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Joint Public Hearing with the Township Board of Trustees at 7:05 pm, for PC-2021-90, Ridgewood Planned Unit Development (PUD) Concept, located at 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-007), the vacant parcel west of 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-006), and the vacant parcel east of 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-008). The applicant, In-Site LLC, is proposing to rezone the properties from Single Family Residential-1 (R-1) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) to construct 50 townhomes on approximately 11.37 acres.
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In the spirit of compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals with a disability should feel free to contact the Township at least seventy-two hours in advance of the meeting when requesting accommodations.
TO: The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission
FROM: Tammy Girling, Zoning/Planning Director
DATE: December 30, 2021
RE: Election of officers

As requested, I am providing a suggested motion for the matter mentioned above. Please feel free to modify the language. The verbiage below could change based upon the Planning Commissions’ findings of facts. Any additional findings of facts should be added to the motion below. Please note that it was suggested to me that on matters that involve rezonings, PUD’s, Special Land Uses or variances that I provide language indicating that the matter can be approved or denied.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS, SITE WALK COMMITTEE, & ZBA APPOINTMENT

Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and Secretary
(nominations are made and supported then.)
Move that nominations are closed and a ballot be cast to elect (or re-elect if no change) _____________ to serve as the Chairman, _____________ to serve as Vice-Chairman, and __________ to serve as Secretary, for 2022.

Recommendation of ZBA Appointment
Move that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Trustees to appoint ________________ as the representative from the Planning Commission to serve on the Zoning Board of Appeals for 2022.

Site Walk Committee
(per the PC By-Laws, the Chair appoints members to committees)
Chair: I appoint ______________, ______________, and ______________ to serve on the site walk committee for 2022.
The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, December 15, 2021, at 7:00 p.m. at the Orion Township Municipality Complex Board Room, 2323 Joslyn Rd., Lake Orion, Michigan 48360

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT
Scott Reynolds, Chairman
Don Gross, Vice-Chairman
Joe St. Henry, Secretary
Jessica Gingell, Commissioner

Don Walker, PC Rep to ZBA
Kim Urbanowski, BOT Rep to PC
Derek Brackon, Commissioner

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:
None.

1. OPEN MEETING
Chairman Reynolds opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL
As noted

CONSULTANTS PRESENT:
Rodney Arroyo, (Township Planner) of Giffels Webster
Mark Landis (Township Engineer) of Orchard, Hiltz, and McCliment, Inc.
Tammy Girling, Township Planning & Zoning Director

OTHERS PRESENT:
Tom Fisher  Denise Burns

3. MINUTES
A. 11-17-21, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes
B. 11-17-21, Planning Commission Workshop Meeting Minutes
Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Brackon, to approve both sets of the November 17, 2021 meeting minutes, as submitted. Motion carried

4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL
Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Gingell, to approve the agenda as presented.

5. BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENT – NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY
Mr. Tom Fisher 3094 Beachtree Ct. stated that he was the Chairperson of the Orion Township Parks and Paths Committee which was reformed this year. He noted that he also served on the Orion Township Environmental Resources Committee. He added that both committees would like to remind them that they are there, and they are available to offer their services. Both groups have a great group of people in them, a number of environmentalists to help them with any detailed environmental questions they may have. He said he has known hazardous waste removal from Mott Community College, and a number of other things. They just wanted to let them know they are there and if they have any questions send them an email and they will be happy to help them.

Commissioner Brackon asked for an example of how they could help them? Mr. Fisher replied that they have been talking about the electric charging and what they thought would be some good criteria, good placings for those. He has experience in hazardous waste if they were to
have an issue where there was soil mitigation or something like that. He has a friend that actually does that work in Minnesota at one of the universities. They have a lot of background, and they can do any number of things. When he was up in Port Austin working for a year, a question came up about hazardous waste spill and in five minutes he was able to look it up on the State records, know what they were talking about, and answer the question to say it’s safe, there was nothing wrong there. He said just that level of expertise he thought comes out and helps.

6. CONSENT AGENDA
None

7. NEW BUSINESS
A. PC-2019-47, Lavender Ridge PUD, Site Plan extension, located at a vacant parcel at the southeast corner of Silverbell and Squirrel Roads (Sidwell #09-36-226-001).

Chairman Reynolds said the applicant was present, and to state their name and address for the record.

Mr. Manny Kianicky the Vice President, S.R. Jacobson Development Corp. 32400 Telegraph Rd. Suite 200 A, Bingham Farms, MI presented.

Mr. Kianicky said that they are happy to report they are full speed ahead for moving on everything that they need with the goal of starting construction for Lavender Ridge this summer. Giffels Webster their engineer is working hard on the construction plans they expect in about 8-weeks to be able to submit for review the first set of construction plans. They have their wetland permit. They are just processing the conservation easement over all the wetlands on the property. They need an extension because right now their PUD final site plan would expire in February. To make sure they are not caught short they just need an extension a 12-month extension. They are excited finally, the last couple of years have been tough. Lending wasn’t available for a long time, but they now have a couple of financial institutions/lenders, that are very interested in financing the project. They have four projects under construction, they continue to struggle, and he thought that pretty much all developers do with shortages of labor and material, and they are doing their best as everyone in their business is doing their best to maintain schedules, things are going a little slower than they are. The good thing is that the absorptions are terrific, and they have waiting lists for projects for people even two-three months out that are signing leases, so as soon as they can deliver a building essentially it is leased up by the time, they are able to finish it.

Chairman Reynolds asked if they were through their engineering phase or the engineering review just not permits, correct? Engineer Landis replied no. He added that they have been through the site plan/PUD process, but they have yet to receive the initial engineering submittal.

Secretary St. Henry asked if they foresee the material shortage improving over the next year or so? He knew that was an issue for a lot of builders/developers right now. Mr. Kianicky said he wishes he could be more optimistic than they are, they don’t see a big improvement in the near future, it is hard to predict. He added that with solid relationships that they have with some of the trades sometimes things take a little longer, but they do manage somehow to continue to build. They have a large project in Troy that they are doing with Edward Rose that is 368 units, they are a bit behind there. They have another one they are doing in Orland Park, IL, and again things are a bit slower. Part of it is, is that they expect to have a crew of 8-10 carpenters for example to rough in a building and 4-5 show up for various reasons, there are shortages of labor. A couple of weeks ago they were almost ready to move someone in they needed some vents and whatnot for the HVAC so their contractor sent all of his employees out in a 100-mile
radius to every Lowes and Home Depot so they could pick up those missing pieces, normally they would get that through their supplier but they were getting it at retail just in order so they could move their people in, and they were able to do it. He added that they are not seeing big improvements, but they are not seeing that it is going to get any worse.

Trustee Urbanowski asked if he said for this particular development that they already have people ready to move in? Mr. Kianicky replied not for this particular one. He added that they usually won’t accept lease applications unless they are within three months of being able to deliver a building otherwise, they just frustrate people. He said the current project that they are doing they have buildings leased up a couple of months before they are actually finished and ready for occupancy. Usually, these are signed leases with deposits, the demand is there and seems to be growing.

Chairman Reynolds said it seems the project is moving forward and would be in favor of granting the one-year extension.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that the Planning Commission approves the Final PUD Plan extension request for PC-2019-47, Lavender Ridge Final PUD Plan for 1-year to February 3, 2023. This approval is based on the following findings of facts: that the applicant has indicated that they are in the process of completing their engineering and architectural plans for the project; that the pandemic over the last couple of years has impacted them in terms of their ability to finance and move forward with the project on a more-timely basis, therefore, he would move for a one-year extension to February 3, 2023.

Roll call vote was as follows: Gross, yes; St. Henry, yes; Urbanowski, yes; Walker, yes; Gingell, yes; Brackon, yes; Reynolds, yes. Motion carried 7-0

PC-2021-95, Lifted Investment II, LLC, Ord. 154 Application – Adult Processing, located at 4611 Liberty Dr. S., 09-34-300-018.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that this is Ord. 154 for an Adult Processing, located in Liberty Tech Center. A lot of the ones they have seen to date have been in the first entry, this one is the second entry. She did an analysis that all of the location requirements were met, the distance from residential, the distance from a church, the distances from schools, a road with a certain traffic count, and not having the same entry into a residential neighborhood, all of those requirements.

Chairman Reynolds said that in their packets there was all the supporting documentation that Planning & Zoning Director Girling was referring to. Again, these are reviewed by many of their department heads and lead appointed officials here at the Township. It still has to go on to some additional approvals from here.

Secretary St. Henry asked what adult processing meant? Planning & Zoning Director Girling replied that it is the processing of marijuana. Secretary St. Henry asked if it was similar to the other grow facilities that they have approved? Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that they have “grow” which is growing, “processing” is processing what has been grown. They have had others before.

Chairman Reynolds stated that there is also a difference between medical and adult recreational use.
Secretary St. Henry said so this is the processing of marijuana for adult recreational use. He just wanted to understand exactly what the difference was between this and some of the other ones they have looked at.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said there are several categories within Ord. #154, and this is one of the categories that is allowed.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, that the Planning Commission grants the approval of the application, as required per Ord. #154, for PC-2021-95, Lifted Investment for Adult Processing located at 4611 Liberty S. (parcel 09-34-300-018) based on the fact: that this property is located within an IP zoning district; it meets all the distance requirements as required in Ord. #154; is located in a building that has an ingress/egress to a road with less than 6,000 vehicles/day; is located in a building that has an ingress/egress road that does not serve as a road to residential zoning or residential properties. This recommendation approval is based upon the condition that it meets all other applicable Township Ordinances and standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets all the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Marihuana Regulatory Agency (MRA).

Roll call vote was as follows: Walker, yes; St. Henry, yes; Gross, yes; Gingell, yes; Brackon, yes; Urbanowski, yes; Reynolds, yes. **Motion carried 7-0**

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. PC-2021-51, Kay Industrial Sit Plan, located at 50 Kay Industrial Dr., parcel 09-35-400-033.

Ms. Maria Lukosavich on behalf of Kay Industrial, LLC, 38700 Van Dyke Ave., Suite 200, Sterling Heights, MI presented.

Ms. Lukosavich stated that they are there again, and Mr. D’Agostini had every intention to be present tonight he was sick, and Sara is out of town on a commitment that she could not reschedule.

Ms. Lukosavich said that the 50 Kay Industrial is in the Kay Industrial Park, it fronts Lapeer Rd., and Kay Industrial Rd. This parcel is 3.12 acres, it is zoned (IP) Industrial Park, there are no wetlands to contend with. The footprint of the building is 45,060-sq. ft. with approximately 5,400-sq. ft. of office. It does have an optional mezzanine which would be a total square footage of 50,460. This is a speculative building it would be the building shell that they would be constructing initially and the outside improvements. They did receive some setback variances back in July. Apart of their meeting here today they would be requesting some waivers. The first waiver that they would like to discuss, they did not submit a floor plan because it is a speculative building, they don’t have a tenant, so they don’t have a firm interior floor plan to offer at this time. There was discussion in the plan reviews about tree survey and removal permit. The previous owner Joe Kay he did previously clear this lot some time ago. The trees that are there now, and she had pictures they are inferior trees or scrub trees, they are not specimen trees that they would think to preserve in this industrial park. These are developed lots that front a street, it has storm sewer, and utilities available. The tree survey was triggered by the requirement that parcels over 5-acres are subject to the tree removal permit requirement. There are two lots that they are presenting, they do share a corner, the corners do touch, they are not truly continuous in the sense that they have a large adjacent border where they would contemplate wanting to be able to control tree removal for land development purposes. Furthermore, the tree removal that is taking place is in the building envelop and the Ordinance
contemplates not requiring a tree permit in this type of situation, so they are asking for the Tree Removal Permit for both this lot and the next lot that they would be presenting.

Ms. Lukosavich stated that the landscape waiver, there is a detention area that fronts Lapeer Rd. and there is some vegetation and trees in this detention area. She added that in the plan review comments there is the hedgerow requirement on the west side of the west parking lot. For a couple of reasons, they would like to propose moving this hedgerow to the streetside. Primarily in their experience vegetation or landscaping that’s immediately adjacent to the parking doesn’t do so well with snow removal and salt. Also having the access to the pond for maintenance of the detention area, they would like to maintain that availability. There is a natural buffer which she thought the intent of the ordinance was to shield parking from any street sides, and because they have space there, and they are proposing trees along there, she thought they had an adequate buffer. The waiver that they would be requesting is possibly moving this hedgerow requirement to dress up the street side.

Ms. Lukosavich said regarding the façade, the one requirement that is most concerning for industrial use is over 100-linear ft. The ordinance requires projections or indentations in the facility, and this north side of the building which would be primarily the shop, complying with that ordinance would compromise the use and functionality of that shop. Typically, industrial users would either rack this wall, they would have equipment on the wall, they would have conduits, electrical services, and air-lines on the wall. Having indentations or projects on that wall would not be ideal for the functionality of the space. They do want to enhance this north side that faces Kay Industrial with a brick façade.

Ms. Lukosavich stated that regarding the elevations they are proposing a brick veneer with metal panel siding similar to what is on the opposite side of the street with Kay Automotive, and then they can soften it up with some landscape features. The façade that they are proposing would be on the front of the building a neutral utility brick, stone details, ribbon windows. They are capping the building with glazing on the corner. They are proposing an entrance canopy to draw attention to the front entrance. The façade, they believe meets the spirit of the Lapeer Overlay District.

Ms. Lukosavich said that other items that were brought up in the reviews were roof screening for rooftop units. They would comply with that obviously and provide any roof screening required. Right now, because it is a spec building, they don’t know where rooftop units would be located on the building, so they haven’t specified where that would be. For practical purposes, they strategically located rooftop units in the middle of the building so the parapet usually adequately screens any rooftop equipment. If it is towards the sides they will plan accordingly and will make sure everything is properly screened.

Ms. Lukosavich said regarding wheel stops they will comply and provide wheel stops where required in the parking lot where parking is up against landscaped areas. There were some details with the photometric that need to be updated so that the photometric plans fully comply, including the lighting fixtures being parallel with the ground, there were some fixtures specified that had a tilt on the head but they will put the ones that are parallel with the ground and any timing requirements with the lighting in terms of them either dimming or shutting off if not in use at the time.

Planner Arroyo read through his review date stamped November 24, 2021.

Engineer Landis read through his review date stamped November 24, 2021.
Commissioner Brackon asked regarding the floor plan waiver, he understood the reason for it given that there is not a tenant yet, is there a way to delay that until a tenant is found, and that tenant has to apply for the floor plan waiver? In other words, without having to give up the right to do whatever they want because they are waiving it now? Planner Arroyo replied that this comes up sometimes and he thought that they could come in at a later stage when they have a better feel. He thought it could be conditioned upon a floor plan being submitted. He thought it could be administratively reviewed unless there is a reason that the administration sees that it needs to come back. He had no issues with recommending that they approve that subject to an administrative review of the floor plan at a later date. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that could also cover the screening of the HVAC.

Chairman Reynolds stated that he was happy to see a speculative being constructed for use. He echoed a couple of the professional consultant's comments specific to mechanical and things just to make sure that it is planned out that that would indeed be rooftop moving for not ground-mounted, they have had issues in the past with spec buildings being constructed and then they say, oops it doesn’t fit and then they are moving stuff around and making it work. So, as long as there is a game plan for that in the future. Ms. Lukosavich said they strategically oversized joists in the design to contemplate either doing rooftop units to fully condition the space or these buildings oftentimes get makeup errors in a couple of strategic locations. There are not too many options on conditioning that building and they planned accordingly by sizing the joist so they can put them where they need to.

Chairman Reynolds said that he agreed with the comments from both consultants for the trees. It is something that is tricky there is a large development area and therefore most of the trees fit within that within the spirit of the ordinance. He would be open, he thought the ordinance outlines either landscape architects or an arborist to essentially just provide a letter saying that there are no landmark or historical trees, he would be open to that. As long as they are all on the same page and staff agrees to that letter. He was not in favor of waiving the Lapeer Overlay Design Standards he agreed that there were some nice materials being proposed but thought there was the ability to meet them, he didn’t think the spirit of the ordinance was to inhibit interior use but rather create some rhythms and some potentially in masonry even with a four or twelve-inch step, that just breaks up a 100-ft. façade. He thought that could be easily met even with some of the materials that are being proposed.

Commissioner Brackon said he didn’t understand the reason for wanting to move the landscaping? He said it seems like such a minor issue compared to everything else that is being asked for why even bother? Ms. Lukosavich replied that they do want to move that hedgerow to that north side. Commissioner Brackon said if they wanted everything else why not say, “hey we are willing to put in the hedgerow where it is planned and add the additional hedgerow”. Ms. Lukosavich replied that they were actually good with that, for the maintenance of the pond, and just as property managers they know that the plantings don’t do very well adjacent to parking areas with snow removal, salt, and such. To put a hedgerow if the Planning Commission feels strongly about it, they will surely comply. They do intend to soften the north property line dress it up with some plantings, and if they wanted to add some different maybe doing a combination of split-face brick and maybe different panel heights, they could propose some options. For the functionality of the inside, they don’t want any major protrusions into the space, as long as they are able to maintain a straight wall on the inside that is important for the users. Chairman Reynolds said he didn’t know if that answered Commissioner Brackon’s question or not she was kind of answering both? Commissioner Brackon said he understood it as they would be willing to concede. Ms. Lukosavich said to satisfy the Planning Commission, move forward, and get approval they would be glad to put in that hedgerow on the west side as well as dressing up the north side with plantings.
Chairman Reynolds said he was not looking to inhibit interior floor space. They have asked other industrial buildings to do similar things, to create some pilasters, relief of the façade. He didn’t think it was intended to necessarily be anything crazy ornate but rather create some nice scale and rhythm through those neighborhoods. He knew some of the buildings that have been the comments in the past when they have been super long facades and it is very plain Jane and they understand it is an industrial area but they still want to continue to the raise the bar and promote nice facilities.

