



Rochester Hills Minutes Planning Commission / City Council Joint Meeting

1000 Rochester Hills
Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309
(248) 656-4660
Home Page:
www.rochesterhills.org

PLANNING COMMISSION

*William Boswell, Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, Kathleen Hardenburg,
Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis, David Reece, C. Neall Schroeder*

CITY COUNCIL

*Erik Ambrozaitis, Jim Duistermars, Barbara Holder, Greg Hooper,
Linda Raschke, James Rosen, Ravi Yalamanchi*

Tuesday, June 27, 2006

7:30 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Boswell called the Special Joint meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the auditorium.

ROLL CALL

Present: William Boswell, Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, Kathleen Hardenburg, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis, David Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Barbara Holder, Linda Raschke, James Rosen and Ravi Yalamanchi

Absent: Erik Ambrozaitis and Jim Duistermars

Quorum Present Planning Commission and City Council.

Also Present: Ed Anzek, Director, Planning and Development
Derek Delacourt, Deputy Director, Planning and Development
Dan Casey, Manager of Economic Development
Amy Chesnut, McKenna Associates, Inc.
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

COMMUNICATIONS

- A) Letter from O. Luedeke, dated June 21, 2006 re: Master Plan
- B) Letter from W. Popyk, dated June 23, 2006 re: Oakville Estates

NEW BUSINESS

2005-0107 Request for approval of the 2005/2006 Master Land Use Plan Distribution Draft as required to be sent to adjacent communities, schools and required State agencies for a 95-day review and comment period.

(Memo prepared by Derek Delacourt, dated June 24, 2006 had been placed on file and became part of the record thereof).

*Present for the applicant was Amy Chesnut, McKenna Associates, Inc.
235 Main St., Suite 105 Northville, MI 48167.*

Mr. Delacourt gave a brief overview of the process regarding the Master Land Use Plan Distribution Draft. He recapped that for over a year, a Technical Committee, comprised of members of the Planning Commission, City Council, Historic Districts Commission, Planning Staff and McKenna Associates, Inc. had been working on an update to the Master Land Use Plan. He emphasized that the draft was not going to be approved at this point, but just released for distribution to surrounding communities and reviewing agencies required by State law for a 95-day comment period. He advised that the draft had been available on the City's web site for over a month and that an electronic version was sent to all members. He introduced Ms. Chesnut of McKenna Associates, Inc., who outlined an agenda, including that they would discuss the adoption process, and go through the basics of the plan, the implementation and the next steps.

Ms. Chesnut advised that stakeholder workshops were held in February of 2005, and that there was an online survey to solicit additional comments from the public. That information was used by the Technical Committee to formulate some of the goals and objectives in the Plan, which occurred in the last quarter of 2005. For the past five months, the Technical Committee had worked on refining the Plan and had developed the Implementation chapter.

Ms. Chesnut noted that the adoption process was different than that of the previous Master Plan. It was now a multi-stage process. The first part was a 95-day distribution to surrounding communities and required governmental agencies for review and comment. During that time, there would be the opportunity to review and discuss the plan in more detail. She advised that there would be an open house on August 29, at which the public would have further time to comment on the plan. After they received comments from all surrounding communities and entities, a Public Hearing was planned, and the Planning Commission would be the body that approved the Plan.

Ms. Chesnut explained that the Planning Commission would make a recommendation to City Council about approving distribution of the draft, but it could not be sent out until City Council approved it. City Council had the option to approve it or send it back to the Commission. If the Plan was approved for distribution, it would be sent to the surrounding communities, the County, SEMCOG, and other agencies for 95-days. She reiterated that the Plan was being reviewed for a recommendation only and that it was not being approved in any manner. There was still a lot of time for Planning Commission, City Council and the public to comment on the Plan. The main public opportunity would be at the open house, an informal event with booths set up at City Hall to view different components of the Plan and get answers to any questions.

