



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

May 19th Meeting -comment concerning topic

1 message

Melissa Leitch <missyleitch@yahoo.com>
To: planning@rochesterhills.org

Sun, May 17, 2026 at 3:33 PM

To whom it may concern;

I am writing to formally submit my perspective regarding the proposed Penelope apartment building and the data center development, as I regrettably will be unable to attend the public meeting scheduled for the 19th of this month. Please accept this correspondence as my official public comment on these critical matters.

I wish to convey my unequivocal opposition to both the Penelope apartment building and the data center proposals.

Rochester Hills holds the esteemed designation of "Tree City USA," a recognition that profoundly resonates with me and, I believe, with the vast majority of our community. This status is not merely an accolade; it embodies our collective dedication to preserving natural habitats, maintaining our verdant canopy, and fostering a high quality of life through environmental stewardship. This pride in our natural surroundings is a cornerstone of our community identity.

The proposed Penelope apartment building represents a significant increase in density that I fear would irrevocably alter the low-density, suburban character Rochester Hills residents cherish. Such a development typically brings with it increased traffic congestion, places undue strain on our existing infrastructure, and often necessitates the removal of mature trees and green spaces – directly undermining our "Tree City USA" principles and the tranquil atmosphere we value.

Similarly, the prospect of a large-scale data center raises a host of environmental and aesthetic concerns. These facilities are often energy-intensive, require substantial land clearings, and can introduce issues such as noise pollution, visual blight, and increased demands on utilities. These impacts are fundamentally incompatible with our identity as an "amazing city" that prioritizes natural beauty and resident well-being.

Allowing either of these projects to proceed would, in my view, compromise the very essence of what makes Rochester Hills a desirable and thriving community. Our commitment to green initiatives and our unique quality of life would be profoundly diminished.

Therefore, I respectfully implore to carefully weigh these profound implications and ultimately reject both the Penelope apartment building and the data center proposals. Let us continue to uphold the values that define Rochester Hills and safeguard its future for all residents.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter.

Sincerely,

Melissa Natzke
A Dedicated Resident of Rochester Hills

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

May 19, 2026 Planning commission meeting - apartments and data-center rules1 message

Molly Caporale <molly.b.caporale@gmail.com>

Sun, May 17, 2026 at 8:44 PM

To: "planning@rochesterhills.org" <planning@rochesterhills.org>

I am unable to attend the planning commission meeting on Tuesday so I am submitting my opinions on both the proposed apartments and data-center rules.

As far as data centers are concerned, I am adamantly opposed to them. I don't think they are inevitable and I don't think we need them - unless they can be built and used in a way that doesn't destroy our environment, deplete our water supply and create excess noise pollution just to name a few major issues. This is not good for the people of Rochester Hills or anybody else for that matter.

I don't think people understand the devastation that these data centers will cause and are already causing in areas where they are currently being built and used.

I'm also against any new large apartment buildings being built in our city. I feel like we are starting to be overbuilt and the traffic is horrible. Most people live in Rochester Hills to enjoy the green areas that we have.

Of the two issues I would take 10 new apartment building complexes over any data centers in our city.

Marlene (Molly) Davidson
[388 Willow Grove Ln.](#)
[Rochester Hills, Michigan](#)



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Additional Comments on Penelope Place under PUD 15-30-302-034 and -036

1 message

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

Sun, May 17, 2026 at 11:37 PM

Dear Rochester Hills Planning Commission and City Counsel:

May 17, 2026

RE: Penelope Place PUD
Parcel 15-30-302-034 and -036

Dear Planning Commission:

First, thank you Mr. Scot Beaton for his comments and valid points he made available to all. I appreciate his service to the residents and businesses back in 1988 as a City Council Member helping to forge a path towards residential and business development in Rochester Hills.

Citizenship voice is necessary from those that engage and support the City of Rochester Hills Planning Commission, Planning & Economic Development and City Council in their decision making. It is agreed that not all developments get it right for the area and are repurposed years or decades later.

I have the following additional points supplementing my previous comments sent to Planning on May 7, 2026, concerning the Proposed PUD for the development of two , 29 unit buildings on approximately 4 acres of land on Parcels 15-30-302-034 and -036.

