



Rochester Hills

Minutes - Draft

Planning Commission

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

Chairperson Deborah Brnabic, Vice Chairperson Greg Hooper
Members: Gerard Dettloff, John Gaber, Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Stephanie Morita,
David A. Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Ryan Schultz

Wednesday, July 31, 2019

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Present 9 - Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis, Stephanie Morita, David Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Ryan Schultz and John Gaber

Quorum present.

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

COMMUNICATIONS

There were no Communications presented.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairperson Brnabic opened Public Comment at 7:01 p.m. Seeing no one come forward, she closed Public Comment.

NEW BUSINESS

[2019-0331](#)

Request for a Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 19-014 - Christenbury Site Condos, a proposed two-unit site condo development on 2.4 acres located south of Washington, west of Dequindre, zoned RE Residential Estate, Parcel Nos. 15-01-278-005 and -007, Vito Terracciano, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated July 26, 2019 and site condo plans and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Vito Terracciano, 19910 Westchester Dr., Clinton Township, MI and Jeff Rizzo, Fenn & Associates, 14933 Commercial Dr., Shelby Township, MI 48315.

Ms. Kapelanski indicated that it was a slightly unusual request for a proposed two-unit site condo on Christenbury. One unit would be an existing residence, and unit two would be a proposed new residence. The applicant was taking a portion of land from the existing residents to the west and east to form unit two. She noted that the property was zoned RE Residential Estate, the proposed site condos met with Zoning Ordinance standards, and that staff reviews all recommended approval. A Tree Removal Permit was also being requested for the removal of 22 trees, all of which would be replaced on site. The applicant was seeking a recommendation to City Council for the Preliminary Site Condo Plan.

Mr. Terracciano thanked everyone for coming for a Special Meeting. He advised that it would be his personal residence, noting that he had developed the subdivision. The house to the east was his, and he sold it hoping that he would be able to do the split. He had a lot of history behind the sub, and he just wanted to have one lot for his family. He also noted that he had done a lot of work as a developer with Clear Creek and the Vistas in the City.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 7:05 p.m.

Evan Stashefsky, 1865 Christenbury Ct., Rochester Hills, MI 48306

Mr. Stashefsky noted that he lived across the driveway where the proposed house would be built. He stated that it was an uncomfortable situation for him, because he did not want to prevent anyone from building a house. When he moved to his house, he bought a beautiful property for country living in Rochester Hills. He said that Mr. Terracciano's house would look directly at his, and it would totally ruin his view of the trees and the pond. He claimed that it would be directly on top of his property. He did not know where a driveway could be put. When he first bought his house, there was supposed to be four houses on the street. To go and slap another house in between two houses would destroy everything he wanted to move out there for, and he stated that more development would cause more noise pollution. There would be trucks driving all over his driveway, which had already been destroyed from the previous houses being built, and there was one being built currently. The way the grading was, Mr. Terracciano would have to build up the grading and change the whole landscape. Mr. Terracciano had said that he would surround his house with trees, but the plans did not show that. Mr. Stashefsky said that he sat on his driveway all the time, and he would lose all his privacy. He looked at the original documents for the development, and it was supposed to be a site for four houses. He

had expected there to be four houses, not a fifth house right on top of his house. He reiterated that it would totally destroy the way his house looked and destroy what he came out there for. He came for rolling hills and trees and not to have a cookie cutter sub where all the trees were knocked down. He said that when the meeting started, it was stated that it was an unusual request to take neighbors' property and build a house in between (not quite stated that way). He passed out some pictures he had taken.

Mr. Terracciano responded that there was a row of trees that were all dead. He did not show the actual landscape plan, but he assured that he would plant trees. He stated that his house would not be in front of Mr. Stashefsky's at all. He maintained that there was always a plan to build something on the property. He believed that the reason Mr. Stashefsky bought in that sub was because of the other homes Mr. Terracciano had developed, which created value. He clarified on the overhead map where his house would be and where the driveway would be.

Terry Willingham, 1171 Miners Run, Rochester, MI 48306. *Mr. Willingham asked which trees would be coming down, which Mr. Terracciano pointed them out. Mr. Willingham said that he lived across the pond. He recalled that the sub was originally set up for four houses. Prior to that, it was going to be an apartment complex, to which he was really opposed. He was okay with four houses of high quality going in, and the tree line was important to him. He was more interested in the tree line that went along the back of the houses. He had the same issue as Mr. Stashefsky in that the view would get changed, and the trees would come down.*

Mr. Terracciano said that the neighbor he bought the property from was already cutting down all the trees, because they were diseased. If he had not purchased the property, his neighbor would still cut down all the trees, but he told his neighbor that he did not have to if the condo got approved, because he would pay for that cost. He had set up the pond and spent a lot of money. The houses sold for a couple of million. His home would fit in, and it would have a lot of landscaping. He planned to have a pool, and his neighbor planned to add more trees. He believed they would be able to create a nice privacy for everyone and add brand new, healthy trees. Mr. Willingham said that he understood, it was just his understanding that originally, the site was approved for four homes, and it had been emphasized at the time that the trees were important to people, and that they needed to stay. He agreed that it would block Mr. Stashefsky's view of the pond.

Mr. Terracciano said that he did not have a view of the pond now. He added that the other four neighbors in the sub had all agreed with what was proposed before he even started, and they were friends. He said that if it was impacting anyone, it was the guy across the street from him who had spent the most money who would not have a view of the pond.

Chairperson Brnabic closed the Public Hearing at 7:17 p.m.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that as a casual remark, he really did not like seeing neighbors come together with so much tension. The Planning Commission always told developers to talk to their neighbors and get them on the same page to work out things. He suggested that a tree or something could go a long way. It bothered him when neighbors had so much conflict.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the pond was used for detention, or if it was a wetland feature. Mr. Terracciano said that it was an unregulated wetland. The only reason it was filled was because he got a well to feed it. When he first bought the property, there was no pond there; it was completely dry. He had heard that it could completely dry out, so in order to fix the problem he would have had to get rid of the pond or kept it filled at a certain height. Mr. Kaltsounis thought that the pool Mr. Terracciano wanted to have would be pretty close to the pond, but he considered that it was unregulated.