Ms. Chesnut continued that after the 95-day comment period, the Planning Commission would take all the comments received and consider them in any revisions to the Plan. All the comments received would be advisory and it would not be required to incorporate them, but they would be considered. Subsequent to that, the Planning Commission would hold a Public Hearing to received additional comments and the Plan could be adopted at that time.

Ms Chesnut gave some background information on the Plan. She stated that Rochester Hills was entering into a new phase of development, going from a growing community to a built-out community looking at redevelopment of existing sites, as opposed to green field development. New development would be on smaller, infill sites and new development on large, vacant parcels would become increasingly rare. She noted that of the large parcels left, many had environmental issues that had to be taken into consideration. She referred to the existing zoning regulations, noting that they had been tailored for a growing community and had served Rochester Hills as it had grown, but they did not anticipate redevelopment. New planning and zoning tools were needed to deal effectively with growth in the community. The future land use plan included tools to deal with conditions affecting the City, including flexibility in land uses for nonresidential areas. Flexibility meant there were areas planned for nonresidential uses where several uses on a site were permitted. Something might have traditionally been all commercial; now commercial and office and some residential would be allowed. A traditional use-specific approach had been planned for many areas, but primarily, the residential land use areas would stay the way they were. The key goal of the Technical Committee and McKenna was protection of the residential areas. No density or land use changes were proposed for single-family areas. Secondly, they heard from the public that expansion of commercial uses beyond where they were currently located or zoned was not desired. They also needed to maintain the nonresidential tax base, while keeping the nonresidential properties from becoming obsolete. Another goal was to have quality development to improve the appearance of the City. They encouraged more timeless architecture and amenities within a development, and encouraged pedestrian connections - or emphasized the pedestrian focus - while taking into account that there were auto-oriented uses.

Ms. Chesnut showed the Future Land Use Map on the overhead projector, noting that there were essentially the same categories from the past meetings. The Mixed Use areas were changed to Flexible Use, because mixed use was not required on a site. Flexible would allow mixed use, with the provision that design criteria be followed. She advised of the four Residential categories, which had been planned

based on existing development patterns in the City, and were intended to preserve the character of the neighborhoods. There was a Multiple-Family designation, which included apartments, townhouses, and condos; and One-Family Cluster housing, which included open space developments. There were now Flexible Use one through three designations (FU-1 to FU-3), all of which were based on conventional, or use-specific, zoning with an overlay option that would allow a developer to choose between conventional or an overlay, and permit a variety of uses on the site. FU-1 would permit residential and office, but no retail; FU-2 and FU-3 would permit office, retail and residential. The difference between 2 and 3 was the intensity of retail. The overlay would allow mixing the uses or a single use on the site, but there would have to be compliance with the design standards and guidelines set up in the Master Plan. The specifics would have to be worked out in a Zoning Ordinance amendment. There was an Office category and those areas were planned in general along Barclay and along South Boulevard. Ms. Chesnut pointed out a proposed new designation called the Regional Employment Center, which essentially encompassed the SmartZone boundaries. She advised that the Landfill Planning and Private Recreation areas were also new, and they would help make sure open space areas stayed open and preserved. (Ms. Chestnut had a brief problem with the laptop so several other comments were taken).

Mr. Kaltsounis stated that as a member of the Technical Committee, it was important to him to try to preserve the density of the current residential areas. He mentioned that he used to live on Hazelton (east of Livernois, south of Auburn) and the area had homes in the R-1 and R-2 density range. It had become more dense over the last few years because there were a lot of R-4 developments being added. He noted that Ms. Chesnut mentioned the density did not change. It was recommended that it be less dense than the current R-4 zoning, and they proposed preserving it through the Plan. They hoped to change the Zoning Ordinance to help protect what was there and keep the neighborhoods the way they were.

Mr. Boswell advised that anyone wishing to speak would need to fill out a card and turn it in to the Secretary.

