



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, October 7, 2025

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

In compliance with the provisions of Michigan's Open Meetings Act, Public Act No. 267 of 1976, as amended, notice is hereby given that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission will hold a special meeting on Tuesday, October 7 2025 at 7:00 p.m. in the Auditorium at the Rochester Hills Municipal Offices, 1000 Rochester Hills Dr., Rochester Hills, Michigan 48309 for the purposes of considering requests associated with two projects:

The Nowicki Park site plan and associated requests for the development of a community center building, playground, dog parks, walking paths, maintenance garage, and associated site improvements typical of a city park on approximately 34 acres of land located on the east side of Adams Rd., south of Tienken.

The Auburn Angara Oaks final site condominium plan and associated requests for nine (9) single family detached residences, six (6) multi-unit condominium buildings and related amenities on approximately 9.7 acres of land located on the south side of W. Auburn Rd. and west of Crooks Rd.

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Hooper called the October 7, 2025 Special Planning Commission Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., Michigan Time.

ROLL CALL

Present 8 - Sheila Denstaedt, Gerard Dettloff, Anthony Gallina, Greg Hooper, Marvie Neubauer, Dale Hetrick, Scott Struzik and Ben Weaver

Excused 1 - Deborah Brnabic

Others Present:

Sara Roediger, Planning and Economic Development Director
Chris McLeod, Planning Manager
Ken Elwert, Parks and Natural Resources Director
Dennis Andrews, Deputy Parks and Natural Resources Director
Jason Boughton, Engineering Utilities Specialist
Kyle Hottinger, PEA-ASTI, Wetland Consultant
Jennifer MacDonald, Recording Secretary
Siddh Sheth, Rochester Hills Government Youth Council Representative

Ms. Brnabic provided prior notice that she was unable to attend and was excused.

Chairperson Hooper welcomed everyone to the October 7, 2025 Special Planning Commission Meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2025-0427](#) August 11, 2025 Planning Commission/City Council Joint Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Struzik, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Brnabic

[2025-0428](#) August 19, 2025 Planning Commission Regular Minutes

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Gallina, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Brnabic

COMMUNICATIONS

Chairperson Hooper noted that the Commissioners received information on the upcoming MAP Conference, and mentioned that Mr. McLeod would be a presenter at the event.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairperson Hooper called for public comment not related to items on the Commission's agenda this evening. Seeing no one wishing to speak, he closed Public Comment.

NEW BUSINESS

[2025-0429](#) Request for Site Plan Approval - File No. PSP2025-0014 - for the City of Rochester Hills to develop Nowicki Park with a community center building, playground, dog park, walking paths, maintenance building, and associated site improvements on approximately 34.5 acres of land, located at 670 N. Adams Rd. and Parcel Nos. 15-08-151-001 and -002, and 15-08-100-006, -007 and -008, on the east side of Adams and south of Tienken, zoned R-1 One Family Residential; Steve Sutton, P.E., Nowak & Fraus Engineers, on behalf of the City of Rochester Hills, Applicant

(Staff Report dated 9-25-25, Reviewed Plans and ASTI Review dated 9-16-25, NF Engineers Letter dated 9-12-25, Wetland Delineation Report dated 4-18-25, Environmental Impact Statement, Development Application, WRC Letter dated 8-6-25, Public Meeting Notice, Email Notice to HOAs dated 9-26-25, and Public

Comment Received had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

Present for the applicant were Ken Elwert, Parks and Natural Resources Director, Dennis Andrews, Deputy Parks and Natural Resources Director, George Ostrowski, Nowak and Fraus, and Ed Alonso, A3 Architects.

Chairperson Hooper introduced this item, noting that it is a request for Site Plan Approval, Tree Removal Permit, Wetland Use Permit Recommendation, and Natural Features Setback Modification for the City of Rochester Hills to develop Nowicki Park with a community center building, playground, dog park, walking trails, maintenance building, and associated site improvements on approximately 34.5 acres located on the east side of Adams Road south of Tienken Road, zoned R-1 One Family Residential.

Mr. McLeod explained that there are four separate requests before the Commission this evening, and noted that three of these requests stay with the Commission, while the Wetland Use Permit is a recommendation to City Council. He mentioned that most of the Commissioners know Nowicki Park in its current form, and described the surrounding properties, residential and open space for the abutting subdivision, large lot residential to the north and to the south, and residential to the west across Adams Road. A wider view noted Premier Academy to the north and the Village of Rochester Hills to the south.

He pointed out the site's access from Adams, with a proposed boulevard entry with a single lane coming into the park and a dual lane coming out with dedicated right and left turn exit lanes. He noted that there will be a deceleration lane on the east side of Adams and a bypass lane on the west side, and he commented that the City has been working with the Road Commission in terms of extending the turn lane all the way up to Tienken Road to help address concerns and provide additional efficiency for traffic movement. He described the traffic flow internal to the park, and mentioned that the community building will be used not only for park functions, but can potentially be used for other City functions as well. He reviewed the other areas of the site, including the outdoor pavilion, playground area, restroom facility and two individual dog park areas, one for small breed and one for large breed dogs. He pointed out that the east side becomes the more natural preservation area, and commented that the walking pathways will be both improved and gravel or another alternative surface. He mentioned the wetland permit and reviewed Wetland Area B, the main wetland central to the site, that the City is looking to modify; and he commented that he thinks of it more as a wet wetland versus a dry wetland. He stressed that it will be a natural looking water feature, but will not be a pristine pool or detention pond as is seen in many developments. He reviewed how the parking needed was estimated relative to how city parks function, noting that the Parks Division estimated the number of spots that will be truly needed.