Mr. Gaber asked Mr. Terracciano why he was not doing a land division and instead going through the condo process. Mr. Terracciano said that originally, they did a four-lot land split, so they were out of divisions, and the only method he could use was the site condo process.

Ms. Morita asked if legal had looked at the private road agreement. She confirmed it was a private road, and said that she did not know what the agreement said, and if it had been put through Assessing to see if an additional unit could be created. The Planning Commission had not been provided that information as to whether or not the additional lot would legally have access to the road and whether or not another unit could be created under the LDA.

Ms. Roediger said that staff had many meetings with Assessing and Engineering about whether the proposal could even happen, so there was review. Ms. Morita asked if legal had looked at the private road agreement, and Ms. Roediger said that Mr. Staran had been involved in the discussions, but she was not sure whether he had looked at the

agreement. She offered that it could be confirmed before the matter moved forward to Council. Ms. Morita concluded that it would be a condition of approval. Another speaker had come in late:

Deborah Prachaseri, 1860 Carter Rd., Rochester Hills, MI 48306 Ms. Prachaseri had heard someone mention the pond. She said that she had lived in her house for over 30 years, and she knew the pond had been there all along, because her children had skated on it long ago. She asked if there would be a precedent regarding condominiums in the middle of houses. She knew that it was a four-lot approval originally, and that it was zoned RE Residential Estate, and she wondered if the zoning would still be the same.

Chairperson Brnabic said that it would be. She explained that site condos were comparable to houses; it was just a different form of ownership. Ms. Prachaseri said that originally, there would have been four families in four homes, but she asked if there would now be six.

Ms. Roediger said that the request was to add one more lot. There would be five homes instead of four and the addition of only one family. She agreed that a condominium was a different type of ownership. From a planning standpoint, the zoning was looked at, which was not changing. It would still be RE and still require a one-acre minimum lot. The proposed units met all the requirements for size and density for the district. Ms. Prachaseri asked if there would be a two-condo association, which Ms. Roediger confirmed.

Mr. Kaltsounis stated that by the book, the developer had met the requirements for the condo split. People thought of site condos as attached units, but he explained that they were separate homes. He lived in a site condo, and no one noticed the difference - it was a house. There would be a Master Deed and By-laws over the two homes. Hearing no further discussion, he moved the following, adding a condition so that no trees would be removed prior to approval of the site condo plan:

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schultz, in the matter of City File No. 19-014 Christenbury Site Condos, the Planning Commission **grants a Tree Removal Permit**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on June 20, 2019, with the following two findings and subject to the following three 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 22 regulated trees and replace on site.*

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. *Should the applicant not be able to meet the tree replacement requirements on site the balance shall be paid into the City's Tree Fund at a rate of \$216.75 per tree.*
3. *The Tree Removal Permit is contingent upon approval by City Council of the Final Site Condominium Plan..*

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schultz, that this matter be Granted . The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

2019-0324

Public Hearing and request for Preliminary Site Condominium Plan Recommendation - City File No. 19-014 - Christenbury Site Condos, a proposed two-unit site condo development on 2.4 acres, located south of Washington, west of Dequindre, zoned RE Residential Estate, Parcel Nos. 15-01-278-005 and -007, Vito Terracciano, Applicant

Mr. Kaltsounis clarified that the applicant was in agreement with adding a condition about having legal review the private road agreement.

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Dettloff, in the matter of City File No. 19-014 Christenbury Site Condos, the Planning Commission **recommends approval of the Preliminary Site Condominium Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on June 20, 2019, with the following six findings and subject to the following four 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 Christenbury Ct., thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the*

- site and on the adjoining street.*
3. *Adequate utilities are available to the site.*
 4. *The preliminary plan represents a reasonable street and lot layout and orientation.*
 5. *The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.*
 6. *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.*

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 performance bond for replacement trees in an amount to be determined, plus inspection fees, as adjusted as necessary by staff, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit by Engineering.*
3. *Payment of \$216.75 into the City's Tree Fund for one street tree, prior to the issuance of a Land Improvement Permit by Engineering.*
4. *Prior to the City Council meeting, the City Attorney shall review the private agreement to see if the home is allowed on the road.*

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Dettloff, that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting. The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

After each motion, Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously. She congratulated the applicants.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2019-0246 Zoning Ordinance Amendments:

R-5 Zoning District
Auburn Road Corridor Zoning Amendments

(Reference: Memos prepared by Giffel Webster, dated July 25, 2019 and proposed Ordinance amendments had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

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

Ms. Bahm recapped that R-5 was a new, single-family zoning district that would accommodate a slightly more dense and walkable residential district. They did not make a lot of changes, but just revised what the Planning Commission had recommended at the last meeting. They consolidated the building types to make it a little easier to understand. They limited the residential building types to single-family homes, two-family homes, the detached bungalow court and multi-plex, three or four-plex units. The latter would be designed to look like large, single-family homes, and they added a new provision that they could not occupy more than 25% of the total number of lots on a single block. She noted a correction on page 2, number 2, Table 4 under Permitted Uses, which should have been one-family detached dwelling units, and said that she would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Hooper recalled talking about State Licensed Residential Facilities for up to 12 residents under Conditional Uses. He recalled that the Planning Commission had a request for a facility in an R-3 district to go from six to 12 residents. They talked about parking and other things, and it did not get too much support. He could not conceivably see them in an R-5 district.

Ms. Roediger believed that the State required the City to offer those as a Conditional Use. Ms. Bahm felt that the City Attorney could weigh in, and perhaps they would have to add standards while staying within the State law. Mr. Hooper did not want to lead someone down a path thinking they had a chance, because he did not think the Planning Commission would recommend one in that dense of a district. Ms. Roediger said that if they could legally take it out, they would be happy to do so, and she would make sure before the Public Hearing.

Ms. Bahm thought that the deciding factor would be whether it was similar to what other residential uses were permitted in the district. If they felt that the density proposed in R-5 would be less, they might not have to include it. If they felt that the density would be comparable, it would be required to remain, and it would stay a Conditional Use.

Ms. Roediger said that if the Planning Commission felt comfortable, the Public Hearing would be scheduled for the August 20th meeting.

