



Rochester Hills

Minutes

Planning Commission

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

Chairperson William Boswell, Vice Chairperson Deborah Brnabic
Members: Gerard Dettloff, Greg Hooper, Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Nathan Klomp, David A. Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Emmet Yukon

Tuesday, October 20, 2009

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson William Boswell called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Auditorium.

ROLL CALL

Present 8 - William Boswell, Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis, David Reece, C. Neall Schroeder and Emmet Yukon

Absent 1 - Nathan Klomp

Quorum Present

Also present: Derek Delacourt, Deputy Director, Planning and Development
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2009-0390 August 18, 2009 Regular Meeting

A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Yukon, that this matter be Approved as Presented. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 1 - Klomp

COMMUNICATIONS

- A) Planning & Zoning News dated September 2009
- B) Strategic Planning Process 2009 Report from RCOG
- C) Letter from C. Burckhardt, Oakland County re: Orion Twp. MLUP
- D) Orion Township Master Plan CD
- E) Clinton River Watershed Council Brochures and Information (3)

PRESENTATION

2009-0391 The Importance of Quality Stormwater Management in the Planning Process - Anne Vaara, Clinton River Watershed Council Executive Director, presenter

Mr. Delacourt advised that several months ago, Staff approached the CRWC, knowing they did presentations to groups in the watershed area about the importance of stormwater runoff maintenance, the impact to the watershed, and how the planning process affected it. The City had recently updated its Engineering Standards, the Master Land Use Plan (MLUP) and the Zoning Ordinance, all of which now had components of stormwater maintenance. In connection with the updates, Staff asked the CRWC to do a presentation. He thanked Ms. Vaara, noting that it had been difficult trying to schedule the presentation for previous meetings, and they had been very patient.

Ms. Vaara related that it was an honor to be asked, and they appreciated the opportunity to come before the Commission. The CRWC did a lot of presentations; by the end of the year they will have done a little over 100. They included stormwater management issues, the things that could be done to protect water quality, and the watershed story. She had taken a variety of presentations and put them together and intertwined the planning component. She advised that she was the Executive Director of the CRWC, but her background was in planning. As an Environmental Planner and Wetland Ecologist, she had an extensive background in the Site Plan Review process and integrating environmental components. She started out in ecology and then went into planning. When she was the Environmental Director at West Bloomfield Township, there were things she did not like about the planning process, and she wanted to integrate the environmental approach. She felt that Rochester Hills had done a good job with that, and there were quite a few communities in Oakland and Macomb that had integrated the stormwater management process into the planning process.

Ms. Vaara showed an image of the Great Lakes and talked about the amount of fresh water in Michigan that people appreciated more every day. They heard stories about the Governor in New Mexico who thought it would be a good idea to pipe Michigan's water down that way. Since then, the Great Lakes Compact was formed, and the State now had water rights, as did seven other states to protect their water. She informed that Michigan had 1/5 of the world's fresh water supply, and it had the most to lose and to gain from protecting it. She added that there was 41% of

coastline along the Great Lakes.

Ms. Vaara advised that a watershed was a basin, a low area that drained from the high points to the lowest body of water, which could be a wetland, river, lake or stream. She showed the watershed Rochester Hills is in, and mentioned that it drained from Springfield Township 81 miles down to Lake St. Clair. It covered 760 square miles, and there were 1.5 million people living in the watershed. It was the most populated watershed in the State. There were 63 communities in the watershed, and nine in the St. Clair drainage district. Of those 72 communities, 55 were member communities, including Rochester Hills.

Ms. Vaara stated that the mission of the CRWC was to “protect, enhance and celebrate the Clinton River, its watershed and Lake St. Clair.” She recalled that 40 years ago, the Clinton River was in trouble, and it was the most polluted river in the State of Michigan. No one would swim or spend any time in it, and its fish could not be eaten. The CRWC was started in the 1970’s, about the same time as the Clean Water Act came about. It started with a small group of citizens taking on the Army Corp. of Engineers on the east side in Macomb. The Army wanted to channelize the River and the citizens emphasized that they wanted to keep the system naturalized for water quality, aesthetics and flood control, and they won. It did not become a channel; it was now a very natural system and very navigable. The eight miles from Lake St. Clair back up the River was very nice, with marinas and people living nicely along there.