1. First, the placement of buildings is on calculated acres of 3.34, which is well below the 4 acres mentioned in the documents. The extra .66 acres is a separate supplemental lot used for parking. This PUD proposed may fit on paper however, it is oversized for 3.34 or 4 acres for its footprint and height size while lacking amenities like carports, swimming pool, and significantly more green space, etc. and a safety concern with close to or over 100 cars in the parking lot.
2. The leasing of units being residential is outside the zoning Class Code as Commercial with a Neighborhood Code of General Office which should be developed as was the Car Wash to the north and the transportation facility directly behind this acreage and an office to the south. If residential, it should be only two story with expanded commons desperately necessary.
3. Clearly, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission and City Council should follow zoning ordinance standards for this site as it has followed through when ruling on other homeowner and business owner requests for review and approval.
4. The size proposed of 3 levels is overwhelming in appearance and too close to Adams Rd. with two ingress/egress entrances where drivers have to decelerate and slow down on approach into or exit from the complex. The ingress/egress to the north is especially a concern due to being on a curve for this site making it dangerous for accelerating northbound traffic from Auburn Rd.
5. The plan proposed appears to provide a limited size playscape which is too close to the parking area and causes a clear safety concern for a complex of close to 100 – 116 renters, some who may have children.

6. The proposed development in appearance looks more of a hotel/motel complex which are located near the exit ramp of an expressway that offer concierge service of even a complimentary breakfast with beverage at today's rental rates. What does this development really offer renters/tenants and the community on one of its major premium arteries?
7. A review by anyone would see this development as all building and parking with little to offer renters while tenants look out as high at 3 stories at the roof of a transportation facility. Some apartment complexes offer much more as Five Points Apartments (as an example), to the west of Chic Fil- A in Auburn Hills with a exercise facility and pool with lighted carports at a price of 1 BR \$1,729; 2 BR \$2,191 and 3 BR \$2,376 per month excluding electricity, gas, and internet. Carports no doubt are extra.
8. Any thoughts of building apartments in Rochester Hills as Domenic Moceri did back in the 1960's 1970's with cement floors who then transitioned in the mid 1980's and sold them as condominiums in Warren, MI? (i.e. Lancaster Woods and Yorkshire Woods). Back in the 1980's a 1 Bedroom sold for \$22,000 & 2 Bedroom for \$29,000 which helped 1st time homebuyers establish a home and build equity. Today, the 1 BR's sell for \$70,000-\$75,000 and 2 BR's sell for \$95,000 updated by its owners over time. Maintenance Fee is \$280.
9. The City of Rochester Hills Master Plan 2025 has raised the bar on being a prime community site for developers, investors and homeowners. I do not see this development at this location meeting or raising the bar expected of Rochester Hills with its need for aesthetically looking architecture with premium design looking structures and landscaping.

Other Concerns & Questions – (not all inclusive)

1. Is there ingress/egress from this site to the Clinton Trail for renters/tenants?
2. There apparently is one garbage trailer in the back corner. It is uncertain if this is large enough to handle the waste and recycling for close to 100 plus renters.
3. The sidewalk proposed in front will also be a concern for drivers exiting onto Adams Rd. and looking for bikers as well as walkers not to mention easy and safe access to cross the Adams Rd. Blvd.
4. Although seeing bike safety racks, where do renters or tenants secure bikes even after the season with no garages, basement, etc.?
5. Do apartments recycle and if not, why at this time in 2026?

In summary, in accordance with the zoning ordinance established, these parcels should be used for Office/Medical in conformance with the other businesses on the east side of Adams Rd. and no higher than 2 story.

After consideration of this and hearing other feedback from concerned residents of similar concerns, the Planning Commission and City Council should vote No for this PUD as presented with continued work by Planning and Economic Development with the owner for other options, even donating the parcels for a tax benefit.

Sincerely,

Richard Bosler

The City Planning Commission may post this or email it for the Public to read.

