

City's Staff. Whether it is more efficient, or less efficient, remains to be seen. It would be faster and probably cheaper for the City to have its own BRA.

Ms. Hill said she was pleased to hear that the City can have its own authority and still utilize the tool of the County. She was concerned the plans would be difficult to put together.

Mr. Terry replied that unlike a DDA or LDFA, there has to be a financial plan and development plan put together on a yearly basis or over the long term. A BRA is not a district, and unlike a DDA, it is a site. The only job of the City is to gather data and put it together. The BRA reviews the data and it is put together when needed.

Ms. Hill said the client can put together a package and there would be some review of it by Administrative Staff before it goes to the BRA. Whether the City would handle it or the County would, there is still Staff time before the BRA makes the decision.

Mr. Duistermars agreed with Ms. Hill that a BRA is a good way to reclaim land that would probably not be reclaimed. Cleaning up the sites would be a benefit to everyone in the community, but it is something Government alone could not afford. He wished to look further at the increased revenue margin from which the BRA would collect. If a property is vacant and the owner is paying \$25,000.00 in taxes, for example, and then the owner develops it, the taxes jump to \$100,000.00. The difference that is eligible for brownfield revenue is \$75,000.00. He asked if the BRA can establish a portion of that margin to apply to brownfields, or if they must apply the whole margin.

Mr. Terry answered that it could be a portion. Mr. Duistermars indicated that the net tax base benefit could be zero up to the margin, so there is an improvement of the tax base either way. He mentioned that if they used the County BRA, money collected would go to the county. Mr. Terry replied that the County could decide where to spend those dollars. They discussed various circumstances between using a County versus a City BRA.

Mr. Dalton said he liked the idea of being able to use both. He felt that would keep all the doors open. He clarified that typically with a TIFFA fund, a 12-year tax abatement is given to a property owner. Under a BRA, a property owner is only compensated for the actual money spent. Mr. Terry replied that was correct. Mr. Dalton said it would not be a profit center for the owner for many years. Mr. Dalton advised that if the City starts a program, it would have expenses, and he wondered if the City would be allowed to capture those expenses. Mr. Terry replied that a BRA is allowed to capture up to \$75,000.00 annually from non-school tax capture.

Mr. Kaiser stated that in light of the fact that there are properties contaminating the Clinton River, he hoped that as the City decides about BRAs, people remember the City is not an island unto itself in relation to other communities. When they discuss incentives for tax reasons, they should also discuss the costs not only to this community for the next 100 years, but to the neighboring communities and counties, Lake St. Clair, and other ground waters. It is not just a dollars and cents issue, but one regarding the impact to the environment and the quality of life for the next generations.

He asked anyone who had comments to come forward, which no one did.

Recess: 8:58 to 9:05

#### **4. DISCUSSION** – Proposed PUD Development

Mr. Kaiser explained the order for the discussion and that there would be comments heard from those who had filled out speaker cards at the end of the presentation. Prior to that would be dialogue by Commission and Council members. He advised that since he had to limit the amount of time people could speak, and because they would not be able to get answers to their comments tonight, if they so desire, people were encouraged to forward lengthier comments and concerns in writing to the Planning Department.

Mr. Kaiser continued that a PUD process calls for preliminary and informal meetings, such as this one and a prior one, held during a July 30 Planning Commission meeting. The process is complicated, and the reason for it is to provide flexibility to the City, to the applicant, and to the residents, to accomplish certain goals. The developer may ask for concessions regarding the requirements of a particular zoning district. At the same time, during the process of a PUD, which is a contract with the City, the City is allowed to negotiate and obtain concessions from the developer it would not otherwise be able to get through City Ordinances for the zoning districts involved. It is a give and take process, which is a little different than an ordinary development.

