



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 15, 2025

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Brnabic called the April 15, 2025 Regular Planning Commission Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., Michigan Time.

ROLL CALL

Present 9 - Deborah Brnabic, Sheila Denstaedt, Gerard Dettloff, Anthony Gallina, Greg Hooper, Marvie Neubauer, Dale Hetrick, Scott Struzik and Ben Weaver

Others Present:

Sara Roediger, Planning and Economic Development Director
Chris McLeod, Planning Manager
Debby Hoyle, Senior Financial Analyst
Tracey Balint, City Engineer
Jason Boughton, Engineering Utilities Specialist
Mike Viazanko, Building/Ordinance/Facilities Director
Matt Exley, Manager of Facilities
Dennis Andrews, Deputy Director, Parks and Natural Resources
Jennifer MacDonald, Recording Secretary

Chairperson Brnabic welcomed attendees to the April 15, 2025 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

[2025-0150](#) March 18, 2025 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 9 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

COMMUNICATIONS

None.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

NEW BUSINESS

2025-0151

Public Hearing and Request for Adoption of the 2026-2031 Capital Improvement Plan

(Hoyle Memo dated 4-15-25, Roediger Memo dated 4-9-25, 2026-2031 Capital Improvement Plan and Public Hearing Notice had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

In addition to Planning Staff, other staff members present were Deborah Hoyle, Senior Financial Analyst, Tracey Balint, City Engineer, Jason Boughton, Engineering Utilities Specialist, Mike Viazanko, Building/Ordinance/Facilities Director, Matt Exley, Manager of Facilities, and Dennis Andrews, Deputy Director, Parks and Natural Resources.

Chairperson Brnabic introduced this item and invited staff to present the CIP.

Ms. Hoyle stated that tonight she will be presenting the new projects for the 2026 to 2031 Capital Improvement Plan. She explained that projects will continue all over the city and not just in one area, and throughout all the coming years. Her presentation included a chart which highlighted that there are 22 new projects, and 26 projects were removed including 19 that had been completed and seven that were deleted. She noted the following projects, dates and estimated costs:

- FA-010 - City Hall Carpet Replacement - 2027 - \$850,000*
- FA-01P - City Hall Conference Room Scheduling Displays - 2027 - \$30,000*
- FA-01Q - City Hall DTE Line Upgrades - 2026 - \$150,000*
- FA-13P - Fire Stations Vehicle Exhaust System Replacement - 2026 - \$600,000*
- MR-05I - Adams Road Improvements at Nowicki Park - 2026 - \$1,575,500*
- MR-22B - Star Batt Left Turn Signal at Crooks (and at Avon Industrial Drive) - 2026 - \$37,500*
- MR-26H - Livernois Left Turn Signal at Drexelgate - 2026 - \$75,000*
- PK-01Q - Bloomer Park Drainage Study - 2026 - \$200,000*
- PK-05R - Borden Park Fuel Tanks at Maintenance Yard - 2026 - \$150,000*
- PK-13B - Innovation Hills Electrical Upgrades - 2026 - \$150,000*
- PK-24B - Veterans Memorial Pointe Pathway Replacement - 2026 - \$275,000*
- PK-27B - Stoney Creek Historical Signage - 2026 - \$100,000*

Chairperson Brnabic asked Ms. Hoyle to pause and answer any questions on the projects listed so far.

Mr. Hetrick asked if the project for Adams Road at Nowicki Park shared with the

Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC) or is one hundred percent funded by Rochester Hills.

Ms. Balint responded that Engineering is still in the preliminary stages and Staff have been communicating with RCOC. She explained that they have a preliminary plan and a preliminary estimate for the cost of the work; however, they do not have knowledge of the funding yet. She stated that Staff will keep working with RCOC to see if there is the potential for different opportunities to share costs for that improvement.

Mr. Hooper asked the extent of the work at Veterans Memorial Pointe and if \$275,000 was just to resurface and replace stenciling on the bricks, or to replace all of the bricks.

Mr. Andrews responded that they would be taking up all of the brick pathways, laying a foundation to negate some of the weeds and things of that nature and lay them back down with a better brick product and consistent brick throughout.

Mr. Hooper asked about highlighting or repainting all of the bricks as many of the names are faded.

Mr. Andrews responded that all of the bricks will be replaced and the verbiage taken off of the existing bricks for the newer bricks. He explained that right now there is a mishmash of different types and colors of bricks and they want to have a consistent brick throughout the pathway.

Ms. Hoyle continued, moving on to Professional Services and other projects:

- PS-02 - PNR Master Plan 2027-2031 - 2026 - \$80,000
- PS-07C - Master Plan Recommendations Implementation - 2026 - \$75,000

Ms. Roediger interjected that those included design standards that were discussed earlier along with some other off studies that they may want to do.

Ms. Hoyle continued:

- PS-14 - DPS Facility Master Plan - 2026 - \$250,000
- PW-03B - Hamlin Elementary Hawk Signal - 2026 - \$375,000
- PW-07F - S. Adams Pathway Connections - 2026 - \$106,875
- PW-26F - Livernois Fence Replacement - 2026 - \$350,000
- WS-07B - Booster Station 1 Improvements - 2026-2027 - \$281,250
- WS-47B - Tienken Road Water Main Replacement and PRV #8 Improvements - 2027-2028 - \$5,675,000
- WS-67 - Nowicki Park Water & Sewer Extension - 2026 - \$803,565
- WS-68 - DPS Fuel Island Replacement - 2027 - \$1,300,000

Ms. Hoyle offered to answer any questions.

Mr. Hetrick asked if the Adams Pathway project is being paid for by the Transit Millage, and if the amount cited was Rochester Hills' portion of the shared cost.

Ms. Hoyle responded that the City actually received a grant for the project.

Ms. Balint responded that it was based on timing, and DPS worked with Ms. Roediger on it. She confirmed that this was the City's portion of the shared cost for the project.

Ms. Roediger stated that the full grant was for the access to transit through Oakland County, and explained that they had a total of \$2 million for all communities in Oakland County based on who applied. The City received \$470,000 and the City's share for the cost is only \$106,000.

Mr. Hooper asked about the types of materials proposed for the Livernois fence replacement. He commented that it appears that the current fence is obsolete and cannot be replaced.

Ms. Balint responded that they have been trying to do their best in replacing the material and it is just not available anymore. She commented that they need to start fresh, and stated that she will make a note that it will definitely go through the Planning Commission.

