



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 21, 2008

7:30 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson William Boswell called the Regular Planning Commission Meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Auditorium.

ROLL CALL

Present 9 - William Boswell, Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis, Nathan Klomp, David Reece, C. Neall Schroeder and Emmet Yukon

Quorum Present

Also Present: Ed Anzek, Director of Planning and Development
Derek Delacourt, Deputy Director
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

Chairperson Boswell welcomed Mr. Nathan Klomp, the newest member of the Planning Commission, and announced that Mayor Barnett wished to say a few words before the meeting.

Mayor Barnett explained that he came to the meeting to introduce Mr. Klomp, who was filling the position of former Commissioner Kathleen Hardenburg, whom the Mayor declared did a fantastic job for the Commission. He was very happy that Mr. Klomp had joined the ranks of "this esteemed body." He told the story of how he first met Mr. Klomp. There had been a simulated drowning exercise at Spencer Park one day, and the Mayor was sitting with the Fire Chief. They had alerted all the people who had entered the Park via the road about the exercise. There was an off-duty fire fighter in a lifeboat in the middle of the lake. Unbeknownst to the lifeguards, and at a certain point during the day, the gentleman was to fall over and simulate a drowning, and they would film how quickly the lifeguards rescued the victim. They had not planned on Mr. Klomp out on a run in the back of the park in red lifeguard shorts, and he did not know about the training drill. When the gentleman fell over,

they saw Mr. Klomp jump in and attempt to rescue the non-drowning fire fighter. When they got him to shore, the Mayor thought Mr. Klomp was a lifeguard, and he told him what a great job he did. Mr. Klomp said he was just jogging by, and he saw someone in the lake. The Mayor remarked that Mr. Klomp had been jumping into public service ever since, including serving on RARA, and the Mayor thought this would be a perfect place for him to get involved in the community.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2008-0518 September 2, 2008 Regular Meeting

A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Kaltsounis, that this matter be Approved as Presented.

The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 9 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Klomp, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

COMMUNICATIONS

- A)** Planning & Zoning News dated August 2008
- B)** Clinton River Connection Local Trip Planning Guide
- C)** Letter from Charter Township of Shelby, dated 09/09/08 re: Master Plan
- D)** Letter from C. Burckhardt, Planner for Oakland County, dated 09/09/08 re: Troy’s Master Plan
- E)** Letter from C. Burckhardt, dated 09/09/08 re: Troy’s Master Plan review

NEW BUSINESS

2007-0029 Request for Adoption of the 2008 Master Thoroughfare Plan Update (Public Hearing)

(Reference: Memo prepared by Ed Anzek, dated October 21, 2008 and March 2008 Master Thoroughfare Plan Update, submitted by The Corradino Group of Michigan, Inc., had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Mr. Anzek stated that the Master Thoroughfare Plan (MTP) came to a conclusion in late spring. At that time, it was his desire to have McKenna Associates review the MTP to make sure there was nothing in it that worked against the Master Land Use Plan adopted in February 2007. Mr.

Breuckman reviewed it and offered some considerations for the consultants, and the draft MTP provided to the Commissioners contained a few changes to the text. Mr. Anzek introduced the team members: Mr. Joe Corradino and Mr. Jim Hartman of The Corradino Group of Michigan, Inc.; Paul Shumejko, the City's Transportation Engineer; and Steve Dearing of Orchard, Hiltz & McCliment, Inc. He advised that they had worked closely with a very solid technical team, including Jerry Dettloff and Neall Schroeder of the Planning Commission. There were also representatives from City Council, MDOT, the Road Commission, the City of Troy, Oakland University, the Transportation Improvement Association and several other Staff members. He had asked Mr. Shumejko to give a little more detail about the process and the extensive outreach program. He felt that the fundamental reason the consultants were selected was because of their extensive outreach and public input programs. There were numerous meetings held, and he felt it paid off very well for the City.

Mr. Shumejko expressed that he was pleased to present the final update to the MTP. The process began in December 2006 with initial meetings with the technical advisory committee, which was comprised of many good resources and agencies. During the entire process, there were several public informational meetings which took place at various locations - City Hall, the library and several schools. They tried to provide different venues for the public to be able to look at and comment about the Plan, and a lot of that information was incorporated into the final report. He noted that in 1989, the City adopted the first Plan, which was called the Comprehensive Transportation Plan. It was amended in 1991, and in 1998 the Plan was updated and renamed. There was one final amendment in 1999, and typically, the updates occurred every six to eight years and were coordinated with the Master Land Use Plan update.

Mr. Shumejko continued that the process came to closure in February of 2008 and it received the full support of the Advisory Technical Committee. There were some additions, subsequently, based on comments from McKenna Associates. There was a joint Planning Commission/City Council meeting in March 2008. The main intent of the meeting was to provide an overview of the plan and to show the preferred alternative. After the presentation, they would open the floor to comments and questions. He turned the discussion over to Mr. Hartman.

Mr. Hartman said he was the Project Manager for the Plan update. He advised that there were 14 meetings along the way, and he thanked the City Staff for their participation. They wanted the document to be flexible

to be able to change as priorities, budgets and timing also did. He also advised that they held six public meetings. They introduced the project and their scope of work at the first meeting. They held four workshops, which he felt were great exercises. They handed out disposable cameras to find out what made people proud and what they felt needed improving. It was critical to make it a plan of the residents. They held visioning exercises, to find out what people wanted to see in the future in Rochester Hills. In May of 2007 they began to get into the technical aspects and the deficiencies, both safety and operational. In July they came back with some alternatives to address those concerns. They asked people to evaluate factors such as air quality, congestion, safety or noise. There were three different groups rating. It was interesting to see that all groups were not that far off. Safety and moving traffic were the most important items to the community.

During the overall process, the groups evaluated the alternatives based on those factors and came up with a preferred Plan, which quantified right-of-way impacts, looked at the parks and non-motorized facilities and at how everything related. They tweaked everything and came up with priorities. They met in April 2008 with the Advisory, Traffic and Safety Board, Planning Commission and City Council.

