

*other things, whether the project has begun, funds committed, sources of funds, prior City Council decisions, Planning Commission or administrative recommendations and decisions; and*

**RESOLVED**, that the Capital Improvement Plan presented for review on April 17, 2018, is adopted by the Rochester Hills Planning Commission on April 17, 2018; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that this Plan should be published and attested to according to law.

*Mr. Kaltsounis thanked staff and everyone on the committee for another great job. Every year, the CIP gave them a great idea of the future and how to plan for it. City Council could pick and choose, but it set the table for them quite well. He asked how many projects were received from the public. Ms. Hoyle said that there were none. It was put out there and they were hoping, but they did not get any recommendations.*

*Chairperson Brnabic agreed with Mr. Kaltsounis and said that everyone did a great job of putting the CIP together. She had a request regarding the new projects pages. Several years ago, she had asked that the page be slightly enlarged, because she did not think they should need a magnifying glass to read it. She asked if the print could be enlarged before it was printed, and Ms. Hoyle said that it definitely could.*

**A motion was made by Schroeder, seconded by Hooper, that this matter be Adopted. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye** 8 - Anzek, Brnabic, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

**Excused** 1 - Dettloff

- 2018-0144** Public Hearing and request for Conditional Use Recommendation - City File No. 18-003 - First State Bank, a proposed 6,100 s.f. bank with drive-through on 1.31 acres located east of Rochester, north of Eddington Blvd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-23-300-039, Eugene Lovell, First State Bank, Applicant  
*(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated April 13, 2018 and site plans and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)*

*Present for the applicant were Eugene Lovell, President, First State Bank, 24300 Little Mack, St. Clair Shores, MI 48080, Robert Kirk, Kirk, Huth, Lange & Badalamenti, 19500 Hall Rd., Suite 100, Clinton Township, MI 48038 and Andrew Dahaner, Stucky Vitale Architects, 27172 Woodward*

Ave., Royal Oak, MI 48067.

*Ms. Kapelanski stated that the applicant was proposing a bank with drive-through. It would be at the newly realigned Eddington Blvd. and Rochester Rd. The site was being developed under the FB-2 provisions. A two-story bank was being proposed fronting on Rochester Rd., and entrances would be from old and new Eddington Blvds. The drive-through was proposed at the rear of the site, and it required a Conditional Use permit. A Tree Removal Permit was required to remove 32 trees, and the applicant would pay into the Tree Fund to mitigate the removal. There was an area for future development (phase 2) shown. It was for informational purposes only and was not proposed for any type of approval. There was an open space area proposed in the northwest corner of the site to coordinate with the new City open space on a portion of Eddington that was closed. The applicant was requesting a number of modifications under FB. The minimum building frontage build to area and front yard minor setback for the Eddington frontages, the minimum facade transparency and an allowance to have the entrance in the rear of the building had been requested. The applicant had noted that those conditions could not be met because of bank operations. They were also requesting some landscape modifications for a deficient number of trees due to utility and corner clearance conflicts. Staff recommended approval, and she said that she was available for any questions.*

*Chairperson Brnabic asked Mr. Lovell if he had anything to add. Mr. Lovell related that First State Bank was originally headquartered in Macomb County. It was a community bank with about 12 branches in Macomb County. The proposed would be their first in Oakland County, and they were excited about the opportunity to do business in Rochester Hills.*

*Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 7:31 p.m.*

**Lisa Winarski, 194 Bedlington, Rochester Hills, MI 48307** *Ms. Winarski had a concern regarding the entrance onto Eddington to the east. Ms. Kapelanski said that the area she was referring to was the circulation for the site and not an entrance. Ms. Winarski asked to be shown the entrances, which Ms. Kapelanski pointed out.*

*Ms. Roediger explained that the site included a future phase. The applicants were only proposing to develop the front half of the site. The new north/south road that connected the old and the new Eddington was to the east, and the internal drive was in the middle of the property. There*

would not be an entrance to the bank from the east.

