



Rochester Hills

Minutes

Zoning Board of Appeals

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

Chairperson: Kenneth Koluch; Vice Chairperson: Charles Tischer; Secretary: Jayson Graves
Members: Deborah Brnabic, Marvie Neubauer, Jason Sakis, and John Young

Wednesday, September 10, 2025

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Koluch called the September 10, 2025 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Michigan Time.

ROLL CALL

Present 7 - Deborah Brnabic, Jayson Graves, Kenneth Koluch, Charles Tischer, Jason Sakis, Marvie Neubauer and John Young

Others present:

Chris McLeod, Planning Manager
Mike Viazanko, Building, Ordinance & Facilities Director
P. Daniel Christ, City Attorney
Jennifer MacDonald, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2025-0375](#) August 13, 2025 Zoning Board of Appeals Minutes

Chairperson Koluch noted that he was not in attendance at the August 13th meeting so is unable to verify the accuracy of the minutes.

A motion was made by Brnabic, seconded by Young, that this matter be Approved . The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

Aye 6 - Brnabic, Graves, Tischer, Sakis, Neubauer and Young

Abstain 1 - Koluch

COMMUNICATIONS

Chairperson Koluch that he had recieved the Michigan Planner magazine, which everyone else receives electronically.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

NEW BUSINESS

[2025-0376](#) Public Hearing - File No. PVAI2025-0008

Location: 1737 N. Fairview Ln., located north of Tienken between Brewster and Livernois, Parcel 15-04-304-007, zoned R-2 One Family Residential District

The applicant is requesting interpretations of the following Articles/Sections/Paragraphs of the City of Rochester Hills Zoning Ordinance: Article 1, Chapter 3 Permits and Certificates, Section 138-1.300 Duties, Powers, and Limitations - Paragraph C; Article 5, Chapter 1 Schedule of Regulations, Section 138-5.101 Footnotes to the Schedule of Regulations - Paragraph A; and Article 10, Chapter 1 Accessory Buildings and Structures, Section 138-10.102 Detached Accessory Structures - Paragraph A.

(Staff Report dated 9/3/25, Location Map, Application, Public hearing notice and Public comment had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

Present for the applicant was Bradley Wolfbauer, Universal Consolidated Enterprises, Inc., P.O. Box 80850, Rochester, MI.

Chairperson Koluch introduced this item, noting that it is a request for an interpretation of three different sections of the zoning ordinance. He explained that the requested interpretations would be handled individually, and allow the applicant to present his case for each, and then have the staff presentation, allow for public comment, and then allow the board to deliberate and ask questions.

Mr. Wolfbauer said that he is representing Universal Consolidated Enterprises, which he is the qualifying officer of and the owner. He noted that he is representing the occupant of the house this evening though the questions they are presenting are of citywide importance and not specific to that particular location. He noted that he appreciates everyone being here.

Chairperson Koluch noted that he would start with the first interpretation request for Section 138-1.300 - Duties, Powers and Limitations Section C, which states the Building Department, Public Services and Fire Department are under no circumstances permitted to make changes to the ordinance or to vary the terms of the ordinance in carrying out their duties. He asked the applicant to proceed and present his case and to focus on this first interpretation first.

Mr. Wolfbauer asked how many ZBA members have a law degree and asked for a show of hands. He asked if that was not a valid question.

Chairperson Koluch said that he did not think it was relevant.

Mr. Wolfbauer suggested that they should all have a pretty good concept of the law. He said that he is just a common guy that knows how to read. He said with regard to this particular provision it goes without saying that no one who's enforcing it or applying it has any right to change it, and he asked if he was correct in saying that.

Chairperson Koluch asked for clarification on what Mr. Wolfbauer was asking, if he was asking for an interpretation on specific words or language.

Mr. Wolfbauer said that he was just asking the board to tell him what they think it means. He said that the Building department, Fire department and quite frankly any other department are not allowed to make changes to what the ordinance says should be done or should not be done. He said it's pretty self-explanatory and he did put that in his application. He said that he submitted the application, a brief in support of the application, and he also submitted an answer to Mr. McLeod's staff report and he assumes everybody had been brought abreast of that.

