



Rochester Hills

Minutes

Planning Commission

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

Chairperson Deborah Brnabic, Vice Chairperson Greg Hooper
Members: Sheila Denstaedt, Gerard Dettloff, Anthony Gallina, Dale Hetrick, Marvie Neubauer, Scott Struzik and Ben Weaver
Youth Representatives: Janelle Hayes and Siddh Sheth

Tuesday, April 16, 2024

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Brnabic called the April 16, 2024 Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., Michigan Time.

ROLL CALL

Present 8 - Deborah Brnabic, Sheila Denstaedt, Gerard Dettloff, Anthony Gallina, Greg Hooper, Marvie Neubauer, Scott Struzik and Ben Weaver
Excused 1 - Dale Hetrick

Others Present:

Sara Roediger, Planning and Economic Development Director
Chris McLeod, Planning Manager
Tracey Balint, Public Utilities Engineering Manager
Andrew Burdett, DPS Aide, Utilities
Paul Davis, Deputy DPS Director, City Engineer
Keith Depp, Project Engineer
Ken Elwert, Parks and Natural Resources Director
Bill Fritz, Department of Public Services Director
Rochelle Lyon, Information Systems Director
Leanne Scott, City Clerk
Joe Snyder, Chief Financial Officer
Mike Viazanko, Building/Ordinance/Facilities Director
Lindsay Wood, Constituent Services Associate
Captain Russell Yeiser, Oakland County Sheriff's Office
Jennifer MacDonald, Recording Secretary

Mr. Hetrick provided prior notice that he would be unable to attend and was excused.

Chairperson Brnabic welcomed attendees to the April 16, 2024 Planning Commission meeting. She noted that if anyone would like to speak on an agenda item tonight or during Public Comment for non-agenda items to fill out a comment card, and hand that card to Ms. MacDonald. She noted that all comments and questions would be limited to three minutes per person, and all questions would be answered together after each speaker had the opportunity to speak on the same agenda item.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2024-0209](#) March 19, 2024 Work Session Minutes

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

Aye 8 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Hetrick

[2024-0210](#) March 19, 2024 Regular Meeting Minutes

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

Aye 8 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Hetrick

[2024-0211](#) April 2, 2024 Special Meeting Minutes

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

Aye 8 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Hetrick

COMMUNICATIONS

Chairperson Brnabic stated that the Commission received notice from the Charter Township of Oakland of the Township's intent to update their Master Plan.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Seeing no speaker cards and no one wishing to speak, Chairperson Brnabic closed Public Comment.

Ms. Neubauer stated that the Planning Department has invited city residents to participate in updating the City's Master Plan. She explained that there are toolkits available that can be picked up from the Planning Department that allow residents to hold small meetings in their neighborhood to participate in the future of Rochester Hills, whether it is input on bike trails, connectivity or other topics.

NEW BUSINESS

[2024-0203](#) Public Hearing and Request for Conditional Use Recommendation - File No. PCU2024-0003 - to allow construction of a third floor (with a maximum height of

45 ft.) for the proposed Gerald Plaza, a three-story mixed use residential and commercial building located at 1760 E. Auburn Rd., located at the southwest corner of Auburn Rd. and Gerald Ave., Parcel No. 15-30-226-068, zoned BD Brooklands District, Mike Chaudhary, DMC Consultants, Inc., Applicant (Staff Report dated 4/10/24, Reviewed Plans, Updated Renderings received 4/9/24, Development Application, Environmental Impact Statement, Public Hearing Notice, Previously Approved Plans from 2021, City Council Minutes of 2/22/21 and Planning Commission Minutes of 2/16/21 had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

Present for the Applicant was Mike Chaudhary, President and CEO of DMC Consultants, developer and general contractor for the project, and Hisham Turk, Turk Architects.

Chairperson Brnabic introduced this item for conditional use approval recommendation and site plan approval to allow construction of a third floor with the maximum height of 45 feet for the proposed Gerald Plaza, a three-story mixed use residential and commercial building located at 1760 East Auburn Road, at the southwest corner of Auburn Road and Gerald Avenue. She called for the Staff Report.

Mr. McLeod explained that this item consists of two different requests - one for Site Plan Approval and one for Conditional Use Recommendation to City Council for the proposed mixed use development, formerly known as Zeenat Plaza, and now called The Gerald. He stated that it is the same project as was originally approved several years ago, and explained that the conditional use is specific to the third story of the building within the Brooklands District.

He noted that this will be a 33,000 square foot building in total between all three floors, and encompasses 10 residential units, which he stated he believes will be sold as condominiums, along with 8,400 square feet on the first floor dedicated to non-residential use between commercial and office. He stressed that there are no significant changes from the previous approval granted in 2021; however, due to unforeseen circumstances the site plan expired and that is why the applicants are before the Commission seeking reapproval.

He displayed an aerial photograph which he noted is a bit older as there are now parking lots near the proposed project which have not made it to Google Earth images. He noted that the surrounding zoning district is the Brooklands District, with the exception of to the south across the alley where it is R4 one-family residential, and all uses conform to the zoning designation for the most part. He stated that it basically meets all of the requirements of the Brooklands District and they are providing parking on-site relative to the residential uses that are on floors two and three.

Mr. McLeod explained that in terms of landscaping, the streetscape will serve as the landscaping. He pointed out that the Brooklands District requires buildout along two lines on Auburn as well as the Gerald roadway. The third story of the building is required to be stepped back 10 feet to help minimize the impact on the surrounding environment, and he noted that this is one of the conditional use requirements. He noted that the landscaping plan is pretty

minimal, and he mentioned that one of the items suggested was some additional plantings in the landscape island against the alleyway to provide a little bit more buffer between the site and the residential structure to the south. He mentioned that it is already buffered somewhat with the fence that was put in place as part of the overall Brooklands redevelopment. He noted that staff has had conversations with the applicant leading up to the meeting about slight changes or discrepancies between building materials particularly on floors two and three. He stated that where it appears tan on the rendering, it is noted as either brick or a composite material, and he pointed out that on the original site plan approved in 2021 that material was shown as all brick. He stated that the applicant did not seem opposed to having the facade being brick to match what was originally proposed.

He reviewed parking, showing the parking for the units and some additional on-street parking and parking that abuts the alleyway. He mentioned that the Brooklands District requires onsite parking for all residential uses. He reviewed the floor plans, noting that the first floor buildout will probably fluctuate depending on who the ultimate tenants will be.

