

Excited About This Plan!! 4/4/25 15:49

"I am not able to attend the meeting in person, but would like to indicate my support for the proposed master plan! I believe the focus on walkability, green-space, mixed zoning, public transit, and multi-family housing will result in a more enriched, community-oriented city. My husband and I chose Royal Oak as the city in which we want to raise our children because, while it is a suburb, it has more of a city feel (feels more like the outer neighborhoods of Chicago—e.g., near O’Hare—than the sprawling lawns and subdivisions of Farmington Hills or Troy). We love that we can walk to a few restaurants within 15 minutes and a bustling downtown on Main Street within half an hour. We are extremely excited at the prospect of making those walks more pedestrian-friendly with greenways and having an activity center with more non-industrial businesses even closer to our home (Bellaire Ave by Kroger Marketplace)!! I appreciate the detail and focus on creating a more people- and community-oriented (as opposed to car-oriented) city by utilizing greenways and physical barriers/cues for drivers to think more about pedestrians (like the road diets). Can’t wait for this vision to be executed in Royal Oak (wish we could fast forward through the construction part though)!!"

Support for Master Plan 4/4/25 13:41

I think this plan represents a set of smart and realistic future steps for the city of Royal Oak to continue improving and make itself a leader in Metro Detroit and the state of Michigan. As a Royal Oak homeowner I support changes that will make this city healthier and more sustainable.

Lack of city park in SW area of RO 4/4/25 1:27

As a city with many parks and a mandate, from long ago, that all children in Royal Oak should have access to a park without crossing a 'main road', we in SW Royal Oak do not have one. There is no park south of 11 Mile and West of Main Street. The closest parks are Meininger at Maxwell and Farnum, and Grant Park at 4th and Kayser. There is a lone small wooden play structure that was placed on a few feet of grass, on West St, when the Lafayette Parking Structure was built - it has fallen into disrepair and is now partially boarded up. Should space and funds permit, it would be wonderful to see a park established in this part of the city. I do believe this may be the last area of the city without a park. Adding this as a goal in the city's Master Plan would be a good step in this direction.

Single Family Homes 3/28/25 17:55

It's sad that you have not considered the cause of this country being transformed into a serfdom. Spreading the wealth is the business of government, not accommodation of capitalism. Although, single family homes are nice to live in, their existence is a manifestation of wealth being spread. A reality not lost on those who don't want to share, and a fundamental basis for human interaction. What does this have to do with a Master Plan? I would suggest that it has everything to do with it.

Bicycles 3/28/25 17:43

Bicycle lanes should not be allowed on roads that have a speed limit of 35mph or higher. They create a dangerous situation for cyclists and most likely would result in liability for the motorist. The environmental impact of this approach seems to be nil. Moreover, focusing on the damage auto emissions cause would have a much greater impact on the environment.

Even more comments 3/27/25 18:19

Please protect green spaces with a dedicated Zone! Build a green corridor or linear park system connecting Starr Jaycee Park - Arboretum - Quickstad - Normandy Oaks, and Red Run park - Wagner park, etc. Create more “pocket parks” and traffic-calmed streets with gardens and tree canopy, and bioswale included in the green space. Add stormwater features like bioswales, permeable pavers, and rain gardens for climate resilience. Extend walkable, mixed-use zoning along Woodward Ave, Main St, and 11 Mile! “Stitch” together downtown with nearby areas (like North Main or the neighborhoods south of 10 Mile) using pedestrian-priority infrastructure and small-scale development. Encourage corner stores, cafes, bakeries, and apartments in existing residential areas — European-style mixed-use “gentle density.” Permit duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, courtyard apartments, and ADUs by right, in all neighborhoods — with even more density near transit or downtown. Incentivize co-housing, community land trusts, and mid-sized multifamily housing that blends into neighborhoods. Use design guidelines to maintain character without excluding density. Make the Amtrak station a mobility hub: bike share, bus integration, EV charging. Support regional BRT or light rail along Woodward (Royal Oak is the perfect anchor). Diet the half-mile roads or others into shared streets or woonerven (Dutch-style slow streets) in residential areas (Gardenia, Catalpa, Lincoln, Webster, Farnum, Girard, Normandy). In downtown, encourage architecture with variety, DETAIL(!), and color — not just glass and gray (or flat&colored) boxes. Add in city center area (including at the edge of the city centre core zone) public art, sculpture parks, fountains, and DECORATIVE PAVING like in European plazas. Adopt a “Strong Towns” financial model: prioritize incremental development that pays for itself, not mega-projects or sprawl. Track return on infrastructure investment per acre, and encourage small-scale infill. Use land value taxation or split-rate taxes to encourage denser development on underutilized parcels. Hold neighborhood-level design workshops for future development. Let residents co-create park improvements, mobility plans, and zoning updates. Make the city’s financial and planning data public and visual, like Zürich’s dashboards. Adopt a strategy forcing the administration to work towards making every neighborhood self-sufficient with grocery, school, café, green space, and transit within a 15-minute walk or bike ride.

a few more comments i forgot in the previous message 3/26/25 16:01

A few more ideas, I wish the new planning strategy for the city: 1. will allow people to convert a single-family home into a duplex or triplex by right, in at least 80% of the city surface area (everywhere, exceptions for the Vinsetta/OneFamily overlays only) 2. will permit backyard cottages in all residential zones (everywhere, exceptions for the Vinsetta/OneFamily overlays only) 3. will ALLOW starter homes as legal in all residential zones (small, affordable homes, typically for first-time buyers but not by subsidies or force in some projects, but by homeowner citizens free will) 4. eliminate ALL minimum lot size requirements in existing neighborhoods 5. reduce the parking requirements even more, from 1.3 to 1 parking per apartment. 6. ensure and legally force the local administration to offer approval for a duplex or triplex, a starter home, or a backyard cottage in less than 24 hours.

Master Plan Revision 2 Diverging Themes 3/24/25 18:59

Why is the Master Plan indicating for "road calming and diets" which are prime indicators of population decline, but are promoting more high density housing development to meet "demands". High density high rises are not the solution for stagnant or declining population. These are diverging themes. The overall Master Plan is gravely challenged.

Section 4 Draft Revision 2 3/24/25 18:50

Section 4 is the exact opposite to what is stated in "Main Streets" in the previous sections. The "Main Street" section needs to be removed. Also placing renderings on top of images by the City or their consultants of current existing privately owned land is a grave mistake. The consultants who are in charge of the "Master Plan" are obviously unprofessional and not compassionate for others.

Section 3 Actions Rev2 Master Plan 3/24/25 18:42

Updating zoning codes and zoning incentives is not best approach for multi-use housing and is ill advised. It does not promote a level playing field for all and will lead to further corruption within the City

Section 3 Housing Options 3/24/25 18:37

The ADU portion of Section is not applicable to Royal Oak since they allowed residents to have residential properties encompass the entire a lot. Simply put, Royal Oak has too many Big Foot Houses/Mansions to have ADU's be a viable option. 10 to 20 years ago the City changed the laws and ordinances and now were stuck with big houses dwarfing single family ranches. Implementing additional mid to high rise buildings is not the answer to the housing "challenge" The City of Royal Oak got greedy collecting all the tax dollars from the McMansions and now their stuck. The best solution would be instead of knocking down one story "right sized" single family homes would be to knocking down some of the McMansions so they could provide additional ADU's. City of Royal Oak needs to stop handing out variances to developers because large footprint structures bring increased environmental challenges/impacts that are highlighted in this report.

Sustainability REV 2 3/24/25 18:25

The "action" of proposing a law where two separate trucks one for garbage and one for recycling (2.5.2) is trash. Obviously the consultants are not knowledgeable that there are two different trucks for recycling and refuse already. 2.6 Actions listed are hilarious because everyone knows the tree canopy has dwindled in Royal Oak since all the development. Conducting a study is not needed. Look on Aerial map from years past and compare to current. The outcome will become apparent. The consultants developing the Master Plan are stretching for work. It is believed the people developing this "Master Plan" should actually do work instead of providing a "boiler plate" Master Plant to the City of Royal Oak.

Neighborhood Main Street 3/24/25 18:17

The proposed Neighborhood Main Streets at multiple intersections is unwanted and unnecessary especially where they're proposed (e.g 13 Mile and Crooks and 13 Mile and Rochester as two examples). These intersections have never done well from a business perspective and redeveloping them is not the solution. This would be a waste of investment and tax dollars. Expanding these areas over a .25 in all directions is not nor needed. Again Royal Oak, is trying to be something their not or using ideas from other cities. If they continue to use the same ideas of others the outcome will be the same with the exact same humans populating which is not good for society in general. There are other models and unique ideas residents have, but are not taken seriously because we're not getting "paid" to create the Master Plan yet we're paying for it. If Royal Oak was smart they should be focusing on buffering zones of greenspace and nature and stop focusing on high density models from 20 years ago. Michigan's population is stagant or declining. Why is the City attempting to build for a non-existent population. Look at Detroit, they built on these new high density and "Main Streets". They're all more than half empty and unused because they were built by people from outside the City who do not know what the people in City need or want.

Neighborhood Main Street 3/24/25 18:10

The proposed Neighborhood Main Streets at multiple intersections is unwanted and unnecessary especially where they're proposed (e.g 13 Mile and Crooks and 13 Mile and Rochester as two examples). These intersections have never done well from a business perspective and redeveloping them is not the solution. This would be a waste of investment and tax dollars. Expanding these areas over a .25 in all directions is not nor needed. Again Royal Oak, is trying to be something their not or using ideas from other cities. If they continue to use the same ideas of others the outcome will be the same with the exact same humans populating which is not good for society in general. There are other models and unique ideas residents have, but are not taken seriously because we're not getting "paid" to create the Master Plan yet we're paying for it. If Royal Oak was smart they should be focusing on buffering zones of greenspace and nature and stop focusing on high density models from 20 years ago. Michigan's population is stagant or declining. Why is the City attempting to build for a non-existent population. Look at Detroit, they built on these new high density and "Main Streets". They're all more than half empty and unused because they were built by people from outside the City who do not know what the people in City need or want.

Master Plan Revision 2 - Delemere and Bellaire Areas 3/24/25 17:54

Royal Oak will be doing an disservice to the residents if they intend on turning all the industrial areas of Delemere and Bellaire into residential. It is suggested that Royal Oak continue with diverse areas within the City. In the future there may be more "industrial and manufacturing" coming to the MidWest and it would be ill advised for Royal Oak NOT to have ANY options. Royal Oak already decimated the Southern Industrial Area two decades ago. If they continue to do this to the remaining to industrial areas, it will hinder Royal Oak economically as it will be dependent on mainly retail and healthcare as they main sources of income for residents which is not an intelligent model. A better solution to the areas would be "Cleaner" Industrial and Manufacturing areas. This can be achieved with current and future industrial and manufacturing technologies. Developing Delemere into a "Main Street" hub is again unintelligent. Not everyone in Royal Oak wants the identical surroundings and unfortunately this Master Plan is boring and ho-hum as it is trying to implement the same things that Southern Royal Oak already has. Royal Oak will not ever have enough population two support TWO "Main Streets". This Main Street Plan is two decades old and does not align with what future is going to be in Royal Oak.

Master Plan Revision 2 Comments - 13 Mile Corridor 3/24/25 17:36

The proposed 13 Mile Corridor being change to mixed use from West to East City limits is absurd. There are gigantic residential structures the City of Royal Oak has approved with variances and now the Master Plan is asking for mixed use development up and down 13 Mile. Not a wise move attempting to cater to only one demographic. North West and North East Royal Oak should remain different compared to be has been done to downtown/Southern Royal Oak. That's what attracts people to Royal Oak. No one is going to want to reside in Royal Oak if it looks exactly the same. Royal Oak needs to take their blinders off and stop trying to be a City that their not. If this goes through for the Master Plan, it will be a loss for everyone. There are better alternatives. Feel free to contact if you want to learn more as the consultants hired to do this Master Plan Study "copied and pasted it" from Ann Arbor or Detroit, or some other SE Michigan suburb. Unfortunately, that's what the consultants and developers want because it's easy money for them. The residents don't want it and is a waste of the money. Instead of having consultants and developers produce the Master Plan it should solely come from the residents who live there and ultimately will have to live with the decisions because they are directly affected. The developers and consultants do not care because it only affects their pocket books.

