UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2026-0009 Public Hearing and Request for Recommendation for Preliminary Site Condominium Approval - File No. PSP2023-0010 - for Grandview condominiums, a proposed development of 16 detached single family residences on approximately 6.0 acres of land, located at 1548 W. Auburn Rd., Parcel No. 15-28-300-059, on the north side of Auburn between Crooks and Livernois, zoned R-4 One Family Residential with the MR Mixed Residential Overlay; Vito Munaco, Grandview of Rochester Hills, LLC, Applicant

(Staff Report dated 10/12/26, Reviewed Plans for 10/20/26 Meeting, Updated Development Application, Updated Environmental Impact Statement, Staff Report dated 1/7/26, Reviewed Plans pt. 1, Reviewed Plans pt. 2 & ASTI Report dated 11/26/25, AEW Letter dated 11/21/25, Development Application, Environmental Impact Statement, WRC Letter dated 3/17/23, MDOT Preliminary Approval 8/17/23, Public Hearing Notice 10/20/26, Public Hearing Notice 1/13/26, PC Minutes 1/13/26, PC Minutes 5/19/15, SUPPL Staff Presentation 1/13/26, Public Comment 10/20/26 meeting, and Public Comment 1/13/26 meeting, had been placed on record and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

Present for the applicant were Sydney Kanan, Anderson, Eckstein & Westrick, Inc. (AEW), and Scott Lozon, Grandview Development, LLC.

Chairperson Hooper introduced the unfinished business item regarding a public hearing and request for recommendation for preliminary site condominium approval for Grandview Condominiums. The proposed development consists of 16 detached single-family residences on approximately six acres of land located at 1548 West Auburn Road. Chairperson Hooper invited the applicants to introduce themselves. Ms. Sydney Kanan introduced herself as the consulting engineer for the project and Mr. Scott Lozon introduced himself as the representative for Grandview Development.

Mr. McLeod presented the staff report, noting that the project was last brought before the Commission in January. He outlined four reviews and approvals for consideration: a preliminary one-family residential detached condominium, a wetland use permit, the associated natural feature setback review, and a tree removal permit. Mr. McLeod stated the property is zoned R-4 One-Family Residential and contains the MR Mixed Residential Overlay district. He clarified that the proposed site condominiums are detached single-family homes, and noted that the applicant revised their plans to reduce the total number of units from 17 down to 16 following the previous discussion regarding overall project density. Mr. McLeod explained that the applicant also removed an extension of the cross access street along the north end of the property to the east. Consequently, the requested wetland use permit impact was reduced from 18,267 square feet down to 15,822 square feet, and the requested tree removals were reduced from 137 to 134 based on the plan revisions.

Mr. McLeod then provided an overview of the site's surrounding area. He noted the Saddlebrook development to the west and explained that a cross connection

to Sage on the west side of the site would ultimately connect to the proposed project if approved. He identified industrial uses to the north, Auburn Road to the south, and three single-family residential parcels located between the proposed project and Saddlebrook.

Mr. McLeod detailed the overall zoning scheme for the area, indicating that the property to the north is zoned Industrial, while the subject site and surrounding areas are zoned R-4 One-Family Residential with an MR Mixed Residential Overlay district. He explained that the MR overlay district allows for the reconfiguration of housing layout and density and is typically reserved for properties of 10 acres or more, noting that the applicant is requesting a modification of this acreage requirement.

Mr. McLeod reviewed the revised wetland plan, pointing out the areas of proposed wetland removal and preservation. He clarified that a wetland in the middle of the site is not regulated by the City, while the wetland at the north end of the property is City-regulated. He identified specific hatched areas on the plan designating wetlands to be preserved and darker crosshatched areas indicating wetlands proposed to be disturbed. Mr. McLeod noted that resetting the natural feature setback is included as part of these impacts under the wetland use permit and natural feature setback modification requests.

Pointing out the cross connection of Sage, Mr. McLeod explained that the developer modified the sidewalk configuration to limit further impact to the wetlands, with the road extending out to Auburn Road. He then presented the tree removal permit site plan, identifying the regulated trees on the site. He stated that the largest portion of tree preservation is occurring on the north end of the site within the wetland area, while regulated trees located in the middle of the site are proposed for removal. Mr. McLeod confirmed that the plan was reviewed under the City tree preservation ordinance, which requires 40 percent tree preservation, and City review determined that the project meets this requirement.

Mr. McLeod then reviewed the final configuration of the site plan, highlighting the main drive, the cross connection of Sage to the north, and the western connection that would align with Sage and Saddlebrook. He explained that Unit 17, previously located next to the detention pond, was removed from the plan, providing additional open space adjacent to the stormwater detention facility. He also pointed out a proposed open space amenity, a seating area, and an extension of the walking pathway for the development. He emphasized that the primary point for the Commission to consider with this plan is the reduction from 17 to 16 units, as discussed in the January meeting, and the overall reduction of density for the site.

Mr. McLeod then presented the landscape plan, noting that the applicant has met the landscape buffer planting requirements along the west and east property lines, as well as the stormwater pond and street tree planting requirements. He addressed a concern raised at the previous Planning Commission meeting regarding a neighbor's driveway that encroaches onto the southern portion of the subject site. Mr. McLeod stated his understanding that the applicant intends to allow the driveway to remain in its current location

without impacting the neighbor. Consequently, the landscape plan would need to be modified to route around the driveway, and the master deed legal documents would need to reflect the driveway's permanent presence on the condominium property.