Ms. Roediger added that the intent is to use the same brown fencing that they used along the alley in the Brooklands. She added that there are portions immediately north of Avon that back up to nature and in that case she expected that they would use the more standard wrought iron where you can see through it until getting to the first residential subdivision.

Ms. Neubauer asked if there was any plan to put a light in front of West Middle School or Rochester High, because she knows that it is something that they have received emails about numerous times.

Ms. Balint responded that in terms of Rochester High they have been in communication with RCOC for not necessarily a Hawk signal but some sort of crossing. She added that as it is a Road Commission road, they would need a permit. She commented that they are still in preliminary discussion of what they can see the City installing there and the last discussion was approximately a week ago. She stated that she would get back to the Commission relative to West Middle School as she was not sure.

Ms. Neubauer expressed concern for the exiting time because of the stacking that occurs on Old Perch and stated that pedestrians cannot see past the stacking. She noted that her kids go there and it needs to be addressed. She asked about the City Hall carpet replacement project and how much square footage that entailed.

Ms. Hoyle noted that it is set for 2027 and would not include the Auditorium as that was recently done.

Mr. Exley responded that it is approximately 70,000 square feet. He explained that they do not have a specific carpet picked out yet, and explained that the estimate is for removal, installation, material, and also includes funds for picking up and moving all of the furniture and replacing it at completion.

Mr. Struzik noted that Hampton Circle was in the CIP for 2028 and asked whether they are looking at doing any kind of traffic calming, bike lanes or reduction of road size.

Ms. Balint stated that there had been discussion about a bike lane, and noted that they just completed Barclay Circle. She commented that she does not have a really good idea of what is being done yet as it is in preliminary design.

Ms. Roediger responded that they have talked about some different options from the Transportation Master Plan that were recommended. She noted that the first step was Barclay Circle.

Mr. Struzik stressed that the residents are looking for relief there as there is a lot of speed because of how unnecessarily wide the road is.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that the CIP requires a Public Hearing, opened it, and noted that there were no speaker cards handed in and no one wishing to speak. She closed the Public Hearing and thanked Ms. Hoyle for her work on the CIP, noting that it is always put together and excellent. She extended thanks to the Department Directors for attending tonight and being available in case the Commission had any questions. She asked for a motion.

Mr. Struzik made the motion in the packet to approve the Capital Improvement Plan for years 2026 through 2031. The motion as seconded by Mr. Hooper.

After calling for a Roll Call Vote, she announced that the motion passed unanimously.

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

Aye 9 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission Approves the Capital Improvement Plan that has been proposed for the years 2026-2031. 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 15, 2025 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 15, 2025, is adopted by the Rochester Hills Planning Commission on April 15, 2025 and

Be It Further Resolved, that this Plan should be published and attested to according to law.

2025-0152

Public Hearing and Request for Preliminary Site Condominium Recommendation for Oak Creek Condominiums, a proposed development of twenty-one (21) single family detached residences on approximately 8.5 acres of land, located at 3249 and 3271 Livernois, Parcel Nos. 15-34-101-053 and 15-34-101-055, located on the east side of Livernois, south of Auburn Rd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential; Mohammed Bahauddin, Enliven Developers, Applicant

(Staff Report dated 4-15-25, Reviewed Plans, Development Application, Environmental Impact Statement, HOA Letter dated 4-4-24, WRC Letter dated 9-21-23, Tetra Tech Report dated 3-24-25, Notice of Wetlands and/or Floodplain Designation, Off-Site Storm-Wetland Notice, Public Hearing Notice and Public Comment Received had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.

Present for the Applicant were Mohammed Bahauddin, Enliven Developers, and Joseph Vaglica, GES-Gateway Engineering and Surveying, and Brian Devlin, Landscape Architect.

Chairperson Brnabic introduced this item noting that it is a request for Preliminary Site Condominium Recommendation for Oak Creek Condominiums, a proposed development of 21 single family detached residences on approximately 8.5 acres of land located at 3249 and 3271 Livernois, located on the east side of Livernois south of Auburn Road, zoned R-4 One Family Residential. She invited the applicant to the presenters' table and requested the Staff Report.

Mr. McLeod noted that this is a request for a Preliminary One-Family Detached Condominium Recommendation, Tree Removal Permit, Wetland Use Permit, and a Natural Features Modification Request. He explained that this site is comprised of two different parcels which include about 8.5 acres of land on the east side of Livernois south of Auburn. Currently each one of these parcels are large residential lots which connect into the abutting residential subdivision to the east and just south of the Mosque. He noted that four different requests are before the Commission tonight, and stated that two will stay with the Planning Commission including the Tree Removal Permit as well as the Natural Features Modification Request. Two of the requests will result in recommendations to City Council, including the Condominium request as well as the Wetland Use Permit. Whenever the Planning Commission is ready to make decisions, two of those decisions will be final decisions.

He reviewed the overall site, noting that it is relatively extensively wooded in terms of the back portion of the site, and where the wetland traverses the site. There is a residential subdivision to the south and to the east, and a non-residential place of worship to the north, and place of worship directly to the west across Livernois.

He stated that the site plan provides 21 sites, with access to Livernois and Raffler Dr. to the east. The Tree Removal Permit is requested for the removal of 99 regulated trees and 38 specimen trees, provide 142 required replacement trees on the site, and pay into the City's Tree Fund for a total of 318 trees. He added that they are proposing to oversize some of the replacement trees to try to bring that number down based on the total number of replacements required.

Mr. McLeod reviewed the wetland impacts as 417 square feet of permanent impact, and the Natural Features Modification setback requested is 542 linear feet or just under 12,000 square feet of permanent impact to natural features.

He reviewed the site plan and landscape plan, noting a simple connection from Livernois to Raffler, and he noted the location on the site of the wetland impact and natural features setback modification, and explained it is a simple crossing of the wetland requested. He mentioned that there are no other impacts to the wetland from any lots. He noted that they are providing open space commons both to the north and to the south side of the proposed roadway to preserve that wetland area and to preserve much of the natural features setback adjacent to the wetland area.

He reviewed the landscape along the Livernois frontage and in terms of replacement trees along the back sides of many of the lots, and in the open space areas with additional tree plantings.

He pointed out the stormwater system is to the far southeast corner of the site, which will have the water traverse the site to the pond and then flow further to the southeast; and he reviewed the lot configuration noting that it is similar to the lots to the south and east of the development.

