



Jennifer MacDonald <macdonaldj@rochesterhills.org>

RE: Grandview condominiums - 10-20-26 Planning Commission meeting

1 message

Gary Cunningham <ghcunningham@comcast.net>

Mon, Sep 28, 2026 at 8:54 PM

To: Jennifer MacDonald <macdonaldj@rochesterhills.org>, Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Cc: Chris McLeod <mcleodc@rochesterhills.org>, Sara Roediger <roedigers@rochesterhills.org>

Thanks Jennifer. It looks like the only change the developer has made is to reduce the project from 17 to 16 houses. Is that correct?

That is still 60% more houses than in Saddlebrook Orchards (on about the same total acreage) immediately to the west of the proposed site. So I assume the developer still wants approval for smaller houses with reduced setbacks and spaces between the houses. If that is true, then my original objections have not been addressed. I also note in passing that I believe there is an unresolved drainage issue that will be worsened if this newest proposal gets approved.

A copy of my original objections is attached for your quick reference. Please let me know if you need anything else from me prior to the hearing on October 20. -Gary

From: Jennifer MacDonald <macdonaldj@rochesterhills.org>

Sent: Monday, September 28, 2026 4:36 PM

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

Cc: Chris McLeod <mcleodc@rochesterhills.org>; Sara Roediger <roedigers@rochesterhills.org>

Subject: Grandview condominiums - 10-20-26 Planning Commission meeting

Hello -

Please see the attached legal notice for the Grandview condominium project which will be on the agenda for the October 20, 2026 Planning Commission meeting. You are receiving this notification because you provided public comment on this topic at the January Planning Commission meeting.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Jennifer



Jennifer MacDonald

Planning Specialist

Planning & Economic Development

Phone: 248-841-2575

rochesterhills.org

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Gary Cunningham <ghcunningham@comcast.net>

To: <Planning@rochesterhills.org>

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Wed, 31 Dec 2025 11:49:40 -0400

Subject: Grandview Condominiums

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am a property owner within 300 feet of the proposed condominium plan submitted for the 6.0-acre parcel located at [1548 Auburn Road, Rochester Hills, MI](#). As such, I received a notice from you about the public hearing to be held concerning this project on January 13, 2026.

Unfortunately, I will be out of town on the 13th but have several important questions about this project which the members of the Planning Commission should take into account. Based on my review of the Preliminary Site Plan (copy attached), I have the following concerns about this proposed development:

1. At 1,683 sq ft, these proposed single-family detached homes are significantly smaller than the existing homes in that area of Rochester Hills. For example, the new homes being built on Livernois Avenue immediately east of this proposed project appear to be about 2,400 sq ft. What is the minimum size of homes allowed in that area?
2. At only 15 feet of spacing between the homes, and cramming 17 of them in such a tight space, it appears that the minimum setbacks for new residential construction in Rochester Hills is not being complied with by the developer. Please tell me what the actual requirements are for a project of this type.
3. When we built our home in the same area, we were told that enclosed sunrooms attached to the rear of the home were not permitted in Rochester Hills unless you can maintain a 30 ft setback from the rear property line. It appears that this proposed project intends to violate that rule. If they are allowed to violate that rule, then can

other homeowners in the neighborhood also be permitted to construct similar additions to their existing homes?

4. It appears that the developer intends to essentially strip the entire construction site of all existing trees and landscaping. It also appears that there will be an elimination of wetlands and inadequate set asides for common areas for a condominium project. What are the minimum requirements for such items for a project of this size in Rochester Hills?
5. We have experienced a lot of drainage problems in our neighborhood and when we requested both the city and county to add some additional drains in the area we were told those would be installed when new developments are approved. What extra steps have you imposed on this new project to help alleviate the flooding we experience near that site?

I would appreciate it if you would respond to my concerns in writing at your earliest convenience. Based on your responses, I may want to find a representative to attend the public hearing on my behalf.

Very truly yours,

Gary Cunningham

M: 248-470-4000



Grandview Condominiums.eml

12K

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am a property owner within 300 feet of the proposed condominium plan submitted for the 6.0-acre parcel located at [1548 Auburn Road, Rochester Hills, MI](#). As such, I received a notice from you about the public hearing to be held concerning this project on January 13, 2026.

