



Rochester Hills

Minutes

Planning Commission

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

Chairperson Greg Hooper, Vice Chairperson Deborah Brnabic

Members: Sheila Denstaedt, Gerard Dettloff, Anthony Gallina, Dale Hetrick, Marvie

Neubauer, Scott Struzik and Ben Weaver

Youth Representatives: Oliver Blakeley and Siddh Sheth

Tuesday, December 9, 2025

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Hooper called the December 9, 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:

Chris McLeod, Planning Manager

Tracy Balint, Acting DPS Director

Kyle Hottinger, PEA-ASTI, Planning Consultant

Oliver Blakeley, Rochester Hills Government Youth Council Representative

Jennifer MacDonald, Recording Secretary

Chairperson Hooper welcomed everyone to the December 9, 2025 Regular Planning Commission Meeting. He noted that anyone wishing to speak on the Public Hearing item must submit a comment card to the Recording Secretary prior to the start of the Public Hearing.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2025-0501 October 21, 2025 Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Brnabic, 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

Chairperson Hooper noted that a communication had been received from Shelby Township acknowledging the notice regarding the adoption of Rochester Hills' Master Land Use Plan and availability of the Plan on the City's website.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

NEW BUSINESS

2025-0502 Public Hearing and Request for Recommendation for Preliminary Site Condominium for Camden Crossing condominiums - File No. PSC2025-0001 - for a proposed development of 25 detached single family residences on approximately 9.36 acres of land, located at 430 W. Hamlin Rd. and Parcel Nos. 15-22-451-029 and 15-22-451-038, located on the north side of Hamlin between Livernois and Rochester, zoned R-3 One Family Residential with the MR Mixed Residential Overlay; Jim Polyzois, Sare Inc., Applicant

(Staff Report dated 12-03-25, Reviewed Plans and ASTI letter of 11-3-25, Atwell Letter dated 10-23-25, PEA letter dated 9-19-25, PEA Letter and Test Pit Observation dated 5-5-21, Environmental Impact Statement, Development Application, WRC Letter dated 4-16-25, Streets Review dated 9-30-25, Public Comment and Public Hearing Notice had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

Present for the applicant were Jim Polyzois, SARE Inc., and Jared Kime, Atwell, Project Engineer.

Chairperson Hooper introduced the public hearing and request for recommendation for preliminary site condominium plan approval for Camden Crossing, a proposed development of 25 detached single family residences on approximately 9.36 acres of land located at 430 West Hamlin Road. He noted that tonight's request includes a wetland permit use recommendation, natural features setback modification and tree removal permit. He invited the applicants forward and asked for the Staff Report.

Mr. McLeod explained that site condominium approval is a two-step process, including preliminary and final. He noted that this was the first step, which also includes a tree removal permit, wetland use permit and a natural features modification associated with the wetland use permit. He described the total property as 9.36 acres at the corner of West Hamlin and Crestline, and an aerial noted the adjacent houses on the east side of Crestline that would abut the back end of the development, and the single family housing to the north. To the east is a church, as well as Hamlin School which is zoned residential as well, and single family across Hamlin. He explained that the property is zoned R-3 One Family Residential, and the applicant is requesting to use the MR Mixed Residential Overlay zoning which allows for flexibility in terms of the overall layout. He pointed out that the MR overlay requires a minimum of 10 acres for usage, and the applicant is requesting a modification to utilize it for the 9.36 acres.

He mentioned that this project may look familiar to several of the Commissioners as it received final condominium approval in 2022, however the approval expired before construction began. He noted that the configuration is essentially the same as what was approved by the Planning Commission and Council in April of 2022, showing 25 units, 19 along Cardinal Lane and six along

Crestline. He pointed out the wetland area, stormwater facility, utilities easement, and open space remaining. He showed the landscape plan proposed, pointing out that the applicant is providing an open space concept that provides a parklet, an amenity-laden open space area that will traverse the development and will include exercise equipment and a seating area. He noted the turnaround provided for the Fire Department's review, and a small gazebo-structure sitting area to the far north end of the site. A pathway traverses the overall development, and there will be sidewalks along the development and crosswalks along Cardinal Lane connecting all portions of the site together. He mentioned that the applicant is required to provide a Level B buffer landscaping between the single family residential and this development, and those calculations have been provided showing the requirements are met.

He reviewed the wetland portion of the site, noting that the site technically has two wetlands but only one is regulated by the City. He pointed out that the bulk of the wetland impact is to accommodate the development's stormwater facility, which is a detention pond that will not only clean the water but hold it and discharge it at an approved rate. The other wetland impact area is at the end of Cardinal Lane for the turnaround as well as creation of a portion of Unit 15. He pointed out that most of the impact is exempt because it is a stormwater facility, as per the ordinance. He reviewed the tree survey noting that there are 96 identified trees within the site that are regulated by ordinance. Proposed removals are either dead or diseased or otherwise within building envelopes. Based on that, 39 trees are required to be preserved and that is what the applicant is proposing. He added that based on calculations, a total of 245 replacement trees are required, and the applicant as of now is requesting to pay those into the City's Tree Fund at \$334 per tree current rate. He stressed that the wetland is a lower quality that has actually been mowed and maintained as a part of a yard and includes a large amount of non-native vegetative species. A small portion of the natural features modification pertains to the area adjacent to Unit 15 and the turnaround. He pointed out that the Ordinance requires some sort of physical boundary, and the applicant is proposing to provide a stone outcropping around the entire wetland and natural features area as their method to stress the boundary.

He stated that the houses will be around 1,900 to 2,200 square feet, three bedrooms with a fourth bonus room that could be used as a den, library or bedroom. The homes will be mostly brick in construction and single story elevations are typically proposed. The applicant's EIS notes the mid fives for pricing, based on the current market rate.

