



# Rochester Hills

## Minutes - Draft

### Planning Commission

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

*Chairperson Deborah Brnabic, Vice Chairperson Greg Hooper*  
*Members: Ed Anzek, Gerard Dettloff, Nicholas O. Kaltsounis,*  
*Stephanie Morita, David A. Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Ryan Schultz*

---

Tuesday, August 21, 2018

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

---

#### CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Deborah Brnabic called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Auditorium.

#### ROLL CALL

**Present** 9 - Ed Anzek, Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis, Stephanie Morita, David Reece, C. Neall Schroeder and Ryan Schultz

Quorum present.

Also present: Sara Roediger, Director of Planning & Economic Dev.  
Kristen Kapelanski, Manager of Planning  
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2018-0323](#) July 17, 2018 Regular Meeting

**A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Morita, that this matter be Approved as Presented. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye** 9 - Anzek, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

[2018-0338](#) August 1, 2018 Special Work Session

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

**Aye** 9 - Anzek, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

## COMMUNICATIONS

A) *Planning & Zoning News (2) dated July and August 2018*

*Chairman Brnabic outlined the procedure for speaking at the Public Hearings.*

## NEW BUSINESS

### 2018-0335

Public Hearing and request for Conditional Use Recommendation - City File No. 17-009 - Detroit Meeting Room - South Boulevard, a proposed 1,370 s.f. meeting room for a small congregation on .84 acre, located on the north side of South Boulevard, west of Crooks, zoned R-4 One Family Residential, Parcel Nos. 15-32-481-022, -023, and -024, Michael Gordon, Moiseev/Gordon Associates, Inc., Applicant

*(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated August 17, 2018 and Site Plans and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)*

*Present for the applicant was Michael Gordon, Moiseev/Gordon Associates, 4351 Delemere Ct., Royal Oak, MI 48073.*

*Mr. Gordon thanked Ms. Kapelanski and Ms. Roediger, and said that the applicants looked forward to moving ahead with the project. He noted that he had also been working on the Lorna Stone property at Adams and South Boulevard with Robert Gibbs (well known architect), who was in the audience. Mr. Gordon stated that they would like to be strong members of the community, and they had locations in other cities. He advised that they were proposing a 1,370 s.f. building with a population of no more than 50. They would meet Sunday mornings from 5:30 to 6:30 a.m. and Monday and Thursday evenings from 5:30 to 6:30 or 7:00. There would be some special events. He claimed that the traffic would be minimal. The existing vegetation would be preserved. Headlights would face the road, and none would face toward the neighbors. They had reached out to the immediate neighbors to let them know what was going on and to make sure that they were aware of the proposal. He said that it would be a very low impact development with little influence. He felt that the architecture and style would fit into the community well, and that the enhanced streetscape would add to the area.*

*Chairperson Brnabic asked Mr. Gordon if he had mentioned meeting on Thursdays. She noted that the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) only listed Sunday mornings and Monday evenings. She asked if there were more days of operation.*

Charles Truan of Detroit Meeting Rooms responded that they might use the room for a Thursday evening meeting at 7:00 p.m. Chairperson Brnabic asked until what time, and Mr. Truan said that it would usually be from 7-8:30 p.m. Chairperson Brnabic asked if the EIS could be updated to reflect that as they moved forward, and Mr. Truan agreed.

Ms. Kapelanski stated that per the recent Zoning Ordinance amendment, places of worship were now a Conditional Use in the residential districts. She advised that the applicant had met all ordinance provisions with minor items to address on the final plans.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 7:08 p.m. Seeing no one come forward, she closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Hooper said that the Commission had dealt with the same type of development previously, but it had not been in a good location for a number of reasons. He felt that the proposed site was a much better location, and he moved the following:

**MOTION** by Hooper, seconded by Schroeder, in the matter of City File No. 17-009 (Detroit Meeting Room - South Boulevard) the Planning Commission **recommends** to City Council **Approval** of the **Conditional Use** for a place of worship, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on June 14, 2018, with the following six (6) findings.

**Findings**

1. The proposed building and other necessary site improvements meet or exceed the standards of the zoning ordinance.
2. The proposed use will promote the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance.
3. The proposed building has been designed and is proposed to be constructed, operated, maintained, and managed so as to be compatible, harmonious, and appropriate in appearance with the existing and planned character of the general vicinity, adjacent uses of land, and the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the use.
4. The proposed development is served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage ways, and refuse disposal.

5. *The proposed development should not be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to existing or future neighboring land uses, persons, property, or the public welfare.*
6. *The proposal will not create additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services that will be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.*

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

**Aye** 9 - Anzek, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

**2018-0336**

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 17-009 - Detroit Meeting Room - South Boulevard, a proposed 1,370 s.f. meeting room for a small congregation on .84 acre, located on the north side of South Boulevard, west of Crooks, zoned R-4 One Family Residential, Parcel Nos. 15-32-481-022, -023, and -024, Michael Gordon, Moiseev/Gordon Associates, Inc., Applicant

***MOTION*** by Hooper, seconded by Schroeder, in the matter of City File No. 17-009 (Detroit Meeting Room - South Boulevard) the Planning Commission **approves the Site Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on June 14, 2018, with the following five (5) findings and subject to the following four (4) conditions.

**Findings**

1. *The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that all applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as other City Ordinances, standards, and requirements, can be met subject to the conditions noted below.*
2. *The proposed project will be accessed from Grant, thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets. Walkways have been incorporated to promote safety and convenience of pedestrian traffic.*
3. *Off-street parking areas have been designed to avoid common traffic problems and promote safety.*
4. *The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.*

5. *The proposed development will not have an unreasonably detrimental or injurious effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the site or those of the surrounding area.*

Conditions

1. *City Council approval of the Conditional Use.*
2. *Provide a landscape bond for landscaping/trees /irrigation in the amount of \$39,450, plus inspection fees, as adjusted as necessary by staff, prior to temporary grade certification being issued by Engineering.*
3. *Address any applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, prior to final approval by staff.*
4. *Applicant to provide an updated Environmental Impact Statement to reflect the correct days and hours of operation, prior to City Council review of the matter.*

*Mr. Reece said that he was not at the last meeting when the Brewster Meeting Room was proposed. He asked if there was something that drove the start time of 5:30 a.m. on Sunday mornings.*