Mr. McLeod reviewed the proposed landscape plan, and explained that the tree removal permit talks about the potential removal of up to 550 trees; however, there is approximately a 90 tree buffer in terms of additional trees being asked for that most likely will not come down. He commented that the City wanted flexibility in the event that additional trees would have to come down during the

establishment of some of the features, and he mentioned that this was a similar scenario to the development of Innovation Hills. He stressed that the City's planting plan is incredibly aggressive, and commented that while there are trees coming down on the site, there is a landscape plan that brings back those trees. He noted that the City is meeting its own ordinances in terms of the preservation requirement of 40 percent minimum, and also in terms of planting as a result of the tree removal.

He pointed out a berm that will surround the playground area in an effort to help reduce noise, noting that it will be heavily landscaped with evergreens to help encapsulate the active area. He noted that the City's Parks team has had meetings with the general public and has worked to increase the number of plantings in the passive area of the park where it starts to abut the single family residential lots.

He explained that there are eight wetlands on the site, and he reviewed the most impacted wetland, stressing that the wetland is not being filled to create landscape, parking or structures. He noted that the wetland is being filled to create a wetter wetland/water feature that will service the overall site, and he stressed that these areas have all been fully vetted by ASTI. He stated that a representative from ASTI and the City's Engineering team are in attendance to answer any questions.

Mr. McLeod reviewed the renderings showing the park and stressed that it is not an urban or heavily developed park, and commented that the intention is to respect the feel and character of the park as it stands today, while making it more modernized by providing a number of amenities to the residents. He commented that the dog park area includes a dog wash, and the community building will be a very natural building, using stone and wood to fit well into the character of the park.

Mr. Elwert explained that this has been a two-and-a-half year process and noted that they started gathering public input during the Parks Master Plan and Department Master Plan in 2022, where this was one of the significant elements. He noted that over that process they undertook randomized surveys throughout the entire city that established a need for some of the elements in this particular park, as well as conducted multiple focus groups in different locations regarding the conceptual plans.

Chairperson Hooper noted that he would be calling for public comment on this item, limited to three minutes each, and mentioned additional emails received from Steve Yuhasz, and Max and Marianna Larroquette.

Theresa Pounders, 3172 Devondale, stated that while she is all for making the parks beautiful, 550 trees is a lot. She asked why the park couldn't be developed and left more natural.

Matthew White, 754 Snowmass, stated that he is the President of the Shadow Woods Subdivision Association, and represents 419 homes. He commented that the residents have been very happy with the evolution of this park plan from its earliest incarnation, which most of the residents had found objectionable. He

commented that Mr. Elwert and Mr. Andrews have worked with the board and the residents to allay their concerns and have moved walking paths away from the backyards and have modified the screening. He stated that their residents look forward to the interconnection of the park with the proposed enhancements, and to work with Mr. Elwert to ensure that light pollution and sound pollution are eliminated in their neighborhood from the development.

Molly Barth, 624 Rolling Green Circle N, commented that Mr. Nowicki was really the Green Space person. She stated that she does not know how animals will be displaced. She asked for additional screening with trees or berms to buffer Brookdale Woods on the west side of Adams Road. She thanked staff members for what has come of the design process, noting that many people suggested baseball diamonds or a pool.

David Thomas, 580 Rolling Green Circle N, stated that he backs up to Adams Road and would prefer that Nowicki Park stays exactly how it was in its natural state. He thanked Mr. Andrews for his efforts to help explain things, and he asked that the parking lot lights be as far back from Adams Road as possible to decrease light pollution and vehicle noise.

Thomas Yazbeck, 1707 Devonwood Drive, asked for information regarding the programming that would occur at the community building. He stated that he thinks that this is awesome and has been waiting for Nowicki Park to be a real park for his whole life. He commented that he has a large active dog and the dog park will be great and is desperately needed.

Seeing no additional public comment cards or anyone wishing to speak, Chairperson Hooper closed Public Comment. He asked that questions raised be addressed and started with comments regarding the tree removal and the option of some supplemental tree removal.

Mr. Elwert responded that removing trees is hard, and explained that they have gone through and adjusted many of the trail locations along with the parking lot corners in some cases to focus on saving specimen trees. He commented that it is a balance of providing more access to the public and understanding what the public amenity is meant for. He mentioned the dog park, noting that they believe that they can clear out enough so that there is a sight distance where dog owners would be comfortable with dogs running in between trees. He added that they are continuing to work with residents on other items, especially near Shadow Woods, where they adjusted the trails to fit between large trees. He commented that they are trying to focus on saving large specimen trees as a priority.

Chairperson Hooper noted that an issue was raised regarding screening on the west side of Adams, and pointed out that the City does not own Adams Road and cannot plant trees on the Road Commission for Oakland County's right-of-way.

Mr. Elwert stated that they are looking to the RCOC to find a way to allow more planting sites around the city, and he noted that this may be a good sample case. He mentioned that there are challenges as there is a sewer line on that

side of the road, and it would be difficult to plant trees on top of it. He addressed the comment regarding berms, noting that while this is something that could be looked at, there are wetlands and other things on the property that make it more challenging.

Chairperson Hooper addressed a question on lighting, and pointed out that the City's ordinance does not allow exceeding one foot candle at the property line, and the proposed photometric plan goes well below that standard.

Mr. Elwert responded that the whole parking lot will not be lit, and the night activity areas will be the community building and the dog park. He explained that the entire south parking lot will be gated and there will not be lighting in that area.

Chairperson Hooper asked about programming for the community building.

Mr. Elwert responded that there are not a lot of meeting spaces in the city and it would provide approximately 2,000 square feet, similar in size to the Museum's Calf Barn space. He explained that it could host approximately 100 to 125 people, and would be available for the public to rent for a birthday or graduation party. He commented that they have already been in discussion with RARA for summer camp usage, noting that they are currently bursting at the seams for their camps. He added that the City's Outdoor Engagement unit is excited about the possibility of having space to run nature programs. He stated that it will be a variety of City programming and availability to the public, including the possibility of hosting HOA meetings.

Chairperson Hooper asked about other communities utilizing the park facilities and whether that would be legal.