Ms. Vaara next showed some headlines from through the years about the improvements that were made. People learned not to dump refrigerators and cars into the River. It was celebrated with special days like Clinton Cleanup River Day. She showed the impact out of the fishery. They have a day celebrating steelhead by Yates Cider Mill, and she showed pictures of some of the larger fish. She showed a lake sturgeon caught from the River, which was a special species. It was put back into the River, and the picture was sent to the DNR, and it was estimated to be 10-30 years old. The moral of her story was that the River was now clean enough so the sturgeon made its way up to spawn.

Ms. Vaara was enthused that people could now paddle down the River. She mentioned the first Paddle Palooza that went from Auburn Hills to Rochester Hills. Rochester Hills was an active participant, and she recalled that the Mayor had paddled it with his brother. The goal was to eventually have lakes to the Lake and hopefully, people would be able to paddle the whole system someday. There were other projects, including

River Day and Clinton Cleanup, which allowed them to have these events.

Ms. Vaara informed that the Council was always looking for ways to protect the resources from a planning point of view. The Council was involved in education and stewardship. There was a stream monitoring program done by students from four middle schools, and she was proud to say that there were hundreds of Rochester Hills students that graduated from the program every year. The "Adopt a Stream Program" was an adult monitoring program, similar to the one for students. Both programs sampled twice a year, and the date was used by the State of Michigan for gauging water quality using vertebrates or aquatic insects. They really wanted to inspire a new generation. She also talked about watershed management and what could be done from a planning point of view.

The CRWC gets involved in Site Plan review and Permit reviews, if asked. They provide technical assistance to communities, citizens and elected and appointed officials. They also assisted communities with the Federal Stormwater Permit, of which Rochester Hills was a participating member. The three components used to do that were watershed planning, stormwater management and the educational opportunities. Ms. Vaara showed a picture of the topography of the watershed. It was not flat - there was a 500-foot drop from the headwaters down to Lake St. Clair. There were a lot of hills in Rochester Hills. Because the urbanization had slowed, it was a good time to get involved and understand the planning process, even from a citizen point of view. There was a lull in development currently, and it was a great opportunity to revise ordinances or update policies and integrate some environmental policies. Most communities did not want to look like urbanized areas and wanted to maintain and use their natural resources for many years.

Ms. Vaara talked about the history of water quality, noting the contaminated sediments and industrial runoff back in the 1950's, 1960's and 1970's. That problem was still in the Clinton River, and they were trying to remediate that. It was a slow process and took a lot of testing. They hoped to have gotten to most of the sources of the contaminant, but there was always some leakage. The superfund sites and landfills have helped resolve those issues. Flooding was a terrible water quality problem.

Ms. Vaara noted that there had been a dramatic reduction in combined sewer systems, and there had been a dramatic reduction in sources of

industry discharges and successes from all the hard work. She mentioned stormwater pollution and how to deal with it. She said that Mr. Delacourt had talked about integrating policies in the Site Plan Review process, showing that Rochester Hills was ahead of the ballgame compared with a lot of other communities that had not caught up. She showed photographs of flooded areas, and mentioned the flood of May 2004, where there were back to back 500-year storms and five inches of rain in a couple of hours and really severe flooding.

Ms. Vaara brought up stormwater and where it went. There were basins all over the place, but the stormwater was seldom treated the way it should. A lot of times they did well, but they could always do better. A lot of people raked leaves and clippings and washed cars without recognizing where the stormwater went. It went into a pipe and into an open body of water. She showed a series of the way water traveled and showed pollutants - animal waste, fertilizer, salts, pesticides - that went into the catch basin and into the drain and eventually to an open body of water. Stormwater was linked to water quality and quantity problems, and they were very serious to try to solve, especially when dealing with redevelopment issues and deciding what to do with the stormwater. She showed a graph of a reduction of sewer overflows from the 1960's projected to 2012. It showed an 80% reduction and the sophisticated engineering that had been enjoyed over the last 15-20 years. She showed an illustration about ways to do things better and cautioned to not just wash things down the drain.

