



Rochester Hills

Minutes

Planning Commission / City Council Joint Meeting

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

CITY COUNCIL

*David J. Blair, Jason Carlock, Ryan Deel, Carol Morlan,
Theresa Mungioni, Marvie Neubauer, and David Walker*

PLANNING COMMISSION

*Deborah Brnabic, Sheila Denstaedt, Gerard Dettloff, Anthony Gallina, Dale Hetrick,
Greg Hooper, Marvie Neubauer, Scott Struzik, and Ben Weaver*

Monday, August 11, 2025

5:30 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

In accordance with the provisions of Act 267 of the Public Acts of 1976, the Open Meetings Act, as amended, notice was hereby given that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission and the Rochester Hills City Council would hold a Special Joint Meeting on Monday, August 11, 2025 at 5:30 p.m. The purpose of the Joint Meeting is to review the draft Master Plan and to consider a recommendation to approve its distribution pursuant to state statute.

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Hooper called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m., and welcomed attendees, President Deel and City Council members to the August 11, 2025 Joint Planning Commission and City Council meeting.

ROLL CALL

*Brian Barnett, Mayor
Chris McLeod, Planning Manager
Jennifer MacDonald, Planning Specialist*

Present 15 - David Blair, Jason Carlock, Ryan Deel, Carol Morlan, Theresa Mungioni, Marvie Neubauer, David Walker, Deborah Brnabic, Sheila Denstaedt, Gerard Dettloff, Anthony Gallina, Dale Hetrick, Greg Hooper, Scott Struzik and Ben Weaver

Others present:

COMMUNICATIONS

None.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

NEW BUSINESS

2025-0338

Review and Consideration for Recommendation of Distribution of the Draft 2025 Master Land Use Plan

(Roediger memo dated 8/11/25, Master Plan Presentation dated 8/7/25, City of Rochester Hills 2025 Master Plan, Draft Planning Commission Worksession Minutes of 7/15/25, Planning Commission Worksession Minutes of 6/17/25, 4/17/25, 2/18/25, 12/10/24, 11/19/24, 10/15/24, 9/17/24, 7/16/24, 6/18/24, 5/21/24 and 3/19/24, Planning Commission Regular Minutes of 5/20/25 and 12/10/24, and Planning Commission-City Council Joint Minutes of 11/18/24 had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

In attendance representing Giffels Webster were Ian Hogg and Julia Upfall.

Sara Roediger stated that she is really pleased with where the Draft Plan has landed, which upholds all of the principles and policies that make Rochester Hills great, and why everyone chose to live here, raise families, have a workplace, and play. She stressed that tonight's meeting is a step toward finalization. She explained that the State requires a public distribution period where notice is provided to surrounding communities, a public meeting will be held, and the plan will progress to a final draft for adoption hopefully later this year.

She stressed that a lot of changes have been made along the way to the draft to uphold all that everyone loves about Rochester Hills and reinforce those policies and visions. She stated that hopefully the Planning Commission will feel comfortable recommending distribution tonight at this meeting; and Council will recommend distribution at their regular session tonight.

Ian Hogg noted that the Draft Plan reaffirms the character and values in Rochester Hills, and does that by reaffirming the 2018 Plan throughout the whole process. He pointed out that there have been a number of different public input opportunities to provide feedback.

He explained that typically a master plan is a PDF; however, Planning Staff wanted to implement a more interactive website and give people an opportunity to with interact with the plan in a different way. He stated that the Plan uses five different planning neighborhood areas, which are based on the high school districts, and the goal of these neighborhoods is to help residents identify with the neighborhood level of recommendations.

He stated that the plan is broken out into five main components or chapters - Housing, Economic Development, Transportation and Mobility Preservation, Sustainability, and Community Amenities. He noted that the Master Plan is a way to bridge the gap between all of the different plans that have been adopted by the City, including the Transportation and Parks and Recreation Master Plan, and serve as an umbrella to bring all those strategies and recommendations into one plan.

Mr. Hogg noted that filters were used throughout the planning process, which helped influence the discussions and the plan itself. These filter included

age-friendly, sustainability, and innovation, which were used as a way to ensure alignment between public feedback and the discussions with City Staff. He explained the planned vision is called Timeless Tradition. He stated that this vision preserves the existing residential character of the neighborhoods, and maintains stability of the city and suburban lifestyle. He stressed that single family housing is the main type of housing going forward. In addition, they will be looking for ways to strengthen pedestrian connectivity, preserve natural resources, and expect high quality development.

