War II suburban movement, some of the first houses established were historic. He did not believe that created historic value to the community, and he would not favor that expenditure. The third option was for properties that the City had already reviewed and acknowledged might have some potential for historic designation in the future, but he would like to see what was in the 2002 survey. He questioned the price of \$60-70k to study, and he was not sure how much more would be found that was not found in 2002.

President Deel said that with respect to the Brooklands, he would not be

in favor of evaluating that area. The area had been targeted for redevelopment, and they had just adopted the Brooklands district to spur development in the area. He was not really interested in looking at it in light of the potential future development there.

Vice President Bowyer said that she agreed with Chairperson Brnabic about people having no idea their property was designated as historic. She had seen court cases and people trying to get out of that because they could not afford it. That was one of the reasons that the potential list did not exist any longer. Regarding the Brooklands, as President Deel had said, they were looking at developing the area. She said that she had lived there, and she remarked that she did not think there was a place she would want to visit as a museum. She liked the idea of resurveying the Winkler Mill district, so the people with new homes that were not historic did not have to come before the HDC.

Vice Chairman Granthen said that it was not so much that they had made something historic retroactive; it was that people bought a property and did not realize, or claimed that they did not know, it was in an historic district. One of the HDC's struggles was how they could let people know, whether it was signage or some other way.

Mr. Walker suggested that it could be made a matter of public record. There could be a document filed with the County that stated that a house was historic. When someone did due diligence before buying a property, it would be discovered. He claimed that there should be a public place that signified that something was in an historic district.

Mr. Tischer added that the HDC dealt with people not knowing at a lot of meetings, and it was a challenge to figure out how to educate people. They questioned having to come before the HDC every time they wanted to add a deck or take down trees or something else. The HDC had struggled with it for a number of years. People claimed that something was not historically designated, even after a title search. He said that the first option was the one the board wanted to go with the most, to get noncontributing properties off the rolls. They felt that Council would find that more palatable, cost wise, too.

Chairperson Brnabic felt that there were people who, for some reason, bought and did not know. She had lived in Rochester Hills a long time and had observed a lot of unnecessary stress and anxiety from property owners due to financial obligations that could not be met due to the requirements. She wondered if it was the HDC or Council that would

institute a policy that a property owner would have to be in agreement with designation.

Ms. Kidorf said that if the City changed its Ordinance to require property owner permission, it would not be in compliance with the State Enabling Legislation, and the City would not be able to be a CLG. Chairperson Brnabic felt that it was a shame.

Mayor Barnett indicated that some of the toughest votes he had ever been a part of on Council revolved around historic properties. In his experience, people had come before them and had not known their properties were designated, but there were situations where people had definitely known. He said that he was glad that the HDC and HDSC members were present and had spoken. The City valued their contribution, and they all recognized the value of historic properties. They loved the Museum, and they were blessed to have two big, contiguous historic districts in the City. Their kids visited the one-room schoolhouse that someone had the foresight to save. Council was the group that drove the bus on a lot of it. There was a bent towards personal property rights, and that had led the discussion, and it tended to be where Council fell. He remarked that if Dr. Stamps had been there, he would take the counter position to everything. He was passionate about history, and wherever he was, he wished he could chime in. Mayor Barnett stated that Council valued the contiguous districts and wanted to prioritize what they could do to invest and put time into, as opposed to the noncontiguous, random barn on Auburn. He felt that it made a lot of sense to look at focusing the continued investment on option number one, but he did not want the HDC and HDSC to leave feeling that it was not a struggle for Council. Historic properties helped make Rochester Hills unique; it was just a difficult subject. The CLG did not move him as much. If it advantaged the City from an economic development standpoint, it made sense. He was not worried about losing it or keeping it. If it made sense, and they could do it by way of what they wanted to do for the City anyway, it should be maintained. The other two options, to him, went against what Council's recent years had said about focusing on the contiguous areas and being challenged about the problems that came with expanding elsewhere. He wanted to make sure that the message showed how Council valued things so everyone was using their time wisely, and they were all on the same page, and it had been one of the benefits of getting everyone together.

Ms. Janulis noted that she was new to the HDC. She felt that it was important that they all went through the steps. She had thought that it was

a good idea to evaluate the Brooklands area, and no one ever suggested that they would do a land grab. It was a matter of allowing people to understand that a structure might have some significance. It would strictly be voluntary. She felt that it was important the City reviewed its options. When she saw the price tag, it lost excitement for her. She had been excited about the Brooklands, because the City had just put money into the corridor, and she thought that they should take a look at it, but the price tag was a huge turnoff. She had no idea how expensive it would be to do some windshield surveys and research. She thought that it was important that the City went through the steps to remember and understand what they had and to validate what was important to them so they could focus on the right things. She appreciated everyone's comments. She had not known about the potential list being gone, but she reminded that the buildings were still there even if the list had been taken away. She was glad that they had at least looked at the options, even if it was determined that something was too expensive or the history left a bad taste or whatever the outcome, and they could move on.