*Mr. Truan said that they gathered around 6:00 a.m., which was their time of worship. Mr. Reece said that it was fine, but there were a couple of residents behind them. He asked that they be respectful of their privacy that early in the morning. If the City got complaints about the noise, although he did not anticipate it, those complaints would need to be addressed. He asked them to be mindful of the neighbors, as they had lived there a long time, and their privacy was just as important as the church's right to congregate.*

**A motion was made by Hooper, seconded by Schroeder, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye** 9 - Anzek, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

*After each motion, Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously, and she wished the applicants well.*

[2018-0284](#)

Public Hearing and request for Conditional Use Recommendation - City File No. 18-008 - to allow attached housing in the MR Mixed Residential Overlay district

for Breckenridge Condominiums, a proposed 12-unit duplex residential development on 3.73 acres, located on the south side of Hamlin, west of Livernois, zoned R-3 One Family Residential with an MR Mixed Residential Overlay, Parcel Nos. 15-28-226-023 and -024, Mark Gesuale, Hamliv, LLC, Applicant

*Mr. Kaltsounis noted that previously, he had to recuse myself from projects with the applicants. Since then, his family no longer had a contract with them. Chairperson Brnabic concluded that there was no reason to recuse himself.*

*(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated August 17, 2018 and Site Plans and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)*

*Present for the applicant were Jim Polyzois, Hamliv, LLC, 14955 Technology Dr., Shelby Twp., MI 48315 and Ralph Nunez, Nunez Design, 249 Park St., Troy, MI 48083.*

*Ms. Kapelanski stated that the applicant was proposing to construct a 12-unit development comprised of six, two-unit buildings. She noted that the property was zoned R-3 with an MR Mixed Residential Overlay, and the applicant was using the MR Overlay provisions. The development required a Conditional Use approval to have attached housing in the MR district. She advised that the plan was generally in compliance with the exception of a deficient lot size. Ten acres were required; however, the Planning Commission had the ability to modify the standard. There were two regulated wetland areas, and the applicant was requesting a Wetland Use Permit. Also being requested was a Natural Features Setback Modification for 812 linear feet of impacts and a Tree Removal Permit for 31 trees to be replaced on site. She stated that the plan was in compliance with only minor conditions, and that all staff recommended approval.*

*Mr. Nunez noted that there was an historic home and City-owned property to the east, a single-family home to the south and two other residential properties to the west. He pointed out that the units off of Hamlin were similar to those in Brampton Parc which was just about completed. The southern four units were a modification of another project they had worked on giving a different mix for the elevations. He advised that the way they proposed the T intersection, if other properties became available, they could utilize them for utilities and access. He thanked the City, which he said kept them on track. He offered to answer any questions. Chairperson Brnabic asked if it would be a private road, which he confirmed.*

*Chairperson Brnabic observed that the applicants had sent letters to the adjacent neighbors, and she asked if there had been any inquiries. Mr. Polyzois said that he had spoken to the gentleman who owned the home to the south. He gave him an update, and he seemed fine with it. He also had Mr. Polyzois' number if he had further questions. Chairperson Brnabic stated that the Commissioners appreciated that the neighbors were contacted.*

*Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 7:19 p.m. She reiterated that if anyone wished to speak, that a card needed to be filled out and turned into Ms. Gentry.*

**Syed Raza, 2084 S. Livernois, Rochester Hills, MI 48307** *Mr. Raza noted that he was the neighbor on Livernois south of the bottom four units. His biggest issue was the grade to the north. He asked if the applicants were planning to change any of the grade and which way it would lean. He said that if it was towards the wetland to the south, he would have a problem. If it leaned to the north, he claimed that it would be better. His second concern was the trees. He recalled when Woodland Park was going through a review, and he was thankful that Mr. Kaltsounis had requested 12-foot rather than six-foot ornamentals. Mr. Raza said that there were Poplars where the four southern units would be, which created a mess. He asked which trees would be removed and what they would be replaced with. He did not think there would be an issue with headlights. He asked how far the backyards for the four units would be from the boundary. He was not sure if the applicant would be interested in putting up a fence to prevent people from crossing into his yard. Pulte (developer of Woodland Park) did not agree to it, so he put up a fence on the southern boundary of his property. He thought that they could discuss it separately - he had kids and a dog, and they would not want anyone affected. He noticed that the wetland impact would be almost 10k s.f., and he wanted to know the plan for the wetland, because most of the creek was on his side. He asked if any of it was on the applicant's side, and Mr. Polyzois did not believe so. Mr. Raza said that he could foresee a problem with the wetland in the future. He commented that Pulte promised they would not change the grade, but part of his front yard was now a pond because of what they did to the grade. He stated that it was pretty big. He asked how much of the back end of the four units would look into his home. He wondered about privacy, since some of the trees would be removed. He asked if the setback modification could be explained as well.*

*Mr. Nunez stated that as far as the wetlands, the majority of the impact would be where the four southern units were. There was a low quality wetland that was being removed which drained to the west into the larger wetland. He advised that there would be a 60-foot setback from the back of the units to the property line. He claimed that there were a lot of poor quality trees. The majority were Box Elder, Cottonwood and White Ash. They tried to minimize the removal. The large stand of trees behind the units were Cottonwoods that were being preserved. The vegetation along the southern property line would not be disturbed. There would be boulders to line the wetland edge based upon the wetland consultant's recommendation. They wanted to make sure that the lawns did not encroach any further south. They would meet and exceed the requirements for the buffers on all four sides. They were getting credit for some of the trees in the wetlands. He did not think there should be any problems with headlights, because the cars would be parked in front of the units. Regarding the grade, the swales would be located in the rear yards on the east property line, and there would be inlets in the roadway system. Everything would drain to the northwest corner into the detention basin. What was draining off the property on the south side was the side yard of the units. Half would go toward the street and the back half would drain toward the wetlands. Regarding the windows and looking into the home to the south, the patio spaces would have glass doors, and some windows in the living room faced south. Those residents would be as interested in privacy as the neighbor, and that was why they placed the vegetation where it was shown. He suggested that it was not fixed in stone, and it could be moved to make sure it would not be a problem for the neighbor.*

*Mr. Polyzois responded that the setback for the units abutting the neighbor to the south would be 60 feet from the units. The lime green area around the perimeter represented wetlands that would remain undisturbed. That area was approximately 35 feet. He proposed to add a few trees in the dark green area, which abutted the neighbor's property line to ensure more privacy. He would also meet with Mr. Raza to discuss fencing. The property was fairly flat, so he did not anticipate any drainage running onto Mr. Raza's property. He maintained that Engineering would be thorough and make sure that all the drainage went to the detention pond.*