Mr. Anzek stated that Mr. Kaiser's summation of the PUD process was on target. In this case, a PUD is the recommended procedure, since the Master Land Use Plan calls for mixed-use development. This project will include commercial, retail and residential components. The Ordinance supports and encourages meetings of this nature, where the applicant can come before the Planning Commission to present their concept and obtain feedback. The applicant also requested such a meeting with City Council members. If the applicant goes forward, he might incur expenses of over \$300,000.00 just for the next level of drawings. That is a sizeable commitment and they wanted to hear the members' thoughts and concerns before they made this next step. The next process will be a technical review, which involves almost every department in the City. He added that the applicant is here to present a concept only.

Mr. Kaiser asked Mr. Anzek to define the subject area. Mr. Anzek replied that it is a corridor of land located on the eastern side of Rochester Road, running north from Bordine's Nursery, up to the southern property line of the office building under construction. It is bisected by a Detroit Edison easement, which will be shown on the Site Plan. Immediately east of the development is Eddington Farms. He noted that Staff has met with Mr. Gilbert for the past 12 months trying to deal with the issues that would affect the concept design.

Mr. Kaiser asked what zoning districts are currently included in the subject site. Mr. Anzek replied that the site is currently zoned R-4, One Family Residential. Mr. Kaiser asked what zoning is designated for this site in the current Master Land Use Plan. Mr. Anzek answered that the Plan, developed in 1999, calls for a mixed-use development of commercial, office and residential. Mr. Kaiser clarified that the zoning that is in place would countenance some of what the applicant is proposing, but in other parts, the zoning district would not call for residential. He asked if there is anything in the proposed development that the Planning Department feels is inconsistent with the Master Land Use Plan. Mr. Anzek answered that there was nothing at this time.

Present for the applicant was Mr. Bill Gilbert, Gilbert & Vennettelli, Inc. and Mr. Alex Bogaerts, Alexander J. Bogaerts, Architects and Designers. Mr. Gilbert gave a brief history of the property.

Mr. Kaiser asked Mr. Gilbert to give some background of his developments in the City. Mr. Gilbert replied that they have been involved in the community since the mid-1970's. He advised that they developed Rochester Glens, Winchester Village, Sycamores, Brookwood, Grosse Pines, and Eddington Farms, among others.

Mr. Gilbert said it was never intended that the Rochester Road frontage for this property would be developed as single family residential. The plan they have introduced was arrived at after taking into consideration many issues, including environmental, utility, and the historic home on the site. He said they met with the Historic Districts Commission first to discuss options for the house. It was suggested that they move it to the southern corner on Rochester Road, which they plan to do. After meeting with the Planning Commission, they added some detail to the plan, such as end elevations, so the people to the east would be able to know what those exteriors would look like. Staff also suggested lowering the profiles of those buildings so they were dropped to two-story to lower the scale. He said the topography of the property drops from west to east. There is a berm on the eastern property that is on his site, and their intention is to enhance that with heavy landscaping and to involve the neighbors in that.

Mr. Kaiser asked Mr. Gilbert to explain the percentage of each zoning, and where it would be, on the site. Mr. Gilbert said they have developed the building plans so the buildings would accommodate any use within them. If they developed office, it would be primarily on the northern portion of the site and would include about 46,000 square feet of office. The retail would be a local, neighborhood retail use, spread over eight buildings along Rochester Road. The total for that would be 19,000 square feet. They envision small users and as developers, they will have market condition flexibility. If the plan changed from office, it would become residential rather than retail.

Mr. Kaiser asked how much residential there would be with 19,000 of retail and 46,000 of office. Mr. Gilbert replied 267,000 square feet of residential. Mr. Kaiser asked if he would acknowledge and agree that the percentages will be locked in with a PUD. Mr. Gilbert replied he would. Mr. Kaiser informed the applicants that if they wanted a change, they would have to return and re-negotiate the contract with the City.