Mr. Elwert responded that in general, if there are no grant funds on the property, there aren't necessarily restrictions on what can and cannot be done on accessing public parks. He noted that they have been looking at dog parks and plan to limit the number of memberships on a fob-based system, starting with residents and then seeing how much space they have. He noted that the fee structure will be further discussed with City Council and internally with staff.

Chairperson Hooper asked if this location will have paid parking.

Mr. Elwert responded that they are looking at all options as possibilities, and noted that this is a different model than Innovation Hills, being a community park nestled within the neighborhoods and not near the expressway. He stressed that it is not meant to bring people from long distances to visit. He explained that typically they look at a cost recovery of between 20 and 30 percent for operations, and he pointed out that Bloomer and Spencer have charged entry for years, while Borden charges for field rentals.

Chairperson Hooper asked if there was anything else Mr. Elwert wanted to address before opening discussion up to the Commission.

Mr. Elwert responded that they are trying to be good neighbors and have had

many public meetings and walks with the neighbors to make adjustments where possible while still maintaining the public purpose of the park which is for everybody.

Ms. Neubauer stated that she sits on City Council and is proud of the fact that the City has acquired at least four new parcels of green space since she has been on Council, making 142 acres of green space in Rochester Hills. She commented that this City Council, administration and Parks Department are big in preserving natural features and as much green space as possible. She pointed out that Rochester Hills has one of the strictest and most aggressive tree ordinances in the area, and mentioned that the trees that are being removed area actually being replaced and planted throughout the city, which in this situation is more generous of a give back than just paying into the Tree Fund which is what a lot of developers do.

Mr. Elwert confirmed that approximately 465 trees will be planted on the site.

Ms. Neubauer added that in addition to the building being used for the community, the City has been having issues with having a voting site in Rochester Hills and hopefully one of the uses for the building would be for an early voting site. She pointed out that the Rochester Hills Public Library is not conducive to continuing as an early voting location with the population growing the way that it is, and she stressed that the City does not want to be at the mercy of Oakland County when it comes to voting. She suggested an additional condition that staff will investigate with the Road Commission to find out what might be able to be done with berms and extra plantings.

Mr. Elwert responded that he doubts very strongly that berms will be allowed on the right-of-way, although he has hope for some trees.

Ms. Neubauer suggested that it be an investigative ask, requesting a solid response before voting on it at City Council. She stated that she wanted to move for approval with the additional condition. The motion was supported by Mr. Struzik.

Mr. Struzik stated that he was excited to have such a great design before the Commission. He commented that he is kind of spoiled living near John R and Auburn and being walking distance to Borden and Spencer, a short bike ride to Wabash and Bloomer, and a short drive to Innovation Hills. He stated that the northwest side of the city needs something like this and he was glad to see Shadow Woods Subdivision working with the City. He commented that this will be a wonderful asset to the City and will increase property values. He stated that the City's slogan is Innovative by Nature and he thinks this is exactly what the plan is.

Ms. Denstaedt stated that it is exciting to see this as the Commission has gone through and worked on the Master Plan, and green space and recreational venues have been asked for. She concurred with investigating trees and potentially berms. She liked the idea of having two dog parks broken out.

Mr. Weaver questioned whether the gated parking lot would have hourly times

and asked about park hours.

Mr. Elwert responded that it is not a 24-hour dog park, and noted that there would be a gate in the south lot. He likened the park to Borden, where the park opens at 10 or 11 a.m., with a closing at 10 p.m. and starting to move people out of the park at 9:30 p.m. He noted that renting the room opens another element.

Mr. Weaver asked if there was any idea of the membership structure for the dog park and how many people would be allowed.

Mr. Elwert responded that they are probably looking at a membership somewhere in the neighborhood of 1,000 people, and he mentioned that Sterling Heights has a smaller dog park and caps their membership at 700 or 750. He noted that not everyone will come at the same time, and only a certain percentage will use it in a given day.

Mr. Weaver stated that he is not worried about it being too crowded, but wants to know the odds of getting a membership as he lives across the street.

Mr. Elwert responded that in the beginning they intend to limit it to residents for annual passes to see where it goes from there.

Mr. Weaver stated that there was a comment of a need to maintain a natural area based on Mr. Nowicki's desires, and he stated that he thinks the plan before the Commission does a good job of presenting this as a passive park and not a destination park like Innovation Hills. He stressed that the activity is based along Adams Road which is relatively busy. He pointed out that the planting plan tries to get rid of all of the invasive species such as the buckthorn and olive. He suggested removing the cottonwoods.

Mr. Elwert mentioned that there is a Nowicki daughter that lives in the City that they have been in contact with, and she has seen the plans. He commented that this fits and tries to respect Mr. Nowicki's wishes and balance that with allowing access to everyone.

Mr. Hetrick stated that it has been some time for this to come to fruition and it is outstanding to see something that has been planned for a number of years come to a point where it will be implemented. He asked if removing some of the parking spaces in front may allow clearance to plant more trees outside of the right-of-way.

Mr. Elwert responded that they hesitate to remove parking spots; however, there may be some opportunities for berms on this side along with more tree plantings. He noted that this could be reviewed in the construction drawing phase.

Mr. Hetrick noted that there was a question of funding, and he stated that this will be funded through the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for Rochester Hills.

Mr. Elwert responded that it has been in the CIP for quite a while and is also in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan since 2023. He pointed out that this

project was moved into the budget for next year per City Council's direction. He added that they are also working on solidifying several large partnerships or fundings to help support the project.

Mr. Dettloff expressed his appreciation to staff, noting that this has been a labor of love and what makes Rochester Hills the great community it is.

Chairperson Hooper asked about the dog park fencing and stated that he would assume it is not opaque.

