

*withdraw that request and come back with a Conditional Rezoning request. Mr. Kato thought it was very clear that the Commission would rather see a Conditional Rezoning request, so if Mr. Yu agreed, he wished to withdraw. Chairperson Boswell thought Mr. Delacourt had a good idea of what the Commission would like to see. Mr. Kato said they would meet with the neighbors again and with Mr. Delacourt.*

*Chairperson Boswell thanked the applicants for working with the neighbors and for attempting to work with the adjacent property owner. Mr. Schroeder thanked the applicants for their cooperation.*

**Withdrawn**

**Withdrawn**

## **NEW BUSINESS**

**2007-0422** Conditional Land Use Recommendation (Public Hearing) - City File No. 05-039 - Faith Evangelical Presbyterian Church, a proposed 24,640 square-foot church on approximately seven acres, located on the north side of Hamlin, west of Rochester Road, zoned R-3, One Family Residential, Parcel No. 15-22-451-034, Scott Barnes, Merritt, McPherson, Cieslak, P.C., applicant. (Reference: Staff Report prepared by Derek Delacourt, dated August 7, 2007 had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

*Chairperson Boswell read the requests, and stated that the Conditional Land Use Recommendation was a Public Hearing.*

*Present for the applicant were Ron Cieslak, Merritt, McPherson, Cieslak, P.C., 33750 Freedom Road, Farmington, MI 48335 and Del Stanley, Faith Evangelical Presbyterian Church, 375 East 2nd St., Rochester, MI 48307.*

*Mr. Stanley advised that their church had been a part of Rochester Hills for 20 years. They launched the church at Van Hoosen Middle School, and then moved to Adams High School. In that time, they launched three churches in neighboring communities and then decided it was time to have a church home, and they wished it to be in Rochester Hills. The majority of their members were citizens of Rochester Hills, and a number of those who were not were in neighboring communities and did their shopping in Rochester Hills (such as Oakland Township residents).*

*Mr. Delacourt recalled that the Planning Commission had seen the project previously regarding a request for potential Buffer Modifications. He stated that the applicants proposed a 26,000 square-foot place of worship on just over seven acres on the north side of Hamlin Road. The*

Site Plan had gone through extensive reviews, and the main issues were the storm water detention and the buffering. The project had met, in all other ways, Ordinance requirements for parking, height, access and other issues. The City's Landscape Architect had reviewed the plans extensively, and her recommendations for appropriate Modifications were included in the packet. There were two motions regarding the Buffer Modifications provided; one was based on the Site Plan and was the request from the applicant. The other motion would tie the Site Plan to the Landscape Architect's recommendations. He noted that there was an extensive amount of work for the stormwater retention. There was a City regulated wetland feature on site, but in reality, it amounted to a low quality ditch running through the site. The applicant would use that towards the detention. The applicant came up with a design that made the City's engineers comfortable, and it was something that could be an enhancement to the wetland feature. They would use a sedimentation pond and weir. The parking count exceeded what was required, which he felt was a good thing, as many places of worship were taking on more of a community function role. The applicant provided a traffic study, which indicated the need for a left hand turn lane, which was shown on the plans. The applicant showed a plan for proposed future development (phase two), but the applicant was aware that it did not indicate implied improvements. It showed why the site was laid out the way it was toward the rear of the property.

Chairperson Boswell said there were several tasks before the Commission. He advised that the first task would be consideration of the Conditional Land Use Recommendation, because if the Commission decided they did not want a church in that location, the other issues would be moot.

Chairperson Boswell opened the Public Hearing concerning the Conditional Land Use at 8:46 p.m. Seeing no one come forward, he closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Schroeder moved the following motion:

**MOTION** by Schroeder, seconded by Yukon, in the matter of City File No. 05-039 (Faith Evangelical Presbyterian Church), the Planning Commission **recommends** to City Council **Conditional Land Use Approval** of the proposed project, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on July 13, 2007 with the following five (5) findings.