Mr. Hartman explained that they used SEMCOG's transportation demand model that used demographics to forecast traffic to the year 2035. They made sure it was right for the area and added network and zone changes to refine it to reflect what was out there today. They discussed roundabout designs and how people would cross one, especially on Rochester Road, and the benefits of roundabouts. The Technical Committee discussed the deficiencies at the intersections and how the future would be problematic - they were problematic to some degree today. He suggested that for both sides of the equation, if they had to get together to widen something, for example, the City would have to work together to facilitate it with an amendment. The Technical Committee did not get into that issue, and he felt it would be something the Zoning Ordinance Technical Committee might have to tackle.

Mr. Hartman listed context, the pedestrian feel and how the road looked, and said that they were outside of what they looked at, but he assured there was a lot of flexibility, and that a lot of detail in the document would help lead to the right decisions when the time came. It would not be the perfect solution to all the problems, but they considered it a test that might work on some of the major roads.

Mr. Hartman indicated that the update was being done because land use had changed, the transportation network changed - there was a new Adams Road interchange - and there was new development in the last 10-15 years, all of which they tried to reflect in the update. They focused on the major roads: The State roads included Auburn, M-59 and Rochester Road; the County roads included South Boulevard, Adams, Avon, Livernois, Dequindre, Walton, Tienken and Dutton; the major roads for Rochester Hills were John R, Old Perch and Brewster, and the rest were categorized as local roads.

Mr. Hartman noted that Rochester Hills was surrounded by growing communities - Auburn Hills, Shelby Township, Troy and Oakland Township. Members from those communities were invited and had attended some of the Technical Committee meetings. Troy had ideas to deal with improvements to Dequindre, which were put into the Plan. When they looked at the future road network, they took into account the existing and committed projects. Those projects were planned but not built, and solutions for the transportation deficiencies were shown through the year 2035. Projects in adjacent communities also had an effect on Rochester Hills' traffic and planning. In 2035, deficiencies would continue to get worse - portions of John R, Dequindre and sections north of the boulevard on Livernois. He mentioned that SEMCOG had modified their forecasts. They thought the demographics and growth, especially on the urban fringe, would be a lot greater than they turned out to be. The consultants did some sensitivity tests as requested by the Technical Committee. SEMCOG said that traffic was down another 5%. They put together 30 different alternatives. They started fixing north/south roads one at a time, but it was not giving them much relief for the future. They looked at improving one east/west road. They did not see much relief by just improving South Boulevard, for example. They started to combine the alternatives, and it was not until years 2020 to 2030 that they would start to see a lot of congestion relief. They would need a combination of north/south, east/west road improvements to help traffic. An idea was raised about doing all perimeter roads, where they could share in the costs with other communities. They came up with the top seven alternatives. He referred to evaluation factors and said they looked at congestion, better connect links, travel time, air quality, noise, right-of-way impacts and safety, all of which were largely considered. He went over various tables in his presentation, and said they calculated impacts and savings and scored citizen input. He pointed out that those improvements did not include costs, but they looked at that next. They wanted the community to come up with the plan that made the most sense, and costs made a difference in the ranking. Alternative 23

originally had Old Perch in the Plan, but the Technical Committee thought it made better sense to look at the section of Livernois just north of Hamlin, so that modification was made. Another was to look at Dequindre Rd. The City saw a lot of benefit to doing that project, but they did not think they could push it onto Rochester or Shelby Township. They needed to talk with those communities before moving forward. The Technical Committee thought it was a great idea to focus on the section that could have an effect, and that was the section of Dequindre between Auburn and Avon. That would provide a lot of relief. The intersections of Avon and Dequindre and 23 and Dequindre by Yates Cider Mill were looked at. They suggested realigning Dequindre and putting in a bridge over the valley behind the Cider Mill. It would be about ten million dollars, but it would really improve the traffic operations at the intersection. There would have to be right-of-way purchased, but there would be an opportunity to improve the flow.

Mr. Hartman said they had been focused on the operational side in selecting the preferred plans - he claimed that safety and operations went hand in hand - and they did a detailed crash analysis, looking at vehicular and non-motorized crashes. There were about seven or eight intersections that were above average for crashes, and Auburn and Rochester was top in the County.

Mr. Hartman said they suggested adding a right turn lane at Tienken and Adams on the westbound, southbound and northbound approach. There was a lot of cut-thru traffic. The Plan was a solution to fix 2035 deficiencies at Rochester and Auburn Road. They could add dual lefts, thru lanes and other ideas. They looked at a roundabout for that intersection, something with a significant safety component. It had issues with flow and the adjacent intersections and potential pedestrian impacts and land use impacts. They spent a lot of time on the concept, as well as on traditional concepts, and even recommended improving the section north of that intersection by adding a series of roundabouts and putting in a boulevard section between Auburn and Barclay Circle.

Mr. Dearing added that the roundabouts hit the corners to get the circular roadway. The traditional way of adding more lanes under signal control still would have right-of-way impacts that stretched down the road in all directions for ¼ to ½ mile. They could not add a lot of capacity without some sort of an impact. They would have to trade off a big hit at the corners and isolate it to the immediate area of the roundabout. Or there could be "frontage takes" that stretched down the road 1,000 or 1,500 feet or more, touching many parcels. There was no such thing as a silver

bullet and no painless way of getting those kinds of improvements made, and they had to be sensitive to the tradeoffs they would accept.

Mr. Hartman advised that they had asked MDOT to address the intersections on Rochester Road. There was a potential to get some safety funding, but a roundabout could eliminate about 40% of all crashes, and there had been 400 over three years at Rochester and Auburn.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if they showed actual data or data predicted based upon the conflict points. Mr. Dearing said it was a study done by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety. It was a study of intersections that had been under signal control and were rebuilt to be roundabouts. They were actual intersections converted to roundabouts. Mr. Kaltsounis said he would be interested in seeing the size of the roundabouts and the volume of traffic. He thought one might work at Livernois and Hamlin, but Rochester Road had a lot of potential energy around the circle. He referred to the one at 18 and Van Dyke, when the plant let out, and said it was a nightmare. He thought it was too small, and that they needed a radius that was large enough to support a lot of traffic. He said he had been in a lot of places that had roundabouts, but it was too small there. Mr. Dearing said there were different practices about roundabout design. Small translated into slower speeds. He explained that the key to getting roundabouts to work was keeping them slow. For a multi-lane roundabout, no one should enter or go through it at much more than 20-23 miles per hour.

Mr. Yukon wondered about the recommendation for deceleration speed, and if they had to slow the traffic down on Rochester Road, how far back it would start if they were looking at a roundabout for the intersection.

