



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: Susan Bowyer, Gerard Dettloff, John Gaber, Marvie Neubauer,
Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Scott Struzik and Ben Weaver

Tuesday, October 19, 2021

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Deborah Brnabic called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Auditorium.

ROLL CALL

Present 8 - Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, John Gaber, Greg Hooper, Susan M. Bowyer, Ben Weaver, Marvie Neubauer and Scott Struzik

Excused 1 - Nicholas Kaltsounis

Quorum present.

Also present:

Sara Roediger, Director of Planning and Economic Development
Kristen Kapelanski, Manager of Planning
Jason Boughton, Utilities Services Manager, DPS/Eng.
Jennifer MacDonald, Recording Secretary

Chairperson Brnabic announced that if any member of the public wished to speak on an agenda item or during Public Comment, which was for non-agenda items, they should fill out a comment card located at the back of the Auditorium and hand it in to Ms. MacDonald. She advised that people might also be recognized by joining the meeting on Zoom video conferencing and raising a hand in the zoom application. Members of the public could also comment by sending an email to Planning@rochesterhills.org prior to the discussion on an agenda item.

All comments and questions would be limited to three minutes per person, and all questions would be answered together after every person had an opportunity to speak on the same agenda item.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2021-0429 September 21, 2021 Regular Meeting

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

Aye 8 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Gaber, Hooper, Bowyer, Weaver, Neubauer and Struzik

Excused 1 - Kaltsounis

COMMUNICATIONS

None.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Matthew Berard, 1698 Westridge Dr. *Mr. Berard said that although his comments pertain to both of the agenda items tonight, they are general with regard to how he sees the City trending in the years that he's been a resident. He was basically born in Rochester Hills and is now raising his family here, and as it just so happens over the last few months, he's had the occasion to talk to many different neighbors and residents of the City, and he can say overwhelmingly the issue that has come up is overdevelopment. He fully appreciates that people have property rights; he is a lawyer, he took property law, and he fully understands the concept that you can build on your property. He said that you have to do so within the confines of the ordinances and within the zoning designations. He wanted to implore the Planning Commissioners and to encourage them to not let those ordinances be changed or to be freely granting variances. He wants to be sure that the Commissioners understand that many of the residents he's talked to think that this is a big problem, and in the City charter there's nothing that requires every square inch of the City to be developed. As a resident of the City of Rochester Hills, he moved here with the expectation that the zoning ordinance and zoning designations would be upheld and would be enforced, because if they're not then what is the purpose of having them in the first place. He wanted to make sure that the Commissioners understand that there are a lot of residents that are concerned about this issue, and to encourage them to be extremely strict with any projects that they approve in the City of Rochester Hills. He thanked the Commissioners for their time.*

NEW BUSINESS

2021-0427

Public Hearing and request for Conditional Use Recommendation - City File No. 95-044.3 - to construct a drive-through associated with a two story 29,000 sq. ft. mixed use building with retail, office and restaurant use on approximately 2.6 acres located on the west side of Rochester Rd. and north of South Blvd., zoned B-3 Shopping Center Business District, Parcel No. 15-34-477-018, Emily D'Agostini Kunath, Applicant

Present for the applicant was Emily D'Agostini Kunnath, on behalf of Gateway II Development

Ms. D'Agostini introduced herself on behalf of Gateway II development for site plan approval for the proposed drive through on the south side of the building. She said that she is intimately aware of both the construction and the marketing of the property and can answer any questions or concerns.

Ms. Kapelanski stated that the applicant is seeking to add a drive through to the two story building that is currently under construction, near the intersection of

Rochester and South Blvd. The current zoning for the property is B-3 Shopping Center Business District, which permits drive through uses as a conditional use. She said that the site plan for the building was approved some time ago, and now the applicant is proposing some minor modifications to the parking lot and landscaping onsite in addition to the proposed drive-through. Ms. Kapelanski suggested an additional motion to be added for the Planning Commission's recommendation since the drive-through tenant has not been identified at this time, which is included in the packet: "If, in the determination of City staff, the intensity of the drive-through changes, increases, or becomes materially greater than the intensity normally and reasonably associated with other food service drive-through uses that are established in the City, in terms of traffic, queuing, noise, hours, lighting, odor, or other aspects that may cause adverse off-site impact, City staff may require and order the conditional use approval to be remanded to the Planning Commission for re-examination of the conditional use approval and conditions for possible modification or supplementation."

Ms. Brnabic opened the floor for Public Comment at 7:07 p.m.

Janet Salisbury, 233 Grace Ave., Rochester Hills, MI Ms. Salisbury said that the map contained within the packet is unreadable. She asked where traffic be entering and existing if a fast food restaurant is added. Chairperson Brnabic said that this would not be a back and forth, and asked if Ms. Salisbury would like to come back up to speak after this was discussed, and Ms. Salisbury agreed.

Ms. Kapelanski clarified the circulation on the overhead screen for the drive through on the site plan. She showed that the entrance is on the north side of the building, cars would circle around the rear of the building, and the drive through is on the south side of the building, near the medical building.

Mr. Gaber asked the applicant whether they have signed a lease yet for the space, and whether they are aware of what kind of tenant would occupy the space. Ms. D'Agostini said that they have indicated to potential tenants that they are seeking approval for a drive through. She said that they have a handful of users that are interested, but they are only interested if there will be a drive through operation. Ms. D'Agostini said that the landscape for this type of tenant has changed a lot with Covid.

Mr. Gaber asked how many drive through stacking spaces there would be. Ms. Kapelanski said there will be ten, which is in compliance with the ordinance. Mr. Weaver asked if there are more than ten cars stacking whether they would be able to wrap around the rear of the building. Ms. D'Agostini said that the rear of the building is meant for service since that is the location of the delivery doors, and it would not be a patronized area.

Mr. Gaber asked where the menu board would be located. Ms. D'Agostini said that they had not planned that location yet, but that it would probably be closer to the corner of the building or north of that, so that not too many cars are stacked behind it. She commented that she is open to suggestions.

