

After each motion, Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously. She congratulated the applicants and thanked them. She said that they had really done a great job listening to the Commissioners, and with the improvements made, she felt that it would be a very nice development. Vice Chairperson Hooper thanked them for their investment in Rochester Hills.

NEW BUSINESS

2020-0231 Public Hearing and request for recommendation of an Ordinance to amend Sections 138-1.203, 138-2.206.C.5, 138-5.200.A, 138-10.101.A.2, 138-10-308.2.e, 138-11.304, 138-12.304 of Chapter 138, Zoning of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Rochester Hills, City of Rochester Hills, Applicant (*Reference: Memo prepared by Ms. Kapelanski, dated November 9, 2020 and draft Ordinance Amendments had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof*).

Ms. Kapelanski recapped that Planning staff had presented several potential Zoning Ordinance amendments to the Planning Commission at the July and August meetings for discussion. They now had the finalized draft text for the amendments for consideration and for the Public Hearing. The amendments included requiring on-site signage for Planned Unit Development requests, requiring five-foot sidewalks on roads with a right-of-way of less than 120 feet, requiring average lot widths equal to the minimum lot width for the Lot Size Variation Option, clarifying when an accessory structure was considered attached, removing parking lot double stripes and requiring street trees on private roads. Staff was seeking a recommendation to City Council if the Commission was comfortable with the language proposed.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 7:23 p.m. Seeing no one wishing to speak or in the Auditorium and no email communications received, she closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Gaber had some questions about the sidewalk changes. He asked if there were any circumstances in the City where there was a main road with a right-of-way of 120 feet that was not existing or planned. He wanted to make sure that there would be nothing that fell in that category that could end up with a five-foot sidewalk rather than an eight foot pathway. He wanted to make sure there was nothing lesser than 120 feet where they expected to have an eight-foot wide pathway that could get by under the change with a five-foot wide sidewalk.

Ms. Kapelanski was not aware of any. She did not think that anything would slip through the cracks. Mr. Boughton agreed with Ms. Kapelanski that it would not impact any major or local roads, and that nothing would slip through.

Mr. Gaber referred to Section 5.a.i. that talked about either existing or planned right-of-ways greater than 120 feet. The new Section ii. talked about existing or planned less than 120 feet. He asked what would happen if the existing was less than 120 feet but the planned was 120 feet or more. It seemed to him to be somewhat of an overlapping circumstance where it was not clear what would happen.

Ms. Kapelanski felt that it was a good point. If it was a planned right-of-way of 120 feet, the City would ask for the larger pathway. Mr. Gaber said that it did not say that. If it was existing less than that, something could qualify for a.i instead of a.ii. It would be a situation where something could qualify for i. or ii. Ms. Kapelanski noted that it had been read by a lot of staff, but Mr. Gaber caught it, so she assured that it would be addressed. She believed that the City would defer to the greater pathway, but they could clean up the language to make sure it was clear.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if that was corrected if the item needed to be re-advertised for a public hearing. Ms. Kapelanski did not think so. She said that it was a fairly minor change, so they did not need another public hearing. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if a condition needed to be added to the motion. Ms. Kapelanski said that he could add a condition that staff would clarify the intent of the five-foot path on right-of-ways planned for 120 feet. Ms. Roediger reminded that the matter would still have a first and second reading at Council, so there would be more opportunity for public comment. She indicated that they were just trying to clean up some things.

Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Kaltsounis moved the following, seconded by Mr. Hooper.

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby recommends to City Council approval of an ordinance to amend Sections 138-1.203, 138-2.206.C.5, 138-5.200.A, 138-10.101.A.2, 138-10-308.2.e, 138-11.304 AND 138-12.304 of Chapter 138, Zoning, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan, to require public hearing signs for planned unit developments, to require sidewalks on roads with a right-of-way of 120 feet or less, to clarify regulations for lot size variation, to clarify

regulations for accessory structures, to remove regulations inconsistent with the sign ordinance, to modify parking lot striping requirements, to require street trees along private roads and to ensure consistency across various ordinance sections; to, repeal conflicting or inconsistent ordinances, and prescribe a penalty for violations with the following condition:

Condition:

1. Staff shall clarify Section 138-2.205C.5a. regarding sidewalks and pathways on planned and existing right-of-ways per the discussion.

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

Aye 8 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Gaber, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Bowyer, Weaver and Neubauer

Excused 1 - Reece

2020-0446

Public Hearing and request for recommendation of an Ordinance to amend Sections 138-8.600.A, 138-8.604, 138-11.204, Table 14, and 138-11.302 of Chapter 138, Zoning, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Rochester Hills, City of Rochester Hills, Applicant

Ms. Kapelanski noted that Ms. Bahm from Giffels Webster was present. Giffels Webster had been working with the Commission to address multiple-family parking over the past several months, and draft language for consideration and for the Public Hearing had now been provided. Staff was looking for a recommendation to City Council. She indicated that both of them were available for questions.

Ms. Bahm pointed out that the language in the draft had been discussed last at the September meeting, and nothing had been changed since that time. The amendment was in response to potential concerns by the Planning Commission about parking and if enough was being provided, primarily for multi-family developments. She felt that it had been a very interesting process to look at the causes and the perceptions and how they could address it in a way that made an impact. The amendment increased the parking standards for visitor parking to ensure that the parking provided was sufficient for the residents and their visitors. The amendment also talked about tandem parking.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 7:34 p.m. Seeing no one wishing to speak or in the auditorium and no email communications