Chairperson Brnabic invited the applicant to comment.

Mr. Turk stated that he just read the staff report from the Planning Department and would concur with the recommendations. He suggested that his viewpoint is that they are thinking that the first floor would be brick, the second floor would be brick, and the third floor would be composite site panels, noting that in his opinion it would look better. He stated that if it is still desired for the third floor to be brick, they would do that.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that she personally agrees with the Planning Department and would like to see the additional brick put back on the facade and have it look identical to what was approved in 2021, unless they would like to add more somewhere else.

Mr. Turk responded that would be fine.

Mr. McLeod reviewed the elevations that were approved in 2021.

Mr. Turk stated that while they proposed brick or composite material, when they did the construction documents for the permit, they decided to do the second floor brick and the third floor composite. He stated that they could do the third floor in brick.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that this would be one of the conditions, and wanted to confirm they were agreeable to that.

Mr. Chaudhary responded that they were agreeable to that.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that as this will be the first three story building in the Auburn Road corridor, and it should stand out as a very good example.

Ms. Neubauer noted that the report dated April 10 included a denial from the

Fire Department, pointing out that an additional hydrant was required along Auburn Road. She asked if that had been resolved, along with Engineering comments regarding land improvement permit, storm sewer maintenance agreement and utility easements. She stated that those should be added as conditions as well to ensure they are resolved. She commented that she does not have a problem with changing the style of brick on the third floor to make it a lighter color to match the composite color shown, but she does want the second and third floor to be brick so it matches the rest of the area.

Ms. Neubauer asked if they were agreeable to adding the extra plantings as buffering. Seeing the applicant's concurrence, she noted that this should be added as a condition as well.

Mr. Dettloff stated that he was glad to see this moving forward, and asked for the previous renderings to be shown.

Mr. McLeod displayed the elevation set that was submitted and approved as a part of the 2021 approval. He stated that Mr. Turk is correct that there was a sheet included that showed alternative materials; however, he pointed out the rendering that was approved. He stated that those materials had been changed on the current elevation drawing, and that is why it was marked up by the office in terms of different materials. He explained that if the composite material is removed and brick goes back up in those designated areas, it is basically back to the 2021 approval.

Mr. Dettloff stated that he was a part of the planning stages of that project, and he thinks that it will add to the enhancement of the whole area and provide a neighborhood district mini-downtown type of setting. He asked whether they had any idea what the rents of the units will be.

Mr. Chaudhary responded that this is a new development, and they do not have any comps to compare. He commented that the City has spent a lot of money to make this a downtown area, and he is currently thinking \$2,600 to \$2,800; however, their plan is to sell condominiums so they can reinvest the money in other opportunities in the same corridor. He commented that they have a lot of projects in Detroit and are happy to come to the city and are anxious to start their project.

Mr. Dettloff asked what other communities they are in.

Mr. Chaudhary responded that he has worked in several communities all in the Metro-Wayne area, and in Ann Arbor. He commented that they have not done the commercial construction for their own development, but have worked all around the state of Michigan.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that the EIS states they are planning on having five two-bedroom and five three-bedroom condominiums in a projected price range of \$385,000 to \$455,000, and asked if that is correct.

Mr. Chaudhary responded that this may go up a bit as the project has been pushed back, but he would think this would be close to those numbers. He

commented that they want to work six days a week to catch up with a month-and-a-half loss of time, and will know more once the project is done and they start advertising. He added that they have had a lot of inquiries and thinks that before they are finished it will be sold out.

Mr. Struzik stated that the Brooklands is a great neighborhood that has seen a lot of redevelopment north and south of Auburn Road, and is a success story. He commented that he is excited by this proposal and has been following it since 2021. He noted that it is a short walk from where he lives and hopes it becomes a blueprint for future development projects. He stated that he would hope that the developers will take some of the proceeds and replicate this elsewhere in the corridor, and noted that there are a number of lots along Auburn Road that could accommodate a similar development. He stated that he would agree with Council Member Neubauer and Chairperson Brnabic that he would like to see the original brick material back, and agreed that the color could vary a bit.

Ms. Denstaedt asked if the applicants had again reached out to the neighbor immediately behind, and if they knew what retail might be in the building.

Mr. Turk responded that it is the same neighbor. He explained that they did not reach out to him this time, but previously they had reached out and there was no problem and they were happy with the project. He noted that there are some restaurant restrictions, but the previous owner had mentioned that there were a lot of inquiries for this particular retail. He explained that they wanted to make sure that everything is clear with City Council first before advertising. He stated that he is confident that this will be sold out before it is built.

Mr. Weaver referenced the landscape plan, and noted that the tree grate is labeled on the landscape plan, but the image is not correct, and that should be cleared up prior to a contractor installing the wrong thing based on the image. He stated that he would concur with the need for additional plantings along the back end of the alley, and noted that it would have to be something that can handle salt spray as the alley will most likely be heavily salted. He mentioned the lone planting area and commented that he thinks it is overstocked with trees and the Serviceberry and Sweet Gum will grow together and quickly choke each other out. He stated that he would recommend moving the Serviceberry to the ends of the islands at each end of the parking area, and add grasses or a low shrub. He commented that he is excited for this project. He added that he would concur with Ms. Neubauer's suggestion of a lighter brick on the third floor.

Mr. Hooper asked if the applicants had any issues with the additional conditions in the proposed motion along with those raised today. Seeing the applicant's agreement, he moved the motion in the packet to recommend conditional use approval, with the six findings and four preprinted conditions.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that this item requires a Public Hearing, and noted that she did not have any cards or sees anyone wishing to speak, so she closed the Public Hearing. She asked if the applicant was willing to contact the neighbor one more time prior to this item moving on to City Council.

Mr. Chaudhary responded that he would contact them as early as tomorrow morning.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that the timeframe for construction was approximately 14 months.

Mr. Chaudhary responded that he would check with this construction team, but the answer is yes.

Mr. Hooper moved the motion in the packet to recommend approval of the conditional use and was seconded by Mr. Dettloff.

Chairperson Brnabic read the motion in the packet for conditional use approval recommendation, noting that the additional conditions the Commission discussed would apply to the site plan. After calling for a roll call vote, she noted that the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Hooper moved the motion in the packet to approve the site plan and was seconded by Mr. Dettloff, noting the conditions regarding the additional fire hydrant required, the additional brick for the second or third floors along with reference to color, relocation of the additional tree plantings as discussed and approved by staff, and correction of the tree grate reference and image on the plans.