Mr. Gaber asked if there is a raised curb located to the west of the stacking

lane, and for clarification regarding whether a car could leave the stacking lane if they so choose. Ms. Kapelanski said that the drive through was not designed with a bypass lane, and such a lane is not required by the ordinance. She noted that the drive through meets the ordinance requirements.

Mr. Gaber said that he agrees with the added condition of approval that Ms. Kapelanski read since the user has not been identified. He asked if the intent of this additional condition would allow for the conditional use approval to be rescinded, or if it could just be used to modify the conditions. Ms. Kapelanski noted that she worked with the City's attorney on the language, in case a tenant came in with a very intense use. She said that it was staff's intent that a conditional use approval could be reconsidered if a drive through use came in that was extremely intense. However she was not sure what the attorney had in mind when he wrote it. The site could definitely not accommodate 40 stacking spaces, as an example. Mr. Gaber said that if he was the applicant's attorney looking at the conditions, he would say that the conditions could be adjusted but they could not be revoked as it is written.

Chairperson Brnabic reopened the Public Hearing at 7:16 p.m. Ms. MacDonald noted there were no email communications received, and Ms. Roediger noted there were no hands raised in the Zoom to speak.

Janet Salisbury, 233 Grace Ave., Rochester, MI. Ms. Salisbury said that South Blvd. is not a road that was ever made for that much traffic, and the drive through will be detrimental to those living in the area. She noted that the Road Commission for Oakland County changed the traffic signal at Rochester and South Blvd., and ever since they did it has been horrendous. She said that she has emailed them and they have not responded in two weeks and have not come out to do anything to change it. She said that what is happening on South Blvd. is that if you are headed eastbound during the day, it used to be only during the evening during a typical rush hour, that the center left hand turn lane gets backed up past the entrance of Nino Salvaggio's. Now that is happening all day long. She said that she sits there through three cycles of the light, wasting gas, in order to turn. If they would have left the flashing turn signal most of the time she could have turned. She said that if a fast food restaurant is added it will add a tremendous amount of traffic on South Blvd. that cannot handle the traffic right now the way that they've done this light. She said that Rochester Rd. is nonstop traffic, and when the City allowed the hotel to go in there it was also a conditional use and there was a right hand turn lane needed. There is a tiny right hand turn lane but it is not enough to handle the additional traffic. She said that the City already granted one conditional use for the hotel, she agrees with Mr. Bernard that the City may as well throw out the ordinances because such requests will always be approved. She asked the commissioners to take an interest in the people that already live there who didn't want the hotel there because of the traffic and for the lights that the hotel has. She said that she feels sorry for the people who live there and for the houses that back up to the hotel.

Chairperson Brnabic asked Mr. Boughton if he had any comments regarding the current traffic on South Blvd. Mr. Boughton said that he was not able to comment regarding the traffic on South Blvd., but noted that there are three

entrances to the development, two that existed prior to the development and one that was added with the addition of the hotel, retail and office space. He explained that one of the existing entrances on Rochester Rd. was revised to a right-in/right-out entrance. Ms. Kapelanski noted that it would be expected that people would generally access the site through from Rochester Rd., although it could be accessed from South Blvd.

Dr. Bowyer asked regarding the size of the businesses that will occupy the building, and whether it would be three tenants or one. Ms. D'Agostini said that's a good question; the building will be two stories, but one portion of the building, about 6,000 sq. ft., does not have the second story over it. She said that as a result food users wouldn't likely occupy the portion where there is the second story since they would need exhaust systems. So this would limit the intensity of the user of the drive through, and any food use would be the least amount of tenancy in the space. She guessed that the drive through user would likely be a smaller user that wouldn't have a lot of grease or need exhaust type of ventilation systems. She said that the user would not add to the intensity of the use of the site whatsoever, and cars stacking would not cause any congestion.

Dr. Bowyer asked if all of the building entrances would be on the east side. Ms. D'Agostini agreed that the main entrances will be on the Rochester Rd. side. She said they will probably have about seven tenants on the main floor, and noted they will be smaller users.

Dr. Bowyer asked Mr. Boughton to comment on whether there is enough room for people exiting and turning right onto Rochester Rd. when there are people turning in at the same time. Mr. Boughton said it is not an ideal situation; some turning movements could cause conflicts when a car is exiting the drive through. He noted that there will be an arrow so that a driver can only turn left when exiting the drive through, and there will be signage as shown on Sheet 3.0.

Chairperson Brnabic closed the Public Hearing at 7:27 p.m.

Mr. Weaver asked Ms. Kapelanski whether the aerial photo shown on the screen is still current for what the area looks like today. Ms. Kapelanski said not at all.

Mr. Weaver asked for clarification of the location of the second story of the building on the plans and whether it is on the north end of the building. Ms. D'Agostini clarified that it is on the south side of the building, and said that if they get a food user for that space, it will be small and low intensity, like coffee or toasted subs. On the north side of the building it may be more of a sit down type of restaurant.

Mr. Weaver asked whether there is any way to prevent someone from pulling in if traffic is backed up. Ms. Kapelanski suggested that signage prohibiting cutting through could be considered. Ms. D'Agostini said that she is not opposed to that idea, and that they would not be in favor of people cutting through the parking lot at all. Mr. Weaver said that the City does not want people to use such shortcuts, and that can be accomplished with signage. Vice Chairperson Hooper are there any specifics regarding the language for restricting the drive through use other than what has been read, and asked

whether the Commission could put some specifics on the condition such as restricting the square footage that the drive through user could occupy in the building, or restricting the number of stacking spaces to ten. Ms. Kapelanski noted that the situation with the unidentified tenant is a bit gray, that is why staff asked for the attorney's input. She said that she would be reluctant to put a square footage restriction in the condition. She said that in terms of the required stacking, she is not sure what that number should be. Vice Chairperson Hooper said this would not be a destination location, it will be a drive through to grab coffee for people driving by. Ms. Kapelanski suggested that perhaps the Planning Commission could review the drive through again if it were to start affecting Rochester Rd.