*Mr. Reece asked Mr. Nunez if he could describe what the boulder wall would look like, which he felt would be helpful for the neighbors. Mr. Nunez said that the wall was more for retaining the slope at the detention basin on the west side. The wall started at the access road to the basin, and it would continue to near the back of unit ten. The wall was designed*



to hold the grade, so there was a separation between the detention and the wetland area. From unit nine down and around to the east side, they would place boulders - it would not really be a wall, but more of a delineation to keep mowers from it. The boulders would be large enough so that the homeowners would not move them, but they would keep the mowers at bay. They would place new planting material there. Mr. Reece asked if the boulders would be approximately one to two feet tall, to which Mr. Nunez agreed, noting that it was per ASTI's recommendation.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that the height of the buildings was relatively normal for the proposed type of house, which he was fine with. He did wonder about the height of the proposed mixed residential buildings compared with the homes around them. He went through the plans to see if cross sections were provided, but he did not see any. He asked if the City could make it a policy to require cross sections to see how a development might encroach on neighbors' properties. He suggested getting a cross section for the home to the south to compare with the proposed buildings.

Ms. Roediger felt that in special circumstances, such as with discretionary PUDs, they could request it, but two-and-a-half stories were allowed, and the applicants were proposing two-story homes. Mr. Kaltsounis said that he was just asking if a developer could supply cross sections to the surrounding homes when they submitted plans. Ms. Roediger said that staff could look into it, but it would add a cost for the developer.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that he was considering a condition for the motion asking the applicant to meet with the neighbor to the south to create a plan for more trees and to add fencing. It would ultimately be reviewed and approved by staff. He believed that the trees and fencing that they were talking about would be in the wetland, however, so it might not be possible. Ms. Kapelanski said that she believed the applicants were proposing to add trees in the darker green area, which was not in the wetland. She was not sure how much sense fencing would make along the border, because there was already quite a significant buffer with the wetland. If that was something the applicant was willing to talk about with the adjacent homeowner, that would be fine, but it would have to be out of the wetland. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the wetland encroached into the neighbor's property, and Ms. Kapelanski agreed that it did.

**Jeong Kim, 2122 Logan Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48309** Mr. Kim said that he lived in a Pulte home south of the proposed development. In the drawing he viewed, it was not clear how far it was between Logan and the south end of the subject property. He asked how tall the buildings would

be and if the trees between the development and Logan Dr. would be tall enough to give privacy.

**Ronald Stover, 2559 N. Harrison, Rochester Hills, MI 48309** Mr.

Stover stated that his mother owned the home to the west. He observed a driveway on the west side, and he asked if it was her driveway. He asked if the duplexes would back up to her fence. He stated that she was not selling. Pulte tried to get her to sell, but she would not sell to them or to the applicants. He asked if the houses were going to be right behind his mother's bedroom, which was on the east end of her house.

Chairperson Brnabic closed the Public Hearing at 7:36 p.m.

Mr. Polyzois said that the driveway on the upper left corner was an existing driveway that did not go anywhere, and it would be eliminated. The setback from the property line to the rear of the homes on the west was over 100 feet. That area would stay in a natural state with the exception of the detention pond. He felt that there would be an extensive separation from the owner to the west.

Ms. Kapelanski said that it appeared that the driveway was labeled on the plans as pond access. Mr. Nunez agreed. Engineering proposed it for maintenance of the basin, and it was new. Just to the right of that were utility connections for the storm water system. He agreed that from the back of the units on the west, the setback was at least 100 feet from the property line. There was also quite a bit of vegetation proposed along the back of the units.

Mr. Reece noted that Mr. Raza had indicated that he was having drainage issues due to the Pulte development, and he asked if staff could go out and take a look to see if something had not been correctly. Ms. Kapelanski agreed to look into it.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that with the type of townhouses that they were seeing recently, the height of the buildings were similar to what was seen in a house. When they discussed the area in the Master Plan ten years ago, the proposed development was the type of community they hoped to see. He moved the following motion:

**MOTION** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, in the matter of City File No. 18-008 (Breckenridge Condominiums) the Planning Commission **recommends** to City Council **Approval** of the **Conditional Use** to allow attached housing in the MR Mixed Residential Overlay district, based on

*plans dated received by the Planning Department on July 24, 2018, with the following seven (7) findings.*

*Findings*

- 1. The proposed development and other necessary site improvements meet or exceed the standards of the zoning ordinance.*
- 2. The use will promote the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance.*
- 3. The proposed units have been designed and are proposed to be constructed, operated, maintained, and managed so as to be compatible, harmonious, and appropriate in appearance with the existing and planned character of the general vicinity, adjacent uses of land, and the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the use.*
- 4. The proposal should have a positive impact on the community as a whole and the surrounding area by further offering another housing option.*
- 5. The proposed development is served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage ways, and refuse disposal.*
- 6. The proposed development should not be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to existing or future neighboring land uses, persons, property, or the public welfare.*
- 7. The proposal will not create additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services that will be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.*

*Mr. Reece explained that the homes would be standard residential, two-story homes. As far as the height, there was nothing unusual with regards to being taller or looking down onto the neighbor's property to the south. He wanted the neighbors to understand that they were typical, two-story residential homes, and that was all they were.*

*Ms. Roediger added that there was a question about the distance from Logan St. She advised that the distance from the Pulte property line to the proposed homes was over 225 feet, which was substantial.*

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

**Aye** 9 - Anzek, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

2018-0277

Public Hearing and request for a Wetland Use Permit Recommendation - City File 18-008 - for impacts of up to 9,671 square feet associated with construction activities for Breckenridge Condominiums, a proposed 12-unit duplex residential development on 3.73 acres located on the south side of Hamlin, west of Livernois, zoned R-3 One Family Residential with an MR Mixed Residential Overlay, Parcel Nos. 15-28-226-023 and -024, Mark Gesuale, Hamliv, LLC, Applicant

*Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 7:43 p.m. Seeing no one come forward, she closed the Public Hearing.*

**MOTION** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, in the matter of City File No. 18-008 (Breckenridge Condominiums), the Planning Commission **recommends** that City Council **approves a Wetland Use Permit** to impact approximately 9,671 square feet for the construction of several units and associated grading, the construction of the storm water detention basin, grading in the lawn areas of several units and to the boulder retaining wall areas, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on July 24, 2018, with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following three (3) conditions.