Mr. Delacourt stated that the Technical Committee wished for input from the members regarding the Distribution Draft. They wished to know if anything had been missed, or if something changed that required discussion or resolution before they went forward with the distribution.

Ms. Chesnut showed the existing commercial zoning and where Flexible Business areas were planned. There were some areas along Auburn that were currently zoned, but not planned, commercial in the future.

There were areas with PUDs that were planned to be Flexible areas and there were existing areas zoned commercial that were not planned for future Flexible use.

Ms. Chesnut explained that new overlay districts were proposed for the Flexible Business areas and the Mixed Residential areas. The properties would essentially have two zonings; the base zoning and an overlay of Flexible use. It would give the property owner the right to choose which standards they wanted to comply with. The overlay zones would permit more Flexible uses than allowed in conventional zoning. The development standards would be tailored to make sure that the overlay zones were compatible with conventional zones. A benefit of the overlay approach would be that property owners would retain the rights they currently possessed under conventional zoning and would also have another option to develop their property. The benefit to the City would be that a clear vision could be established for redevelopment - how the City would want things to look. It could include how tall the buildings should be, the materials that should be used, where parking should be, etc.

Ms. Chesnut stated that the implementation of the Plan was something the Technical Committee had worked a lot on over the last couple of months. She noted that a plan was only as good as its implementation, and it was a very important part of the Master Plan. Some specific implementation tasks included Zoning Ordinance amendments; natural features activities (Steep Slope Ordinance, woodlands map); that significant economic development activities were needed to retrain and recruit businesses and to find ways to encourage redevelopment within Olde Towne and the Regional Employment Center (REC); identifying Historic Districts; and continuous planning. She advised that new zoning districts would need to be created for the Regional Employment Center, as would overlays for the Mixed Residential, Flexible Use areas and Landfill Planning areas. They needed to look at existing development standards for parking, landscaping, and other design guidelines, to make sure they were compatible with the vision of the Plan. They needed to ensure that the conventional development was compatible with the Flexible overlay districts. She advised that there was a Natural Features Inventory prepared by Dr. Steve Niswander, and some recommendations from that analysis included updating the City's floodplain map, adopting a Steep Slope Ordinance, riverbank restoration, protecting woodland areas, looking at a stormwater management program, and looking at Leed (green) building.

Ms. Chesnut referred to implementation of economic development and stated that they discussed establishing an Economic Development Committee to investigate the continued relevance of the Olde Towne

Corridor Study; promoting redevelopment of key corridors in commercial areas; developing the M-59 corridor as a premier office location, and addressing parking and other related issues.

Ms. Chesnut talked about designating historic and cultural resources as an implementation of the Plan. She stated that they should raise public awareness of the Historic Districts, and make sure they incorporate historic preservation into the land use and zoning decisions. The Plan must be looked at every five years, but some things dictated that it be looked at more often. They must update the Parks and Recreation Plan (done) and the Master Thoroughfare Plan, and implement the Gateways Plan. Ms. Chesnut asked if there were questions. Mr. Delacourt added that they would like any input and wanted to make sure they had come up with a Plan both boards felt comfortable moving forward.

Mr. Yalamanchi asked if they tried to take into consideration the parameters of Rochester Hills and the potential changes in other communities when they developed the Plan.

Ms. Chesnut agreed they took those items into consideration. She reminded that other cities would have an opportunity to comment on the Master Plan and see if it impacted them. Mr. Yalamanchi asked if we looked at other cities' Master Plans, which Mr. Delacourt affirmed. Mr. Yalamanchi asked about residential density and keeping it the same or lowered. Ms. Chesnut responded that one of the concerns heard loud and clear from the public was about making sure the neighborhoods were preserved. The four single-family Residential zoning districts were identified, which corresponded to the development pattern that had evolved. In some areas, development evolved that was less dense than what it was currently zoned. If there were a lot of parcels divided, it would change the neighborhood's character, so they planned areas as they existed.