Mr. Dearing replied that the normal practice was that the posted speed limit would not change, but the drivers would be told of the advisory speed to enter a roundabout. During peak rush hour traffic, there would be some queuing of vehicles waiting to enter the roundabouts, and that was a self-enforcing way of getting people slower. With multiple-lane roundabouts, they would have to worry about pedestrian safety, so they would want vehicles slower. If there were a back up of 10-15 cars waiting to enter, that would ensure a slow pace for pedestrians to cross. The design they used in the Plan was the same one used at Maple and Farmington roads, except that they had three by two lanes, and the one for Rochester and Auburn showed three lanes entering, circulating and existing in all directions. The roundabout at Maple and Farmington had

been built and was operating very well.

Mr. Reece asked how the volume of each interchange compared. Mr. Dearing advised that Rochester and Auburn had an entering traffic volume of about 75-80,000 from all directions. The peak would be about 10% of the total, so they would have about 7,500 to 8,000 per hour during those times. At Maple and Farmington, the peak was about 4,500 to 5,000 per hour. He mentioned that there was a roundabout planned in a year or so for Orchard Lake Road and Maple, which would have 8,000 cars an hour. Mr. Reece asked where there was a roundabout that handled the volume of traffic such as that at Rochester and Auburn. Mr. Dearing said the Northwestern projects would be the largest collection of the highest volume roundabouts in North America. Mr. Reece clarified that there was not one yet built where they could test for real data.

Mr. Kaltsounis questioned if there was anything in the plan to address factors of the roundabout to assess if it was a good idea ten years down the road. He felt there things they were not sure about. Mr. Dearing said that it was a Plan that represented a vision of 20 years into the future for the community. They recognized that there was a certain level of discomfort associated with roundabouts, but they would have the largest concentration of high volume roundabouts built in neighboring communities as examples. They would be the pioneers and Rochester Hills could benefit from their experiences. Even if the City passed a Resolution saying it wanted that location to look the roundabout, there would be MDOT bureaucracy to get through, a wait for funding, and it would probably be eight to ten years away. Mr. Hartman said that the County required that roundabouts be looked at for every intersection.

Ms. Brnabic asked if the traditional intersection improvement was the first plan and the roundabout was the alternate or if they would be equally considered. Mr. Hartman relayed that there was a safety and an operational deficiency at the intersection. They did not pick a route because there were many steps and priorities that would go into a decision. The City would have to buy the right of way and there really was no money for that. He believed there were great safety benefits to a roundabout. Mr. Shumejko said that there had always been a lot of discussion about putting in a six-lane boulevard on Rochester Road. With a roundabout, because of the capacity improvement, they would possibly be afforded the opportunity to not need the six-lane boulevard and eliminate potential impacts to the right-of-way along the corridor. They could perhaps get away with only a four-lane boulevard with an landscaped median. That would increase the safety with conflicts from

direct left turns along Rochester Road in front of the Target mall.

Ms. Brnabic said she would need more information and data to convince her a roundabout was a good idea at that intersection. She was curious whether the light at Lowe's had helped alleviate accidents. She felt that the lanes they put in at Rochester and Tienken were working very well. Mr. Shumejko said there had been evidence that there was some delay there based on recent data by the Road Commission. Mr. Reece agreed with Ms. Brnabic that there was a significant improvement from what it was.

Mr. Shumejko referred to Ms. Brnabic's question about the light at Lowe's, and said that because of its close proximity to Auburn Road they did not add a dedicated left southbound into the Lowe's site. He mentioned that MDOT was doing a safety audit and corridor study of Rochester Road, and they were going to look at the signal and the intersections. Ms. Brnabic thought that having a light to make a left turn out of Meijer's made a noticeable difference. She said she was not totally against roundabouts, but she felt they were somewhat confusing. Mr. Shumejko said it was just another tool in the toolbox and when they did get around to doing something, it could be taken under consideration.

Mr. Hartman said that the City had asked the consultants to look at the non-motorized pathway system. He stated that Rochester Hills had an "awesome" system. They tried to look for gaps and they looked at accidents.

Regarding roundabouts, it was suggested that the City needed to consider that they might need right-of-way, and they should plan to move away from the intersections and widen the right-of-way.

Mr. Anzek said that the basis for doing a Master Thoroughfare Plan was to identify future right-of-way needs and future intersection improvements. The Zoning Ordinance had a provision that setbacks should be measured from planned, future right-of-ways, which was an example of how the City worked toward a cooperative arrangement with an applicant. The adoption of the MTP would set the benchmark for measuring for future development and redevelopment affected by those intersections.

Mr. Schroeder said they would need a Master Right-of-Way Plan adopted by the City showing the right-of-way. He said that Big Beaver Road had a Master Right-of-Way Plan for 30 years and every time developers wanted to do something, they were shown that Plan. Mr. Anzek agreed, and said

that it would be done with the adoption of the Master Thoroughfare Plan with the map included.

Mr. Hartman referred to the Crooks Road project, which had been deferred to 2013 north of the boulevard. They had a lot of discussion about getting capital to the projects to be able to do the second bridge and make road improvements up to Hamlin Road. The next priority was to do the first phase of Dequindre. He summarized that there were some committed, non-motorized plans, and they identified 18 priority sections, including those across M-59, to be about \$5 million. There was about \$20 million in existing committed projects, the City's share, which would include the Crooks Road project. The first phase of Dequindre, including the bridge and the tie behind the Cider Mill would be \$19 million; the rest of Dequindre would follow. The short-term roadway and intersection fixes would happen when the City felt it was time to move and start planning. In total, they had recommended about \$87 million of roadway improvements.

Mr. Anzek said that in the future, some of the identified projects and problematic intersections would start to show up in the Capital Improvement Plan. He thought they should get them into the Plan to get moving. They had met with Shelby Township, and the City of Rochester's Master Thoroughfare Plan called for the widening of Dequindre. Shelby Township was very interested in doing it, but because of the cost, it would take a very strong, solid, committed effort many years into the future.

