



Rochester Hills
Minutes
Planning Commission

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

*William Boswell, Deborah Brnabic, Kathleen Hardenburg, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis,
David Reece, James Rosen, C. Neall Schroeder*

Tuesday, January 18, 2005

7:30 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

Present 7 - William Boswell, Deborah Brnabic, Kathleen Hardenburg, Greg Hooper,
Nicholas Kaltsounis, James Rosen and C. Neall Schroeder
Excused 1 - Eric Kaiser

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2005-0046 Regular Meeting - January 4, 2005

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

Aye 8 - Boswell, Brnabic, Hardenburg, Hill, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Rosen and
Schroeder
Excused 1 - Kaiser

COMMUNICATIONS

A) Letter from C. Burckhardt dated Jan. 12, 2005 re: City of Rochester Master Plan Amendment.
B) 2004 Year in Pictures from the Parks and Forestry Department.

*Regarding item A) above, Ms. Hill asked if they could see a copy of the changes
Rochester was making, noting that they would be helpful to review as Rochester Hills
updated its Master Plan. She heard that Rochester was considering extending its
downtown area and she was curious how that might affect Rochester Hills. She referred
to the recent State Act which encouraged communities to look at regional development,
and pointed out that it was important to look at what adjacent communities were
proposing. If other cities were sending materials to review, she felt the Commissioners
should take the opportunity to look at them. Mr. Rosen said he had inquired about
information from another city, and Mr. Delacourt said he would check into both requests.*

NEW BUSINESS

2005-0045 Planned Unit Development (PUD) Pre-Application Workshop - City File No. 05-003 -
Historic Central Village, a proposed residential PUD on approximately ten acres, located
east of Livernois and south of Hamlin, zoned R-3, One Family Residential, known as
Parcel No. 15-27-151-003, Premium Construction, LLC, applicant.

(Reference: Memo prepared by Derek Delacourt, dated January 14, 2005 had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Mr. Delacourt advised that when applicants were considering use of a PUD, they were allowed to come before the Commission for an optional Pre-Application Workshop. This would be done prior to any formal submittal or review, and it would let the applicant discuss the possible use of a PUD to redevelop the property before investing a lot of time and money. He advised that one qualifying condition for use of a PUD was the redevelopment of an existing historic district. The applicant had appeared before the Historic Districts Commission (HDC) to discuss development ideas. Mr. Delacourt further advised that the presentation would include a conceptual plan and he advised that there had been no technical review of any documentation.

Mr. Rosen asked the applicants to introduce themselves, advising that fundamentally, the Planning Commission would try to determine some indication of whether the proposal would work as a PUD and if there were any "show-stoppers." By the end of the discussion the applicant would hopefully have enough information about proceeding.

Present for the applicant were Mukesh Mangla, Premium Construction, LLC, 1052 Oaktree Lane, Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304, and Michael Campbell, Campbell Planning and Architecture, 2361 Sunnyknoll Ave., Berkley, Michigan 48072.

Mr. Campbell stated that that the site was heavily wooded and he pointed out the existing historic house. The house was moved in 1972 from its original location on Rochester Road and was currently hidden from view from Livemois by trees. He did not feel it was too much of an asset for the City. He advised that the plan was shown to the HDC and they liked the way the areas were preserved around the perimeter in particular. The applicant proposed to cluster the development toward the center, and a conservation easement would be drawn up for the trees.

Mr. Campbell continued that at the request of the City, they increased the size of the central common to make it more useful. There would be 36 units plus the historic site, for a density of 3.7 units per acre on a 10 acre site. There would be duplexes and they would be built according to the setbacks for an RCD, Residential Cluster District. The 80-foot lots, he felt, would be comfortably spaced, but could be reduced to 75-feet to have a stronger streetscape to enclose the open space. He felt that the benefit of using a PUD would be the large, central common and to save trees, and that the staging of the historic resource at the head of the town square would give it visibility in the City. The central common could be a public park for the City. He felt that the duplexes would offer a complimentary housing option. The Site Plan would provide interconnectivity of streets and it would be a walkable district. The development could be perceived as an attractive new district for the City and might bring an identity to the City. He noted that 55% of the space would be open.