Masterplan comments 3/24/25 11:51

There are citizens that are not NIMBYs and the current masterplan does seem very accommodating to their opinions. (it's democracy and if they are more than us YIMBYs, then so be it, but to add to the counts for my position, i must voice my concerns also) Things i would see differently on the new masterplan (i wish i could add images, but here it goes, long text): 1) Single Family Zones i would see reduced. Don't go full Ferndale, but they would be protected in: 1a) to Vinsetta Boulevard (whole of the street, plus the Vinsetta overlay), 1b) to One Family Overlay 1c) One Family Large Lots 1d) Cul-De-Sacs (Alicia Ct, Lakeside, Symes Ct etc) 1e) curved, slow inner streets (eg. Bembridge rd, Verona Cir, Sheffield rd, Seminole dr etc) 1f) maybe... inner areas not adjacent to main roads (eg. taking the area between 11mi rd - 12 mi rd and Campbell rd - Main Rd: everything would remain one-Family as proposed on inner streets of this 1 sq mi area, as long as property is not adjacent to any main road, so remains single family zoning for inner streets for all lots not touching Campbell, Main, 11 mile, 12 mile road, and also neither Rochester road. Then, for other smaller but important roads, like Farnum or Gardenia, allow up to fourplexes residential. Also, for anything adjacent to a park, allow at least fourplexes residential. 2) Two Family i would see replaced with up to quad, Fourplexes, since we want to encourage missing middle. + maybe include Neighborhood business in this zone. Allow minimum this on all residential lots adjacent to main roads

(where i include half mile roads). Or maybe, similar to Warren's masterplan, have a "traditional residential" group, where you allow attached housing styles that blend in, and are fairly similar in scale (+ 1-2 floors) to the surroundings, entrance locations that mimic single-family units; and landscaping for privacy to reinforce seamless integration Having 15 categories of zones definitely sounds like overregulation to me, and added administrative costs. I don't see the value of a separate Office Service zone, esp if we want a multi-polar, multi-use city, with shorter commutes and less car dependency. Furthermore, Neighborhood Business could be allowed on all main roads in residential areas, where 2) Two Family i mentioned above (maybe even include both into one zone, maybe keep them separate), without NB1 and NB2, and then having another General/Regional Business (together), and Mixed Use 1 and 2 going from 6 zones to just 3.

Master Plan Housing Types 3/22/25 21:15

Hello, My name is Brock Bosack, and I'm a resident of Royal Oak. I want to express my support for the Proposed Master Plan. This comprehensive plan aligns with my future vision of Royal Oak: a sustainable city, with plentiful housing, easy to traverse even without a car. I'm particularly pleased with the plan's focus on increasing types of housing available to property owners and reducing parking requirements: actions like these are important to keep housing affordable enough that folks who work in Royal Oak can live in Royal Oak. Additionally, this plan maps actions the city can take to reduce our environmental impact which I whole-heartedly support, as I believe reducing climate change should be a high priority for the city. Finally, I appreciate the plan's emphasis on improving non-motorized infrastructure. When we make it easier to travel without a car, we can reduce congestion, lower emissions, and make our city more accessible. I believe this Proposed Master Plan could have a lasting positive impact on our community and look forward to its approval and then successful implementation. PS. Most of my friends and colleagues (all under 40) strongly agree with the sentiments above. Seeing as the master plan is geared toward the next few decades, I think the opinions of younger citizens should be taken into account over a vocal minority of citizens (typically older) who seem to oppose any types of change. In my opinion, Royal Oak went from a small town to a vibrant city over the last few decades thanks to careful planning geared toward sustainable growth, and this master plan would continue in that direction over the next few decades.

- 3/16/25 17:37

Hello! I am a long time resident of Royal Oak and I fully support this latest version of the master plan. I hope it gets positive votes from the committee. I believe this version lines up with my vision for a sustainable city going forward. We need more rain gardens, composting, and bringing our city buildings to be more energy efficient in the future. It also provides a path for affordable housing so that anyone from anywhere can move to Royal Oak, so that the people that work in the city can also live here, and Seniors can afford to stay in their homes as long as they want. All while allowing for more dense housing and also protecting the character of our beloved single-family home neighborhoods. I also appreciate the path towards a more walkable and bike able city. I like the plan's emphasis on improving non-motorized infrastructure. When we make it easier to travel without a car, we can reduce congestion, lower emissions, and make our city more accessible. Please enact the new Master Plan. My household will be happy!

Support For Master Plan 3/16/25 2:00

Hello, My name is Joshua Light, and I'm a resident of Royal Oak. I want to express my support for the Master Plan. The plan aligns with my future vision of Royal Oak: a sustainable city, with plentiful housing, accessible to individuals of all ages, backgrounds, and physical abilities, and easy to traverse even without a car. I'm pleased with the plan's focus on increasing types of housing available to property owners and reducing parking requirements. I bought my home when rates were low before the inflation that followed the COVID19 Pandemic; I could not afford to purchase my same home today due to inflation, increasing home prices, and increasing mortgage rates. The privilege that I have as a homeowner makes me really empathize with future generations of homeowners, and places a huge importance for me on the actions that Royal Oak has laid out in the plan to improve housing affordability. This plan has actions the city can take to reduce our environmental impact which is important to me as well. Reducing climate change should be a high priority for the city. I appreciate the plan's emphasis on improving non-motorized infrastructure. When we make it easier to travel without a car, we can reduce congestion, lower emissions, and make our city more accessible. I know it is not always a popular decision, but I applaud the road narrowing and bike lane additions. I live off of Lincoln, and I appreciate the additional cross walks and road narrowing to make it a more pedestrian friendly road that I am happy to walk to downtown. Americans need cars to get to school and work, but more than anything we need transportation choice to be able to walk, bike, ride a bus, or drive a car depending on the trip. Transportation choice is better for the environment and for individuals health. I believe this Proposed Master Plan will have a lasting positive impact on our community and support its approval and implementation. Thank you for your time!

Proposed Master Plan 3/16/25 0:34

My name is Steve Philips and I've been a resident of Royal Oak since 1985. I support the Proposed Master Plan. I want to thank you for all the hard work in developing the plan. Royal Oak needs more housing & more apartments. It needs to be walkable & needs better access to public transportation. We need to be an affordable city to live in. We need to reduce parking requirements & make it easier just to park on our public streets. We have too many parking lots that remain vacant most of the time. I think reducing climate change should be a high priority for the city. I appreciate the plan's emphasis on improving non-motorized infrastructure and public transportation. When we make it easier to travel without a car, we can reduce congestion, lower emissions, and make our city more accessible. This Proposed Master Plan will have a positive impact on our city and I look forward to its approval and implementation. Thank you, again.

- 3/12/25 2:19

I'm a resident of Royal Oak writing to express my support for the Proposed Master Plan. This comprehensive plan aligns with my future vision of Royal Oak: a sustainable city, with plentiful housing, easy to traverse even without a car. I'm particularly pleased with the plan's focus on increasing types of housing available to property owners and reducing parking requirements: actions like these are important to keep housing affordable enough that folks who work in Royal Oak can live in Royal Oak. Additionally, this plan maps actions the city can take to reduce our environmental impact which I whole-heartedly support, as I believe reducing climate change should be a high priority for the city. Finally, I appreciate the plan's emphasis on improving non-motorized infrastructure. When we make it easier to travel without a car, we can reduce congestion, lower emissions, and make our city more accessible. I believe this Proposed Master Plan could have a lasting positive impact on our community and look forward to its approval and then successful implementation.

Bike Lanes 2/16/25 17:22

1. Woodward is a historical road. It is also a highway. question #1-how will parking demand be reduced? question #2- How can rear setbacks be reduced? 2. Under Objectives - kindly explain how #1, #4, and #5 will be accomplished. 3. I was at the Woodward charrette. We had ONE hour to do a Q&A. The first 45 minutes was taken up by two people, one from Ferndale and one from Birmingham. They explained how the changes on Woodward would improve their downtowns, which are on both sides of Woodward. The last 15 minutes was for Q&A, which never happened. The 2 lawyers at the meeting got into a verbal battle and the meeting broke up when one lawyer lunged at lawyer #2. The attendees were told another meeting would be arranged. NEVER HAPPENED! FERNDAL AND BIRMINGHAM DOWNTOWNS ARE CONNECTED TO WOODWARD, Royal Oak is not. In talking to my neighborhood, many want to see more greenbelting along Woodward like what Birmingham has done north of Maple (15 Mile). Thank you.

Bike Lanes 2/16/25 17:22

All bike lanes need to be protected. I have been hit by a car while biking in Royal Oak because I had to share a lane with a motor vehicle. Follow the lead of Detroit - put the bike lanes between the curb and the parked cars. If this is not possible then use plastic uprights as Detroit has done along Jefferson and Michigan Ave to at least give drivers a visual cue that cyclist are present.

Municipal Solar 2/16/25 17:15

Solar panels should be installed on the highest level of all parking decks. This space is generally under utilized. Solar panels can be mounted on the deck surface or elevated for cars to park underneath. See MSU parking Lot 91 as an example. Power to be used for EV or e-Bike charging

- 2/9/25 15:26

Thank you for being so transparent in this long and speed bump riddled process! I like the way the public has had input along the way and it is visible in the changes made from the first draft to this last draft. This last draft does not fully satisfy all my desires for the future of our great city, but has enough of them for me to be happy to support this final draft! I like the way sustainability is promoted in this draft. I like the way public transit is addressed and promoted. I like the way housing for all is highlighted. I also like the way single family neighborhoods are protected while also finding ways to promote affordable housing. Thank You for seeing and hearing our residents and their concerns throughout the process!

RO Master Plan - from Troy 2/7/25 16:25

Love the Master Plan aiming for more density and emphasizing sustainability. As a resident of Troy who frequently visits Royal Oak, I wish we had the same kind of urban vision from our leaders in our city. Where Troy has an edge over Royal Oak is on resident racial, ethnic and immigrant diversity, and on the quality of schools, two factors which are highly correlated. I do not see any headings on these topics. What are immigrants looking for in city living? Does the Master Plan provide for that. I would encourage you, to fully maximize the potential of R.O., to see how urban planning can better meet the needs of immigrants, not simply a U.S.-centric view of desirable living.

Two Comments about Transit 1/27/25 16:42

1) On page 94 it says, "A new transit center would provide more convenient, safer and winter-friendly access to trains, a streamlined transfer to buses . . ." I would hope the plan envisions a space where people waiting for the bus will be protected from the elements AT ALL HOURS that the buses run, preferably in an in-door space. Currently, a person can wait inside the Royal Oak Transit Center during business hours only. If not inside, at least protected from the wind during winter. 2) On page 94 it says, "6.13.2 Improve bus stops with seating, shelters, and accessible waiting areas." From what I've seen, few people take the bus into Royal Oak's city center to go to the library, the Farmers Market, Centennial Commons, or the downtown restaurants. If that changes (especially, if the City promotes that), I would particularly support Action 6.13.2 along Eleven Mile in downtown near the library and the Farmers Market. While it is impossible to improve seating and shelter at all stops, there should be at least one stop along Eleven Mile in downtown with good seating (and hopefully, shelter). p.s. I know this is trivial, but here are some typos I saw: -- page 7, bottom of left-hand column: It says "extend". I think "extent" was meant. - page 28, right-hand column at end of paragraph: It says "tall ground flood". I think "floor" was meant. -- page 33, in paragraph 2.5.5: It says "Reserach" instead of "Research" -- page 62, right-hand column next to the red "See Figure 37": It says "on street diabled parking". Probably meant "disabled"

Master Plan comment 1/9/25 19:47

Preserve & protect Single-Family Zoning Counter the YIMBY arguments: “Yes in my backyard” (YIMBY group) believes that affordable housing needs to be constructed as we have a shortage in this country. They believe that Single -Family zoning should end with its protection. They believe that constructing more housing will drive up the supply and lower the housing costs. These are the reasons why the YIMBY belief is flawed. Royal Oak not the only place to live: Royal Oak is abutting 11 different cities, and most are more affordable than Royal Oak. If RO was the only city in a vast rural area, to construct, then it would be a legitimate to change the codes. The Single Zoning is currently in existence is not something being contemplated: To do this would be unfair to homeowners that currently live in these protected areas. We bought our homes in Single-Family zones, not “neighborhood Zoning”. I don’t understand why the City can masterplan & change our existing zoning without a fair legal process. Royal Oak’s added housing will be top end only and not qualify as “affordable”: This has been proven. Cost of property, cost of construction in Royal Oak will make any new housing at the top of the housing cost to buy or rent.

Single Family Homes 1/9/25 15:04

Your data states that that people want houses. Your solution is to add ADUs and townhouses. Maybe you can't read. As for ADUs the end result is the properties become more expensive. You guarantee that housing will be more unaffordable. But the builders and landlords will be happy.

- 1/8/25 21:14

Royal Oak has to stop people from congregating in Woodward parking lots like gas stations, and the Woodward Corners shopping center. If the weather is at all nice they are constantly noisy and hard to navigate if you need to use the lot. The city should ban overnight parking on all streets. The city should allow 8 foot fences between houses and allow nice looking concrete walls.