Chairperson Hooper opened the Public Hearing, and noted that three additional emails had been received after the agenda had been published and were distributed to the Commissioners, including from Thomas Baier, Gary Elrod, and Mary Worley. He noted that comments are limited to three minutes as part of the public hearing and questions will be addressed by the Chair after Public Comment is closed.

Terry Schafer, 1697 Crestline, expressed concern regarding the traffic volume on Crestline coming off of Hamlin, noting that it is a bus route. He commented that he is on the Advisory Traffic and Safety Committee, and counters put out

on Crestline this past May noted almost 500 cars going out in the morning and 800 back in the afternoon. She mentioned that it is disturbing that many of these cars ignore the stop sign at Parkland.

Gary Elrod, 495 Parkland, stated that he does not believe this is a good fit and does not want to see this development happen. He asked about the perimeter boulders, and expressed concerns regarding possible flooding issues, noting that their retention pond failed during the hundred year storm. He asked how the hundred year rainfall calculations were made and how rainfall translated to the design. He stated that they preferred a park there.

Madelyn Upleger, 1835 Crestline, explained that they are the last house on Crestline before Parkland. She stated that they were promised that trees would go behind their property and now it appears that there is a walking path there. She commented that people cut through their yard all the time with their dogs. She added that they have had floods go through their backyard at least five times from Parkland. She stressed that they have been there 38 years, and originally had been told that theirs would be a dead-end street.

Jody Williamson, 452 Parkland, questioned the clearing of a wetland for a new use, which is discouraged by the Michigan Department of Environment Great Lakes and Energy. She stated that the land in question is a large beautiful treed area of over nine acres that is significantly lower than the residences to the north. She stressed that buried beneath part of the wetland is a Sunoco high pressure product pipeline. She added that the land provides essential habitat for area wildlife that has been pushed out of surrounding areas.

Mary Worley, 233 Parkland, expressed concern over the amount of traffic going up and down Crestline. She stated that she thought that none of the condos would be built on or able to access Crestline.

Seeing no additional Public Comment, Chairperson Hooper closed the Public Hearing. He commented that he would be addressing the questions raised, and started with traffic. He noted that when the road was paved 12 or 14 years ago, traffic counts were at 2,000 per day and there had been justification for paving. At that time, speed was a concern, and four traffic humps were added on Crestline. He asked for verification that the six homes to be built on Crestline would be the only ones that would impact traffic on Crestline and everyone else would be coming off of Hamlin Road.

Mr. McLeod confirmed that was correct, and the other 19 homes would enter off Hamlin on Cardinal. He pointed out that regardless of whether it was this development, or simple lot splits, there would likely be homes constructed on Crestline. He mentioned that Tracey Balint was in attendance to respond to any traffic questions.

Chairperson Hooper commented that the six homes would generate in the range of 54 trips total for impact on Crestline, and asked Ms. Balint if that was accurate that these cars would not necessarily be coming north on Crestline and would most likely go south to Hamlin. He added that he would expect that construction traffic would be prohibited from using Crestline.

Ms. Balint confirmed that was correct, and added that the construction access would be through Cardinal Rd.

Chairperson Hooper asked for a discussion on the wetland impacts and flooding in general within the community and for this project. He asked for a definition of the 100-year rain event.

Mr. Kime responded that the County defines a hundred-year storm event and explained that there is a calculation that determines the amount of runoff that needs to be stored for any proposed development. He stated that it increases based on the amount of impervious area, therefore creating more runoff. The detention pond proposed is designed to account for the runoff based on calculations for a 100-year storm event that accommodates both the site and the adjacent church, and the existing church's pond is being expanded and incorporated into one contiguous pond. He stated that the site itself is the low area where the wetlands are, and the surrounding properties flow into it. He stressed that there is nothing that they can do about flooding events from upstream areas, as the site is the receiving body. He stated that the wetland will flow directly into the stormwater basin and then be released through a controlled outlet structure to the wetlands to the east, which continue to flow to an existing drainage ditch and then ultimately into a country drain at the required discharge rate.

Chairperson Hooper asked about the issue of potential flooding on any adjacent properties to the north or west.

Mr. Kime responded that all of those properties sit significantly higher, and this property is receiving all of their water so there would not be any backup to them.

Chairperson Hooper mentioned that when the Nottingham development was constructed, the detention pond discharged into the storm sewer that was on the south side of the properties on Parkland, and he stated that he knew there had been a problem.

Ms. Balint responded that this was addressed and a year and a half ago they completed the work that met the requirements of the approved design and it should improve drainage.

Chairperson Hooper asked about the perimeter boulders. He noted that the screening brought up by Ms. Upleger was noted in the 2022 submittal as being enhanced. He asked if the screening was being planted on the neighboring property, and whether there is an agreement in place with that owner.

The applicant's representatives responded that the boulders are essentially a landscape feature to provide a visual delineation of the wetland buffer line, and prevent lawn mowers from going into the area. The additional evergreen plantings on the northern parcel are proposed on the homeowner's side so that they can be maintained properly, as there is no access to bring utilities across to water or maintain any of that area, and their proposal is to keep that northern area maintained in a natural state because of the lack of ability to get any

irrigation into the space. There is no signed agreement, however, the last time this was before the Commission, it was discussed to plant on their property. They could remove this if needed.

Chairperson Hooper asked for the applicant to meet with the Uplegers and come to a resolution as to whether they wanted the plantings on the property line. He mentioned that there was a garden back there. He asked that the plans be revised to reflect what would be on their property and what was on the development property.

Mr. Polyzois responded that this would be resolved.

Chairperson Hooper asked about other landscaping including evergreen trees.

The applicants responded that the existing evergreens at the fire truck turnaround are where the pipeline goes through the property. Mr. Polyzois commented that Mr. Nunez is typically with him at these meetings, but he is recovering from surgery.

They continued that there are a mixture of plantings along there including a number of existing evergreens already on the neighboring property, which will be supplemented with some additional evergreens to ensure that the headlights for anyone using that turnaround space would be blocked from shining through.

