



Jennifer MacDonald <macdonaldj@rochesterhills.org>

Re: Camden Crossing Planning Commission meeting follow up questions.

1 message

Jason Boughton <boughtonj@rochesterhills.org>

Tue, Dec 23, 2025 at 3:57 PM

To: Gary Elrod <gtesr2000@yahoo.com>

Cc: Jennifer MacDonald <macdonaldj@rochesterhills.org>, Sara Roediger <roedigers@rochesterhills.org>, Tracey Balint <balintt@rochesterhills.org>, Angela Hysinger <hysingera@rochesterhills.org>, Chris McLeod <mcleodc@rochesterhills.org>, "neubauer@rochesterhills.org" <neubauer@rochesterhills.org>, Paul Schira <schimoto@wowway.com>, "manninod@rochesterhills.org" <manninod@rochesterhills.org>, "mungiolit@rochesterhills.org" <mungiolit@rochesterhills.org>, "skelcym@rochesterhills.org" <skelcym@rochesterhills.org>, "carly.uhrig@gmail.com" <carly.uhrig@gmail.com>

Good Afternoon Mr. Elrod,

I will do my best to respond to your questions below in **blue**, but if you have any more follow up questions or clarifications please feel free to reach out to me directly. I will be in the office next Monday and Tuesday and then Monday Jan 5th if you want to meet in person, or feel free to call me or email, whichever you prefer.

innovative *by* nature**Jason Boughton**Engineering Utilities Specialist
Department of Public Services

248-841-2490

rochesterhills.org

From: **Gary Elrod**
<gtesr2000@yahoo.com>

Date: Fri, Dec 19, 2025 at 1:59 PM
Subject: Camden Crossing
Planning Commission meeting
follow up questions.

To: Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>, Chris McLeod <mcleodc@rochesterhills.org>, neubauerm@rochesterhills.org <neubauerm@rochesterhills.org>
Cc: carly.uhrig@gmail.com <carly.uhrig@gmail.com>, Paul Schira <schimoto@wowway.com>, manninod@rochesterhills.org <manninod@rochesterhills.org>, mungiolit@rochesterhills.org <mungiolit@rochesterhills.org>, skelcym@rochesterhills.org <skelcym@rochesterhills.org>

Hello everyone. I am following up to get clarification on a few items from last week's Planning Commission meeting that was held on December 9th to move the project to the next step. As follows:

RE: Nottingham Woods subdivision retention pond flooding history onto both East and West side of Crestline and adjacent Sycamore subdivision neighbors:

1) Mr. Hooper indicated that the failure of the Nottingham Woods retention pond to contain the flooding we experienced was addressed and the issue is now resolved. What objective evidence does the city have to substantiate this statement? Because of the "no back-and-forth discussion is allowed after public comments rule", we didn't get the detail on what happened and how it was fixed. I asked what the root cause and corrective actions from the flooding we experienced was taken in my letter and didn't get a response that satisfies me or any of my neighbors. It was glossed over by Hooper and no information on what was fixed was provided. Residents cannot accept a verbal comment as flooding has happened before and will again if the retention ponds are not constructed to handle a major rain event with the natural elevation drop to wetlands in this area.

When Ms. Hurst at 1840 Crestline St. brought it to the attention of the City with the first submission of Camden Crossing at the Planning Commission Meeting in 2021, I was out there the next day to inspect what was occurring. The initial detention basin construction for Nottingham Woods was not per the approved construction plans. The outlet structure of the Nottingham Woods detention basin was restricted incorrectly and revisions were needed. The way it was initially constructed it was not releasing the storm water below the rim of the outlet structure which in turn, turned the planned detention basin (aka detaining the storm water for a length of time) into a retention basin where no outletting of storm water was occurring below the rim elevation. When rain events were occurring it only had the highest top portion of the detention pond to hold back the storm water from overflowing and going downstream to the east towards Crestline. The correction was to revise the restrictors that were constructed in the outlet structure so they were consistent with the approved plans and allowed for the storm water to be slowly discharged downstream within the storm sewer system to the north, rather than being retained in the pond. These revisions occurred within a few days. Other revisions to the slopes of the detention basin, the berm between the forebay and detention basin and the removal of invasive species within the detention basin has also occurred throughout the years.

