

4. *The Final Plan represents a reasonable lot orientation.*
5. *The development should have no substantially harmful effects on the environment.*
6. *The Final Plan is in conformance with the Preliminary Plan approved by City Council on September 29, 2006.*

Conditions:

1. *Provide a Notice of Wetland/Floodplain Designation in recordable format after City Council approval and prior to Plans being stamped "Approved" in accordance with Ordinance 469: One-family Residential Detached Condominium; Sec. 122-368 (d).*
2. *Eliminate Note #3 that references the need for a sidewalk waiver. The note is part of 3 notes placed near the bottom center of sheet 1. The City Council had already granted that with the Preliminary Plan approval in 2006.*

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

Aye 7 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hetrick, Hooper, Reece and Schroeder

Absent 2 - Kaltsounis and Yukon

Chairperson Boswell wished Mr. Lombardo good luck, and commented that it had been a while.

2005-0394 Request for a Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 00-037.2 - Northbrooke East Site Condominiums, a 12-unit site condo development on 3.7 acres, located south of Auburn between Crooks and Livernois, Parcel No. 15-33-128-009, zoned R-4, One Family Residential, Northbrooke East, LLC, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by James Breuckman, dated May 31, 2012 and Preliminary/Final Site Condo Plan had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Andrew Milia, President, Franklin Property Corporation, 300 South Old Woodward Ave., Birmingham, MI 48009, development consultant, and Jim Jones, JJ Associates, Inc., 1055 S. Blvd. E., Rochester Hills, MI 48307, civil engineer.

Mr. Anzek advised that the proposal was for a single-family site condominium plan. He explained that this was a process used to subdivide land that had been previously platted. It was not attached condos on a common ground; it looked like, acted like and appeared just like a single-family development. He wanted to make that clear, because Staff had received a couple of phone calls questioning the homes.

Mr. Anzek recalled that the development was initially approved in 2005. At that point in time, it met all the City's requirements, and there were Extensions granted until they ultimately expired in 2009, when the owner at the time let the approvals lapse. There were now new developers who wished to reactivate the project. The City's Engineers had reviewed it and determined that the retention system designed in 2006 met or exceeded the City's current standards, so there were no changes required to what was approved in 2006. It still met all the zoning setback requirements and other Ordinance requirements. The Staff Report summarized that it was very straight forward. There had been some inquiries from the neighbors, and he asked Mr. Breuckman to address what had been communicated.

Mr. Breuckman advised that most of the inquiries were about the site condo question, and Mr. Anzek had addressed that. There was one comment from Mr. Larry Dropiewski, who lived in the adjacent Northbrook subdivision. He had some concerns about trees on the common property line between his lot and the proposed development and whether those could be protected during the construction process. He suggested some things that Mr. Breuckman felt would be good to explore with the City's and the project's engineers to see if it was feasible. Mr. Dropiewski had a large box elder on his property line, and he wanted to know if it would be possible to move the storm sewer in the rear of lot 3 within the easement. Mr. Breuckman felt that they could explore it. He would like to see some tree protective fencing along that property line. The Tree Survey did not show the trees on Mr. Dropiewski's property. Because the development did not have direct access onto Auburn Rd., construction traffic would be passing on public streets through adjacent neighborhoods. Mr. Dropiewski was concerned because there was already rutting that existed at some of the 90-degree corners from the construction traffic over the years. He wanted to make sure that was adequately addressed and repaired after construction was finished.

Mr. Jones suggested that they could meet with the neighbors, and there was some flexibility with regards to shifting the storm, if that would

preserve the tree. The easement was wide enough for that flexibility. Mr. Milia added that regarding tree protective fencing, they would be happy to work with Mr. Dropiewski and place additional fencing to minimize traffic in that area.

Mr. Schroeder asked about the rutting in the road. Mr. Breuckman believed that was inside the radius of the corners on the grass, and Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Jones to address that. Mr. Jones said that typically, they suggested that the developer take pictures of pavement prior to development. If there was any rutting of the grass behind the pavement, that would definitely be repaired. If there was any damage to the pavement, it would be repaired. It was their common practice to record what was there before and after and make sure it got restored back to its original condition.

Mr. Hetrick asked if the condo units would be consistent with the housing that surrounded them. Mr. Milia agreed, and said that the adjacent subdivision, Meadow Creek II, consisted of about 2,500 square-foot homes, and the proposed homes would be about 2,500 to 2,800 square feet, with a price point that would meet or exceed the adjacent sub.