Chairperson Hooper asked if this would be an opaque screen or something that will take a number of years to grow in.

Mr. Kime responded that there is already an opaque screen and it will be enhanced to ensure nothing gets through. He pointed out that plantings are prohibited within the pipeline, and the additional plantings will be planted outside of the easement and will be redundant in the event that the pipeline owner ever comes through and removes existing evergreens and shrubs in the easement.

Chairperson Hooper recalled when Sunoco came through a number of years ago and clear cut plantings in the easement. He explained that through negotiation, Sunoco agreed to defer some of the removal and keep some of the vegetation and trees. He asked about the wetland mitigation.

Mr. McLeod deferred to Kyle Hottinger, the City's wetland consultant from ASTI-PEA. He explained that the City's ordinance does not require wetland mitigation, and the wetland use permit is either you can disturb the wetland or you cannot. He commented that if this ultimately is determined to be an EGLE-regulated wetland, they will need to submit and seek approval from EGLE.

Mr. Hottinger confirmed that there are no stipulations for mitigation within the city. He commented that it is not their place to say whether it is an EGLE-regulated wetland and that would be up to Atwell-Hicks and the developer. He noted that any mitigation required by EGLE would be dealt with through the State.

Mr. Kime noted that they met with EGLE and had a pre-application meeting to discuss wetlands. He explained that EGLE declined to provide an opinion at the time on the regulatory status and did not have the ability to come out to do a field assessment due to staffing. Their recommendation was to assume it would be treated as regulated and file a permit application with the State, which they did about three weeks ago. He stated that EGLE's preference would be to have the mitigation paid for in the form of credits that would be applied to a mitigation bank within the area. He noted that EGLE likes to centralize the wetlands to have a more sustainable habitat rather than trying to piecemeal little pockets of wetlands around. He commented that their expected outcome of the permit application process is that the permit will be approved and the mitigation will be paid for into a bank.

Chairperson Hooper commented that he has had the privilege of serving on the Planning Commission for 26 years, and every time there is a development proposed in Rochester Hills, the common theme is that residents were never told that the land behind their backyard would be developed. He stated that the issue comes down to private property rights. He noted that the Planning Commission has a guiding document, the Master Land Use Plan, with a recommendation of how future properties can be developed. He commented that it is a balancing act of the rights of private property owners, and those owners being able to monetize and develop the property according to the laws and ordinances of the City, versus maintaining trees and wetlands, and preserving open space. He commented that if you see open space behind your home, he would pretty much assure that someday it would be built on. He stated that you can choose to own it yourself or you can go and appeal to City Council to have the City purchase it and not develop it; however, there are limited funds and only so much tax monies that could be spent to acquire properties. He noted comments regarding density of the development and asked Mr. McLeod to weigh in.

Mr. McLeod responded that in the MR District there is an overall density guideline at 3.45 units per acre net density. Once homes are fit in net of setbacks, stormwater facilities and infrastructure taken into account, that density typically decreases. He pointed out that this particular development has a significant area left undisturbed, which then transfers overall density to other portions of the site. He stressed that based on the MR overlay, northward of 30 units would be technically allowable assuming the site was perfectly configured. He stated that the overall density of the development pursuant to the MR District is being met within the ordinance limitations.

Chairperson Hooper asked about site condominiums versus single family homes.

Mr. McLeod responded that in today's world, site condominiums and subdivisions are one and the same, and reflect a method of ownership. He pointed out that pretty much every development built in the last 30 years are site condominiums. He explained that they would not have lots per se but would have common space around each one of the units, and the HOA would take care of the common areas in between the units.

Chairperson Hooper commented on the estimated pricing, noting that he believes that another one hundred thousand would be tacked on to the price of each home based on what he has seen recently. He added that he has not seen these new developments affect surrounding values as Rochester Hills is such a desirable community.

Mr. Polyzois added that he finds that many of his buyers come from Rochester Hills, whether they are current apartment renters or are downsizing from larger homes.

Discussion ensued as to whether the private road was being constructed under the City standards. While the road construction itself would be to City standards and 27 ft. wide, the sidewalks are only three feet off the back of the curb with a narrow corridor that does not meet the City standards for it to be a public road. It was noted that it was proposed to be a concrete road with an integral pour curb and road slab, however, that could change dependent upon pricing at the time.

Chairperson Hooper stressed that if the plans were approved for a concrete road, it would not be able to be changed at a later date.

Ms. Neubauer noted that under the landscape review comments, a section was included noting that a form of authorization shall be provided prior to planting off site. She asked if this was included.

Mr. McLeod responded that this referenced the arborvitaes for the adjacent resident. He commented that if these are being moved on-site, this becomes a null statement.

Ms. Neubauer asked that if this is to be successful, a condition will be added that the developer meet with Ms. Upleger and come to a resolution before final approval. She addressed Mr. Schafer, thanking him for his service on the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board, noting that the City needs its residents to be vocal about their concerns. She noted that much of the traffic is the result of the school and morning drop-off. She commented that she has had recent discussions with the School Superintendent about the need to beef up safety because every elementary, middle and high school in the city has dangerous traffic conditions. She pointed out that now that it is dark out, it is difficult to see, and kids do not seem to be excited about staying and waiting their turn to exit vehicles. She stressed that any issue with school traffic should go to through the Superintendent, who has to address such issues through the school principals, and if it is a City road, it can be addressed by the City, or a County road by the Road Commission. She stated that she did not see this development having much impact on traffic. She commented that there is a new Council member who will be working with the Traffic committee and hopefully they can work to beef up the committee for new traffic studies and added safety measures for City roads.

