



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

comments are for the May 19 Planning Commission meeting

1 message

Annette Gilson <gilson@oakland.edu>
To: planning@rochesterhills.org

Tue, May 19, 2026 at 2:10 PM

Hello,

I am writing about the apartments on Adams and the data-center rules. I live off Adams between Avon and Walton and the traffic is already terrible. Yes, someday we might do some road work to change that, but certainly not for five years.

I don't think this is the time to cram more people onto a road that is already over capacity.

I am also very concerned about data centers. We already have one that may go in at OU. We as a community need to be very proactive to keep other such data centers out of RH. People won't stay if we don't stop over building and start conserving green space and our ecological balance.

Thanks, Annette
[559 McGill Drive, 48309](#)

--

Annette Gilson, Ph.D.
they/them or she/her
Associate Professor of English
348 O'Dowd Hall
[586 Pioneer Drive](#)
[Oakland](#) University
Rochester, MI 48309-4482
Pandemic cell: 248.842.0489

I acknowledge the Traditional Owners, past and present, of the land on which I work. Our main campus is on the Land of the three Algonquian Nations: the Ojibwe, Ottawa, and the Potawatomi.



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Please include in record re: PPUD 2025-0001

1 message

Ken Koluch <kkoluchpc@gmail.com>
To: planning@rochesterhills.org

Mon, May 18, 2026 at 6:12 PM

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I have been a resident of the City of Rochester Hills since 2009, and I am writing to express my opposition to the PUD request for the proposed development known as Penelope's Place.

While I appreciate the need for housing growth and community development, I am concerned about the fact that the area in question was clearly set aside to be used solely for office/business use (per the Adams-Vito settlement agreement), and therefor granting a PUD request here does not necessarily align with the Master Use plan. More importantly, it fails to address the very practical issue of whether this proposal is "right" for the city.

As it stands, the surrounding areas have already been the subject of significant multistory residential development that impossible to ignore when driving down M-59 or across the Adams Road overpass. This area is already stands out from the overall aesthetic of the rest of the city, and I'm concerned that adding yet another high density residential structure will contribute to the feel of tower-block

neighborhood, which few residents would likely find appealing.

I also believe that allowing for PUD development on this site would require an overly-broad interpretation of the criteria qualifications, as there are other development options available to the applicant under conventional zoning restrictions. Also I fail to appreciate how adding another tower complex to an area that is already starting to look and feel overly crowded could possibly count towards improving the public health, welfare, or safety of the area.

This proposal is not a good fit for our city, and therefore I ask that you reject the applicant's request for this PUD.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Koluch



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Comments for May 19 planning commission meeting1 message

sarah morisot <smorisotdd@gmail.com>
To: planning@rochesterhills.org

Mon, May 18, 2026 at 4:24 PM

Hello,

I am writing to share comments regarding the May 19 Planning Commission Meeting.

I do NOT want to see a data center in Rochester Hills. The amount of power to run these is staggering, and much of the cost gets passed onto the taxpayers, even if the companies skillfully word their message to make it seem like it won't be. It would also put pressure on our water supply. Again, despite what they will promise, there will be a toll on our city's water. And then there are the effects on the wildlife, the noise pollution created by the massive generators, and emergency response teams that could be tied up dealing with frequent small electrical fires at the centers and thus unable to respond to other local emergencies. Also to be considered, once construction is completed (if that's not outsourced as well), how many permanent jobs at the facility in Rochester Hills would actually be created?

Second, affordable housing is needed in Rochester Hills.

Sarah Morisot
Rochester Hills resident since 2000

All other Rochester Hills PUD submissions have had independent planning reports and an extensive traffic study.

Sample Resolution Planning Commission Tuesday May 19th 2026

Motion to postpone Penelope Place Apartments

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

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

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

That upon further review

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

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

Roll Call Vote

transitional design architecture



photos courtesy of google

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

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

Good evening,

Thank you for your service to the People of Rochester Hills.

The Michigan State Constitution states in

Article 1 section 1 Political Power

All political power is inherent in the People. Government is instituted for their equal benefit, security, and protection.

Article 1 section 3 on assembly, consultation, *instruction*, and petition states

The people have the right peaceably to assemble, to consult for the common good, to instruct their representatives and to petition the government for redress of grievances.

Now that I have clarified the People's authority and for what purpose the People are assembled here today, I'd like to state that: I can appreciate that Mr. Kassab has been a resident of Rochester Hills for 32 years and his desire to invest in Rochester Hills is commendable, however Mr. Kassab presents here this evening not as one of the People, but as Penelope's LLC. Which is a private entity.

A private entity's wants or desires does not supersede the will of the People. As a board representing the People of Rochester Hills, your alliance lies with the People not with private entities.

I have no objections to Mr. Kassab building in our community. My grievance is not with him; it's my objection to another apartment building in Rochester Hills. We have approximately 15 apartment complexes; not counting condos or townhouses.

There have been 16 new developments in the last ten years in a two-mile radius of my home, some being apartment complexes that are in addition to existing apartment complexes.

I don't know what the rush to develop every inch of this city is; I thought that we were essentially a community of family homes, yet I'm now surrounded by apartment buildings. Apartment dwellers are not invested in our community; they don't necessarily stay when their lease is up, versus homeowners that build a legacy for their children to inherit and stay in our community. We may be creating a revolving door for people coming and going that aren't invested in Rochester Hills.

We don't want to be like Royal Oak or Auburn Hills, and we need to take a lesson from the recent water main break. That was an Auburn Hills water main pipe. Apparently while

they've been over developing their city, they've neglected their infrastructure. Is this where Rochester Hills is headed, aesthetically beautiful with a crumbling foundation?

I personally have many sunny sky electrical outages while my bill continues to rise.

More apartments equate to a denser population, more drivers on the roads, more people using utilities, more police and fire calls, more strain on our infrastructure.

We need to slow down the development in this city.

Erin Pruitt

District 4



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Penelope Place Development on Adam's and Auburn Road

1 message

Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>
To: hmarra1569@gmail.com

Tue, May 19, 2026 at 8:18 AM

Hello Heather -

Thank you for your comments, they will be provided to the Planning Commission.

Jennifer MacDonald
Planning Specialist

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed apartment complex development (Penelope place) on Auburn/Adam's Road in Rochester Hills.

As a first-time homeowner in this area, one of the reasons I chose Avalon Road was because it represents an attainable path to long-term homeownership for young families and local residents. Rochester Hills already faces a shortage of affordable entry-level homes, and developments like this reduce opportunities for residents to invest in permanent housing and build long-term community roots. Expanding transient rental housing instead of supporting attainable homeownership changes the character and stability of the neighborhood.

I am also concerned that the proposed three-story height does not align with the existing character of the area or Rochester Hills zoning standards. A development of this scale would feel out of place in a neighborhood primarily made up of lower-density residential homes.

Additionally, the site plan appears to include very limited green space for residents. Increased density without adequate outdoor space negatively impacts both quality of life and the overall appearance of the community.

Traffic and safety are another concern. The section of Adams Road already includes a dangerous bend with limited visibility, and adding significant additional traffic from a high-density apartment complex would worsen congestion and increase safety risks for residents, pedestrians (especially near the paint creek trail crossing), and drivers alike.

I encourage the council to reconsider this proposal and instead prioritize development that supports long-term community investment, homeownership opportunities, neighborhood compatibility, and traffic safety.

Thank you for your consideration.



Planning Department

Phone: 248-656-4660

rochesterhills.org