Mr. Campbell cited the Master Plan, which said that the City should provide a variety of housing types to meet the needs of people of different ages, incomes and lifestyles. He stated that the density would be similar to conventional zoning; they propose 3.7 versus 2.9 allowable under a single-family PUD without the duplexes. It would not be an intense development of townhouses. Unit sales prices, from \$300-350,000, would be comparable or higher than sale prices in the immediate area so the proposal would not degrade the area. They would have 2,000+ square feet, which would be comparable in size with units nearby.

Mr. Campbell indicated that the motivation for building duplexes did not have to do with getting more units for more revenue, but rather, with product absorption in the market place. They determined that there would be, in the next 3-5 years, a higher demand for smaller units and this type of product than for single-family homes. Attached units would only generate an extra \$1.2 million for the developer and there would be higher construction costs so he stressed that money was not the issue - meeting the market was. He noted that demographically, there was a graying of the nation and that living in the 3-bedroom, 2.5 bathroom home would be something that changed in the near future. He felt it could be beneficial for Rochester Hills to "get in the game." He read a quote from the Building Industry Association: "Attached condominium housing saw tremendous increases in new home starts throughout southeast Michigan. For the region as a whole, new attached condo starts were up nearly 18%, to 6,380, in 2004."

Mr. Campbell stated that if planned under R-3 zoning, a development would require minimum lot sizes of 12,000 square feet and minimum lot widths of 90 feet. Under lot averaging, they could reduce that to 10,800 square feet and 81 feet in width. He showed several plan variations without using a PUD, and said they could get 25 units. If they moved the historic house to Livemais, they could get 26 units. If they developed a one-family PUD without duplexes, they could reduce the lot area by 20%, to 9,600 square feet and the width to 75 feet.

Mr. Campbell said the applicant believed the Site Plan would be consistent with the intent of the PUD Ordinance to preserve significant open space and to encourage the appropriate redevelopment and reuse of a historic site. He noted that variances would have to be requested if the proposal was done as a PUD - for setbacks, the architecture, and the berm. He indicated that the HDC was attracted to the new urbanism qualities of the Site Plan because it would use a common open space in the center and would preserve space around the perimeter. They would introduce flexible building types and interconnectivity of streets.

Mr. Mangla referred to information he gathered from SSR, a large consulting firm, which did a very comprehensive study of why the condo market was surging. There would be 77,000,000 people in the 65 year-old age group by the year 2025, a surge of 354%. The Building Association advised that developers should gear up for that age group. He felt this site would be perfect to offer a different product, and he said that there were four people who lived nearby, including the property owner, who wanted one of the proposed units. He stated that the market was becoming very product-oriented. They were very encouraged by the HDC, and Mr. Campbell noted that the HDC approved of the Site Plan.

Mr. Schroeder asked where the garages and driveways would be. Mr. Campbell said that the driveway would be to the right of the garage, as a 9 or 10- foot wide lane. Mr. Mangla added that there would be a common driveway for two garages to minimize the concrete.

Mr. Kallsounis thought the applicant had good intentions and that it was a nice proposal but that it seemed to be targeting someone in their thirties. He mentioned that his parents were empty nesters who were looking for a ranch home. Mr. Campbell replied that the proposal would have ground-floor master bedrooms. Mr. Mangla agreed some people were looking for ranches and he indicated that developers were trying to create loft areas for the visiting grandchildren or children. The plan they showed had a den and bedroom downstairs, but they wanted to create a room for visitors.

Mr. Kallsounis said he would be concerned about the site being rezoned from R-3 to RCD. He felt it would be a roadblock for the development. The Commissioners would have to determine whether the proposal was harmonious to the surrounding environment.

The property was small, and people would see a cluster development in the middle of big open lots with large, single-family homes. A residential cluster development would be hard for him to recommend. He noted the R-3 alternatives shown, and said he did not have a problem with those. He would be concerned about saving the good trees and he thought that would be a challenge.

Referring to an Alternative plan (C) provided, Mr. Hooper asked if it could be built as proposed, without variances. Mr. Campbell said that plan would be a PUD but that there would be no incentive for them to go through the arduous PUD process because they would only end up with 25 lots. They could do a development with the existing zoning and get more. That was why they were motivated to come up with the proposed plan. Mr. Hooper stated that the incentive would be the open space and maintaining the existing historical house and those would be two arguments for cluster housing. Mr. Campbell said they would be benefits to the City, but there would not be an economic incentive for the developer.

