



Rochester Hills

Minutes - Draft

Planning Commission

1000 Rochester Hills Dr
Rochester Hills, MI
48309
(248) 656-4600
Home Page:
www.rochesterhills.org

Chairperson Deborah Brnabic, Vice Chairperson Greg Hooper
Members: Susan Bowyer, Gerard Dettloff, John Gaber, Marvie Neubauer,
Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, David A. Reece, and Ben Weaver

Tuesday, December 15, 2020

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Deborah Brnabic called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. She outlined the procedure for the virtual meeting, stating that "In compliance with the Open Meetings Act, as amended, the Planning Commission will continue to move forward and carry out our Planning and Development meeting agendas using Zoom video conferencing to limit the potential exposure to the Covid-19 virus. Any member of the public who would like to speak on a particular agenda item or during Public Comment, which is for non-agenda commentary, will be recognized by calling into the Zoom meeting and using the I.D. number. Once you are on the call, press 9 to speak on the phone or raise your hand in the Zoom application. All comments and questions will be audio only and limited to three minutes per person. All questions will be answered together after every person has had the opportunity to speak on the same agenda item. Each member of the public that wishes to speak will be asked to state and spell their name and give their address for the record. Members of the public may also comment on an item by sending an email to Planning@rochesterhills.org prior to discussion on the agenda item."

ROLL CALL

Present 9 - Deborah Brnabic, Gerard Dettloff, John Gaber, Greg Hooper, Nicholas Kaltsounis, David Reece, Susan M. Bowyer, Ben Weaver and Marvie Neubauer

Quorum present.

Also present: Sara Roediger, Director of Planning & Economic Dev.
Kristen Kapelanski, Manager of Planning
Jason Boughton, DPS/Engineering Services Utilities Mgr.
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2020-0559](#) November 17, 2020 Regular Meeting

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

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

COMMUNICATIONS

- A) *Planning & Zoning News dated November 2020*
 - B) *RCOC's Chairman's Report dated December 2020*
- (Items provided to those who got hard copies of the packet)*

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairperson Brnabic opened Public Comment at 7:03 p.m. Seeing no one wishing to speak or in the Auditorium and no communications received, she closed Public Comment.

NEW BUSINESS

2020-0201

Public Hearing and request for a Revised Wetland Use Permit Recommendation - City File No. 19-042 - for impacts to approximately .181 acre related to construction activities for North Row Development, a proposed 20-unit apartment development on 2.4 acres located on Old Orion Ct. west of Rochester, zoned R-1 One Family Residential with an FB-1 Flexible Overlay, Parcel No. 15-03-476-016, Kevin Baird, North Row, LLC, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen 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 Kevin Baird, North Row LLC, 720 Kimberly, Troy, MI 48098; Jeff Klatt, Krieger Klatt Architects, 2120 E. 11 Mile Rd., Royal Oak, MI 48067; and Paul Tulikangas and Brett Buchholz, Nowak & Fraus Engineers, 46777 Woodward Ave., Pontiac, MI 48342.

Mr. Reece stated that due to an ongoing relationship that his office currently had with Krieger Klatt, he felt that it would be appropriate to recuse himself from the discussion.

Ms. Kapelanski recapped that the applicant was proposing to construct a 20-unit attached development on 2.4 acres on the west side of Old Orion Ct. The site was zoned R-1 with an FB Overlay, and the applicant was using the FB Overlay to develop. The Site Plan, Tree Removal Permit, Natural Features Setback Modification and the Wetland Use Permit were

either approved or recommended for approval in June 2020. Following that approval, EGLE had indicated that modifications would be necessary before the State could release its Wetland Permit. Modifications had been made to address those concerns, including expanding the wetland delineation limits. That led to a slight increase to onsite wetland impacts and the natural features setback area. She noted that the amenity space had been split into two and now included an additional area in the south portion of the site. A right turn only sign had been added at the northern entrance at Maplehill, along with some revised landscaping, per the Planning Commission's previous request in June. She advised that all staff reviews, including the ASTI wetland review, were recommending approval of the revised plan set, and the Planning Commission was being asked to approve the revised Site Plan, Natural Features Setback Modification and to recommend approval of the revised Wetland Use Permit. The applicant had a brief presentation to show, and she turned it over to Mr. Klatt.

