CITY OF ROCHESTER
400 SIXTH STREET
ROCHESTER, MI 48307

PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
October 5, 2026

---

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

   A meeting of the City of Rochester Planning Commission (PC) was called to order on October 5, 2026, 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Kendziuk.

   PRESENT: Richard Kendziuk, Chairman
   Debbie Jones, Mayor
   Christian Hauser, Council Member
   Dan Bachmann, Commissioner
   David Berletich, Commissioner
   Laura Murphy, Commissioner
   Matt Stone, Commissioner

   ABSENT: David Hardin, Vice Chairman
   Jenna Campbell, Commissioner

   quorum was present.

   Also Present: Nik Banda, City Manager
   Jeff Kragt, City Attorney (Zoom)
   Lori Morgan, McKenna Planner
   Brian D'Annunzio, City Clerk
   Jeremy Peckens, Planning and Zoning Administrator (absent)
   Rose McKinney, Building and Planning Clerk (Zoom)

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

   Chairman Kendziuk led the reciting of the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT NON-AGENDA ITEMS

   There was no public online or in person.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

   A. Consideration of the Minutes of the Planning Commission Meeting of September 8, 2026.

   MOTION by Hauser supported by Jones to approve the minutes of September 8,2026.

   Ayes: Kendziuk, Hauser, Bachmann, Berletich, Jones, Murphy, Stone
   Nays:
   Absent: Campbell, Hardin

   MOTION Carried.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Notice of Public Hearing: 530 Pine St: Site Plan Review.

Lori Morgan from McKenna provided a recap of the previous review of the proposed video-based paid parking system at 530 Pine Street. She explained that concerns remained regarding the concrete islands and bollards installed at the site and their impact on emergency vehicle access. Ms. Morgan stated that the City Planner was deferred to the Fire Department regarding compliance with fire-code and emergency-access requirements. The primary outstanding issue was maintaining adequate emergency access to the property from Main Street.

Dr. Attallah was present he stated that the requested structural analysis and supporting documentation had been submitted to the city. He requested clarification regarding any remaining requirements necessary to lift the stop-work order and asked the Planning Commission to approve the site plan so the project could proceed.

Fire Chief Demoff stated that the Fire Department continued to have concerns regarding emergency vehicle access to the property. He emphasized that the Department's requested changes were supported by specific provisions of the Fire Code and were necessary to ensure adequate access for fire apparatus.

Fire Marshal Shepp explained that the existing access points did not comply with the 2018 Fire Code and that the Department needed to avoid making an already difficult access situation more hazardous. He discussed the need for multiple points of fire department access, the size and turning-radius requirements of the City's fire apparatus, and existing obstacles affecting access to the property.

The Fire Department indicated that the Main Street access was particularly important because alternative access routes presented difficulties for large fire apparatus. The Department expressed concern that the concrete island and bollards would further restrict its ability to maneuver emergency vehicles onto and through the property during an emergency.

Aseel Petros, AEW stated that AEW's structural engineer reviewed the submitted structural report and found the information to be generic and unclear. She explained that although the report referenced a 100-pound-per-square-foot design live load, it did not clearly identify what portion of the building that load applied to.

Aseel further stated that AEW requested a more specific analysis using the City of Rochester's heaviest fire apparatus, including the axle loads of the vehicle. Those loads would need to be compared with the building's slab and framing system to determine whether the structure could safely withstand the weight of the fire apparatus.

She indicated that the submitted report did not contain this analysis and that additional information would be necessary before AEW could make a definitive recommendation regarding the structural capacity of the parking deck.

The Public Hearing was opened at 7:22 p.m.

There was no public online or in person.

Public Hearing was closed at 7:23 p.m.

Motion by Hauser, supported by Berletich to approve site plan, contingent on the following four conditions. Once those four conditions are met then work can commence.

No work can commence until the following four items are completed.

- Remove the concrete entrance island located at the N. Main Street entrance to Rochester River Square, 530 Pine Street, in its entirety.
- Remove all bollards associated with the concrete island configuration at the Main Street entrance throat.
- Restore the entrance lane width to a minimum unobstructed width of 20 feet in compliance with IFC Section 503.2.1.
- Provide written confirmation of compliance to the Fire Chief upon completion of the removal.

Ayes: Kendziuk, Hauser, Bachmann, Berletich, Jones, Murphy, Stone
Nays:
Absent: Campbell, Hardin

MOTION Carried.