Mr. Delacourt indicated that there were a couple of areas in the City where that was the case. He explained that some areas were currently zoned R-4, which was the most dense of the single-family designations. Much had been redeveloped by people assembling parcels, but the underlying parcels had been the size of R-2 or R-3 zoned parcels. The updated Master Plan identified those areas and planned lower density zoning - and rezonings - which could be implemented through amendments to the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Yalamanchi asked if they would try to amend the Zoning Ordinance in accordance with the Master Plan. Mr. Delacourt said that the current Master Plan did not have various residential density categories, so there was not a basis to recommend that the City implement the rezonings. The proposed Plan would provide a basis, should the Planning Commission and City Council

want to rezone parcels.

Mr. Yalamanchi asked for clarification about the three Flexible Use designations. He asked if the business areas would change to include business and residential. Ms. Chesnut said there was an option in FU-2 and 3, but FU-1 would not permit retail. Mr. Yalamanchi asked if there was retail in FU-1 areas currently. Ms. Chesnut said she did not believe so, but it was pointed out that west of Crooks, south of Auburn there were parcels with retail development that were planned for FU-1. Ms. Chesnut explained that there was a lot of "hodge podge" along Auburn, and they tried to organize and improve the Auburn Road corridor, and tried to determine if different types of land uses would be appropriate. In some areas, there might be commercial that was now being planned for single-family because they were in a single-family area of Auburn.

Mr. Yalamanchi asked if FU-2 would allow retail and residential and if it added retail. Ms. Chesnut corrected that none of the Flexible Use areas added retail; they allowed other uses in the commercial areas. Mr. Delacourt said that there were areas along the Auburn corridor that were zoned B-1, and only allowed small retail or small professional offices, but under the new Plan, if those areas were redeveloped, they could only have office or residential and the retail would become non-conforming. The Master Plan would not make the existing retail non-conforming because of the underlying zoning, and the City would have to initiate rezonings.

Ms. Hardenburg read the first paragraph of page 7.2 : "It is intended that development in the residential land use categories be tied to overall density in terms of units per net buildable acre." She asked if that meant if there was a site with nine acres of wetlands and six buildable acres, if the density would be based on the six acres, not the total 15. Ms. Chesnut agreed it would. Ms. Hardenburg thought that was wonderful to hear. Mr. Delacourt pointed out that the Zoning Ordinance would define what was buildable. Currently, it was defined that 50% of open space could not be counted toward buildable density. An applicant could be granted a Wetland Use Permit by City Council and a portion could become buildable. Ultimately, City Council would make the determination about a buildable area in a zoning district should an amendment come forward. Ms. Hardenburg clarified that if they kept the current zoning, 50% of a wetland area would be counted as buildable under the Open Space provisions of the Subdivision Ordinance. She commented that she like the wording in the new Plan.

Ms. Brnabic asked for an explanation of the objective on page 6.3, 12: "Seek to overcome the perception that the City may already have enough medium and high density development."

Ms. Chesnut explained that part of the goal was to identify areas for alternative types of housing. That could be senior housing, attached condos, or other developments that appeared denser. The objective was to work together to assert that those types of uses could be encouraged and could happen in an appropriate fashion in the City. Mr. Delacourt said he did not really remember where the term "perception" came from, and said they would go back and look at that. He did not really like that term. Ms. Chesnut added that the intent was to deal with alternative types of housing.

Mr. Dettloff referred to the Economic Development Strategy and asked Mr. Delacourt if it was the intent that a strategy be put into place once the Plan was adopted or if it could be done simultaneously with the final steps or as an on-going process. Mr. Delacourt believed it was being done simultaneously, but they wanted to identify what the City did regarding that in the Master Plan, and to make sure that the Planning Commission and City Council were supportive of the goals and objectives for economic development.