Mr. Hooper said that another problem he saw was houses with streets on both sides of them. He thought they should possibly consider an eyebrow or cul-de-sac. It appeared to him that the site could be developed under the current zoning creatively, and that the applicant would not necessarily have to build a clustered, or attached, development. It would be a little hard to sell him on that.

Mr. Campbell said that they did not think the HDC would allow them to have 25 homes. Mr. Hooper said they did not have to worry about HDC because the Planning Commission would make the decision about the proposal. Mr. Campbell said that if they only built 25 homes, there would be no bonus for the developer to use the PUD process. Mr. Hooper said he understood that, and Mr. Campbell said they would provide open space and redevelopment of the historic home but get nothing in return. Under conventional development they would get 26 homes, so he questioned why they would consider using a PUD, spend the extra money and only get 25 homes.

Mr. Rosen clarified that Mr. Hooper questioned what it was about Alternative C that the applicant could not do. Mr. Campbell said they could do it, they just did not have to. Mr. Rosen said that if they moved the house, it would take HDC approval and there would also be Planning Commission approval required for the Site Plan. If the house were not moved, the site could still be developed. He asked what it was about their proposal that would cure a defect or make it to the City's advantage to grant extra density.

Mr. Campbell said there would be a common open area in the center, a wonderful staging of the historic home, and tree preservation around the perimeter. Mr. Rosen said it was not necessary to do it that way to preserve or enhance a significant natural feature or open space, or to provide for appropriate redevelopment of a historic district. Mr. Campbell indicated that it would give them the density bonus.

Mr. Rosen said he understood that, but he suggested that they could do the plan or a variation of the plan and still meet the City's density ordinance. Although it might be nice, he stated that they did not need to get the density bonus to develop the property.

Mr. Campbell wanted everyone to put aside the Alternative Plans because they were just shown for the Commission's benefit, but were not what the applicant was proposing. He advised that they were proposing a plan with 36 units and 18 buildings, and after accusing the Commission of not understanding things, he admitted there was not proper communication.

Mr. Mangla clarified that Mr. Hooper advised them to do a single-family PUD rather than a duplex. Mr. Mangla felt the answer to that was that it was a single-family PUD and they would have to go through the process and planning for that. Mr. Campbell suggested that rather than going through that process, they had explored alternatives. Mr. Rosen said they did not need the PUD or qualify for it, so it would be much harder to determine that a PUD should be used. Mr. Campbell said he was not aware it had to be determined, and thought that there would be a give and take process with the City and the applicant.

Ms. Hill advised that the HDC did have more authority than the Commissioners might have acknowledged. All ten acres were part of a historic district and therefore the HDC could make a decision about what development would go on the site. The HDC did not, however, have the authority to decide whether it should be developed as a PUD or not. She felt that because it was a historic district, the PUD process might be advantageous for developing the site. She referred to the plan for a single-family PUD and said she was not sure the HDC would agree with that particular plan if it did not showcase the historic home and it proposed a full-blown residential development on a historic district. When the applicant presented the duplex idea to the HDC they might have liked that layout because it helped showcase the historic resource in the district, but she advised that the Planning Commission might take a little different view. She was concerned about the density of the duplex plan, although she felt it would work on the site and that perhaps it would be a niche for the area. She referred to Rochelle Park to the west of the proposal, and noted that they had attached condos, verifying that the mixed concept was not new to the area.

Mr. Campbell said that their desire was to have the type of unit that would sell, as opposed to potentially having some homes just sitting. Their desire was also to preserve open space, which the HDC would like, and if they did a one-family PUD, they would not get that.

Ms. Hill said she did not think the HDC would have a problem with that. She would like to see the historic resource showcased, but she would have the same concerns as others about the density levels. She did think that the applicant had presented a nice application. She recalled a similar situation in the Stony Creek Historic District, noting that the Planning Commission was involved in that approval process. There was not an existing home, and the Commission requested that something compatible be built. There were attached duplex units built which had the appearance of a single-family home. There were 46 total units, but she advised that only half had been developed because they were not selling. That was interesting to note because the single-family homes adjacent to them were sold out. She concluded that she liked the duplexes and the single-family PUD shown, but she would be concerned about the density of a multi-family unit and agreed with the other Commissioners who questioned the need for a PUD. The HDC would probably be hesitant about a single-family development, and she stressed that they would have a say in the matter.