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 <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Re: Item 2025-0266 June 17, 2025 Planning Meeting

1 message

Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Tue, Jun 24, 2025 at 3:44 PM

To: Richard Bosler <richbosler@gmail.com>

Cc: Bryan Barnett <barnettb@rochesterhills.org>, Chris McLeod <mcleodc@rochesterhills.org>, Sara Roediger <roedigers@rochesterhills.org>

Hello Mr. Bosler -

Thank you for taking the time to provide your comments on the discussion item that was presented at the last Planning Commission meeting. As noted at the meeting this project is still in its initial phases of review (only one administrative review had been completed). It is not uncommon for a proposed project of this size and scope to have 3,4, or more administrative reviews until city staff have determined that all ordinances have been met and the project is ready for the planning commission to review. Overall, if the proposed project follows the current course, as a planned unit development, the Planning Commission and City Council will ultimately have the authority to determine whether the proposed project meets those additional criteria for a planned unit development and should be approved or whether the project falls short of those standards and therefore should be denied. The applicant in this particular case was seeking specific direction on whether additional stories for a multiple family project would be entertained and whether the composition of units having 1/2 bedrooms was appropriate. Again, as a discussion item and as explained at the meeting no final decisions were to be made. The Planning Commission did take the opportunity to provide additional feedback on other site plan items to give additional direction to the applicant. All in all it is anticipated this project will continue to evolve through the administrative review process based on the input received from the Commission. Not knowing when this item may reappear before the Planning Commission, if you would like, we will forward your comments to the applicant as additional input for consideration as well as to the Planning Commission members themselves.

Jennifer MacDonald
Planning Specialist



innovative by nature

Planning & Economic Development

248-656-4660

rochesterhills.org

On Mon, Jun 23, 2025 at 12:06 AM Richard Bosler <richbosler@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Rochester Hills Planning Commission:

As a resident of Rochester Hills who attended the Planning Commission meeting on June 17, 2025, please find below my Public Comments on the Agenda pertaining to Item 2025-0266 - Potential Multiple Family Residential Development Discussion - Adams, Old Adams and Forrester.

With regards to the proposal by an investor(s) with the architect/builder to develop a 32 to 48 unit apartment complex on this 3.3 acre site:

1. The apartment complex pictured likely does not do it justice and makes it look like a great deal of parking area with stucco buildings. What percentage is brick vs.vinyl and/or stone and how does it conform to the buildings in this area? If vinyl, is it minimal with the siding stain and fade resistant? Are the walls, fire retardant and noise resistant?
2. Certainly it was concluded by the Planning Commission that any 4 story building is out of the question. All I see is parking making it unattractive.

3. Other building alternatives should be investigated including a small business medical or business facility or a two story housing storefront on the bottom floor with owners dwelling home above with a garage entrance from the back.

An example of this type of development was proposed years ago for the northeast corner of South Blvd. and Adams Rd. however, never occurred. A development of this nature is located at the north west corner of Shelby Twp. at 24 Mile and Van Dyke Ave. Possibly there is no market for this.

4. If this is an apartment complex, (1) how will this look in 15 years, (2) where will the garbage bins be located on this site and trees. (3) lighting, (4) type of landscaping, (5) security of entering and exiting one's unit and (6) where to camouflage the parking lots with better locations for the air conditioning units and gas meter units to make it look attractive.

5. The proposed park-like setting is paltry.

6. Is this structure going to be developed with quality so it can be later sold as condominium units so people can afford them in the future? This is where the Baby Boom generation started back in the 1980's when apartments were converted to condominiums for less than \$30,000. Mocerri even sold off some of his apartment developments back in the 1980's in this manner. This is what our young people need today. Attractive Carports lend themselves to be an asset to protect cars in a project.

7. If this is an apartment complex for young career minded and newly married dwellers, where is the playground area and type.

8. Are pet's going to be allowed at all or in a certain number of units since there is a cost to this in replacing the carpet, floor area, wear and tear, etc.

9. For a 1 bedroom unit at \$2,000 plus per month and 2 bedrooms over \$3,000 per month, the price is out of sight compared to a development below.

One such apartment complex the investor should visit to get ideas both good and bad is at::
Stone Ridge of Shelby Twp.- <https://www.stoneridgeofshelby.com/>

This is not a well hidden complex, stand out and could use better buffering from the street.
The clubhouse and pool could certainly be larger for the number of units.
The access to units has no security from the parking lot since it is open air.
Some gas line meters are right next to the A/C which both are right next to a small porch sitting area.

However, these are priced according to the website from:
\$1,515 per month for 1 bedroom, 1 bath at 850 sq. ft.to,
\$1,820 for 2 bedroom and 2 bath at 1,145 sq. ft..

