

~~Chairperson Kilpatrick noted the applicant had received input from some of the Commissioners regarding rehabilitation of the structure. Ms. Sieffert asked how much of a pitch could be put on the shed roof, while not tampering with the bounds of historic integrity.~~

Mr. Dziurman stated he would have to check, noting he would like to look at the original structure to determine what was there. He felt it was probably very similar to the chicken coop at the Cranberry Lake Farm. He thought the drawings prepared by his firm for the Cranberry Lake coop would assist the applicant's builder in restoring the applicant's structure.

Ms. Sieffert asked the applicant whether or not she could cover the structure with a tarp if the weather turned unexpectedly harsh. Ms. Bates indicated the structure was too large.

Mr. Dziurman asked if the size of the structure was the original structure or it had been added on to. Ms. Bates stated it was the original structure.

Ms. Bates thanked the Commission for reviewing this matter with her. Chairperson Kilpatrick ~~thanked the applicant for coming in, noting the Commission appreciated her cooperation.~~

B. Address: 2371 S. Livernois Road
Sidwell: 15-27-151-003
Applicant: Mukesh Mangla

Chairperson Kilpatrick stated the Commission would continue with renumbered Item 6(B), and asked the applicants to introduce themselves.

Mike Campbell, Campbell Planning and Architecture; Mukesh Mangla, and Manuj Mangla were present.

Chairperson Kilpatrick explained Mr. Delacourt would provide a brief summary of the applicant's proposal, followed by a presentation by the applicants, and then the Commission would discuss the matter with the applicant. He noted the matter was before the Commission as a discussion item and no action would be taken at this meeting.

Mr. Delacourt explained the applicant had been discussing various redevelopment options for the property located at 2371 S. Livernois Road. He stated the applicant had put some serious thought into the type of project that would be the most compatible with the existing historic district. He indicated the district was ten (10) acres in size with a single-family home located on it. He stated the project that was determined to be the most compatible did not conform to the conventional zoning on the property, which was a single-family zoning. He indicated the applicant was before the Commission to receive input regarding whether the proposed project was compatible with the historic district. He noted if the Commission felt the project was compatible with the historic district, the applicant would move forward to propose the use of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Mukesh Mangla stated he had been associated with the City for some time through his Boulevard Office Park project on South Boulevard, and the completion of the last phase of Rochelle Park off Hamlin Road.

Mr. Mukesh Mangla stated he had been interested in the subject parcel for approximately three (3) years, noting at one time he had options on the adjacent parcels. He noted the options on the adjacent parcels had run out and his proposal was for 2371 S. Livernois, which was the largest and most challenging parcel, due to its historic designation.

Mr. Mukesh Mangla introduced Mr. Mike Campbell, who had been associated with Bob Gibbs and was the Director of Planning for the Gibbs Planning Group. He noted Mr. Gibbs was well known in his field for the best layout of a project and his knowledge regarding historic structures.

Mr. Campbell provided a PowerPoint presentation to the Commission, which began with a site location map identifying the location of the project as being east of Livernois and north of M-59. He stated the parcel was a heavily wooded, ten (10) acre site, with the historic house and garage located off Livernois Road, which are normally not visible from Livernois. He stated the current zoning for the parcel was R-3 (One Family Residential), which implied a minimum lot size of 12,000 square feet and a minimum lot width of 90' for a single-family home.

Mr. Campbell stated he considered the home on the site to be a Southern Colonial style. He explained the house appeared to have been intended to be in the Greek Revival style, although it was built in 1945, which was during the Colonial Revival period. He indicated the house was a bit of a hybrid between the two styles, although it was closer to the Greek Revival style. He noted the home was not located on its original site. He explained the house was originally located on Rochester Road, but was going to be demolished at its original location, and was moved to its present location. He stated no historic landscape is associated with the structure, but that it was merely moved in 1971 to preserve the structure.