Chairperson Boswell opened the Public Hearing at 9:02 p.m. Seeing no one come forward, he closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Kaltsounis thanked the team members for the work they did on the Plan. He thought there was a lot of passion involved, and he thought the public input was great. He agreed with Mr. Anzek about getting the projects into the CIP and about looking ahead. He thought that Mr. Schroder's idea about the Master Right-of-Way Plan and saving space at the intersections was a great idea also as they looked to the future. He moved the following motion:

MOTION *by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schroeder, that the Planning Commission hereby adopts the 2008 Master Thoroughfare Plan Update for the City of Rochester Hills as presented.*

WHEREAS, Act 285 of the Public Acts of 1931 (Municipal Planning Act, as amended), requires the municipal Planning

Commission to prepare and adopt a Master Plan for the physical development of the municipality; and

WHEREAS, the City of Rochester Hills Code of Ordinances, Chapter 2-07 established a City Planning Commission with all the powers, duties, and functions set forth in the Municipal Planning Act; and

WHEREAS, the City Transportation Plan is an important element of the City Master Land Use Plan; and

WHEREAS, the "2008 Master Thoroughfare Plan Update" ("the Plan") has been prepared by the City's professional staff in consultation with the transportation consulting firms of The Corradino Group and Orchard, Hiltz & McCliment, Inc. and transportation agencies involved with the City's road system; and

WHEREAS, the Plan has been developed in consideration of projected future traffic volumes and traffic demand on the City's road system which have been derived from extensive information and data that have been collected and used to make projections of future growth and development in Rochester Hills; and

WHEREAS, the Plan is further based on established criteria and policies relative to preserving community character and the natural environment, and strategies to intercept and divert through-traffic originating outside the City while accommodating local traffic and facilitating a reasonable level of service on the City's roadways in the future; and

WHEREAS, input and comments have been received from many sources including citizens, the City Council, and other public agencies and surrounding communities regarding future traffic projections, transportation issues, goals and objectives, alternative plans, and priority improvement projects through the year 2035; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a Public Hearing in accordance with the Municipal Planning Act on October 21, 2008 and received public comment; and other public meetings were held by the Technical Committee for the Master Thoroughfare Plan on November 13, 2007, July 31, 2007 and March 29, 2007 and public workshops were held throughout the month of May

2007; and

WHEREAS, the general public, the City Administration, and other public agencies need to know the policies that the Planning Commission intends to use to guide the development of the City's transportation system; and

WHEREAS, the Plan provides a comprehensive and well-defined program for improvement of the City's transportation system to meet the needs of the community for the foreseeable future.

RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission of the City of Rochester Hills does hereby adopt the 2008 Master Thoroughfare Plan Update for the City of Rochester Hills, and that the Major Thoroughfare Plan element of the current Master Land Use Plan is superseded by the 2008 Master Thoroughfare Plan Update.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the adopted Plan in its final form shall be attested to and transmitted to the City Council of the City of Rochester Hills, the Oakland County Register of Deeds, the Oakland County Planning Commission, the Oakland County Road Commission and the Michigan Department of Transportation.

Mr. Reece stated that the first phase of the Dequindre road improvement was \$19 million, and it was indicated that the cost to realign Dequindre was about \$10 million. Mr. Anzek said that it would be \$10 million for the bridge over the wetland, and the remainder of Dequindre would be the other \$9 million. Mr. Reece clarified that the \$10 million excluded any costs for right-of-way, which Mr. Hartman confirmed, and he added that it would not include utility work. Mr. Reece asked if the \$9 million would be for the widening of Dequindre, and Mr. Hartman said it would be for about three miles south. Mr. Kaltsounis echoed Mr. Kaltsounis' comments and said it was a phenomenal plan, however, he was struggling about getting the best bang for their bucks. He questioned \$10 million to build a bridge, and wondered if there was a fairly significant amount of other improvements that could be made within the City for \$10 million that would help alleviate congestion other than at one particular intersection. He said he drove Dequindre quite often from 5 to 7:00 p.m. and he said it was a little bit of a pain at times, but he felt there were certainly other intersections that were significantly worse from a convenience standpoint. He asked if the concept was to off-load traffic from other roads onto Dequindre to make it more efficient and help alleviate congestion elsewhere. He asked the desire to spend \$10 million on the bridge, and

indicated that he could imagine public outcry if that were to happen.

Mr. Dearing agreed that there were a lot of spot improvements that could be done for \$10 million, but they already identified short and long-term intersection improvements. He stated that sooner or later, they would have to work on corridors to move traffic. It turned out that the Dequindre Road corridor gave several types of benefits that other corridors did not show. If there were people who liked to keep outsiders out of Rochester Hills, it was a boundary road where doing something about that would show a significant benefit. "Picking up" Dequindre and "delivering it" down to M-59 and the freeway system would help alleviate traffic that would otherwise avoid the corridor because of the Yates Cider Mill and come into town on Washington, Tienken and Parkdale. The other boundary roads did not hold anywhere near the promise that Dequindre did. Going behind the Cider Mill addressed one of the key problems of trying to otherwise improve the corridor because the Cider Mill was a historic property. To try to widen Avon in front of the Cider Mill would pose a detriment to it and to everything that made it valuable to the community as a resource. Going behind it would be the only way of avoiding the environmental issues associated with the property. It was a lot of money, but because it was a border, the costs would be shared between the Road Commission for Oakland and Macomb Counties, Rochester Hills and Shelby Township. Mr. Reece asked if \$10 million was not the City's cost. Mr. Dearing said it was a project cost. The Rochester Hills' share would be five pennies on the dollar, so he felt that there would be a large community benefit for a relatively modest cost.

Mr. Anzek said that the City's share would be about \$1 million. As a boundary road, there would also be twice as many legislators seeking support of the road.

Mr. Hooper also agreed with Mr. Kaltsounis that the consultants and the team did a great job on the Plan. He recalled that the previous Plan showed improvements to Adams Road, but the current Plan did not propose any. The best alternative showed Adams becoming increasingly congested with no relief proposed for the next 25 years. He asked the reason for leaving Adams out of the equation of the preferred alternative.

Mr. Dearing said that it was not that they did not see any intrinsic value to making improvements along the Adams Rd. corridor, but they were always searching for the least miles of improvements that would generate the largest incremental benefit. Widening Adams would provide a benefit to the community, but it was not a "big bang for the buck," whether it was

measured without dollar figures or if you looked at how much it cost to widen the roads. It was a valuable improvement, but it was not the best use of very limited resources. It was all predicated on forecasting for travel patterns, and a wild card would be if Oakland University decided to put in a major conference center or use it in some way that would suddenly generate a lot more traffic.