She concurred with Chairperson Hooper's comments on the development of property, and noted that values have increased at almost four percent every year. She pointed out that with respect to tree removal, the City has acquired several new green spaces in Rochester Hills, and currently has about 142

acres of green space in eight natural green space areas. She stressed that those properties cannot be developed; however, as Chairperson Hooper stated, private property owners cannot be deprived of their right to develop. She suggested another condition be added that construction vehicle traffic would solely be through Cardinal Street.

Ms. Neubauer stated that the Commission just completed the Master Plan and took surveys of countless homeowner associations. She stressed that she wants the citizens of the city to know that they need this type of development because people need places to either downsize or start out in. She stated that nobody wants mega houses that are 5,000 square feet or four story apartment buildings, and it was these types of houses that were requested. She commented that she knows change is hard, but this is a good change. She added that this is what was previously approved and was set to be constructed. She stated that if this gets approved, construction needs to start and she does not want to see this applicant back in three or four years with the same presentation.

Mr. Hetrick stated that he is almost certain he was on City Council when this was previously approved and he does not see a reason to change his vote now.

Mr. Struzik asked how they could limit construction equipment from Crestline if six homes would be built on that road. He noted that while the construction vehicles could come in from the back, there would be driveways and foundations that may need cement trucks. He suggested that it be minimized to as little as possible. He noted that originally a 26th home was proposed which would have required a variance for a rear yard setback, and this is how there was a slightly lower density with 25 homes. He commented that he was for it then and is for it now and likes the parklet included along with the pathway connection to Crestline. He added that he would anticipate that the stormwater management would improve flooding issues. He stated that he thinks it looks like a great neighborhood and is excited to see it come to fruition.

Mr. Weaver asked if there was more information on the wetland quality and how it was classified as poor.

Mr. McLeod responded that to paraphrase Mr. Hottinger's report, it is in terms of the non-native species located within the wetland itself as well as the fact that large portions of this wetland have been manicured as lawn, slowly deteriorating the quality of it.

Mr. Hottinger stated that he had been out to the site a couple of times and explained that the majority of the northern area down through the detention basin has been mowed and is totally dominated by prairie grass which is a non-native species along with a lot of buckthorn around the edges. He commented that deepening the detention basin will hold a little more water and maybe get a couple of different species in there. He stressed that it won't degrade it further.

Mr. Weaver asked if the seeding mix for the detention basin will be a native species and if it might potentially increase its functionality or value.

Mr. Hottinger responded that it would be better just due to the water flow.

Mr. Weaver commented on the pollinator garden, noting that the growth could spread into the existing wetland. He expressed appreciation for the use of boulders or rocks rather than a fence. He noted an area behind the wetland where no trees are proposed because they can't get to that area to grade it out. He expressed concern over placing spoils in an area where they cannot be graded out and could potentially block the flow of water.

Mr. Kime responded that any grading done would be done with the intention of maintaining the direction of flow to the wetlands. He pointed out that every development generates some spoils from utilities and basements and instead of trucking it offsite they would like to keep them onsite, grade them out, seed them and let them grow naturally and become a nice hill within the meadow. He pointed out that the wetland stops short of the eastern or western property line and during construction they could get a small bulldozer back there to spread it out.

Mr. Weaver stated that he would want them to insure that drainage is not hampered in any way. He asked if any of the 242 trees proposed would go toward replacement trees.

Mr. McLeod responded that these are completely separate items and separate calculations, and explained that any tree required by ordinance for buffering or street trees do not count toward tree replacement.

Mr. Weaver commented that trying to stuff trees onto a site is counterproductive to the health of the trees proposed, so he is okay with that proposal. He asked how the density of this site compares to adjacent developments.

Mr. McLeod responded that to the west, Crestline is much less dense, with older, traditional lots. To the north, it jumps to a different denser district. He stressed that when the MR District is utilized it is a permissible density based on the underlying zoning district. He commented that with this development, it probably could never truly get to 3.45 units per acre that would be allowable, and the density notches down toward something more traditional as in the R-3 District.

Mr. Weaver stated that he is trying to determine whether this fits in with the general character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Mr. McLeod responded that while everyone's review would be a little different, planners try to transition uses. He explained that when non-residential uses such as a school or church are within a residential district, those are deemed as about as intense as you can normally get within a residential district. He pointed out that this buffers it down or steps down into what would normally be allowable within that district as more of a single family use. He stated that there is higher density to the north and this steps down to a lower density toward Hamlin. He commented that from a staff standpoint, he thinks it fits in relatively well.

Chairperson Hooper stated that his subdivision is R-4 with open space lot averaging and with neighbors 14 feet away. He commented that it will be similar to the homes that are there.

Ms. Neubauer moved the motion for recommendation for preliminary condominium approval, noting the additional conditions that 1) Construction vehicle traffic shall primarily utilize Cardinal Lane as much as possible to limit construction traffic on the surrounding streets, particularly Crestline; 2) that the applicant is to meet with the residents of 1835 Crestline with respect to planting trees to provide buffering to their property; and 3) that the road shall be constructed of poured concrete. The motion was supported by Mr. Gallina.

Chairperson Hooper noted that the plantings would not be installed on the Upleger's property, but would be installed on the developer's property. He called for a roll call vote. After the vote, he announced that the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Neubauer made the motion in the packet to approve the Tree Removal Permit. which was supported by Ms. Denstaedt. After calling for a roll call vote, Chairperson Hooper noted that the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Neubauer made the motion in the packet to grant the Natural Features Setback Modification and the motion was supported by Ms. Brnabic. After calling for a roll call vote, Chairperson Hooper noted that the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Neubauer made the motion in the packet to recommend City Council approval of the Wetland Use Permit. The motion was supported by Mr. Struzik. Following a roll call vote, Chairperson Hooper noted that the motion passed unanimously.

Chairperson Hooper stated that the next step would be for this item to move on to City Council.

Mr. McLeod stated that the target date would be for the January 12 meeting for the Preliminary Site Condo as well as the Wetland Permit.