Mr. McLeod noted the renderings provided, and reiterated that they are single family homes. He stated that they would be similar to what the developer will be

providing with the possibility of some custom homes as well, and pointed out that they are typically noted as two-story structures. He noted that standardized floor plans were provided.

Mr. Vaglica reiterated that this is an 8.46 acre site and they are proposing 21 residential lots. He noted that the design intentionally preserves and integrates the site's natural features including existing wetlands which will remain essentially undisturbed. He stated that to further protect the sensitive habitat, they are proposing the installation of a split-rail fence along the wetland to preserve the wetland boundaries.

He stated that they have engaged with an environmental team of Megan Davis from Tetra-Tech, and Brian Devin, their landscape architect. He commented that in alignment with the City's priorities for natural preservation, they also included 22,000 square feet of passive natural park within the development. He noted that this area will feature picnic tables and a play structure for children and was designed to preserve the surrounding wetlands, offering meaningful amenities to the community while reinforcing their commitment to conservation. He added that the detention basin was also a part of their stormwater management and features a 3-foot deep permanent pool in accordance with design engineering practice and City standards.

He stated that the architectural styles and layout of the lots are consistent with the adjacent Pinewood subdivision, to which they are directly connected. He noted that under the current zoning, they were able to accommodate up to 29 plus-or-minus units and in recognition of the site's natural constraints and their preservation objectives, they are proposing 21 homes, reflecting an environmentally-sensitive approach.

Ms. Neubauer noted that the letter from WRC states that a storm drain permit may be required.

Mr. Vaglica responded that this would be during the construction engineering phase.

Mr. Boughton stated that the Planning Staff submit the plans to the WRC, and they typically provide a boilerplate letter indicating that a permit may be required.

Ms. Neubauer asked if the WRC may present a problem for the applicant to obtain a permit and whether this is just a procedural issue.

Mr. Boughton noted that for the most part the City has the same stormwater standards, and whether a permit is necessary or not should not be a roadblock. He added that it would happen as a part of the construction process.

Ms. Neubauer noted that there were comments by Planning, Engineering and Traffic, with one of the conditions of approval being that they address conditions made by the departments, including Fire, although she did not see a Fire condition listed. She commented that if this goes forward, she would like to specifically include a condition to address the comments from Planning,

Engineering, Traffic and Fire just to make sure that all of the bases are covered. She added that based on the last couple of meetings with Council she thinks that it would be helpful if these items were resolved before they come to Council, or at least have an answer as to how those things would be resolved so there are no roadblocks.

She noted that there was another note about separate buildings permits being required for the demolition of all of the structures of each existing parcel.

Mr. McLeod responded that this is for the existing structures on the site. If and when the site receives approval and assurances to the developer that the development will go forward, they would then secure the permits most likely just before the actual construction of the development. He noted that they would have to abandon the existing utilities to those residences and make sure that those structures are all cleared, leading the way for construction of the new development.

Ms. Neubauer asked what the timeline would be from development to completion of construction.

Mr. Vaglia responded that they are probably 80 percent toward the engineering, and they would be able to turn around and submit for permits within 30 days. After permitting, this is perhaps a three-to-four-month type of development.

Mr. Weaver noted that they will need to obtain permits from EGLE, and asked if submission has been made.

Mr. Vaglia responded that these are typical permits for water and sanitary sewer that will be applied for.

Mr. Weaver commented that he would advise they submit sooner than later as these can take a little while to obtain.

Mr. Vaglia responded that as soon as they start the construction phase, all of the permits will go in. He added that the wetland permit has already been submitted for, and the others will be submitted for after City approval.

Mr. Weaver asked if there is a ballpark price point.

Mr. Bahauddin responded that the price point was around \$800,000-\$850,000.

Mr. Weaver asked what street tree was called for, noting that the plans did not specify.

Mr. Vaglia responded that they were told by the City not to specify the variety.

Mr. McLeod responded that since this is a public road, they would give money to the City and the City will actually install the tree.

Chairperson Brnabic asked about the total project timeline.

Mr. Vaglia responded that the development part is three to four months for the roads to be in; and then houses constructed based on sales, which are usually fairly quick in Rochester Hills. He commented that it should be wrapped up in about one year.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that she thought one year seemed a bit short, and pointed out that the EIS projected up to two years to complete the development. She commented that she was happy to hear it could be much quicker. She asked if they were planning on starting this summer.

Mr. Vaglica responded that they are hoping to.

Mr. Gallina stated that like any project where wetlands back up to residences, there are neighbors that have submitted comments; and he asked that concerns be addressed as to how they will prevent water coming onto adjacent property.

Mr. Vaglica responded that all of the water is going to be directed into a catch basin, which will then flow to the pond. He pointed out that all of the backyards will have catch basins and the lots will be graded to manage all of the water on site through gravity. He stated that they feel that it will not impact any of the neighboring properties. He added that they have been working with the City for a few years trying to manage all of the stormwater issues.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing, noting that she had a number of speaker cards. She reminded speakers that they would have three minutes and all questions would be answered together after everyone had an opportunity to speak.

Robin Wright, 3239 S. Livernois, stated that her house is north of the proposed development. She commented that they have lived there 25 years and will be sad to see the loss of the wooded area, and appreciate the fact that they have taken density into consideration versus the maximum density that could have been proposed. She noted that staff answered some of her questions in advance relative to the landscape plan and stormwater and it is her understanding that there will not be any surface water discharge from sumps and no backup due to lack of maintenance onto properties that exist. She expressed concern that while DTE is responsible for the design of the power poles, wiring, and high power lines, there is a proposed routing that would have a line go from the front of her house on Livernois straight back to their house over their shed and deck, causing a safety and aesthetic concern. She asked if they could be a part of DTE discussions, and asked if there was a possibility of burying those lines.

Chairperson Brnabic asked if Ms. Wright received answers to her concerns about the water discharge and maintenance prior to the meeting.

Ms. Wright responded yes.

James Cooper, 3327 Hazelton Avenue, stated that he appreciates Enliven's efforts to make this as least disruptive as possible. He expressed concern

about construction noise and invasion of privacy, noting that his home has floor to ceiling windows that are not curtained. He noted that adjacent homes would have a straight line of sight into his home. He mentioned that there are a couple of recent developments such as Pine Creek that have not taken off as quickly as expected, and commented that their timeline might be a bit aggressive. He stated that his property has flooding issues when it rains, and expressed concern for the 100-year-old trees in the back where any replacements will take time to mature and fill in. He mentioned one tree up against his fenceline that is slated for removal and asked if it could be considered to remain.