Ms. Roediger said to be consistent with the ordinance, there is a rule that if the use increases 20% then the project needs to go back to the Planning Commission. She noted that this allows for some leeway for small modifications.

Chairperson Brnabic commented that there are ten stacking spaces right now, so a 20% increase to that number would be acceptable. She reread the additional condition of approval from the City attorney and noted that every drive through has some variation, whether it is a Starbucks or a McDonalds.

Ms. Roediger said that Staff often gets the question about what is going in front of the Dunham's on Rochester Rd., where the City approved a drive through without a tenant being identified, and whether it could be a Chick Fil-A. The additional condition presented tonight could catch such a situation and provide the City with more protection.

Chairperson Brnabic commented that the conditional use approval would not be revoked with how it is written. She asked if it were to come back to the Planning Commission and there are 20-25 cars stacking consistently, how could the site be modified to accommodate that and asked how that could be addressed if there is not an answer. She said that Chick Fil-A would be an extreme case.

Ms. Roediger said that the Commission would then be reevaluating if the use is still appropriate.

Ms. D'Agostini said that they have been marketing this building since it was initially approved in 2018, and they haven't signed a single lease, and Covid did not help. She said that tenants are smart, and a high intensity user would never take a building like this. She remarked that she would accept having some checks and balances on the use. She noted that any new tenant would have to apply for required permits and zoning compliance could be checked at that time.

Ms. Kapelanski said that the City does have an opportunity to discuss new tenants when a permit application is submitted, and a high intensity user would be a red flag for the Building department. Ms. D'Agostini said that users that want this type of building include those such as Beyond Juice, small food users, and high end products that don't generate a lot of traffic. She commented that she is not concerned about limiting the use since they will never get the high intensity users mentioned.

Mr. Gaber said that he was not on the Planning Commission when this original site plan was approved, and that was the time to address a lot of these issues about the intensity of uses. He said that he doesn't think that adding this drive through will do much to add to the intensity of the uses, he does think that the use for the drive through will be minimal in comparison to others. Mr. Gaber remarked that he thinks adding the condition discussed to the conditional land use approval will help as a check and balance for future uses. He said that the language is a little confusing, but to Mr. Hooper's point, the language should be broad to give the City the discretion to be able to address any increases in the intensity. He said that he doesn't want to limit this to certain metrics or numbers, and he suggested changing the approval conditions to read that "if in the determination of City staff the intensity of the drive through changes or increases in terms of traffic, queuing, noise, hours, lighting, odors, or other aspects that may cause adverse offsite impacts, City staff may require and order the conditional use approval to be remanded to the Planning Commission and City Council for reexamination of the conditional use approval and conditions, for possible revocation, modification, or supplementation". This would leave the discretion to City staff to determine what is an adverse use and what is negatively impacting the surrounding community and he does not think that it should be tied to certain numbers.

Mr. Gaber moved, Mr. Hooper seconded the motion in the packet adding two conditions.

Mr. Dettloff asked for clarification that on the site plan it looks like there are three tenant spaces in the building, but it was mentioned that there would be five to seven tenants. Ms. D'Agostini said that he understood correctly, the tree spaces shown could be subdivided.

Mr. Dettloff said that Ms. D'Agostini had mentioned they have been marketing the new building since 2018, and asked the price per square foot that they are asking. Ms. D'Agostini said that right now they have 3 leases that they are in negotiations on and they are not signed, they are in the low \$30 per sq. ft. triple net range. They found that as soon as the building started taking shape and people saw that they were serious about building it, things have picked up. The pre-marketing was rough. They have completely relandscaped and repaved the building next door, and they are really improving the site as a whole. The hotel user is doing the same. They are getting a lot more interest than they were previously. She said that their pricing is actually low in comparison. The problem is they are kind of the last ones to the party, every retailer is already on Rochester Rd., so that's why they've made only half of the building retail.

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

Aye 8 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Gaber, Hooper, Bowyer, Weaver, Neubauer and Struzik

Excused 1 - Kaltsounis

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. 95-044.3 (Gateway Spec. Building Drive-Through),

the Planning Commission recommends to City Council Approval of the Conditional Use to allow for a drive-through operation, based on documents dated received by the Planning Department on September 2, 2021 with the following findings.

Findings:

- A. The proposed use will promote the intent and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance.
- B. The building has 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.
- C. The proposal should have a positive impact on the community as a whole and the surrounding area by further offering jobs.
- D. The proposed development is served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, water and sewer, drainage ways, and refuse disposal.
- E. The proposed development should not be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to existing or future neighboring land uses, persons, property, or the public welfare.
- F. 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. If, in the determination of City staff, the intensity of the drive-through changes or increases, in terms of traffic, queuing, noise, hours, lighting, odor, or other aspects that may cause adverse off-site impact, City staff may require and order the conditional use approval to be remanded to the Planning Commission and City Council as necessary for re-examination of the conditional use approval and conditions for possible revocation, modification or supplementation.

2021-0428

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 95-044.3 - for construction of a new two story 29,000 sq. ft. mixed use building with retail, office and restaurant use on approximately 2.6 acres located on the west side of Rochester Rd. and north of South Blvd., zoned B-3 Shopping Center Business District, Parcel No. 15-34-477-018, Emily D'Agostini Kunath, Applicant

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

Aye 8 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Gaber, Hooper, Bowyer, Weaver, Neubauer and Struzik

Excused 1 - Kaltsounis

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. 95-044.3 (Gateway Spec. Building Drive-Through), the Planning Commission approves the Site Plan, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on September 1, 2021 with the following findings and subject to the following conditions:

Findings:

- A. 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.
- B. The proposed project will be accessed from Rochester Rd., thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets.
- C. The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.
- D. The proposed development will not have an unreasonably detrimental or injurious effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the site or those of the surrounding area.

Conditions:

1. Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, prior to final approval by staff.
2. Provide a landscape bond in the amount of \$136,981.75, plus inspection fees, as adjusted by staff as necessary, prior to the preconstruction meeting with Engineering.