Findings

1. *Of the approximately 50,500 s.f of City-regulated wetlands on site, the applicant is proposing to impact approximately 9,671 s.f.*
2. *Wetlands A and B are of low quality and function, and should not be considered a vital natural resource to the City, according to the ASTI Environmental letter of July 27, 2018. Wetland C is not regulated by the City.*

Conditions

1. *City Council approval of the Wetland Use Permit.*
2. *If required, that the applicant receives all applicable DEQ permits prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
3. *That the applicant provides a detailed soil erosion plan with measures sufficient to ensure ample protection of wetlands areas, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*

**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** 9 - Anzek, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

**2018-0280**

Request for a Natural Features Setback Modification - City File No. 18-008 - for impacts of up to 812 linear feet associated with construction activities for Breckenridge Condominiums, a proposed 12-unit duplex residential development on 3.73 acres, located on the south side of Hamlin, west of Livernois, zoned R-3 One Family Residential, Parcel Nos. 15-28-226-023 and -024, Mark Gesuale, Hamliv, LLC, Applicant

***MOTION*** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, in the matter of City File No. 18-008 (Breckenridge Condominiums), the Planning Commission **grants a natural features setback modification for 812 linear feet for impacts from the construction of the detention basin and other site development, based on plans dated received by the Planning and Economic Development Department on July 24, 2018 with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following one (1) condition:**

**Findings**

1. *The permanent impact to the Natural Features Setback area is necessary to construct the detention basin and other site developments.*
2. *The proposed construction activity qualifies for an exception to the Natural Features Setback per the ASTI Environmental letter dated July 27, 2018.*

**Condition**

1. *Work to be conducted using best management practices to ensure flow and circulation patterns and chemical and biological characteristics of wetlands are not impacted.*

**A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, that this matter be Granted. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye** 9 - Anzek, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

**2018-0278**

Request for a Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 18-008 - for the removal and replacement of as many as 31 regulated trees for Breckenridge Condominiums, a proposed 12-unit duplex residential development on 3.73 acres, located on the south side of Hamlin, west of Livernois, zoned R-3 One Family Residential with an MR Mixed Residential Overlay, Parcel Nos. 15-28-226-023 and -024, Mark Gesuale, Hamliv, LLC, Applicant

***MOTION*** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, in the matter of City File No. 18-008 (Breckenridge Condominiums), the Planning Commission

*grants a Tree Removal Permit for the removal and replacement of as many as 31 regulated trees, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on July 24, 2018, with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following two (2) conditions.*

Findings

- 1. The proposed removal and replacement of regulated trees is in conformance with the Tree Conservation Ordinance.*
- 2. The applicant is proposing to replace 31 regulated trees with 36 tree replacement credits on site, as required by the Tree Conservation Ordinance.*

Conditions

- 1. Tree protective and silt fencing, as reviewed and approved by the city staff, shall be installed prior to issuance of the Land Improvement Permit.*
- 2. Should the applicant not be able to meet the tree replacement requirements on site the balance shall be paid into the City Tree Fund.*

**A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, that this matter be Granted. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye** 9 - Anzek, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

2018-0279

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 18-008 - Breckenridge Condominiums, a proposed 12-unit duplex residential development on 3.73 acres, located on the south side of Hamlin, west of Livernois, zoned R-3 One Family Residential with an MR Mixed Residential Overlay, Parcel Nos. 15-28-226-023 and -024, Mark Gesuale, Hamliv, LLC, Applicant

***MOTION*** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, in the matter of City File No. 18-008 (Breckenridge Condominiums), the Planning Commission **approves the site plan** based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on July 24, 2018, with the following four (4) findings and subject to the following seven (7) conditions.

Findings

- 1. Upon compliance with the following conditions, the proposed site plan*

*meets all applicable requirements of the zoning ordinance and one-family residential condominium standards.*

- 2. The Planning Commission waives the ten-acre minimum site area, finding that the site cannot physically comply with this requirement.*
- 3. Adequate utilities are available to properly serve the proposed development.*
- 4. The site plan represents a reasonable and acceptable plan for developing the property.*

*Conditions*

- 1. City Council approval of the Conditional Use.*
- 2. City approval of all easements and recording of such easements with the Register of Deeds prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
- 3. Submittal and City attorney approval of the condominium documents, prior to final approval by staff.*
- 4. Submit a landscape bond in the amount of \$83,048 plus inspection fees, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
- 5. Provide payment of \$2,601 into the City's Tree Fund for street trees, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
- 6. Approval of required soil erosion permit and approval from outside agencies.*
- 7. Applicant to meet with the neighbor to the south to create a plan to add trees and potentially fencing, to be approved by staff prior to final approval.*

**A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye** 9 - Anzek, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

*After each motion, Chairperson Brnabic stated that the motion had passed unanimously, and she congratulated the applicants. She said*

*that it was always a pleasure to work with them, and they were always prepared and answered questions well and talked with their neighbors. Mr. Hooper thanked the applicants for their investment in the City.*

*The Commissioners took a short break from 7:50 to 7:58 p.m.*

## **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**2018-0095** Master Plan Work Session - Giffels Webster

*Present for the discussion were Jill Bahm, Rod Arroyo and Eric Fazzini of Giffels Webster, 1025 E. Maple, Suite 100, Birmingham, MI 48009.*

*Ms. Bahm went over what they would discuss, which included a quick review of the working draft, concepts for the redevelopment sites, crowd source polling, the second Open House and next steps.*

*She noted that in the working draft, the existing conditions had been updated to include a brief discussion about complete streets and to address non-motorized and motorized transportation. They (consultants) had included a broader overview of the existing natural features and a map. They added goals and objectives and the Future Land Use chapter. They also added a housing chapter with maps (pages 95-103) that began with a discussion of some of the public input received. She referred to the map that compared planned and proposed housing densities which they found, in large part, to be in alignment. They touched briefly on the potential for housing units at August 1st meeting and talked about the amount of total developable land available for residential uses. There were 1,765 potential dwelling units. Regarding housing strategies, there were three main areas: Continuing to encourage new single-family, detached homes, in which the residents had expressed interest; preserving the existing neighborhoods; adding varied housing types; and increasing density in key locations. They had talked about a proposed R-5 residential designation that envisioned four to six dwelling units per acre. They talked about the Auburn Rd. corridor as an opportunity for additional density for housing.*

*Ms. Bahm said that they would like the Commission's input about four-story buildings. She suggested that the two upper floors on such a building could be set back to minimize the massing. Up to three stories was allowed throughout most of the City, and they wondered if, in particular, there was an opportunity to add density in the Auburn Rd. corridor.*