2) Since Sare Inc. added the verbiage "100-year rain" onto the Camden Crossing retention pond site plans, did Nottingham Woods make any changes to their retention pond by addressing the 100-year rain event? If not, all residents north and east of Nottingham Woods are still potentially exposed to another flooding event if we receive another "100-year rain event."

I completely understand how you would come up with that conclusion based on the naming culture of the sizing of detention basins. Hopefully I can provide some insight of how the detention basin volume formulas have changed between the Nottingham Woods Development and now the Camden Crossing Development.

There was a traditional formula to determine how many cubic feet (CF) the detention basin needed to be depending on the rain/flood year event. When the Nottingham Woods engineering plans were approved by engineering back in December of 2016 it was based on the current engineering design standards at that time. During that time frame the standard detention basins had to meet a traditional 25-year storm event volume. The City increased the volume needed for detention basins from a 10-year event (all developments prior to 2008) to a 25-year event in 2008. For Nottingham Woods the 25 year event volume is roughly 41,000 CF, if the City would have remained with the 10-year event it would have been roughly 32,000 CF. Some would think 2.5x the years, why not 2.5x the size of the detention basin but the traditional formulas don't work that way.

With Camden Crossing they are utilizing the current stormwater standards that were adopted in September of 2023. The stormwater revisions were based on the 5 southeast Counties of Michigan coming together with EGLE (the state agency) to provide stormwater standards that were essentially the same throughout southeast Michigan. As part of the City's

MS4 permit (stormwater permit required by the State), the City had to adopt the new stormwater standards instead of keeping the 25 year event standards that were adopted at the time. The new stormwater standards detention basin volume calculation calls for a modified 100-year storm event. Utilizing the modified 100-year storm event formula and inputting the information from the Nottingham Woods development their detention pond sizing would be roughly 39,000 CF which is 2,000 CF less than the traditional 25-year storm event formula that was used at the time it was approved and developed. Depending on the development, most of the smaller developments that are using the newly adopted standards are seeing a slightly smaller size detention basin sizing compared to the traditional 25-year storm event formula.

3) Was the Nottingham Woods retention pond initially constructed to meet the 100-year rain event?

Since the Nottingham Woods development was constructed in 2017, it was always being constructed at the traditional 25-year storm event and not the modified 100-year rain event

4) Also glossed over was my question about what engineering standard or reference was used to define what a 100-year rain event translated to by Sare Inc. No intelligible response from Sare Inc, was given.

I have attached the current engineering design standards for the City that were adopted in September of 2023. These standards define the applicable regulated rain events. The major revisions that occurred with this update were to Chapter 4 which is the stormwater management chapter. The standards that were adopted were taken from Oakland County Water Resource Commission's (WRC) standards, which I have also attached.

5) Please advise if the 100-year rain note on the current Camden Crossing plans are being or have historically been an engineering standard for all RH retention ponds.

I believe my answer for #2 provides the historical lineage of how the detention basin volume formula has been changed throughout the years, however, here is a brief timeline:-traditional 10-year storm event up to 2008, 2008-2023 a traditional 25-year storm event, 2023-current, a modified 100-year event. The one caveat of this is that if the storm water management system is discharging to a county drain (WRC) the development would need to meet WRC standards at that time, or if discharging into a MDOT or RCOC road drainage they would need to meet their standards at the time.

6) Litigation question. Camden Crossing has had at least four plus years of delays. Has there been any legal action of any type regarding Sare Inc or the builders Sare Inc, represents with the City of Rochester Hills during this time? Sare Inc did not respond when asked about the delays.

The Planning Department is not aware of any litigation with this development.

I look forward to your response. Please feel to contact me for any questions or clarification. Thank you.

Gary Elrod
495 Parkland Drive
Rochester Hills MI 48307

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad

--

innovative *by* nature**Chris McLeod**

Planning Manager

Planning & Economic Development

248-841-2572

rochesterhills.org

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.

2 attachments

RochesterHillsEngineeringDesignStandards.pdf
2248K

WRCStormwater Engineering Design Standards.pdf
2382K



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Camden Crossing

1 message

Gary Elrod <gtesr2000@yahoo.com>

Wed, Dec 3, 2025 at 2:06 PM

To: "Planning@rochesterhills.org" <planning@rochesterhills.org>, "neubauerm@rochesterhills.org" <neubauerm@rochesterhills.org>

From: Gary Elrod
 495 Parkland Drive
 Rochester Hills, MI 48307-3451

To: Deborah Brnabic/Planning Commission

Dear Ms. Brnabic,

I am once again writing to address the proposed Camden Crossing development being considered directly South of my home in the Sycamore Subdivision. First, I am a (25) year resident of Rochester Hills and we purchased our home here because of the natural and undisturbed setting we have had since moving here.