6. CONSIDERATIONS

A. Consideration of 136 Walnut: Site Plan Review & Payment in Lieu of Parking. Request to Set Public Hearing.

The applicant has requested removal from tonight's agenda

Motion by Jones, supported by Stone to remove 136 Walnut from tonight's agenda

Ayes: Kendziuk, Hauser, Bachmann, Berletich, Jones, Murphy, Stone
Nays:
Absent: Campbell, Hardin

MOTION Carried.

B. Consideration to set a public hearing for the proposed zoning ordinance and zoning map changes.

`

John Jackson and Lori Morgan from McKenna were present. It was explained that a joint working group consisting of Planning Commission and City Council members had reviewed the draft Zoning Ordinance and zoning map and recommended revisions to both the ordinance text and map.

Lori further explained that the proposed revisions reflected comments received during the joint Planning Commission and City Council discussions. Due to the extent of the changes, particularly the substantive amendments to the zoning map, staff determined that the revised ordinance and map should be returned to the Planning Commission for consideration and a public hearing.

The Commission discussed its role in the proposed Master Plan update. The Commission would provide local knowledge, guidance and support throughout the process and assist with community engagement.

Lori explained that because the proposed Master Plan would be a targeted update rather than a complete rewrite, public engagement would focus on specific topics through in-person workshops. A public survey was also suggested related to a housing study to obtain more detailed public input.

Following discussion of the proposed revisions, it was recommended the Planning Commission:

- Review the proposed housekeeping amendments to the zoning ordinance.
- Conduct the required public hearing.
- Consider any public comments received.
- Recommend the zoning ordinance to City Council for adoption, as presented or with any modifications deemed appropriate.

Motion by Hauser, supported by Jones, to set a public hearing at the next available meeting.

Ayes: Kendziuk, Hauser, Bachmann, Berletich, Jones, Murphy, Stone
Nays:
Absent: Campbell, Hardin

MOTION Carried.

7.MISCELLANEOUS

A. Zoning Ordinance Section 2118 amendment update.

Chairman Kendziuk discussed the ongoing work of the Section 2118 Subcommittee. It was reported that the subcommittee had met with nearly all City Council members and was continuing to refine the proposed standards. Additional graphics were being developed to better illustrate the intent of the regulations, with remaining issues including building height and the painting of brick and masonry.

The subcommittee anticipated continuing its work and presenting a revised draft for consideration at the November meeting. Commissioners expressed appreciation for the work completed to date and noted that the graphics illustrating existing buildings compared with potential improvements were helpful in demonstrating the desired consistency and appearance along Main Street.

The Commission also discussed whether the Section 2118 amendments should be incorporated with the pending Zoning Ordinance. The consensus was to proceed with the Zoning Ordinance separately and address Section 2118 afterward as an immediate amendment, as the Section 2118 revisions were not yet ready for consideration.

B. Discussion of 2027 Planning Goals, including proposed Master Plan elements and work plan.

Lori reviewed the proposed 2027 Planning Commission goals and the anticipated scope of the Master Plan update. The proposed goals included continued updates to the Zoning Ordinance, review of administrative site plan procedures, consideration of architectural standards for districts outside the Central Business District, a five-year Master Plan review, a citywide housing study, and a South Street Subarea Plan.

The proposed Master Plan update would be a targeted update rather than a complete rewrite. The Planning Commission would serve as a steering committee and periodically review the work, provide comments and local knowledge, and assist with community engagement. The proposed scope included an implementation status report evaluating the existing Master Plan, a housing study examining current and projected housing needs, and a South Street Subarea Plan addressing development opportunities, the floodplain, site planning and implementation.

The Commission discussed the importance of maintaining involvement and oversight of the housing and South Street studies while allowing the planning consultants to complete much of the technical work. It was also suggested that City Council be involved during the process so that the Planning Commission and Council remain coordinated as the plan develops.

The Commission supported developing a phased work plan identifying the individual components of the Master Plan update, the anticipated schedule and the cost associated with each phase. Staff indicated that a more formal proposal and fiscal analysis could be prepared for review at a future meeting. Because the work was not currently included in the budget, City Council would ultimately need to consider the necessary funding.

There was not an update on the Albertson property.

8.PUBLIC COMMENT
There was no public online or in person that wished to speak.

9.ADJOURNMENT
Hearing there is no further business, the meeting was Adjourned at 9:50 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,
Rose McKinney, Building and Planning Clerk