This is a far difference compared to \$2,000 plus for a 1 BR and \$3,000 plus for a 2 BR proposed by the investor for his apartments.

Finally, there are many leasing units and condominiums directly west off Adams Rd. in Auburn Hills that have been under development for years. From my observation, an investor should work towards developing a medical or business building with architecture similar to what appears along the Clinton River Trail off Avon Rd. just east of Livernois. Or, even build them as condo office units.

Some other noteworthy comments of developments already built in Rochester Hills includes:

Breckenridge Hills of Rochester - <https://rochesterhillscondos.com/>

This small 12 unit Duette Condominium development is south off Hamlin Rd. and just west of Livernois Rd.

This very limited condominium complex size and price of \$700,000, plus with options placed on this small piece of land is only worth a buyer's expectations for the price and amenities. From my perspective, this is not a good piece of land or price for such a development. Not close to stores, shops, etc.

The planting of large trees in front of Bay Windows on small plots of land just to get the tree count conditions met and planting arborvitaes also in front of bay windows does nothing to camouflage the traffic noise of Hamlin Rd. and results in problems as the plantings mature in the wrong locations.

Finally, the narrow entryway, step, archway and no porch to speak of make moving furniture in and out restrictive without scraping assets through the stone arch and entryway as one enters and exits these units.

My point is, this complex is developed on the wrong piece of land and depending upon the developer's landscapers to place trees and shrubs does not pass muster when they need a landscaping architect.

The City of Rochester Hills needs to work on establishing more berms along its main roads for developments with grassy plantings to hide parking lots. One only needs to see the store name and not all the cars or size of parking lots that take far too long to maintain. Other cities and states have done better work.

One very attractive development completed is the Fairfield Inn and Suites Marriott is hidden along Rochester Rd. just south of M-59 by a bank of attractive retail outlets. Both buildings look attractive at the City of Rochester and City of Troy entrance to the south.

In summary, and again from what I am observing, some of developer/investors are selecting the wrong land for their projects and/or could do a far better job of receiving guidance in landscaping them.

Sincerely,

Richard Bosler
Resident of RH
248-885-4525

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 <planning@rochesterhills.org>

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

1 message

Richard Bosler <richbosler@gmail.com>

Thu, May 7, 2026 at 12:41 AM

To: Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Cc: Richard Bosler <richbosler@gmail.com>

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 <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Penelope Place Apartments ... Letter posted

1 message

Scot Beaton <scotbeaton@gmail.com>

Fri, May 15, 2026 at 4:55 PM

To: info@gavassociates.com, Bryan Barnett <barnettb@rochesterhills.org>, Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Cc: manninod@rochesterhills.org, David Blair <blaird@rochesterhills.org>, carlockj@rochesterhills.org, limbergb@rochesterhills.org, Theresa Mungiolit <mungiolit@rochesterhills.org>, neubauerm <neubauerm@rochesterhills.org>, skelcym@rochesterhills.org

GAV & Associates Inc.

Letter posted on all local facebook pages, City Council, Planning Department and the Mayor's office ... note: A Royal Oak Architect that designed the new art deco Royal Oak city hall is also building a stunning transitional design apartment complex on the north side of town in Rochester Hills look at their work please!!! no BS ugly, cheap looking gray modern buildings in Rochester Hills!!!

Public Hearing and Request for Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Site Plan Approval, Tuesday May 19th 2026

Penelope Place Apartments, a proposed development of two three-story apartment buildings, each with twenty-nine units, on approximately 4 acres of land, located at on the southeast side of Adams Rd. and north of Auburn rd., zoned O Office Business District and subject to a consent judgment.

Staff report ... "The proposed elevations of the building reflect a modernistic design aesthetic and utilize a mixture of several different grey brick tones, Hardie Board panels (also in a grey tone) and limestone panels. The roof is proposed to be pitched and utilize both an architectural asphalt shingle as well as standing seam metal roofing in a dark grey/black tone."

FYI info ... The land is zoned office but decades-old consent judgment will allow a residential development. Build height for office allotted is 42 feet. The residential proposal is 39'-7". So build massing would be similar either office or residential. We could ask does the city need another gray three-story apartment complex? We could ask for a less dense development; but the developer GAV & Associates Inc. is staying within the boundaries of our city ordinance and not asking for more.