Chairperson Boswell opened the Public Hearing at 7:16 p.m. He instructed that there would be no dialogue until after the Public Hearing was closed. He asked the speakers to direct all comments and questions to the Chair.

Bill Gaw, 3305 Gilsam Ct., Rochester Hills, MI 48309. Mr. Gaw wished further clarification and detail about the construction traffic. His street came off of Crooks, and the construction traffic for the existing subdivision was required not to come in off of Crooks, but it constantly did and actually broke the water main directly across from his property due to the transition of the trucks from the old blacktop to the new 8" concrete, which was in front of his house. He had not seen the street complete plan for the condo site, and he would like to see its final stage to see how the traffic would flow. He was concerned how the plan would be finalized as far as where the homes would end up and how they would look relative to the other homes in the neighborhood. Having the property developed was bound to happen, and he said that he was not opposed to development, but making sure it fit in with the existing lots was important to him.

Larry Dropiewski, 3154 Davenport Lane, Rochester Hills, MI 48309. Mr. Dropiewski said that he appreciated the opportunity to talk with Mr. Breuckman earlier in the day. He lived in lot 13 behind Northbrooke

East's lot number 3. He believed the plans were older and were being reused. They indicated that the construction access would be off a temporary road to Auburn, which the neighbors would be very thrilled about, and they would like to see that. They had endured a lot of construction traffic for many years with Meadow Creek II. There had been quite a bit of damage to Newstead, Wilmington and Davenport, particularly at the corners. The road was rutted and held quite a bit of water in rain events, and it was getting cracked. They would like to see that addressed. The plans showed the streets to be constructed out of concrete. Both Northbrooke and Meadow Creek II were asphalt roads with concrete curb and gutters. The plans said there was an option to do either one, but it made sense to him to do the asphalt option to connect everything. They were a little sensitive because the name of Northbrooke East was similar to Northbrooke, and they considered their housing a notch up from those in Meadow Creek II; they were all brick as opposed to just brick front and vinyl-sided. They would prefer the same for the housing in Northbrooke East. He was glad to hear about the house sizes and the prices. On a personal note, Mr. Dropiewski related that he had a son graduating from high school, and they were having an open house on July 21st. He hoped that construction would start after July 21st, if possible. He would hate the thought of bulldozers and trucks in the area during an open house, and he would appreciate any help he could get with that. He noted that he had five trees along the lot line, and he would really like to see them retained. It looked like that would not be an issue; he looked at the profile for the storm drainage, and it drained down slightly to the north to the inlet at the northwest corner of site three. The only issue might be with his big box elder. It had a large canopy and a ten-foot pipe would be in the roots. He talked with the City Engineers, and asked if they would consider moving that to 15 feet, which would still be within the 20-foot easement and less likely to kill the tree. He would appreciate the willingness to provide some type of protection for those trees. He remembered when his lot was built, and the builder told him that the apple tree would still be on his site. He went there one day, and it was lying on its side, having been bulldozed when the site was graded. He was a little sensitive to trees disappearing when he was at work. He reiterated that if the construction traffic would, in fact, use their subdivision streets, it would be nice if at the conclusion, the ruts could be filled in or if the City could commit to some type of repair so down the line the residents of Northbrooke did not get stuck with a special assessment to fix the roads. They always felt that the traffic should have gone up and down Gilsam Rd. when they were building Meadow Creek II. He understood that the City Engineer felt they had a more engineered road in their subdivision, but through the course of time, the trucks did damage.

Kim Lavallee, 1632 Newstead Lane, Rochester Hills, MI 48309. Ms. Lavallee said that she lived at the end of Newstead Lane, which would border the construction of the new sites. She wanted to get a little more information about the water retention site proposed. She understood that the plans were established in 2006 and were being re-activated, but she would like to find out more because she had three small children, and she had concerns about having water right there. She was also concerned about construction traffic and echoed Mr. Dropiewski's comments.

Jim Zych, 3139 Davenport, Rochester Hills, MI 48309. Mr. Zych stated that he lived on the corner of Newstead and Davenport. He had written in with some questions about the proposed subdivision, partially because he just learned about the meeting yesterday. He was happy to say that his nephew bought the last lot in the annex to Northbrooke, so that should complete the construction there. He wanted to make the Commissioners aware that the residents of Northbrook had gone through eight constant years of construction traffic through that subdivision. The other speakers had talked about the roads being chewed up quite a bit. His understanding was that there would be an annex out to Auburn Rd. When he looked at the plans, they indicated that the church had not given them the right-of-way to go out to Auburn, so he questioned how that would be addressed. He stated that it would be great if the subdivisions could be avoided altogether. He had a concern about Northbrooke East being landlocked by Northbrooke, and he said that he appreciated the single-family homes, but he would like to see them developed within the spirit of Northbrooke. They had lot size and building material restrictions, and in the annex, they had not kept the same standards as they had in Northbrooke. He would like that to be enforced, if possible.

