

1/2/2026

Dear Members of the Rochester Hills Planning Commission,
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed development of the six-acre parcel adjacent to our property on the driveway side.

Our home was built in 1996, and the neighboring property has remained vacant since that time. We purchased our home in 2019, unaware that portions of our existing driveway encroach onto the adjacent parcel. Specifically, at the driveway turnaround and near the garage, where the driveway encroaches approximately three feet onto the neighboring property.

During our six years of ownership, we have maintained approximately 20 to 25 feet of the adjacent property in good faith, believing it to be ours. This maintenance has included regular mowing, snow removal, and the expenditure of several thousand dollars to remove downed trees and roadside blight near the road frontage.

We now understand that this land is not part of our property. While we will miss the natural beauty and wildlife the vacant parcel has provided over the decades, we also understand that development is inevitable. We look forward to welcoming a well-planned development and future neighbors.

We respectfully request consideration of the following two items:

First, we ask that our driveway be permitted to remain in its current configuration. After reviewing the plans provided by the Planning Department, we understand that a berm approximately 15 feet wide is proposed between the development and our property, extending the full depth of our lot. We respectfully request that the berm be constructed up to the edge of our existing driveway, without requiring any alteration or relocation of the driveway itself.

Second, we noted that spruce trees are proposed to be planted within the berm. We are concerned that spruce trees may create sap-related maintenance issues affecting our driveway and vehicles. We respectfully ask whether an alternative evergreen species could be considered, such as Giant Arborvitae. This species provides an equal or superior privacy screen, grows quickly, and would be more compatible with our driveway and daily use of the property.

We love our home and take great pride in maintaining it. We sincerely hope these two requests will be carefully and thoughtfully considered as the project moves forward. Thank you for your time, consideration, and service to our community.

Respectfully,

Bob Hathaway

Linda Hathaway

1582 west Auburn Road

Rochester Hills, Mi 48309

248-709-6355

586-419-0167

Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

RE: Grandview Condominiums

1 message

Gary Cunningham <ghcunningham@comcast.net>

Mon, Jan 5, 2026 at 5:27 PM

To: Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>, Jennifer MacDonald <macdonaldj@rochesterhills.org>, Sara Roediger <roedigers@rochesterhills.org>, Chris McLeod <mcleodc@rochesterhills.org>

Thanks for the prompt response Chris. It is not what I wanted to hear, but I appreciate you taking the time to explain it to me. -Gary

From: mcleodc@rochesterhills.org <mcleodc@rochesterhills.org> **On Behalf Of** Planning Dept Email

Sent: Monday, January 5, 2026 5:01 PM

To: Gary Cunningham <ghcunningham@comcast.net>; Jennifer MacDonald <macdonaldj@rochesterhills.org>;

Sara Roediger <roedigers@rochesterhills.org>; Chris McLeod <mcleodc@rochesterhills.org>

Subject: Re: Grandview Condominiums

Good Afternoon Mr. Cunningham

Thank you for providing your comments on the proposed Grandview development. City Hall was closed over New Years and that is why you are just hearing back from us. But we wanted to make sure you got a response. I have provided answers to your original comments/questions as well as a couple that I believe you raised when you spoke with Jennifer earlier today. Hopefully this provides answers to your questions. Please also know your comments will be forwarded to the Commission for their review. If you have any additional questions or comments please let me know.

Chris

1. At 1,683 sq ft, these proposed single-family detached homes are significantly smaller than the existing homes in that area of Rochester Hills. For example, the new homes being built on Livernois Avenue immediately east of this proposed project appear to be about 2,400 sq ft. What is the minimum size of homes allowed in that area? **The minimum size residence in the R-4 District is 912 sq. ft. based on zoning ordinance requirements. This is applicable citywide.**
2. At only 15 feet of spacing between the homes, and cramming 17 of them in such a tight space, it appears that the minimum setbacks for new residential construction in Rochester Hills is not being complied with by the developer. Please tell me what the actual requirements are for a project of this type. **Within the MR Mixed Residential Overlay District, which is a development option for this particular property that the developer is opting to use, side yards are allowed at 15 feet for detached single family homes.**
3. When we built our home in the same area, we were told that enclosed sunrooms attached to the rear of the home were not permitted in Rochester Hills unless you can maintain a 30 ft setback from the rear property line. It appears that this proposed project intends to violate that rule. If they are allowed to violate that rule, then can other homeowners in the neighborhood also be permitted to construct similar additions to their existing homes? **The site plan shows the allowable building envelope for the homes of the development. Any portion of the home, including a sunroom can be constructed within the defined building envelope. The site plan does not necessarily show the building footprint for each residence. The MR District requires the following setbacks for the exterior of the development: 15 ft. side (so the east and west sides)**

and 60 ft. rear (north) and these setbacks are met. Additionally, the MR district requires interior setbacks as follows and these have been met: 20 ft. front, 15 ft. side, and 35 ft. rear.

4. It appears that the developer intends to essentially strip the entire construction site of all existing trees and landscaping. It also appears that there will be an elimination of wetlands and inadequate set asides for common areas for a condominium project. What are the minimum requirements for such items for a project of this size in Rochester Hills? The applicant is seeking a wetlands use permit for the impacts to the wetland at the northern end of the site. That will be part of the discussion and decision making process for the wetlands permit with the Planning Commission and ultimately the City Council. The wetland shown near the center of the site plan is actually not regulated by the City and likely not regulated by the state. In regards to trees, the applicant is subject to the City's regulation for tree preservation which requires a development to preserve 40% of the regulated trees onsite. The site plan has been reviewed by our forestry department for compliance with those standards. As a part of the planning process, tree removal requires a tree removal permit and either replanting of those trees removed or payment into the City's tree fund. The site plan shows dedicated open space areas, primarily the wetland area to the north of Sage Lane and the neighborhood park area near the front of the development. Those areas outside of the dedicated building envelopes along the west and east sides of the development are also shown as open space areas. Those areas are common to the entire development.