*Mr. Kaltsounis indicated that the problem for the Commissioners with higher buildings was not their being against the street - it was the view for the neighbors. He reiterated the request to have applicants provide cross sections to the neighboring properties. He was not sure about four stories. Mr. Arroyo considered that it could be addressed through zoning, to make sure that the fourth floor had to be closer to the roadway with a greater separation from the residential.*

*Ms. Bahm asked the Commissioners if they felt it would be worthwhile to discuss four stories with the community at the Open House. She suggested showing a graphic and asking for input. They would state that it was not necessarily going to be that way, but they could ask what conditions people would like imposed if the City were to consider four stories.*

*Ms. Morita said that she would be interested in hearing feedback. Anytime that the City saw larger developments, and she mentioned the one going in at Adams and Hamlin (Legacy Apartments) with four stories, there had been a tremendous amount of pushback from the residents when it was near two-story residential. She felt that would be worthwhile to bring up, as long as it suggested that the City was just trying to engage public interest, and it was not something the City was necessarily planning to do. It had to be set up so that people did not walk away thinking the City was going to put in four-story buildings on every corner.*

*Mr. Reece agreed with Ms. Morita, although he stated that he would have a tough time with a four-story building in the community. He maintained that it was not who they were. He was not sure why they were trying to force something when it was not them. He thought that the vast majority of the residents would be extremely opposed to it in their backyards. If they could find a location where there were no residents behind it, it might be appropriate in a location, but he was not sure where they would find it.*

*Mr. Schroeder said that one problem was that it would bring traffic and parking. He thought that adding a four-story building would be a "killer."*

*Mr. Hooper noted that in the past, they looked at corresponding setback distances with rising stories, which he thought was added to the Ordinance. He felt that more stories would be appropriate along M-59. He was not sure about putting them in a residential neighborhood. Ms. Bahm recapped that they had discussed wanting to keep the neighborhoods as they were, knowing that there was development pressure. She thought that if they could concentrate development in*

*certain areas, that it might relieve some of the pressure in other areas. They could leave the density lower in most of the community and amp it up where it was appropriate in terms of the context and what was going on around it.*

*Mr. Arroyo offered that it could be an incentive for redevelopment, noting that there were areas that might not redevelop if there was not an incentive. He explained that it was discussed in those terms for Auburn Rd.*

*Mr. Anzek felt that there should be an incentive. He suggested that it would be appropriate for potential future redevelopment of the Hampton Plaza at Auburn and Rochester. Another site was Bordine's. He believed that there were appropriate places for it. It was not the Commission's responsibility to find solutions for the City's finances, but it was their responsibility to determine if something looked right, felt right, fit in and did not offend. If the higher buildings were internal to a site, he felt that it could work very well. Mr. Reece had brought up what the community was, but Mr. Anzek said that he was not sure he could describe what it was. If height was a concern, he reminded that the City had eight-story towers at the high schools. There was an eight-story tower at the hospital. When a taller building was designed and done right, he felt that it could work very well for the community.*

*Chairperson Brnabic noted that at the last meeting, it was brought up that the Auburn Rd. corridor could possibly be a place for three-stories. She stated that it was not zoned that way, and going through the process, three stories was never mentioned. It was her opinion that if they were changing that in the Master Plan vision or if the Planning Department envisioned it differently, that they had to go back through the process. There was an Auburn Rd. corridor committee with businesses and residents involved with many meetings. Three stories was never mentioned, so she was somewhat alarmed that they might now be considering changing the Ordinance or putting it into the Master Plan at this point in the process without backtracking. She had asked several times if there was an outside developer interested in the corridor, and she had always been told no, so they were dealing with current business owners as they went through the update. She did not know if that had changed, but she thought that before they moved forward considering three-stories, that they needed to go back and ask questions of the original group to see if that even was a possible vision. She did not think that they could just say that they decided three stories might be better. She thought that three stories would be towering in that area. She reminded that there had been*

*a process, and she did not think that they could move forward with a different vision without going back and getting feedback from the initial members involved to see if that was remotely acceptable to them. She agreed with other Commissioners who stated that four stories would be too much.*

*Ms. Bahm asked if it would be reasonable to add to the text that three stories might be a possibility in the Auburn Rd. corridor if reconvening the group to discuss it was an implementation step before moving forward. That would open the door a little, but it would not be a commitment. She agreed that there had been a process, and for the Master Plan to override that might not be fair and equitable to the people who participated in the process.*

*Chairperson Brnabic said that Ms. Bahm's suggestion might be a possibility, but she knew that people applied the vision of the Master Plan. If they backtracked and the feedback was positive and people were willing, that would be one thing, but she felt it was premature to just add something about three stories.*

*Mr. Schroeder asked if developers would have to meet the parking and drainage requirements if they wanted to develop in the Auburn Rd. corridor area. Ms. Roediger said that at the last City Council meeting, the City received two property donations and did one property acquisition to create the first public parking lots in the City in that area. She suggested that they could add language about proximity to public parking and that having all of the required parking onsite would not likely be feasible for the type of development the City was trying to attract in the area. She thought that they would probably modify the parking requirements for that corridor. Mr. Schroeder asked if the City would take the initiative to build the parking lots, which Ms. Roediger confirmed.*

*Ms. Morita added that it was a requirement of the donation that the City build the parking lots. If they were not built within a certain number of years, the land would have to be given back. She added that the City could not charge for parking for the first ten years, after which it could be metered if they found that it was necessary.*

*Ms. Morita noted Mr. Anzek's comments about incentivizing a project to allow four stories. She felt that needed to be very clear. At Adams and Hamlin where they were allowing four stories, the owners were paying \$14 million for property cleanup for environmental issues. If someone wanted to clean up a highly contaminated piece of property, the City would*

*consider giving them four stories, but absent that, she did not think that the current Council would embrace that. She noted that the four-story buildings were 200-300 feet from the residences, which had been a distance requirement for the project.*

*Mr. Hooper advised that the distance requirement had been part of the Consent Judgment on the property, and amending the Consent did not go to the Planning Commission. He recalled that the Commissioners looked at a potential development at Auburn and John R that proposed three stories. Chairperson Brnabic said that it had an FB-2 Overlay, and more than two stories would not be allowed currently.*

*Chairperson Brnabic asked about the proposed zoning changes labeled on the Future Land Use Map. She asked for a brief explanation on how some might change or move and what was permitted in certain areas, for example, Residential 4 to Commercial/Residential Flex 2. She asked if the overlay was put on because anything changed.*