Eric Hartfiel, 3071 Wilmington, Rochester Hills, MI 48309. Mr. Hartfiel said that he lived around the corner from the proposed development. He was against the construction of the condo complex, and said that it did not conform to the subdivision. He saw it as a landlocked property that would increase traffic. They had already seen traffic increase with all of the new homes in Meadow Creek II, which were not built to the standards of the homes already there. To him, the homes were done more cheaply and not as rich and classy looking as the original homes in the subdivision. He thought that a condo complex would completely drive the values of the other homes in the area even further down and increase traffic. On Wilmington, there was always someone getting mad when he tried to get in and out of his driveway, because there were so many people coming down Wilmington because there was a cul-de-sac instead of an exit to

Auburn. The people in Meadow Creek II were not allowed to exit onto Auburn because of the school next door. He had tried to get a petition to have the cul-de-sac turned into an exit and entrance. He felt that the proposal was a bad idea, and he hoped that the developer would reconsider and put up homes that were more representative of the subdivision rather than condominiums.

Chairperson Boswell interjected at this point, and said that he would break precedent a bit and address the issue of the homes. He stated that they would be single-family homes, and there would not be one, big building of condominiums. He assured that the lot sizes were very similar to those in Northbrooke.

Kathy Lam, 1674 Newstead Lane, Rochester Hills, MI 48309. Ms.

Lam stated that she lived on the corner of Wilmington and Newstead and in the eight years that she had lived there, she had to deal with corner traffic all the time. She could reiterate everything everyone had stated, because she agreed 100%. She commented that she loved having the nice, vacant land there and the trees, but if they were going to do construction, she agreed about traffic going out to Auburn. She stated that the construction traffic they had endured had killed their roads. She could not count how many construction trucks had driven over her lawn. There were small children in her neighborhood - over ten kids under the age of eight - and there were many times that a construction vehicle zoomed through without looking. She truly believed that they had to have a better plan for construction traffic for the kids, for the road, etc., and she agreed with everything that had been said.

Chairperson Boswell closed the Public Hearing at 7:32 p.m. He noted that the biggest question regarded construction traffic. He asked Mr. Jones about the temporary drive to Auburn.

Mr. Jones responded that there were some comments about the church not dedicating access for the property. He clarified that the note on the drawing indicated that the church was not willing to dedicate the right-of-way for the future Auburn Rd. The City was looking for the church to give up 60 feet of their property along their frontage for the ultimate Auburn Rd. right-of-way, and they were not willing to do that at this time. It was a separate issue from construction access. They were getting a 20-foot easement along the church's west property line, which would provide access back to the detention area and also for the storm sewer that needed to be installed to the detention basin. There would be some construction access utilizing that easement, but they also needed a

secondary access because when the detention basin was being constructed, they could not physically get across from one side to the other. They also showed, on the Soil Erosion Plan, that they would provide a mud tracking mat just to the east of the stub street of Newstead Lane. Some of the construction traffic would need to utilize that when the detention basin was being constructed. They were willing to work with the residents to try to minimize how much traffic would use the public right-of-ways.

Chairperson Boswell asked about the detention basin. Mr. Jones said that the City had requirements for detaining storm water and for treating the water for water quality. They had been in contact with the Drain Commission, to make sure that the size of the pond met their standards. They exceeded the Drain Commission standards and met the City's standards. Regarding the safety of the basin, he advised that it would have a six-foot high fence around the perimeter, which should alleviate the safety concerns for the kids in the area. Chairperson Boswell asked what type of fence, and Mr. Jones said that it would be chain link. Mr. Schroeder asked if it would be a dry pond, and Mr. Jones said that the bottom of the pond would be wet for sedimentation purposes.

Chairperson Boswell questioned which option would be used for the streets. Mr. Jones said that they were showing concrete on the drawings, but the City did allow an asphalt alternative. Typically, when it was bid, they got prices for both. In the past, asphalt had been a better price than concrete. It was up to the developer, but there was a good possibility it could be asphalt.