Findings:

1. Places of Worship are permitted in any zoning district; the addition is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance in

*general, and of Section 138-1337 in particular.*

- 2. The proposed church building is designed and will be constructed, operated, maintained, and managed so as to be compatible, harmonious, and appropriate in appearance with the existing character of the general vicinity, the capacity of public services and existing facility affected by the use, and the community as a whole.*
- 3. The proposed development will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage ways, and refuse disposal.*
- 4. The proposed church has been designed so as to not be detrimental, hazardous, or unreasonably disturbing to existing land uses, persons, property, or the public welfare.*
- 5. The proposed church will not create additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services that will be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.*

**A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Yukon, that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council Work Session. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Recommended for Approval to the City Council Work Session**

**Aye:** Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hardenburg, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

**Absent:** Kaltsounis

*Chairperson Boswell stated that the motion had passed unanimously. He asked the gentleman if there was anything they would like to tell the Commission.*

**2007-0195**

Request for Buffer Modifications - City File No. 05-039 - Faith Evangelical Presbyterian Church

*Mr. Cieslak gave some background about the concept of the plan. He advised that the site was split almost in half by a drainage ditch. In early discussions with the Engineering Department, they were told that it could not be filled or moved because it carried water from approximately 50 acres upstream. Rather than fighting it, the applicants decided to work with it and create a natural feature, which would enhance what was there now and allow them to accomplish two goals. For that reason, they proposed a detention area along the drainage ditch. They had created an entrance point in the middle of the site because they wanted to preserve the large evergreen trees on either side of the drive. That would also keep the curb cuts furthest from the neighbors. To allow for*

logical development of the site, they moved the drive to the west property line to get by the detention area. That was the reason for the requested Buffer Modification to the west, which was normally 25 feet because it was adjacent to the school, which was a non-residential use. They proposed to alleviate the buffer requirement by planting landscaping along the western property line. The parking was located to the north side of the building so that from Hamlin, it would not be visible for phase one. The building was set adjacent to the water feature, and would be about 550 feet back from Hamlin Road. By locating it there, because the topography sloped down toward the ditch, it would allow natural light into the lower level and it would have an upper grade level entrance. They included a plan for future development, and the future sanctuary would be across the water feature and be reached by an enclosed bridge. They also planned some parking around that building.

Mr. Cieslak advised that the church sent out invitations earlier in the year, inviting neighbors within 300 feet to hear a presentation about what was planned. There were five or six attendees, and they were very positive. They had questions, and he felt that it helped that the building would be set back so far. He added that even phase two would be about 300 feet from the road.

Mr. Stanley noted that there was nothing new from the discussion he had with the Planning Commission several months ago. He had met with neighbors on the east and west about keeping the beauty of the surrounding properties. Mr. Schroeder had suggested that if either the west or east property became residential they would be required to put in the required buffers. They followed that suggestion in the proposal. The people at Hamlin School wanted to use the church's parking lot because they had limitations, and for emergencies or training, it would be much closer than where they had to go currently. The church offered to help them out, and told them they would make accommodations. The school offered their property also, for any overload parking or for seminars. He commented that they were very cooperative with each other.

Mr. Cieslak said that in terms of the stormwater detention, it had been extensively analyzed by their engineers and had been reviewed by the City. The hydrology calculations had been made, particularly for the upstream area. They had three sedimentation basins, and the water feature would be two-stage. It was designed to retain all the necessary water per Ordinance, and if there were more, there would be a weir to hold the church's water and to allow some to pass through the site. In terms of the building design, he showed the two-level plan. The main entrance had a spacious welcome area, and the worship center would seat 324 in chairs. There were nursery and office areas on the main level. The lower level would be Sunday school space. He showed the

building elevations and the view from Hamlin Road. They proposed a two-color concept, with the lower level being a lighter color. The welcome area in the center would be all glass and would allow a lot of natural light. It would be visible from Hamlin, and they wanted to have something that caught the eye. They proposed a cross to be mounted on the building. He concluded that they met all setbacks and other requirements, and said he would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Reece asked the applicants to pass out the colored renderings while they were discussing the Site Plan.