A brief history ... Around 1988 when I was a member of the Rochester Hills City Council there was a discussion that Auburn Hills MI requested a new interchange for M-59 and Squirrel Road. Auburn Hills MI at the time was aggressively seeking new high tech industries and offering substantial tax brakes for new business. But to build this new interchange the State MDOT would also have to move the existing Adams and M-59 interchange further east. Hence the realignment of Adams Road. Rural, suburban highway interchanges are two miles apart. The property that needed to purchase for this realignment was zoned Heavy Industrial. Heavy Industrial zoning was a district the city did not desire at that location; so not only did we negotiate for the new Adams right-away we were also successful in creating a new zoning district ORT Office - Research - Technology. Adams Road was to be built as a two lane road to the left side of the new 120 foot right-away and at a later date a second two lane road would be built as the land was developed. Final design a four-lane beautiful landscape boulevard all the way to Auburn Road.

A brief sad history ... Upon leaving City Council in 1997 there were many bad choices by future City Council members. Our resolution no more five lane highways in Rochester Hills was thrown out by new City Council members and Adams Road was turned into a five-lane highway creating a dangerous curve in front of the new Penelope Place Apartments proposal. Also the new zoning district ORT Office - Research - Technology was turned into a content judgment to build retail. Hence Walmart, that immense strip mall and very inexpensive looking hotels. All very poor City Council, Planning Department and Planning Commission decisions.

Now ... we a being asked to approve an inexpensive looking gray three-story apartment complex on a dangerous curve five-lane highway. Let's be sarcastic what is proposed will fit in perfectly with all the other wrong decisions

for this area of town. If you read the city staff report this proposal passes with flying colors. As of late our Planning Department and Planning Commission are passing dull gray inexpensive looking developments all over town. It seems they love this look. These continuing bad decisions are ruining our small-town residential character!

Note ... City Council will make the final decision if this (PUD) will pass; BUT... if they vote no and the Planning Department and Planning Commission are yes votes the developer will easily win their case in court.

Suggestions what we could do ... A traffic study fifty-eight units is going to generate a lot of traffic; more than the office zoning would allow? If so less units should be built. A traffic study should be a given before any approval. The look of the buildings, A (PUD) is a legal agreement between the developer and the city ... and the city can mandate aesthetics that would look residential traditional, not inexpensive looking gray modern. The current proposal looks like an inexpensive, low price, budget hotel. GAV & Associates Inc., based in Farmington, MI, is a highly regarded architecture firm with a diverse, award-winning portfolio. Great examples ... of their traditional architecture: JOHN R & ERSKINE Detroit, Michigan ... SOMERSET PLACE CONDOS Monroe, Michigan ... modern too, EVOLUTION EMPOWERMENT Dearborn, Michigan. Can we please ask them for that look instead? Please no more dull depressing looking gray buildings.* Please residential traditional or transitional design.**

Almost forgot ... the floor plans are all shower stalls if this development is family oriented half the units should have bath tubs ? ... how do you bathe a one year old in a shower stall.

"Architecture is art, but unlike art that can be hung inside a gallery architecture is public art and can have either good or bad consequences affecting a cities character and charm." Scot Beaton

Scot Beaton -- semi retired five time national, international NYC Clio award winning designer. Political experience former Rochester Hills City Council member 1988 to 1997 President, Rochester Hills City Council.

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/scot-beaton-474a7b51>

* "The trend of dull, depressing, and gray buildings, often referred to as "Millennial Gray" or "Sad Gray," has become a prevalent, often criticized, aesthetic in both residential and commercial architecture over the last decade. This design choice is frequently described as cold, flat, and reminiscent of institutional or prison-like." source google

**transitional design ... "A mix of modern and traditional architecture, often called transitional design, blends historic charm with contemporary functionality. This approach commonly pairs traditional building materials (stone, timber) with modern elements (glass, metal) to create a balanced, comfortable, and unique aesthetic." source google

CC:

Diana Mannino

District 1

City Cell: 248-309-1190

Term: 11/18/2029

manninod@rochesterhills.org

David J. Blair

District 2

Voicemail: 248-841-2647

Term: 11/14/2027

blaird@rochesterhills.org

Jason Carlock, President

District 3

City Cell: 248-318-2074

Term: 11/14/2027

carlockj@rochesterhills.org

Bradley Limberg

District 4

City Cell: [248-309-2861](tel:248-309-2861)