Commissioner Walker said he compares this to the request for the PUDs that they have gotten recently. The petitioner is in front of them asking for a number of things and thought it was the second time that they have been here on the subject. He thought there were way too many moving parts as far as he was concerned. He is the tree guy on the board, and the cavalier that these are just scrub trees, they don’t have to deal with that, but they have a Tree Ordinance to do that. Even if those trees didn’t qualify for that ordinance, you would think it would be nice for them to say that they will put some greenery around the project. There are a number of objections still from the Planner and from the Engineer and thought there was too much. They often go too far he would rather have them back having this stuff fixed and then asking. The Zoning Board has already granted them six variances on this property. It is not that the Township is taking a really hard look at this they are trying to help them but thought what they were asking for was asking them to help them too much as it is presented right now.

Ms. Lukosavich said that they would be glad to have their landscaping architect, actually, he was already out to the site to give them an opinion of the vegetation that is out there, they would be glad to have their landscape architect write the letter that they had suggested. With respect to some of the comments on both the Giffels and OHM reviews and speaking with Engineering Landis, she felt they agreed in their previous discussions that a lot of those comments could be addressed and erected during the engineering phase of the development. Engineer Landis said that there were comments on the next case that he thought that they could push to engineering. The items on the letter for this particular case he thought should be addressed at site plan. Ms. Lukosavich said that the limitations of disturbance where it matches the existing grades that is something that she understood that they could address during the engineering phase. With the photometrics, in identifying the lighting poles that peripheral photometrics, where it was deficient around the perimeters, they were going to add the lighting poles to the perimeters. The description of the land use because it is a speculative building short of being an industrial shell, they don’t have a land use at this time. The pavement section having more detailed sections she thought that these were items that could be done during the engineering phase. The letter they discussed, addressed the tree survey ordinance with a letter. She respectfully requests that the site plan be approved as it is today, and they can address these comments in the engineering phase if at all possible.

Commissioner Gross thought that there are a number of these issues that are basically administrative items that need to be resolved during the actual submission of detailed engineering plans. He liked the fact that the applicant is maintaining the large setback from Lapeer Rd. with the detention pond in the front which is complimentary to the detention pond property to the north. That additional setback does provide some relief to the architectural façade of the building. He thought that the façade that they are showing for the Lapeer Rd. frontage is acceptable in terms of their overlay district. The north wall could use some additional relief just some architectural relief to soften it up and the applicant has indicated that there is an opportunity to use different materials along that north wall to provide some visual relief of that north wall. He thought both the planner and the engineer have identified some issues that can be resolved internally and administratively. He was prepared to move forward with this.
Chairman Reynolds said that he agreed he is always in favor of moving forward with projects with the chance to keep development rolling along. He stated that he will still promote to not waive the Lapeer Overly Standards, he thought that should be demonstrated and a revised elevation was his only response to that. He would be in favor of some administrative reviews of some of the other items as long as they don’t trigger the intent changing drastically from what they were seeing now. Ms. Lukosavich asked if the revised elevation was that something that they could move forward with? She asked if he was suggesting approving conditioned upon a revised elevation for the north façade? Chairman Reynolds replied correct; it doesn’t necessarily just apply to just the north façade but rather the design standards outlined in Giffels review but specific to providing relief on a 100-ft. façade of canopy’s, projections, recesses, just various things that relieve that façade.

Trustee Urbanowski said her problem with that is it is not an administrative thing. They could resubmit it and then who is going to review it? That is one of the things they do is the waivers, it is not an administrative thing.

Ms. Lukosavich said one of the things that she did want to point out was she didn’t know how familiar everybody was with the subdivision. It is an older development and the surrounding facilities this is the Kay Industrial facility that is right across the street. Again, they see brick below with the siding above. This building will very much meet or exceed the architecture already in the development, and the spirit of the elevations she thought was consistent with the Lapeer Overlay District. The facility would look very similar to this with the canopies that were proposed over the entryways.

Commissioner Brackon said in order to grant a waiver for this ordinance there is a standard that has to be demonstrated that was presented here. Consistency with the buildings around it is not part of that standard. The standards required would prevent reasonable use of the site. He hasn’t heard anything that the ordinance requirements would prevent reasonable use of the site. Ms. Lukosavich said for the reasons that she mentioned before were their concerns with the shop portion of the building. If they had indentations along these walls that are primarily shop walls it would compromise the functionality of the space, and for industrial users that is very important.

Commissioner Brackon said they don’t even know if there are going to be shop walls yet because there is no tenant. Ms. Lukosavich stated that there is no tenant at this time but they own and property manage several million square feet of space and the requirements are somewhat typical. They want straight walls for either racking, crane weighs, equipment modules, robotic modules, assembly lines, various things, it is very much a linear footprint.

Ms. Lukosavich said to Chairman Reynolds point they could do some different things with the masonry to enhance the perimeter elevations as long as it doesn’t compromise the interior of the building.

Commissioner Brackon said the existing site design, he thought that they don’t even have that yet, the architectural, parking driveways, which would make the application of the standard impractical. He asked if that had been addressed? Or is it too early to even address that? Ms. Lukosavich replied no; what has got them adjusted, as long as it doesn’t compromise the interior having straight clean lines on the shop, they could achieve the masonry details that get adjusted. Chairman Reynolds said that Commissioners Brackon’s comment that’s potentially something that would present a fact of support or lack of support of the waiver. Commissioner Brackon said that was something that he was trying to balance in his head, is it support or lack of support? Chairman Reynolds replied that comment specifically he thought it was more about
if there was a site feature or a site width or something along those lines that would make it impractical to provide that feature.

Secretary St. Henry said what they are proposing is exterior masonry modifications to break up the straight wall, which would most likely have no impact on the interior wall. And they have agreed to that on all walls over 100-ft. long. Ms. Lukosavich replied correct.

Ms. Lukosavich said that the hope was being able to proceed with full engineering and getting the project underway. With lead times and shortages of labor and everything else, they were anxious to get this to the next phase of plan review. If the requirement or the decision of the Planning Commission is to bring it back with some revised masonry details, they will have to live with that decision and get it done expeditiously as possible.

Planner Arroyo stated that one option here could be potentially for conditional approval by the Planning Commission subject to bringing back revised façade drawings which would allow them to start the process of engineering drawings, come back, bring the façade drawings, doesn’t slow them down but still gives them the opportunity to see those and approve those separately.

Chairman Reynolds asked for thoughts, ideas on motions, considerations for motions? He added that they have had some mixed discussions here, but it might be worthwhile having something on the table to discuss or amend and work through.

Chairman Reynolds stated that what he would like to do is approve the site plan, get the site plan approval with conditions that were outlined by the engineer and the planner, and delay and action on an Overlay Design Standards Waiver until a resubmission is made relative to the design of the building. That would allow the applicant to move forward with the engineering work on the plans and give them an opportunity to return to them within the next 30-60 days with a revised elevation.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Secretary St. Henry relative to the site plan for PC-2021-51, Kay Industrial site plan located at 50 Kay Industrial Dr., 09-35-400-033, that the Planning Commission grant site plan approval for the plans date stamped and received 11/10/2021 due to the fact: that waivers have been granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals on July 12, 2021, for a greenbelt and parking setbacks, and dumpster locations. This approval is based upon the conditions that the applicant comply with the Township Planners review letter of November 23, 2021, with items #1 through #5; and that the applicant resolves the issues relative to the Township Engineers review letter of November 23, 2021 items #1 through #6 with the understanding that a tree review will be done by a qualified arborist or a landscape architect regarding the tree inventory and quality of the trees on the site; the design of the exterior building relative to the Lapeer Overlay Design Standards be postponed until a revised design plan has been submitted to the Planning Commission relative to the design standards within the district.

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds said there were comments on the visibility of the FDC connection. Ms. Lukosavich stated that the FDC connection right now they have proposed it coming in towards the back of the building. She would suggest putting it somewhere on the south façade where they could have their strobe easily visible and it is on a no parking fire lane, that was a poor choice, she didn’t know who proposed that there but the best location would be somewhere in the south façade probably towards the front because
they don’t want to be towards the dock wall, and it would come straight off that water main that is being looped around.

Chairman Reynolds said essentially there is an understanding that those comments would be addressed to the liking and approval of the Fire Marshal? Vice-Chairman Gross replied yes.

Chairman Reynolds said so clarification of the motion, is that how you understood it? Secretary St. Henry replied yes.

Chairman Reynolds said on the table they have conditional approval to essentially allow for the applicant to come back with a revised façade that meets the Lapeer Overlay Design Standards to come back before them, along with the opportunity to address all of the comments outlined in Giffels Webster’s review, along with OHM’s review, and the Fire Marshal review. And those are to be administratively reviewed and are any of those to come back before them as a Planning Commission to review? Vice-Chairman Gross replied if they think it is necessary.

Chairman Reynolds said anyone in Robert Rules can amend a motion, and if there is a disagreement about the motion on the table, they are happy to discuss it.

Commissioner Walker said he heard the motion maker say the actions taken by the Zoning Board as a granting of waivers as opposed to a granting of variances. He didn’t know if that would torpedo a motion or not, but he thought that should be clarified. Vice-Chairman Gross confirmed that he meant granted variances by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Trustee Urbanowski questioned where the dumpster was going? Ms. Lukosavich replied that they are not moving the dumpster. The Fire Department had a concern with the FDC connection, the Fire Department connection into the building is being brought in through the back and is being proposed back by the dumpster. He agreed with the Fire Department, it is a poor location as a practical matter, there is a possibility for there to be debris placed here. The appropriate area for an FDC connection would probably be somewhere along the south side of the building where it is fully accessible to a fire/water truck to charge the system. It would come straight off that water main that is proposed, and just have a lead straight into the building.

Chairman Reynolds wanted to clarify that it would be the intent for these to be rereviewed by their professional consultants. He asked if that was their intent? Vice-Chairman Gross said that those are details within the various engineering standards and intended for them to be rereviewed.

Ms. Lukosavich stated that they are very eager and anxious to get development going in this Township. They are excited to do business here. Between the two buildings, they anticipate this being about an 8-million-dollar investment on the shells. They would be glad to bring a new proposed façade back for the Planning Commission’s review and would be very excited to move forward on a conditional basis with all of the other items addressed. She added that she did want some clarification, was it a letter or, did they want a full tree inventory? Vice-Chairman Gross replied revised by a landscape architect or an arborist. Ms. Lukosavich said that they did have a landscape architect out to look at the site and was confident that they could fully satisfy that request.
Roll call vote was as follows: St. Henry, yes; Gingell, yes; Brackon, yes; Urbanowski, yes; Walker, no; Gross, yes; Reynolds, yes. Motion carried 6-1

B. PC-2021-52, Kay Industrial Site Plan, located at unaddressed parcel 09-35-400-044 (a parcel south of 100 Kay Industrial Dr.

Chairman Reynolds asked the applicant to state their name and address for the record.

Ms. Maria Lukosavich on behalf of Kay Industrial Land, LLC. 38700 Van Dyke Ave., Suite 200, Sterling Heights, MI, presented.

Ms. Lukosavich said this site is right around the corner from the previous site they talked about. There is the corner where the overlap of the two parcels meets. Some of the conditions are similar to those that they discussed for the previous site. This is a 4.39-acre parcel, it is zoned (IP) there are no wetlands to contend with. The building’s square footage is 66,955 with approximately 6,000-sq. ft. of office, and 60,955-sq. ft. of the shop. There is an optional 6,000-sq. ft. mezzanine which would lead to the total square footage of 72,955-sq. ft. Again, this is a speculative building they don’t have a specific user, for the reasons discussed in the previous presentation. They would be requesting the Building Floor Plan waiver because they don’t have a definite floor plan for the interior of the space. That would be generated once a tenant is identified. The tree survey and tree removal permit for the reasons stated before would be glad to get a letter confirming that none of the trees are of historic nature or would require preservation. The facades they would also be willing to entertain coming back to the Planning Commission moving forward on a conditional basis and addressing any façade issues that they have with the reconvening with the Planning Commission at a later time.

Ms. Lukosavich stated that there were no objections by the Fire Department on this site plan. She said she will let Engineer Landis speak more on the conclusions but there was a couple of items that they determined were not a concern, items #1 & #2 on the items that needed to be corrected and the other items that were discussed in both approvals. The rooftop screening again they were not able to identify where the rooftops went, they strategically locate them so the parapet can cover them if they are not able to be covered by the parapet, they would provide the appropriate screening at that time. There were a few deficiencies on the perimeter of the photometric which they would correct, as well. As stated, the fixtures being parallel, and the timing of the lighting being shut off between 11 p.m. and sunrise they would make sure that the facility once occupied complied until their use required otherwise.

Planner Arroyo read through his review date stamped November 24, 2021.

Engineer Landis read through his review date stamped November 24, 2021.

Chairman Reynolds said as mentioned by the applicant the Fire Marshal did review the project and recommended approval with no additional comments.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked if they had a rendering of the proposed building? Ms. Lukosavich replied they do and showed the Board the elevations. She noted that they don’t have a computer-generated rendering, but they did this similar façade at a different facility and a lot of the architectural features that they were proposing are on that building in Shelby Twp. Vice-Chairman Gross asked this is basically at the entrance though? Ms. Lukosavich replied correct. Vice-Chairman Gross said but otherwise it is just a block building? Ms. Lukosavich replied correct. She added that it would be painted CMU on the sidewalks that are adjacent to other buildings, with metal panel siding. The front façade will have stone details spandrel glass, envision glass, and then a canopy, with some metal architectural panels to call out the front
entrance. Vice-Chairman Gross asked if it had glass windows along the front? Ms. Lukosavich said correct. Chairman Reynolds said that he has similar comments to the previous one. He thought there were some measures that could be taken to meet that Lapeer Overlay Standard. He understood that it was an industrial building but would love to see something a little bit more than just low masonry especially painted CMU and a façade that is blank.

Vice-Chairman Gross said like the previous plan the site plan seems to comply with all the other ordinance requirements. There are some engineering concerns that have to be reviewed but was sure that there will be others as the plan is reviewed that there will have to be some revisions, as well, but it won’t affect the site plan. There were some variances granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals previously, the greenbelt.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, the Planning Commission grants site plan approval for PC-2021-52, Kay Industrial Site Plan, located at unaddressed parcel 09-35-400-044 (a parcel south of Kay Industrial Dr.) for the plans date stamped received 11/10/2021 based on: the conditions being satisfied, and the planner’s review of 11/23/2021 which apparently have been addressed, as well as the engineers report of 11/23/2021. The fact that the Zoning Board of Appeals granted variances on July 12, 2021, relative to greenbelt and parking setbacks, therefore the plan complies with ordinance requirements. Further, that a review by an arborist or a landscape architect regarding the tree inventory and the character be submitted as a part of the condition. He would recommend approval with the stipulation and condition that the final design of the project be resubmitted to the Planning Commission to ensure that there is compliance with the design standards of the Lapeer Overlay District as required on the sides of the building.

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds stated that he did not believe that all of the Giffels Webster comments have been addressed. He asked if he was correct? He added that there is still the hedgerow. Vice-Chairman Gross said that he had indicated that his interpretation is that it complied.

Planner Arroyo said that regarding the hedgerow it appears that it could comply, but they just need more information to confirm the species and the height of the hedge on top of the berm. Provided that is acceptable then it would comply. He thought it looked like they are attempting to meet the spirit of the ordinance, but he just needed some more information. It is an administrative type of review, but they need additional information.

Chairman Reynolds said he would be more comfortable with it because he would like one or both of those reviews to still be included because there are comments on the tree survey. He understood in the motion he is clarifying that but would feel more comfortable especially in the Giffels Webster review in which references mechanical screening and things, as they move forward and kind of reiterate some of the Lapeer Overlay Design Standards that he thought they were looking to meet and would like to include those comments to be met and reviewed.

Vice-Chairman Gross amended the motion, Trustee Urbanowski re-supported that address the comments #1 through #5 in the Giffels Webster review plus anything bold in essentially the review summary. The overlay redesign would still have to come back to the Planning Commission, it would not be done administratively.
Roll call vote was as follows: Urbanowski, yes; Brackon, yes; St. Henry, yes; Gingell, yes; Walker, yes; Gross, yes; Reynolds, yes. Motion carried 7-0

C. PC-2021-07, 5-Year Master Plan Update

Planner Arroyo said that they are going to go ahead and make some of the changes that were suggested, and they will have a new draft for them for next month. He asked them to let Planning & Zoning Director Girling know if you would like a hard copy of the next version and she will make sure that you get a hard copy because there were a few members that were asking for hard copies.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that she will make sure that everyone gets a hard copy of the next draft.

Chairman Reynolds said with their schedule they are looking to bring back the draft and potentially recommend approval of that draft to be posted for public review in a 63-day period.