Chairperson Brnabic asked Mr. Cooper how many sales he thought have occurred in Pine Creek.

Mr. Cooper responded that he did not have a good estimate but thought it was two or three.

MaiLia Kue, 3307 Hazelton, stated that her backyard overlooks the proposed project, and stated that she has three children all under the age of 10 and a basketball court out front. She expressed concern over increased traffic due to 21 homes. She commented that with two religious centers and the Mosque on Auburn often a police officer is directing traffic. She stated that there should be a level of respect for the current residents.

Chairperson Brnabic referenced Ms. Wright's concerns regarding utilities lines and asked if they could possibly be buried.

Mr. Bahauddin responded that when they get to that phase they will definitely contact her as a part of the discussion, noting that they definitely do not want to route lines over any sheds or structures.

Mr. Vaglica commented that once the roadway is installed and a proper curb and gutter put in, no more water from that property will be going onto anyone else's property, and noted that this is the design intent. He commented that they will be fixing the current issues. He added that as they will be regrading the property to ensure proper drainage, sometimes trees will have to go. He commented that obviously if they can save a tree, it is less money that will have to be paid to the City and it would be a positive thing for the developer.

He commented that as far as hours of construction, the City has an ordinance that people can only work there during the day and they will not be working on the weekends. He added that relative to traffic concerns, they should be improving traffic as right now with Pine Wood, all of the construction traffic is going through the subdivision to the south and once the road is connected, at least 50 percent of that traffic should be diverted.

Chairperson Brnabic noted comments relative to privacy.

Mr. Bahauddin responded that Lots 17 and 16 have additional trees planned which will add more of a privacy fence.

Mr. Vaglica noted that all of the trees were upped to three-inch calipers and 12

to 15 feet high to get more benefit from the Tree Fund.

Ms. Denstaedt asked if the detention pond would be fenced, noting that she was a little nervous for a three-foot pond with children in the neighborhood.

Mr. Vaglica responded that it would be three feet deep in the middle, but the slope is one on six, and likened it more to a depressed lawn area. He stated that there will be extensive landscaping around it and fencing is not required.

Mr. McLeod responded that the City actually discourages fencing around detention ponds, and this is the reason why slopes are designed to be a safe and recoverable. He added that someone would have to be fully committed to get to the center where the deep portion is. He noted that if the Commission felt it was a concern that could be a conversation, but reiterated that it has been designed pursuant to the regulations.

Mr. Weaver asked if any of the trees could be upped to five or six inch caliper, pointing out that while it is at a higher cost, it would reduce the amount to the Tree Fund and appease the neighbors. He stated that the selected trees are great and will get big; however, the canopy will be sparse at planting.

Mr. Devlin responded that availability would be a problem, and with so much development going on there are not many large trees available. He added that spading in trees will be considerably more expensive, and the cost would be at least double a three-inch tree. He commented that they could consider a 3-1/2 or four-inch caliper tree.

Mr. Weaver suggested evergreens, noting that they might provide more privacy.

Mr. Devlin noted that they have tried to show evergreens where it seemed appropriate, with the others being deciduous.

Mr. Struzik asked whether they would plan to have construction traffic enter the site from only Livernois, noting that he does not want traffic to go down Hazelton as it would be unfair for the residents. He suggested that he would request construction traffic enter and exit from Livernois only.

Mr. Vaglica responded that they only have access to their site from Livernois.

Mr. Struzik stated that he appreciates a less intense development, and commented that he would anticipate that if the road were completed, some of the existing neighborhood traffic would use the new road instead of Hazelton.

Mr. Hooper commented on maintenance of the split rail fence proposed for the natural features setback and asked if a boulder wall instead of a fence could show the delineation, as that would not be easily removed.

Mr. Vaglica responded that the split rail fence was actually suggested by the Planning Staff. He suggested that it could be written into the condominium documents that the fence belongs to the site and not to the individual lots. He

commented that he did not understand how a boulder wall would be implemented.

Mr. Hooper responded that they have done this in the past on several developments, with one or two-foot diameter boulders in a continuous row to protect the natural feature as the fence won't last. He mentioned units 17, 18, 19 and 20 and the adjacent neighbors.

Mr. Vaglica stated that this is something he can discuss with the landowners.

Mr. Bahauddin stated that they will have a serious look at this.

Mr. Hooper noted that traffic is always a concern, and asked if there was any discussion with Staff on adding any traffic calming to Cordoba Drive.

Mr. Vaglica noted that they had a raised pavement bumper, and Traffic asked them to remove it. He noted that an alternative suggestion would take away from the park and take down additional trees.

Ms. Roediger commented that this is a touchy subject and there is currently an internal disagreement amongst Fire and other Departments. She stated that they will have an ongoing discussion internally to determine what the process will be going forward as they continue to have traffic calming as a goal for the community that can also meet the criteria established by Fire.

Chairperson Brnabic asked if anyone else wished to speak, and seeing no other member of the public requesting to speak, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Hooper made the motion in the packet for the Preliminary Site Condominium Recommendation to City Council with the six preprinted findings and two conditions. The motion was seconded by Ms. Neubauer.

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

Mr. Hooper made the motion in the packet to approve the Tree Removal Permit with the two preprinted findings, two preprinted conditions, and added a third condition that the Developer is to review with Staff the ability to save the three trees on the back of lot number 17 from removal. The motion was seconded by Ms. Neubauer.

Chairperson Brnabic asked Mr. Vaglica if he would confirm to agree to discuss saving those trees.

Mr. Vaglica confirmed that if they could make it work with Engineering, he would absolutely agree.

Chairperson Brnabic called for a voice vote, and after the vote noted that the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Hooper made the motion in the packet to approve the Natural Features

Modification with the two preprinted findings and three preprinted conditions, and added a fourth condition that the developer work with staff on the ability of providing an alternative protection method for the wetland feature setback from a split rail fence to a single continuous boulder wall for the lots that impact private property and the new future lots. The motion was seconded by Ms. Neubauer.

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

Mr. Hooper made the motion in the packet to recommend the Wetland Use Permit, with the two preprinted findings and five preprinted conditions. The motion was seconded by Ms. Neubauer.

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

Mr. McLeod noted that if Councilperson Neubauer's recommendation was for these items be resolved prior to them appearing before Council, it would only give two days to resolve these issues in order for it to be on Council's agenda on April 28.