Mr. McLeod reviewed the proposed home statistics, noting they would be approximately 1,900-square-foot, three-bedroom units, with price points yet to be determined due to market fluctuations. He highlighted that a significant consideration for the site is the requested modification to the MR district acreage requirement, as the site is approximately six acres and the ordinance requires 10 acres. He explained that the Commission must evaluate the surrounding area, context, density, and development patterns, utilizing conditional use requirements as a guide to determine if the modification should be granted. Mr. McLeod concluded his presentation by summarizing the reduced project impacts, noting the wetland use permit request was reduced from over 18,200 square feet to 15,800 square feet with 336 linear feet of natural feature setback, tree removals were reduced from 137 to 134, and replacement tree requirements were reduced from 139 to 136. He then offered to answer any questions from the Commission.

Ms. Brnabic inquired about the percentage of trees saved on the site, noting the City tree ordinance requires 40 percent preservation. Mr. McLeod replied that 47 percent of the trees were saved. He explained that trees located within the designated building envelopes are exempt from the 40 percent preservation requirement, though they still require replacement.

Ms. Brnabic confirmed with Mr. McLeod that 134 trees are being removed, including two specimen trees. She noted the history of the property, stating that 125 trees were removed in 2005 for a project that did not move forward, resulting in a significant percentage of trees being removed from the property over time. Ms. Brnabic then asked if the Sage Lane connector road would be constructed at the expense of the developer or the City.

Mr. McLeod clarified that the road configuration shown on the plan would be at the developer's cost. He explained that any future connection between Sage, the proposed development, and Saddlebrook to the west would rely on the future development of the three private parcels located in between them. He stated that the City would not connect the roads across private property, but the connection would be completed if those individual properties are developed in the future.

Ms. Neubauer asked staff for clarification regarding a reference in the staff report to an August 21, 2026 letter, noting that the letter was not attached to the agenda. Ms. Roediger explained that the reference pertained to a Street Committee letter. She stated that whenever a new street is proposed, the Street Committee reviews the plans to ensure the proposed street name does not already exist within the City, preventing confusion for fire and emergency access.

Ms. Neubauer inquired if one of the proposed names was already being used in the City. Mr. McLeod replied that the street name in question is Sage. He

explained that until the developments eventually connect, there would be two disconnected streets named Sage. However, he noted that assigning different names now would make it difficult to change residents' addresses and billing information later when the streets do connect. He indicated that the matter could be resolved with the Fire Department. Ms. Neubauer stated that she simply wanted to understand the condition since it is included in the proposed plan.

Chairperson Hooper announced that the item requires a public hearing and requested that anyone wishing to address the Commission submit a public comment card. He noted that four emails regarding the project were received from Annette Gilson, Catherine Pokropek, Stephan Pang, and Katie Page, which will be included in the record. Mr. Gary Cunningham stated that he also submitted an email for the package, which Chairperson Hooper confirmed was included. Chairperson Hooper then opened the public hearing, establishing a three-minute time limit for speakers.

Gary Cunningham, 1648 Sage Lane - Mr. Cunningham introduced himself as a resident of Sage Lane in the Saddlebrook subdivision, noting his home is located in the northeastern corner in line with the subject property's wetland area. He expressed concern regarding the proposed density and the size of the houses, stating that Saddlebrook contains a similar amount of land but only has 10 homes, whereas the applicant is proposing 16. He questioned why an exception is being made for a six-acre parcel rather than requiring the development to follow the same rules applied to Saddlebrook. Mr. Cunningham also raised significant concerns regarding regional drainage issues, noting that property owners to the east and west have complained about it for years. He explained that the dense clay soil in the area prevents percolation and forces water to run off. Because the highest elevation is Livernois Road located three-quarters of a mile away, water drains downhill across the subject site and into Saddlebrook. He shared that Saddlebrook floods every spring, recalling that when his basement was poured in 2023, it filled with three feet of runoff water from the east despite there being no rain. Finally, Mr. Cunningham pointed out that the industrial properties to the north consist entirely of hardscape, and when their parking lots flood during heavy rains, the excess water drains south directly into Saddlebrook.

Rhonda Yates, 56 Texas Avenue - Ms. Yates addressed the Commission to speak in opposition to the development as currently proposed. She stated that while she appreciated the developer reducing the number of homes and proposed wetland impacts, the revised plan still permanently alters 0.36 acres of wetlands and disturbs 336 linear feet of the natural feature setback. Ms. Yates questioned whether these environmental impacts are necessary and what public benefit would be derived from them. She noted that the staff report described the future extension of Sage Lane as a greater public good than preserving the affected wetlands, but pointed out that the road connection depends on neighboring properties being developed in the future, which may never occur. She expressed concern about asking residents to accept permanent environmental damage today for a potential future benefit that might not materialize.

Ms. Yates also shared her concerns regarding the requested modification to the

Mixed Residential Overlay, noting that the property is 5.6 acres while the ordinance generally requires 10 acres, and she worried about the precedent set by making exceptions to City development standards while permitting significant impacts to natural resources. She stated that while she is not opposed to responsible development according to City rules, she does not believe the current proposal adequately justifies the trade-offs, emphasizing that the ecological functions of wetlands and trees cannot be replaced by landscaping or payments to a tree fund. Ms. Yates concluded by urging the Commission not to recommend approval of the development.

Theresa Pounders, 2866 Avalon Road - Ms. Pounders addressed the Commission and expressed sympathy for the previous speaker from Saddlebrook, recalling that the subdivision was built on a wetland and that the promised flood control measures for those residents have failed. She questioned the modification to the acreage requirement and disagreed that the project was originally delayed in 2005 due to a recession. She also stated that the City owned the property in 2005 and questioned if the City sold the land to the current developer.

Ms. Pounders expressed doubt regarding the proposed road connection, noting it would require crossing a neighbor's property and gaining agreement from Saddlebrook residents, who she believes would not want to connect to this new development. She also asked if the project was a Pulte development. Furthermore, she expressed concern over building new homes when other approved or completed developments, such as the duplexes at Hamlin Road and Livernois Road, are currently sitting vacant.

Ms. Pounders noted that the property is located in the Avondale School District. She suggested that a $700,000 price point would result in approximately $12,000 in annual property taxes, which, combined with homeowner association fees, would deter buyers looking to downsize. She also cited concerns about traffic congestion, backups, and frequent vehicle crashes near the school and at intersections along Auburn Road. Ms. Pounders concluded by stating her opposition to continued building in the City, suggesting a halt on new residential developments while existing projects remain unoccupied.

Chairperson Hooper officially closed the public hearing and initiated a discussion to address the questions raised during public comment. He first addressed the density of the proposed development, noting that the 16 proposed units equate to 2.66 units per acre. Chairperson Hooper stated his understanding that the neighboring Saddlebrook development was developed at a higher density of 2.95 units per acre. Mr. McLeod corrected this figure, explaining that Saddlebrook contains 10 units on approximately five acres, making its density closer to two units per acre. He attributed the previous 2.95 figure to a discrepancy where the City GIS system calculated density based on actual parcels rather than gross acreage. Chairperson Hooper noted that both properties are zoned R-4 One-Family Residential, though a developer always has the option to build at a lower density.

Mr. McLeod explained that the MR Mixed Residential Overlay district allows for a different density calculation than the underlying R-4 district. He stated that as

long as setbacks and other applicable ordinances are met, the MR district provides more leniency in achieving density, though the requested acreage modification remains a significant consideration for the Commission. Chairperson Hooper pointed out that standard R-4 zoning allows a theoretical density of 4.25 units per acre if site conditions are perfectly ideal, which Mr. McLeod confirmed.

Addressing concerns regarding the size of the proposed homes, Chairperson Hooper asked for clarification on the current proposal. Mr. McLeod stated that the applicant's plans feature homes ranging from 1,900 to 2,000 square feet. He noted that this is a typical size for empty nesters seeking lower-maintenance homes with upgraded finishes as they downsize from larger 3,000 to 5,000-square-foot homes.

Chairperson Hooper then addressed the public's concerns regarding drainage, asking for clarification on how adjacent properties currently discharge and what stormwater management responsibilities apply to developments in the City. Mr. Boughton explained that the proposed drainage system is designed to capture runoff from the east, encompassing approximately nine acres, and discharge it south to Auburn Road into a drain owned and maintained by the Water Resource Commission. Mr. Boughton clarified that the undeveloped parcels located between the proposed development and Saddlebrook will continue to drain to the west. However, he emphasized that the proposed development should improve the overall drainage situation for Saddlebrook residents by actively capturing those nine acres of runoff and redirecting it to Auburn Road rather than allowing it to continue flowing westward.

Chairperson Hooper inquired whether the Saddlebrook development accounted for adjacent drainage when sizing their pond and capture systems. Mr. Boughton responded that he did not have the historical data on Saddlebrook readily available, but assumed the system should have been sized accordingly to capture drainage from the east. He suggested that the high groundwater table in the area likely causes the reported issues, noting that some homes are built with basements when the ground conditions are not suitable for them.

Chairperson Hooper then asked about the industrial properties to the north, stating they are not permitted to discharge stormwater to the south. Mr. Boughton explained that the industrial site utilizes a pump system on the east side that discharges to the north. However, he noted that the pump system has failed numerous times due to a lack of maintenance by the industrial subdivision's association, which has likely contributed to flooding on the properties to the south. Chairperson Hooper suggested this sounded like an enforcement issue, to which Mr. Boughton agreed.

Chairperson Hooper addressed the public concerns regarding wetland disturbance, tree removal, and traffic. He stated that these concerns are common whenever property in the City is developed from its natural state, pointing out that the construction of existing residents' homes also required tree removals, potential wetland impacts, and contributed to traffic. He emphasized that the Commission's responsibility is to balance the pros and cons of a development while upholding private property rights, ensuring landowners can

develop their property in accordance with City laws and ordinances. Regarding the proposed Sage Lane road extension, Chairperson Hooper noted that stub streets anticipating future connections are a standard practice in the City. Reflecting on his 27 years on the Commission, he stated that some stub streets eventually connect while others do not, and he asked staff to explain the general philosophy regarding road extensions across properties not currently proposed for development.

Mr. McLeod explained that if a connection is not proposed during the development phase, the opportunity is permanently lost. He outlined that interconnecting subdivisions helps reduce traffic on main roadways by keeping local trips internal. For example, residents traveling between the proposed Grandview development and Saddlebrook would not need to enter Auburn Road, which reduces turning movements and increases the overall efficiency of the roadway. He noted that interconnections also improve child safety by allowing children to travel to adjacent subdivisions to visit friends without needing to use exterior pathway systems along main roads. Mr. McLeod stated that the ultimate goal of interconnecting roads is to reduce traffic, congestion, and pressure on the City's main road system. He acknowledged that while some residents may view a stub street as a deterrent if they expected a permanent cul-de-sac, the connections are designed to be beneficial to both the City and its residents by alleviating traffic and increasing safety.

Chairperson Hooper addressed the concern regarding the property's acreage, noting that the Commission has previously approved projects on parcels smaller than 10 acres. Mr. McLeod clarified that the request is not for a conditional approval, but rather a modification built into the ordinance, confirming that similar modifications have been granted for other subdivisions and site condominiums in the past.

Chairperson Hooper then inquired about the public comment suggesting the City previously owned the property. Ms. Roediger explained that a search of the BS&A site showed a transaction in 2005 from Grandview to the City of Rochester Hills for one dollar, which typically indicates a dedication of the right-of-way for road access along Auburn Road. Chairperson Hooper concurred, and also addressed previous public comments regarding the Avondale School District, stating his strong disagreement and expressing his full support for what he considers an excellent school district.

Chairperson Hooper then invited the applicant to add any further comments. Ms. Kanan stated that the applicant listened to the Commission's feedback from January and reduced the development by one unit to lower the overall density, noting that this density is what makes the project financially feasible for them. She explained that their team met with the Planning, Engineering, and Fire Departments regarding the Sage Lane connection, wetland impacts, and the reduction of the sub-street to the east. She expressed confidence that the resulting plan satisfies the developer as well as all City departments, including meeting the Fire Department's life safety and truck turning movement requirements.

Ms. Kanan also addressed the neighboring Hathaway property's driveway to the

west, apologizing that the current packet did not reflect their intent to allow the driveway to remain. She confirmed that the plans have been updated to retain the driveway and incorporate the neighbor's landscaping requests, specifically the omission of pine trees. She stated that they have shared the plans with the neighbor and believe she is satisfied with the accommodations. Finally, Ms. Kanan addressed the proposed homes, clarifying that they are not Pulte homes. She stated that the updated plans feature a sophisticated design with an all-brick exterior and windows on all sides to avoid blank exterior walls, which she noted elevates the project based on the Commission's previous feedback. Ms. Kanan concluded by stating their team put their best foot forward to reach a compromise and welcomed any questions from the Commission.

Mr. Lozon thanked the Commission and stated that after the last meeting, he took the passion of Commissioners Neubauer and Brnabic to heart and focused on resolving key project issues. He noted that retaining the neighbor's driveway and minimizing tree impacts were top priorities. He explained that any development on the site would require some wetland encroachment for a fire turnaround, but their team met with Mr. McLeod, Mr. Boughton, and the Fire Chief to ensure the proposed design represents the absolute minimum impact possible.

Mr. Lozon stated that the density has been reduced to the lowest feasible level for today's market. He expressed confidence in a strong demand for this type of housing from residents wanting to remain in the City, projecting base prices to exceed $699,000 for high-quality, all-brick homes. He detailed the product's height restrictions, noting that any upper bedrooms would be built into the roofline with a dormer to minimize the overall height of the homes. Mr. Lozon also addressed earlier public comments regarding the Avondale School District, expressing his respect for the district and praising its hardworking teachers, parents, and students.

Regarding traffic and density, Mr. Lozon argued that this product type, which he likened to an active adult community for individuals over 55, would generate significantly less traffic than a development of 14 or 15 larger homes. Finally, he expressed doubt that the adjacent property will be developed in the future, suggesting it holds higher value as a large estate lot, though he acknowledged the necessity of making provisions for future road connections. He concluded by thanking the Commission for their time.

Chairperson Hooper asked for clarification regarding the neighboring driveway, questioning if it would be handled through deeded ownership or an easement. Ms. Kanan responded that an easement will be granted through the condominium's master deed and will be reflected on the site plan and engineering plans. Chairperson Hooper then opened Commission deliberation and recognized Commissioner Neubauer.

Ms. Neubauer stated that she appreciated the applicant characterizing her and Ms. Brnabic as passionate, taking it as a compliment. She addressed the project's density, expressing that reducing the development by a single unit did not represent the applicant's best foot forward. Ms. Neubauer recalled that the Commission postponed the item 10 months prior to allow the applicant to

mitigate the Commission's concerns. She argued that upgrading to a brick exterior with windows on all sides was not a special accommodation, but rather a standard materiality requirement expected of all developers to remain harmonious with the surrounding area. She noted that the original proposed product was subpar, and the current design merely meets basic grade-level expectations.

Ms. Neubauer reminded the applicant that she had previously suggested reducing the development to 12 units, while Ms. Brnabic had specifically requested the removal of units nine and ten to lessen wetland impacts. She noted the applicant failed to remove the requested units, only reducing the count by one instead of four or five. Ms. Neubauer observed that a price point was not provided in this presentation, unlike the previous meeting. She agreed with earlier public comments that property taxes in the Avondale School District are higher than those of Rochester Hills residents. She argued that offering a smaller home at a higher price point does not constitute true downsizing, as buyers would uncap their property taxes and ultimately pay more.

Regarding the requested acreage modification, Ms. Neubauer stated that past approvals of modifications do not mandate granting them for every development. She referenced a recent similar case where a developer attempted to build too densely for the area, stating she believes the same is happening with this project. Ms. Neubauer declared she will not support the development, emphasizing that the Commission provided 10 months for the developer to mitigate wetland impacts and reduce density, but they refused due to financial feasibility. She stated she does not want to establish a precedent of allowing negative wetland impacts under these circumstances, and announced her intention to make a motion to deny the project rather than postpone it again, after hearing from her fellow Commissioners.

Ms. Kanan asked to respond and stated that she respects Commissioner Neubauer's position but wholeheartedly believes the development team put their best foot forward. She explained that the location of units nine and ten is where City departments collectively determined the road must be placed. Because of this required road placement, removing units nine and ten would still result in the exact same amount of wetland impact. Ms. Kanan expressed that holding the development to that specific threshold is an unreasonable expectation.

Commissioner Neubauer responded by explaining that City departments make evaluations based on specific guidelines and are obligated to grant approval if those criteria are met. She noted, however, that the practical application of those guidelines often looks different in real life. As an example, she stated that while a project might technically meet Fire Department code, firefighters have expressed that highly dense developments make it difficult to adequately protect public safety. Commissioner Neubauer emphasized her position representing residents as a Councilmember on the City Council, and serving as their designated representative on the Planning Commission. She cautioned the applicant that even if the project receives a recommendation of approval from the Planning Commission, which she stated she hopes it does not for the sake of the residents she represents, it will likely face a difficult time surviving a vote at the City Council level.