He reviewed the community engagement process, reporting that over the past year and a half, over 2,000 people participated in surveys and in-person events. Community engagement was broken out into five different phases beginning in January of 2024. He noted that based on what was learned from the community engagement opportunities and processes, residents want to increase walkability and safety, preserve natural features, focus on single family housing, and maintain stability and the high level of satisfaction here in Rochester Hills.

He pointed out that the Future Land Use Map illustrates the intended land use for the future, and he explained that this is different from zoning, because zoning is legally binding and provides regulations on what can or cannot be done with property. He stressed that the key component of the 2025 Future Land Use Map is that it took the 2018 categories and consolidated them to ease reading and understanding, and stated that the density of the residential categories did not change. He moved on to the non-residential categories, and explained that Residential Office Flex and Commercial Residential Flex 2 and 3 have now been consolidated to one category and labeled as Mixed Use.

He mentioned the residential categories on the 2025 Future Land Use Map, stating that the updated map better reflects what is currently in the built environment and provides an opportunity where there is still a need for additional single family homes to better reflect the demands of today's market.

Ms. Roediger noted that a lot of the discussion at the Planning Commission level has been about balancing the single family character of the community and allow for some attached units that provide for a different lifestyle. She mentioned that many of the attached single-family ranches promote low maintenance, and appeal to an aging population who do not want a large home with stairs. She pointed out that many of the projects that everyone is already familiar with were developed by Jim Polyzois over the past years, including Crestwyck and Breckenridge, which all have first floor masters and are duplexes.

She stated that while duplexes historically have had a negative connotation, she wanted to point out examples of existing attached residential units that give somewhat of a single family neighborhood character, and she mentioned that there have been members of Council and the commissions that have lived in developments like Sanctuary in the Hills or Kings Cove. She commented that there are examples of fairly low-density attached units that exist and there is a high market demand for that in the right location along busy roads, especially if it can allow for preservation of trees and other natural features while keeping the

same density of surrounding developments. She stressed that they are not looking to increase the density at all, but are looking to change the form of what the houses look like as attached instead of being single. In answer to Ms. Mungoli's question regarding pricing, she commented that Breckenridge started at \$650,000 and went up from there.

Ms. Morlan asked if these would be condominium ownership with a monthly fee.

Ms. Roediger responded that many of them are owner-occupied and they are like a condominium. She mentioned the condominiums in Kings Cove and suggested that she would assume there is a monthly fee as they handle all lawn maintenance and snow removal.

Ms. Neubauer stated that one of the things that changed in the approach after the last meeting was the idea of affordable housing and how it is not an attainable goal for the community. She added that the word "duplex" has very negative connotations, but stressed that along arterial roads, density will not increase and stressed that this will be where the aging population or new homeowners can go if they do not want monster housing in large developments. She suggested incentives to allow a developer to put perhaps 30 percent of their development as single layer housing with ranches or first floor masters.

Ms. Roediger noted that mandating more single floor units or first floor masters would require a Zoning Ordinance amendment.

Ms. Mungoli stated that the City cannot restrict what a builder is going to charge per unit regardless of how many units are in an acre or whether they are off of or on a main road.

Ms. Roediger stated that there is an obvious cost for the land and construction; and that defines how affordable something is for less units. She stated that they are looking at trying to diversify the housing stock because right now the vast majority of the city contains single family detached houses, which are good for a certain segment of the population; however, not for other segments of the population such as empty nesters or young professionals.

Mr. Blair expressed his thanks that this part of the presentation includes photos, and stated that Sanctuary in the Hills is an example that does not strike him as a duplex. He asked if there would be guidance or materials recommendations as to how they would want the duplexes to look, as no one wants to see cookie-cutter duplexes in the city.

Ms. Roediger responded that the City's architectural design guidelines are outdated, and one of the recommendations of the Plan is update the guidelines in the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Neubauer noted that this was the intention of the wording in the Plan, stating that the Planning Commission did not want to see quadplexes and triplexes.

Council President Deel noted that he lives across from Crestwyck which he

finds to be a harmonious development. He cautioned that he loathes to do anything where it would mandate a developer put in so many of these types of units and would be more apt to allow the market to dictate whether there is a demand for it.