Mr. Rosen recapped that ordinarily, a historic district property or structure could not be developed without HDC approval. Mr. Delacourt agreed. Mr. Rosen said that because the entire ten acres of the subject property was a historic district, an approval was required up front. He said the applicant was requesting approval to develop an HDC district as an ordinary subdivision in R-3, which normally might not occur. Mr. Delacourt said that the applicant showed several plans to the HDC; single-family options and for an attached PUD. They asked the HDC how they wanted to see the property redeveloped to preserve the context of the historic district and the HDC was much happier with the multi-family, or attached, unit product. That did not mean they were opposed to a single-family development, but he agreed they would have a say about it before it was done.

Mr. Rosen said that if this were an acre or two with a house on it, it probably would not be developable as a historic district. Mr. Delacourt noted that there had been instances where historic districts could be split without HDC approval, but that any structures built on the resulting parcels would have to be approved by the HDC.

Mr. Rosen explained that in exchange for HDC's approval, the applicant was proposing something different than they normally would for a subdivision. What the applicant felt was necessary to get approval from the HDC was the open space, which required a PUD. Mr. Delacourt agreed that a PUD would help facilitate that. Mr. Rosen asked if there was something they could not do without a PUD. Mr. Delacourt said it would depend on the size and how many lots there were. There were other ways to preserve open space, but what they had shown for R-3, single-family lot averaging conceptually appeared to conform with the Ordinance. That would fit under the permitted uses for the district. The PUD would be easier for redeveloping a historic district because it would allow open space goals to be accomplished and would allow an applicant the density.

Mr. Schroeder noted the plan that had no access to homes two and three. Mr. Campbell said those would be addressed on Livernois Road with an alley access. Mr. Schroeder felt that would be totally inadequate for access and that they would need something a fire truck could manipulate. Mr. Mangla agreed there were some flaws in that plan, and Mr. Campbell added that it was not the one proposed, but rather, just a diagram to see how many homes could be built on 9,600 square foot lots with a 75-foot minimum lot width.

Mr. Schroeder referred to the applicant's proposed plan and said that it had no access at all, and reiterated that it would be totally unacceptable in the event of a fire. Mr. Campbell said they could face homes one and two on the road they proposed to build and eliminate home three. Mr. Mangla said that they drew the plan to show that more trees could be preserved, and he suggested that there was more than one way to do the plan.

Mr. Rosen said that without going into detail about the Site Plan, they should try to answer whether it should be a properly engineered PUD with duplexes.

Mr. Mangla referred to the Loma Stone PUD at Adams and South Boulevard and noted that he owned the property on the corner. He said that the HDC, Planning Commission and Council approved the plan with a density of almost 16 homes an acre. In the historic district of ten acres, there would be 50-foot lots. There would be 400 homes on 24 acres. He thought that the City was taking the direction toward diversity, and not looking so much at density and zoning, but being more open. He thought the City had opened the gates for developers to work as partners with the City, rather than doing things as they had for 20 years. He saw an opportunity to do something for the City, noting the economy was changing drastically and that developers would play a very important role in bringing taxes and people to the City and keeping them in town. Developing had become a lot more risky and in terms of that, they had come to see if the Commission could see a little small sub in an area of many homes. He believed that people wanted to keep their parents close by. They tried to look at the needs of the community - they were not trying to worry about density - but they had to look at where the community was going, and stacked products were selling.

Mr. Rosen observed that small condos, particularly two stories, did not sell well now. They did back in the 1970s, but he felt the reality was that duplexes would be tough to sell. They still sold out 3,000+ square-foot homes literally as fast as the plans were done. He realized everyone was getting older, but getting older was not the same as it used to be and people in their eighties still used the stairs. He thought people would tend to move somewhere warm when they decided to move. He stated that when they

discussed market demand, they had to be very careful, because each community was different. Birmingham and Beverly Hills were different than Rochester Hills, which had a certain reputation. They had to be careful about being critical or intrigued by the submitted design, and he restated the question about whether the proposal should be a PUD that included a significant amount of open space and duplex units.