Chairperson Hooper stated that subject to that approval, the applicant would be coming back to the Planning Commission for Final Site Plan Approval.

Mr. McLeod confirmed this, noting that they have some engineering work to complete and would have to complete their legal documents including the master deed.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Gallina, 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. PSC2025-0001 Camden Crossing, the Planning Commission recommends to the City Council Approval of the Preliminary Site

Condominium Plan, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on October 30, 2025, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions.

Findings

1. The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that all applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as other City Ordinances, standards, and requirements, can be met subject to the conditions noted below.
2. The proposed project will be accessed from W. Hamlin Road, thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on the adjoining street.
3. Adequate utilities are available to the site.
4. The preliminary plan represents a reasonable street and lot layout and orientation.
5. The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.
6. The proposed development will not have an unreasonably detrimental or injurious effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the site or those of the surrounding area.
7. The requested modification for the reduction for the overall minimum land area required to utilize the MR Mixed Residential Overlay District is warranted since the site is approximately 9.5 acres and the site layout otherwise meets all City requirements.

Conditions

1. Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, prior to final site condominium site plan approval.
2. Provide a landscape bond in the amount of \$169,717.40, plus inspection fees, as adjusted by staff as necessary, prior to the preconstruction meeting with Engineering.
3. Construction vehicle traffic shall primarily utilize Cardinal Lane as much as possible to limit construction traffic on the surrounding streets, particularly Crestline.
4. Applicant is to meet with the residents of 1835 Crestline, with respect to planting trees to provide buffering to their property.
5. The road shall be constructed of poured concrete.

2025-0505

Request for Tree Removal Permit approval - File No. PRP2025-0012 - to remove 66 regulated trees and 27 specimen trees, with 245 replacement trees to be paid into the City's Tree Fund for Camden Crossing condominiums, a proposed development of 25 detached single family residences on approximately 9.36 acres of land, located at 430 W. Hamlin Rd. and Parcel Nos. 15-22-451-029 and 15-22-451-038, located on the north side of Hamlin between Livernois and Rochester, zoned R-3 One Family Residential with the MR Mixed Residential Overlay; Jim Polyzois, Sare Inc., Applicant

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Denstaedt, 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. PSC2025-0001 (Camden Crossing) the Planning Commission grants a Tree Removal Permit (PTP2025-0012), based on plans received by the Planning Department on October 30, 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 66 regulated trees and 27 specimen trees.
3. Based on the number of preserved trees onsite, the number and type of trees being removed, the applicant is required to provide a total of 245 tree credits as a part of the overall development.
4. Overall, the applicant is planting 73 shade trees, 88 evergreen trees, plus 59 ornamental trees onsite as a part of the overall landscape plan.

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 245 replacement trees identified on the site plan

2025-0504

Request for Natural Features Setback Modification approval - File No. PNFSM2025-0004 - to impact approximately 487 linear feet or 11,201 square feet of the natural features setback for Camden Crossing condominiums, a proposed development of 25 detached single family residences on approximately 9.36 acres of land, located at 430 W. Hamlin Rd. and Parcel Nos. 15-22-451-029 and 15-22-451-038, located on the north side of Hamlin between Livernois and Rochester, zoned R-3 One Family Residential with the MR Mixed Residential Overlay; Jim Polyzois, Sare Inc., Applicant

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Brnabic, that this matter be Granted. 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. PNFSM2025-0004 (Camden Crossing), the Planning Commission grants a natural features setback modification for 487 linear feet of Natural Features Setback (or a total of 11,301 square feet) of permanent impacts to the natural features setback area from the wetlands identified on the site plans to construct the proposed private road, to provide the building area for the single family residential units, and associated development infrastructure, based on plans received by the Planning Department on October 30, 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, and the applicant has minimized the impacts to the natural features and associated natural features setbacks. Further, 378 linear feet of the impact is for stormwater purposes which are exempt from ordinance regulation and the applicant has provided for the future protection of the natural features setback by providing a boulder "wall" 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 the delineated City regulated wetland 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.
3. ASTI has indicated that the existing natural features setback areas are not of a medium or high quality in their current condition and therefore only provide minimal benefit currently.

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 November 3, 2025 prior to final approval by staff.

2025-0503

Request for Wetland Use Permit Recommendation - File No. PWEP2025-0004 - a request to impact approximately 11,427 square feet of wetlands for Camden Crossing condominiums, a proposed development of 25 detached single family residences on approximately 9.36 acres of land, located at 430 W. Hamlin Rd. and Parcel Nos. 15-22-451-029 and 15-22-451-038, located on the north side of Hamlin between Livernois and Rochester, zoned R-3 One Family Residential with the MR Mixed Residential Overlay; Jim Polyzois, Sare Inc., Applicant

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Struzik, 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 PWEP2025-0004 (Camden Crossing) the Planning Commission recommends to City Council approval of a Wetland Use Permit to permanently impact approximately 11,427 square feet of wetlands to construct the private road, building areas for single family units, and associated development infrastructure based on plans received by the Planning Department on October 30, 2025, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions.

Findings

1. The wetland located onsite is an emergent wetland and its quality, as determined by ASTI, is of low ecological quality due to its small size, high percentage of non-native

vegetation and location with a highly urbanized area, but does provide some stormwater detention and filtration and is considered to be a medium/low quality natural resource to the city.

2. ASTI has reviewed the subject plans and proposed impacts to the city regulated wetland along with the proposed mitigation efforts to help reduce the impacts to those wetlands and has indicated that the plans as proposed are satisfactory.
3. The majority of the proposed wetland impacts, 11,284 square feet, are a result of the construction of a stormwater facility for the site and are therefore exempt from regulation.
4. Only 143 square feet of actual wetland impact is regulated by City Ordinance and given the limited amount of impact and the current medium/low quality designation of the wetland, it has been recommended by the City's environmental consultant to allow the proposed impact.