*Ms. Bahm said that in most of those cases, the change would primarily bring the Master Plan future designations into better alignment to what zoning existed. It was not to change what the future would hold for the parcels. It was going back to what was there, which was not normally what was done. They felt that there were some areas that needed to be more responsive to what was actually on the ground.*

*Mr. Fazzini said that they looked at the major commercial intersections where development had occurred, but the Land Use Plan had been done prior to the development. They addressed some businesses in residential districts. The residential change was R-5, which was outside of the intersection areas. Ms. Bahm said that other changes were to the names of the Flex designations to make it clearer that they included residential. She said that the information could be added to the appendix, and they could have reference sheets available to people at the Open House if they were interested in knowing how the changes came about.*

*Mr. Schroeder said that he had a personal problem calling alleys alleys. They were platted as alleys, but he felt that they were old places where horses did not ride through any more. He thought that they should be called something other than alleys, such as service drives. He indicated that just because they were platted that way did not mean they had to continue calling them that.*

*Ms. Roediger asked if he was referring to the Brooklands area, to which Mr. Schroeder agreed. Ms. Roediger said that in terms of the Auburn Rd. project, they would be paving the alleys and putting them back into service. Mr. Arroyo claimed that alleys were becoming very hot. There were all kinds of papers coming out about making alleys more pedestrian-friendly. The term was changing in the way they were perceived to be more positive. Ms. Morita remarked that the City's alleys were going to be nice.*

*Ms. Bahm asked if everything that had been discussed was captured in the draft. She asked if there was anything they had not included. Mr. Kaltsounis mentioned the proposed R-5 district, and he asked if everyone agreed with increasing the density in the City over what they had. He stated that he was thumbs down, but he would like to hear others' thoughts. Ms. Bahm said that R-5 would be four to six units per acre, which was on par with the manufactured home community on Auburn Rd.*

*Mr. Anzek asked if there were spots by the Brooklands where R-5 could be. He would not like to see them add something that was not properly defined. It could restrict people doing additions and so forth. He thought that the whole context of R-5 was that it was appropriate for higher density, looking toward affordable housing, and that it could be a plus. He did not personally have a problem with it.*

*Mr. Arroyo maintained that the range of density in R-5 was a single-family density, not a multiple-family density. They were trying to build an opportunity for some units that might be on smaller lots that were more affordable. They did hear from many people that it was lacking in the City and how it was getting difficult to afford to live in the City. It was not planned for a significant amount of land area, and they were trying to balance planning. Mr. Kaltsounis said that it was hard to see where R-5 was planned, and he thought that he might feel better if he knew where they were going to put it. Mr. Arroyo said that they would provide a larger map.*

*Ms. Roediger said that the R-5 areas were on the map with yellow dots, next to the two existing manufactured home facilities and for areas adjacent to them and at the Streamwood condos. Regarding Mr. Arroyo's comments, she said that they were trying to update the Master Plan to have the appropriate balance between affordable housing, which City Council had identified as a priority, a diversity of housing, aging in place, homes for first time buyers and for empty nesters with traffic and height. Building costs were fairly standard, but the land values were higher. As*

land became more scarce, if they were not going to go up, they had to go a little smaller in terms of lot sizes. That was consistent with trends across the country with missing middle housing and people wanting less yard maintenance. They felt it was appropriate to plan for areas already adjacent to other areas that had smaller lots. She liked Mr. Anzek's idea of looking at the Brooklands area, where some of the lots might already fit into the R-5 density. They wanted to allow for a smaller lot, single-family home in lieu of going up and to have affordable pockets in the community. They were very conscientiously thinking about and trying to find solutions. There were pros and cons for up or smaller, and they were trying to find realistic options to provide the community.

Mr. Reece recalled that they did ask for the R-5 designation to be better delineated. He did not know if that attempt was made, but it did not look any different to him. Ms. Bahm said that they did, and the map showed yellow with dots. Mr. Reece said that Residential 2.5 looked the same. Ms. Bahm said that it had a slightly different pattern, but if it was not clear, they would change it. Mr. Reece wondered if there was an issue with cross hatching. Ms. Bahm said that they would test the shading and symbols. Mr. Reece said that he tended to agree with Mr. Kaltsounis about the R-5 designation. In limited locations, it might be appropriate, but he noted page 58 which stated that the number one major challenge facing the City was traffic congestion. By adding density, they would only make it worse. There might be a few limited locations within the City where it might work, but he thought that they were turning their backs on one of the biggest concerns. Just above that was aging infrastructure. The more traffic added to the infrastructure, the worse it would get. They were not able to make the roads any wider. There was a reality that they had to come to grips with. When he first moved to Rochester Hills 30 years ago, as a graduate architect making \$7 per hour, he bought in Cumberland Hills. At the time he felt, and still felt, that it was more of an entry level community for Rochester Hills. He knew that there was some high rise in the City, but it was in specific locations. They were, for the most part, a residential, bedroom community supported by commercial and business use, and that was why people moved to the City.

Mr. Arroyo said that they were trying to accomplish, based on feedback, enabling people to stay in the City who had lived there a long time who wanted to move out of their larger home and wanted something more affordable. Mr. Reece said that he understood that. Mr. Arroyo said that one of the advantages was that if someone was in a smaller, more dense unit, it might not necessarily lead to more traffic. There would be fewer trips being made with one or two people. Mr. Reece said that Mr. Arroyo

*was talking about seniors that might not drive, but if they were younger people, trips would be generated. Ms. Bahm said that she agreed, and they were sensitive to the traffic issue. That was the first thing they heard at the first meeting and had subsequently. They tried to accomplish having concentrated areas of density adjacent to places people could walk. They were talking about the Flex areas along Rochester Rd., the Brooklands area or some of the R-5 areas that were close to employment centers. There could possibly be workforce housing, where people did not have to get in their cars and drive to everything. There was a beautiful trail system, and they could strengthen the non-motorized facilities to help alleviate some of the traffic. They were not trying to create additional density on the edge of the community where problems would be created with traffic. They were not trying to randomly increase the density across the whole City; it was targeted.*

*Mr. Hooper asked if he could assume that the manufactured home communities were the primary location for the R-5 districts, which Ms. Bahm verified. Mr. Hooper asked about the zero lot line homes on the north side of Drexelgate in Winchester Village. There was 15 feet between houses, and they had a lower price point. He envisioned them as the entry level, single-family, compact homes. Ms. Bahm said that she had driven around that area, and she agreed it was more of an affordable area. She wondered why people said that they struggled to find places to move once they wanted to downsize. Mr. Hooper said that they did not want to move to a manufactured home or rent or go to an expensive senior facility. He stated that they could not solve everyone's problem, but he thought that the Drexelgate location might be an example to show people. He said that he saw tiny homes on T.V., and he wondered if it was just a fad. Ms. Bahm asked if they should be included in the Plan. She remembered that they talked about them previously, and the discussion lasted about as long as the one about accessory dwelling units.*