Planner Arroyo said at the next meeting if they are ready to do that, they would make a motion to forward the draft to the Board of Trustees to request their permission to allow it to be distributed to the various agencies and adjacent communities for the 63-day review period. Then they would go ahead and pick a date meeting for when the Open House would occur.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS
None.

10. COMMUNICATIONS
None.

11. PLANNERS REPORTS/EDUCATION
A. Giffels Webster – Safety and Site Design Training

Planner Arroyo said this one of their Planning Commissioner training program two pages. He briefly overviewed some safety issues. One of the things they talk about is, there has been a program that has been around for quite a long time from the 1970s which is called (CPTED) which is Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design. The thought of that is they can design sites when they go through a site plan approval process to try to enhance the ability for public safety officers to be able to see into the site, for people to feel comfortable moving about the site, and to provide for the opportunity for people who are nearby to see into the site and actually observe and report activities that would be inappropriate. There are some issues one deals with lighting, when they have those high-intensity lights that are so bright, and they are next to an area that is dark then your eyes are adjusting to that bright area, and you can’t really see those dark areas very well. When they have that even lighting which is typically reflected in an average to minimum ratio of 4:1 is kind of the goal, they then can see across the entire site. Then that makes it safer as they move about, so a police officer who is patrolling, they could see evenly throughout the site as well. There are some suggestions for minimum lighting and when those areas are being actively used. Also, the color of lighting has become an issue because they used to have those old sodium lights that glowed orange. It may seem warm from a distance, but it also changes how your clothes appear in terms of color. If you see someone and you are trying to describe someone and you may say that person was wearing a red shirt, well, it may not have been red because the glow of the light is impacting how you perceive it. When you report that to a police officer you may not always get an accurate description. If they can use the lighting it is called kelvin temperature that more closely is associated with daylight, it tends to give a more-true color rendition and that is also something that is helpful. There is a
kind of nuance in not getting too blue/white so that it looks so cold but has a little bit. The nice thing about LED is they now have a lot more flexibility and fine-tuning that kelvin temperature so that it has a little bit of warmth to it, but it is still closer to a true color rendition.

Planner Arroyo said site lines obviously looking so they can see into a site and showing that vegetation is blocking it and avoiding entrapment spots. One of the things they talked about tonight is this requirement for the low hedgerow and that is a really good example of something that is consistent with the (CPTED) technology because our concepts because they are getting the benefit of the landscaping, but they are still able to see into the site when they drive by. There is a driver’s eye height in a vehicle is typically about 3 ½ feet above the pavement. The 30-inch-high landscaping is below that sightline. When you are driving in a car you are still going to be able to see into the site and when a police officer is patrolling there still going to be able to see with a 30-inch hedgerow or a combination berm and hedgerow or wall you are softening the edges of the parking lot while still maintaining the ability for the appropriate safety mechanisms to be put into place.

B. Winter 2022 Citizen Planner Flyer

Chairman Reynolds said as always, the Planning Department allocates training dollars for them as Planning Commissioners. One of the very useful opportunities that are provided to them is through MSU and their extension program. They are offering Citizen Planner via live zoom. It looks to be occurring in the middle of February through the middle of March about a month-long process meeting on Tuesdays. Registration deadline is the 28th so if you express an interest please speak with Planning & Zoning Director Girling or the Planning & Zoning staff, they would be happy to sign you up, so, maybe by the next meeting get a conclusion on whether they would like to participate or not.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling strongly encouraged it. They would be having six sessions it does cover a lot of material and a lot of topics.

12. COMMITTEE REPORTS
None.

13. FUTURE PUBLIC HEARINGS

Planning & Zoning Girling said there will be a public hearing on January 5, 2022, for Ridgewood at 7:05 p.m.

14. CHAIRMAN’S COMMENTS

Chairman Reynolds said he would like to note in the wake of all of the tragedies that occurred in Oxford, for anyone that is looking to support both time, money, or any resources there is the Oxford Strong community website that has been posted now to help organize efforts. There is obviously a lot of funds and opportunities out here but that is one way to get connected to just contribute money that directly contributes towards families affected that have lost loved ones or have injured loved ones but also the opportunity to provide resources and your time to not only students in our district but also neighboring districts including Oxford.

15. COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS
Vice-Chairman Gross said to have a happy and safe holiday season for everybody.

Trustee Urbanowski said Merry Christmas & Happy New Year.
The Planning & Zoning Director said if anyone would like a tour of the building, she would be happy to give it. Merry Christmas to everyone.

ADJOURNMENT
Moved by Trustee Urbanowski, seconded by Commissioner Gingell to adjourn the meeting at 8:43 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Walton
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary
Charter Township of Orion

Planning Commission Approve Date
PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:
Don Walker, PC Rep to ZBA       Don Gross, Vice-Chairman
Scott Reynolds, Chairman       Jessica Gingell, Commissioner
Kim Urbanowski, BOT Rep to PC Derek Brackon, Commissioner
Joe St. Henry, Secretary

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:
None

1. OPEN MEETING
Chairman Reynolds opened the workshop meeting at 6:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL
As noted

CONSULTANTS PRESENT:
Rodney Arroyo, (Township Planner) of Giffels Webster
Mark Landis (Township Engineer) of Orchard, Hiltz, and McCliment, Inc.
Tammy Girling, Township Planning & Zoning Director

OTHERS PRESENT:
Neal Porter

3. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL
Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, to approve the agenda as presented.

4. NEW BUSINESS/UNFINISHED BUSINESS
A. PC-2021-07, 5 Year Master Plan Update

Planner Arroyo highlighted key components of select pages from the draft Master Plan which included:
- Missing Middle Housing
- Residential Density Plan
- Economic Development Plan
- Complete Streets/Safety Path Plan
- Long-Range Street Classification
- Thoroughfare Plan/Master Right-Of-Way Plan
- Corridor Planning specifically:
  1) Brown Road
  2) Lapeer Road Screening Concept
  3) Baldwin Road
  4) District Natural Corridors
  5) Natural Beauty Roads
- Future Land Use Map
- Planned Density
• 15-Minute Neighborhoods
• Zoning Plan

Planner Arroyo went on to present Implementation Action Items which consists of four categories and all four categories are actions within five key goals.
  1) Zoning
  2) Advocacy
  3) Capital Improvements
  4) Other

Planner Arroyo then covered the proposed five key goals and the action strategy (broken down by the 4 categories) of each.
  1) High and Diverse Housing
  2) Natural & Historic Resources
  3) Economic Development
  4) Community Facilities
  5) Community Characteristics and Aesthetics

5. ADJOURNMENT
Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, to adjourn the meeting at 6:47 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Walton
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary
Charter Township of Orion

Planning Commission Approval Date
TO: The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission
FROM: Tammy Girling, Planning & Zoning Director
DATE: December 22, 2021
RE: PC-2021-90, Ridgewood PUD Concept and Eligibility Plan

As requested, I am providing a suggested motion for the matter mentioned above. Please feel free to modify the language. The verbiage below could change based upon the Planning Commissions’ findings of facts. Any additional findings of facts should be added to the motion below. Please note that it was suggested to me that on matters that involve rezonings, PUD’s, Special Land Uses, or variances, that I provide language indicating that the matter can be approved, denied or postponed.

Planned Unit Development (Ordinance #78, Section 30.03)

Motion 1: I move that the Planning Commission forwards a recommendation to the Township Board to approve/deny PC-2021-90, Ridgewood Planned Unit Development Concept and Eligibility plan, located at 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-007), the vacant parcel west of 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-006), and the vacant parcel east of 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-008) for plans date stamped received December 14, 2021. This recommendation to approve/deny is based on the following findings of facts:

That the applicant has/not met the following eligibility criteria of Section 30.03(B) of the Township Zoning Ordinance and has/not met the intent of a PUD as stated in 30.03A of the Township Zoning Ordinance:

A. Recognizable Benefit
   * How will a PUD approval result in a recognizable and substantial benefit to the ultimate users of the project and the community (insert findings of fact)
   * How would such benefit otherwise be unfeasible or unlikely to be achieved (Insert findings of facts),

B. Density Impact
   * Will the proposed type and density of use result in a material increase in the use of public services, facilities and utilities, in relation to what would be permitted if the property were developed without using the PUD (Insert findings of facts),
   * Will the proposed PUD place an unreasonable burden upon the subject and/or surrounding land and/or property owners and occupants/or the natural features (Insert findings of facts),

C. Township Master Plan
   * Will the proposed development be consistent with the intent and spirit of the Master Plan and community (Insert finding of facts),

D. Economic Impact
   * Will the proposed PUD result in an unreasonable negative economic impact upon surrounding properties in relation to the economic impact that
would occur from a more traditional development (Insert finding of facts),

E. **Guaranteed Open Space**
   * Does the proposed PUD contain at least as much usable open space as would be required in the Ordinance for the most dominant use in the development (Insert findings of facts),

F. **Unified Control**
   * Is the proposed PUD under single ownership or control such that there is a single person or entity having responsibility for completing the project with this Ordinance (insert findings of facts)

**If Recommendation to Approve:**
This recommendation is subject to the following conditions:
   A. (Motion maker to list any unresolved issues related to the Township Planner’s review letter).
   B. (Motion maker to list any unresolved issues related to the Township Engineer’s review letter).
   C. (Motion maker to list any additional conditions).

**Or**

I move that the Planning Commission **postpone** action on PC-2021-90, Ridgewood Planned Unit Development Concept and Eligibility plan, located at 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-007), the vacant parcel west of 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-006), and the vacant parcel east of 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-008) for plans date stamped received December 14, 2021 for the following reasons (insert findings of facts).
December 13, 2021

Mr. Daniel Johnson
JMF Properties LLC
1700 West Big Beaver Road
Troy, MI  48084

Re:  Wetland Delineation Report Supplement – Ridgewood

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Pursuant to your request, I conducted an on-site evaluation on northern portions of the above-referenced 11.38-acre proposed Ridgeview development site at 625 Clarkston Road in Orion Township of Oakland County on December 7, 2021. In particular, the specific purpose of my visit was to supplement the findings of our November 10, 2017 wetland determination report (which was written to address the entire site. (Please note that the original report was prepared under our business name at the time of King & MacGregor Environmental, Inc. (“KME”) – however in the intervening time KME was acquired by Barr Engineering (“Barr”), so while there has been a “name change”, there has not been a change in the actual wetland consultants assisting the developer of the project – now employees of Barr.)

The reason for this supplemental report is in response to an Orion Township plan review letter prepared by OHM Advisors (“OHM”), dated November 16, 2021, wherein OHM states;

“The applicant should verify if the two depressions located in the northeast portion of the site are wetland areas subject to Orion Township wetland ordinance. Based on our field review, there appears to be a change in vegetation and soils indicating the possibility of wetlands. In addition, the MIRIS and NWI maps appear to include these areas. Should these depressions be determined to be wetlands, a wetland impact permit from Orion Township will be required for the proposed impacts and the PUD and Density plans would need to be revised accordingly.”

Both the original wetland delineation and my follow-up evaluation were conducted in a manner consistent with the Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual (USACE 1987) and the Regional Supplement to the Manual: Northcentral and Northeast Region (Version 2.0, USACE 2012). The wetland delineation procedures outlined in these manuals require the evaluation of on-site vegetation, soils, and hydrologic characteristics.

I reviewed the two subject, obvious, depressions, noting that they represent an extremely severe topographic change from the surrounding areas, which are predominantly forested. The slope down into the bottom of these depressions is very steep, and the actual bottoms of both depressions constitute very small areas due to that steep topography. While it should be noted that doing a wetland evaluation outside of the growing season can be somewhat less reliable than one done during the growing season, it was apparent to me that neither area represent wetlands (as was indirectly concluded, without specific reference to the subject two areas, by the original KME report when the field work was conducted at the end of the 2017 growing season). I noted no evidence of wetland hydrology within the depressions, and the dominant vegetation in them was primarily upland vegetation, including such species as bittersweet,
common buckthorn and one large silver maple in the westerly depression and species such as black cherry, white oak and red maple in the easterly depression.

Please be advised that EGLE and Orion Township have regulatory authority regarding wetland boundary location(s) and jurisdictional status of wetlands on this site. This evaluation was performed in general accordance with accepted procedures for conducting wetland determinations. Barr provides no warranty, guarantee, or other agreement in respect to the period of time for which this wetland determination will remain valid. Barr’s conclusions reflect our professional opinion based on the site conditions within the AOI observed during the site visits. Discrepancies may arise between current and future wetland determinations and delineations due to changes in vegetation and/or hydrology as the result of land use practices or other environmental factors, whether on-site or on adjacent or nearby properties. In addition, wetland delineations performed outside the growing season, from late-October until late-April, may differ from those performed at the same site during the growing season due to the presence of snow cover or frozen ground conditions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this supplemental evaluation. If you have any questions, please contact me at your convenience at 249 207 6996 or jking@barr.com.

Sincerely,

BARR ENGINEERING CO.

[Signature]

Jeffery A. King
November 10, 2017

Mr. Tim Storey
Storey Engineering Group, LLC
48264 Manchester
Macomb, Michigan 48044

Re: Wetland Evaluation
625 W Clarkston Road, Orion Township, Oakland County

Dear Mr. Storey:

We performed a wetland evaluation of the above referenced property on November 2, 2017. The intent of our evaluation was to delineate the on-site wetland boundaries and to provide a report of the character of the wetland areas within the subject parcel as well as an opinion as to the possible jurisdiction of the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) over the identified on-site wetlands.

The methods used to conduct this wetland evaluation are consistent with our understanding of the procedures and general practices used by the MDEQ. This evaluation included review of in-office information including the on-line MDEQ Wetlands Map Viewer, the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey and available aerial photography.

The MDEQ Wetlands Map Viewer Part 303 Final Wetlands Inventory shows portions of the property as having areas previously mapped as wetland as well as areas which include wetland soils (Figure 1).

Figure 1. MDEQ Wetlands Map Viewer
The Web Soil Survey (Figure 2) shows the eastern and southern areas of the property to include wetland soils which consist of the hydric soil unit (27) Houghton and Adrian mucks.
Figure 2. NRCS Web Soil Survey

Hydric soils are soils which are formed under extended periods of inundation or saturation during the growing season and typically support wetland habitats in an undrained condition. Hydric soils can also occur in non-hydric soil areas as inclusions which were too small for NRCS to accurately map.
As determined by our on-site evaluation, we identified one wetland area, Wetland A, and marked its boundary with alpha-numerically numbered pink surveyor’s ribbon, labeled A1 to A23. Figure 3 shows the approximate location of the wetland boundary. We recommend the wetland flags be surveyed to more precisely locate the wetland boundary prior to completion of site plan development.

Figure 3. Identified Wetland Areas

Wetland A is a forested wetland. Commonly observed wetland plant species included duckweed (Lemma minor), jumpseed (Persicaria virginiana), fowl mannagrass (Glyceria striata), common buckthorn (Rhamnus cathartica), American elm (Ulmus americana), green ash (Fraxinus pennsylvanica), and silver maple (Acer saccharinum).

The upland areas were a combination of abandoned homestead, fallow field, and upland woods. Commonly observed species included common plantain (Plantago major), common selfheal (Prunella vulgaris), orchard grass (Dactylis glomerata),
smooth brome grass (Bromus inermis), common milkweed (Asclepias syriaca),
garlic mustard (Alliaria petiolata), chicory (Chicorium intybus), wild carrot (Daucus
carota), tall goldenrod (Solidago altissima), Canada thistle (Cirsium arvense),
Pennsylvania sedge (Carex pen-sylvanica), blackberry (Rubus allegheniensis),
common buckthorn, Morrow’s honeysuckle (Lonicera morrowii), autumn olive
(Elaeagnus umbellata), multiflora rose (Rosa multiflora), Oriental bittersweet
(Celastrus orbiculatus), box elder (Acer negundo), red oak (Quercus rubra), white
oak (Quercus alba), black cherry (Prunus serotina), and American beech (Fagus
grandifolia).

MDEQ Jurisdiction/Regulatory Discussion
In order for the MDEQ to have regulatory authority over a wetland under Part 303
(Wetlands Protection) of 1994 PA 451, as amended, the wetland must be within 500
feet of a lake, pond, river and/or stream, have a direct surface water connection to a
lake, pond, river and/or stream, or be greater than 5 acres in size.

Wetland A is likely regulated by the MDEQ because it is greater than 5 acres in size
and appears to have a direct surface water connection to an unnamed stream,
located off-site, that flows to the south under Casemer Road. A permit must be
obtained from the MDEQ prior to conducting most filling, dredging and/or draining
activities or maintaining a use of a regulated wetland.