We were initially told this property behind me was considered "land locked" and part of the natural wetland drainage system that leads to the area behind the St. Mark Church on Hamlin Road that eventually leads into the existing wetland area behind Hamlin Elementary. We were also told that any development would have to include homes of equal or greater value than the Sycamore Sub home values. Maybe this was not 100% true, but I want to say that and some of my neighbors are very opposed to this development and want the City to address the following concerns as follows:

(1) During the 2021 Camden Crossing planning commission meeting to review the plans for Camden Crossing, I brought up the flooding problem from a major rainstorm that flooded all properties East of Crestline with 8-12 inches of water. At that point, Mr. Hooper stated that this was because the retention pond in the Nottingham Woods subdivision had failed to stop the flooding and that was the reason for the Sycamore Sub flooding issue. So, what was the corrective action implemented from the Nottingham Farms subdivision to stop the flooding in a 100 (or less) year rain? If nothing was done, why? Also, has there been any legal issues or subsequent land sales between the city and or the developer/s during the past several years regarding this proposal for Camden Crossing? I do not recall Sare Inc's name during the last meeting.

(2) Wetland and tree removal. Currently this plan eliminates 13,000 sq. feet or approximately 0.3 acres of existing wetlands. Doesn't sound like a lot initially, but given the current drainage issues my neighbors have endured this summer with the heavy rain runoff flooding their yards on Crestline, how will the removal of the wetland affect this natural drainage scheme? Was there a study done that considers the current drainage issue? I know there is an attempt to maintain some wetlands with the current plans, however there is already a major drainage issue for my current neighbors during heavy extended rains. This drainage issue became more apparent once Crestline was paved. To me, proposed units adjacent Crestline need to be totally removed from this proposal because of this one issue alone is resolved to the full satisfaction of my Crestline neighbors.

(3) **Traffic study.** Has one been done assuming normal traffic patterns with the entrance/exit so close to Hamlin Elementary and on Crestline at peak hours to make sure this is a safe and robust place to enter/exit the proposed subdivision? This area is one of chronic speeding and children and parents walking at peak hours during in person learning.

(4) Deviations to RH city Engineering requirements: Why would the City allow a deviation to the ingress/egress road construction material for the proposed subdivision? Historically, drawing note #6 on C-02 indicated the proposed private roads are *not being* constructed to the city's public road standards, and therefore, cannot be transferred as public roads in the future. What does this statement exactly translate too? Was this an asphalt vs concrete financial decision on the part of Sare Inc. that this deviation is being requested? If so, this deviation should not be allowed and the developer should be held to the same building standards as the Nottingham Woods subdivision west of Crestline recently was. **No deviations** to the current standards should be allowed.

(4) **Density of homes vs acreage:** Even though the Nottingham Farms homes adjacent Crestline are larger, the density is much less. Theirs is 1.96 dwellings/acre. The proposal for Camden Crossing is (approximately) 2.5 dwellings/acre. This just confirms that Sare Inc. is more interested in shoe horning or cramming as many units into this subdivision as they can for profit without considering the impact on other existing residents. If they move forward, this needs balanced

to decrease the amount of units per acre to be a viable development and fit better into the current environmental conditions we have now.

In closing, I am very against this development. This is unnecessary and flies in the face of Mayor Barnett's claim when he was initially running for Mayor on how "built out" our city was already in his first campaign. It's ironic that he's now facilitating the development of every last green space we have in this city with his "committee". We need to stop the over development of every last Green Space to maintain the nature and beauty in this city. I was hoping the post covid material costs and labor shortages would have negatively affected the original cost/re-sale enough to stop this, but it looks like Sare Inc. has not stopped with their attempt to help over develop Rochester Hills.

Camden Crossing must not be allowed to go forward. If it does, it needs to be dramatically scaled back and the above mentioned issues need resolved. Feel free to read this letter into the record tonight. I will see you on the 8th. Thank you.

