



---

## Penelope's Place - PUD Parcels 15-30-302-034 and -036

1 message

---

**Richard Bosler** <richbosler@gmail.com>  
To: Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>  
Cc: Richard Bosler <richbosler@gmail.com>

Thu, May 7, 2026 at 12:41 AM

Dear Planning Department Commission:

Although I may not have attended the Planning Commission meetings recently, the sign off Adams Rd. for the PUD at Parcels 15-30-302-034 and -036 located on the east side and just north of Auburn Rd. warrants comments from Rochester Hills residents.

Below are my comments regarding the Preliminary Planned Unit development (PUD) of Penelope's Place, a two building 3 story apartment complex housing 29 units each with parking lot area

Granted, my comments may not include the more technical considerations that make this not a good fit for this PUD, however, it brings front and center an number of obvious considerations current residents and the Planning Commission should reject this PUD for this site.

My comments and conclusion are based from educational degrees in accounting, audit and finance with a number of active licenses which include Real Estate. Having an eye for what brings or does not bring value should be respected from all residents and expressed before the Planning Commission of the City of Rochester Hills.

My conclusion is that this building as proposed in the Architectural documents for this PUD is in the wrong location and design for the following reasons:

1. This area appears to be for business and industrial use. Why would this development be a good fit at this location just because it may fit on paper? A 1 story medical development or office building would be more appropriate for this site much like the Rivercrest Professional Center at 930 940 & 950 Avon Rd. just east of Livernois in Rochester Hills. The Proposed PUD is oversized for this area.
2. A one story Transportation Company called Gemini sits within view of numerous units of this proposed 3 story Apartment Complex of 29 units each. What renter would want to pay a monthly lease cost of over \$1,800 to over \$3,000 a month to look at the roof of a transportation company with a parking lot with trucks?
3. The Apartment complex being proposed sits too close to Adams Road which is an example of how not to place an oversized building into sites that may appear to fit on paper however, is not attractive for the area and within the site of many single family residential homes to the south. From my perspective, this building does not add value for them and these residents or the City of Rochester Hills.
4. The Building architecture although not seeing the actual materials to be used looks cheap and like a hotel one would find off the expressway for transients without even a sufficient playground or commons area as part of its assets of attraction. What are the assets of this proposed development for renters paying a substantial portion of wages monthly?
5. If you travel across the Street to Parkway Blvd. in Auburn Hills, you will find some attractive all brick leasing or condominium buildings with a pond in the center that befits this development and in back of one story residential buildings. This development looks attractive, hidden, is lower in height and in a secluded area with total brick.
6. Consideration to change this area to Mixed Use just to pass this PUD leased unit development site is not the catch all to have this development passed by the Planning Commission. Most of this area is low height Industrial with a section to the south as single family residential on dirt roads with a small number of Office/Retail to the east of Adams Rd. towards M-59.
7. Cutting down the many trees on this site would make this PUD standout with Hardy Board Panels along with 4" light grey brick type not to mention boxed air conditioning units showing beyond expectation how unimpressive this building structures would look for this area of Adams Rd. The tree replacement program would not return this area to environmental and landscaping beauty for decades.

In summary, for a number of reasons addressed above (which are not all inclusive):

Just because it seems to fit on paper and reviewed by the City of Rochester Hills Planning and Development Department does not mean it is the right building site for this type of development by the investor and add to the City of Rochester Hills Master Plan Development Projects.

I am requesting that the Planning Commission reject this PUD and the Planning and Development Department continue to assist the investor to look for other locations that may be available for a more appropriate site.

Sincerely,

Richard J Bosler  
399 Daylily Dr.  
Rochester Hills, MI 48307

**Confidentiality Disclosure:**

This e-mail, and any files or attachments with it contain privileged and confidential information. It is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail (or the person responsible for delivering this document to the intended recipient), you are hereby notified that any unauthorized use, disclosure, dissemination, distribution, printing or copying of this e-mail, and any attachment thereto, is strictly prohibited and maybe unlawful. If you have received this e-mail in error, do not disclose or forward its contents and/or attachments to others. Please notify the sender of the message by email or telephone at (248) 885-4525, and permanently delete the original with any attachments from your system as well as destroy any copy of the e-mail and printout thereof. Thank you.



Planning Dept Email &lt;planning@rochesterhills.org&gt;

---

**PUD Development (Penelope Place Apartments)**

1 message

---

**THERESA POUNDERS** <thepounders@comcast.net>  
To: "planning@rochesterhills.org" <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Tue, May 12, 2026 at 4:50 PM

Hi,

I would first like to start off by saying the sign on this property does not reflect the type of sign that was supposed to be displayed for a PUD. Had I not received a notice in the mail because my property is close to this proposed development, I would have never seen it. It pretty much can only be read clearly by someone who might happen to be walking on the sidewalk, across the street in Auburn Hills. People living in our city, driving on Adams road would have difficulty noticing it or reading it.

I suggest everyone in the planning department take a drive north or south on Adams to see how easily this sign would be missed.

I have viewed the plans on the Ped map. Unless you are an engineer, architect or planner, they are difficult to understand.

Is the entrance to this sitting around a curve? There are already safety issues in the multiple curves along Adams.

Will this development put the Clinton River Trail in jeopardy? We've already seen many of our trail ways washed out because of development and soil erosion.

This land is zoned office and under a consent judgement. Has any part of this consent judgement been modified or proposed to be modified?

I feel this should be postponed until the proper signage is displayed and more of our city can be made aware of what's being proposed. These multi-story apartments are not what most residents in the city want to see.

Thanks,  
Theresa Pounders