Mr. Elwert responded that they are still researching a few options and stated that there is a desire to use a material that is more appealing than a chain link fence. He mentioned that based on citizen comments they were trying to do more solid walls on the east and west ends to block sound, but aesthetically that is challenging and it is probably not headed that way. He stressed that it had to be small enough where dogs could not push through it.

Chairperson Hooper suggested decorative woven wire that is black in color which would look beautiful and not detract from the park. He pointed out that the playground will eventually have equipment in it.

Mr. Elwert responded that they are working with a playground vendor who will be putting a number of proposals together. He noted that there will be a berm or a mini bridge to the playground equipment which will allow for wheelchair access. He mentioned that they are looking at rock wall equipment and a shade area.

President Hooper called for a roll call vote on the motion to approve the site plan. After the vote, he noted that it passed unanimously.

Ms. Neubauer moved the motion in the packet to approve the tree removal permit. The motion was seconded by Ms. Denstaedt. After calling for a roll call vote, Chairperson Hooper noted that the motion passed unanimously.

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

Ms. Neubauer moved the motion in the packet to recommend City Council grant the Wetland Use Permit, and the motion was seconded by Mr. Gallina. After calling for a roll call vote, Chairperson Hooper noted that the motion passed unanimously.

Following the vote, Mr. McLeod noted that depending on the Parks team's availability, this item would appear at the October 20, 2025 City Council Meeting for the Wetland Use Permit recommendation.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Struzik, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Brnabic

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. PSP2025-0014 (Nowicki Park), the Planning Commission approves the proposed Site Plan, to allow for the construction of an upgraded City Park, including a community building, open air pavilion, restroom facilities, dog park area, outdoor playground, pathway systems, parking areas, and associated infrastructure systems in the R-1 One Family Residential District, based on plans received by the Planning Department on September 11, 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 is being constructed in a manner that provides for dedicated parking areas that provide adequate parking and the site will be accessed via an entrance/exit with dedicated exit turn lanes, directly to Adams Road, which is a major roadway, thereby promoting current and future safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and the general area.
3. Off-street parking areas for the general public are being provided for the park site based on the occupancy of the proposed buildings and structures in addition to general attendees of the park.
4. The proposed development and associated improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the existing development in the adjacent vicinity since the park is being left largely natural with structures taking up a small portion of the site area, is being heavily landscaped, and design accommodations in excess of ordinance requirements have been made in an attempt to reduce impacts to surrounding neighbors.
5. The proposed development will not have an unreasonably detrimental or injurious effect upon the existing characteristics and features of the site or those of the surrounding area. The proposed improvements will bring newly desired recreational opportunities, including a dog park, to a portion of the City that has not historically had an improved park and the Parks department has determined that 90 additional parking spaces over those required for building occupancy onsite will be sufficient to accommodate parking needs generated by general park users.
6. The Planning Commission finds that a modification to allow the required number of allowable parking spaces to be exceeded is appropriate, given the size and unique nature of the park that requires additional parking above and beyond those spaces solely required for the buildings.

Conditions

1. The applicant shall address all remaining comments and notations as depicted on the reviewed site plans.
2. Staff will investigate with the Road Commission for Oakland County the possibility of adding screening on the west side of Adams Road.

2025-0430

Request for Tree Removal Permit - File No. PTP2025-0010 - to removal up to 550 regulated trees (including specimen) with up to 527 replacement trees required associated with plans for the City of Rochester Hills to develop Nowicki Park with a community center building, playground, dog park, walking paths, maintenance building, and associated site improvements on approximately 34.5 acres of land, located at 670 N. Adams Rd. and Parcel Nos. 15-08-151-001 and -002, and 15-08-100-006, -007 and -008, on the east side of Adams and south of Tienken, zoned R-1 One Family Residential; Steve Sutton, P.E., Nowak & Fraus Engineers, on behalf of the City of Rochester Hills, Applicant

See Legislative File 2025-0429 for discussion.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Denstaedt, that this matter be Granted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Brnabic

Resolved, in the matter of File No. PTP2025-0010 (Nowicki Park) the Planning Commission grants a Tree Removal Permit based on plans received by the Planning Department on September 11, 2025, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions:

Findings

1. The proposed removal of regulated trees is in conformance with the City's Tree Conservation Ordinance.
2. The applicant is proposing to remove a total of four hundred and sixty-six (466) regulated trees and twenty-two (22) specimen trees as a part of site development, and replant a total four hundred and sixty-five (465) trees onsite.
3. Further, the applicant has requested an overall blanket approval to remove an additional number of trees to not exceed an overall total of five hundred and fifty (550) trees and with that have a total potential replacement total not to exceed five hundred and twenty-seven (527) trees, to allow additional flexibility in overall site development. Given the scope of this project, the public benefit being provided, and the City's desire to work with abutting property owners to address concerns that may require minor modifications to the plans, the Planning Commission finds that this flexibility is necessary to allow the appropriate development of the site.

Conditions

1. Tree protective fencing, as reviewed and approved by the City staff, shall be installed prior to temporary grade being issued by Engineering.

2025-0432

Request for Natural Features Setback Modification - File No. PNFSM2025-0003 - to modify the required natural features setbacks by approximately 3,200 lineal feet associated with plans for the City of Rochester Hills to develop Nowicki Park with a community center building, playground, dog park, walking paths, maintenance building, and associated site improvements on approximately 34.5 acres of land, located at 670 N. Adams Rd. and Parcel Nos. 15-08-151-001 and

-002, and 15-08-100-006, -007 and -008, on the east side of Adams and south of Tienken, zoned R-1 One Family Residential; Steve Sutton, P.E., Nowak & Fraus Engineers, on behalf of the City of Rochester Hills, Applicant

See Legislative File 2025-0429 for discussion.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Denstaedt, that this matter be Granted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Brnabic

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. PNFSM2025-0003 Nowicki Park, the Planning Commission grants a natural features setback modification for approximately 3,200 linear feet of permanent impacts to two (2) different wetland areas identified on the site plans to construct the proposed building and associated overlook area, parking areas, and pathways, and associated development infrastructure, based on plans received by the Planning Department on September 11, 2025, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions:

Findings

1. The impact to the Natural Features Setback area is necessary for construction activities related to the proposed development; further, the applicant has minimized the impacts to the natural features.
2. ASTI has reviewed the subject plans and proposed impacts to the natural features setbacks associated with Wetland B and Wetland F 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.