2021-0426

Public Hearing and request for Preliminary Site Condominium Plan Recommendation - City File No. 19-031 - Camden Crossing Site Condos, a proposed 26-unit, detached single family condominium development on 9.36 acres located on the north side of Hamlin Rd., between Livernois and Rochester Rd., zoned R-3 One Family Residential with MR Mixed Residential Overlay District, Parcel Nos. 15-22-451-029, 15-22-451-002 and part of 15-22-451-022, Camden Crossing, Applicant

Present for the applicant were Jim Polyzois on behalf of Camden Crossing, 14955 Technology Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48315 and Ralph Nunez of Nunez Design, 249 Park Street, Troy, MI 48083.

Mr. Gaber noted that he will be recusing himself from this item, for Camden Crossing site condos because he's done work with and represented the applicant, not on this project but on other unrelated projects. Chairperson Brnabic excused Mr. Gaber.

Ms. Kapelanski summarized the proposal for a 26 unit condominium development on about 9.5 acres using the MR Mixed Residential overlay district. She noted that the houses are allowed to be spaced a little closer together with an open space development and the applicant is requesting to modify the requirement to allow the development on a parcel that is less than 10 acres. Ms. Kapelanski noted that Units 7 and 8 have a deficient rear yard setback. Additionally, it should be noted that the development has been reviewed under the previous version of the City's tree ordinance.

Mr. Nunez explained that they have worked on this project for quite some time, and have ensured that adjacent neighbors were part of the discussion. Based on the comments from neighbors as well as from Planning staff they redesigned

the layout to reduce the number of units and to move the units further south on the property. He said that 238 trees would be required to be planted for the development, and they have 20 trees that are in the preservation zone and they meet the intent of the zoning ordinance. Mr. Nunez said that the neighbors to the north have done a great job screening their property to the rear which will help. He showed on the plans a heavy dashed line which shows the limits of the construction, and he said that part of the wetland onsite is being reconstituted into a detention basin. He said that one of the things that they looked at was the open space requirement of 20,000 sq. ft., and said the dark areas shown on the plans are about 65,000 sq. ft. so they will have a little more than three times the required open space area. He explained that they have created a pathway system on the property, and he said that the wetland in the open space area will remain intact. He said the pathways will be a 1,000-1,500 ft. linear circuit to help provide exercise. At the front of the property there was a lot of existing vegetation, they had a birch tree that was a great specimen tree, and cottonwoods that were required to be saved.

Mr. Nunez explained that as part of their design process they also did a test plan for a development under the R-3 Single Family Residential zone district, which included a connection to Crestline Ave. The plan included a modified turnaround with four units on the north side of the site. He said that they knew that plan would not be desirable. He explained that they've had some difficulties with their engineering services due to the death of a contracted employee who was working on the project. He noted he can answer any questions regarding the project.

Chairperson Brnabic said that she does not see any uniqueness to the site or any special circumstances to justify modification of the interior rear yard setback, and it appears that the applicant just wanted to add another unit.

Mr. Polyzois offered to eliminate either Unit 7 or Unit 8 from the plans immediately. He said that he would remove Unit 7 since it will allow for an opportunity to add more trees and green space which could be viewed from Hamlin Rd.

Ms. Brnabic asked the applicant to update the Environmental Impact statement since it was done in 2019 and asked if the prices listed will still be current. Mr. Polyzois said the prices will be in the \$500,000 range.

Ms. Brnabic said that at this point she does not have a problem using discretion to allow for the modification of the 10 acre minimum for this development.

Mr. Weaver said that he appreciates the applicant's willingness to remove the one unit and the addition of more green space. He asked whether the applicant knows the condition of the trees onsite that will be saved.

Mr. Nunez that a survey was not completed to show the condition of the trees.

Mr. Weaver said that the pathway is located within a drainage swale, and asked if there could be any issues in winter with freezing or ice hazards.

Mr. Nunez said that their engineers have reviewed it and do not see any issues with the pathway location.

Mr. Weaver suggested that the applicant use any deer tolerant plantings if possible. He referred to Sheet 1.5 and asked whether the seeded area shown is just for lawn. He commented that he appreciates the northern portion of the property being left open after listening to neighbors.

Mr. Struzik commented that the green space on the north side of the site is very desirable, and said that he likes the meandering pathway. He asked the applicants whether it was their intention to allow people from outside the development to use the pathway. He noted that there are some developments in the City that restrict entry to such areas.

Dr. Bowyer thanked the applicant for designing something unique so that people can interact with each other; for reducing the density; and for not building on the Sunoco pipeline. When she comes out of her subdivision across the street she will be looking right at this development and sees the pipeline area going through the rear yards of all of those houses. When Sunoco came through and clear cut all of the trees those residents lost their beautiful backyards. To have the layout so these new residents will not have to worry about that is nice. She said that she likes that they have kept the open area, green spaces, and expanded the wetlands area, so the animals that area there will still be able to use that area. She said that there is not much new affordable housing under construction anymore, construction costs are skyrocketing. With the price point identified this will not be affordable housing, but she thanked the applicant for providing the prices. She thanked the applicant for saving trees, even more than what the tree preservation ordinance says must be saved. She said the development will be located right at the end of here street and it will be nice to have the additional green areas. She said that it's a win for residents in the area.

Mr. Dettloff commented that it is a great looking development, and he appreciates the investment of affordable housing in the City. He said that new housing starts are down currently due to material costs and labor shortages. He asked when they plan on starting construction. Mr. Polyzois said they plan to start next fall.

Ms. Brnabic referenced three resident emails that were received, and asked for staff to clarify whether a traffic study was completed, and to comment on removal of wetlands and the proposed density of the development.