Mr. Reece asked how many parcels within the City the R-5 district would be applicable. Ms. Roediger said that it was for two or three areas of the City, so it was not a lot. Mr. Reece said that his only objection was that they talked a lot about density, and he felt that it could potentially make it worse. Ms. Roediger reminded that they also talked about affordability, which they were trying to provide. Ms. Bahm added that affordability came up repeatedly during the Master Plan process. There was a concern about housing and affordability for residents of all ages but notably, residents in the senior category of empty nesters who wanted to stay in the City but were looking to downsize. People did not feel that there was a lot available to them.

AUBURN ROAD (Brooklands)

Mr. Fazzini noted that at the June 5th meeting, Giffels was directed to meet with Council members Mr. Deel and Dr. Bowyer, which they did on June 17th. He advised that the new Brooklands district copied the C-1, Commercial Improvement chapter, and it would replace Chapter 3. They kept the format and some of the sections in the C-1 district. They brought in some new proposals as far as permitted and conditional uses and building typology that were not in the current Ordinance. They also brought in some of the FB-2 Overlay standards. Currently, some of the standards applied to the Brooklands area, but it was by reference to the Overlay, so it was not entirely clear what applied. They tried to bring in everything except certain accessory provisions and things like that into a singular chapter. Parking, landscaping and signage standards were from the FB-2 standards. Building height and typology were new proposals.

Mr. Fazzini mentioned site plan requirements currently in the C-1 district, which allowed unique, reduced requirements for the area. They were moved up in the chapter, because they were administrative. They wanted to discuss whether or not it was necessary to have unique site plan requirements or if the base Zoning Ordinance site plan requirements that applied throughout the City should be required.

Ms. Roediger clarified that when the C-1 Ordinance was drafted, the intent was to relax some of the requirements to allow for redevelopment and investment in the corridor, recognizing that there were older, small sites. Since the City was investing heavily in the area, she was not sure if they wanted to allow gravel parking lots, for example, or some of the other things that were allowed to be approved administratively. It was staff's opinion that a lot in the section might be outdated, but they wanted to run it by the Planning Commission before removing it completely.

Mr. Hooper asked if it would eliminate the C-I site plan requirements. Ms. Roediger agreed, and said that it would follow the normal Zoning Ordinance site plan procedures rather than allow special exceptions.

Mr. Gaber felt that it should be eliminated, given the circumstances. He did not know why they would want to provide additional flexibility, for example, being able to increase a floor area of a building by 25% or less without submitting a site plan. He agreed that they seemed like outdated regulations, and that they would hamstring the Commission's review. He thought that the normal standards should apply. Chairperson Brnabic agreed.

Mr. Kaltsounis thanked everyone for their hard work. He wondered if the corridor started to become the next Birmingham and people started buying houses, tearing them down and building massive houses in their place if they should do something regarding that aspect. He wondered if there would be a lot of people going before the Zoning Board of Appeals. Ms. Roediger asked if he was referring to the residential neighborhoods surrounding the district, to which Mr. Kaltsounis agreed. Ms. Roediger said that the proposed district only applied to Auburn Rd. Mr. Kaltsounis said that he understood, but he wondered if they needed to look at the abutting neighborhoods while they were discussing the Ordinance. Ms. Roediger asked if he meant that they should limit the maximum size of the houses in Brooklands. Ms. Bahm asked if he felt that they should be considering other amendments in the future that anticipated growth and change in the residential neighborhoods because of reinvestment in the commercial corridor. Mr. Kaltsounis agreed. Ms. Bahm did not know if there was the demand to do anything now, but they might want to think about trying to maintain the character and allow for some modest expansion and renovation or envision the tear downs and large home renovations. That would require some additional study.

Chairperson Brnabic did not think that would happen anytime soon. Mr. Kaltsounis said that it was just a hypothetical question looking forward. Ms. Roediger said that the district was R-4, and new houses had been built in the Brooklands. They tended to be two-story and a little larger than the homes that were traditionally there. The Ordinance had a 30% maximum lot coverage, which would prohibit the big-foot homes of downtown Rochester. Mr. Kaltsounis said that he would like to see growth and some change in the area, and Ms. Bahm said that it was worth keeping an eye on it, but she did not think anything had to be done immediately.

Mr. Fazzini talked about uses next, and said that they did not propose substantial changes from the previous use list. The list they created would replace the FB-2 uses allowed. Previously, drive-through facilities had been a conditional use, but based on the June meeting, there was strong consensus that they should be prohibited in the district, so that use had been moved to a new Prohibitive Use section.

Mr. Schultz wondered about a request for a bank. He felt that they would be hamstringing themselves for an opportunity that might come. He showed an example of a Flagstar bank with drive-through in another location.

Mr. Gaber felt that what Mr. Schultz was saying made sense. He did not know why they would want to foreclose an opportunity. As long as it was a conditional use, there were protections in place to ensure that it would not materially adverse the neighborhood. If the drive-through was in the rear of the building that was accessed from an alley, he thought that it would make sense. He stated that banks were one of the few types of businesses that were investing in bricks and mortar. He felt that there very well might be an opportunity for more financial institutions to invest in the district, and he felt that it would be part of the momentum to help the rest of the area develop. He indicated that there were other examples. He was involved in a site where a drive-through was put in downtown Clawson on 14 Mile, east of Livernois. It was in their walkable, central business district. There was a building with two or three tenants, and on the endcap, there was a Biggby coffee with a drive-through. It did not stick out, and it did not adversely affect the neighborhood. He did not think that they should just say no to them. He thought that having them as a conditional use made sense, because the Commission would have the ability to look at things on a case-by-case basis and make a determination as to whether it made sense. They would be precluded from doing that under the draft.

Ms. Morita thanked Giffels for going back and talking with Council members Dr. Bowyer and Mr. Deel. She felt that it was kind of their baby, and she was just along for the ride, whether she wanted to be or not. She liked the changes that were made, and she felt that they represented where Council would like to go. She had noticed that for the permitted and conditional uses, there were numbers listed, which she felt should be letters. Other than that, she said that she thoroughly appreciated the fact that they took her concerns to heart and addressed them.