Mr. Lozon requested to respond, which Chairperson Hooper allowed. Mr. Lozon stated that he respects Commissioner Neubauer's passion for protecting residents. Addressing the fire safety concern, he noted that if the distance between homes is an issue, connected condominiums should theoretically never be built. Regarding property taxes, Mr. Lozon argued that buyers make their own financial decisions and budget accordingly when purchasing a $700,000 home in a higher-tax district. He explained that his team conducts deep market studies to determine demand, noting that the proposed product features an all-brick exterior and height restrictions, and will likely benefit the site's drainage. He questioned whether building 12 to 14 larger, two-story homes would be a more appropriate use of the density. Mr. Lozon emphasized that the current proposal is a high-demand product that sells well and will generate less traffic than other potential developments, reiterating that any development on the site will have some wetland impact due to fire safety requirements.

Commissioner Neubauer responded by clarifying that she did not address the drainage issue because she agrees a new development will help resolve it, though she noted this would be true for any development on the site. Regarding taxes and housing demand, she stated that the City conducts its own studies on what residents are looking for, contrasting her focus on what is feasible and necessary for residents with the developer's focus on their own financial feasibility. Commissioner Neubauer concluded by stating that after the Commission provided 10 months for the applicant to mitigate concerns, the reduction of only one unit, the omission of a price point, and the addition of brick exteriors and windows was simply not enough to earn her support. She then deferred to the rest of the Commission.

Commissioner Brnabic stated she agreed with much of Commissioner Neubauer's assessment. She questioned the applicant's previous claim that the presence of units nine and ten does not affect the wetlands due to the required road placement, noting that the grading activity for those specific units would indeed impact the wetlands. She asked Mr. McLeod if removing units nine and ten would allow the Coriander road extension to be shortened and the connector road to be shifted further south, thereby reducing the extent of the wetland impacts.

Mr. McLeod confirmed that if the Commission provided that direction, the road could be redesigned. He explained that while the goal is to make the western connection to Sage Lane as seamless as possible, the road could be curved or maneuvered if units nine and ten were removed, which would potentially further reduce wetland impacts on the north end of the site.

Ms. Brnabic emphasized that removing units nine and ten was a basic request from the previous meeting that would have decreased both overall density and wetland impacts, whereas the applicant chose to remove unit 17 instead. She also pointed out that the applicant failed to correct the environmental impact statement as previously requested; she noted that part 3B incorrectly states the property is zoned MR with an R-4 underlay, when it should read that it is zoned R-4 with an MR mixed residential overlay.

Ms. Brnabic expressed significant concern regarding the requested acreage modification for the MR overlay, highlighting that the property is roughly four acres short of the 10-acre requirement. She questioned why the MR overlay was ever applied to a property of that size. While she acknowledged the developer's focus on profitability and appreciated the upgraded full brick and stone exteriors, she emphasized that the Commission must prioritize the best possible development for the community. Ms. Brnabic also voiced personal doubts regarding the market demand for a 1,900-square-foot ranch home priced between $700,000 and $750,000, though she acknowledged that buyers will make their own choices. She concluded her remarks by thanking the applicant for working with the neighbors to retain their driveway.

Mr. Struzik inquired about the eastern portion of the Sage Lane stub road that was removed from the plan to preserve wetlands, asking if the area would remain a City right-of-way without a paved road or if it would belong to the homeowners association. Mr. McLeod and Ms. Kanan clarified that there would be no public right-of-way heading east; instead, the developer would provide a sanitary easement and a sidewalk connection, while the unpaved area would become open space owned by the condominium.

Mr. Struzik then asked about the western stub road, questioning if it needed to extend its full proposed length to the west or if it was only required to serve as a Fire Department turnaround. Mr. McLeod explained that if the Commission or City Council determines the western street connection is undesirable, some form of approved turnaround, such as a cul-de-sac or T-turn, would still be required at the termination of Coriander. Mr. Struzik asked if there was any precedent for the City retaining the western stub as a right-of-way and holding developer funds in an escrow account to construct the street only if the adjacent property is developed. Mr. McLeod stated that while maintaining the right-of-way to allow a future developer to construct the road is feasible, the City would likely not agree to hold monetary commitments for an indefinite timeframe.

Mr. Struzik expressed his support for extending the sidewalk beyond the end of the stub road to connect with potential future developments, noting that connected sidewalks help establish cohesive neighborhoods over time. However, he suggested that routing the sidewalk across to the north side of Sage Lane might be unnecessary, and eliminating that crossing could help further mitigate site impacts. Finally, Mr. Struzik asked for confirmation regarding the proposed home floor plans. Mr. Lozon confirmed that all homes will feature a minimum of two bedrooms and two bathrooms on the main floor, with some including an additional half bath, along with an option to add a third bedroom and a full bathroom upstairs.

Mr. Struzik addressed the public's flooding concerns, stating his belief that capturing, managing, and slowly releasing stormwater on the site would improve conditions for downhill neighbors to the west. He also commended the applicant for working with the neighboring property owner regarding the encroaching driveway. He noted that while the applicant was not required to provide an accommodation on their own property, their willingness to compromise and help

a neighbor was highly appreciated.

Mr. Struzik discussed the project's density, stating that despite the minor reduction from 17 to 16 units, he still considers it a low-density development of single-family detached homes. He emphasized that the City needs more housing variety to complement its existing stock. He suggested that the proposed project provides this variety, offering options that could serve as upscale starter homes or ideal residences for empty nesters looking to age in place, specifically highlighting the community's need for homes with first-floor bedrooms.