Mr. Gilbert noted that the buildings would be masonry, full brick, and look similar to those of a traditional urban neighborhood development. The buildings in the back would be more traditional condominium buildings, with a center entrance and parking on the first level. They feel there is a tremendous market for that, for both single people and empty nesters, and they feel it would help keep people in this community.

Mr. Kaiser asked if Mr. Gilbert would agree that everything, right down to the elevations, will be a part of the contract and that there will not be last minute changes. Mr. Gilbert agreed, and said the advantage of a PUD is that the City has control. With rezoning, the City does not have nearly the control of the style, color, elevations, and landscaping of a project.

Mr. Bogaerts discussed the Site Plan, and said the intent was to bring a downtown feel to Rochester Hills, noting that the scale of the buildings would drop behind Rochester Road. He said they have tried to create as much green, open space as possible, and have limited the number of buildings adjacent to the neighbors. He related that Eddington Road has not changed on the plans.

Mr. Kaiser asked them to address the wetlands. Mr. Gilbert said that they have kept disruption to a minimum. The Honeywell Drain will be crossed and there will be storm piping to carry the water from the west, which will open up past the drives. Any stormwater created by the development will be handled through its own storm drainage pipes. They will not need much mitigation land, but they will leave the land to the east open for that.

Mr. Kaiser asked what the distance is between the existing homes and the eastern buildings. Mr. Bogaerts replied approximately 80 feet, and advised that there will be a berm. The distance from the homes to the buildings to the north is approximately 300 feet and the south side has about 200 feet behind it. Mr. Bogaerts mentioned that the residential portion would include all home ownership and said there would be no rental properties.

Mr. Kaiser asked Mr. Anzek if fire or safety issues had been addressed. Mr. Anzek replied that the Fire Department have not reviewed the plans, but the Engineering Department and the Wetland Consultant have. Mr. Kaiser turned the discussion over to the Council members.

Mr. Barnett said that when an area like this is developed, the developer comes up with a project that "works." He asked what is taken into consideration when deciding the numbers. Mr. Gilbert said it all boils down to density, whether it is rural, single family, or for large country lots. They did not want to see more of what is already out there. They set out to do a higher end project. A full brick building is extremely expensive, so they would need the density to offset that detail. It might still work if they cut it down, but the dollars left for the building portion would suffer. To get the look they wanted, but not get out of hand with pricing, they needed density. Each building is designed to accommodate each use.

Mr. Barnett said he liked the idea of thinking outside of the box. He asked if they had done studies for the retail, to see if they would be competing with downtown Rochester. He noted that there seemed to be a lot of turnover there, and he wondered if they were concerned there would be enough business. Mr. Gilbert replied that it does not do anyone any good to have empty spaces in this town. The numbers for retail are to be a ceiling. They may determine they have too much and the first floors could become living units.

Ms. Golden said it seems like what is proposed is an improvement over what was approved in the Master Land Use Plan. She asked Mr. Anzek if there were mitigation percentages calculated. Mr. Anzek said that those calculations had not been done, but they had talked to Mr. Gilbert about the possibility of expanding the wetland in the southeastern corner of the site. Ms. Golden asked Mr. Gilbert if he had looked at vacancy rates for office. Mr. Gilbert replied that they did not feel there was a strong market for office. That component will probably be a last phase. He said he would not spec an office building of any size right now. Ms. Golden asked if this project would be in phases and was told it would, and would take three or four years.

Ms. Hill asked how much of the property is historically designated. Mr. Delacourt replied the entire parcel is. Ms. Hill said a survey was done and this site was shown as a contributing one. She asked what type of use would be proposed for the building, if moved. She did not believe residential was a viable use. She said it would be a shame to lose some of this City's heritage and having variety makes this a unique community. It has been proven that more people come and visit areas that have historic resources; they also stay longer and spend more money. Economically, they are viable. She added that she was concerned about the density, drainage and open space of the proposal.

Mr. Gilbert responded that it is not his intention to have this home be a for-sale, single family home. There are many other uses this home could be retrofitted for and still keep its integrity.

