

drive-through, and she was glad the matter was being postponed.

Chairperson Brnabic said that there was an insurance agency on the corner, a small house and then the Marathon station. She cautioned that they would have to think about how far a drive-through could encroach into the neighborhood.

Ms. Roediger said that because of the Dequindre widening, it was her understanding that the insurance agency would be removed, and the property would be ripe for redevelopment.

Chairperson Brnabic closed the Public Hearing at 8:56 p.m.

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Kaltsounis, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby ***postpones recommending to City Council an Ordinance for Chapter 138, Zoning***, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan to rezone the following parcels from Commercial Improvement District (CI) and/or Automotive Service Business (B-5) and/or General Business District (B-2) with a Flexible Business Overlay (FB-2) to a new district - B - The Brooklands District and to repeal conflicting or inconsistent Ordinances and prescribe a penalty for violations until the next available meeting.

Postponed

Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motions had passed unanimously.

2019-0246

Public Hearing and request for recommendation of an Ordinance to amend Chapter 138, Zoning, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Rochester Hills to add a new R-5 One Family Residential district.

(Reference: Memo prepared by Giffels Webster, dated September 12, 2019 and Ordinance amendment document had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Rod Arroyo and Eric Fazzini, Giffels Webster, 1025 E. Maple, Birmingham, MI 48009.

Mr. Arroyo noted that the proposed district was a recommendation from the Master Plan. It was a new district that would provide for a variety of housing types on smaller lots, including single-family homes and

attached products to provide housing styles lacking in the community. They would typically be suitable for empty nesters and young professionals and be more affordable, which was another thing heard during the Master Plan process. Existing manufactured housing communities were included in the category, although new communities were not planned as part of the Master Plan. He pointed out the areas identified for potential rezoning to R-5, but advised that no rezonings were proposed at this time. The action requested would create the district, and it would be up to property owners to petition the City to initiate a rezoning. The uses were generally consistent with other residential uses except for allowing attached dwelling units. Certain uses were not included, such as some agricultural uses, cemeteries, golf courses and funeral homes. There would be an increase in maximum lot coverage, recognizing the need for affordability and certain housing types on smaller lots with reduced setbacks. There were different standards for minimum floor area, allowing for smaller units than in other districts. The idea was to create a walkable neighborhood that would not be dominated by garages facing the street or having parking in the front yard, and access and parking in the rear was encouraged. He showed pictures of units facing a common area and a duplex type. The attached dwelling units, even three or four-units, were intended to look like single-family homes. He indicated that decreasing setbacks would provide flexibility on smaller lots. The tri-plexes and quad-plexes would be limited to a maximum of 25% of the lots on a single block. He noted that building frontages were identified, focusing on pedestrian orientation and conversations with the neighbors, with stoops and projecting porches. In terms of the next steps, he explained that the Planning Commission was being asked to make a recommendation to City Council. Regarding the text, he referred to page three and sections labeled Part 6. and Part 8. One dealt with agricultural operations and one with funeral homes. He advised that those uses had been deleted, so if the Commission chose to move forward, he recommended that both Parts be stricken.

Mr. Schultz recalled a proposal before the Commissioners for non-traditional group home settings which he had been really excited about, and it would tie in with the R-5 concept. He asked what happened with that proposal. Ms. Roediger said that the applicant was unable to get the property. Mr. Schultz said that he was still excited about an opportunity for alternative housing methods, and it was unfortunate that it did not work out. He stated that he was behind the R-5 100%. He wanted to see alternative housing, and it would be a way to help get another level of individuals into the community, which he felt was really needed.

Mr. Hooper mentioned seeing adult foster homes as a conditional use, but he remembered talking previously about that use even being possible. Ms. Roediger agreed that they did not want to include those. She had talked with the City Attorney, and they had the option of whether or not to allow 7-12 residents, which the City did not want to permit, and it would be stricken.

Mr. Kaltsounis commented that the last applicant that came before them with a request for more than six residents stated that they had space in the kitchen.

Ms. Morita said that the area the district was supposed to go into covered the manufactured housing areas. She understood that they were talking about a paper district, and they were not rezoning anything, but hypothetically, if they were to rezone a district, the way the Ordinance was written, it would not allow for manufactured housing. If they were, hypothetically, to no longer have a paper district, but to actually put land into the district, she asked if there was anywhere else in the Ordinance that would permit manufactured housing.

Mr. Arroyo responded that the intent was that within the umbrella of the R-5 area on the Master Plan, that they could potentially have two different zoning districts - one being the manufactured housing and one being the R-5. As long as there was a demand for manufactured housing, that separate district would continue to exist in those areas. The new R-5 would be covering other areas that were within the geographical areas that had been identified in the Master Plan but not developed as manufactured housing. It was not intended to apply to manufactured housing. It would be a separate district within the umbrella area in the Master Plan, but manufactured housing would be kept as its own district. They would always provide for it as long as it was a legitimate land use.

Ms. Morita said that the Commission needed to understand that they were not intending to put any property into the R-5 district or rezone anything. Mr. Arroyo said that was correct; the land would be available for someone to petition and ask for a rezoning if the district passed.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 9:10 p.m. Seeing no one come forward, she closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked about halfway houses. He noted that there were a couple in the City, and he wondered if they needed to address them. Mr. Arroyo stated that they were not permitted in the R-5 district. They were

not called out as a permitted use, so they were not permitted. That is, if it was not listed, it was prohibited.

Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Kaltsounis moved the following motion:

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby **recommends to City Council an Ordinance for Chapter 138, Zoning**, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan to amend Section 138-3.104(b)(2) to include the new R-5 District; amend Section 138-4.100, Table 3. Zoning Districts, to include the R-5: One-Family Residential District; insert new text into Section 138-4.200 RE, R-1, R-2, R-3 and R-4 One Family Residential Districts to add the R-5 District; amend Section 138-4.300, Table 4, Permitted Uses by Zoning District to add a new R-5 Column with permitted and conditional uses; amend Section 138-4.400(C) to include the new R-5 district; amend Section 138-4.401 to include the new R-5 district; amend Section 138-4.402(C) to include the new R-5 District; amend Section 138-4.412(A) to include the new R-5 District; amend Section 138-4.415(A) to include the new R-5 District; amend section 138-5.100, Table 5, Schedule of Regulations - Residential Districts to add a new row R-5; amend Section 138-5.101 (A) Footnotes to the Schedule of Regulations to include the R-5 District; amend Section 138-6.102 Setbacks for the RM-1 District to include the R-5 District; amend Article 6 Supplemental District Standards, to add a new Chapter 7. R-5 One-Family Flex Residential; amend Section 138-10.102 Height for Detached Accessory Structures to add the R-5 District; amend Section 138-10.106 Gazebos to add the R-5 District; and to amend Article 13, Section 138-13.100 to add a new Definition; and to repeal conflicting or inconsistent Ordinances and prescribe a penalty for violations subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

- 1. Parts 6. and 8., pertaining to agriculture and funeral homes shall be stricken.*
- 2. Page 2, Adult Foster Care Large Group Homes and Adult Foster Care Congregate Facilities shall be stricken as conditional uses.*

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