Addressing potential conflicts between connected subdivisions, Mr. Struzik shared his personal experience living in a City neighborhood that features a wide mixture of home sizes across multiple homeowner associations. He described this housing variety as beneficial, noting that it creates an environment where younger families can assist older residents who are aging in place. Finally, Mr. Struzik expressed his support for the proposed stub street. He acknowledged that the resulting impact on the wetlands is unfortunate, but stated his strong preference for building connected, cohesive communities rather than allowing future developments to become isolated islands requiring their own separate curb cuts onto Auburn Road.

Mr. Lozon responded to Mr. Struzik, stating that statistically across the country, 2.85 units per acre is considered low density for new single-family home projects. He expressed respect for the Commission's decision-making process but emphasized his belief that the proposed project is high quality, will service and uplift the area, and features a product in high demand. Mr. Lozon acknowledged the City's market studies but noted that developers rely heavily on their own internal statistics when investing millions of dollars into a project. He expressed confidence that the development will be a successful community, beautify the area, maintain a low impact on traffic, and introduce a housing product currently unavailable on that side of town.

Mr. Struzik then addressed earlier concerns regarding how project price points interact with property taxes. He stated that the market will ultimately dictate success, explaining that if taxes are too high for buyers to afford a mortgage, the homes will not sell, which would force the developer to lower the price point. He expressed that this market dynamic should not be a primary concern for the Commission. Mr. Struzik acknowledged that while the prices seem high, they reflect the current housing shortage where a lack of new construction drives up costs across the board. He concluded his remarks by stating that the current proposal is a significant improvement over the previous version. While he respected the differing opinions of his fellow Commissioners, Mr. Struzik stated his support for the development, affirming his belief that it would be a good thing for the City.

Mr. Hetrick thanked Chairperson Hooper and expressed appreciation for the applicant's confidence in their product, their understanding of the market, and their efforts to reduce density. He asked Mr. McLeod if reducing the development from 16 to 14 units would still leave the density per acre in question under the MR district. Mr. McLeod clarified that the density would

remain compliant within the MR overlay district; the actual question is whether the project aligns with the realistic density range of the underlying R-4 district, which depends on meeting all ordinance and configuration requirements. He recalled that when a previous iteration of the project was brought before the Commission in 2015, 14 units was the maximum achievable number utilizing lot averaging requirements.

Mr. Hetrick stated that whether the count is 14 or 16 units, the concern ultimately comes down to a perception of density, and he considers 16 units to be acceptable and not overly dense for the site. He observed that the proposed all-brick ranches fit the character of the area and visually resemble the homes in the neighboring Saddlebrook development, though he acknowledged Saddlebrook homes have larger footprints generally ranging from 2,200 to 2,600 square feet, which caters to a different demographic. He agreed with Mr. Struzik that the market price is a decision for the developer and should not be a primary concern for the Commission. Mr. Hetrick emphasized that the proposed homes are aesthetically consistent with the surrounding older brick homes and ranches.

Mr. Hetrick further noted that the proposed site drainage will likely improve conditions for the downhill residents in Saddlebrook. He commended the applicant for reducing wetland impacts and stated that the Sage Lane cross connection must be maintained to ensure proper transport between adjacent neighborhoods. He concluded by expressing his overall support for the project's density and the introduction of ranch homes, noting that adding ranches promotes a more diverse housing selection in the City for buyers looking to downsize or enter the market.

Ms. Denstaedt thanked Chairperson Hooper and expressed her appreciation for the evening's discussion. She noted that since January, the Commission has reviewed applications for varying developments and has recently turned down other projects for proposing too much density on too small a parcel of land. She stated that it would be unfair to approve this development after denying others for similar reasons. Ms. Denstaedt emphasized her concern regarding the property's size, stating it is not even five full acres. She recalled that during the January meeting, the Commission requested a reduction of a couple of homes, and she felt that removing only one unit did not adequately address that request. However, Ms. Denstaedt complimented the proposed homes, stating they are beautiful, and she expressed her appreciation for the design modifications and the applicant's willingness to work with the neighboring property owners. She concluded by reiterating that approving the project would be inconsistent and unfair given the Commission's recent decisions on other dense applications.

Mr. Weaver inquired about the square footage of the proposed wetland impact. Mr. McLeod clarified that the overall impacted area is 15,822 square feet, a reduction from the originally proposed 18,267 square feet. Mr. Weaver then asked for the size of the proposed detention basin. Ms. Kanan responded that the basin is 13,800 square feet and confirmed it is designed as a wet basin. Mr. Weaver noted that because a wet basin essentially functions as another wetland, the project results in a net difference of roughly 2,000 square feet.

Mr. Weaver stated that while he does not favor impacting wetlands, he is more opposed to misaligning the drive, as doing so would create a future hardship for the neighboring property attempting to make a cross-connection. He expressed his approval of the home styles and layout, and declined to discuss project economics, trusting that the developer has completed the necessary market research. Regarding density, Mr. Weaver stated he would have preferred a further reduction. He acknowledged the project is denser than Saddlebrook, but pointed out that the density is very similar to the neighborhoods to the east and the properties directly across Auburn Road. He compared this application to a previous project near Walton Oaks where the Commission required density reductions to match the surrounding area, concluding that because this development is in character with 70 percent of its neighbors, it would be a disservice to deny it. Mr. Weaver stated he would reluctantly support the project for those reasons, though he still wished one additional unit had been removed, and he commended the applicant for their efforts and adjustments.

Mr. Gallina thanked Chairperson Hooper and expressed appreciation for the applicant's improvements to the proposed homes and their cooperation with the neighboring property owners. He stated that upon reviewing the updated packet, he noticed the development was reduced by only one unit, which he felt remained too dense given the Commission's previous discussions regarding the two units on the end of the site. Mr. Gallina noted that if the applicant had removed two additional units to reach a total of 13 or 14, aligning with the 12 to 14 unit sweet spot discussed at the prior meeting, he would be thrilled to move the project forward.