Chairperson Koluch responded that everybody had read that and they received all the paperwork that he sent, in three different emails. He thanked the applicant for his brief and all the other documentation and said that it helped to have that on file. He asked the applicant if he was offering an alternative interpretation for what the plain language of the ordinance says.

Mr. Wolfbauer responded no. He said that he was asking for verification of what the plain language says in that particular provision.

Chairperson Koluch said that if the applicant has nothing else he would ask for Mr. McLeod's comments.

Mr. McLeod said that to take one step back, the zoning ordinance does allow for the ZBA to make interpretations of the ordinance. He said that whenever there is a determination that the ordinance is unclear, the ZBA is the body at the local level to provide for that interpretation, whether it's zoning text or zoning map issues.

(The applicant's court reporter asked for a clarification off of the microphone.)

Mr. McLeod requested that there not be interruptions.

Chairperson Koluch said that he also did not hear Mr. McLeod's comment.

Mr. McLeod said that relative to the first section for interpretation, Sec. 138-1.300 subsection C, the ordinance indicates that those three entities (Building, Public Services and the Fire Department) and under no circumstances permitted to make changes to the ordinance or to vary the terms of the ordinance in carrying out their duties. He explained that there is a specific requirement within state law to change or vary the ordinance. To change the ordinance, that has to go through a public hearing, the Planning Commission, and then City Council makes the final decision. This body, the ZBA, can vary the terms of the ordinance, in terms of granting variances. Other than that, that's staff's opinion for what the language says in that particular section.

Chairperson Koluch told the court reporter that the board would like to avoid interruptions during the meeting, and suggested that she could listen to the recording afterward. He asked if any board members has questions for the

applicant or staff regarding interpretation number one.

Mr. Sakis asked the applicant if he would agree that city employees, including the Building department, should do their best to interpret the ordinance without changing or altering anything.

Mr. Wolfbauer responded that city employees should follow the letter of the written ordinance, to the very best of their ability.

Mr. Sakis asked if interpretation is part of that.

Mr. Wolfbauer response that to some extent they would have to have some latitude.

Ms. Neubauer noted that for the sake of clarity she'd like to address a few things. She said that the first issue is to determine if Sec. 138-1.300 allows provisions to be varied by the different departments. She said the discussion should be super limited, and noted there is a difference between interpretation and the ability to make variations. She said the ZBA should not get in the weeds of things that are beyond the scope of their abilities. She told the applicant that the ZBA did receive all the information that they provided, which she said she was sure it took hours for him to prepare just as it took hours for her and the ZBA to review.

Chairperson Koluch asked if there were any other questions or comments, and none were provided.

Ms. Neubauer made the motion in the packet, and the motion was seconded by Mr. Tischer.

Mr. McLeod corrected the ordinance reference section to 138-1.300.

Ms. Neubauer corrected her motion to provide the correct ordinance section.

After the roll call vote, Chairperson Koluch announced that the motion passed unanimously. He apologized and called for public comment for interpretation number one and then noted no speakers cards were turned in and closed the floor for public comment. He instructed anyone wanting to speak for public comment to fill out a speakers card on the back table and to give those to Ms. MacDonald.

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

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Graves, Koluch, Tischer, Sakis, Neubauer and Young

Resolved, the matter of File No. PVAI2025-0008, to interpret that Section 138-1.300 of the Zoning Ordinance does not permit the Building, Public Services or Fire Departments to make changes or vary provisions of the Zoning Ordinance to carry out their duties.

[2025-0376](#)

Public Hearing - File No. PVAI2025-0008

Location: 1737 N. Fairview Ln., located north of Tienken between Brewster and Livernois, Parcel 15-04-304-007, zoned R-2 One Family Residential District

The applicant is requesting interpretations of the following Articles/Sections/Paragraphs of the City of Rochester Hills Zoning Ordinance: Article 1, Chapter 3 Permits and Certificates, Section 138-1.300 Duties, Powers, and Limitations - Paragraph C; Article 5, Chapter 1 Schedule of Regulations, Section 138-5.101 Footnotes to the Schedule of Regulations - Paragraph A; and Article 10, Chapter 1 Accessory Buildings and Structures, Section 138-10.102 Detached Accessory Structures - Paragraph A.

