



October ~~22~~ 07, 2019
October 22, 2019 - Revised

Mrs. Sara Roediger
City of Rochester Hills - Planning Department
1000 Rochester Hills Dr.
Rochester Hills MI 48309

Re: Clarification

Ms. Roediger:

On ~~July 2, 2019~~ *June 20, 2019* I prepared a letter summarizing issues regarding the project status of Trio. Members of the Planning Commission expressed displeasure for this letter. On ~~July 22nd~~ *July 31st* I wrote a letter apologizing for offenses that the first letter may have caused. Further clarification was requested by administration regarding statements in the ~~July 2~~ *June 20, 2019* letter. My understanding is that there are three topics requiring clarification; the use of the term “unanimous”, the “contamination” status of the Speedway site and the city’s position regarding the acquisition of the Speedway property.

First, the original letter was drafted while reviewing the written minutes from 4/17/2018. I noted that there were no negative comments regarding the architectural style. This is not the same as 9 unanimous supporters. A less presumptive statement would have been more appropriate.

Second, statements in the letter indicate that this developer is cleaning a contaminated site. At great cost, OYK was required to thoroughly investigate the environmental status of the property and confirm testing results (re-test) done by Speedway. Without detailed information as to how bad the site was historically, or at what cost the previous owner cleaned it, I should refer to the property in its current state of residentially restricted, not “contaminated”. A more careful description would have been to refer to the project as “repurposing a previously contaminated gasoline station.”

Third, the city administration made no guarantees of approval based upon the acquisition of the Speedway. They also did not direct us to purchase the Speedway parcel. The statement in paragraph 3 of the ~~July 2~~ *June 20, 2019* letter including the word “asked” does not elaborate on the reality of the circumstances. The developer did indeed ask the question to administration regarding acquisition. Together, we also discussed PUD impacts such as public benefits tied to repurposing such sites. Arriving at the conclusion that we qualify as a PUD, or not, is the decision of the Planning Commission and either way will not be in contradiction with statements and expectations provided by the city administration.

In conclusion, I hope this letter served as a final piece of the puzzle as we culminate over a year’s worth of discussions, suggestions, and recommendations. It has been an enlightening process along the way, and



we hope to continue our hard work to the next phase and beyond. We ultimately hope to meet once again as a team and celebrate, but this time with a ribbon and a pair of scissors and under better pretenses.

Regards,

Peter Stuhlreyer
Chief Architect
Designhaus, LLC

Cc Fred Hadid, Motaz Kaakarli, Designhaus