Mr. Casey said it was true that when they began the process, the decision was made to develop an Economic Development Strategy as a part of the Master Plan, and as soon as the Plan was accepted, it would become the vision of the community. It was a general strategy in that there were bullet point items the City needed to develop item by item over the next few years. Many of the strategies had already been implemented, and he referred to a business retention and attraction program, which the City already had. The goal was basically to continue establishing and growing those programs in the future.

Mr. Kaltsounis pointed out another feature that was added. Throughout the residential areas, there was a lot of green shown, which was open space used to retain certain densities. The Committee identified those areas in the proposed Plan so the properties could not be touched. He mentioned that in his sub, there was a large parcel which was a wetland considered open space, and it had been identified so no one could try to develop it.

Mr. Boswell opened the public comments at 8:23 p.m.

John Gaber, Williams, Williams, Ruby and Plunkett, P.C., 380 N. Old Woodward, Suite 300, Birmingham, MI 48009 *Mr. Gaber thanked the boards for the opportunity to present. He asked Mr. Boswell if it would be appropriate to speak about senior housing with reference to a particular area on the map, and Mr. Boswell asked him to continue. Mr. Gaber stated that his client owned the corner and four parcels to the*

north and two to the east at South Boulevard and Crooks (northeast corner). The property was currently zoned R-4, and was currently master planned Senior Housing. That category had not been carried through to the new Plan. He suspected that one of the Flexible Use categories would be appropriate for senior housing. His client believed it was a great area for senior housing, and he noted that one of the goals of the Plan was to foster that type of development and help residents stay in the City. He suggested that the owners of the property not be penalized for trying to develop senior housing, consistent with the current Master Plan. Under the proposed Plan, the corner showed FU-1, which would allow office, residential uses and senior housing, but the lots to the north and east would continue to be zoned and master planned Residential with a Mixed Residential overlay. He did not believe Mixed Residential permitted senior housing because it only permitted the same density that was currently there - 3.4 units per acre - which he did not believe would be feasible for a senior housing community. He believed that the area would be good for senior housing because there was commercial across the street in Troy and across Crooks. He said they would like to request the ability to build senior housing under the new Plan. They believed senior housing with a retail component would be appropriate if the retail were on the corner. He requested that the area be master planned for senior housing and some retail, which could be done with FU-2 for the whole area, or FU-2 for the corner and the lots surrounding that as FU-1. That would be consistent with retail on the other three corners. He concluded that they would appreciate not being penalized with the new Plan and precluded from doing senior housing, and he asked for consideration in that regard.

Owen Winnie, 833 Hampton Circle, Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Mr. Winnie referred to the Hampton area between John R and Rochester and Auburn and Hamlin, and asked if it had changed since the May 4 draft. Ms. Chesnut said that area had not changed. Mr. Winnie referred to the Olde Towne Corridor and asked if that referred to Auburn Road, which was confirmed. He said he was involved in committees relative to a study that had been done ten years ago for that area, and asked if the study they had referred to was the same. Ms. Chesnut said it was a component of the 1999 Master Plan. Mr. Winnie asked what the recommendations in the Master Thoroughfare Plan were relative to Auburn Road.

Mr. Delacourt responded that the component of the 1999 Master Plan talked about different roadway configurations, including on-street parking and redefinition of the lanes, and the proposed Plan tied back to that study. There were no other changes proposed that were not part of the first study. Mr. Winnie said that when he was involved, the business people were not receptive to many things related to control of traffic, the