Chairperson Koluch announced that he would move on to interpretation number two regarding Section 138-5.101 Footnotes to the Schedule of Regulations, specifically Paragraph A regarding regulations for building height measurements. He asked Mr. Wolfbauer to present his case regarding this interpretation.

Mr. Wolfbauer said that the Building department seems to want to measure building height from all four sides of a structure as opposed to measuring it from the front average grade elevation to the midpoint of the roof. He said the ordinance is very clear, it states that measurement of building height shall be taken from the front facade of the building, not from all facades averaged of the building. He explained that there is a City published guideline that is ancillary to the ordinance which spells out specifically that this is how you measure the height of an accessory building. He said that members of the Building department have disputed this yet that's still posted, at least the last time he checked a day or two ago. He said he's having a hard time understanding how they are supposed to be able to interpret this as Mr. Sakis had said. He said this is very plain English, not ambiguous or vague. He said that he wants the board to say this is how you measure building height. He said that building height measurement is not the definition of building height. He said that to convolute that into saying this is the definition so we're measuring it this way is not what the ordinance says. He said that the ordinance is very specific and does not exclude any particular type of building, it simply says this is how you measure building height in these districts, which is pretty much all residential districts. He said that he wants the board to say yes, you measure building height from the front facade of the building, from the grade to midpoint of the roof or as otherwise indicated in the ordinance. He said there's no arbitrary decision of the Building department or any particular person that they get to vary the terms of the ordinance and decide that they're going to measure building height from some other point than where the ordinance dictates it should be.

Chairperson Koluch asked for staff comments.

Mr. McLeod explained that this section is a specific footnote provided as part of the Schedule of Regulations, specifically for One Family Residential districts. In this instance, most of the total height requirements are either 30 or 35 feet in total height. He said there is a Footnote A which is the subject of the ZBA's

deliberation tonight, which says that building height measurement, specific to the chart for the R-1 through R-5 and RE districts, shall be measured from the average grade of the front facade of the building. That provision is specific to this chart because it is a footnote specific to this chart.

He explained that there are other instances within the city where height is measured and height becomes an issue in terms of how it's measured and what that actually means. In the absence of a height definition, for instance, in the accessory structure provision where there are different height provisions, which are 14 or 16 feet in height, and there's an absence of a specific way to measure it, the ordinance provides a definition of what determines building height and that is a very relevant conversation. So in that instance, building height is defined by the ordinance to say that the mean level of the vertical distance from average grade to the mean level of the highest gable or slope of a hip gable roof, the top of the highest roof beam for flat roofs, the deck line for mansard roofs and the mean level for a shed roof from the highest point to the lowest point of the roof. And then it goes on to give several different graphic representations of what building height would be measured in certain instances. So again, in those areas where for specific structures, for specific circumstances that define their own height, and there is no definition of what that specific height measurement is, the ordinance would then fall to the overall definition of building height. And this specific chart, which is the subject of the ZBA's consideration here tonight, that is applied to main structures or the overall maximum height within the district for the single family district. But again, it can be qualified and can be overridden by specific provisions for other instances within that district, which may require a different height. He said that he'd be more than glad to try to answer any questions.

Chairperson Koluch opened the floor for public comment. Seeing none he closed the floor for public comment and asked for the applicant's comments.

Mr. Wolfbauer said that he would like to speak to that specifically. He said that Mr. McLeod speaks of language in the ordinance that says that it's specific to the table. He said that he doesn't see that language in the ordinance. He asked Mr. McLeod to point out the language to him.

Mr. McLeod asked Mr. Wolfbauer to direct his comments to the chair.

Mr. Wolfbauer agreed that he would direct his comments to the chair regarding what Mr. McLeod had just stated. So he's using a general definition of building height to determine how a building height is measured. He said that when you have a specific directive as to how to measure building height in the ordinance, there's nothing in that footnote that says that only applies to this particular section of the ordinance. There's nothing in that footnote that says this only applies to table six or table seven of the ordinance. There's nothing to that effect. It simply says in all districts and states, building height shall be measured and they give you the conditions in which it shall be measured in. And then the city goes on further to publish the guide to residential zoning requirements. This guide is posted on the City of Rochester Hills website under construction guidebooks and inspection guides, under Building, Ordinances and Facilities. The guidebook, which was published or created on February 1st,

2022, revised on February 1st, 2024, basically on page one it says new homes and additions, and it pretty much restates for the most part the table in which Mr. McLeod is referring to. And it says building height as measured from the average grade at the front of the home to the midpoint between the bottoms of the eave to the highest peak of the roof. It shows the table pretty much they're all 35 to 30 feet maximum building height. Nothing in the table says that is the maximum building height for principal structures. Nothing in the table says that's a building height restriction for a garage or any other kind of building. He said that as far as he's concerned when he reads this, that's the maximum building height.