After calling for a voice vote, Chairperson Brnabic noted that the motion to approve the site plan passed unanimously. She congratulated the applicants.

Mr. Chaudhary thanked the Commissioners, and stated that he looks forward to the opportunity to work with Rochester Hills.

Mr. McLeod noted that the target date for this item to go to City Council is May 6th.

A motion was made by Hooper, seconded by Dettloff, that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Hetrick

Resolved, in the matter of File No. PCU2024-0003 (The Gerald), the Planning Commission recommends to City Council Approval of the Conditional Use to allow the proposed development of a three (3) story building within the BD Brooklands District, based on documents received by the Planning Department on March 1, 2024 with the following findings and subject to the following conditions:

Findings

1. The proposed use will promote the intent and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance.

2. The proposed building and proposed conditional use have been designed and is proposed to be operated, maintained, and managed so as to be compatible, harmonious, and appropriate in appearance with the existing and planned character of the general vicinity, adjacent uses of land, and the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the use.

3. The proposed mixed use development building should have a positive impact on the community as a whole and the surrounding area by providing additional shopping opportunities and residential housing options within the Brooklands District.

4. The proposed development and proposed uses are served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, water and sewer, drainage ways, and refuse disposal, subject to the conditions noted below.

5. The proposed mixed use development should not be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to the existing or future neighboring land uses, persons, property, or the public welfare as the use is fully compliant with all zoning ordinance requirements, meets the intended development and use patterns as outlined in the City of Rochester Hills Auburn Road Corridor Plan, is separated from the abutting residential uses to the south by the existing alley and privacy fence.

6. The proposal will not create additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services that will be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.

Conditions

1. City Council approval of the Conditional Use.
2. The applicant must provide the additional fire hydrant as required by the City's Fire Department. All original comments from City departments on the reviewed site plans, this staff report, and outside agency review letters, remain applicable.
3. The applicant must provide additional brick on the facades of the building as discussed during the public hearing of April 16, 2024, specifically to add brick on the second and third floors as depicted with the beige color on the renderings discussed and as previously shown in the 2021 approved plans.
4. Additional tree plantings must be provided within the landscape island along the alley to provide buffering to the residential properties to the south, as approved by Staff in regard to location, species and height.

2024-0202

Request for Site Plan Approval for The Gerald Plaza - File No. PSP2024-0005 - for a three-story mixed use residential and commercial building located at 1760 E. Auburn Rd., at the southwest corner of Auburn Rd. and Gerald Ave., Parcel No. 15-30-226-068, zoned BD Brooklands District, Mike Chaudhary, DMC Consultants, Inc., Applicant

See Legislative File 2024-0203 for Discussion.

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

Aye 8 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Hetrick

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. PSP2024-0005 (The Gerald), the Planning Commission approves the proposed Site Plan, based on plans received by the Planning Department on March 1, 2024, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions:

Findings

1. The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that all applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as other City Ordinances, standards, and requirements, can be met subject to the conditions noted below.
2. The proposed project will be accessed from the public ally along the south side of the building and providing access to Gerald Ave. and Eastern Ave., thereby promoting current and future safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets.
3. Off-street parking areas for the residential uses have been provided onsite and the nonresidential uses will have access to dedicated onstreet parking spaces and the newly constructed Eastern Ave. parking lots thereby avoiding common traffic problems and promoting customer safety.
4. The proposed development and associated improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship between the development on-site, the existing development in the adjacent vicinity, and the overall vision of the Brooklands District.
5. The proposed development will not have an unreasonably detrimental or injurious effect upon the existing characteristics and features on the site or those of the surrounding area.

Conditions

1. The applicant must provide the required additional fire hydrant as required by the City's Fire Department.
2. All original comments from City departments on the reviewed site plans, this staff report, and outside agency review letters, remain applicable.
3. The applicant must provide additional brick on the facades of the building as discussed during the public hearing of April 16, 2024, specifically to add brick on the second and third floors as depicted with the beige color on the renderings discussed and as previously shown in the 2021 approved plans, or color as discussed during the public hearing.
4. Additional tree plantings must be provided within the landscape island along the alley to provide buffering to the residential properties to the south, and applicant must provide revised planting types and locations for the eastern planting area, as approved by Staff.
5. Provide a landscape bond in the amount of the landscape installation cost estimation shown on the site plan, plus inspection fees, as adjusted by staff as necessary, prior to the preconstruction meeting with Engineering. This bond must include additional costs for additional tree plantings noted in #4 above.
6. Tree grate labeling and image to be corrected on the plans.

(Memo prepared by Sara Roediger dated 4/10/24, Memo prepared by Deborah Hoyle dated 4/16/24, 2025-2030 Capital Improvement Plan and Public Hearing Notice had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

Present was Joe Snyder, Chief Financial Officer.

Mr. McLeod stated that as a part of the State Planning Act, it is a requirement that the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) come before the Planning Commission for its consideration.

Mr. Snyder stated that he is pleased to present the proposed 2025-2030 Capital Improvement Plan. He displayed a map of the city and all of the various CIP projects proposed over the next six years, and he pointed out that there are projects in just about every section of the city. He noted that there are more projects proposed in the CIP than are projected to be able to be funded, and he explained that the CIP helps prioritize the capital projects so they can be scheduled in a sequence that is financially feasible and afford the possibility of bundling projects to be bid out together to gain economies of scale. He added that this allows the City to be more proactive in its improvements and less reactive, as being reactive typically costs more.

He displayed a pie chart that represented the basic project groups, and pointed out that it is dominated by water and sewer, roads, pathways, parks and some internal services like fleet, fire apparatus, equipment, facility and stormwater projects. He mentioned that the total of all projects included in this year's CIP is \$206 million, which is actually a decrease from last year's CIP of \$247 million. He explained that part of this decrease is due to 56 projects removed from this year's CIP, of which 30 of those projects are already done. He noted that the new entrance sign is one project that is off the books, others will be completed this year, and 21 projects were deleted by either being merged into a similar project or no longer needed. Five projects were deferred to the pending section as they may be outside of the 2025-2030 timeframe. He explained that they would go through the 28 new projects submitted for this year, and he began to list them, beginning with Facilities projects.