Mr. Hooper said that outside of costs and speaking politically, they should ask the residents what they would rather see - Dequindre improved, that would not service many Rochester Hills residents, or Adams improved, which services quite a few Rochester Hills residents. He thought it would be hands down for Adams.

Mr. Dearing remarked that if it were simply a beauty pageant method of choosing road improvements, the preferred alternative would look quite a bit different.

Mr. Yukon noted that currently in the middle of Livernois where the Clinton River Trail passes, there is a pedestrian calming traffic device. In the unimproved areas of the MTP, he wondered if there were plans to put in more of those types of devices. He added that in the summertime, when people on the Trail crossed Livernois, they went around the device and did not wait on the island, which was a concern.

Mr. Shumejko responded that they did not get into that level of detail with the pedestrian component. When the devices were installed at Livernois and Avon, the design was in its infancy. They were designed for the existing two-lane road configuration with limited space. He reminded that when Hamlin was widened, there would be a full boulevard. They would take advantage of it to provide a z-pattern crossing and bike trail across Hamlin, and it would have a much wider refuge island. The ones they had now were more intermediate until something more permanent occurred with the roadway. Mr. Yukon also agreed that it was a very good Plan.

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schroeder, that this matter be Adopted.

The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 9 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Klomp, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Chairperson Boswell stated that the Master Thoroughfare Plan Update was adopted unanimously. He thanked the gentleman, and said that he was also highly impressed with the Plan.

Recess from 9:21 to 9:30 p.m.

DISCUSSION

2007-0489 City File No. 07-011 - A request to discuss proposed future development of two parcels of land totaling approximately 3.8 acres, located at 1590 and 1608 Walton Blvd., east of Shagbark, Parcel Nos. 15-09-378-018 and -019, zoned R-2, One Family Residential, John Gaber, PLC, applicant.

(Chairperson Boswell had changed the order of the Agenda to hear the Discussion item next).

Present for the applicant was John Scaccia, Walton Boulevard Associates, L.L.C., 1080 N. Opdyke, Suite 220, Auburn Hills, MI 48326 and John Gaber, Williams, Williams, Rattner and Plunkett, P.C., 300 Old North Woodward, Birmingham, MI 48009.

Mr. Anzek stated that as the Commissioners might recall, when Conditional Rezoning were permitted by a new Planning Act, The City's Ordinance allowed an applicant to request a discussion with the Planning Commission prior to making a formal request. He deferred to the applicants, and reminded the Commissioners that it was a discussion only, not a negotiation.

Mr. Gaber corrected that he was not the applicant, as was stated on the Agenda. He informed that they wished to give their thoughts about development of the property and to illicit feedback and suggestions from the Commissioners. They realized that nothing was mandated; they wanted to put the property to its best potential use. He pointed out that the subject site was approximately four-acres comprised of two parcels, which were east of Shagbark on Walton Boulevard, across the street from townhomes and west of Abiding Presence Church. The last time Mr. Scaccia was in front of the Commission, he was considering developing the property with condos. There were issues with the density, and as a result of the current market conditions, the project was not feasible, and he had to look at other alternatives. He was now considering a medical office use, and they would like input regarding that idea. They believed the site was ideal for that use; it was close to Crittenton Hospital and near Medi-Lodge nursing home, and there were other offices and commercial buildings nearby on Walton. He noted that the property would have to be rezoned for a medical use. They could ask for a straight rezoning to O-1, but it might or might not be acceptable to the Commissioners. They did not really see a detriment to the straight rezoning with the uses in O-1 allowing professional and medical offices, banks and nursery schools.

Cell towers would be allowed, but the Commission might not want that use in the area. They could put a condition on the rezoning so they could not put cell towers or any other uses the Commission might find objectionable. They felt that the reason medical office would work in that location was because O-1 had limited uses; they were not objectionable uses; the hours would be basically 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.; the setbacks would be greater than for residential; and there would be a Type B Buffer required (25-foot width and plantings). If they put up a medical office building, it would be relegated to a single curb cut, and he reminded that residential would have many. He noted that it was on a major thoroughfare, which they believed would be better for a medical office building than for residential facilities. He recalled that there were neighbors that spoke at the last meeting who raised certain concerns with the condos they proposed. He pointed out that there was a lot of greenery in its natural state, and it would be their intention to preserve the existing buffer as much as they could, as well as add to it. They would rather put in greenery instead of a fence or wall. He offered that they would be amenable to a condition with regard to the buffer to ensure there was enough screening to satisfy the neighbors. In terms of the dimension of the site, they could possibly agree to extend the distance of the buffer. He related that they would put up a one-story medical office building; however with market conditions, it could be have other professional offices. He put up a drawing showing a configuration they felt made sense. They would like to have one, boulevard entrance in the middle of the site. The building would be approximately 20,000 square feet, and there would be ample parking. Mr. Gaber concluded that it was the direction they would like to move if everything went according to their plans.

Chairperson Boswell asked Mr. Gaber if he knew the occupancy rate for medical offices in Rochester Hills currently. Mr. Gaber said that Mr. Scaccia had done a lot of market research, and he surmised that Chairperson Boswell was asking the feasibility of filling the building. Mr. Scaccia said they had talked with some doctors who had expressed an interest in leasing in that location, as tenants or in partnership. He thought that half of the building could be leased right away. Chairperson Boswell remarked that half of the building would be empty. Mr. Gaber reiterated that they would like it to all be medical office, but they would probably need some flexibility about what office uses could be in the building in addition to medical.

Chairperson Boswell recalled that Mr. Gaber served on the Planning Commission and worked on the 1995 Master Land Use Plan. At that

time, the Commission stated that they would like to see commercial and office confined to specific intersections. He questioned whether Mr. Gaber was suggesting that they should fill in Walton.

Mr. Gaber said that there was a childcare center on the property and an old house next to it, which would not be there long term, so the question was about how they should redevelop the property. They could put in condos or single-family residential facing Walton, but he questioned whether that would make the most sense. There was a progression of uses along Walton from the east that would suggest that single-family residential might not be the best use for the property. He said he understood how the property was zoned and master planned. He suspected that the two parcels were not specifically scrutinized in the Master Plan update to see whether they should be converted or whether the designation should stay the same. Chairperson Boswell advised that on the south side of Walton, there was property scrutinized as to intensifying the use a little bit, but it was met with strong opposition from the neighbors.