Ms. Morlan asked if this would fall into multiple family residential.

Ms. Roediger responded that Kings Cove and Huntington Park are actually four unit buildings. She noted that if someone wanted to do something more like Sanctuary in the Hills and Crestwyck, where it looks and feels like the surrounding neighborhood in terms of density and scale, those could be appropriate along major roads such as along John R and Auburn Road. She stated that this is what is being seen with the infill developments where there might be a street that comes off of a main road with a couple of attached units on it. She commented that they are not seeing large-scale subdivisions like they did in the 1980s and 1990s as there is no room.

Mr. Hogg moved on to give a snapshot of the planning neighborhoods, based on the high school districts.

Ms. Mungioli suggested that Rochester East and Rochester West be renamed Rochester Hills East and West, as they could be confused with the City of Rochester.

Ms. Roediger noted that these districts were based on the school names. She stressed that the thought is that people identify with the high school boundary that their home is in. She stated that the idea is not to have a one-size-fits-all approach because these are very different neighborhoods with different concerns and recommendations.

Mr. Hogg responded that they could review district naming, and highlighted the neighborhoods.

- Adams Neighborhood. 300 people participated in the community engagement activities from the Adams Neighborhood. Action strategies include to maintain and reinvest in existing neighborhoods, preserve natural features, work with safe routes to school and develop Nowicki Park. The Future Land Use Map for the Adams Neighborhood reflects the consolidation of categories, and what has been developed since 2018 to ensure everything is aligned.

Mr. Carlock called out an area that was previously residential and is now labeled multi-family, noting that the definition of multi-family is eight to 12 units per acre. He questioned whether that area was proposed for apartments. He also mentioned an area on the far east side and asked whether Suburban Residential or Neighborhood Residential might be a better term.

Ms. Roediger responded that there were two particular areas that averaged the different types of existing multiple family, including two senior living areas which are probably closer to 20 units per acre. She stated that the intent was not to change what is out there, and suggested that they can better clarify the text.

She noted that the area to the east included Kings Cove which is closer to eight units per acre, more dense than the single family neighborhoods. She reiterated that the language could be fine-tuned to make sure that it is clear that they are not looking to intensify anything. She commented that these areas should be shown correctly that if some disaster came through and took out a development like Kings Cove, they would want them to be able to build it again.

Ms. Mungioli stated that as the map says "Future Land Use", it is not clear to her that it is just being changed to represent what is currently there and could possibly suggest that the density could increase.

Ms. Upfal stated that they would add language to the text to stress the intent that the density does not change.

- Stoney Creek Neighborhood. Mr. Hogg noted that 134 people participated in the public engagement, and some of the action strategies involved improvements to Bloomer and Yates Park. He pointed out that there were areas that were changed to conservation-open space and those are based upon the City potentially buying certain vacant lots to convert to conservation areas.

- Rochester West. Mr. Hogg noted that 472 people participated; and some of the strategies include continuing to improve Innovation Hills, replacing the gazebo at Veteran's Memorial Pointe, and looking toward traffic management options at Avon and Crooks. He noted that a lot of the traffic action items in the Plan are based on the Capital Improvement and Transportation Master Plans. He added that changes are meant to reflect the future land use category consolidation and current land use to better reflect what is there today.

- Rochester East. Mr. Hogg noted that 300 people participated, and strategies include improvements to Spencer Park, passive recreation options at the Eddington property, and working with OPC on potentially looking to improve or expand the transportation service. The Future Land Use map follows the same as the other neighborhoods, reflecting current land uses and the consolidation of categories.

- Avondale. Mr. Hogg noted that 159 people participated here, and action strategies include looking at Livernois to complete pathway gaps, and ensuring that the Zoning Ordinance accommodates flexible office, research and maker spaces. The Future Land Use Map reflects changes as in the other neighborhoods.

Ms. Mungioli asked how the property with the Bebb Oak might be able to be moved to a conservancy park, with nothing built within the root structure of the tree. She stressed that it is the symbol of the City and she would not want multifamily or anything there.

Ms. Roediger responded that the property is privately owned. She pointed out that the south portion of the site calls for residential and there could be single family homes constructed there. She noted that the Bebb Oak is a specimen tree, which is held to the ultimate standard in the ordinance.

