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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)
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

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 that should be explored as part of the master plan update.

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

**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?

What needs work?

What’s missing?

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

[Bar chart showing the distribution of responses]
Questions 2 and 3 were open-ended and asked respondents to share three things they like most and three things they would improve in Rochester Hills.

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

Popular responses to improvements include:

- Traffic
- Development (comments suggested too much)
- Roads
- Sidewalks
- Housing (comments suggested more variety needed)
Lifestyle and/or cultural conflicts

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

Q4 What are the major challenges facing Rochester Hills? Check all that apply.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</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>41.88%</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?

![Bar chart showing percentages of yes, no, and not sure responses.]

City of Rochester Hills 2018 Master Plan — Visioning Meeting Summaries 19
Q8: Please indicate if you would encourage or discourage the following types of residential development in Rochester Hills in the future:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Development</th>
<th>Encourage</th>
<th>Neither Encourage Nor Discourage</th>
<th>Discourage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing for first-time homebuyers</td>
<td>52.46%</td>
<td>32.61%</td>
<td>14.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing for move-up or second-time homebuyers</td>
<td>65.64%</td>
<td>24.23%</td>
<td>10.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached single family homes</td>
<td>71.08%</td>
<td>18.46%</td>
<td>10.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached condominiums/townhouses</td>
<td>34.34%</td>
<td>29.29%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental apartments</td>
<td>15.13%</td>
<td>25.94%</td>
<td>58.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior housing</td>
<td>42.24%</td>
<td>36.21%</td>
<td>21.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted living</td>
<td>34.83%</td>
<td>40.17%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory dwellings (aka “Granny Flats”)</td>
<td>25.47%</td>
<td>43.96%</td>
<td>30.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments above retail or office uses</td>
<td>42.63%</td>
<td>32.95%</td>
<td>24.42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

89% Yes

33% No
**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><strong>39.28%</strong></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><strong>39.42%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores and Other Businesses</td>
<td>15.42%</td>
<td>30.12%</td>
<td>21.18%</td>
<td><strong>33.29%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Hills Schools</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>23.37%</td>
<td>15.53%</td>
<td><strong>49.35%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland University</td>
<td>3.32%</td>
<td>13.56%</td>
<td>14.14%</td>
<td><strong>68.98%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester College</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>5.51%</td>
<td>11.45%</td>
<td><strong>81.88%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes of family and friends</td>
<td>20.35%</td>
<td><strong>43.00%</strong></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?

![Graph showing the percentage of people who use private transportation services](image)

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?

Land Use and Natural Features

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
- Restaurants
- Stores
- Entertainment
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Questions 18-22 asked respondents to share a bit of information about themselves.

Q18 Please indicate your age group:

- Under 16 Years
- 18 to 34 Years
- 35-49 Years
- 50 to 64 Years
- 65 Years or Older

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

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

- Less than 1 year
- 1 - 5 years
- 5 - 10 years
- 10 - 25 years
- + 25 years

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

- Improved
- Stayed the Same
- Declined
- Don't know

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 Sixteen
- Fifteen 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 Trees
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 follow (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 61</td>
<td>Pool 82</td>
<td>Pets/animals 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks 45</td>
<td>Park/nature preserve 69</td>
<td>New/better playgrounds/parks 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village 32</td>
<td>Bigger playground 27</td>
<td>Trees 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Rochester 23</td>
<td>More trees/pond 27</td>
<td>Stores 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library 23</td>
<td>Theme/water park 20</td>
<td>Pool/hot tub 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie theater 21</td>
<td>Baseball/soccer/football field/basketball court 18</td>
<td>Starbucks 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Queen 20</td>
<td>Bigger Houses/lots of houses 15</td>
<td>A ferris wheel 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamestop 15</td>
<td>My friends 7</td>
<td>Arcade/laser tag 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starbucks 15</td>
<td>Pets everywhere/dogs 7</td>
<td>Pond/lake 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school 14</td>
<td>Starbucks 7</td>
<td>Football/baseball fields 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 14</td>
<td>Arcade 5</td>
<td>Nature center 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizza places 13</td>
<td>Dog park 5</td>
<td>Houses, more schools 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakery/Cupcake Station/Knapps 11</td>
<td>Animal shelter where you can volunteer to help 4</td>
<td>Trampoline 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald's/Burger King 9</td>
<td>Happy people 5</td>
<td>Dairy Queen/ice cream parlor 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibachi House Restaurant 8</td>
<td>Ice cream shop 5</td>
<td>Fair 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants 8</td>
<td>Trails 5</td>
<td>Ga Ga ball pit 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods 8</td>
<td>Animal shelter where you can volunteer to help 4</td>
<td>No dirt roads 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicks 7</td>
<td>Ice cream truck 4</td>
<td>Plants 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Leaf 7</td>
<td>A School 3</td>
<td>Supplies store 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool 7</td>
<td>Gamestop 3</td>
<td>McDonald's/Fast Food 5</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 2/13/19 Date Certified