Mr. Campbell reviewed some photographs of the sides of house depicting the west side of the house facing Livernois Road. He noted the owners placed the house out of sight behind the woods. He explained an addition was added in 1971 on the east side of the home, which was used as the main entrance to the home. He reviewed a drawing of the house plans from 1971, which reflected the original house and the addition to the east side of the house.

Mr. Campbell stated if the property were developed according to the current zoning, they would probably use the lot averaging approach under the R-3 zoning, which meant the width of the lots could be reduced by Ten (10%) Percent, as long as the result did not exceed 2.9 units per acre. He stated that method would allow the development of a project consisting of thirty (30) single-family units. He reviewed a proposed conventional development plan using the lot averaging method, while retaining the historic home in its present location. He pointed out there would be some expense involved in moving the historic home.

Mr. Campbell then reviewed a plan that would not conform to the existing zoning, but would have to be developed under the PUD Ordinance. He stated this proposed plan dignified the

historic house by giving it a prominent location while relying on the principal of having smaller lots with less private open space devoted to individual residential units, while allowing a clustering of the development and the preservation of open space around the perimeter, as well as common open space in the middle of the project. He explained the use of common open space in the middle allowed for a larger site for the historic house on the central common, and would provide more visibility and prominence for the historic home than could be provided in a conventional development.

Mr. Campbell reviewed some of the elements of the "new urbanism" method of development, which provides more common open space, but includes the laying out of a site plan without pre-determining building types, allowing for market demand to have some input. He noted the current market appeared to indicate that duplexes might be absorbed more quickly than single-family homes. He stated another principal dealt with the interconnectivity of streets, which meant there would be no cul-de-sacs. He pointed out the connections to adjacent sites, which included three (3) stubs, i.e., one required connection to Corbin Road to the east of the parcel, and two (2) located to provide connection for future developments. He stated that would improve walk ability, along with providing interconnected streets.

Mr. Campbell stated they had tried to arrange the plan so that the historic house would be placed on a central common area and have high visibility. He reviewed some recent photographs from the west, east and south, which showed how the historic resource was not currently being "shared" with the Community due to the thick foliage that hid the house from view. He stated they were enthusiastic about giving the house more visibility.

Mr. Campbell reviewed another proposed plan, with the building footprints depicted as duplexes, which allowed them thirty-two (32) units, as opposed to the single family plan that only allowed twenty-four (24) houses. He noted although that provided more density, the structure of the duplexes would be such that they would appear to be single-family homes. He stated this plan would also provide more visibility and prominence to the historic home, although the house would have to be moved. He explained the historic home would be located on the periphery of the development, where it would receive a prominent location on the corner of Livernois and the development's proposed street, which would open up visibility to the home.

Mr. Campbell stated the use of the PUD would provide an opportunity for the house to receive a prominent location and the best exposure for the Community. He explained their reason for appearing before the Commission was to determine if the Commission felt the use of the PUD Ordinance would be better for the historic resource, rather than a conventional development.

Mr. Mukesh Mangla summarized that there were two (2) ways the property could be developed, noting the property could be developed conventionally as single-family homes. He indicated it was not their intent to develop a project with residences and retail. He felt the historic house was key to the whole project. He stated it was their intent to restore the historic house, which had a very sound structure but would require some restoration and a new driveway. He pointed out the way the house was currently situated, with the house was being accessed from the back. He felt the house could be enhanced with landscaping.

Mr. Mukesh Mangla stated the reason they were proposing the duplexes over single-family homes was due to market demand. He noted they wanted to mingle the demand, the salability, City codes and ordinances, and the historic context of the house. He referred to a recent article in *The Detroit News* discussing senior citizens in the Metropolitan area looking for housing. He stated the article indicated this area contained a large population of seniors, and only about Fifteen (15%) Percent of the seniors were being served. He stated the National Association of Housing was predicting a demand of 2.2 Million houses for seniors and empty nesters.

Mr. Mukesh Mangla stated this proposal was one of very few projects in Rochester Hills that proposed attached condominiums, noting they were proposing a duplex-style product. He indicated they had looked at the architecture of the historic house because architecture was indicated as the area of significance in the survey conducted for the City by Dr. Busch. He noted the house was indicated to be of the Greek Revival style, even though the Greek Revival period was in the 1800s. He pointed out the Township survey had indicated it was a Greek Revival, and the State had indicated it was Colonial Revival.

Mr. Mukesh Mangla provided a brief history of the house noting the house had been owned by the father of the current owner and was originally located on a farm on Rochester Road. He stated the farm property was converted to commercial property and the Chrysler Dealership now sits on that site. The son, Louis Berklich, was given the option of taking the house because it was going to be demolished. He stated Mr. Louis Berklich had grown up in the house and at that time was an intern at a local architectural firm. He noted Louis Berklich had purchased the Livernois property in 1954 and built a small 20 x 40 block house. He stated the house on the farm property was moved to the Livernois location in 1971, and an addition put on the house in 1977, noting the Certificate of Occupancy for the house was dated 1977. He explained the older block house was demolished in 2001.

Mr. Mukesh Mangla stated they wanted to develop the best product for the Community, and noted their proposal contained a very unique product in that it looked like a house but was actually a duplex. He indicated there would be approximately 50% to 60% open area, with about 50% of the trees remaining intact.

Mr. Campbell stated if duplexes were constructed, they would be asymmetrical and would appear like a single family home. He indicated he felt the State's determination of the style of the historic house, which was Colonial Revival, would most likely be the most authoritative description. He stated Colonial Revival is also referred to an English Renaissance Classical, and Greek Revival is also referred to an Ancient Classical. He noted the duplexes would be designed adhering to the principals of classical architecture, without committing to either Greek Revival or Colonial Revival to avoid creating a false sense of history. He reviewed a rough sketch of a proposed building with double-hung windows, a pitched roof, and the appropriate architectural treatments.

Chairperson Kilpatrick clarified that the entire ten (10) acre parcel was the historic district. Mr. Delacourt indicated that was correct, and noted the survey sheets indicated that only one (1) structure was referred to as contributing, with the balance of the parcel being undeveloped.

Chairperson Kilpatrick clarified the HDC would retain review rights over the entire project. Mr. Delacourt stated no matter how the project was developed, either through a PUD or as a single-family option, the HDC would retain review rights over the elevations and lot layouts. He indicated the applicants wanted the Commission's input to help them determine which development would be the most compatible with the district.

Mr. Dziurman stated he would like to see the elevations of the historic house. Mr. Campbell reviewed the photographs of the house, noting the east elevation. Mr. Dziurman noted the east elevation would become the prominent view in one of the proposed developments. Mr. Campbell then reviewed the west and south elevations of the house. Mr. Mukesh Mangla mentioned that the east side elevation was added in 1977. He noted the front porch was also added because the Berklich's only moved the rectangular portion of the house, not the porch. He indicated Lou Berklich's son had added the dental moldings in the 1980s.

Mr. Dziurman asked if the proposed duplexes would be rental units or condominium units. Mr. Mukesh Mangla stated they would be condominiums. Mr. Dziurman asked what the sizes per unit would be. Mr. Mukesh Mangla stated each unit would be about 2,000 square feet.

Mr. Dziurman noted he had not seen any garages or outbuildings depicted on the proposed site layout. Mr. Mukesh Mangla indicated the units would have attached garages. Mr. Campbell stated he had only provided the rough sketch of a proposed unit and pointed out the garage. Mr. Mukesh Mangla explained the proposed layout of the entrances to the units, with one unit having a garage located in the rear. Mr. Campbell explained if both garages were viewed from the front of the building, the building would not give the appearance of a single-family home.

Mr. Dziurman stated there was no question in his mind that the better site layout was the proposal containing the duplexes, noting that plan also nicely showcased the historic home. He asked if the development profitability was more or less than with a single-family development. Mr. Mukesh Mangla stated the duplex proposal would be more challenging because they were 2,000 square foot units. He indicated the enhancement of the historic house would also be somewhat challenging and would include a landscaped entrance. He referred to a development in Birmingham called Westwood Commons that was a small development project done by Bob Gibbs.

Mr. Dziurman asked if the development would have sidewalks to add to the walk ability of the project. Mr. Delacourt stated the City's Ordinance would require sidewalks no matter how the project was developed.

Mr. Dziurman stated of the three (3) site proposals presented, he felt the duplex plan was the superior plan. He noted there were still many other things to discuss with respect to the proposed project. Mr. Delacourt stated the applicants were before the Commission asking for input regarding the best proposal, and were well aware the elevations and other matters would have to come back before the HDC.

Mr. Dziurman noted the previous comments about the Greek Revival versus Colonial Revival, and noted the different styles of architecture did not start and stop, but rather blended. He

clarified despite the fact one particular style was more predominant in the 1800s, the style did not stop at that time.

Mr. Dunphy stated he was most impressed with the new urbanism approach used by the applicants. He felt of the options presented, that approach had the most to offer. He indicated he felt very strongly that the City could use more of those types of projects, and that the more the housing options can be diversified the more is contributed to the City. He felt it was a public good in using that approach. He stated that proposal also gave the most prominent treatment to the historic structure, which was the main focus of the HDC. He indicated the project reminded him of the Lorna Stone project that had come before the HDC. He stated he would like to see the project go forward on the basis outlined by the applicants, and indicated he would support the project.

Mr. Szantner stated he preferred the new urbanist approach, noting he really liked the fact that approach would allow them to preserve more of the original wooded areas on the site, which he felt was the hallmark of the site. He indicated he also liked the idea of showcasing the existing historic home. He pointed out the scale of the houses, when the two garages were included, would be the equivalent of a 4,000 square foot house with two garages. He felt the footprints of those homes in relationship to the historic home was pretty obvious, and stated the way the facades are broken down, the scale of the individual elements should be kept in mind in developing the architecture of the structures. He noted he thought the plan could also work with single-family homes if that type of project would meet market demand. He noted the scale may just be a fact of life because that was the way housing was constructed at this time, and it would have to be dealt with. He felt there should be some recognition that the scale of the duplexes would be more massive, although not the Birmingham "big foot" phenomenon, but would be roughly equivalent based on the same market factors.

Mr. Castile asked the square footage of the existing historic home. Mr. Mukesh Mangla stated the owners had told him it was about 2,300 square feet.

Mr. Castile asked if it was the applicant's intent to include the historic home as part of the condominium association, or whether the historic home would be sold separately. Mr. Mukesh Mangla stated the house would remain an individual house, noting several people had expressed interest in purchasing the home.

Mr. Delacourt stated the historic home would most likely not be included in the condominium association, but remain its own individual single-family parcel. Mr. Mukesh Mangla agreed the home would remain separate.

Mr. Delacourt asked if the historic home would have an internal access rather than an access from Livernois. Mr. Mukesh Mangla indicated that was correct. Mr. Delacourt clarified the historic home would be granted access rights in perpetuity. Mr. Mukesh Mangla stated that would be incorporated in the Deed.

Ms. Sieffert asked if the entire ten (10) acre parcel would continue to be a historic district or whether a request would be made to delist the site. Mr. Delacourt stated he did not believe the

applicants had any intention of asking for a delisting, nor did the Commission have any intent of asking the site to be delisted. He clarified the parcel would stay a historic district and any future additions or modifications would have to come before the HDC for approval, just as any other new home in a historic district.

Ms. Sieffert clarified the applicants were looking for the Commission's approval for a proposed plan prior to moving on to request approval from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Delacourt explained the proposed site plan did not conform to the current zoning; however, the PUD process could be utilized to develop the site. He stated one of the intents of the PUD was to allow creative redevelopment of historic districts. He indicated the applicants wanted to determine if the HDC felt the proposal met that intent. He stated if the HDC agreed, the plan would then be presented to the Planning Commission for the Planning Commission to determine if the proposal was the appropriate use of the PUD Ordinance. He noted if the Planning Commission agreed, the plan would be presented to City Council to ask the same question. He explained if all the boards agreed the proposed plan was the appropriate way to redevelop the property, then the formal applications and plans would be submitted. He noted the project would have to come back before the HDC for approval of either individual elevations for each site, or a range of elevations that would be allowed to be developed on the site under certain conditions.

Ms. Sieffert asked if the large green areas depicted on the proposed plan would be left as open space and left wooded. Mr. Campbell stated they would remain wooded. Ms. Sieffert asked if those areas would be landscaped in any manner. Mr. Campbell indicated they would not. Mr. Mukesh Mangla stated it was very heavily wooded parcel.

Ms. Sieffert stated she thought it was a really creative plan, and noted she would like to see more creativity in the City's housing developments.

Mr. Dziurman asked about the price range of the proposed houses. Mr. Mukesh Mangla stated it was their intent to price them in \$300,000.00 range.

Mr. Dziurman stated he did not like to see vinyl siding in a historic neighborhood, but would prefer wood or cement fiberboard. He noted cement fiberboard was being used more frequently and was a good material. He stated it was a preference to have quality real materials used. Mr. Mukesh Mangla stated they wanted to provide a "no maintenance" exterior, and noted there would not be too much brick used because brick was a different style of architecture.

Mr. Dziurman suggested the use of stone in some instances, such as features with cultural stone. He noted those were common elements that blended with historic homes. Mr. Mukesh Mangla stated they would put together a good product, noting the current owners and some neighbors had expressed an interest in purchasing four of the homes. He stated the current owner is adamant about not moving from the site.

Ms. Sieffert clarified that Mrs. Berklich wanted to move from the historic home to one of the new homes. Mr. Mukesh Mangla stated that was correct because she was having trouble negotiating stairs.

Chairperson Kilpatrick asked if the applicants had anything further they wished to discuss regarding the proposed project. Mr. Mukesh Mangla inquired about the next step in the process. Mr. Delacourt stated the next step would be a preapplication workshop with the Planning Commission to discuss the use of the process from a land use standpoint.

Chairperson Kilpatrick thanked the applicants for coming before the Commission, noting their project was an exciting project.

~~C. Address: 1631 W. Avon Road
Sidwell: 15-21-126-037
Applicant: William Church~~

Chairperson Kilpatrick stated Mr. Delacourt would provide a brief summary regarding this matter, noting the applicant had not been requested to attend this meeting.

Mr. Dziurman stated he had worked with the applicant and would ask to be recused during this portion of the meeting. Mr. Dziurman then left the dais and took a seat in the auditorium.

Mr. Delacourt stated the Commissioners might remember this project, noting the parcel was located just west of City Hall on Avon Road. He explained Mr. Church had received permission from the HDC to demolish a detached garage on the site to make room for a land division of the property to create a separate lot. He stated at that time Mr. Church had received approval from the Commission for some proposed additions for the existing farmhouse. He noted the siding had been removed from the farmhouse.

Mr. Delacourt stated the resulting lot had been the source of some mistakes and misunderstandings between the City and Mr. Church regarding the review of the resulting lot. He stated that after the land division was accomplished, the resulting lot was still part of the historic district and under the review of the Historic Districts Commission (HDC). He noted Mr. Church was informed about that fact, but it was not made completely clear to him.

Mr. Delacourt stated Mr. Church had sold the lot with the historic home on it, and had also sold the newly created lot to a builder. He indicated the builder submitted plans to the Building Department for a new house on the vacant lot. He stated the Building Department subsequently issued the permits for the lot due to the fact the newly created lot had been given a new sidwell number and address, neither of which were reflected in the City's computer as being a historic district. He indicated that error had since been corrected.

Mr. Delacourt reviewed the proposed plans for the home to be constructed on the new lot. He stated it was not until the foundation was seen being poured on the site that Staff realized what had happened. He stated a stop work order had been issued for the building and a meeting held with Mr. Church, who was very apologetic and had been very accommodating.

Mr. Delacourt stated Mr. Church had been working with his builder and architect to revise the elevations on the home. He reviewed the elevations submitted to the Commissioners prior to the