Unfortunately, I will be out of town on the 13th but have several important questions about this project which the members of the Planning Commission should take into account. Based on my review of the Preliminary Site Plan (copy attached), I have the following concerns about this proposed development:

1. At 1,683 sq ft, these proposed single-family detached homes are significantly smaller than the existing homes in that area of Rochester Hills. For example, the new homes being built on Livernois Avenue immediately east of this proposed project appear to be about 2,400 sq ft. What is the minimum size of homes allowed in that area?
2. At only 15 feet of spacing between the homes, and cramming 17 of them in such a tight space, it appears that the minimum setbacks for new residential construction in Rochester Hills is not being complied with by the developer. Please tell me what the actual requirements are for a project of this type.
3. When we built our home in the same area, we were told that enclosed sunrooms attached to the rear of the home were not permitted in Rochester Hills unless you can maintain a 30 ft setback from the rear property line. It appears that this proposed project intends to violate that rule. If they are allowed to violate that rule, then can other homeowners in the neighborhood also be permitted to construct similar additions to their existing homes?
4. It appears that the developer intends to essentially strip the entire construction site of all existing trees and landscaping. It also appears that there will be an elimination of wetlands and inadequate set asides for common areas for a condominium project. What are the minimum requirements for such items for a project of this size in Rochester Hills?
5. We have experienced a lot of drainage problems in our neighborhood and when we requested both the city and county to add some additional drains in the area we were told those would be installed when new developments are approved. What extra steps have you imposed on this new project to help alleviate the flooding we experience near that site?

I would appreciate it if you would respond to my concerns in writing at your earliest convenience. Based on your responses, I may want to find a representative to attend the public hearing on my behalf.

Very truly yours,

Gary Cunningham

M: 248-470-4000



Grandview Preliminary Site Plan.pdf

18414K



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Planning Commission Meeting - January 13, 2026

1 message

Richard Bosler <richbosler@gmail.com>

Wed, Jan 14, 2026 at 5:24 PM

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

Dear Planning Commission Members:

Just a note to let you know, I appreciate all the work and great questions you put forth in addressing points of concern when investors, builders, businesses for profit or non-profit, etc. bring their plans before the Planning Commission to approve and pass before going to the Rochester Hills City Council.

With regards to the Grandview Condominium site that was addressed last night January 13, 2026, your comments were spot on regarding addressing the density and other concerns supporting it with the community surveys, not to mention other valid points including water run-off and wetlands requirements and conditions.

It I heard correctly, the owner mentioned he was having this development bricked 360 to the 1st level which is a plus. I have seen many developments of Pulte as the builder where only the front was bricked to the 1st level and vinyl siding on three. Not attractive.

When attending the Planning Meetings for Camden and Grandview, I am just appalled at the price levels that appear to start at \$699,000 plus in this part of Rochester Hills.

This always brings me to review the developments on John R. north of Hamlin Rd. and south of Avon Rd., which is a nice section of Rochester Hills with less traffic and two great parks which are an asset.

This brings up the following beautifully done condominium developments with reservoir work.
Crestwyk - 16 Units Priced as low as \$497, 255 back on 2/14/2024 and as high as \$580,000 on 2/9/2024 with approximately 1,734 - 1,981 sq. ft.

Brampton Parc - 12 Units Priced as low as \$365,603 on 12/18/2023 and as high as \$515,000 on 11/14/2023 with approximately 1,632 sq. ft.

Birkshire Ridge - 13 units Priced as low at \$510,000 3/5/2021 and as high as \$670,000 for the same unit on 9/29/2023. with approximately 2,206 - 2,489 sq. ft.

These figures were all obtained from the Rochester Hills Property Tax Lookup website.

Comparing these developments for example to Berkshire off Hamlin Rd. west of Livernois that began in 2025, the above properties are by far more attractive to me than this development. My understanding is that the builder at this development site is the same builder that built Crestwyk and he mentioned a couple years ago about the higher cost of land paid for this site.