Ms. Morita said that for those who had been on Council with her, they knew that she had not been a fan of designated properties. They struggled with the potential list that kept causing problems. Property owners had come to them, because they found out they were on the "super-secret" list, and Council tanked it. It was troubling to her that it was showing up in front of them again. She reiterated that Council got rid of the super-secret list, and it needed to stay gone, for a lot of reasons. She sat on the Museum Foundation Board, and she knew that there was value in the Stony Creek Historic District area and maintaining it. They needed to maintain the cultural value of the museum and the historic nature of the residences around the museum. There was a new home built in that district, and it was built to fit in with the other homes. She felt that they needed to do what they needed to do to keep the CLG, and she was a fan of the first option to see which properties should no longer be in the district. She would not support evaluating the Brooklands. They were putting in Rebar Trees in the middle of the streets, which would not be historic at all. It would be new and exciting, and there would be a splash pad, and it did not make sense to require everyone to keep their 1950s bungalow the same way it was 70 years ago. She would support number one, and she felt that there was value in keeping the CLG in place, especially for the Stony Creek area.

Ms. Mungoli asked if they would have to do a survey for number one regardless of the CLG status if they wanted to remove that designation. She said that she would rather invest in the Van Hoosen Farm area and

Stony Creek Village. She said that she could agree to number one, but she wanted to understand the long-term cost implication of maintaining the CLG. She questioned why they would not put it around the property they really wanted designated historic and that had value and drew people to the community as opposed to 30 noncontiguous designated properties she would have to spend three hours driving around the City to see. She would want to be able to invest money where it would do the most good and have the most long-term support of the community. She would support number one for now, but down the road, she would want to know where they would invest money to preserve the truly historic pieces of the City.

Mr. Kaltsounis thanked the HDC members. He did not want them to think that everyone was against them, but there was frustration around the table. He wanted to see historic districts repaired, but he did not want it to be a hardship. He gave a story that he felt applied to the issue with historic districts. He knew a gentleman who had a 1956 Porsche who made a lot of conversions to it. He tried to sell it, and it did not sell, because he did something that someone else did not like. He changed it back to be more original, and it sold. The City might not like what someone wanted to do to a property, but something happened to have that property preserved. No one was doing anything now, because there were too many restrictions. Properties were sitting and rotting away, and too many were being torn down. He would rather have people do something with those older properties and document the history for reference. They might not agree with what a person who currently lived in a house did to it, but there would be someone there tomorrow who would get a treasure trove of information to help guide them back to the original. Regarding evaluating the Brooklands, the City just invested a lot of money into the area, and it would scare him to find out that a lot of the houses were historic when they were the ones they wanted to tear down. He thought that they could help guide people to keep some of them. He stated that he would rather see something happen than nothing at all, because they were going to hear the word "demolish" a lot more, and that was what broke his heart.

Mr. Walker noted that in Ms. Roediger's memo, it said that in order for the City to maintain an historic designation, it had been required to submit an annual report cataloging preservation and HDC activities in the past year. He asked if one of those requirements was surveying and inventorying historic resources, and if they would be expected to do it every year.

Ms. Roediger said that the City had not done a survey in almost 20 years,

and it was catching up with them. If they showed progress and started with one of the options, they would continue and see if, in the future, there was a need to resurvey Stony Creek. Doing one of the options would help keep the CLG certification at bay for several years.

President Deel thanked the HDC and HDSC members for all of their hard work and the thoughtful consideration that went into everything that had been presented. He hoped that they all recognized that the Council members recognized the importance of preserving the historic areas in the City. They were very valuable. The meeting was to have a dialogue so they could all get on the same page and reach a consensus. He wanted them to know that Council valued and appreciated all the hard work they had done.

Chairperson Brnabic echoed those comments. She appreciated what they did, and she supported historic preservation. She had just expressed some concerns, which were not meant on a personal level. She wrapped up stating that they all did a great job.