Mr. Boughton said that the neighboring houses off of Parkland Drive are roughly 10 ft. higher in elevation and have a different drainage district than the proposed development. Avon Hills subdivision drains to the east and then north across Rochester Rd. toward Genisys Credit Union and keeps going east. Camden Crossing will drain under Hamlin Square shopping center, the to the Bordine's parking lot, and then heads south toward the City of Troy. He said that the proposed development will not help or hinder the existing drainage for Avon Hills Village. Regarding having units on Crestline Street, it is a City/local road and the Hamlin Crestline condominium that was previously approved in 2003 with five units having a driveway off of Crestline. Similar developments have had

units on existing streets such as Clearcreek 5 subdivision which had houses on Sheldon Road. With regards to the traffic impact study, Mr. Boughton commented that the number of condominiums proposed did not require that one be completed. He said that the proposed road does meet requirements and is consistent with previous developments that have been approved in the City, and referred to Chapter 6 Engineering Design Standards. He explained that the reason for the note was due to providing a 45 ft. road easement instead of a 60 ft. right-of-way.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 8:19 p.m.

Elizabeth Hurst, 1840 Crestline St., Rochester Hills, MI Ms. Hurst said that she is surprised that the City needs more tax money so desperately to let this development to go through. She said that she knows the people who own that lot and knows they would love to get it sold, however 26 detached condos is overdoing it. She said that Hamlin Rd. does not need that kind of traffic, Crestline does not need that kind of traffic, and the development would be turning loose 56 more cars. She said that the City has already allowed the speed bumps to be flattened from having all of the cement trucks driving over them, and the City has not given much help to the people that already live there. She and her family have lived there for 50 years, and her house is older than she is, 102 years, and it was moved from Rochester Rd. She said that she has a flooded yard because nothing has been done about any of that, she couldn't even live in her house and now they are putting in this many houses. When the new sewer line was put in on Hamlin Road they cut through one of her friend's sewer lines and the City did nothing to help. They could not even live in the house for a while. She said that she thinks it is pathetic.

Gary Elrod, 495 Parkland Dr., Rochester Hills, MI Mr. Elrod said that he sent an email earlier today, he has lived in his home for 25 years and this development is not worthy of approval. He said that even though some of the changes he's seen since they were last submitted are better for him because he's on the north side of the development. From his family room all he'll be able to see is this development going on from start to finish. He's concerned with the flooding on Crestline and it hasn't been resolved yet, so why put in all of these new condos. Every time we get a rain there is flooding, because there is a problem with Crestline. He said this development is unnecessary and he was hoping with the problems that we're having with materials and labor that this wouldn't go through. He said they moved there because it's beautiful and they don't want it ruined.

Paul Schira, Sycamore HOA, 227 Parkland, Rochester Hills, MI Mr. Schira said he was walking around with Mr. Polyzois looking at the plans. He said these plans are a lot better than what was originally planned because of the setback. He said that he's like Dr. Bowyer, he's located right on the pipeline and had his backyard torn up twice for that and lost three pine trees in his back yard. He asked whether there is a potential for a street light in the future for the intersection at Hamlin Rd. He also said that there was another new development west of Crestline and their detention pond was supposed to be able to accommodate a 100 year rain, and it has flooded ten times this year already. He asked if the detention pond for Camden Crossing could be larger, and if the

elevation was higher on the west side so that the water flows into the pond, or if it will flow into the yard to the northwest corner of the property. He said that he understands the concerns about traffic, however if you are driving over 25 m.p.h. over the speed bumps you will hit something.

Alex Kiwior, 1860 Crestline, Rochester Hills, MI Mr. Kiwior said that all of the houses on Crestline that are proposed are all opposite from his property, so he has concerns for this and he's lived there for 45 years. He said that this meeting was one big surprise, it's the first time that she's been contacted that there's a meeting. His neighbor across the street told him he had heard of the development but he's never been contacted, what is wrong with the communications. He said on Father's Day he had two inches of rain in his basement for the first time, there are a lot of issues there. A few years back the property on Crestline was proposed for 5 houses, now there are 7. Crestline used to be a dead end street, now it's a cut through. He has a lot of concerns but he'll have to reserve his comments until he sees full sized blueprints. There's a ravine that will affect the whole subdivision and he'll like to see how they will handle that with all of the water flowing through.

Carly Uhrig - 459 Parkland Dr., Rochester Hills, MI Ms. Uhrig said that her home is on the bottom right of the map. She said that this development will be a manufactured green space, it is currently a heavily wooded area and the home of many deer, coyote, woodchucks, and every kind of bird that you can imagine. She said that she is having a hard time coming to terms with seeing it destroyed. She said that as a parent it is also difficult, she is concerned about the traffic. Hamlin Elementary is right down the road on Hamlin, during the morning and afternoon it is extremely busy. She explained that it will be difficult to add seven driveways to Crestline, there are no sidewalks on the street. She said that it is behind her home where they will have the detention basin that's part of the open space being created. She said that 25 units is an incredible amount of development for the property and it is not suitable at all for development. She said that on paper it looks lovely, and planting individual trees will not be the same.

Madelyn and Dale Upleger, 1835 Crestline, Rochester Hills, MI Mr. Upleger said that they have lived there for 33 years. They have had five floods coming through their yard this year, it was unbelievable. He said that all of the water came between those homes, came on the northwest side of Hamlin, and right through their property. He said that if they raise the land for the condominiums it will landlock their property, their yard will become a detention area and dam it all up. Mr. Upleger said that they were told the property is wetlands and would never be built on. He said that 1,000 cars a day go down that street, and this development will make it so much worse. He is against the development because of the water and there will be no privacy, and he would like some sort of fence to be installed.

Chairperson Brnabic asked if the flooding on their property has been consistent or if there was more this year because of the heavy rains. Mr. Upleger said that they have videos of all of the rain.

Chairperson Brnabic asked Mr. Boughton whether there has been any City

involvement regarding flooding in the vicinity.

Mr. Boughton responded that he was not aware of draining complaints, which would be handled by others. He said that the proposed detention pond has a 25 year volume storage, and he said it will be a lower elevation than all of the ground around it and not higher, so all of the water will flow to that pond. And they are providing 14% more than what is needed. If the water exceeds the capacity it will head to the east to the existing wetlands behind Hamlin Elementary and further east.

Chairperson Brnabic noted there was a request for a larger detention pond. Mr. Boughton said that they are currently proposing more than 14 percent more than the required amount. She asked the applicant to respond to the last homeowners' request for additional landscaping.