Chairperson Brnabic questioned number three under the uses and read, "Existing Gas Stations, Auto Repair and Service, established prior to the effective date of adoption of the Chapter (X), provided no expansion of the auto related use is permitted." Ms. Bahm said that last time, they talked about the existing facilities and the ability to perhaps expand the convenience store portion of a gas station but not allowing extra gas pumps or service bays. It would just be for convenience purposes to have a retail store.

Chairperson Brnabic mentioned number seven "Lodging, Bed and Breakfast." She saw that hotels and motels had been removed, but she wondered why Bed and Breakfasts would be allowed as a principal use. In the definition in the Ordinance, it was a subordinate use. Ms. Bahm agreed that it could be deleted.

Mr. Hooper referred to the expansion of auto related uses. He clarified that if an existing gas station asked to triple the size of the store it would be allowed, but he wondered about the used car dealership that recently went up. The owner could ask to put a 7-Eleven next to his dealership. Ms. Bahm added that he could ask for a retail business to sell car accessories. Mr. Hooper stated that he was not trying to spot zone, but he wondered if the language was strong enough. Ms. Bahm said that if they stated that they were not permitted, the existing gas stations, etc. would still be able to remain. It would give people the opportunity to make some improvements with a type of use that could be more compatible with the district. Mr. Hooper suggested that they could incentivize it enough to find a different use. Regarding drive-throughs, he could see Mr. Schultz' and Mr. Gaber's points. He mentioned the survey result for drive-throughs, and it had 13 yes and 8 no votes. The picture referenced in the Ordinance showed a bank, but the drive-through could not really be seen. He considered that there might be a conflict with walkability.

Ms. Bahm said that since the goal for the district was to be a walkable part of the City, it seemed like not allowing drive-throughs would help get them to that point. She did not disagree with Mr. Schultz or Mr. Gaber that there could be opportunities for drive-throughs to be tucked into the back and be less intrusive to the walkable space, but it was a small area. She considered that they could prohibit them but if Planning got 25 calls a month asking about a bank with a drive-through, staff would probably come back to the Planning Commission and talk about that. They could try prohibiting for a while and see how it went. She stated that there were plenty of other places in the City they could be allowed. She suggested that they should let the area develop the way they envisioned as a very

walkable area with neighborhood-oriented uses and not auto-oriented uses. Mr. Hooper asked how they would turn down a McDonald's or Burger King even as a conditional use. Ms. Bahm said that in the district, there was not much difference from one block to another. If they allowed it in one place, it would be difficult to not allow it in another place. Mr. Hooper asked if they would have to grant one if it was a conditional use. Ms. Bahm said that they would have some leeway in terms of discretionary standards, but if one facility met those standards and another one came along, with similar traffic patterns, etc., it would be difficult to say no. Mr. Hooper said that would be his fear. If a conditional use could allow that opportunity, he would not support it. Ms. Bahm said that there would be a lot of momentum when the new streetscape was finished, and there would be a lot of interest. She thought that the City would be able to be more selective. She did not know if they needed to jump at the first bank with a drive-through that came along to stimulate the area. She thought that there would be other opportunities. However, if that was not true, and it seemed as if the only thing people wanted to build included a drive-through, they might have to make changes at that point.

Mr. Gaber asked why Assembly and Machining Operations was a conditional use and why it would be permitted under any circumstances. Ms. Bahm explained that there was a general idea that the area could still have a little bit of light industrial activity. Mr. Gaber asked for an example. He stated that it sounded totally contrary to what they were trying to accomplish. Ms. Bahm mentioned a small furniture maker or a metal cutter for gates and architectural features. They would try to mitigate odor, dust, lights and things like that.

Mr. Fazzini said that they had updated the Ordinance based on comments from the June meeting regarding height. The maximum would be two stories and another 15 feet, or an additional story, would be permitted as a conditional use. They had included standards for the impact of the additional height from the rear of a site on the adjacent residential. There was a preliminary list of conditional use standards on page six. The minimum building height had previously been 30 feet, two stories, and that was reduced to 18 feet, one story. The building design standards were the same; they had just been reorganized based on topic.

Mr. Hooper referenced condition one under Height and Floor Area Requirements and read, "Submission of architectural perspective drawings that illustrate the relationship of the additional height with the nearest residential buildings on any residentially-zoned parcels sharing a boundary with the site. Sight lines from windows or other occupied areas

of the subject building seeking additional height shall be indicated to minimize views from areas of additional height to adjacent residential buildings.” He asked how that would be regulated.

Mr. Fazzini said that the developer would need to make a new submission and provide site line studies. Mr. Hooper asked how they would tell if it was a good or bad site line. He was worried about subjectivity. Mr. Fazzini said that the concern was that people on a third floor terrace or window would look down on someone in an adjacent house. That was the basis for trying to come up with wording to address that, short of a requiring a direct view from window to window which could be overly restrictive. Ms. Bahm said that they might not see those types of submissions very often, but they could see a sketch up model from the architect that would show the residential component and a dashed line. Mr. Hooper said that he saw those types of perspectives all the time where he worked. He clarified that there would be no standards; it would just be reviewed for height and depth, etc. by the Commissioners. Mr. Hooper asked if they could say that with the proposed perspective and the site lines that the applicant was required to shield or obscure. Ms. Bahm asked if he wished to see the site lines eliminated or minimized. It was to minimize currently, because there was a recognition that site views might not be able to be completely eliminated. They could be minimized with a step back or with landscaping or some other architectural variation. Mr. Hooper felt that there should be the opportunity for three stories, but he thought he might be in the minority. He was trying to play devil’s advocate as to how it would be presented and how it would be regulated and approved or not. Ms. Bahm said that they could add “approaches to minimize site lines could include additional landscaping, step backs, etc.” Mr. Hooper asked about flat roofs versus pitched roofs, and if the 45-foot height for the third story would be to the average of the pitch of the roof or to the top of the roof. Ms. Bahm said that it would be to the midline roof or to the eave of a flat roof. Mr. Hooper considered that there could be another eight feet on top of the 45 feet. Ms. Bahm said that it would then have to be further set back from the residents.

