

**NEW BUSINESS:**

3. Conditional Land Use Recommendation - City File No. 02-013 (Public Hearing)
- Project: Ahmadiy'ya Mosque and Muslim Community Center, a proposed 19,265 square foot development on approximately five acres.
- Requests: 2004-0867 - Conditional Land Use Recommendation  
2004-0868 - Tree Removal Permit  
2004-0878 - Buffer Modifications  
2004-0879 - Site Plan Approval
- Location: North side of Auburn, east of Crooks Road
- Parcel: 15-28-300-026
- Applicant: DeMattia Group  
45501 Helm Street  
Plymouth, MI 48170

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Derek Delacourt, dated October 19, 2004 had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Mr. Kaiser explained the procedure for a Conditional Land Use (CLU) request, advising that the Planning Commission would hold a Public Hearing and make a recommendation to City Council. The Planning Commission would recommend or deny approval the request, and Council would make the final decision. Council could either adopt the recommendation, reject or modify it, or approve it with different conditions.

Present for the applicant were Tim Zawodny, DeMattia Group, Architect representing the applicant; Nassar Malik, President of the Michigan Ahmadiy'ya Movement in Islam, 8218 Wyoming Street, Detroit, MI 48204, Shamik Tripathi, Engineer with R K Engineering & Surveying Associates, Inc., 48645 Van Dyke, Shelby Township, MI 48317.

Mr. Delacourt summarized the Staff Report, which was a review of the entire project. He stated that the applicant had proposed the development of a Muslim Community Center and Mosque on approximately 4.6 acres, located on the north side of Auburn Road, east of Crooks Road. The subject site was zoned and master planned R-4, One Family Residential, and he advised that places of worship, per Section 138-1337 of the Zoning Ordinance, were permitted in any district in the City, subject to a CLU recommendation from the Planning Commission and approval by City Council. He noted that the site had been reviewed by all internal City departments and applicable outside agencies, which recommended approval, some with conditions, or had no outstanding comments relative to the site. There were a few issues that Staff wanted the Planning Commission to address. The first related to the pick-up and drop-off area at the north side of the building. Staff and the applicant examined various iterations regarding this, and the two feasible options included the one indicated on the plan and the other on a sketch by McKenna Associates, Inc., the City's planning consultant. The applicant was aware of the recommendation, and Mr. Zawodny was prepared to discuss the pros and cons of both options and to agree to what the Planning Commission recommended. He advised that banked parking had been provided because although the applicant was technically compliant regarding parking, after monitoring it at other places of worship, Staff felt it would be appropriate to provide areas that could be used for parking in the future if problems were documented. He noted that there was a Condition in the proposed motion regarding banked parking, and that there were other conditions relating to issues Staff felt should be addressed.

Mr. Kaiser questioned whether there should be something specified further that would trigger development of the banked parking. The Staff Report listed that trigger as three incidents. Mr. Delacourt said that Staff used the language "three incidents of problem parking," which would allow an Ordinance enforcement officer to make the determination of whether there was a problem with parking. If there were some confusion as to whether or not the complaints raised were actually a problem with parking, then the final solution about whether parking should be constructed would need

some indicator and Staff could not come up with better language. If the Commission had other suggestions, he said he would welcome them.

Mr. Malik gave an introduction about his community, and said he hoped to give the Commissioners an understanding of where they were coming from and where the community was headed. He stated that Islam was about 1500 years old, and like other religions, had sects. Islam had 73 sects and Ahmadiy'ya was the youngest. He knew that the City was familiar with the IAGD, and he wanted to distinguish his group from them. IAGD presented the mainstream Muslim community and their membership was considerably larger. He advised that his community had about 340 members throughout Michigan, including some from Toledo. That included 100 households and in the Detroit Metro area, there were only 75 households. They did not anticipate the level of growth shown by IAGD. He noted that the community was growing to the west and south (Ann Arbor and Toledo areas) and that the plan was to build another mosque in the next five to ten years for those areas. His community was introduced to the United States in the 1920s, and in Michigan they had been in existence since the 1960s. They acquired a building in Detroit in the late 1970s, which was sufficient, but over the years they had grown and purchased a parcel of land in Troy. When they were about to build the center in Troy, they were advised that the State was planning to build an exit ramp off of I-75, which took the property. They sold the land to the City and bought land in Rochester Hills. He said he hoped their journey would end here. They would like to build a community center, which they believed would be an asset to this area and would bring positive attributes. He advised that they represented a community that, although small, consisted largely of very educated, responsible professionals. They had very high family values and liked to be active in the community. They would like to attract the community to their center to work together and cooperate with each other for the larger good of the neighborhood. They had enjoyed good receptions from other churches and community centers, where they had been holding meetings and they hoped to return the favor. Most of their activities were focused on their families, and moral and spiritual training. He noted that they performed several community programs each year - for example, they held a vaccination drive and the Adopt a Highway project and supported the food kitchens - and they hoped that with the building in place they would be able to do more.

Mr. Zawodny stated that the site was approximately 261 feet wide by 775 feet deep, orientated in a north-south direction. In an effort to work with the site and its long and narrow configuration, and in trying to make sure they respected the impact to the residential properties, the building was placed away from Auburn Road, in the middle of the site. He noted a drive that led into the building and the main entrance, which was focused to the northeast. He also noted that the alignment of the building was done in response to the precepts of the Muslim community relative to its worship and prayer, and that it faced Mecca. The benefit of that was that the building would not necessarily become a barrier, creating a front and back to the site. The positioning created more green space and less of an impact to the adjoining residences. The corner of the building would fade away in both directions, as opposed to showing a big wall. They tried to maintain green space in the front, dealing with natural flow of stormwater, and located the detention basin toward the building. They tried to maintain as much planting and vegetation as possible. They have had extensive dialogue with the City Staff and have massaged the Plan a number of times to try and increase the number of trees and to maintain open space and dense buffers along the east and west boundaries of the property and they increased the evergreens and buffer material.

Mr. Zawodny indicated that the main parking area would be to the north of the building. There would be outdoor activities' areas adjacent to the building, which would be defined by landscaped zones. Closer to the residences, they proposed a dense buffer for screening. He referred to parking, and said they finalized a count of 84 spaces, which would allow an attendance of about 250 individuals. That would satisfy the community's needs relative to its current size. He indicated that if the community grew, it might require extra parking and that was the reason for the 30 additional banked spaces to the northern edge and to the Auburn Road side, where there would be a secondary lot. The ultimate count would be 114 spaces, and they would be agreeable to the language put forth in the Staff Report about parking violations.

