

\$5,875.00, and posting of bond prior to temporary grade certification being issued by Engineering.

3. Signage plan be submitted to staff to address one-way traffic down the drive-thru, left turn issues with the drive-thru and warning signs for traffic in the back of the building, prior to final approval by staff.
4. Update Environmental Impact Statement prior to the City Council meeting.

Approved

2019-0289 Public Hearing and Request for Conditional Use Recommendation - City File No. 19-018 - to construct a drive-through associated with Genisys Credit Union, a proposed 3,528 s.f. new building proposed at the southeast corner of Rochester and Eddington Blvd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-23-300-041, Genisys Credit Union, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated July 12, 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 Thomas Alter, Genisys Credit Union, 2100 Executive Hills Blvd. Dr., Auburn Hills, MI 48326, Jim Butler, PEA, Inc., 2430 Rochester Ct., Troy, MI 48083, John Debruyne, SDA Architects, 42490 Garfield Rd., Clinton Township, MI 48038.

Ms. Roediger said that similar to the previous approval, a conditional use approval was requested for a banking facility. Unlike the previous request, the site would be developed under the FB-2 district, which had some additional requirements in terms of building façade, open space, public amenities and other things. She noted that the property was located on the southeast corner of the newly realigned Eddington Blvd. As part of the design for that road, the eastern portion of the property would continue the road and the streetscape started by the City. She advised that a couple of waivers were being requested for the FB requirements, including for transparency, building materials and parking spaces (the applicant was requesting more than the Ordinance allowed, but the applicant stated that they were needed based on their employees and membership). A Tree Removal Permit was required to remove and replace 20 trees, which would be replaced on site. The sidewalk on the eastern side would be continued along the property line, and landscaping would be added. Evergreen trees would be added on the City's property where the berm was to replace any gaps in the buffering. On the west side of the new Eddington Blvd., the applicant would be adding some parallel spaces and as part of their public amenity space, they would add a sitting area and a meandering path along the rear of the site. She noted that a slight Natural Features Modification was being requested because of the drainage, and that staff had recommended approval with some minor comments.

Mr. Alter stated that they were excited about the project, noting that Genisys had been part of Rochester Hills for over two decades. They served about 6,800 members in Rochester Hills who had \$78 million in deposits and \$59

million in home and consumer loans. They had been involved with the community for a number of years, and he hoped that people had seen their sponsorship at many community events. He indicated that one of the reasons they really liked the plan was that they felt it was a good use of the property. The plan was very conducive to the area around it, and he felt that it should be a minimum distraction for the residences in the area.

Mr. Butler said that Ms. Roediger did a good job of explaining the project. He related that there were some challenges and grade issues. There would be a temporary disruption to the natural features setback of about 300 lineal feet to install the landscaping and build a retaining wall because of the grade differential. They were asking for some waivers. One related to the front to build along Rochester Rd. The City's requirement was 40%, and they were proposing 36%. Along Eddington, the Ordinance required 90%, and they were providing 13.7%. In the FB district, nine parking spaces were required, and they were asking for 31. Based on conversations, Genisys felt that they needed that amount of parking to support their members and their employees. As Ms. Roediger had mentioned, they worked with staff regarding screening. The building was set approximately 304 feet from the east property line. There was another 30-foot buffer (berm), which was four to five feet high which they would supplement. There had been some discussion about adding a building to the east side of the property, but when they started to look at everything, there was not much area left. Genisys was committed to making some sort of an amenity, and that was why the pathway was added. There would be connectivity from Rochester to Eddington. He felt that it would be a nice feature for potential residents and the bank employees.

Mr. Debruyne advised that the building would be a 3,500 s.f., single-story credit union. The building materials would be primarily face brick with aluminum composite material for the upper roof areas with clear, anodized aluminum frames. There would be a three-lane, connected drive-through of face brick and aluminum composite material. They would be asking for waivers for building transparency. They complied with a majority of the building, but in the northeast corner, there were some interior functions that would not lend themselves well to glass, such as electrical rooms, cash rooms and various work rooms. They were also asking for a waiver to the front entry location, based on building function and security requirements. They needed one main entrance to the building, and they needed to also accommodate pedestrian traffic and parking in the rear. They decided to locate the entry at the south side of the building, which would be centrally located to both customer access points.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing at 9:49 p.m.