possibility of curbing the street or the possibility of providing parking to the rears of the businesses. He had lived in Hampton almost 30 years and had looked at Auburn for all that time. There had been some improvements, but he stated that the area between John R and Dequindre was an absolute embarrassment to the City. He had not seen anything positive done to improve it. He referred to an operation on the southwest corner of Auburn and John R that had gone out of business and said it was a mess. He felt it reflected on the environment of that corridor from at least John R to Dequindre. He reiterated that it was an absolute disgrace. Although it was a gateway that was somewhat upstream, people coming into the City westward down Auburn saw a terrible appearance. He stated that it would be really nice if they did some action planning as it related to Auburn Road. He also thought the Economic Development strategy was extremely critical. He stated that economic development and planning had to go hand in hand. The Planning Commission and the City Council had to embrace an Economic Development Strategy, and that strategy had to be in the Master Plan. If not, there would be economic development going in one direction and planning in another. It was oftentimes difficult when the economic development people were involved in pushing new development in the City and the Planners were saying it was not part of the strategy. He complimented the Planning Commission and Staff, and especially McKenna Associates, Inc. for doing an absolutely good job on the proposed Plan.

Mr. Boswell closed the public comments.

Mr. Rosen said he still had doubts about eight stories along M-59 in any significant amount. He thought they had to be very careful about using the words "encouraging development" in the Regional Employment Center (REC). He thought "encouraging" might be a little too strong. In all areas, he felt the emphasis should be on "allow" or "accommodate" and not "promote" or "encourage," because when they promoted or encouraged, he was not sure they knew how to do that to make the right decisions for economics and substitute their judgment for sound business practices. When he first saw the REC, he asked himself if someone looked at the Master Plan and saw the big, blue REC, if it would change their decision about where to live. If so, the members might want to think about not doing the whole area. For example, the REC included the mobile home park, so he wondered if they would be suggesting that it go away and if it was something the City should do. He was not sure. He thought they might be overdoing the incentive concept for redevelopment. He believed they did not need it, and he thought there was enough money to be made in the City and that good landlords would keep their areas current due to competition. He noted that Mr. Frankel was doing it at Hamlin and Rochester because the

center had become functionally obsolete and it was time to tear it down and rebuild it. He would get double the rent and be far better off. On having residential plus another use on a site, whether it be office or commercial, he felt it would be very lukewarmly received, if at all, because the City was not a downtown and never was intended to be. It was intended to be a nice, residential, suburban community. He thought the Lorna Stone development at South Boulevard and Adams would be the test. If that succeeded he would be surprised, but it would tell the tale. He hoped it did not fair poorly because it would be hard for that part of town.

Mr. Winnie referred to Mr. Rosen's comments about the REC and said he did not quite understand what he meant about it changing whether people would want to live there. He asked him to elaborate.

Mr. Rosen said that there were a lot of subdivisions at Adams and Hamlin going east to Crooks and to the east of Livernois and south down to South Boulevard. With the area identified as it was, he wondered whether people would say they did not want to be near it, and if it would have an effect on decisions people made about buying houses in the future. If they saw the area as ORT, it would not be such a general concept.

Mr. Winnie said that he had looked at the corridor of M-59 for many years. He watched Softball City grow and saw the halo of lights they had at night, yet south of Hamlin and east of Squirrel there were very substantial residential communities being built and people buying expensive homes in that general area. Those people backed up to Volkswagen and other high rise buildings, and it did not discourage them from buying, and their homes were still attractive. The areas south of Hamlin were buffered by open space, and homes sat beyond that. In terms of discouraging any residential development, he did not think it had happened yet, and the area was a mess before they got into the consent judgment. There was going to either be vacant land there (Softball City) or property that would be developed for economic purposes in that corridor, and no new residential development on the landfill site. He did not see that as a discouragement for people who wanted to live in the area because there were already homes there. They were being built while other nonresidential developments were being built. He did not think it was a negative; it was more of a positive. He referred to the City of Troy, noting that it had a well-balanced land use plan - a strong commercial and office base and a strong residential base. He remarked that Rochester Hills should be so fortunate, but it was not. The founding fathers decided when it became a City that the best way to sell city-hood was to take the things the township had and put them in the Charter. The thing they wanted first was to be a

bedroom community, and bedroom communities meant that those that lived there had to pay the fare for the needed improvements. He thought it was a step as far as they could go in the City trying to balance the land use component. He did not see that as being a discouragement or making people shy away from the City. He thought it would be fine when it was developed. He had a lot of faith in the Planning Commission and City Council that whatever materialized would be in good taste and would not scare people away. It was a residential community and that was not going to change. He thought it was unfortunate, to some degree, that there was not a better land use balance in the City.