Mr. Gaber said that they would be willing to go along with conditions to ensure that the neighbors would not be impacted.

Mr. Kaltsounis pointed out that a church could go in a residential zoning, and if a church was put there, it would be similar to what the applicants were proposing. He noted that there were a lot of churches on Walton. He suggested that if the applicant came back with a proposal, it would definitely have to be one story, and he would also like to see the Tree Ordinance complied with as much as possible. In the new Master Plan, they planned zoning according to the current density of properties, and he noted that the density proposed was much lower than it had been with the condos. He was grappling with those types of factors.

Mr. Delacourt commented that there was extensive discussion during the Master Plan update about the intersection at Rochdale and Walton (about which Chairperson Boswell spoke) and about the subject parcels. Parcels to the east of the applicant's were developed with the Abiding Presence Church and some other non-residential development and they were first identified in the Master Plan as Flex Business Use 1. There were different alternatives shown at different times, ranging from Flex 1 to office to residential. As the Tech Committee went forward, there was not 100% agreement about which direction the parcels should take. It was decided that unless it was 100%, they would leave the parcels as they were, but they would review individual requests as they came forward and

base decisions on whether the situation was the same or if something had changed since the Plan was adopted. They also agreed to take a harder look at the corners during the next update in five years.

Mr. Schroeder said that the difficulty would be that they turned down the rezoning request to office for the southwest corner of Rochdale and Walton, and there was a traffic signal there and it was a much busier intersection. They turned down two parcels at Hamlin and Livernois, at another major intersection. He thought it would be difficult to grant the applicant's request, having not granted the other requests.

Mr. Anzek updated the Commission about some happenings in the Walton corridor. He noted the Abiding Presence Church, which had another church to its east and east of that was a medical office building with a nursing center behind it. The nursing home bought the church to the west with plans to expand the nursing home. Also, he and Mr. Staran, the City Attorney, met with Mr. Plourde, who owns the parcel at Rochdale and Walton, and also with the attorney for the Rochdale homeowner's association. Mr. Plourde was trying to put an office on his property, but the lots were deed restricted. The City's efforts to master plan it office were principally sound, but the lobbying effort put forth by the residents convinced the Commission that it should stay residential. He reminded that the City did not get involved with deed restrictions, but Staff always tried to apply best planning practices to sites. He thought there was a strong chance that the southwest corner of Walton and Rochdale might come in front of the Commission again for a Conditional Rezoning. He wanted them to be aware that the Walton corridor was starting to have some transition.

Mr. Dettloff referred to the current occupancy rate for medical and the nature of the credit crunch, and he wondered if it would make sense to pursue a market feasibility study. He indicated that the lenders would want to see something to help substantiate whether or not they were making a good loan. He asked Mr. Scaccia if he only had a general discussion with the doctors. Mr. Scaccia said they could not commit to anything in writing because they did not have anything to sell. Mr. Dettloff said he understood, but he suggested that they pursue finding out what would work in today's market.

Mr. Gaber said he realized the concerns, and he reminded that Mr. Scaccia had been very successful with his past endeavors, and that he always built high quality developments. He commented that the lender and developer would obviously not put their money into the project unless

it was feasible. A market study was something they could look into, to try and find additional information to assure the Commission that there was a use for the building. Mr. Dettloff added that they would not want a void, and Mr. Gaber said that if Mr. Scaccia was not confident he could lease the building, he would not put his blood, sweat and tears into it.

Ms. Brnabic agreed with the comments, and she added that although the City could not honor deed restrictions, she felt that they needed to consider them for this property and for the residents. She recalled the deed restrictions they encountered with the residents of Juengel Orchards on Rochester Road, and said that the residents went to court three times and won against changing the zoning from residential. She wondered why the City would not consider that, and she thought they needed to draw a line somewhere. She agreed it would be impossible to consider every deed restriction, but with some situations, she felt the City had to. When the City's vision was different, she did not think it was logical to spend dollars in court to try to change something. She emphasized that they had to use caution.

Mr. Anzek responded that there were standards for planning principles, and that it was not really wise to put single-family homes on extremely busy streets. They were seen there, but it was not the best. He related that the City had not spent any money in court; it was a civil matter between landowners, and the City did not get in the middle of those debates. The City proposed that the southwest corner of Rochdale and Walton be planned office because there was office across the streets to the east and north and a commercial center to the northeast. It made more sense from a planning perspective to create a node of business offices, even though they knew it was deed restricted. The attorney for the homeowners advised him that they did not have a problem with that, but they would be concerned about further rezonings to office moving south on Rochdale. He told the attorney for the homeowners that it was highly unlikely that would happen because the City did not encourage commercial going into neighborhoods. He explained that the City did not ignore deed restrictions - they just did not want to let the "tail wag the dog."

Ms. Brnabic said she understood that there had been situations where it might not have seemed practical to have single-family, like Rochester Road, but she indicated that there was a history with that area and perhaps they had to think about another vision for those areas. Mr. Anzek said that where they were aware, they advised prospective applicants about the deed restrictions and that they needed to resolve that issue first. He thought it would be a great disservice to the community if they ended

up with a series of single-family homes in Juengel Orchards (on Rochester Road) with individual curb cuts. They talked about that with the Master Thoroughfare Plan, and they adopted a variation of residential that would accommodate access to side roads, which would still go against the Juengel Orchards deed restrictions. Ms. Brnabic did not mean that due to a prior decision that she would ever close the door to another plan, because there was always an exception to the rule, but she did feel they had consider what had occurred in the past when they were deciding things. She concluded that she was not sure if she would be for or against the request at this point.

Mr. Gaber noted that the property was not deed restricted, and that Mr. Scaccia owned the property. Ms. Brnabic said that the last time, the issue was the density. Mr. Gaber indicated that they would be allowed more density on the parcels - about 180,000 square feet - and they were proposing a 20,000 square-foot building. That would leave a lot of room for greenery and other amenities on the site to buffer the neighbors.

