

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Gaber, that this matter be Recommended for Denial to the City Council Regular Meeting. The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

*Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously, and that she was sorry that the request had been denied for all the reasons discussed. She asked if the applicants were open to exploring different options. Mr. Mike Batu asked what the other options were, and Chairperson Brnabic mentioned the suggestion by Ms. Morita about demolishing the house and doing a land division. They could explore a Variance from the ZBA, and although she did not know that it would be a productive route, it might be an option.*

## UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 2019-0372 Request for Conditional Use approval - City File No. 19-020 - to add a drive-through to a new, 4,638 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 October 10, 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 Compeau and Marty Peltier, Lake Michigan Credit Union, P.O. Box 2848, Grand Rapids, MI 48501; 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. Kapelanski noted that the matter had been postponed at the August 20, 2019 meeting. The applicant had made a number of changes to the plans in order to address the Planning Commission's concerns. The site layout had been altered to decrease the number of parking spaces, and the building had been reduced by approximately 2,000 s.f. The updated elevations and renderings showed a considerable amount of stone and glass along with some accent metal panels. The ten parking spaces at the front of the building had been removed. Additional information about the operation of the temporary building had been provided, and the temporary building was relocated to be parallel with the Bedford Square Dr. The requested east/west cross section had also been provided. The applicant was still requesting a parking modification to allow for 23 spaces*

*instead of the maximum 18 required, and she concluded that staff reviews had all recommended approval.*

*Mr. Compeau introduced Mr. Peltier, and said that he was a local resident who worked in southeast Michigan for Lake Michigan Credit Union (LMCU). He noted that they were new to the Rochester Hills area, but they had other locations including Farmington Hills, Troy, Livonia and as far north as Saginaw.*

*Mr. Peltier gave some background for LMCU and how they supported the communities in which they were located. LMCU started in 1933 in Grand Rapids as the Grand Rapids Teachers Credit Union in the basement of a school teacher's home, and they currently had 58 branches in Michigan and Florida. They were the largest credit union in Michigan in terms of branches, assets, employees and members, and they served over 450,000 members. They had over 1,300 employees, and they were very active in the communities. In 2018, they gave back \$472k in philanthropic support and were rated the number one financial institution in Michigan by Money Magazine. He advised that anyone could join LMCU, and they looked forward to supporting Rochester Hills and their members in the area.*

*Mr. Witte believed that they had addressed all the recommendations from the last meeting. He noted that they showed a new sign centered on the building rather than keeping the existing one at the corner. The parking north of the east/west drive and at the temporary office building had been removed, and the temporary building would be south of that access drive. He agreed that they had included a narrative about the temporary building. He said that as a result of the changes, they were down to 23 parking spaces instead of 51. LMCU anticipated having approximately 12 employees who would get between 10 and 15 customers at a time, which was why they were asking to have slightly more than the Ordinance required. He noted that the landscaping plan had been modified accordingly, as had the drainage, grading and utilities plans. The cross section that had been requested by a Commissioner was shown on C-301.*

*Chairperson Brnabic said that she liked the addition of the stone, and to her, the building was much more aesthetically pleasing. She did not have a problem with the additional parking, and she thought that they knew their business and customers better. Regarding the temporary building, she asked if the construction traffic would only use the first entrance and never interfere with the temporary building. Mr. Witte said*

that was correct. He had created a separate plan to clarify the construction sequencing. He said that there would be construction fencing placed all along the south side of the temporary office building to separate the northern part from the main construction area. All of the construction traffic would stay towards the front.

Chairperson Brnabic asked how they felt about the suggestion from staff to use the grassy area in back for employees with a bench or some amenities. Mr. Witte said that they were open to that and would work with staff to come up with something for the employees to use. Chairperson Brnabic pointed out that the Building Dept. review had incorrect dates (extra pages subsequently deleted).

Mr. Gaber said that the Commissioners appreciated the fact that the applicants were able to accommodate the concerns and suggestions raised at the last meeting. He thought that the building looked great, and that the changes were a substantial improvement. He was curious, however, as to how they could reduce the parking they needed from 51 to 23 spaces. He thanked them for accommodating their concerns.