- City Hall First Floor Restroom Automatic Doors, similar to the automatic door openers on the second floor. This may require the first floor doors to be replaced to function with the new openers. Proposed for 2026 for \$27,000.*
- City Hall Resource Room Redesign. The current Resource Room is an underutilized space and the proposed redesign will transform it into a more dynamic space for both residents and employees to gather and collaborate. Capabilities proposed will include multimedia presentations. Proposed for 2025 \$50,000.*
- Cemetery Irrigation System, a proposal to install a complete underground irrigation system at the Cemetery. Currently staff irrigate the grounds with approximately 1,000 feet of garden hose creating trip hazards and maintenance obstacles. The system will use sprinkler heads that will be able to be operated remotely at night, minimizing disruptions to visiting families and will comply with the City Watering Ordinance. Specific zones can be targeted. Installation will free up staff time. Proposed for 2025 for \$555,980.*

Mr. Weaver questioned a reference to \$600 per day and asked if that is what is being spent now on irrigation.

Mr. Snyder responded that this is what the consultants propose if the system runs fully for the entire time, which it will not. He added that with the topography of the cemetery, certain shady areas may not need much water at all. He continued with more Facilities projects.

- *DPS Dirt Barn Replacement*; the current building is over 40 years old and has started to exhibit structural concerns, especially with roof trusses. It is proposed for replacement of the existing structure on the current foundations. Proposed for 2026 for \$1,350,000.

- *DPS Garage High Speed Overhead Door System*. The existing heavy-duty low speed door is in constant use throughout the day, and it takes quite some time to go up and down. The door springs require replacement every 100,000 cycles so it gets to be quite costly. Predator is America's top-selling high performance door, and the direct drive motor opens the door up to 50 inches per second. The speed improves the flow of traffic while containing the flow of air and conserving energy. This system would go on the outside of the building allowing that the heavy low speed door could be opened once per day in the morning and closed at night for security. Installation will likely provide savings on heating and cooling at the garage. Proposed for 2025 for \$225,000.

- *Structural Repairs at the Red House, Farmhouse, and Schoolhouse*. Engineering consultants recently performed structural analyses of all three historic Museum buildings and they noted repairs to be performed, including collar ties on roof structures, attic ventilation, mortar and brick repair, and repair to floor joists. Proposed for 2025 for \$300,000.

- *Schoolhouse Lift Replacement*. The current lift is experiencing downtime and it is getting much more difficult to acquire replacement parts for the unit. Proposed for 2025 for \$100,000.

- *Citywide Elevator Project*. An evaluation phase including an initial study to evaluate and recommend improvements and/or replacements of the City's elevators at the DPS Garage and City Hall. It is anticipated that the elevator improvements recommended will come forward as a future CIP project. Study proposed for 2025 for \$30,000.

- *Fire Station #5 Detention Basin Retrofit*. When Fire Station #5 was initially originally designed, the detention basin north of the building took advantage of some of the topography of the area. Use of this building has expanded, and the existing surface area for the basin is now in conflict with the safe use of the parking lot. To correct this, water on the paved parking lot surface needs to be moved to an oversized underground storm drainage pipe, which will provide for storage capacity and release rates. It is proposed to excavate a strip of the parking lot asphalt and subsoils, place the new pipe underground, and backfill and repave the parking lot. Proposed for 2026 for \$55,000..

- *Sheriff's Substation Carport Replacement*. The original carports at the Substation were installed in the early 2000s during construction of the building. At that time, OCSO patrol cars were typically smaller sedans. Since then, OCSO has transferred over to larger SUV units, and the fleet has grown to over 35 vehicles including two smart traffic carts. The current carport only has enough space for 20 vehicles. This proposal would add an additional three

vehicles to the carport and enclosed garage space for the smart carts. No more bays can be added due to limitations of the space available. Slated for 2025 for \$405,000.

- *Purchase of a Tow-Behind Air Compressor.* This equipment would be shared between the Facilities and DPS divisions. The DPS team currently owns one air compressor and it is mounted onto a truck trailer. The new proposal would be a freestanding unit and would offer more flexibility, as Facilities currently rents a similar unit for irrigation systems winterization. It would also allow DPS crews to work in multiple areas of road repair at one time. Proposed for 2025 for \$25,000..

Mr. Snyder moved on to cover the IT projects.

- *Conference Tech Room Upgrades.* With the transition from in-person meetings to more remote meetings, the current technology does not allow for participants to clearly communicate in a remote meeting. Technology will be upgraded and standardized in all of the City's conference rooms to allow for more seamless use by all users and provide a higher quality sound for participants. Upgrades include standardized microphones and speakers; wiring will be cleaned up and conference rooms will be given a more professional appearance. Scheduled for 2025.

- *Flock Safety Cameras.* A Flock is a license plate reader system utilized by the Sheriff's Office which uses vehicle fingerprint technology to capture vehicle identifiers. The City currently has 10 of these Flock cameras located at various intersections and this proposal is for the lease of 10 additional Flock safety cameras. Eight of the 10 will be stationary and permanently affixed at designated intersections; two will be portable or flex cameras with the ability to be placed in any specific area of concern within the city. Proposed for 2025 for \$60,000.

Ms. Neubauer asked if this is the same Flock system that was recommended by the Sheriff's Department to be placed at HOA entrances when all of the break-ins were occurring.

Captain Yeiser confirmed it was.

Mr. Snyder moved on to Road Projects.

- *Childress Paving SAD.* Pave approximately 750 feet of Childress Avenue and Enid Drive in accordance with the City's Special Assessment District (SAD Gravel to Pavement) Policy. This portion of Childress currently has nine homeowners and currently the City's portion of the resident's share is approximately \$15,000. This figure will be adjusted from the April 2023 to April 2024 CPI figure once it is published by the Bureau of Labor and Statistics sometime in May 2024 for an estimated City cost of \$150,000.

- *Paving of Dunning East of Eastwood.* An SAD project to pave approximately 450 feet of Dunning east of Eastwood Drive in accordance with the SAD Policy. Dunning currently has nine homeowners. Proposed for 2026 for an estimated city cost of \$150,000.

Mr. Hooper stated that he does not see the economics of it as nine

homeowners will spend \$10,000 and the City would be picking up \$300,000 to pay for nine homes.