Mr. Polyzois said that they could reposition some of the plantings to the west property line. He said that he did speak to a homeowner on Crestline and he has no problem working with neighbors to reposition trees.

Vice Chairperson Hooper asked the applicant to clarify the location of the referenced plantings.

Mr. Nunez explained that they were keeping trees away from the resident's property to the west was to allow them to get sun for their vegetable garden. He highlighted the area on the site plan on the overhead that would remain untouched.

Chairperson Brnabic directed the applicants to speak with the Uplegers and work with them to address the concerns, and noted City staff could act as moderators if needed.

Mr. Polyzois said that he would speak to them after the meeting.

Dr. Bowyer commented that at Monday's City Council meeting they had a discussion of flooding, also at Cumberland Hills, and asked for City staff to look into those areas and to see if the storm sewer system could handle the flooding better.

Vice Chairperson Hooper said that he lives right next to the Uplegers, and said there is a detention pond for the Nottingham Woods subdivisions. He said if it doesn't function properly, when the developer is getting ready to close out their project the city may need to use that bond money to address the issue. He said that the soil grades are not being changed for the homes behind Crestline, and it may be appropriate to add screening for the two neighbors. With regard to traffic issues, he said that people would mostly use Hamlin Rd. As far as meetings go it's unfortunate the residents on Crestline were not included as part of the meeting.

Mr. Polyzois said that he knocked on doors of the homes on Crestline, left his business card and a brochure, and some residents called him. He said that he did not leave information on Vice Chairperson Hooper's door because he knew

that he would get a packet with the plans for the meeting.

Vice Chairperson Hooper said that in the area the drainage heads to the east, and with this development there would not be increased flooding because the water would be heading east toward the Hamlin Pub property. He noted that proposed development homes will exceed the value of their homes, none of their homes have sold for \$500,000. He commented that developments like this add value to the City, it will raise the value of their homes and will not be detrimental.

Mr. Weaver suggested that the applicant remove the walkway on the north side of the property, and therefore all improvements located to the north of the pipeline would be removed. Ms. Kapelanski noted that the walkway is not required.

Mr. Polyzois said that he would meet with Mr. Nunez and draw some new concepts, while keeping the spirit of what they are trying to accomplish in place.

Mr. Weaver suggested that if the trail was woodchipped it would be more natural and not require bulldozing. Mr. Polyzois said that he would come up with something before the council meeting.

Ms. Roediger said there was no one with their hand raised to comment on the Zoom, and Ms. MacDonald noted there were no additional emails received.

Chairperson Brnabic closed the Public Hearing at 8:55 p.m.

Vice Chairperson Hooper said the plans to be presented at the City Council need some further refinement. He noted that he would like to address the common themes of the public comments about the property being developed. He explained that the property has been residentially zoned for 50 years, and now that development is being proposed, it's legal and within the ordinance and the City intended for it to be developed residentially. He understands that people want it to be left as undisturbed green space but noted that they have to balance with the rights of the people who own the property to develop the property within the City ordinances and the laws of the community. He said that this development is less intrusive than it would be if it were a standard R3 development, they could put homes right up along the north property line. It would be well within their rights to do that. With the Mixed Residential district, reduced setback and reduced side yards, the homes can be moved further south.

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

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Bowyer, Weaver, Neubauer and Struzik

Abstain 1 - Gaber

Excused 1 - Kaltsounis

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. 19-031 Camden Crossing Condos, the Planning Commission recommends approval of the Preliminary Site Condominium Plan, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on September 14, 2021, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions:

Findings:

A. 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.

B. The proposed project will be accessed from Hamlin Rd., thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on the adjoining street.

C. Adequate utilities are available to the site.

D. The preliminary plan represents a reasonable street and lot layout and orientation.

E. The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.

F. The proposed development will not have an unreasonably detrimental or injurious effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the site or those of the surrounding area.

Additionally, the modifications presented to the MR Mixed Residential Overlay District, including development on the 9.36 acre property when 10 acres are required, and for 28 ft. interior rear setbacks when a minimum 35 ft. setback is required, are acceptable based on the following findings:

A. The site plan and use will promote the intent and purpose of the ordinance.

B. The site has been designed and is proposed to be operated, maintained and managed so as to be compatible, harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing or planned character of the general vicinity, adjacent uses of land, the natural environment, the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the land use and the community as a whole.

C. The proposed development will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainageways, refuse disposal or that the persons or agencies responsible for the establishment of the land use or activity shall be able to provide adequately any such service.

D. The proposed development will not be detrimental, hazardous or disturbing to existing or future neighboring uses, persons, property or the public welfare.

E. The proposed development 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. Condominium Unit #7 is to be removed from the plans as discussed.

2. Additional landscaping in the form of trees and vegetation is to be provided, as reviewed

by staff, to address the adjoining westerly neighbor's comments.

3. Applicant to address meeting comments and provide alternatives for the open space area of the development.

4. Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, prior to final approval by staff.

5. Provide a landscape bond in the amount of \$181,093.20, plus inspection fees, as adjusted by staff as necessary, prior to the preconstruction meeting with Engineering.

Chairperson called for a short break for the meeting at 9:00 p.m. and called the meeting back to order at 9:10 p.m.

DISCUSSION

2021-0424

Proposed Multi-Family Development, consisting of approximately seven (7) acres near the northeast corner of Avon and Rochester Roads, zoned O-1 Office and B-3 Commercial with a Mixed Residential Overlay, Doraid Markus, Markus Management Group, Applicant

Mr. Gaber noted that he will be recusing himself from discussion on this item because he represents the property owner. Chairperson Brnabic excused Mr. Gaber.

Present for the applicant were Doraid Markus, Markus Management, 251 E. Merrill, Suite 205, Birmingham, MI 48009 and Mark Abanatha, with Alexander Bogaerts & Associates, 2445 Franklin Rd., Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302.

Chairperson Brnabic reviewed the plans submitted for a proposed multi-family development consisting of approximately seven (7) acres near the northeast corner of Avon and Rochester Roads, zoned O-1 Office and B-3 Commercial with a Mixed Residential Overlay.