Ms. Hardenburg asked if the applicants had spoken with the principal of Hamlin Elementary or the Administrator of the school district. Mr. Stanley said he spoke with the principal and the Director of Operations of the school system. Ms. Hardenburg explained that she asked because the principal would probably retire sooner than later, and she wanted to make sure they got the appropriate approvals, not really knowing what the next principal might expect. Ms. Hardenburg noted that only five people showed up at their meeting with the neighbors, and that at the last meeting, Mr. Stanley had agreed to knock on doors and talk to people. She asked if he did, in fact, do that.

Mr. Stanley stated that he spoke with neighbors to the east and west. He met with the four affected neighbors to the north, and he talked with someone on the phone who lived on the south side. He had a call into someone else, and the conversation was very positive about the improvements that had already been made by taking the buildings down, and they did not see a need for a personal meeting.

Mr. Hooper wished to walk through the Buffer Modification requests. He referred to the Buffer Modification for the northern property line and clarified that they were requesting relief from a wall or fence, and to add a berm and tree plantings. He recalled that there was an existing chain link fence along the northern property line, and he asked if the church owned it, which was confirmed. He asked if it would stay in place. Mr. Stanley said they were leaving it up to the four neighbors. He had asked them to vote on it, and he said they would do what the neighbors decided, which was still open. Mr. Hooper said he did not see any issue about drainage moving west to east. There was a good swale in the neighbors rear property, and he did not see that it would be an issue until it got to the tree (#380) going east. The neighbors' property to the north sloped directly onto the church property, and he foresaw that if a berm were located there, it would block the drainage. He thought the design of the berm would be critical, but he supported use of a berm and plantings to provide the screening.

Mr. Stanley said that was a good observation. On the berm at the tree point, because of the potential damage to the root system, they left a gap in the berm to the north of the tree. There would be a swale three to four feet wide that would drain along the north side of the berm. Mr. Hooper asked if it would go around the berm, and Mr. Stanley said there would be a swale on the north side of the berm that would take water from either property and run into the detention pond east of the parking lot. Mr. Hooper said that if the swale was on the north side of the berm, he would question how water would get through the berm, and he asked if it would go around the east side. Mr. Cieslak agreed it would go around the east side. Mr. Hooper cautioned that it might be a challenge because the property sloped from east to west. He suggested that they might have to go the other way.

Mr. Hooper referred to the Buffer Modification for the western property line, and summarized: The City's Landscape Architect recommended that they maintained the screening on the southwest portion adjacent to the residence (tree #350 south), which he supported; elimination of the six-foot high opaque screen wall or fence from tree #350 north; and allowing the required 25-foot width to be 10 feet wide. If the applicants planned to allow the school to use their parking lot to the north, he wondered how they would get there from the school. Next to the parking lot was a baseball diamond, on the school property, that was about eight feet lower than the parking lot, and heading south from the baseball diamond there was the school's detention pond. He did not see where there was an access walkway.

Mr. Cieslak said they planned to make a connection further south, where it had a lower grade level. Mr. Hooper said there was a chain link fence along the western edge of the property, and he asked if it would remain. Mr. Stanley said they would leave it if the school wanted. He added that there were a lot of trees and brush existing; that was why they did not propose to add something more. Mr. Hooper suggested a condition regarding adding a sidewalk or walkway from the school to the church property, which he noted was not shown currently on the Plan.

Mr. Hooper referred to the Buffer Modification requested for the eastern property line, which included eliminating the six-foot fence from tree #365 north, so the resident to the east would be screened. He pointed out that from #365 north, it was completely clear cut and wide open. He asked if the weir would be installed, which was confirmed, and he said there was no screening shown. He pointed out that the City's Landscape Architect recommended that the entire weir be well screened, and he asked the applicants what they proposed and to explain the weir.

Mr. Cieslak said they would be happy to add landscaping at the weir.