Ms. Morita said that she would like a condition added that required the applicants to remove the temporary building within two weeks of the final Certificate of Occupancy being issued, and Mr. Reece suggested 60 days.

Mr. VanDoeselaar showed pictures of their existing locations on the west side. The proposed building had more metal panel and stone and less EIFS. He showed interior shots at other locations and evening shots to see how the building was lit at night.

Mr. Kaltsounis echoed some of the comments. He said that it was a bit tough for Mr. Witte, but he definitely came back with something appealing. Mr. Kaltsounis felt that it was a better development than was shown before, and it would be positive for the community and the property. He thanked everyone for their hard work and for coming back with something that he looked forward to seeing.

**MOTION** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schroeder, in the matter of City File No. 19-020 (Lake Michigan 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 310 W. Tienken Rd., based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on September 17, 2019, 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*

*Mr. Hooper recalled at the last meeting that the elevations were not correct, and they still were not, on the architectural plans. North was really east, and south was really west and west was south and east was really north. Mr. Witte said that they would get that fixed.*

*Ms. Morita said that she had been advised by staff that for the issue with the 60 days, whether it was from the issuance of a temporary C of O or final C of O, they would want to defer whether it was 60 days from the temporary or final and leave that to the Building Dept. to make the final determination.*

**A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Schroeder, that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting. 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, 4,638 s.f. new build with drive-through on 1.8 acres located

on the north side of Tienken, west of Rochester Rd., zoned O-1 Office Business with an FB Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-03-451-029, Lake Michigan Credit Union, Applicant

***MOTION*** by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, in the matter of City File No. 19-020 (Lake Michigan Credit Union), the Planning Commission **approves the Site Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on September 17, 2019, with the following seven (7) findings and subject to the following five (5) 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 Tienken Rd. to two access drives on Bedford Square Dr., thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets.*
3. *Off-street parking areas have been designed to avoid common traffic problems and promote customer safety.*
4. *The Planning Commission has waived the parking requirement due to the applicant's stated need for more parking.*
5. *Parking is allowed in the front yard setback as the site will be landscaped in accordance with Section 138-12.301.B.*
6. *The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development on-site as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity.*
7. *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, 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 in the amount of \$30,110.00, and posting of bond prior to temporary grade certification being issued by Engineering.*
3. *The applicant will work with staff to provide pedestrian features such as benches in the grassy area in the rear.*
4. *Based on Building Dept.'s recommendation, the temporary building must be removed either 60 days from the temporary or 60 days from the final Certificate of Occupancy.*
5. *The applicant shall revise the plans to show the correct elevation names (directions), prior to final approval by staff.*

**A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Reece, that this matter be Approved. The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.**

*After each motion, Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously, and she congratulated the applicants. Mr. Hooper thanked the applicants for their investment in Rochester Hills.*

**2019-0444** Request for Planned Unit Development Agreement Approval - City File 18-016 - Rochester Hills Trio, a mixed-use development on 5.77 acres, located at the northeast corner of Auburn and Livernois, zoned RM-1 Multiple Family Residential with an FB-1 Flexible Business Overlay and B-1 Local Business with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-27-351-009, Designhaus Architecture, Applicant

*(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated October 10, 2019 and site plans, PUD Agreement and elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)*

*Present for the applicant were Peter Stuhlreyer, Mike Pizzola and Joe Latozas from Designhaus Architecture, 301 Walnut Blvd, Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Fred Haddid and Motaz Kaakarli, OYK Engineering, 30700 Telegraph Rd., Bingham Farms, MI 48025.*

*Ms. Kapelanski summarized that the proposal was to add 120 residential units plus 21,000 s.f. of retail and office space at the northeast corner of Auburn and Livernois. She noted that the Preliminary PUD was recommended for approval and approved by City Council at its August 12, 2019 meeting. The applicant was requesting recommendation of the PUD Agreement and Final PUD Plans and approval of a Tree Removal Permit and Natural Features Setback Modification. There was one*