Thank you for prioritizing pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users 1/8/25 15:34

Hello: Thank you for continuing to address denser housing (especially "missing middle" housing), wider sidewalks, and reducing car-dependent design in the master plan. I've lived in downtown Royal Oak for 18 years and have enjoyed watching the city evolve. Please continue along this path--I truly believe that Royal Oak can set an example for other Michigan cities by taking bold steps like the ones outlined in the plan. I especially liked seeing the proposed changes for 11 Mile. Please make this narrower and slower so crossing it isn't such a stressful experience, especially for those of us who can't move as quickly. Best, Anna Shih

Neighborhood Main Street at 13 and Main 1/8/25 14:53

Hello again, I just looked over the future land use, and noticed something crucial is missing. The commercial properties on Main Street between E Lawrence and 13 Mile should absolutely be designated as Neighborhood Main Street. If the 7-Eleven at the northwest corner of 13 Mile and Main can be designated as neighborhood Main Street, the main-street-esque buildings just north of Lawrence should also be designated this way. Thank You

Request for Historic District Protections and Higher Standards for Neighborhood Nodes 1/8/25 14:47

As a community member invested in the future of Royal Oak, I appreciate the effort and thought going into the development of the new master plan. I would like to suggest that the plan include historic district protections or establish higher design and development standards for specific neighborhood nodes. These nodes are central to the character, history, and identity of Royal Oak’s neighborhoods, and preserving their unique attributes can help maintain the charm and vibrancy of our community. I would like to specifically highlight the following intersections for consideration: - 13 Mile and Rochester - 13 Mile and Main Street - Rochester and Bauman - Catalpa and Fernwood - Lincoln and Rembrandt - Crooks and Edgewood - Crooks and Webster - 14 Mile and Delemere - 13 Mile and Campbell/Windemere - 13 Mile near Greenfield By implementing historic district protections or higher standards in these areas, the city can guide future development while honoring the architectural and cultural heritage of these neighborhoods. Strategies such as architectural guidelines, incentives for preservation, and community-centered planning could make a meaningful impact. Holding these nodes to a higher standard can create new and unique opportunities for Royal Oak to have more walkable and boutique-like commercial areas for smaller businesses to thrive.

Great Detail 1/8/25 14:11

Overall I think this plan is designed well. I enjoy seeing what the future of our city could be! Side note, I believe there is a typo in the draft document (12/06/24) on page 18. The word "apartment" is used but I believe you meant to use "apparent".

Draft master plan 12/10/24 3:11

In its current state, should the draft master plan be being used now by city leaders for decision making if it is not yet adopted or implemented? According to the website, that is the next stage not the current stage? (Or is the website not updated yet?)

Density is Good 9/30/24 20:46

Thank you for developing a plan to add missing-middle housing, remove parking minimums, and support public transit. These are all great steps to enhance density, which also promotes: -A more walkable community, benefiting the health and sociability of residents while reducing vehicle use and emissions. -Lowering housing costs by increasing supply, especially important in the context of the national housing crisis. -Increasing energy efficiency for new structures while proportionally reducing the amount of costly infrastructure (roads, powerlines, sewage, etc.) required to maintain them. -Creating more local business opportunities as additional potential customers live closer to downtown and other commercial areas. -And more. I would like to encourage you to go further. Maximum building heights, additional zoning restrictions, and other barriers to density can threaten to undo all of this, even when well-meaning. I understand some of these may be necessary as compromise is inherent to politics. But that is why I felt it important to voice my support as a resident of Royal Oak for a pro-density plan. Thank you for your time, Zachary Pauley

Neighborhood Greenways and Affordable Housing 9/27/24 20:35

I love the idea of neighborhood greenways that can provide sheltered bike and pedestrian uses similar to Clinton River Trail, Paint Creek Trail, Polly Ann Trail, Macomb Orchard Trail, etc. There are many areas in Metro Detroit that have better outdoor activity infrastructure than Royal Oak. As a potential homebuyer in the area I am specifically looking for those amenities. I specifically think that a greenway initiative would make me purchase a home in Royal Oak. On the suggested map I think there needs to be added greenways across 11, 12 and 13 mile. I think trails leading off the city lines should show possible location endings. Ex: East 12 mile leads to large region employers (GM, TACOM, etc). I'd like to see what specific neighboring assets these trails could lead to. A fun fact for you, if Southeast Oakland County was its own 6x6mi township it would contain ~208,000 people, making it the 2nd largest city in Michigan; larger than Grand Rapids! Royal Oak can be the anchor for region and that starts with non-auto transportation infrastructure and increasing the overall and affordable housing stock. One possible method to increase affordable housing stock at low cost would be to have the City of Royal Oak purchase land currently zoned for manufacturing or commercial use and the rezone it as mixed use or multifamily housing and allow developers to lease the land for free and develop housing as long as it is affordable. This keeps startup costs for developers cheap and allows the city to own these assets long term. I think parking minimums should be removed to allow more density into the city and make development easier. I think the draft proposal should go farther at addressing this as a goal. 2050 is a ways away and we should get in line with other Michigan cities who have made that leap. Thanks!

master plan - draft 1 9/16/24 1:03

Hello City of RO leaders - thank you for the due diligence on getting the master plan draft 1 out recently. There are some opposition groups who have raised concerns regarding the reclassification of single-family zoned neighborhoods to "neighborhood residential". I must say I also find this peculiar, because the RO webpage states that the master plan "does not change zoning"...which seems contradictory to the document changing the name. Can you please comment on this discrepancy, as well as why the change in names? Again, the opposition groups are stating that this would enable zoning changes to our neighborhoods, making way for multi-person/family units throughout the city, less restrictions on parking requirements, and even less governance when such changes are proposed/approved. Thank you for sharing your perspectives. Frank

Master Plan 9/12/24 11:52

At Genesis the Church, we are excited to see the initiatives and the visionary energy being put forth in the Master Plan. I would love an opportunity to dialogue with someone about the "best use"opportunities for our footprint, as we are situated in the "red" district of downtown. The timing for this conversation aligns with us well, as we are developing our Ten Year Vision. We are key stakeholders in the Royal Oak Community and are a value add to the community.

Elk's Park - Adjacent to Normandy Oaks 9/8/24 16:57

Thank you for taking the time to read my comment! I am a fellow Royal Oak resident in my late 20's that resides in the Starr Acres neighborhood off of Normandy and Woodland Ave. My husband and I absolutely LOVE all of the nature preservation and walking paths created at Normandy Oaks park. It's stunning! That being said, right next to Normandy Oaks park is the older Elks Park that is major need of some TLC. With the rise in popularity of pickleball, it would be amazing to see the dilapidated tennis courts refurbished to be safe for residents to play on. Along with that, the equally run-down basketball courts are being utilized constantly by children and adults alike. It would be amazing to see more courts added in and refurbished for their safety. Normandy Oaks park is such a shining gem, our whole community easily pours over into Elks Park. I know I speak for all my fellow neighbors when I say that it would be such a gift to see it equally refurbished and safe for the amount of use it gets in a daily basis. I would love to speak further with someone on this topic if needed so we can learn more about the plans for Elks park! Thank you for your time and I look forward to hearing back.

- 9/8/24 13:35

I read the entire first draft. I fully support the vision presented and the actions needed to achieve it. To stay vibrant and to facilitate better public transit Royal Oak really needs to increase housing options and developers need a straight forward zoning process for realizing the future development described in the Plan. Also Royal Oak needs to improve its bike ability. The non- motorized component of this draft is the direction that the city needs to go.

Don't Fold to Misinformed, Ignorant Residents 9/4/24 16:35

Please amend the master plan to remove "single family" zoning as we have today. It is restrictive and bad for affordability and densification in our great city.

Thumbs up on the Draft Master Plan 8/30/24 0:30

Hello! I suspect you'll get many naysayers attending your upcoming Town Hall, but please remember that they're simply louder, not more numerous. I was pleased to see the emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians, bicyclists, and anyone else not in a car as well as improving transit. There are already many people using these options despite the poor infrastructure (lack of a protected bike lane network, lack of plentiful and convenient bike parking, narrow downtown sidewalks, etc.), which indicates an underlying pent-up demand. Please make more room for *people*, not cars.

First Draft Comments 8/26/24 23:10

I think this master plan draft is directionally correct for the city of Royal Oak and I agree with the majority of it (really appreciate the emphasis on making sure pedestrians and cyclists have places to go and safe ways to get there!); however, I would like to see the final draft include support for more housing options through-out the city and less emphasis on preservation. My full comments from reading the draft are below: *Introduction 1.2 Goals has the following statement: “To enhance Royal Oak’s high quality neighborhoods by preserving their existing character” **I don’t think our goal should be to preserve character at the expense of multi-family housing or growth. As someone who lives in a single-family home, in a single-family neighborhood, I think moderate changes to my neighborhood (ADUs, duplexes, 2-3 story multi-family) would certainly be acceptable. **There are similar comments through-out the master plan draft that I would like to see updated: ***Page 20 - “keeping growth out of stable neighborhoods” → I disagree with this comment, we shouldn’t be stopping all “growth” in the neighborhoods; I believe reasonable growth (including multi-family developments / ADUs) should be allowed in all areas of the city. *I think Neighborhood Residential doesn’t allow enough types of uses **My opinion is we should change goal 3.2.1 from “Revise the Future Land Use map in order to enable a wider range of housing types, including multi-family, along major road corridors and within neighborhood nodes and activity centers” to instead read “Revise the Future Land Use map in order to enable a wider range of housing types, including multi-family” and remove the modifier to only allow this in some areas **Neighborhood residential defined as “to preserve the…principally single-family use of the city’s residential neighborhoods” → I think that duplex and multi-family should at least be a special land use in these areas if not out-right permitted (change the “R” on page 31 to a “P” or “S”) **Essentially, I’d be fine with something more like Neighborhood Edge becoming the primary land use everywhere that is primarily residential today *General wording comments: **Page 44 says “As a result, change in predominantly single-family areas, a concern of existing residents, can be avoided if new and diverse housing can be provided for” (there are other similarly worded comments too like page 58). I would like this to change to emphasize not all residents feel this way and this is a concern of only SOME residents (if it remains at all). **Page 99 states “Amtrak provides daily service to Royal Oak along the Wolverine Line, with morning and evening trains and additional trains on weekends”, the Amtrak typical schedule is actually 3 trains per day in each direction every day of the week without additional trains on the weekend. **I think ADUs should be allowed city-wide. Not everyone will pursue this option, but I believe it should be available to any homeowner in the city that wants to have one. I think the Master Plan should make it more clear that it is supportive of ADUs city-wide. **Page 80 says “Increasing mobility means to make it easier for most residents to access these destinations, whether walking, rolling, by bicycle, car, or bus.”, I think this should be differentiated to make it clear that some impact to car / personal automobile travel time is acceptable if it enables other modes of traffic to more efficiently get where they’re going. **On page 81, there is a graph titled “Risk of Pedestrian Fatality”, I think this needs to say “Risk of Pedestrian Fatality when Involved in a Collision with a Vehicle” or something along those lines. **A note on accessibility: I believe that all maps and figures should have patterns to differentiate sections in addition to just colors for folks who may struggle to tell the colors apart *Areas I would like to emphasize my agreement: 2.3.3 Reduce or eliminate parking requirements citywide or area-by-area 2.4.2 Study opportunities for underground stormwater storage within parks, especially in the northern half of the city. Some opportunities are identified in the Recreation Plan, in reaction to flooding issues in parks like Isabel and Myron Zucker. The next Recreation Plan should investigate this potential in detail. 2.4.3 Study opportunities for dual-use surface stormwater storage within parks. Earth moving associated with such spaces could be used to create kid-friendly play spaces that include elevation changes, and sledding opportunities during winter. The next Recreation Plan should investigate this potential in detail 2.5.5 Research viability of residential food composting programs (S-CAP 3.3.1) and partner with neighboring communities to expand the availability of recycling and composting services. 3.2.4 Establish an ordinance enabling accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in residential districts, tailored to their configuration as internal, detached, and attached ADUs and the surrounding neighborhood character, along with appropriate standards concerning setbacks from neighboring properties, and other commonly regulated conditions for ADUs 4.1.4 Improve crosswalks and accessibility features throughout neighborhoods, as addressed in other sections. 4.1.5 Improve pedestrian and bicycle access through neighborhoods, as addressed in other sections by the greenway network. 4.1.6 Add safe crossings of major streets, as addressed in other sections 4.2.3 Provide more significant crosswalk improvements and additional opportunities to cross major roads, in coordination with other mobility recommendations 4.2.5 Provide bike parking and repair, and EV charging stations at neighborhood main streets and nodes. 5.2.2 Offer publicly owned surface parking lots for development, in exchange for attainable and affordable housing as part of the development program, and needed retail spaces like a downtown market 5.3.1 Improve crossings of Woodward and 13 Mile for pedestrians, and add additional pedestrian crossings on 13 Mile. 5.3.3 Encourage housing development on the Corewell / Beaumont campus, whether the primary medical campus, its 13 Mile frontage, or additional Corewell / Beaumont holdings. 5.4.2 Redevelop Delemere Blvd to provide a main street focused streetscape 5.4.5 Acquire available properties in the area for redevelopment to include attainable and senior housing. 6.5.1 Continue pursuit of road diets where traffic allows and reclaim that space for other uses. 6.5.3 Pursue right-sizing of Crooks Road. 6.5.4 Pursue right-sizing of Campbell Road. 6.5.5 Pursue right-sizing of 11 Mile Road. This improvement should be combined with zoning changes to enable more development capacity while reducing driveway curb cuts and off-street parking, which interrupt future on-street parking 6.5.6 Study right-sizing of 12 Mile Road. 6.5.8 Study right-sizing of 14 Mile Road. 6.6.1 Revise minimum sidewalk widths to correspond with future land use categories and the anticipated amount of pedestrian activity. 6.6.5 Consider shared use paths where pedestrians share with bicyclists, scooter riders, rollerbladers, and others share a wider, intentionally designed path. 6.7.1 Update the street millage priorities to include improvements for safe street crossings. 6.7.2 Improve crossing safety along major roads: • Increase the frequency of crosswalks. • Add crosswalk markings at minor street intersections along the major road to alert turning vehicles of pedestrians. • Add crosswalks at signalized intersections where they are missing. • Add highly visible striping and pedestrian signals at signalized intersections and other crossings of major roads. • Modify pedestrian signal operation to provide an automatic pedestrian phase. 6.9.2 In Corridors and the Neighborhood Edge • Provide benches at significant intersections; • Provide benches at bus stops;• Provide trash and recycling at bus stops; and• Provide pedestrian-oriented lighting at bus stops. 6.10.1 Update the street millage priorities to implement a neighborhood greenway network 6.11.2 Improve the accessibility of the properties along Woodward, beautify its character, and reduce the impact on neighboring properties by reducing a travel lane on Woodward and creating an improved frontage road. 6.13.1 Work with SMART and others in the county to expand or improve service, prioritizing additional stops at key destinations and routing improvements to reduce wait times. Oakland County passed a transit millage in November of 2022 which will provide additional funding for transit in the region. 6.13.2 Improve bus stops with seating, shelters, and accessible waiting areas.