Ms. Vaara reiterated that the point of being before the Commission was to talk about some of the issues of dealing with stormwater management and that it should be integrated into the Site Plan Review process. One of the most important things was to deal with it at the very beginning. She had seen a lot of communities wait until the end when they could not find a good place for the stormwater basin. Rochester Hills' standards included having a low impact, best management practices approach to Site Plan Review. She referred to a manual put together by SEMCOG the previous year, which was a low impact development manual for the State of Michigan, and it contained many best management practices for various situations. She offered that it was available to anyone interested, and that it was very helpful. The processes from the manual could be used for new or redevelopment sites, large or small sites. The CRWC always encouraged that a long-term maintenance plan be built into the plans. In five or six years, at the end of the process, there could be new best management practices. They were dealing with the issues of retrofitting basins and trying to make sure the stormwater on site was

taken care of before it was released.

Ms. Vaara talked about some projects done in neighboring communities, and showed one bordering Oakland Township and Lake Orion Township. The CRWC partnered with the Road Commission and HRC Engineering, as well as several community volunteers, as part of a conservation project. She showed the bank of the Paint Creek in that area, which had been bio-engineered and constructed using seed and rolled, live plants that sprouted. The sprouts and erosion control blankets grew over the winter and completed one growing season, and they virtually eliminated any erosion runoff into the Paint Creek. She stated that it was a very successful project. She showed some examples of green roof technology, which was also used on carports on another city. She showed some vegetated bio swales that were used for stormwater management. Instead of using a typical curb and gutter, a community chose to have the water run off the road and into the bioswales, in the middle of the neighborhood. Bioswales are aesthetically pleasing and also save a lot of money in the long run in construction costs, because they do not have to deal with infrastructure.

Ms. Vaara referred to Rochester Hills' Steep Slope Ordinance, Tree Conservation Ordinance and new Engineering Standards and said it was very important to have complete cooperation between disciplines - Planning, Engineering and Building all talking to each other to make sure the process was coordinated.

Ms. Vaara concluded that the CRWC had seven staff members with disciplines in education and stewardship. They relied on memberships from individuals, businesses, local government and grant money. That was how they existed and how they remained in business for 38 years. She ended saying that it was about "fresh water."

Mr. Delacourt pointed out that it was clear to see why they built stormwater management into the Zoning Ordinance and other documents. The Planning Commission had seen more tools being implemented in Site Plans - rain gardens and bioswales, for example. When Staff asked the Planning Commission about moving things around on a site to incorporate above ground detention basins as opposed to underground, having the perspective of the CRWC was important to remember.

Mr. Schroeder asked if the cities and the DEQ had resolved the SWPPI ("swiftee") disagreement yet.

Ms. Vaara said that she was not sure. It was still being reviewed, as far as she knew. She added that the public education part of the new permitting process had not changed, and according to the DEQ, it would not change. Those requirements were still in place, which was essential. They were discussing changes in rules and regulations for the elicit discharge and elimination plans, stormwater pollution prevention plan and so on.

Mr. Kaltsounis commented that there were no glaciers or mountains with snow feeding the rivers, so he wondered how the Clinton River was fed naturally, other than stormwater.

Ms. Vaara responded that groundwater recharge was certainly a part of it, as was rainwater. The area was lake controlled, so in the spring and fall the River was a little deeper and more flashy. The best time to kayak would be in the spring. There were very low flows in the summertime, and that was due to some of the lake controls that were upstream. In the summer, the stream suffered because there was not enough precipitation, although the past summer was better and good for the environment because there was more rain. The temperature increased and flow decreased causing the River to suffer in the summer. They were concerned about that for the Paint Creek, because it was the only cold water fishery in southeast Michigan and was recognized by the DNR as such. That was constantly being monitored for flow and temperature.

Hearing no further comments, Chairperson Boswell thanked Ms. Vaara for her presentation. Ms. Vaara thanked Rochester Hills for supporting the CRWC.

This matter was Discussed

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 2007-0324** Request for Recommendation of an Extension of the Tentative Preliminary Plat Until May 17, 2010 - Rochester Meadows, a 47-lot subdivision development on approximately 22 acres, located east of Rochester Road and south of Avon, zoned R-3, One Family Residential, Rochester Meadows LLC, applicant.
- (Reference: Memo prepared by Derek Delacourt, dated October 16, 2009 had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)*

Present for the applicant was Joe Check, representing Rochester Meadows LLC., Shelby Township, MI 48317.