Ms. Roediger suggested that as this is a condominium, this is only the preliminary phase, and noted that the intention of preliminary is to lay out lot locations and roads. She explained that many of these details are handled during final. She commented that this could delay the project a couple of months and make starting in the summer unlikely.

Ms. Neubauer responded that she did not think full resolution has to be made; however there should be a good faith effort so there is no question of whether something is approved or not approved.

Ms. Roediger suggested working with the applicant to have an updated letter based on the conditions from today and their intention to meet them, and the details would be hammered out during final.

Ms. Neubauer responded that this was more than fair. She commented that the next meeting is the 28th.

Mr. McLeod responded that the packet deadline is short one day due to Good Friday.

Ms. Neubauer suggested that they work closely with Ms. Roediger and Mr. McLeod so that it goes smoothly at City Council.

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 9 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. PSC2023-0001 Oak Creek Condominium, the Planning Commission recommends approval of the Preliminary One Family Residential Detached Condominium Plan, based on plans received by the Planning Department on March 13, 2025, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions.

Findings

1. The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that the proposed development will promote the intent and purpose of the ordinance, as well as other City Ordinances, standards, and requirements; and those requirements can be met with the exception of the acceptable modifications shown below and subject to the conditions listed below.
2. The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that the proposed development will be designed, constructed, 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. The proposed project will be accessed primarily from Livernois Road, thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjacent roadways. The preliminary plan represents a reasonable street, building and lot layout and orientation.
3. The development will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as major roadways, streets, police and fire protection, drainageways, refuse disposal, and utilities.
4. The proposed development will not be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to existing or future neighboring uses, persons, property or the public welfare.
5. 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.
6. The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development onsite as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity and act as an extension of the residential development to the east out to Livernois Road.

Conditions

1. Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, including the Fire Department Streets review, prior to final detached condominium approval.
2. Provide a landscape bond in the amount as determined by an updated landscape cost estimate to be provided by the applicant and verified by city staff, plus the cost of inspection fees, as adjusted by staff as necessary, prior to the preconstruction meeting with Engineering.

2025-0153

Request for Tree Removal Permit approval for Oak Creek condominiums, to remove 99 regulated trees and 38 specimen trees and to provide 142 replacement trees and pay the remaining 318 required trees into the City's Tree Fund, located at 3249 and 3271 Livernois, Parcel Nos. 15-34-101-053 and 15-34-101-055, located on the east side of Livernois, south of Auburn Rd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential; Mohammed Bahauddin, Enliven Developers, Applicant

See Legislative File 2025-0152 for discussion.

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

Aye 9 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Resolved, in the matter of File No. PTP2025-0005) (Condominium Tree Removal Permit) the Planning Commission grants a Tree Removal Permit (PTP2025-0005), based on plans received by the Planning Department on March 13, 2025, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions:

Findings

1. The proposed removal and replacement of regulated trees is in conformance with the City's Tree Conservation Ordinance.
2. The applicant is proposing to remove 99 regulated trees and to provide 142 replacement trees onsite, with the remaining 318 required replacement trees to be paid into the City's Tree Fund.

Conditions

1. Tree protective fencing, as reviewed and approved by the City staff, shall be installed prior to temporary grade being issued by Engineering.
2. Provide payment, equal to the current required fee for replacement trees, along with any additional fees associated with such, into the City's Tree Fund for the remaining 318 trees identified on the site plan.
3. Developer to review with City staff the ability to save the three trees on the back of Lot Number 17 from removal.

2025-0155

Request for Natural Features Setback Modification Approval to impact the natural features setback by approximately 542 linear feet/11,872 square feet for Oak Creek condominiums, a proposed development of twenty-one (21) detached single family residences on approximately 8.5 acres of land, located at 3249 and 3271 Livernois, Parcel Nos. 15-34-101-053 and 15-34-101-055, located on the east side of Livernois, south of Auburn Rd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential; Mohammed Bahaudin, Enliven Developers, Applicant

See Legislative File 2025-0152 for discussion.

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

Aye 9 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. PNFSM2025-0002 Oak Creek Condominium, the Planning Commission grants a natural features setback modification for 542 linear feet/11,872 square feet of permanent impacts to the identified Wetland area A identified on the site plans to construct the proposed public road providing service to the proposed single family residential units, and associated development infrastructure, based on plans received by the Planning Department on March 13, 2025, with the following findings and conditions:

Findings

1. The impact to the Natural Features Setback area is necessary for construction activities related to the proposed development; further, the applicant has minimized the impacts to the natural features and associated natural features setbacks by maintaining much of the sensitive area as common open space or edges of proposed units and the applicant has provided for the future protection of the natural features setback by providing split rail fencing and appropriate signage to define the area for future residents, workers, etc.
2. ASTI has reviewed the subject plans and proposed impacts to the natural features setbacks associated with Wetland A and the unnamed watercourse along with the proposed mitigation efforts to help reduce the impacts to those natural features and has indicated that the plans as proposed are satisfactory.

Conditions

1. Work to be conducted using best management practices to ensure flow and circulation patterns and chemical and biological characteristics of wetlands are not impacted.
2. Site must be graded with onsite soils and seeded with City approved seed mix.
3. Those areas identified as "Temporary Impacts" must be restored to original grade with original soils or equivalent soils and seeded with a City-approved seed mix where possible, and the applicant must implement best management practices as detailed in the ASTI review letter dated February 27, 2025 prior to final approval by staff.
4. Developer to work with City staff to provide an alternative protection method for the natural features setback, changing the method from a split rail fence to a single continuous boulder wall on those lots impacted by the natural features setback.

2025-0154

Request for Wetland Use Permit Recommendation to impact approximately 417 square feet of wetlands for Oak Creek Condominiums, a proposed development of twenty-one (21) detached single family residences on approximately 8.5 acres of land, located at 3249 and 3271 Livernois, Parcel Nos. 15-34-101-053 and 15-34-101-055, located on the east side of Livernois, south of Auburn Rd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential; Mohammed Bahauddin, Enliven Developers, Applicant

See Legislative File 2025-0152 for discussion.

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 9 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Resolved, in the matter of City File PWEP2025-0001 (Oak Creek Condominium) the Planning Commission recommends to City Council approval of a Wetland Use Permit to permanently impact approximately 417 square feet of wetland to construct the public road to service the single family units, and associated development infrastructure based on plans received by the Planning Department on March 13, 2025, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions.