*Mr. Schroeder said they could not put plantings in the floodway, and he asked where they would add them. Mr. Hooper asked if they would be on the high point (east side of the weir), which was confirmed, but he thought that would be difficult because of the overflow. Mr. Cieslak agreed that the water could affect the plantings. Mr. Hooper did not really see the purpose of screening the weir or what it would gain. Chairperson Boswell agreed, and said he did not really see how it would be done.*

*Mr. Delacourt said that during the last review, it was unclear what that structure would be composed of, and Staff was not sure it would be aesthetic. It would project above grade, and they wanted the applicant to make every effort to use some type of water resistant vegetation to screen the weir from the adjacent residential. If there was a way to screen it within reason, he would like the Landscape Architect to look at something proposed, but he did not feel it was as important as when they first looked at it, after finding out the materials they would use.*

*Mr. Hooper next talked about the Buffer Modification requested for the southern property line. He said he looked at it and did not feel the applicant needed to add anything beyond what was shown on the plans. He observed that the residents on the south side of Hamlin would be hard pressed to see the church beyond the canopy of the trees existing there now, and he added that the church would be set far back from the road. The finished floor elevation of the church would be the same as the road. He recommended that they approve the applicant's request. He said he had a hard time understanding the motions for Buffer Modifications, and he did not feel they were really descriptive of what the Commission would recommend.*

*Chairperson Boswell said they might write something additionally, such as that they could accept them as presented on the drawings. He was a little concerned about the drainage, and he was not sure how they could guarantee that the neighbors would not have ponding in their yards. If the Commission believed that the Engineering Department would make sure that would not occur, then the Buffer proposed for the north would be fine with him. Regarding the west side, it would be acceptable, with the addition of a pathway connecting the church's driveway to the school, at a location satisfactory to the church, the school and Staff. He agreed that the south side did not need additional plantings, and said that they had to decide about the east side and the weir.*

*Mr. Yukon said he believed both motions were the same, with the exception of the elimination of the IVO requirements on the east, west and south property lines and not including the homes on the east and west sides of the church property. Mr. Hooper recalled that when they*

reviewed the American House, each section of the buffer was labeled, "A," "B," "C" and there was a description of what should be done for each section so there would be no errors. He thought the proposed motion was too generic and that they would have to dig into the details, and he thought it could be clearer.

Chairperson Boswell asked if any Commissioners had concerns with the Modifications as outlined by Mr. Hooper. There was a question about whether there would be additional plantings for the east and west property lines, by the residences, that were not shown on the plans. Mr. Hooper felt that what was shown, plus the existing, was sufficient.

Mr. Delacourt asked if the only thing they discussed that was not shown on the plans was the screening for the weir. Chairperson Boswell said it was listed as a condition of the motion. Mr. Delacourt stated that the second motion in the packet reflected exactly what was on the plan, plus the additional screening around the weir. He suggested that adding a pathway should be a condition of Site Plan Approval.

Ms. Hardenburg said that the City's Landscape Architect agreed the buffer could be reduced from 25' to 10' on the west side, but that she still requested IVO plantings. Ms. Hardenburg thought it would be much safer if it was left open, and without thicker vegetation, since there was a playground on the school property. Chairperson Boswell agreed that by the motion they were considering there would not be additional IVO plantings.

Chairperson Boswell opened the public comments at 9:26 p.m.

**Matt Jaroma, 193 Sandalwood, Rochester Hills, MI 48307.** Mr. Jaroma stated that his property was directly to the north and east of the church. He met with Mr. Stanley, and he said that it was a nice meeting and a very positive experience. Mr. Stanley was very accommodating. Mr. Jaroma was still a little concerned about the drainage around the east of the berm. Mr. Stanley spoke about putting a break in the berm so the water could flow from Mr. Jaroma's property to the north and down to the southern point of the basin. He was concerned there could be ponding in his backyard. They had a bad storm a while back and his sump pump kept going and going. He thought that additional water might be difficult without a hole in the berm. He was not sure that might even work, but he was requesting that the Engineers look at that to see what might work. They further discussed what the vegetation might look like on the berm, and the church mentioned installing 14' pine trees, which would not lose their leaves in the winter. He said he appreciated the time that Mr. Stanley took to meet with them.