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 a 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 September 16, 2025 prior to final approval by staff.

2025-0431

Request for Wetland Use Permit Recommendation - File No. PWEP2025-0003 - to impact approximately 1.26 acres of wetlands associated with plans for the City of Rochester Hills to develop Nowicki Park with a community center building, playground, dog park, walking paths, maintenance building, and associated site improvements on approximately 34.5 acres of land, located at 670 N. Adams Rd. and Parcel Nos. 15-08-151-001 and -002, and 15-08-100-006, -007 and -008, on the east side of Adams and south of Tienken, zoned R-1 One Family Residential; Steve Sutton, P.E., Nowak & Fraus Engineers, on behalf of the City of Rochester Hills, Applicant

See Legislative File 2025-0429 for discussion.

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 8 - Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Brnabic

Resolved, in the matter of City File PWEF2025-0003 (Nowicki Park) the Planning Commission recommends to City Council approval of a Wetland Use Permit to permanently impact approximately 1.26 acres of wetlands to construct Nowicki Park, including the proposed building and associated overlook area, parking areas, and pathways, and associated development infrastructure based on plans received by the Planning Department on September 11, 2025, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions.

Findings

1. Of the approximate 4.6 acres of regulated wetland on site, the applicant is proposing to impact approximately 1.26 acres.
2. The most significant area of wetland impact, being the area where the main building and wetland viewing area will be constructed and the associated modifications to the overall wetland depth and makeup, is within the low quality portion of the wetland. In addition, the soil borings that were provided and analyzed by the City environmental consultant indicate the soils are conducive to isolating impacts to other areas of wetland area B and finally, much of the impacted area of wetland area B will remain a water feature, with overall wetland-like qualities.
3. In part, the proposed wetland impacts to construct a boardwalk system over the wetlands will help long term preservation of the wetland by providing access to additional areas of park and not requiring at grade pathways or users to traverse the area outside of defined raised pathway areas.
4. The proposed wetland impacts required as a part of the parking lot construction are limited and are located within a low-quality portion of the wetland.
5. ASTI has reviewed the subject plans and proposed impacts to Wetland B along with the proposed mitigation efforts to help reduce the impacts to those wetlands and has indicated that the plans as proposed are satisfactory.

Conditions

1. City Council approval of the Wetland Use Permit.
2. That the applicant receives an EGLE Part 303 Permit (as applicable) prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.
3. 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.
4. 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.

5. The applicant shall abide by all conditions and recommendations as outlined in ASTI's review letter of September 16, 2025.

2025-0433

Request for Final Site Condominium Recommendation - File No. PFSC2025-0001- for Auburn Angara Oaks Condominiums, including nine (9) single family detached residences, six (6) multi-unit condominium buildings and related amenities on approximately 9.7 acres of land located at 2469 & 2489 W. Auburn Rd., 3045 Angara Dr., 3050 Harvey St., Parcel Nos. 15-32-201-001, -002, -003, -004, and -006, located on the south side of W. Auburn Rd. and west of Crooks Rd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential and a portion of the land has the FB Flex Business Overlay; Bruce Michael, Auburn Angara Oaks, LLC, Applicant

(Staff Report dated 10-1-25, Reviewed Plans, Draft Master Deed and Bylaws (not approved) dated 9-25-25, Summary of Changes from Preliminary dated 8-14-25, Changes after first review of final condo, ASTI review dated 9-9-25, City Attorney comments on Master Deed and Bylaws dated 7-23-25, WRC Letter dated 7-25-25, Environmental Impact Statement, Development Application, Public Meeting Notice, Email to previous public commenters dated 9-25-25, Public Comment dated 10-1-25 and 10-6-25, City Council minutes of 11-11-24 and Planning Commission minutes of 10-15-24 had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

Present for the applicant were David Mingle with Rochester Housing Solutions, and Bruce Michael and Bill Godfrey with Three Oaks Communities.

Chairperson Hooper introduced this item noting that it is a request for a recommendation to City Council for approval of the Final Site Condominium for Auburn Angara Oaks, including nine single family detached residences, six multi-unit condominium buildings and related amenities on approximately 9.7 acres of land located at 2469 and 2489 West Auburn Road, 3045 Angara Drive and 3050 Harvey Street.

Mr. McLeod stated that this was a request for final site condominium approval as well as an amendment to the originally-approved wetland use permit and the originally-approved natural features setback modification. He explained that the City has a two-step process including preliminary approval, which was granted for this development approximately one year ago. He explained that they start their engineering process and vet out the project in terms of feasibility and return to request final site condominium approval when the engineering is essentially complete and they start to receive their permits from outside agencies. He added that they also have to present a final master deed document for review, and he stated that these are ongoing currently.

He reviewed that this is approximately a nine-acre site on the south side of West Auburn Road, west of Crooks Road. He mentioned that the wetland use permit is approximately 200 square feet of an increase from the preliminary approval. This was caused by a slight modification to the road alignment as well as a modification to the overall cul-de-sac radius at the very terminus of the development. He noted that the natural feature setback modification is actually a reduction, and he commented that staff contemplated whether that was

necessary to bring back before the Commission; however, to ensure that everything was neat and tidy it was determined to bring this back as well. He noted that multiple family units are consistent with the FB District along the front of the site.

He explained that the intersection of where Harvey and Angara meet is where the traffic division and the City's traffic consultant indicated that the alignment needed to shift slightly, which then pushed into the wetland slightly. In addition, the cul-de-sac at the rear of the site had to be increased by approximately two feet in radius, which again started to push some of the features on the site to slightly encroach into additional wetland areas. He pointed out that in terms of a benefit to the wetland areas during the engineering process, the sewer line that comes off of the very south end of the site, which was originally going to be bored through the wetland area, was moved out of the wetland area in total after it was determined that this was the best option. The sewer line still traverses the natural features setback, but it is out of the wetland area.

Mr. McLeod noted that the applicant has submitted their master deed that is currently under review with the City and that is nearing completion, and the applicant has submitted for all of their outside agency permits, although they have not been secured at this point. He pointed out that those would all be conditioned should the Planning Commission make this recommendation to City Council for the final condominium and the wetland use permit.

Mr. Michaels stated that they have the wetland fill permit in hand from EGLE and can go pick up the soil erosion control permit from Oakland County Water Resources Commission (OCWRC). He stated that the sewer permit applications have been submitted by the City to EGLE, and he commented that they have already had some preliminary requests for information from EGLE which they have provided.

Jason Boughton, City Utilities Engineer, stated that the watermain goes directly to EGLE, and he noted that they have reviewed it and are changing it slightly at Harvey Street where it dead ends for future connection to the east/northeast. He explained that this modification needs to be made and resubmitted, but they should get approval for that. With regards to the sanitary sewer permit, it is now at the beginning phase at the OCWRC. He explained that Mark Davis has given his comments and they are waiting on a change of plans and it will still have to go to the Great Lakes Water Authority and then after that EGLE, and then back to the County for a sewer tap permit. He noted that it is a four-step process for the sanitary sewer, which is ongoing.

Chairperson Hooper called for public comment, noting that it is limited to three minutes.

Theresa Ponders, 3172 Devondale, voiced opposition to the proposed development by raising several concerns. She questioned the project's environmental impact on wetland and trees, stating that one good cause shouldn't be promoted by destroying another, especially since the property in question has an enormous amount of water on it. She also challenged the idea that the community would be truly inclusive, arguing that with home prices

around \$1 million, it would only be affordable for the wealthy. Additionally, she noted her concerns about the builder, pointing out that their identity was listed as "coming soon" on the website and that a previous builder had not maintained another property. She expressed frustration with the project's projected five-year timeline, which she believes is unfair to the IDD community, and requested greater transparency in the process after noticing inconsistent dates on a development report.

Gerald Seizert, 615 West Brown Street, Birmingham, spoke in support of the proposed development, advocating on behalf of his daughter and other families with similar experiences. He shared the story of his daughter, Laurel, who has learning differences. After his wife's passing, he realized that Laurel, who is now 45, would likely outlive him by many years. This led him to search for the best housing models for people with disabilities. He ultimately became a partner with the developer, Mr. Godfrey, after his research, and as a finance professional, it convinced him that this development was the most sustainable model in the country. He believes this project will set a national precedent and bring a different kind of community to the area. He stressed that a key issue for people like his daughter is loneliness, and this development would provide a community where she can be with "her peeps" and other people with similar abilities. He concluded by stating that the lives of many families would be forever changed by the project and urged the commission to approve it.

Justin Tout, 20074 Canterbury Rd., Detroit, stated that he is a board member of Rochester Housing Solutions, and spoke in favor of the development, highlighting its broader impact. He emphasized that there's a significant shortage of long-term, stable housing for adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities in the region. The housing that does exist often lacks key features like proximity to family, access to the community, and opportunities for homeownership. He explained that the Auburn Oaks project addresses these priorities for people who already live in or near Rochester Hills and rely on the city's resources and services. He stated that approving the project would do more than just green-light a site plan; it would signal that Rochester Hills is a forward-thinking, inclusive city that values compassion and is willing to support projects that strengthen the community's fabric. He concluded by stating that the development would be a model for other organizations and towns to follow.

Brad Conkey, no address given, stated that he is a father who is also a commercial real estate professional, and expressed support citing both his personal and professional reasons. He stated that as an appraiser for over 30 years and a former planning commission chairman, he said he was impressed with the plan, calling it really, really great. He learned about the project through a colleague and saw it as an ideal solution for his high-functioning autistic son. He commented that his son, who loves to bike, would benefit from the development's proximity to places like Walmart and Meijer, which are also potential employment opportunities. He concluded by expressing his hope that the Commission would approve the project so his son could become a member of the Rochester Hills community.

Thomas Yazbeck, 1707 Devonwood Dr., expressed his support for the

proposed development, even though he has no direct connection to it. He stated that he is always in favor of new housing and believes people are more important than trees. The speaker praised the project's design, noting that the multifamily housing is well-situated closer to the street and helps to protect the single-family homes. He also highlighted the location as ideal because of a planned bus route extension nearby, which would be beneficial for residents who may not be able to drive. He stressed the importance of encouraging more developments like this to provide a variety of housing options, as not everyone wants or can afford a large single-family home. He added that approving such developments is crucial for the City's property tax revenue. He also spoke positively about the project's location, noting its proximity to downtown Auburn Hills and major stores. He stated that the development fits in well with the surrounding area's character, unlike larger, more "flashy" projects.

Chairperson Hooper closed public comment and asked for responses to some of the concerns and questions raised regarding wetlands, tree removal, and the revised wetland use and natural features setback modification.

Mr. McLeod responded that the site went through preliminary site plan; and through the full engineering and site review process per the City's ordinances and regulations, it is anticipated that some changes will occur and that is what happened in this instance. He reiterated that the alignment of Harvey and Angara was shifted slightly which pushed the wetland, and the cul-de-sac got a little bit larger based on City standards to ensure that an emergency vehicle can turn around. He pointed out that it was a net increase of about 200 square feet overall in wetland impact than what was originally proposed. He mentioned that in the grand scale the amount of wetlands being impacted is pretty minimal, and he confirmed that it has been fully vetted by ASTI, whose representative is here this evening if there are more specific questions.