Lisa Winarski, 198 Bedlington, Rochester Hills, MI 48307. Ms. Winarski mentioned that the project needed a land division. When the property was originally taken out of the PUD, it was stated that there were three parcels and that those parcels would not be cookie-cuttered up, but she claimed that it was exactly what they had. The Planning Commission had agreed that the three parcels would not be sliced and diced. She stated that the drainage issue was the biggest concern for Eddington Farms. The sub would be the lowest, topography wise, with the new developments. That has created an enormous

amount of detrimental impact on the residents that backed up to the wetlands. The backyards had flooded, and she stated that the City was well aware of it, including the Planning and Engineering Departments and City Council, and yet nothing had changed. There was now another plan that would dump into the wetlands. There had been numerous complaints, and nothing had changed, so it was like falling on deaf ears. She did not feel that the residents should have to bear burden of someone else's financial gain. When Eddington Blvd. was realigned, there were not supposed to be entrances off of the new Eddington Blvd. Now there was a new entrance from First State Bank, and there would be a new one from Genisys Credit Union. She said that Eddington Blvd. was a main entrance to a subdivision of over 300 homes. To the north of Eddington there were power lines and a major liquid line, and that was a major concern. It looked as if there were not two entrances to the new Genisys, and she thought that all commercial buildings required that. She was not sure why that was happening. Also, she was not sure what the applicants had provided as proof of why they needed more parking spaces. She asked what the parking was at their existing building and why the new building needed so much more. It appeared that any time she passed the current Genisys, there were only about seven or eight cars in the lot. On the Planning memo for the zoning and existing land usage, there was no mention of Eddington Farms to the east. She felt that needed to be corrected, because Eddington Farms was taking a hit regarding new development and drainage. She reiterated that her biggest concern was why things were not tied into existing systems instead dumping into the wetlands. She passed her phone around which showed pictures of the back of the properties on Bedlington since the restructuring of Eddington Blvd. They never had drainage issues before, but ever since the developments began, they have had nothing but drainage issues.

Tanmay Kulkarni, 1710 Farnborough Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Mr. Kulkarni was also concerned about drainage. He said that in previous meetings when the realignment was going to take place, there was a drainage issue. They were told by City Council that the drainage would be connected to City drainage and would not be left open. The runoff was being left in the yards in the open. There was a lot of puddling behind the First State Bank, so the grading was a problem. He was a runner, and he had to run through that water. His second concern was the lack of safety getting in and out of Eddington Blvd. because there were no sidewalks. He and his family ran into traffic and cars getting in and out of the newly realigned Eddington Blvd. With the addition of two banks, there was a big safety concern for walkers. He said that he would like to see sidewalks added on both sides, or at least one side, of Eddington Blvd. He maintained that his backyard was getting eroded because of all the water, and that his sump pump was running every ten minutes. He reiterated that safety was his biggest concern.

Ayyappa Kondapanent, 1662 Farnborough Dr., Rochester Hills, MI 48307 Mr. Kondapanent noted that his house was right behind the proposed bank. When he moved into his house, there had been privacy, but now there were two roads. He had two sons, seven and ten, who he used to let stay in the backyard. He asked what the plans were for privacy and who would maintain the berm behind his house. He noticed that trees would be planted on the berm, and he asked how soon that would be done. He asked if the road would end at

the south property line of Genisys or if there was a plan to connect it to Rochester Rd. He did not see a driveway to their parking lot, and he wondered what the point of the road was and what the traffic would be.

Mr. Davis agreed that Ms. Winarski had a long standing drainage complaint that had been addressed by their department. Mr. Schneck (Director of DPS/Engineering) had been out there several times. The site drained to where it should and where it previously did. Accommodations had been taken into account for the proposed site's drainage. It was typical of any other development, and it was being offset by detention on site. It was being done in accordance with the City's standard requirements for detention and discharge. The pipe that went along the portion of private Eddington Blvd. going south was previously designed to handle it, and water would discharge to that area. They might have a continuing issue with Ms. Winarski, whether the site went in or not. They had heard the same issues for a couple of years, and they had tried to address it. He suggested that perhaps through future development the wetland area would be handled a little differently as the properties continued to develop, however, the subject property was being developed in accordance with what the City would accept for detention standards.

Chairperson Brnabic asked how the previous flooding problem was dealt with through Engineering. Mr. Davis said that portion of the drain was privately owned. It was not a County or City drain. Ms. Winarski had stated that it had worsened since the Eddington project went into construction, but the City did not know if that was necessarily true. They had looked at how the original plan was developed for her rear yard, and there was a wetland area that had been encroached upon. Whether it was a seasonal issue that had caused it or whether it was related to a change in degradation of the wetland and its ability to pass through the flow properly, they had not been able to agree. He knew she felt very strongly that it was because of the new developments, but as far as the correction, that was still ongoing, and the City had been trying to address it with her. He knew that Mr. Schneck had met with Ms. Winarski and traded correspondences with her a number of times about the issue.

Chairperson Brnabic said that there was also a question about the land division. She said that she would like some clarity about Ms. Winarski's statement that the parcels were never supposed to be split.