Mr. Delacourt stated that there was an effort to coordinate the REC area, which included the SmartZone, existing land uses of residential, industrial, some office and retail, and various master planned areas. They proposed a phased, or integrated, zoning district to allow coordinated redevelopment of the area. That was the consensus from the Tech Committee meetings and from initial Planning Commission meetings. The intent was a vision for the entire area, and he agreed that it was a large area of change on the map, which had yet to be defined through the Zoning Ordinance. They did not know if people would request rezonings or if the boards would initiate them.

Mr. Kaltsounis spoke about living in the area and said that it was one of the things throughout the process that he really had to fight with, because no one was more affected than he was. He noted that he lived south of Auburn across from the mobile home park. He spoke with a lot of people in his subdivision and one thing people said was that the City should come up with something new to get the area moving. They talked at the Tech Committee meetings about the height of buildings off of Auburn. He was concerned about having higher buildings transitioning to Auburn so it was palatable to the people who lived in the area. He said he would love to see ORT there, and he would be interested to see how the area would evolve if what they did helped. He pointed out that there were a lot of good comments and offered the following motion.

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hardenburg, that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council the Distribution Draft of the Master Land Use Plan of 2005/2006 as presented at the Planning Commission meeting of June 27, 2006.

Mr. Hooper referred to the REC text and said the description was what bought him: "This district, Regional Employment Center, is intended to be the economic engine of the City and will accommodate a wide range of business types, such as light manufacturing, research and development and headquarter operations." He stated that how the

district was written would be how things developed, but it would provide flexibility, and that was the whole form-based plan they were going to for redevelopment of the City. He indicated that it would always be a residential community, and that was not going to change. The areas that were blighted or becoming blighted needed flexibility to encourage redevelopment and to provide an economic base for the City. He thought that was a primary focus of the district. How it turned out would evolve, but he believed the REC would be a key component.

Mr. Delacourt said he made notes about the use of the terms "encourage" and "incentive." He also made a note about eight stories. He thought the intent was there, but before the final, those issues had to be looked at and discussed by the Planning Commission. He pointed out that Mr. Gaber was correct that the area he referred to was master planned for senior housing and was taken out of the proposed Plan. He advised that FU-1 did allow senior housing, but the density had not been determined. Mixed-Residential allowed senior housing, but tied it to the underlying zoning.

Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting

2006-0551

Mr. Rosen asked about City Place on Rochester Road and whether it had been before the Planning Commission. Mr. Delacourt said it had been for discussion with new applicants. There was an approved PUD for the site, but they would like something other than what was approved. Mr. Rosen asked if the timing would be such that whatever was decided for that parcel, it could be incorporated into the Master Plan - if they went away from Mixed Use into Mixed Residential, for example. Mr. Delacourt said that it could, but he did not think they should base the Future Land Use Plan on what was finally decided as part of that PUD. Mr. Rosen surmised that they could possibly be 120-160 days away from a Master Plan.

Roll Call Vote:

*Ayes: Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hardenburg, Hooper,
Kaltsounis, Reece, Schroeder*

Nays: None

Absent: None

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Boswell stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously and thanked the members. Mr. Delacourt reminded that this matter would be in front of City Council in July.

Discussed

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no further business to come before the boards.

NEXT MEETING DATE

The Chair reminded the Commissioners that the next regular meeting was scheduled for July 11, 2006.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission and the City Council, the Chair adjourned the Special Joint meeting at 9:03 p.m., Michigan time.

William F. Boswell, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

James Rosen, President
Rochester Hills City Council

Maureen Gentry
Recording Secretary

Approved as presented at the July 18, 2006 Regular Planning Commission Meeting