Mr. Klatt thanked the Commissioners for their time. They were primarily present because the wetland impact was slightly higher than what had originally been approved. Since the June meeting, per the comments and requests, they had extended the second floor balconies to three feet, a right turn only sign had been added at the Maplehill Rd. approach, and they had made some landscape revisions. There had been an onsite review by EGLE on June 6, 2020, and the wetland boundary needed to be extended north to the ditch culvert along Maplehill. The hardscape pavers for the amenity space had been reduced to minimize wetland impacts, as suggested by EGLE. To meet area requirements, a second amenity space was added in the south part of the site to compensate for the reduction to the northerly amenity space. A swale had been added on the adjacent property to the west, which was also owned by the applicant. That was to maintain a hydraulic connection between the Maplehill ditch and the wetland, also as suggested by EGLE. He put up a slide that showed the original perimeters and areas of the wetlands and one that showed the revised area, where it extended a bit more to the northeast. The wetland encroached a little into the amenity space in the northwest corner of the site, and it had to be reduced. As mentioned, they compensated by adding an area to the south. They were proposing a community garden. He stated that no major changes had been made to the first floor plans. The buildings still had the same look and style, but the balconies in the front had been increased to three feet in depth. He said that they would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Kaltsounis referred to the community garden, and he asked what

amenity had been removed from the northern space. He asked if there had been a garden there, too. Mr. Klatt said that they had a longer seating area. They had a central BBQ dining area, a seating component and a fire pit area, and they just reduced the seating. He said that it was still quite large, and they thought that a community garden would be welcomed by the community.

Mr. Kaltsounis questioned what past precedent had been for allowing buildings in wetlands. They would typically stay away from the wetlands or maybe encroach a little, but he was not sure if there was a river going across. He asked staff their thoughts about the proposed impacts as opposed to what had been done before.

Ms. Kapelanski said that it was a fairly difficult site. ASTI reviewed it and felt that the impacts being proposed, which were only .08 acres more than what had previously been proposed, were not detrimental to the larger function of the wetlands and were recommending approval. Mr. Kaltsounis agreed that there was sort of a "tail" being impacted, not the main part of the wetland, which was more of what they had typically approved. He asked how the development would have scored with the new parking ordinance.

Ms. Kapelanski said that it had not been analyzed, but they would have met it for visitor parking. Previously, the ordinance allowed driveways and garage spaces to be counted as visitor spaces. Mr. Tulikangas advised that there were 10 visitor spaces. That would be .5 spaces per the 20 units, so it complied.

Mr. Gaber asked how many square feet the amenity space at the northwest had been reduced. Mr. Klatt advised that the new area was about 700 s.f., so that was how much the north had been reduced. Mr. Gaber asked what would happen to the area if no one used the community garden. Mr. Klatt indicated that they were optimistic that it would be used, but he could see the point. Mr. Gaber asked if it would just remain grass or if there would be empty bins with soil. He wondered what it could look like. Mr. Baird said that if it was unused, it would be maintained by management. Mr. Gaber clarified that it would still have to be maintained if it was not used to be in compliance. He hoped that it would get utilized as envisioned.

Ms. Roediger suggested that the management company could always plant some flowers or landscape it in some way. Mr. Gaber said that it was not noted on the site plan, and he asked if there was a requirement

that it be maintained in a planted form. Ms. Kapelanski said that it could be added as a condition. She agreed that it was not noted on the site plan. She did not think that they would want to specify plants. Mr. Gaber thought that there should be a condition. He said that it was a small site without much room for anything, so if it was not going to be used for a garden, he thought that it should be beautified in some manner. Mr. Gaber asked the applicants to go over the landscaping along Maplehill Rd. Mr. Kaltsounis asked Mr. Gaber if he felt that a garden would be of more use to the community than a sitting area. Mr. Gaber thought it would be if it were utilized, but he would want to ensure that the space had something planted, whether it was a flower or a vegetable garden. He would not want to see just soil or weeds.

Chairperson Brnabic agreed that if a community garden did not work out, that the area should be a dedicated amenity area whereby if the garden was not planted, they could add benches or something else for the public to enjoy. She asked Mr. Klatt his thoughts about that. Mr. Klatt felt that Mr. Baird would be open to a small seating area if the community garden did not work out. He knew that he would want to maintain a beautiful site. Mr. Baird said that he would be fine adding that. He was hopeful that the garden would be successful but if not, they could add some benches and landscaping. He suggested a butterfly garden, but he indicated that they would make sure that it was an asset to the site.