Mr. Snyder continued:

- Hamlin Road near Crooks Road Reconstruction. Reconstruct approximately 600 feet of Hamlin from 140 feet west of Crooks and 400 feet east of Crooks. The Pacer Road Rating for this particular segment is a three, which rates as poor, and requires a complete removal and replacement of the existing concrete including edge drains, aggregate base, ADA, ramps and base repairs. Construction proposed to begin in 2027 for \$640,000.

- MR-41B - Rochester Road Rehabilitation from M-59 to Avon. The City has been notified by the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) that they are proposing to resurface Rochester Road between M-59 and Avon Road. This is approximately 2.8 miles of asphalt mill and fill, and also includes areas of full depth concrete repairs, signing and pavement markings, stormwater drainage, upgrades, and traffic signal upgrades. The City has a 12.5 percent local share and MDOT has this project proposed to begin in 2027 for an estimated City cost of \$2,337,500.

Mr. Struzik asked if it is known which traffic signals will be upgraded.

Mr. Davis noted that MDOT has indicated that the signal at Barclay and Wabash would be upgraded. He also believes that the signal at Auburn is one that they are looking at modernizing. He explained that both of these signal projects have been deferred in the past. He noted that there have been some funding changes at MDOT that freed up some monies and they are now looking to move full speed ahead on the project.

Mr. Struzik asked if the City's work on Barclay Circle will enable a better signal, due to alignment issues.

Mr. Davis responded that the City's project is a road diet, and they are stopping just short of the signal in anticipation that this Rochester Road project will change the signal phasing and upgrade the intersection.

Mr. Struzik stated that he would like to see box span signals allowing right hand turns when the left turns are going. He stated that there are opportunities for improvement along a very critical corridor in the City.

Mr. Davis stated that he would concur, and commented that the goal would be to redo that to a box span configuration more typical of an intersection signal.

Ms. Neubauer asked for more information on correcting drainage issues, noting that some of the businesses had to address drainage in their own parking lots.

Mr. Davis responded that the next project is more specific to the drainage improvements. He stated that if there are localized concerns with this project, they can request MDOT look at those concerns. He added that this is not a full reconstruct; it will be a resurface, restoration and some repairs. Areas that require more significant concrete base repairs may include some localized

drainage improvements; however, it will not redo the whole storm system there. He mentioned that MDOT has indicated that they are agreeable to adding some pathway system improvements, in particular south of Eddington on the east side of Rochester Road. He explained that the City recently acquired some property and they would like to make a connection or pathway improvement there. He mentioned that there is the possibility of pursuing a TAP Grant which would basically include some pathway construction through the interchange at M-59. MDOT has indicated that if the City can get approved for that, it could be added into this project. He commented that this has been a project in the pending section for a number of years.

Mr. Struzik asked how long it would be before there would have to be another major project on Rochester Road.

Mr. Davis responded that he did not think that MDOT would entertain another project for a while. He explained that the next project would be a reconstruct and it would be to do something similar as was done in downtown Rochester a number of years ago where all of the pavement was torn out. He noted that a reconstruct should last 20 years; however, with this type of traffic they would make it a heavier type of section. He stated that he would expect that the section between Avon and M-59 being a mill-and-fill would last at least ten years; however the reconstruct north of Avon Road would probably be 20 years out before MDOT does anything there.

Mr. Struzik stated that he would highly encourage anything the City can do to pursue the pathway improvements. He noted that many people walk and bike on these pathways, and there are incomplete areas. He added that not being able to get over the freeways is a huge impediment to going to other places.

Mr. Davis concurred, noting that another area is Livernois at the M-59 bridge crossing.

Mr. Snyder continued with more road projects:

- Reconstruction of Rochester Road from Avon to the Clinton River, and from Paint Creek up to Tienken. The total proposed length is 1.5 miles and includes work related to road reconstruction, traffic signals, pivot marking, stormwater drainage improvements, sidewalk, ramps, lighting and traffic signals. Similar to the other project, the City has a 12.5 percent local share and the project will begin in 2027 for an estimated City cost of \$1,483,720.

- M-59 Sound Barrier Maintenance Project. The two existing noise barriers constructed by MDOT in 2011 along M-59 are starting to look dirty on the roadway side and are being impacted by vegetation growth on the resident side. MDOT is responsible for the road side of the barriers per the construction agreement; however, the project is a low- to no-priority project for MDOT so it is unlikely that MDOT would contribute any funding or get around to cleaning up those barriers anytime soon. The proposal is for the City to hire a contractor to clean the roadway side and to remove vegetation and trees from the back side of the barriers. The cleaning and maintenance project is proposed to begin around 2027 for \$500,000.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that the look of the walls reflects upon the City. She questioned how much it would cost to power wash the walls, as she noted that in the CIP this project is not due to start until 2030.

Mr. Davis responded that he did not have any comparables for cleaning noise barriers in estimating the construction costs. He pointed out that it is a little more involved than just power washing as they would have to shut down land area on M-59 in order to have sufficient safe working space around the work. He noted that it would be a major detour and a rolling operation as they clean the face of the wall. He added that they would have to get a contractor out to remove trees and vegetation as it is starting to creep over the wall. He noted he estimated \$400,000, plus a design package and some level of inspection, which is where he estimated the total project cost of \$500,000.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that she does not know what is on the back of the walls, and it seems that the vegetation work is probably more intense on the back of the walls than on the front.

Mr. Davis responded that it definitely is, mentioning yards on Michelson where a lot of the vegetation has been growing over the past 10 years, and by Dequindre in the Whispering Winds development. He added that they would not just hit the trees immediately adjacent to the wall and would try to clear out a good corridor so that the growth doesn't return right away.

Chairperson Brnabic asked if the project could be split to clean the walls facing M-59 sooner than 2030.

Mr. Davis responded that it could be done as a separate project; however, for economies of scale, if a contractor is maintaining one side, that same contractor and equipment should be maintaining the other side. He noted that some of the vegetation and trees growing on the back side of the wall could be posing a larger threat to the structural ability of the wall. He stated that both sides should be done on the same project.

Chairperson Brnabic asked why it has been put out six years.

Mr. Snyder responded that was mainly due to the Rochester Road projects.

Mr. Davis responded that it was not a high priority as the other projects.

Mr. Dettloff asked if would be an ongoing maintenance item and asked if there were any coatings that could be applied to prevent dirt buildup.