Mr. Check summarized that the request was for an Extension of the original approval of the Preliminary Plat, until May 17, 2010, for Rochester Meadows Subdivision. He stated that they were finalizing the engineering plans; they had obtained Sanitary Sewer, Water and Drain Permits; and they were putting the finishing touches on the Final Preliminary Plat.

Chairperson Boswell asked Mr. Delacourt if he anticipated any major changes to the upcoming Plat.

Mr. Delacourt did not believe that there would be major changes. He noted that the City's Engineering Standards had changed since the Preliminary Plat was designed. Staff would have brought the matter forward sooner, but they wanted to have an Extensions Policy in place first, whereby an applicant would be required to bring a Plat into conformance with the new requirements prior to getting an Extension. It was decided that an applicant would be required to provide a letter indicating that they understood there was a change to the standards. Prior to the matter going forward for any additional steps, the applicant would have to bring the Plat in for a revised review. The letter for Rochester Meadows was submitted, the Extensions Policy was finalized, and the applicant understood the requirements. Mr. Delacourt added that there would probably be some changes, but not major ones, and the applicant might be required to come back in the future with a revised Plat.

Mr. Schroeder moved the following motion:

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Yukon, in the matter of City File No. 99-011 (Rochester Meadows Subdivision), the Planning Commission recommends a one-year Approval of an Extension of the Tentative Preliminary Plat until May 17, 2010.

Mr. Dettloff asked Mr. Check what he saw out in the marketplace. Mr. Check said that it was still a very difficult market, but they were confident enough to get the plans approved and the underground work in, and he felt the market would come around in the next year or so. They were prepared to finish the subdivision, and they wanted to do so in 2010. Mr. Dettloff concurred that it was encouraging.

Chairperson Boswell called for a voice vote.

A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Yukon, that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 1 - Klomp

DISCUSSION

2009-0393 Discuss proposal for northeast corner of Hamlin and Livernois; Signature Associates.

(Reference: Memo prepared by Derek Delacourt, dated October 16, 2009 had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Chileshe Mulenga and Kathy Wilson, Associates, Signature Advisory Services, One Towne Square, #1200, Southfield, MI 48076 and Brian Iseler, 1921 S. Livernois, Rochester Hills, MI 48307-3369, owner of one of the parcels under discussion.

Mr. Delacourt recalled that several years ago, the Planning Commissioners looked at a request for a Rezoning to O-1 (Office) for the subject parcels, which was not supported by the Master Land Use Plan, and recommended denial. The matter did not progress further. Recently, Staff was approached with a request to again discuss the potential for O-1 zoning. He summarized that there had been changes to the economy, a change to the intersection at Hamlin and Livernois, and that the City had updated its Master Plan. Staff and the applicant felt there was merit to re-evaluate the matter, and the applicant wanted to get input from the Planning Commission. The applicants represented both property owners, and they were considering a Rezoning to O-1 from single-family residential. They submitted a basic Site Plan, although they did not have a user, to see if the parcels could be reasonably developed under the O-1 district. There would obviously have to be some issues worked out and a complete set of plans submitted.

Chairperson Boswell asked Mr. Delacourt to explain what the Master Plan showed for the parcels.

Mr. Delacourt replied that the Master Plan identified the parcels to be Single-Family Residential with a Mixed-Residential overlay, which would allow flexibility in the type of residential, including senior living and would allow several other uses.

Chairperson Boswell noted that the parcels were bordered on the north

and east by churches. Mr. Delacourt added that one of the parcels was currently developed with a single-family residence and the one directly on the corner was vacant.

Mr. Mulenga reviewed that they were proposing a change in zoning from R-3 to O-1. The Site Plan showed a maximum allowable building, if used as O-1, of about 28,000 square feet at three stories high. It would require 248 parking spaces. They overlaid the proposed roundabout at the corner of Hamlin and Livernois to show the impact on the property and intersection. He asked Mr. Iseler to speak about the roundabout's impact to his residential property.

Mr. Iseler noted that he lived just north of Hamlin on Livernois, and when the light turned red, he could now at least make a left turn. When the roundabout was added, he said there would be a constant flow of traffic, and it would be impossible for him to get out. He said he was not looking forward to the roundabout.