Conditions

1. City Council approval of the Wetland Use Permit.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. The applicant shall abide by all conditions and recommendations as outlined in ASTI's review letter of November 3, 2025.

(Planning Commission recessed from 8:26 to 8:38 p.m.)

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

2025-0507 Request for Appointment of a Planning Commission Representative to the Citizens Pathway Review Committee for a one-year term to expire December 31, 2026

Chairperson Hooper noted that Mr. Struzik has been the Planning Commission representative to the Citizens Pathway Review Committee.

Ms. Neubauer made the motion for Mr. Struzik to continue as Planning Commission representative to the Citizens Pathway Review Committee for the coming year. The motion was seconded by Ms. Brnabic.

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

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Gallina, 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 representative to the Citizens Pathway Review Committee for a term beginning January 1, 2026 and expiring December 31, 2026.

2025-0508

Request for Approval of the 2026 meeting schedule

Chairperson Hooper noted that the Commission is asked to approve the proposed 2026 Meeting Schedule. He asked if the January meeting could be moved to January 13 instead of January 20.

Mr. McLeod noted that Ms. MacDonald will be out for January 13, but hopefully a new Administrative Assistant starting in the department would be available to attend the meeting for her.

Ms. Neubauer moved the motion in the packet to approve the 2026 Meeting Schedule with the January meeting set for January 13, 2026 instead of January 20, 2026 and the Joint Meeting with City Council added for February 2, 2026. The motion was seconded by Ms. Denstaedt.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Denstaedt, 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 establishes its 2026 meeting schedule at the December 9, 2025 Regular Meeting as follows:

**ROCHESTER HILLS PLANNING COMMISSION
2026 MEETING DATES***

January 13, 2026	July 16, 2026
February 2, 2026 Joint Meeting with City Council	July 21, 2026
February 17, 2026	August 18, 2026
March 17, 2026	September 15, 2026
April 21, 2026	October 20, 2026
May 19, 2026	November 17, 2026
	December 15, 2026

*Meetings will generally be held on the third Tuesday of the month at 7:00 p.m. unless otherwise approved. Worksessions may be added at 5:30 p.m. on the above meeting dates as needed. The Planning Commission reserves the right to add Special Meetings or Workshops generally on the first Tuesday of the month at the applicant's request and cost or as necessary. Meetings may be cancelled if no applications are received in the appropriate timeframe. Meetings will be held in the Auditorium of the City Municipal Offices at 1000 Rochester Hills Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48309.

2025-0569

Potential Ordinance Amendments

(Potential Ordinance Amendments for Discussion, Memo by McLeod and Roediger dated 12-4-25, Cat Cafe Business Proposal (for discussion purposes), Devon Yousif email of 10-27-25, and Draft PC Minutes (excerpt) from 10-21-25 had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof).

Mr. McLeod noted that many changes encompass housekeeping items. He stated some are basic typographical errors or corrections but the items for discussion included EV charging stations as a primary use. He noted that the approach they feel is most appropriate is to deal with them no differently than a gas station as they will look essentially the same. He commented that while there will be a convenience store/seating area, there will still be pumps and canopies.

Ms. Brnabic stated that she does view EVs differently than gas stations as there will be a draw on electricity and people sit there much longer. She stated that she does not feel comfortable with that right now.

Ms. Roediger stated that it is a conditional use in many of the districts and it is the wave of the future. She commented that they will see gasoline service stations and more of these EV charging stations. She suggested that any concerns could be addressed with conditions.

Ms. Brnabic responded that things may be taking a different turn because of the change in requirements by the current administration. She commented that there is no requirement that everyone have an electric car by 2035 and things are moving in a different direction.

Ms. Roediger stated that while it is not mandatory in terms of how people fuel their vehicles, there will probably be more hybrid stations where gas stations have started to install EV charging stations. She noted that fully EV charging stations are not out of the realm of what is coming as they already exist in other places and the City wants to be prepared for them.

Ms. Brnabic stated that while she understands that, she is just saying that combining them into one category under gas stations still raises concerns.

Ms. Roediger noted that if they are made conditional uses in every district, then conditions could be applied as to how to treat them differently. She stressed that this does not have to be solved today but it should be given some thought if there are conditions something specific to EVs that could be incorporated.

Mr. McLeod noted that there is time to deal with this. He commented that one project has been proposed as a discussion item. He stated that otherwise more information gathered about these uses will help determine the best way to approach them; and while they share a lot of similar features, there are differences. He commented that there is probably more screening with an EV station as travel time and duration of stay is different. He stressed that with a conditional use, it allows a closer view to see how each site operates independently and how it fits into the context of the surrounding environment. He gave the example that for abutting residential or in a more visible location, it might require a lot more screening. He commented that it is food for thought as to whether it needs to be pulled out separate or if it should be treated the same.

Chairperson Hooper commented that the Meijer location is installing EV stations. He asked if every large big box retail environment is going to want to put in electric vehicle charging stations for parked cars as everyone has a big

parking lot. He noted that it sounds like it's the wave of the future if Meijer is doing it for their parking lots.

Mr. McLeod stated that if there is a shopping center or big box user that is overparked, and a national brand wants to come in and use 10 spaces for EV charging, they are currently reviewed as an ancillary use, and he suggested that this may be something that they want to take a further dive into as well. He commented that it would not surprise him to say the Target shopping center might be a candidate, or Walmart, or wherever there is a main trunk line or property that is easily accessible from a main trunk line, and with a large parking lot that is underutilized.

Chairperson Hooper suggested that it probably should be in the parking standards. He stated that he could see Emagine Theater or the Village of Rochester Hills might want to add more electrical charging.

Mr. McLeod stated that there is a distinction, whether the parking is being provided for the actual patrons of the store or if the charging station is a destination.

Mr. Struzik commented that he did not think this was so much as forcing people to buy electric vehicles, but enabling the businesses to be ready. He stated that people are going to want this and businesses are going to want electric vehicles in their parking lots. He commented that it enables the City to set up its businesses for success.

