
CITY OF ROCHESTER HILLS

Building
Department

Robert White Ordinance Supervisor
Scott Cope Director

DATE: October 9, 2007

TO: Mayor/City Council

RE: Property Maintenance Ord.
comments

A motion was made at the August 8, 2007 City Council meeting for City Council members to provide their suggested changes to the proposed ordinance to the Building Department prior to the next work session. Below are written comments or suggestions that were provided to staff by council members. We have included a synopsis of public comments from the August 8th meeting as well.

President Rosen stated that he is fine with Article 1 but is uneasy about Article II, Division one and is not in support of Article II, Division 2. He is concerned about the older folks in the community who can no longer tend to their property but don't have the financial resources to have someone else do it for them.

Greg Hooper had the following changes or additions:

1. Add language to goal, "To enhance neighborhoods and preserve property values, to encourage families to live, work and invest in Rochester Hills".
2. Add language "Objective", "Enact a fair and responsible Property Maintenance Code to enhance the quality of life".
3. 84-4 (a), 9. Drop the words "and trees" after...tall grass". How are trees blight? I can see the rest of the items applying with reasonable application.
4. 84-11 (a) 1, suggestion, "Free from trip hazards and maintained in a condition of good repair".
5. 84-13 (e) 3. Why is this paragraph in here? This would apply to the agreement between the Homeowner and Waste Company. Suggest drop it.
6. 84-14 (a). "stagnant water". All pools become stagnant during the winter, don't they? Time exclusion on this one?
7. 84-16 © 3. Drop the last sentence, "unused vehicles stored under a tarp must be stored in a side or rear yard". You already have the licensed vehicle requirement and if over 90 days they have to move it anyway with or without the tarp.
8. 84-17 (b) 2. add your language "starting at the street edge".

Article II, Building Exterior and Building Interior- Drop

Public Comments during the August 8th, 2007 City Council meeting;

- Accepting an expanded Property Maintenance ordinance would cause too much government intervention into the lives of private citizens.
- Ordinance language is too broad and needs to be defined.
- Rochester Hills does not need this ordinance that is potentially intrusive into residents private lives and personal property.

- The City has many ordinances not enforced at this time. The City does not need a new ordinance to try to enforce.
- Resident is in favor of the new blight ordinance. Subdivisions do not have adequate restrictions in their bylaws to prevent blight issues.