Mr. Zawodny next referred next to the building plan, pointing out that women and men would have separate prayer and activity rooms. The prayer rooms were about 1,270 square feet and could accommodate up to 75 individuals. There would be a multi-purpose area for social gatherings and some athletic activities. It would support a middle school sized basketball court and a couple of small cross courts. There would be a small kitchen for food preparation, not necessarily commercial cooking. There would be storage areas, mechanical and office space. They showed a possible expansion of the current 16,500 square feet to 19,250 square feet on the Plan. Staff asked that they take the markings for that off the Site Plan, and they were aware that any expansion would require Planning Commission recommendation and City Council approval. They would not have a problem removing the markings from the drawing, but they felt it was important that the Commission understood the ultimate concept of the site. He showed the materials to be used, including masonry products, block, cast stone, glass, aluminum, and also those for the light fixtures. The building colors would be neutral. They looked at stamped concrete for the entryway plaza, which would be submitted for review and confirmation. They would like to use a paver material, but they had to be conscious of the budget. The light fixtures would be located solely at the entry points and would be decorative sconces, not high intensity, alloy fixtures shining into the night. He advised that there would be pole-mounted fixtures along the driveway, which would be fully equipped with cutoff shields to make sure the light would not spill into the residential district. All the poles would be 15 feet high. He noted that if there were to be a tower in the future, its placement would have to be approved, and it would be within the guidelines of the height restrictions of 50 feet. He acknowledged that there would not be any amplification or external call to prayer.

Mr. Zawodny continued that the applicants held a meeting with some of the residents in February to introduce the community and to show the concept of the development. There was a strong intent expressed to not have a six-foot wall placed along the eastern or western half of the property. The applicant pursued the concept of dense plantings. He referred to the Conditions proposed in the Tree Removal Permit and said they had replaced 299 tree credits on site and were committed to paying into the City's Tree Fund for the balance. He mentioned that they were trying to keep activity on the site to the north and south ends of the structure and to the parking areas of the front entry plaza, and the original design concept did not show sidewalks, which would create more pedestrian traffic along the residential side of the property. He suggested that they could perhaps provide a connecting walk at the edge of the building to tie the walks together and to provide a continuous walkway, but they would like circulation to take place through the building. He did not feel there would be a need for pedestrian traffic to walk the entire length of the site. He also noted that there would be a six-foot, decorative iron fence around the detention pond, which would be black to blend in with the landscaping. He showed lighting detail, as requested in Condition 4 of Site Plan approval, and pointed out the proposed entryway and footpath locations.

Mr. Zawodny concluded with the approach for drop-offs and pick-ups. He showed three proposed layouts with various drive approaches and methods of circulation and explained the traffic flow (those were on file with the Planning Department). He showed the plan he felt might cause congestion and direction problems. They tried to evaluate the impact to pedestrians and vehicles and that led them to work with a version they felt would simplify the process.

Mr. Kaiser confirmed that there would be nothing used to call people to worship. Mr. Malik said that in mosques throughout the world, including several in western European countries and Canada, they did not have any outside loudspeakers. They were all indoors. Mr. Kaiser clarified that Mr. Malik was talking about the Ahmadiyya sect. Mr. Kaiser asked if he would object to a condition for the CLU that read: "No public address system or audio or sound amplifying system may be installed that could be heard beyond the property lines." Mr. Malik said he would not have a problem with that. Mr. Kaiser asked if he would object to the following condition: "That there shall be no Site Plans or changes to the use without a new CLU request," which he noted would be the standard practice. Mr. Malik did not see that as a problem. Mr. Kaiser explained that there had been a history of churches expanding, and that was how the City was assured it would be properly handled. He noted that the new St. Paul's Albanian

Church in the community had serious parking issues, and although he realized the use would be different than that proposed for the mosque, he felt having more specificity was appropriate. He suggested that the word incidents would mean “there were three events in which tickets were issued by law enforcement officers to members of the congregation as a result of limited parking on site.” Mr. Malik said that would be fine.

Mr. Zawodny advised that they addressed future expansion and where things would be placed on the site, but he wanted it identified that for the southeast corner, there was space for a potential future residence for a leader of the community. It would be the equivalent of a rectory on site. In the final approved drawings that would not be indicated, and he realized that there would have to be a review of the CLU recommendation and approval to add a residence. They wanted it addressed before it came up in the future.

Mr. Kaiser opened the Public Hearing at 8:30 p.m.

**Robert Traskall, 3015 Wilmington, Rochester Hills, MI** Mr. Traskall stated that he lived in the Northbrooke Subdivision south of Auburn between Crooks and Livernois. He had lived there for ten years and was concerned about potential spill-off of parking and traffic into his subdivision. He noticed that for the other two churches east on Auburn, the Rochester Hills Police Department had to negotiate the traffic when there were meetings or celebrations. He lived on a corner and was concerned there would be parking in front of his house. He realized people had a legal right to park there, but there were families and he was concerned for the safety of his children. It seemed to him that the applicants wanted it both ways – they wanted to have a residence on site, but there would also be a mosque. It seemed like there was a lot effort to try and make this area appear residential, and he wondered why it could not be left as residential and another location found for the mosque. He noted that there was a large new office complex approved for Crooks and Auburn and that the proposal would add to the congestion on Auburn, a two-lane highway.

**Richard Thomas, 6825 Donaldson, Troy, MI** Mr. Thomas stated that he owned property on Auburn Road and wanted to do something with it. He called the City and was told he could not cut down the trees. He wanted to sell the property and had a sign up, but when people called the City, they were told they could not do anything with the property. He stated that the applicant wanted to cut down 477 trees but he was told he could not cut down even one. He also asked if there were wetlands on the property.

**Nancy Raffler, 713 W. Auburn, Rochester Hills, MI** Ms. Raffler stated that she did not oppose St. Paul’s Albanian Catholic Church at Auburn and M-59 or the present IAGD mosque at Auburn and Livernois, but that she was strongly opposed to another high traffic generator on this short stretch of Auburn. There would be three places of worship in 1.1 miles. The northeast corner of Crooks and Auburn was torn up for a new medical building and Meijer’s was just east of this area. She stated the traffic would be increased, during the rush hours and on Friday when the IAGD services let out or on days when the IAGD or St. Paul’s had a funeral or large event. The IAGD started out at about 7,000 square feet and expanded through an administrative approval to more than 30,000 square feet. She hoped that would not happen again. She indicated that there were unresolved issues with drainage, traffic and parking at the IAGD. She spoke about the drainage issues involving her property and the IAGD earlier during the meeting. For nearly four years she had been trying to get the City to take care of this, but all she got were empty promises. This site proposed a detention pond and she questioned where it would drain or what private property owner would be forced to take on the water from the subject site. She asked that this *please* not happen to another private property owner. She stressed that the proposed site was so wet that water could be seen from the road and that the IAGD already generated too much traffic and parking problems now. She indicated that people parked on the right-of-way, on lots zoned R-4, and on private property. They parked on or drove across other people’s properties unless confronted. On Friday, when the services ended, there were two Oakland County deputies to let the traffic out. She stated that stopping traffic on a State road violated a State law, for which she had proof. She said that the IAGD exited out of five driveways and that only one was State approved, as required. She brought

this to the attention of the Mayor and City Council but as usual, nothing was done to correct it. She said she had a tape of a Council meeting at which the Mayor actually defended this violation and stated that they could use as many driveways as they wanted. With thinking like that and lack of enforcement, it was unreasonable to add any more traffic to this area. She indicated that Council constantly talked about following the Master Plan, and reiterated that the subject site was Zoned R-4. She asked the Commissioners to *please* keep the site residential and she believed there were many other areas in this City where the applicant could build. Based upon the large amount of water on the proposed site and the fact that this short stretch of Auburn already had enough traffic, she asked the Commission to reject the proposal.

**Mary LeBeault, 19 Canterbury Trail, Rochester Hills, MI** Ms. LeBeault stated that she had lived in Rochester Hills for 11 years and had many family members who lived in the area. Her niece lived off of Auburn Road, and she recently visited her and was shocked. When she tried to get home, near Walton between Old Perch and Adams, she ran into gridlock traffic. It was stop-and-go and she stated she was appalled. She indicated that Rochester Hills has had a lot of growth and that it was wonderful to live there, but when she saw an article in the newspaper stating a new mosque was proposed for this area, she wondered what it would mean. She indicated that families and churches grow, and she was appalled that the City would consider adding more congestion and traffic. People travel at about 50 miles per hour on Auburn and she felt it would be increasingly unsafe and that there would be more people on the roads trying to get to the facility. She stated that accidents would increase and she felt it would be unfair to the people who lived in the area, especially since the roads did not even handle what was already there. She indicated that a lot of other people would have liked to be at the meeting but could not change their schedules.

Mr. Kaiser closed the public hearing at 8:35 p.m.

Mr. Kaiser advised that Auburn Road was a State Road and that the City had tried to seek improvements to it. However, since the State controlled Auburn, the City had been unable to accomplish that and in the current economic times, the likelihood of much happening was low. The State has had little concern about Auburn Road because they dealt with M-59.

Regarding keeping the area residential, Mr. Kaiser advised that churches were approved in residential zoning districts for a reason. Traditionally, in the cities and towns across the country, churches were put in these areas because that was where people wanted them to go. They were placed in neighborhoods where people lived for a reason. He asked Mr. Delacourt to address the issues of traffic as they related to what the applicant would be compelled to do if the mosque was approved for construction.

Mr. Delacourt responded that the applicants submitted a Traffic Study for the proposal. That had been reviewed by the City's Engineering Department and MDOT. He advised that there was a note on the Site Plan indicating that the mosque was willing to work with the City and MDOT to make traffic improvements to Auburn Road, including the potential for a left-hand turn lane. The reason the improvements were not on the plan was because the State and City were still determining the final design. There was development at the southeast corner of Crooks and Auburn and the road widening of Crooks was supposed to have taken place. Traffic improvements were proposed for the northeast corner of Crooks and Auburn, as well as for the developments east of the subject site. He advised that as soon as MDOT came up with a final design, the applicant would be willing to include them on the construction plans. The proposal had been reviewed and the City's Engineering Department and MDOT indicated that the improvements, when approved, would fall within the required guidelines. He read the note from the Site Plan, Sheet 1: "It is proposed Auburn Road improvements will be subject to MDOT requirement. Improvements as shown on Plan are subject to change, with center turn lane as required by MDOT and the City of Rochester Hills." Mr. Kaiser asked if he was satisfied that locked in the applicant to construct and fund the improvements. Mr. Delacourt said he was confident that it would, as would the fact that

without the approval of MDOT, they would not be able to obtain a curb cut permit for the proposal.

Mr. Kaiser asked Mr. Delacourt about the drainage issue and he responded that there were wetlands on the site, which was stated in the letter from the City's wetland consultant and from the MDEQ. He indicated that the wetlands were not regulated by either the City or the MDEQ because they did not meet the criteria under the Ordinance. The proposed method for drainage had been reviewed by the City's Engineering Staff, which recommended approval with conditions. There would be a detention basin, which would outlet to a pipe on the south side of Auburn Road. The pipe had more than enough capacity for the proposed development. He said Staff had no concerns with drainage or detention on site. The applicants were required to detain and outlet stormwater at an acceptable standard and it should not encumber anyone else's property. Mr. Kaiser commented briefly on the drainage at the IAGD mosque.

Mr. Kaiser asked why they could not put a right-turn only sign at the end of the drive onto Auburn Road. Mr. Delacourt said that with the improvements MDOT required, no one felt it would be necessary and that in fact, Staff wanted to see the traffic dispersed in all directions. For other projects, traffic was not handled through signage, but through design. Mr. Kaiser felt that based on the membership of the mosque, most of the traffic would turn right and head for Crooks Road to go either north to M-59 or south to I-75.

Mr. Kaiser asked Mr. Delacourt if he had changed his choice of alternative A for the drop-off area after seeing what Mr. Zawodny had provided. Mr. Delacourt replied that he had not, although he acknowledged that there were pros and cons for each design. Each one had a small conflict – one might be better for traffic movement and one might be better for pedestrian movement. Staff recommended alternative A because it would create the least impervious surface. Mr. Kaiser asked why they should be concerned about impervious surfaces and Mr. Delacourt answered that less pavement would have less stormwater runoff and more natural absorption of water. Alternate A also would leave the most room for future banked parking.

Mr. Kaiser referred to Mr. Thomas' comments and asked Mr. Delacourt if he was familiar with the tree(s) he discussed. Mr. Delacourt said he was not, and added that like Mr. Thomas, the applicant would not be allowed to cut down trees without going through the process to obtain a Tree Removal Permit. He believed Mr. Thomas' property was governed by the Tree Conservation Ordinance. Mr. Kaiser suggested that Mr. Thomas be given an appropriate City phone number.

Ms. Hill asked why the development was not moved toward Auburn Road, but rather, the banked parking was shown toward the front. The applicant mentioned a future home near Auburn Road, but she felt there would still be a fair amount of room for the building and indicated she would not like to see so much parking near Auburn. Since the development would back up to industrial at the north, she would prefer to see the parking along there. Additionally, she was not against the alternative A drop-off plan, but she did not like the setup for the handicapped parking. Having spent a week with someone who used handicap parking all the time, she realized how difficult it was for someone to have to go to the rear of an automobile and walk through a parking lot. She felt it would be better to have ramp access forward of the vehicle, out of the trafficked area. The way the handicap parking was positioned by the drop-off area was a concern. Mr. Kaiser asked if she would like to see a ramp and sidewalk in front of the handicap spots. Ms. Hill, noting it was not on the Plan, stated that it would be very inconvenient for a handicapped individual to have to go into the vehicle flow. She would like to see that changed and suggested it could be accomplished by moving everything a little to the southwest.

Mr. Zawodny, responding to re-placing areas on the Plan, said that, for instance, the detention pond was located in an area where there were a number of deceased and dying trees, and he felt that certainly had to be taken into account. He noted that also, to the south of the lot, there were a number of healthy, desirable trees they wished to preserve and that there were many ash and elm trees on site. He advised that the building and parking areas were proposed there because those trees could come down.

He acknowledged that Ms. Hill's point was very valid, and suggested that they might shift the northern parking lot to the west by approximately five feet, which would allow the sidewalk access all the way to the entry.

Ms. Hill noted that if the building were expanded, the parking would be moved further to the south, yet the majority of the activity would be to the north. She would prefer to see most people park in the north lot. She would not want more trees taken down than necessary, but she was not satisfied with some areas of the Plan's design.

Recess: 8:56 p.m. to 9:08 p.m.

Mr. Kaiser read Mr. Lewis' letter (see Communications, page one) into the record: "Ladies and Gentleman, my name is Mike Lewis and I live at 2908 Alexander Ave. I would like to express my concerns regarding the community center development. 1) Traffic. With this further development on Auburn Road comes along another traffic problem. Traveling east from Crooks there will be traffic lights and four left hand turns within one-half mile (new Walgreen's development, Dentist Office, Alexander Ave., plus community center). Will this cause a backup of traffic? Will there be problems like the one found every week further east on Auburn at the two churches? The police do traffic control. I suggest that a "No left-hand turn" when traveling east into the center should be considered. 2). Noise. The plans I've seen show a 40-foot tower. Will this be used for calling people to prayer? Suggest for local residents' peace, no calling to prayer be allowed in this residential area."

Mr. Kaiser asked the applicants if they had anything to add regarding Ms. Hill's concerns.

Mr. Zawodny said they looked at a number of different layouts for the property and tried to respect the residential character in the area, with the concept that the position of the building would allow the parking to be dispersed in the front and back. He noted that they looked at a solution that had the parking all to the commercial side, but in those situations, the parking tended to become an element unto itself, because all the parking was consolidated in one area, even if there were interior planting islands. The parking, as configured, would allow for the building to be accessed from multiple sides, and would allow the trees and other vegetation to act as a foreground buffer, whether potential residences were developed along Auburn Road or not. When driving along Auburn Road in this area, the first perception of the property would be the landscaping and the existing vegetation rather than the proposed structure. They wanted to make sure the landscape was the foreground for the image of the property and surrounding community. They felt that the building - placed after much study and massaging - was in the best-seated location.

Mr. Kaiser asked how he would alter what was just said if they were to add a house on the front of the property.

Mr. Zawodny said it would not alter what he said - it would support it. Mr. Kaiser replied that if a house were added, the trees shown on the drawing would be gone. Mr. Zawodny said that from the footprint shown, they would take out some of the center trees, but mature trees could be replanted and the image could be restated. If he placed a building further toward the road, at 24 to 26-feet high, there would be a significant difference on the impact. The residence would reinforce the fabric that was there, as opposed to having a more structured facility toward the road.

Mr. Kaiser clarified that they proposed moving the parking area to the west to accommodate a sidewalk. Mr. Zawodny agreed, saying they could locate the sidewalk where it would not encroach in the buffer. They had a few extra feet so they would only have to move the parking about three feet. Mr. Kaltsounis said he agreed with Ms. Hill about the sidewalk, having been handicapped once, and would not want to see someone guided into oncoming traffic.

The Commissioners each indicated their preference for the drop-off/pick-up area at the building's front entrance, choosing from three plans submitted by Mr. Zawodny (known

as alternates A, B and C and placed on file in the Planning Department). The pros and cons, including space, traffic flow, stopping and parking options, were discussed, and after a straw vote the majority of the Commissioners chose plan A. Mr. Rosen suggested that it might be a good idea to add a few handicap spaces at this lot, noting that adding them during this phase would be easier than doing it later.

Mr. Hooper asked if the community had an option for the parcels to the east. Mr. Malik said they approached the adjacent property owner but he declined their request.

Mr. Hooper asked the maximum height allowed in the R-4 zoning district. Mr. Delacourt replied that it was 25 feet and added that for a place of worship, one additional foot would be allowed for each additional foot of setback. He advised that the closest point to the property line for the proposed building would be 38 feet so with the 10-foot setback, the building could be 28 feet higher, for a total of 53 feet. The proposed minaret would fall below that. Mr. Hooper asked if the tower would *not* be constructed as a part of the proposed Site Plan. Mr. Delacourt said it was his understanding that the applicant was requesting approval for that height and that it would be constructed during a future phase. If that were the case, Staff would recommend that it be removed from the current plans and when they were ready for construction, they would have to get approval at that time.

Mr. Malik said they might not build it during phase one because of funding; but if something happened and they could afford it, they would build it right away. It would be a symbolic part of the development, but they would like to keep it in the initial plan even if they could not build it as soon as they would like.

Mr. Hooper referred to the review of St. Paul's Albanian Church and said he was certain that after a long discussion, the Planning Commission required that a passing lane be constructed. He noted that he traveled Auburn by the church recently and there was no such lane. Mr. Delacourt said he was not with the City when that project was reviewed and approved, and he was not aware of the status.

Mr. Kaiser agreed that the road was to be widened and a passing lane added across the entire length of the property, but it had not been done. The lineage that was put on the south side of Auburn was done improperly so that westbound traffic in front of the church was steered to provide a right turn into the church. He brought this up to Mr. Anzek at least four times in the last two years and was told that the church would fix it. He added that the State did sign off on the Plan approved by the Commission, but nothing was constructed.

Mr. Hooper asked what the mechanism to enforce the construction was; if, for example, it was issuing tickets or another form of enforcement. Mr. Delacourt stated that if it were not constructed as approved there probably was recourse, but he suggested that MDOT could have prevented the construction.

Mr. Hooper referred to the submitted Traffic Improvements and asked if 93 parking spaces were proposed. Mr. Delacourt advised that 84 were proposed. Mr. Hooper stated that the Study showed the applicant anticipated two events a year and would have an expected attendance of 275 members. The mosque would also hold weddings and social events about six times a year for 300 members, and during Ramadan they could expect 150 members every weekend. He questioned whether they were certain 84 parking spaces would be adequate with those events in mind.

Mr. Malik said he believed it would be because most of the membership was comprised of families – four or five members to a vehicle. For 250 members that would be about 50-60 cars, so he felt that 84 would be more than adequate for their current needs. As the future unfolded, they would use the banked parking if necessary. He reiterated that they were planning to build another site on the west side, where they expected more growth. He did not foresee a large growth in this area in the near future. Mr. Hooper said that St. Paul's banked parking was constructed with a gravel surface and he wondered if they had any thought about that or if they would leave the proposed parking



as grass. Mr. Kaiser said he would prefer to see it left as natural as possible to not impact the drainage, and to allow the applicant to add the paving later.

Mr. Rosen questioned where the water from the detention pond would go when it was discharged. Mr. Tripathi said that the detention pond would have an outlet to the south side of Auburn Road, to a 36" diameter County storm sewer called the Lueders Drain.

Mr. Rosen referred to the drawing of the building and asked about the metal paneled screen wall. Mr. Zawodny replied that the area would serve the HVAC units for the multi-purpose room. He advised that there would be an enclosed panel on the roof to screen the mechanical equipment, and it would have the same metal finish as the windows – a champagne bronze - and it would also match the other metal on the building. Mr. Rosen said it would be about 34 feet high and he wondered if there could be another color used to disguise it, as it would be noticeable unless someone was closer to the building. Mr. Zawodny said that had been an ongoing debate because, given the Michigan weather, some people thought a lighter color was better, but when it was cloudy those colors tended to show up. Dark colors would also show up so they tried to find a neutral tone, but he agreed the color could be given some consideration. Mr. Rosen wondered if it would make sense to put up a taller parapet wall around the outside. Mr. Zawodny explained that setting something back was a secondary element and would create less of a presence than raising the primary wall. In terms of the building scale, if they raised the entire perimeter wall on the activities area, the structure would appear far more massive than having a stepped-back structure. Mr. Rosen referred to the Village of Rochester Hills and said that HVAC units could be seen by the neighbors. Also, when driving by the old Letica Building on Livernois, big canvas-looking screens for the HVAC units drew attention. He felt that if the applicant could get the screen area lower, it would look better. Mr. Zawodny agreed that result would be their desire.

Mr. Rosen observed that if residential homes were put on the subject five acres, the taxable value generated would be about \$5 million, about \$45,000.00 would be collected in taxes for the City and \$130,000.00 collected for all jurisdictions. He acknowledged that a discussion of tax generating land uses could be taken up during the Master Plan review, but he questioned whether there already was enough non-taxable land areas, because the City would lose income again and it was a concern.

Mr. Kaltsounis referred to Page L-3 and the trees on the proposed banked parking, and said they were not shown as removals. He wondered if they were included as part of the Tree Removal Permit. Mr. Delacourt replied that they were not counted as removals. The applicant would be required to obtain a revised Tree Removal Permit. The City's Landscape Architect decided that they would not be counted because she was hopeful they would not be removed. She did not ask for replacement credits in that area either. Mr. Kaltsounis asked the applicants if the current location of the detention pond would stop the development's future progress, noting that if more parking was needed it might be easier if the detention pond were placed closer to Auburn. He questioned what would happen if more parking were added and there still was not enough. He commented that parking requirements for churches needed further review, recalling that a number of tickets were issued at St. Paul's and the IAGD with no resolution to the parking problem. Because of that situation, he wondered if the applicants could be sure of the direction they were going, and he observed that they might have to consider the sale of the property in the future.

Mr. Zawodny said it was difficult to address those types of questions, but he stressed that they had gone through a number of generations of site configurations and layouts, trying to look at building and pond placement, tree removal and so on. There was a possible building footprint of approximately 22,000 square feet, given lot coverage, parking, and tree removal. Relative to parking placement, and in meeting the Ordinance requirements, they believed the parking would be adequate. They had some space to the north to expand the northern parking lot, but they would like to maintain as much greenery as possible. They tried to take everything into account relative to placement, the storm system's layout and service requirements, building configuration,

the front of the lot by Auburn Road and space for a possible residence, and they believed they had proposed the optimal layout.

Ms. Brnabic referred to Drawing 1 and the statement that read: "No fire suppression is required for this building," but she noted that a fire department connection was included and that there was reference to a sprinkler system a few pages later. She wanted to verify that the building would be sprinkled and if the statement was an error. Mr. Zawodny agreed that statement was an error. He said that the building footprint, if enacted under the previous BOCA code, could have been constructed without fire suppression, but with the 2003 restrictions, a building of this type would need it. Ms. Brnabic clarified that the Plan would be corrected.

Ms. Brnabic indicated that Staff recommended removal of details for the trash enclosure from Drawing 1, and that the detail included on Sheet AS1.01 should be the acceptable drawing, to which she agreed. Mr. Zawodny said they would work with Mr. Delacourt on that, but initially they were required to put the detail on the engineering drawings and that was why there was some redundancy. He stated that they would make sure that the correct variation was applied.

Ms. Brnabic noted that a cover sheet was enclosed regarding the meeting that took place on February 26, 2004 with the applicant and the neighbors. She said the Commission did not receive any feedback from that meeting, and after listening to residents, she knew there were drainage concerns, requests for vegetation versus a concrete wall, traffic concerns and concerns about the trash dumpster. She wondered if the resident who inquired about the dumpster was aware of the trash enclosure and that spruce trees would be planted. She also questioned whether there were other concerns the Commissioners had not heard.

Mr. Malik felt that all the issues raised, including traffic and the berm, were addressed in the planning. He indicated that two or three neighbors were very impressed and happy there would be a positive image in the community.

Ms. Ruggiero felt that the trash dumpster should be moved to the north side of the property for two reasons. First, as proposed, it would be adjacent to residential, and at the north side of the property it would be adjacent to industrial. She felt that was a huge difference. Second, when the trash company was there, they would be on the main traffic drive in and out of the sight, and if the dumpster were at the back, the trucks would be out of the main flow of traffic. She felt that if they had the opportunity to move it away from the residential area they should take advantage of that.

Ms. Ruggiero said she was a little confused about the tree count for the Tree Removal Permit. It was her understanding, relative to the Staff Report, that 37% of the regulated trees would be preserved. On the drawing that Mr. Kaltsounis referenced relative to the tree removals, it showed trees to be removed in the banked parking on the north end of the site, but not from the banked parking on the southwest portion of the site. When the trees were removed from the southwest banked area, more regulated trees would be gone and that would affect the count.

Mr. Zawodny replied that they wanted the placement of the dumpster within a certain distance of the facility, obviously for the ease of taking things out of the southwest door. They wanted to keep the waste truck travel into the property at a minimum, while allowing it to come into an area with a wider pavement for movement. Mr. Kaiser asked his thoughts about moving the dumpster to the north. Mr. Zawodny replied that if they did that, it would be in the banked parking, but he suggested they could look at the trade-off of one for the other. They would have to bring trash out the front door of the facility and take it all the way across the parking lot.

Mr. Kaiser asked how far the dumpster would be from the adjacent houses as currently drawn. Mr. Zawodny said it was currently shown at 45 feet from the property line. Mr. Kaiser asked how far it would be from the property line to the homes on Alexander. Mr. Zawodny said another 45 feet, so about 90 feet total. Ms. Ruggiero commented that

someone would be emptying a dumpster at 5:30 in the morning right behind peoples' homes, so they would be going from bad to worse, in her opinion.

Mr. Malik said that his facility would be empty almost all day long and that worshippers would come after hours, and on Friday and the weekends. Trash could be picked up anytime Monday through Thursday without interfering with any traffic. Ms. Ruggiero said that typically, dumpsters were not well maintained. Doors were left open, garbage would be piled up at the top and overflowing, and soon the neighbors would be complaining that stuff was blowing into their yards. It was inevitable, but she advised that the Commission tried to avoid those problems for the applicant as well as the City. It made perfect sense to take advantage of having an industrial area next to the site.

Ms. Ruggiero asked about the water pump station that was mentioned in a memo from Public Services. Mr. Tripathi said that considering the grading around the property and to protect the trees, they discussed this system with Engineering. Where the storm sewer went into the detention basin, the inlet was much lower than going to the 36" drain on Auburn. They would pump it out at a restricted rate and outlet to the drain system. The pump would drain the water out from the property into the storm sewer on Auburn. Ms. Ruggiero clarified that it would come out of the detention basin and asked if it was an above-ground structure. Mr. Tripathi said it was a storm sewer manhole and the pump would be fitted into the manhole and be easy to maintain. It would be like a regular manhole sitting in the ground.

Mr. Zawodny said they discussed the banked parking for the northern and southern ends of the property. If there were a need to expand the banked parking to the north they would have that opportunity by removing some of the trees there. In the interim, by removing trees in that location, with approximately one-half to two-thirds of those being in rather poor condition, the land could be opened up and utilized as a small outdoor activity area. It would be available to the community until such time as the parking was utilized. He emphasized that it would truly be their desire to not push the parking any further towards Auburn Road. They tried to leave the trees in that area as part of a grouping.

Mr. Delacourt reminded the Commissioners that preserving 37% of the trees applied to residential developments and that this applicant was not obligated for this percentage, but Staff requested that they try and save that amount.

Mr. Rosen referred to Ms. Ruggiero's question about the dumpster and questioned whether there would be an opportunity to put it on the southwest face of the building, in an enclosure that was easily accessible yet further away from the neighbors.

Mr. Zawodny felt that if the minaret and more space were developed in the area, they would have to pursue the answer with study to see if it would be a feasible concept. He did not feel he could answer with certainty, given the things they wished to do with that corner of the building in terms of image, symbolism and outdoor space. Mr. Rosen felt that it would be a good thing to do if they could work it out.

Ms. Hill disagreed that the dumpster should be moved, and felt that if it had a wall around three sides, some plantings and an opening toward the mosque, the neighbors would not have to look, especially from their second floors, and see an open dumpster. She felt that by keeping it towards the front, versus having trucks have to haul garbage all the way from the back, that it would lessen the noise and debris and be in a good location for the members to access it.

Ms. Hill referred to the handicap parking proposed for the southern lot and said people would have to cross the main entry drive, and she wondered if they could put a sidewalk along the building next to the drive. There was no cross striping or ramp shown and people would have to go behind the vehicle and then cross the entrance drive. She realized the applicant wished access to be through the building rather than around it, but she felt there should be sidewalk access to go around at least one side of the building to approach the main court in the main entrance.

Continuing, Ms. Hill brought up the issue of traffic, and reminded about the improvements requested for St. Paul's that were never completed. She mentioned the commercial center proposed for the northeast corner of Crooks and Auburn, and the improvements required, and said she would not want to see Auburn Road have too many entry and exit drives. She referred to a stretch along Livernois where the pavement was not continued in places and she wanted to make sure that was avoided for the subject area. She was very concerned about ingress and egress on Auburn, noting that it was an extremely busy road.

Mr. Delacourt agreed with Ms. Hill's comments, and said that they would have to wait for the intersection design for Crooks and Auburn to be finalized, to see how far back the boulevarded section would be, and to see what would happen with the left-hand turn lanes for the developments to the east. The City had looked into what would be necessary to extend the left turn lane across all the developments, so there would not be a gap from Crooks. The intent would be to come up with a design that would bring the boulevarded section of the intersection east and convert it into a left hand turn lane, but he did not know what the final design would look like. Mr. Zawodny clarified that from Crooks and Auburn eastward, there was a commercial development on the corner, Alexander Ave. residential property, the subject site, two vacant parcels and then the ten-unit Saddlebrook site condominium development. In conjunction with MDOT, everyone was working together so that going east from the intersection there would be a center left-turn lane all the way past Saddlebrook. They were committed to try and make that improvement work, as was the developer for the northwest corner of Crooks and Auburn.

Ms. Hill said that Mr. Rosen mentioned the screening for the top of the building, and that Mr. Zawodny indicated it would be six feet. She would like that kept lower than six feet if at all possible. At the Village of Rochester Hills the height and parapet walls caused a great deal of contention for the neighbors, so she would like to see a nicer-looking wall rather than the screening proposed if they kept it at a six-foot height. She indicated that something that high would be very apparent to someone driving down Auburn Road. She asked about the minaret, and said she was not opposed, but observed that if constructed, it would add another 20 feet above the 34-foot height.

Mr. Kaiser said he had some uncertainty about the road, not having a configuration to review. As Mr. Hooper brought up, even when the Commission tried to control what happened with St. Paul's, years later the improvements had not been made and there was a nightmarish traffic situation. If cars wanted to go westbound toward Crooks or Livernois, they would be breaking the law if they passed a car to the right. He did not feel they should approve something without having more understanding of how the traffic would work, realizing that this religious community would not have services in the exact same fashion as St. Paul's. The Commission was being asked to make decisions without having all the information they should. The applicant brought up that this was the optimal layout for their development, but he thought that perhaps the storm basin could be moved to the south considerably, without going all the way to Auburn. The landscaping would be incorporated into the site and he suggested that the banked parking could be moved into the vicinity almost immediately adjacent to the southeast side of the church. That would accommodate future handicapped spaces. If there was a house constructed in the future, he wondered if that should be done on the western side of the driveway to accommodate the storm basin further south and the banked parking north of that. In the meantime, trees were there. In response to Mr. Delacourt's statement that the Tree Ordinance did not apply to this site, he felt the Commissioners were confronted with the classic issues of trying to save trees and the fact that there was little left of Rochester Hills' natural resources. The Commissioners could enforce the Tree Ordinance in its entirety for this site if it were developed as zoned (residentially). For the developments along Auburn that had been reviewed and/or approved in the last year, the Commissioners had forced the maintenance of huge stands of trees. Rather than wiping out 63% for the developments approved in the last year or so, they had requested that more trees be saved and planted along the edges of the properties, which saved stands of trees. If the proposal were approved as submitted, that would not happen. They would be letting go of the effort they had made in the last 12-24 months.

Mr. Kaiser stated that he did not feel they had enough answers. He said he would not support putting the dumpster all the way back at the north end of the site. It would be an enforcement issue, but as Ms Hill said, if the truck drivers started from the north end and drove out to Auburn, the residents to the west would hear the engine revving longer than if the dumpster was closer to the road.

Mr. Kaiser strongly felt that they might be making a wrong decision by putting the proposed development at this site, knowing that if the parcel were developed residentially, it would remain fully compatible and harmonious. They could continue what they had been doing for that stretch of Auburn, which was saving stands of trees, or they could let a developer knock down 63% and put money into the tree fund, which would bother him and not do anyone in that neighborhood any good.

Mr. Kaiser said that Mr. Rosen asked about putting the dumpster on the building or about using a compactor. Mr. Zawodny felt that compactors, while having trash conceptually contained within the enclosed compactor, would give rise to the same concerns or considerations as a dumpster. Mr. Kaiser asked how much further away from the residences the dumpster would be if put adjacent to the building. Mr. Zawodny replied approximately 70 feet, depending on which portion of the building. Mr. Kaiser said he was not convinced that in terms of sound, it would make that much of a difference because either way, a truck would be backing up, pulling forward, loading trash and driving away. He thought that where it was shown, in the middle, if properly screened and handled, would probably be as good a location as any. Mr. Zawodny said that if it were adjacent to the building, there would be other issues they would have to address relative to the outdoor areas adjacent to the building and other internal concerns.

Mr. Kaiser asked about moving the detention basin closer to Auburn Road, and about configuring the banked parking closer to the mosque. Mr. Tripathi responded that if they moved the banked parking on the south, the real concern would be the outside play area. Mr. Kaiser suggested that if they were to swap everything and bring the detention pond to the south they would not have to put the banked parking any further north than where the detention pond was proposed. Whatever amount of play area they proposed would not be a net loss or create any issues regarding the children. In terms of the space the applicant felt was needed, he did not see how moving the referenced items would change the ultimate use of the property. He did not like the idea of locating the parking so far to the south. He suggested that it was probably put there because they did not think it would ever be needed, but the development had to be planned as if it would be, and that would result in a lot of cars parked close to Auburn Road.

Mr. Zawodny responded that during their evaluations, it was determined that they would rather not invoke parking in that location. The thought process regarded green space, settings for the building, breaking up and balancing the site with religious structure, trying to make sure there was not a lot of blacktop close to the building, and balancing open area versus paved area to keep clusters of natural settings together, all done as more than just a gesture. From a design aspect, they had some concern about the detention pond being adjacent to Auburn Road and the site's overall image relative to its setting within the community. They wanted to make it part of the natural setting and the foreground of the building, and leave the trees as a buffer. He questioned if it would be successful in a spot more forward. He said he understood the concern, but he had to try to balance the needs of the community and the layout and design of the building, versus respecting the needs of the surrounding environment and neighborhood.

Mr. Kaiser said that the first part of Mr. Zawodny's response was essentially about looking at the applicant's property as if it were an island unto itself, although he mentioned some concern for the adjacent and surrounding properties. Mr. Kaiser felt that reconfiguring the pond and the banked parking would show more sensitivity towards the surrounding area than the current layout. Mr. Zawodny asked them to consider that the two parcels to the east of the subject site might be developed as residential parcels. If they put the parking where the detention pond was shown, and put some closer to the building on the eastern half, they would create a 200-foot wide section of blacktop and parking that neighbors on either side would see. Or, the parking

could be kept in smaller amounts, with islands that were substantial with larger components of green space. If this were a commercial, developer-oriented parcel, he would put as much parking nearer to the building as possible.

Mr. Kaiser stated that if banked parking were put on the east side of the drive and in the area of the detention pond, if landscaped properly it would never be seen by potential residents to the east. The only people who would see the parking would be those who came to worship. Mr. Zawodny clarified that by moving the detention pond to the south, they would still have to consider the possibility of a residence, and would have to reduce the amount of parking shown on the west. In essence, they would be "moving the checkers around" and would still have to maintain the same area amounts. Mr. Kaiser assured that he would want to see an optimal layout, but felt they were trying to push too much into the site. They were creating the eventualities they wanted to see, which he understood was what Mr. Zawodny was hired to do, but he felt it was too much. If there was a residential development at this site in the future, the Commissioners could do a lot better job of saving stands of trees. The Commissioners could not tell the applicants they could never come back and ask for a revised CLU, but he was having trouble with what they wished to do, for now and for the future. He would rather have seen areas dedicated to preserving stands of trees and other reconfigurations, which he felt would lead to a much better situation.

Mr. Kaiser indicated that he would like more information regarding the road improvements and asked the Commissioners if they would be interested in having a vote on the CLU recommendation only, which would be forwarded to City Council. It would be tied to plans similar to those dated received September 12, 2004, so the applicant would know how to proceed. He felt that the Commissioners had the right to know what the applicant proposed for the future development of the site. If the CLU dictated that the applicant could never put a house on the property, they should know that also. He added that the Commissioners could vote on all the requests.

Mr. Rosen agreed that the proposal seemed too much for the site, and that he was also a little bothered by the layout, noting that it had to do with the orientation of the building. He believed the widest dimension was from the southeast to the northwest, or 171 feet, but it was only 131 feet from the northeast to the southwest. He realized one would be considered the front and one would be the back, but 131 feet was almost half of the width of the property. By orienting the building in the manner they did, they forced the driveway to the west, and since the building would be relatively close to the eastern property line, it would make the site look like all building. People would see two sides of the building, which would total far more than if they saw one face. He agreed with Mr. Kaiser that the applicant should look at alternatives for the storm detention basin, and he noted the current placement was a concern. If it required a storm pump and there was a classic heavy rain and a power failure, there would be a lot of water in the storm detention basin with nowhere to go. He realized the drainage would be toward it, but stated that it could overflow and flood the houses to the south as well as flood the site, so he felt they should look at that issue further.

Mr. Delacourt said that the plan had been reviewed carefully to try and avoid putting a pump in, and it was the conclusion of the applicant's and City's engineers that it was the best and only way to make it function. Mr. Rosen said that might not be the way to go and might be the reason to look differently at this site and maybe it would be determined that residential would make more sense. He also agreed about the banked parking on the south and felt there were several alternatives that could be looked at. He stated that making a recommendation for the CLU only would give him great pause.

Mr. Tripathi referred to the detention basin and said that if they started from the end point of the storm sewer at the upstream level, it would require minimum depth of so many feet from the rim inward and after that, based on the design, most of the contributing area of the pipe would dictate how far from one point to another the depth would go. There would still be the same length to travel with a required depth of three feet in the rear yards from the rim inward and the same pipe requirement. The depth of the Lueders Drain was not that deep so even if a subdivision were put in, it would also require a pump, because of the required slope for the storm sewer down to the

detention basin, which would be lower inward to the basin and then higher because at the outlet point there was not enough depth to begin with.

Mr. Rosen asked how deep the Lueders Drain was. Mr. Tripathi answered about five feet. Mr. Rosen clarified he meant that if the basin were moved to the south, if they were able to keep it at the same depth, 2/3 of the basin would be above the level of the drain and 1/3 of the basin would be below. He indicated that would be a much different set of circumstances. There could be a larger basin that covered more area and had a higher floor for flow. He understood that the pump was the only way to do it with this configuration, but he did not know it was the only way to do it in a different one. He was uneasy about the pump. Mr. Tripathi said that the pump would be the only way to go for the depth of the storm sewer, whether for residential or for the mosque.

Mr. Kaiser asked Mr. Zawodny if he saw merit in looking at some of the issues and rescheduling to come back before the Commission. Mr. Zawodny said they were trying to work with their client, and that they were also concerned with the surrounding community. He felt the pond should be kept away from the residences, but he said there might be an alternative so that the pond could occupy a different area and some of the parking could be moved to minimize the encroachment of future banked parking to the south. That would afford more natural space on the side of the existing residential subdivision, but not knowing what the future would hold for the parcel to the east, they would have to work with the elements that existed and with concern for maintaining the best trees on the parcel. After all the dialogue with the City's Landscape Consultant and trying hard to keep the best trees, he felt somewhat concerned about saying they would wipe out trees they knew were better than others.

Mr. Kaiser remarked that he was glad Mr. Zawodny was concerned and felt it would be useful if Mr. Zawodny could look at alternatives. He realized that part of Mr. Zawodny's drawings were done because he was told to make sure there was room for a house someday, but Mr. Kaiser was not sure that was a good part of the plan. He suggested they might need to find a home nearby but not on the site. This parcel was one of the "bowling alley" lots left in the City and unless a developer could buy three or four of them and propose a sensible development, they would be stuck trying to do one on a small rectangle. He complimented Mr. Zawodny on the job he had done, but he was not really in favor of what he saw, and he suggested that keeping space to develop a future home might be the problem. If they did not have to work within that constraint, they could be much closer to approval. He asked if they wanted the Commissioners to vote or if they wanted to rework the plan.

Mr. Delacourt said that if the matter were tabled and came back, Staff would make sure the City Engineer was present to clarify the storm sewer issue, and the applicant could perhaps include some of the proposed improvements on the Plan. Regarding the road improvements, Mr. Zawodny said that the intent that everyone had committed to was not that MDOT would come up with a design and everyone would implement it. They discussed the concept of sharing in the expense of the project, but it would still be an MDOT project. Once they designed and engineered the road, MDOT would make the improvements and it would be out of anyone else's hands.

After a short recess from 10:45 to 10:49 p.m. to confer with his clients, Mr. Zawodny asked for a postponement to evaluate some of the issues raised. Mr. Kaiser asked for a straw vote about the dumpster location and it was 5-3 to leave it where it was, and he noted that could change depending on the plan reconfiguration.

Ms. Ruggiero asked if it was the front of the mosque or the people praying who had to face toward Mecca. She explained that it saddened her that people would be looking at the back of the building when they entered the property, and indicated that the front would be much more beautiful to the visitors, the neighborhood and community.

Mr. Malik said they initially had the front of the building facing the entryway, but he noted that when people prayed, they had to face a certain direction. They did not want people to walk through the whole building to get to the prayer area because that was the "prime" space and people wanted to go into that area first.

**NEXT MEETING DATE:**

The Chair reminded Commissioners that the next joint meeting was scheduled for November 16, 2004.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the Chair adjourned the regular meeting at 10:55 p.m., Michigan time.

---

Eric Kaiser, Chairperson

---

Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

**Distribution:**

Planning Commission  
City Attorney  
File

I:\Pla\MINUTES\PC\2004\101904minutes.doc