*Ms. Bahm clarified that was why they brought items to the Commissioners. They wanted them to think about the issues and possibilities. They might not be ready for them, but they might include bits and pieces of things so that at the next update in five years, they might revisit those ideas. If they designated some areas in 2018 as R-5, in 2023, they might consider other possible areas for it or consider adding stories.*

*Mr. Hooper pointed out page seven, where it stated that Master Plan updates were done in 1974, 1979, 1992, 1999 and 2012. He knew that*

they did one in 2007 as well. Mr. Anzek agreed that was a big one, and noted that 2013 was just a brief update. Ms. Bahm said that they would add 2007. Mr. Hooper referred to page 25, Table 11, Future Estimated Sales and Support Space - Retail Goods and Related Services and the categories General Merchandise and Miscellaneous which were the two next growth targets between 2020 and 2030. He asked what Miscellaneous was. It stated that General Merchandise would go from \$500k square feet of space to \$775k. Ms. Bahm said that Miscellaneous was a catch all of thing that could not easily fall into one of the other categories. She said that they could break it down further if the Commissioners felt it would be helpful. Mr. Arroyo added that they would give some examples. Mr. Hooper referred to page 26, Table 12, Traditional Manufacturing and Tech Center Driven Space Opportunities. It went from 147k square feet to 1.5 million square feet. He said that it was in line with what they had talked about for R&D centers. The vacancy rate was negligible, and everything that opened up was taken right away. He believed that Ms. Valentik (Manager of Economic Development) would support the huge demand for that type of development. He wondered if there was some way to make the landfill area work for that type of development, which he felt would be a perfect location.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked the consultants to not take it the wrong way, but he felt that the Master Plan was just sort of a progression of where the City was at. He asked if they were afraid to ask the Commissioners to do something that might be groundbreaking or different other than four-story buildings. Ms. Bahm remarked that he meant to add "other than accessory buildings and tiny homes, also." Mr. Kaltsounis wondered if there was that next big thing that could suit the community. He asked what the consultants would recommend out of the box.

Ms. Bahm thought that a positive step was the potential for energy generation at the landfill site. The community was fairly well built-out. They should play on its strengths in terms of what was there, such as the existing neighborhoods, new trail connections and anticipating how to reutilize much of the Rochester Rd. corridor. Mr. Arroyo said that something out of the box, which might be better addressed in the Transportation Plan, was a private transportation system up and down the major corridors. Other communities were doing that. Ms. Morita said that it was something that Council had looked at, because they had been contacted by SMART. Council did not think that SMART was a good fit for the community. They had looked at what other communities were doing in Florida and Texas in providing subsidized, private transportation for that last mile. The problem was that transportation was changing so



*dramatically and quickly, especially with autonomous vehicles and Uber and Lyft. She said that they would look at, but she did not know if it was something they wanted in the Master Plan. The last thing they wanted to do was encourage a transportation company to come and ask them to levy a millage that would take \$3.5 million out of the community without giving residents what they needed. Mr. Arroyo said that he was talking about something besides that, which he felt could be considered when the time came. He said that a lot of the new thinking regarded the changing retail arena. The retail they had in the City currently might not be there in five years, or it would change into something else, such as entertainment or more dining. Trends included residential, technology and manufacturing, where there was potential growth.*

*Mr. Schroeder recalled that years ago, they looked at providing transportation from Oakland University to downtown Rochester, but it never went anywhere.*

*Chairperson Brnabic noted that the proposed development at Auburn and John R at three stories had been mentioned. The Commissioners saw it as a concept, and the developer was moving forward with a PUD, which could allow the development to happen. She clarified that was how three stories might happen at that corner, which she had shared concerns about.*

*Ms. Bahm brought up the redevelopment sites, and stated that Suburban Softball had been a tough one for them. There was a Consent Judgment on the property that allowed a considerable amount of development. The likelihood of modifying the Consent would require both an interested property owner and the City. It was hard to anticipate what else those parties might want. She was concerned about creating an unrealistic concept for redevelopment there, and they were recommending that the Commission considered removing it from the redevelopment sites.*

*Mr. Arroyo agreed that the Consent Judgment was a strong document that could not be bent unless both parties agreed to change it. They did not want to collect public input and present something that was not consistent with the Consent. Ms. Bahm said that they were thinking about what kinds of questions to ask the community. They had showed the Commissioners imagery of a corporate office park setting with a lot of place making elements, which was not necessarily in the Consent. They would be asking for input for something that might not even come to pass. They could ask where the buildings should be focused, but she did not know if that was even up for discussion. They had suggested including*

*housing, which was in demand. If they could open the Consent to allow housing, the other place making elements could be talked about further. However, they heard from the Commissioners that housing was not an option there, because redevelopment for housing would be too expensive. They were not sure what else there was to discuss about the site.*

*Mr. Anzek agreed that it was a big can of worms. He stated that hindsight was 20/20 and when the Consent was negotiated, there were a lot of things happening. No one mentioned how much that site was leaching into the Clinton River, and not a thing had been done to stop it. He thought that it would be to the City's advantage if something were in the Master Plan that said that the use mix negotiated in the Consent Judgment might not be appropriate for the changing trends. He said that he would love to scale back the amount of retail. Adams Marketplace across the street had a lot of vacant stores, because there was an oversaturation of retail. He suggested that the Master Plan could be used to give both the City Council and the Planning Commission a new negotiating standpoint to look at the potential for housing and what was right for the market, given that the Consent was 15 years old. The square-footage for retail was requested because the developer wanted to get something out of the ground quickly to create cash, but it did not happen. He thought the City could emphasize that markets and trends changed, and that the Consent should be revisited. He was concerned about the 500k s.f. of retail permitted in the Consent. If a big box came, another one in the City would close. They would have to find incentives for Hampton Plaza to redevelop if Target moved to the Softball site, such as allowing four stories or apartments above retail.*

*Ms. Bahm asked if it made sense to preface that the City recognized that there was a Consent Judgment on the site, and it allowed so and so, but if it were to be modified, and the developer decided to re-market the site, the City would like to see X. Mr. Anzek said that he would be hard pressed to believe a market analysis that said there was room for 500k s.f. of retail in the City.*