Please be advised the information provided in this report is a professional opinion.
The ultimate decision on wetland boundary locations and jurisdiction thereof rests
with the MDEQ and, in some cases, the Federal government. Therefore, there may
be adjustments to boundaries based upon review of a regulatory agency. An
agency determination can vary, depending on various factors including, but not
limited to, experience of the agency representative making the determination and
the season of the year. In addition, the physical characteristics of the site can
change with time, depending on the weather, vegetation patterns, drainage,
activities on adjacent parcels, or other events. Any of these factors can change the
nature/extent of wetlands on the site. Wetland evaluations performed outside the
growing season from late-October until late-April may not be consistent with the
official MDEQ wetland identification program and therefore are subject to increased
potential for change than those performed during the growing season. We
recommend the MDEQ be requested to confirm our wetland boundaries and
jurisdictional opinion.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this wetland evaluation. If you have any
questions, please contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

King & MacGregor Environmental, Inc.
James Sallee, PWS
Planned Unit Development Concept Review (2)
Ridgewood

Case Number: PC-2021-90
Address: 625 West Clarkston Road
Parcel ID: 09-15-226-006,-007, & -008
Area: 11.37 AC
Applicant: Daniel Johnson

Plan Date: 11/01/2021 rev 12/14/2021
Zoning: R-1 Single Family Residential
Reviewer: Rod Arroyo
Matt Wojciechowski

Dear Planning Commissioners:

We have completed a review of the application materials and a summary of our findings is below. Comments are provided in italics.
Project Summary
The proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) is located at the south side of Clarkston, east of Casemer Road. The 11.37-acre site is comprised of three lots with the primary access and frontage located on Clarkston Road. There are significant natural features, including standing water, wetland and woodlands, that are planned to be preserved as part of the overall development. The western portion of the site is proposed to feature 11 buildings, ranging from 4-5 units, for a total of 50 units. The proposed units would consist of 2-story units totaling 2,700 square feet. Each would have their own two car garage and rear patio area.

Existing Conditions


2. Adjacent zoning & land uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North (across Clarkston)</td>
<td>R-2 – Single Family Residential, RB Restricted business</td>
<td>Single-family Orion Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>R-1 – Single Family Residential</td>
<td>Single-family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>R-1 – Single Family Residential</td>
<td>Single-family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>R-1 – Single Family Residential</td>
<td>Single-family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY

1. **Intent.** The concept plan proposes a density (4.40 units/acre).

2. **Township Master Plan.** The Future Land Use map indicates a designation of Single Family Medium High Density for the site, the proposed density aligns with this density. This designation single-family category with a range of three to five dwelling units per acre and lot sizes in the range of 8,400 – 14,000 sq. ft. This designation corresponds to the single-family zoning districts. The Master Plan is currently undergoing a review and update.

3. **Zoning.** The proposal is more intense than the R-1 thru R-3 zoning districts and it closer in alignment with multiple family zoning standards (RM-1). For example, an 8,400 square foot lot size is roughly equivalent to a gross density of 4.1 units/acre.

4. **Open Space and preservation of natural features.** The southeastern portion of the site, which contains significant natural features, is proposed to be preserved. A tree survey for the entire site was conducted, although the applicant did not address how many trees would be saved in this development compared to a traditional layout per the single-family zoning standards. The applicant should also identify the area and amenities proposed to satisfy the 15% open space preservation requirement.

5. **Improvements in traffic patterns.** The plans show two access points; one on each end of the site fronting on Clarkston Road. A traffic study (reviewed by engineering) should be provided for review.

6. **Unified Control.** The applicant shall provide sufficient documentation of ownership or control in the form of [purchase] agreements, contracts, covenants, and/or deed restrictions that indicate that the development will be completed in its owned entirety as proposed.

7. **Density plan submittal.** The ultimate density shall be recommended by the Planning Commission and determined by the Township Board and shall be based upon the underlying zoning or a density as designated by the Master Plan.

8. **Base zoning regulations and regulatory flexibility.** The proposed project is permitted within the township’s multiple family zoning districts. The current building placement requires modifications from the established setback standards and will need to be approved by the Planning Commission and Township Board as part of the PUD process.

9. **Impact of traffic.** The applicant should address how the project was designed to minimize the impact of traffic generated by the proposed development on surrounding uses, as outlined in 30.03.C.7. Details will be reviewed by the Township Engineer.

10. **Transition areas.** It appears that the grade changes adjacent to the existing residential areas to the east, south and west of the site are more than three feet. The applicant should submit cross sections of these areas in accordance with this section.
11. **Natural features and preservation.** The applicant should verify if any animal or plant habitats of significant value exist on the site in accordance with Section 30.03 C.15. Additionally, a Tree Removal Permit will be required for this development in accordance with Section 27.12.

**PUD Review Criteria:**

A. **Intent.** A Planned Unit Development (PUD) may be applied for in any zoning district. The provisions of this section are not intended as a device for ignoring the Zoning Ordinance and specific standards set forth therein, or the planning upon which it has been based. To that end, provisions of this section are intended to result in land use development substantially consistent with the existing zoning and existing Charter Township of Orion Master Plan, with modifications and departures from generally applicable requirements made in accordance with standards provided in this section to ensure appropriate, fair, and consistent decision-making.

The concept plan proposes a density (4.40 units/acre) that aligns with the Single Family Medium High Density future land use category, which envisions R-2 or R-3 zoning. However, the density proposed is higher than what would be permitted in R-3, so it is aligned more with RM-1 density.

B. **Eligibility Criteria.** To be eligible for Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval, the applicant shall demonstrate that the following criteria will be met.

*Please see the application package submitted by the applicant (11/02/2021) for the responses provided to the criteria listed below.*

1. **Recognizable benefit.** The PUD should result in a recognizable and substantial benefit, both to the residents of the project and the overall quality of life in the Township. Recognizable benefits include:

   a. **Preservation of natural features,** specifically, but not limited to, woodlands, specimen trees, open spaces, wetlands, and hills.

   The eastern half of the site, which contain significant natural features including woodlands and wetlands, is proposed to be preserved. A tree survey for the entire site indicates that the site contains 69 landmark trees, with 12 proposed to be removed with replacement. It is unclear how this removal rate compares to a permitted development.

   b. **Preservation of historic buildings.** N/A

   c. **Improvements in traffic patterns** including unified access and conformance with the access management section of the ordinance should be applied.

   The plans show two access points along Clarkston Road that would provide for ingress and egress on the site.

   d. **Improvements in the aesthetic qualities.** Improvements in the aesthetic qualities of the development itself, such as unique site design features, extensive landscaping, and safety
path/greenway connections should be clearly delineated on the site plan so that the planning commission can review the extent of the improvements.

- The Pathway shown along Clarkston Road does not connect to any existing safety pathways, as the existing pathway is located along the north side of the Road. A designated connection to the buildings is provided with a sidewalk connection to provide for pedestrian circulation.

e. Improvements in public safety or welfare. Improvements in public safety or welfare through better water supply, sewage disposal, stormwater management, or control of air pollution and water pollution.

   The Planning Commission may wish to discuss this with the applicant.

f. High-quality architectural design.

   The Planning Commission may wish to discuss this with the applicant.

g. Provision of transitional areas.

   The application does not address this concept; the Planning Commission may wish to discuss this with the applicant.

Those benefits to the community that are concrete in nature, and therefore easily monitored, shall be listed on the plans. Benefits that shall be listed shall include, but not be limited to, historic buildings and natural features to be preserved and specific improvements in water supply, sewage disposal, and stormwater management plans and shall become part of the agreement between the Township and the applicant.

2. Density impact. The proposed type and density of use shall not result in an unreasonable increase in the need for or impact to public services, facilities, roads, and utilities in reaction to the use or uses otherwise permitted by this Ordinance and shall not place an unreasonable impact on the subject site and/or surrounding land and/or property owners and occupants and/or the natural environment.

   We defer to the township engineer in regarding to impacts related to roads, utilities and potential flooding impacts.

3. Township Master Plan. The proposed development shall be consistent with the intent and spirit of the Township Master Plan, and further its implementation. If the proposed development is not consistent with the Master Plan but there has been a change in conditions in the area in that will explain why the proposed PUD is a reasonable use of land, the Planning Commission can consider an amendment to the Master Plan and site plan approval for the proposed development in question.

   The Future Land Use map indicates a designation of Single-Family Medium High Density for the site. This designation is a single-family density category with a range of three to five dwelling
units per acre and lot sizes in the range of 8,400- to 14,000-sq. ft lots. This designation corresponds to the existing R-2 and R-3 single-family zoning districts.

4. **Economic impact.** The Planning Commission should determine that in relation to the existing zoning, the proposed development shall not result in a material negative economic impact upon surrounding properties.

5. **Guaranteed open space.** Section 30.03 B.5. states that 15% of the site shall be guaranteed open space including usable active and passive upland spaces and trails. Park-like amenities may be provided, and open space shall be equally available to all residents of the development with maintenance and ownership documentation shall be submitted.

   *The applicant shall guarantee to the satisfaction of the Township Planning Commission that all open space portions of the development will be maintained in the manner approved. It is unclear if the 15% threshold is met by the proposal; the applicant should identify the areas and amenities proposed to satisfy this requirement.*

6. **Unified control.** The proposed development shall be under single ownership and/or control, such that there is a single person or entity having proprietary responsibility for the full completion of the project.

   *The applicant shall provide sufficient documentation of ownership or control in the form of [purchase] agreements, contracts, covenants, and/or deed restrictions that indicate that the development will be completed in its owned entirety as proposed.*

C. **PUD Project Design Standards:**

1. **Location.** The subject property is R-1 and is eligible for a PUD development.

2. **N/A**

3. **Permitted Uses or Combination of Uses.** A PUD is permitted for single-family detached, attached residential dwellings, commercial uses, industrial uses and mixed-use projects

4. **Plan Submittal.** Any application for a PUD shall be accompanied by three (3) plans:

   - (1) a plan based on existing zoning at the time of application. See sheets C6.0 & C6.1
   - (2) a density plan prepared in accordance with this section See sheet C6.0
   - (3) a PUD plan. See sheet C2.0

   a. **Density Plan Density plan submittal.** The applicant shall prepare, and present to the Planning Commission for review, a density plan for the project that is consistent with State, County, and Township requirements and design criteria for a tentative preliminary plat or site condo, whichever is appropriate. The density plan shall meet all standards for lot size, lot width, setbacks, public roadway improvements and private parks, and contain an area which conceptually would provide sufficient area for stormwater detention. Lots in the density plan shall provide sufficient building envelope
size without impacting wetlands regulated by the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality. All structures, buildings, parking lots, streets, roads and driveways shall be set back twenty-five (25) feet from any wetland.

- The density plan does not appear to contain an area which could conceptually provide for sufficient stormwater runoff (engineer to comment)
- Both concept plans proposed lots that are within regulated wetland areas and could not feasibly be constructed

b. The density plan shall contain the following elements:
   1) Layout of roads and rights-of-way. **Provided**
   2) Lot lines. **Provided**
   3) Wetland boundaries, submerged lands. **Provided**
   4) Floodplains. **None shown**
   5) Lot numbers and a schedule of lot areas. **Not provided**
   6) Areas proposed for stormwater management. **Not provided**

c. **Minimum lot area.** The density plan is only used to determine allowable density for a PUD project.

   The density plan (c6.0) yields a density of 1.32 units per acre. Lot 12 was not counted toward the lot count as the buildable area shown was not consistent with the requirements of the density plan, which requires all lots have similar buildable area.

d. **Density Credit.** The Planning Commission shall review the design and determine the number of lots that could be feasibly constructed under the density plan. This number, as determined by the Planning Commission, shall be the maximum number of dwelling units allowable for the PUD project, shown on the PUD plan.

   The density plan provided, based on the minimum acceptable lot size for the existing zoning, yields a maximum density of 15 units for this site. This equates to approximately 1.3 units per acre.

e. **Overall Density.** The overall residential density shall be determined by use of the density plan using the underlying/existing zoning and corresponding lot sizes and/or the Township’s Master Plan. The applicant may propose other underlying zoning categories for the consideration of density in the chart provided.

   No zoning categories were proposed by the applicant for consideration. The applicant’s proposed density of 4.40 units per acre is consistent with the RM-1 multiple family residential district, which has a maximum density of 6.0 units per acre.

5. **Public Services.** The proposed PUD shall not exceed the capacity of existing and available public services, including utilities, public roads, police and fire protection services.

   We defer to the township engineer
6. **Base Zoning Regulations.** Unless specifically waived or modified by the Planning Commission and Township Board, all Zoning Ordinance requirements for the underlying zoning district, except for minimum lot area, and other Township regulations, shall remain in full force.

The proposed project would not be permitted in any single-family zoning districts in the Township.

7. **Impact of traffic.** The PUD shall be designed to minimize the impact of traffic generated by the proposed development on surrounding uses. In determining whether this requirement has been met, consideration shall be given to:
   a. The access to major thoroughfares.
   b. Estimated traffic to be generated by the proposed development.
   c. Proximity and relation to intersections.
   d. Adequacy of driver sight distances.
   e. Location of and access to off-street parking.
   f. Required vehicular turning movements.
   g. Provisions for pedestrian traffic.

The applicant should address these points in detail. Defer to township engineer for comment.

8. **Regulatory Flexibility.** To encourage flexibility and creativity consistent with the PUD concept, the Planning Commission may recommend, and the Township Board may grant, specific departures from the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance as a part of the approval process.

The following zoning modifications require Planning Commission and Township Board approval:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Modifications</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Permitted / required</th>
<th>Proposed PUD</th>
<th>Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front setback</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>35’</td>
<td>5’ setback variance requested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above, another zoning modification is that the number of units exceeds the underlying permitted density and attached units are proposed.

9. **Compatibility with adjacent uses.** Consideration shall be given to:
   a. The bulk, placement, and materials of construction of proposed structures.
   b. The location and screening of vehicular circulation and parking areas in relation to surrounding development.
   c. The location and screening of outdoor storage, outdoor activity or work areas, and mechanical equipment in relation to surrounding development.
   d. The hours of operation of the proposed uses.
   e. The provision of landscaping and other site amenities.

The applicant should address how the site was designed in relation to potential impacts on adjacent residential areas to the east, south and west of the site.
10. **Transition areas.** Where the PUD abuts a single-family residential district, the Planning Commission and Township Board may require a transition area. Grading within the transition area shall be minimal unless needed to provide effective buffering or accommodate drainage. If the grade change adjacent to a single-family residential area is to be varied by more than three (3) feet, the site plan shall include cross sections illustrating existing and proposed grades in relation to existing and proposed building heights. Perspective renderings from adjacent residential units are encouraged. The Planning Commission may review the proposed transition area to ensure compatibility.

The applicant is proposing tree screening, consisting of deciduous and evergreen trees, within the transition area to the abutting single-family residential districts south and west of the site. The existing trees are proposed to screen the single-family area to the east of the site. The Zoning Ordinance requires that if the grade change adjacent to a single-family residential area is to be varied by more than three feet, the site plan shall include cross sections illustrating existing and proposed grades in relation to existing and proposed building heights. The setbacks/buffering from existing residential uses to the east, south and west are not robust for such a significant change in density. The Planning Commission and Township Board may require additional screening or setbacks to ensure that the transition area provides a sufficient buffer.

11. **Architectural and site element design.** Residential facades should not be dominated by garages. Where attached garages are proposed, at least 50% of the garages should be side-entry or recessed, where the front of the garage is at least five feet behind the front line of the living portion of the principal dwelling. The intent of encouraging recessed or side entry garages is to enhance the aesthetic appearance of the development and minimize the visual impact resulting from the close clustering of units allowed under these regulations.

*Applicant should address this standard.*

12. **Access.** Direct access onto a county road or state highway shall be required to a PUD. The nearest edge of any entrance or exit drive shall be located no closer than two hundred (200) feet from any existing street or road intersection (as measured from the nearest intersection right-of-way line).

*Traffic will be reviewed by the Township Engineer.*

13. **Internal Roads.** N/A

14. **Pedestrian Circulation.** The PUD plan shall provide pedestrian access to all open space areas from all residential/development areas, connections between open space areas, public thoroughfares and connections between appropriate on-site and off-site uses. Trails within the PUD may be constructed of gravel, wood chips or other similar materials, but the Planning Commission and Township Board may require construction of an eight (8) foot wide asphalt safety path through portions of the development. Safety paths are required along all public roads, as denoted in the Master Plan and detailed in the Safety Path Ordinance No. 97.
A safety path is currently installed along the north side of Clarkston Road; however, the project proposed internal pathway does not appear to sufficiently link to the site. The proposed pathway on the south side of Clarkston Road along the project frontage does not have any connections the existing pathway network.

15. Natural Features. The development has been designed to preserve natural features, specifically woodlands, around much of the perimeter of the site and the northern portion.

The applicant should verify if any animal or plant habitats of significant value exist on the site in accordance with Section 30.03 C.15. Additionally, a Tree Removal Permit will be required for this development in accordance with Section 27.12. A preliminary woodland assessment was submitted indicating regulated wetland and landmark trees are present on the site.

16. Existing Structures. All existing structures are proposed to be removed

17. Additional Considerations. The Planning Commission shall take into account, in considering approval or denial of a particular project, the following considerations, as the same may be relevant to a particular project: drainage and utility design; underground installation of utilities; insulating the pedestrian circulation system from vehicular thoroughfares and ways; achievement of an integrated development with respect to signage, lighting, landscaping and building materials; and noise reduction and visual screening of mechanical equipment.

D. Not applicable – no commercial proposed

E. Optional Provisions for Exemplary Projects The Planning Commission and Township Board may allow an exemplary Planned Unit Development (PUD) to include one (1) or more of the following optional provisions. In order to qualify for an optional provision, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission and Township Board, that the proposed project exceeds the minimum standards for PUD eligibility under Section 30.03 (B).

In order to qualify for development under the optional provisions of this section, architectural standards shall be subject to review by the Planning Commission and Township Board. Buildings shall be harmonious with adjacent uses in terms of texture, materials, roof lines and mass, but there shall be a variation of front facade depth and roof lines to avoid monotony. Building elevations shall be required for all structures.