Ms. Neubauer stated that she would agree that it is coming and that there should be a separate ordinance. She suggested that communications should be made with the Fire Department regarding extinguishing a fire and a study is needed about the amount of energy that it will pull because when storms happen lights go out in the neighborhoods. She commented that it is more important to have heat and air conditioning in homes rather than fueling stations and usage needs to be prioritized. She stated that she has had a number of conversations with Deputy Chief Echols, who expressed her concerns.

Mr. Weaver stated that he would agree with both sides that it falls into the category of a fueling station, but it perhaps needs to be separated as a subset. He noted that demand will determine whether it happens or not and he agrees that the City needs to be prepared as it is coming soon. He asked what other communities nearby have done.

Mr. McLeod responded that he is not sure that there is a fully EV station within the metro Detroit area. He stated that if it can be provided as an ancillary use, it can be dealt with as a simple site plan or simple building permit; however, as a standalone or primary use this would be the first venture in the state.

Ms. Neubauer commented that one of the things that should be considered is that if only 10 percent of the community has EV cars, it does not make any sense. However if the greater demand gets here, it should be put into the ordinance. She stated that she does not want it to end up like the transit system where the city gives Oakland County a gigantic amount of money and less than

one percent of the population uses it.

Mr. McLeod commented that people who live here will probably charge their vehicles at home; however, a location on a transit corridor is probably sought.

Ms. Neubauer stated that she would like to separate it from gas stations as there are different dangers and energy draws. She commented that to properly address it, the Fire Department should be brought in.

The consensus was that further research and discussed needs to be done.

Mr. McLeod continued that the next topic was relative to golf courses. He stated that Mr. Bylen approached Planning staff and noted that they wanted to work on an accessory building which currently sits 205 feet from the property line. He stated that he needs to modify the building because they want to go to EV vehicles, so he wants to bring all of his vehicles inside and provide a different configuration. He had asked if have to maintain a 200-foot setback for the building if they ensured that everything was screened and there is no outdoor noise. McLeod explained that this depends on the level of review that the modification prompts. He stated that in this instance, it would be a Planning Commission item and the Commission would make the determination whether the building can go closer and if the screen would be appropriate. He noted that Mr. Bylen's golf course is the only course that actually meets all of the setback requirements.

He continued with the topic of places of worship and community facilities, and noted that nonprofit organizations are not listed anywhere within the zoning ordinance. He stated that the ordinance is vague on where they are permitted. He commented that staff felt that in terms of nonprofit organizations, a community facility or nonprofit organization could be included within this section of the ordinance as long as they are located on a designated major roadway on the City's Master Thoroughfare Plan. He mentioned that one of the items that prompted this discussion was a place of worship at 730 East Auburn Road that is currently for sale. He commented that it is unlikely that it will be another place of worship, so the question becomes whether a nonprofit organization that does charitable work or includes a place for a small assembly would be permissible.

Seeing no comments on that item, Mr. McLeod moved on to discuss lot widths in the R-4 District. He noted that as of now, reductions of lot width are allowed down to 60 feet and 7,000 square feet based on the surrounding area. He stated that no one can define what the surrounding area consists of, and it appears that this has been different over the course of time. He commented that surveyors contend that the entire Brooklands have been considered as a surrounding area over the past 30 years, while current reviewers are looking at whatever is on the same block. He stated that going from the direction of the Master Plan, and what staff has seen with development and the taste of the community, it is probably best to remove this consideration in its entirety, simply saying that lots must be 80 feet.

Ms. Brnabic stated that she would agree. She asked if this reduction had been permitted in any other zoning district.

Mr. McLeod responded that it was only in R-4, and has only really been for three different distinct areas of the city, the Brooklands being one area. He stressed that it just causes confusion and puts reviewers in a bad spot. He added that they have seen ZBA cases come forward for that reason, and he stated that this would clarify things.

He moved on to the subject of retaining walls, noting that the city has rolling hills and a lot of retaining walls are being utilized, some of them getting quite high. He commented that right now the City does not have a way to stop someone from installing a six or seven foot high wall almost right on the property line; and the thought is to create setbacks and to create a system where the retaining wall should be stepped back once it gets to a certain height, allowing for the massing to be controlled and providing for additional planting area. He suggested that three feet in height would be the threshold where a fence is required for falling, and that was a good place to start a step and create a planting area, and then stepping another three feet. He stated that they would work this out with Engineering.

Chairperson Hooper commented that this would have potentially wiped out the opportunity for Home Depot because they had their detention pond behind the wall and had to extend the wall for the pond.

Mr. McLeod commented that the pond has problems. He suggested there might be a way to build in a modification allowance, where in a particular instance it would create no harm. He pointed out that this was brought to light because they have issues with the retaining wall on the property line for a detention pond. He added that an industrial site could have a substantial retaining wall very close to a residential property line, and he suggested that this is trying to help minimize the impact on the surrounding properties.

He moved on to discuss performance bonds. He explained that maintenance bonds for landscaping yield problems when bonds expire. He stated that staff chase bonds all the time, and this proposed modification flips the responsibility and puts it in writing that the developer or applicant is required to maintain that bond.

Ms. Neubauer asked what the punishment would be if a developer did not maintain the bond.

Mr. McLeod stated that it would be an ordinance violation and they could be taken to District Court, fined or jailed. He noted that this would most likely never happen in theory.

He moved on to public road screening. He mentioned that the Cloverport property that was rezoned from industrial to residential, and noted that there has been a settlement on the court case to allow for a residential development. He explained that this change would require buffering between a public road placed close but not quite to a property line, and the thought is to maintain a buffering between a roadway which could cause noise or light pollution to the adjacent property owner. He stated that a Buffer C based on ordinance requirements

should be provided in this instance. He likened it to protecting the outside world to any sort of development going on. He commented that staff was debating how significant the setback should be to provide some protection to the adjacent property owner.