2020-0024

2019 Planning and Economic Development Annual Report

Ms. Roediger noted that every year, the Planning and Economic Development Department put together an annual report, and for 2019, there was a new and improved report. It was a playbook of what the department worked on with the various boards and commissions. She mentioned the staff members who worked more closely with either Planning or Economic Development, including Ms. Senta Glasewald, the newest member of the Economic Development team who put the report together and had elevated the graphics for the department's marketing materials. Ms. Roediger advised that the State required the report each year to summarize the efforts of the Planning Commission. However, staff wanted to broaden that to include other boards and commissions. She pointed out page four, which listed the stats for development that had been approved in the community in 2019, including single-family, multiple-family, retail, office and industrial. The Planning Commission held 14 meetings, and the HDC held six. There were a number of concept meetings prior to projects going to the Planning Commission. Staff tried to get issues worked out beforehand to, hopefully, make the process as efficient as possible. There was also information on economic development. Ms. Valentik, Manager of Economic Development, went to over 100 retention visits. She worked hard to make sure the businesses were happy and continued to stay and employ

people and invest in the community. The report highlighted some of the larger projects for housing options, which would have significant investment in the community, and they were excited to see how they would turn out. Staff was asking the Planning Commission to accept the report, and it would go to City Council at its next meeting. She said that she would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Dettloff asked if Ms. Valentik also utilized Oakland County and the State for retention visits. Ms. Roediger related that Ms. Valentik was often jointed by representatives from those organizations, but she headed all of them. Mr. Dettloff had observed the vacancy rates, which he stated were impressive. Ms. Roediger said that one of the biggest challenges for the business community was finding talent and space. She remarked that everyone wanted to be in Rochester Hills, but there was only so much space.

Vice Chairperson Hooper thanked Ms. Roediger. He said that they were blessed to have a great Planning and Economic Development Department and such professional and highly-trained people. He had noted mention of short-term rentals and airbnbs, and he asked if the City was tracking them now.

Ms. Roediger agreed. She recalled that they had talked about them at last year's joint meeting. Since that time, Ms. Glasewald had been tracking, on a regular basis, the major rental places and doing random searches. It was a very small number in the City - about 17 available units, and most were a bedroom in an existing house where someone lived. The Building Dept. had confirmed that there had been no complaints related to short term rentals in 2019. Vice Chairperson Hooper commented that he wanted it kept that way. He would not like one of his neighbors renting out a home for that. Ms. Roediger offered that the City had Ordinances to address noise and other nuisance issues.

Ms. Mungoli asked about RRC Certification and when the City would become certified. Ms. Roediger explained that RRC certification was done through the MEDC, and it stood for Redevelopment Ready Community. It was a designation given to communities that showed a high level of transparency and openness, with very clear regulations and processes. The process began a little over a year ago, and they had to evaluate all the department procedures, what was available on line and how things were communicated to the public. Her goal was to wrap up the last two or three items in the next week, and then it would go to the MEDC for final approval. If given the green light, they would come before City

Council and officially certify the City. There were only 30-some certified communities currently in the State, and 180 were in the pipeline. It was a highly sought after certification that not many had achieved. Ms. Mungioli asked if there was a cost associated with it. Ms. Roediger advised that there was just internal staff time involved. She noted that one of the requirements was that the annual report should be posted on the website. When she first started, the City was already at 75% the way things were being done. Ms. Mungioli wondered if they could use the RRC designation for promotional efforts to developers. Ms. Roediger agreed, and said that there were also grant abilities once a City was certified.

President Deel complimented the report. He liked how they presented what could be a lot of very dry, statistical data in a very interesting and eye catching way. He thanked staff, and he thought that since the public would see it, it was important to make it readable and understandable, and he appreciated the format. Ms. Roediger indicated that all the credit went to Ms. Glasewald.

Mr. Kaltsounis requested that one of the graphics for the Brooklands district be updated, which Ms. Roediger said would be done before it went to Council. Mr. Kaltsounis agreed with the comments that the City had a great Planning Department. He remarked that Ms. Roediger had had big shoes to fill, and that she was doing a great job. He said that he had the easiest Secretary's job, because the department prepared the annual report and did the Minutes. Hearing no further discussion, he moved the following.

MOTION *by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby accepts the 2019 Annual Report for the Planning and Economic Development Department subject to updating the graphic in the Brooklands prior to City Council consideration.*

Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously, and she thanked everyone.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Chairperson Brnabic reminded that the next Planning Commission meeting was scheduled for February 18, 2020 and the next City Council meeting was scheduled for February 10, 2020.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission and City Council and upon motion by Mr. Kaltsounis, seconded by Mr. Reece, Chairperson Brnabic adjourned the Joint Meeting at 9:09 p.m.

Deborah Brnabic, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Ryan Deel, President
Rochester Hills City Council

Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Secretary
Rochester Hills Planning Commission