

*site or those of the surrounding area.*

6. *The proposed development offers another type of housing as outlined in the Master Plan.*

**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 bond for landscaping and irrigation, plus inspection fees, as adjusted as necessary by staff in the amount of \$69,905.00 to be posted prior to temporary grade certification being issued by Engineering.*
3. *Payment into the City's Tree Fund of \$16,040.00 prior to temporary grade certification being issued by Engineering.*
4. *Update the EIS prior to the City Council meeting to show the corrected monthly rents.*
5. *That the applicant works with staff to develop an alternative plan for the amenity area in the south if the community garden as planned is not feasible.*

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

**Aye** 8 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Gaber, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Bowyer, Weaver and Neubauer

**Abstain** 1 - Reece

*After each motion, Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously. She congratulated the applicants on moving forward. She said that it looked like it would be a very nice development.*

**2020-0550**

Public Hearing and request for a Conditional Use Recommendation - City File No. 20-029 - to construct a drive-through associated with Chief Financial Credit Union, a proposed 7,425 s.f. building on 1.36 acres located at the northeast corner of Rochester and Diversion in Rochester and Rochester Hills, zoned B-2 General Business with an FB-3 Flexible Business Overlay in Rochester Hills and B-1 General Business in Rochester, Parcel Nos. 15-14-301-007 and 15-14-154-004, Tom Dluzen, Chief Financial Credit Union, Applicant  
*(Reference: Memo prepared by Ms. Kapelanski, dated December 9, 2020, Site Plans and Elevations had been placed on file and by*

reference became part of the record thereof).

*Present for the applicant were Tom Dluzen, Dina Viviano and Cheryl Boodram, Chief Financial Credit Union, 200 Diversion St., Rochester, MI 48307; and Robert Clarke, Paul Merlo and Amanda Fox, CBI Design Professionals, 838 W. Long Lake Rd., Suite 110, Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302.*

*Ms. Kapelanski explained that the property was split by the municipal boundaries of Rochester and Rochester Hills where the applicant proposed to develop a credit union, mainly using the existing building footprint. She advised that the majority of the building would be in Rochester, and City Council had recently approved an Interlocal Agreement that allowed the site to be reviewed and designed under the development standards of the City of Rochester, which was consistent with similar past reviews. Any inconsistencies between the standards of both cities' ordinances would be resolved by referring to Rochester's standards, which would generally supersede Rochester Hills' ordinances. The Rochester Hills staff had reviewed the plans and had provided some advisory comments as outlined in the staff review memos. The Site Plan, Conditional Use and Tree Removal did need to be approved by Rochester Hills, however, they did not have jurisdiction to require any Site Plan adjustments. She said that she would be available for any questions.*

*Mr. Clarke, Architect for the project, indicated that the subject building, the former US Scuba facility, was very well known, especially to those who resided in the area. He noted that Chief Financial purchased the building a little over a year ago, and they would be using it as a new branch office. Their administrative offices were immediately adjacent on Diversion, and they would create sort of a campus. He advised that the building footprint would essentially stay as it was with the addition of a drive-through at the southeast and a patio area at the north of the building. They were adding parking on the north end and changing the parking on the west to one row of parking rather than two. There was a little "dog leg" portion of 200 Diversion St. at the southern end of the site that would be split off and combined with the new development for the drive-through lanes and parking. He stated that the major component was the addition of a glass atrium for the lobby entrance and glass on other places of the façade. They were extending the access drive along the west side of the property to allow traffic to come in from Diversion. He said that he would be happy to answer questions.*

*Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 7:51 p.m. Seeing no one wishing to speak or in the Auditorium and no communications received, she closed the Public Hearing.*

*Mr. Gaber asked about the drive-through lanes and how many cars they could get lined up at a time, although he assumed that it was not a high volume use. Mr. Merlo advised that there would be six spaces for two lanes. Mr. Dluzen agreed that the Rochester demographic did not spend a lot of time going to the bank. In their original discussions, they were not going to have a drive-through, but with the advent of Covid, they decided that they needed it.*

*Mr. Gaber asked if the main entrance was on the slanted wall where the glass was, which was confirmed. He asked where the handicap spaces closest to the entrance were. Mr. Clarke said that they were at the south end so someone did not have to cross traffic.*