5. We have experienced a lot of drainage problems in our neighborhood and when we requested both the city and county to add some additional drains in the area we were told those would be installed when new developments are approved. What extra steps have you imposed on this new project to help alleviate the flooding we experience near that site? As with every development project within the City, the City's engineering department has reviewed the proposed plans against the City's adopted engineering standards for stormwater. Within the last several years, these standards have been updated to more closely align with Oakland County and the larger 5 county region.

I believe you spoke with Jennifer MacDonald at our counter earlier today regarding the naming and potential extension/connection of Sage Lane towards the north end of the proposed development and the northern end of Saddlebrook. Much like the stub streets within Saddlebrook, the proposed development includes stub streets that are intended to eventually connect should the properties in between the 2 developments ever decide to sell for development. Stub streets are common throughout the City and are used to help provide neighborhood connections and help alleviate traffic. Since the intention is that these two stubs ultimately connect, the Fire Department who reviews all street names within the City, has required the proposed development to utilize Sage Lane for consistency purposes.

I also want to note that the developer is requesting the Planning Commission to grant a modification to allow the MR Mixed Residential Overlay District to be used for the development when the property is slightly more than 6 acres and a minimum of 10 acres is required. The Planning Commission has reviewed similar requests in the past and will do the same for this particular application.- As a part of the meeting next week, the Planning Commission will determine whether the MR District can be utilized based on the following provision within the Ordinance

- **SECTION 138-6.507 - Modification of Standards**

The Planning Commission may modify the dimensional requirements of this

Article 6, Chapter 5 if it finds that another standard would be more reasonable due to existing site or neighborhood conditions, or because the site cannot physically comply with one or more of the requirements listed herein. In making a determination that a modification is warranted, the Planning Commission shall review the proposed development against the standards for approving a conditional use listed in [Section 138-2.302](#).



Planning & Economic Development

248-656-4660

rochesterhills.org

On Wed, Dec 31, 2025 at 10:51 AM Gary Cunningham <ghcunningham@comcast.net> wrote:

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am a property owner within 300 feet of the proposed condominium plan submitted for the 6.0-acre parcel located at 1548 Auburn Road, Rochester Hills, MI. As such, I received a notice from you about the public hearing to be held concerning this project on January 13, 2026.

Unfortunately, I will be out of town on the 13th but have several important questions about this project which the members of the Planning Commission should take into account. Based on my review of the Preliminary Site Plan (copy attached), I have the following concerns about this proposed development:

1. At 1,683 sq ft, these proposed single-family detached homes are significantly smaller than the existing homes in that area of Rochester Hills. For example, the new homes being built on Livernois Avenue immediately east of this proposed project appear to be about 2,400 sq ft. What is the minimum size of homes allowed in that area?
2. At only 15 feet of spacing between the homes, and cramming 17 of them in such a tight space, it appears that the minimum setbacks for new residential construction in Rochester Hills is not being complied with by the developer. Please tell me what the actual requirements are for a project of this type.
3. When we built our home in the same area, we were told that enclosed sunrooms attached to the rear of the home were not permitted in Rochester Hills unless you can maintain a 30 ft setback from the rear property line. It appears that this proposed project intends to violate that rule. If they are allowed to violate that rule, then can other homeowners in the neighborhood also be permitted to construct similar additions to their existing homes?
4. It appears that the developer intends to essentially strip the entire construction site of all existing trees and landscaping. It also appears that there will be an elimination of wetlands and inadequate set asides for common areas for a condominium project. What are the minimum requirements for such items for a project of this size in Rochester Hills?
5. We have experienced a lot of drainage problems in our neighborhood and when we requested both the city and county to add some additional drains in the area we were told those would be installed when new developments are approved. What extra steps have you imposed on this new project to help alleviate the flooding we experience near that site?

I would appreciate it if you would respond to my concerns in writing at your earliest convenience. Based on your responses, I may want to find a representative to attend the public hearing on my behalf.

Very truly yours,
Gary Cunningham
M: 248-470-4000

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.

Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Re: Grandview development

1 message

Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>
To: THERESA POUNDERS <thepounders@comcast.net>
Cc: Chris McLeod <mcleodc@rochesterhills.org>

Tue, Jan 6, 2026 at 4:55 PM

Hello Theresa -

Your comments will be provided to the Planning Commission. We will post the agenda tomorrow, that is why public comments need to be provided today if they are to be included in the agenda. The plans submitted are available at our office any time during business hours for the public to view and you can also view them on our [Development Status Map](#). You are free to submit public comments after the agenda has been posted as well, however those are provided directly to the Planning Commission members.

Jennifer MacDonald
Planning Specialist



innovative *by nature*

Planning & Economic Development

248-656-4660
rochesterhills.org

On Tue, Jan 6, 2026 at 3:30 PM THERESA POUNDERS <thepounders@comcast.net> wrote:

I would like to express my opposition to the above referenced development. The destruction of our trees and impacts to our wetlands and overdevelopment are a large concern for many residents of the city. This is another development that requires 10 acres of land, yet they have just over half that. Why are we allowing this?

I would also like to know why there is no information on the planning commission agenda for this development. Usually there are links allowing someone to access information regarding the development (environmental impact, wetland report, communications with the planning department, etc.). The deadline to make comments is today, Tuesday, January 6, 2025, in order to be included in the planning commission agenda that will be posted online. It's currently 3:30 and nothing is there. I may have had more comments to make regarding the development if this information was there.

Thank you,
Theresa Pounders