1. Density Credit. A variable density credit may be allowed at the discretion of the Planning Commission and Township Board, based upon a demonstration by the applicant of design excellence in the PUD. Projects qualifying for a density credit shall include no less than two (2) of the following elements (amended 05.18.09). The items in bold are clearly met by the proposal; others may be met subject to additional review and information:

a. High level of clustered development, where at least twenty percent (20%) of the PUD is common usable open space.

b. Providing perimeter transition areas or greenbelts around all sides of the development that are at least one hundred (100) feet in depth.
c. The proposed plan is designed to enhance surface water quality and ground water quality.

d. Provisions and design that preserve natural features.

e. Donation or contribution of land or amenities that represent significant community benefit.

f. Other similar elements as determined by the Planning Commission and Township Board.

The Planning Commission should consider which of these elements apply. We note that open space exceeds 20% and natural features are preserved (two of the required elements).

F. Project Standards. In considering any application for approval of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) plan, the Planning Commission and Township Board shall make their determinations on the basis of the standards for site plan approval set forth in Section 30.01, Site Plan Review, as well as the following standards and requirements:

1. **Compliance with the PUD Concept.** The overall design and land uses proposed in connection with a PUD plan shall be consistent with the intent of the PUD concept, as well as with specific design standards set forth herein.

2. **Compatibility with Adjacent Uses.** The proposed PUD plan shall set forth in detail, all specifications with respect to height, setbacks, density, parking, circulation, landscaping, views, and other design features that exhibit due regard for the relationship of the development to surrounding properties, the character of the site, and the land uses. In determining whether this requirement has been met, consideration shall be given to:

   a) The bulk, placement, and materials of construction for the proposed structures.

   b) Pedestrian and vehicular circulation.

   c) The location and screening of vehicular use or parking areas.

   d) The provision of landscaping and other site amenities.

3. **Impact of Traffic.** The proposed PUD shall be designed to minimize the impact of traffic generated by the PUD on surrounding uses.

4. **Protection of Natural Environment.** The proposed PUD shall be protective of the natural environment. It shall comply with all applicable environmental protection laws and regulations.

5. **Compliance with Applicable Regulations.** The proposed PUD shall comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations.
6. **Township Master Plan.** The proposed PUD shall be consistent with, and further the implementation of, the Township Master Plan. If the proposed PUD is not consistent with the Master Plan, the Planning Commission and Township Board shall consider reasons for deviating from the Master Plan. This could include one (1) or more of the following:

   a) Changes in surrounding land use or zoning.
   b) Changes in infrastructure, such as roads, sewers, etc.
   c) Community benefit.
   d) Design excellence.

**Next Steps**

**Planning Commission Action.** Following the public hearing, or at a subsequent Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission shall review the Concept Plan and shall take one of the following actions:

1) **Approval.** Upon finding that the Concept Plan meets the criteria set forth in the intent and this section, the Planning Commission shall make a recommendation regarding the Concept Plan to the Township Board. Approval by the Township Board shall constitute approval of the uses, density, and design concept as shown on the Concept Plan and shall confer upon the applicant the right to proceed to preparation of the Final Plan. A recommendation of approval of the Concept Plan by the Planning Commission shall not bind the Township Board to approval of the Final Plan submittals.

2) **Approval with Changes or Conditions.** The Planning Commission may recommend conditional approval to the Township Board, subject to modifications as performed by the applicant.

3) **Postponement.** Upon finding that the Concept Plan does not meet the criteria set forth in the intent of this section, but could meet such criteria if revised, the Planning Commission may recommend to postpone action to the Township Board until a revised Concept Plan is submitted.

4) **Denial.** Upon finding that the Concept Plan does not meet the criteria set forth in the intent of this section, the Planning Commission shall recommend denial of the Concept Plan to the Township Board.

5) **Request Changes.** If the Planning Commission request changes, the applicant shall submit the revised drawings and/or information within the time frame allotted. Failure to submit the revised plans and/or information within the requisite time frame shall void the request.
Respectfully,

Giffels Webster

Rodney L. Arroyo, AICP
Partner

Matt Wojciechowski, AICP
Senior Planner
December 15, 2021

Scott Reynolds, Planning Commission Chairperson
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION
2525 Joslyn Road
Lake Orion, MI 48360

RE:  Ridgewood PUD, PC-2021-90
     Concept PUD Review #2

Received: December 14, 2021, by Orion Township

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

We have completed our review of the Ridgewood Concept PUD plan set. The plans were prepared by Washtenaw Engineering, Hobbs & Black Architects and Allen Design, and were reviewed with respect to the Township’s Zoning Ordinance, No. 78, Stormwater Management and Soil Erosion & Sedimentation Control Ordinance, No. 139, and the Township’s Engineering Standards.

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:
The site is located east of Hemingway Rd. on the south side of Clarkston Rd. within the northeast 1/4 of Sections 15 of the Charter Township of Orion. The site consists of three parcels all zoned Single Family Residential (R-1). The site is bound by parcels on the west, south and east zoned Single Family Residential (R-1) and parcels to the north zoned Single Family Residential (R-2) and Restricted Business (RB).

The existing site is 11.38 acres in total. The site used to contain a single-family residence located near the center of the site with a detached garage and drive to Clarkston Road. The applicant is proposing (5) four-plex 2-story townhomes and (6) 5-plex 2-story townhomes for a total of 50 units. Each unit is approximately 3,000 square-feet in size. The eastern two-thirds of the site is heavily wooded. The existing site drains to the southeast towards an existing wetland in the southeast corner. There are also two large depressions located in the northeast portion of the site. These depressions have been re-reviewed on 12/13/2021 by the applicant and confirmed they are not wetlands. The wetland in the southeast corner is noted to have been flagged by King & MacGregor in 2017. A copy of the delineation report has been provided for review. The applicant is proposing to preserve the approximate 1.8 acres of on-site wetlands and not impact the associated 25-foot wetland buffer.

DENSITY PLAN:
One (1) density plan was provided using the underlying Single Family Residential (R-1) zoning. The plan has been revised to be based on 15 lots located off two dead end cul-de-sacs with no wetland impacts. Adequate room has been set aside for stormwater management. The building envelopes are primarily located outside of the existing standing water/existing wetland and appear to be feasible from a permitting standpoint.
**WATER MAIN & SANITARY SEWER:**
There is existing 12-inch water main located along the south side of Clarkston Road. The applicant has indicated extending 8-inch water main through the site and looping back to Clarkston Road. Per the Orion Township water model, there is sufficient capacity to serve the development.

There is existing 8-inch gravity sanitary sewer located along the north side of Clarkston Rd that runs east toward an existing downstream pump station opposite Walloon Way. The existing 8-inch sewer is approximately 8-feet deep and therefore too shallow to service the site via-gravity. The applicant has therefore proposed to construct a lift station towards the southwest end of the site. The lift station would collect the sewage from the development and pump north through a forcemain and connect to the existing 8-inch sewer in Clarkston Road. Improvements to the existing downstream pump station will likely be required due to limited existing capacity available. Those improvements would be the responsibility of the applicant. The applicant has included a note on the plans acknowledging this requirement. Aside from these downstream pump station improvements, there is sufficient capacity to serve the development per the Orion Township sewer model.

A franchise utility easement will need to be included in the Final PUD plans. Note the franchise utility easement cannot overlap with the required easements for water main and sanitary sewer. Preliminary water main and sanitary sewer basis of design calculations shall be provided at Final PUD.

**STORMWATER MANAGEMENT:**
The existing site drains towards the southeast to an existing wetland complex. These wetlands appear to be regulated by EGLE due to size.

The proposed PUD shows two sediment forebays and a detention basin. Preliminary detention calculations following the new Orion Township design requirements were provided and appear acceptable. If infiltration will be proposed, a geotechnical investigation will be required at Final PUD to confirm the suitability of the existing soils.

**TRAFFIC & CIRCULATION:**
There are two proposed entrances into the site from Clarkston Road. The approaches will require approval from RCOC. It appears the Orion Township Fire Apparatus can easily navigate through the entire site. The applicant is proposing to construct a 27’ wide back-to-back road with 2.5’ curb and gutter per township standards, a 5’ wide sidewalk along both sides of the street and a 5’ sidewalk meandering along the edge of the wetland buffer. In addition, the plans show the required 8’ wide safety path along the Clarkston Road frontage.

The plans currently include a Trip Generation table to show the site is below the threshold for a full Traffic Impact Study. As required by Township ordinance, these new trips have been calculated using one standard deviation over average trip rates.

It is our recommendation that a left turn passing lane be provided for WB Clarkston Road at both the site access points. The applicant has added a note on the plans stating they will undertake a warrant analysis during Final PUD which will need to be submitted to both Orion Township and RCOC for review.

The westerly drive approach has been shifted to be aligned with Evan Court as requested to avoid conflicting left hand turns. The eastern street offset between its intersection at Clarkston Road and Merritt Ave is sufficient at 237 feet which exceeds the required 200 feet.

The design provided several pedestrian facilities within the development. But did not provide sufficient crossing opportunities. There should be a crossing near the horizontal curve in the eastern part of the development. The crosswalk located in the T-intersection should be repositioned to provide right angle approaches to the street being crossed, not the angled approach being depicted. These changes can be provided at Final PUD.
At Final PUD, please confirm the centerline radius for the roadway curvature in the PUD plan meet RCOC requirements. In addition, the typical dimensions for the various buildings from garage door to sidewalk should be provided to confirm vehicles parked in the driveways do not block the sidewalk.

At Final PUD, typical dimensions of the parking stalls should be shown in the design plans to demonstrate that they are consistent with Township Ordinance Requirements. If parking car bumpers can overhang the sidewalk, then walk must be 7 ft wide minimum. In addition, each parking stall grouping should have at least one handicap parking stall.

**PAVING & GRADING:**
Existing grades on site were provided via 2-foot contours. The site reaches an elevation of 1016 in the northwest corner of the site and falls towards the southeast to an elevation of 987 in the wetlands. There are also two depressions located in the northeast corner of the site that vary from a high of 1018 to a low of 990. Proposed grades are shown via 2-foot contours and finish grades of the townhomes and appear acceptable. Detailed grading will be required at Final PUD to ensure the site maintains existing drainage patterns and that Township slope requirements are being met in paved areas as well as green space. Maximum recommended slope for green space is 1:4. Drive aisles are to remain under 6% and parking areas are to remain under 4%. All sidewalks and pathway must be ADA compliant.

**NATURAL FEATURES:**
**WOODLANDS**
The eastern two-thirds of the site is heavily wooded. A tree survey was provided including landmark trees and replacement tree calculations.

**WETLANDS**
The plans indicate the presence of approximately 1.8 acres of wetlands on-site. The wetlands were flagged by King and MacGregor back in 2017. A copy of the wetland report has been provided for cursory review. The proposed PUD plan also includes the required 25-foot wetland buffer. Per the current plan, there will be no impacts to the wetlands or buffer.

As noted above, the applicant has verified that the two depressions located in the northeast portion of the site are not wetland areas subject to Orion Township wetland ordinance.

**LANDSCAPING:**
Landscaping plantings and trees were included on the PUD plan sheet. It is unclear at this time whether the trees and plantings are in proximity of the water main and sanitary sewer for the site, as those utilities were not included in the plans. A landscape plan is required at Final PUD. Utilities shall be shown in gray on the landscape plan so that the separation between trees and utilities can be assessed.

**CONCLUSION:**
In our opinion, the Concept PUD is in substantial compliance with the Township’s ordinances and engineering standards.

Please feel free to contact us with any questions at (248) 751-3100 or mark.landis@ohm-advisors.com.
Sincerely,

**OHM Advisors**

Joe Lehman, PE  
Project Engineer

Mark A. Landis, PE  
Project Manager

cc:  
Chris Barnett, Township Supervisor  
David Goodloe, Building Official  
Jeff Stout, Director of Public Services  
Tammy Girling, Director of Planning and Zoning  
Lynn Harrison, Planning and Zoning Coordinator  
Jeff Williams, Township Fire Marshal  
Bill Basigkow, Water and Sewer Superintendent  
Rod Arroyo, Township Planning Consultant  
Daniel Johnson, In-site, LLC  
Joseph Maynard, Washtenaw Engineering  
Fale
To: Planning Commission/Planning & Zoning Director  
From: Jeff Williams, Fire Marshal  
Re: PC-2021-90, Ridgewood PUD Concept Plan, 2nd Review  
Date: 12/29/2021

The Orion Township Fire Department has completed its review of Application PC-2021-90 for the limited purpose of compliance with Charter Township of Orion Ordinance’s, Michigan Building Code, and all applicable Fire Codes.

Based upon the application and documentation provided, the Fire Department has no concerns at this time regarding the concept plan.

If there are any questions, the Fire Department may be reached at 248-391-0304 ext. 2004.

Sincerely,

Jeff Williams  
Jeff Williams, Fire Marshal  
Orion Township Fire Department
Dear Tammy,

The Department of Public Services has reviewed the above-mentioned project and has no issues or concerns at this time.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeffery T. Stout
Director
Department of Public Services
To: Planning Commission  
RE: PPC-21-90  
12/30/2021

A site plan review has been completed by the building department for PPC-21-90.

The Building Department has the following recommendation:

☐ Approved
☐ Approved with conditions (See below)
☐ Not approved (See below)

Comments:

If you have any questions feel free to contact me at 248-391-0304. Ext 6001

Sincerely,

David Goodloe

Building Official
Orion Township Building Dept.
DGOODLOE@ORIONTOWNSHIP.ORG
November 22, 2021

IN-SITE LLC
Attn: Daniel Johnson
3454 Ridgeline Drive
Arbor, MI 48105

RE: R.C.O.C. PRELIMINARY PLAN REVIEW 21P0041
LOCATION: CLARKSTON RD, ORION TOWNSHIP
PROJECT NAME: RIDGEWOOD PUD

Dear Mr. Johnson:

At your request, the Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC) has completed a preliminary review for the above referenced project. Enclosed you will find one set of plans with our comments in red and green. All comments are for conceptual purpose only and should be incorporated into detailed construction plans. Below you will find a listing of the comments generated by the RCOC review:

A) The RCOC Master ROW Plan indicates a 60-foot wide half width ROW for Clarkston Rd. The existing ROW is shown to be 33-foot wide half width. Please contact Right-of-Way Department, at (248) 645-2000 to discuss dedicating the ROW or establishing a dedicated highway easement.

B) A Left Turn warrant analysis for both entries off of Clarkston Rd should be submitted to RCOC. analysis shall include supporting documentation. Also, it is preferred that the western approach to be aligned with Fairlidge St.

C) Remove or relocate all fixed objects prior to excavation. Fixed objects shall be no nearer than 5 feet from back of curb, or 12 feet from lane line.

D) Driveway must have sufficient corner sight distance (see enclosed RCOC policy).

E) Any pedestrian facilities shall be constructed in accordance with current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) guidelines.

F) Pavement cross section shall consist of a minimum 2 inches of MDOT 5E HMA, over 3 inches of 4E, over 4 inches of 3E, or 9 inches of MDOT 35-P concrete, with epoxy coated rebar lane and curb ties over a suitable base, as determined in the field by RCOC.

G) All drive approaches should include a detail M curb line to provide controlled drainage across the driveway.

H) The road Right of way shall be graded and ditched to provide positive roadside drainage.

I) Excavations within a 1:1 influence of the roadway will require MDOT Class II backfill compacted to 95% maximum density.
Daniel Johnson  
November 22, 2021  
Page 2

Once the comments above are addressed, plans should be submitted to this office with completed RCOC permit application(s) Form 64a, signed by the owner (or his agent), three sets of plans (per application) and the appropriate application fee(s).

All future correspondence related to the above referenced project will be sent to the address provided by the applicant. Separate applications will be required for:

a) Drive approaches and road improvements  
b) Utility connections

Upon receipt of the appropriate application packet, RCOC will provide a more detailed review. Please contact this office at (248) 858-4835 if you have any questions, or if we may be of further assistance.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Simon Yousif, P.E.  
Permit Review Engineer  
Department of Customer Services

SS/mac  
Enclosure
November 5, 2021

Lynn Harrison
Orion Township
Planning & Zoning
2525 Joslyn Road
Lake Orion, MI 48360

Reference:  Ridgewood PUD – CAMS #202100898
Part of the NE ¼ of Section 15, Orion Township

Dear Ms. Harrison,

This office has received one set of plans for the Ridgewood PUD Project to be developed in the Northeast
¼ of Section 15, Orion Township.

Our stormwater system review indicates that the proposed project has no direct involvement with any
legally established County Drain under the jurisdiction of this office. Therefore, a storm drainage permit
will not be required from this office.

The water system is operated and maintained by Orion Township and plans must be submitted to Orion
Township for review.

The sanitary sewer is within the Clinton-Oakland Sewage Disposal System. Any proposed sewers of 8" or
larger may require a permit through this office.

Please note that all applicable permits and approvals from federal, state or local authorities, public utilities
and private property owners must be obtained.

Any related earth disruption must conform to applicable requirements of Part 91, Soil Erosion and
Sedimentation Control of the Natural Resource and Environmental Protection Act, Act 451 of the Public
Acts of 1994. An application should be made to Orion Township for the required soil erosion permit.

If there are any questions regarding this matter, please contact Dan Butkus at 248-897-2744.