Joe Gendich, 140 W. Hamlin, Rochester Hills, MI 48307. Mr. Gendich said that he owned property on the eastern border of the church, from Hamlin to the Sandalwood properties. They shared the same mini-ditch river the church had. He thanked Mr. Stanley for contacting him, and said he had spoken to him on the phone. They talked about the tree plantings. They agreed that if there needed to be additional trees, that it would be from Hamlin Road north for 300 feet, and that the last 700 feet did not need any additional screening. It could be left wide open. He said he had lived there since 1998, and had watched the water flow across the property, and he wondered where it came from. He did some research and walked across the school's property, and noted that the water mostly came from a natural river from the neighborhood to the west, plus the school drainage. According to the plan for the school, drainage was supposed to be captured in the baseball diamond. There was a large pipe along their property that went to the south, and it came out and the river flowed on his property. He stated that the pipe should have had a throttle or something, which was missing. Water went into the baseball diamond, filled it up like a lake, and then created a deluge across his property. That was not part of the plan for developing the school property - the water came through at full blast. He would like it to stay in a small tract through his yard, and as far as ponding and pooling, he saw that as adding to a problem. He did not understand the engineering of the berm, but he thought the church would capture the water and hold it, and let some go through on a regular basis. He would like a big pipe across his yard, which he would help put in, when they developed the church. He commented that the applicants were very nice and courteous, and that the entire building project was a thrill to his family. They were happy to have them as neighbors, and he welcomed them to the neighborhood.

Chairperson Boswell closed the public comments. He questioned how the City would guarantee that the berms would work. They had to be comfortable the City's Engineers would make sure there was proper drainage.

Mr. Delacourt said the Engineering Department looked at culverts and at making a break in the berm. Those were details that would be handled during Construction Plan review, and they would decide the most effective way to handle it. He reminded that the City Engineer had to ensure that a new development would not create a water problem, especially for homes in the area. They would make a decision when they got the final plans, and they would do soil testing along with the submittal. He realized it was a big issue, but he reminded that drainage was dealt with for all sites. There were two options discussed - a culvert through the berm or having a break in the berm with additional landscaping. He assured there would be no ponding of water, and he

*felt it would be relatively easy to fix.*

*Chairperson Boswell said that even without an engineering background, when he looked at the slope of the land, it appeared there could be a water problem. Mr. Delacourt pledged that the next part of the process would produce a remedy.*

*Mr. Schroeder said that the "devil was in the details," and pointed out that the applicant was not at that point. The applicant would work with the Engineering Department and the matter would be addressed, and at this point, without all the Engineering, they could not say for sure exactly how. The detention held the water back and it would be released at a controlled rate so there would not be flooding, which would be a plus for Mr. Gendich. Chairperson Boswell agreed that the water across his property should be a steady trickle, rather than a raging flood. Mr. Delacourt said they would keep the flow at an agricultural rate, and he advised that the detention ponds around it were for the extra water the church development would create. He encouraged the neighbors to contact him or the City Engineer, and he offered to walk them through everything.*

*Chairperson Boswell asked about the school's drainage, and Mr. Delacourt said the City could look at it to see if a restrictor had been removed. He suggested that the church's detention would help correct the problem from the school. He noted that public schools were not required to submit plans to the City, so he would have to ask the Engineer about it.*

*Mr. Yukon noted the Environmental Impact Statement, which stated that there were no wetlands regulated by the City. He assumed that ASTI's environmental report superceded the EIS information. Mr. Delacourt explained that the wetlands on site were not regulated by the DEQ, but in ASTI's opinion, they were regulated by the City. It was a marginal wetland, and the applicant had agreed to go along with that opinion and seek the appropriate Wetland Use Permit.*

*Chairperson Boswell noted that the lights would be on a timer, and he asked when they would be turned on and off and if it would be the same time every night. Mr. Cieslak said that the latest would be 9:00 p.m. - when the functions at the church ended.*

*Chairperson Boswell asked if five handicap parking spaces would be enough. Mr. Cieslak said they were required to have four, but he believed that five would be enough.*