Regarding the landscaping along Maplehill, Mr. Tulikangas noted that the Commission had recommended some tree species changes to screen Building A mostly. They had proposed Ginkgo Bilobas, and they were swapped out with Black Hills Spruces. Another landscape change provided additional evergreen screening around the detention basin. Mr. Gaber asked if all the trees along Maplehill would be evergreens and how large they would be when installed. Mr. Tulikangas advised that the Black Hills Spruces would be planted at eight feet tall, and they grew to 30 or 40 feet. There would also be three Red Jewel Crabapples, 3" calipers, and Honeysuckles, which were shrubs. Mr. Weaver added that the Crabapples would bookend the Spruces. Mr. Gaber felt that it would provide a visual barrier to break up the side of the building, which was what they were trying to accomplish.

Relative to the amenity space, Mr. Gaber suggested that they should approve it as a community garden with a condition that if it was not regularly used, the applicant should work with staff to convert it into some other type of acceptable public amenity space.

Mr. Weaver said that he liked the idea of introducing a community garden, but he did share the concern that it might not be used. He thought that it should be able to be converted to something that would be used. He said that he was good with the landscape changes. He liked the boulder wall and felt that it would be a nice, natural accent along the wetland. He realized that ASTI had recommended approval, but he wondered if there were any structural concerns about putting a building where the wetland soils were.

Mr. Klatt responded that they would design the foundation according to the geo-tech reports. The amenity space structure would be fairly light weight. Mr. Weaver explained that the revised wetland boundary looked as if it came all the way up through the two northern buildings. He asked if there were structural concerns for the soils in that area. It looked as if the original boundary did not extend as far. Mr. Klatt said that when the soil borings were taken, they accounted for the placement of the buildings on the site.

Mr. Weaver pointed out trees 155 and 156 in the center of the front of the property. The survey showed them to be pretty poor or fair, and one was covered in vines. He asked if they were really worth saving. He wondered if it would be worth taking them down and putting up healthier trees. He commented that the renderings looked great, and he liked the balconies, but he would not like them detracted with some gruesome-looking trees that might not be worth saving. Mr. Tulikangas said that they would have to reassess those. (It was later determined that those trees were in the right-of-way, so the applicant could not remove them).

Dr. Bowyer stated that extending the balconies was a beautiful design, and she liked the added landscaping, especially around the fire pit. She commented that people would not feel watched by people driving or walking by on Maplehill. She thought that the community garden was a great idea. She used one on Wabash, which had a ten-foot fence around it because of the deer problem. She noticed that there was corn planted in the middle of the proposed garden, which she claimed would be a feeding box for the deer. She was not sure anything could be grown that would not be eaten, and the residents might get frustrated by a garden that was continually eaten by the deer. She would not want to see a ten-foot fence around it. She thought that a butterfly garden with a seating area would be nicer, and they could plant flowers for bees to pollinate. She thought that the plan looked great, and she thanked the applicants and welcomed them to Rochester Hills.

Mr. Hooper agreed 100% that the garden would not work. He thought that the deer would have a feast without a fence. He thought that they would be better off having a bench and tables. They might add something similar to what they lost with the northerly amenity area. He was all for trying it, but if it did not work, there should be a Plan B ready to go. He echoed all the other comments.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that at the June 2 meeting, the applicants had estimated the monthly rent to be \$2,200 for lower units and \$2,600 for upper units. She asked if that had changed. Mr. Baird said that it would still be very close to that range. Chairperson Brnabic had noticed the Environmental Impact Statement listed the projected price range to be between \$1,000 and \$1,800. She asked if they would correct that prior to final approval, and Mr. Baird said that they would definitely make that correction.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing for the Wetland Use Permit at 7:35 p.m. Seeing no one wishing to speak online or in the Auditorium and no communications received, she closed the Public Hearing.

Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Kaltsounis moved the following, seconded by Mr. Hooper.

