

A regular meeting of the Troy Planning Commission was held in Council Chambers, City Hall, Wednesday, August 14, 2024, at 3:30 p.m. with Chairman James McGarry presiding. ATTENDING: Members – McGarry, Westmeyer, Wolke and Titterington; Development Staff – R. Long; A. Eidemiller, and Development Director Davis. Also present were citizens, City Council President Rozell and Council Member Westfall.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Upon motion of Mr. Titterington, seconded by Mr. Westmeyer, the minutes of July 31, 2024, meeting were approved by unanimous vote.

HISTORIC DISTRICT APPLICATION - CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, 15 S. MARKET STREET FOR STAINING EXTERIOR BRICK TO BLACK; OWNER APPLICANT – TECUMSEH OF TROY LLC, BETH KERBER. Remove from Table: A motion was made by Titterington, seconded by Mr. Westmeyer to remove the application for 15 S Market Street from the table.

MOTION PASSED, UNANIMOUS ROLL CALL VOTE.

Staff stated that the summary report was unchanged from the prior meeting, and staff continued to recommend the application be denied based on the same findings.

The applicant was present. The Commission had received in the packet information about the benefits of staining brick and information related to KEIM exterior coating. Information directly from Brian Brothers regarding their stated recommendation for staining brick was not provided.

DISCUSSION. Ms. Kerber, applicant, stated she would agree not to stain any area/areas the Commission did not want stained; that her application be considered “grandfathered” because when the drawing was made, that was prior to the City adopting any standards, even though the application was not submitted prior to the approval of the standards; each brick can be individually stained and the mortar left unstained; and as the Commission approved the painting of the brick at 13 S. Market Street, she does not understand why the Commission will not approve the staining of the brick of 15 S. Market Street;

Regarding 13 S. Market Street, staff concurred that will be painting unpainted brick, but there is nothing within the brick that gives it any special character; that the idea of the standard is to preserve the look and character of the original façade and painting the brick of 15 S. Market Street will change that look and character; and staff continues to recommend denial of the application.

Mr. Wolke commented that he sees the difference as brick covering and blocking the brick, and stain changing the color but allowing the brick to breathe. He also stated he was hoping to have additional information from the painting contractor as to why the staining was recommended and how it is not detrimental to the brick.

In response to Mr. Westmeyer, staff stated that any stain applied will change the color of the brick.

Mr. Titterington noted that the Commission has adopted standards, and that this application does not comply with the standards, and that prior to the current standards, the Commission followed the Secretary of the Interior recommendations which are unchanged.

A motion was made by Mr. Wolke, seconded by Mr. Westmeyer, to approve the application for 15 S. Marke Street as submitted.

VOTE: Yes – Wolke; No – Titterington, McGary and Westmeyer

MOTION FAILED ADOPTION

HISTORIC DISTRICT APPLICATION - CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, 10 N. MARKET STREET, PAINTING OF THE BUILDING; OWNER – 3 N RIDGE, LLC; APPLICANT – ANNELOSE KIMMEL. Staff reported: the zoning is B-3 Central Business District; the OHI form describes this property as a small, turn-of-the-century commercial building; distinguishing features include a sheet metal cornice, brackets and frieze, ornate upper sash and plain longer sash; building was previously painted in 2017; proposed colors are to paint the paneled frieze a Deluxe Lt Bonze #244; the main body color on the second story is proposed to be painted SW Pure White 7005; and the main body color on the first floor is proposed to be SW Iron Ore 7069; regarding the design manual:

“Design Manual: *Design Manual*: 2.6 Paint Colors states: (Staff analysis can be seen below in red following each section):

- A. A concentration of similar colors on the same block should be avoided. **A concentration of similar colors is avoided on the same block. Although the Agave and Rye building is black, the proposed colors have a second story body color of white of which will compliment the Agave and Rye building.**
- B. Historically unpainted surfaces should not be painted. Historically painted surfaces should remain painted. **All the surfaces have previously been painted.**
- C. Simpler buildings should have a simple color scheme. More ornate structures, such as larger Queen Anne styles, may incorporate three or more colors. **Three colors are being proposed that will highlight the significant features on the building.**
- D. Matte, flat, or semi-gloss paint should be used. Avoid high gloss paint. **High gloss paint is being avoided.**
- E. In all circumstances, avoid bright and obtrusive colors, such as neon or day-glow hues. **There are no bright or obtrusive colors.** “

Staff recommended approval as the proposal complies with section 2.6 of the Design Manual. Staff commented that the repainting is in basically the same colors now on the building, just using those colors on different areas of the building. Mr. Titterington reminded staff that the Commission has previously stated that the Commission wishes to see color swatches with all applications.

A motion was made by Mr. Westmeyer, seconded by Mr. Titterington, to approve the Historic District Application Certificate of Appropriateness for 10 N. Market Street as submitted, based on the exact colors stated in the application, and based on the findings of staff that the application complies with Section 2.6 of the Design Manual.

MOTION ADOPTED BY UNANIMOUS ROLL CALL VOTE

HALIFAX VILLAS PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, CHANGE NAME OF HALIFAX VILLAS AND PATIO HOMES TO “COTTAGES OF HALIFAX SUBDIVISION”; **OWNER-APPLICANT HALIFAX LAND DEVELOPMENT LLC, FRANK HARLOW.** Staff reported: the Record Plan for the Halifax Villas Planned Development was approved as O-10-2019 and O-36-2021 with additional minor amendments in 2021 and 2023; applicant is requesting the Planning Commission to allow for a minor amendment to the Planned Development to change the name of the Halifax Villas and Patio Homes Planned Development phase two to the “Cottages of Halifax Subdivision”; this request has been reviewed by the Law Director and it was determined that this request is a minor amendment. No other changes will be made to phase two; and staff recommend approval of the minor amendment as the subdivision will still conform to the Final Development Plan and General as approved by the Planning Commission and City Council.

It was discussed that this name change is only for Section Two of the Planned Development.

A motion was made by Mr. Westmeyer, seconded by Mr. Titterington, that the Troy Planning Commission approves the name change from Halifax Villas and Patio Homes Planned Development – Residential Phase Two to the “Cottages of Halifax Subdivision”.

MOTION ADOPTED BY UNANIMOUS ROLL CALL VOTE

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE: Consultants of American Structurepoint provided the attached update, noting their work on that document was about 80% complete, and they are hoping Commission members can consider final approval in September. The consultants stated that the current draft incorporates what they heard from the Commission, other officials, the advisory groups, and the community. The Consultant noted that a public Comprehensive Plan update session will be held on August 15 at 6 p.m.

Also discussed was the update regarding the Zoning Code and Subdivision Regulations. The consultants indicated they plan to place these codes and regulations into one document as this should help avoid conflicts in the provisions and provide for easier review and applicability. The consultants discussed that the proposal for the Zoning Code should address ambiguous provisions, some uses may need to be spelled out individually rather than combining a number of like provisions into one title, and that they will propose some processes being handled individually rather than going before boards and commissions which lengthen processes.

Commission members provided some feedback, with Mr. Wolke reminding the consultants of his prior request that the wording be in as simple English as possible for easier understanding by all parties using the documents.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

_____Chairman

_____Secretary