Error in designation re Future Land Use along Maxwell and Sherman Dr? Meeting Schedule 8/21/24 20:05

On pg 21 "Future Land Use Structure" please look at the bright yellow area on far left of the map - it starts at Eleven Mile and moves north on Maxwell and curves towards Woodward via Sherman Drive. Just north of Eleven Mile (the YMCA area), the area consists of recently built homes and even newer townhouse/condos on the former Longfellow Elementary School location as well as other older single and multi home bldgs closer to Woodward. My question is 'shouldn't the area behind the Eleven Mile corridor and east of Woodward be considered an Area of Preservation/Neighborhood Edge rather than an Area of Growth/Mixed Use Corridor? Secondly, I was just able to watch the meeting this evening - thank you for considering the addition of an open forum however I do think a date that is not in the same week as the other meetings is needed. Doing these meetings and the forum on top of one another creates a limitation of a different sort if one is not available at all during that week.

Car free zone 8/4/24 15:30

Any studies done on a car free zone downtown? Paris has implemented this. We also love baguettes here in Royal Oak. We could become the Paris of Michigan!

Right-sizing roads and energy and water policies 8/3/24 13:17

Suggest you put this stuff on the ballot before you put it in the Master Plan. I don't see all the need for Bikes since I rarely see anyone using them. Also. if you try to get rid of the Royal Oak Golf Course there will be a lot of problems.

Suggestions 8/3/24 1:58

I think there should be an emphasis on public transportation and providing ample housing so that diversity can increase and flourish.

Noise Levels 7/30/24 13:39

I do not see anything in your plan regarding noise levels. As you are well aware, the noise levels caused by vehicles which the owners have modified the mufflers to replicate explosion and machine gun sounds, makes the nearby residential areas next to impossible to live in. Or were noise level issues omitted on purpose, in order to encourage this activity and supposedly bring customers to the businesses on Woodward?

Single family Definition is not being truthful 7/19/24 0:10

You do a survey. You get mostly young people visiting downtown and going to restaurants. You find they want to rent. There are a number of reasons for this: Don't have the downpayment, aren't ready to settle down. Renting is a good way to figure out if you want to live here. The other aspect is gentrification. Homes in my neighborhood are being torn down and the house that replaces them sells for 1.1 million. I can't afford that. I will not rent. I will leave Royal Oak first. Please get someone other than people with an agenda to do a scientific survey. Any of the surveys have stated in a way to get the results you desire. Then you use 'but we did a survey'. With behavior like this you are driving people to vote for others they may not really want because that is the only way they see of making a change. Please listen. The council states its opinion at council meetings and thanks the people they hear speak that they like. Then they tell the audience not to do likewise because it intimidates others. You always handle controversial items at the end of the meeting when most people have left. If you really feel that way you do have the courage to do it at the start.

RO Master Plan - ADUs 5/1/24 14:40

I've recently made the decision to move back to Royal Oak, where I grew up, after living Scandinavia for a few years and in Seattle since 1999. The decision is being strongly driven by wanting to be near family and friends, and also by negative changes that occurred in Seattle over the last decade. The negative changes in Seattle include lack of law enforcement abilities, open-air drug use, tolerance for homeless encampments, increasing graffiti, and lack of genuine DEI engagement (all talk, less action). I explain this to put my comments into context. One thing that has worked out amazingly well in Seattle, and the entire State of Washington, has been the implementation of ADUs, and rezoning to allow for controlled and compliant ADUs both for renting and for AirBnB. With housing costs soaring to exceed what most young people can afford to get into, having the ability to augment owning a home with an ADU to rent has made a huge difference in helping young people get into a house while also accommodating affordable housing for those who either do not want or cannot afford to buy. Some of the rules that have worked well include: - Restrictions on property size to create an ADU. - Ability to divide a single family residential house into a duplex, vertical or horizontal. - Expedited permitting for ADU (takes longer for permitting to build new or remodel a single family home) - ADU/rental tenant protections on behalf of tenants (though overly favor irresponsible tenants, see the below section) What could use improvement, and be in consideration for Royal Oak: - Assured dedicated parking for the ADU resident. - For AirBnB ADUs, approval from immediate neighbors. - Clear documentation on rules/standards/regulations - Cost of permitting and lack of tax breaks for supporting affordable rents for residents by supporting an ADU - ADU/rental tenant protections on behalf of tenants which are overly stringent and harm the landlord. There's a balance to strike. And make the rules clear. I wholly support limited ADU's in Royal Oak. From a personal bias perspective, I would love to turn the family home into a duplex and/or build an outbuilding garage with an ADU studio as a second floor. From a community member, I understand the desire for folks to protect their property values and preserve the safe and quiet community. Having regulated ADU capabilities would go a long way to strengthen the community, bring revenue to the City, and also help homeowners augment income while bringing in new faces to Royal Oak.

- 2/17/24 23:38

These are my concerns. The bike lane on 4th Street is awful. Why is it on the parking side of the street so bikes are between moving cars and parked cars instead of protected in the middle of the boulevard by the green space? Did you even research bike lane safety in Europe first? I also hate the new medians on Main Street. I can't believe we wasted tax money and a whole summer of construction on that project, and now, you can't turn left for 6 whole blocks! I hate parking in Royal Oak. Half the time, I will drive to Clawson or Birmingham instead of patronizing businesses in Royal Oak. The meters are terrible. Trying to pay a parking ticket with the new system is even worse. Also, why were we charged for parking in the supposedly free parking structure during Winter Blast? Ice skating isn't really free if it costs \$5 to park. Furthermore, why is the music so loud at the ice rink? Even with earplugs, I was extremely uncomfortable, so I left after 10 minutes. What a waste of \$5! It was almost certainly dangerously loud enough to cause permanent hearing damage, and children were present since it is a family friendly event. Another thing, do you know how much time I waste trying to cram my yard debris into those stupid expensive paper bags? Why can't we just put it in a dedicated garbage can like civilized cities? Lastly, why is this the only city out of 10 I have lived in where rats just run rampant? Aside from the gourmet grocery store and the Zoo, there isn't much I like about this frat boy-tastic bar town that is absurdly expensive to live in but doesn't offer hardly any living wage jobs. I would never have moved here if my boyfriend didn't already live here.

Plan Royal Oak 1/9/24 17:49

Seems I've missed the opportunity to participate in the survey, but wanted to add what I think would be of benefit to the greater Royal Oak community. As a parent, I love that we have an overabundance of outdoor playing areas, I have 3 in less than a 5 minute walk from my house, which is great. Now that it is winter however, we are very limited in what we can do. If I were to have wishlist items for RO, they would include a Children's Science Museum (see Austin, TX "Thinkery" for inspiration), an indoor aquatic/recreational center (see Farmington Hills "The Hawk" for inspiration), and an indoor kids play place that isn't McD's (see Kidcadia Play Cafe in Dearborn for inspiration). These would be year round attractions for the city that I imagine would be wildly popular, and worthy of the effort to attract/build the business. It would be nice if downtown were a bit more family friendly, just not into the bar scene. VFW park at Campbell and Lincoln could use some updating. A pond surrounded by Michigan appropriate wildflowers would drastically help the drainage problem, and would make for a beautiful backdrop for events. A public bathroom and a re-imagined pavilion could make this a go-to for RO outdoor events, like Starr Jaycee is on the north end. Thank you!

Master Plan 1/9/24 15:34

Shame on you for the short window on the master plan survey. Push it through during the peak holidays and you are assured to get the lowest participation possible. I do not like what Royal Oak has turned into. Parking structures and expensive lofts. This city has lost its charm under the current leadership.

- 1/6/24 23:53

I am very impressed with the master plan! I am a younger resident of Royal Oak and really appreciate the future development plans for mixed housing, as right now the inventory outside of single-family homes and high rise apartments is quite limited. I think the proposals for bike lane improvement and public transit expansion would be really beneficial as well, especially if adjacent towns are able to adopt similar improvements in the future. I feel very fortunate to live in a city that is investing so much into it's future and am excited to see what be future Royal Oak looks like!

Royal Oak Master Plan 12/30/23 17:25

Royal Oak is an established community, of single families with mostly single family homes. We have good schools, good business, churches, and public services. We should not make changes that increase population which will stress the services, of the city. Stop narrowing main streets for bike lanes that are not used. Keep Royal Oak a small town.

recreation 12/28/23 16:23

please help our local children by adding dirt to 60 percent of baseball diamonds. repair ice rink flooring and locker rooms. replace nets for youth hockey at ice arena. there will be no people left to age in place if all the families move because we cant play baseball or hockey.

Additional Master Plan feedback 12/9/23 17:44

I recently submitted the second survey but have a few additional comments to the proposed Master Plan: I live on S. West Street. There is currently single family residential on the west side of the street, south of 4th Street. The east side of the street between 4th and 6th Streets is proposed to be classified as "Activity Center, Major" which is probably the most intense and potentially large scale use in the City. The existing uses on that side of the street between 4th and 5th are historic homes adaptively reused as professional offices and a newer (uninspired) two story office building. Between 5th and 6th is a pocket park which doubles as a softened transition to the parking deck behind it. I propose that new use classification on the east side of S. West Street between 4th and 5th be revised to be "Flex Residential Medium Scale" and that the portion of the street with the pocket park, between 5th and 6th, be classified as "Parks and Schools". This would help to guide future zoning/planning by showing the intent to provide a sympathetic and respectful transition from the existing historic homes across the street to the more intense uses on Lafayette and eastward, as well as maintain the only park (though miniscule) we have in our neighborhood and section of the City. Likewise, I propose that the property on the southeast corner of S. West and 6th Streets be classified as "Flex Residential Medium Scale" in lieu of "Flex Residential High Scale". I believe it would be a more appropriate transition, being across the street from our smallish single family homes, if the building(s) were limited to no more than three stories. (The existing apartments at that corner are two stories.) One of the main fears I have heard from neighbors and friends in Royal Oak is that the City sometimes seems to ignore good planning practices and residents' concerns in deference to developers. I tend to believe such fears are often overblown or not completely considered. However, there are a couple of examples they point to that are concerning to me. One is the relatively new "Elevate" multi-family building on the southwest corner of Main and Harrison. The back of the three story building and the projecting balconies are only about 10 or 15' from the property line of the adjacent single-family home behind it, probably less than 25' from the actual house structure. (I want to attach a photo but your form does not permit it.) I have practiced as a professional architect for over forty years, had a few college courses in urban planning, and dealt with many zoning ordinances. The fact that "Elevate" was allowed to be built like that does seem to illustrate that much more care needs to be taken in the next zoning ordinance revisions or rewriting to prevent such disrespect in the transitions between single-family and other types of development. Thank you!

comments to city officials 12/4/23 23:16

Please, please enact a tree ordinance. Every new home being built in our city begins with the removal of existing, mature trees. Many of them are/ were ROYAL OAKS!!! There are plenty of municipalities that have moratoriums and or limitations on the removal of trees. Our city is being denuded of its very namesake so that property developers can have as many sq. ft. of house on their lots to maximize profits.