Chairperson Boswell indicated that given that the surrounding subs had asphalt, he thought it would make sense to install the same. He asked about the type of houses. Mr. Melia brought up that someone mentioned condominiums, and he explained that it was just a legal form of ownership. He felt that the Commissioners had done a good job of explaining that. They would be true single-family homes, similar to the adjacent homes. The word condominium was just a legal form of ownership, and the homes would range from 2,500 to 2,800 square feet with a price range of \$265,000 to \$300,000.00. He pointed out that there would only be 12 homes built, and they felt that the economic climate was different from the past three years. It was the goal of the developer to complete the homes in a quick fashion - 12 to 18 months - whereas in the past, the subdivisions had languished. It was the goal of the developer to get in and out very quickly and complete the whole development.

Chairperson Boswell asked for clarification of whether construction would begin after July 21st. Mr. Melia stated that if they received all their permits, it could start prior. The plan was to start sometime in July, but they would meet with Mr. Dropiewski and if the open house was on a Saturday, they could work with him.

Mr. Anzek advised that the matter could probably not get to City Council until July 16th, so they would not have final approval, and the applicants would still have to work on engineering drawings in between. He thanked them for offering to work with Mr. Dropiewski.

Mr. Schroeder said that as far as the roads, concrete was a better product that lasted longer. If the developer put in concrete, it would be better for the subdivision and would last for 20-25 years and be relatively maintenance free, versus 10-15 years for asphalt. He recommended using concrete, but it would be a collective decision. He asked the applicants if they could give a better description of the homes, for example, if they would have brick fronts and how much siding there would be.

Mr. Melia said that he did not have the exact details, but they would not be brick on all four sides. There would be some brick on the fronts, and they would be comparable to the homes in Meadow Creek II.

Mr. Hetrick suggested that the applicant consider allowing options so that there was more of a harmonious architectural feel between the proposed development and the adjacent subdivision. Mr. Melia agreed.

Ms. Brnabic said that most of her questions had been answered, but she wanted clarification as to whether the homes would be partial brick or full brick on the fronts. Mr. Melia answered that they would be partial brick. Ms. Brnabic asked where the brick would be, and Mr. Melia said that it would be generally on the first floor level. There could be brick and stone accents. Ms. Brnabic also recommended that they try to do something more in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood - not necessarily brick on the entire home, but she considered that full brick on the front would be nice.

Chairperson Boswell confirmed that the applicants would be able to add tree fencing on the property lines where there were trees close. If they were going to be bulldozing and they were under a tree, that tree would not make it. Mr. Jones said that if the trees were on the neighboring properties and the overhang of a tree was on the proposed property, when

they staked for the snow fencing location, they tried to measure by the drip line of the trees. If the overhang of the box elder mentioned was encroaching and they could move the storm about four to five feet to help save it, they would be more than willing to move the protection.

Mr. Anzek advised that when the City did tree inspections prior to a Building Permit being issued, they confirmed that the tree protective fencing lined up with the drip line of all trees proposed to be preserved or those of adjacent trees that hung over. They basically stood underneath the drip line and made sure the fencing was there. It was a general rule of thumb that the drip line matched the root line below the grade, and he offered that they would work to shift the storm line to preserve the box elder.

Mr. Dettloff felt that the applicants had adequately addressed a lot of the concerns expressed. Given the nature of some of the concerns, for example, construction traffic and children in the area, he suggested that it might be beneficial to coordinate some type of communication effort among the neighbors. He thought that keeping them informed would help the relationship and be appreciated by the people living in the area. He did think the proposal would be an enhancement to the area, but communicating with the surrounding people would be very important, and he encouraged that.

Mr. Melia felt that was a very good suggestion, and prior to construction, if they could get addresses and emails for the neighbors, they would send out a more formal communication before and during the process.

Another card was turned in, and Chairperson Boswell called the speaker forward.

Fariba Sadeghr Hartfiel, 3071 Wilmington Blvd, Rochester Hills, MI 48309. Ms. Hartfiel agreed with her husband (who spoke previously) that when they tried to come out of their driveway, they had a really hard time. The traffic was very heavy, and it would not help them to have more traffic. She stated that it was not good or safe for the children, and she hoped that would not happen.

Chairperson Boswell said that ordinarily, the Planning Commission would very strongly suggest that the applicants meet with all of the neighbors. Mr. Dettloff had mentioned it, and the Commission had, in the past, delayed voting on applications until that occurred. He acknowledged that the current application had been around for a long time.

Hearing no further discussion, Ms. Brnabic moved the following motion, seconded by Mr. Dettloff:

MOTION by Brnabic, seconded by Dettloff, in the matter of City File No. 00-037.2 (Northbrooke East Site Condominium), the Planning Commission **approves the Tree Removal Permit** based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on May 16, 2012, with the following three (3) findings and subject to the following two (2) conditions.

Findings

1. The proposed removal and replacement of regulated trees on-site is in conformance with the tree conservation ordinance.
2. The applicant is proposing to preserve 41.6% of the regulated trees on-site.
3. The applicant is proposing to replace seven regulated trees with four replacement trees with a value of eight replacement credits on-site.

Conditions

1. Installation of tree protection fences and City inspection and approval prior to the issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.
2. Posting of a performance guarantee in the amount of \$2,826, as adjusted by the City if necessary, to ensure the proper installation of replacement trees and landscape plantings. Such guarantee is to be provided prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.

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

Aye 7 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hetrick, Hooper, Reece and Schroeder

Absent 2 - Kaltsounis and Yukon

2012-0190 Request for Recommendation of the Preliminary and Final Site Condominium Plans - City File No. 00-037.2 - Northbrooke East

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Hetrick, in the matter of City File No. 00-037.2 (Northbrooke East Site Condominium), the Planning Commission **recommends that City Council approve the preliminary and final one-family residential detached condominium plan** based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on May 16, 2012, with the following four (4) findings and subject to the following conditions.

Findings

1. The proposed condominium plan meets all applicable requirements of the zoning ordinance and one-family residential detached condominium ordinance for both preliminary and final approval.

2. Adequate utilities are available to properly serve the proposed development.
3. The proposed development will connect three current dead-end streets, providing an area-wide benefit.
4. The Environmental Impact Statement indicates that the development will have no substantially harmful effects on the environment.

Conditions

1. Provide all off-site easements and agreements for approval by the City prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.
2. City Attorney and Staff approval of the proposed condominium documents.
3. Payment of \$2,400 into the tree fund for street trees prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.
4. Developer shall make every effort to meet with neighboring homeowners, adjacent to the road access and adjacent to the development, prior to start of any construction and continuing throughout the construction process.
5. Relocate the storm at the back of lot three to save the box elder on the adjacent property.
6. The homes shall be a minimum of 2,350 square feet, and the front façade shall consist of brick and/or stone on the first story at a minimum.

Prior to formalizing the above conditions, the following discussion took place.

Mr. Hooper suggested a condition that the storm in the rear yard of lot three be relocated to accommodate preservation of the box elder of the homeowner in lot 13 of Northbrooke. Also, regarding the architectural design of the homes, he suggested that a condition be added that the homes resembled at least the look of the Meadow Creek II development in regards to the quantity of brick siding. He wanted the proposed development to look like the adjacent development or better.

Mr. Anzek believed that the applicant was the same developer that built the homes to the east. He believed it was the same style of homes they wanted to build in Northbrooke East. They were not the same style as in Northbrook, which had more brick. He was not sure if they were 90 or 100% brick, and he wondered if they should look for a balance between the two or look for it to be reflective of Northbrooke, which was primarily all brick.

Mr. Hooper wished to see what the developer was proposing. Chairperson Boswell noted that earlier, the applicant had said that the front would have brick on the first story and the rest would be siding. Mr. Melia said that there was a brick option homeowners could elect to have, but it would not be mandatory.

Mr. Hooper said that he was looking for a happy medium; not the one to the east or possibly the west, but he wanted to make sure the home values were maintained for the surrounding neighborhood. He would like to see a quantity of brick that would assure the home values were maintained.

Mr. Reece reiterated that there would be single-family homes, 2,500 to 2,800 square feet, and the sales price point would be between \$265,000 and \$300,000. He asked Staff if they had an idea of the average square-footage of the homes to the east and west. He observed that someone could have brick all around or a home could have similar accents and still maintain a price point. Just because a house was all brick, it did not necessarily mean it would not have a lower price point. It could depend on the siding, trim or other aspects. He would be curious, if they could make a comparative analysis, about the sizes and prices of the homes to the east and west.

Mr. Anzek said that they did not have the answer currently. He did not anticipate that question and did not look at Northbrooke to determine the size or materials used in construction. He asked the applicant if the proposal would be associated with Meadow Creek II. Mr. Melia said that was correct; those homes were all about 2,500 square feet, and the proposed homes would be 2,500 square feet and larger, up to 2,800 square feet, so they should meet or exceed those in Meadow Creek II. Mr. Anzek clarified that those homes were built with first level brick and that the rest had a siding wrap. Mr. Melia believed that was correct. Mr. Anzek said that to find a happy medium, he and Mr. Breuckman would have to go back and look at the adjacent subs and report back to the Planning Commission or to the City Council.

Mr. Hooper asked if they could add a condition that the homes would be at least 2,500 square feet and have brick siding at least on the first floor of the street side.

Mr. Reece thought that there was still some confusion that the homes would be attached condos. He stressed that they would be single-family

homes just like in Northbrooke, at 2,500 to 2,800 square feet. They were good size homes on individual lots, and there would only be 12 going in. He reiterated that the term condominium referred legally to how the property was being developed, and that was all it meant. There would be no attached condos going in, and he wanted people to be comfortable with that. He thought, as Mr. Hooper had mentioned, that averaging was a good solution.

Mr. Schroeder concurred with amending the motion, and Chairperson re-read the two additional conditions

Mr. Breuckman was not sure if they should add a 2,500 square-foot minimum requirement. He commented that someone might want to build a really nice 2,000 square-foot home, but they would be prohibited. That would be the trap they would get into with area limitation. He felt that the exterior treatment was valid. He suggested that a possible way to address it would be to request the developer to put the conditions in the Master Deed. He did not want to confuse the issue, but he had slight concerns about it. Mr. Schroeder asked the developer if a 2,500 square-foot minimum would be a problem.

Mr. Milia reminded that he was a development consultant, and he was advised by the developer that it was what he intended to build. He agreed that it was appropriate to put conditions in the Master Deed, but suggested that they could take a short recess, and he could make a phone call to confirm the home sizes.

Chairperson Boswell agreed with Mr. Breuckman that someone could build a home that was a little less than 2,500 square feet, but it could be really nice. They would have to add a shed to bring it to 2,500 square feet. He called a recess at 8:02 p.m., stating that they would resume the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

Chairperson Boswell called the meeting back to order at 8:10 p.m. Mr. Melia advised that he spoke with the developer, who informed him that the most popular model he had was 2,486 square feet. The next most popular was 2,350 square feet, and the third was about 2,700 square feet. He would like the flexibility to do all, and he would like to propose a 2,350 square-foot minimum, if possible. They did not want to sacrifice quality if someone could not really afford the biggest home. They wanted to cooperate in the spirit of the suggestion.

Mr. Hooper asked Mr. Melia if he had asked about the amount of brick.

Mr. Melia said that it would be acceptable to require brick for the first floor of the fronts of the homes.

Chairperson Boswell spoke to the audience members and asked them to make sure they gave Mr. Melia contact information. Also, he wanted the developers to be aware that the Planning Commission expects them to do everything possible to meet with as many of the adjacent neighbors, and the Homeowner's Association would be a good place to start. Mr. Melia agreed to that.

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

Aye 7 - Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hetrick, Hooper, Reece and Schroeder

Absent 2 - Kaltsounis and Yukon

Chairperson Boswell stated for the record that both motions had passed unanimously, and he thanked the applicants.

2012-0210

Request for Revised Site Plan Approval - City File No. 93-382.3 - Rochester Hills Automotive Addition, a 900 square-foot addition to the existing 2,370 square-foot auto service station at 1015 E. Auburn (northeast corner of Auburn and John R), on 1.26 acres, Parcel No. 15-25-351-041, zoned B-5, Automotive Service, Rochester Hills Automotive, LLC, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by James Breuckman, May 31, 2012 and Sketch Plan had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant was Gary Kwapis, Heins & Kwapis Architects, P.C., 126 E. Third St., Rochester, MI 48307.

Mr. Breuckman stated that the plans were to construct a 900 square-foot addition to house a walk-in cooler. He noted that the site was at the northeast corner of Auburn and John R at the Marathon Gas Station. The application was an existing building and qualified for Sketch Plan review, which was why the plans were basic in detail, and the project did not trigger an Engineering review. The setbacks were in compliance because of the recent amendment passed to the B-5 district. Without that amendment, the project would have required a Variance. The site was well landscaped, and there was no landscaping in the area and no additional landscaping or buffer was required. The building was fairly utilitarian in design at 30 x 30 feet and would incorporate materials from the existing building. The Fire Department reviewed the plans and had three notes that had to be added. The applicant added those, but with the re-submittal, the Fire Department did not have a chance to look at the