Mr. Gallina acknowledged that while the proposed density fits the area better than other overly dense applications the Commission has recently reviewed, the Commission must evaluate the current proposal on its own merits in the present moment. He recognized that the developer likely faces financial limitations that dictate the current unit count, but reiterated that a reduction to between 12 and 14 units would be the sweet spot necessary to earn his full support for the project.

Chairperson Hooper stated that the proposed density is 2.66 units per acre, noting that his research of the Avondale planning neighborhood documents shows an average density of 2.68 units per acre for the community. He explained that the proposed development falls right in line with the existing average for the area. Chairperson Hooper stated he does not have an issue with the 16 proposed homes, predicting that the ranch products will sell very quickly and agreeing with Mr. Struzik that the price will ultimately be market-driven.

Addressing an earlier public comment suggesting that the attached condominiums at Hamlin Road and Livernois Road were not selling, Chairperson Hooper shared that the developer for that project previously informed him that all units were pre-sold before construction even began. He noted the developer expressed a desire to build more of the same product because the City is a highly desirable community for ranch-style single-family homes, and he expects this proposed product will experience similar demand.

Chairperson Hooper noted that the other project issues have been addressed,

specifically highlighting the accommodation the developer made for the neighbor's driveway. He reiterated his belief that the proposed density is appropriate for both the neighborhood and the City. He concluded by stating that while a developer can choose to build at a lower density, as seen in the neighboring Saddlebrook development, it is a private property right to develop land to its full allowed capacity in accordance with the laws and ordinances of the City, and he supports the proposed product.

Ms. Neubauer asked Mr. Lozon if he was willing to remove any additional units to secure a motion to approve the project. Mr. Lozon declined. Ms. Neubauer then stated her intent to make a motion to deny the application. Ms. Kanan interjected, asking the record to reflect that the applicant had met with City staff nine months prior and proposed a plan to reduce the length of Coriander and shift Sage Lane to accommodate the removal of units nine and ten. She explained that this reduction would have lowered street, sanitary, and tree removal costs, making the project financially feasible, but City staff determined Sage Lane needed to remain in its currently proposed location. Ms. Kanan expressed feeling caught between a rock and a hard place, noting the development is 1.5 units per acre less dense than the zoning allows. Ms. Neubauer responded that the Commission must evaluate the project by considering multiple sets of rules in context rather than focusing on just one metric.

Ms. Neubauer officially made a motion to deny the application for the reasons stated on the record, which was supported by Ms. Brnabic. Mr. Weaver asked for procedural clarification, questioning whether the project would be approved if the motion to deny failed. Chairperson Hooper explained that if the motion failed, the Commission would need to entertain a new motion, such as a motion to approve or postpone. Mr. McLeod further clarified that the motion applied specifically to the overall preliminary site condominium plan, noting that if the primary request failed, the remaining three associated items would not need to be addressed.

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

Aye 4 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Neubauer and Gallina

Nay 5 - Hooper, Struzik, Weaver, Dettloff and Hetrick

Following the failed motion, Chairperson Hooper asked the Commission for a new motion. Mr. Struzik made a motion to recommend approval of the preliminary site plan to the City Council, including the seven pre-printed findings and two pre-printed conditions.

Chairperson Hooper acknowledged that Mr. Dettloff supported the motion and opened the floor for discussion. Ms. Brnabic requested adding a condition for a deed restriction to ensure only ranch-style homes are built on the property, expressing concern over the property's long history of changing proposals. Mr. Lozon clarified that he has only been a partner on the project for the last five

years and reiterated that the proposed homes are two-bedroom ranches on the main floor with an option for a loft or third bedroom built into the roofline as a dormer in the rear, which would not affect the overall height restriction. Chairperson Hooper characterized this as a ranch or one-and-a-half-story home, and Mr. Lozon confirmed there would be no more than one bedroom upstairs.

Mr. Struzik initially stated he did not want to amend his motion, preferring to leave flexibility for housing additions. Mr. Weaver asked Ms. Brnabic to clarify if she was attempting to restrict future homeowners from building two-story additions, or if she simply wanted to ensure the initial construction matched the presented plans. Ms. Brnabic clarified she only wanted to ensure the initial build strictly follows the plans presented to the Commission as ranches with an optional loft, and she was not trying to restrict future homeowners from adding onto their houses ten years down the line.

Following this clarification, Mr. Struzik agreed and amended his motion to include a third condition requiring that the initially built homes must be constructed as presented, specifically as a ranch or a ranch with a loft-style home. Chairperson Hooper summarized the third condition as requiring a ranch with a dormer option as presented in the plans, which Mr. Struzik accepted. Hearing no further discussion on the motion by Mr. Struzik, supported by Mr. Dettloff, Chairperson Hooper called for a roll call vote, noting that a yes vote is in support of the motion to recommend approval to the City Council.

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

Aye 5 - Hooper, Struzik, Weaver, Dettloff and Hetrick

Nay 4 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Neubauer and Gallina

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. PSP2023-0010 Grandview, the Planning Commission recommends to the City Council Approval of the Preliminary Site Condominium Plan, based on plans received by the Planning Department on August 14, 2026, 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 W. Auburn Road, thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on the adjoining street. Further, the plan provides for future cross connection to adjacent properties to the west.

3. Adequate utilities are available to the site.

4. The preliminary plan represents a reasonable street and lot layout and orientation.

5. The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.

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.