Ms. Kapelanski explained that this is a potential application and they are requesting comments on this 130 unit proposed development at the northeast corner of Avon and Rochester. This item is for discussion purposes only; the applicant has not submitted an application and departmental reviews have not been conducted. She noted that the current zoning designations do not accommodate this request so they would need to request a rezoning, a conditional rezoning or a PUD. They are here tonight to introduce this idea to the commissioners and to get their initial thoughts on whether they think this could be a good fit for the location.

Mr. Markus said that while they have been working at the mixed use development at the northeast corner of Rochester and Avon that was recently approved by the Planning Commission and will be going before the City Council, they looked east and saw a vast piece of land and wondered how to best enhance it and make it part of the overall development at the corner. They spoke to the adjoining property owners to see if they could acquire their parcels, one of whom is in the audience tonight. As they formulated a plan they thought an apartment development would be best suited to the location. There is FB-3 Flexible Business District zoning on the adjacent parcel to the east, and if they

were able to rezone the property to FB-3 it would allow for a variety of uses. If the easterly portion of the property were left zoned as MR Mixed Residential there is really no way to develop the property, he thinks when the City's Master Plan was completed this was not considered.

Mr. Abanatha commented that he is excited about this project, to create a true mixed use development by bringing in a residential component, since there will be retail, office and restaurants at the corner, and it would act as a wonderful transition to the adjoining residential properties. He explained that they are proposing six (6) and a half buildings, they are designed to be compact when it comes to typical multifamily type buildings, with twenty (20) units in each building. There would be a mix of one (1) to three (3) bedroom units, and eleven (11) units or a little more than half of the units would have a garage. He said that the balance of the parking would be on the periphery of the site. He said that they would try to get one covered parking space or carport per unit, and they are proposing a community building on the north side of the property and they would provide for a large greenbelt to create even more of a transition. He said the architecture would be contemporary vernacular, with vertical and horizontal siding and stone and brick, it has a feel of being more commercially oriented with regard to the architecture, to relate well to the development at the corner. He said that they would have a nice pool at the clubhouse and it would also have cutting edge amenities, including a tech room and fitness area. He explained that typical parking standards for low rise or midrise multifamily are somewhere between 1.2 and 1.5 cars per unit, and they are providing 1.87. He said that if you were to look at the number of one, two and tree bedroom units in order to provide a car per bedroom, they are parked beyond that. He said with the added shared parking on the east side of the site they basically have two spaces per unit. He believes that this will be a wonderful addition to the community, and a great way to cap off the corner. He said that they try to present all of their projects for input prior to formal submission, so that they can work as a team to bring the community what it is looking for.

Mr. Markus explained that they would be closing the curb cut that is in front of the house onsite right now. They would be maintaining access to the Shelton GMC between the apartment complex and the retail center, to allow Mr. Shelton to still have his trucks delivered there if he needs that access. They would be looking to have shared parking with the corner development which would add 14 and then 8 more spaces. Obviously for weekends and evenings, the corner development offices would not be using their parking spaces, so there would be an opportunity for even more parking as part of a shared parking agreement.

Chairperson Brnabic asked the applicants to clarify the number of proposed parking spaces, whether it would be 244 spaces plus an additional 22 for the shared parking. Mr. Abanatha confirmed that it would be 266 total spaces, a little more than two per unit. She said that she has concerns with the amount of parking based on past experience, and noted with each 20 unit building to have eleven (11) 1-car garages, it is not a lot of parking if there are some three (3) bedroom units. She said that she does not think that is a lot of parking.

Mr. Markus said that there is onsite parking which would be sufficient but it was not their intent to provide a garage to every tenant. Mr. Abanatha said that this

is a high mix for multifamily development, the goal is generally to provide a combination of garage and open parking spaces. He said that this development would be higher end in terms of that mix. He said that parking for multifamily development is usually a mix of attached or detached garages and open parking with carports.

Chairperson Brnabic said that the Planning Commission has seen parking problems over time and would like to avoid that. She said that there will probably be two vehicles in the 2 and three (3) bedroom units from a planning perspective and the amount of parking provided is not realistic, since most people have their own vehicle.

Mr. Abanatha said that that is changing nationally, and here residents would have proximity to downtown, that is how this project is driven and they don't believe parking would be an issue. He said with a lot more people working from home a second bedroom may just be used as a home office. He said that the parking could spill over to the property to the west when the offices at the corner building are not open. He noted that they could have a parking consultant come in and run the numbers.

Mr. Markus said that 84 of the units would be two bedrooms and there would be 40 one bedroom units. He said that they want to avoid having a huge sea of parking spaces and instead allow people to use the office parking spaces for visitors to the multifamily development, that people might as well be able to use that back lot. Mr. Abanatha said that some of the two bedroom units may have only one car, some of the one bedroom units could have two cars, there are many ways to look at the parking, it depends on the tenants.

Vice Chairperson Hooper asked for confirmation that this development would have rental units. He remarked that they are attractive buildings but the development looks awfully dense, he'd like to see what density the commission has approved for other developments. He said that he doesn't see anything that would allow this development to qualify as a PUD, there is no underlying condition to allow for that. Mr. Markus said that they would be looking to submit for a conditional rezoning. Vice Chairperson Hooper said that he's all for shared parking. He asked if the tree ordinance would apply and noted they would probably have to reduce the density to meet the tree ordinance requirements. He said when they need to address storm sewer requirements and provide detention that will take up some space also. He said the pool and clubhouse is going to have to move to the middle of the development and away from the existing residential properties, the location presented is not going to fly as it is bordering the four residences that are right there. Otherwise he said that he is not opposed to the idea of a mixed residential concept here as long as it's high end.

Mr. Struzik commented that he also likes the idea of shared parking, he doesn't want to see unnecessary parking spaces which just add to the impervious surface of the property and stormwater to deal with, and reduced green space. He said that he likes the idea of having a mix of apartments that have an attached garage and those without, they would be priced differently and offer people more options. He said that the pool was the immediate item that he was

drawn to and said it will not work in that location. To the north is Dalton, there are 3 or 4 houses there and he suggested that a pool can be very noisy and distracting for neighbors who are enjoying their own peaceful backyards.