Mr. Mulenga proposed two means of ingress and egress for the site, which were pushed back as far as possible from the roundabout. That was due to the merging issues that would be attributable down both Hamlin and Livernois. If it stayed as a residential use, it would be a major issue to get in and out of the site. The traffic in the area would be increased with the roundabout. They felt that by changing the use, it would compliment some of the adjacent uses that were business-oriented and in close proximity to the corner. They felt a business use would be more appropriate for the corner. There had been a market shift nationally and locally, and the housing market had been dramatically changed. Housing was projected to drop by 15-25% by 2011. A business use would have a higher impact as far as the tax rolls, and they felt the use would also be synergistic with regards to some of the local institutions - Crittenton Hospital and Oakland University, for example. He asked if any Commissioners had feedback.

Chairperson Boswell asked Mr. Delacourt about the present occupancy rate for office in Rochester Hills. Mr. Delacourt said it was somewhat high, but overall it was about 8.5% for office and light industrial, which was much better than most communities (Oakland County average at the time was 14%).

Mr. Kaltsounis recalled when the matter was before them previously, and said the proposal was for a one or two-story office building and a day care center. It did not go over well at the time. He remembered that the corner

was brought up in the Master Plan review meetings, and they discussed it at length. They went back and forth about what should be on the corner(s), and what it should look like. They ended up with the Mixed-Residential overlay, where there could be fewer curb cuts and houses could be attached, to try to accommodate the challenges of the corner. He observed that if there was a residential development, 37% of the trees would have to be saved, but an office building would give the corner a completely different look. There was a potential to lose most of the trees, replacing them with pavement and underground retention and a three-story building, and that really concerned him. With all the work that went into the Master Plan, he did not think the corner was right for an office building, although he felt that the south corner might be different. Three stories was pushing it, and he did not think it would be compatible with the environment, and it would stick out like a sore thumb.

Mr. Schroeder wished to echo those sentiments. He noted that the Site Plan showed the property going into the Livernois right-of-way. He asked if the City had not acquired the right-of-way. Mr. Mulenga advised that a small amount had been acquired for the right-of-way.

Mr. Schroeder stated that a three-story building was not acceptable for the site. He did not think it was the right site for commercial. He noted that no detention was shown on the Plan. The applicant had commented that traffic would increase due to the roundabout, but Mr. Schroeder assured that a roundabout did not increase traffic. It might change the character, but it did not increase traffic. He stated that the driveway onto Hamlin Road would definitely be a right-turn only, which the applicant had no control over. The southwest corner would be a concern; they had the same situation. They had the same situation on the southeast corner, but he believed the City now owned that property. He did not think the site was proper for a Rezoning and a three-story building.

Mr. Mulenga offered that the Site Plan was only conceptual. It described the maximum allowed, and he stated that in no way, shape or form was it final or what would be built. Mr. Schroeder acknowledged that.

Ms. Brnabic asked the applicants if they were the same group that was before the Commission in 2005. Ms. Wilson agreed that she was with the former applicant, Talon Group, but said they went out of business. They still owned the property, and Signature was representing them and acting as consultant for the project.

Ms. Brnabic agreed that three stories was too much for the location. At

the previous Rezoning request, the applicants approached it two different ways - a straight Rezoning and a Conditional Rezoning. They were waiting for the update to the Master Plan, which had now occurred. It was left Single-Family Residential with an option for Mixed-Residential. She did not have a different view than she had previously, especially regarding three stories. They had discussed office and a day care mix. She did not think she could go along with O-1 as proposed.

Mr. Reece agreed with most of the sentiments expressed. He said that Mr. Kaltsounis had a good point about the number of trees that would be cut down for an office development. The three stories would be a deal killer, and he felt it was completely inappropriate for the site. He would also be concerned about the other corners and whether it would open it up to other Rezoning requests. If there was a creative approach to the site for an office use, he would be more inclined to consider it. He tended to agree that residential on that corner would be problematic. He did not think there would be too many people who wanted to build a single-family residence on that corner, particularly with the roundabout. It was his opinion that if the applicants came up with a more creative approach, it would be more palatable. If they came back with something that allowed an office use that still blended in with the character of the neighborhood that was not three-story, he would be more open to it.