Ms. Mungioli suggested whether there could be a way to protect that piece of property, restricting it to residential with two acre lots.

Ms. Roediger reiterated that they can make it a specific recommendation in the action plan or implementation table about ensuring to the greatest legal extent possible the preservation of that tree and the City would not do anything to jeopardize it.

Mr. Hogg stated that the plan goes into much greater detail with each of the highlights, scattered through various chapters. He mentioned design standards, placemaking, and community identity, looking for ways to strengthen the character of nearby development and looking to implement different recommendations from the Gateways and Streetscape Master Plans. He added the 2024 Natural Features Inventory is a guide for preserving natural features. He stated that they look for ways to preserve Rochester Hills' character and history to ensure it is here for future generations.

He commented that the Plan also discusses redevelopment strategies, broken out into three different tiers. The First Tier looks to improve the exterior of existing development to freshen the look. Tier Two is outlot development, looking at potential areas that could be good for future development and provide some recommendations on what that could look like. Tier Three focuses on those sites that are underutilized or obsolete and provides recommendations and strategies on the best way to go about redeveloping those areas.

Ms. Mungioli called out the grocery store retrofit in the Hampton center, noting that it is non-conforming to the rest of the center. She stated that she wanted to ensure that when encouraging a facelift that it does not result in one that looks very different than what surrounds it.

Ms. Roediger stated that the Architectural Guidelines in the Ordinance provide the ability to regulate that. She noted that if there is stronger language in the Zoning Ordinance about architectural building materials, certain things could be required. She commented that the current guidelines are very general and were more written for residential zoning.

Ms. Mungioli noted that regarding outlot development, the City has seen patterns of drive-throughs, banks, or standalone businesses and asked how to balance having the encouragement for development, but having something that is economically viable and not becoming blight.

Ms. Roediger responded that outlot development is not necessarily encouraged, but is allowed. She pointed out that the uses seen in strip mall development have changed over the past 20 years, and noted that there is less retail and more services and restaurants. She added that because of some of the changes in the Zoning Ordinance, hopefully there will be more studios, flip spots, and other recreation-oriented types of businesses.

She mentioned the Kroger shopping center and stated that hopefully the outlot in

front encourages the owner of the center to up his game to compete, noting that from they have let the center's maintenance slide.

Ms. Mungioli stated that she has heard from residents who have questioned why Starbucks was allowed to go in front of Von Maur when that store should be the showcase of the development. She stated that she does not rely on outlots to make her area more walkable, and commented that there is no dance studio she would go to as a senior residing in place.

Ms. Roediger pointed out that Deborah's Stage Door moved into the Kroger shopping center; and she stated that this is a great example of things that can backfill some of these spaces, and it is a convenience as parents can run into Kroger while they wait. She noted that it is a cross synergy of different uses, and she stated that there is a diminishing demand for retail that is being replaced with experience and service-oriented uses.

Ms. Mungioli stated that she wants to ensure that the outlot does not block the view of the primary business that was a part of the original development. She added that she has concern that a lot of the outlots are vacant.

Ms. Roediger pointed out that the property owner has to be the one that initiates an outlot. She mentioned that Meijer has specific sightline rules, and she commented that Starbucks in the Village worked with Von Maur.

Mr. McLeod added that the uses of today are different than the uses when the shopping centers first went in. He noted that restaurant and service-oriented businesses want to be out front and do not want to be in a line. He stated that walkability and ensuring that everything works together physically is a good thing to look at; however, if those restaurants or service businesses stay in the back, they will not make it or will not want to stay there. He mentioned North Hill, noting that Verizon wants to be out front, and was willing to move to the back to wait for a new building. He stated that more of a destination-type user can be in the back of the center. He commented that walkability is important, but it is also making sure that those uses are viable going forward as it continues to evolve.

Mr. Blair commented that the Target center has become a place to store automobiles and he stressed that he does not want to promote this becoming a pattern, especially in parking lots adjacent to other dealerships. He asked if there is a plan to address this and if the City has received complaints.

Mr. McLeod responded that as of right now this is a temporary situation. He stated that Serra is coming toward the completion of their construction, and added that while they could put them behind the center, visibility adds security and could discourage anyone from breaking in to the vehicles. He suggested that going forward, City staff could bring forward options for addressing this issue.