Ms. Hill cautioned about the look of the west side of the road and said she would like to maintain some sense of balance without having something looming across from it.

Mr. Kaiser indicated that this would obviously be done in phases and he wondered if Mr. Gilbert would agree to the contract including the order of the development. The sales point so far has been the creation of a streetscape for Rochester Hills. He asked if there would be a problem doing that portion before any other. Mr. Staran agreed that an order could be determined. Mr. Gilbert remarked that he did not think they would be agreeing to anything tonight.

Ms. Brnabic asked about the pitch of the roof for building 100D and how much higher it would be than the pitch of the lower buildings. Mr. Bogaerts answered that it was about 8-10 feet above the parapet of the other buildings. Ms. Brnabic asked how much higher it would be than comparable buildings. Mr. Bogaerts said only 5-6 feet. He said they were trying to get a variation and did not change the height of the floors internally, just the roofs. Ms. Brnabic said it was her opinion that the concept of building 100D is attractive on its own, but when looking at the project in its entirety, it stands out too much.

Mr. Rosen mentioned that at the Planning Commission meeting, he said four stories struck him as very high. He encouraged people to drive down Adams Road to Hamlin to a development called Forester Square, which has four stories. He thought that appeared huge. He said he understands the economics, but felt the height should be carefully looked at. Secondly, the buildings adjacent to Eddington seem really close to the property lines. He suggested removing a section from the middle buildings to move them away from the residents. He felt that the wetland crossing should be given serious consideration. He said he realizes this is not a huge amount of fill and he thinks they can justify the westerly crossing, but he thinks an alternative could be shown for the eastern. That would mean they have done everything they could to minimize the

wetland intrusion. If they could show that it truly would not work without it, it would be beneficial to the approval process.

Ms. Golden said they would like to look at numbers regarding revenue. She understands the density issue and mentioned that having more people using the infrastructure takes the burden off the taxpayer. She anticipates that revenue information would also be beneficial to the decision making process.

Mr. Kaiser said he would like to see what the numbers would be if this were built as currently zoned – not only density and tax revenue comparisons, but the distance the current zoning would restrict building next to the existing homes, how many roads would have to go through, and so on. The setbacks would obviously be very different for single-family homes than for this type of development.

Mr. Barnett referenced the buildings adjacent to the residents and asked the reason Mr. Gilbert felt they could not be moved to go north/south. Mr. Gilbert responded that they wanted to lessen the impact on the homes to the east. They would only have to look at the end section, as opposed to the whole building.

Mr. Hooper asked if the 600 series buildings would be of the same architecture as the series 100. Mr. Bogaerts replied they would not, and added that they were more residential looking. Mr. Hooper asked if there is a buffer required between a PUD and an existing residential.

Mr. Anzek replied that the buffer is determined for use to use, not zoning to zoning. If there were residential next to residential use, there would not be a buffer requirement. Mr. Hooper asked if it were developed as R-4, whether a home could be placed in the same location as the 600 series building, with a 35-foot rear yard. The setback conceptually shown looks to be about 20 feet from the property line. Mr. Bogaerts said they discussed expanding that to meet the residential setback and they do plan to adjust it. Mr. Hooper asked if there would be any other modifications in a PUD that would require separate action.

Mr. Anzek said that in a PUD procedure, setbacks are guidelines, not hard and set standards that have to be met. If the PUD they were presented showed acceptable ways to buffer, it could be negotiated. He explained that the applicants would also need Wetland Use and Floodplain Permits, and approval from the HDC.

Mr. Kaiser said that while the setback that would ordinarily be in place for that zoning does not have to be adhered to in a PUD, it could be negotiated at an even greater distance. He advised that any member who wanted to speak should do so at this time because they would take citizen comments and then the discussion regarding this Agenda item would be over. He felt it would be unfair to the citizens to hear something they might want to comment on after the members spoke, but could not. Mr. Anzek reminded everyone there was a sign-up sheet if anyone wished to be notified of upcoming meetings.