Master Plan Draft 2 Comments - Zach Bowling 12/4/23 17:51

To whom it may concern, My name is Zach Bowling, I am a 27 years old, and have been a resident of Royal Oak since 2021. Below are the comments I have on the second Master Plan Draft. Overall I like the direction, but have a few thoughts. One thing I would like addressed is the homeless situation I have noticed when walking downtown. Right now, I have only seen 5-6 homeless people hanging out/sleeping downtown regularly, but as the city gets nicer and more wealthy, and inflation continues to hit Americans, this problem could quickly become a real issue. Please add language in the plan to directly address how we can help those in need, prevent further homeless numbers from growing, and protect citizens from potential altercations. Another issue I would like to be addressed, is we need to ensure that corporations (i.e. Blackrock) are not allowed to buy up single-family houses or property in bulk, just to turn it into rental units. This is a huge issue happening around the country, and in a hot real-estate market like Royal Oak, there is potential for corporations to take majority ownership of land from individual citizens. On a similar note, there should be language in the plan to make sure that new mixed-use housing going in isn't all just luxury \$3,000+ a month apartments like it is now. We need truly "affordable" housing, not more high-end apartments and condos. Likewise, there should be language to encourage smaller single-family homes to be built + preserve historic old homes. Part of Royal Oak's charm is the variety of housing available, not just Mc-Mansions. If you are considering road diets and which one to pursue next, please consider 11 Mile from Woodward to Main initially, and Main to Campbell after. We walk that route a ton to get Downtown, and it is by far the most stressful part of the walk. A road diet and re-surfacing would be great to enhance the walk-downtown experience from all neighborhoods north of that area. I also love the idea of re-doing the Amtrak station. That road / area desperately needs a face-lift, and a proper train station would be a great addition. As far as road diets and bike lanes, please make sure the next ones do not end up like Rochester. The contractor took forever, and there is not actually a true bike lane. Painting a bike with some arrows on the road does not count, no one wants bikes riding in the middle of the road. Finally, I love the initiatives to maintain and preserve the parks. That is one of the main reasons I moved to Royal Oak, and one of the reasons I plan to stay and have kids here. Selfishly, I would love to see updates to Mehinger park (down the road from me) like the ones I have seen downtown (i.e. outdoor workout equipment, new playscape for kids. Any updates at all would be a huge incentive to stay in my neighborhood for a long time. Overall, I think the master plan is in the right direction. Please take care in using tax payer money and only use it in the most efficient, responsible way possible. Royal Oak has potential to be one of the nicest cities in Metro Detroit, and we need to get this right. If you have any questions or would like to discuss, please respond back by email, or give me a call. Thanks! -Zach Bowling

Housing and Land Use 12/1/23 12:30

Hello and Thank you for reading my comments today! :) The City of Royal Oak draws two main crowds: Those that come to shop, eat and enjoy other services, and those that live and raise families here. As the city changes and grows towards its updated master plan, kindly continue to remember that everything we have now came from previous generations of those that lived here, and worked hard to maintain their properties. The mayor, the city hall and every city employee will also need to work hard to be both welcoming to our guests and respectful of those that pay the taxes. Perfect harmony is not possible, but peaceful, quite living should be. Let's keep downtown peaceful and quite. We are not a Detroit, a Flint, or a Grand Rapids. Nor do we want to be. We all live here because it is a charming, SMALL city. As a long time corporate employee and an active community member, I understand the need to update equipment, buildings, and infrastructure. However, kindly continue to do your best to be fiscally responsible and to try harder to maintain some of our small town charm rather than overcrowding the working people raising beautiful, healthy children in this city. I've suggested this before, but would like to reiterate: The city should consider adopting a strategy that avoids taller buildings unless every structure is at 100% capacity. Although many of the new multi family homes look nice today, I wonder what they will look like in 50 years, or 450 years! We need to stop building with such short-sightedness. Overall, this is still one of the nicest neighborhoods that I have lived in, and I hope it continues to be for thousands of years to come. Paul from Woodlawn Ave

Bike Accessibility 12/1/23 3:33

While I appreciate the direction document's recognition of the need for bike accessibility, I am very concerned about the direction it is going. A greenway that provides access through neighborhoods is one good aspect of a bikeable community, but it is not sufficient. It is not safe infrastructure to force bikers to wait on the edge of a busy road for traffic to clear enough to cross it, regardless of how many traffic islands and flashing lights are provided. Such a design still requires bikers to play "Frogger" with their lives, hoping that cars will stop for them to cross. It is also incredibly inefficient. Biking is already slower than driving--stopping every mile or less to sit and wait for traffic to clear is a huge mental deterrent. I regularly commute by bike in Chicago, and even I do not currently feel it would be safe to bike in Royal Oak. For commuters and serious car-alternative bikers, the main roads need to be made accessible. Paint is not infrastructure--Royal Oak needs protected bike lanes criss-crossing the city, just as it has roads for cars. I am happy to discuss any of these points--please feel free to reach out.

Roads 11/30/23 22:14

What is "right sizing" the roads? I'm very concerned with the medians Royal Oak approved of on Normandy between Crooks and Coolidge. The medians force traffic to weave in and out of the bike lanes. How can this be safe? I don't like that changes to the roads are being made without the approval of the residents of Royal Oak. This is just one example of a lack of thought process with only agenda in mind.

Woodward corridor and adjacent housing 11/28/23 19:27

I support the direction of requiring larger rear setbacks and screening for properties adjacent to Woodward or other major streets that will be further developed. This screening should include screening for lights that are left on in businesses overnight and shine directly into homes. This has been a major problem in not requiring sufficient screening to include lighting- for example on Arden Place adjacent to the Agee Realty development. Tasteful screening planning between developers that deliberately engage impacted property owners should be part of the development process and then monitored by the city for compliance after the business is operating.

Biking and density 11/27/23 2:40

There is so much accommodation for biking paths at this time, but I see very few people on bikes, even in downtown area. Also, for density, please try to avoid any kind of change to the character of neighborhoods that have been there for a very long time and are part of historical Royal Oak. I understand that you may want density in downtown. It is my opinion that a great deal of different kind of planning is needed to make that happen. Downtown is so crazy right now and putting more residential buildings everywhere you turn, then rent out to probably mostly young people, is going to make a crazy situation even crazier. I live downtown and I see the craziness all the time. It can be a headache because some of the celebrations there go too late and noise invades my apartment, what is it going to be like for families if they go down there or is it just being planned for young and upcoming people? Anyhow, that's my two cents. I wouldn't worry so much about the bike paths. They're causing a traffic problem and not being used. I know it's meant to make the city look attractive to a certain demographic, but it really doesn't look very good at all because the streets don't work for the bike paths. They are narrow and cutting out half a street to look cool and upcoming, that's awful on streets that are narrow to begin with. It just deadlocks downtown even more. If density is to attract young people and their dollars, you may end up paying the piper on that one. Young people are here today and gone tomorrow. I just feel it's all to increase revenue. This is my two cents. Thank you for listening.

Master Plan 11/24/23 21:23

I am opposed to any further apartment dwellings being built unless it is to update an already existing apartment complex. We are becoming over-populated and our roads are too busy and deteriorating at a rapid rate due to overuse. The over building of apartment complexes in Royal is a burden to existing residents. We do not need to attract any more population to our city. The overpopulation is very noticeable during every day life and unpleasant to deal with. Too many people; too many cars. The density is reducing the quality of life in our neighborhoods. Too much drinking on the weekends with noisy people coming into the neighborhoods when bars close at 2:00 p.m. We need to attract families with children rather than single people who entertain on the weekends. Too many bars. On any given weekend, there is a constant drone of sirens. People are becoming inconsiderate and rude due to the overpopulation. I am opposed to road diets. Our roads are already deteriorating at a fast rate because of heaving traffic. The bicycle lanes are not necessary. We drivers use the roads 12 months of the year. Cyclists can only use the bike lanes 6-7 months of the year. It isn't reasonable. It makes no sense to have a couple of blocks with bike lanes and then they disappear. Bike lanes should be continuous for miles so there is a route to follow. This just doesn't work in Royal Oak. Please no more road diets.

Master plan 11/22/23 17:34

I LOVE it! I am very happy to see Royal Oak moving forward, adapting and planning for the future. It is the only way our city will grow and prosper. Thank you. Thank you.

Master Plan - 13 Mile Rd. 11/22/23 14:15

I wanted to bring up that, if this master plan drastically plans to change 13-mile rd where I live, why did I not receive any information about this until after the elections? I had to walk my dog around the block to find "No to rezoning" signs in order to be informed of what is going on. When I first found out about this, I called the zoning board. I asked, how can the city do this where there are a majority of single family homes? To me, this is spot zoning. The zoning board told me that it's not spot zoning but instead, eminent domain. So, the planning commission is saying they will not be rezoning and the zoning board says it is eminent domain. This is why the people are upset. We are not getting clear answers and possibly being lied to for all we know. It doesn't make sense to create such a wild multi-family master plan and say that you are not rezoning. If the city has to follow the master plan, how can they achieve this without rezoning? If you are not going to rezone, are you planning to apply variances so that one day you can rezone the property because it's being used for other than what it was originally zoned for? Is the city planning to remove non-conforming use of land contracts that protect single-family homes? The affordable living crisis isn't going to be solved by building apartments. This is only a temporary solution. Also, there is property next to my home, zoned single-family by the way, operating as a multi-family using a non-conforming use of land-contract. I have seen them list these units as condos attempting to charge 1800+ for a unit the size of my kitchen. This will not fix the affordable living crisis. This will just allow developers or property owners to charge outrageous amounts because Royal Oak is a popular location.

senior housing, downtown parking for seniors, road safety 11/22/23 2:42

As a senior citizen of Royal Oak I no longer feel welcome to come downtown. Backing into parking spaces is not an easy task. The option of parking structures is less appealing because it means longer walking to shopping and restaurants. Although it might be a good way to try to keep physically fit many of us are not. I've always enjoyed going downtown as far back as when Montgomery Wards was the prime store. Now I find the parking structures too far away, usually having to park on the top floor, and not feeling safe. I also wonder with all the new residential building why there are no ranch homes being built? There are seniors who would like to downsize from 2 story homes to a 1 story home. In reading the master plan I don't see any plans for them. Are we planning to build them? Lastly, just what lanes are the bike lanes? The markings are in the center lane not the curb lane and who has the right of way when the bike lane ends because the new pedestrian crossing is extended into the driving lane forcing the car into the bike lane? Thanks for allowing me to express my feelings. Ann

Master Plan - 13-Mile Rd. 11/22/23 1:39

Single-family zones on 13-mile between JC park and main street should remain single-family zones. Any single-family zone using a non-conforming use of land contract should also remain single-family. 13-mile between JC park and main street is also the skinniest part of 13 mile and doesn't seem wide enough to be four lanes. 12-mile is wider than 13-mile in that area. I think a road diet should be applied. 13-mile between JC park and main street should go from four lanes to three with the center lane being used for turning. The center lane will also keep the road open for emergency vehicles and improve safety along 13-mile rd. I also want to point out that Charrette input didn't encourage multi-family on 13-mile, specifically between Crooks and Main, so I don't know how it turned into having medium scale residential buildings. I like some of the ideas but I think we should improve existing multi-family units, that are zoned for multi-family, instead of encouraging zoning changes that effect single-family zones. It's sad that Beaumont is buying all of this land for commercial use where multi-family would be perfect. It is sad that downtown is building unaffordable units and at the same time saying we need to fix the affordable living crisis. I once wasn't able to live in Royal Oak but I worked hard to live here today. With affordability comes crime which will take us backwards not forwards. Let keep Royal Oak a thriving city without encouraging multi-family development. Thanks, Jon

Additional Comments 11/21/23 20:55

I am absolutely begging you, please include language and planning that will prevent gas station expansions, like at 14 & Crooks, where the Speedway has bought adjacent properties to attempt to expand. Larger gas stations are a detriment to our lovely city, especially when placed directly adjacent to residential neighborhoods. I also think the master plan should include language and planning to preserve historic buildings such as the building at the southeast corner of Crooks & Washington, and others just farther up Crooks road. I would also again like to encourage the master plan team to develop a special and/or historic district in the area surrounding 13 & Rochester. Please include language to force the strip malls out/away, and preserve small scale commercial and mixed use like the Stumpf building (HISTORIC) and the block of old buildings up near Hanson's running shop. I think the city would also greatly benefit from including language that can/will encourage and prepare the city for expansion of rail service and other public transportation systems.