Sincerely,

Brian Bennett, P.E.
Civil Engineer III
Ridgewood Properties

A site walk was completed on November 15th at approximately 5:15pm.

The vacant and undeveloped parcel(s) appears to have been had some residential structures previously, but have since been removed. Portions of the parcel are heavily wooded with significant grade variation. It was not clear at the time of the site walk if a tree survey has been performed or if any existing trees are considered legacy trees per the township ordinance.

The property is primarily bordered by residential properties. The northern border appears to be shared with the previous auction gallery site.

Scott Reynolds
APPLICATION FOR A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

Case Number PC-2021-90

*PROOF OF OWNERSHIP MUST BE INCLUDED IN THE APPLICATION*
(Acceptable documentation includes: Warranty Deed, Quit Claim Deed, Land Contract, and Option to Purchase with a Copy of the Warranty Deed. If the applicant is not the property owner, then written authorization from the property owner must be included.)

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

The following application must be completed (incomplete applications will be returned to the petitioner) and filed with the Township at least four (4) weeks prior to a scheduled Planning Commission meeting in order to initiate a request for PUD Approval. Regular meetings of the Planning Commission are held on the first and third Wednesday of each month at 7:00 p.m. at the Orion Township Hall, 2525 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion.

Date November 1, 2021 Project Name Ridgewood

Applicants Name IN-SITE LLC (Daniel Johnson - contact person)

Applicants Address 3454 Ridgeline Drive

City Ann Arbor State Michigan Zip Code 48105

Phone# 847-476-9944 Fax # E-Mail djohnson@in-site.us.com

Property Owner Name JMF Properties LLC

Property Owner Address 1700 West Big Beaver Road

Phone# 248-602-2220 Fax # 248-220-4636 E-Mail michael@fairview.com

Name of Firm/Individual who Prepared the plan Washtenaw Engineering Co.

Address 3526 W Liberty Road - Suite 400, Ann Arbor, MI 48103

Phone# (734) 761-8800 Fax # (734) 761-9530 E-Mail jkm@wengco.com

*Please Indicate Above The Contact Person For The Proposed Project*
Property Description:
Location or Address of the Property  625 West Clarkston Road
Side of Street Walloon Way Nearest Cross Streets: Hemingway Road
Sidwell Number(s) 0-09-15-226-006 0-09-15-226-007 0-09-15-226-008
Total Acreage 11.37
Subdivision Name (if applicable)
Frontage (in feet): 749.16' Depth (in feet) 660.41'(average)
*Please Attach to the Application a Complete Legal Description of the Subject Property

Zoning Classification:
Subject Property R-1 (existing) PUD (proposed)

Adjacent Properties:
North R-2 South R-1
East R-1 West R-1

Comprehensive Statement of Intent:
Give a Detailed Description of the Proposed Development (Refer to Section 30.03 (A) of the Orion Township Zoning Ordinance) Please Indicate the Number and Size of the Buildings or Units Being Proposed:

Please refer to Attachment
ATTACHMENT

Comprehensive Statement of Intent

- The proposed Project contemplates 52 townhome style units in a Cluster Plan development with a PUD zoning designation in order to preserve many of the existing natural features on the property. The units proposed will be 2 story, 2,700 sq. ft. include a 2-car garage and situated in 12 buildings as indicated on the Concept Plan.

- The property includes a wetlands area of approximately 2 acres and over 900 trees including approximately 69 that would be considered landmark.

- The use of the Cluster Plan development approach and PUD zoning affords the opportunity to preserve the significant natural features on the property and enhance the environmental quality of the development and neighboring area.

- By locating the development envelope primarily on the west side of the property, the Concept Plan provides for the opportunity to preserve many of the site’s natural features including the wetlands area and significant number of landmark trees.

- The Concept Plan proposes to incorporate “Density Credit” features outlined in the Township Ordinance including the following:
  
a. A high level of clustered development, where at least twenty percent (20%) of the PUD is common usable open space.
    ✓ (The Concept Plan contemplates approximately 36.4% usable open space and over 59% including all open space areas)

b. The proposed plan is designated to enhance surface water quality and ground water quality.
    ✓ (The Concept Plan contemplates the use of roof water infiltration and rain gardens for each unit to enhance storm water management)

c. Provisions and design that preserve natural features.
    ✓ (The Concept Plan contemplates the preservation of the wetlands, a significant number of trees including many landmark trees, will plant nearly 500 new trees and contribute to the Township Tree Fund)

d. Donation or contribution of land or amenities that represent significant community benefit.
   ✓ (The Concept Plan contemplates the creation of a land conservation easement to preserve the wetlands area in perpetuity)
   ✓ (The Concept Plan contemplates the contribution of approximately .57 acre for additional Right of Way area to the benefit of the community)

- The proposed Project and Concept Plan proposes to include the following:
  - Total Net Property (not including ROW designation) = 10.35 acres
  - Usable Open Space = 3.75 acres (36.3%)
  - Other Open Space = 2.44 acres (23.6%) (wetlands and detention area)
  - Total Open Space = 6.19 acres (59.9%)
  - Proposed units per acre (net property) = 5.02
  - Proposed building envelopes per acre (net property) = 0.86
- The proposed Project would result in benefits to the user residents and the community by the preservation of a significant portion of the existing natural features on the property including wetlands and woodlands areas. The proposed storm water management details would enhance the environmental quality of the local community area as well as the proposed Project.

- The benefits gained using a cluster development and PUD flexibility would unlikely be achieved in a normal subdivision configuration where traditional single family lot configurations would imply a more significant impact on the natural features of the property.

- The proposed cluster type development and relative density of 5.02 units per acre would not under normal circumstances be considered a negative and would not have a material negative impact on public services.

- The proposed Project would not place an unreasonable burden on the subject land or property owners. The PUD would allow for flexibility to preserve natural features to a greater degree and achieve over 59% open space on the property.

- The proposed Project would not have an unreasonable negative impact upon the surrounding properties in relation to the economic impact.

- There is an existing run down vacant residential structure on the property that would be removed.

- The proposed project would provide a positive economic impact to the community through construction job creation and property tax revenue.

- The proposed project would provide new residential home ownership opportunities in Orion Township to attract new residents and retain existing residents desiring to transition from a rental to home ownership.
Eligibility Standards for PUD Eligibility Approval:
Refer to Section 30.03 (B) of the Orion Township Zoning Ordinance. Please fill out the attachment.

****4 Sets Of The Site/PUD Plan Prepared In Accordance With The Orion Township Zoning Ordinance #78, Section 30.03, Section 30.01 And Any Other Applicable Township Ordinance Requirements Must Be Included As Part Of The Application. Applicable Planning Commission Review Fees Included In Ordinance #41 Are Also Required When Submitting For PUD Approval. Please Note That Section 30.03(C)4 Also Requires A Density-Parallel Plan As Part Of The Application****

I hereby submit this application for PUD Approval, pursuant to the provisions of the Orion Township Zoning Ordinance, Ordinance #78, Section 30.03 and Section 30.01 and any other applicable Township Ordinance requirements. In support of the permit application, I hereby certify that the information provided herein is accurate and the application that has been provided is complete. As the property owner (or having been granted permission to represent the owner as to this application) and on behalf of all owners of this property, I hereby grant the Planning Commission members and Township Building Department staff permission to perform a site walk on the property, without prior notification, as is deemed necessary.

[Signature]
Signature of Applicant  
November 1, 2021  
Date

****Please Attach The Street Name Approval Form To The Application****
Section 30.03 (B)

Please provide more than just a “yes” or “no” answer. Use additional sheets of paper if necessary.

1. How will a PUD approval result in a recognizable and substantial benefit to the ultimate users of the project and the community?

The proposed project would result in benefits to the users, residents and the community by the preservation of significant portion of the existing natural features on the property including wetlands and woodland areas. The proposed storm water management system would enhance the environmental quality of the local community area as well as the proposed project.

2. Would such benefit otherwise be unfeasible or unlikely to be achieved?

The benefits gained by the use of a cluster development and PUD designation would unlikely be achieved in a normal subdivision configuration where the traditional lot configurations would or could imply a more significant impact on the natural features of the property. The project would remove the dated existing structures that exist on the property and improve the Clarkston Road appearance in that regard.

3. Will the proposed type and density of use result in a material increase in the use of public services, facilities and utilities, in relation to what would be permitted if the property were developed without using the PUD?

The proposed cluster type development and relative density of 5.02 units per acre would not under normal circumstances be considered a negative relative to average multi-family density ratios and would not have a material negative impact on public services.

The improved density on the property would contribute to the property tax base which supports the public services in the Township.

4. Will the proposed PUD place an unreasonable burden upon the subject and/or surrounding land and/or property owners and occupants/or the natural features?

The proposed PUD project would not place an unreasonable burden on the subject land or property owners. The PUD would allow for the flexibility to preserve natural features to a greater degree and achieve over 59% open space on the property.
5. Will the proposed development be consistent with the intent and spirit of the Master Plan and community?
   The proposed PUD project would be consistent with the intent and spirit of the Master Plan and community in that it is a residential use (surrounded by other residential uses) with a relative density of 5.02 units per acre and a proposed open space area of 59.9%.
   The proposed PUD project would provide residential home ownership opportunities in Orion Township to attract new residents and retain existing residents desiring to transition from rental to home ownership.

6. Will the proposed PUD result in an unreasonable negative economic impact upon surrounding properties in relation to the economic impact that would occur from a more traditional development?
   The proposed PUD project would not have an unreasonable negative impact upon the surrounding properties in relation to the economic impact and would be similar in overall range to the current zoning. There is an existing run down vacant residential structure on the property that would be demolished and the proposed project would upon completion enhance the economic impact on the community through tax base improvements and the creation of construction jobs.

7. Does the proposed PUD contain at least as much usable open space as would be required in the Ordinance for the most dominant use in the development?
   The proposed PUD project will contain 36.3% usable open space and will allow for park like site amenities including a gazebo, seating areas and pedestrian walking path in order for the residents of the project to enjoy the site's natural features, exercise or walk pets. The proposes open space would compare favorably with the guaranteed open space criteria of 15% for residential land use as referenced in the ordinance.

8. Is the proposed PUD under single ownership or control such that there is a single person or entity having responsibility for completing the project with this Ordinance?
   Yes
Section 30.03 (C): Project Design Standards

1. Which of the following requirements established in the underlying district (first column), or other applicable sections of the Ordinance will need to be waived in order to grant PUD approval? Insert the proposed amount in the second column. Information should be listed separately for each phase of the development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulations</th>
<th>PUD Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size</td>
<td>14,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Floor Area</td>
<td>1,320 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>40'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
<td>10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Section 27.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading</td>
<td>Section 27.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>Section 27.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Section 27.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setback For Side Yard Entry Garage</td>
<td>30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Does the project have adequate:

   - Perimeter setback and berming? Yes
   - Thoroughfare design? Yes
   - Drainage design? Yes
   - Utility design? Yes
   - underground utilities? Yes
   - Insulation of the pedestrian circulation system from vehicular thoroughfares and ways? Yes
   - Achievement of an integrated development with respect to signage, lighting, landscaping and building materials? Yes
   - Noise reduction and visual screening mechanisms (particularly where nonresidential uses adjoin off-site residentially zoned property)? Yes
A PART OF THE NORTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 15, T4N, R10E,
ORION TOWNSHIP
OAKLAND COUNTY, MICHIGAN
FOR:
IN-SITE LLC
3454 RIDGELINE DR
ANN ARBOR, 48105
PH: (847) 476-9944

RIDGEGROUD
CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN
CLUSTERED RESIDENTIAL
PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

TAX ID'S: O-09-15-226-006
O-09-15-226-007
O-09-15-226-008

RECEIVED
December 14, 2021
Orion Township Planning & Zoning

The Proposed Project contemplates a Cluster Plan development of 50 Townhouse units located in 11 building envelopes per acre (net property) = 0.21

The proposed development is located on the south side of West Clarkston Road and extends to the west.

The proposed project would not have an unreasonable negative impact upon the surrounding properties in any circumstances be considered a negative and would not have a material negative impact on public services.

The benefits gained by the use of a clustered development and PUD flexibility would differently be achieved in a normal subdivision configuration where traditional single family lot configurations would imply a more significant impact on the natural features of the property. 

The benefits gained by the use of a cluster development and PUD flexibility would differently be achieved in a normal subdivision configuration where traditional single family lot configurations would imply a more significant impact on the natural features of the property. 

The proposed PUD project would result in benefits for the user residents and the community by the preservation of the wetlands area and existing trees including many landmark features. 

The proposed PUD project would provide a positive economic impact to the community through construction job creation and property tax revenue and provide new residential home ownership opportunities in Orion Township in the west.

The proposed project would retain existing natural features in perpetuity. 

The property includes a wetlands area of approximately 2 acres and over 900 trees including approximately 69 landmark designated.

§ The Concept Plan proposes to include the following:

- The wetlands area and existing trees will be preserved in perpetuity.

- Provisions and design that preserve natural features.

- Grouped in pods of four and five units. The proposed development is best classified by ITE Land Use Category I-2. 

- The conceptual Plan attempts to incorporate "density Credit" features outlined in the Township Ordinance including a "North Shore" second story addition within a single floor-up to 10 dwelling units, a "Central" a single floor-up to a multi-family housing including apartments, townhouses, and condominiums located in.

- For a multifamily development with 50 dwelling units, the estimated trip generation would be of single-family residences in all directions, with more commercial and retail uses on it, the site does not negatively impact adjacent street traffic volumes during either the weekday AM or PM peak hours. Additionally, the surrounding land uses are grouped in pods of four and five units. The proposed development is best classified by ITE Land Use Category I-2.
Landscape Summary

General Landscaping

Net Site Area
450,580 s.f.

Less Wetland and Buffer
98,707 s.f.

Less Impervious Area
180,709 s.f.

Net Site Area
171,161 s.f.

Trees Required
57 Trees (171,161 / 3,000)

Trees Provided
57 Trees

Greenbelt - West and South

Greenbelt Length
987 l.f. (Net Wetland and Buffer)

Trees Required
32.9 Trees (987 / 30')

Trees Provided
33 Trees (15 Existing)

Greenbelt - Clarkston Road

Greenbelt Length
749 l.f.

Trees Required
24.9 Trees (749 / 30')

Trees Provided
25 Trees (7 Existing)

Street Trees

Street Frontage
2,820 l.f.

Street Trees Required
56.4 Trees (2,820 / 50)

Street Trees Provided
57 Trees

Woodland Replacement

Total Replacement Required
148 Trees, 2.0" Deciduous or 6' Evergreen

Trees Provided
50 Trees, 2.0" Deciduous or 6' Evergreen

Trees Paid into Tree Fund
98 Trees
Tree Protection Fencing
See Sheet L-4 for Detail

© 2021 Allen Design L.L.C.
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### Tree List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree #</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Woodland Summary**

- **Total Trees**: 993 Trees
- **Total Trees Removed**: 644 Trees
- **Trees Preserved**: 349 Trees (35.1%)
- **Regulated Trees Removed**: 140 Trees
- **Regulated Trees Replacement**: 140 Trees
- **Landmark DBH Removed**: 34 Trees (341"
- **Landmark Replacement Required**: 114 Trees (341 x 3)
- **Total Replacement Required**: 140 Trees, 2.0" Deciduous or 6' Evergreen
- **114 Trees, 3.0" Deciduous or 8' Evergreen**

**Legend**

- **Building**: Tree is Located within a Building Envelope and is Exempt.
- **Detention**: Tree is Located within a Detention Pond and is Exempt.
- **Drive**: Tree is Located within a Driveway and is Exempt.
- **EX**: Tree Recommended for Replacement Exemption per Ordinance Sec. 27.12(D)8
- **EX-DED**: Tree has Been Identified as being Infected with Dutch Elm Disease.
- **Landmark**: Tree Designated at Landmark Status per Ordinance Sec. 27.12(L)
- **Landmark EX**: Tree Recommended for Replacement Exemption due to Very Poor or Dead Condition.
- **ROW**: Tree is Located within a Right of Way and is Exempt.
- **Street**: Tree is Located within a Street and is Exempt.
- **Utility**: Tree is Located within a Utility and is Exempt.

Tree Inventory Performed by Mike's Tree Surgeons, Inc.
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TREE STAKING DETAIL

2"-3" WIDE BELT-LIKE NYLON OR PLASTIC STRAPS.