Chairperson Brnabic indicated that she was trying to figure out how they had gotten to three stories from when things started in 2016. There had been a lot of concerns about the height for that area since there were many single-family, ranch homes. There was a concern about adding three stories to the area with the lack of parking and the traffic and so on. She had been getting the impression that to attract developers and investment, they had to look at three stories. She did not see it that way, however. Rochester Hills was ranked the safest City, it was in the top ten

places to live in the country, it was a top ten places to start a business, and it had been ranked eighth best city to start a small business. She had heard that mom and pop places were not going to be able to open in this district with new buildings. She reminded that there was a used car dealer that recently built a new building who felt that it was a good investment. She said that developers had been snatching up every available piece of property for quite a few years or redeveloping sites across the City, including at the former car dealership site on Auburn and Rochester Rd. She felt that business investment would come to the area if they only had one and two-story buildings. She pointed out that downtown Rochester had thrived for years with one and two stories, and that was what their Main St. was. They had a problem for years with parking with only one and two stories. She was afraid of what they were creating for the corridor. She was still bothered by the fact that when they started the project in 2016 and even at the open houses, they showed one to three stories, but now they were showing just three. The public input was a visual preference that strongly favored short brick buildings with façade offset, small pitched roofs, awnings, canopies with signs projecting off the sidewalks and two stories with simple, neo-traditional design. That was where they were. She indicated that she was not just a Planning Commissioner; she lived in the area. She had heard from the beginning, until recently, that the intent of the Auburn Rd. Corridor was to provide an update for the residents of the Brooklands area, to make it more liveable, safer and walkable, with a family atmosphere and the impression of a mini-downtown. All of a sudden, there were parking concerns they did not know how they would deal with, but they were going higher. She questioned the effect of a three-story building on residents in a single-story ranch home. She claimed that it would be towering over them, and it would not just be the boundary line residents; it would be seen all down the first streets. She was questioning why they would go to three stories. At the last open house, there were no examples or illustrations presented to residents of one and two-story buildings. Only three and four were shown. Ms. Morita had stated a concern, and the answer to her was that residents wanted three-story buildings with a step back. Chairperson Brnabic claimed that the residents had no other option than to pick a three or four-story building. She had been there and had questioned why there were no illustrations of at least a two-story. It was almost as if there had been a pre-determination that happened somewhere in between that changed the project. It was not the image a lot of them envisioned, and it was not the change for the area that Council had envisioned. She asked if people knew what kinds of businesses were thriving in the area currently. There were a lot, and they were only supposed to be doing an update to the area. When four stories was

proposed, she was basically horrified. She was very concerned that residents were only shown three and four-story buildings, and she put her little dot on the three-story step back, because it had been the best example she could find for three stories. She did not think they were truly asking the people of Brooklands what they wanted to see in the area; they were given a pre-determined choice. She thought that was wrong. When it started, four stories never existed, and it had since been eliminated, but only 20 or so people showed up, which she felt was probably a good thing, because they only saw three stories. She said that she ran into people in different areas of the subdivision who asked her what was going on. When she started explaining that they were talking about three stories, people were not happy. She was concerned with the direction it had taken. She had, for years, asked about the corridor, as had other Commissioners. She was a big supporter and very excited at the prospect of the project, but she was disappointed about the three stories. She did not think it was needed, and she pointed out that if warranted, there could always be a change in the future. They talked about monitoring the parking, because they did not have the answers. They would be adding to the area with three stories when they did not even have answers about parking, which was short now. There were a few businesses that dominated the parking, and she questioned what would happen if they added three-story buildings. She recalled that Ms. Morita had stated that they were losing focus about why Council chose to move forward with improving the corridor. The area was the most neglected sector of the City that had had no investment for decades. They were redoing the road and making it safer to walk in the area, because it was a health, safety and welfare issue. It was about making the area more livable and safer for people who lived there. She agreed that they had lost the focus by talking about three stories. The intent behind the investment was to make it a walkable neighborhood and if people drove through, they might stop at the local businesses or a restaurants. She thought that there would be investment, and she did not think that they needed three-story buildings. She stated that they should be going with one and two stories. She knew that there was interest, because at the joint meeting in January, Ms. Valentik (Economic Development Manager) had said that there were people calling, because they were interested in the area. Ms. Valentik had said that nowhere else in the City was there a stronger concentration of business owners, entrepreneurs and people running great businesses. Chairperson Brnabic said that she could not have stated it better than Ms. Morita about what had happened. She said that she did not have anything against three-story buildings; it was just not the place for them, in such a small area. It was supposed to be a special district, and there was supposed to be an update for the area. However, to

create three-story buildings with parking and traffic and everything that went with that, she was concerned. She did not think that three stories was appropriate for the area. The lots were very small, and that was what also concerned her about drive-throughs for the area. She said that Giffels' intention was always not to include drive-throughs, and she understood why. She had nothing against them, and she used them. She did not think they were appropriate for the area, and with all the other concerns about parking, traffic and the roundabouts and trying to make the area safe and walkable and a family atmosphere, that was a concern. She thought that they might be a possibility after they saw how things worked out, but at the start, she did not think they were a good idea. They asked in the survey about them, and people did not want them. She reiterated that she would not like to see three stories, and if one and two did not work, perhaps they would have to look at other options. She was upset that at least two stories was not shown at the open house, and it appeared to be pre-determined. If there had been illustrations of one, two and three stories, she felt that they would have gotten a more accurate opinion from people in the area.