Ms. Roediger noted that the project predated her time at the City. At one point, there had been a PUD proposed for the property that never came to fruition. There might have been some conditions along with that PUD, but the PUD no longer applied. In terms of the site now, there was property, and the owner was in the process of selling off different pieces. As part of the realignment of Eddington, there was discussion about global access. There was not to be any access off of Rochester Rd., and that was the point of Eddington Blvd. It was to allow for cohesive access from the rear of the properties. The long term plan for Eddington Blvd. was to connect from the Cedar Valley Apts. down to Bordine's to the south. The plan was not to connect around to Rochester Rd. It was to create a secondary access off of Rochester Rd. for the properties and the neighborhood to avoid Rochester Rd.

Regarding the sidewalk concerns, Ms. Roediger advised that when they realigned Eddington, they continued the existing sidewalk from the previous Eddington. As part of the subject site plan and the plan to the north, the applicants were to install the sidewalks on both the north and south side of the new Eddington. The proposed project would create a nice walking loop in the area, and it should definitely enhance the sidewalk connectivity in the area.

Chairperson Brnabic mentioned the concern about additional parking spaces. Mr. Alter said that at the existing location had 33 parking spaces, and they were asking for 31. The employees would take six to ten parking spaces at any time. There were some employees, for example, mortgage offices and investment counselors, who were not always at the branch but who came and met with members. They looked at peak activity, and from a recent month, they saw that the branch averaged 62 transactions per hour. About 30-40% of those transactions were conducted through the drive-through. That left 40 lobby transactions, which generally took a little longer. He said that it was feasible to have 20-25 during peak times.

Chairperson Brnabic noted the question about entrances. Ms. Roediger stated that there was no requirement for two entrances for a property of the proposed size. The site met the ordinance requirements from Building, Fire, Engineering and Planning. She reiterated that the restriction for driveways was for Rochester, and it was always envisioned to have driveways off of the new Eddingtons.

Chairperson Brnabic closed the Public Hearing at 10:07 p.m.

Mr. Schroeder noted that the plans showed that the future Eddington Blvd. would be graded, not paved, and he asked if that was correct. Mr. Butler advised that the north/south section would be paved to their south property line. Mr. Alter added that it was a requirement to connect that to any future development to the south. Mr. Schroeder asked why there were parking spaces. Ms. Roediger said that was also the City's requirement. Mr. Schroeder thought they would want to keep parking spaces off of Eddington. Ms. Roediger advised that on-street parking was required as part of the FB Overlay. Mr. Schroeder asked if the sidewalk would be in the median on the east side. Ms. Roediger said that as part of the realignment, the City received a long, narrow piece of property that acted as a buffer and open space between the subject property and the neighborhood. There would be landscaping and a continuation of the sidewalk that the City started just north of it. It was not a median; it was a landscape buffer. Mr. Schroeder asked if the sidewalk would go into the property. Ms. Roediger agreed, and she pointed out the location of the sidewalk and landscaping.

Mr. Kaltsounis said that he had considered the drainage. He had noticed that Eddington Blvd. was a non-impervious surface that slanted toward the south, but he did not see any catch basins. He asked the plan to drain water on the road.

Mr. Butler advised that there would be two catch basins at the far south end just off their site. That was on C4.0, the Utility Plan. Mr. Kaltsounis did not see catch basins. Mr. Butler said that there were two structures, and there was a

note regarding a temporary easement that was required. Mr. Davis added that the structures were south of the subject property. Mr. Kaltsounis wondered if they would be enough for that surface. Mr. Davis reminded that the storm calculations would be reviewed during construction plan review. He assumed that the applicant's engineering had calculated and determined that just two structures were needed for that section of roadway. He pointed out that when Eddington was realigned across from Drexelgate, there was a public portion of Eddington that went east from Drexelgate then north then east again to line up with Eddington Farms' Eddington Rd. The other north/south extensions would be private roads that would connect to the public road. There was an offset road section and then private roads going north or south from that. They would have to figure out if it should be called Eddington Blvd. He said that they could have Eddington Blvd. east and west and north and south for a stretch or they could do something different with the private road sections. The plans showed that the proposed road for the project was a 76-foot private easement. The private road extensions were taken into account for the drainage calculations for the storm sewer that went south of the subject property and east into the wetland. Mr. Kaltsounis had just wondered if there would be enough catch basins. Mr. Davis said that if there were not, they would have to build more, and it would be part of the process. Mr. Kaltsounis said that the sanitary sewer was average for five people, but there would be more than five people there. He thought that might have to be looked at also. Mr. Butler said that it was the equivalent flow in REUs. That was how they calculated the flow of sanitary sewer. He agreed that the Engineering Dept. would certainly look at it. Mr. Davis was sure that what had been presented was fine. Mr. Kaltsounis said that he would appreciate it if he did look into because of the questions from the residents. He wanted to make sure that there was not a flooding situation at the end of the road that compounded the situation.