Chairperson Koluch said that the ZBA is here to interpret the ordinance and not the guidebook that Mr. Wolfbauer is referring to, and that is all the ZBA is allowed to interpret.

Mr. Wolfbauer said that he is just letting the ZBA know, that he would accept that answer but would read on because it's very misleading.

Chairperson said that the ZBA can incorporate the entire document by reference if the applicant wants because he has already submitted it. That would save the applicant time from having to read the entire document. He asked if ZBA members have any questions for staff.

Ms. Neubauer said that she wanted to address a couple things that were said and hopefully it'll lower the temperature a little bit. She said that it's her personal interpretation that the footnote that the applicant is referencing is inapplicable because it refers specifically to the proceeding section as footnotes do. And that specifically relates to building structures, not accessory structures, which is what the ZBA is here to discuss and substantively with respect to the ordinance presented. She said that she also agrees that guidelines are not equal to ordinances. Ordinances properly interpreted, should be interpreted the same way that other statutory and legal things are interpreted, which is with proper supporting either case law, practices, historical data, but not with guidelines. Guidelines are just a preschool version of an introduction to something, so the ZBA can't be bound by that.

Ms. Neubauer made the motion in the packet for Interpretation number two, and it was seconded by Ms. Brnabic. After a roll call vote, Chairperson Koluch said that the motion was passed unanimously.

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

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Graves, Koluch, Tischler, Sakis, Neubauer and Young

Resolved, the matter of File No. PVAI2025-0008, to interpret that Section 138-5.101 (A) requires that maximum building height of structures within the One Family Residential Districts be measured from the average grade of the front façade. Further, this method of measurement is not applicable to accessory structures since the section of the ordinance regulating accessory structures (Sec. 138-10.102) provides specific regulations limiting the height of accessory structures and the Ordinance has general definitions for

determining building height.

2025-0376

Public Hearing - File No. PVAI2025-0008

Location: 1737 N. Fairview Ln., located north of Tienken between Brewster and Livernois, Parcel 15-04-304-007, zoned R-2 One Family Residential District

The applicant is requesting interpretations of the following Articles/Sections/Paragraphs of the City of Rochester Hills Zoning Ordinance: Article 1, Chapter 3 Permits and Certificates, Section 138-1.300 Duties, Powers, and Limitations - Paragraph C; Article 5, Chapter 1 Schedule of Regulations, Section 138-5.101 Footnotes to the Schedule of Regulations - Paragraph A; and Article 10, Chapter 1 Accessory Buildings and Structures, Section 138-10.102 Detached Accessory Structures - Paragraph A.

Chairperson Koluch said that he would move on to the interpretation number three for Sec. 138-10.102 Detached Accessory Structures, and noted that the applicant is requesting an interpretation as to whether the specific provisions should exclude fireplaces, chimney stoops, planter boxes, etc., which do not support a roof. He asked Mr. Wolfbauer to present his case for the board.

Mr. Wolfbauer said that he believed that he articulated it very well in his brief and support of their application and also in the answer to Mr. McLeod's staff report.

Chairperson Koluch said that he wanted to confirm that the applicant has nothing else to add beyond that.

Mr. Wolfbauer answered yes and said he'd be happy to answer any of the board's questions.

Mr. McLeod said that in terms of Sec. 138-10-102.A, the discussion is also about the size and square footage of accessory buildings here and how area is calculated. The pertinent section, is "for the purposes of this subsection, floor area for an accessory structure shall be defined as the exterior footprint of the structure supporting a roof measured from the exterior of the exterior walls assembly or structural supports. A structure shall be considered detached when it's completely separate from the main structure when it does not meet one of the conditions noted in section 138-10.101.A.2 above". So the question here really becomes if whether a line or an area is tightly drawn from structures or from the columns or the structure that supports the roof itself and whether that counts as any ancillary structures which are integral to that substructure that holds up the roof.