Mr. Reece thought that some precedent had been set along Walton to support a facility like Mr. Scaccia proposed. His biggest concern would be for the second homeowner on Shagbark, and he would be very curious to see how there could be a 20,000 square-foot building on the site without significantly affecting that neighbor's quality of life, for example, when he used his pool and had to look at a parking lot. Mr. Reece said he would have to see some fairly significant landscaping and preservation of trees, particularly in that corner of the property. The neighbors have had the luxury of trees to help deaden the noise from traffic along Walton and to provide shading and greenery. He was not sure that the Site Plan the applicants had shown did justice to the site. The drawing showed very few trees left, and a 35-foot buffer was not a lot for those neighbors who had significant investments in their backyards. He would be very curious to see what type of setbacks and screening would be proposed. He thought there was precedence with the buildings adjacent to the east, but he felt they had to be extremely respectful of the people who had lived there for many years.

Mr. Gaber agreed with those concerns. They wanted to preserve existing screening and substantially enhance it. They produced a conceptual plan that did not have much detail, and he said they would certainly look into the comments. Mr. Reece stated that it had to be single-story. He thought Mr. Dettloff's point relative to a market study was important because of the unprecedented times. They had seen too many developers come back for Site Plan extensions, a year after sitting in the

same position as Mr. Scaccia, confident they had a market for their product.

Mr. Delacourt pointed out the economic development strategy of the MLUP, which talked about office corridors located on M-59 and Rochester Road. They had also identified medical office locations to serve an aging population. One of the objectives to accommodate the long-term demand for medical office, to the degree feasible, was that such clusters should be located in close proximity to Crittenton and Beaumont hospitals. The Plan just talked about location, and he felt the subject site fell reasonably close in that regard.

Mr. Schroeder agreed that the proposed building would be in close proximity to Crittenton, and he pointed out that Crittenton would be opening up a Residency program. He pointed out that there were medical offices at Walton and Rochdale, and that the City was planning for the long term. He did not believe the economic slump would last more than a year or so. His main concern was for the residents, and he recommended that the applicants talk to them after they had a plan. Regarding the southwest corner of Rochdale and Walton, he felt that the minute they did something there, someone would approach the City about doing something with the land south of it. Mr. Schroeder referred to a new development at the corner of Crooks and South Boulevard and said that the developer, Mr. Joe Paluzzi, had done a beautiful job. He suggested that something like that would be great.

Mr. Klomp asked how the homes on the subject parcels were accessed, and Mr. Gaber said they had individual curb cuts onto Walton. Mr. Klomp indicated that they were fairly independent of the neighborhood in that regard. Mr. Gaber suggested that the parcels were like an island because they were not a part of the surrounding subdivision, and there was a church next door.

Chairperson Boswell summarized that it was evident that if the applicants came back with a proposal it should be one-story, and he stressed that they should leave a lot of trees. He did not believe they could put up a 20,000 square foot building after considering the engineering that would have to be done. Mr. Gaber agreed that they would have to look closely at that. Chairperson Boswell said he would have preferred to see condos, and Mr. Gaber said if they could have built 18 units they would have, but 12 units would not work. Chairperson Boswell stated that it would have been pretty dense at 18 units. He asked if there were further comments and hearing none, Mr. Gaber thanked the Commission for their time, and said they would get to work and address the issues.

2008-0543 Request for recommendation of the Historic Districts Study Committee Report for Frank Farm, three parcels located on Auburn Road, east of John R, as it relates to the City's Master Land Use Plan.

Chairperson Boswell stated that there were two Historic Districts Study Committee (HDSC) Reports regarding property designation that the Commission was being asked to comment on only as they related to the Master Land Use Plan.

Mr. Delacourt advised that the reports were similar to others the Commission had seen in the past. He explained that at the Preliminary stage, the HDSC held a Public Hearing, and then sent the reports to the State Historic Preservation Office. State law and the City's Ordinance required input from the Planning Commission regarding impacts a designation might or might not have relating to zoning or Master Land Use Plan (MLUP) issues. In the past, there had been very little discussion when reports came forward, and Staff did not see any major impacts to future land use or zoning issues as the subjects related to the MLUP. He added that as part of the process, two potential resolutions were included for consideration.

Ms. Brnabic said she read the Minutes in the packet and called the Planning Department office to see if the HDSC had met with the applicants since that meeting. It seemed as if some of the members wanted to meet with the owners again, but she was told the HDSC had not met again. She asked if it would be the only review the Commissioners would have. Mr. Delacourt said that the HDSC met after the Public Hearings with representatives of both groups. Ms. Brnabic said she was told that the last meeting was April 2008, and she asked for clarification. Mr. Delacourt said they met with representatives from Stiles School and family members of Frank Farm at the October HDSC meeting. Mr. Frank was not there. Ms. Brnabic said that she knew the question about designation was eventually going before City Council, but she was concerned because the residents had valid concerns about their properties being designated historically. She maintained that it was different if a property was already designated and someone chose to purchase it, but if someone had a home and it was not designated but it was going to be designated, she felt that was different. The City might designate properties of people who were concerned about it, and to some extent, she did not feel the City had that right.

Mr. Delacourt advised that the HDSC did not designate property; they only made a recommendation to Council. The recommendation was based on the criteria established by the Ordinance, and the question was

not whether they felt something should or should not be designated; it was a question of whether the property complied. The opinions in the Minutes regarding the Frank Farm property were not those of the property owner - he was in support of the designation. He did not come to the meeting, but he had been on the farm for 80-plus years, and Mr. Delacourt met with him several times at the farm. It was family members who were concerned about the designation, but they were not objectionable. One property owner involved with the Frank Farm was an absentee landlord that the City was pursuing to do some upkeep, and he was not opposing the designation. Ms. Brnabic said she did not have that information, and that was why she called. She reiterated that representatives from Stiles School had concerns, and she felt that all of the concerns had to be considered. Mr. Delacourt said they were not objectionable to the designation, but they had some questions about the size of the district and the impact. They had not come to a meeting to make a formal objection. They talked to the HDSC about changing the size of the district, and ultimately, the HDSC advised that the recommendation to City Council would stay the same. Ms. Brnabic agreed it would be City Council that had the final say, and she understood why the City wanted to protect the sites, but she was not quite sure they had that right. Mr. Delacourt said that State law was implicit that it was not a voluntary process, and he added that he was not expressing his opinion. He advised that from a process standpoint, the City's Ordinance mirrored State law. They considered the historic districts much the same as wetlands. If the historic district added value to the community, much as the environment did, the development could be regulated, regardless of the homeowner's opinion. Ms. Brnabic did not think that necessarily made it right. She did not really like the direction it was taking for some people, because the City was not buying the properties and making them a historical part of the City; they were putting a financial burden on the homeowners.