Mr. Davis said that the drainage issue discussed by the residents was for east of the proposed development. On Sheet C4.0, it showed the storm system. There was a wetland going diagonally towards the northwest to southeast, and that was the drain. It would end up heading east. The drainage problem that had been discussed was much further east of the development.

Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Kaltsounis moved the following:

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, in the matter of City File No. 19-018 (Genisys 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 the southeast corner of Rochester and Eddington Blvd., based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on July 9, 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.

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 should 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 Hooper, that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting,. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 6 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita and Schroeder

Abstain 1 - Gaber

Excused 2 - Reece and Schultz

2019-0291

Request for Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 19-018 - for the removal and replacement of as many as 20 trees for Genisys Credit Union, a proposed 3,528 s.f. new building proposed at the southeast corner of Rochester and Eddington Blvd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-23-300-041, Genisys Credit Union, Applicant

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, in the matter of City File No. 19-018 (Genisys Credit Union), the Planning Commission grants a Tree Removal Permit, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on July 9, 2019, with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following two (2) 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 20 regulated trees and replace on site.*

Conditions

1. *Tree protective and silt fencing, as reviewed and approved by the City staff, shall be installed prior to issuance of the Land Improvement Permit.*
2. *Should the applicant not be able to meet the tree replacement requirements on site the balance shall be paid into the City's Tree Fund at a rate of \$216.75 per tree.*

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

Aye 6 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita and Schroeder

Abstain 1 - Gaber

Excused 2 - Reece and Schultz

2019-0292

Request for Natural Features Setback Modification - City File No. 19-018 - for temporary impacts to 300 linear feet of natural features setback for grading for Genisys Credit Union, a proposed 3,528 s.f. new building proposed at the southeast corner of Rochester and Eddington Blvd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-23-300-041, Genisys Credit Union, Applicant..Body

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, in the matter of City File No. 19-018 (Genisys Credit Union), the Planning Commission **grants a temporary natural features setback modification** for 300 linear feet for impacts from grading in the southern portion of the site and near the southwest corner of the site, based on plans dated received by the Planning and Economic Development Department on July 9, 2019 with the following two (2) findings and subject to the following three (3) conditions:

Findings

1. The temporary impact to the Natural Features Setback area is necessary for grading portions of the site.
2. The proposed construction activity qualifies for an exception to the Natural Features Setback per the ASTI Environmental letter dated May 30, 2019

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.
3. Show natural features setback areas in linear feet, not square feet, prior to final approval by staff.

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

Aye 6 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita and Schroeder

Abstain 1 - Gaber

Excused 2 - Reece and Schultz

2019-0290

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 19-018 - Genisys Credit Union, a proposed 3,528 s.f. new building proposed at the southeast corner of Rochester and Eddington Blvd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential with an FB-2 Flexible Business Overlay, Parcel No. 15-23-300-041, Genisys Credit Union, Applicant
Mr. Kaltsounis said that there would obviously have to be some engineering work done for the drainage, for which he knew staff was well aware. He indicated that he had been on the board for a long time, and the development had come up over and over again. It was interesting to see how it was settling in, and he was happy to see it, and he thanked staff for their hard work. He never did imagine that there would be so many banks in one area. He was not sure if it

was becoming "financial row" but with all of the homes, restaurants and shops that had been proposed for the property, it was interesting to see how things had turned out. He felt that it would be lower activity than planned.

MOTION by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, in the matter of City File No. 19-018 (Genisys Credit Union), the Planning Commission **approves the Site Plan**, based on plans dated received by the Planning Department on July 9, 2019, with the following seven (7) findings and subject to the following three (3) conditions.

Findings

1. The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that all applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as other City Ordinances, standards, and requirements, can be met subject to the conditions noted below.
2. The proposed project will be accessed from Eddington Blvd., thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjoining streets.
3. Off-street parking areas have been designed to avoid common traffic problems and promote customer safety.
4. The minimum building frontage build-to area (Rochester Rd. and Eddington), minimum facade transparency and building materials have been modified upon determination by the Planning Commission that the proposed requirements meet the intent of the FB district.
5. The maximum number of parking spaces has been modified upon determination by the Planning Commission that evidence has been submitted by the applicant showing that additional parking is required due to the number of employees.
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 \$64,185.00, and posting of bond prior to temporary grade certification being issued by Engineering.
3. A land division must be obtained prior to the plans being stamped approved.

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

Aye 6 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Morita and Schroeder

Abstain 1 - Gaber

Excused 2 - Reece and Schultz