Ms. Hill felt there was a slight dilemma for the Commissioners and thought the meeting would have been better if held jointly with the HDC. She had a sense of what the HDC saw and liked, and that they would want open space around the historic resource. To create a development to help showcase that would really leave only one avenue for the applicant to pursue - the PUD. She did not think it would be likely that the applicant would agree to put in a low number of residential units and showcase the resource. She understood why the applicants were pursuing the direction they were, however, there was a density concern. She felt that a different type of layout would be very welcome in the community because as times changed there would be a niche for that type of diversity. She believed the City was not really planning enough for that diversity and that there might be people in the community looking more for attached units. She was just not sure that this location was exactly the right one. She felt the one nice thing about the proposal, compared with Stony Creek, was that it would create its own neighborhood enclave. Stony Creek, being right on Tienken, had drawbacks. She liked the architectural style proposed by the applicants and felt it would compliment the existing historic home. She had some reservations about whether the development should be comprised of all duplexes, but she felt that what was shown had a nice feel. Considering a PUD, the applicant could work together with the Planning Commission and the HDC to get a nice result.

Mr. Kaltsounis agreed the Commission could meet with the HDC and perhaps get on the same page, and he felt that would be beneficial. Mr. Rosen said that might be beneficial, but he remarked that at joint meetings they did not always get breakthrough ideas. Mr. Kaltsounis indicated that he would like to know if the HDC agreed with the Commission.

Mr. Boswell commented that he was not as opposed to the proposal as others. He felt there would be advantages to the City, especially since the perimeter of the property would be preserved forever. The proposed density bothered him a little, and he did not feel they could get 37 units, but he could see the advantages of using a PUD.

Ms. Bmabic said she could see points for both sides, but was still in the middle about a decision. Mr. Rosen agreed that he could also see both sides, but he could see using a PUD to be able to achieve tree preservation and to highlight the historic house from inside the development. The condos to the west and the apartments south of M-59 would be sufficiently separated from the proposal, but it would be difficult for him to approve a development with all duplexes. If the density were not as great, and the units were not so packed together, it would be better.

Ms. Bmabic stated that "less dense" was a pertinent point, because she felt that was what was bothering most Commissioners, and she suggested the applicants might want to consider that. Mr. Campbell said he made a note to look at the streetscape, which showed the Commissioners how the buildings would be spaced. In order to define a common open space, they did not need to see the ceiling, which was the sky, but they would need to see the walls - whether a back drop of trees or of building facades. A town square in New England would have buildings around it and if the buildings were moved away, the square would become weaker.

Mr. Rosen said that when he realized where the garages and driveways would be, the plan

appeared very tight. He mentioned that he was in Florida recently in a development where the homes were 8 or 9 feet apart, yet from inside from the house it did not seem so close. There were no driveways or walkways between the homes, and when he saw them from outside, he thought it looked too close, but from inside people could not tell the homes were that close. With the proposal, people would feel and see something too close. He noted that his house was 15 feet from his neighbors and that it was very tight. He realized there was new urbanism, but they had to be careful where in the City it was located. Mr. Campbell said they might be able to move the driveway.

Mr. Mangla stated that he was somewhat bothered by the fact that Loma Stone, with a ten-acre historic district, could be approved for 200 homes and 70,000 square feet of retail and commercial. Mr. Rosen remarked that it might turn out to be a mistake. Mr. Mangla said he was trying to understand why something was acceptable for one site but not another. He was proposing something very close to the density permitted in the R-3 district - 30 versus 35 for the whole site - yet Loma Stone was approved for 20 units per acre. He was having difficulty understanding how the Commission could say his proposal was too dense. He could not believe the Loma Stone developer was allowed 70,000 square feet of retail space on Adams Road with the traffic and other issues. He stated that since he owned property on the corner, he was devastated by that PUD.

Mr. Mangla advised that he did homework before trying to do something. He referenced a few other developments that were duplexes or four-plexes that sold out very quickly for \$250,000 to \$450,000.00. They thought about building ranches, but wanted to do something more innovative. They spent thousands of dollars on drawings to do something different and to do a product the community would need. That was what drove him - not the density. People liked the sense of community from living in duplexes or attached housing, and market studies showed growing statistics for them. He wanted to assure the Commissioners that it was not the density; they had to look at the plan from every angle.