Ms. Bahm said that she heard everything Chairperson Brnabic said about the area being designed to be a walkable, compact, family-friendly area for the residents that had lived in the Brooklands for many years and to attract new residents. They had that conversation during the Master Plan process. They had raised the issue about additional height in the area to accommodate including the costs of reconstruction. There were viable businesses in the area, and for a business owner to take down he or her business, there was a cost, and to replace it with exactly the same might not be financially feasible. They wondered if two stories would be realistic. The lots were not big, and the development could not be the same as elsewhere in the City. They talked about four stories, and heard that it was not at all acceptable. They backed it down to three with the step back idea. At that time, there was reasonable consensus. Not everyone wholeheartedly embraced the idea of three stores, but they felt that there was consensus amongst most that it was a reasonable approach. It was an option shown at the open house. Everyone knew what a two-story looked like, and they felt that if they asked if it should be one, two, three or four that everyone would say two. The question was IF it was to be three, if people would support that. It was not asking people to pick an option, but the only option was three stories. She talked to people about the City encouraging and promoting the area as an economic opportunity, and they wanted to be able to facilitate and leverage some private investment. They were not forcing people to choose among the same choices. They were asking if any would be reasonable if the City allowed it. They still felt

that there was enough consensus to continue to move it down the road. If the Commission felt that two was plenty, then two was what they should do. In a year, if a lot of people had been asking for a third story, they could add it later. She did not want everyone to think that they were pushing it on the City. They just wanted people to think about it within the framework of being in a very residential place. They did not feel that it would be terribly imposing or out of context, but she did not want them to feel as if they were pressing for three stories.

Chairperson Brnabic mentioned downtown Rochester at one and two stories, which had been very successful. She felt that the infrastructure being done was an incentive for developers. Ms. Bahm agreed that there would not be a shortage of people interested in the area. If the economics worked, they would be there. They were trying to give a little additional height as an option. At the Public Hearing, they could present two options for the public (two stories and three with step back).

Chairperson Brnabic said that from the beginning, they talked about the current business owners and what the City could do to assist them. She heard from them that the main concern was the infrastructure costs, and the City was doing something about it. She was concerned about smashing 50 lbs. into a 20 lb. bag. The parking was going to be a big issue, and they did not have an answer for how it would be supplied. The City was done with funding, so it could not buy spaces. She said that she was grateful that they had funded what they had so the area could finally move forward. She felt that they could move a little slower regarding three stories and drive-throughs and see what the outlook became. It did not mean that the Ordinance could not be tweaked and that they could not have further conversations in the future.

Ms. Roediger responded that Administration had talked about it for a long time internally and with the Planning Commission. The City was investing heavily in the area, and they looked at what would be defined as success in the district. If they completed all of the road and plaza projects and nothing really changed in the corridor, she felt that they would have failed. With the Ordinance, they were trying to create a framework that would allow for an appropriate level of redevelopment. Administration's concerns were about missing an opportunity to affect change as part of the project. They talked about the land values in the area, and that there would be no shortage of people coming. That would be accurate if the framework was there to allow people to succeed. There were costs associated with tearing down a building and constructing new. The Bozana Liquor store had been for sale for years. The land costs in the

corridor would only go up with the City's investment. Administration was concerned about creating a walkable area and to have a destination in the Brooklands. That would include density and residential on upper floors. They questioned the viability of a two-story with residential on one floor versus on the second and third floor. Regarding having the corridor turn into a whole three-story district was why it was a conditional use. It would allow for the opportunity, if it arose, to affect change. They looked a lot at the existing businesses. Throughout the process, they asked what was there that they were trying to save, whether it was the fence company or the electronic company. They had not had reinvestment in decades, and they wanted to make sure they were providing an opportunity for success. They were concerned that if they did not allow a third floor option as a conditional use that it might hamstring the City from allowing success. The City would be afraid of missing an opportunity to create exactly what they wanted to create - affordable, diverse housing options and a mixed-use, walkable area. She did not think that downtown Rochester would be able to be done the way it was now because of the land values.

Discussed

Chairperson Brnabic said that she did understand land values. That was why she stayed in the middle for a while and considered things. She did not understand why two-story buildings could not be profitable. Ms. Bahm said that they might be able to do a model, with staff input, on local property values and cost of construction and get an idea of what first floor rents would have to be and what residential spaces would be. It sounded to her as if they still needed to have discussion about it. She wondered what others felt. Chairperson Brnabic thought it would be a good idea to bring some financial information.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that they did not want to turn too many knobs, that is, when they made changes, they wanted to make the least amount so if something went wrong, it could be readily seen. He said that he could approve a one or two-story approach, because it was an easier thing to do. He did not think Rochester Hills was downtown Rochester. He thought that it might be similar to downtown Auburn Hills in that they needed to find a way to grow. Auburn Hills made the same type of investment as the City 12 years ago or so. They were now putting in four-story buildings. In order to make a developer want to move into the Brooklands area, they had to consider that Auburn Hills was their competition. He said that having a lot of people show interest was one thing, but having people invest money was another. If they put restrictions

on drive-throughs, they would be setting themselves back ten years. He used that date, because it took that long for Auburn Hills. He did not know if they should start with one and two stories, but he did not really think that it would work. He said that he did not mind finding out if it did, but the precedent had been set down the street that they had to go higher than two. He said that his nephew lived in an apartment there and it was full, and they were putting in a four-story nearby. He wanted one to two stories to work, but he reiterated that he really did not think it would.

Mr. Reece indicated that he was not an engineer, but he was an architect, and he worked with a lot of developers, so he knew where they would come from. He did not think Chairperson Brnabic could have spoken more eloquently about the concerns of a three-story building. He said that he was not about the opportunity to affect change on the back of the residents in the neighborhood who had lived there forever. They could have sketch up models and financial models and perspectives that attempted to show what a three-story step back would look like 30 or 40 feet from the resident across the alley, but they would not want that building in their back yard. He felt that it was incumbent on the developers to come up with creative ways to go one or two stories. He stated that they were not Auburn Hills, and they were not Rochester. They were who they were, and sometimes he thought that they tried to be too many things to too many people. His main office was in Lansing. He mentioned Reo Town there, which was an area very similar to the Auburn Hills corridor. He drove through Reo Town, and he was shocked and amazed at the one and some two-story buildings on a Tuesday afternoon. They had an open food fair for all the residents of the area, and the streetscape was packed with people, and the enthusiasm he witnessed when he drove through took his breath away. He did not think the Auburn corridor was the appropriate location for a three-story step back. He did not think there was the infrastructure or parking to support it, and they would be making the area more congested than it already was. If the developers did not come because it was not three stories, he thought that there would be enough interest in the area in the two stories. He thought that Mr. Schultz had a lot of good ideas about the drive-through. If Mr. Reece were to consider one, they would have to condition it such that it was very restrictive on the hours, use and location. It did "smack in the face" of wanting it to be a walkable community, and having cars pull out into a walkable community was a complete contradiction of what they were trying to accomplish.