Mr. Dettloff agreed with Mr. Reece's thoughts. He would be open-minded to a Rezoning because of the roundabout issue and the glut of housing in the marketplace. If the applicants came up with something creative, that was not three-story, he would be more open to hearing about it. From an economic development standpoint, something there would be better than nothing to support the City's tax base, but he would like to see something a little better than what was proposed.

Ms. Brnabic asked if the house that was currently on the parcel was occupied, and Mr. Iseler confirmed that he was the owner and that he lived there. Ms. Brnabic said that she was not totally shutting the door to something else. As far as residential, she realized it was not moving now, but as a long-time member of the community, she had seen homes built on busy roads all over. It was surprising, but it happened. She could not be sure a home would not eventually be built on the parcel, but she stated that she could keep an open mind regarding something else. She would not want to see a three-story development, and she shared the concerns about losing trees.

Mr. Hooper recalled that when the matter came before them previously,

he felt then that single family would not be appropriate for the corner. He noted that there were spirited discussions about the corner during the Master Land Use Plan meetings that ended with Mixed-Residential, but he was not sure that would work, either. He agreed that three stories would be totally out of character, but if they would come back with a proposal for Conditional Rezoning with office with a smaller footprint that retained the character of the area and the vegetation and trees to a certain degree, he would be willing to look at it. He commented that the devil would be in the details and how it was presented. He added that the site was bordered by two churches that would not be going away, and that presented an opportunity. He thought Mr. Reece's comments were well founded, and that something creative could be an asset to the community.

Mr. Dettloff said that whatever the applicants came back with, he would like a market research included. Statistics that showed what the market would bear currently and in the future. He felt that it would be beneficial to have that, as opposed to just putting up a building and waiting for it to be leased.

Ms. Wilson said that the owners would not speculate on a building. Giving it time to get through the process and to figure out who the potential users were, they were anticipating that the market would turn. As for what the market was today, that was difficult to know. She knew the applicants had spent a lot of money on the property over the years on plans, engineering especially, and she wanted to get a better idea of what they were looking for as far as something creative.

Mr. Delacourt said that Staff discussed Conditional Rezoning. They realized that the applicants did not have a user and to come up with a Site Plan and elevations they felt would be compatible would be difficult prior to a Rezoning. The Planning Commission had considered Conditional Rezonings in the past that had conditions that limited the height of buildings and required the elevations to be approved by the Commission and so on. That would be a way to do it and not adopt a Site Plan that would come back differently. It could give some assurance that the things the Commission were most concerned about would be protected. He thought a Conditional Rezoning with conditions would be the best suggestion based on the conversation they just had.

Chairperson Boswell summarized that it was fairly obvious the Commissioners would be pretty open. They all seemed to agree that residential for the corner at this time was pretty iffy. There were churches on two sides. It was open for something, and they were not going to close

the door. A Conditional Rezoning seemed to be a good answer. As far as creative, they did not want to see asphalt, three stories, and a block building, to save some character of the corner, because it was a nice, well-treed corner that was up a little higher. He felt that the Commissioners would be open to hearing what the applicants had to say about a plan other than maximums and three stories.

Mr. Mulenga said that their task for the meeting was to describe in general the footprint and not go into details about green space and landscaping. The comments were well taken and they would do what they had to do.

Ms. Brnabic asked if the applicants were going to propose Conditional Rezoning that they first came back before the Commission to have a discussion about the conditions proposed. If they just came before the Commission for a Rezoning with conditions, there would only be the option to approve or deny. They would not have the discretion to re-discuss everything or suggest anything. If the Commission agreed with 11 out of 12 conditions, they would be put in a position. If they had a discussion first, they could go over everything, which she felt would be a better option.

Ms. Wilson asked if the City had utilized Conditional Rezoning previously, which was confirmed.

Chairperson Boswell asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak, and no one came forward.

This matter was Discussed

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

NEXT MEETING DATE

The Chair reminded the Commissioners that the next Regular Meeting was scheduled for November 17, 2009.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Commisison, and upon motion by Kaltsounis, the Chair adjourned the Regular Meeting at 8:10 p.m., Michigan time.

William F. Boswell, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary