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Executive Summary

Preserve. Enhance. Diversify. The 2018 Master Plan Update was launched with three guiding themes:

Preserve. Through the planning process, the community was consistent in the desire to preserve existing neighborhoods, parks and natural open spaces. Housing and development strategies are included to preserve, strengthen, and protect these important elements.

Enhance. Traffic concerns were nearly unanimously cited from everyone who participated in the planning process. While the Plan does not address traffic, land use policies and implementation strategies focus on concentrating redevelopment activities and creating more walkable places in the city.

Diversify. While many people enjoy the city’s existing residential neighborhoods, there was a stated need through the process to diversify the city’s housing stock to better accommodate the needs of aging residents.

Visioning. Through a series of early visioning sessions with leadership staff, the Rochester Hills Youth Council, Planning Commission and City Council, the following influencing themes emerged and are woven into the resulting goals and objectives, redevelopment site concepts and future land use map.

- Improve community health. This includes accommodating an aging population, continuing to enhance walkability and promoting active lifestyles for residents of all ages.
- Support residents of all ages. Improve walkability, mobility and availability of age-friendly activities. Ensure a variety of diverse housing choices are available.
- Promote sustainable development. Support changing modes of transportation, protect natural resources, promote low-impact building techniques and preserve open spaces and natural features.
- Improve transportation. Make land use recommendations that limit impacts to the existing transportation network. Accommodate alternative transportation modes, including autonomous vehicles.

Guiding and Influencing Themes

Public Engagement

Public participation is critical to the planning process. During the Master Plan update, several public participation approaches were used to reach a diverse group of residents—from young to old. To engage the community, the city created a webpage specific to the planning process (www.RochesterHills.org/MasterPlan) and updated it regularly with plan-related information and links to the variety of input opportunities, which included:

- Public Input Survey. Online survey focused on potential redevelopment sites, housing needs and wants, and ways to improve the image of Rochester Hills.
- Picture This!!. Online platform for photos and comments about things people like in the city and other communities.
- Public Open House #1 – April 23, 2018. Open House at Rochester College
- Open House Story Map. Following the open house, an online webpage included the posters and summary of input received and encouraged additional input.
- Fourth-Grade Surveys. As part of the annual 4th grade visit to City Hall, students were asked what their favorite places were in the city, what they wanted to see in their neighborhoods, what they wanted near their schools, and if they thought they might want to live in the city when they grow up.
- Art Contest. Young people ages 5-18 were asked to consider what makes a Great Place and respond by drawing or painting a picture, writing a poem, or taking a photograph of their favorite Great Places in the City of Rochester Hills. Winning entries are included in the Master Plan Update.
- Public Open House #2 September 15, 2018, at the Village of Rochester Hills. Second open house to share the draft Plan, changes to the Future Land Use Map and concepts for the redevelopment sites.
- Public Hearing. December 18, 2018

Goals and Objectives

To address these broad themes, the 2018 Master Plan goals are broken into the following categories:

- Land Use Planning
- Housing
- Economic Development
- Transportation
- Community Amenities and Services
- Preservation and Sustainability

Within each category, the goals are presented in clear, concise bullet points that address the following:

- What do we want?
- Why?
- Where? (Note: generally, goals apply throughout the city, but the question is included a guide for the future; some goals may apply in specific areas of the city)
- What are the potential obstacles or related considerations that may impact achieving the goal?

Housing

This plan calls for the continued diversification of the city’s housing stock to offer a greater range of sizes, forms, price points, ownership and tenancy models, and configurations. The plan addresses this through the addition of the R-5 land use category and suggests increased density in mixed-use areas, including the Auburn Road corridor, focusing on areas that have redevelopment potential. This will allow the city to address areas appropriate for increased density without compromising the character of its larger lot areas. The concentration of denser housing forms in specific areas also ensures that such developments will have proximity to shopping and employment centers that encourages alternative transportation arrangements such as walking or biking to work.

Redevelopment Sites

Three redevelopment sites were identified as currently vacant or underutilized, given their location, unique features, and size. Concepts for redevelopment suggest key components that are envisioned and approaches to facilitate redevelopment.

Suburban Softball Landfill Area Concept. Focus on office uses and incorporate walkability and placemaking amenities to attract high-quality development.

Hamlin Landfill Area Concept. Public and private recreation uses that connect to existing recreation areas and area supplemented by energy generation and light industrial businesses.

Bordine’s Concept. Housing-focused redevelopment that includes supporting retail and commercial uses designed with walkability in mind.
Elyse Miller, Age 9—Great Places in Rochester Hills Youth Art Contest Winner
Introduction

Community Planning History

The City of Rochester Hills and its predecessor, Avon Township, have engaged in land use planning and policymaking for over 50 years. The first Future Land Use plan was adopted by Avon Township in 1964. The Master Plan was revised and updated in 1974, 1979, 1986, 1992, 1999, 2007 and 2012. The Master Plan updates were completed as Rochester Hills entered different phases of growth: from rural township, to a developing community on the suburban fringe, to a developed suburban township, to a full-service city, and finally to a largely developed suburban community continuing to evolve.

Purpose of a Master Plan

This Master Plan Update represents an opportunity to affirm the course for new development and redevelopment of the city as identified and described in the 2012 Master Plan. This Plan contains the community’s vision, goals, objectives, and strategies.

The Master Plan addresses future land uses and community development, and other community features in a coordinated fashion. It portrays a clear statement of community goals and objectives, establishes a vision of the future, and includes plans to achieve the vision. If followed carefully, the Master Plan will have a lasting impact on the built and natural environment. Decisions made when the Plan is developed will likely be implemented over many years.

The Master Plan is long-range in its view and intended to guide development in the city over a period of 10 to 20 years. It is reviewed and/or updated every five years, consistent with state law (Michigan Planning Enabling Act of 2008). The information and concepts presented in the Master Plan are used to guide local decisions on public and private uses of land and the provision of public facilities and services. A sound Master Plan promotes a land use pattern that reflects a community’s goals. It establishes long-range general policies in a coordinated and unified manner, which can be continually referred to in decision-making.

Youth Engagement

As a part of the Master Plan Update process, students were asked to participate in several ways:

- Short surveys provided in conjunction with the annual 4th grade visits to City Hall (see public input chapter)
- Art contest for kids under age 18 encouraged students to reflect on what they thought made the city a great place to live. The four winning entries are included within the Master Plan on pages 8, 48, 54, and 88.
- Youth Council
Master Plan Update Process

The Master Plan Update process began in 2017 with a series of visioning exercises that tapped into the expertise of city staff, the Youth Council, and appointed and elected officials. These visioning exercises combined self-study and reflection with group discussion to identify commonly cited community strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (S.W.O.T.), as well as emerging issues and trends. As informed by the S.W.O.T. visioning process, the following Master Plan influencing themes were created:

- Improve Community Health
- Create an Age-Friendly Community
- Improve Community Sustainability
- Improve Transportation Choices

These guiding themes were at the heart of Master Plan discussions by the Planning Commission, City Council, residents, and business owners as the Master Plan was developed. As part of the planning process, the city facilitated several visioning sessions and focus groups, gathered 747 responses to an online survey, sponsored a youth art contest, held two public open houses, and launched the Picture This! community input portal, which allowed users to upload and comment on photographs taken throughout the community. Through this process, in addition to the guiding themes above, the city’s public input process has sought to gather opinions on the following three overarching goals:

- **Preserve.** Identify, celebrate and preserve the best things about the city
- **Enhance.** Identify what the community believes should be enhanced, improved, and enriched
- **Diversify.** Identify cultural, social, and economic opportunities

The Master Plan Update includes a brief overview of existing conditions, an overall assessment of planned land uses in the city, as well as a focus on housing and three specific redevelopment sites.
Existing Conditions

Regional Setting

The City of Rochester Hills is situated in eastern Oakland County and covers 32.91 square miles. It is located approximately nine miles east of Pontiac and 28 miles north of Detroit. Surrounding communities include Oakland Township (north), City of Troy (south), City of Auburn Hills (west), and Shelby Township (east in Macomb County). The City of Rochester is located to the northeast and is largely surrounded by the City of Rochester Hills. M-59, an east–west state trunkline highway, runs through the southern portion of the city. This highway affords access to I-75 to the west of the city and I-94, through Macomb County to the east.
Regional Influences

Oakland County

Oakland County is located in Southeast Michigan and is among the wealthiest counties in the state with a median household income of $67,465 in 2017, compared to $56,124 for all U.S. households. It is the second most populated county in the state, experiencing steady growth throughout the 20th century. The Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG) predicts the population to remain fairly steady with a slight increase through 2040. Oakland County contains both highly developed urban areas, as well as open spaces and rural areas, with diverse topography, rivers, and lakes. According to Oakland County’s Existing Land Use data for 2015, 43% of the county was made up of single-family residential areas, followed by park, recreation, and conservancy uses (14%), and open spaces (10%). Oakland County’s top employment sectors are knowledge-based services, private education/healthcare, and services to households and firms. The county is a major hub for automotive corporate offices and has one of the highest concentrations of engineers per population in the country.

Southeast Michigan

The City of Rochester Hills is included in the Detroit Metropolitan Area. The location and access of Rochester Hills provides people with the opportunity to live in Rochester Hills and commute to jobs in Oakland, Macomb, and Wayne counties. Similarly, businesses in Rochester Hills have a large population pool from which to draw employees.

Economic Growth in the Region

According to SEMCOG, the seven-county regional planning agency that spans the Metropolitan Area, the overall forecast from 2015 to 2045 shows the region emerging from the Great Recession with moderate growth in households and jobs. Overall regional population growth will remain slow at 0.26% per year. Total employment in Southeast Michigan is estimated to grow, on average, only 0.1% per year between 2015 and 2030. (Source: 2017 Economic and Demographic Outlook for Southeast Michigan through 2045).

Aging Population in the Region

According to SEMCOG, in 2016, people aged 45 to 64 accounted for 28.4% of the SEMCOG region’s population, compared with 26.2% nationally. The share of the population 65 and older is similar in the region and the nation, 14.8% and 14.9%, respectively.

In comparison, the younger age cohorts, that is, those under 45, constitute a smaller share in the region than in the nation. Those aged 25 to 44 account for only 24.9% of the region’s population compared with 26.4% nationally; and those under 25 make up 31.9% of the region’s population compared with 32.6% nationally.

The implication is that the share of the over-65-year-old population will grow more dramatically going forward in the SEMCOG region than in the nation.

Planning in Neighboring Communities

In addition to the wider regional influences given above, planning and zoning efforts in neighboring communities can influence the city’s growth and development.

Oakland Township borders the city to the north. The primary future land use designation along the adjacent border is residential, ranging from low to high-density development. The township’s 2017 Master Plan designates the southeastern corner of the township, adjacent to the northeast boundary of the city of Rochester Hills as Recreation Conservation. This area includes Stoney Creek Metropark.

Shelby Township is located directly east of Rochester Hills. Future land use designations in the 2017 Master Plan near the common border include Public/Recreation (for Stoney Creek Metropark), Transportation Industrial, Manufactured Housing, Mixed Residential, Moderate Density Residential, Community Commercial, and Regional Commercial. Commercial designations are assigned to areas around major intersections.
The City of Troy borders the City of Rochester Hills to the south. The majority of the future land use along this edge is single-family residential, followed by Neighborhood Nodes around busy intersections, and pockets of Recreation and Open Space. There is also a public/quasi-public designation located in the northeast corner of the city, as well as a small pocket along the northwestern border, as identified in the 2016 Master Plan.

The City of Auburn Hills is located to the west of Rochester Hills and has two land use plans that govern its east edge bordering Rochester Hills. The 2009 Master Land Use Plan for Auburn Hills designates the area along the shared border from South Boulevard north to Walton Boulevard as Residential 2.0, 4.5, 9.0, and 15.0 dwelling units per acre, Non-residential along Auburn Road and north of M-59, and Public (Oakland University). In 2016, Auburn Hills adopted the Northeast Corner Neighborhood Master Plan Update for the area between Walton Boulevard to the south and Dutton Road to the north. This Plan designates the shared border as Multiple Family just north of Walton Boulevard and Single Family Residential for the remainder of the border.

The City of Rochester’s north, west, and south boundaries abut Rochester Hills. In Rochester, most of the future land uses designated on the city’s 2014 Master Plan are residential, with some existing industrial at the south boundary with Rochester Hills. Along the western boundary, there is some land designated Quasi-Public, which is Ascension Providence Rochester Hospital, which sits partially in Rochester Hills.

Population and Households

Population

Rochester Hills has a population of 72,761 according to SEMCOG’s July 2016 data. This is a population increase of 2.5% from 2010 (see Chart 1). SEMCOG predicts that the city’s population will remain fairly steady through the next two decades, with an
estimated population of 79,709 in 2045. Comparatively, Rochester Hills’ growth over recent years is similar to that of Oakland County, higher than the State of Michigan (See Table 1). As can be seen in Table 2, the city’s growth has remained relatively steady compared to that of the surrounding communities, and its growth is most similar to that of Troy. Along with Troy and Shelby Township, Rochester Hills has one of the largest populations in this area.

**Population by Age.** The city’s largest population cohort are adults aged 35-59—people who are typically in the workforce and in their family-forming years (see Chart 2). Young children and teenage populations have declined slightly from 2010 to 2015, and this trend is predicted to continue through 2020. The largest cohort (35-59) is also predicted to decline in 2020. However, young adults 25-34 are predicted to increase slightly in 2020. Older adults, aged 60 and older are expected to grow in the city, on par with state and regional trends. As noted in Table 3, the median age in Rochester Hills in 2015 was 42.2. This aligns with the county, state, and national trend of an aging population, as the median age in all these geographies has increased. Rochester Hills’ median age, however, has been higher than those of the county, state, and nation.

**Population by Race.** According to the 2012-2016 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year demographic estimates, the racial breakdown of the city is 80.7% white, 11.4% Asian, 5.0% black, and 4.3% Hispanic or Latino. The city has a relatively high foreign born population of 17.41%, compared to 13.25% nationally.

---

**TABLE 1: ROCHESTER HILLS POPULATION GROWTH COMPARISON 2000, 2010 AND 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Hills</td>
<td>68,825</td>
<td>70,995</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>72,643</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland County</td>
<td>1,194,156</td>
<td>1,201,113</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1,229,503</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>9,938,444</td>
<td>9,883,640</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>9,900,571</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>281,421,906</td>
<td>308,745,538</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>316,515,021</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census and ACS estimates

**TABLE 2: ADJACENT COMMUNITY POPULATION COMPARISON 2000 - 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Hills</td>
<td>68,825</td>
<td>70,995</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>72,643</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>10,467</td>
<td>12,312</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>12,909</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Twp.</td>
<td>13,071</td>
<td>16,779</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>18,174</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby Twp.</td>
<td>65,159</td>
<td>73,804</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>75,986</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>80,959</td>
<td>80,980</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>82,542</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Hills</td>
<td>19,837</td>
<td>21,412</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>22,085</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census and ACS estimates

---

**CHART 2: ROCHESTER HILLS POPULATION BY AGE COHORT 2010, 2015 AND 2020**

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Hills</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland County</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census and ACS estimates

Households

In 2015, there were 28,046 households in the city of Rochester Hills. Two or more persons without children made up the largest cohort in household composition at 42.8% of all households. People living alone made up 26.4% of households in the city, with slightly less than half of those as individuals over age 65. Households with children made up 30.8% of total households. The average household size was 2.55 persons in 2015; this figure has remained steady compared to 2010 (2.54 persons), 2005 (2.63 persons), and 2000 (2.59 persons) (See Chart 3).

TABLE 4: HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION COMPARISON, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rochester Hills</th>
<th>Oakland County</th>
<th>SEMCOG Region</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Households</td>
<td>28,046</td>
<td>493,489</td>
<td>1,862,504</td>
<td>3,841,148</td>
<td>116,926,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With children</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more persons without children</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live alone</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live alone under 65</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live alone 65 and over</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census and ACS estimates

CHART 3: ROCHESTER HILLS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION, 2015

Source: US Census and ACS estimates
**Educational Attainment.** The population of Rochester Hills is highly educated, with over half of the population obtaining a Bachelor’s or post-graduate degree. This is significantly higher than the state and national segment of this population (See Table 5). According to the 2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimates, 40.2% of the city’s total population 25 years and over with a Bachelor’s degree or higher has a Bachelor’s degree in science and engineering, and 24.4% has a Bachelor’s degree in business. This is higher than the 34.7% of the nation with a Bachelor’s degree in science and engineering, and the 20.4% of the nation with a Bachelor’s degree in business.

**TABLE 5: EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Level of Education (25+ years old)</th>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Rochester Hills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate / Professional Degree</td>
<td>11.20%</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td><strong>23.50%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>18.50%</td>
<td>16.50%</td>
<td><strong>30.60%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>8.10%</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
<td><strong>8.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College, No Degree</td>
<td>21.20%</td>
<td>23.80%</td>
<td><strong>18.40%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>27.00%</td>
<td>29.90%</td>
<td><strong>15.30%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Graduate High School</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td><strong>4.30%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census and ACS estimates

*Of those city residents with a Bachelor’s degree,
- 42% are in Science & Engineering
- 24.4% are in Business*

**Housing.** Of the city’s 29,625 housing units, 94.7% were occupied in 2015. Of the occupied units, 75% were owner-occupied; 25% were occupied by renters. Most householders moved into their home between 2000 and 2009 (32.5%), followed by 2010 to 2014 (28.2%) (See Chart 4).

**CHART 4: YEAR HOUSEHOLDER MOVED INTO UNIT**

Source: US Census and ACS estimates
Housing Types. As shown in Chart 5, single-family detached housing is the predominant housing type in the city, making up 66.9% of all units. Multi-unit apartments made up 20.6% of housing types and single-family attached units (such as townhomes and condos) made up 8.6% of all housing units. Duplexes comprise the smallest housing type in the city at 0.5%.

Housing Value. The median housing value in 2015 was $230,100 (see Table 6). In 2010, the census identified the median household value as $238,700. This is a 3.6% decrease within five years. However, this drop in housing values is similar to that of the county, state, and national trends, post-recession. Rochester Hills has consistently held higher housing values than the county as a whole and has experienced significant recovery since the Great Recession with housing values increasing 42% since 2013 according to the City’s assessed values.

According to the 2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimates for housing costs, the median monthly housing cost in the city is $1,271, which is notably higher than the national median monthly housing cost of $1,012.
Rental Value. Rochester Hills has also held relatively high rental values compared to that of the state and nation. Rental values have steadily increased from 2000 to 2015. Housing costs that comprise less than 30% of the household’s gross annual income are considered affordable. More than half of renters in the city were spending 30% or less of their income toward gross rent in 2015 (54%). Twenty percent of renters in Rochester Hills were spending at least 50% of their gross annual income toward rent (See Table 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Median Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Hills</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Twp.</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby Twp.</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Hills</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census and ACS estimates

TABLE 7: MEDIAN GROSS RENT COMPARISON 2000, 2010 AND 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Hills</td>
<td>$827</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
<td>$1,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland County</td>
<td>$797</td>
<td>$871</td>
<td>$942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>$546</td>
<td>$723</td>
<td>$783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>$606</td>
<td>$841</td>
<td>$928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census and ACS estimates

Median Year of Housing. The median year homes were built in Rochester Hills was 1981. Compared to some adjacent communities, Rochester Hills’ housing stock appears to be more established (See Table 8).

TABLE 8: MEDIAN YEAR HOMES BUILT IN ROCHESTER HILLS AND ADJACENT COMMUNITIES
TABLE 9: ROCHESTER HILLS RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PERMITS 2000 - 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single Family</th>
<th>Two Family</th>
<th>Attach Condo</th>
<th>Multi Family</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Total Demos</th>
<th>Net Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SEMCOG

**Housing Stock.** While the median year of home construction is 1981, the city has seen an increase in its housing stock since 2000. Annual permits for detached single-family homes bottomed out in 2007, but has since risen. However, most growth in recent years in residential development has been in attached condominium units and multi-family resident units (See Table 9).

Additional discussion on housing is found in the Housing chapter, which starts on page 79.
Local Economy

**Income.** In 2015, the median household income in Rochester Hills was $82,112, compared to $56,124 for all U.S. households. Median household income is projected to be $91,533 in five years, compared to $62,316 for all U.S. households. Current per capita income is $43,972 in the area, compared to the U.S. per capita income of $30,820. The per capita income is projected to be $48,769 in five years, compared to $34,828 for all U.S. households.

**Employment.** Top industries that employ city residents include manufacturing (7,604 residents), healthcare and social assistance (4,955 residents), professional, scientific and technical services (4,134 residents), retail (3,409 residents), and educational services (3,117). Rochester Hills had a poverty rate of 5.5% in 2015 and an unemployment rate of 4.6% according to 2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimates.

Of the population between ages 16 and 54, 52% had full-time employment and 26% had less than full-time employment. The majority were employed by a private business (87%), followed by government workers (8.3%), and self-employed peoples (4.3%).

**Commuting.** Nearly 20% of residents of Rochester Hills also work within the city. Troy, Auburn Hills, Rochester, and Warren were the most common places of work outside of the city for residents. The mean travel time to work in 2015 was 27.1 minutes. Of the jobs located within Rochester Hills, the largest share of commuters lived within the city (25%), Shelby Township (5.1%), Sterling Heights (4.3%), Troy (4.3%), and Waterford Township (3.6%). See Charts 6 and 7.

According to the 2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimates of commuting to work characteristics of city residents, 87.3% of workers 16 years and over drove to work alone, 6% carpooled, 4.8% worked from home, 1.1% walked, and 0.1% took public transportation. Comparing these characteristics to national averages, more city residents drove to work alone (87.3%) than did so nationally at 76.4%, fewer city
residents carpooled (6%) than did so nationally at 9.3%, and substantially fewer city residents took public transportation (0.1%) than did so nationally at 5.1%.

**Market Assessment**

In late 2016, a market analysis was prepared by The Chesapeake Group (TCG) in conjunction with the Auburn Road Corridor Plan. The analysis that follows updates that data and takes a broader view of the city as a whole. The analysis of the city’s data is considered within the context of existing external forces, including:

**Demographics.** Many demographic trends impact all land uses everywhere but play an especially important role in future housing development. These include the following:

- **Declining Birth, Fertility, and Marriage Rates.** Particularly in households whose residents range from 18 to 35, often defined as Millennials, declining birth, fertility, and marriage rates have modified the housing market as well as the length of time members of this age group stay in one area to live and maintain employment at one location. These households often desire mobility, which may lead to renting instead of purchasing homes, as well as seeking jobs versus careers with one employer or one geographic area. Many are technologically savvy.

- **Baby Boomers.** The second largest population cluster behind Millennials is commonly called Baby Boomers. Many have outgrown their houses and no longer prefer homeownership; they often seek environments that differ from the suburbia where they raised families.

**Changing Non-Residential Activities and Uses of Land.** Locally and Nationally, there are fundamental changes to commercial activity and related development. Additional changes underway impacting future retail goods, related services, and professional services will result in significant changes to development patterns.
Changes in technology are evolving that will impact even the smallest operations.

**Retail in General.** Retail is redefining itself. All aspects favor smaller operations more befitting traditional downtowns and mixed-use areas. There are virtually no components of the retail goods and services market, or office services where the adage “bigger is better” is any longer valid. Further, people no longer need to go shopping; anyone can purchase virtually any product desired or needed online at any time. Successful commercial is now, and in the future will be, more about the experience of the trip. “Experiential retailing” is a growing phenomena.

- **Department stores.** There are only a few large national department store chains left, and they are all are facing challenges associated with changes in retailing formats.

- **Box stores.** Except for operations associated with TJX (including TJ Maxx, Marshall’s, and Home Goods), other known national chains like Kohl’s are financially struggling to compete with online entities. The largest operations, such as Walmart and Target, are rapidly moving online and expanding home delivery. The number of wholesale clubs and other box stores will continue to shrink.

- **Made to order and fit.** New technologies allow clothing and many other commodities to be made to fit. The entities offering such goods exist at present require much less space than traditional operations as inventory needs are reduced. One example is Indochino, a Canadian-based men’s clothing operation. This retailer started its business online and now has 24 “showrooms” across North America.

- **Less space per operation.** Less inventory as a result of enhanced inventory control and “made to fit or order” technology application will continue to result in decreased space needs for all operations.

- **Online growth.** Purchasing online continues to grow at double-digit or exponential rates. Shifting of traditional box and mega stores to online operations will only further this growth.

- **Home delivery.** Home delivery is growing rapidly, whether for prepared foods, groceries, or other merchandise. Regional and national grocers including Meijer, Kroger, and Whole Foods are expanding their home delivery capabilities in the Detroit Metropolitan Area. The introduction of new technology for deliveries will further facilitate the growth of these services. New trends in home design, particularly in multi-family housing units now include areas designed explicitly to accommodate and hold deliveries.
**Offices.** Nationwide trends are impacting office space demand.

- **Professional offices in traditional multi-tenant spaces.** Less space per employee is the trend in offices. Open spaces to foster comfort and collaboration is also diminishing space needs in buildings, increasing internal net space.

- **Home office activity.** The home office is not yet the majority but is the most rapidly growing office "space" market. The market growth is a result of both a growing number of employees able to work from the home part or full-time and home-based business activity. This erodes the need for traditional office space. The space trends are favored by individuals in their 20s and 30s, large technology driven entities as well as professional services.

- **Medical services.** It is unlikely that future medical space growth will impact land use as significantly as in the past. Conversations with significant hospital interests in the Rochester Hills area, other areas of Michigan, and in other states from Maryland to Florida indicate that there are many factors involved in the transition including the following:
  - The diminished number of independent practitioners.
  - The focus from treatment to wellness.
  - Growth in services likely through virtual activity and reaching out to employers, schools, etc., to deliver services in work, education, and other such environments.

**Manufacturing.** For the past six years, manufacturing has been returning to the U.S. The cost of labor has been and will continue to be minimized as a cost of production. New processes, such as 3D printing and new materials, will result in production in smaller spaces that do not require anything other than electricity and can complement existing or create new viable commercial, residential, and mixed clusters.
Manufacturing facilities are adapting to new technologies (Source: City of Rochester Hills)

Changing desires and attitudes. The market is changing in many ways as a result of changes in household demographics noted previously as well as desires of the population.

- **New housing options sought.** Baby Boomers are seeking different housing options, shopping experiences, and living environments than those associated with past generations of seniors.

- **Recreation and entertainment.** Both Baby Boomers and the Millennials are seeking, and participating in, passive and other recreational activities and new forms of entertainment. Interactive activities and technology-driven entertainment are increasingly desired.

- As a result of fewer individuals having children at early stages of life, the large number of Baby Boomers past child-rearing age, and increased wellness consciousness, the desire for walkable environments in which to live has grown and will continue to be a desirable lifestyle in the future.

- **Jobs versus careers.** The young adult population relocates and shifts employment at a faster pace than any previous generation.
**Evidence-Based Future Housing Demand**

Certainly for retail goods and related services as well as professional services, the number of rooftops along with the density of the population in non-rural settings are vital factors in supporting economic viability and vitality. There is evidence that housing development in Rochester Hills is responding to market forces resulting in a potential change that will be carried into the future.

**Historic residential permit issuance.** Since the technical end of the Great Recession (2010) and through 2015, Rochester Hills permitted a total of slightly more than 600 new housing units, averaging about 120 units annually. During that time frame, 22% of the units permitted were for multi-unit housing or non-single-family housing. Over the past two calendar years of 2016 and 2017, and through early 2018, the following are changes in the housing units permitted:

- The number of overall units permitted during 2016 and 2017 is 88% of the total over the previous five years.
- 188 of the units are multi-unit housing. This represents 35% of the permitted units.
- January figures for 2018 are higher than the number of units permitted in January of 2017, and 43% of all units permitted are multi-units.

**Survey of area residents.** A survey of Rochester Hills area residents conducted in the past two years indicated that demand for traditional single-family homes is likely to continue.

- Between 25% and 45% of residents living in and around Rochester Hills may or are likely to move from their current home in the next five years.
- A majority would like to stay in the Rochester Hills area.
- Of all those who may or are likely to move, about one third want smaller housing units than those currently occupied.
- A walkable, safe environment is the aspiration of the majority.
- Between one-third to one-half of all those that may or are likely to move find condominium form of ownership or rental as being acceptable alternatives to current ownership.

**Future housing demand.** Assuming positive economic conditions continue in the next two years, between 350 and 500 new housing units are likely to be permitted in Rochester Hills between 2018 and 2020.

### TABLE 10: ADDITIONAL HOUSING UNITS FOR ROCHESTER HILLS 2020 - 2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020 (number of units)</th>
<th>2021-2030 (number of units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>210 to 300</td>
<td>420 to 525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Unit</td>
<td>140 to 200</td>
<td>780 to 975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>350 to 500</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,200 to 1,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2018
Future Retail Demand
Opportunity for additional retail and services will exist into the foreseeable future.

Survey of area residents. The previously defined survey also provided information on household spending.

- The average household spent $130 per week on groceries. Over 40% of households spent more than $125.
- About two-thirds of households eat lunch or dinner outside the home at least as once per week.
- Local non-chain food service establishments are the preference when eating dinner and lunch outside the home.
- About 43% of the households purchase fresh items from non-box or non-supermarket chains at least twice per month. Baked goods, meats, produce, and fruit are the products purchased by most in non-box or non-supermarket operations or settings.

For 2018, the residents of Rochester Hills are expected to spend about $1.2 billion on retail goods and services at locations both within and beyond the city’s boundaries, not including online sales. The community supports a total of roughly 3.2 million square feet of space, excluding space associated with online purchases.

Future spending and supportable space. The identified external factors will impact future opportunities for brick and mortar space in Rochester Hills generated from spending by area residents. However, because of the growth in "rooftops," there will be an opportunity to fill vacancies which may arise from the transition in retailing and services as well as new space.

**TABLE 11: FUTURE ESTIMATED SALES AND SUPPORTABLE SPACE—RETAIL GOODS AND RELATED SERVICES (EXCLUDING ONLINE SALES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2020 Retail Sales Excluding Online</th>
<th>2020 Supportable Retail Space Excluding Online (square feet)</th>
<th>2030 Retail Sales Excluding Online</th>
<th>2030 Supportable Retail Space Excluding Online (square feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>$174,274,000</td>
<td>277,222</td>
<td>$174,616,000</td>
<td>277,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat/Drink</td>
<td>116,722,000</td>
<td>277,910</td>
<td>116,951,000</td>
<td>278,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise</td>
<td>84,363,000</td>
<td>500,716</td>
<td>84,529,000</td>
<td>776,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>41,604,000</td>
<td>95,757</td>
<td>41,686,000</td>
<td>95,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>208,828,000</td>
<td>684,405</td>
<td>209,238,000</td>
<td>685,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugstore</td>
<td>79,394,000</td>
<td>77,156</td>
<td>79,550,000</td>
<td>77,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>74,078,000</td>
<td>205,534</td>
<td>74,223,000</td>
<td>205,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>109,672,000</td>
<td>446,911</td>
<td>109,888,000</td>
<td>447,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service</td>
<td>150,583,000</td>
<td>366,592</td>
<td>150,879,000</td>
<td>367,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous (see below)</td>
<td>116,144,000</td>
<td>463,826</td>
<td>116,372,000</td>
<td>662,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,155,662,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,396,029</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,157,932,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,874,836</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Miscellaneous includes: advertising signs, barber/beauty shops, book stores, bowling, cigar/tobacco dealers, dental/physician labs, florists/nurseries, laundry/dry cleaning, optical goods/services, photography, printing, paper products, gifts/cards/novelties, newsstands, video rental/sales, and others.
Future Employment Needs and Office Space Demand

This market assessment assumes that it is desirable for Rochester Hills to absorb as much employment growth that is compatible with its character, while minimizing adverse impacts from increased traffic. Based on current employment patterns and the estimates of new housing units, a growth in office space will be required. Based on these factors, the amount of additional office space that could be absorbed in the next two years ranges from roughly 55,000 to 78,000 square feet. About 25% of the space (13,750 to 19,500 square feet) would be accommodated within home offices.

Between 2020 and 2030, 187,000 to 234,000 square feet of additional space would be required. Again, about 25% of the space (50,000 and 100,000 square feet) would be accommodated in homes depending upon the industries of employment associated with the new households.

Future Additional Space—Manufacturing/Tech-Related

Rochester Hills has a strong manufacturing component to its economy at present. Growth in space that could facilitate economic diversity is possible from a market perspective. There is potential for growth in traditional manufacturing, as well as tech-driven and research/development space that can locate in spaces designed for conventional offices (See Table 12).

Total Future Space

In total, the market is capable of supporting a total of between 2.1 million and 2.3 million square feet new non-residential space by 2030 (See Table 13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Manufacturing/Tech-Related Space (square feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>147,000 to 210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>1,500,000 to 1,630,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Space</th>
<th>Square Feet by 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Office</td>
<td>187,000 to 234,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Space including Traditional and Non-traditional Manufacturing</td>
<td>1,500,000 to 1,630,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,187,000 to 2,364,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2018
Transportation

An important element of the Master Plan process is the development of a plan for the overall system of streets and roads in a community. The city will begin updating its Thoroughfare Plan in 2019, and this Master Plan Update will provide an overview of the city’s transportation network as it relates to land use. The transportation system provides for the movement of people and goods from places both inside and outside the community. Road rights-of-way also provide places for various public utilities such as water lines, gas lines, sanitary and storm sewers, cable television lines, electrical power, and telephone lines. Because of this combined function, the system of roads in a community can impact economic conditions, environmental quality, energy consumption, land development, and overall quality of life in a community.

Street Function

Over the years during which the majority of roads and freeways were constructed in the United States, the concept of “functional classification” was developed by the Federal Highway Administration. This involved two main elements: mobility and access. Mobility relates to how vehicular traffic is able to flow through or around an area. Access relates to how travelers of the streets access adjacent land uses (primarily through intersections and driveways).
At higher levels of mobility, travel speeds and volumes are higher; as a result, access to these roads becomes more limited. Conversely, lower classification roads often feature slower speeds and provide more access points to adjacent land uses.

While this system of classification worked in the past, it is clear that the functionality of roads only takes one type of user into consideration: motorized travelers. Assessing the function of roads in conjunction with non-motorized users is not as clear. Motorists learn to drive understanding the tradeoffs of roadways: freeways run faster than surface streets, but they can’t be used to get directly to their destination. However, with non-motorized uses, the function of roads isn’t as black and white. For example, if a pedestrian or cyclist wants to go somewhere, generally speaking, their travel time may not be impacted by the type of road on which they travel. The decision of what route to use depends largely on what the destination is, the directness of the route, how safe it is to get there, and the availability of transportation facilities like pathways/sidewalks, crosswalks, and bike paths. The idea of mobility for non-motorized users goes beyond simply the efficiency of roadway travel and includes a wider range of barriers to mobility that partly correspond with functional road classifications, but also correspond to land uses, overall community safety, and the condition of transportation facilities.

Existing Road Classifications for Rochester Hills

Traditional transportation planning identifies several major categories of road classifications known as National Functional Classification (NFC). These classifications were created by the US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration and are based on mobility and access provided by certain roads. As roads are modified over time, they may not fall neatly into one classification or another, but their functions for motorized travel can generally be understood. It is important to note that substantial variations in road characteristics exist although the NFC may be the same for many roads in a community. The City of Rochester Hills currently has roads that fall generally into the following categories:

**Rural or Urban Interstates (Principal Arterials):** Interstates function to carry a heavy amount of traffic over long distances. They are major connectors from city to city, county to county, from one end of the state to the other, and between states. Interstates are eligible for federal funding. M-59, a non-interstate freeway, is the only principal arterial in the Rochester Hills.

**Rural or Urban Major Arterial:** Major arterials carry through-travel movements that serve both local and regional access, both short and long-distance trips and moderate traffic flows, though less intense that principal arterials. Arterials are eligible for federal funding. Examples of Rochester Hills major arterials include portions of Rochester Road and Walton Road.

**Rural or Urban Minor Arterial:** The main function of arterial roads is to serve as routes for through traffic, while providing access to abutting properties and minor intersecting streets. Minor arterials carry through-travel movements, but carry trips of shorter distance and to lesser traffic generators. Arterials are eligible for federal funding. Examples of minor arterials in the city are Auburn Road, John R. Road, and South Boulevard.
Rural Major or Urban Collector Street: Collector streets primarily permit direct access to abutting properties and provide connections from local streets and neighborhoods to minor arterials. Through traffic movement from one part of the city to another is deliberately discouraged on these streets. Collectors provide the opportunity to connect to arterials, allowing for the reduction in the number of curb cuts onto arterials and ensuring fewer interruptions for arterial traffic. Collectors are eligible for federal funding. Examples of existing collector roads include Dutton Road and Barclay Circle.

Rural or Urban Local Streets: Local streets provide access to abutting land. These streets make up a large percentage of total street mileage, but they almost always carry a small portion of vehicle miles traveled. They offer the lowest level of vehicular mobility and may carry no through traffic. Local roads are not eligible for federal funding. Examples of this class of roadway are the city’s residential streets.

Map 1 shows the Planned Right-of-Way for roads in the city. Both of these maps will be updated with the 2019 City of Rochester Hills Master Thoroughfare Plan.

Community Facilities and Infrastructure

City Hall. Rochester Hills municipal offices are located at Rochester Hills Drive and Avon Road. Meetings for Council and other commissions utilize the chambers located at the offices. If Rochester Hills desired an expansion of administrative offices in the future, the current site could accommodate growth.

Police. Rochester Hills relies on the Oakland County Sheriff for police services. The nearest Sheriff’s Office is located at Barclay Circle.

Fire. The Rochester Hills Fire Department is an employed force. The city has five stations, one in each quadrant of the city. The city shares mutual aid agreements with the City of Auburn Hills, City of Rochester, and Oakland Township.

Utilities. Rochester Hills is serviced by Consumers Energy for gas and DTE Energy for electricity. The city also contracts with a curbside recycling and trash removal service for residents. Rochester Hills purchases water from the Detroit Water and Sewage Department (DWSD). Water is taken from Lake Huron and filtered at DWSD’s plant in Port Huron before being transferred to the city. The city manages 315 miles of sanitary sewer, 408 miles of water main, 2,000 isolation valves, 24,00 water meters, and four master meter facilities.

Schools. The city is served by the Rochester Community School and Avondale School Districts. The majority of schools are operated by Rochester Community Schools, while Avondale Schools operates only three schools within the city.

Parks and Natural Resources. Rochester Hills owns and operates 15 public parks that total approximately 900 acres. There are three parks that have been reserved for parkland by the city, but have not yet completed the development process or remain undeveloped.

Complete Streets

In its 2008 Transportation Plan, the city plans for motorized and non-motorized transportation facilities. That document illustrates a plan to expand the non-motorized pathway system to run the length of every non-local road in Rochester Hills. See the Trails, Pathways and Sidewalks map (Map 2).

The planned pathway system will provide non-motorized access within a reasonable distance of most of the city’s neighborhoods, even those without internal sidewalks or paved roads.

The city also contains segments of two regional trails (also shown on Map 2). The Clinton River Tail runs through the city adjacent to the Clinton River. This trail contains a total of 16 miles through multiple jurisdictions, from the City of Sylvan Lake at the west to the City of Rochester at the west. Nearly five miles of this trail traverse the city. The trail supports biking, hiking, and wildlife viewing. The Clinton River can be accessed from parts of the trail, providing fishing opportunities. Benches and drinking fountains and provided along the trail as well.

The Paint Creek Trail was the first Rail-to-Trail site in Michigan, and totals 8.9 Miles from the City of Rochester at the south to the City of Lake Orion at the north. Rochester Hills contains 1.5 miles of the Paint Creek Trail, which offers biking, hiking, cross-country skiing and wildlife viewing opportunities.

Additionally, these trails provide access to places further north (Polly Ann Trail), east (Macomb Orchard Trail), and west (West Bloomfield and Huron Valley Trails).
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Natural Features

The city has long valued its natural resources, including open spaces, woodlands, and wetlands. With ongoing residential, commercial, and industrial development occurring in the city over the past 40-plus years, the city recognizes the need to be proactive in the preservation of its natural features. The city currently has standards and ordinances that address woodlands and wetlands impacted by development. See maps 3 and 4 that illustrate the city’s woodland and wetland coverages. The greenspace map on page 38 illustrates protected lands within the city, both public and private subdivision open space.

In 2004, Niswander Environmental completed a comprehensive field evaluation of all accessible natural features as part of a citywide Natural Features Inventory (NFI). This analysis was conducted for all of the city’s Natural Area properties, which are defined as both public and private land that is primarily undeveloped and includes land devoted to active or passive recreation, or is retained for visual or natural resource protection. This Inventory has proven to be a valuable tool for the city and the Green Space Advisory Board (GSAB) in directing land protection, acquisition, and evaluating land use decisions at the citywide scale. The NFI is intended to be used on a daily basis by city staff in evaluating land use decisions as it was developed using GIS and provides multiple layers of information to guide short and long-term decisions.

In 2005, a 0.3-mill 10-year Open Space Millage was passed in order to acquire and preserve natural greenspace within the city, with the nine-member GSAB created to manage green space and develop strategies and recommendations to City Council.
regarding spending. Specifically, the millage allowed expenditures of funds to permanently preserve natural green spaces, wildlife habitats and scenic views, to protect woodlands, wetlands, rivers and streams, and to expand the Clinton River Greenway and other trail corridors. In 2013, voters approved a revision to the millage to allow expenditures of funds to be used for the protection, care and maintenance of green space, and to improve pedestrian accessibility to and within green spaces and natural features owned or controlled by the city, in addition to funding the purchase of additional land and interests in land.

In 2014, the City Council contracted Niswander to implement its Natural Features Stewardship Program, which provides invasive species control, habitat restoration, comprehensive wetland services, open space evaluations and planning, ecological assessments, endangered species surveys, GIS services, and other ecological services as needed by the city. In 2015, Niswander conducted ecological assessments of each Green Space parcel and the Clinton River corridor, focusing on identifying threats to each property and potential restoration opportunities. The 2015 Long-Term Management Plan outlines the results of the ecological assessments, potential projects, and provides a priority rating of restoration/enhancement activities and a work plan with immediate, short-term, and long-term goals. This Plan provides guidance to the Green Space Advisory Board as they make decisions on the management and stewardship of Green Space properties.

As of June 2015, the City has acquired six Green Space properties totaling 108 acres (see map 6 on page 40). As of May 2017, the City has acquired an additional 9.48-acre parcel known as the Ruby Site on the north side of Ruby Avenue west of South Livernois Road (not shown on map 6). In addition to Green Space properties, the City also owns and/or controls several parkland properties.
MAP 5: GREENSPACE: PARKS, SUBDIVISION OPEN SPACE AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE
Green Space Acquisitions / Donations
The following is a list of properties purchased with millage funds or donated to the city for green space preservation. Also see map 6 on the following page.

- **Rivercrest Green Space.** The 1.74-acre Rivercrest property is located on the northeast corner of Livernois Road and West Avon Road. The parcel is 38% woodland, has 578 feet of frontage on the Clinton River, and is situated in the Clinton River Greenway Corridor.

- **Childress Green Space.** This 5.3-acre parcel located west of Rochester Road and to the north and west of Childress Avenue is nearly 100% wooded with steep slopes, scenic views, and Clinton River frontage.

- **Harding Green Space.** This top-ranked 26.8-acre parcel of land located between Harding Avenue and the Clinton River, east of Livernois, was chosen based on its natural features and its location adjacent to the Clinton River Trail.

- **Cloverport Green Space.** This 7.42-acre parcel located between the west end of Cloverport and the Clinton River is predominantly wooded and ranked a Priority 1 for its wildlife habitat. There is approximately 1,026 feet of river frontage, sensitive wetlands, an upland forest floodplain, and steep slopes.

- **Clear Creek Green Space.** This 23.68-acre area located on the southeast corner of Mead Road and Sheldon Road contains environmentally sensitive Priority 1 wetlands.

- **Innovation Hills Green Space.** This 48.38-acre parcel, formerly known as Dr. White's property, is located on the north side of the Clinton River and Innovation Hills. This property is the single largest piece of green space acquired in the city's history. Its significant natural features and location will offer connectivity to the Clinton River Greenway while expanding Innovation Park (not shown on map 6).

- **Ruby Green Space.** The 9.48-acre parcel shown below is located at 1380 Ruby Avenue and was selected for acquisition for its high quality and old growth tree canopy. This green space was recently expanded by 4.7 acres to include the wooded area to the east (not indicated below).
Figure 1. Greenspace Properties Location Map
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Visioning and Public Input

The Master Plan process started with a series of visioning exercises that tapped into the expertise of city staff, the Youth Council, and appointed and elected officials. These exercises resulted in a few guiding themes that continued to be discussed by the Planning Commission, City Council, residents, and business owners during the Master Plan process. The visioning exercises combined self-study and reflection with group discussion. In addition to the focus groups associated with the market assessment, the following visioning sessions were conducted in late 2017 to early 2018:

1. **City Staff Visioning Session.** The City’s staff participated in a workshop where Giffels Webster staff facilitated discussion on issues raised in the planning resource packet, prepared by Giffels Webster. Using their expertise and background, the team explored the city’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats that impact land use planning. Articles and report excerpts provided in this resource packet helped frame the discussion.

2. **Youth Council Visioning Session.** The city’s Youth Council participated in an abbreviated study session where the Master Plan process was explained and two exercises were conducted. In addition, some students also participated in the joint workshop of the Planning Commission and City Council.

3. **City Council and Planning Commission Survey.** Using the findings from the staff visioning session, as well as the resource packet, Giffels Webster developed an online survey that encouraged officials to respond to emerging concepts. The survey included multiple choice questions, ranking questions, and open-ended questions.

4. **Planning Commission and City Council Visioning Session.** At this joint workshop, officials discussed the planning resource packet, summary of the staff and youth visioning, and findings from the online survey. The remainder of the time was spent refining key concepts to be used as the guiding principles for the Master Plan.

The pages that follow summarize the visioning sessions; more complete responses are found in the Appendix.
City Staff Visioning Session

Strengths and Weaknesses

Individually, staff shared their thoughts on the city's greatest strengths and weaknesses within the context of their department or area of expertise. The top five responses include:

### Strengths:
- Trails
- Parks
- Schools
- Natural beauty - trees and wildlife
- Diversity in economic groups

### Weaknesses:
- Traffic
- Affordable housing options
- Transportation options
- Lack of downtown
- Communication / community engagement

Opportunities and Threats

In small groups, staff discussed threats to the city's strengths as well as the greatest opportunities the city should pursue that will enhance the city's strengths and address its weaknesses. Emerging trends were considered. Actions the city should explore are framed in the top five opportunities and threats as follows:

#### Opportunities
1. Enhance north-south major roads with new technology to improve circulation (smart signals)
2. Involve the city proactively in regional transit; Mass transit – encourage the community to support
3. Identify new model of development, consider ways to retrofit existing
4. Encourage affordable housing
5. Encourage neighborhood parks

#### Threats:
1. Mitigate development pressure impacts on traffic and other infrastructure
2. Strive to make mixed-use affordable
3. Promote public transportation
4. Ensure safety of pedestrians, lack of sidewalks in neighborhoods
5. Address the needs of the aging population

Emerging Issues/Trends

Based on their skills and areas of expertise, staff discussed emerging trends in technology, governance and livability. The following trends were identified that are influencing, or have the potential to influence, the quality of life in the city:

1. Balanced approach to growth (considering needs of businesses and residents)
2. Aging population
3. Autonomous vehicles
4. Low impact development and redevelopment (solar panels, green roofs, rain gardens, etc.)
5. Transformation of the work environment (such as shared work spaces for telecommuters/home-based businesses)
Who is the Youth Council? The Rochester Hills Government Youth Council (RHGYC) was established by the city to promote youth involvement in local government through active participation and the mutual exchange of ideas and experience.

There are 13 positions on the youth council, including: two representatives from each City Council district and five at-large members. Youth members serve one-year terms with the opportunity for reappointment and terms run concurrent with the school year, September 1 through August 31. Youth Council members present at the December 2017 visioning meeting represented three high schools and ranged in age from freshman to seniors.

### Youth Council Visioning Session

#### Strengths and Weaknesses

The Youth Council was asked the same question posed to city staff, “What are the city’s greatest strengths and weaknesses?” Students were given three post-it notes each for strength and weakness that were then assembled in categories on the wall of the room and grouped according to common responses. The following categories emerged:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths:</th>
<th>Weaknesses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village of Rochester Hills / Commercial uses</td>
<td>Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks/Areas</td>
<td>Lack of Things to Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Rochester</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### King or Queen for the Day exercise

The Youth Council was asked to imagine being “king or queen” of Rochester Hills for a day and having the resources to do something immediately to make the city a “great place.”

If I were the King or Queen of Rochester Hills for a day, the first thing I would do to make the city a Great Place is....

- **Strengths:**
  - More spaces in the Village
  - Make downtown the village more teen friendly

- **Weaknesses:**
  - Fix the traffic
  - Get rid of dirt roads
  - More involvement in the community

---
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Emerging Issues/Trends
The Planning Commission and City Council members also discussed emerging trends in technology, governance and livability. They identified the following trends that are influencing, or have the potential to influence, the quality of life in the city:

1. Autonomous vehicles and other infrastructure challenges
2. Potential for big data, social media to change city operations
3. Need to shift style of development to accommodate changing tastes, aging population, permit height in absence of land for expansion
4. Less land devoted to parking
5. Open space: incorporate into new development

Planning Commission/City Council Visioning

Strengths and Weaknesses
The Planning Commission and City Council were also asked to consider the city’s strengths and weaknesses. Their responses were similar to those identified by staff and the Youth Council:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths:</th>
<th>Weaknesses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsive Government/Financial stability</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Open Space</td>
<td>Housing variety/condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Lack of transportation options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Communication/community engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/housing choices</td>
<td>Infrastructure/roads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opportunities and Threats

Opportunities
- Roads and road funding
- Improve communication
- Redevelop landfills and other older corridors
- More parks and natural areas
- Active parks

Threats
- Traffic
- Housing variety/condition
- Lack of transportation options
- Communication/community engagement
- Infrastructure/roads
- Perception by others

Vision for the city in 10 years
- Improved transportation infrastructure
- Diversified housing stock
- Evolve while maintaining strengths (financial stability, good services, appealing community, safe)
- Denser, more appealing commercial areas
- Tension between maintenance of status quo and adapting to changing times
Influencing themes

Together, the Planning Commission and City Council developed the following themes that should influence this Master Plan Update:

Community health. Consider how land use patterns and building forms influence the ability of city to influence the overall health of the community in terms of:

- Aging population
- Exercise and walkability + parks
- Walkability
- Resources for aging population – branch out to other age groups
- Consider needs of younger families and Millennials
- Promote active lifestyle – 10-minute walk to a park for everyone
- Socially interact with all walks of life

Age-Friendly. Housing, transportation and the availability of goods, services and social engagement has an impact on residents of all ages. Consider the following within the context of the Master Plan:

- Density
- Walkability
- Mobility
- Diversity of housing
- Parks and entertainment – ability to get there
- Age in community – lifecycle housing

Sustainability. Minimize the impact of development impacts people and the natural environment through:

- Low impact design elements: bioswales, raingardens, green roofs
- Changing modes of transportation
- Get people to mass transportation/other modes (uber, lyft)
- Parks and open space near larger developments
- Protect natural resources – water, etc
- Encourage development to incorporate sustainable building elements
- Reduce sea of parking
- Park maintenance

Transportation. While the city will be developing a separate Thoroughfare Plan, transportation issues should be considered in conjunction with this Master Plan Update:

- Hard to get to destinations on opposite sides of city
- Future is autonomous vehicles – impact on infrastructure, parking
- More roundabouts
Focus Groups: The Master Plan includes an update of the market analysis completed in 2016 (in conjunction with the Auburn Road Corridor Study). As a part of this assessment, several small focus group discussions were facilitated by The Chesapeake Group (who also performed the 2016 analysis). The discussions involved the following groups:

- Major private sector employers
- Health care industry employers
- Major private sector employers in health care industry
- Collection of non-chain retailers
- Education and training entities
- Active developers and/or those who may be planning investments.
- Realtors (Residential and non-residential)
- Non Profit organizations providing social services

Market Analysis Update Focus Group Meetings

Synopsis from Interviews

Development - Residential

- Several small residential developments underway (12 to 57 units).
- Decreased demand at the upper end of the price spectrum ($600K)
- Condos are selling.
- Lot sizes now are smaller than previous developments.
- Mixed-use or mixing of uses most probable in future. "Attached" units being built and sold (condos).
- Redevelopment of old sites, such as former K Mart site, likely to include residential.
- Many of the employees of the manufacturing-oriented interests in the community may have trouble finding affordable housing in Rochester Hills.
- Population in the city is aging, which impacts housing supply and demand.
- Schools continue to be an asset with high achievement on test scores and college placements.
- Cost of building housing (and all other construction) rising, locally, statewide, and nationally. Increased density can offset some costs.

Development - Commercial Interests and Manufacturing/Industrial/Business

- Redevelopment is a key in the future.
- Unlikely to see much added off-campus development in the future by medical industry. Focus on wellness, virtual care, and taking wellness intervention to places of employment, schools, etc. as a way to avoid costly treatment of diseases once they evolve.
- A number of operations have their North American or regional headquarters in Rochester Hills.
- Many of the larger manufacturing employers are largely dependent on the auto industry. Attempts are being made by most to diversify client base.
- Finding quality, trained labor at all ends of the spectrum is a real challenge for many businesses, even when pay is significant.
- Attempts at internship and apprenticeships have met some success, but there are fundamental issues around the short-term return to employers, given the investment of time into training.
• Strong relationship between professional employment in the area and Oakland University (OU).

• There is much greater concern for traffic issues than physical road conditions, including congestion.

• Finding land and/or land assemblage is difficult in the city. There are perceived difficulties with future expansion of manufacturing and other industrial activity.

• Prices/cost of land relatively high compared to some other established and growing jurisdictions.

• OU controls a large amount of undeveloped land and it is likely that housing and related commercial could be expanded on campus, which is located in both Rochester Hills and Auburn Hills.

Emerging Potential Policy Issues

• Nurturing relationships with international manufacturing businesses in Rochester Hills could help not only bring jobs to the city, but also increase cultural opportunities.

• The city’s population is aging. Long-term policies may include aging in place and housing options more desirable for seniors. Additional services for seniors in the future should address mobility needs, walkability, continued growth in condos or other ownership options through homeowner or other organizations, and an expanded rental market. This transition will allow opportunities for growth of younger households.

• As a largely built-out community, growth for residential, commercial, and industrial uses will need to take place on formerly developed sites. Policies to encourage redevelopment should be explored to retain growth in the city as opposed to taking place elsewhere.
Katy Wood, Age 6—Great Places in Rochester Hills Youth Art Contest Winner
Public Participation Opportunities.

Public participation is critical to the planning process. During the Master Plan update, several public participation approaches were used to reach a diverse group of residents—from young to old. To engage the community, the city created a webpage specific to the planning process (www.RochesterHills.org/MasterPlan) and updated it regularly with plan-related information and links to the variety of input opportunities, which included:

**Public Input Survey.** An online survey tool gathered input from the community about potential redevelopment sites, housing needs and wants, and ways to improve the image of Rochester Hills. This survey ran during the analysis portion of the project—from January to April 2018. The survey was completed by 748 people.

**Crowdsource Story Map—Picture This!™.** This online tool is an engaging online platform that gives the community the opportunity to submit photos and comments about things people like in the city and other communities. This tool was intended to be intuitive and user-friendly, and to be used on a computer, tablet, or phone. Eighteen people responded on this platform.

**Public Open House.** Following data collection, the public was invited to attend an open house to review the findings and offer additional input. This open house was held at Rochester College and laid out the information collected in stations that allowed attendees to spend as much time as they wanted to learn about the city, ask questions, and offer their comments. Approximately 40 people attended the open house.

**Open House Story Map.** Following the open house, an additional story map was developed that included the posters and summary of input received. Comments were welcomed through this format as well.

**Fourth-Grade Surveys.** As part of its curriculum, 4th graders in Rochester Hills schools visit city hall each year. This year, students were asked what their favorite Places were in the city, what they wanted to see in their neighborhoods, what they wanted near their schools, and if they thought they might want to live in the city when they grow up. Over 400 children provided feedback.

**Outreach Efforts**

The city recognized the challenges of reaching residents and business owners and used a variety of approaches so as to reach as many residents as possible. Outreach efforts included the following:

- Large promotional posters on display at civic uses throughout the city that provided an overview of the Master Plan themes and asked for public involvement
- Press release that generated multiple newspaper articles, including in *The Oakland Press*, Rochester Media and Detroit Carpe Diem website
- Personalized emails from the mayor to school superintendents, Rotary Club, Rochester Hills Public Library, Chamber of Commerce and local Homeowners Association presidents. The emails invited everyone to participate in the various public involvement efforts
- Water bill mailers that were sent to over 23,000 addresses

**Art Contest.** Young people ages 5-18 were asked to consider what makes a Great Place and respond by drawing or painting a picture, writing a poem, or taking a photograph of their favorite Great Places in the City of Rochester Hills. Winning entries are included in this planning document.
• Promotional video shared on local cable TV and YouTube channel (nearly 500 views)
• Posted all efforts on the city Facebook page and on City Hall electronic signage

Online Survey

Over 700 people responded to the Master Plan’s online survey. Generally, people are satisfied with the overall quality of life in the city. Respondents said they liked the city’s green spaces, parks, schools and feeling of safety. They said they would like to see improvements to sidewalks, roads and traffic as well as limits placed on development. Traffic and congestion was the overwhelming challenge identified by respondents; development pressure and aging infrastructure were close seconds.

Generally, people tend to be satisfied with most of the city, especially with neighborhoods and parks. Interestingly, an overwhelming percentage of respondents would recommend the city to friends as a good place to live. However, because people were not restricted to one answer, 33% also said they would not recommend the city, citing common concerns including congestion, housing costs, and the deer population.

Housing. Housing was identified as an issue in the visioning exercises and survey respondents also suggested that affordability and appropriate size of housing options are important issues to be addressed.

Transportation. While congestion was an important issue and challenge for the city, most respondents said they almost always drive to their destinations, even within the city. Private transportation is rarely used.

Land Use and Natural Features. Loss of tree cover, open space and wildlife habitats were the top environmental issues identified by respondents. Protecting water resources, including drinking water, was also noted.

Commerce and Development. Respondents were asked what types of development should be encouraged and discouraged. The top three land uses in each category were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encourage</th>
<th>Discourage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and open space</td>
<td>General manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public uses, such as schools, libraries and museums</td>
<td>Large offices / office parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment facilities</td>
<td>R&amp;D / Light industrial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rochester Hills Public Input Open House #1

The Public Input Open House for the Rochester Hills Master Plan was held on April 23, 2018, at Rochester College. Public notices were advertised on the city’s website and social media pages. Comments were recorded on note cards at each station and below is a summary of responses received based on each topic.

Natural Features. Participants said they value living in a community that protects its natural features and would like the city to continue its efforts.

Housing. The housing station summarized existing housing types and presented information about trends in housing choices as well as other housing types that might be beneficial for current and future residents. Generally, participants said they would like to see attached single-family residential housing, including townhomes and other forms that had a single-family character. Mixed-use development with commercial on the ground level and residential on upper floors was also noted as a desired housing type. Participants expressed that existing neighborhoods should be preserved in terms of maintenance as well as current density.

Redevelopment Sites. Three redevelopment sites were identified by city staff and the Planning Commission to be studied as a part of this Master Plan Update: Suburban Softball/Cardinal Landfill; the Hamlin area landfill; and the Bordine’s site. General location, future land use, and zoning maps were presented; participants identified the following:

1. Cardinal/Veteran’s Landfill Area:
   - No more big boxes or medical buildings
   - Detached condos or ranch homes with manageable yards
   - Walkable neighborhood
   - Institutional uses or Live/Work

2. Hamlin/Avon Landfill Area:
   - Revert to greenspace or recreation use
   - Minimize impact on watershed; minimize impervious surface
   - Residential
   - Low-traffic uses

3. Bordine’s Site:
   - Single-family residential
   - Low-density and low-traffic uses

Transportation. Respondents also identified some transportation-related issues:

- Expand transportation connected to SMART
- Connect to SEMTA buses
- Historic trolley
- On-demand public transportation
- Privately-funded transit connecting O.U. to shopping

The open house included stations on subjects including technological and social change, communities for all ages and abilities, demographics, existing housing and national trends, transportation and mobility, housing and employment market assessment, natural features, three redevelopment sites, and previous visioning session summaries.

Throughout the meeting, staff and the consulting team guided attendees through the stations. At some stations, participants were asked to provide general comments, as well as specific comments to questions asked about existing conditions, desired housing types, natural features, and the three redevelopment sites.
4th Grade Survey

As a part of their curriculum, the 4th graders in Rochester Hills schools make a visit to city hall each year to learn the basics of local government and how the city works. The Planning Department took this opportunity to share a bit about the Master Plan process and asked for students to give some thought to what they liked best about the city and what improvements they would make. Their top 20 responses through May 2018 are noted below (including the number of times each response was provided):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Are Your Favorite Places in the City?</th>
<th>What Do You Want in Your Neighborhood?</th>
<th>What Do You Want Near Your School?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response #</td>
<td>Response #</td>
<td>Response #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My home/house/barn</td>
<td>Pool #</td>
<td>Pets/animals #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Park/nature preserve #</td>
<td>New/better playgrounds/parks #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village</td>
<td>Bigger playground #</td>
<td>Trees #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Rochester</td>
<td>More trees/pond #</td>
<td>Stores #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Theme/water park #</td>
<td>Pool/hot tub #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie theater</td>
<td>Baseball/soccer/football field/basketball court #</td>
<td>Starbucks #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Queen</td>
<td>Bigger Houses/ lots of houses #</td>
<td>A ferris wheel #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamestop</td>
<td>My friends #</td>
<td>Arcade/laser tag #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starbucks</td>
<td>Pets everywhere/dogs #</td>
<td>Pond/lake #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school</td>
<td>Starbucks #</td>
<td>Football /baseball fields #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Sidewalks #</td>
<td>Nature center #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizza places</td>
<td>Arcade #</td>
<td>Houses, more schools #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakery/Cupcake Station/Knapps</td>
<td>Dog park #</td>
<td>Trampoline #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald’s/Burger King</td>
<td>Happy people #</td>
<td>Dairy Queen/ice cream parlor #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibachi House Restaurant</td>
<td>Ice cream shop #</td>
<td>Fair #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>Trails #</td>
<td>Ga Ga ball pit #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>Animal shelter where you can volunteer to help</td>
<td>No dirt roads #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicks</td>
<td>Ice cream truck #</td>
<td>Plants #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Leaf</td>
<td>A School #</td>
<td>Supplies store #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>Gamestop #</td>
<td>McDonald’s/Fast Food #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked, 45% of the 4th graders say they plan on living in Rochester Hills when they grow up. 28% are unsure and 28% say no.
Rochester Hills Public Input Open House #2

The second Public Input Open House for the Rochester Hills Master Plan was held on September 13, 2018, in Festival Park at the Village of Rochester Hills. Public notices were advertised on the city’s website and social media pages.

At this point, the draft plan was complete and open house stations provided summaries of proposed Future Land Use map changes, housing, and redevelopment site concepts. Throughout the open house, staff and the consulting team guided attendees through the stations. Several members of City Council and Planning Commission attended and helped the planning team engage visitors and answered questions. Thirty to forty people attended this event. A short survey asked for specific feedback related to the stations; nine responses were submitted.

As a companion engagement tool, a “virtual open house” was developed as an online platform, providing an opportunity for those who could not attend the open house. Eleven responses were submitted. While the total of 20 responses is not statistically significant, the comments made by participants were consistent with those made throughout the Master Plan process. Of particular note were the responses to the Redevelopment Site concepts:

**Cardinal/Veteran’s Landfill Area.** Corporate office park would be appropriate; some workforce housing and/or a mix of uses may be appropriate. Connections to the trail are important.

**Hamlin/Avon Landfill Area.** Recreation uses are preferred but energy generation could be appropriate if consistent with the surrounding uses.

**Bordine’s Site.** Respondents continue to support the retail-focused concept proposed several years ago, but many also would support a residential-focused concept.
In the previous planning process, the city identified several goals and objectives for the Master Plan based on vision statements developed during that process. During the 2018 planning process, the guiding principles behind the goals and objectives were found to be consistent with public input and previous planning efforts, but have been refined to be more clear and provide better direction for the action strategies that will implement the plan.

**Goals** are general guidelines that explain what the community wants to achieve. Goals are usually long-term and represent global visions such as “protect the city’s natural resources.” Goals define the “what,” “why,” and “where,” but not the “how.” Identifying obstacles to overcome is also useful in defining goals.

**Objectives** identify the milestones that mark progress in achieving goals and provide more of the “how” goals will be implemented. For example, with a goal of “protect the city’s natural resources,” an objective to “maintain the city’s tree cover” is something that may be measured and tracked over time.

**Action items** are more specific and define the steps to accomplish objectives and attain the identified goals. The most effective action strategies will include who will tackle that task and when it should be accomplished. For the above example objective of maintaining tree cover, one action strategy might be: “Using the city’s GIS data, map the current tree cover in the city.” This may be assigned as a staff item to be completed within one to three years.

Goals and Objectives

Goals describe the community’s vision for the future. Objectives describe how the community can achieve the goals. This Master Plan Update incorporates the goals and objectives from the 2012 Master Plan. Based on public input, current demographic and economic data, and changes since the adoption of the last update, these goals and objectives have been refined for the clarity and direction.

These goals are intended to be general and illustrate the overlap between various elements that contribute to the quality of life in Rochester Hills.
Updated Goals and Objectives

This 2018 Master Plan Update refines goals and objectives to be more succinct and easier to understand. As noted in earlier chapters, the influencing themes of the plan are to:

- **Improve community health.** This includes accommodating an aging population, continuing to enhance walkability and promoting active lifestyles for residents of all ages.
- **Support residents of all ages.** Improve walkability, mobility and availability of age-friendly activities. Ensure a variety of diverse housing choices are available.
- **Promote sustainable development.** Support changing modes of transportation, protect natural resources, promote low-impact building techniques and preserve open spaces and natural features.
- **Improve transportation.** Make land use recommendations that limit impacts to the existing transportation network. Accommodate alternative transportation modes, including autonomous vehicles.

To address these broad themes, the 2018 Master Plan goals are broken into the following categories:

- Land Use Planning
- Housing
- Economic Development
- Transportation
- Community Amenities and Services
- Preservation and Sustainability

Within each category, the goals are presented in clear, concise bullet points that address the following:

- What do we want?
- Why?
- Where? (Note: generally, the goals that follow apply throughout the city, but the question is included here as a guide for the future; some goals may apply in specific areas of the city)
- What are the potential obstacles or related considerations that may impact achieving the goal?
Land Use Planning Goals

What do we want?

- A proactive plan for the future that responds to a changing world
- A plan that is informed by the needs and wants of existing residents, business owners and visitors
- A plan that anticipates the needs and wants of future residents, business owners and visitors

Why?

- To ensure the city enjoys predictable development and redevelopment that achieves the community’s goals
- To help the city make responsible, transparent land use decisions
- To protect, support and encourage private and public investment
- To educate and inform citizens about planning and development in the city
- To encourage input from residents, business owners and visitors that helps the city understand the wants and needs of the community

Where? Throughout the city

Potential obstacles/related considerations?

- Communicate Master Plan goals in decision-making
- Keep open lines of communication with residents
- Ensure transparency
- Stay up to date with local, regional and national changes that impact current and future residents
- Monitor engagement and test new approaches as the way people participate in civic life changes

Land Use Planning Objectives:

- Protect established neighborhoods and business districts from the potentially negative impacts of development, including noise, traffic, waste, odor and other nuisances through effective and thoughtful site and building design.
- Provide connections between neighborhoods, to schools, parks and other civic uses, and to neighborhood goods and services to promote a feeling of community within the city as well as to reduce the amount of motorized traffic on local roads.
- Promote the use of quality building design and materials to enhance the appearance and long-term maintenance of new development.
- Review and update the Master Land Use Plan every five years to address changing conditions, redevelopment opportunities and the changing needs of the community.
- Cooperate with nearby communities through the exchange of information on development and redevelopment issues, and other shared interests, such as community facilities and services and development along shared boundaries.
- Continue to improve public notification of planned developments and projects.
Housing Goals

What do we want?
- Attractive, safe, quiet and well-maintained neighborhoods
- Diversified range of housing for all ages

Why?
- To enable older residents to stay in the city
- To attract younger residents
- To attract families

Where? Throughout the city

Potential obstacles/related considerations?
- Increased density should be located where traffic impact is mitigated
- Increased density should not impact the natural environment without mitigation
- Zoning regulations should support housing types desired by current and future residents

Housing Objectives:
- Encourage maintenance of and reinvestment in existing neighborhoods.
- Preserve natural features and open spaces in and around residential areas to soften the impact of development, provide opportunities for passive and active recreation, and enhance property values.
- Ensure that infill and redeveloped residential properties are compatible with the surrounding area and adjacent parcels in terms of architectural style and building materials.
- Provide a diverse range of housing options that meet the affordability, maintenance, and lifestyle needs of current and future residents.
- Promote the inclusion of neighborhood parks and gathering spaces within residential developments.
Economic Development Goals

What do we want?
- Thriving local businesses
- Employed workforce
- Convenient selection of goods and services
- Competitive marketplace
- Diverse tax base
- Resilient economy

Why?
- To provide high-wage jobs for residents
- To provide entry-level jobs for younger residents
- To offer access to local goods and services for residents

Where? Throughout the city
- Local goods and services should be accessible locally
- Regional employment should be accessible to regional transportation facilities

Potential obstacles/related considerations?
- Economic activity should be compatible with residential areas in terms of noise, traffic, lights, upkeep, and other nuisances

Economic Development Objectives:
- Encourage entrepreneurship and growth for diverse businesses of all sizes to promote a balanced local economy.
- Provide incentives and flexible zoning mechanisms for commercial and industrial property owners and tenants to upgrade existing commercial and industrial sites.
- Promote the mix of commercial, office, and industrial uses in a way that fosters collaboration and business growth, while creating a desirable environment for the local workforce.
- Concentrate infill commercial development in nodes as opposed to strips along the major corridors as a more efficient use of land and to provide easier access for local residents.
- Encourage infill development and the improvement of existing retail areas in the Brooklands area to strengthen the Brooklands as a primary commercial area serving the surrounding commercial neighborhoods.
- Encourage office and corporate headquarter uses to locate along the M-59 corridor to capitalize on the visibility of this heavily traveled roadway as well as to showcase the city’s economic strength.
Transportation Goals

What do we want?
• An efficient and safe multi-modal transportation network

Why?
• To improve traffic safety
• To reduce traffic congestion by offering non-motorized options for local travel
• To appeal to residents and businesses looking for a community with a variety of transportation options
• To provide transportation choices that improve independence for residents of all ages and abilities
• To improve community health by encouraging non-motorized travel

Where? Throughout the city

Potential obstacles/related considerations?
• Current land use pattern dictates motorized travel
• Current road design supports motorized travel

Transportation Objectives:
• Promote the use of accepted traffic calming and access management techniques that make all travel safe and efficient.
• Provide a safe, efficient non-motorized pathway system that provides links to various land uses throughout the city that gives residents choices about their modes of travel.
• Promote public education about roadway planning and decision making to help residents and property owners understand the short- and long-term goals of transportation projects.
• Require transportation infrastructure decisions that support the land use recommendations of the Master Land Use Plan.
• Explore innovative traffic designs and flexible engineering standards to improve the safety and efficiency of travel for motorized and non-motorized travel.
• Explore opportunities for alternative transportation methods for those who don’t have access to a car.
• Monitor and plan for future trends in transportation in terms of autonomous/connected vehicles.
Community Amenities and Services Goals

**What Do We Want?**

- Parks and recreation facilities and programming that meet the needs of and are accessible to all residents and visitors
- Well-maintained infrastructure that meets the needs of current and future residents, businesses and visitors
- Excellent public services that meet the health, safety and welfare needs of the public

**Why?**

- To provide access to recreation facilities and programming that is essential to building a socially and physically healthy community
- To plan for and budget resources for infrastructure expenditures that are likely to grow over time as neighborhoods age
- To provide the high level of service city residents deserve and expect, including responsive, well-equipped emergency services

**Where?** Throughout the city

**Potential obstacles/related considerations?**

- With limited large-scale new development to provide additional revenue, the cost of repair and replacement of infrastructure is largely borne by residents
- Cutting edge infrastructure products often entail a higher up-front cost in exchange for longer-term benefits
- Additional resources will be needed to maintain aging parks and recreation facilities, while potentially adding and/or expanding facilities, amenities and programs

---

Community Amenities and Services Objectives:

- Expand the range of recreational opportunities and facilities in Rochester Hills in accordance with residents’ needs and abilities.
- Close the remaining gaps in the city’s extensive off-street pathway system.
- Continue to seek opportunities to share facilities with other public and quasi-public agencies such as the school districts and non-profit organizations and institutions.
- Encourage the active participation of adjoining neighborhoods in the development, operation, and support of new parks and programs in their area.
- Link school sites, neighborhood sidewalks and parks to the non-motorized pathway system.
- Replace aging infrastructure as necessary, with technologically advanced, state-of-the-art infrastructure and materials.
- Evaluate Police and Fire facilities on a regular basis to determine whether modifications or additions are needed to serve the existing population and new development.
- Continue to cooperate with surrounding communities and the County to provide public services.
- Keep recreation and capital improvement plans up to date.
Preservation and Sustainability Goals

What do we want?
- A city that is naturally beautiful and ecologically healthy
- A city that shares its evolving story with the community and preserves its history for future generations
- A sustainable, energy-efficient community

Why?
- The condition of the natural and built environment is part of the legacy we leave to future generations
- The city’s natural and historical assets help tell its story and are part of what makes the community unique and memorable
- Improving sustainability and energy efficiency can help mitigate the long-term costs of environmental change and ultimately make a community more resilient to challenges

Where? Throughout the city

Potential obstacles/related considerations?
- All development has some level of environmental impact
- Maintenance of natural and historical assets requires investment and engagement from advocates of preservation
- Tools and techniques for preservation and sustainability are rapidly evolving

Preservation and Sustainability Objectives:
- Use innovative tools to protect important natural features in the city, including wetlands, woodlands and other water-related resources.
- Use innovative storm water management and efficient building and site development techniques to improve the environment.
- Ensure that new development employs low-impact design techniques to minimize the impact of development on the natural and built environment.
- Share the story of the city with the community through key historic structures and sites.
- Minimize impacts on identified historic properties when development or redevelopment is proposed on or adjacent to the site.
- Encourage investment in historic resources to ensure their ongoing use and maintenance.
Future Land Use

The Master Plan and Future Land Use Map are tools to be used by the Planning Commission and City Council during land use decision-making, capital improvement planning, development review, and ongoing reevaluation and refinement of the city’s ordinances. Implementation of the general recommendations and specific action strategies will occur over time and will depend upon many factors, including the overall economic climate, changing development and demographic trends, availability of infrastructure, local budget constraints and political priorities.

The Future Land Use Map (Map 9) is a representation of the city’s preferred long-range future land use arrangement. The map identifies general locations for various land uses envisioned by the Planning Commission. Following are descriptions of the future land use categories illustrated on the map.

Residential Districts

The residential category includes a number of districts based on density in dwelling units per acre. The primary land use in the residential categories is detached single-family dwelling units, while other types of land uses such as schools, churches, parks, and attached single-family dwelling units, such as townhomes or attached condominiums, are appropriate in certain locations.

In all cases, providing connectivity between adjacent developments is a priority. Stub streets must be provided in all residential developments that abut vacant land or land with redevelopment potential, unless the Planning Commission waives the stub street requirement. At least one stub street must be provided to each property line that abuts such land.

It is intended that development in the residential land use categories be tied to overall density in terms of units per net buildable acre, rather than minimum lot sizes. This will permit greater flexibility in the development and redevelopment of land and presents an opportunity to create parks and other types of neighborhood features without reducing the overall potential yield on any particular piece of property.

What is the Future Land Use Map?

The Future Land Use Map, along with the entire Master Plan document, is a guide for local decisions regarding land use. The boundaries reflected on the map are not intended to indicate precise size, shape, dimensions or individual parcels. In addition, where the Future Land Use Map and the Zoning Map are not in alignment, the Future Land Use Map does not necessarily imply that rezoning is imminent; rather, the Future Land Use Map sets forward recommendations to achieve long-range planning goals.
**Estate Residential:** Estate detached single-family development with a maximum density of one dwelling unit per acre. This designation is intended to be the most rural in character, and is intended exclusively for detached single family dwelling units on large lots.

**Residential 2, 2.5, 3, and 4:** These designations are based on the existing single-family development pattern and permit varying densities of detached single-family development based on the established character of the neighborhood. Residential 2 permits a maximum density of two dwelling units per acre, Residential 2.5 permits a maximum density of two and one-half dwelling units per acre, and so forth. The Residential 2, 2.5, 3, and 4 land use areas are intended to coincide with the existing R-1 through R-4 zoning districts.

**Residential 5:** This land use designation is intended to provide residential areas that accommodate smaller and denser single-family housing than what is permitted in the other single-family areas. These areas support a density of four to six dwellings per acre. Smaller homes in a compact development may be well-suited to empty-nesters and young professionals looking for more affordable housing, home sites with lower maintenance, and housing within walking distance of goods, services and employment centers. This designation replaced the One Family Cluster designation on the 2012 Future Land Use Map. Manufactured housing communities are also included in this category, although no new communities are planned.

**Mixed Residential Overlay:** The Mixed Residential Overlay land use designation is intended to permit the construction of varied residential development types at locations identified on the Future Land Use Map or on parcels greater than 10 acres in area zoned single-family residential. Parcels identified for Mixed Residential Overlay on the Future Land Use Map may also be developed using the conventional standards of the underlying zoning district.

In areas designated for Residential Mixed Use, attached single-family dwelling units should not be the sole unit type in any individual development developed under the Mixed Residential Overlay standards – it is the intent that development and redevelopment in Mixed Residential Overlay areas provide a variety of housing types, including both attached and detached single-family units. Further, any attached unit building should not contain more than four dwelling units without conditional use approval by the City. Apartment buildings are not appropriate in Mixed Residential Overlay areas. The density in Mixed Residential Overlay areas is intended to comply with the underlying density designation shown on the Future Land Use Map. Quality site design and amenities such as parks, nature preserves, or other types of open space must be provided in these areas. Senior housing may be developed in these areas at the discretion of the Planning Commission based upon the type of senior housing proposed (i.e. independent vs. assisted living units) and the impact on the overall site design and neighborhood character.

By way of example, the parcels in the Juengel Orchards subdivision located along Rochester Road are planned for mixed residential. This will permit the development of the same number of single-family homes that could otherwise be developed, but will
provide flexibility to better buffer the development from Rochester Road and to eliminate the need for driveway accesses onto Rochester Road.

**Multiple Family:** This category may accommodate a wide range of development types, including attached single-family dwelling units, senior housing, or apartment complexes. In general, the expected density range of development in the multiple family category is expected to be between eight and 12 dwelling units per acre, depending upon the type and design of the project.

**Office**

This district is intended to accommodate a range of scales of traditional suburban office development. Due to the regional connectivity and visibility provided by M-59, a band of multi-story office use is envisioned to continue to develop along the south side of M-59 within the area bounded by Dequindre Road to the east, East South Boulevard to the south, and Michelson Road/Shelldrake Drive to the west. This area is bisected by John R Road, which helps to define two character areas of existing development. Specific areas in the city have additional goals and objectives based on the findings of the M-59 Corridor Plan.

**M-59 Office A: Dequindre Road to John R Road:** The office area extending west from Dequindre Road to John R Road is envisioned to continue to develop as two- to three-story office buildings with high visibility from M-59 and large parking areas. Additional office use of undeveloped areas along the north side of East South Boulevard just east of John R Road is desired and in some cases buildings may exceed three stories. Preservation of existing landscaping and the location of curb cuts and cross-access drives should strongly be considered as the undeveloped wooded area is adjacent to single family residential uses along the south side of this portion of East South Boulevard east of John R Road. Intensity of development as it relates to oversized parking areas and building footprint-to-parking ratios should also be considered and monitored as the area continues to develop to ensure a loss of developable area does not occur once the strip is fully built out.

**M-59 Office B: John R Road to Michelson Road:** The existing office area extending west from John R Road to just past Michelson Road (Shelldrake Drive on the south side of East South Boulevard) is generally envisioned to remain or redevelop as one- to three-story office buildings. Preservation of existing landscaping should continue as this area is adjacent to single-family residential areas to the east, south and west, and separated from commercial areas along Rochester Road to the west and Dequindre Road.

**Small-Scale:** Small-scale office use is envisioned on sites along the perimeter of Barclay Circle, the west side of Crooks Road north of Auburn Road, and the north side of Walton Boulevard east of Brewster Road. However, as property continues to be used and developed as allowed based on existing zoning, these small-scale office areas may be minimized. This has occurred with the recent Barrington Park townhome development on Barclay Circle north of Auburn Road. Small-scale office use is expected to continue and some infill office development may occur.
Though the office designation and small- to large-scale traditional suburban office development represents a relatively small amount of the total land area of the city, existing and future office development is also envisioned in the Regional Employment Center and Residential/Commercial Flex areas.

Regional Employment Center

(Note: these descriptions are based on the M-59 Corridor Plan)

The Regional Employment Center (REC) district is recognized as the economic engine of the city due to its proximity to M-59 and the current mix of office, research, technology, light industrial, commercial, and regional retail uses. It is anticipated that the area will continue to provide opportunities for light manufacturing, research and development, office, and retail uses in evolving mixed-use districts. The M-59 Corridor Plan serves as the master development plan for the area and outlines an overall vision for the corridor. Recommendations in that plan explore the potential to incorporate a variety of additional modern office and mixed-use developments within the district’s existing network of legacy residential neighborhoods, industrial/office parks, and auto-centric commercial and retail uses. To accomplish this, the Corridor Plan introduces additional future land use designations within the study area to help guide future development. These are incorporated into this 2018 Master Plan Update:

**Interchange:** The Interchange development area is located near the M-59/Crooks Road interchange, which is currently categorized by underutilized strip malls and older or underused industrial properties. Future development should have a street presence featuring high quality design to create a memorable first impression for visitors to the area. Appropriate uses for this area include office, research, retail, and multiple-family residential on the upper floors of mixed-use buildings.

**Technology and Office:** The Technology and Office Image corridor is envisioned adjacent to M-59 and Adams Road. This high visibility corridor is physically separated from existing residential development and offers an opportunity for more intense non-residential uses. Future development in this area should establish a presence along the M-59 corridor, featuring taller buildings, up to six stories, with reduced street setbacks.

**Workplace:** Employment development areas, or workplace areas, are generally located where single-family residential development currently exist south of M-59. These areas are envisioned to evolve over time, with land transitioning from traditional single family uses to more office and research park type uses as land is acquired and rezoned appropriately.

**Regional Commercial:** Much of the recent commercial development in this area has taken place west of Adams Road and south of M-59 in the *Adams Marketplace* development. The recently constructed large-footprint and strip-mall style
developments are not planned to change and future land use considerations should focus on the stability, visibility and connectivity of the area.

The city recognizes that the M-59 Corridor is a valuable asset, providing opportunities for quality economic development that is keeping with the aesthetic character and unique qualities of the city. The Master Plan envisions 1) high quality building design and materials, 2) attractive signage that includes context-sensitive wall and monument signs and excludes billboards, and 3) ample landscaping that provides year-round benefits and encourages the use of native vegetation.

Business/Flexible Use Areas

The Future Land Use Map includes three Business/Flexible Use categories to accommodate a range of residential, office, and commercial uses as standalone uses, or within mixed use buildings or areas. The majority of areas planned for Business/Flexible Use are currently used for commercial uses. Existing uses in Business Flexible Use areas are permitted to improve, develop or redevelop as permitted by the Zoning Ordinance or the flexible use guidelines in this plan. The intent of the flexible use areas is to encourage the introduction of additional uses into existing commercial areas in accordance with each flex area. The introduction of additional uses may mean the addition of non-commercial uses on commercial sites or the wholesale redevelopment of commercial site in accordance with the intended uses in each flex area. Flexible use areas are intended to prevent the expansion of strictly commercial parcels beyond their current boundaries. Flexible use areas may include the following uses: residential, public, institutional, office, business and personal service uses, and retail. These uses may be located within single-use or mixed-use buildings or within a mixed-use area or site designed as an integrated development.

Benefits of Flex Use Development

As Rochester Hills is primarily a developed suburban community, the flexible use areas are intended to serve two functions that acknowledge this. First, is to substantially correspond with conventional uses and development patterns of the five business zoning districts, B-1 through B-5, typically located along arterial or collector roads and at major intersections. These conventional areas typically include a range of old and new commercial, service and office developments that do not contain residential uses.

The second function of the flexible use areas is to provide responsiveness and incentive for property owners to redevelop older commercial developments. Specifically, with a wider range of uses and careful consideration of appearance, design and function with the ultimate coal of encouraging the redevelopment of older commercial sites in order to enhance property values and the overall appearance of the City. In most flexible use areas, this means the injection of
residential uses in areas that are currently nonresidential. As a result, existing commercial areas will be equipped to adapt to the changing retail and residential markets as a flexible range of uses will be envisioned on commercial sites.

**Design Standards for Flexible Use Areas**

The flexible use standards emphasize pedestrian orientation and minimize automotive uses or uses geared towards the automobile. Design standards are established in the zoning standards for the flexible use areas to ensure that mixed-use development in a flexible-use area is human scale and includes civic spaces and amenities. Design guidelines for projects using the flexible use standards are presented later in this Chapter, and are the basis for developing the requirements of the flexible use zoning standards.

Recognizing that automotive services are necessary, properties with gas stations or other automotive uses should be permitted to continue to operate at any site where they currently exist, including any remodeling or reconstruction of the existing use. If new zoning districts are adopted, gas stations and other automotive uses should still be permitted to develop on any land zoned B-5 at the time of the adoption of this Master Plan.

**Permitted Uses in Business/Flexible Use Areas**

Each Business/Flexible Use Area has two land use descriptions – one land use description that corresponds with the existing conventional zoning standards and one description that corresponds with the flexible use concept. New zoning overlay districts will have to be created to implement the flexible use option. Please refer to the Implementation chapter for more details in that regard.

**Residential Office Flex (formerly Business/Flexible Use):** The Residential Office Flex category is the lowest intensity business use area and generally corresponds with the B-1 Local Business zoning district and the FB-1 Flexible Business Overlay district. Residential Office Flex areas are intended to serve adjacent residential areas with limited basic shopping and/or service uses which are not related to the shopping pattern of the citywide or regional shopping centers. Residential Office Flex areas are located along South Boulevard at intersections with Adams Road, Crooks Road and Livernois Road, and at the fringe of intersections along Auburn Road also at Adams Road, Crooks Road and Livernois Road. At these six intersections in the southwest area of the city, Residential Office Flex areas occur either on their own, such as along South Boulevard, or in conjunction with the more-intense Commercial Residential Flex 2 designation. Residential Office Flex areas are also located at the fringe of the Livernois Road and Walton Boulevard area and at certain sites along the length of Rochester Road.

**Conventional Zoning: Professional and general office uses**

Flexible Use Zoning: A mixture of single-family and multiple-family residential, public, limited institutional, professional office, and general office uses. Smaller-scale senior housing developments that are compatible with adjacent neighborhoods may be appropriate in these areas. Detached single-family dwelling units may be located on
reduced area lots to broaden housing choice available in the City and to contribute to the neighborhood feel of the mixed-use area. Retail commercial uses are specifically excluded from Residential Office Flex areas.

The Residential Office Flex designation applies to a number of sites in the City that contain historic buildings. These historic buildings should be preserved and integrated into any development on the site to the greatest extent feasible.

**Commercial Residential Flex 2 (formerly Business/Flexible Use 2):** The Commercial Residential Flex 2 category is the medium intensity business use area and generally corresponds with the B-2 General Business zoning district and the FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay district. Commercial Residential Flex 2 areas are intended to serve a larger consumer population than serviced by the Residential Office Flex designation and are found in areas adjacent to both Residential Office Flex areas and Commercial Residential Flex 3 areas. Commercial Residential Flex 2 areas are located along Auburn Road at intersections with Adams Road, Crooks Road, Livernois Road, the southwest quadrant of Rochester Road, John R Road and within the Brooklands Focus Area between Culbertson Avenue and Dequindre Road. Commercial Areas along Auburn Road are also subject to the 2017 Auburn Road Corridor Plan. Commercial Residential Flex 2 areas are also located as transition areas along Rochester Road between Hamlin Road and the City of Rochester, around the intersection of Rochester Road and Tienken Road to the north, and along Walton Boulevard at intersections with Adams Road and Livernois Road.

Conventional Zoning: Convenience and Community commercial land uses. Convenience uses include convenience stores, drug stores, dry cleaners, smaller grocery stores, and other establishments that serve the daily needs of persons living in adjacent residential areas. Community uses include larger grocery stores, hardware stores, clothing stores, and other establishments that serve the shopping needs of all residents of Rochester Hills.

Flexible Use Zoning: A mixture of single family and attached/detached residential housing, multiple-family housing, retail commercial land uses, office uses compatible with residential uses, schools, churches, and day care centers. This flexible land use area may also be appropriate for senior housing developments that are compatible with adjacent neighborhoods and integrated into a larger flexible use development. Detached single-family dwelling units may be included in a flexible use 2 development, provided that they are located on small lots (less than approximately 7,000 sq. ft.) to broaden housing choice available in the City.

Commercial Residential Flex 2 areas are intended to create non-residential “nodes” at key intersections and to provide a transition between the residential land categories and more intense Commercial Residential Flex 3 areas. Accordingly, flexible use developments located in the Commercial Residential Flex 2 land use category should include a significant residential component, however, in no case should any flexible use development in a Commercial Residential Flex 2 area be comprised solely of residential uses.
Commercial Residential Flex 3 (formerly Business/Flexible Use 3): The Commercial Residential Flex 3 land use category is intended to be the most intense business use area in the City and generally corresponds with the B-3 Shopping Center Business zoning district and the FB-3 Flexible Business Overlay district. Commercial Residential Flex 3 areas are intended to serve larger consumer populations than served by the Residential Office Flex and Commercial Residential Flex 2 areas, and are typically shopping centers grouped to generate large volumes of traffic. Commercial Residential Flex 3 areas are located along Rochester Road south of the City of Rochester and along Walton Boulevard at intersections with Livernois Road and Adams Road west of the City of Rochester. Along Rochester Road, the Commercial Residential Flex 3 area includes the main City shopping areas such as the Hampton Village Center on the northeast corner of Rochester Road and Auburn Road, Bordine’s on the northeast corner of Rochester Road and Hamlin Road, a large shopping center on the southwest corner of Rochester Road and Avon Road, and several car dealerships along the east side of Rochester Road north of Avon Road. Along Walton Boulevard, the Commercial Residential Flex 3 area includes the Campus Corners Shopping Center next to Ascension Crittenton Hospital and a smaller shopping center to the north on the east side of Livernois Road. In the area of this intersection, there is little distinction between existing development in the Commercial Residential Flex 3 area east of Livernois Road and the existing development in the Commercial Residential Flex area west of Livernois Road north of Rochester High School.

Conventional Zoning: Community and Regional commercial land uses. Community commercial uses are as described in the Commercial Residential Flex 2 category. Regional commercial land uses serve the residents of Rochester Hills, as well as residents from other communities in the region and are located on or near roads with very high traffic volumes. Such uses typically include malls, big box stores, super grocery stores, warehouse clubs, department stores, and furniture stores.

Flexible Use Zoning: A mixture of retail commercial land uses, attached and multiple family dwelling units, senior housing, office uses, schools, churches, and other public uses. Detached single family residences are not permitted in Commercial Residential Flex 3 areas.

While large-scale retail uses are intended to be located in the Commercial Residential Flex 3 areas, it is critical that the mixed-use concept be properly executed in order to ensure that sites are not developed with large, single-use buildings and equally large parking fields following the existing strip retail prototype. Accordingly, non-retail uses are strongly encouraged in areas developed using the Commercial Residential Flex 3 standards.

Encouraging non-retail and residential land uses will ensure that development in this district retains a walkable, human scale and is not dominated by auto-oriented development. Incorporating residential land uses into mixed use centers will also support entertainment, restaurant, and leisure businesses, increasing the quality of life for all residents of the city.
The Village of Rochester Hills development on the northeast corner of Walton Boulevard and Adams Road is one of two developments not in the form of a conventional mall/big box/shopping center development as seen at other major intersections. The second development intended to be more walkable is the City View development on the southeast corner of Tienken Road and Rochester Road. Despite the Village of Rochester Hills containing a pedestrian-friendly main street, with medium-sized commercial buildings fronting the internal street with parking to the east and west behind the buildings, this development does not provide a fully walkable and mixed-use environment; no residential uses are provided within the development and it is not integrated with the single-family residential area to the east. Future redevelopments within the Commercial Residential Flex 3 areas should strive to include a residential component.

**Industrial**

Areas planned for industrial uses are appropriate for light industrial land uses that are characterized by light manufacturing operations that are not of sufficient size or scale to negatively impact surrounding non-industrial use areas. Examples of such light industrial uses include bump and paint shops, warehousing and wholesaling, and light assembly operations. In the Hamlin/Avon Landfill area, light industrial is envisioned to be developed consistent with low-impact design features and/or be businesses that focused on or support sustainability, energy generation and/or recreation.

**Special Purpose**

The special purpose land use category includes civic uses (including city hall), colleges and institutional uses such as Ascension Crittenton Hospital, the Humane Society, and Leader Dogs for the Blind. Special purpose land uses account for approximately 4.5% of the total land area of the City. This figure has remained constant since the first land use survey was completed in 1973.

**Public Recreation/Open Space**

The city’s publicly owned parks and trail facilities are included in this land use category. In the Hamlin/Avon Landfill area, lands designated for public recreation and open space may include privately-owned recreational facilities when connections such as shared-use paths are provided to adjacent public recreation facilities.

**Private Recreation/Open Space**

This land use category includes protected open space that has been preserved in conjunction with development. Often this land is unbuildable due to natural features such as wetlands or woodlands and is set aside as part of a residential development. Detention areas on separate parcels are also included in this land use category. Land designated “open space” is generally commonly owned by the residents of the subdivision or condominium, or by the owner of the commercial or industrial development, and is not public land. While some open space is permanently protected by conservation easements or other legal protections, not all areas designated as open space are guaranteed to remain open in perpetuity.
Future Land Use Changes from 2012

Summary of Changes from 2012 Future Land Use Map

Map 8 illustrates the changes with descriptive text and Map 9 is the non-annotated Future Land Use Map. Designation colors have been refined for clarity.

New R5 Residential Designation. A new residential land use designation has been created that is intended to provide residential areas that accommodate smaller and denser single-family housing than what is permitted in the other existing single-family areas. These R5 areas support a density of four to six dwellings per acre. Smaller homes in a compact development may be well-suited to empty-nesters and young professionals looking for more affordable housing, home sites with lower maintenance, and housing within walking distance of goods, services and employment centers. This designation replaced the One Family Cluster designation on the 2012 Future Land Use Map. Manufactured housing communities are also included in this category, although no new communities are planned.

Business/Flexible Use Areas Renamed. The Business/Flexible Use designations have been renamed to emphasize planned primary uses as the first use word and planned secondary uses as the second word:

- Business/Flexible Use 1 renamed Residential Office Flex
  - Mixture of residential uses with reduced single-family lot areas
  - Public, limited institutional, professional/general office
  - Small-scale senior housing
  - Commercial uses excluded
  - Applies to sites containing historic buildings

- Business/Flexible Use 2 renamed Commercial Residential Flex 2
  - Mixture of single-family, attached/detached, multiple-family housing
  - Retail, office, schools, churches, daycares
  - Senior housing may be appropriate
  - Detached single-family may be included if on small lots

- Business/Flexible Use 3 renamed Commercial Residential Flex 3
  - Shopping centers
  - Attached and multiple-family housing
  - Senior housing, offices, schools, churches, public
  - Detached single-family housing prohibited
  - Discourage large, single-use buildings and parking fields
Redevelopment Sites. As part of this Master Plan Update, the following sites, currently vacant or under-utilized, were identified by the City for specific redevelopment concepts that have been developed. Public input in these redevelopment concepts was sought at both public open houses and through online crowdsourced polling and surveys (“virtual open house”).

- Redevelopment Site 1: Cardinal/Veteran’s Landfill Area
- Redevelopment Site 2: Hamlin/Avon Landfill Area
- Redevelopment Site 3: Bordine’s

List of Proposed Designation Changes from 2012 Future Land Use Map. As part of this Master Plan Update, a parcel-by-parcel analysis of use, zoning, and ownership was done for all commercial intersections and adjacent areas within the city to determine the appropriateness and accuracy of the 2012 Map designations. As a result of inaccurate designations, recent developments that occurred after the 2012 plan, planned developments the City is now aware of, and the direction of City staff and the Planning Commission, the following list of parcel designation changes are included with this Update.

South Boulevard
1. Office to Residential 3 - Single family use on west side of Michelson Road
2. West side: Office to Commercial Residential Flex 3 - Reflects Overlay zoning
3. East side: Office to Commercial Residential Flex 2 - Reflects Overlay zoning
4. Residential 3 to Residential Office Flex - New senior housing development
5. Residential 4 to Residential Office Flex and Mixed Residential Overlay removed - Planned development north of Chase Bank parcel and PC-approved overlay removal

Auburn Road
6. Residential 4 to Commercial Residential Flex 2 - Reflects office zoning
7. Residential 4 to Commercial Residential Flex 2 - Reflects zoning and uses
8. Residential 4 to Residential Office Flex and Mixed Residential Overlay added - Increase development potential and planned development
9. Office to Multiple Family - Townhome development
10. Residential 3 to Commercial Residential Flex 2 - Reflects zoning
11. Residential 4 to Commercial Residential Flex 2 - Reflects zoning

Rochester Road
12. Multiple Family to Commercial Residential Flex 3 - Reflects zoning and uses
13. Residential Office Flex to Commercial Residential Flex 2 - Reflects use
14. Residential 4 to Commercial Residential Flex 2 - Reflects zoning and uses
15. Multiple Family to Commercial Residential Flex 2 - Reflects use
16. Commercial Residential Flex 2 to 3 - Reflects development

Walton Boulevard
17. Residential 3 to Residential Office Flex - Reflects use variance
18. Residential 5 to Residential 3 - Reflects Andover Woods development
19. Multiple Family to Residential Office Flex - Reflects development potential
Sheldon Road
20. Multiple Family to Residential 5 - Reflects duplex use
21. Multiple Family to Public Recreation/Open Space - Reflects museum public park
22. Estate Residential to Residential 2.5 - Reflects Clear Creek Subdivision extension

Landfill Designation Removed. Refer to Hamlin/Avon Landfill Area updates.

Landfill Area (Hamlin/Avon)
The 2012 Map designates this area as Landfill, Industrial and Residential 3. Due to concerns with the Landfill designation being too broad as it relates to future uses, the updated map removes the Landfill designation and includes an expanded Industrial designation along East Hamlin Road to reflect existing uses and likelihood of future uses, new Park/Public Open Space areas to reflect desire energy and recreation uses in this area, and the new Residential 5 category to reflect existing uses within and surrounding the landfill and likelihood of future uses. Specific details regarding this area are included within the Redevelopment Sites chapter.

Regional Employment Center
This area of the city underwent a study in 2012 (M-59 Corridor Study), which identified five future land use categories within the study area, separate of the master plan future land use designations, Four of the five designations were added to this master plan as new future land use categories, while the fifth was combined with commercial residential flex 3. This addition eliminated the need to reference a separate plan to find important future land use information.
MAP 7: EXCERPT FROM M-59 CORRIDOR STUDY

Source: Local Development Finance Authority. M-59 Corridor Study, April 2012 (p. 62)
MAP 8: ANNOTATED CHANGES TO FUTURE LAND USE MAP
Housing

Community Input on Housing

Housing and transportation play an enormous role in our quality of life. The availability of housing and mobility choices dictate where we live, where we work, how we spend our free time and with whom we socialize. Housing for current and future residents has been an ongoing discussion through the 2018 Master Plan Update process, particularly for older residents who are looking to move from their current home and wish to remain in the city. As discussed in the public input chapter, 92% of survey respondents said the overall quality of life is “excellent” or “above average,” and throughout the planning process, residents continue to express their desire to stay in the city as long as possible. Unfortunately, rising housing costs were noted by survey respondents as a major challenge facing the city (median housing values are discussed in the Existing Conditions chapter and illustrated on Map 10).

When asked about a potential move, almost 35% of respondents were unsure if they could find their preferred type of housing in the city. While detached single-family homes continue to be a popular choice for housing among survey respondents (71% would “encourage” more of this housing type), 35% would also encourage attached single-family homes and townhomes. Over 25% would encourage accessory dwellings (also known as “granny flats”). While 15% would encourage rental apartments, 58% would discourage this housing type. From the survey responses and open house comments, residents seem to support the addition of smaller and more affordable housing, while seeking to ensure the long-term viability of existing single-family neighborhoods.

As noted in the Existing Conditions chapter, single-family detached homes comprise two-thirds of the housing stock in the city. Most of the housing was built in the last fifty years, as illustrated on Map 11—Age of Housing. It is likely that many of these homes are larger than homes built pre-1950, when the average home size was 1,000 square feet. Since that time, according to the National Association of Home Builders, home sizes have increased from 1,400 square feet in 1970 to 2,700 square feet in 2009. While average home sizes decreased after the recession, by 2018 the average home size is back to 2,641 square feet. Homeowners looking to downsize in the city

The 2018 Master Plan Update is influenced by the following themes:

- Improve Community Health
- Create an Age-Friendly Community
- Improve Community Sustainability
- Improve Transportation Choices

These themes guide the plan’s goals and objectives for housing as well as direct the Future Land Use Map.
may be challenged to find the housing they desire in terms of size and/or affordability.

Build-Out Analysis

The Planned Dwelling Units per Acre map (Map 12) illustrates the built and planned density of residential dwellings per acre throughout the city. Densities range from a low of 0.8 dwellings per acre for single-family residential to a high of 20 dwellings per acre for multiple-family residential (note that most multiple-family residential development is between eight and ten dwellings per acre, with higher densities for special-purpose housing, including assisted living). Generally, the built density is in alignment with the planned density throughout the city.

The future residential build-out is based on the planned dwellings per acre as defined in the future land use chapter and the number of developable vacant acres available for all types of residential development (See Map 13). Developable acreage is the total vacant acreage designated for residential use on the future land use map, minus wetlands, floodplains, and a typical 20% of total area for internal roadways. See “Calculating Build-Out” at left for additional details.

Currently, there are 463.45 acres of vacant land that is planned and zoned for single-family residential development. Future build-out could result in an estimated 1,414 new single family dwelling units. These new dwellings will range from smaller homes in denser neighborhoods (as described in the R5 land use designation) to large homes on estate-sized lots (as described in the Estate Residential land use designation).

Within the areas designated for multiple-family residential, approximately 20 acres are available, which could result in an estimated 242 dwelling units. Mixed-use areas, including the flexible land use designations total approximately 81.3 acres. Based on the calculations shown at left, approximately 351 dwellings could be added, some in the form of detached homes as well as attached and stacked dwellings (e.g., townhomes and apartments).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Density Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>0.8 DU/AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>1.7 DU/AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2.5</td>
<td>2.3 DU/AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>2.9 DU/AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>3.4 DU/AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>5 DU/AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-1</td>
<td>12 DU/AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROF</td>
<td>50% of developable land @ 8 DU/AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRF-2</td>
<td>30% of the developable land @ 12 DU/AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Rd Corridor</td>
<td>30% of the developable land @ 25 DU/AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRF-3</td>
<td>30% of the developable land @ 18 DU/AC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAP 12: PLANNED DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE
Housing Strategies

The Goals and Objectives chapter discusses the city’s vision for attractive, safe, quiet and well-maintained neighborhoods that provide a diversified range of housing options for all ages. This variety of housing types will enable older residents to stay in the city while attracting younger residents and families.

The previous chapter on the future land uses within the city addresses changes to the Future Land Use Map, which include the addition of a residential category called R5. As discussed, this land use designation is intended to provide residential areas that accommodate smaller and denser single-family housing than what is permitted in the other single-family areas—roughly four to six dwellings per acre. Smaller homes in a compact development may be well-suited to empty-nesters and young professionals looking for more affordable housing, home sites with lower maintenance, and housing within walking distance of goods, services and employment centers.

Housing Types

**Single-Family Homes.** Single-family homes are a staple of the community and should be encouraged in various sizes. Situated in neighborhoods that connect to each other and to surrounding commercial areas, single-family homes appeal to a wide segment of community residents, whether they be home owners or renters.

**Missing Middle Housing.** Multi-unit or cluster housing may be characterized as “Missing Middle” housing, a term coined by Daniel Paroleck of Opticos Design, Inc. in 2010. Parolek defines this type of housing as follows:

> “Well-designed, simple Missing Middle housing types achieve medium-density yields and provide high-quality, marketable options between the scales of single-family homes and mid-rise flats for walkable urban living. They are designed to meet the specific needs of shifting demographics and the new market demand, and are a key component to a diverse neighborhood. They are classified as “missing” because very few of these housing types have been built since the early 1940s due to regulatory constraints, the shift to auto-dependent patterns of development, and the incentivization of single-family home ownership.”

Characteristics of these housing types include:

- Walkable (homes are set in walkable context)
- Medium density but lower perceived density
- Smaller, well-designed units
- Smaller footprint and blended densities

While the term “Missing Middle” suggests a gap in housing stock, the city’s housing inventory does include examples of the forms included in the term. Duplex and attached single-family residential homes comprise about nine percent of the city’s housing options.
The city’s pathway plan addresses the walkability objective inherent in the missing middle housing concept, by envisioning and providing off-street facilities such as sidewalks and pathways for pedestrians and bicyclists. However, great distances to local goods and services may pose a challenge for those who wish to walk or ride a bicycle for more than just recreation. This has particular implications for individuals with compromised mobility and little or no ability to drive, a category that includes many seniors and is likely to grow within the city. Missing middle housing is envisioned in the R5 land use designation, mixed residential, flex areas and the Auburn Road corridor area.

**Multiple-Family Housing.** The city envisions multiple-family housing to include attached single-family dwelling units, senior housing, or apartment complexes at an approximate density of eight to 12 dwelling units per acre, depending upon the type and design of the project. There are several apartment complexes in the city and, as noted in the build-out analysis, approximately 20 acres for stand-alone multiple family development. However, there may be opportunities to include such housing within a mixed-use development.

**Mixed-Use Housing.** The Future Land Use Map illustrates several opportunities to incorporate a mix of residential and non-residential uses within the “flex” land use designations. Housing ranging from detached single-family to multiple-family are appropriate, depending on the location. Densities are anticipated to range from as low as four dwellings per acre to 18 dwellings per acre in the Commercial Residential Flex 3 areas (up to three stories). Redevelopment in the Auburn Road corridor may warrant additional height sufficient to accommodate up to 25 dwellings per acre. However, any increase in building heights in the Auburn Road corridor will be subject to further study with the city and stakeholders in the area. The illustrations below show how setting the top floor back from the façade can mitigate the visual impact of building height and mass at the ground level.
Housing Plan

The Existing and Proposed Dwelling Units per Acre Map (Map 12) illustrates the alignment between most of the existing and planned residential development throughout the city. While the 2012 Master Plan discussed the availability of vacant lots in existing neighborhoods that could be split, it should be clear that such splits are envisioned only when they are in alignment with the Future Land Use Map and the Zoning Ordinance. It is not anticipated that the density of existing neighborhoods would increase at this time.

This plan calls for the continued diversification of the city’s housing stock to offer a greater range of sizes, forms, price points, ownership and tenancy models, and configurations. The plan addresses this through the addition of the R-5 land use category and suggests increased density in mixed-use areas, including the Auburn Road corridor, focusing on areas that have redevelopment potential. This will allow the city to address areas appropriate for increased density without compromising the character of its larger lot areas. The concentration of denser housing forms in specific areas also ensures that such developments will have proximity to shopping and employment centers that encourage alternative transportation arrangements such as walking or biking to work.

Neighborhood Preservation. As noted previously, proposed changes in permitted densities, housing forms, and scale of development are concentrated in specific areas of the city already characterized by more intense development and where existing conditions provide opportunity. This plan recognizes that the preservation of existing neighborhoods and the way of life they provide is key to preserving the character of Rochester Hills, even as the city explores and embraces new and varied models of development.

In particular, the neighborhoods along Auburn Road as it runs through the city area tend to include a higher concentration of older homes than elsewhere in the city. In these areas, the city should encourage the on-going maintenance of these neighborhoods that keeps home values affordable as well as preserves the country-like atmosphere that makes them distinctive. A framework for this area should address maintaining existing housing stock, upgrading infrastructure where upgrades are desired, and providing for redevelopment that does not out-scale existing homes.

An example of a ranch-style home on an unpaved road south of Auburn Road in the City of Rochester Hills. (Source: Giffels Webster)
Mena Nasiri, Age 13—Great Places in Rochester Hills Youth Art Contest Winner
Redevelopment Sites

To implement the goals of this Master Plan, three specific redevelopment sites have been identified by the city that are currently vacant or under-utilized, given their location, unique features, and size. Concepts for redevelopment of these suggest key components that are envisioned and approaches to facilitate redevelopment.

Redevelopment Site 1: Cardinal/Veteran’s Landfill Area (“Suburban Softball”)
Background

**Location.** This 97-acre site is bounded by Hamlin Road, Adams Road, M-59, and the Clinton River Trail. It contains landfill and non-landfill properties.

**History and Existing Development Constraints.** There is a 2004 Consent Judgment (CJ) that permits up to 2,000,000 square feet of office, hotel, commercial, and research/development uses with a maximum of 500,000 square feet of retail. The permitted heights of buildings is 45 feet for commercial, eight to ten stories for office and hotel, and four stories for parking decks. This area is intended to be built as a cohesive development and reviewed as a planned unit development (PUD). The CJ states that the developer would remediate landfill contamination in exchange for extensive freedom to develop the site and capture brownfield tax revenues that would result from the investment.

**Future Land Use Map.** The Future Land Use Map designation for this parcel is “Regional Employment Center.” This category anticipates a wide range of business uses.

**Public Input.** At the first open house (April 23, 2018), attendees suggested avoiding more big box retailer and medical buildings. They expressed a need for smaller homes, including detached condos or ranch homes with manageable yards in a walkable neighborhood. Institutional uses or Live/Work type uses were also suggested.

Concepts for the Redevelopment

**Land Use.** Land uses in the CJ are broad and permit a variety of commercial uses in this area. Housing is currently excluded from the terms of the CJ. However, the city anticipates that there may be an opportunity to amend the CJ to reflect current market conditions. Housing may be a use of interest for future development. While housing requires a higher level of environmental remediation than commercial uses, the additional expense associated with cleanup may be worthwhile provided enough density could be established. The city may benefit from additional housing in this location, particularly housing to support the local workforce. The mix of housing and commercial uses as an integrated development could offer residents opportunities to walk to work; commercial uses could benefit by limiting the commute times for their employees. Traffic, a repeated concern throughout the planning process, could potentially be alleviated by providing residential and commercial uses within a walkable area.
**Building Form.** The current CJ does not address building form, design or materials. If the opportunity to amend the CJ becomes available, standards for development should be included. High-quality materials and pedestrian-oriented details will help this area stand apart as a unique development in the region.

**Transportation.** All parts of the site should be served by non-motorized transportation facilities that connect to adjacent sidewalks, roadways, and sites as identified in the city’s Thoroughfare Plan.

**Sustainability.** Development on this site should be based on a framework of sustainable building and site design practices that offers a model for development and redevelopment elsewhere in the city. The use of low-impact design, pervious paving materials, and native landscape materials should be prioritized.

**Development of the District.** Since this property is under a consent judgment, that agreement guides and controls development of this site. When the opportunity to renegotiate the agreement arises, the city should explore these concepts with the property owner and strive to incorporate housing, walkability and placemaking elements into new standards for development.
Redevelopment Site 2: Hamlin/Avon Landfill Area

Background

**Location.** The Hamlin/Avon Landfill Area is bounded by Avon Road to the north, Dequindre Road to the east, Hamlin Road to the south, and a residential area to the west fronting John R Road. It contains landfill and non-landfill properties.

**History and Existing Development Constraints.** Map 14 on page 94 is from an environmental study prepared in 2010 that shows areas where development is likely given the costs associated with development and remediation (green is more likely to be redeveloped, red is unlikely to be redeveloped). The study stated that the former Stan’s Trucking/Six Star site (Sites 26, 27, and 33) is the most significant environmental challenge in the Landfill Planning Area. This site began as a gravel pit sometime before 1937, ending in 1966 with the disposal of municipal solid waste beginning at that time. Contamination was detected in nearby wells in 1974/1975 and remediation was done by a new operator in 1976. Waste operations ceased in 1981/1982 and the area was covered with two feet of clay. Testing in 1992 indicated elevated levels of volatile organic compounds (VOC’s) and metal, elevated arsenic levels were detected in 1997, and testing in 2000 showed compliant VOC levels but elevated metal levels in groundwater. In April 2000, an adjacent residence on Parke Street exploded due to what was found to be methane build-up in the basement from the landfill. Emergency methane remediation was installed on City-owned Site 26 and methane levels are monitored biweekly and have found to have successfully reduced methane concentration along Parke Street.
In 2014, a rezoning request to permit a 490-unit manufactured home park on 77 acres between Hamlin Road and School Road (Sites 27 and 33) was denied. The applicants environmental analysis stated that municipal waste on these two sites is believed to be 30 to 35 feet deep over most of the site. Also, City water and sewer would need to be provided due to contaminated groundwater that has not been used since the 1980’s. Subsidence (gradual sinking) and ventilation of the land was also a primary concern with development of the manufactured home park.

East of the Stan’s Trucking/Six Star area is the Kingston Development Landfill and Sandfills #1 and #2. Kingston was originally a sand and gravel extraction site and illegal landfilling began in 1970. In 1977, the site was licensed to dispose of steel slag from Warren. In 1983, new owners began improving the site drainage and filling unused portions of the pit with clay, known as the Kingston Pit and indicated with the purple circle. Surface soil, sediment, and groundwater samples taken in 2000 indicated levels of metals and VOC’s that exceeded related residential standards. Surface soil, sediment, and groundwater testing done in 2001 on the Sandfill sites indicated elevated levels of VOC’s and metals exceeding residential criteria.

The 2010 environmental study considers a significant portion of the north half of the landfill area between School Road to the south and Avon Road to the north as supportive of residential redevelopment. The largest residential development site (Site 15) was previously used to dispose of diseased trees from the City of Highland Park and may be unstable. The additional residential parcels along the north side of School Road have either never been developed or have been used as residential. However, all but two of these residential parcels are within the groundwater gradient of the Stan’s Trucking/Six Star site to the south across School Road, which may have a negative impact on redevelopment potential.

Source: ASTI Environmental. Environmental Concerns Inventory, September 2010 (p. 11)
MAP 14: 2010 ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY (HAMLIN/AVON LANDFILL AREA)

Source: ASTI Environmental. Environmental Concerns Inventory, September 2010 (p. 54)
**Future Land Use Map.** The Future Land Use Map designation for this area includes “Park/Public Open Space”, “Industrial”, “Residential 5”, and “Residential 3”. These designations are guided by the 2010 Environmental Study and existing industrial and residential uses, and desire the following uses:

- **Recreation:** Uses could include private and public recreation, including passive facilities such as walking trails and active uses such as sports fields, indoor sports facilities, and the like.
- **Energy Generation:** Uses could include passive energy generation such as wind and solar as well as methane gas conversion.
- **Commercial/Industrial:** Given the adjacent residential uses within the city and in the adjacent Shelby Township, low intensity uses could include as storage, warehousing, and light manufacturing.
- **Limited Residential:** Single-family residential could be appropriate if remediation permits.

**MAP 15: FUTURE LAND USE MAP (HAMLIN/AVON LANDFILL AREA)**

**Public Input.** At the first open house (April 23, 2018), attendees suggested greenspace, recreation, and residential uses for the area with a desire to provide pedestrian connectivity and minimize impervious surface and watershed impacts. Low-traffic uses and garden plots for use by schools were also mentioned.
Concepts for the Redevelopment

Land Use. Focusing redevelopment efforts on sustainability, energy and recreation may help attract users with complementary businesses and set this area apart in the region as a hub for innovation.

Updates to the Future Land Use Map reflect existing uses and likelihood of future uses (considering the potential for remediation) and include an expanded Industrial area along Hamlin Road, new Public Park/Open Space areas and the new Residential 5 category. Energy uses could be encouraged throughout the landfill area as a means to accomplish remediation and encourage sensitive redevelopment. Such uses could include methane gas collection, green houses, solar farms, wind energy, other energy-related uses as determined appropriate.
In addition to energy generation, light industrial uses could be compatible, provided they are relatively low-impact in terms of noise and traffic. Storage facilities, self-storage and light manufacturing may be appropriate. Uses of this nature should reflect a sustainable business model and low-impact design.

A wide variety of low- and high-impact recreation uses could complement energy and light manufacturing uses, particularly if an educational component is added. Non-motorized transportation facilities could be opportunities for educational wayfinding signage and kiosks while linking recreational uses. Depending on the level of remediation required for development, this area holds a potential for passive uses like a nature sanctuary, habitat creation, dog park and/or dog field trial training. Active recreation uses could include a golf course/training area, sledding slope, and indoor/outdoor sports fields. Specific sport facilities could include an archery range, model airplane flying field, cross-country/BMX bike courses, skateboard park, paint ball and other as determined appropriate. Connectivity with surrounding recreation facilities will be a key goal of redevelopment in this area.

**Transportation.** Avon Road, Dequindre Road, and Hamlin Road are Designated (Class A) Truck Routes on the City’s Truck Operators Map. The appropriateness of future land uses fronting and accessing these truck routes should be strongly considered with redevelopment. These routes provide for the continued and expanded use of industrial uses north of Hamlin Road to School Road as shown on the Future Land Use Map. These truck routes are also compatible with the desired energy uses throughout the area that are not typically sensitive to truck traffic and that may benefit from truck access.

The city’s Pathway and Sidewalk Inventory map proposes pathways along the south side of Avon Road, the west side of Dequindre Road, and both sides of School Road. Pathways are existing along Hamlin Road. All of the Landfill Area frontages should be served by non-motorized transportation facilities that connect to adjacent sidewalks/pathways as identified in the city’s Transportation plan. Given the large size of undeveloped areas within the Landfill Area, additional nonmotorized connections should be considered as redevelopment occurs. A nonmotorized and/or greenspace connection between Helen V. Allen Park and Borden Park should also be pursued as indicated by a strip of Park/Public Open Space on the Future Land Use Map running along the west side of the Landfill Area from Hamlin Road to School Road, then east along the north side of School Road.

**Sustainability.** Development in this area should be based on a framework of sustainable building and site design practices that offers a model for development and redevelopment elsewhere in the city. As discussed previously, the use of low-impact design, pervious paving materials, and native landscape materials should be prioritized and highlighted as a unique feature of this area.

**Development of the District.** It is anticipated that extensive study will be required to determine appropriate and feasible land uses for the landfill parcels if they are proposed to be redeveloped at a future date. Since there are varied existing uses and zoning within the Landfill Area, the city should carefully consider this plan as sites redevelop within the area. Expanding green space and recreation uses within the Landfill Area may require the city to become more actively involved in land acquisition, ownership and/or remediation.
Background

Location. This area is located at the northeast corner of Rochester and Hamlin Roads. The site is currently developed with a plant nursery and retail operation. A large multiple family area exists to the south/southeast of the site across Hamlin Road and a large and relatively-dense single-family area exists to the southwest of the site. Commercial uses exist at the northwest, southwest, and southeast corners of the intersection of Rochester Road and Hamlin Road, and institutional uses have a large presence on the north side of Hamlin Road west of the commercial area.

History. A concept for development known as The Gardens of Rochester Hills (above), proposed in the early 2000s, included 4-story buildings with over 300,000 square feet of retail space, 84,000 sf of nursery, a theater, and 72 dwelling units, in a walkable environment, somewhat like the Village of Rochester Hills. Due to the Great Recession, this ambitious plan was not realized.
Future Land Use Map. The Future Land Use Map designates this area as “Business-Flexible Use 3.” Anticipated uses include a mixture of large-scale retail commercial land uses, attached and multiple family dwelling units, senior housing, office uses, schools, churches, and other public uses. Detached single family residences are not permitted in Business/Flexible Use 3 areas.

Public Input. At the first open house on April 23, 2018, attendees suggested adding smaller homes, including detached condos or ranch homes, and other uses that would not generate significant traffic in an already congested area. At the second open house, participants continued to show interest in the previous concept, but also liked the housing-focused aspects of the redevelopment concept illustrated on the following pages.
Concepts for the Redevelopment

Land Use. A mix of commercial uses, including small, independent and/or local retail shops and restaurants is envisioned in this location; big-box retailing is discouraged. This location would be ideal for more housing, including attached and detached single family homes.

Building Form. Place non-residential buildings closer to Rochester Road and linear buildings along Hamlin Road to begin to establish a more walkable core for this intersection and to strengthen connectivity between existing residential areas along Hamlin Road. Some front-yard parking may be appropriate, especially along Rochester Road.

While a future development could include multiple-family dwellings and attached single-family dwellings, small compact housing is another type that could also be accommodated. The “Missing Middle” housing types discussed in the Housing Chapter would be appropriate with the nearby existing neighborhoods while providing additional density.

The examples shown on page 102 of a “cottage court” development illustrates how smaller units, clustered together, could potentially be added at the north and west end of this site and potentially other locations in the city.

These housing types typically offer ample front porches and are designed to face a commons area, contributing to a neighborhood feeling. The spaces between buildings may serve as private yard space as well as common courtyards.

Transportation. The City of Rochester Hills has jurisdiction over Hamlin Road. All parts of the site should be served by non-motorized transportation facilities that connect to adjacent sidewalks, internal pathways, roadways, and sites as identified in the city’s Transportation plan. In the future, the city may wish to explore adding additional crosswalks in this area and on-street parking to Hamlin Road to slow traffic, provide convenient parking and create a “downtown” type setting that could begin to transform this auto-oriented strip commercial corridor into a unique walkable district.

Sustainability. Development on this site should be based on a framework of sustainable building and site design practices that offers a model for development and redevelopment elsewhere in the city. The use of low-impact design, pervious paving materials, and native landscape materials should be prioritized.

Development of the District. Zoning for the parcels is currently B-3 Shopping and RM-1 Multiple Family with a FB-3 Flexible Business Overlay. The FB-3 district is an optional method of development that permits a mixture of uses that may include residential, public, institutional, office, business, and retail commercial uses in buildings up to three stories in height and up to four stories in height along Rochester Road with additional setbacks. The city may wish to amend the Zoning Ordinance to permit detached single-family residential housing, such as a cottage court development. In addition, the city may wish to explore limiting the size of individual users to encourage the development of a commercial center with small independent and local businesses rather than stand-alone big-box retailing.
Redevelopment Concept. An alternative to the previous redevelopment concept would focus on housing as the main land use, supported by retail, dining and entertainment uses. This modifies the previous concept by adding more housing. Additional recommendations include:

- Allow attached and detached single family homes
- Place non-residential buildings closer to Rochester Road and Hamlin Road.
- Possible future on-street parking on Hamlin
- Provide additional design guidance in the Master Plan
- Make four corners more walkable
- Incorporate public art
The lofts at Gateway Centre in West Chicago IL is an example of a two-story mixed use development with some parking in the front. (Source: Matthew Haylock architect)

Above: Danielson Grove in Kirkland, WA. These homes cottage homes range from 651 - 1500 square feet on 2.5 acres. (Source: cottagecompany.com)

Below: Concord Riverwalk in West Concord, MA. These homes range from 1,340 square feet to 1,760 square feet on 3.7 acres. (Source: RossChapin.com)
Implementation

The thoughtful preparation and adoption of any plan would be of diminished value without a program of implementation strategies. The implementation strategies of this chapter will assist the city in putting the key recommendations of the Master Plan to work.

The implementation program is based on the goals and objectives discussed earlier. Some of these goals are carried over from the previous Master Plan. A specific Zoning Plan outlines steps that can be taken toward implementation through amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.

The tables that follow assign actions to the goals and objectives, leaving room to establish priority levels for short-term, mid-term, and long-term items as the next step following adoption of this plan. This chapter should be reviewed periodically and at least annually to assess progress and adequately budget for specific strategies. Each action should have a “lead,” a board, commission, group, or individual who is responsible for project initiation and coordination.

Zoning Plan

The Zoning Ordinance is one of the primary tools for implementing the Master Plan. Many of the land use recommendations, goals and objectives found in this plan can be aided by amendments to the city’s Zoning Ordinance. Amendments can range from minor changes to text all the way to the creation of new districts, which will be needed for the new Residential 5 land use category.

Implementation

The best plans are those that are implemented in a consistent, incremental, and logical manner. The implementation matrix that follows is designed to show how the goals of the Master Plan are fulfilled by the action strategies. All boards, commissions, and authorities are encouraged to read through all of the strategies to understand how they all work together to create a better community to live, work, and play.
Aside from the modification of existing districts and the creation of a new residential district (to support Residential 5), some objectives of the Master Plan will be addressed with text amendments. The implementation tables that follow in this chapter identify the amendments that are necessary to move the city toward its goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Intended Zoning District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estate Residential</td>
<td>RE Residential Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 2</td>
<td>R-1 One Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 2.5</td>
<td>R-2 One Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 3</td>
<td>R-3 One Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 4</td>
<td>R-4 One Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 5</td>
<td><strong>New District Needed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMH Manufactured Housing Park</td>
<td>(existing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Residential Overlay</td>
<td>Underlying Residential <em>WITH</em> MR Mixed Residential Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family</td>
<td>RM-1 Multiple Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Office Flex</td>
<td>B-1 Local Business <em>WITH</em> FB-1 Flexible Business Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Residential Flex - 2</td>
<td>B-2 General Business <em>WITH</em> FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Residential Flex - 3</td>
<td>B-3 Shopping Center Business <em>WITH</em> FB-3 Flexible Business Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>O-1 Office Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>REC-W Regional Employment Center Workplace District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and Office Corridor</td>
<td>ORT Office - Research - Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interchange</td>
<td>REC-I Regional Employment Center Interchange District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commercial</td>
<td>ORT Office - Research - Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>I Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Purpose</td>
<td>SP Special Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Recreation/Open Space</td>
<td>Residential (varies) and Special Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Recreation/Open Space</td>
<td>Residential (varies)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Implementation Matrix Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix Categories</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Strategy</td>
<td>The actions necessary to carry out goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Body</td>
<td>Identifies the primary party responsible for accomplishing the action strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Identifies and prioritizes the timeframe for the action strategy to be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Funding Sources</td>
<td>Lists potential funding sources that could be utilized to accomplish the action strategy.  See Funding Sources Matrix Below for reference details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Partners</td>
<td>Identifies other parties involved in the accomplishment of the action strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix ID</th>
<th>Type of Financing Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General fund and/or other typical financial mechanisms available to the city for general government operation and for public infrastructure and services improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tax increment financing revenues as provided by the Brownfield Redevelopment Authority (BRA) and Local Development Finance Authority (LDFA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Historic Preservation programs, including historic tax credits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Redevelopment and urban renewal programs (Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), etc).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Special Improvement District programs that may be created for maintenance and improvement of public facilities. Certain funds may also be used for planning, design, construction, managing, marketing activities and business recruiting services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Grants related to transportation improvement, streetscape enhancement and alternate modes of travel programs; funds to improve air quality in areas that do not meet clean air standards; funds for recreation-related acquisitions and improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Non-traditional grants and funding programs for beautification, enhancement and public art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public-Private Partnerships (P3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Matrices

In order to illustrate the connection between goals, objectives and action strategies, each of the implementation matrices that follow align with the Master Plan goals outlined in pages 55-62. Within each matrix, the action items are broken into subcategories intended to assist with identification and prioritization. Not all goals contain action items within each subcategory. These subcategories include:

**Zoning Action Items.** These are items requiring zoning amendments and will generally be led by staff and the Planning Commission.

**Advocacy Action Items.** These will be items involving education of the community, including residents, business owners, property owners, developers and design professionals. They will be led by a combination of staff, boards and commissions.

**Other Action Items.** Other items may involve research, study and further evaluation by staff and/or other boards and commissions.

The timeframes are intended as guides and may be adjusted as resources allow or as other issues arise. Generally, short timeframes are intended as three years or less; medium-to-long timeframes are more than three years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal: Land Use Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Strategy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADVOCACY ACTION ITEMS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement zoning action items as identified in the Master Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make 2018 Master Plan Update available in a prominent location on the city’s website as well as in hard-copy format at City Hall, the library and OPC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the Master Plan Update is referenced when land use policies are developed and/or land use decisions are being made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the future land use plans of adjacent communities as opportunities arise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to engage the community in a variety of ways with regards to land use issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the Master Plan every five years as required by state law, but amend and/or update in part or whole as needed without regard to a strict schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZONING ACTION ITEMS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and amend the Zoning Ordinance to provide standards for the Brooklands area that align with the Auburn Road Corridor Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Zoning Ordinance audit to identify areas for improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Goal: Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Strategy</th>
<th>Lead Body</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Potential Funding Sources</th>
<th>Supporting Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADVOCACY ACTION ITEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise awareness within the community about available home maintenance and improvement programs.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Ongoing/Short</td>
<td>1, 4</td>
<td>City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise awareness within the community about available programs to help aging seniors stay in their homes as long as they want. Promote policies and programs to make housing more accessible to the elderly and mobility challenged individuals.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Ongoing/Short</td>
<td>1, 4</td>
<td>City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage proactive and positive communication within the city related to housing, particularly within the context of other community goals.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Ongoing/Short</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with homeowners’ associations on maintenance plans for existing and future open spaces and recreational facilities.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Ongoing/Short</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZONING ACTION ITEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise the subdivision control ordinance to include design standards for smaller residential infill parcels that promote connectivity between parcels to prevent isolated and unconnected developments.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Medium-to-Long</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess and amend the Zoning Ordinance as needed to ensure adequate protection of existing neighborhoods from potential impacts of development, including buffering, screening and traffic mitigation.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Medium-to-Long</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess and amend the Zoning Ordinance as needed to require internal connections within housing developments and external connections to city sidewalks, pathways and adjacent development.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Medium-to-Long</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess and amend the Zoning Ordinance as needed to require open space within housing developments; strengthen the Subdivision Open Space Plan Option provisions to incentivize such development.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Medium-to-Long</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend the Zoning Ordinance to add standards that align with the new Residential 5 land use designation. This new district should include form-based elements that foster walkable neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Ongoing/Short</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Goal: Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Strategy</th>
<th>Lead Body</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Potential Funding Sources</th>
<th>Supporting Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADVOCACY ACTION ITEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain the city’s business retention program to support the ongoing health and</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Ongoing/Short</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainability of local businesses. Develop annual survey tool to better understand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the needs of local businesses and identify areas in which the city can provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support and/or connect businesses to supporting partners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update the city’s Gateways Plan and incorporate implementation into the city’s</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Medium-to-Long</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff, Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZONING ACTION ITEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise the minimum landscaping, building design, parking, and other similar</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Medium-to-Long</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zoning requirements to improve the appearance and protect the investment of new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development in the city.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER ACTION ITEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the benefits, costs and overall feasibility of implementing a Corridor</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Ongoing/Short</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Authority for redevelopment in the Auburn Road and Rochester Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corridors. Assess alternative programs, including Commercial Rehabilitation Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or other incentives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Goal: Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Strategy</th>
<th>Lead Body</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Potential Funding Sources</th>
<th>Supporting Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADVOCACY ACTION ITEMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update the city’s Thoroughfare Plan.</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Ongoing/Short</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff, Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement strategies associated with the Thoroughfare Plan.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Medium-to-Long</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8</td>
<td>City Council, Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate the community about the benefits of a strong non-motorized transportation network. Help business owners identify opportunities to support non-motorized travel within the city. Encourage residents to incorporate non-motorized travel into their daily lives to alleviate traffic congestion and improve public health.</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Ongoing/Short</td>
<td>1, 6, 8</td>
<td>Staff, Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONING ACTION ITEMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and amend the Zoning Ordinance as needed to improve access and connectivity throughout the city.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Ongoing/Short</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and amend the Zoning Ordinance as needed to accommodate autonomous vehicles, ride-sharing and other forms of transportation.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Medium-to-Long</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Goal: Community Amenities and Services Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Strategy</th>
<th>Lead Body</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Potential Funding Sources</th>
<th>Supporting Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADVOCACY ACTION ITEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the creation of an ad hoc committee tasked with evaluation of sharing facilities and services between adjacent communities, schools, the county and private businesses with a goal of providing effective and efficient community amenities and services.</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Ongoing/Short</td>
<td>1, 8</td>
<td>Staff, Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER ACTION ITEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to assess the city’s infrastructure and plan for updates and improvements as needed.</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Ongoing/Short</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff, Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that the city’s recreation plan is updated every five years, consistent with the requirements of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources.</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Ongoing/Short</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff, Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update the city’s Capital Improvement Plan annually.</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Ongoing/Short</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff, Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Goal: Preservation and Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Strategy</th>
<th>Lead Body</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Potential Funding Sources</th>
<th>Supporting Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADVOCACY ACTION ITEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate the development community about the benefits of LEED certification for</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Ongoing/Short</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
<td>City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential and non-residential buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to work with the appropriate agencies to restore damaged riverbank</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Ongoing/Short</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td>City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>areas of the Clinton River, and to protect undamaged areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate the community about the city’s historic resources and how they</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Ongoing/Short</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribute to the character of the city.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZONING ACTION ITEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Best Practices for woodland protection and amend the Tree Conservation</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Ongoing/Short</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinance as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER ACTION ITEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentivize LEED certification for new or renovated buildings in the City.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Medium-to-Long</td>
<td>1, 8</td>
<td>City Council, Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED standards provide a framework for green development, and are the most</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fully-developed comprehensive certification system for energy efficient and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmentally friendly construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain the city’s 10-year schedule of updating the floodplain map.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Medium-to-Long</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>City Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

Beyond 2018

Trends to Watch

This Master Plan Update touched on several local, regional, and national trends, including the aging population, sustainable development, and creating a more walkable community. Technology will play an increasingly larger role in our daily lives and will not only change the way we live, work, and play—but will also influence our land use, transportation, housing, and recreation as well. Over the years ahead, the city should be aware of trends and new technologies related to some of the following topics:

**Transportation Innovation.** Traffic congestion, environmental impacts, high vehicle costs, and limited mobility are just some of the factors influencing demand for transportation choices that go beyond the personal vehicle. From low-tech bicycle sharing programs to high-tech autonomous vehicles, the way we travel from place to place is likely going to change significantly for most of us in the next five to ten years. The city will be updating its Thoroughfare Plan in early 2019. Future planning studies will likely consider the impact of autonomous vehicles, ridesharing, and car sharing on the personal mobility of city residents as well as on parking standards, road infrastructure, and traffic congestion.

**Community Health.** Land use decisions impact community health in a number of ways. The location of housing and neighborhoods far from goods, services, parks, schools, and other civic uses means people have to drive a vehicle to satisfy their daily needs. This Master Plan Update identifies several places in the city where residents could have options for their personal mobility; walking and biking then become options that allow people to be physically active as part of their daily routines. These concentrated areas of development also afford older residents a measure of independence, should their mobility become limited.
Sustainability. The city is known for exploring sustainability concepts and implementing improvements. This plan recognizes that innovation and recommends reuse of the landfill area for alternative energy generation. Improved technologies may make alternative energy systems, including solar power, wind energy, geothermal power, biofuels, and energy from other sources (evaporation, desalination, etc.) more accessible and productive for residents and businesses.

Other sustainable trends to watch for in the future include adapting to new techniques for waste management/recycling, recycling water/using gray water, and the transition to LED Lighting/ultra-efficient fluorescents.

Workplaces. Technology is greatly changing the way people work across almost every industry. Today’s offices are often accommodating more employees per square foot of space as people work more collaboratively and in open spaces. Technology makes it easier for employers to offer opportunities to telecommute from home or other remote locations. Co-working spaces are becoming more common, allowing small businesses, home-based businesses, and start-up businesses opportunities to share office amenities such as copiers, printers, teleconferencing equipment, and conference rooms. The availability of wireless facilities, such as broadband, will have an impact on the location of offices and other technology-dependent businesses.

Industrial and manufacturing jobs also are being transformed by technology as automation continues to grow and expand. Fewer, but more highly-educated employees are often needed for these industries. Automation will likely influence the nature of jobs in other, non-manufacturing business as well over the next several years.

Sharing Economy. From lodging to tool rentals to ride services, the sharing economy is turning the idea of asset ownership upside down. Other related transformations include crowdfunding and crowdsourcing, where people have a direct impact on raising money for charity and business ventures. In addition, technology is helping freelancers and people in the “gig economy” find work and be more self-sufficient, while also allowing people to collaborate in new ways. These variations on the sharing economy have expanded exponentially.
over the past few years and will likely continue growing and changing the way the economy functions and transactions take place.

**Housing.** While many people continue to demand single-family detached homes, new ideas on housing and homeownership are appealing to a wide variety of people. From tiny homes to accessory dwellings (backyard cottages/granny flats), smaller housing units offer increased affordability and lower maintenance for students, empty nesters, and those who desire the freedom to travel or spend their resources in other ways. As the Baby Boomers continue to age, they, too, are changing where and how they live. Over the past several years, there has been an increase in the number of senior housing projects in almost every community; however, at a point in the future, demand for such housing will wane and communities will need to consider how to adapt and/or reuse much of this housing.

**Next Steps**

The Master Plan is a living document. Following the adoption of this Master Plan Update, the Planning Commission reviewed the Implementation chapter and established guiding priorities and timeframes for actions. Each year, the Planning Commission’s annual report should include targeted actions for the following year, which can be sent to the City Council if additional resources are required.

**Five Year Review**

The Michigan Planning Enabling Act requires a community to review its Master Plan every five years. The results of the review determine whether the master plan is still relevant or should be updated, or whether a new master plan should be prepared for adoption. However, there is not a requirement to wait five years; the preceding items may be considered at any time.
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As part of the Master Plan process, the City of Rochester Hills explored concepts that impact short-, mid- and long-range policies and strategies. The Master Plan process started with a series of visioning exercises that tapped into the expertise of city staff, the Youth Council, and appointed and elected officials. These exercises resulted in a few guiding themes that continued to be discussed by the Planning Commission, City Council, residents, and business owners during the Master Plan process. The visioning exercises combined self-study and reflection with group discussion. In addition to the focus groups associated with the market assessment, the following visioning sessions were conducted in late 2017 to early 2018:

1. **City Staff Visioning Session.** The City’s staff participated in a workshop where Giffels Webster staff facilitated discussion on issues raised in the planning resource packet, prepared by Giffels Webster. Using their expertise and background, the team explored the City’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats that impact land use planning. Articles and report excerpts provided in this resource packet helped frame the discussion.

2. **Youth Council Visioning Session.** The city’s Youth Council participated in an abbreviated study session where the Master Plan process was explained and two exercises were conducted. In addition, some students also participated in the joint workshop of the Planning Commission and City Council.

3. **City Council and Planning Commission Survey.** Using the findings from the staff visioning session, as well as the resource packet, Giffels Webster developed an online survey that encouraged officials to respond to emerging concepts. The survey included multiple choice questions, ranking questions, and open-ended questions.

4. **Planning Commission and City Council Visioning Session.** At this joint workshop, officials discussed the planning resource packet, summary of the staff and youth visioning, and findings from the online survey. The remainder of the time was spent refining key concepts to be used as the guiding principles for the Master Plan.
City Staff Visioning Session

Post-It note exercise - Strengths and Weaknesses.

Staff was asked the question, “What are the city’s greatest strengths and weaknesses that impact your department or area of expertise within the city?” Each participant was given five post-it notes each for strength and weakness. As each post-it was completed, they were assembled in categories on the wall of the room and grouped according to common responses. They were categorized as noted at right. The number following the item indicates how many times that item was mentioned.

Strengths:
- Trails (10)
- Parks (9)
- Schools (9)
- Natural beauty - trees and wildlife (4)
- Diversity in economic groups (3)
- Reputation of the city (3)
- Financial stability (3)
- Oakland University (2)
- Neighborhoods (2)
- Safe neighborhoods (2)
- Low taxes (2)
- Employment opportunities and high end job market (1)
- Food (1)
- Shopping (1)
- Diversity of cultures and age groups (1)
- Progressive (1)
- Highly educated residents (1)
- Good mix of development (1)
- Well-run community (8)
  - Departments work well together to create great developments
  - Proactive Planning and Development
  - We provide great services to the residents, owners of businesses, and developers
  - Large scale resources with small town service and feel
  - Investments in infrastructure

Weaknesses:
- Traffic (19)
- Affordable housing options (8)
- Transportation options (6)
- Lack of downtown (5)
- Communication/community engagement (4)
- Staffing levels (3)
- Limited areas for growth (2)
- Lack of diversity (1)
- Lack of neighborhood parks (1)
- No indoor recreation facilities (1)
- Not centrally located in metro Detroit (1)
- Dirt roads (1)
- Big focus on residential v small businesses (1)
- Residential is majority of tax base (1)
- No Costco (1)
Small Group Discussion: The team was divided into four groups of 4-5 members each. They were asked, “Using your professional knowledge and expertise, along with the background resources provided, what are the greatest opportunities the city should pursue that will enhance the city's strengths and address its weaknesses? Are there any threats or potential threats that need to be better understood in terms of long-range impact?

In addition, the groups were asked to consider emerging issues or trends should be explored as part of the master plan update.

The numbers that follow in this section reflect the number of mentions.

Opportunities

- Potential to address traffic by improving intersections
- Encourage neighborhood parks
- Community/recreation center
- Greater involvement in regional transit; Mass transit – encourage the community to support
- Identify new model of development, consider ways to retrofit existing
- Autonomous vehicles
- Rezoning of residential on mile roads
- Enhance north-south major roads with new technology to improve circulation (smart signals)
- Tiny homes in mobile home parks, elsewhere
- Affordable housing
- Accessory dwellings
- Complete streets – bike lanes in the streets so people recognize them, especially at intersections
- Strengthen partnerships to leverage additional outdoor recreation opportunities

Threats/Potential Threats

- Development pressure impacts on traffic and other infrastructure (3)
- Sustainability of large homes and developments
- Mixed-use – could it be more affordable?
- Backlash from new concepts
- Will future changes in leadership continue the strong relationships between boards, commissions, staff?
- Aging population – concerns over lack of public transportation (also supports Millennials)
- Managing changing household composition – away from families with children
- How to plan for next recession
- Managing diversity in terms of services, communication (especially with language barriers) (2)
- Safety of pedestrians, lack of sidewalks in neighborhoods
- Demand for services compared to revenue sources
- Managing new technology such as drones and autonomous vehicles
- Manage trends of people to leave suburbia
Emerging Issues and Trends

- Autonomous vehicles
- Technology impacts on shift in retail
- Improve governmental transparency and efficient delivery of services
- Environmental innovation in terms of waste, recycling, water consumption, climate change
- Take the lead in adapting buildings with low impact development tools like solar panels, green roofs, rain gardens
- Encourage use of green spaces with additional new partnerships
- Encourage shared work spaces for telecommuters/home-based businesses
- Provide community wifi to support home-based businesses
- Capitalize on trends to encourage manufacturing in the US
- Encourage a balanced approach to growth
- Encourage tiny homes
- Encourage renewable energy programs, like PACE program
- Live-work community centers and planned mixed-use developments
- Adapt to reduced parking demand

Top Five: After the responses were shared, each individual was given dots to please next to the highest priority items in each category. The top five in each category are noted below (number of responses follows):

Opportunities:
1. Enhance north-south major roads with new technology to improve circulation (smart signals) (8)
2. Greater involvement in regional transit; Mass transit – encourage the community to support (6)
3. Identify new model of development, consider ways to retrofit existing (6)
4. Affordable housing (5)
5. Encourage neighborhood parks (5)

Threats:
1. Development pressure impacts on traffic and other infrastructure (10)
2. Affordability of mixed-use (7)
3. Lack of public transportation (6)
4. Safety of pedestrians, lack of sidewalks in neighborhoods (5)
5. Aging population (4)

Emerging Issues/Trends:
1. Encourage a balanced approach to growth (10)
2. Aging population (7)
3. Autonomous vehicles (4)
4. Take the lead in adapting buildings with low impact development tools like solar panels, green roofs, rain gardens (4)
5. Encourage shared work spaces for telecommuters/home-based businesses (3)
Youth Council Visioning Session

Who is the Youth Council? The Rochester Hills Government Youth Council (RHGYC) was established by the city to promote youth involvement in local government through active participation and the mutual exchange of ideas and experience.

There are 13 positions on the youth council, including: two representatives from each City Council district and five at-large members. Youth members serve one-year terms with the opportunity for reappointment and terms run concurrent with the school year, September 1 through August 31. Youth Council members present at the December 2017 visioning meeting represented three high schools and ranged in age from freshman to seniors.

Strengths:

Village of Rochester Hills/Commercial uses (11)
- I live close to the village and that is a very fun, family friendly place
- Accessibility to stores and restaurants (ex. The Village)
- Many walkable locations
- Variety of stores and businesses throughout the city.
- The Village
- The multiple areas for people to meet up (public space)
- Variety of retail
- Everything is pretty close together and its easy to get around
- Fun atmosphere (ex. The Village)
- I like the public areas that people can all join together and have fun at (the village).
- Lots of great places to eat and spend time with family
- The Village

Community Parks/Areas (10)
- All the parks in Rochester, like Borden or Bloomer, or the Rochester Park
- All the trails for biking or walking are very nice
- Green space and parks
- Parks and trails
- Roads

Community involvement (8)
- The city sponsored events like festival of the hills create a strong community
- Lots of city events and gatherings for the entire community
- Ways for people to get involved throughout the city/city events
- The opportunities for students in the community
- Heavily involved community life
- I like all the opportunities everyone has to get involved. Not only people within council and government get to do things.
- The local government is making efforts to involve the community residents, so they are informed and understand what’s going on
- Good public safety and public services

Schools (7)
Downtown Rochester (2)
Other (2)
- Diversity
- Social media reach throughout the community

Post-It note exercise - Strengths and Weaknesses.

The Youth Council was asked the same question posed to city staff, “What are the city’s greatest strengths and weaknesses?” three post-it notes each for strength and weakness. As each post-it was completed, they were assembled in categories on the wall of the room and grouped according to common responses. They were categorized as noted at right. The number following the item indicates how many times that item was mentioned.
Weaknesses:

Roads (8)
- Dirt roads and certain roads in poor conditions
- Traffic

Things to Do (5)
- Add more youth/high school age friendly stores to the village
- Variety of stores in the village (more stores for a younger demographic)
- We don’t have a large venue for a lot of people to go to.
- Not enough open spaces or public spaces for large groups of people

Transportation (4)
- Not many sources of transportation for those who can not drive
- Public transportation (other than school bus)
- Public transportation
- Not a lot of transportation for elderly

Health (4)
- More healthier options for food especially in downtown/village
- Not a lot of public health initiatives
- More mental illness/health awareness
- Prevent older people from falling with better assisted living

Involvement (5)
- Ways of finding out about projects in the city (Maybe some new ways)
- Not enough things for kids to get involved/interact
- Not as many people getting involved in city projects
- Although there are opportunities for people to get involved, sometimes it can be hard to communicate about complaints that you may have
- Not enough advertisement of the city and its plans or ways of getting involved

Other (1)
More support for less wealthy people and families
King or Queen for the Day exercise

The Youth Council was asked to imagine being “king or queen” of Rochester Hills for a day and having the resources to do something immediately to make the city a “great place.”

If I were the King or Queen of Rochester Hills for a day, the first thing I would do to make the city a Great Place is....
Online Survey: In a similar fashion to the earlier exercises, the Planning Commission and City Council were offered an online survey that asked them to consider the city’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. In addition, they were also asked to consider emerging issues or trends should be explored as part of the master plan update.

### Online Survey

#### Strengths:
- Responsive Government/Financial stability (9)
- Parks and Open Space (8)
- Safety (5)
- Schools (4)
- Neighborhoods/housing choices (4)

#### Weaknesses:
- Traffic (9)
- Housing variety/condition (5)
- Lack of transportation options (5)
- Communication/community engagement (3)
- Infrastructure/roads (3)
- Perception by others (3)

#### Opportunities:
- Roads and road funding (9)
- Improve communication (6)
- Redevelop landfills and other older corridors (5)
- More parks and natural areas (3)
- Active parks (3)

#### Threats:
- Traffic (9)
- Housing variety/condition (5)
- Lack of transportation options (5)
- Communication/community engagement (3)
- Infrastructure/roads (3)
- Perception by others (3)

#### Trends:
- Autonomous vehicles and other infrastructure challenges
- Potential for big data, social media to change city operations
- Need to shift style of development to accommodate changing tastes, aging population, permit height in absence of land for expansion
- Less land devoted to parking
- Open space: incorporate into new development

#### Vision for the city in 10 years:
- Improved transportation infrastructure
- Diversified housing stock
- Evolve while maintaining strengths (financial stability, good services, appealing community, safe)
- Denser, more appealing commercial areas
- Tension between maintenance of status quo and adapting to changing times
Visioning Meeting: In addition to the questions on the previous page, the Planning Commission and City Council met on Wednesday, January 17, 2018 to review the Master Plan process and timeline as well as discuss guiding concepts.

January 17, 2018 Visioning Meeting

Small Group Breakout Responses: Guiding Thoughts for the Planning Process

Housing:
- Diverse housing: Focus on younger residents; Baby Boomers
  - Smaller homes
  - Ranch homes – one floor living
  - Lower maintenance
  - Attract college graduates back home to the city
  - Limit height of multiple family buildings
- Retrofit single family homes (“front-door” style of thinking)
- Mixed-use
- Diverse portfolio of housing choices
  - Millennials
  - Aging population – consider a progression of housing to promote aging in community
- Include housing at a variety of price points
- Housing that is walkable to something: goods and services and entertainment
- Close affordability gap
- Be sensitive to aging population while attracting younger generation
- Housing that supports younger families
- Build a closer relationship with Rochester
- Preserving character of neighborhoods, including trees, natural features
- Mix of housing options
- Encourage aging in place and also students – accessory dwellings
- New ideas for housing and living

Land Use
- Entertainment and recreation uses: skate park, waterpark, splash pad
- More mixed-use: residential, office, commercial (similar to
- Drop off for autonomous vehicles
- Open space – land banking
- Be mindful of parking in residential neighborhoods
- Coordinate land uses in nearby communities in terms of traffic
- More boulevards – opportunities for green space and landscaping
- Landfills – increase economic viability of these properties; explore innovative financing
- Redevelopment of aging corridors (Auburn Road)
- Reducing setbacks
With less land, we need more stories/height – pay attention to design and context

Incorporate autonomous vehicles – circulation/parking

Ensure flow is cohesive between developments – make everything walkable
   ◦ Support young and old

Redevelopment Sites

• Potential around Brooklands
• Consider neighborhood character when planning land uses
• Landfill area
• Big box stores – reduce parking and let market define what they need
• Refresh tired office buildings and aging strip malls
   ◦ Incentivize this redevelopment
   ◦ Look to Auburn Corridor as template
• Incorporate placemaking and walkability into redevelopments
   ◦ How to create walkability in places never intended to be walkable
• Encourage walkability – increase demand for walkable places
• New technologies and their impact on the economy
• What structures will be obsolete with autonomous vehicles?
• Obsolete commercial centers – increase density strategically and thoughtfully
• Increase height when appropriate; consider sun/shade, noise
   ◦ Allow in heavier traffic areas (M59)
• Impact of technology on retail and businesses
• Timeless/Better architecture
• Less parking
• More green space
• Rehabilitate industrial buildings for residential purposes
Other:

- How to take redevelopment west down the Auburn Road corridor?
- Consider where to permit higher buildings/denser development

Influencing themes

- Community health:
  - Aging population
  - Exercise and walkability + parks
  - Walkability
  - Resources for aging population – branch out to other age groups
  - Consider needs of younger families and Millennials
  - Promote active lifestyle – 10-minute walk to a park for everyone
  - Socially interact with all walks of life

- Age-Friendly
  - Density
  - Walkability
  - Mobility
  - Diversity of housing
  - Parks and entertainment – ability to get there
  - Age in community – lifecycle housing

- Sustainability
  - Low impact design elements: bioswales, raingardens, green roofs
  - Changing modes of transportation
  - Get people to mass transportation/other modes (uber, lyft)
  - Parks and open space near larger developments
  - Make city more bikable
  - Protect natural resources – water, etc
  - Encourage development to incorporate sustainable building elements
  - Reduce sea of parking
  - Park maintenance

- Transportation
  - Hard to get to destinations on opposite sides of city
  - Future is autonomous vehicles – impact on infrastructure, parking
  - More roundabouts

Other: Ensure all codes are compatible with Master Plan and its implementation
Focus Group Meetings Summary

Focus Groups: The Master Plan includes an update of the market analysis completed in 2016 (in conjunction with the Auburn Road Corridor Study). As a part of this assessment, several small focus group discussions were facilitated by The Chesapeake Group (who also performed the 2016 analysis). The discussions involved the following groups:

- Major private sector employers
- Health care industry employers
- Major private sector employers in health care industry
- Collection of non-chain retailers
- Education and training entities
- Active developers and/or those who may be planning investments.
- Realtors (Residential and non-residential)
- Non Profit organizations providing social services

Synopsis from Interviews

Development - Residential

- Several small residential developments underway (12 to 57 units).
- Decreased demand at the upper end of the price spectrum ($600K)
- Condos are selling.
- Lot sizes now are smaller than previous developments.
- Mixed-use or mixing of uses most probable in future. "Attached" units being built and sold (condos).
- Redevelopment of old sites, such as former K Mart site, likely to include residential.
- Many of the employees of the manufacturing-oriented interests in the community may have trouble finding affordable housing in Rochester Hills.
- Population in the city is aging, which impacts housing supply and demand.
- Schools continue to be an asset with high achievement on test scores and college placements.
- Cost of building housing (and all other construction) rising, locally, statewide, and nationally. Increased density can offset some costs.

Development - Commercial Interests and Manufacturing/Industrial/Business

- Redevelopment is a key in the future.
- Unlikely to see much added off-campus development in the future by medical industry. Focus on wellness, virtual care, and taking wellness intervention to places of employment, schools, etc. as a way to avoid costly treatment of diseases once they evolve.
- A number of operations have their North American or regional headquarters in Rochester Hills.
- Many of the larger manufacturing employers are largely dependent on the auto industry. Attempts are being made by most to diversify client base.
- Finding quality, trained labor at all ends of the spectrum is a real challenge for many businesses, even when pay is significant.
- Attempts at internship and apprenticeships have met some success, but there are fundamental issues around the short-term return to employers, given the investment of time into training.
- Strong relationship between professional employment in the area and Oakland University (OU).
• There is much greater concern for traffic issues than physical road conditions, including congestion.
• Finding land and/or land assemblage is difficult in the city. There are perceived difficulties with future expansion of manufacturing and other industrial activity.
• Prices/cost of land relatively high compared to some other established and growing jurisdictions.
• OU controls a large amount of undeveloped land and it is likely that housing and related commercial could be expanded on campus, which is located in both Rochester Hills and Auburn Hills.

Emerging Potential Policy Issues
• Nurturing relationships with international manufacturing businesses in Rochester Hills could help not only bring jobs to the city, but also increase cultural opportunities.
• The city’s population is aging. Long-term policies may include aging in place and housing options more desirable for seniors. Additional services for seniors in the future should address mobility needs, walkability, continued growth in condos or other ownership options through homeowner or other organizations, and an expanded rental market. This transition will allow opportunities for growth of younger households.
• As a largely built-out community, growth for residential, commercial, and industrial uses will need to take place on formerly developed sites. Policies to encourage redevelopment should be explored to retain growth in the city as opposed to taking place elsewhere.
Preserve.

Enhance.

Diversify.

Master Plan.

What is worth preserving?
Everyone can probably identify at least one thing they love about Rochester Hills. Through the planning process, let's celebrate those things and explore strategies to preserve, strengthen, and protect them.

What needs work?
There may be areas in the city that need work. What are the things that should be enhanced, improved, and corrected to make the city a better place to live, work, and play?

What's missing?
The city offers more than “one size fits all” housing, jobs, and education. What is missing when it comes to offering a variety of cultural, social, and economic opportunities? The Master Plan will include strategies to help the city diversify.