**MOTION** by Schroeder, seconded by Brnabic, in the matter of City File

No. 05-039 (Faith Evangelical Presbyterian Church), and with the exception of the property lines adjacent to the homes at 222 and 140 W. Hamlin, the Planning Commission **grants Buffer Modifications** to eliminate the requirements and allow existing vegetation supplemented by additional plantings to meet the six-foot opaque screen requirements on the north (intermittently where berming is not possible) and west property lines, and regarding the east property line, only until, and if, homes are constructed adjacent; to reduce the 25' width requirement to 10' along the western property line, and to eliminate the IVO requirements for the east, west and south property lines, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on July 13, 2007, with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following one (2) condition:

Findings:

1. That the use of existing vegetation supplemented by additional plantings is consistent with the intent of the "Type B" buffer requirement for the subject site.
2. That the proposed plan meets the criteria of Section 138-1218 to allow the Planning Commission to modify or waive the buffer requirements for the proposed development.

Condition:

1. Resubmission of the Plant Schedule/Cost Estimate and irrigation system, subject to review and approval by the City's Landscape Architect, prior to Final Approval by Staff.

A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Brnabic, that this matter be **Granted**. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Granted**

**Aye:** Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hardenburg, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

**Absent:** Kaltsounis

2007-0471

Wetland Use Permit Recommendation - City File No. 05-039 - Faith Evangelical Presbyterian Church.

**MOTION** by Schroeder, seconded by Yukon, in the matter of City File No. 05-039 (Faith Evangelical Presbyterian Church), the Planning Commission **recommends** to City Council **approval of a Wetland Use Permit**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on July 13, 2007 with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following one (1) condition.

Findings:

1. *The Wetland and Watercourse Protection Ordinance is applicable to the subject site because it is not included within a site plan which has received final approval prior to January 17, 1990.*
2. *Approximately 1,006 square feet of permanent wetland impacts will result from the utilization of the water feature for storm water management.*

Condition:

1. *Implementation of site appropriate structural and non-structural best management practices, to prevent or minimize the impact on water quality.*

**A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Yukon, that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council Work Session. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Recommended for Approval to the City Council Work Session**

**Aye:** Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hardenburg, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

**Absent:** Kaltsounis

2007-0441

Natural Features Setback Modification - City File No. 05-039 - Faith Evangelical Presbyterian Church.

***MOTION*** by Schroeder, seconded by Brnabic, in the matter of City File No. 05-039 (Faith Evangelical Presbyterian Church), the Planning Commission **grants a Natural Features Setback Modification** for approximately 320 lineal feet of direct and permanent Natural Features Setback impacts that will result from construction of the detention basin in the central location of the site, based on plans dated received by the Department of Planning and Development on July 13, 2007, with the following one (1) finding and subject to the following one (1) condition.

Finding:

1. *A Natural Features Setback Modification is needed to construct a detention basin.*

Condition:

1. *Change "Wetland Buffer" to "Natural Features Setback" where labeled on the plans, prior to Final Approval by Staff.*

**A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Brnabic, that this matter be Granted. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Granted**

**Absent:** Kaltsounis

2007-0442

Site Plan Approval - City File No. 05-039 - Faith Evangelical Presbyterian Church.

**MOTION** by Schroeder, seconded by Brnabic, in the matter of City File No. 05-039 (Faith Evangelical Presbyterian Church), the Planning Commission **approves the Site Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on July 13, 2007, with the following five (5) findings and subject to the following seven (7) 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 church development should not have a detrimental increase in traffic onto Livernois, but a passing lane is being added.*
3. *Off-street parking areas are designed to avoid common traffic problems and promote safety.*
4. *The proposed development should not have an unreasonably detrimental nor an injurious effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the site or those of the surrounding area.*
5. *The addition will help meet the religious, cultural and educational needs of the Evangelical Presbyterian community.*

Conditions:

1. *Conditional Land Use Approval by City Council.*
2. *That the applicant obtains a Soil Erosion Permit prior to construction.*
3. *That a Land Improvement Permit shall be required from the City's Engineering Services Department prior to work on the site.*
4. *Correct planting schedule for the northeastern portion of the site per Landscape Architect memo of June 20, 2007 and resubmit plans for landscaping cost estimates and bond amounts, in consideration of buffering requirements, prior to Final Approval by Staff.*