Chairperson Hooper asked if the neighborhood was inclusive or not.

Mr. Mingle responded that approximately 30% of the units would be available for purchase by individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities. He explained that this ratio is intentional, as it promotes meaningful interactions between neurotypical residents and their IDD neighbors. He added that Rochester Housing Solutions is also working with the broader community, including organizations like Oakland University's Best Buddies, to ensure IDD residents have opportunities for social integration outside of their homes. Addressing the affordability concern, he clarified that the development is not intended for people living solely on social security, as that income is not enough to live unsupported in the area. Despite this, he noted that the demand for the units is extremely high, with 23 of the 27 IDD-focused homes at this project, and many at their previous development, already reserved by families. He commented that this demonstrates that the development is, in fact, affordable enough for the target demographic and that a significant need exists.

Mr. Godfrey explained that some families are co-buying units to share the cost. He also noted that the development will include affordable one-bedroom units in the condominium buildings, priced below \$450,000 to serve the "neurotypical" market. He said that the single-family homes are priced to be competitive with

or slightly below what's currently available in the market for similar-sized homes. He emphasized that affordability is a key consideration that affects the speed of their sales. He also mentioned that they are exploring various financing strategies, including down payment assistance, and that one lender, First State Bank, has set aside money specifically for mortgages for families buying these homes. He concluded by reiterating that they are committed to making the model as affordable as possible for both their IDD and neurotypical homebuyers.

Chairperson Hooper asked what the least expensive unit is for sale in the complex.

Mr. Godfrey responded that it is \$325,000 for neurotypical or to the general public. He explained that the IDD condominiums are still going through their design process but they will end up in the \$235,000 to \$265,000 range depending on finishes. He reiterated that some families are going in together on the units, and some families are combining units and dividing them into two, three and four bedroom units to defray costs as well. He commented that it is a strategy because they could share some caregiver services such as overnight care with other families.

Chairperson Hooper asked if a builder had been determined.

Mr. Michael responded that right now Wolverine Development is currently the builder at Walton Oaks and he noted that they have had discussions with them about the Auburn Oaks project. He commented that the contract has not yet been finalized.

Chairperson Hooper noted that questions were raised about property upkeep.

Mr. Godfrey responded that they are cutting the grass on a semi-regular basis and would remove a sign that was from a previous owner.

Mr. Michael commented that the City has been cutting the grass and they are paying for it.

Chairperson Hooper opened comments up to the Commissioners.

Ms. Neubauer voiced strong support for the development, noting that it's unique because it builds a community, not just housing, for a population that often lacks services and housing options. She highlighted the huge concern that aging parents have about the future care and living arrangements for their adult children with disabilities. She praised Rochester Hills for already having excellent services for this community, mentioning groups like Dutton Farm, Woodside Church, Best Buddies, and RAH. She also expressed pride that this is the second such development in the city, and acknowledged her initial skepticism during the first proposal. She said she was pleased to see that the developers had addressed concerns, particularly regarding protecting residents' access to care and services through special needs trusts and deed requirements. She believes these measures will ensure the development stays true to its purpose. She commented that as someone who works professionally

with this community, she is proud to support the project, calling it a much-needed development. She concluded by commending the developer for working to protect a vulnerable population and stated that the project has her full support. She moved the motion to recommend Council approve the final site condominium plan. The motion was supported by Mr. Struzik.

Mr. Gallina stated that Ms. Neubauer stated everything perfectly, and he wanted to reiterate that the first time this project came through he was in support of it. He stated that he knows what Rochester Housing Solutions has done, and he did not need to be reminded of the power of what the development and the community is and what the other development is becoming. He stated that it is good to hear about how this is becoming a transformative solution to families and individuals and he is proud to know it is in the City.

Mr. Hetrick expressed his support for the project, recalling that the developers' previous project, Walton Oaks, had a similar situation where homes were reserved before approval. He noted that the same high level of interest is present here, with 23 of the 27 IDD-focused homes already reserved. He believes this strong demand confirms the development's importance and vitality for Rochester Hills and the surrounding area. He questioned the site's grading, noting a steep decline from Auburn Road. He asked if the developers planned to adjust the grade to make the roadway's access to Auburn Road less challenging.

Mr. Michael noted that the crest of the hill is at Auburn and it is flatter at that point. He commented that this is why the buildings are walkouts, to take best advantage of the grade. He stressed that their plans have been approved by MDOT and are fully engineered for a flatter approach. He pointed out that they are extending the left turn lane to the east along with the taper as a part of the project.

Mr. Struzik voiced his strong support for the development, praising the plan's design. He mentioned the look of the condos, townhomes, and houses, calling the materials and colors high end and stating it's what he would want to see built near his own neighborhood. He commended the plan for its inclusion of units for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities, which he believes will make the neighborhood more than just a place to live, but a true community where residents can build support networks. He also highlighted the importance of the project's variety of housing options, as it will make it possible for more people who work and serve the community to live there, regardless of whether they are neurotypical or IDD.

Mr. Weaver noted that there are 58 units on the plan and asked the breakdown of spoken for units.

Mr. Mingle noted that they have a reservation for a neurotypical single family home. He pointed out that the condominiums are considered individual units, with a standard configuration of two bedrooms, counting as one unit. He added that the single family homes will have three suites separately deeded within the homes, so each home will count as three units.

Mr. Weaver asked for confirmation that roughly 50 percent of the IDD units are spoken for, and Mr. Mingle responded yes.

Chairperson Hooper called for a roll call vote on the motion to recommend site plan approval. After the vote, he announced that it passed unanimously.

Ms. Neubauer moved the motion in the packet to grant the amended natural features setback modification. The motion was seconded by Ms. Denstaedt. After calling for a roll call vote, Chairperson Hooper announced that it passed unanimously.