Mr. Davis responded that it will require ongoing maintenance. He noted that per the contract with MDOT, they will maintain the roadside part of the wall; however, it is not specific to say every ten years it will be cleaned. He explained that they contacted MDOT and they stated that they would not clean the wall. He stated that MDOT could fault the City if a tree damages the wall and the City is responsible for the repair. He noted that when the wall was constructed, MDOT informed the City that any coatings or covered concrete appearance would be one hundred percent the City's cost, and MDOT advised against coatings as

they fade and require ongoing maintenance. He mentioned coatings on exposed concrete aggregate along the Brooklands corridor did not last a whole summer before fading.

Mr. Struzik commented that removing the vegetation would be to protect the integrity of the wall, and the power washing would be purely for aesthetics. He asked if the power washing would be just for the M-59 side and if the wall was visible to the resident side.

Mr. Davis stated it would be just for the road side along M-59. He stated that he has not heard any complaints from either the residents or the multi-family development about the appearance of the wall. He commented that the residents probably like the vegetation.

Mr. Weaver asked if it is anticipated that the same contractor would do both sides, as if it were a different contractor it might be able to be split up. He asked how far from the wall the vegetation would be removed and if a gravel base might be able to be included to prevent things from coming up closer to the wall.

Mr. Davis responded that it could be a tree removal contractor on the back and a different type of contractor power washing the road side. He commented that if the Commission would like to see two separate projects, that could be done. He stated that the vegetation would be removed at least 10 feet to get some bigger maintenance vehicles in there and give them room to work. He stated that he was not sure that they would want to install gravel. He added that he was not sure of the easement, as the wall by Michelson is pretty close to the road.

Mr. Hooper commented that he could see residents not wanting to have trees touched on their property.

Chairperson Brnabic suggested that Staff have some further discussion regarding this item to find out the options.

Ms. Roediger noted that this will be Mr. Davis' last meeting before the Commission as he has about two weeks left with the City.

Ms. Neubauer stated that the Commission appreciates everything he has done and congratulated him on his retirement.

Mr. Davis commented that he has been with the City for 23-1/2 years and is looking forward to retiring.

Mr. Snyder reviewed the last road project on the CIP list:

- Eddington Blvd. Reconstruction (Farnborough to Windrift). Reconstruction of approximately 1,000 feet of Eddington, which has a Pacer road rating of three, which is poor. Replacement of existing concrete edge drains, aggregate base and undercutting is proposed. Three speed humps along the segment are also in poor condition and these will be removed and replaced. Construction proposed to begin in 2025 for \$900,000.

Mr. Snyder moved on to stormwater projects:

- *Eagles Landing Stream Bank Stabilization at Livernois and Avon Roads.* Approximately 250 linear feet of increasing shoreline erosion along the Clinton River. Due to increased storm intensity and development in the watershed upstream, erosion and accelerated channel migration threatens City infrastructure and is causing a loss of City property and its usage. Proposed solutions include armoring the banks where permissible, lessening the bank slope and realigning the river. Planned for 2028 for \$350,000.

Mr. Struzik asked if the project will impact access to the river for kayakers.

The response from DPS staff in attendance was no.

- *Innovation Hills Stream Bank Stabilization.* Approximately 300 feet of increasing shoreline erosion along the Clinton River in Innovation Hills Park. Increased storm intensity and development has caused increased erosion and accelerated channel migration, threatening City project mitigated ponds and wetlands, established donor-sponsored trails, paved pathway and sanitary sewer infrastructure access. The location is centered between the new rope bridge upstream and the kayak landing downstream. Proposed solutions include river bank armoring and/or the river may need to be shifted north. Project will ensure the river has flow capability while allowing current and future park projects to continue. Construction planned for 2025 for \$300,000.

Pathway projects highlighted by Mr. Snyder include:

- *Tienken near Medinah mid-block crossing.* This will allow a safe route to and from Adams High School from the west side of the Adams/Tienken intersection. This section of Tienken will have to be studied first to find the optimal location. Includes installation of two solar-powered push-button rapid flasher beacons, a steel pole, and mast arm with overhead signage and two light poles, ADA-compliant ramps, landings and refuge island. Construction to begin in 2026 for \$100,000.

Mr. Struzik stated he is not a big fan of the rapid rectangular flashing beacons, and prefers the HAWK signals. He stated that nobody is legally required to stop until the pedestrian puts his foot in the roadway, and it can give a false sense of entitlement to a pedestrian who has not entered the roadway yet. He prefers the HAWK where it turns to red, and then flashes allowing traffic to go after that.

Mr. Snyder continued:

- *Walton Blvd. Pedestrian Crossing near Firewood.* HAWK signal to provide connection to Meadow Brook and Oakland University. Segment would also need to be studied to find the optimal location. Project planned for 2027 for \$625,000.

Mr. Struzik stated that this may be a corridor for a SMART bus route, and he would request the City work with SMART because it might make a lot of sense to place a bus stop near a mid-block crossing.

Mr. Snyder continued with the last pathway project:

- *Pedestrian Bridge and Structure Repair.* Twelve pedestrian bridges and existing structures at the Avon Nature Study Area and Highland Hills Sensory Trails were inspected in 2023, and maintenance repairs for the various sites were identified into a final report. Four Museum bridges are planned to be replaced in the fall of this year (after the Pumpkin Festival). Construction will start with the Museum bridges in 2024. This will be an ongoing program where bridges will be reviewed, and will be followed up the following year with any construction or remediation issues. Estimated cost is \$2,225,000.

Mr. Snyder listed the watermain projects:

- *Stratford Knolls and Stratford Manor Watermain Replacement.* Approximately 1,100 feet of six-inch asbestos cement (AC) and 18,800 feet of 8-inch AC/ductile iron watermain. The watermain is approximately 50 years old and will be replaced with ductile iron pipe or high-density polyethylene pipe (HDPE), depending on the installation method. Construction to begin in 2030 for \$7,462,500.
- *Watermain Replacement along Dutton Road.* Approximately 2,300 feet of 12-inch ductile iron watermain along the south side of Dutton between Adams and Wales, replaced with ductile iron or HDPE depending on the installation method. Proposed for 2026 for \$1,006,250.
- *Kings Cove Watermain Replacement.* 9,000 feet of 8-inch and 2,200 feet of 12-inch AC watermain, approximately 50 years old. To be replaced with ductile iron or HDPE depending on installation method. Beginning construction in 2028 for \$4,900,000.