STAKING/GUYING LOCATION

STAKE AS SPECIFIED 1 PER TREE

PERENNIAL PLANTING DETAIL

2" SHREDDED BARK
METAL EDGING
PUDDING DICE
PLANTING MIXTURE AS SPECIFIED

DECIDUOUS TREE PLANTING DETAIL

EVERGREEN TREE PLANTING DETAIL

TREE PROTECTION DETAIL

1. Tree shall be staked with "T" stakes and burlap collar. Baskets and roots shall be covered with 3" shredded hardwood bark. Basket ends shall be cut flush. Stirring shall be provided as necessary. Baskets shall be placed within 1' of the tree trunk.
2. Topsoil shall be placed 1' above grade. Soil shall be used to form "saucer." Non-biodegradable materials that are unsightly or could cause problems shall be removed.
3. Pots shall be cut to release roots at least 3" from root flare. Supports shall be removed from all containers.
4. Containers shall be removed completely from the roots of the plant.
5. Plants shall be staked at the first branch and shall be guaranteed to be true to name, free from physical damage and wind burn.
6. Plants shall be north midwest American region grown, No. 1 grade plant materials, except on slopes greater than 3:1 oriented to slope. All plants shall be guaranteed to be true to name, free from physical damage and wind burn. All trees must be staked, fertilized and mulched and shall be guaranteed.
7. Through a protected area, the swales need to be hand dug. Machinery of any kind is prohibited.
8. All landscape areas shall be provided with an underground automatic irrigation system. The Landscape Contractor shall seed and mulch or sod (as indicated on plans) the plans and field conditions prior to installation. The Landscape Contractor shall be responsible for maintaining all plant materials.
9. All planting shall be removed per planting details located on the plans.
10. The Landscape Contractor shall be responsible for all work shown on the plans.
11. No removal of vegetation from the ground up without permission from the proper reviewing authority, including the Woodlands Review Board.
12. Regulated woodland or regulated trees adjacent to the property are also required to be protected whether or not they are shown on the plans.
13. Landscape architect shall be notified in writing of any discrepancies between landscape drawings and specifications. The Landscape Contractor shall be responsible for all work shown on the plans and field conditions prior to installation.
14. All trees shall be staked, fertilized and mulched and shall be guaranteed to be true to name, free from physical damage and wind burn. All trees must be staked, fertilized and mulched and shall be guaranteed.
15. Topsoil shall be placed 1' above grade. Soil shall be used to form "saucer." Non-biodegradable materials that are unsightly or could cause problems shall be removed.
16. Roots shall be guaranteed to be true to name, free from physical damage and wind burn. All trees must be staked, fertilized and mulched and shall be guaranteed.
To Whom on the Planning Commission it May Concern,

I am a proud Lake Orion resident in my 30's and have lived here my entire life. I live in the surrounding area of 625 West Clarkston Road, which is the parcel under rezoning. I STRONGLY OPPOSE the proposition that it be rezoned for townhomes. Over the past 10 years in particular, my family and I have noticed all the beautiful trees that provide shade and aesthetics in Lake Orion being bulldozed, the natural curvature of the land being flattened, more blacktop being laid just to pave the way for more housing complexes and strip malls. Its a disturbing trend that local residents detest. In the city where "Living is a Vacation," over the past 10 years or so, it is feeling less and less like living in a vacation area. Lake Orion is building up into a large city, and losing its "Vacation" status and "Small Town" charm that used to define it.

It baffles me that the city sends out surveys about what new pathways the citizens want built to enjoy the natural beauty of untouched land, but simultaneously you are stripping our communities of that natural beauty just to put man's footprint on more of it. What I am proposing to you is to question when enough is enough.

If we have learned anything from the disruption in supply chain from the pandemic, it has been how to become more self-reliant. How can people become more self-reliant if all the land is being used to build more complexes like townhomes? There has to be a balance with the earth. It is fact that areas with more blacktop or cement raise temperatures substantially, which in turn affects wildlife and the ecosystem in the surrounding area, not to mention drives up homeowner costs like air conditioning. With all the strip malls and housing complexes being built around here, your commission is responsible for creating that "bad vacation" (you know the one, where you are camping with all your kids, it unexpectedly rains so much that it floods, your tent breaks, everything gets soaked, then you have to drive an hour at 1 o'clock in the morning to find a hotel to sleep in- ok, maybe that was just my family but you probably have a vacation of your own that you wish would just end so you could get back to the comfort of your home) that residents can't escape from. Our homes are supposed to be a sanctuary from the hustle and bustle, the unpredictability of life, and the place you retreat to with family to unwind and feel connected to nature. Except there is no nature to commune with. Instead, our backyards are being bombarded with more people, more noise, more lights, more heat, more more more, as many as we can squeeze into as small a space as possible. When is the city of Lake Orion going to ask, "When is enough, enough?" Is the leadership of Lake Orion willing to put the quality of life of each citizen over profit?

In conclusion, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the rezoning and implore your committee to reexamine your goals and the overall health and wellbeing of the land we are blessed to occupy.

With Gratitude of Your Time,
Kate Erdman

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2021

Orion Township
Planning & Zoning
Subject: FW: Concerning a new development PC-2021-90 Ridgewood planned unit development

-----Original Message-----
From: Raymond Grech <raymondgrech1960@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 9:14 AM
To: Tammy Girling <tgirling@oriontownship.org>
Subject: Concerning a new development PC-2021-90 Ridgewood planned unit development

Sent from my iPhone I own property across the street from 625 Clarkston road and already have issues with drainage that’s been neglected I would hope developers would do all the necessary updates on both sides of Clarkston road than you Raymond Grech 987 Fairledge lake Orion
Hi Debbie,

Thank you for taking the time to discuss the rezoning proposal at 625 W. Clarkston Rd with me on the phone today. I would like to take the time to express my concerns formally. My wife and I live at 1133 Walloon Way (see below) with our two young children. We moved here from a townhouse located at 4643 Woburn Rd (see below, Baldwin Square Townhomes). When we first drove through our new neighborhood, we fell in love with how quiet and secluded the surrounding area felt. We had so many issues living in the townhouses with people letting their dogs run off leash (our dog was attacked 3 times in less than one year), people littering, and just general lack of concern for their neighbors. Since moving to Walloon way, we have fallen in love with our little Hemmingsway Woods community. We take our children on walks and bike rides in the neighborhood, and really feel a sense of community. Our concern is that with a development of townhouses of this size, we will lose that sense of tranquility we have grown to love in this community. I will never forget hearing my neighbor describe his first impression of his home when he toured it ("It felt like I was up north without even having to leave lake orion"). We ask that the planning commission consider our concerns when deliberating on this proposed rezoning. Please let me know if you have any questions for us.

Kind Regards,

Rocky Stout

This also occurred at the townhouses off of Baldwin.
Regarding the requested rezoning on Clarkston Road

It is a fact that a property owner has the right to develop his property.

The township ordinance says the zoning should not be changed if the property can be developed as zoned.

The surrounding property was developed as zoned, in agreement with the township Master Plan.

It is the responsibility of the petitioner to prove that the property cannot be developed as zoned.

Neal Porter
TO: The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission
FROM: Tammy Girling, Planning & Zoning Director
DATE: December 22, 2021
RE: PC-2021-96, Natrabis DBS Society C Site Plan, 09-34-100-012

As requested, I am providing suggested motions for the abovementioned project. Please feel free to modify the language. The verbiage below could substantially change based upon the Planning Commissions’ findings of facts for the project. Any additional findings of facts should be added to the motion below.

**Site Plan (Ord. No. 78, Section 30.01)**

**Motion 1:** I move that the Planning Commission grants site plan **approval** for PC-2021-96, Natrabis DBS Society C Site Plan, located at unaddressed parcel 09-34-100-012 for plans date stamped received 12/13/2021 based on the following findings of facts **(motion make to insert findings of facts)**.

This **approval** is based on the following conditions:

a. (Motion maker to list any unresolved issues related to the Township Planner’s review letter).

b. (Motion maker to list any unresolved issues related to the Township Engineer’s review letter).

c. (Motion maker to list any unresolved issues related to the Fire Marshall’s review letter)

d. (Motion maker to list any additional conditions).

Or

I move that the Planning Commission **denies** site plan approval for PC-2021-96, Natrabis DBS Society C Site Plan, located at unaddressed parcel 09-34-100-012 for plans date stamped received 12/13/2021. This **denial** is based on the following reasons **(insert findings of facts)**.

Or

I move that the Planning Commission **postpones** site plan approval for PC-2021-96, Natrabis DBS Society C Site Plan, located at unaddressed parcel 09-34-100-012 for plans date stamped received 12/13/2021 for the following reasons (motion maker to indicate outstanding items to be addressed from the Planner’s, Fire Marshall’s, or Engineer’s review letter(s). Case to resubmit to Township within **(insert time frame)**.)
December 21, 2021

Orion Township Planning Commission
2525 Joslyn Road
Lake Orion, MI, 48360

Site Plan Review no. 2
Natrabis d.b.a. Society C

Case Number: PC-2021-96
Address: Delta Ct. Lot 3
Parcel ID: 09-34-100-012
Area: 3.044 AC
Applicant: Michael D’Agostini

Plan Date: 10/22/2021
Zoning: IP – Industrial Park
Reviewer: Rod Arroyo
Matt Wojciechowski

Dear Planning Commission Members:

We have reviewed the above application and site plan, landscape plan, and tree survey and a summary of our findings is below. Items in **bold** require specific action by the Planning Commission. Items in *italics* can be addressed administratively.

![Site Plan Diagram]
SUMMARY OF REVIEW

Project Summary

The applicant is proposing to construct a 12,304 sq.-ft. building on lot 12 of Delta Ct, located west of Giddings Road and the ITC corridor. The 3 acre site would feature and internal circulation road and parking lot that would have two access points along Delta Ct, with the eastern driveway designated as exit only. The building is proposed to be utilized for retail, with one to three units possible within the building. Any retail use will need to be reviewed to determine compliance with Township standards.

Comment Summary

1. **Safety pathway.** The Township safety pathway plan shows a proposed pathway along Giddings; engineering to determine if pathway is required on this site.

2. **Lighting.** The photometric plan (12/13/2021) showing the proposed lighting should provide fixture details (shielding). (See page 5 for details)
   
   **Free standing light poles.** The photometric plan (12/13/2021) showing the proposed free-standing lighting indicates a mounting height of 25’. The maximum mounting height is 20’; therefore, these poles require a PC waiver. If granted, the applicant shall confirm none of the proposed fixtures that are over 20’ are within 200’ if the residential (SE) district located north of Delta Ct.

3. **Parking Lot.** Wheel stops are required on all 90° parking spaces

4. **Trash area.** The Planning commission should confirm that the proposed materials for the dumpster enclosure meet the desired standards.

Existing Conditions

5. **Zoning.** The site is currently zoned IP, Industrial Park.
## Zoning Ordinance Compliance Tables

### Industrial Park District (Article XVIII)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.00 Preamble</td>
<td>It is intended that the effects of any industrial activity in an IP District should be confined within the IP District, so as to not create any nuisance or hazard for adjacent or nearby uses. It is further intended that Industrial Park Districts shall have an internal roadway with a minimum sixty (60) foot right-of-way, that each building or use within the complex have direct access onto that internal roadway, and that the district, as a whole, have direct access onto an existing or proposed major thoroughfare.</td>
<td>Delta Court appears to address this requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.01 Use Matrix</td>
<td>General Retail - Building material sales P</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Showrooms for kitchen, bath, household fixtures, household furniture or other retail activities associated with fabrication, assembly processing, or wholesaling.</td>
<td>Requires special land use approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The township is currently amending ordinance no. 154. If passed this facility will be permitted by right within the IP district, subject to ordinance no. 154.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.03 Required Conditions</td>
<td>Off Street Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. One (1) parking space per one thousand (1000) square feet of gross floor area or one per employee 1 per 200 (retail*) = 4,000/20 = 20 1 per 1,000 (industrial) – 8,304/100 = 8 1 per employee @ 25 employees = 25</td>
<td>Required: 53 spaces Provided: 81 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The internal roadway shall not be closer than one hundred (100) feet to an adjacent property line.</td>
<td>PC to determine if Delta Ct. meets this requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>See 27.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. A landscaped greenbelt at least twenty (20) feet in width shall be provided along the entire perimeter of the zoning lot, except where ingress or egress drives are located</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>See 27.11 (pg. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A lighting plan shall be submitted with all site plans as set forth in Section 27.11 of this Ordinance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Road Access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Any industrial park developed or proposed in the Industrial Park District shall have an internal public road having a minimum right-of-way of at least sixty (60) feet.</td>
<td>Delta Court satisfies this requirement; access to Giddings Road provides access to a major thoroughfare (120’ ROW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The internal public road shall have direct access onto an existing or proposed major thoroughfare having a thoroughfare having a right-of-way of at least one hundred twenty (120) feet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covered Trash Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **General Provisions.** The standards in the table below are a summary of the applicable Zoning Ordinance standards in Article XXVI; please refer to the individual sections referenced herein for the full Zoning Ordinance text.

### General Provisions (Article 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.04 Parking &amp; Loading</td>
<td>A. Wheel Stops. Except for those serving single and two-family dwellings, all parking lots shall be provided with wheel stops or bumper guards so located that no part of parked vehicles will extend beyond the property line or into required landscaped areas</td>
<td>None shown; applicant shall provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. 2.c. Access. Each required off-street loading berth shall be designed with appropriate means of vehicular access to a street or alley in a manner which will least interfere with traffic movement.</td>
<td>A determination that this standard has been met shall be made by the Planning Commission during site plan review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.05 Landscaping</td>
<td>4. Parking Lot Landscaping Adjacent to Roads</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 18.04 Area and Bulk Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard</td>
<td>50’</td>
<td>125’</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>50’</td>
<td>205’</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard</td>
<td>20’</td>
<td>58’</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min lot area for principal structure</td>
<td>2.0 AC</td>
<td>3.04 AC</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max lot coverage</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max height</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>24’ 4”</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Space</td>
<td>15’</td>
<td>15’ min</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
twenty (20) feet in width and minimally landscaped as follows:

| a. | One (1) tree for each thirty (30) lineal feet, or fraction thereof, of required greenbelt separation area (including driveways). Such trees shall be located between the abutting right-of-way and the off-street parking area or vehicular use area. 10 required; 10 provided along Delta Court front yard (north) |
| b. | In addition, a hedge, wall, decorative metal fence, or berm, or other landscape elements with a vertical rise of at least thirty (30) inches shall be developed within said separation zone. The hedge, wall, fence, or berm shall have the effect of reducing the visual effect of parked cars. If the developer decides to construct a masonry wall or decorative fence, he/she shall in addition plant one (1) shrub or vine for each ten (10) lineal feet of masonry wall on the street side of the wall. A 24” tall hedge row consisting of 57 Goldflame Spirea bushes are proposed along the northern edge of the parking lot to screen the lot from view of Delta Court |
| d. | The Planning Commission may at their discretion waive or modify the requirements of this section subject to one or more of the following conditions: limited parcel depth, existing vegetation or other site factors which limit the practical application of landscaping standards. |

| 27.06 Access | F. | Safety Pathways |
| 27.06 Access | F. | The Township safety pathway plan shows a proposed pathway along Giddings; engineering to determine if pathway is required on this site |

| 27.11 Lighting | D | Lighting Plan Submittal Requirements. The following information must be included on all site plan submissions: |
| 27.11 Lighting | D | Applicant shall confirm fixtures G, E & F are building mounted; add notes to photometric plan for clarification |
| 27.11 Lighting | D | Provided: see photometric sheet 1 of 1 (12/13/21) |
| 27.11 Lighting | D | Applicant shall add type of fixture and method of shielding |
| 27.11 Lighting | E. | 1. Free Standing Light Poles |
| 27.11 Lighting | E. | Provided 1.4 within parking area; compliant |
| 27.11 Lighting | E. | Parking Lot Lighting. Parking lot illumination shall average above 0.6 fc (parking lots 11-99 spaces) |

| 27.11 Lighting | E. | 1. Location of all free-standing, building-mounted and canopy light fixtures on the site plan and/or building elevations. |
| 27.11 Lighting | E. | 2. Photometric grid overlaid on the proposed site plan, indicating the overall light intensity throughout the site (in foot-candles) |
| 27.11 Lighting | E. | 3. Specifications and details for the type of fixture being proposed, including the total foot-candle output, type of lamp, and method of shielding. |

www.GiffelsWebster.com
| **The maximum height of pole fixtures shall be twenty (20) feet, or the height of the building, whichever is less, measured from the ground level to the centerline of the light source. The Planning Commission may permit a maximum height of thirty (30) feet in an industrial district where fixtures are no closer than two hundred (200) feet to any residential district.** | **Building = 24’ 6”**  
Max light height = 20’  
Light poles proposed at 25’ mounting height  
**PC waiver required – fixtures on north side of building within 200’ of property line abutting SE cannot exceed 20’** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Except where used for security or safety purposes, as approved in advance by the Planning Commission, all outdoor lighting fixtures, existing or hereafter installed and maintained upon private property within commercial, industrial and office zoning districts, shall be turned off or reduced in lighting intensity between 11:00 p.m. and sunrise, except when used for commercial and industrial uses, such as in sales, assembly, and repair areas, where such use continues after 11:00 p.m., but only for so long as such use continues.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Applicant shall confirm</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No exposed luminous tube lighting shall be used.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Applicant shall provide light fixture details of building mounted lighting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Building Mounted Lighting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building-mounted lighting shall be fully shielded and directed downward to prevent off-site glare.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff will be available to discuss this review at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Respectfully,

Giffels Webster

Rodney L. Arroyo, AICP  
Partner

Matt Wojciechowski, AICP  
Senior Planner
December 15, 2021

Scott Reynolds, Planning Commission Chairperson
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION
2323 Joslyn Road
Lake Orion, MI 48360

RE: Natrabis DBA Society C, PC-2021-96
Site Plan Review #2

Received: December 13, 2021 by Orion Township

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

We have completed our review of Natrabis plan set. The plans were prepared by Fenn & Associates and were reviewed with respect to the Township’s Zoning Ordinance, No. 78, Stormwater Management and Soil Erosion & Sedimentation Control Ordinance, No. 139, and the Township’s Engineering Standards.