Term: 11/18/2029

limbergb@rochesterhills.org

Theresa Mungiolli, Vice President

At-Large

City Cell: [248-804-4894](tel:248-804-4894)

Term: 11/14/2027

mungiolit@rochesterhills.org

Marvie Neubauer

At-Large

City Cell: [248-318-6382](tel:248-318-6382)

Term: 11/14/2027

neubauerm@rochesterhills.org

Mark Skelcy

At-Large

City Cell: [248-394-7899](tel:248-394-7899)

Term: 11/18/2029

skelcym@rochesterhills.org



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Penelope Place Apartments

1 message

Scot Beaton <scotbeaton@gmail.com>

Fri, May 15, 2026 at 4:02 PM

To: Leanne Scott <scottl@rochesterhills.org>, Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Almost forgot ... the floor plans are all shower stalls if this development is family oriented half the units should have bath tubs ? ... how do you bathe a one year old in a shower stall.

please add to my letter always thanks for your time... :)



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Motion to postpone

1 message

Scot Beaton <scotbeaton@gmail.com>

Sun, May 17, 2026 at 4:48 PM

To: Leanne Scott <scottl@rochesterhills.org>, Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>, Bryan Barnett <barnettb@rochesterhills.org>

History... All other Rochester Hills PUD submissions have had independent planning reports and an extensive traffic study what makes this proposal different or special!!!

Sample Resolution Planning Commission Tuesday May 19th 2026

Motion to postpone Penelope Place Apartments

Whereas the Rochester Hills Planning Department shall provide the following documents to the Planning Commission so they can make an informed decision to pass on to City Council for final approval.

1) An independent non-biased report from a planning consultant firm ... (such as McKenna and Carlisle | Wortman Associates) to review this PUD submission, is two three-story apartment buildings, each with twenty-nine units, on approximately 4 acres of land an appropriate use for this property that is currently zoned office. Is this PUD submission in compliance with the City's steep slope ordinance. Is a three-story apartment building compatible with the other existing structures in this area both Auburn Hills and Rochester Hills.

2) An independent non-biased report, extensive traffic study ... (such as Hubbell, Roth & Clark, Inc.) that two three-story apartment buildings, each with twenty-nine units on dangerous curve Adams road five-lane highway is an appropriate use for this property that is currently zoned office. Would the current office zoning generate less traffic and if so the recommendation could come back with fewer units to match the current office zoning.

That upon further review

1) To retain Rochester Hills family values this PUD submission; one half of the apartment units will have bath tubs.

2) To retain the residential character of Rochester Hills, no modern gray architecture building facade. A PUD submission can be aesthetically regulated by the City. That the building facades will only be transitional design or residential traditional. They will be rendered in warm colors: beige, taupe, cream, reclaimed red brown brick or natural stone. Hardie Board wood grain panels beige, taupe, cream, dark brown or black. No gray metal panels.

Roll Call Vote



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Penelope Place Apartments

1 message

Scot Beaton <scotbeaton@gmail.com>

Thu, May 14, 2026 at 11:42 PM

To: Sara Roediger <roedigers@rochesterhills.org>, Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Penelope Place Apartments

Planning Department and City Council please post this letter for the public to read.

Public Hearing and Request for Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Site Plan Approval, Tuesday May 19th 2026

Penelope Place Apartments, a proposed development of two three-story apartment buildings, each with twenty-nine units, on approximately 4 acres of land, located at on the southeast side of Adams Rd. and north of Auburn rd., zoned O Office Business District and subject to a consent judgment.

Staff report ... "The proposed elevations of the building reflect a modernistic design aesthetic and utilize a mixture of several different grey brick tones, Hardie Board panels (also in a grey tone) and limestone panels. The roof is proposed to be pitched and utilize both an architectural asphalt shingle as well as standing seam metal roofing in a dark grey/black tone."

FYI info ... The land is zoned office but decades-old consent judgment will allow a residential development. Build height for office allotted is 42 feet. The residential proposal is 39'-7". So build massing would be similar either office or residential. We could ask does the city need another gray three-story apartment complex? We could ask for a less dense development; but the developer GAV & Associates Inc. is staying within the boundaries of our city ordinance and not asking for more.