*Ms. Morita asked Mr. Arroyo if he was involved in the Novi Sandstone Master Plan park change to comply with a Consent Judgment. They eventually put in housing. Mr. Arroyo said that he was involved in the retail portion. Ms. Morita said that it was sticky dealing with a Consent and trying to address it inside of the Master Plan in a manner that might be inconsistent with the Consent. She strongly suggested that it be reviewed by the City Attorney to make sure it would not cause any*

*problems for the City down the road before it was addressed in the Master Plan.*

*Ms. Roediger thought that was a great suggestion, and they would run it by him. She noted that the original intent of keeping the site as a redevelopment site recognized that the City did not want 500k s.f. of retail. If the Consent were to be reopened, they could put in what the City would prefer to see. There was a huge demand for R&D, and she knew that the owner was targeting more office uses, and the Plan could promote more office use at that location. Mr. Arroyo asked if they should include housing. Ms. Roediger said that she knew there was not much support for that, but she had learned to never say never. It was determined to keep the site as one of the redevelopment sites.*

*Ms. Bahm next talked about the Bordine's site. They had talked about housing as the new anchor with smaller edged retail with office or residential above. They talked about trying to build in additional pedestrian crossings across Hamlin and having an internal roadway to connect Hamlin to Rochester Rd. Mr. Anzek had a concern over the size of individual users, and she agreed. They would not want to see something come in that would result in the closure of any existing retail spaces along the Rochester corridor.*

*Mr. Arroyo said that hopefully, there could be some type of additional pedestrian crossing on Hamlin away from Rochester to be able to walk across the street to get groceries and other things. There were restaurants, places to shop at the intersection, and walking and biking would generate less traffic than the previous plan for Bordine's. Ms. Bahm said that they talked about aligning the street on the south end with a driveway across Hamlin and adding a light.*

*Mr. Kaltsounis said that they were pushing all of the developers to add parks and walkable areas. He thought that the plan showed too much parking, and that it needed more green space. Mr. Arroyo agreed that they could add more green pockets. Mr. Kaltsounis said that with new mixed-use developments, they should also require designating areas for that.*

*The landfill area was discussed next potentially for recreation, energy generation and continuing to encourage commercial and industrial of low intensity natures, such as storage, warehousing, light manufacturing and limited residential. The current text in the Master Plan spoke generally of being flexible based on future land use and environmental analyses.*

*They talked with Tom Wackerman of ASTI who did the Environmental Concerns Inventory. In their understanding of the redevelopment potential, several maps were consolidated in the document and they recommended areas for industrial uses and energy generation. Green areas showed recreation and open space, making sure connections were being made between the existing facilities. They recommended allowing some mixed-use residential in the area. She thought that the recreation area could also have passive energy generation like solar or wind.*

*Mr. Anzek mentioned that the Highland Park parcel was shown as residential. He said that the very northeast piece going to Avon was bought by Sunoco who put a pump station there. Next to that was the piece owned by Highland Park. It was their tree dump site for trees with Dutch Elm disease. A gentleman who worked for Highland Park once told him that they brought in a lot of trash, too. He would not automatically flag it for residential. They should put a note on the sites stating that they were subject to environmental review. Mr. Arroyo thought that it had been designated as moderate redevelopment potential.*

*Ms. Bahm noted that the area on the northwest side was more planned for recreation. Someone had asked about the level of remediation required for active recreation uses, which she said would be similar to residential standards. For more passive recreation uses, like trails, it would be a little less. She considered that if they combined recreation and energy generation, it might offset some of the costs of remediation.*

*Mr. Schroeder asked if anyone had talked with SOCCRA. Ms. Roediger said there had not been conversations with them. She advised that there was interest in the parcel for sale at the southwest corner of Avon and Dequindre, which was planned for Residential 5. It was currently zoned Mixed Residential, and environmental studies on the site came back clean. She imagined that it would be redeveloped in the future.*

*Ms. Bahm talked about one of their web-based platforms called Crowd Source Polling. It showed basic information about the three redevelopment sites, information about the Consent Judgment, comments from the Open House and potential redevelopment opportunities. People could comment. It also showed environmental maps and listed some background and potential uses. It was a way to reach out to people who did not come to the Open Houses or meetings.*

*Ms. Roediger asked if it would have the overall Future Land Use Map City-wide and not just show the redevelopment sites. Ms. Bahm said that*

*they could talk about adding it and about what they would like people to comment on. Mr. Anzek claimed that 95% of the people could not read a map. Ms. Bahm suggested that they could add imagery.*

*Ms. Bahm reminded that the second Open House would be on September 13 from 4-7 p.m. at The Village of Rochester Hills. It would be outside, with a more informal discussion at stations. She encouraged the Commissioners to come to help facilitate discussion. They would have a station on the Future Land Use changes, and the map would be highlighted to show the changes. They would talk about the Residential 5 district and what it would replace. They would talk about housing strategies, the redevelopment sites and have a station open for all comments. They would have a laptop or two available to show people how Crowd Source Polling worked. Ms. Morita asked what would happen if the weather was bad. Ms. Bahm advised that everything would be under a big tent. Ms. Roediger agreed, and pointed out that at the Auburn Rd. public meeting, they were under a tent, and there were storms all day. If the weather was going to be really iffy, there might be some vacant spaces at The Village.*

*Regarding next steps, the redevelopment sites would be completed, and the implementation chapter would be added to the Master Plan. They would work with staff on the implementation chapter to make sure that they understood what had been accomplished since the last Master Plan and look at things they needed to do to implement the update. She reiterated that the Open House would be held on September 13th, and they would meet with the Commissioners again on September 25 to review the public input gained from the Open House and the online platform and hopefully, present a final working draft. They hoped that at the meeting or the one subsequent that the Planning Commission would make a recommendation to City Council to distribute the Plan to the adjacent communities and reviewing agencies. That would be a 42-day review, and then they would hold the Public Hearing and adoption mid to late fall.*

*Mr. Hooper asked where the kids' artwork was. Ms. Bahm said that it still needed to be included in the Plan. There would be eight to ten images included for the next meeting.*

## **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

*There was no further business to come before the Planning Commission.*

**NEXT MEETING DATE**

Chairperson Brnabic reminded the Commissioners that the next Regular Meeting was scheduled for September 25, 2018.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission and upon motion by Mr. Kaltsounis, seconded by Mr. Reece, Chairperson Brnabic adjourned the Regular Meeting at 9:25 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Deborah Brnabic, Chairperson  
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Secretary