Mr. Gaber thanked everyone on both sides of the issue for all their thoughtfulness. He came down on the site that if one or two stories would

be redeveloped to evolve into their vision, he thought that was great and could work. However, he was skeptical as to whether that would happen given the economics of the situation and what he had dealt with on the development side. He saw no harm in allowing a conditional use for a third story. That meant that there would be a lot of constraints. There were additional standards that had been proposed for specific conditional use standards, and he felt that they made sense. He had been involved in lawsuits dealing with conditional use approvals. It was very difficult for someone to defeat a municipality when the municipality had discretion based on conditional or special use standards. He felt that the community would be protected, and he thought that there were other protections built in. If someone wanted to build three stories, they had to satisfy the parking requirements. If there was a three-story building that the Commission determined was in the best interest of the community to approve, he would not mandate that there be a step in on the front and rear of the building. He thought that should be looked at on a case-by-case basis. He would add that as a specific condition stating that there was a preference for it, and it shall be evaluated by the applicant as to why it could not be built that way or if it made sense. He realized that no one had a crystal ball. They could only look at the information they had, the investment the community was making and the objectives they were trying to accomplish and balance the considerations of the neighborhood and the residents to see what made sense. He did not believe in precluding such an opportunity. He thought that the conditions would make it difficult to achieve a third story, but if a developer could show that it made sense, he thought that the City should have the opportunity to approve the project.

Mr. Schroeder observed that the area had always had traffic problems. By improving the area, they were going down to two lanes. The marginal friction that they were creating was tremendous, and it would be a problem. There were two roundabouts, which were put in for safety, and they would definitely slow down the traffic. People would be looking for parking spots, and when there was an accident, it would tie up the whole area. People might stop going that way. There was development on Auburn from Livernois west that had a traffic level of D. When the development was finished, the level of service would be F. The westbound traffic in the afternoon would be at a standstill. When the traffic study was done, it would show that the majority of the problems came from the residents themselves trying to find ways around their own subdivisions. He did not think that they should encourage more people and cars with three stories, which he felt would make the problem much worse.

Mr. Dettloff noted that he worked with downtowns a lot. As Chairperson Brnabic said, when they got involved a few years back, there was no doubt that the area needed some TLC. He was very excited to see the commitment that was made on all sides. His opinion, in hearing from a lot of the businesses and residents in the area was that plans were done in the past but nothing had happened. The new plan presented a real opportunity, and the City had stepped up to the plate. He thought that they were getting a little ahead of themselves in some of the discussions. As Mr. Gaber said, he also appreciated the comments from both sides of the aisle. As Mr. Reece said, they were not downtown Rochester or Auburn Hills. He thought that they had to see what the future would bring. He would support a drive-through, and for the height issue, he did not think that three stories with a step back would necessarily be out of character for the area. However, they had no idea what would happen. Ms. Valentik had indicated that there was interest, but he felt that they needed to get through the streetscape and everything. He did not think that they should be overly restrictive moving forward and possibly shoot themselves in the foot for potential investment and development. He thought that there was a way to satisfy all parties. He agreed that the Planning Commission would have a lot of discretion when it came to a conditional use.

Mr. Schroeder said that he did not mean to be negative. He thought that they should take it slow and not just jump in. They should take baby steps, not giant steps. People would gradually adjust and find different traffic patterns. He did not think that they should do everything all at once and create a massive problem. He stated that he was not against the project, and the City was cleaning up a real problem.

Ms. Roediger summarized that the outstanding items were three stories and drive-throughs as conditional uses. A Public Hearing needed to be scheduled for the matter. They had to determine which draft they wanted to put forward at the Public Hearing. She suggested a straw poll to try to get the majority vote.

Chairperson Brnabic said that they did not have the conditions that would be placed on drive-throughs. Ms. Bahm said that they could develop some. Ms. Roediger mentioned that when she worked in West Bloomfield, the concern was about fast food restaurants, and they had a condition that no restaurants with deep fryers were allowed. They could say that drive-throughs were a permitted accessory to banks, for example. Ms. Bahm added that people would not be allowed to exit onto Auburn

Rd. Chairperson Brnabic said that they would still infringe into the residential area. Ms. Bahm agreed, and said that was why they had recommended to not bother with drive-throughs for now. They did not want the cars on the Auburn Rd. side, and if the access was moved to the back, there would be noise and light issues and traffic with the residential.

Ms. Bahm asked if the Commissioners felt that they could be okay with a third-story step back with some additional standards to help minimize the views and that limited the uses. They could ask the question and always scale it back if needed.

Ms. Morita suggested that they should leave the drive-through out for now. She did not think that it would get passed by Council. She understood the concerns about the third story, but she said that she would like to open the issue up at the Public Hearing to see if residents had a strong opinion. She said that she was not sure she was in favor, but she liked the step back provision a lot better. She liked the fact that they were not looking at four stories any longer, but she would like to see if they got public comment about the third story.

Mr. Gaber asked about parking, noting that it had not been talked about. He thought that they should discuss it.

Mr. Fazzini said that they included the text from FB to see what was required in the area currently. The underlined text in c. and d. were changes. The shared parking section in g. had been replaced with the proposal the Commission saw last month. Nothing had been changed with the ratios. 1.5 per residential dwelling unit was the same. The valet issue had been removed. At the June meeting, the 500-foot distance from public parking lots was agreed upon, which had been added. The driveway section they previously had shown was removed, and it would now be under the City Engineer's jurisdiction.

Mr. Gaber noted subsection d. Offstreet Public Parking which said that the minimum parking requirement may be reduced by 15 spaces if a public lot is within 500 feet of the proposed use. He asked how they came up with 15 spaces. He thought that it should be a ratio and percentage reduction depending on the need. There could be a building that took up a whole block or a small building. A small building might have zero parking requirements. Ms. Bahm said that the calculation was based on the average depth of a building and a typical storefront square-footage divided by 400 feet which was 15 square feet. The idea was that one average building could have parking covered. If it was a larger use, the

extra parking would have to be provided. She said that they had talked about monitoring the parking as it was being utilized as businesses expanded, and they might have to do some refinements.