Mr. Blair suggested that the Master Plan could contain recommendations of things that the City does not want to see.

Chairperson Hooper commented that the City is a victim of its own circumstances as it created the parking standards, which led to enormous parking lots that are not needed. He noted that after the Zoning Ordinance was revised, reducing the parking standards made the outlots and other areas of development available. He mentioned that Rochester Hills Chrysler Jeep has been using the area behind Dick's Sporting Goods for several years, noting that this is prime for outlot development and the parking is not needed.

Ms. Roediger commented that the City has a concept plan in that it is beginning to review for an outlot in the Target Center for Chick-fil-A.

Mayor Barnett stated that it is important to not forget that the City is doing things well, based on property values being as high as they have ever been in every corner of the city, and vacancy rates being generally as low as they have ever been. He commented that while no one wants to see all of those cars parked in those lots, the ownership of the properties generally are okay with it because it is a revenue stream. He pointed out that almost all of the dealerships have undergone some pretty significant work and have used the parking. He mentioned that sometimes it is the way the dealerships have to purchase a certain amount of product, and he commented that there would most likely be pushback from both the dealerships and the property owners if it were to go completely away.

Ms. Mungoli noted that there was mention of public-private partnerships, but did not want to see the City say that they are going to give tax breaks, loans, or tax incentives to make it happen.

Mr. Hogg noted that the next step would be for the Planning Commission to make a recommendation to City Council to distribute the Plan, and at Council's Meeting, they would consider approving distribution of the Plan. Further down the line, while the Plan is out for distribution, they would work behind the scenes to get the plan text into the website format and ensure that things are working right. After the public review period, Staff will look at all of the public comment, make any necessary updates to the Plan, and then prior to the Planning Commission hosting the public hearing, a Master Plan Open House would be hosted, with the completed website up and available for residents to come in, experience the Plan, and interact with the Plan here at City Hall. He stated that they look toward October for the Planning Commission to host the public hearing and adopt the Plan and recommend approval to City Council, and November approval at City Council.

Chairperson Hooper noted that he has one Public Comment card, and invited Scot Beaton to speak.

Scot Beaton, 655 Bolinger, recalled that 40 years ago, the Bebb Oak tree was part of the Oakland County right-of-way, and was not private property, with its drip line within the right-of-way. He commented that the proposed Master Plan upzones the land around the Oak from R-4 to suburban residential, allowing for six homes per acre instead of four. He mentioned that per the suggestion, this upzoning, combined with the inability to build single-family homes on mile roads,

permits the construction of quadplexes, triplexes, and duplexes on this property, although single-family homes are still being built on mile roads elsewhere. He also raised concerns about the mixed-use zoning across the street from the Bebb Oak, which he believes encourages a four-story apartment. Additionally, he questioned the zoning of a property on the Auburn side of the Bebb Oak as a strip mall, given it has been zoned retail for 40 years without development. He suggested rezoning this property and supported the idea of a 50-yard inclusion zone around the tree where no construction would be allowed.

Seeing no more public comment, Chairperson Hooper closed Public Comment.

Ms. Roediger responded to Mr. Beaton, noting that there was no zoning happening as a part of this Plan, stressing that it is a planning document. She stated that in terms of the Bebb Oak, it is the same as in the last Plan. She pointed out that the Auburn Road corridor has always been zoned Flex Use Commercial, and it was shown that way on the last Master Plan and is in the zoning that is being kept in terms of zoning it up to Neighborhood Residential. She stressed that the property is single family zoned and would be an example of a site that could accommodate a couple of duplexes at the south end, leaving the north end and the location of the Bebb Oak completely natural. She explained that it would be a great example of allowing some attached residential at the same density as a surrounding neighborhood and allow for a public park-type area around the Bebb Oak. She stressed that it is consistent with every future land use plan that the City has had for this area. She stated that it is not upzoning or even up-planning that property.

Mayor Barnett stated that he wanted to update the group on a common thread that appears on survey after survey of the biggest issues in the country, affordable housing. He commented that affordable housing here is seen as too much as people do not love the idea of higher density. He mentioned that in the City's recent resident survey, one growing concern is the cost of housing and the cost of living. He added that overdevelopment as a concern has dropped over the last two years with traffic congestion remaining about the same. He stated that while everyone is on the same page of what they would like to see here, those in Lansing are in the process of introducing legislation that has bipartisan support entitled the Michigan Home Program that would essentially take away the ability to control development as a local municipality.