Recess 10:20 to 10:27 p.m.

**Dr. Lisa Barno-Winarski, 194 Bedlington, Rochester Hills, MI.** Ms. Winarski addressed the traffic issues. She referenced the proposal, and said there is one access, which also goes to her subdivision. She invited people to come to Eddington Farms and try to exit from Eddington Blvd. onto Rochester Road. It is now impossible, and the problem will be condensed. She asked the following: if any traffic studies were done; whether the Land Division Act qualifies for this plan; if there was an economic analysis done for a PUD versus residential development; if the internal road network was adequate for safe and efficient vehicle movement; and if the existing public road system is able to meet projected traffic demands of the project. Regarding four stories, even though the level of the condominium is dropped, there would still be a barbaric building along the back of Farnborough. Construction over three or four years is a concern. They do not have sidewalks and there are other developments connecting connect to their subdivision, and all that traffic needs to be considered. She asked why

a downtown area would be put in the middle of Rochester Road when there is a lot of vacant property from I-75 in Troy up to Tienken in Rochester Hills.

**Dave Bassett, 624 Essex Dr., Rochester Hills, MI.** He remarked that the artist who drew the plans had a great imagination because the tree line drawn in Eddington Farms does not exist. He said some people were probably upset about lack of notification, and he found out about this meeting from some friends. Some people do not know there is a major Zoning Ordinance update meeting Monday, because notices did not go out to enough people. He thinks that notification is something the City needs to work on. He does not think it is the Commission's, or Council's, fault necessarily, but he feels they can make a big difference by saying "no" when sufficient notice is not given. He believed that some Council members found out about this meeting Thursday and felt that was not enough advance notice for them. He hopes the City buys full-page ads in the Clarion, Eccentric and Oakland Press because according to the notice he got, the public should get news. He said residents do not like this proposal. He hopes this becomes a big issue for the Council and the Commission, and that they take this to heart. He felt that some of their comments tonight indicated they would. This is the second special meeting and the first was on July 30, 2002. The minutes from that meeting look like there was a hearing, but the Council representative said it was only an informational workshop. He said he was having a hard time seeing the difference. He thinks this is serious problem. At the meeting they talked as if this development were a proposal, not a rezoning. He commented, "no rezoning here." Unless there is huge community support for rezoning, they should not change the zoning. Unless the community is begging for it, which it is not, they should not change it. Only one property owner is begging for it. These informational meetings are potentially more dangerous than others. There might have been almost zero attendance from the public tonight if individuals had not gotten the news out about it. He concluded that this plan is not community friendly.

**Debbie Fox, 245 Bedlington Dr., Rochester Hills, MI** She said that this proposal should not be looked at as a downtown development for Rochester Hills. The traffic here is 50 m.p.h. and two people have been killed at the end of Eddington. Increasing subdivision traffic is not a good idea. The drawings are not representative of what the applicant is proposing. From the plan, everyone has to enter the complex from Eddington Blvd. This is a long piece of property and she believes four stories would be very tall. On the other side of Rochester Road there are one-story homes, so this does not make sense. She added that she agreed with what has already been said.

**Mark Steffe, 1371 Pembroke Dr., Rochester Hills, MI** Mr. Steffe advised that they really need to think about this. He moved in two years ago and it was not to move into an area that was going to become the "downtown of Rochester Hills." He thinks the showing tonight should tell the members how they feel about this.