Regards;

Gary Elrod
(248) 930-4409 mobile

Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Camden Crossing condominiums

1 message

Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Tue, Dec 9, 2025 at 12:21 PM

To: Maryaworley1954@gmail.com

Cc: Jennifer MacDonald <macdonaldj@rochesterhills.org>, Chris McLeod <mcleodc@rochesterhills.org>

Hello Mary -

Thank you for contacting us. As you may be aware this project was previously approved by the City. Both the Preliminary Condominium Plan and the Final Condominium Plan were recommended for approval by the Planning Commission and approved by City Council in [November of 2021](#) and [April of 2022](#), respectively, with essentially the same layout that is currently shown, with six houses fronting on Crestline. It appears at one time, during the review of the previous set of plans, there was discussion that the actual road from the proposed development would extend to Crestline, however, that was never a part of the plans that came to the Planning Commission or City Council for approval. Since a portion of the property within the development abuts Crestline, Crestline is a public road and the property is zoned for single family purposes, houses are permitted to front the roadway. Hopefully, this answers your question. If you have any additional questions or comments regarding the proposed development feel free to contact us or discuss those items at tonight's meeting.

Chris McLeod
Planning Manager

It appears that there will be access on to Crestline rd from this new development. We, the homeowners of the attached subdivision, were told that there was not going to be access to Crestline rd. It appears that the houses have their driveways from crestline. Could you explain this to me. Thank you



**Planning & Economic
Development**

248-656-4660

rochesterhills.org



Jennifer MacDonald <macdonaldj@rochesterhills.org>

Re: Proposed Camden Crossing Condo Development

1 message

Jennifer MacDonald <macdonaldj@rochesterhills.org>

Thu, Dec 11, 2025 at 2:00 PM

To: tmbaier@comcast.net

Cc: Chris McLeod <mcleodc@rochesterhills.org>, Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Hello Thomas -

There is no video of Planning Commission meetings. There is an audio recording, you would have to file a [FOIA](#) with the Clerk's office for that. The meeting minutes are posted in draft form as part of the next meeting agenda (which would be January 7th), if you'd like them prior to that time please also file a FOIA with the Clerk's office.

Chris can respond regarding the density.

Jennifer



innovative *by* nature

Jennifer MacDonald
Planning Specialist
Planning & Economic Development

248-841-2575
rochesterhills.org

On Thu, Dec 11, 2025 at 11:24 AM Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org> wrote:



innovative *by* nature

**Planning & Economic
Development**

248-656-4660
rochesterhills.org

----- Forwarded message -----

From: tmbaier@comcast.net <tmbaier@comcast.net>

Date: Thu, Dec 11, 2025 at 11:21 AM

Subject: Re: Proposed Camden Crossing Condo Development

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

Chris,

Thank you for the info.

I see that the overlay district does allow a higher density than the underlying Zone R-3.

The table showing maximum density uses the term 'Net Density". Does this not mean that net area excluding wetlands should be used in determining density? This would yield closer to 19 units.

Do you know when the meeting minutes and video will be ready to view?

Thanks

Tom

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

Sent: Tuesday, December 9, 2025 12:44 PM

To: tmbaier@comcast.net <tmbaier@comcast.net>

Cc: Chris McLeod <mcleodc@rochesterhills.org>; Jennifer MacDonald <macdonaldj@rochesterhills.org>

Subject: Re: Proposed Camden Crossing Condo Development

Hello Thomas -

Good Afternoon Thomas,

Thank you for your additional email. Your previous email was forwarded to the Planning Commission for their consideration. In regards to the overall density, the ordinance allows for 3.45 units per acre within the [MR Overlay District](#) within the R-3 Zoning District. The overall property is approximately 9.6 acres. This would allow for an overall density in excess of 33 units for the entire property. Obviously the developer is only proposing to "develop" a portion of the property and therefore the density in the "developed" portion is concentrated in the southern portion of the property. The density is still further regulated by applicable setbacks, open space requirements, stormwater facilities, etc. As a part of their review of this project, the Planning Commission will be considering all of these items at the meeting tonight.

Chris McLeod
Planning Manager



Planning & Economic Development

248-656-4660
rochesterhills.org

On Tue, Dec 9, 2025 at 2:38 PM tmbaier@comcast.net <tmbaier@comcast.net> wrote:

A supplement to my previous comments:

Can you verify the allowable dwelling unit per acre for this development? The plans state a maximum allowable of 3.45 units per acre. The only number I see in the Muni Code is 2.9 units per acre based on net site density. What is the basis for the allowable 3.45 units per acre?

Thank You

Thomas Baier
234 Parkland Drive

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.