Ms. Winarski said that she had been concerned about busses. It was originally not supposed to have been realigned for commercial use; it was supposed to be realigned for Eddington Farms. She also had a concern about what trees on old Eddington would be removed, if any. She noted that there were some big pines. She asked about street lighting on old Eddington Blvd. Her biggest concern was where the storm water would drain. She asked if it would drain to what was redeveloped on the street, which would drain to the wetlands or if they would tie it into an existing system.

Mr. Danaher noted that he was not the engineer, but regarding trees, the project was realigning the three roads on the south, east and north, including the reconnection at the closed Eddington. The project would plant a number of trees on all four sides of the property and also internally. He was not sure how many trees would be saved, but they would replant larger trees on the roadway edges. Regarding retention, the entire project would have onsite retention under the parking lots. Day one of property use would contain below grade retention for both the current and the future use, so they would have capacity in the system. There should not be concerns about draining off to the roadways, because they had to contain it onsite.

Mr. Schroeder said that Ms. Winarski had been concerned about the trees on the property not being developed at this time. Mr. Danaher said that it would stay lawn for the most part. Any trees there were not planned to go away as part of the bank project. The new areas for retention would happen in the east part, including under the drive lane that divided the current and future uses.

Chairperson Brnabic pointed out that the applicant was proposing to remove 32 regulated trees. Ms. Roediger said that Ms. Winarski was referring to the evergreen trees near the entrance of the old Eddington, and it appeared that they would be removed as part of the plan.

Chairperson Brnabic noted a question about street lighting. Ms. Roediger asked Mr. Davis to come forward. She said that the realignment was done last year, and they were still working out the final list items. Part of that was working with DTE on the lights along old Eddington.

Mr. Davis advised that the plan was to eventually replace the existing

lighting. There was lighting on old Eddington that the Homeowner's Association previously owned, and the City had taken over that lighting contract. Eventually, when the area got redeveloped, the City would put in an updated style of lighting, but it would be a future project. As far as storm water drainage, he said that underground detention was proposed for the site. The storm water would be directed to underground piping, and it would be held there temporarily, and then it would be discharged at a controlled rate. He asked Mr. Danaher if the outlet went to the north of the property or the south. If it went to the north, it would continue along old Eddington into the subdivision, and if it went to the south where new Eddington was, it would continue towards the wetland area east of the property.

Mr. Danaher said that it would connect to the south. Mr. Davis concluded that it would connect into some of the new storm drainage constructed as part of realigning Eddington, and it would go towards the wetland area.

Ms. Winarski stated that there was a significant amount of flooding in the wetlands because of Stonecrest Senior Living and poor planning. It was a 90k s.f. building that dumped off into the wetlands. Her house happened to be the most affected along Bedlington because it sat at the lowest point. She mentioned that her house was the last one to be built in Eddington Farms because of some DEQ issues. She had a huge concern about all of the proposed properties dumping off into the wetlands. The topography of the land went lower towards the wetlands, and it went lower towards the houses. Stonecrest raised the property 15 feet if not more, and all of the drainage sloped down into the wetlands. She stated that the wetlands could not handle it. The water came almost to the foundation of her house. She maintained that having another property drain off into the wetlands was unacceptable.

Chairperson Brnabic closed the Public Hearing at 7:42 p.m.

Mr. Danaher stated that the site did not slope in the direction that was mentioned. There was an entire greenfield site that sloped from the top of the site to the southeast. Undeveloped, the water was shedding directly off of the property. The current plan would contain all the rain water into an underground system and hold it so that it would be distributed and managed and not just dumped into an open area. If they did nothing, the problem would not change. He pointed out that the way the site would be developed and engineered, it would bring nearly \$200k of underground retention that would help the situation that was there.

*Mr. Davis related that the City was working with Ms. Winarski to address her concern. It had been ongoing, and they would continue to work with her. He had contacted the MDEQ to see what ability the City had to do work within the wetland area. Until they heard back, they were not sure what could be done. There was a process the City was following. As far as the subject and future developments, the outlet was toward the wetland area. It always had been; the natural flow went there and water from Stonecrest went there. If there was a problem as a result of anything, the City would address it and get it fixed.*

*Mr. Hooper said that related to the storm drain outlet and development, sheet C-5 showed that underground detention was proposed. A statement had been made that nothing would be done in the future phase area, but he said that was really not true, because they were proposing to put in the underground detention system there. He asked if the bank owned the second parcel, which was confirmed. He clarified that it was one parcel, but it would be sized to encompass both areas. Should the bank be approved, the site plan also included underground detention for the future phase.*

*Mr. Hooper referred to sheets A1.1 and A1.2, and he asked where the teller windows were. He asked if it was a new concept. Mr. Danaher agreed that it was for the bank. They just finished a project in Macomb to realign them to a pod-type scenario. It was a more hospitable way of approaching a bank and more like a hotel where it was a one-on-one transaction between a banker and a customer. There were two components within the lobby that were built in that had cash recycling. It was meant to be a new way of banking, and it was happening throughout the credit union industry and at other banking institutions. Mr. Hooper asked if the two pods would be four locations to handle four customers at a time. Mr. Danaher said that was correct.*

*Mr. Hooper noted drawing C-9 which showed two drive-throughs. Looking at the geometry, he did not think it would work. If he drove his truck through one, he would not make it.*

*Mr. Danaher said that there would be one drive-through ATM lane and one teller lane. There were two teller tube systems in the drive lane built in for redundancy. There were times the tubes were down and times when they worked. The goal was to have one always operating at all times. Mr. Hooper said that the third lane was a bypass lane. He said that for the one closest to the bank, he did not think a truck could make the turn. He said that his question came from a situation at the Rochester Hills*

*Library. The way it was built, someone could never make the turn and would scrape the building. Bumpers got ripped off, and the teller window was picked off. They rebuilt the building and pushed the extension out and got rid of the turn, because no one could make it. He was concerned that the bank's drive-through would not work for a truck or larger vehicle.*

*Mr. Danaher responded that their engineers had tested it with turning clearances for a typical vehicle, and the lanes all met the requirements. He said that they could take it back to their team to make sure and verify that the clearances would work. Mr. Hooper said that if he got to the box location, he would have to open his door to get to it. He would have to be away from the building. Mr. Danaher said that the lanes approaching were just striped spaces. The curbed area was at the actual tube stations. The painted lines were meant to help keep people in their lanes, and there was no curb to mount to make a larger turn. The City had a requirement for stacking that was more than their customers saw at the branches typically. They were showing the worst case scenario for stacking. Mr. Hooper thought that there would be two teller positions open at all times. If only one was open, there would be stacking.*

*Mr. Kaltsounis brought up the future phase to the east. He said that he did not like seeing the words "proposed two-story," because that was not being proposed with the plan. He suggested saying "proposed building" instead. He pointed out that an approval of the plans should not be an approval for a two-story building on the future phase. If something came in the future, someone could state that the Commissioners approved two-stories previously. He asked why the underground detention basin had to go underneath the east property. He asked why it could not go under the area being developed for the bank. The east side of the property had been before the Commissioners 100 times with many different developments and/or changes. He was concerned that they were touching a property that did not need to be. He would love to see the group of trees in the back be kept. If the underground retention was added there, those trees would have to be removed. He asked if it could be put underneath the bank and kept away from the rear of the property and left as it was.*

*Mr. Danaher said that they would still have to connect at the southern corner where the existing manhole was. He agreed that they could look at moving the underground system to the west. He indicated that the engineering was not complete, but they wanted to show the intent. Their engineers were ready to work with the City to make sure they got it right. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if they would agree to a condition whereby the*

*applicant would work with City staff to propose a plan to move the underground system to the west with the intention to save as many trees as possible on the future phase.*

*Mr. Lovell said that he had no problem with that at all. Mr. Kaltsounis suggested that they could leave the removal number at 32 and perhaps change it later. Ms. Roediger thought that everyone understood that the intent was to try to relocate the underground detention to minimize tree removal. Mr. Kaltsounis added that there was a very nice group of trees that he would like to keep. He was not saying that it would never be developed. Mr. Lovell said that they would want an attractive place for their customers, the bank and the community. Mr. Kaltsounis maintained that it would really help them to keep trees.*

*Mr. Danaher explained that the future development was shown initially to spur the engineering and make sure the site was designed for underground detention for full build out. They did not know what it would eventually be. They showed another two-story building to handle the density for the FB-2 Overlay. There was discussion early on as to whether they should leave it or not, but the main intent was to show that there were future plans, and the engineering would be done up front. They would be making the investment today. Mr. Kaltsounis considered that they might decide to put in something else.*

*Ms. Morita said that it was hard to tell from the plans what improvements and where curb cuts would go in old Eddington Blvd. She asked the applicants to describe what they intended to do in that area. Mr. Danaher confirmed that she was talking about the northwest corner in the vacated Eddington. Ms. Morita corrected that it was not vacated. Mr. Danaher agreed that it was not vacated, but there were plans that were not a part of their contract that the City was working on with Nowak and Fraus.*

*Ms. Roediger explained that the City was not vacating the right-of-way; they were creating a park area. Mr. Danaher said that there was not a road there today, and the improvements being done to the site were not part of the bank project. They were aligning the new pathways along Rochester Rd. and providing connections to it, but they were not doing the renovations to the Eddington Park. Ms. Morita said that the preliminary site plan showed a concrete curb to be removed. Mr. Danaher agreed, and said that there would be a new connection back to the east out of the north drive. Ms. Morita said that it showed that in the center of the lot on the north side, the bank would be removing a concrete curb to get to the old Eddington Blvd. Mr. Danaher said that was correct, and they would*

install a new curb so there would be a full connection. Ms. Morita asked if they would be doing anything else on old Eddington. Mr. Danaher said trees and sidewalks. Ms. Morita asked if that would be inside the road right-of-way itself or not. Mr. Danaher said that inside of the road right-of-way, they would do the curb ways to finish the connection to the north. It would be completed with bollards so someone could not drive into the park. Those details would have to be finalized, but their intention was to complete the road so people could safely navigate to the north and get back out onto Eddington to go east. Ms. Morita asked Mr. Davis if his department had taken a look at it. She pointed out that it was the City's road.

Mr. Davis believed that Ms. Morita was asking if the applicants were going to plant any trees or construct a sidewalk in the City's road right-of-way for old Eddington or if the work would be done on the their property. Mr. Danaher said that the sidewalk on the north property line leading from the roadway all the way to the east would be new, and it was on the City's property. If the City did not want them to do it, they would not, but the intent was to finish the sidewalk and make the area walkable. Ms. Morita said that she appreciated that, and she thanked them for coming and building in the City. However, she thought a condition should be added that anything that occurred in the City's right-of-way, which included the old Eddington Blvd. needed to get proper approval from the City. That included curb cuts, trees and sidewalks.

Mr. Anzek advised that the City had a process for issuing permits for curb cuts, driveway aprons and so on. He did not feel a condition was necessary. Regarding the objection to a future two-story building, he actually found two-stories to be more of a positive than a negative statement. Two-stories was closer to meeting the objectives of the FB-2 Overlay district to shrink the footprint, go vertical, and have less parking and impervious surface. There were 15 spaces required and 25 proposed. In the objectives of FB-2, the City wanted to make a development look seamless, and that would include the future building. He assumed that it would continue under the bank's ownership because of the retention, and he asked if that was correct.

Mr. Lovell said that was their intent. Mr. Anzek asked if they would be the landlord of the future building, which Mr. Lovell confirmed. Mr. Anzek reiterated that he preferred noting two-story, because it gave the message that the City supported it. It was o.k from his perspective that it be part of the record. Regarding the parking, he asked if it could be sharable with cross access.



*Mr. Lovell said that at first blush, he did not see why they would not want to encourage that, and he could foresee few situations where that could be problematic. Mr. Danaher said that they knew 15 spaces were not enough to support the branch function. They would build the spaces to serve the needs of the building, and the goal was to make the whole site walkable with shared parking. They did not want to build any more parking than was necessary. When the next use came into play, they would look at it closely with Planning, and make sure they were providing the minimum number of spaces to support both sites. Mr. Anzek said that movement back and forth between the bank and whatever happened in the future building should be comfortable and safe with crosswalks and defined areas.*

*Mr. Anzek mentioned the public amenity at the northwest corner, and said that he did not see a detailed drawing of what would happen there. He also noticed a curb in the wall on sheet C-6. He asked if that was intended to create a bench seating for pedestrian traffic on Rochester Rd. or if it was perhaps an easement for signage. Mr. Danaher said that the triangle area was being shown for clear vision at the corner. The goal in the radial area was that it would be a similar type function of what was happening on the opposite corner of Eddington. The hope was that it would be set up for artwork and benches and other things for a park-like setting. Mr. Anzek said that another objective should be to get as many trees planted along the streets as possible, although he realized that there were water and sewer conflicts.*

*Mr. Reece said that he appreciated the development. He asked if the intent of the façade was to mimic some of their other buildings so people would recognize it was a First State Bank. Mr. Lovell said that it was something they would like to work to develop for each of the branches, but it was a new design for the bank. They had undertaken, with the other branches, to develop signage that would mimic the appearance. If they were to build additional branches, they would develop buildings that looked like the proposed.*

*Mr. Reece said that he liked the geometry and the materials, but he would like it more if the building was further north by the dealerships. He believed that at one point in time, this area along Rochester Rd. was supposed to be part of a PUD with symmetry with the architecture. The Fifth Third Bank was to the north and north of that was another brick building with copper colored roofs. He was not suggesting that those should be mimicked, but the applicants proposed champagne colored*

metal siding and limestone. He thought that was a pretty stark contrast with anything in the immediate area up and down Rochester Rd. If the rest of the Commissioners were o.k. with it, he would acquiesce. The intent at one time was to get everything aligned from a design perspective. He thought the proposed building was very attractive, but he was not sure it fit in with the area. He suggested perhaps just changing the stone to a more natural color.

Mr. Danaher said that their goal initially was to use natural, earth tone materials. The limestone would be natural. Mr. Reece observed that there was limestone and metal panel. Mr. Danaher said that the metal panel would be a warm champagne color, similar to what was on a Comerica Bank. They knew that an aluminum raw metal, which was what they were using for the storefront colors on other branches, was not the right fit, so they were using a warmer range of aluminum to try to make it align with the brand and fit the site. They were trying to use long lasting, natural materials that were high quality but low maintenance.

Mr. Reece indicated that he had no issues with the materials. It was more the palette with the surrounding area. Mr. Lovell said that they did not want to give an impression that they were not amenable to making changes to suit the desires of the Commission. Mr. Reece said that he appreciated that, and if the rest of the Commissioners were o.k., he would let it go. He asked if staff was comfortable with the up-lighting on the front façade. Ms. Kapelanski said that there was a note in the planning review stating that fixture B would have to be changed so the building was not up-lit. Mr. Reece said that he really did like the building a lot; he was just concerned about the location.

Mr. Schultz followed up with Mr. Kaltsounis' suggestion about moving the retention basin. He thought that would allow the applicants to have more flexibility when they came in for phase two, and it would keep the trees. He suggested that they might want to push the future building to the far west property line. Instead of spending \$150k to move the detention, he thought that it made more sense to put it in the parcel to be developed first. Mr. Lovell said that he had no objection to that.

Mr. Danaher said that there would be some engineering with that. The grade changed eight feet over the short distance of the Rochester frontage. They wanted to make sure that ADA was accommodated. That was one of the reasons for the location of the entry. They wanted to make sure it was accessible on all four sides. He indicated that the eight-foot grade differential was challenging.

Mr. Anzek stated that he liked the building very much. He thought that the geometry was different, and he thought it would be attractive. He agreed that in 2003, there was an overall PUD approved for the site that included the Fifth Third Bank down to the senior housing project. Every building and façade was designed so it worked together. That went aside when the PUD went aside, and the site was rezoned to allow flexibility. He thought the building would be attractive at the corner, but he would be concerned how the second building would complement and work with it. Mr. Danaher said that they would want to have complementary materials, but not match exactly. They would not try to create a campus of identical buildings. Mr. Anzek suggested that there could be a series of different textures.

Chairperson Brnabic clarified that the building would be 6,100 s.f. She noted that the EIS Summary stated that it would be 5,100 s.f. , and she asked if that could be corrected.

Mr. Kaltsounis he remembered in 2003 when the property first came before the Commission. The developer at the time showed easels with poster boards from one end of the room to the other. They said that it was the vision for Rochester Rd. There had been a lot of churn, and it was interesting to see how development in the area was turning out with the banks, the apartments and the senior living facility. Hearing no further discussion, he moved the following, seconded by Mr. Reece.

**MOTION** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, in the matter of City File No. 18-003 (First State Bank) the Planning Commission **recommends** to City Council **Approval** of the **Conditional Use** to allow a drive-through at a bank in the FB-2 district, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on March 21, 2018, with the following seven (7) findings.

Findings

1. The proposed drive-through and other necessary site improvements meet or exceed the standards of the zoning ordinance.
2. The expanded use will promote the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance and Master Plan.
3. The proposed drive-through has been designed and is proposed to be constructed, operated, maintained, and managed so as to be

*compatible, harmonious, and appropriate in appearance with the existing and planned character of the general vicinity, adjacent uses of land, and the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the use.*

4. *The proposal should have a positive impact on the community as a whole and the surrounding area by offering another financial institution with the convenience of drive-through banking and add 15-20 jobs.*
5. *The proposed development is served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage ways, and refuse disposal.*
6. *The proposed development should not be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to existing or future neighboring land uses, persons, property, or the public welfare.*
7. *The proposal will not create additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services that will be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.*

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

**Aye** 8 - Anzek, Brnabic, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

**Excused** 1 - Dettloff

**2018-0145**

Request for a Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 18-003 - for the removal and replacement of as many as 32 trees associated with the development of a First State Bank, 6,100 s.f. with drive-through on 1.31 acres, located east of Rochester, north of Eddington Blvd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-23-300-039, Eugene Lovell, First State Bank, Applicant

***MOTION*** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schroeder, in the matter of City File No. 18-003 (First State Bank), the Planning Commission **grants a Tree Removal Permit**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on March 21, 2018, with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following three (3) conditions.

**Findings**

1. *The proposed removal and replacement of regulated trees is in*

*conformance with the Tree Conservation Ordinance.*

2. *The applicant is proposing to remove 32 regulated trees and pay into the City's Tree Fund.*

Conditions

1. *Tree protective and silt fencing, as reviewed and approved by the City staff, shall be installed prior to issuance of the Land Improvement Permit.*
2. *Should the applicant not be able to meet the tree replacement requirements on site  
the balance shall be paid into the City's Tree Fund at a rate of \$216.75 per tree.*
3. *City staff shall review and approve the applicant's plan to delay the removal of trees on the east side of the proposed future phase two development.*

*Mr. Anzek said that the first time Mr. Kaltsounis read the motion, he thought he said that no tree removal could be done on the east side. Where the retention facility was located would be an engineering driven issue. He wanted to make sure staff had flexibility. Mr. Kaltsounis said that they would be given the approval for the 32 trees; it would just be delayed if the retention could be moved.*

**A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schroeder, that this matter be Granted. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye** 8 - Anzek, Brnabic, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

**Excused** 1 - Dettloff

2018-0146

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 18-003 - First State Bank, a proposed 6,100 s.f. bank with drive through on 1.31 acres located on east of Rochester, north of Eddington Blvd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-23-300-039, Eugene Lovell, First State Bank, Applicant

***MOTION*** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schultz, in the matter of City File No. 18-003 (First State Bank), the Planning Commission **approves the Site Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on March 21, 2018, with the following nine (9) findings and subject to the following six (6) 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 proposed project will be accessed from Eddington Blvd., thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets. Paths and bike racks have been incorporated to promote safety and convenience of pedestrian traffic.*
3. *Off-street parking areas have been designed to avoid common traffic problems and promote customer safety*
4. *The minimum building frontage build-to area for Eddington New - south, the front yard minor setback for Eddington New - east, the minimum building frontage build-to area for Eddington New - east, the front yard minor setback for Eddington Old - north, the minimum building frontage build-to area for Eddington Old - north and the width of the planting area along Rochester Road are modified based upon the Planning Commission's determination that they meet the intent of the FB district.*
5. *The maximum height is modified based upon the Planning Commission's determination that the building is set back at least 100 feet from any single family residential district and because the property has 180 feet of Rochester Rd. frontage (100 ft. required).*
6. *The principal entrance to the building does not face a street; however, the applicant has indicated that due to bank security concerns, the site can only have one entrance which has been position toward the parking area and the Planning Commission waives this requirement along with the minimum façade transparency finding that evidence has been submitted demonstrating that compliance with the standard makes development impractical for the organization's operations.*
7. *The proposed development will improve a vacant parcel with the addition of a bank, and should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the vicinity.*

8. *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.*
9. *The relocation of Eddington and the Master Plan have anticipated this type of development, eliminating the need for a curb cut onto Rochester Rd.*

Conditions

1. *Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, prior to final approval by staff.*
2. *Provide a landscape cost estimate for landscaping and irrigation, plus inspection fees, as adjusted as necessary by staff, and posting of bond prior to temporary grade certification being issued by Engineering.*
3. *Payment into the City's Tree Fund for any trees that are not replaced onsite in the amount of \$216.75 per tree.*
4. *The developer shall work with City staff to revise the location of the underground retention storage facility to the area being developed on the west side of the property. The intention is to save as many trees as possible on the east side of the property.*
5. *Changes to the City-owned property (the right-of-way of old Eddington Blvd.) must be reviewed and approved by City staff.*
6. *City staff shall review and approve the drive-through lane to ensure that large pickups, SUVs and cars can efficiently maneuver through the lanes. Any changes shall be approved by staff prior to final approval.*

**A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schultz, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye** 8 - Anzek, Brnabic, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita, Reece, Schroeder and Schultz

**Excused** 1 - Dettloff

*After each motion, Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously, and she congratulated the applicants. Mr. Hooper thanked them for their investment in Rochester Hills. Ms. Roediger noted that the Conditional Use Recommendation would be*

*forwarded to City Council for the May 7, 2018 meeting.*

## DISCUSSION

**2018-0152** Brewster Place Duplex Condominiums, a proposed 32-unit development on 7.3 acres located north of Walton, west of Brewster, zoned SP Special Purpose, R-1 and R-3 One Family Residential, Robertson Brothers Homes, Applicant  
*The item had been postponed at the request of the applicants.*

**2018-0151** Brookland Park Lofts, a mixed-use commercial and residential development located near the northeast corner of Auburn and John R, 77 loft apartments and 12,200 s.f. of ground floor retail space with outdoor plaza seating for a restaurant and professional uses, plus 20,000 s.f. of outdoor recreational space that includes a dog park, children's jungle gym and all-season sports court, zoned B-2 General Business with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay on a portion, InvestaFind, Applicant

*(Reference: Memo prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated April 13, 2018 and site plan had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)*

*Present for the applicant were Mark and Katrina Barishaj, managing members of Investafind. Mr. Barishaj stated that they were luxury, family-owned builders, and they had managed apartment buildings for over 20 years. They had also participated in different developments across all five major counties in southeast Michigan. It was their first venture in Rochester Hills, and they were very excited.*

*Ms. Kapelanski stated that the proposed development wrapped around the northeast corner of John R and Auburn and did not include the property at the corner. The site was 5.6 acres with a variety of zoning districts. The applicant would like to pursue a PUD. They had tried to incorporate several features of the Flex Overlay. Two three-story buildings composing 77 loft-style, luxury apartments and 12,200 s.f. of ground floor retail located closest to Auburn and a recreation area near John R were proposed. She had not performed a full review for conformance with the Zoning Ordinance. If developed as a PUD, she advised that modifications to the Zoning Ordinance would be permitted. Mr. Barishaj said that when the project was outlined, FB-1 was mentioned, but it was actually FB-2.*

*Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the office plaza on Auburn would be removed,*