Mr. Snyder thanked the Commissioners for their attention and consideration of these new proposed CIP projects. He noted that the Accounting Division is in the final stages of wrapping up the FY 2023 audit with the final report scheduled to be presented to Council on May 6th. The Fiscal Division has begun the planning process for the FY 2025-2027 proposed budget and this will be presented to Council at their first meeting in August, per the City Charter. He suggested that if the Planning Commission is comfortable approving the proposed 2025-2030 CIP this evening, the Fiscal Division can get a head start on developing the various capital plans for the upcoming three-year budget.

Chairperson Brnabic thanked Mr. Snyder for tonight's presentation, and thanked the staff and department representatives that spent time in case of any questions. She noted that the CIP requires a Public Hearing, and opened it. Seeing no cards and no one wishing to speak, she closed the Public Hearing.

Ms. Neubauer thanked the department heads that were in attendance, and stated that she learned so much during her Council orientation. She commented that the City is always functioning at a surplus, which is great; and the City has such amazing people in charge that can put this together. She moved the motion in the packet to approve the CIP as presented. Mr. Hooper seconded the motion.

Mr. Struzik stated he would echo the comments and stated that this plan represents a wide range of expertise that has been brought together.

After calling for a voice vote, Chairperson Brnabic announced that the motion passed unanimously.

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

Aye 8 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Hetrick

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission Approves the Capital Improvement Plan that has been proposed for the years 2025-2030. The Rochester Hills Planning Commission has determined the following:

WHEREAS, the Michigan Planning Enabling Act, Act 33, of Public Acts of 2008, as amended, requires the Rochester Hills Planning Commission to annually accept a Capital Improvement Plan for the benefit of the health, safety and welfare of the community as those criteria relate to the physical development of Rochester Hills; and

WHEREAS, the Rochester Hills Fiscal Office has consulted with the City's professional staff who carry out the business of planning for and providing for the present and future needs and desires of the citizens of Rochester Hills; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Improvement Plan is meant to consider the immediate and future needs and goals of Rochester Hills, as identified by the public, City Boards and Commissions, and the Mayor's staff, in light of existing projects and plans and anticipated resources; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Improvement Plan is a flexible document, necessarily meant to be reevaluated and amended each year, to project into the six succeeding years, and further amended as needed to address practical realities as they relate to policies and philosophies of relevant Boards, the City Council and the Mayor's office; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Improvement Plan is a guide and forum to aid the Rochester Hills Mayor's Office and the Rochester Hills City Council in making decisions regarding the physical development and infrastructure maintenance of the City and determining what, if any, resources can or should be available to carry out City Council's policies and budgetary decisions; and

WHEREAS, the components of the Capital Improvement Plan have been subject to a public hearing, public review, and committee reviews over the course of several years and a duly noticed full public hearing held on April 16, 2024 and

WHEREAS, the components of the Capital Improvement Plan were arrived at through a point system using variables that included, among other things, whether the project has begun, funds committed, sources of funds, prior City Council decisions, Planning Commission or administrative recommendations and decisions; and

RESOLVED, that the Capital Improvement Plan presented for review on April 16, 2024, is adopted by the Rochester Hills Planning Commission on April 16, 2024 and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Plan should be published and attested to

according to law.

DISCUSSION

2024-0205

Discussion regarding ordinance requirements for small lot single family residential construction

(McLeod memorandum dated 4/10/24 had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof).

Mr. McLeod displayed a photo, noting that the house represented in the photo started a conversation regarding reduced lot sizes. He explained that the property was narrow and was even further complicated by being a corner 40-foot lot. He mentioned that the Zoning Ordinance allows for a reduction in side yard setbacks for those lots that are less than 60 feet, and he noted that the Ordinance allows adjustments to side yard setbacks to allow some reconfiguration of where the house gets placed on the lot. He stated that the Ordinance does not account for the occurrence of two of these lots side-by-side, and noted that someone in theory could put two houses within 10 feet of one another and staff would not have much to say about it. He mentioned that this may not be as much of a concern with a ranch-style home; however, it could be a concern for the placement of two story homes or homes that are at the maximum height provision, which is often a preference in terms of today's housing style designs.

He explained that a provision was suggested to be added to the Ordinance that if they are going to allow minimizing the side yard, that there must be an abutting 10-foot side yard on the adjacent property. He noted that this will still maintain the 15-foot separation, which is the ultimate design of the Ordinance. He added that it was also decided to discuss with the Commission limiting the height of structures on these lots at 24 feet versus the normal height of 30 feet, requiring a different configuration of the roof structure.

He stated that both of these provisions ensure that the building massing is kept in check, so that a smaller older ranch-style home is not impacted by a new modern construction that will create more mass. He added that there are not a great number of these lots within the city, but there are enough that should require attention. He mentioned that the Building Department, in conjunction with Assessing, is proactively trying to seek owners out where there are two 40-foot lots side-by-side that are technically separate lots but under common ownership, encouraging the owners into doing an official combination so that the lots cannot be broken apart. He noted that this would further reduce the potential of having a conflict of people trying to build bigger houses on the smaller lots, and minimize the number of times that this Ordinance may get tripped.

He stated that the idea is not to totally restrict the ability for someone to have creative ability on a lot to construct a home in terms of size and fee within ordinance requirements, but ensure that it will not improperly relate to surrounding properties.

Mr. Hooper stated that his home is in R-4 with lot averaging, and he knows that

his side yard is seven feet, and his neighbor's yard may be seven feet as well.

Chairperson Brnabic questioned whether this would be for new structures.

Mr. McLeod responded that there might want to be a qualifier put into the language for specialty subs where lot averaging or open space was utilized, that if it was approved under a separate scheme, that separate scheme would dictate; but this would apply to the general public.

Mr. Hooper stated that his neighbor is in a colonial that is easily more than 24 feet in height.

Mr. McLeod responded that the same qualifier would apply if it were under a different provision or approval mechanism. He explained that most of these lots are in old plats like supervisors or assessor's plats. He stated that most of those houses are the post-World War II ranches that are maybe 14 or 15 feet tall. He commented that the idea is to allow for a two-story structure, keeping in mind that the 24-foot is a mid-span calculation, and the ultimate height of those structures would probably be 28, 29 or even 30 feet in terms of true peak, albeit not as tall as if someone was able to utilize the full 30 feet that the Ordinance currently allows.