Ms. Neubauer moved the motion in the packet to recommend approval of the amended wetland use permit. The motion was seconded by Mr. Struzik. After calling for a roll call vote, Chairperson Hooper announced that it passed unanimously.

Following the votes, Mr. McLeod noted that depending on schedules and availability for the City Council agenda, these items would go to the October 20, 2025 City Council Meeting.

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 8 - Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Brnabic

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. PFSC2025-0001 Auburn Angara Oaks, the Planning Commission recommends approval of the Final Site Condominium Plan, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on August 20, 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 Auburn 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 plan represents a reasonable street, building and lot layout and orientation.
5. The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development onsite as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity given the split zoning of the property that allows for single family development or development consistent with the FB Flex Business District to the east.
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. The proposed encroachments into Wetland A are situated in portions of the wetland with

lower ecological quality and the applicant has proposed a retaining wall to limit impacts; and the proposed encroachments into Wetland B are relatively minor and the applicant has also proposed a retaining wall to limit impacts. Finally, the natural features setback will be defined as part of the development with split rail fencing and large boulders to protect the area for the future.

Conditions

1. Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters prior to a Land Improvement Permit being granted.
2. That all applicable outside agency permits being obtained, including those for water, sewer, storm drainage, roadway, wetlands (EGLE), etc.
3. That a master deed acceptable to the City be provided for review and approval.
4. Provide a landscape bond in the amount of \$171,745, plus the cost of inspection fees as adjusted by staff as necessary, prior to the preconstruction meeting with Engineering.

2025-0435

Request for Revised Natural Features Setback Modification - File No. PNFSM2024-0001 (amended) - to allow for 1,137 linear feet of NFS Impact (previous impact was 1,211 linear feet) for the Auburn Angara Oaks Condominium development, a proposed development with nine (9) single family detached residences, six (6) multi-unit condominium buildings and related amenities on approximately 9.7 acres of land located at 2469 & 2489 W. Auburn Rd., 3045 Angara Dr., 3050 Harvey St., Parcel Nos. 15-32-201-001, -002, -003, -004, and -006, located on the south side of W. Auburn Rd. and west of Crooks Rd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential and a portion of the land has the FB Flex Business Overlay; Bruce Michael, Auburn Angara Oaks, LLC, Applicant

See Legislative File 2025-0433 for discussion.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Denstaedt, that this matter be Granted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Brnabic

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. PNFSM2024-0001 Angara Oaks Site Condominium, the Planning Commission grants an AMENDED natural features setback modification for 1,137 lineal feet of permanent impacts to two different wetland areas identified on the site plans to construct the proposed private road, to provide the building area for multiple and single family residential units, and associated development infrastructure, based on plans received by the Planning Department on August 20, 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; further, the applicant has minimized the impacts to the natural features and associated natural features setbacks by modifying the means of construction such as installing retaining walls along the proposed roadway to limit the footprint of the roadbed and finally, the applicant has provided for the future protection of the natural features setback by providing split rail fencing and large boulders

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 Wetland A and Wetland B 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.

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 September 9, 2025 prior to final approval by staff.

2025-0434

Request for Modified Wetland Use Permit Recommendation - File No. PWEP2024-0001 (amended) - to impact approximately 39,625 square feet of wetlands for the Auburn Angara Oaks Condominium development (previously approved wetland use permit allowed an impact of 39,404 square feet), a proposed development with nine (9) single family detached residences, six (6) multi-unit condominium buildings and related amenities on approximately 9.7 acres of land located at 2469 & 2489 W. Auburn Rd., 3045 Angara Dr., 3050 Harvey St., Parcel Nos. 15-32-201-001, -002, -003, -004, and -006, located on the south side of W. Auburn Rd. and west of Crooks Rd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential and a portion of the land has the FB Flex Business Overlay; Bruce Michael, Auburn Angara Oaks, LLC, Applicant

See Legislative File 2025-0433 for discussion.

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 8 - Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Brnabic

Resolved, in the matter of City File PWEP2024-0001 (Auburn Angara Oaks Condominium) the Planning Commission recommends to City Council approval of an AMENDED Wetland Use Permit to permanently impact approximately 39,625 square feet of wetlands (both Wetland A and Wetland B) to construct the private road, building areas for multiple family and single family units, and associated development infrastructure based on plans received by the Planning Department on August 20, 2025, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions.

Findings

1. Of the 97,484 square feet of wetland area on site, the applicant is proposing to impact approximately 39,625 square feet, an increase of approximately 421 square feet from the

previously recommended and approved permit. Additionally, although Wetland A was determined to be of medium quality overall, the portion that is proposed to be impacted is of poor quality due to its non-native species content and low ecological function. And although Wetland B was determined to be of high quality overall, the impacts are noted to be small and the proposed retaining wall will limit further impacts and have been addressed to ASTI's satisfaction.

2. ASTI has reviewed the subject plans and proposed impacts to Wetland A and Wetland B along with the proposed mitigation efforts to help reduce the impacts to those wetlands (including the installation of a retaining wall to allow for the reduction in the roadbed width for Wetland A; the impacts to Wetland B are relatively small; and a retaining wall is proposed adjacent to Wetland B to limit further impacts) and has indicated that the plans as proposed are satisfactory.

3. The current proposal while increasing overall wetland impacts does reduce the overall impacts to the associated natural features setbacks (slightly less than 100 linear feet) as originally approved during preliminary condominium review.

Conditions

1. City Council approval of the Wetland Use Permit.
2. That the applicant receives an EGLE Part 303 Permit prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. The applicant shall abide by all conditions and recommendations as outlined in ASTI's review letter of September 9, 2025.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None.

NEXT MEETING DATE

- Regular Meeting, October 21, 2025, 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 8:40 p.m.

*Greg Hooper, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission*

Jennifer MacDonald, Recording Secretary