Share Your Thoughts in 2018:
Open Houses + Picture This!™ + Online Survey + Crowd Polling

www.RochesterHills.org/MasterPlan
Master Plan Public Input

Online Survey

Over 700 people responded to the Master Plan’s online survey. Generally, people are satisfied with the overall quality of life in the city. A summary of the survey results is presented below.

Q1 The overall quality of life in Rochester Hills is:

- Excellent
- Above Average
- Average
- Below Average
- Poor
Q2 Please share three things you like most about the City of Rochester Hills:

Green Space Walking Paths Trails Clean Library Trees 
Rochester OPC Downtown Location 
Parks Events Schools Activities 
Shopping Businesses Community Government 
Safety Low Crime Safe Quality of Life Restaurants Services 
Family OPC Neighborhoods Proximity to Rochester Trees 
Crime Rate Nature Lots Safety Location 

Responses to these questions appear as “word clouds,” where the more frequently used words appear larger. For example, in terms of “likes,” popular responses include:

• Downtown 
• Parks 
• Schools 
• Green space 
• Trails 
• Safety 

Q3 What are three things you would improve in the City of Rochester Hills?

Community deer Lanes Construction Sidewalks 
Infrastructure Lights Stop Building Housing Police 
Development snow Removal Traffic 
Public Transportation Roads Businesses 
Parks Taxes Rochester Residents 
Green Space Water School Park Residential 

Popular responses to improvements include:

• Traffic 
• Development (comments suggested too much) 
• Roads 
• Sidewalks 
• Housing (comments suggested more variety needed)
Q4 What are the major challenges facing Rochester Hills? Check all that apply.

Note: “Other” concerns included: Increasing taxes, development impacts on neighborhoods, road conditions, and increasing deer/coyote populations.

Q5: How satisfied are you with the appearance of the following in Rochester Hills?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Very Unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial buildings</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
<td>64.90%</td>
<td>14.07%</td>
<td>7.38%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial and office parks</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>59.64%</td>
<td>20.80%</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>38.72%</td>
<td>50.56%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>5.99%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods</td>
<td>23.22%</td>
<td>64.62%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>6.15%</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Rd commercial corridor (south of Avon Road)</td>
<td>6.57%</td>
<td>41.26%</td>
<td>16.64%</td>
<td>29.65%</td>
<td>5.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tienken/Rochester commercial area</td>
<td>12.15%</td>
<td>54.05%</td>
<td>15.36%</td>
<td>16.20%</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livernois/Walton commercial area</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
<td>47.24%</td>
<td>15.98%</td>
<td>24.61%</td>
<td>5.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton/Adams commercial area</td>
<td>18.82%</td>
<td>55.62%</td>
<td>13.06%</td>
<td>9.55%</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams/M59 commercial area</td>
<td>10.83%</td>
<td>52.04%</td>
<td>19.13%</td>
<td>14.91%</td>
<td>3.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Road (Brooklands)</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
<td>20.09%</td>
<td><strong>41.88%</strong></td>
<td>26.35%</td>
<td>8.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, people tend to be satisfied with most of the city, especially with neighborhoods and parks. The highest response is noted in bold above. People seem to be split on the Rochester Road corridor, and while many do not have an opinion on the Auburn Road area, those who responded were mixed between satisfied and unsatisfied.
### Housing

**Q6** If you were to consider moving from your current home, does Rochester Hills provide what you want as you look for your next home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I can get that in Rochester Hills</th>
<th>I cannot get that in Rochester Hills</th>
<th>Not sure if I can get that in Rochester Hills</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A smaller home</td>
<td>53.32%</td>
<td>19.80%</td>
<td>19.22%</td>
<td>7.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A home with less maintenance on home/yard</td>
<td>63.72%</td>
<td>10.01%</td>
<td>20.46%</td>
<td>5.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A larger home</td>
<td>80.49%</td>
<td>4.62%</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
<td>13.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To live closer to family</td>
<td>28.55%</td>
<td>31.01%</td>
<td>5.07%</td>
<td>35.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To live closer to employment or school</td>
<td>44.36%</td>
<td>20.38%</td>
<td>6.21%</td>
<td>29.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To live closer to more outdoor recreation opportunities</td>
<td>70.29%</td>
<td>9.57%</td>
<td>10.29%</td>
<td>9.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To live closer to more cultural opportunities</td>
<td>39.62%</td>
<td>25.25%</td>
<td>21.34%</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To live in an area with more transportation options</td>
<td>7.42%</td>
<td>61.57%</td>
<td>19.07%</td>
<td>11.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q7** Based on your answers to Question 6, do you think you could find your preferred housing in your price range in Rochester Hills?
Question 9 asked whether the city offered enough housing choices to allow people to “age in community” and stay in the city as long as they wanted to. However, the comments offered by respondents suggested that affordability and appropriate size of housing are still important issues to be addressed.

**70% Yes**

**30% No**

In response to Question 10, an overwhelming percentage of respondents would recommend the city to friends as a good place to live. However, because people were not restricted to one answer, 33% also said they would not recommend the city, citing common concerns including congestion, housing costs, and the deer population.
Transportation

Q11: How often do you access the following destinations by walking or by bicycle, rather than in your car?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Hills Municipal Offices</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td>9.84%</td>
<td>18.38%</td>
<td>70.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
<td>26.52%</td>
<td>16.23%</td>
<td>48.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Hills Parks</td>
<td>16.40%</td>
<td>39.28%</td>
<td>13.81%</td>
<td>30.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Rochester</td>
<td>16.81%</td>
<td>29.57%</td>
<td>14.20%</td>
<td>39.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores and Other Businesses</td>
<td>15.42%</td>
<td>30.12%</td>
<td>21.18%</td>
<td>33.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Hills Schools</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>23.37%</td>
<td>15.53%</td>
<td>49.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland University</td>
<td>3.32%</td>
<td>13.56%</td>
<td>14.14%</td>
<td>68.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester College</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>5.51%</td>
<td>11.45%</td>
<td>81.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes of family and friends</td>
<td>20.35%</td>
<td>43.00%</td>
<td>13.85%</td>
<td>22.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q12 Do you use a private transportation service to travel in the City?

Q13 If so, which services do you use (Check all the apply):

- Uber or Lyft
- Taxi
- Limousine
- Private luxury car
- Other (please specify)
Q14 How many times per month do you use a private transportation service to travel in the city?

Q15 Which of the following do you feel are the three most pressing environmental issues facing Rochester Hills? Please pick only three.
Q16: Please indicate the extent to which you would encourage or discourage the following land uses in Rochester Hills in the future:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Encourage</th>
<th>Neither Encourage Nor Discourage</th>
<th>Discourage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small-scale retail shops</td>
<td>62.92%</td>
<td>23.60%</td>
<td>13.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating and drinking establishments</td>
<td>72.22%</td>
<td>14.44%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment facilities</td>
<td>63.33%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>14.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large offices/office parks</td>
<td>19.10%</td>
<td>34.83%</td>
<td>46.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small offices</td>
<td>47.13%</td>
<td>35.63%</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and open space</td>
<td>92.22%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development with a mix of uses, such as townhouses, offices, food, and shops</td>
<td>60.67%</td>
<td>23.60%</td>
<td>15.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public uses such as schools, libraries, and museums</td>
<td>78.65%</td>
<td>13.48%</td>
<td>7.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R &amp; D/light industrial</td>
<td>28.41%</td>
<td>31.82%</td>
<td>39.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General manufacturing</td>
<td>12.79%</td>
<td>27.91%</td>
<td>59.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17 Are there any goods and services not currently available in Rochester Hills that you would like to see offered in the City?

I do not believe the city is missing any goods or services

Goods and services I would like to see:

Splash Pad Water Rochester Hills Dining Restaurants SMART Options Public Transit Stores Community Costco Run Independent Entertainment Public Transportation
Questions 18-22 asked respondents to share a bit of information about themselves.

Q18 Please indicate your age group:

- Under 18 Years: [Bar Graph]
- 18 to 34 Years: [Bar Graph]
- 35-49 Years: [Bar Graph]
- 50 to 64 Years: [Bar Graph]
- 65 Years or Older: [Bar Graph]

Q19 What is your connection to Rochester Hills? Check all that apply.

- I live in Rochester Hills: [Bar Graph]
- I work in Rochester Hills: [Bar Graph]
- I own a business in...: [Bar Graph]
- I frequently patronize...: [Bar Graph]
- I frequently visit family...: [Bar Graph]
- I go to school in Rochester...: [Bar Graph]
- Other (please specify): [Bar Graph]
Q20 How long have you lived in Rochester Hills?

- Less than 1 year
- 1 - 5 years
- 6 - 15 years
- 16 - 25 years
- + 25 years

Q21 Since you moved to Rochester Hills, the quality of life in the city has:

- Improved
- Stayed the Same
- Declined

Q22 Please indicate how many people live in your home, including yourself:

- One
- Two
- Three to Five
- Six or More
Q23 Please indicate how much longer (in years) you are likely to live in Rochester Hills:

- Less than One
- One to Five
- Six to Ten
- Eleven to Fifteen
- Sixteen or More

Q24 What are the most important qualities you look for in a community? Select up to three.

- Trails
- Space
- Medical
- Safe
- Transportation
- Pick
- Quality of Life
- Library
- Hospital
- Property
- Safety
- GREEN Public
- Elected Roads
- Mayor
- OPC
- Proximity Traffic Safety
- Own Police Department

Q25 If you were in charge of Rochester Hills for a day, what is the first thing you would change?

- Tax Friendly Live Rochester Rd Mayor Speed Limit
- Community Infrastructure Sidewalks Deer Park
- Rid Traffic Commercial Roads Construction
- Development Auburn School Businesses
- Stop Building Public Transportation
- Green Space Rochester Hills Affordable Housing Increase
Rochester Hills Public Input Open House #1
The Public Input Open House for the Rochester Hills Master Plan was held on April 23, 2018, at Rochester College. Public notices were advertised on the city’s website and social media pages.

The meeting began with attendees viewing poster board information on subjects including technological and social change, communities for all ages and abilities, demographics, existing housing and national trends, transportation and mobility, housing and employment market assessment, natural features, three redevelopment sites, and previous visioning session summaries. Throughout the meeting, staff and the consulting team guided attendees through the poster board information and a presentation on the purpose of the Master Plan process was given near the end of the meeting. While viewing certain poster boards, participants were asked to provide general comments, as well as specific comments to questions asked about existing conditions, desired housing types, natural features, and the three redevelopment sites. Comments were recorded on note cards at each station and below is a summary of responses received based on each topic.
**Natural Features**
Maps relating to natural features were presented and two questions were asked. Five responded “Yes” that they value living in a community that protects its natural features. Two responded “Yes” that they believe the community is doing enough to help protect natural features, with two expressing doubt.

Favorite Natural Places/Parks:
- River
- Paint Creek Trail
- Dinosaur Hill
- Innovation Hill
- O.U. wetland
- Borden Park
- “My back yard”

**Housing**
The housing station summarized existing housing types and presented information about trends in housing choices as well as other housing types that might be beneficial for current and future residents.

**Desired Housing Types**
- Townhomes/Condominiums – 4 Yes
- Mixed-use communities with commercial on the ground level and residential on upper floors – 4 Yes
- Duplexes/multiple family with a single-family character – 2 Yes
- Accessory dwelling units – 1 Yes
- Senior living communities – 1 Yes

Other Desired Housing Types/Comments:
- Detached middle-market condos
- Low-rise, high-character condos
- Middle-market single-family
- Under $400K
- Ranch-style
- Triplex and Fourplex
- Convert Carson’s to apartments
- Smaller lot width in south end
- Adults with disabilities
Redevelopment Sites

Three redevelopment sites were identified by city staff and the Planning Commission to be studied as a part of this Master Plan Update. General location, future land use, and zoning maps were presented and attendees were asked to consider the following:

1. How should the Cardinal/Veteran’s Landfill Area Redevelop?
   - No more big boxes or medical buildings
   - Detached condos or ranch homes with manageable yards
   - Walkable neighborhood
   - Institutional uses or Live/Work

Redevelopment Site #1: Cardinal/Veteran’s Landfill Area
2. How should the Hamlin/Avon Landfill Area Redevelop?
- Revert to greenspace or recreation use
- Greenspace
- Recreation
- Walkways
- Minimize impact on watershed
- Minimize impervious surface
- Residential
- Pedestrian bridges to reduce traffic
- Low-traffic uses
- Residential
- Maintain hometown feel
- Garden plots for use by public and schools

3. How should the Bordine’s Site Redevelop?
- Single-family residential
- Low-density and low-traffic uses

Other comments:

Transportation Comments
- Expand transit
- Expand transportation connected to SMART
- Connect to SEMTA buses
- Historic trolley
- On-demand public transportation
- Privately-funded transit connecting O.U. to shopping
- Rail transit to airports
- Less reliance on Uber and car services
- Autonomous vehicles unlikely

Additional Comments
- Too many “McMansions”
- Need affordable housing
- Love the natural features and hometown feel
- Increase historic preservation efforts
- Community is safe, stable and has natural beauty
- Require LEED for new construction over 10,000 sq. ft.
Rochester Hills Public Input Open House #2

The Public Input Open House for the Rochester Hills Master Plan was held on September 13, 2018, at the Village of Rochester Hills. Public notices were advertised on the city’s website and social media pages.

Poster board stations provided summaries of proposed Future Land Use map changes, housing and redevelopment site concepts. Throughout the meeting, staff and the consulting team guided attendees through the stations. Several members of City Council and Planning Commission attended and helped the planning team engage visitors and answered questions. About thirty-four people attended this event. A short survey asked for specific feedback related to the stations; nine responses were submitted.

As a companion engagement tool, a “virtual open house” was developed as an online platform, providing an opportunity for those who could not attend the open house. Eleven responses were submitted online and an additional 9 responses were inputted for a total of 20 responses. While the total of 20 responses is not statistically significant, the comments made by participants were consistent with those made throughout the Master Plan process. Of particular note were the responses to the Redevelopment Site concepts.

**Redevelopment Site #1: Cardinal/Veteran's Landfill Area**

Corporate office park would be appropriate; some workforce housing and/or a mix of uses may be appropriate. Connections to the trail are important.

Question 1. If the City has the opportunity to amend the Consent Judgement in the future, how should this site be developed? (Check all that apply)

- Shopping Center—1 Response
- Keep 2004 Consent Judgment as-is—2 Responses
- Workforce or Live/Work Housing (intended for employees of local businesses)—3 Responses
- Corporate Office/Industrial Park—4 Responses
- Corporate Office Headquarters—5 Responses
- Mixed Use with Corporate Office Focus, Multiple Family Workforce Housing, and Limited Retail—5 Responses
- Other:
  1. “Let it go green with golf course”
  2. “Community center/sports stadium”
  3. “Not for housing”
  4. “Environmental remediation should be a significant consideration to clean the spaces”
  5. “Workforce, small retail, small housing. M-59 and Adams area is already way too busy. Also needs to be a trailhead, bathroom, and improvements to the Clinton River Trail in this area.”
Redevelopment Site #2: Hamlin/Avon Landfill Area
Recreation uses are preferred but energy generation could be appropriate if consistent with the surrounding uses.

Question 2. How should the city guide redevelopment of this site? (Check all that apply)
- Residential—1 Response
- Light Industrial: storage, warehouses, and light manufacturing—6 Responses
- Passive Recreation: open spaces, woodlands—6 Responses
- Energy Generation: solar, wind, and methane—8 Responses
- Active Recreation: indoor/outdoor sports fields, trails—10 Responses
- Mixed Use with Corporate Office Focus, Multiple Family Workforce Housing, and Limited Retail—5 Responses
- Other:
  1. “Would love to see a task force team started to figure out what to do with all these older subdivisions with no sidewalks to make walking and biking safer.”
  2. “All with walkable areas (sidewalks)”
  3. “We should avoid any use that exposes residents to the hazards that lie within or near this space. Homeowners surrounding this area should be made aware of the nearby environmental dangers.”

Redevelopment Site #3: Bordine’s
Respondents continue to support the retail-focused concept proposed several years ago, but many also would support a residential-focused concept.

Question 3. How should this site be redeveloped in the future?
- Suburban Shopping Center—0 Responses
- The Gardens of Rochester Hills concept: 300,000 sq. ft. of retail with a movie theatre and 72 housing units—3 Responses
- Walkable Retail Town Center similar to Village of Rochester Hills—5 Responses
- Other:
  1. “Affordable housing” —2 Responses
  2. “No to a walkable town center; too congested for more housing, traffic is terrible now.”
  3. “The area doesn’t need any of these options, surely not unless Rochester Road is widened.”

Question 4. Are there any other areas of the city that need attention/study?
- Rochester Road Traffic Management
- Area east of Reuter Middle School
- Aesthetics: sidewalks, lighting, street posts, green spaces, character
- Auburn Road from Dequindre to Livernois
- Heavy industry near the Ajax plant
- Lighting and street signs

Question 5. What do you think of allowing alternative housing like accessory dwellings or tiny homes?
- The city should allow only if the homeowner lives in one of the homes—1 Response
- The city should allow—3 Responses
- The city should not allow—5 Responses
- Let each neighborhood offer input regarding whether appropriate—7 Responses
- Other:
  1. “Homes with big lots could have guest house in back.”
  2. “Most lots are not large enough to include.”
  3. Should relate to high residential prices and high-paying jobs.
  4. “If they already exist, allow to stay.”
4th Grade Survey

As a part of their curriculum, the 4th graders in Rochester Hills schools make a visit to city hall each year to learn the basics of local government and how the city works. The Planning Department took this opportunity to share a bit about the Master Plan process and asked for students to give some thought to what they liked best about the city and what improvements they would make. Their top 20 responses are noted below (including the number of times each response was provided):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Are Your Favorite Places in the City?</th>
<th>What Do You Want in Your Neighborhood?</th>
<th>What Do You Want Near Your School?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My home/house/barn</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Park/nature preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Bigger playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Rochester</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>More trees/pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Theme/water park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie theater</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Baseball/soccer/football field/basketball court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Queen</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bigger Houses/ lots of houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamestop</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>My friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starbucks</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pets everywhere/ dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Starbucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizza places</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Arcade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakery/ Cupcake Station/ Knapps</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dog park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald's/ Burger King</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Happy people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibachi House Restaurant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ice cream shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Animal shelter where you can volunteer to help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ice cream truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Leaf</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gamestop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked, 45% of the 4th graders say they plan on living in Rochester Hills when they grow up. 28% are unsure and 28% say no.
NOTICE OF PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
CITY OF ROCHESTER HILLS
TO CONSIDER ADOPTION
OF THE 2018 MASTER LAND USE PLAN

In compliance with the provisions of Act No. 267 of the Public Act of 1976, the Open Meetings Act as amended, NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Rochester Hills Planning Commission will hold a Public Hearing on Tuesday, December 18, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall to consider adoption of the City’s updated Master Land Use Plan.

A copy of the Plan can be viewed on the City’s web page at www.rochesterhills.org/masterplan or at the Planning and Economic Development Department from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.

The public is encouraged to attend and join the City in its efforts. Citizen input is welcomed, and questions or comments may be directed to the Planning and Economic Development Department Staff at (248) 656-4660, or by email to planning@rochesterhills.org or to the Planning Commission at the Public Hearing.

The Master Plan will be forwarded to City Council after the Public Hearing.

Deborah Brnabic, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Dated this 28th day of November, 2018
At Rochester Hills, Michigan
Adopted by the Planning Commission at the January 29, 2019 Joint Meeting:

WHEREAS, the City of Rochester Hills Planning Commission may prepare and adopt a Master Plan for the physical development of the City, as empowered by the Michigan Planning Enabling Act of 2008; and

WHEREAS, the City of Rochester Hills established a Master Plan theme of “Preserve, Enhance and Diversify,” and contracted with a professional planning consultant to assist the Planning Commission with the technical assessments necessary to make the Master Plan for the City; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission and City Council held a joint meeting on January 17, 2018 to identify influencing themes for the Master Plan that included:

- Age-Friendly Community: The Master Plan should explore what it means to be an “age-friendly” community and provide current and future residents of all ages with a variety of options for housing, transportation, goods and services, and community facilities/resources.
- Sustainability: The Master Plan should direct growth, development, and redevelopment in ways that preserve natural features, reduce storm water runoff, and enhance non-motorized transportation.
- Transportation: While the city will begin updating its Thoroughfare Plan in early 2019, the Master Plan should support connectivity throughout the city and anticipate how changing technology will impact our mobility; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held two public open houses in conjunction with the development of the 2018 Master Plan Update on April 23, 2018 and September 15, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on its proposed 2018 Master Plan Update on December 18, 2018.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby adopts this Master Plan for the City, along with the text, maps, charts, graphs, and other descriptive materials contained in the Plan.

Voice Vote:

Ayes: All
Nays: None
Absent: Anzek

MOTION CARRIED
Request for Adoption of the 2018 Master Land Use Plan Update

Whereas, the City of Rochester Hills Planning Commission may prepare and adopt a Master Plan for the physical development of the City, as empowered by the Michigan Planning Enabling Act of 2008, and

Whereas, the City of Rochester Hills established a Master Plan theme of "Preserve, Enhance and Diversify" and contracted with a professional planning consultant to assist the Planning Commission with the technical assessments necessary to make the Master Plan for the City; and

Whereas, the Planning Commission and City Council held a joint meeting on January 17, 2018 to identify influencing themes for the Master Plan that included:

- Age-Friendly Community: The Master Plan should explore what it means to be an "age-friendly" community and provide current and future residents of all ages with a variety of options for housing, transportation, goods and services and community facilities/resources.

- Sustainability: The Master Plan should direct growth, development and redevelopment in ways that preserve natural features, reduce storm water runoff and enhance non-motorized transportation.

- Transportation: While the City will begin updating its Thoroughfare Plan in early 2019, the Master Plan should support connectivity throughout the City and anticipate how changing technology will impact our mobility; and

Whereas, the Planning Commission held two public open houses in conjunction with the development of the 2018 Master Plan Update on April 23, 2018 and September 15, 2018; and

Whereas, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on its proposed 2018 Master Plan Update on December 18, 2018; and

Whereas, the Planning Commission adopted the 2018 Master Plan Update on January 29, 2019.

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills City Council hereby adopts this Master Plan for the City, along with the text, maps, charts, graphs and other description materials contained in the Plan.

I, Tina Barton, City Clerk, certify that this is a true copy of RES0015-2019 passed at the Rochester Hills City Council Regular Meeting held on 2/11/2019 by the following vote:

Moved by Stephanie Morita, Seconded by Dale A. Hetrick

Aye: Bowyer, Deel, Hetrick, Kubicina, Morita, Tisdel and Walker

Tina Barton

Date Certified 2/13/19