Yet, the asking price by developers and/or investors seems to start at \$700,000 plus. The reservoir at this site looks like an eyesore with paltry small boulders outlining the property line with very little property frontage as well as back with shrubs placed in front of bay windows to buffer the Hamlin Rd. traffic.

Granted, it is what buyers are willing to pay and some are doing so. However, the high cost of homes certainly is the result of the policies which drove up construction costs to new levels during the past 4 years of the previous administration pushing out many looking for affordable housing today for especially post Baby Boom owners.

From my perspective, the John R properties, although going for more in the area now in the \$600,000 range seem more attractive than the asking prices some developers expect to yield at \$700,000 plus in middle Rochester Hills.

I question really what better grade of product and landscaping backs up their development and price. Today, you would even think that homes would include a Home Generator as a standard option no doubt built into the price.

Again, just my comments and concerns.

Keep Up All Your Great Work in addressing what is expected from Builders, Investors, Business Owners to make Rochester Hills continue to be attractive and raise a Family!

Rich Bosler
Rochester Hills Resident and
Precinct Delegate

Confidentiality Disclosure:

This e-mail, and any files or attachments with it contain privileged and confidential information. It is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail (or the person responsible for delivering this document to the intended recipient), you are hereby notified that any unauthorized use, disclosure, dissemination, distribution, printing or copying of this e-mail, and any attachment thereto, is strictly prohibited and maybe unlawful. If you have received this e-mail in error, do not disclose or forward its contents and/or attachments to others. Please notify the sender of the message by email or telephone at (248) 885-4525, and permanently delete the original with any attachments from your system as well as destroy any copy of the e-mail and printout thereof. Thank you.



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Grandview development

1 message

THERESA POUNDERS <thepounders@comcast.net>

Tue, Oct 13, 2026 at 3:33 PM

To: "planning@rochesterhills.org" <planning@rochesterhills.org>

I'm writing to speak in opposition of the proposed development referenced above. This development does not have the required acreage for such density. Stop allowing these developers to come in and impact our wetlands and tear down trees. We've already seen enough flooding in our city.

We are not in short supply of these types of homes. Many homes are available right now that are sitting unsold.

Auburn road already gets backed up during drop off and pick up times at the school across the street. It's already dangerous there. I can only imagine what additional development will do.

We also have similar developments that have been approved and waiting to be built.

Most residents are tired of seeing the beauty of our city slowly disappear.

I urge you to reject this development.

Theresa Pounders



Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Re: Grandview development

1 message

THERESA POUNDERS <thepounders@comcast.net>
To: Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org>

Wed, Jan 7, 2026 at 11:04 AM

Thank you Jennifer. I appreciate your quick response.

I did go on the project development map and saw the plans. They are difficult to understand. The writing is difficult to read even after zooming in to the highest level I could on my computer. I really don't have a lot of time to run down to the city.

Thank you,
Theresa Pounders

On 01/06/2026 4:55 PM EST Planning Dept Email <planning@rochesterhills.org> wrote:

Hello Theresa -

Your comments will be provided to the Planning Commission. We will post the agenda tomorrow, that is why public comments need to be provided today if they are to be included in the agenda. The plans submitted are available at our office any time during business hours for the public to view and you can also view them on our [Development Status Map](#). You are free to submit public comments after the agenda has been posted as well, however those are provided directly to the Planning Commission members.

Jennifer MacDonald
Planning Specialist



**Planning & Economic
Development**

248-656-4660
rochesterhills.org

On Tue, Jan 6, 2026 at 3:30 PM THERESA POUNDERS <thepounders@comcast.net> wrote:

I would like to express my opposition to the above referenced development. The destruction of our trees and impacts to our wetlands and overdevelopment are a large concern for many residents of the city. This is another development that requires 10 acres of land, yet they have just over half that. Why are we allowing this?

I would also like to know why there is no information on the planning commission agenda for this development. Usually there are links allowing

someone to access information regarding the development (environmental impact, wetland report, communications with the planning department, etc.). The deadline to make comments is today, Tuesday, January 6, 2025, in order to be included in the planning commission agenda that will be posted online. It's currently 3:30 and nothing is there. I may have had more comments to make regarding the development if this information was there.

Thank you,
Theresa Pounders

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the originator of the message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender.