



Rochester Hills

Minutes

Planning Commission

1000 Rochester Hills Dr
Rochester Hills, MI
48309
(248) 656-4600
Home Page:
www.rochesterhills.org

Chairperson William Boswell, Vice Chairperson Deborah Brnabic
Members: Gerard Dettloff, Dale Hetrick, Greg Hooper, Nicholas O. Kaltsounis,
David A. Reece, C. Neall Schroeder, Emmet Yukon

Tuesday, August 20, 2013

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson William Boswell called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Auditorium.

ROLL CALL

Present 7 - William Boswell, Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, Greg Hooper, David Reece, C. Neall Schroeder and Emmet Yukon

Absent 2 - Dale Hetrick and Nicholas Kaltsounis

Quorum present.

Also present: James Breuckman, Manager of Planning
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2013-0303 July 16, 2013 Regular Meeting

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

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

Absent 2 - Hetrick and Kaltsounis

COMMUNICATIONS

- A) *Letter from Dominic Mocerri dated Aug. 5, 2013 re: The Parkways Development*
- B) *Public Notice from the City of Auburn Hills for Aug. 27, 2013 re: The Parkways*
- C) *Planning & Zoning News (3) dated May, June and July 2013*
- D) *Letter from Wayne State College of Eng. Dated Aug. 19. 2013 re: Traffic Study for Rochester Square*

There were no further Communications brought forward.

Chairperson Boswell announced that if anyone wished to speak on an agenda item, a card should be filled out and turned in to the Secretary. He added that all questions should be directed to the Chair and would be addressed after the Public Hearing.

NEW BUSINESS

2013-0305 Request for a Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 13-001 - for the removal and replacement of as many as 23 regulated trees for Regal Estates, a nine-unit single-family development on 3.5 acres, located east of John R, north of Auburn, zoned R-4, One-Family Residential, Parcel No. 15-25-352-022, Roy Rathka, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by James Breuckman, dated August 15, 2013 and Preliminary Site Condo Plans had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof).

Present for the applicant were Roy and Tim Rathka, 11684 Majestic Ct., Shelby Township, MI 48315 and James Klinkenberger, Fenn & Associates, 14933 Commercial Dr., Shelby Township, MI 48315.

Mr. Breuckman summarized that the proposal was for a 9-unit, one-family detached site condo development located north of Auburn and east of John R, off of DeMar. The site was 3.5 acres, zoned R-4, One Family Residential. The applicants proposed a dead-end street with the ability to continue the road onto the property to the north and potentially loop back to Gravel Ridge. For that reason, the stub street layout was chosen rather than a cul-de-sac. He added that the stub street met Fire Department standards.

Regarding specific review considerations, Mr. Breuckman advised that Engineering had recommended conditional approval, which would not affect the site layout, and the conditions could be handled prior to Final Site Condo submittal. There were 47 trees on site, and the applicant was proposing to remove 23, leaving a preservation percentage of 51%. Most of the trees to be preserved were along the edges of the property of lots 1, 2 and 3, along the rear property line, and some on lot 4. There were also some trees in the wetland area in the back of lot 5 and a few along the property line next to the access road leading to the detention pond. There were some landscaping and tree replacement items to be addressed on the landscaping plan prior to Final Approval, should the

Plan be recommended to move forward. ASTI had reviewed the plans, and did not see that there would be any temporary natural features setback impacts. They had a few recommendations that could be handled by adding notes to the plans regarding lot 5, and lot 5 was large enough to accommodate the wetland while remaining buildable. With respect to easements, tree protection, wetlands and natural features setback easements would be required to be recorded at the County Register of Deeds prior to the issuance of a Land Improvement Permit for the project.

Mr. Breuckman concluded that the Plan met all technical requirements of the Ordinance, subject to the conditions in the review memos and in the Staff Report, and Staff recommended approval. He said that he would be happy to answer any questions.

Chairperson Boswell asked Mr. Rathka if he had anything to add, but he did not. Chairperson Boswell asked the Commissioners if they had any questions or comments.

Mr. Yukon said that the narrative mentioned that the homes would be ranch-style. The Site Condo Plan stated that the maximum stories would be two. He thought of ranches as having one story, and he asked for clarification about whether the homes would have two.

Mr. Rathka responded that they planned to build colonials - two stories, three to four bedrooms and two-and-a-half baths. He stated that they would not be ranches. He showed some pictures on the overhead. Mr. Yukon said that they did not look like ranches, but he pointed out that the narrative stated that they would be ranch-style.

Mr. Breuckman explained that ultimately, it really did not matter. The Planning Commission would be recommending the division of the land, not what type of homes there would be. The applicant had to meet the Ordinance with respect to the homes, and that would be handled at the Building Permit process.

Mr. Yukon noted that the Environmental Impact Statement stated that any lighting at the entrance to the development would be for the aid of motorists, and glare from traffic would be shielded for neighboring residences. He asked Mr. Rathka how they planned to do that, especially for lots 1 and 8 when someone came off of DeMar onto Jewell.

Mr. Klinkenberger replied that the lighting would be typical of that seen on

houses; it would not be street lighting or streetlamps that would give off a lot of light. The EIS was speaking more to car lights. Cars would not give off direct lighting into the houses.

Ms. Brnabic noted that there was a 25-foot natural features wetland buffer on lot 5. She realized it was a larger lot, but she wondered if the buffer would affect the building envelope in any way. She asked how many feet it measured as it moved closer into the yard.

Mr. Breuckman pointed out a hatched area on the Plan, which indicated the natural features setback. Someone could build to the edge of that. He referred to lots 6, 7 and 8, and said that if the rear setback line was continued north onto lot 5, it was apparent that lot 5 had the same buildable area as lots 6, 7 and 8, which would meet the minimum standards for the R-4 district. He was confident that lot 5 would be buildable. Ms. Brnabic felt it would be a "buyer beware" type of situation. There would be a considerable amount of property that could not be built on because of the buffer. Mr. Breuckman explained that was why an easement would be recorded. It would show up on a title search, and the home buyer would have ample warning of the limitations.

Chairperson Boswell opened the first Public Hearing at 7:16 p.m.

Jeff Springer, 2731 Gravel Ridge, Rochester Hills, MI 48307 *Mr. Springer noted that he lived behind lots 2 and 3. He said that he had planted some pine trees in 1985, and he asked if they would be retained. He had tried to plant them on his lot, but he was not sure if they were.*

Chairperson Boswell clarified that the Plans showed that the trees would remain on Mr. Springer's lot. Mr. Breuckman agreed that was correct.

Margaret Goethe, 2743 Gravel Ridge, Rochester Hills, MI 48307 *Ms. Goethe stated that she lived on the corner of Gravel Ridge and DeMar. She wondered if there was a plan to add a wall or fence or some shrubs between the proposed development and her lot. She admitted that having lived there 35 years, she was used to the open land behind her, although she knew the day would come. She said that they had a lot of birds that they were very concerned about, but it appeared to her that the trees with circles beyond her fence line would be saved. Chairperson Boswell agreed. Ms. Goethe asked again if there would be a fence or some type of barrier between properties.*

Chairperson Boswell asked Mr. Breuckman what the Ordinance required

for screening residences to residences. Mr. Breuckman advised that there were no requirements for single-family buffering. The applicant did have a tree replacement requirement, and there were trees proposed at the southwest corner of the detention pond and the northwest corner of lot 4. He believed that those trees could easily be redistributed amongst the site to provide screening in other locations. Staff recommended some screening on the east side of the detention pond, but some of those could be planted, if space existed, between the existing trees and the utility lines along the western property line.

Chairperson Boswell closed the Public Hearing at 7:20 p.m. and opened the Public Hearing for the Preliminary Site Condominium Plan.

Angela Bucciarelli, 2707 Gravel Ridge Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307

Ms. Bucciarelli said that she and her brother owned the five-acre property to the north. She wanted to thank Mr. Rathka for stubbing the street in the development. They had their property up for sale, and she recalled that a builder who had wanted their property previously was doing a cul-de-sac. She thought it would help in selling her property. She asked the definition of a wetland, noting that part of the wetland was on their property. She went to City Hall and saw a wetland outline on GIS (County computer program), but there was not anything written down about it. She asked if a builder could fill a wetland. She mentioned that they had hoped to sell the property to the church next door, but the church had no money. She had mentioned to Mr. Rathka that the property in front of her had less acreage, and it sold for \$490k during the high times.

Elio Buciarelli, 2707 Gravel Ridge Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307. Mr. Buciarelli noted that he was the brother of Angela, above. He questioned putting in two-story homes, when the EIS said ranch-style, and said that he was under the impression that there would be a single level, not two stories. He asked about the intention for the easement for the northwest corner (the thin strip of land).

Chairperson Boswell closed the Public Hearing at 7:24 p.m. He asked Mr. Breuckman for a brief explanation of wetlands, how they were determined and who did the determining.

Mr. Breuckman said that regarding what constituted a wetland, there were State standards that determined that. It had to do with vegetation, the presence of water and soil types. An environmental professional had to go out and survey the site to determine the boundaries of the wetland. The City had a wetland GIS file, which was very general in nature and not

sufficient to base any type of planning decisions, but it was a guide. The applicant (Mr. Rathka) had paid for a wetland determination, and an environmental scientist went to the site and measured the boundaries. On Mr. Buciarelli's site, someone would have to do the same thing. There were City and State protections for wetlands. A wetland could be filled, if the MDEQ approved it, and it would have to be mitigated by creating more wetlands somewhere else. He believed it was a 2-1 ratio, so for every square-foot that was filled, two square feet of wetlands would have to be created somewhere else. He indicated that it was harder to do that now than in the past. The MDEQ wanted the new wetland to be in the same watershed, which was more difficult because there was a decrease in the amount of potential land that could be filled.

Regarding the homes, Mr. Breuckman said that it actually did not matter at this point. The Planning Commission was approving only the division of land or the creation of the lots along with other site improvements, such as the roads, the landscaping, etc. When it came time to build the houses, it would be handled through the Building Permit process, whether the developer wanted to build single-family or two-story houses. If a buyer wanted a ranch house, that was what they would get.

Chairperson Boswell mentioned the additional question about the thin strip at the northwest corner of the site. He did not believe that anything could be done there, and there were trees planned for that area. Mr. Breuckman said that the trees could be moved to serve a better purpose, but that strip of land could be set aside as saleable land. It would not do the property owner of lot 4 much good. The Engineering Dept. required that access be prohibited to Gravel Ridge from lot 4. He added that this piece of land could potentially be split off and sold.

Chairperson Boswell said that if they were to sell that property to the north, it could become a viable piece of land. Mr. Breuckman agreed it could become useful at that point.

Mr. Schroeder asked the applicants if they would consider adding a berm for the neighbors on Gravel Ridge. Mr. Klinkenberger said that there were trees in other areas that they could distribute a little more effectively along that property line. Mr. Schroeder also recommended that the applicants talked with the neighbors during the development and construction phases.

Mr. Hooper thought that the 14 trees shown for the southwest corner of the detention pond and the trees from the northwest corner of the site could

be redistributed. If the lot owners along Gravel Ridge wanted some additional screening in the back, he would recommend redistributing the trees along the western property line of lots 1, 2 and 3. They could also add trees on the east side of the detention pond. He recalled that Mr. Rathka had developed Rochester Meadows (now the Vistas) and there were issues with the view of the detention pond, so they planned additional screening.

Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Schroeder moved the following motion, seconded by Mr. Yukon.

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Yukon, in the matter of City File No. 13-001 (Regal Estates), the Planning Commission grants a Tree Removal Permit, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on August 12, 2013, with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following one (1) condition.

Findings

1. The proposed removal and replacement of regulated trees is in conformance with the Tree Conservation Ordinance.
2. The applicant is proposing to replace 23 regulated trees with 24 tree replacement credits, as required by the Tree Conservation Ordinance.

Condition

1. Tree protective fencing, as reviewed and approved by the City's Landscape Architect, shall be installed prior to issuance of the Land Improvement Permit.

Granted

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

Absent 2 - Hetrick and Kaltsounis

2013-0302 Public Hearing and request for Preliminary Site Condominium Plan Recommendation - City File No. 13-001 - Regal Estates, a proposed 9-unit single-family development on 3.5 acres, located east of John R, north of Auburn, zoned R-4, One-Family Residential, Parcel No. 15-25-352-022, Roy E. Rathka, Applicant

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Reece, in the matter of City File

No. 13-001 (Regal Estates Site Condominium), the Planning Commission recommends that City Council approve the preliminary one-family residential detached condominium plan based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on August 12, 2013, with the following five (5) findings and subject to the following twelve (12) conditions.

Findings

1. Upon compliance with the following conditions, the proposed condominium plan meets all applicable requirements of the zoning ordinance and one-family residential detached condominium.
2. Adequate utilities are available to properly serve the proposed development.
3. The preliminary plan represents a reasonable street layout.
4. The Environmental Impact Statement indicates that the development will have no substantially harmful effects on the environment.
5. Remaining items to be addressed on the plans may be incorporated on the final condominium plan without altering the layout of the development.

Conditions

1. Provide all off-site easements and agreements for approval by the City prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit (LIP).
2. Inspection and approval of tree protection and silt fencing by the City prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.
3. Submittal of detailed landscape plans addressing staff comments in item 3 of review considerations, above.
4. Provide landscape cost estimates for landscaping, replacement trees, and irrigation on the landscape plans, prior to issuance of an LIP.
5. Payment of \$1,800 into the tree fund for street trees prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.

6. *Submit of a landscape bond in an amount equal to the cost estimate for landscaping, replacement trees, and irrigation prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
7. *Filing of conservation easements for all wetland, infiltration trench, and natural features setback areas prior to the issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
8. *Approval of all required permits and approvals from outside agencies.*
9. *Compliance with the Engineering Department memos dated June 11, 2013 (Taunt); July 3, 2013 (Boughton).*
10. *Temporary Natural Features Setback impacts from construction activities associated with Lot No. 5 or the proposed drainage Level Spreader structure must be restored to original grade with original soils and seeded with a City approved seed mix, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
11. *The By-Laws and recorded easement for the natural feature setback area should stipulate a prohibition of buildings, decks, patios or other physical structures.*
12. *Relocate the replacement trees along the east side of the detention pond and along the west side of lots one, two and three, prior to Final approval by Staff.*

A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Reece, 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, Hooper, Reece, Schroeder and Yukon

Absent 2 - Hetrick and Kaltsounis

Chairperson Boswell stated for the record that the motions had passed unanimously. He asked the applicants to please speak to the neighbors, advising that they might want trees or they might not want them.

2008-0244

Request for a Revised Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 99-007.4 - for the removal and replacement of as many as 54 regulated trees for American House of Rochester Hills, a proposed 32,525 square-foot adult foster care facility on 3.48 acres located on the east side of S. Adams Rd.,

north of South Boulevard, zoned SP, Special Purpose, Parcel No. 15-31-301-037, Fusco, Shaffer & Pappas, Inc., Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by James Breuckman, dated August 16, 2013 and Site Plans had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof).

Present for the applicant was Tim Miller, Fusco, Shaffer & Pappas, Inc., 30800 Northwestern Hwy, Suite 100, Farmington Hills, MI 48334.

Mr. Miller advised that the proposal was for a 40-bed licensed adult foster care (assisted living) facility. It would be an additional continuation of care to what was currently there. There were also non-licensed, independent senior living and multiple senior apartments on the campus.

Mr. Miller brought a power point presentation, and he showed the overall campus of American House. He pointed out the main entrance to the proposed building from Adams, which was at the southwest corner, and the existing detention pond to be utilized in the far southeast corner. The City's Engineers asked that the traffic flow one-way through the site.

Mr. Miller noted that they were proposing 21 parking spaces. Regarding the building, the east and west wings were identical to each other. Both had individual entrances and exits. The section in the middle of the building had services for the seniors, including a commercial kitchen, laundry and staff operations. To the north side from each wing, they were proposing a fenced-in garden area and north of that there was currently a swamp area that would be reconfigured to become a landscape feature pond with a fountain. He noted that the specialty service was in memory care, which was for residents that had developed Alzheimer's or dementia. The gardens would be secure and allow the residents to go outside and enjoy the views, but they would not be able to go outside the fence. The current drive to the far north would become a secondary entrance/exit to the campus. They were proposing new entrance signage to identify the campus.

Mr. Miller showed an example of one of the wings, which had 20 beds. Resident beds were around the perimeter, and there was a small courtyard, lounge areas and a small residential kitchen in the center. There was also an activity room that would be run by the staff. They were proposing an emergency generator, which would have a long masonry screenwall with decorative landscaping. He pointed out the existing dumpster, which he said would be refurbished. He showed the exterior elevations. The building would be one-story, slab on grade construction

and mostly brick with some composite siding and trim. There would be residential style windows, and the building was made to look more like a residence versus a nursing facility. They would also incorporate some limestone sills under the windows and at the siding and brick transition. He felt that it would fit in better with the community and be more appealing.

Mr. Breuckman said that the plans were quite complete, and they met all the City's Ordinances. There were some outstanding items from Fire and Engineering that needed to be addressed prior to Final Approval, but he said that he could confidently recommend approval of the requests.

Mr. Yukon mentioned that it was the third proposal the Planning Commission had seen in the past couple of years. He asked if the market or the needs of the community had changed that much, causing them to create different renditions.

Mr. Miller agreed that the market had changed, to a certain extent. When they first started going through the process in 2008, they proposed a home for the aged. It was a different market, and the needs of the residents were slightly different. The care was not as advanced. The project had been scaled back due to the market. Mr. Yukon asked if the residents living on the campus could be relocated to the new facility depending upon their needs. Mr. Miller agreed that they very well could. The whole campus was pretty close to a continuing care community where a resident could stay in the same area and advance his or her care on the same campus. Mr. Yukon asked when they anticipated the project to start and how long it would take.

Mr. Miller said that American House hoped to start doing some ground work at the end of the year if all approvals went through; otherwise, construction, based on State approvals, would start next year. Mr. Yukon asked if there were set hours for deliveries to the building and where they would be made. Mr. Miller pointed out the service area, and said that they could establish hours for deliveries. Mr. Yukon said that he was just considering the residents that lived there.

Mr. Hooper asked what the staff loads would be. Mr. Miller said that peak staff for each wing would be two or three people. The residents would have a family-type relationship with staff versus a caregiver at a nursing home. Mr. Hooper asked about the nursing care. Mr. Miller said that nursing care would be provided 24 hours a day, seven days a week; it was part of the State's licensing requirements. Mr. Hooper asked how many

staff would be needed for nursing care. Mr. Miller said that the two to three people in each wing included nursing care and resident care per shift. Mr. Hooper said that the reason he was asking was that although there would be no residents driving, he wondered if 21 parking spots would be enough. He was familiar with this type of operation, and he believed people would pay for supplemental nursing care (requiring additional staff). He thought that the parking was a little light.

Mr. Miller stated that based on their experience with those types of facilities, and it was their specialty, the parking should be adequate. Mr. Hooper had observed that when they had events or concerts where his mother stayed, more people came, and the parking got filled. He wanted to make sure there would not be a problem only having 21 parking spots. He asked where there would be overflow parking for special events. Mr. Miller said that they could look at it, but they would not really hold events due to the specialty. He said that there was more parking to the north and the south outside the existing independent living that could be used. Mr. Hooper said that he understood there would only be 40 units and most of the parking would be used by staff. If there were five relatives visiting at one time, however, it would take up five spots, and he did not think there would be any empty spots if there was an event. He was not saying that they had to add parking for an event, but he wondered what the accommodations for that would be. Mr. Miller felt that the existing parking could accommodate it. He noticed another parking area as well and pointed it out. Mr. Hooper said that other than parking, he had no issues. He thought that the colored renderings were appropriate and to scale, and he felt it would be a welcome addition to Rochester Hills.

Mr. Dettloff agreed with Mr. Hooper that it would be a welcome addition, and he thanked Mr. Miller for bringing it to Rochester Hills. He asked what type of market study the applicants used. He asked if it was based on something that had been in place for a while or if they used a current market study.

Mr. Miller advised that the owners continually looked at the market and looked for areas where the market would hold a facility such as this. That was why things had changed from the 2008 submittal.

Mr. Reece asked if a Certificate of Need was required. Mr. Miller said it was not. It did not go through the State Health Department; it went through the Bureau of Fire Services.

Mr. Schroeder asked if meals were prepared in the main kitchen and

taken to the rooms. Mr. Miller said that in the proposed food service plan, there was a small warming kitchen, and the major cooking would be carted to the warming kitchen and stored. Staff would serve the residents during a certain time each day. The residential kitchen was used when families wanted to prep and serve food like they did at home. Mr. Schroeder asked if there was a dining area, and Mr. Miller confirmed that there was.

Chairperson Boswell opened the Public Hearing at 7:57 p.m. Seeing no one come forward, he closed the Public Hearing. He asked if there was any further discussion. Hearing none, Mr. Yukon moved the following, seconded by Ms. Brnabic.

MOTION by Yukon, seconded by Brnabic, in the matter of City File No. 99-007.4 (American House of Rochester Hills), the Planning Commission grants a Tree Removal Permit, based on plans dated received by the Planning and Development Department on August 14, 2013, with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following one (1) condition.

Findings

1. The proposed removal and replacement of regulated trees is in conformance with the Tree Conservation Ordinance.
2. The applicant is proposing to replace 54 regulated trees with 54 tree replacement credits, as required by the Tree Conservation Ordinance.

Condition

1. Tree protective fencing, as reviewed and approved by City Staff, shall be installed prior to issuance of the Land Improvement Permit.

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

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

Absent 2 - Hetrick and Kaltsounis

Chairperson Boswell stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously.

2008-0245 Request for Approval of a Revised Site Plan - City File No. 99-007.4 - American House of Rochester Hills, a proposed 32,525 square-foot adult foster care housing facility on 3.4 acres on Adams, north of South Boulevard, zoned SP,

Special Purpose, Fusco, Shaffer & Pappas, Inc., Applicant

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Dettloff, in the matter of City File No. 99-007.4 (American House of Rochester Hills), the Planning Commission **approves the site plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on August 14, 2013, with the following eight (8) findings and subject to the following three (3) conditions.

Findings

1. *The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that all applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as other City ordinances, standards, and requirements, can be met subject to the conditions noted below.*
2. *The development meets the intent and standards of the SP, Special Purpose district.*
3. *The proposed phase is a continuation of the existing American House Community, which serves the population with several types of senior care living, from independent living to convalescent care.*
4. *Off-street parking areas have been designed to avoid common traffic problems and promote safety.*
5. *The development is or can be adequately served by essential public facilities and services, and all utilities are available to the site.*
6. *The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.*
7. *The proposed development will not have an unreasonably detrimental or injurious effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the site or those of the surrounding area.*
8. *The proposal should have a positive impact on the community as a whole and the surrounding area by further offering jobs and a more intense level of care on the campus for the elderly.*

Conditions

1. *Submittal of an irrigation plan, prior to Final Approval by Staff.*

2. *Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, specifically the Fire Department letter dated July 29, 2013 and the Engineering Department letter dated July 31, 2013.*
3. *Post a landscape bond in the amount of \$96,949.00, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit*

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

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

Absent 2 - Hetrick and Kaltsounis

Chairperson Boswell again stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously.

2013-0304

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 13-010 - Rochester Square, a proposed 15,500 square-foot four-tenant retail building on 1.97 acres located on the Meijer property on Rochester Road, south of Auburn, zoned B-3, Shopping Center Business, Parcel No. 15-35-100-048, Versa Development, Applicant
(Reference: Staff Report prepared by James Breuckman, dated August 16, 2013 and Site Plans had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof).

Present for the applicant were Steve Robinson, Ryan Schultz and Josh Sykiert, Versa Development. 25900 West 11 Mile Rd., Suite 250, Southfield, MI 48034.

Mr. Robinson advised that they were proposing to develop an underutilized parking area of the Meijer store that faced Rochester Rd. They had been through a number of iterations for the project before they got to the submittal point. They worked with Staff on different concerns and the goals and objectives of the community. He noted that the project was a multi-tenant retail operation in two buildings. They had done the same for a number of other projects. They felt it gave the building more character than a typical retail building. Mr. Robinson indicated that they had done a significant amount of designs in 3-dimensional mode. When they first began, one of the main considerations was the context of the structures relative to Rochester Rd. There were some landmark trees that existed within the Rochester Rd. right-of-way. They modeled the building with the trees in place to site the buildings, so they could maximize exposure but still be considerate of the view along the Rochester Rd. corridor.

Mr. Robinson noted that they had done quite a few of these projects with Meijer and other retailers, and that the space was in high demand. He showed a rendering of the buildings, and said that they had tried to provide connectivity through the architectural feature at the bottom. Between the two buildings was an outdoor seating area for restaurants or just as a public space for people to sit. The buildings had softer materials, color-wise, to give a traditional, yet strong feel with brick, and they added black awnings. The corners had higher glass, which he felt made them really stand out.

Mr. Breuckman informed that the use was permitted in B-3, Shopping Center Business. The applicant was not proposing to split the property, but to land lease. The minimum lot area requirement had been met. Regarding Site Plan review considerations, he pointed out consistency with the Rochester Road Access Management Plan and with a previously recorded easement in an ongoing struggle to try to connect the Verizon site with the Meijer site. The applicant would be required to complete the cross access drive within the existing cross access easement to the north to facilitate a future connection to the Verizon site. The City could not force Verizon to connect, but they could ask for an access to the property line. In terms of the site layout, the applicant had completed a traffic assessment study and was working on a traffic impact study. No new driveways were proposed, so the results of the traffic impact study, if any, would be to make adjustments to the existing driveways. The project was brought forward because that would not affect the site layout. The drive was already restricted to right in, right out at the north driveway, and that would not change. There might have to be some reconfiguration of the pork chop, but the City's Engineers and the applicant could work with MDOT on a solution. The applicants had submitted a letter from their traffic consultant from Wayne State with some preliminary findings, which had been placed under Communications.

Mr. Breuckman noted that the site preserved the large, existing deciduous trees along Rochester Rd. Those provided great canopy, and they could be pruned, if necessary, to provide visibility into the site. He stated that it was great that those trees were being saved, because the City did not have many trees of that size along Rochester Rd. The landscape plan was fine; they were transplanting some of the moderately-sized trees that were not that old mostly along the south edge of the property where parking was going in. Staff recommended that two trees be added to the landscape island along the south edge of the property. It would mirror landscaping in the island along the north edge of

the development. The irrigation plan still had to be submitted. Staff was asking that a note be added stating that all irrigation would be between the hours of 12:00 a.m. and 5:00 a.m. in accordance with the City's watering Ordinance. The Fire Department had a few landscape adjustments which were necessary to maintain access to Fire Department connections on the building. That could be done prior to Final Approval. There were a couple of lighting items, which he said were housekeeping in nature. Fixtures proposed had to comply, and some details needed to be added regarding the light poles and height. He suggested adding a seventh condition regarding constructing the drive to the property to the north within the cross access easement for future connection to the Verizon site if and when they would agree. That should match the existing grade at the property line as closely as possible.

Mr. Schroeder asked what happened to putting in a gas station. Mr. Robinson brought up a term his firm used called "deal fatigue." Mr. Schroeder asked what type of tenants they would normally attract, other than restaurants. Mr. Robinson said they had cell phone stores, mattress stores, eyeglass tenants, etc. They had seen Secretary of State offices in other locations and had service retail establishments. Mr. Schroeder asked if there was some flexibility to move the internal walls. Mr. Robinson agreed it was set up to be able to adjust things over time. He believed they had one vacancy for this project.

Mr. Yukon referred to the traffic impact study - first page, second bullet - which said there would be four tenants, and the center would be closed between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. He asked if that was a for sure thing. Mr. Schultz said that was correct; they would not have tenants open from 7-9:00 a.m. Mr. Yukon said that it stated that the peak p.m. period of the adjacent roadways would be critical in determining traffic impact of the proposed development. The second page stated that the traffic impact study would be completed soon that expanded upon the summary and recommended counter measures as necessary. He asked Mr. Breuckman if he was talking about counter measures when he brought up the porkchop design. Mr. Breuckman said that was something that came up with MDOT's preliminary review of the project and in also speaking with the City's Traffic Engineers. They talked about the possibility of extending the porkchop island out into the existing right turn lane on Rochester Rd. so people did not get into the right turn lane and blow by the site to turn right onto Auburn. Mr. Yukon clarified that the counter measures were still yet to be determined. Mr. Schultz agreed. They had collected all the site data, and it was an extensive process to go through with MDOT to get the study prepared. It had been ongoing for about a

month, and they believed the completed report would be submitted to MDOT by the end of August. A lot of the guidance in the report came from a previous one done by Opus Engineering, which called for the porkchop to be extended. They took all those considerations into mind when preparing their document. Mr. Yukon clarified that any counter measures would not affect the project if the Planning Commission approved it. Mr. Breuckman said that if any did, Staff would have to bring it back for a Revised Site Plan Approval.

Mr. Dettloff said that Mr. Robinson had identified tenants such as restaurant and service establishments, and he asked Mr. Robinson if they used market data to determine where the voids were. Mr. Robinson said that typically, they had a tenant need that drove a project, rather than the other way around. They had a number of different tenants around the State, and they met with them on a regular basis. As they saw repeated demand at a location, they started to look for a location. The proposed project had been on the list since before the gas station, and it had been a target. The project was pretty much pre-leased at the beginning. He was not at liberty to divulge the tenants, but they had leases in progress for all but 2,100 square feet. Mr. Dettloff asked if he had ever worked with Oakland County and its Business Development team. He indicated that they had some savvy marketing tools and used a system called ESRI, which was the latest and greatest. Mr. Robinson said that they had been very fortunate, even in the last three or four years, to have great tenant demand and relationships. They did not have a single vacancy in their entire portfolio. Mr. Dettloff asked how long the land lease ran. Mr. Robinson advised that it was being negotiated currently, but he thought it would be a minimum of 60 years. That would be a combination of base term and extensions. Mr. Dettloff wished them luck and thanked them for choosing Rochester Hills. Mr. Robinson commented that it had been a really nice process so far.

Ms. Brnabic brought up the gas station/convenience store Mr. Schroeder had asked about. She questioned whether that plan was totally unlikely or if it was on hold. Mr. Robinson said that it was gone. He said that he did not want to speak on Meijer's behalf as to what they would do in 60 years, but their full intention was to have the project under construction by the end of next month, so it would look good by the holiday season, and then they would be able to deliver to the tenants in the spring of 2014.

Ms. Brnabic was not sure that Rochester Rd. was the most likely location for the gas station. She thought Meijer was considering Auburn Rd. Mr. Breuckman advised that Rochester Rd. was always the location, and

every drawing he saw showed it there. Ms. Brnabic cautioned that there would be a great deal of traffic stress if both were put in - Rochester and Auburn.

Mr. Hooper was curious about Wayne State doing traffic impact studies. Mr. Schultz said that there was an entire engineering group that was dedicated to the study of traffic engineering. One of the doctors at Wayne was someone they used frequently, and many of the people that currently worked for MDOT were former students of his. He was well regarded in the industry, and they felt very solidly about using him.

Mr. Hooper understood Versa's perspective, but from his perspective, there appeared to be a taxpayer-funded university doing private development traffic impact studies. Mr. Schultz maintained that they paid Wayne, and Mr. Robinson added that they were not cheap. Mr. Hooper was a little hesitant with regards to taxpayer funded government competition with private industry.

Mr. Hooper noted the east elevations of both buildings, which had blank walls. He said he understood that they wanted the windows to face the west because that was where the traffic was. People would park in front, but when someone went around the back, the walls were blank. The City had a development about ten years ago - Barclay Square - and the Planning Commission asked that faux windows be added to the back of the building. In that case, it could be seen from Rochester Rd., and they wanted it to have the same appearance in the front and back. He realized the traffic would not see the east elevation here, but going behind it, it would be seen. He asked if they had found this model to be successful.

Mr. Robinson said that they had found it to be quite successful. They had broken it up by having two buildings with a throughway with landscaping in between the buildings. It would be pedestrian-friendly. They used spandrel glass when a building was right up against a road. In that case, with more of a downtown building, they mirrored the two elevations. They had not done it on a building like the proposed, and they had not seen a problem. They had enough of them up to believe it was fine. Mr. Hooper said that someone would drive in from Auburn and see the back of the buildings and then drive to the front to get to the front door. Mr. Robinson said they could carry the awnings over the doors in the back to break it up. He did not think spandrel glass looked that great in the end. Mr. Hooper indicated that he would defer to the architect in the group. He was looking for other suggestions, and if extra awnings were appropriate, he would be interested in that.

Mr. Reece said that the applicants had commented several times that they had developed elsewhere. He asked if they had done anything in Rochester Hills. Mr. Robinson said not recently, but he worked on the American House when he was with a different company. Mr. Reece asked if Versa had done anything in the area. Mr. Robinson said they had done work in Shelby Township, Bingham Farms, Novi, Orion Township, Taylor and Fort Gratiot. They had a lot of product out there, and he said he could get some pictures. The proposal was based on one in Shelby Township, which was under construction currently at the northwest corner of Hall and Hayes in front of the Meijer. The proposed elevation had evolved from that one with new details on the corners. The glass on the corners was not spandrel. They opened the interior to bring light in from above, and they used different material colors. Mr. Reece observed that it was a niche market, in terms of developing under utilized parking areas. Mr. Robinson said it was one component of their company, but it was definitely a niche piece they had found to be very successful.

Mr. Reece asked the net parking change and if parking would be decreased over the entire site. Mr. Breuckman commented that Mr. Reece had asked a good question. He did not look at that, because overall there were still a lot of extra spaces. He thought it would be close with the new development included. Mr. Reece asked if what was proposed would make any kind of a difference in the long term as far as exiting in or out of the site if Meijer was really successful and all the spaces were utilized. Mr. Breuckman did not think it would. He thought that the total number of parking spaces would be fairly much a wash. He had looked at the historical aerial photographs, and in none of those did he ever find more than five cars where the new buildings were going. Mr. Reece wondered whether the area was utilized much during Christmas season. He said that relative to the elevations, he was o.k. with the east side. He said that with a development such as this, it was unfortunately the nature of the beast. That was what happened when the front facing façade was the architectural element, and the back was more service. He said that he would not debase the back by putting anything there that was not for a specific reason knowing what it was and where it was located.

Mr. Breuckman said that the only thought he had was for the courtyard between the buildings. That connected to the rear portion, and he was not sure if there was a way to carry the glass further back on the north and south side facing that. Mr. Robinson said that was the problem, and that was where the kitchens, bathrooms and things like that were. Mr.

Breuckman wondered if there was a way to punch up the entrance to the courtyard with some extra features, for example, some extra landscaping. Mr. Robinson assured that they would do something nice there. Mr. Breuckman said that it could flow out to the rear area to draw the eye. Mr. Robinson said they had been evolving with how they made the building look better over time. They did not want the area to be a dust collector, but a nice space. Mr. Reece suggested that if there was a restaurant by the courtyard, there could be outdoor seating. Mr. Robinson said that three of the end caps would have outdoor seating. Mr. Reece asked if they had to allow for outdoor seating as part of the Site Plan, and Mr. Breuckman advised that it was permitted. There were standards in the Ordinance for where it could go. He noted that the landscape plans complied, but they did not show the treatment between the buildings. Mr. Reece recommended that it could be contingent upon Staff review of the area.

Mr. Reece said that when they had a discussion about a gas station in this location, there was some limited talk about Auburn Rd. He asked if it was feasible for another, similar type of outlot development on the Auburn Rd. side, or if the area would already be maximized.

Mr. Breuckman said that they would have to look at the parking a little more closely, but there was extra greenbelt space along Auburn. It would be harder, because if they put something along Auburn Rd., it would start to push into the main east/west access aisle. It would entail relooking at the entire circulation pattern for the Meijer parking lot. He stated that it would be possible, but there would be a lot more involved.

Mr. Schroeder said that regarding having a blank wall, he recalled that at Hamlin and Rochester, there was a CVS on the southeast corner and they put blank (phony) windows on the corner to add a detail on the side of the building. Mr. Breuckman commented that it was a philosophical thing, and he was not a huge fan of spandrel windows.

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

MOTION by Brnabic, seconded by Yukon, in the matter of City File No. 13-010 (Rochester Square), the Planning Commission **approves the site plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on August 2, 2013, with the following six (6) findings and subject to the following eight (8) conditions.

Findings

1. *The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that all applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as other City ordinances, standards, and requirements, can be met subject to the conditions noted below.*
2. *The development meets the intent and standards of the B-3 Shopping Center district and the Rochester Road Access Management Plan.*
3. *Off-street parking areas have been designed to avoid common traffic problems and promote safety.*
4. *The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.*
5. *The proposed development will not have an unreasonably detrimental or injurious effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the site or those of the surrounding area.*
6. *The proposal should have a positive impact on the community as a whole and the surrounding area by further offering jobs, shopping alternatives and other dining options.*

Conditions

1. *Addition of a note on the photometric plan that the maximum mounting height for pole-mounted fixtures is 20 feet.*
2. *Addition of a note on the photometric plan stating that all exterior light fixtures will be fully shielded and downward directed with flat lenses.*
3. *Submittal of a landscape bond in the amount of \$4,920.00 for replacement trees and landscaping, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
4. *Submittal of an irrigation plan prior to Final Approval by Staff and addition of a note regarding irrigation time to the plans.*
5. *Address Fire Department review comments and applicable outside*

agency review letters.

6. *Engineering department approval of traffic and driveway improvements as recommended by MDOT prior to construction plan approval.*
7. *Construct a drive to the north property line within the existing cross access easement. The newly constructed drive shall be graded to match the existing grade of the Verizon parking lot as close as is feasible to facilitate a future connection.*
8. *Provide proposed landscape plans for the courtyard area between the buildings, to be reviewed and approved by Staff prior to Final Approval.*

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

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

Absent 2 - Hetrick and Kaltsounis

Chairperson Boswell stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously.

2008-0053

Present Introduction of Architectural Design Standards - James Breuckman, Manager of Planning

Prior to going through a power point presentation, Mr. Breuckman passed out a copy of the draft architectural design guidelines to the Commissioners, which was placed on file for the record. He said that they would not talk back and forth about the actual standards at this meeting, but they could be reviewed between now and the next meeting.

Mr. Breuckman stated that he had taken a different philosophical approach from the past. He said that 90-95% of the buildings were still traditionally styled, but they were not traditionally built. It went back to 5,000 B.C. in Greece, from which the tradition and style of buildings had evolved over 7,000 years. He noted that there were a lot of traditional building styles, and he showed an example of Western Classical. The design guidelines that he proposed had some overarching principals behind them, and he wanted to preserve design freedom. The design guidelines were design-neutral, and someone could work in any style they chose, but the City would try to regulate elements that were common to all traditional styles. There were different ways the elements could be done within a certain set of rules. They could allow non-traditional styles and

different ways for buildings to be styled and built. There had been many architectural movements within the last 150 years, and he felt that the City should absolutely allow non-traditional styles if they were truly non-traditional and not just cheap imitations. They would try to achieve good to great results. He stated that truth in materials was an important theme, and that ideally, the guidelines could be cost neutral. The way that buildings were designed could accommodate better details, and a little simpler form and structure to eliminate unnecessary changes could save money that could be spent on better details.

Mr. Breuckman discussed the elements of massing and composition - how the parts of a building were put together, where the doors went, where the windows went and how things were detailed. When buildings were done until about 150 years ago, materials had to actually hold things up. There were no hidden things behind the outer side to hold up the building. Today, all buildings were built the same way, with steel and sticks and style draped over that at the end. If all of the underpinnings were taken away, the question was whether the building would hold itself up. If someone was building traditional style, the building should look like it could stand up. People would know when they looked at something if it was a little off or a little fake. They would know if a building looked right, and it came down to the details.

Where there were openings in a wall, such as doors, windows, gables, eaves, attachments to buildings, etc., Mr. Breuckman specified that the detail around them was important. He talked about the foundation of Western Classical Architecture, which he noted formed the five classical orders. He showed some structural pictures: A classical building stemmed from basic elements - a post that held up a beam, the frieze above that which concealed the beams that spanned across the building and on top of that the bedmolding, ceiling joints and gutter. All of those were refined artistically to form the different ways traditional buildings were built. He showed a Roman apartment building which was over 2,000 years old. It still stood today, and it was built of nothing but thin brick because the arches over the openings held it up. It was massively durable and a good testament to the construction even to this day.

Mr. Breuckman stated that traditional architecture was based on proportions of the human body, looking at the vertical scale of columns, posts and beams. A taller and more vertical a building was more monumental. Temples had a much more monumental scale than residential buildings. The difference in a traditionally styled building was that it had a human scale and a very clearly defined person entrance. He

said that it was not a coincidence that building façade meant face of a building. He pointed out a building with a front facing garage door, and he did not believe it had much of a human scale. He realized everyone had preferences, and that it was a value judgment about which building looked better to someone.

Mr. Breuckman referred to decoration, and commented that putting up a building was a celebration in the past before modernist architecture took over and everything was slab sided and undecorated. Attention was not spent on details. He showed two 18th and early 19th century buildings that had sculptures such as lions and brick work. He said that no one knew how to do that anymore, and the City would not regulate those types of buildings into existence, but it was a building tradition that used to be seen. The most vernacular style of traditional homes was the farmhouse. There were simple eaves and not a lot of classical decoration, but the porch on a farmhouse had echoes of the classical temple fronts of the Greek and Roman patterns. The columns and piers held up the porch. Everything was doing something, and there was a reason for all of the building elements. He pointed out a farmhouse that had some Italianate details, and one could tell that the farmer was successful and had added some mid-range classical elements to the house over time.

Mr. Breuckman mentioned Georgian architecture, and he showed an Adams-style and England and Georgian in America building, and said that not many of those existed today. It inspired Federalist architecture, which was America's first adaptation in home grown style. Five over four and a door was the standard Federalist building pattern. That is, there were five windows on top and four and a door on the bottom. It was simple, but there was a classical influence to it. In the 18th century, they moved to Revival styles, but there were still classical elements to those buildings, such as posts holding up porch coverings, and the eaves work was reminiscent of the pediments on classical temples. Tudors were romantic style, which hearkened back to the old English times. That led into the very late Arts and Crafts style, which started to get more horizontal as building materials opened up new possibilities. There was also Prairie style, which was very horizontal in its lines and started to use modern materials, but it still conformed with a lot of the traditional patterns. The International style started in the 1920's. He felt that was fine, but it celebrated the possibility of the newer building materials. There were horizontal windows instead of vertical ones. There were non-traditional materials, including concrete. There were unsupported masses using steel. That was true to the materials. Then came mid-century Modern. He showed some Lafayette, Detroit buildings and typical modern houses,

which did not have much privacy. He showed some contemporary and LEED architecture, which infused wood and softer elements along with the colder metal and steel. Those houses did not have a lot of brick, and there was a post and beam style of construction, and it blended Modern and Classical, right down to a statue with no arms.

Mr. Breuckman noted a Louis Sullivan project in Chicago. He showed the first building that Frank Lloyd Wright worked on. It was where modern materials, steel and elevators came into play to support the possibility of building taller buildings, but there were still a lot of classical elements, down to the implied pilasters or columns with arches all supporting the weight of the building. There was very large stone supporting smaller stone supporting more refined limestone going up. It was still styled to conform with traditional styles, even though modern materials were very much used. He showed a train station which was probably the last really expressive Classical style before things moved on to Modernism, which began in the 1950's and took over most of the commercial architecture, particularly for bigger buildings.

Mr. Breuckman showed Rochester Hills today, with buildings that had underlying structure and style draped on top of them. One building had arched support over the windows, and one had more of a Prairie style roof with overhangs. There were differences, for example, one had incorporated horizontal windows. The City would not change those things. He showed a picture of his house, and said it was something they wanted to avoid. It was built in 1950 and had a few echoes of traditional style, but it had a wallpaper look, where brick was slapped on like wallpaper on the outside of the house. There was no supporting arch over the windows. There were some transoms with no real highlight of the building entrance.

Mr. Breuckman referred to the proposed architectural design guidelines, and said they had standards for all of the building elements. It had all the things that went into building a building that would hold itself up in the past. He was trying to get the right details to incorporate into a building. A person should be able to look at a building and know it had the right details. It would add the perception of quality and solidness, and that would add value. They should avoid a brick wallpaper appearance. He said that there were a lot of examples around town, such as one at the Museum. There was support over the windows to carry the weight of the materials above it. The entrance was very well highlighted. The eaves were vernacular and did not have a return - they just ended. The chimney was very clearly built out of fieldstone. He was not sure if the stone was fake or pasted on, because the fieldstones were stacked vertically.

Typically, they would be stacked more horizontally so that the thin side was out. The stones on the chimney were wider than they were tall.

Mr. Breuckman showed a picture next of the Black and White Cow by the Museum. It was built after steel lintel started holding up building openings because there was no arch carrying the weight of the building. There were a lot of details they got right from a classical perspective, but there was nothing holding up the weight of the window, so it was clearly a later construction. He drove by a little settler's cabin at the southeast corner of South Boulevard and Adams. It had incredible details that could not be built today. It was a one-story with low ceilings, and it was completely unfit for habitation today, but they got the details right. He showed another building at the Museum. It was simple, but they had done a nice job of carrying the weight over the garage openings. He showed a house with a deep overhang, and the owner added brackets to make it look a little more traditional, but they did not carry the weight of the canopy over the front door. That made it look like it was being held up by something, and it could not hold itself up. He showed a building with modern eaves and modern materials. It was not vinyl - it was a material that looked like wood. He noted a newer, modern building that used Prairie style and did not try to appear to have stone being held up by nothing. It might have EIFS or stucco. He showed a house with proper dormer detailing. They would not typically want siding on the side of dormers. Little things like that would make a difference in whether or not something looked authentic to traditional style.

Regarding openings over windows, Mr. Breuckman suggested that someone could do a jack arch, a true arch, or something similar. He showed a window with a jack arch, and all the bricks were placed up and down, and they would fall down if there was not a steel lintel holding them up. He showed a house with good shutter details. They looked operable and were the right size, but there was nothing holding up the brick. He claimed that if there was something that said value engineering, it was the pork chop eave return. He showed a traditional eave return on a pediment. The only thing that connected was a trim board, and the gutter did not connect. If someone wanted to do that a vernacular, not a pork chop, should be done.

Mr. Breuckman spoke about materials, and said that the difference between hardy board and vinyl was that vinyl reflected. Someone might know that it was fake. With materials, it was the arms length and eyes only rule. If you could touch it, it had to feel and look like the traditional material it was supposed to be replacing. That was why hardy board was

great, because it looked very much like wood. It actually abutted the trim and did not have a sheen that reflected like vinyl. It passed the arms length rule. It was a modern material that replicated wood realistically. It had a solid sound when someone knocked on it. The second story materials had to look authentic; they did not have to feel authentic. He showed a commercial building done before the economic downturn, and he felt that it got a lot of the traditional details right. There were arches over the openings, and there was a nice cornice that capped the top of the building. It matched all of the rules.

Mr. Breuckman displayed the Village of Rochester Hills, and said that the buildings had a great scale. They were designed very well, but there were a couple of things missing. There was no supporting mass, there was just a brick roll lock that went across, and it would not hold up a building if there was no steel. There was a nice arch that replicated what traditional Mediterranean would be, except that there was a joint right at the top of the arch, which compromised. There was one nice building front that replicated the column and tablature above with an implied cornice, so it looked nice. However, the field stone was stacked taller than it was wide.

Mr. Breuckman noted an office building on north Rochester Rd. in Rochester, which was newer and actually got a lot of the details right. It was a good example of how to build a building today that looked and used all the right details. He had done the Value Per Acre Study, and it turned out to be \$1.6 million per acre.

Mr. Breuckman indicated that those thoughts were the philosophical basis for the design standards he had put forward and things to consider. Cost impacts were a real consideration. The ability of construction workers to build those types of details was also a consideration. For that reason, the City had to very carefully contemplate the design standards and whether they should be consults or required or should versus shall. They could look at requirements for some types of single-family development and not for others. He thought that some could probably be exempted from complying, and he felt that they should set a higher bar for single and multiple-family residential.

Mr. Breuckman concluded that he had given a brief overview, and he was interested in the Commission's initial thoughts. In the past, they considered creating a shadow line and breaking up big building walls and other things, and he felt that those were symptoms, not the cause, for why they needed to have architectural design standards. If people got the details right, hopefully they would not need to start telling them they had

to have a shadow line - it would already be there. He said that he was particularly interested in Mr. Reece's take on the guidelines.

Mr. Dettloff asked what the process for this would be. He asked if there would be a Design Review Board or if it would be handled strictly administratively. Mr. Breuckman said that one of the things he did not like about staffing the Historic Districts Commission was that it was more subjective. The Interior Standards were subjective. The architectural guidelines were intended to be clearer. He hoped they would not need a Design Review Board because that would start to bring in personal taste and opinions. He added that the intent was that the guidelines were style neutral and replicated how buildings were built for thousands of years. There could be an administrative approval or it could be looked at by the Planning Commission. Staff would obviously look at it first. Most things in the standards were structured as guidelines, not requirements, and they would be handed out to applicants at the beginning. A lot of the things in there were things that he would suggest when he did a first review of an application. The American House showed projecting bay windows, and he had suggested that they put a foundation on the bottom to carry the weight, rather than having them just hang off. They also showed square columns that had no top or bottom feature, and he asked that they added a capital and base to those. It was simple stuff that did not cost a lot.

Mr. Reece said that it was a good presentation, and he thought it was a good start. He felt that Mr. Breuckman was on the right approach with consultative versus required. He stated that it was hard to dictate design, but he felt that it was more important to dictate good architecture versus bad. He thought it would be easier to do with the commercial and the office side, but he felt they would have a harder time with residential. Some builders slapped up anything and walked away. They could liken industrial back to the Industrial Age and incorporate some of those elements, even if it were a simple tilt up or cast in place structure. There were still some elements that could be done. He said that he would like to get a copy of the power point to review it hand and hand with the guidelines.

Mr. Breuckman said that he went around and around with the industrial part of it, because it was a unique set of standards on its own. A lot of those buildings were built with modern underpinnings, but they still had some of the detail from traditional because people remembered how to do that then. He questioned melding those two in a set of guidelines, and he said that he struggled with it a little. He suggested that he might have

to look at it as its own subject.

Mr. Breuckman said that when applicants now asked for things, they would have basis for why Staff or the Planning Commission were asking for a little change in the building design, for example. It gave them a shared basis and expectation in why and what they were looking for, and helped them communicate to the applicant. When people came in to talk with Staff about what they wanted to build, Staff always tried to comment, but it put them in a tough spot sometimes. Mr. Reece said that from what he had seen over the years, their opinions and ideas were grounded in solid principals and were not far fetched, and there was a basis for what they were asking.

Mr. Hooper echoed that he would like a copy of the presentation. Mr. Breuckman said that there was one more thing that everyone should consider. The Zoning Ordinance had a statement that said, "Proposed buildings should also comply with any adopted City building design guidelines," so the Planning Commission could adopt the guidelines.

Mr. Breuckman advised that he would bring the matter back when there was a lighter Planning Commission agenda. He asked Commissioners to email if anyone had further thoughts or comments.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no further business to come before the Planning Commission.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Chairperson Boswell reminded the Commissioners that the next Regular Meeting was scheduled for September 17, 2013.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission, and upon motion by Reece, Chairperson Boswell adjourned the Regular Meeting at 9:10 p.m.

William F. Boswell, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Secretary