Ms. Hill commented that the proposal was a viable alternative, but it would be difficult for the HDC. Some of the preliminary analysis the Tech Committee found while embarking on the Master Plan update backed up the applicant's claims about the future direction of the attached housing market in the City. Redevelopment scenarios showed people needing, and developers willing to put, multiple housing on ten-acre sites. She mentioned that if contract zoning came into play, they could see requests for types of developments not currently allowed in the PUD Ordinance. She noted that the Loma Stone development had changed quite a bit and would be coming back to the Commission. They might need a joint meeting with HDC regarding that development because of the same issues they discussed with the subject proposal. She advised that they could let the applicant move forward at their discretion, but she cautioned that there might be a problem with the HDC and that they should perhaps try to address all the issues in a joint discussion.

Mr. Boswell said he would lean toward recommending a PUD, because if the site were developed as R-3 it would look like everything else in the City, and he was a little tired of that - even if he was a little tired of new urbanism.

Mr. Hooper said he was leaning toward the PUD option. He referred to Pine Trail, at Avon and John R, and said that it was somewhat of a residential retirement community. They had single-family, ranch homes, closer together, that sold out quickly. The applicant could build homes closely spaced like that, and he suggested a PUD with open space.

Mr. Campbell said that they did not have enough acreage to fall under RCD zoning and would have to rezone. According to those standards, if a development was next to a

120-foot arterial, the first 360 feet could be a lot denser and after that the site would revert to more conventional planning. They could consider doing a Royal Oak-type of neighborhood with 40-foot lots, front porches and tall homes within the first 360 feet. There would be no duplexes, but they would have the same density as proposed. Mr. Rosen believed that freeways would be somehow involved, and suggested Mr. Delacourt could look into that.

Mr. Rosen asked the applicant if they had received enough information from the Commissioners. Mr. Campbell felt it would be worthwhile if the Commission took a straw vote so they would have an idea of where to go. Mr. Rosen asked the Commissioners if they would be able to vote in favor of a PUD such as the applicant proposed.

Ms. Hill and Mr. Boswell replied that they would be able to vote yes. Ms. Brnabic said she also could, although not with complete firmness. Mr. Kaltsounis indicated that there were a lot of good points about using the PUD, but he felt that for the particular plan in question he would vote no. He urged the applicants to become creative. Mr. Hooper said he would vote no on the plan as presented, but with significant changes he could vote yes. Mr. Schroeder said he could vote yes, but the applicant would have to put a little effort into the plan and Ms. Hardenburg answered that she could vote yes. Mr. Rosen said he would probably vote no, but he could possibly vote yes with changes to the plan. He added that the Commissioners cared about the community and the job they held and that they did not try to berate plans unnecessarily or want applicants to take things personally when the Commissioners discussed their plans.

Mr. Mangla mentioned to Mr. Schroeder that his point was well taken and that the plans were far from finalized. He wanted the Commission to know that they heard everything that was said, noting that they wanted to get input about doing a multiple-type development. They would take another shot at the plan and come back in the hope that everyone would be happy. Mr. Rosen thanked the applicants for coming in for a workshop, rather than just proceeding without any discussion or input from the Commissioners.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Kaltsounis asked Mr. Delacourt about the office development next to the Jax Kar Wash, stating that there was garbage all over and that the sign was in disrepair. Mr. Delacourt said he would talk to the Ordinance Department.

Referring to the proposal they discussed, Ms. Brnabic asked how the land became designated as a historic district. Mr. Delacourt said that the structure was designated and since it sat on ten acres, all of it became the purvue of the HDC. That was to ensure that the context would not be destroyed, and thereby would not lessen the integrity of the district.

Ms. Brnabic asked about the Master Plan workshop of February 28 for business people and residents and if it would be during the day. Mr. Delacourt said that the public forum was being considered for that date and the residents would meet in the evening. He mentioned the joint Planning Commission/City Council meeting for February 8 regarding an update for the Master Plan. Ms. Brnabic asked if there would be two different forums and Mr. Delacourt answered that was the design.

Mr. Rosen asked if Mr. Kaiser was at the Tech Committee meeting and hearing that he was not, said he would contact Mr. Kaiser to see if he should attend in his place, and