5. *Wetland Use Permit approval by City Council.*
6. *Address comments from Building Department memo of July 24, 2007 regarding the landings at exit doors and exterior stairs on the east side of the building, prior to Final Approval by Staff.*
7. *Add a pathway from the church driveway to the elementary school, at a location acceptable to the applicant, the school and Staff, prior to Final Approval by Staff.*

*Mr. Reece asked to discuss the elevations, and colored renderings were put on an easel. He asked if the masonry veneer would be a split face or a jumbo brick, noting that it was delineated as if it were a CMU-type coursing. Mr. Cieslak said it would be CMU coursing. The intent was that the bottom of the building would be a combination of split face and smooth, and the upper portion would be a smooth architectural block. Mr. Reece asked if it would be a 4' solid core, which was confirmed. He asked if the cross would be lit, and Mr. Cieslak said there would be a ground light on it. Mr. Reece asked if it would go off when the light poles went off, and Mr. Cieslak said that those would be on a photocell timer. Mr. Reece questioned the purpose of the awnings over the windows on the south and north elevations. He asked if they were meant to give the building some character. Mr. Cieslak said it was just an architectural detail. Mr. Reece asked if they would be shingled to match the shingles of the roof, which was confirmed. He commented that for a church, his experience was that it should reach up to heaven, but he felt that the masonry shown was quite dark, and that it brought the building down. He liked the massing of the building, but he was surprised by the color choice. If the renderings were close to what the color would be, he would be a little disappointed.*

*Mr. Cieslak said the concept was to have a two-toned building. He was not sure it would be as dark as shown. The bottom portion would be close to the beige range shown. He reminded that the building would be multi-purpose - a worship space and a fellowship space, and that it was their intent to construct a permanent worship space in front, so people would not even be able to see the building behind it.*

*Chairperson Boswell said he thought the way the windows and cross were presented that it did look like it was reaching up to heaven. He did not even really notice the colors. Mr. Hooper asked if the Commission wanted to suggest a lighter-colored brick. Mr. Reece said it was just his opinion as an architect, but he thought the color scheme might be better reversed. He said he would not vote against it because of that. Mr. Stanley said they would take note of that, and added that it was just the architect's rendering.*

Mr. Delacourt pointed out that the renderings displayed would normally show the colors they were locked into when they came for Final Approval. If the Commission wanted other colors, they should give Staff a range. He confirmed that the colors would not be an issue, and asked the applicants if they were still considering colors. Mr. Stanley said it was the first rendering, and he liked it, but they would be open to variation, if there was a good reason.

Mr. Yukon said he did not have a problem with the color. Mr. Dettloff reminded that it would not be the final church building. Chairperson Boswell asked Mr. Delacourt if there should be another condition about the colors. Mr. Delacourt responded that the final set of plans would reflect the colors shown, since it was what the applicant preferred, and that the colors would be labeled. If there were a drastic change, Staff would bring the elevations back to the Commission. Mr. Cieslak said that a lot of times, when something was plotted, it came out darker than how it looked on the screen. He relayed that it was generally the value range they had been looking at.

**A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Brnabic, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Approved**

**Aye:** Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hardenburg, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

**Absent:** Kaltsounis

Chairperson Boswell stated for the record that the motions had passed unanimously, and he wished the applicants good luck. He added that he felt it would be a quality addition to the community.

Mr. Delacourt said that the church had been incredibly patient. Staff had asked for an enormous amount of information and at every turn, the applicants had been very responsive. They wanted especially to ensure that there would be no storm water issues with the site. He thanked the applicants on behalf of the City.

## **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Schroeder asked if anyone would be attending the MAP (Michigan Association of Planners) convention. Mr. Delacourt was not sure if he was, and said it had not really been discussed yet. He advised that the City's new Master Plan was being considered for an award by the State. He thought it would be a good idea to have representation from the Planning Commission, but he thought that the budget might not allow any travel. Mr. Schroeder asked the possibility of a Commissioner attending, noting that he would be interested. Mr. Delacourt did not think there was money for it in this year's budget, but he could possibly ask about an amendment, adding that it was a good conference. He advised