Findings

1. The proposed permanent impact of 417 square feet of wetland area on site is minimal, the wetland is of a medium ecological quality, the crossing of the wetland and watercourse area is the minimum impact that allows the property to be developed pursuant to city plans and regulations, and minimization and mitigation efforts pursuant to the City's environmental consultant have been implemented on the proposed site plans.
2. ASTI has reviewed the subject plans and proposed impacts to Wetland A and the unnamed watercourse along with the proposed mitigation efforts to help reduce the impacts to those wetlands and has indicated that the plans as proposed are satisfactory.

Conditions

1. City Council approval of the Wetland Use Permit.
2. That the applicant receives an EGLE Part 303 Permit (as applicable) prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.
3. That the applicant provides a detailed soil erosion plan with measures sufficient to ensure ample protection of wetlands areas, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.
4. That any temporary impact areas be restored to original grade with original soils or equivalent soils and seeded with a city-approved wetland seed mix where possible, and the applicant must implement best management practices, prior to final approval by staff.
5. The applicant shall abide by all conditions and recommendations as outlined in ASTI's review letter of February 27, 2025.

2025-0156

Public Hearing for Proposed Ordinance Amendments for a PUD Process for EGLE Grant Projects

(McLeod/Roediger Memo dated 4-9-25, Draft Amendment dated 4-9-25, Public Hearing Notice, and Draft Planning Commission Minutes for 3-18-25 had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

Chairperson Brnabic introduced this item, noting that it was a Public Hearing for the proposed Ordinance Amendment for a PUD process for EGLE Grant projects.

Ms. Roediger stated that as discussed at the last Planning Commission Regular Meeting, as simple of an Ordinance as possible was drafted to keep the process of the EGLE Grant dollars primarily at City Council for preliminary and conceptual proposals, and it would be brought back to the Planning Commission when things are more solidified in terms of the development plans. She explained that Staff worked with the City Attorney and the EGLE Grant Committee to come up with an option that makes the process more efficient. She stated that as part of the EGLE Grant, things are very crunched as to timing, and while the City is working on obtaining extensions, projects are definitely taking longer than expected. She commented that she thinks that this will help Staff and the team get through these projects as it is very important to spend all of the \$75 million within the community.

Mr. Struzik moved the motion in the packet to recommend that City Council approve the Ordinance amendment. Mr. Dettloff seconded the motion.

Chairperson Brnabic opened and subsequently closed the Public Hearing as she did not have any speaker cards and saw no one wishing to speak.

Mr. Hetrick apologized for missing the last Planning Commission meeting, and asked if it is the expectation that remediation would typically be done through PUDs.

Ms. Roediger responded that it would, and explained that as a part of the grant the question is whether or not the City or State want to allocate millions of dollars to a particular property owner for environmental cleanup. She commented that the discussion is difficult to have in a vacuum without considering what the end user is; and they do not want to give a property owner or applicant hope that if they are given \$10 million the City is also saying that the owner can do whatever they want with their properties. She stated that the City wants to tie their investment in the environmental cleanup with what the City expects as the end-user.

After calling for a roll call vote, Chairperson Brnabic announced that the motion passed unanimously. She commented that she is happy that the City will not lose any funds now.

Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting

Aye 9 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Resolved, that the Planning Commission recommends to City Council approval of ordinances to amend Section 138-7.106 of Article 7 Planned Unit Development (PUD) of Chapter 138, Zoning, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan. The proposed amendments, if approved, will add provisions to provide a streamlined preliminary PUD process for developments submitted under the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes and Energy (EGLE) Restoration and Remediation Grant 2023-2540, and to ensure consistency across various ordinance sections; to repeal conflicting or inconsistent ordinances, and prescribe a penalty for violations.

DISCUSSION

2025-0163

Proposed 24/7 Express Car Wash at 1100 S. Rochester Rd., located within the Winchester Mall shopping center

(McLeod Memo dated 4-9-25, Business Description, and Site Plan had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

Present for the discussion was John Quigley.

Chairperson Brnabic introduced this discussion item, noting that it was to consider a proposed 24/7 Express Car Wash at 1100 South Rochester Road

located within the Winchester Mall Shopping Center. She invited the applicant to the presenter's table and asked Mr. McLeod to summarize the request.

Mr. McLeod stated that the discussion will revolve around a potential car wash at 1100 South Rochester Road. Initially, it was thought a rezoning might be necessary due to an oversight in the zoning ordinance. However, it was discovered that car washes are permitted as a conditional use in the Community Business (CB) district at that location. The applicant, who was already prepared to discuss rezoning, was instead offered the opportunity to pursue a conditional use request. The proposed car wash site is located between the new Enterprise, Burger King, and Gardner White. The discussion was preliminary, and full site plans would be required for review as part of a conditional use and site plan request.

Mr. Quigley stated that his proposal includes building a fully autonomous, state-of-the-art in-bay automatic car wash at 1100 South Rochester Road. He explained that this type of car wash differs from traditional conveyor car washes. Customers pull into the building, park, and the washing equipment moves around the vehicle, completing the wash in about 90 seconds. He noted that this setup requires a smaller property and does not need staffing, allowing for 24/7 operation. He noted that there are currently no car washes on the north side of Rochester Hills, while the existing car wash in Rochester often has long wait times.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that there previously was a car wash on the north side of Rochester Hills years ago but it is no longer there.

Mr. Dettloff stated that there is a wash at Crooks and Star Batt. He asked if anything like what is being proposed is in existence now.

Mr. Quigley responded that there is a Grand Prix Auto Wash in Utica that is an outdated version of the automatic wash; however, it is not a 24/7 wash. He commented that many of these are operating throughout the country and stated that it is based on technology that is developed by a company called A-Tech Carwash Systems out of North Carolina. He mentioned that they were able to tour several facilities in Denton and Gainesville, Texas just outside of Dallas.

Mr. Dettloff asked what happens if there is a mechanical issue.

Mr. Quigley responded that several individuals would be available 24 hours a day and everything is connected through the internet. He commented that they would be prepared for those situations; however, they rarely are needed.

Mr. Dettloff asked if there would be a tire shine capability, and what the basic price would be for a wash.

Mr. Quigley responded that tire shine is one of the options available and noted that there will be several different wash packages. He stressed that there would be no interior detailing services offered as there is no labor. He noted that the price would be \$10 to \$12; however, they lean toward a membership model which is what many car washes have been going to over the last five to 10

years. He stated that they would push for an unlimited club where a monthly fee allows getting the car washed as often as they like every day. He noted that they would also be open to drive-up customers. He commented that the monthly membership would range perhaps between \$25 and \$40.

Mr. Dettloff asked how many cars would be able to enter at any one time.

Mr. Quigley responded one car at a time, every 90 seconds. He commented that at full capacity, it would be approximately 30 cars per hour. He explained a red and green light process to let people know how to position themselves, with wheel humps. Brushes and sprayers move over the vehicle for 90 seconds, and then the vehicle pulls forward through several rinse stations, then through dryers, and then exits the building.

Mr. Dettloff asked if it would be a land lease.

Mr. Quigley acknowledged that they have been working with a realtor and have been offered both options for purchasing and leasing; however, they are leaning toward leasing.

Mr. Struzik asked how payment would be made.

Mr. Quigley responded that there would be a kiosk, and perhaps it would be a credit card transaction and not be cash. For a membership, a license plate scan would confirm that they are a member. For non-members, a high resolution screen would be very user-friendly and able to be operated quickly.

Mr. Struzik asked where the license plate reader would be.

Mr. Quigley responded that the scanners are set up behind, so as a car pulls past and stops the scanner is behind. He commented that it is a relatively new technology in the carwash business but has been coming through in the last five to 10 years. He noted that traditionally there is an RFID tag system similar to the car wash he is currently managing; however, without an on-site employee to administer the tag, people could use it for multiple vehicles on a membership. He stated that this membership would be for one vehicle and it is based on a license plate. He commented that there are several car washes that may offer family discounts for additional vehicles.

Mr. Struzik stated that he does not have concerns about traffic management, as it is located inside of a private development. He mentioned that the car wash on John R near his home backs onto the road during the busiest days. He expressed concern regarding a 24-hour blower noise. He commented that while the nearest residences are far away, he hears the blowers activate at his home from quite a distance from the car wash. He stated that he has concerns about the appearance of the product, noting that some of the Google images he viewed would not work here; however, the rendering provided in the packet was getting closer to what would be acceptable. He stressed that he wanted it to match the quality and construction materials of the surrounding area, and pointed out that many of the adjacent businesses have recently been built from the ground-up. He added that he has concerns regarding upkeep as it will be an

unattended car wash, and he would hope that they would be able to provide assurances on how often a staff member will visit the site.

Mr. Quigley stated that he would be the operating partner and lives approximately two miles from the site. He stated that this would be his full-time occupation and he would be on-call 24/7. He mentioned that he saw a facility in northern Michigan with similar technology, but it looked like nobody had been there in months. He commented that he will be there pretty much every day as there will be trash collection and interior car vacuums that will need attention. He added that he will also speak to customers about membership.

Mr. Struzik stated that this location is very visible with a lot of traffic, and upkeep will be important as well as the site's appearance.

Mr. Quigley noted that a Texas website where they would purchase the building uses a base building that is essentially an aluminum frame with clear plastic panels. He commented that the nice thing about this setup is almost any type of building can be used, and they would be happy to work with the City to come up with something that works for both parties.

Mr. Weaver asked if the drying function occurred during the 90 second time.

Mr. Quigley responded that the wash function was 90 seconds long and the rinse and dryer time was up to the driver. He noted that some of the facilities they toured had a 60-second clock at the end which was more of a recommendation and helps people move quicker out of the drying process.

Mr. Weaver asked how many cars can be stacked in the driveway.

Mr. Quigley responded that there is some variability and it would be 10 to 12. He commented that the site is pretty tight and they could figure something out if traffic was becoming an issue. He pointed out that there is about a couple hundred feet of distance in the drive that comes off of Rochester Road.

Mr. Weaver pointed out that 10 cars represented about 15 minutes of time.

Mr. Quigley commented that the nice thing about this setup is its 24/7 operation and drivers who see a long line can come back later. He noted that other car washes stack up because of their short hours.

Mr. Weaver stated that stacking onto the private property is their problem; however if it backs up close to Rochester Road it could become an issue and could affect people who are trying to get into the shopping center. He commented that this will be something that they will have to work out with the landowner. He stated that he appreciated the ingenuity to come up with a business that would work on that little chunk of property.

Mr. Hooper asked if the vacuuming was a part of the membership.

Mr. Quigley responded that it was actually a free service. He likened it to a marketing expense where people will drop in for a vacuum and then get their car

washed. He explained that the vacuums will be located on the property, but they have an agreement with the property owner that the overhangs will be over the adjacent property.

Mr. Hooper commented that his only issue with the vacuums is when people will be backing out of those spaces.

Mr. Quigley stated that they are currently parking spaces, and a vacuum is traditionally just a parking space with a vacuum.

Mr. Hooper noted that people could be walking around their car into traffic. He asked what would prevent a driver from going into the wash and just sitting for three minutes.

Mr. Quigley mentioned the video he cited and stated that the wash stops after 90 seconds. After a period of time, it would alert him if someone had just parked there blocking everyone.

Mr. Hooper asked if there would be automated doors, and expressed concern that a door could come down on a vehicle.

Mr. Quigley responded that they are nylon doors, and if the worst were to happen they would not do much damage.

Mr. Hooper asked where the detention would be going for stormwater.

Mr. Quigley stated that he was not yet familiar with that.

Ms. Roediger stated that when the overall site was designed this area of the parking lot was always looked at as an outlot.

Mr. Hooper asked about the car wash water.

Mr. Quigley responded that the water would be contained within the building and then collected. He noted that they will aim for 80 percent reused water and there will be a system where the water goes through a filtration process and is reused.

Mr. Gallina expressed his appreciation for having the conversation versus bringing something they really have to review and digest. He stated that his only concern is the size of the site, and always wondered what could be built there. He commented that he thought it was a cool location, and loves the idea that he could go at 1 a.m. or 10 p.m. when everyone else is closed. He stated that he loves the idea of the places where he could go and spray his own car, but does not see those available any longer. He commented that it is a new concept and different for the city. He added that many people do not do car washes because the conveyors scare them. He noted that he might choose to get a subscription to something like this.

Ms. Denstaedt commented that it seems that the Commission has been seeing more car washes come before them and asked what may be the reason.

Mr. Quigley stated that he attended the International Car Wash Show in Nashville in 2022 when he first became interested in them, and commented that a couple of the presentations were very compelling. He mentioned a large-scale study on car washes nationwide and found that the market was only about 50 percent and more were needed. He added that the subscription model didn't exist in the car wash business until about 10 years ago when everything else started going over to that model which has been very successful and creates a lot of profit and incentive. He mentioned that Jax has been able to buy up other car washes because they received a giant capital injection from Wall Street through private investment.

Mr. Hetrick stated that the concept seems to be appropriate and Mr. Quigley is clearly passionate about it. He asked what experience he had.

Mr. Quigley responded that he is currently working as a general manager in a large car wash chain in Macomb and previously worked in another one. He noted that he has only been in it for a couple of years but has been interested since 2022. Prior to that he was working mostly in sales. He commented that his father is behind him as an investor.

Mr. Hetrick asked if the lanes were separated from Rochester Road and would be curbed off so people could not sneak in.

Mr. Quigley confirmed they were and added that there is an exit lane for escape if someone had to leave the line.

Mr. Hetrick stated that most car washes have a main road entrance, and asked if they will have signage to draw people in.

Mr. Quigley responded that the land is flat and once they have the building up and their signage it should be pretty visible. He added that it will be very visible from the shopping center with many uses such as Gardner White, a gym, and a golf place, which makes it an attractive location.

Mr. Hetrick commented that he thinks that having the 10 to 12 cars of stacking will be plenty and allow the use to commence without interrupting people going to Burger King or Aldi.

Mr. Quigley mentioned that a double lane would be tight but would double the capacity, and they would work with the City.

Mr. Dettloff asked if there will be a trash receptacle at every vacuum station, as he has seen people pull in to vacuum and pull all sorts of things out of the car. He suggested that collection be regular.

Mr. Quigley responded that there should be at least one or two receptacles there. He commented that if it becomes a problem they will have it professionally done, but his initial plan is to be there pretty much every day emptying the trash cans.

Mr. Dettloff commented that he often sees people after they go through the

wash pulling off to do additional wiping down, and he asked if there would be a designated area with signage.

Mr. Quigley noted that there would not be a designated area, but there would possibly be signage for exiting and people could use the vacuum spaces. He added that there is a lot of parking at the shopping center available.

Chairperson Brnabic commented that right now Enterprise has many of those spaces filled with cars, and she asked if it is a part of Enterprise's lease to have the right to park there.

Mr. Quigley responded that this is something that he can talk to the property manager about; however, he did speak with him about building the vacuums that would be on their property but extend over the spaces and he was perfectly willing to accept that. He commented that he did not imagine that Enterprise had any legal right to those spaces, but he would find out.

Chairperson Brnabic asked what they would have as a buffer as it is a matter of safety.

Mr. Quigley responded that right now it is a dirt lot, with a curb to the parking lot; and they would have a self-contained design. He commented that if they needed a wall that would keep people from doing anything crazy and going outside of the lines of the property, it is something they would consider. He pointed out that there are no parking spaces where they would be entering and exiting the car wash site.

Ms. Roediger stressed that this discussion item has not been reviewed by Staff at all, and she believes that there are a lot of concerns that Staff will have with the vacuum spaces. She added that the proposal has not been vetted through Engineering, Planning or Fire. She pointed out that they just wanted to get the concept in front of the Commission up front as it is a discretionary review and will involve an applicant investing money. She noted that they are far from having the details.

Mr. McLeod mentioned that Staff will also be reviewing all of the cross connections to the site and what will happen to the traffic patterns. He stressed that these are the types of things that will be vetted before the project comes forward in the future.

Discussed

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

2025-0160

Request for Election of Officers - Chairperson - for a one-year term to expire the first meeting in April 2026

Chairperson Brnabic stated that she has served as Chairperson for nine years and has totally enjoyed that; however, this year she has decided not to run for Chair. She noted that Mr. Hooper has served for nine years as Vice-Chairperson, and she would like to make a motion to nominate Mr. Hooper

as Chairperson this year.

Mr. Dettloff supported the nomination.

Mr. Hooper stated that he would be honored to serve.

Seeing no other nominations, Chairperson Brnabic called for a voice vote. After the vote, she announced that it passed unanimously.

Mr. Struzik nominated Chairperson Brnabic to serve as Vice Chair for the coming year. Mr. Dettloff supported the nomination.

Seeing no other nominations, Chairperson Brnabic called for a voice vote and subsequently announced that it passed unanimously.

Mr. Hooper nominated Mr. Struzik to continue as Secretary. Ms. Neubauer seconded the nomination.

Seeing no other nominations, Chairperson Brnabic called for a voice vote. After the vote, she announced that it passed unanimously.

Mr. Dettloff stated that the Planning Commission expresses its sincere thanks to Chairperson Brnabic for her nine years of service as Chair.

Ms. Neubauer noted that Chairperson Brnabic was the first female Chair of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Dettloff added that Mr. Hooper had previously served as Chair, and was Chairperson at the time that Mr. Dettloff first joined the Commission.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that she wanted to share some historical tidbits with the Planning Commission. She mentioned that in early 2021, the Mayor honored Arlene Rampson, the first woman to serve on the Avon Township Planning Commission in 1970. Ms. Rampson joined a meeting via Zoom and shared her experiences, including facing resistance from a male member who threatened to quit upon her appointment. Later, Chairperson Brnabic learned that Ms. Rampson had never served as Chairperson. She stated that this led her to inquire with the Clerk's Office about the first female chairperson. After the Clerk's Office conducted a search, she was surprised and honored to discover that she is the first woman to hold the position of Chairperson in the history of both Avon Township and Rochester Hills. She expressed gratitude for serving with her fellow Planning Commission members, whom she considers family.

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

Aye 9 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Resolved, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby appoints Greg Hooper to serve as its Chairperson for a one-year term to expire the first meeting in April 2026.

expire the first meeting in April 2026

See Legislative File 2025-0161 for Discussion.

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

Aye 9 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Resolved, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby appoints Deborah Brnabic to serve as its Vice Chairperson for a one-year term to expire the first meeting in April 2026.

2025-0162

Request for Election of Officers - Secretary - for a one year term to expire the first meeting in April 2026

See Legislative File 2025-0161 for Discussion.

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

Aye 9 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

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 2026.

NEXT MEETING DATE

- May 6, 2025 - 7:00 p.m. *Special Meeting*
- May 20, 2025 - 5:30 p.m. *Special Worksession*
- May 20, 2025 - 7:00 p.m. *Regular Meeting*

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission and upon motion by Neubauer, seconded by Denstaedt, Chairperson Brnabic adjourned the Regular Meeting at 9:06 p.m.

*Deborah Brnabic, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission*

Jennifer MacDonald, Recording Secretary