*Mr. Kaltsounis stated that he did not see how the drive-through would work. He reminded that there was typically a height clearance for fire trucks. There was a choke point going into the drive-throughs that would change three lanes into two. He asked if there were further details for the drive-through. Mr. Clarke explained that the drive-through had two lanes and an escape route around the outer perimeter, and the fire truck would use the escape lane. Chairperson Brnabic asked if that was 13 feet wide, which Mr. Merlo verified.*

*Ms. Kapelanski advised that all fire comments had been deferred to the City of Rochester, per Rochester Hills' Fire Dept. and the Interlocal Agreement. Mr. Kaltsounis said that he would like to see the actual spaces laid out for the drive-through as a condition. He was worried that a fire truck could not get by if there was a choke point created, and it was confusing.*

*Mr. Weaver said that he liked the aesthetics of the new building and the added landscaping. He asked what the retaining wall would be made out of. Mr. Clarke said that they proposed a poured, brick wall with veneer facing and one that was a large format, stacked stone. They were looking at the engineering between the two. Mr. Weaver had noticed that it would be nearly 11 feet tall at one spot and up to three feet wide, and he asked if they would have enough room. He asked if any of the landscaping would be compromised if it became a wider material. Mr. Clarke said that it would not be in that area. Mr. Weaver asked about the area towards the north end of the parking lot where the parking came up to the wall. Mr.*

Clarke claimed that there would be a little room to manipulate, and they did not have much of a concern. Next to the building was a fixed point he had to work from. Mr. Weaver asked if there would be any railings on the top of the wall. He said that he would hate to see a car back over it if someone did not pay attention. There would be a ten-foot wall with a drive at the bottom. Mr. Clarke said that where the cars would interact, there would be a landscape buffer and some distance. Mr. Weaver recommended adding a railing at the top of the wall. He mentioned that the rendering in the packet did not seem to match the landscape plan, and he asked if that could be updated.

Mr. Reece agreed with Mr. Weaver about needing a hand rail due to the change in elevation. He asked if the building would be black and white or if there would be any color introduced. From an architectural perspective, it appeared pretty stark to him, particularly along Rochester Rd.

Mr. Clarke maintained that the color palette was not totally white; it would be bronze and off-white. Mr. Reece asked what the finish material would be. Mr. Clarke said that the brick would remain, but it would be painted. Mr. Reece asked if Rochester had commented on the colors, and Mr. Clarke said that they had not. Mr. Reece joked that they must not have any good architects. He said again that for his taste, it was pretty stark.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked Mr. Weaver about the handrail. Mr. Weaver clarified that it was needed at the northeast corner of the retaining wall because of the ten-foot drop. He said that he would hate for a child climbing on it to fall and land on the roadway. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if they could require that if Rochester had jurisdiction.

Ms. Kapelanski said that the Commissioners/staff could suggest things. If the applicant was amenable to adding a handrail, she did not believe that Rochester would have an issue with it. When they went before Rochester's Planning Commission, they might notice that it had been added, but she agreed that it could not be required.

Mr. Dluzen said that as a practical matter, it made total sense to them. Safety was a high concern of theirs, and they would not want anything to happen, either, so they would want to add the handrail.

Mr. Hooper noticed that no dumpsters were shown, and he asked if the trash removal would be shared with the existing property. Mr. Clarke agreed that there was a shared use between the two properties. Mr. Hooper asked what color the existing red brick would be painted, and Mr.

Clarke advised that it would be off-white with bronze accents. Mr. Hooper asked if the accents would be at the top. Mr. Clarke said that it would include the exposed steel and aluminum frames. Mr. Hooper asked if that was part of the corporate color scheme. Mr. Dluzen agreed that their colors were black and white, and their logo was white on black or black on white. He noted that there was not a lot of brick left. There would be a lot of glass they hoped would be impressive and allow people to see into the building. The inside of the building would have some interesting features. They hoped that would draw more attention than the outside. Mr. Hooper said that he liked the look of the glass atrium. He pointed out that coming down Rochester Rd., it would be a focal point.