- 11/21/23 15:33

Re the "Direction" document: 1) Please define "accessory dwelling unit". 2) Does the term "new commercial unit" (serving adjacent neighborhoods) include cannabis outlets? 3. In modifying zoning standards (example given "Delamere") could greater definition of OTHER POTENTIAL AREAS be identified. Thank you.

Normandy Oaks 11/17/23 13:13

The redevelopment of the Delemere area is a very good opportunity, and a good part of the plan. However, when expanding the park there should be some consideration of actually finishing the Normandy Oaks Park in the first place. It usually gets flooded and it does need a lot more maintenance in particular in the Nature Walk section, before expanding the park consider finishing what's already there.

Masterplan draft 2 11/17/23 13:06

Just a quick thought: I dont see the need of building 2-3 bikeways on Woodward: on the median, and on the side of the street. I like the idea of removing street parking on side of Woodward and moving it behind buildings in the back of the lot, and that extra space can be used for bike lanes on RO side of the street, more green and pedestrian space (sidewalk, mini-plaza, and leased to outdoor restaurants seating). However i see as unnecessary spending having then another median regional bike path (move the regional on the side of street for those portions where street is updated), and that space could be better used to remain green, planted, and maybe even lower than the road so it acts as a rainwater reservoir (accessible, decorated, walkable floodable park)

Public Transit 11/15/23 16:47

Please include language in the master plan for a new train station! I cannot stress enough how important a new station would be for our city. A new station would encourage ridership and prepare the city for a future expansion of rail travel, infrastructure, etc. and a new train station would give the city a unique opportunity to build a new landmark that would contribute to the identity of our city. A train station would also be a great influence on anyone coming to the city via train. I think it would also be beneficial for our city leaders to team up with other nearby leaders to bring Oakland County back to the regional transit table. Get Dave Coulter on the phone and lets get a historic regional transit plan passed to increase our region's economic growth!

As I have read, there's possibly language already for an increase in small scale mixed use buildings along semi-main roads such as main, crooks, and rochester. I think it would make a lot of sense to preserve the existing and historic small scale main street buildings through the creation of districts. For example, there are a bunch of historic and small scale mixed use buildings around the intersection of 13 mile and rochester rd. These should be preserved under a district called the Oak Ridge district, as historically, that's what that area was known as. There's another good example on main street, just south of 13 mile, where there's a small block of old small scale buildings. Regarding the lane reduction on Woodward, I am in favor of that, but there should be language included with this part of the master plan that indicates the lane reduction would further prepare royal oak and woodward communities for the expansion of the QLine or similar light rail and bus expansion projects. Our master plan should include language in support of the expansion of public transit, more than just a bus system (although our bus system does need significant improvements). I would do almost anything to be able to hop on some light rail or commuter rail to go to a sports event or concert in downtown detroit. If you think about it historically, Detroit and its surrounding suburbs saw significant economic growth due to the connectivity provided by public transit such as streetcars, commuter rail, etc. The key to further growth in Royal Oak and other suburban communities is connectivity to the largest city in our state. It's as simple as that. Detroit is only going to continue growing and rebuilding, and Royal Oak and suburban communities should be a part of that. Seemingly my final note, Royal Oak has done a good job of infilling surface parking lots. I think the city can go much further, though, as we still have numerous surface parking lots wasting space in our continuously expanding downtown. Thank you for listening to all of my comments, please reach out if you would like even more input on these topics! Also, don't be afraid to use Birmingham's master plan as inspiration, it has many good components.

Delamare Development 11/15/23 15:30

Hi, I have taken the survey, and appreciate the opportunity to voice my comments/concerns. I live on Massoit right behind Normandy Oaks Park. When I chose this place to build my house, I took into consideration the park. I paid a premium for my lot so my kids could run right out of the backyard into the park! I love the idea of turning Delamere into mixed uses, similar to Eton St. in Birmingham, however the master plan calls for the parking lot at Normandy Oaks to be moved behind the houses on Massoit. I think that this would cause a safety issue as there are so many children in our small neighborhood who run from the yards to the park. Having a parking lot would cause more stress in giving our kids freedom to have fun. I think it is too close to the park AND give the homes who paid a premium for their lots an obstructed view. I CHOSE royal oak over Birmingham/Beverly Hills to build in live in. I think it is such a beautiful community, diverse, safe, amazing people, centrally located and great schools/parks for my kids to grow up in. If the parking lot was approved to be moved, I would put my house up for sale and move to a neighboring community where this wasn't an issue. I know my neighbors would feel the same way. I hope you put some thought and consideration into this area and issue. There is plenty of space at that park to keep the parking lot where it is or move to Normandy on the other side or something, NOT behind our houses. Thank you for listening. Joleen Woof

Short term rentals 11/14/23 10:01

The issue of short-term rentals and the quality of life it poses to current residents was recently brought up my myself and my neighbor at a past October City Commission Meeting. The response we received was that this issue was being addressed in the master plan. How are short term rentals being addressed in the master plan development, and are there any considerations for zoning revisions associated with short term rentals, much like what the City of Ferndale has established? Thank you.

Trees 11/10/23 20:42

The median in the middle of Woodward is a disgrace. Plant and plant more trees in the median and both sides of Woodward. Hate the RO parking.

- 11/7/23 20:46

Looks like a win for developers, loss for residents. Thanks for motivating to vote all of you out. Choke islands make no sense

Protect the neighborhood parks from development 11/4/23 1:27

One of the best parts of our single family neighborhoods are the parks. I enjoy my neighborhood park every day, and so do many others. They are places of beauty to relax after a long day of work or spend a lazy Saturday or Sunday. A place to enjoy each season, walking among the mature trees, or soaking up the sunshine, or lying on a blanket watching the clouds roll by. They are places for children to play, sports teams to compete, and neighbors to gather, all just a short walk from our homes. Please protect them and don't ever develop them!

- 10/29/23 21:53

I think that this proposal moves this new master plan in the right direction, but it does not go far enough to encourage more housing. I do not think "RETAINING the existing zoning and existing character of the city's single family neighborhoods" should be part of the new master plan. I think that more multi-family housing should be allowed through-out the city in the final master plan.

Master Plan 10/26/23 18:40

I have recently become quite interested in the revisions to the Master Plan, perhaps a bit late, but I still want to comment. The section on the website asking you what you like about Royal Oak is cute, but also very one-sided. How about asking what aspects are problematic? As a resident of 40 years and a retiree I want to be able to remain in my house since it is convenient and familiar. My primary concerns are that any changes are environmentally solid and sustainable. Things I feel are moving in the wrong direction are the oversized buildings with minimal setback being allowed both in downtown and in neighborhoods and the congestion and traffic that results. I realize that this is perhaps more of a zoning issue than due to the Master Plan. After looking at some of the details in the current plan I feel that they have not been adhered to or have been overridden by zoning variances, which requires a different letter. Changes should be modest in scope and contribute to a comfortable, visually pleasant, walkable, bikeable city.

Master Plan: Survey 2 10/20/23 16:58

Hi - The Master Plan page on your website says Survey 2 will be open through the fall of 2023. Is this available yet? If so, how do I provide input. If not, is there an ETA for it? I would also like to mention my initial general approval of the pre-draft of the plan as was issued by DPZ a couple of months ago. I am heartened by the Planners' goals of moving Royal Oak to be a more desirable and sustainable community and their commitment to preserving our single-family neighborhoods. The Plan certainly does need some refinement (including addressing sympathetic transitions between single-family land use and more intense multifamily/commercial uses) and a few of the suggestions (such as for a Woodward road diet) should be studied further to confirm if they will really be beneficial to the community before committing them to the plan. Based on what I have gleaned from the Planning Commission meetings of the last few months, it sounds like much of the loud opposition to the plan has been drummed up by a few people who have misinterpreted and exaggerated those misinterpretations. I think it would helpful to the citizens of Royal Oak if the Planning Commission develop an effective means of communication in order to keep the community abreast of the process and status of the Plan, and opportunities for community feedback of the Plan. It would also be good to educate us with reasoned responses and explanations regarding many of the criticisms before the inaccurate criticisms fester too long. Diligent communication can go a long way to making a significant project successful. Thank you!

Memorial Park 10/19/23 2:12

i LOVE Royal Oak, from working in EMS to the hospital; the hub at 13 and Woodward has grown. This last year i had the honor of finally attending open events at the park, it was nice. I truly want to see the park be transformed into something more than an athletic field.

For a more dense Royal Oak 9/29/23 22:01

I wholeheartedly support the proposal to rezone certain areas for increased density. The current predominance of single-family homes across our city's landscape is not economically or environmentally viable in the long term. What our city truly requires are additional multi-family developments accessible to residents of all income levels, improved walkability, reduced traffic speeds, and a decrease in surface parking areas. It's important to recognize that the passionate objections of a vocal minority (NIMBYs) should not overshadow the desires of the silent majority. We, the majority, aspire to create a more vibrant, sustainable, and densely populated city.

- 9/21/23 22:00

I think it's wonderful that you are looking at ways to increase the density of both residents and business in Royal Oak and making the roads friendlier for PEOPLE. These things are essential for a thriving community. I love walking to downtown from my house and wish more people could experience the joy of getting some fresh air, light exercise, and conversations with neighbors and visitors. The only downside is that I fear being hit by a car, so I am all for safer roads for all users and a more walkable and bikeable city.

August Planning Commission meeting- my comments 9/14/23 3:08

The planning Commission sent us two city-wide "plans." Both were impossible to understand. It included two maps of proposed land use ("Current Zoning" and "proposed Future land Use Categories") These maps were simply unintelligible. I can't help but wonder whether the planners deliberately sent these out to forestall feedback from RO citizens. Anyway, I have long experience from my living in many communities who were committed to ensuring the well-being of their members. I lived in Catholic seminaries from 1960 through 1972. I focused my studies on "community." Research on the topic was wide-ranging--from very conservative to very liberal, from in-depth analysis to superficial nonsense. I spent two summers living in Jean Vanier's "L'Arch" communities in France--committed to the care of mentally-physically handicapped men and women. I spent literally years living in seminaries where people genuinely loved each other (with the usual annoying exceptions). One thing I learned from all this is that you cannot please every person. What counts is not a set of rules but rather a Christian "culture" of mutual love. What results is not a set of "look-alike" communities of people who are nice to each other, but a widely-varying set of communities of people who take care of each other, no matter what values they each live by. My point here is that Royal Oak needs to foster a community in which people value one another, regardless of ethnicity, gender, age, religion, or political preference. As a city, we need to foster mutual care throughout Royal Oak. I imagine the growth of neighborhood groups who focus their attention on reliable "handyman" tasks, reliable lawn-maintenance services, better restaurants, and other tasks that one's "neighbor" can help a person complete. The overall goal would be to make Royal Oak a shining example of a community that works" for benefit of all its citizens. A city on a mountain top. In my dreams, I imagine a city that people want come to. Perhaps a city with a song--much like our national anthem: and "crown thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea. But changing the lyrics a bit--such as "and crown our travails with your own care for each and every person on our path." (Maybe ask someone better at music lyrics than I am! Many Irish melodies would lend themselves well to such a song.) Dr. Tad Dunne, Professor, Siena Heights University.

Future Land Use Categories 9/12/23 20:17

I am opposed to the Future Land use changes, especially those north of 12 mile road, I moved into the Northwood sub. because it consists of single family homes and not multi-family dwellings and I want to keep it that way. Thank you! Mr. Lowery

Woodward Building Hight Increases – NO 9/12/23 16:52

As a long time Royal Oak resident I am NOT interested in having the building hight increased off of Woodward ave. Tall buildings can stay downtown royal oak where they are already established. I am very disappointed that the city is considering this. Please know that the neighbors are all quite angry.

Racism 9/12/23 14:17

I am all for big capital interests being squashed when it hurts the residents. I am also curious though if the objection to multi-family dwellings being based at least in part in racism. I am wondering if the new dwellings are actually going to be "affordable housing" as claimed, or if this is just a catch-phrase to move forward and make big money by charging the types of unconscionable high rents that so many places (houses or multi-family or apartments) are currently charging.