Mr. Gaber asked if a normal-sized business might have zero parking requirements. Ms. Bahm said that they could if across from public parking. They would want to encourage shared parking. Mr. Gaber asked what would happen when the public parking was maxed out. Ms. Bahm said that they would monitor to see if requirements needed to be changed. Mr. Gaber asked if the people who came first would be grandfathered, which Ms. Bahm confirmed. The first one in was taking the risk, and they might get an incentive for doing so.

Mr. Dettloff pointed out downtown Rochester where developers were required to pay into a fund for future parking spaces. Ms. Roediger said that the City did not currently have that requirement. Mr. Dettloff said that he would like to discuss that so that the burden was not totally on the City. Ms. Bahm said that when they got ready for the Public Hearing, they would include payment in lieu of parking or some sort of special assessment. They did not have to solve everything today, because she stated that currently, there was not a problem. If they did set up a payment in lieu, she felt that it would be good to have a general plan of how to spend the money. They would have to watch the area closely.

Ms. Morita stated that she was completely against doing any type of special assessment for parking. She maintained that it was difficult to defend or enforce, and she had no appetite for it.

Chairperson Brnabic recapped the votes for and against a drive-through, which would have to have strong conditions of approval attached (seven to two for). Mr. Schroeder asked if they could require a traffic study for a drive-through, which was confirmed. Chairperson Brnabic brought up three stories. She asked if all examples would be shown or if only a three-story with a step back would be shown. Ms. Bahm said that the height would be the third story option with the step back.

Mr. Reece maintained that they needed to show pictures of two stories as well as three, and they needed to state that two stories was permissible and three-stories was a conditional use. If they just showed people three stories and did not give them the opportunity to comment on a two-story they would hear the issues commented on earlier in the discussion. He asked how the public would be noticed about the Public Hearing. They would have to have a strong mail campaign, notices on the website, etc.

or they would get only 20 people. They would not get the input from the residents who would be impacted the most. He asked how the meeting would be noticed. They heard from people that a notice went to homes 300 feet from a location, but they were the next house over and did not get a notice. He wanted to make sure the people were involved, because it would affect the people who had lived in the neighborhood for years. He felt that those were the people they should be worrying about - not the developers.

Ms. Roediger advised that besides mailing to people within 300 feet, the area was unique because staff had worked with a lot of people. There were emails for people who had come to any meeting; an Auburn Rd. Redevelopment Facebook page with almost 300 members; and a Proud to be from Brooklands Sub Facebook page that had 1700 people. The City could also put up signage.

Mr. Reece did not know why they needed a straw poll vote on two or three stories. He thought that they should just say that the permitted use was two stories, and three stories with a step back was a conditional use, and show examples of each.

Mr. Gaber wondered why it had to be a preference. The people who lived there would say that they did not want three, but there were other considerations the City had. He asked if it was strictly the neighbors who lived adjacent who would completely determine the outcome of the height. Mr. Reece asked how he would like a three-story hotel in the back of his house. Mr. Gaber said that was why it would be a conditional use. Mr. Reece asked why both options could not be shown. Mr. Gaber thought that sample streetscapes with one, two and three stories should be shown. Mr. Reece did not think that was going to be shown. Ms. Bahm said that they would show the draft language as it was that stated that two stories were permitted and the third floor might be a conditional use if it was set back and met other standards. She claimed that most all of the graphics shown were two stories. She said that she understood asking the question about which someone preferred, but in their experience, given the choice, people likely would prefer two stories. If the Commissioners felt that was the most important determination that was fair. It was a matter of understanding the implications between two and three in terms of leveraging private investment and the rehabilitation of the corridor envisioned by the City along with understanding the neighbors' concerns and presenting an Ordinance that responded to both.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that at the end of the day, if they showed three or four

at the Public Hearing, everyone would say no. If everyone said no and it did not work, in ten years, they would remember when people showed up in the room and said "no." He was thinking about the future, and he thought that the safest bet would be to show one and two stories, and they would have to let it fail. They would have to come back and rethink everything. He said that it would be easier to rethink it without having had a meeting where everyone was upset with the City than stating what was going on and what the options were.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Paul Boulanger, 2025 Mapleridge Rd., Rochester Hills, MI 48309 Mr. Boulanger thanked the Commissioners for giving their time. He said that he had been to many meetings in many cities, and he had seen some cities grow and one that was dying. The latter had tried to expand the city, and developers literally took over. The problem he saw on Auburn Rd. was that he did not see any developers coming forward saying that they needed a three-story building. He asked if there were any. He drove down Auburn and saw one-story businesses. He asked what a one-story business would do if a three-story business wanted to move in next door. He thought that it might have to move out and go somewhere else. He knew that things did not always stay the same, but many people were worried about that change. Regarding three stories, he stated that they had to consider the road first. Ambulances went to the nearest hospital. The nearest hospital was down Dequindre, and ambulances would have trouble if people parked on the side of the road. He claimed that some cities, such as Berkley, had developed two lanes down their major streets - one for bicycles and another for parking, and then there was a sidewalk for pedestrians. He stated that businesses wanted traffic to slow down. He suggested that when people complained about development on property next to theirs, the City could show them site line drawings and discuss it further. He brought up the Adams and Hamlin area where Legacy of Rochester Hills was being developed, noting that flat pictures had been shown. He asked who looked down from an airplane on a property. People looked from ground level, and that was why there was a concern about two, three and four stories. He stated that people did not really want a four-story apartment building looking down into their house, which he claimed was going to happen in that area. He thought that the Planning Commission handled problems pretty well even though there was some discourse. He said that it had been a pleasure to attend the meeting and listen to the way things were handled. He felt that a lot of good points had been raised. He heard that the Auburn Rd. corridor was to be walkable. Auburn was built to get traffic from one area to another, and no one wanted to go into an area where they would have trouble

getting in to a business or have trouble getting out. He hoped that was being considered as well.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Chairperson Brnabic reminded the Commissioners that the next Regular Meeting was scheduled for August 20, 2019.

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 9:35 p.m.

Deborah Brnabic, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Secretary