A brief history ... Around 1988 when I was a member of the Rochester Hills City Council there was a discussion that Auburn Hills MI requested a new interchange for M-59 and Squirrel Road. Auburn Hills MI at the time was aggressively seeking new high tech industries and offering substantial tax brakes for new business. But to build this new interchange the State MDOT would also have to move the existing Adams and M-59 interchange further east. Hence the realignment of Adams Road. Rural, suburban highway interchanges are two miles apart. The property that needed to purchase for this realignment was zoned Heavy Industrial. Heavy Industrial zoning was a district the city did not desire at that location; so not only did we negotiate for the new Adams right-away we were also successful in creating a new zoning district ORT Office - Research - Technology. Adams Road was to be built as a two lane road to the left side of the new 120 foot right-away and at a later date a second two lane road would be built as the land was developed. Final design a four-lane beautiful landscape boulevard all the way to Auburn Road.

A brief sad history ... Upon leaving City Council in 1997 there were many bad choices by future City Council members. Our resolution no more five lane highways in Rochester Hills was thrown out by new City Council members and Adams Road was turned into a five-lane highway creating a dangerous curve in front of the new Penelope Place Apartments proposal. Also the new zoning district ORT Office - Research - Technology was turned into a content judgment to build retail. Hence Walmart, that immense strip mall and very inexpensive looking hotels. All very poor City Council, Planning Department and Planning Commission decisions.

Now ... we a being asked to approve an inexpensive looking gray three-story apartment complex on a dangerous curve five-lane highway. Let's be sarcastic what is proposed will fit in perfectly with all the other wrong decisions for this area of town. If you read the city staff report this proposal passes with flying colors. As of late our Planning Department and Planning Commission are passing dull gray inexpensive looking developments all over town. It seems they love this look. These continuing bad decisions are running our small-town residential character.

Note ... City Council will make the final decision if this (PUD) will pass; BUT... if they vote no and the Planning Department and Planning Commission are yes votes the developer will easily win their case in court.

Suggestions what we could do ... A traffic study fifty-eight units is going to generate a lot of traffic; more than the office zoning would allow? If so less units should be built. A traffic study should be a given before any approval. The look of the buildings, A (PUD) is a legal agreement between the developer and the city ... and the city can mandate aesthetics that would look residential traditional, not inexpensive looking gray modern. The current proposal looks like an inexpensive, low price, budget hotel. GAV & Associates Inc., based in Farmington, MI, is a highly regarded architecture firm with a diverse, award-winning portfolio. Great examples ... of their traditional architecture: JOHN R & ERSKINE Detroit, Michigan ... SOMERSET PLACE CONDOS Monroe, Michigan ... modern too, EVOLUTION EMPOWERMENT Dearborn, Michigan. Can we please ask them for that look instead? Please no more dull depressing looking gray buildings.* Please residential traditional or transitional design.**

.....

"Architecture is art, but unlike art that can be hung inside a gallery architecture is public art and can have either good or bad consequences affecting a cities character and charm." Scot Beaton

Scot Beaton -- semi retired five time national, international NYC Clio award winning designer
political experience former Rochester Hills City Council member 1988 to 1997 President, Rochester Hills City Council

* *"The trend of dull, depressing, and gray buildings, often referred to as "Millennial Gray" or "Sad Gray," has become a prevalent, often criticized, aesthetic in both residential and commercial architecture over the last decade. This design choice is frequently described as cold, flat, and reminiscent of institutional or prison-like."*
source google

****transitional design ...** *"A mix of modern and traditional architecture, often called transitional design, blends historic charm with contemporary functionality. This approach commonly pairs traditional building materials (stone, timber) with modern elements (glass, metal) to create a balanced, comfortable, and unique aesthetic."*
source google

note ... please feel free to forward this email ... always thanks for your time. Planning Department and City Council please post this letter for the public to read.



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

PUD Development (Penelope Place Apartments)

1 message

THERESA POUNDERS <thepounders@comcast.net>

Tue, May 12, 2026 at 4:50 PM

To: "planning@rochesterhills.org" <planning@rochesterhills.org>

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

.