Mr. Dettloff commented that this is a nice looking development. He asked what the rent structure would be and said that obviously the prices with garages would be factored into the rent. Mr. Markus said that they are conducting a rent study now and the rents will be at a premium, but he does not have an actual price range now.

Dr. Bowyer thanked the applicant for what they have proposed. She said that she agrees with Mr. Hooper and Mr. Struzik that the clubhouse and pool was the first thing that she noticed and said that they need to be moved so that they are not abutting the backyards of the existing single family residences. She suggested that the applicant design for a transition between the 3-story buildings with a 2-story building, so that there would not be a 3-story apartment building next to the existing homes. She said that the look of it is nice and the shared parking is a great idea, and it is nice that they are offering garages. She noted that the density is a little high but as Mr. Hooper stated once you get into all of the things that you're going to have to put in, the density will be reduced.

Mr. Weaver asked whether the three story aspect of this development is conditioned upon the zoning change. Ms. Kapelanski said the current zoning does not accommodate this type of development. If this were to be conditionally rezoned the FB Flexible Business district could be considered. Mr. Weaver said that he echoes Dr. Bowyer's comments about reducing the height of the rear buildings close to the existing residences to two stories, to provide a better transition.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the floor for public comment at 9:38 p.m.

Matthew Berard, 1698 Westridge Dr. *Mr. Berard said that this is a terrible idea. He said that Mr. Markus' proposal from September 21st for the mixed use building was already going to cause a lot of traffic impact at one of the busiest intersections in the City. He said that part of that project is a Starbucks with a wraparound drive through which now is going to be mixed in with the shared parking for the multifamily development. This is going to create a really busy and potentially dangerous intersection. From a general standpoint, he said that the citizens of Rochester Hills expect that you are going to uphold the zoning variances. He said that the Planning Commission is the body to enforce the zoning ordinances and to give the residents the confidence that their city is going to enforce the law. He asked the commissioners to please keep that in mind when they are making decisions. He said that he's also a little concerned that the neighbors were not provided notice of this discussion topic on the agenda tonight. He said that they would have been here if they would have known about it, and suggested that there should not be any further discussion about it until they are given notice. He said that the topic has already been discussed for 20 minutes and some commissioners have given preliminary approval which is not appropriate. He said that he finds the timing odd, because on September 21st there was no mention of this project, and now here we are on October 19th and we have an approval and then we're going to add on to it. He*

encouraged the commissioners to enforce the zoning ordinance and the law because the residents expect.

Chairperson Brnabic closed the floor for public comment at 9:43 p.m.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that this item was for discussion only tonight, so no plans have been submitted and no decisions have been made, it purely was for discussion. She asked Ms. Kapelanski to clarify the procedure for a conditional rezoning. Ms. Kapelanski said that the applicant would submit first for a concept review, and staff would review and provide comments, and then request to rezone for a particular district and proceed through the process. She explained that with a conditional rezoning approval, only the current plans presented can be constructed. It would come to the Planning Commission for consideration of a rezoning, and the plans would be attached, so the only thing that could be constructed would be that plan. She noted this is similar to how a PUD works, but without the aspects of lists of deviations and public benefits and other things that come with a PUD. Then they would go ahead through the site plan process and submit plans with more detail.

Chairperson Brnabic asked whether the commission has the option to offer suggestions when a conditional rezoning is submitted. Ms. Kapelanski said that she would always defer to the City attorney, but she said the commission can make suggestions or ask the applicant to make modifications to respond to resident concerns for example. She explained that the applicant would have the ability to say they cannot accommodate such requests, and the Planning Commission would be welcome to review the proposed rezoning based on its merits and decide whether they want to approve it. Chairperson Brnabic said it has been years since the commission has reviewed a conditional rezoning and wasn't sure whether they could request modifications.

Ms. Roediger said that conditional rezonings were set up for the applicant to come with their set of plans and conditions, versus other reviews when the City imposes the conditions. So the Planning Commission can take or leave the conditions that the applicant presents. She explained that the purpose of a conditional rezoning is to rezone to allow for a specific site plan and to not allow all of the gamete of things that could be constructed within the new zone district, some of which may be less or more desirable. Often times there may be modifications, and the City has a good track record of working with applicants to make developments fit better in the context of the surrounding properties and to respond to concerns.

Chairperson Brnabic said that the proposed development feels a little dense for the property. Mr. Markus said that they will make some changes and come back.

Discussed

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Roediger noted that this will be the last Planning Commission meeting utilizing Zoom, and said that at the next meeting pre-Covid policies and procedures will be followed.

Ms. Roediger presented the Michigan Municipal League (MML) trophy that she, Mayor Bryan Barnett and Pamela Valentik, Economic Development Manager won when they attended the annual MML conference and won project of the year for the Auburn Road Brooklands improvement project. She explained that they were up against 25 other communities and the top four were selected, and each community had to present their project live, after which the conference attendees selected the winner. She said that the City was awarded the trophy which is a big honor in the MML world.

Ms. Neuberger offered general comments that the Planning Commission's duties are to enforce the law and zoning ordinances, and said that each commissioner takes pride in the work they do. She said that there are checks and balances in the system and each application is reviewed on a case by case basis. She commented that variances are part of the procedures but they are not granted without extreme thought and consideration. She said that the commissioners try to accommodate residents more often than not, and none of them want to eliminate green space in the City of Rochester Hills. She said that property owners have rights to develop property and if people want green space then they need to purchase it.

Ms. Roediger commented that staff is planning for a joint Planning Commission and City Council meeting for January 31, 2022.

NEXT MEETING DATE

November 16, 2021

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission and upon motion by Ms. Neubauer, seconded by Mr. Hooper, Chairperson Brnabic adjourned the Regular Meeting at 9:55 p.m.

Deborah Brnabic, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Secretary