Hearing no further comments, Mr. Kaltsounis moved the following, seconded by Mr. Reece.

**MOTION** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, in the matter of City File No. 20-029 (Chief Financial Credit Union), the Planning Commission **recommends** to City Council **Approval** of the **Conditional Use** to allow a drive-through at a proposed credit union on site at 515 S. Rochester Rd., based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on October 1, 2020, with the following six (6) findings.

**Findings**

1. *The use will promote the intent and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance.*
2. *The building has been designed and is proposed to be 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. The site previously held a bank, which will be demolished.*
3. *The proposal will have a positive impact on the community as a whole and the surrounding area by further offering jobs and another financial institution.*
4. *The proposed development is served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, water and sewer, drainage ways, and refuse disposal.*
5. *The proposed development will not be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to existing or future neighboring land uses, persons, property, or the public welfare.*

6. *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** 9 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Gaber, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Reece, Bowyer, Weaver and Neubauer

**2020-0551**

Request for a Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 20-029 - for the removal and replacement of as many as seven trees for Chief Financial Credit Union, a 7,425 new building at the northeast corner of Rochester and Diversion in the Cities of Rochester and Rochester Hills, zoned B-2 General Business with an FB-3 Flexible Business Overlay and B-1 General Business (Rochester ), Parcel Nos. 15-14-301-007 and 15-14-154-004, Tom Dluzen, Chief Financial Credit Union, Applicant

***MOTION*** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, in the matter of City File No. 20-029 (Chief Financial Credit Union), the Planning Commission grants a Tree Removal Permit, based on plans dated received by the Planning and Economic Development Department on October 1, 2020 with the following two (2) findings and two (2) recommended 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 up to 7 trees on site and replace onsite.*

**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 \$304 per tree.*

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

**Aye** 9 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Gaber, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Reece, Bowyer, Weaver and Neubauer

**2020-0552**

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 20-029 - for construction of a new, 7,425 s.f. Chief Financial Credit Union located at the northeast corner of Rochester and Diversion in the Cities of Rochester and Rochester Hills, zoned B-2 General Business with an FB-3 Flexible Business Overlay and B-1 General Business (Rochester), Parcel Nos. 15-14-301-007 and 15-14-154-004, Tom Dluzen, Chief Financial Credit Union, Applicant

***MOTION*** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, in the matter of City File No. 20-029 (Chief Financial Credit Union), the Planning Commission **approves the Site Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on October 1, 2020, with the following five (5) findings and five (5) recommended conditions.

**Finding**

1. *The review by the Planning Commission is advisory only per the Interlocal Agreement between Rochester and Rochester Hills.*
2. *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.*
3. *The proposed project will be accessed from Rochester Rd. and Diversion St. thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets.*
4. *The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.*
5. *The proposed development will not have an unreasonably detrimental or injurious effect upon the natural characteristics and features of the site or those of the surrounding area.*

**Conditions**

1. *Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters.*

2. *Provide a landscape bond estimate for landscaping and irrigation, plus inspection fees, as adjusted as necessary by staff.*
3. *Add a railing to the northeast corner retaining wall.*
4. *Update the plans to include the correct landscape plan and colored elevation of the building.*
5. *Submit a drive-through stacking (layout) plan to staff.*

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

**Aye** 9 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Gaber, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Reece, Bowyer, Weaver and Neubauer

*After each motion, Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously. She thanked the applicants and said that it had been a pleasure to do the review, and she wished them good luck.*

**ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

2020-0560 Request for Approval of the 2021 Meeting Schedule

**MOTION** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby establishes its 2021 meeting schedule at the December 15, 2020 Regular Meeting as follows:

**ROCHESTER HILLS PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**2021 MEETING DATES**

*January 19, 2021, February 1, 2021 Joint Mtg., February 16, 2021, March 16, 2021, April 20, 2021, May 18, 2021, June 15, 2021, July 20, 2021, August 17, 2021, September 21, 2021, October 19, 2021, November 16, 2020 and December 21, 2021.*

*Ms. Roediger noted that they expected virtual meetings to be extended through the end of March 2021.*

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

**Aye** 9 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Gaber, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Reece, Bowyer, Weaver and Neubauer