Sept 12 Planning Meeting - Woodward and 12 Mile / Catalpa corridor proposals 9/12/23 13:21

Hello City Planning Officials, We are residents at 1414 Vinsetta Blvd in the Vinsetta Park historic district. We want you to know that we firmly do not support the proposed changes to the Woodward and 12 Mile / Catalpa corridor. We believe that reducing Woodward to three lanes will increase traffic backups and adding a bike lane on Woodward is not safe for bikers or drivers because of the many residential streets and businesses. Having bikers in the area will further increase traffic backups as traffic turning on residential streets will have to yield to bikers. In addition, we firmly do not support increasing the building height in the area because this is a historic residential area. While we would like to see some of the decrepit commercial buildings on Woodward improved for cosmetic purposes and landscaping maintained, we do not believe adding high rises to the area to replace the existing buildings is the best use of this area because it will attract more business and commercial activity in the area further increasing traffic, traffic backups, and create parking issues. A large high-rise building will also reduce the aesthetics of the neighborhood and surrounding areas. We want a quiet, serene area in and around our neighborhood that quiets down on the weekend, not increases traffic and noise on the weekends and evenings. Lastly, we firmly do not support allowing further multi-family homes in the area. While we would, again, like to see the existing homes on the main streets maintained and landscaped, having multi-family homes will not increase the aesthetics of the area. We would like to see the existing homes and buildings maintained in their original form and updated to keep the nature and integrity of the historic district around Vinsetta Park. Please consider adding trees and parks in areas where building demolition is being considered. We prefer building a serene, quiet setting that attracts young couples and families to a suburban setting as they start their families. Keep the construction of large-scale commercial buildings, bike paths, and multi-family districts in downtown Royal Oak. The current proposals are not consistent with the family neighborhood setting desired in and around Vinsetta Park at Woodward and 12 Mile / Catalpa. Thank you for your consideration, Annemarie Proctor

Royal Oak Maser Plan 9/12/23 13:09

Throughout this process it seems you ask for the residents input and then ignore it. Increasing density of population in Royal Oak should not be a fundamental goal. I believe the looks and quaintness of downtown has been destroyed by this type of thinking. I now call downtown the home of parking garages. It appears you now want to spread this flawed thinking to the neighborhoods. I have been a taxpayer for 37 years. I have one goal- maintain my property value. I do not welcome density, low income or anything else which I believe will lower my standard of living and therefore my property value. Reminder : Mayor and City Commissioners you work for the taxpayers. Nobody else!

Master Plan Direction 9/12/23 0:39

The objective of this email is to request the Mayor and City Commission to NOT approve the re-zoning/changes to the master zoning plan and to consider the interests of the long-time Royal Oak residents/senior citizens. Although I do not know if the Mayor and Commission have the legal authority to dictate such a catastrophic change, I do urge them to decline to exercise such an order; and instead defer this to a vote of the citizens. This is a critically important matter which can and will dramatically impact homeowners/taxpayers. They are certainly entitled to a voice in a change of this magnitude. The additional traffic, road congestion, parking and noise will increase, in addition to what already exists. Within proximity to Woodward Ave. the peace and tranquility of neighborhoods is already declining and will only suffer further with more housing and additional traffic and parking congestion to support that housing. When we bought our home here more than 42 years ago, we chose this city because of the neighborhoods, ambiance, and old-growth tree covered lots. It is our belief that ample housing already exists in Royal Oak. We do not need more housing created through “back-room decisions” or executive/elite actions to address the agendas of the few. Rezoning to achieve diverse multiple-family housing is far removed from why we chose to live here. Long-time residents of Royal Oak made their decision to select Royal Oak as the environs that agreed with their lifetime plans and dreams. They were willing AND ABLE to sacrifice to afford this decision. We have lived in our residence since 1982 and would regard such a re-zoning mandate as an ABSOLUTE BETRAYAL by the Mayor and Commission. Absent a Referendum of the registered voters of Royal Oak, the Mayor and Commision of the Royal Oak need to acknowledge the responsibilities they owe the residents of Royal Oak.

Hard pass on the new proposed land use categories 9/11/23 20:12

Hello, As the owner and resident of a single family home east of woodward and near fourth street, I am strongly against any land use changes that would not only bring too much vehicle traffic and parking but also result in a potential loss of home value and the neighborhoods quality of life. There are already too many rentals around... One family residential lands must be prioritized and protected. Put residents first! Thank you. Kind regards, Stuart

No! on re-zoning 9/11/23 20:06

I am writing to urge you to not approve the re-zoning / changes to the master plan. First, I am sure that you have the legal authority to do this without a vote of the citizens. However, I ask you to decline to exercise your right to do so and to put this to a vote of the citizens. This is an important matter and should be put to a vote of the residents. Second, there is already plenty of housing in Royal Oak and we do not need more. Living in Royal Oak is not a right, rather it's a privilege. Not everyone has to live in Royal Oak. When I was starting my career, I could not afford to live in Royal Oak and bought elsewhere. Once I saved up, I then able to afford to live in Royal Oak. Third, the proposed changes will only make traffic, parking, road congestion and noise worse than it already is. Living two blocks off of Woodward, the peace and tranquillity of our neighborhood is already bad and will only get worse with more housing and traffic to support that housing. Forth, we don't need more population density in the neighborhoods and don't need multi family housing in traditionally single family neighborhoods. Please do not approve this. Jim Waldvogel

Zoning Plan Comment 9/11/23 17:36

When we moved to Royal Oak to raise our family, it was because the city had a reputation for being family-friendly and had good schools and an attractive downtown area with a good mix of shops. The city has changed now, and not for the better, in my opinion. This latest proposal to allow highrise apartments along Woodward directly adjacent to single-family homes will ruin the view of those adjacent homes, lower their quality of life, and depress their value, regardless of what the developer "experts" say. The current city administration's emphasis seems to be on increasing tax revenue by turning the downtown area and what used to be neighborhoods into something that resembles downtown Detroit, with no limit on highrise apartment complexes and very few shops that attract me. In addition, the city seems hellbent on having as many largescale festivals as possible -- it is to the point where the promoter seems to be running the city and not the elected officials. Berkley is looking more and more attractive. In addition, the liberal element in control of the city has decided to pursue all the usual liberal ideas like making R.O. a sanctuary city (for whom?), promoting lesbian/homosexual activity by grooming small children to approve of their lifestyle instead of their parent's lifestyle, endorsing gun control (as if the criminal element will obey any law), etc. If anyone bothers to investigate the effect of those liberal ideas, take the trouble to examine what has happened to Chicago, San Francisco, New York City, Philadelphia, etc. It is obvious that R.O. has been taken over by weak liberal leaders who don't understand where their policies are taking us. The master plan should not infringe on any of the current single-family home areas -- strict limits should be placed on all proposed highrise apartment buildings and Woodward should NOT be lined with multistory buildings just to raise tax revenue.

Vinsetta Neighborhood Zoning 9/11/23 14:31

Hello, I am unable to attend the Planning Committee meeting off September 12th, 2023, however I would like to share my opinion to be entered in as a matter of record for the meeting. As a taxpayer of the Woodward corridor bound by Woodward Ave, 12 Mile Road, and Lincoln (11 1/2 Mile Road) I am not in favor of proposed rezoning of the residential area which I will define as the area East of the alley parallel to Woodward Ave. This neighborhood is rich in history from the covering of Red Run and the bridges covering the "ghost river" to the unique residential architecture often supported by the One Family Large Lot zoning. To my knowledge, this area contains the largest concentration of One Family Large Lot in Royal Oak. To revise the zoning nomenclature from One Family Large Lot to Neighborhood Low Scale is not the issue. My protest is that if I understand correctly this new zoning term allows for multiple family within either existing structures, new structures, or through the splitting of these lots to allow multiple structures on the same original footprint. Other than to reward speculation of investors or developers I cannot see a benefit to the neighborhood, the residence, or the infrastructure that is already strained in this area. During my time on the Royal Oak Zoning Board of Appeals, we would hear requests to change the usage of lots in this area and others of similar composition and rarely found that there was anything unique to the property that would prevent its use as zoned. Revising the zoning to allow any changes of density or use through the use of Neighborhood Low Scale that means anything other than single family and lot sizes in excess of 50' x 110' is not required and does not prevent the use of the property as historically zoned. Thank you for your consideration and listening to the voice of the residents.

Royal Oak Master Plan 9/11/23 1:07

I am a longtime resident of R.O. and am greatly disturbed by the proposed master plan changes that would allow multistory apartment buildings along Woodward Ave., directly adjacent to existing one-family homes, ruining their view and the use of their yards. The current administration in R.O. seems to be focused entirely on raising tax revenue by trying to turn R.O. into downtown Detroit and has forgotten that they are supposed to be representing the current residents of R.O. who raise families here and not just the transient apartment dwellers. The city commission and the planning commission seem to be ignoring the residents' legitimate concerns and have decided to prioritize the money-making plans of the developers. It appears we need some commissioners with common sense and a better feel for the needs of current homeowners.

Rezoning 9/10/23 19:09

Keep tall buildings downtown. This new rezoning plan is not consistent with the neighborhoods you're proposing to rezone. This needs to be voted on by the people it will affect, not the ones trying to raise more tax dollars.

Master plan comment 9/10/23 1:08

Change always occurs if we one wishes to move forward and keep up with everything that changes around them. I think what is being proposed seems reasonable, and while I don't agree with everything they propose I do know that they are the experts, not myself nor most others who comment. Therefore I will put most of my trust in what they propose. Thank you for your time and your service to the community Sincerely, Anthony Offak

Why we don't want multi-family housing in our established single family zoned neighborhoods: 9/7/23 0:56

Why we don't want multi-family housing in our established single family zoned neighborhoods: The following reasons are what new multi-family housing causes when higher density developments encroach into existing single family zoned neighborhoods: • Property value loss: According to local realtors, neighborhoods with consistent streets with all single-family housing sizes have values higher than houses near or next to duplexes and multi-family units. • Sense of community is compromised: Our communities are enhanced and defined by the same common features and scale of a Royal Oak neighborhood. Our community is based on similarly sized houses, yards, and parks nearby. Inserting a new duplex or multi-family unit into an existing neighborhood weakens the continuity and fabric of the community. • House's inhabitant's loss of quality of life: These unfortunate consequences include the following when a new duplex or multi-family housing unit is constructed adjacent or near to an existing single-family house. o Privacy issues: Personal privacy is compromised as the new multi-family units are typically taller and higher site lines allow the new occupants views into the surrounding houses and yards. This is even more important now as many City residents are now working out of their houses besides living in them. They are there for much more time and preserving the residential quality of life and work is even more critical. o Solar exposure & breezes reduced: Our current Zoning Ordinance is based on successful time-tested urban planning science that dictates how tall, wide, and the maximum lot coverage a house can have per zoning. These dimensions were developed to ensure healthy sun light exposure and fresh air and other house amenities such as gardens, lawns, and decks. Any compromise in these current code dimensions will have a measurable loss in the livability quality of the homeowner's house and yard. o Added noise/stress & mixing zoning types: More people living closer together produces a noisier neighborhood. Traditionally different types of residents live in houses versus apartments. Renters often generate more traffic at different times. Typically, multi-family zoning is separate from single family zoning. Multi-family zoning is often issued as a buffer between single-family zoning and higher density commercial and industrial zoning. o Competition for street parking: Existing single-family neighborhoods have a current balance of both on-site and street parking. By adding more density, this adds more occupants to then neighborhood and more cars to park and possibly compete for spaces. o Less greenspace/less sustainable: Mature trees are typically removed for new developments. Bigger buildings with more density cause reduced pervious area with more storm water run-off. Natural Increased heat sink from more urban density is an outcome. More hard surface area and less residential feel including less habitat area for local plants and species. o Traffic safety: More housing density adds more occupants and more traffic through neighborhoods not accustomed to or planned for this added vehicle load. More cars create more challenges with providing safe walkability with increased vehicular volume.