**Danna Boore, 222 Windrift Land, Rochester Hills, MI.** Ms. Boore is on the board of Eddington Farms Subdivision. She said she was at the meeting representing many people who could not attend or had to leave because of time constraints. She said she would love to reiterate what had already been said, and she has additional concerns. There are five developments going on in her square block – between Rochester Road, Hamlin, John R and Avon. Three subdivisions are being connected to Eddington Farms. This involves 198, 50 and 50 homes respectively. That is a tremendous amount of traffic. There are children that stand on Eddington Blvd. to catch the bus who have been doing so for years. She asked if it was going to take one of the children being hit before someone decides this was not a good idea. Five entrances bringing retail into their homes is not a good idea. The office building being constructed on Rochester Road already will increase the traffic on it. The applicant said the four stories would look smaller because the land goes downhill from the west. She cautioned that everything goes downhill, including drainage, and they already have enough problems with that in their subdivision.

**Donald Secker, 226 Windrift, Rochester Hills, MI.** He said that In the interest of brevity and in complete agreement with his neighbor, Ms. Boore, he wished to go on

record and say he was opposed to any development on this site, other than for the existing zoning.

**Mark Artinian, 1465 Pembroke Dr., Rochester Hills, MI.** He noted that his first concern was the increased traffic volume into the main entrance. The traffic volume that will go in a north-south direction and move from retail to retail shop will definitely conflict and cause a big traffic problem for traffic in and out of the subdivision. He believes it is inevitable that people are going to wind their way through the subdivision roads back to John R just to be able to exit the site. He thinks people will not come in from Rochester Road, but will come in from the back door of the subdivision to get to the shops. The identity of the subdivision is perhaps a bit of a selfish issue, and he appreciates what development can do for the City, but he does not see an opportunity for his subdivision, just traffic and things they do not want. They will be adding a lot more activity and lose green space and this is going in the wrong direction, in his opinion. He agrees with the four-story concern. He thinks they need to focus more on what this development will do to the community and not isolate one home or one shop, but look at the grand scheme and how it will affect hundreds of people.

**Beth Rayner, 272 Bedlington, Rochester Hills, MI.** She wanted to repeat the suggestion that the small condos proposed would draw transient residency, and the small store fronts would draw transient businesses.

**Annette Kowalski, 244 Bedlington Dr., Rochester Hills, MI.** Her major concern is the volume of traffic and she mentioned trying to turn off of Eddington and the competing traffic at Drexelgate. She said that people do not really know the rules for using a left turn lane and she said she could not believe the number of accidents seen on a weekly basis. Arcadia Park will be opening up and she thought about the irony of being concerned about Arcadia Park and the traffic from that, and the fact that now Eddington Farms people will be forced to use the roads in Arcadia Park to get to Rochester Road. She feels they are losing the identity of Eddington Farms.

**Jud Gibson, 493 Lexington, Rochester Hills, MI.** Mr. Gibson said it seems to be kosher these days to call things downtowns or villages, but most downtowns were never created, they were based on settlers and so on. He commented that downtowns are not built, they are already there. Secondly, it appears that this is a very carefully crafted marketing ploy to reach a niche market, which is basically for single-family homes in a lower price range.

**Joanie Gibson, 492 Lexington, Rochester Hills, MI.** Mrs. Gibson brought up the fact that there are five developments going on around her. She said that behind her, trees have been torn down and there is no place for the wildlife to go. Fairly soon, people in her subdivision are going to want to sell their homes because of all the development. She thinks the Planning Commission and Council need to think about retaining the residents that are here and about promoting community by developing what is already here.

**Greg Rose, 542 Lexington, Rochester Hills, MI.** He feels he speaks for everyone in attendance in saying that it was very discourteous to make all the people here wait until 11:00 and listen to a Brownfield Redevelopment presentation. He thought this showed an unbelievable level of unconcern for the residents. He thinks the buildings are too tall, it is too dense, and it is a ploy to create single-family dwellings as densely as possible. He does not think anyone appreciates this proposal and the traffic it will bring, and he hopes City Council will seriously think about the developer creating a downtown.