He discussed parking lot landscaping, noting that right now no low level landscaping is required within parking islands and only one tree is required. He explained that this has led to giant mulch islands everywhere, and the idea is to provide some low level landscaping there. He added that right now there is no requirement to plant anything along the foundation of buildings, which leads to parking lots, sidewalks, and buildings with hard surfaces. He stated that the idea is to provide foundation plantings along half of the building and each facade, unless it is a rear facade where the loading area is to help break up and soften it a bit. He suggested that the idea is to get as much greenery and landscape as possible, and this is where the ordinance falls short.

The question was raised relative to snow removal in parking lots and if piled snow would damage the landscaping.

Mr. McLeod responded that developers and landscape architects are ultimately going to have to choose better plant materials for those situations. He mentioned that the developer of the RH Fuel Center at M-59 and Road stated that he would be spending thousands of dollars on landscape to have it dead the first year; and staff suggested that their landscape architect make better plant choices. It was noted that the Village of Rochester Hills installs low fencing to protect their plants from salt.

It was stated that parking lot designers should provide for longer runs and a snow load area.

He noted that data centers are now a hot topic, and mentioned that there are currently 57 data centers within the state of Michigan. He stated that if they came in today they would be looked at as general industrial uses, which would be a conditional use with setback and performance requirements.

Ms. Neubauer stated that certain members of City Council have concerns regarding data centers. She commented that she did not think that the city had the right land area available for a large data center.

Mr. McLeod concurred, noting that he went the MAP Conference recently and attended the sessions on data centers, and learned that they require much more acreage than the city has. He added that if there were to be some evolution of technology, the City would not want to write a whole separate ordinance just for data centers. He explained that they thought the simplest way was to put it in as a part of general industrial as a conditional use. It is very limited as to where they could go and gives all of the control back to the City to do any type of conditions that would be appropriate.

Ms. Neubauer stated that while the city only has three percent of its land undeveloped, the question raised to her concerned any areas of redevelopment.

It was noted that those lands were not zoned industrial, so it would be very limited as to where they could go.

Mr. McLeod stated that their current interpretation is that it is a general industrial use and this modification would solidify it.

He moved on to discuss cat cafes. He noted that he met with the potential applicant who had assembled a business proposal that was included in tonight's meeting packet. He noted that the tenant spaces are technically separate, with coffee and cafe on one side and cat enjoyment on the other. He commented that one of the main concerns expressed was cross-contamination. He stated that he and Ms. Roediger were discussing that pet stores are generally regulated as a retail use; however, this could get into a larger discussion about kennels and boarding which he suggested could be worked on in the ordinance. He noted that at the last discussion, the Commission's reaction was mixed; however, he wanted to see if the Commission wanted staff to pursue this further.

Mr. Hetrick asked if the cats would be housed on site or would be going back to the shelter. He asked if someone would have to be there 24/7.

Mr. McLeod stated that they would be housed on site.

Ms. Roediger stated that people are not at pet stores or boarding places 24/7.

Mr. Hetrick stated that the proposal seemed like it covered a lot of the issues that had been discussed; however, he could not understand how the cats are taken care of when nobody is there.

Ms. Denstaedt stated that she sees a lot of good coming from these locations especially from the standpoint of cats that get adopted. She noted that her friend in Holland with such a business has an issue that they are running out of cats because they are getting adopted so quickly. She pointed out that these cats are obtained from nonprofits and are getting vetted with all of their shots prior to coming to the cafe. She stated that she has read through the business plan and is a proponent of these as they are coming.

Ms. Neubauer stated that as long as it is an Oakland County Health Department issue and is not a City of Rochester Hills issue, she does not care. She commented that the City does not need anything else to regulate that would bring added liability.

Mr. Struzik stated that he wants them and thinks it is a great opportunity. He commented that if people do not like cats, they do not have to go into the cafe. He mentioned that cats are very self-sufficient, and he can leave his cat for three or four days by putting out a clean litter box and leaving out food and water. He pointed out that the old liquor store has been an eyesore on Auburn and he would love to see it redeveloped. He commented that he did not think this would be a nuisance to the surrounding neighbors, and the only issue he has seen regarding cats is around John R where there are a lot of outdoor cats where people are feeding them and not neutering them.

Mr. McLeod asked if the Planning Commission wanted to see this item as a conditional use or would rather it be permissible as long as conditions are met.

Mr. Hetrick responded he would like to see it as conditional. He asked if it would fit into a retail-type of zoning development, and commented that he did not think this was a Brooklands-specific type of thing.

Mr. McLeod responded that while the proposal was written for a location in the Brooklands, he thought that if it is allowed in the Brooklands it would probably be allowed in other retail districts as well. He added that there had been no conversations regarding whether alcohol sales would be allowed. He commented that staff would draft some cat cafe provisions to be presented to the Commission.

Ms. Brnabic questioned the sections regarding State-licensed residential facilities and wanted to know what was proposed there.

Mr. McLeod responded that the definition regarding these facilities was incorrect as it states that all of those are conditional uses. He explained that it is not correct because in State Law, some must be permitted by right. He stated that the proposed change will clarify and change language in the ordinance that contradicted State Law. He mentioned the Land Use Table, which they want to utilize as much as possible, should show what is conditional in which districts. He explained that they are taking this reference out of the definition and letting the Land Use Table remain as-is for this particular use. He noted that there was no change within the regulations, and it was only tightening up the language to avoid anything confusing or contradictory.

Discussed.

NEXT MEETING DATE

- Regular Meeting - January 13, 2026, 7 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission and upon motion by Neubauer, seconded by Denstaedt, Chairperson Hooper adjourned the Regular Meeting at 9:29 p.m.

*Greg Hooper, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission*

Jennifer MacDonald, Recording Secretary