Mr. Hooper stated that he just wanted to ensure it is not a solution in search of a problem.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that the house in question was 25 feet wide by 100 feet long and did have a third-story appearance. She added that she thinks that the setbacks will help too because two five-foot setbacks cannot be next to each other at this point as it is a safety issue. She asked if there was any more information on the lot coverage question.

Mr. McLeod noted that in reviewing this particular lot in question, it was just under 29 percent coverage based on Building Department records, which still met the lot coverage requirements. He stated that in proposing modifications that would deter another lot going adjacent to this, they did not feel that it was necessary to go further in restricting lot coverage. He stated that to Mr. Hooper's point, he did not think that the pendulum should be swayed too far. He commented that ultimately the idea is to tweak the ordinance where they feel comfortable, and in discussing it with the Building Department, they feel comfortable with these tweaks shown tonight, and did not necessarily feel comfortable going further. He stated that at this point Staff seems generally comfortable with where this is at with the ordinance amendments.

Chairperson Brnabic asked if a motion was warranted to approve the two changes.

Mr. McLeod responded that he did not feel the need for a motion at this point. He noted that another provision that they want to put forward is in reference to what is currently permitted in the Neighborhood Business District and the Community Business District, where it is allowed for those two districts to have a reduction in rear yards when adjacent to a similar type of district. He

explained that unfortunately this reduction was omitted in the Highway Business District, not by design but in error; and they want to bring that reduction back in for the Highway Business District. He noted that a proposal has come before staff that the Commission will see hopefully in the near future where one of the gas stations has effectively been zoned-out of the ability to retrofit their site that they want to make improvements to. He explained that if this provision is added it would give all of the business districts similar reduction capabilities, and would allow some opportunity to reinvest in their site as well. He mentioned that these changes are still drafts at this point; and if they get the general head-nod of the Commissioners, they can move forward.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that 10 feet is not a lot, and she would have some further questions regarding this. She mentioned that there have been multiple gas stations coming to the ZBA requesting a variance because they cannot meet current ordinance standards, and they were granted because they were making a concerted effort to update the station and there was no way they could meet today's standards. She asked if there were any other examples of setbacks in regard to something like this.

Mr. McLeod responded that Neighborhood Business and Community Business already have this provision, and Highway Business is a pretty limited area. He noted that this provision gets utilized quite a bit in the NB and CB districts, when the districts are adjacent to each other. He pointed out that when they are against residential or multiple family it is a whole different story. He noted that when reviewing the business districts, it is surprising how some of these parcels are chopped up and buildings are very close to property lines; and the sites function fine. He stated that it is ultimately Planning Commission approval and would not be carte blanche authority. He stressed that it is suggested to be added for the HB district and is a pretty limited application.

Ms. Roediger noted that it happens to affect gas stations as they tend to be corner lots. She mentioned that she can think of an instance where a gas station is next to a bank, and having a 50-foot setback off of the property is not a well-utilized space. She noted that it would make a lot of sites not developable if they had to meet that 50-foot rear setback, and would be a hardship to have a small corner property. She stressed that they are looking to make it consistent with the other two business districts that already have it, and stated that it wasn't intended to be left out of the Ordinance. She stated that it was a footnote that was left off that has had a big impact.

Mr. Dettloff noted that lot combination was referenced and asked who was combining them.

Mr. McLeod noted that the discussion was back to the residential lots, and stated that Assessing and Building were proactively seeking out those in common ownership of 40-foot lots that are technically separate, and asking the owners if they would willingly combine those lots. He stated that he would anticipate that as long as the agenda will allow, these changes will be brought to Public Hearing next month.

Discussed

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

2024-0212

Request for Election of Officers - Chairperson - for a one-year term to expire the first meeting in April 2025

Mr. Struzik stated that the Chairperson is a difficult role to fill and requires a lot of discretion and empathy while maintaining an orderly and productive meeting. He moved to nominate Chairperson Brnabic to serve as chair for the term to expire April 2025. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dettloff.

Ms. Neubauer thanked Chairperson Brnabic for the way she handles the meetings and confirmed her support.

Following a voice vote, Chairperson Brnabic announced that the motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Struzik, seconded by Dettloff, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Hetrick

Resolved, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby appoints Deborah Brnabic to serve as its Chairperson for a one-year term to expire the first meeting in April 2025.

2024-0213

Request for Election of Officers - Vice Chairperson - for a one-year term to expire the first meeting in April 2025

Mr. Struzik stated that Mr. Hooper is a seasoned veteran at the City and he nominated him for Vice Chairperson. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dettloff.

Ms. Neubauer thanked Mr. Hooper, noting that she has personally learned so much from his input regarding architecture and structure, and his experiences on City Council, Planning Commission and other boards.

After calling for a voice vote, Chairperson Brnabic noted that the motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Struzik, seconded by Dettloff, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Hetrick

Resolved, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby appoints Greg Hooper to serve as its Vice Chairperson for a one-year term to expire the first meeting in April 2025.

2024-0214

Request for Election of Officers - Secretary - for a one-year term to expire the first meeting in April 2025

Ms. Neubauer stated that she has been the Secretary for the Planning Commission for the last few years, and has appreciated the honor of doing that.

She noted that the City Charter is silent on whether a Council Member can remain as Secretary, but for the sake of appearances and impropriety and to ensure that everything is clean and done the right way, she would nominate Mr. Struzik to be the new Secretary. Mr. Hooper seconded the motion.

After calling for a voice vote, Chairperson Brnabic announced that the motion passed unanimously.

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

Aye 8 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Hetrick

Resolved, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby appoints Scott Struzik to serve as its Secretary for a one-year term to expire the first meeting in April 2025.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that the next meeting date is May 21, 2024, and a Master Plan Work Session will start at 5:30 p.m. prior to the regular meeting.

NEXT MEETING DATE

- May 21, 2024, 5:30 p.m. Master Plan Work Session

- May 21, 2024, 7:00 p.m. Regular Meeting

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission and upon motion by Neubauer, seconded by Struzik, Chairperson Brnabic adjourned the Regular Meeting at 9:05 p.m.

*Deborah Brnabic, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission*

Jennifer MacDonald, Recording Secretary