**Eric Alstrom, 554 Lexington, Rochester Hills, MI.** He thanked Mr. Olstrom for bringing up points of interest of people who actually live in the subdivision and said that for a moment, he thought the people on the Council were solely focused on tax revenue. He asked if there had been a study about what this type of development would do to the property values of the current housing. He feels Council, if they are representing the people, should feel that is important. He pointed out the traffic issue and asked the members to think about kids running onto Rochester Road and about having 200 additional vehicles trying to get out onto Rochester Road.

**Christine Kidder, 216 Bedlington, Rochester Hills, MI.** She wanted to discuss traffic and said she could safely assume no one on the Council lives in Eddington Farms, since this issue was not brought up by anyone on the Commission. She can imagine some people must travel Rochester Road between 3:30 and 6:30 p.m. every day. She drives children to sports at all different times and it is like "committing suicide" now. She cannot imagine adding any more homes, especially with Arcadia Park being constructed, and then trying to get out onto Rochester Road.

**Angie Kadowaki, 185 Windrift Lane, Rochester Hills, MI.** She said she now uses John R because the Rochester Road entrance is too busy and unsafe. When she moved to Rochester Hills she knew there was no downtown. She thought her downtown was the City of Rochester. That is what drew her to Rochester Hills. She does not see this location as ideal for a downtown development.

**Louis Sardelli, 1650 Farnborough, Rochester Hills, MI.** He thanked the members for giving him a few minutes to speak. He is against this project. The high density and traffic problems are unsightly. Four stories plus a canopy is almost 50 feet high, which is as high as a telephone pole. He surmised how that would look driving down Rochester Road. He feels there will be a dangerous precedent set by rezoning this property. He thinks they will be opening up a Pandora's box with a PUD. Their homes were built with R-4 zoning. The backs of their homes are approximately 40-45 feet to the rear lot line and according to Mr. Gilbert's drawing, the buildings will be within 10-12 feet of their lot lines on the other side of the berm. If anything comes to pass, he would expect that those buildings should be at least 40 feet from their lot lines. He mentioned traffic and asked them to imagine traveling down Rochester Road at 50 m.p.h. and making a right turn on Eddington. If there is a street that goes into this proposed development and someone hits their brakes, so will the person behind and behind them, and it will be pandemonium. He said he hoped these issues would be addressed.

Mr. Kaiser said that all these comments were recorded, and he noted that the applicant is well advised to address all these issues, if and when a PUD request comes forward. A traffic study will be required before a formal presentation. He felt the Commission should be shown not only what the zoning setback allows for homes to the east, but what the average setback to the lot line is for the existing homes. This is an issue that should definitely be addressed. The other issues brought up were very good and will be considered if the applicant chooses to proceed. He noted there were people absent for the initial presentation, and the Planning Commissioners were not present for previous meetings between Staff and the applicant, but what people were concerned about was raised during those meetings. As residents of Rochester Hills, the Commissioners do look at these issues. They spend a lot of time in others' neighborhoods. He cautioned that there is a lot of work to be done. He stated that Mr. Gilbert has developed in this City before and knows that sooner or later the Commissioners will ask how much time he has spent listening to the neighbors and holding meetings with them. He advised that special attention should be given to the traffic issue and to the existing homes that abut this proposed development. He strongly recommended that someone be designated to communicate with Mr. Gilbert or his representatives to keep the lines of communications open. The more issues that can be resolved between the applicant and the neighbors, the less that will have to be contentiously argued down the road. Contrary to some suggestions tonight, the members do not shirk any of their responsibilities, but take their jobs very seriously and donate a lot of their time to this City to do it.

#### **ANY OTHER BUSINESS:**

Ms. Hill informed them that the potential historic character of the property at 1597 Adams had been demolished. This makes her very unhappy because in the Master Plan they discuss trying to help preserve the community. She believes they have to be very cognizant of what is going on if they want to have anything left besides new development. Secondly, tomorrow night Council is being asked to approve a 5-lane road for the stretch of Hamlin between Livernois and Crooks. This community has talked about boulevards for safety, yet if this goes through, they would be putting a