He explained that he was on an emergency call this week along with a number of elected officials with the Michigan Municipal League trying to determine what a secondary plan might be if something is going to happen. He noted that while he does not have all the details, the legislation proposes duplexes in any single family home, and they are proposing maximum setbacks of 25 feet in any zoning. He stated that the goal of this, and a reason why it is popular with groups, is that creating affordable housing is difficult and local planning commissions and councils make it difficult for builders to build affordable housing. He explained that what they are proposing is essentially local preemption, making the rules in Lansing, therefore allowing more houses to be built. He pointed out that it could impact funding to the City.

He commented that they are hearing that this has the support it needs to pass and it could dramatically change the course of not just this community, but communities across Michigan under the guise of trying to solve the idea of affordable housing. Lansing is making cities like Rochester Hills, Birmingham and Bloomfield the bad guys as they do not want to go higher, deeper or denser. He stressed that this is a real threat happening right now possibly with a vote before the end of the year. He mentioned that many of the gubernatorial candidates are going to be asked if they are going to support the MI Homes program. He stressed that this is something that will need to continue to be monitored.

Ms. Morlan asked if they are defining affordable housing, noting that the city has some high densities that are fairly expensive.

Mayor Barnett added that what he has heard is that this gives certain developers resources and access to funds to do different things that comes directly from the State, and a lot of the big home builders are in support of it, as density increases their ROI. He commented that in the last Master Plan, they tried to incentivize more affordable housing, but the market tends to drive the product. He stated that legislators are trying to solve a really challenging problem and the result will probably be a solution that is not great.

Mr. Hetrick commented that the group discussed 45 minutes ago that they did not want to mandate certain things happening in Rochester Hills, and it sounds like this proposed legislation will do just that.

Mayor Barnett stated that it goes so far as to eliminate or almost eliminate the petition process for people to oppose it, puts a maximum lot size on developments, and indicates a goal of getting 10,000 new homes built in six months with a lot of incentives from the State for developers and cities that participate. He pointed out that the challenge is that the City may not be able to opt-in or opt-out.

Ms. Mungioli suggested getting more money to clean up the brownfield so this way high-density apartments can be put in the brownfield areas.

Mayor Barnett responded that it's a great program, but other communities are already unhappy that the City received most of the money for the entire state.

Ms. Mungioli associated "affordable" housing with low-income or high-density developments, drawing a comparison to projects in New York, which they do not want in Rochester Hills. She suggested exploring alternative locations for development, such as brownfield sites, where there are large areas available and which might be less desirable for traditional building.

Ms. Roediger likened it to how communities must allow group daycare and senior living homes in residential districts for up to six people by right, with conditional use required for six to 12. She added that the recent energy initiatives for large scale energy production also bypassed local jurisdiction.

She noted that while the City does not have many parcels available, many townships have hundreds of acres where wind farms or large-scale battery facilities can be constructed with local control removed. She noted that they appear to be taking the same approach with affordable housing. She commented that discussions are continuing with the City's lobbyists.

Chairperson Hooper noted that there is a potential motion included in the packet for the recommendation to City Council for distribution of the Draft Master Plan. That motion was made by Mr. Hetrick, and seconded by Ms. Neubauer.

It was noted that this vote was for the Planning Commission members, and that Council would have this item on their agenda this evening for their vote. After calling for a roll call vote of the Planning Commission members, Chairperson Hooper stated that the motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Hetrick, seconded by Neubauer, that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 9 - Neubauer, Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hetrick, Hooper, Struzik and Weaver

Abstain 6 - Blair, Carlock, Deel, Morlan, Mungoli and Walker

Resolved, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby recommends City Council authorize distribution of the Draft 2025 Master Land Use Plan updates as presented at the joint Planning Commission/City Council meeting of August 11, 2025.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

NEXT MEETING DATE

- August 11, 2025, 7 p.m., City Council Regular Meeting
- August 19, 2025, 7 p.m., Planning Commission Regular Meeting

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no business to come before the Planning Commission and City Council, and upon motion by Neubauer, seconded by Denstaedt, Chairperson Hooper adjourned the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

Greg Hooper, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Ryan Deel, President
Rochester Hills City Council

Jennifer MacDonald, Recording Secretary