He said that this becomes a bit of an interpretation. And so there are instances where there probably are substructures that wouldn't be structural to the overall accessory structure and those probably shouldn't be counted, but there are times where portions of the structure, portions of the building are integral to the structure, are integral to the overall design that support or provide ancillary support to the overall accessory structure. He said that from the Planning department standpoint, staff is able to make that interpretation. He noted that was discussed earlier, whether or not there's the ability to make interpretations. The reason is that if there is no limitation on structures being integral, then, you

could have massive structures that go wildly outside the confines of the ordinance in terms of square footage. So in that instance, if the Building or Planning department, or even the DPS department, determines that the structure and those ancillary portions of that structure are integral to it, they have the ability and almost the requirement to say this is all one structure, and it is supporting the overall roof structure. He explained that he doesn't think it's as simple as just saying there are four columns that support a structure and that's the simple line to do it, there are nuances to it.

Chairperson Koluch opened the floor for public comment for interpretation number three, and seeing none he closed the public comment period.

Ms. Neubauer said that Mr. Viazanko would probably be the best person to answer her questions. She referenced that when there's interpretation that comes across as something vague, but my understanding of how the city is, is that there's a non-discriminatory practice which is consistent across the board of how this is interpreted so that there's not an individual that's singled out. So common practice is interpreting this consistently across the board in the same manner. She asked whether he would agree with that statement.

Mr. Viazanko responded yes.

Ms. Neubauer said that based on historical practice and the non-discriminatory way the city operates, even though it's open for interpretation, it limits the interpretation in order to be equitable to the residents across the city and to best apply the intent and the language of the ordinance. She asked whether Mr. Viazanko would agree with that.

Mr. Viazanko responded yes.

Ms. Neubauer said she would like to make a motion but Chairperson Koluch asked her to wait as he had a question for the applicant.

Chairperson Koluch said that he read the applicant's brief and it was extensive, and said that he wanted to know what specific situation the applicant was talking about when it mentions fireplaces or chimneys and when they need to be excluded. He asked for the applicant to provide a description of what that is.

Mr. Wolfbauer asked if he was referring to his own specific situation. He responded that the language is very clear and it is very specific. It says for purposes of this subsection, so it's narrowing this down to this particular section regarding accessory buildings, as to how floor area is calculated. He said that according to this, floor area is calculated in this particular situation for this provision of the ordinance regarding accessory buildings as to not include that which does not support a roof.

Chairperson Koluch responded that he did not see that in the ordinance where it says to not included that does not support a roof.

Mr. Wolfbauer said that he would read it off - "for the purposes of this subsection floor area of an accessory structure shall be defined as the exterior footprint of

the structure supporting a roof measured from the exterior of the exterior walls, assembly, or structural supports". He said that he could continue reading but the remainder is really irrelevant to what's being presented here.

Chairperson Koluch said that is not necessary and asked if it says that the structure should be measured from the outside of the areas that are supporting the roof, and asked if the applicant was saying the structure should be excluded if it is inside the envelope if it doesn't support the roof.

Mr. Wolfbauer said that in this case, it's not inside that envelope and it's not supporting a roof. He said that a chimney is on the outer portion of the structure of the building and is not supporting a roof, there is no roof over that. He said that it would be no different if there was a wing wall with a foundation, there could be a couple of wing walls to a stair entrance or foundations to the steps or the stoop in front of a building. He said that if the city wants to limit what is allowed to have and not have not supporting a roof, it should be written into the ordinance, not left open-ended. He said that he has complete understanding of what Mr. McLeod is saying. He said that he doesn't think that anyone would build a gazebo that's 180 square foot and then put a 2,000 square foot patio pavilion around it. But to say that this is non-structural, it makes no sense based on the written word of the ordinance to say that would be included in the floor area.

Chairperson Koluch asked if the applicant was saying that if you added something to the maximum area, but it is mounted to the ground, it shouldn't count even if part of it is attached to the outside perimeter.

Mr. Wolfbauer agreed, if it is not supporting a roof.