- 9/5/23 23:32

Overall very good. Really like seeing the emphasis on walkability and bikeability. Really like the emphasis on more housing units and diversifying types of housing. I like the ideas of more distributed neighborhood main streets, and not just making everything happen in downtown. The Delemere area is something I had no idea was improving. I think the small commercial area on Lincoln west of Campbell is a good candidate for improvements as well. Likely outside the scope of this analysis, but can considerations be made to leave room for more train options? I don't know much about the infrastructure required for that, but maybe we leave area by the train station open, so that in the future we can expand that? Can we make room for a tram that goes as far north as 14 mile to Lincoln? I don't know what street would be a good candidate. I would love to shutdown a street to car traffic completely and make it a walking/biking/tram path. Somewhat concerned that the scale of new constructions will be too starkly different compared to surrounding buildings. I know the plan mentions scale explicitly, but some mockups propose very large buildings. Which Im not opposed to necessarily, but having a gradual transitions will be nice to see. with regard to a regional trail in the median of Woodward Ave, i think that it would still be a little too unpleasant to walk or ride on, with cars whizzing by on both sides. The slip lane described sounds like a good idea, but overall, I think any attempts at fixing woodward are going to be tricky. page 19 – Encourage housing along with businesses within centers and along adjacent corridors. (what centers?) typo on page 19 (food -> foot?) page 10 – Retention neighborhood characteristics by maintaining slow streets, deep setbacks, tree lawns, street parking, and consistent sidewalks (missing a word?) page 21 – I got a little confused at the "Crooks and Rochester" label for the second set of images

Proposed Neighborhood Scale Changes 9/4/23 13:05

Monolith-lined North Main canyons... obliteration of senior-friendly surface lots... eradication of a beloved art theatre... And still the rape of Royal Oak thrusts onward, this time with assault on one of the city's most beautiful and enduring neighborhoods. The new pinch-points along Vinsetta are dangerous enough for cyclists (I was nearly hit by cars trying to squeeze-in next to me at several corners). Now, the rezoning plan would further violate that area with Medium- and High-Scale models and still more confusing lane reductions. With no opportunity for a vote by its residents, adoption of this plan would constitute an autocratic decree by a City Administration too willing to sacrifice democracy to a dubious definition of progress. As a 30-year resident I urge the Mayor and the City Commission to, for once, resist their addiction to an ever-increasing flow of revenue and instead choose to preserve the serenity of the Vinsetta and other traditional Royal Oak areas.

Former Resident - Excited About the Master Plan Direction 9/3/23 2:48

I am a former Royal Oak resident and current member of St. Paul Lutheran Royal Oak, and I am very excited about the new master plan direction. I rented in RO in 2014, but was priced out and moved to nearby Madison Heights. When it came time to buy my first home, my wife and I looked in Royal Oak, but once again didn't find anything within our price range, and moved to Oak Park. I would, however, like to move my family back to Royal Oak someday. We love the dense neighborhoods, parks, walkability, our church, food, and entertainment options the city has to offer, which is in contrast to much of the rest of our car-centric region. Seeing the master plan direction's focus on adding housing supply to commercial and industrial-zoned areas is a fantastic idea. Demand is very high, supply is low and prices go up. That's simple supply and demand economics. It is important to continue adding supply in order to make Royal Oak an affordable city. I see and hear lots of comments from people who have lived here for decades, and I greatly respect them, but housing has become much more unaffordable in the past decade. Instead of pricing out recent grads, first-time homebuyers, and young families in the name of "protecting" Royal Oak (i.e., freezing a living, evolving city in time), the city needs to think decades ahead to ensure that it can continue to attract young people who did not have the fortune of buying a home decades ago. Otherwise, Royal Oak will be only for the wealthy and slowly lose the vibrancy that makes it an attractive place to live in the first place. I am also an ardent runner, and I run 5-6 times a week downtown and in the neighborhoods on my regular running route. It's disappointing to often feel like an afterthought to speeding cars flying down Woodward, Main, and other roads unimpeded. Adding traffic calming measures like bike lanes, speed bumps, and other pedestrian-friendly infrastructure will help to make Royal Oak safer for runners, walkers, stroller pushers, cyclists, and pedestrians alike, while also reducing vehicle crashes. Data shows young people are driving less, which makes this master plan the perfect opportunity to think about the next generation of residents and their interests, instead of losing them to other US cities already implementing these ideas. My idea: add a truly protected bike lane to Main St. and connect it to the Ferndale bike lane on Woodward. It creates a biking destination, adds restaurant patio space, improves pedestrian safety, and calms speeding traffic in one of the most walkable parts of Metro Detroit. My generation (millennials) and younger (Gen-Z) want walkability and density (data shows Gen-Z is driving less than any other generation), and Royak Oak has the foundation to be one of the FEW if not only communities in Metro Detroit that can provide that. I am happy to see that reflected in the master plan, and I look forward to learning more. Thank you, Aaron Brandt - Oak Park, MI

Worst service 9/2/23 4:28

We had raised a complaint month ago. Regarding wrong delivery of a product. Now it's if no use complaining. But still wanted to let you know a very bad experience of shopping with royal oak. Would definitely not recommend to anyone. And would like to put such comments regarding your service. As our money got literally wasted by buying such a unwanted product.

- 9/2/23 0:33

I am totally against this master plan. I'm sick of the mayor and commission destroying this beautiful city in the name of greed. Royal Oak used to once be a beautiful place, now it's overrun with corruption, it's disgusting. Leave Royal Oak alone. Stop destroying it with re-zoning, unused bike lanes and road diets.

Objection to Master Plan changes affecting our neighborhoods 8/30/23 19:08

Please know as a lifetime resident of Royal Oak I am very disappointed in the proposed changes to our neighborhoods. People come to Royal Oak because of our beautiful homes in an established neighborhood close to Beaumont, stores and the downtown area. They used to be quiet before the year round Dream Cruise, but still a nice area to live in. Yet you are proposing Neighborhood Medium Scale, Flex Residential High Scale and Neighborhood Main Street it's just confusing woke speak that means you want to take our neighborhoods away. Please leave our neighborhoods alone! I don't see how this helps RO residents in any way. Also you talk about climate issues and green spaces, etc. yet you allow the loud excessive noise pollution and one of the biggest carbon producers drive down Woodward and our residential streets all year long! Plus the month of August the air is full of exhaust from these cars. I don't mind the classic antique cars, but all the others should go. They not only pollute our air but it makes it so hard to breathe especially when you live by Woodward. One last thing, you make a bike route for Royal Oak but you end it at the cemetery! My granddaughter tried to ride her bike from Clawson to Royal Oak but the route ends and you can't ride on the sidewalks. This is a huge oversight. Thank you for allowing my comments to be expressed.

Northwood Masterplan Direction 8/30/23 1:59

I have had an opportunity to see the information about the proposed master plan direction for Northwood neighborhood. And I am convinced that this is the wrong way to go. The zoning changes proposed here Will greatly affect property values, many of them in a negative way. This will ultimately lead to lawsuits and acrimony and division within the city.

pickleball courts 8/29/23 9:33

RO has two official pickleball courts (whittier and upton). Would like to see the many tennis courts that are rarely used, lined for pickleball because it's difficult to get on the existing courts because of league play. Also, I heard rumors about a rec center to be placed somewhere near the batting cages at Starr and Edgar. Any news on that plan?

Zoning changes/proposed future land use Vinsetta Neighborhood 8/24/23 16:59

I was unable to attend the August 15th meeting because, due to lack of available public information/notice, I was unaware of it. I am distressed that changes which would include three and four story multi-family, multi-unit dwellings are even being considered in the Vinsetta Park area. I have lived on Cedarhill Drive for over thirty years and over twenty years on West Houstonia for over twenty years before that. I moved to Royal Oak because it was a family community of multiple generation single family homes with tree-lined streets, good schools, and a sense of belonging to a neighborhood community which provided that environment within a large metropolitan area. Building more apartments and/or multistory condos will upend that sense of community and will create "walls" around open neighborhoods. Lining major roads with such buildings ruins the nature of our city. It's bad enough now that driving down Main Street makes one feel like going through a canyon. Changing the zoning options along Woodward, Twelve Mile, and Crooks is a very bad idea. It also is not good that the Planning Board and the Mayor are the only, as I understand it, individuals involved in implementing these changes. It all feels secretive and undemocratic, as well as short-sighted and with shades of being influenced by developers. We do not need, nor do we want, more three and four story multi-unit buildings in Royal Oak.

Master Plan for High Rise living 8/22/23 23:11

Hello. It has been brought to our attention that the city is considering allowing multi family housing in our neighborhoods. We want to voice our objection to this plan. We believe that there is a place for multi family housing but it is not in our single family housing neighborhoods. We do not believe that it fits in with the charm and character of the single family neighborhoods. Allowing multi family housing into these neighborhoods would be a mistake. We understand that there will be no public vote on this issue so please accept this as our NO vote!! While the city leaders have made some great decisions for our city, we feel that the city leaders have made some decisions recently that are not in the best interest of all Royal Oak citizens so we are hoping that you will please listen to the voters and SAY NO TO MULTI FAMILY HOUSING!! Your consideration is appreciated! John and Teri Shaffer1130 Vinsetta Blvd Residents at this address for 20 years and Teri is a lifelong Royal Oak resident.

Please change main road Future Land Use to Flex Residential Medium Scale 8/22/23 16:57

Hi DPZ, A general theme is that neighbors do not want four story buildings in their back yards, and that they are also worried about parking overflows from buildings occupying most of the site. To address this, please change the Future Land Use along major roads, such as Woodward Avenue and 13 Mile Road, to Flex Residential Medium Scale. Three story buildings should fit within the existing 36 foot maximum allowed height, and the Medium Scale approach should help assure there is enough space left for parking. Thanks, Carl

Change Future Land Use of Woodwardside neighborhood to Neighborhood Low Scale 8/22/23 16:49

Hi DPZ, Page 4 of the Draft Master Plan Document includes a Future Land Use map. Please change the Future Land Use for Woodwardside Subdivision, located between Woodward Avenue and Shenandoah Drive, and between 13 Mile Road and Webster Road, to Neighborhood Low Scale. This will make the Future Land Use proposal for Woodwardside consistent to what is proposed along Vinsette Blvd. one mile to the south. The Vinsette neighborhood is substantially similar neighborhood to the Woodwardside neighborhood. Changing the Future Land Use to Neighborhood Low Scale should make most of Woodwardside neighborhoods a lot happier. Best regards, Carl

Please add Master Plan information to romi.gov City web page 8/22/23 16:40

Hi DPZ, The City of Royal Oak's web page, romi.gov, has no mention of the Master Plan topic. Please add a link to planroyaloak.com to the City's web page, romi.gov. That way, more Royal Oak residents will be able aware of the Master Plan process and can make comments and suggestions. Thanks, Carl

Physically Separated Bike Lanes for major roads like Woodward Avenue and 13 Mile Road 8/22/23 16:35

I prefer not to bike directly next to traffic on main roads, such as on the bike lanes next to the traffic lanes on Livernois Road (Main Street), north of Downtown Royal Oak. It feels uncomfortable to be so close to cars, and it feels dangerous. For these types of main roads, please consider Physically Separated Bike Lanes, positioned in the grass between the curb and the sidewalk. This separation is especially important for biker safety when vehicle speeds are 35 miles per hour and higher - and please do not reduce the vehicle speed limits. Please see this guidance for Physically Separated Bike Lanes: <https://ruraldesignguide.com/physically-separated/separated-bike-lane> This approach can also allow bike lanes on Woodward Avenue without restructuring the existing traffic lanes, and at significantly lower implementation cost. Just add physically separated bike lanes between the curb and the sidewalk. In some cases that is in the front lawn of a business, and in other cases that is the parking access driveway. We can also make it a long-term goal that all Woodward businesses have grass lawn front yards, by moving their parking to the sides of reconstructed buildings, to make this even more attractive. 13 Mile Road already has plenty of lawn between the curb and sidewalk for Physically Separated Bike Lanes, so this should be straightforward to implement without changing the road. Thank you for considering this for the update to the draft master plan document. Best regards, Carl

Master Plan Direction 8/22/23 15:47

I have been a resident in Royal Oak for nearly 20 years and currently reside on Vinsetta Blvd near Woodward Avenue. The proposed Master Plan Direction is NOT something that we support for a number of reasons. High rise apartments increase traffic, add an element of transient people to the neighborhood, and change the overall feel of a neighborhood where families are committed to taking care of the property they own (not rent) on a daily basis. The noise and pollution from bus stops that will inevitably be built to accommodate apartment dwellers will increase exponentially to all those in the nearby neighborhoods. A larger bus stop will bring more transient people to the neighborhood which impacts the safety of current residents. Please consider the negative impact this will have on the neighborhood, home values, and residents. Thank you for your consideration.

Master plan in neighborhood Beverly Hills of royal iak 8/17/23 16:38

We have moved unto this neighborhood because we respect "green space" as it affects the environment! The plan is ludicrous!!!!

Master plan direction 8/17/23 14:07

Please submit this to voters. If not we do not favor new buildings to go to 3 or 4 stories. The contra flow lane seems confusing. The regional bike lane seems dangerous especially, especially for bicyclists who do not stop and look for turning cars.