7. The requested modification for the reduction for the overall minimum land area required to utilize the MR Mixed Residential Overlay District is warranted since the site is approximately 6 acres and the site layout otherwise meets all City requirements, and also based on the context of surrounding properties that are of varying size and there are industrial properties abutting to the north.

Conditions

1. Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, prior to final site condominium site plan approval.

2. Provide a landscape bond in the amount of $105,316.00, plus inspection fees, as adjusted by staff as necessary, prior to the preconstruction meeting with Engineering.

3. The initially built homes must be constructed specifically as ranch style or a ranch with a dormer option as presented in the plans.

2026-0013 Request for Tree Removal Permit Approval - File No. PTP2025-0013 - to remove 132 regulated trees and 2 specimen trees and to provide 136 required replacement trees onsite for Grandview condominiums, a proposed development of 16 detached single family residences on approximately 6.0 acres of land, located at 1548 W. Auburn Rd., Parcel No. 15-28-300-059, on the north side of Auburn between Crooks and Livernois, zoned R-4 One Family Residential with the MR Mixed Residential Overlay; Vito Munaco, Grandview of Rochester Hills, LLC, Applicant

See Legislative file 2026-0009 for discussion.

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

Aye 5 - Hooper, Struzik, Weaver, Dettloff and Hetrick

Nay 4 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Neubauer and Gallina

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby grants a Tree Removal Permit - File No. PTP2025-0013 - for Grandview Condominiums, based on plans received by the Planning Department on August 14, 2026, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions:

Findings

1. The proposed removal and replacement of regulated trees is in conformance with the City's Tree Conservation Ordinance.

2. The applicant is proposing to remove 132 regulated trees and 2 specimen trees.

3. Based on the number of preserved trees onsite, the number and type of trees being removed, the applicant is required to provide a total of 136 tree credits as a part of the overall development. The applicant is proposing to plant 21 trees onsite and pay 115 trees into the City's Tree Fund.

4. Overall, the applicant is planting 98 shade trees, 39 evergreen trees, plus 26 ornamental trees onsite as a part of the landscape plan.

Conditions

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

2. Provide payment, equal to the current required fee for replacement trees, along with any additional fees associated with such, into the City's Tree Fund for the remaining 115 replacement trees identified on the site plan at a rate per tree as prescribed by the City.

2026-0012 Request for Natural Features Setback Modification Approval - File No. PNFSM2025-0005 - to impact approximately 336 linear feet of natural features setback for Grandview condominiums, a proposed development of 16 detached single family residences on approximately 6.0 acres of land, located at 1548 W. Auburn Rd., Parcel No. 15-28-300-059, on the north side of Auburn between Crooks and Livernois, zoned R-4 One Family Residential with the MR Mixed Residential Overlay; Vito Munaco, Grandview of Rochester Hills, LLC, Applicant

See Leg. file 2026-0009 for discussion.

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

Aye 5 - Hooper, Struzik, Weaver, Dettloff and Hetrick

Nay 4 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Neubauer and Gallina

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. PNFSM2025-0005 (Grandview Condominiums), the Planning Commission grants a natural features setback modification for 336 linear feet of Natural Features Setback of permanent impacts to the natural features setback area from the wetlands identified on the site plans to construct the proposed public road, grading associated with units 9 and 10 and associated development infrastructure, based on plans received by the Planning Department on August 14, 2026, 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, and the applicant has minimized the impacts to the natural features and associated natural features setbacks and the applicant has provided for the future protection of the natural features setback by providing a fence 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 the delineated City regulated wetland 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.
3. ASTI has indicated that the existing natural features setback areas are of a moderate quality in their current condition, however, the extension of the public roadway system is of a greater public good.

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 August 25, 2026 prior to final approval by staff.

2026-0010 Request for Wetland Use Permit recommendation - File No. PWEP2025-0005 - to impact approximately 15,822 square feet of wetlands for Grandview condominiums, a proposed development of 16 detached single family residences on approximately 6.0 acres of land, located at 1548 W. Auburn Rd., Parcel No. 15-28-300-059, on the north side of Auburn between Crooks and Livernois, zoned R-4 One Family Residential with the MR Mixed Residential Overlay; Vito Munaco, Grandview of Rochester Hills, LLC, Applicant

See Legislative file 2026-0009 for discussion.

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

Aye 5 - Hooper, Struzik, Weaver, Dettloff and Hetrick

Nay 4 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Neubauer and Gallina

Resolved, in the matter of City File PWEP2025-0005 (Grandview) the Planning Commission recommends to City Council approval of a Wetland Use Permit to permanently impact approximately 0.36 acres of wetlands to construct the public road, grading associated with units 9 and 10, and associated development infrastructure based on plans received by the Planning Department on August 14, 2026, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions.

Findings

1. The wetland located onsite is a forested wetland and its quality, as determined by ASTI, is of moderate ecological quality due to its percentage of tree and shrub canopy, the lack of invasive species, size onsite and extending offsite, and its collection of seasonal localized stormwater runoff.

2. The applicant has reduced its proposed wetland impacts from 0.42 acres to 0.36 acres due to the elimination of the proposed stub street to the east and therefore further limiting potential wetland impacts.

3. ASTI has reviewed the subject plans and proposed impacts to the city regulated wetland along with the proposed mitigation efforts to help reduce the impacts to those wetlands and has indicated that the plans as proposed are satisfactory.

4. Due to the greater public good of the extension and proposed future connection of the road system, it has been recommended by the City’s environmental consultant to allow the proposed impact.

Conditions

1. 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.

2. The applicant verifies that an EGLE wetland permit is not required.

3. The applicant provides a fieldstone or boulder wall of at least 18 inches in height and consistent with ASTI's recommendations of their review letter of August 25, 2026, instead of the currently proposed fence.

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 August 25, 2026.