Ms. Neubauer asked where that ordinance language is located.

Mr. Wolfbauer responded that he would answer that question with a question, and asked where is the language to say otherwise, there's no language that limits.

Ms. Neubauer said that the applicant should not be questioning the board, in accordance with the bylaws. She asked the applicant to read the portion about supporting or not supporting a roof.

Mr. Wolfbauer said that Section 138-10.102 Detached Accessory Structures Subsection A Area, the second paragraph states "for the purposes of this subsection, floor area of an accessory structure shall be defined as the exterior footprint of the structure supporting a roof measured from the exterior of the exterior walls, assembly or structural supports". He said there are no modifiers or language that says otherwise.

Ms. Neubauer said that she just wanted to make that clear.

Chairperson Koluch asked if the board had any more questions for staff or for the applicant, and no one responded.

Ms. Neubauer made the motion in the packet, and it was seconded by Mr.

Tischer. She reread the motion for clarification.

Mr. Graves said that he would like to make a recommendation for an addition to the motion, and Chairperson Koluch said the motion can be withdrawn.

Mr. Graves said that he would recommend that "are integral to support of the structure" to be added to clarify what is not in the ordinance. He said that when Mr. McLeod discussed this portion of the ordinance, he said it could be something supporting the roof not near the building, like a walkway or a flower bed. Mr. Graves said that it should clearly say that it's supporting the roof of the building.

Chairperson Koluch said not necessarily.

Mr. Graves asked what would be not integral, if a walkway or a flower bed would be considered not integral.

Mr. McLeod said this is where the interpretation does get gray, and it is on a case-by case basis, and again the ordinance has to allow for interpretation. If there is a flower planter 2 ft. tall but doesn't have a foundation and it is attached to the accessory structure, whoever is implementing the ordinance should have the ability to say that doesn't count. However if it is something that is fully integral in terms of height to the overall structure, maybe not necessarily supporting the roof, then the Building department should have the ability to make that interpretation and should be allowed to bring that into the calculation.

Ms. Neubauer said that the difference is a nuance of the words here - whether it is integral or supportive. She said that the way she is presenting her motion is that if it is integral but not necessarily supportive, then it could be included in the measurement. She said it would require additional language, and asked whether it changes the intent of the ordinance and noted it would be giving the Building department more to consider. She said that adding language to the interpretation does actually change the intent of the ordinance. In order to be sure that the ZBA is giving the Building department the ability to be consistent across the board and non-discriminatory, we would leave it as integral and not add the supporting language.

Chairperson Koluch said that he is supportive of that language.

Mr. Sakis said that it has some permanency to it if there is something extended beyond the roofline without interruption, in order to distinguish it between flower boxes and a concrete floor, and asked staff to comment on that.

Mr. McLeod said that's where his thoughts were going. With construction methodology there are so many variations in what they are able to construct, it is impossible to draft an ordinance to cover every scenario. He explained that the Building department has to have the ability to say that it is integral to the structure, built into the foundation, has a footprint, and to make the interpretation. Or if it doesn't have a foundation or if it is flatwork to say that it doesn't count. He said this might be an issue that comes up several times in appeal, to say whether a structure is integral or supporting and whether that

should be covered.

Ms. Neubauer renewed her motion as previously stated, which was seconded by Tischer. After the roll call vote, Chairperson Koluch announced that the vote had passed unanimously. He thanked the applicant for his presentation.

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

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Graves, Koluch, Tischer, Sakis, Neubauer and Young

Resolved, in the matter of File No. PVAI2025-0008, that the Zoning Board of Appeals interprets that Section 138-10.102(A) indicates that the area of accessory structures is calculated by measuring from the exterior of the exterior walls, assembly or structural supports of the structure supporting the roof, including any additional ancillary structures that are integral to such accessory structure.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Chairperson Koluch asked if there are any new cases for the October regular meeting. Mr. McLeod responded that there are not any new cases at this time.

NEXT MEETING DATE

October 8, 2025

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, it was moved by Ms. Neubauer, seconded by Mr. Graves, to adjourn the meeting at 7:48 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Jennifer MacDonald.

*Kenneth Koluch, Chairperson
Rochester Hills
Zoning Board of Appeals*

Jennifer MacDonald, Recording Secretary