MOTION *by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, in the matter of City File No. 19-042 (North Row Development) the Planning Commission recommends to City Council approval of a revised Wetland Use Permit permanently impact approximately .181 acre to construct the outdoor amenity area, site access drive and parking lot, the buildings and the boulder retaining wall based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on October 22, 2020 with the following three (3) findings and subject to the following four (4) conditions.*

Findings

- 1. Of the .35 acre of wetland area on site, the applicant is proposing to impact approximately .181 acre.*
- 2. Because the wetland areas are of low ecological quality and are not a vital natural resource to the City, the City's Wetland consultant, ASTI, recommends approval.*
- 3. Construction of a retaining wall should prevent unintended impacts to the wetlands and preserve the City's aesthetics, per ASTI.*

Conditions

1. *City Council approval of the Wetland Use Permit.*
2. *That the applicant receives and applicable EGLE Part 303 Permit prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
3. *That the applicant provides a detailed soil erosion plan with measures sufficient to ensure ample protection of wetlands areas, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.*
4. *That any temporary impact areas be restored to original grade with original soils or equivalent soils and seeded with a City approved wetland seed mix where possible and implement best management practices, prior to final approval by staff.*

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

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

Abstain 1 - Reece

2020-0203

Request for approval of Revised Natural Features Setback Modifications - City File No. 19-042 - for impacts of up to 657 linear feet for construction activities related to North Row Development, a proposed 20-unit apartment development on 2.4 acres, located on Old Orion Ct., west of Rochester, zoned R-1 with an FB-1 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-03-476-016, Kevin Baird, North Row, LLC, Applicant

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, in the matter of City File No. 19-042 (North Row Development), the Planning Commission **grants a revised natural features setback modifications** for 657 linear feet for permanent impacts to construct the access drive, detention pond and several buildings, based on plans dated received by the Planning and Economic Development Department on October 22, 2020 with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following two (2) conditions:

Findings

1. *The impact to the Natural Features Setback area is necessary for construction activities.*
2. *The proposed construction activity qualifies for an exception to the Natural Features Setback per the ASTI Environmental letter dated November 4, 2020, which also states that the areas are of low ecological quality and function and offer little buffer quality.*

Conditions

1. *Work to be conducted using best management practices to ensure flow and circulation patterns and chemical and biological characteristics of wetlands are not impacted.*
2. *Site must be graded with onsite soils and seeded with City approved seed mix.*

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

2020-0202

Request for Revised Site Plan Approval - City File No. 19-042 - North Row Development, a proposed 20-unit apartment development on 2.4 acres located on Old Orion Ct., west of Rochester, zoned R-1 One Family Residential with an FB-1 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-03-476-016, Kevin Baird, North Row, LLC, Applicant

MOTION *by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, in the matter of City File No. 19-042 (North Row Development), the Planning Commission approves the revised Site Plan, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on October 22, 2020, with the following six (6) 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 Maplehill Rd. and Old Orion Ct. thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets.*
3. *The Planning Commission waives the site yard setback to the north requirement of 25 feet to 15 ft, finding that it meets the intent of the FB Ordinance.*
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.*

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, and 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

2020-0561 Request for appointment of a Planning Commission representative to the

Citizens Pathway Review Committee for a one-year term to expire December 31, 2021.

Mr. Roediger recalled that Mr. Kaltsounis had been appointed to fill Mr. Schroeder's remaining term through the end of the year. They needed continuing representation from the Planning Commission for 2021.

Chairperson Brnabic nominated Mr. Kaltsounis, seconded by Mr. Dettloff.

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Dettloff, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby appoints Nicholas Kaltsounis to serve as its representative to the Citizens Pathway Review Committee for a term to expire December 31, 2021.

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Dettloff, that Mr. Kaltsounis be Appointed. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

NEXT MEETING DATE

Chairperson Brnabic reminded the Commissioners that the next Regular Meeting was scheduled for January 19, 2021. She wished everyone a Merry Christmas and Happy Holidays and hoped everyone would stay safe.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Kaltsounis mentioned that the previous Saturday, he had gone to Innovation Hills to photograph a wedding. It was December 12, and he thought that it would be empty. At 5:00 p.m., the parking lot was three-quarters full, and there were people everywhere. He felt that it was a great testament to the work staff and City Council had done. He knew that the word was getting out there. He thanked everyone, and said that he was looking forward to the park getting done. He stated that it was a nice place to visit.

Mr. Gaber thanked staff for their work over the year. He knew that it had been a difficult year, and coordinating things had been difficult. They appreciated the effort, and he wanted to give credit other than when things went wrong.

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission and upon motion by Mr. Kaltsounis, seconded by Mr. Reece, Chairperson

Brnabic adjourned the Regular Meeting at 8:22 p.m.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

All ayes

Deborah Brnabic, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Nicholas O. Kaltsounis, Secretary