Chairperson Boswell said he agreed with Ms. Brnabic; however, evaluating the designations was not the Commission's duty. They just had to comment about whether there were any issues with the Master Plan and the designations.

Mr. Schroeder said he had the same concern as Ms. Brnabic. In his view, they were imposing liabilities and costs for properties that were in bad condition. He asked Mr. Delacourt if Mr. Frank was the owner of everything. Mr. Delacourt said there were three separate owners. Mr. Schroeder asked if the other people would inherit the property. Mr. Delacourt thought that one of the owners was Mr. Frank's cousin's

daughter, but he had not talked with her directly.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that one of the buildings was done in 1979, and he did not think that was very historic. He asked if something else was contributing to the designation. Mr. Delacourt said that the structure should hold a certain amount of integrity to help it meet one of the four criteria of the National Register standard. It might contribute in time, because additional buildings had a way to add to the integrity of a historic district over time, but the consultants did not feel that this structure met the standard. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the property would be reviewed if the owners wanted to do something to it. Mr. Delacourt explained that if it were designated and the owners wanted to do any additions or modifications, they would be required to appear for a review by the Historic Districts Committee. It worked very similar to the Wetlands Ordinance. The City had a set of standards used to determine what wetlands were important to the City. It did not prohibit development; it just required an additional level of review and approval for a Permit. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the owner of Stiles was in agreement. Mr. Delacourt said they were very familiar with it. They were concerned about the size of the district, but he had not received any formal documentation about it from the school board. Their concerns were outside of the review of the Study Committee. Mr. Kaltsounis reminded that the Commissioners had to look at it "according to the book."

Mr. Kaltsounis stated that there could be an issue if someone wanted to put a subdivision on the property, noting that there was a lot of property behind the farmhouse. He recalled the objections the last time several potentially designated historical properties came forward, and he wished the Council luck in dealing with the current requests.

Mr. Reece said that he strongly supported Ms. Brnabic's and Mr. Boswell's comments, although it would not be relative to the process. He agreed that Frank Farm was a fairly significant piece of property, and he wondered if the City would be saddling the property owners if they supported the requests and the property was designated. Mr. Schroeder said he thought so. Mr. Delacourt said it would require an additional level of review. He pointed out Lorna Stone, which was one of the most dense developments the City had done. The HDC reviewed the historic house as part of the proposal, and decided that the surrounding development did not lessen the integrity, and they approved the additional development. Mr. Reece said that someone would have to develop around it essentially, but the difficulty with the Frank property was that there were multiple buildings on the site. Mr. Delacourt agreed, but he

reminded that there was language in the Master Plan that allowed for land use and density flexibility for the development of historical properties. He did not know if "saddle" was a fair term, although he reiterated that there would be an additional level of review.

Mr. Hooper referred to two developments, City Walk and Lorna Stone, and said that they each had to have a historic property as justification for using a PUD, so it was in their best interest to use the historic portion of the site. He stated that if the subject properties were designated, the HDC review would be for the exterior of the structures. He asked if the State got involved if renovations were made to the exterior. Mr. Delacourt said it would if the owner was requesting tax credits. Mr. Hooper said that if an owner kept his building historically accurate, but wanted to change the windows, they could not do so if the windows were not historically accurate. Mr. Delacourt said that if the windows could be removed and refurbished, the HDC would ask them to do that. He advised that there had been a lot of buildings that were approved by the HDC because the applicant had demonstrated that it was reasonable. Mr. Hooper said that in the motion the Commission was being asked to vote on it said, "will" or "will not have an impact with respect to the City's MLUP." He thought, in this case, that it would not because they were both residentially zoned and master planned properties, and how they voted would not change the zoning. However, he felt that the next part of the sentence, "will" or "will not have an impact on any other development related issues," would absolutely not be true, because designating the properties would definitely have an impact. He suggested deleting that last part of the sentence. Mr. Delacourt said it was just a suggested motion, and the Planning Commission could pass a motion with which they were comfortable.

Mr. Schroeder questioned whether the designation would still go through if a property owner objected to it. Mr. Delacourt said that it would if City Council agreed to designate. Mr. Schroeder agreed with Mr. Hooper about designation affecting other development related issues, and that part of the sentence was deleted from the motion.

Ms. Brnabic also agreed with that, and said she realized the Commission was not being asked whether they agreed with designating the properties, but she wanted her opinion expressed, and to explain why she had asked whether the Commission would see the request again.

Mr. Kaltsounis moved the following motion:

Motion by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schroeder,

Resolved, that upon review of the Historic Districts Study Committee Preliminary Report regarding the proposed designation of Frank Farm property (identified as 1290 E. Auburn Road, 1304 E. Auburn Road; 1344 E. Auburn Road and 1356 E. Auburn Road), the City of Rochester Hills Planning Commission has determined that the proposed designation will not have any impact on the property with respect to the City’s Master Land Use Plan.

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schroeder, that this matter be Accepted.

The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 9 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Klomp, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

2008-0544

Request for recommendation of the Historic Districts Study Committee Report for Stiles School, located at the northwest corner of Livernois and South Boulevard, as it relates to the City’s Master Land Use Plan.

Motion by Kaltsounis, seconded by Yukon,

Resolved, that upon review of the Historic Districts Study Committee Preliminary Report regarding the proposed designation of 3976 S. Livernois (also known as Stiles School), the City of Rochester Hills Planning Commission has determined that the proposed designation will not have any impact on the property with respect to the City’s Master Land Use Plan.

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

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Yukon, that this matter be Accepted.

The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 9 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Klomp, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

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

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Schroeder said that there had been a lot of good press about green building. He asked when the next session would be. Mr. Anzek said that Mr. Delacourt had been talking to Professor Goldsmith and Staff would look into it and get it scheduled. He said he would also plan a presentation on roundabouts for the Commissioners.

Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Anzek if he was familiar with the property behind the Abiding Presence Church. He asked if he knew about the status, noting there had been lawsuit. Mr. Anzek said he would look into the status.

NEXT MEETING DATE

The Chair reminded the Commissioners that the next meeting of November 4, 2008 was cancelled due to the elections, and that the next Regular Meeting was scheduled for November 18, 2008.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Commission and upon motion by Kaltsounis, the Chair adjourned the Regular Meeting at 10:50 p.m., Michigan time.

William F. Boswell, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary