

**Nay** 3 - Kaltsounis, Morita and Reece

**Abstain** 1 - Gaber

*Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed five to three, and she congratulated the applicants on moving forward with the PUD. Mr. Clark said that Robertson Brothers had been around for over 70 years, but they had not built in Rochester Hills, and they were very excited about the possibility. Mr. Hooper thanked the applicants for their investment.*

*Break 8:01 to 8:06 p.m.*

[2019-0372](#)

Public Hearing and request for Conditional Use Recommendation - City File No. 19-020 - to add a drive-through to a new, 6,629 s.f. credit union for Lake Michigan Credit Union, located on the north side of Tienken, west of Rochester, zoned O-1 Office Business with an FB-1 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-03-451-029, Lake Michigan Credit Union, Applicant

*(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated August 15, 2019 and site plans and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)*

*Present for the applicant were Steve Witte, Nederveld, 217 Grandville Ave., Suite 302, Grand Rapids, MI 49503 and Chris VanDoeselaar, Newco Design Build, 4131 Roger B. Chaffee Memorial Blvd. SE, Grand Rapids, MI 49548.*

*Ms. Roediger noted that the site had an existing bank, and the applicants wished to demolish and update the site with another bank use. They would improve the landscaping and architecture. They were asking for approval of a temporary building in the rear of the property to use while they built the new building. A parking modification to have more spaces than the maximum allowed by Ordinance was being requested. There was parking currently there, and it would be reduced, but it would still be over the requirement, and documentation had been provided explaining why the parking was necessary for their operation. She advised that staff had recommended approval with minor conditions.*

*Mr. Witte explained the justification for needing additional parking. There would be 24 employees, and they would do mortgages and regular banking at the site. They would get a fair number of customers. There were 57 existing parking spaces on site, and they would be reducing that number. He indicated that the site had very little to no landscaping, and the project included 49 trees and well over 100 shrubs and grasses. He maintained that the new building would be very attractive. On the north*

end of the property, he agreed that a temporary office building was being proposed that would be removed at the completion of construction. The temporary building would allow the customers to continue to do banking, and they hoped to sign up new members during construction. They had worked with staff, and he believed that they were all in support. He advised that he had addressed the traffic and engineering concerns with Engineering, and said that he would be happy to answer any questions.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that she did not know if she considered it a very attractive building. She asked them to list the building materials, which she assumed included stucco. Mr. Witte agreed, and added that there would be stone veneer, store front windows, metal soffit and fascia coping. There would be a flat roof. He suggested that it was more of a modern look. Lake Michigan had constructed many buildings across the State, and it was their brand. He knew that everyone had an opinion on building appearance, but the ones he had seen had looked very attractive.

Mr. Gaber said that he understood what they were saying about the parking, but he did not see the need for that many spaces. He asked if 50 spaces were commonly used at one time by employees and patrons. Mr. Witte replied that 51 spaces were proposed. There would be 24 employees, but he was not sure how many would be at a site at a given time, perhaps 20. From the mortgage side, they would occasionally have 15 customers in at one time. For the banking side, they could have an additional 15 customers at a time. In his opinion, 50 was the high end, and they would never need more than that, but they did not want to have a shortage of parking. Mr. Gaber had heard Mr. Witte say that there could be 30 customers in at one time, but Mr. Gaber said that he had a hard time believing that. He mentioned that Genisys Credit Union was just in front of the Commission for approval, and they got a parking waiver, but they only wanted 30-some spaces. He did not like the parking in the front setback; he would rather see grass or some type of buffer. He recognized that it was a commercial use, and everyone appreciated that the site would be cleaned up with added landscaping. He echoed Chairperson Brnabic's comment about the aesthetics of the building. He asked if there were any other photos that showed a different rendering. The renderings submitted did not look aesthetically pleasing from his standpoint, particularly with the proposed materials. Mr. Dettloff had commented that it kind of looked like a mausoleum, and he agreed. There was a statement in the Planning memo that said that the proposed building "must be designed in accordance with the City's Architectural Design Standards." He asked if they met those standards or if the Planning

*Commission had discretion to apply.*

*Ms. Roediger said that the design standards did state that EIFS could only be used on no more than 20% of one façade. The comment was that the applicants needed to modify the elevations to meet those standards.*

*Mr. Dettloff clarified that it was a standard look the credit union used in other communities. He asked the closest community to Rochester Hills that had an existing facility. Mr. VanDoeselaar said that it was in Grand Rapids. There were nine or ten locations that looked similar to the proposed building in Grand Rapids, and he said that they could provide additional photos of what the buildings looked like when they were finished. He advised that it was the first new build with that design; the others were purchased banks that were modified. Mr. Dettloff asked if it was their first venture into southeast Michigan. Mr. VanDoeselaar agreed for the proposed design. Mr. Dettloff asked if there was a way they could move the parking from the front, as Mr. Gaber had discussed.*

*Mr. Witte stated that the building materials would comply with the Ordinance, and they would work with staff to make sure of that. As far as the parking, he did not think that it would be the end of the world if they lost a few parking spaces, but the credit union stated that they really needed 51. Mr. Witte suggested that they could perhaps create an island in front to create more green space, and he did not think that it would be a deal breaker. He did not think that there was enough room to put it all in the back, however.*

*Mr. Schultz had pulled up a location in Grand Rapids on 2024 Celebration Dr. He asked if that was a representation of what was being proposed. Mr. VanDoeselaar said that it was not, but it had a similar look. He said that there was one on 84th St. in Byron Center and another one in Muskegon on Sherman Blvd. Ms. Roediger pulled up one in Fruitport, which Mr. VanDoeselaar noted had been open for five years. It looked similar to the proposed, although it had a little more stone, and he commented that the CEO liked Florida architecture and EIFS. Based on the comments, they would probably add more stone to the proposed building to meet the requirements.*

*Ms. Morita asked if the type of banking at the Rochester Hills location would be different than what was done in Farmington Hills and Troy. Mr. VanDoeselaar said that it would be the same type of use, except that one half of the building would be for mortgages, which did not exist at the other locations to the same degree as proposed. Ms. Morita asked how many*

people at the other locations would be dedicated to the mortgage business. Mr. VanDoeselaar said that typically, there would be one, and Ms. Morita clarified that there would be 11 more people at the proposed location. She noted that the Troy location had 24 spaces. Mr. VanDoeselaar said that it was an existing location that was purchased. Ms. Morita said that the Farmington Hills location had about 30 spaces. There would be 11 more people, but she questioned why they would need almost 30 more spaces. Mr. Witte said that it would be 20 more, and clients would also be coming in.

Chairperson Brnabic recapped that there would be 24 employees on staff at all times during business hours, which Mr. VanDoeselaar confirmed was for the branch and mortgage office. Chairperson Brnabic clarified that there would be at least 15 customers for the mortgage side and 15 for the banking side on a consistent basis. Mr. Witte said that would be the maximum, and it would allow for transition. Employees on the mortgage side would have meetings out of the office.

Mr. Dettloff asked if the 24 employees would be full time. Mr. Witte agreed that was correct. The days and hours of operation were Monday to Thursday, 9-5:30, Fridays 9-6:00 and Saturdays, 9-1:00.

Mr. Kaltsounis had looked at the new building in Grand Rapids which had 54 spaces. He noted that the proposed site had a ten-foot drop from one side to the other, and he asked the plan to fill that. Mr. Witte said that the west side of the existing building had a lower level, which had drainage problems. The whole lower area would be filled. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if there would be a retaining wall, and Mr. Witte said that he had it set up so that a retaining wall would not be needed along the west end. The ten-foot drop was to get access to the lower level of the existing building, but the proposed building had no lower level. Mr. Kaltsounis asked how many stacking spots there would be, and Mr. Witte said that they were showing two teller lanes and four stacking spaces. There was room for at least three more per lane. Mr. Kaltsounis said that his next concern was the look of the building. He used a term "siding monsters." When he saw siding monsters, he called them that because they were cheap. Some people might like them, but the Commissioners were the people who had to live with them. EIFS was public enemy number two. Mr. VanDoeselaar said that it would actually be stone if EIFS was not approved. Mr. Kaltsounis said that he was looking at the teller side of the building, and there were a couple of windows and a big slab of cream colored EIFS. That was what he would see driving down Tienken and regret if it was approved. He would not see the pretty side of the building (where there

was more glass and angles). He claimed that the back was plain. There were a couple of windows shown on the elevation but not on the rendering. Mr. VanDoeselaar said that the second drive-through elevation did not print very well, but there were windows in the back and at the front edge of the drive-through. He noted that it was not shown on the rendering, because the client asked him to take them off because it was a back room. They could aesthetically add in a window, but it might have to be blocked off on the inside, because it was the cash room, the bathrooms, etc. Mr. Kaltsounis said that he also questioned the windows on the far side of the drive-through and how close they were. He saw more of an expansive view in the rendering that was not broken up and without windows, and it had a lot of EIFS. He questioned whether the project was ready. He was not excited about the cream color, although he realized that it was their brand. He suggested adding some brick and breaking up the back. They had talked about having a cash room, but he remarked that he could punch a hole into an EIFS wall and get into the building. Mr. VanDoeselaar maintained that it would be a full steel structure building that no one could get in. The EIFS would be on a solid base.

Mr. Witte pointed out that the front yard setback was 35 feet. They would be 130 feet off of the road, and there would be landscaping and space in the front. Mr. Kaltsounis said that he would see the drive-through and the whole back wall, and he could not sign up for that.

Chairperson Brnabic said that she agreed with Mr. Kaltsounis. When she had said that it was not a very attractive building, she inferred that she was just being polite. She stated that the building was not attractive to her at all, and she was looking forward to hearing any suggestions. Regarding the parking, there were 57 existing spaces, and they appeared to have an appropriate demand for 51 spaces, so she was not as upset about that request.

Mr. Gaber said that the applicants had obviously heard the comments. He thought that the Commissioners all appreciated the improvement and what the applicants were trying to accomplish, and they were grateful to the owner for doing that. However, he did feel that there were some things that needed adjusting.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 8:38 p.m.

**Donald Birch, 330-337 W. Tienken, Rochester Hills, MI 48306** Mr. Birch thanked everyone for allowing him to speak. He noted that he was one of several owners in the building to the west. There was an easement

across the back of the current bank building which, he claimed, was fairly straight forward. It was concerning to him that if the parking was re-arranged, it would make it difficult for them to exit their building. He hoped that they would not have to drive through a parking lot, and that they would still be able to easily exit. On the north side of Tienken, he said that he would like to see a little longer acceleration lane, because the traffic on Tienken was unbelievable. It looked to be the busiest road to him in Rochester Hills by far, and it would only get worse. He thought that a lane heading west from the two properties could be lengthened, and again, they would like it so the parking was separate from the driveway.

**Basil Considine, Jr., M.D., 458 Steeple Chase Ct., Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304** Mr. Considine said that they were just recently made aware that there was going to be a remodeling of the building but now there was an opportunity for a new credit union suitable in appearance and suitable to the community. He explained that the building to the west of the proposed building was a medical/dental building that was established in 1983 in support of the medical staff at Crittenton which needed radiation oncology and medical oncology services for patients who needed continuing cancer care. The building was set back from the road, where they had some very remarkable pine trees which they had attempted to protect for the area. He believed that there was an attempt to improve the building. In order to bring the lower level of the current building up to one level for the new design, he thought that it would involve a lot of fill and new paving for the drive-through. In the process of establishing a drive-through, he wondered what the drainage would be like and about the sinking of the fill for the drive-through to be appropriate for the new building. He asked where the temporary trailer would be located. He had heard that there would be a 12-month construction period for the new building, and he wondered where the equipment and the sheds would be located. He noted that their access road to the medical/dental building would be adjacent to the drive-through corridor at the north side of the new credit union. He questioned how the traffic would flow through the area, because as people went to the drive-through window, he claimed that they would be confronting patients leaving the medical facility. The access road was concerning to them as was what would happen with the drainage that would no longer go through the gully which was on the west side of the building.

Mr. Witte showed the existing easement, which would remain in the same location and be reconstructed. He showed where the temporary office would be on the north side. They had done a phasing plan in the hopes of getting a building permit for the temporary office. The plan was to

*construct everything to the north right off the bat. That would allow the credit union's customers to still do banking, and it would let the neighboring property visitors have access to their site. There would be construction fencing around the perimeter of the rest of the property. All the equipment for the main building would stay inside the fenced area. There would be some disruption while they reconstructed the access, and they would have to work with the neighbors. Regarding drainage, they were proposing underground detention for the entire site. There would be catch basins to pick up the water from the site, and it would discharge to Tienken. All the drainage would be accommodated, and he had done the calculations. They would work with Engineering for final approval pending site plan approval.*

*Mr. Gaber moved to postpone the Conditional Use and the Site Plan requests (some language added after the discussion below:*

**MOTION** *by Gaber, seconded by Morita, in the matter of City File No. 19-020 (Lake Michigan Credit Union), the Planning Commission hereby postpones the Conditional Use and Site Plan to allow a drive-through at a proposed credit union on site at 310 W. Tienken Rd. until the next available meeting so the applicant can consider the building design and aesthetic issues mentioned - use of material, windows, adding some type of roof variation - and to consider removing the ten parking spaces at the front of the site or breaking them up and adding landscaping, addressing the issues raised during the Public Hearing and by the Commissioners, adding specific information about the temporary building, including the timing, the number of people and parking spaces and having the renderings match the drawings.*

*Ms. Morita requested that they add something to have very specific timing for the temporary building and how long it would be there. There had been other operators in the City who wanted to improve a site while staying on the site when it was clear that they would need to demo the building. She did not know how they would run electric and heat and how the 24 employees would fit in the small temporary building or how 50 people would park in the back of the lot. She would like to know who would be in that building, how many people would be needed in the building, how many parking spaces would be needed and how long the building would be there. She would expect the applicants to be held to that. She would like to see the renderings match the drawings so she did not have to pick out what was different.*

*Mr. Reece said that he did not have a significant concern about the*

*parking; he felt that the applicants knew their business and knew how much parking they needed better than the City did. He agreed that the elevations needed to be addressed. They were enumerated incorrectly. A2.1 was not the south elevation. He thought that what they were calling the south elevation was the west elevation, and it needed a significant amount of redo to get rid of the Stowe and add more stone material. He reminded that the Commission had approved much uglier buildings, noting the dental clinic and the apartment buildings on Rochester Rd., so they had to be careful what they called good or not good design. The building standards did need to be addressed, and there was way too much EIFS for his taste. He felt that the applicants had addressed the concerns of the neighbor to the west. He supported Ms. Morita's recommendation about the temporary building. He thought that they had a sound logistics plan for constructing the new building, but he asked them to provide a cross section through the site. He was curious about the grading and how things would work from east to west and what the transition would be onto the existing property.*

*Mr. Schultz said that looking at the site plan, he had some concerns with the circulation. He referred to the seven spaces in front the building, and said that it seemed odd that someone would come in and park in that location, but there would be only one way out. There would be drive-through traffic coming, and someone would have to circle back around. If he was going to invest the money and build a brand new building, he would push it as close to the road as possible. He remarked that the circulation in the front seemed kind of aimless, and he asked if there was a reason why the spaces were pushed up front.*

*Mr. Witte responded that there were two entrances to the building. The thought was to have parking at each entrance. Mr. Schultz said that he would push the building closer to the road to give it a better presence and put the parking around the back. He had some concerns about the parking flow, because there would be a lot of things going on in that area, and he felt that it could be resolved better.*

*Chairperson Brnabic hoped that the applicants had taken careful notes. She asked if they agreed to the postponement, which they did.*

**A motion was made by Gaber, seconded by Morita, that this matter be Postponed. The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.**

**2019-0373**

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 19-020 - Lake Michigan Credit Union, a proposed, 6,629 s.f. new build with drive-through on 1.79 acres located on the north side of Tienken, west of Rochester Rd., zoned O-1 Office

Business with an FB Flexible Business Overlay, Lake Michigan Credit Union, Applicant

**Postponed**

*Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously.*

**2019-0379**

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 19-013.2 - Auburn Rd. Park Plaza, a proposed .36-acre park area with splash pad, bathroom and pedestrian amenities on Auburn and Emmons, Parcel Nos. 15-25-456-025 and -033, zoned C-I Commercial Improvement with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay, City of Rochester Hills, Applicant

*(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated August 15, 2019 and site plans and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)*

*Present for the applicant were Ben Weaver, OHM Advisors, 34000 Plymouth Rd., Livonia, MI 48150 and Ken Elwert, Director of Parks and Natural Resources for the City.*

*Ms. Roediger summarized that staff and the consultants had been working on the plaza as part of the overall Auburn Rd. Corridor project. She noted that it had gone to City Council the week previously, and funding was approved for the plaza, and they were still finalizing the design.*

*Mr. Hooper said that the firm where he was employed and at which he was a shareholder was doing the work for the project, and he recused himself from the discussion.*

*Mr. Weaver indicated that the project would be an amenity for the residents of Brooklands as well as Rochester Hills as a whole. The plaza plan included some mounded, artificial turn domes for kids to run up and down, and there would be amphitheater-style seating for outdoor events. There would be tables and chairs, a restroom facility and a splash pad.*

*Chairperson Brnabic mentioned that the EIS anticipated the number of employees at zero on a regular basis. Mr. Weaver said that was true. She questioned that, and wondered how the bathrooms would be cleaned, for example. Mr. Elwert noted that Spencer Park was fairly close, and he agreed that they did not intend to have any regular staff on site, but they would do daily inspections. They would also maintain the landscaping on Auburn Rd. with their grounds crew. Chairperson Brnabic asked what was*