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:
The site is located along on Delta Ct, west of Giddings Rd. within the northwest quarter of Section 34 of the Charter Township of Orion. The site is zoned Industrial Park (IP), and bound by parcels to the north of the property zoned Suburban Estates (SE), and parcels to the east, south and west of the property zoned Industrial Park (IP).

The existing site is Lot 12 of the Liberty Techno Center industrial park. Lot 12 is 2.9 acres and located on the south side of Delta Ct. between two detention basins. Topographic Mapping sheet indicates a clear brush line with significant trees located within the site. There appear to be 3 easements on site. A 30-foot private easement for sanitary sewer along the eastern side of the property, a 55.75-foot easement for Detroit Edison Company along the eastern border of the property, and a small storm sewer easement located in the northwest corner of the site. A copy of preliminary approval from DTE shall be provided for the proposed improvements located within their easement.

The applicant is proposing a 12,304-sf retail facility with surrounding parking lot and one-way drive aisle. The site includes two full access approaches on Delta Ct.

WATER MAIN AND SANITARY SEWER:
There is existing 12-inch water main located along the south side of Delta Ct. The Topography Mapping sheet indicate this water main to be 8-inch and shall be revised. The applicant is proposing to extend 8-inch water main into the site from the main located along Delta Ct. The proposed main dead-ends at a fire hydrant approximately 360 feet from the existing main, and the building leads are shown extending from this proposed 8-inch main. A 12-foot water main easement is proposed around the water main and appears acceptable. Hydrant coverage appears acceptable but shall be verified with the Township Fire Marshal. The location of the FDC is along a fire access drive and has a parking space hatch out for full access.
There is existing 10-inch sanitary sewer located along the north side of Delta Ct. and 12-inch sanitary sewer that is located along the east side of the site located inside the 20-foot sanitary sewer easement. The applicant is proposing a 6-inch sanitary service with a proposed inspection manhole. The sanitary sewer lead appears acceptable.

**STORMWATER MANAGEMENT:**
The proposed stormwater collection system is comprised of several catch basins in paved areas and in green space adjacent spillways that will capture the on-site runoff and convey it to an existing stormwater stub located in the northwest corner of the site. The site was originally proposed at a C-value of 0.90 when originally designed as part of the Liberty Technet Center industrial park, and calculations provided appear to be based on a 10-year storm event. A C-value calculation has been provided, indicating that the proposed site has a composite C-value of 0.63. The provided calculations and the C-value used are acceptable based on the originally proposed Liberty Technet Center detention calculations.

**PAVING/GRADING:**
The applicant is proposing two full access approaches onto Delta Ct. Drive aisles appear to vary between 20-feet in the one-way drive aisle on the east to 26-feet on the west, with the aisles between parking spaces on the west and north being 24-feet wide. Parking spaces appear to be 9 feet by 19 feet where parking is perpendicular. There are parallel parking spaces on the east side of the site that are 9 feet by 22 feet meeting ordinance requirements.

A safety pathway has been added along the site frontage include ramps across the driveways. At engineering, the applicant will need to verify the cross slope of the pathway crossing the drives does not exceed 2% per ADA requirements.

Pavement slopes were provided via slope arrows and indicate a maximum slope of 5.9% on the eastern approach. The slopes provided appear to be acceptable. More detailed pavement grades will be required at engineering. Pavement slopes are to remain between 1% and 6% for drive areas, and between 1% and 4% for parking areas. Pavement sections were included for the parking lot and drive aisles (9 inches HMA atop 8 inches aggregate), the approaches (9 inches concrete atop 6 inches aggregate), and the loading zone and dumpster pad (8 inches concrete atop 6 inches aggregate). A pavement section shall be provided for the internal site sidewalk as well as the public pathway that is required. A section for the sidewalk and pathway was provided showing 4 inches of concrete over 4" aggregate. All sections appear acceptable per Orion Township Engineering Standards.

Existing grades were provided via 1-foot contours. The existing site appears to drain from the center outward, with the highest grade on site at 1012 in the center and the lowest grade of 1000 at the southern border. The site is also between two separate detention basins on the east and west sides. Proposed greenspace grades have been provided via spot grades and rim grades. The applicant has included spot grades at the site boundary indicating that the site will match existing grades at the border. Proposed grades appear to be acceptable. More detailed grades a will be required at engineering.

A retaining wall is proposed around the drive aisle along the south of the site (200 feet long). The wall reaches a 4.9-foot-height near the southeast corner of the site. Design details and computations will be required at engineering for all retaining or screen walls which are greater than 3 feet in height. In addition, a hold harmless letter will be required from the applicant at engineering since the proposed retaining wall extends over the existing sanitary sewer.

**TRAFFIC & CIRCULATION:**
The swept path of the Orion Township Fire Truck has been included in the plans and appears acceptable. The east drive has been realigned to make a perpendicular connection to Delta Ct. Approval for the approaches will fall under the justification of the RCOC.
The northern parking lot has been revised to connect to the east and west drives providing for 2-way traffic and fire access as requested by the Fire Marshal. In addition, the one-way drive along the south and east side of the building has been widened to provide a minimum traveled width of 20-feet for fire access.

**LANDSCAPING:**
Landscape trees appear to be proposed around the perimeter of the site and in landscape islands. The tree location appears to be generally acceptable in reference to the location of the site utilities.

**NATURAL FEATURES:**

**Wetlands:**
The site was previously developed as part of the Liberty Techno Center industrial park and no wetlands are currently present within the lot. No wetland impacts appear to be proposed.

**Woodlands:**
A tree survey was included in the plans and appears to indicate landmark trees within the site. The brush line of the existing site appears to mimic the parcel boundary.

**CONCLUSION:**
In our opinion, the site plan as submitted is in substantial compliance with the Township’s ordinances and engineering standards. We ask that any approval include the following:

1. Provide a copy of preliminary approval from DTE for the proposed improvements located within their easement.
2. The engineering plan, designed in accordance with Zoning Ordinance No. 78, Stormwater Management and Soil Erosion & Sedimentation Control Ordinance No. 139, and the Township’s Engineering Standards shall be submitted to the Township for review and approval prior to construction. A detailed cost estimate for the improvements shall be submitted with the plans signed and sealed by the design engineer.

The applicant should note the Township may require performance bonds, fees, and/or escrows for a preconstruction meeting and necessary inspections. Please feel free to contact us with any questions at (248) 751-3100 or mark.landis@ohm-advisors.com.

Sincerely,

**OHM Advisors**

Joe Lehman
Project Engineer

Mark Landis, P.E.
Project Manager

cc: Chris Burnett, Township Supervisor
    David Goodloe, Building Official
    Jeff Stout, Director of Public Services
    Tammy Gilling, Director of Planning and Zoning
    Lynn Harrison, Planning and Zoning Coordinator
    Jeff Williams, Township Fire Marshal
    Bill Basickow, Water and Sewer Superintendent
    Michael D’Agostini, Quadrant Construction
    Michael Thomas, NTBS Properties
To: Planning Commission/Planning & Zoning Director  
From: Jeff Williams, Fire Marshal  
Re: PC-2021-96, Natrabis DBA Society C Site Plan, 09-34-100-012 – 2nd Submittal  
Date: 12/20/2021  

The Orion Township Fire Department has completed its review of Application PC-2021-96 for the limited purpose of compliance with Charter Township of Orion Ordinance's, Michigan Building Code, and all applicable Fire Codes.

Based upon the application and documentation provided, the Fire Department has the following recommendation:

X Approved  
Approved with Requirements (See below)  
Not approved

Requirements: NONE

This approval is limited to the application and materials reviewed which at this time do not raise a specific concern with regard to location and/or impact on health and safety. However, the approval is conditioned upon the applicant providing sufficient additional information at time of building permit application that includes data or documents, confirming full compliance with all applicable building codes, fire codes and Township Ordinances.

If there are any questions, the Fire Department may be reached at 248-391-0304 ext. 2004.

Sincerely,  
Jeffrey Williams  
Jeff Williams, Fire Marshal  
Orion Township Fire Department
Dear Tammy,

The Department of Public Services has reviewed the above-mentioned project and has no issues or concerns at this time.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeffery T. Stout
Director
Department of Public Services
To: Planning Commission  
RE: PPC-21-96  
12/30/2021

A site plan review has been completed by the building department for PPC-21-96.

The Building Department has the following recommendation:

- [x] Approved
- [ ] Approved with conditions (See below)
- [ ] Not approved (See below)

Comments:
2015 MBC 1105.1.3 **Restricted Entrances** Where restricted entrances are provided at least one restricted entrance to the building shall be accessible.

Where parking serves multiple entrances to a facility, accessible spaces must be dispersed among accessible entrances

If you have any questions feel free to contact me at 248-391-0304. Ext 6001

Sincerely,

David Goodloe

Building Official
Orion Township Building Dept.
DGOODLOE@ORIONTOWNSHIP.ORG
November 19, 2021

Lynn Harrison
Orion Township
Planning & Zoning
2525 Joslyn Road
Lake Orion, MI 48360

Reference: Natrabis DBA Society C – CAMS #202100932
Part of the NW ¼ of Section 34, Orion Township

Dear Ms. Harrison,

This office has received one set of plans for the Natrabis DBA Society Project to be developed in the Northwest ¼ of Section 34, Orion Township.

Our stormwater system review indicates that the proposed project has no direct involvement with any legally established County Drain under the jurisdiction of this office. Therefore, a storm drainage permit will not be required from this office.

The water system is operated and maintained by Orion Township and plans must be submitted to Orion Township for review.

The sanitary sewer is within the Clinton-Oakland Sewage Disposal System. Any proposed sewers of 8" or larger may require a permit through this office.

Please note that all applicable permits and approvals from federal, state or local authorities, public utilities and private property owners must be obtained.

Any related earth disruption must conform to applicable requirements of Part 91, Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control of the Natural Resource and Environmental Protection Act, Act 451 of the Public Acts of 1994. An application should be made to Orion Township for the required soil erosion permit.

If there are any questions regarding this matter, please contact Dan Butkus at 248-897-2744.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Brian Bennett, P.E.
Civil Engineer III
The site walk committee conducted the site walk for PC 2021-96, Natrabis Society, on December 9, 2021.
The site is located on the north side of Giddings Road on Delta Court in a vacant industrial park. The site is directly across from the GM facility on Giddings Road. The site is setback from Giddings Road with a major electrical transmission line in an easement of approximately 150 feet off Giddings. The site is approximately 10-20 feet lower than the Giddings surface which will make the review of roof top equipment screening on the proposed building important.
There are no other buildings on the Delta Court industrial park and the subdivision appears to have some topography issues and is heavily wooded.

Respectfully submitted

Donald Gross, Planning Commissioner

-------------------------------------------------------
Donald Gross, Planning Commissioner
Charter Township of Orion
2525 Joslyn Rd., Lake Orion MI 48360
dgross@oriontownship.org
http://www.oriontownship.org
Checklist for Site Plan Approval Application

Applications must be submitted by noon on Wednesday, three weeks prior to a scheduled meeting. Meetings are held on the first and third Wednesday of each month, unless otherwise specified.

Pursuant to Zoning Ordinance 78, Section 30.01, C, 8 the applicant or a designated representative must be at all scheduled review meetings. Refer to 30.01 F. for the criteria the Planning Commission will use to evaluate a site plan.

The following must accompany your completed application; incomplete submittals will not be accepted.

- Complete application including original ink signatures of property owner and the applicant.
- The Site Plan Review fees calculated using Ordinance No. 41.
- Proof of ownership. Acceptable forms of documentation include: Warranty Deed, Quit Claim Deed, Land Contract, or Option to Purchase with a Copy of the Warranty Deed.
- Traffic Study if applicable.
- Wetlands Permit application if applicable.
- 4 sets of signed and sealed 24” x 36” detailed site plans containing all elements within Zoning Ordinance No. 78, Section 30.01, E.
- 4 sets of all supporting documents, reports, studies etc.
- PDF format copy of all information submitted (may be emailed or provided on a USB/flash drive).
- Proof of submittal to outside agencies

The Township reserves the right to request additional copies of printed materials as necessary.

If you have any questions, please call the Planning & Zoning Director (248) 391-0304 ext. 5000.
Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission

Site Plan Approval Application

30.01, A. Intent: The site plan review procedures and standards are intended to provide an opportunity for consultation and cooperation between the applicant and the Planning Commission so as to achieve maximum utilization of land with minimum adverse effects on adjoining property. Furthermore, it is the intent of these procedures and standards to allow for review of site plans by the Planning Commission, to provide a consistent and uniform method of review, and to ensure full compliance with the standards contained within Zoning Ordinance 78, and other applicable local ordinances and State and Federal laws.

Project Name: Natrabis DBA Society C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Development if applicable:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Applicant |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Name: Quadrade Construction llc |
| Address: 15801 23 Mile Road | City: Macomb Twp. | State: MI | Zip: 48042 |
| Phone: 586-677-1111 | Cell: 810-560-4220 | Fax: 586-781-5829 |
| Email: mike@orthedev.com |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: NTBS Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 4601 Liberty Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 239-247-9344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:mike@natrabis.com">mike@natrabis.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* If the name on the deed does not match the name of the property owner on this application, documentation showing the individual is the same as the company name must be provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Preparer Firm/Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Quadrade Construction / Michael D'Agostini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 15801 23 Mile Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 586-677-1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:Miked@quadratedevelopment.com">Miked@quadratedevelopment.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Contact Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Michael D'Agostini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 15801 2 mile road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 586-677-1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:mike@quadratedevelopment.com">mike@quadratedevelopment.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sidewell Number(s): 09-34-100-012
Location or Address of Property: South side of Delta court west off Giddings
Side of Street: South Nearest Intersection: Giddings and Delta Court
Acreage: 3.044 Current Use of Property: Vacant industrial

Is the complete legal description printed on the site plan? ☑ Yes ☐ No (if no please attach to the application)

Subject Property Zoning: Industrial Adjacent Zoning: N. IND S. IND E. IND W. IND
List any known variances needed (subject to change based on Township consultant’s review) NA

Give a detailed description of the proposed development, including the number and size of the buildings or units being proposed: (1) 12,500sf retail building with 1-3 possible units.

Pursuant to Zoning Ordinance 78, Section 30.01.C. a copy of this application and two copies of the site plan must be submitted to the each of the following agencies. Please provide the Township with a copy of each transmittal as proof of delivery.

AT&T
54 Mill St.
Pontiac, MI 48342

DTE Energy Co.
ATTENTION: NW Planning & Design
1970 Orchard Lake Rd.
Sylvan Lake, MI 48320

Michigan Department of Transportation (If applicable)
800 Vanguard Dr.
Pontiac, MI 48341

Consumers Power Company
530 W. Willow St.
Lansing, MI 48906

Oakland County Health Department
Building 34 East
1200 N. Telegraph Rd.
Pontiac, MI 48341

Road Commission of Oakland County (If applicable)
ssintkowski@rcoc.org (electronic submittal only)

I/We, the undersigned, do hereby submit this application for Site Plan Approval, pursuant to the provisions of the Charter Township of Orion Zoning Ordinance; No. 78, Section 30.01 and applicable ordinance requirements. In support of this request the above facts are provided. I hereby certify that the information provided is accurate and the application that has been provided is complete.

Signature of Applicant: (must be original ink signature)

Print Name: Michael D'Agostini

Date: 11/8/2021

I, the property owner, hereby give permission to the applicant listed above to act as my agent in submitting applications, correspondence and to represent me at all meetings. I also grant permission to the Planning Commission members to visit the property, without prior notification, as is deemed necessary.

Signature of Owner (if the deed of ownership does not show an individual, ie is a corporation, partnership, etc., documentation must be provided showing the individual signing this application has signing rights for the entity):

(must be original ink signature)

Print Name: 

Date: 

Version 12/7/20
Charter Township of Orion
Planning & Zoning Department
2525 Joslyn Rd., Lake Orion MI 48360
P: (248) 391-0304 ext. 5002; Fax (248) 391-1454

Project Name: Natrabis DBA Society C

PC# ______________________Parcel#(s) 09-34-100-012

Please select an option below:

☐ Permission to Post on Web Site
   By signing below as applicant and on behalf of my consultants, we agree to allow the plans for the
   above named project, in which approval is being sought by the Planning Commission and/or Township
   Board, to be posted on the Township website.

_________________________ ______________________
Signature of Applicant Date

_________________________
Printed Name of Applicant

☒ Do not want plans posted on Web Site
Did you know Orion Township is located within the Clinton River Watershed?

A watershed is another name for a river basin. It is an area of land that drains into a common body of water. Did you know that rainwater and melting snow makes its way into our lakes and the Clinton River after it leaves the parking lot or storm drain? Orion Township, along with our neighboring communities, is in the process of developing a watershed management plan to comply with Federal stormwater permit regulations to improve the quality of stormwater generated from new development and redevelopment. Your opinion on the following questions would be appreciated. Please answer these short questions and return to the Building Department.

1. Please rate the following governmental goals and objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving Recreational Quality &amp; Opportunities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving Fish &amp; Wildlife Habitat</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing erosion and flooding</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting wetlands and woodlands</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How significant do you believe the problems caused by soil erosion, chemicals such as fertilizer, oil and pesticides are in the watershed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Very Significant</th>
<th>Somewhat Significant</th>
<th>Insignificant</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Are you aware of the functional benefits of preserving natural features in stormwater management, such as increasing infiltration capacity and slowing runoff and decreasing infrastructure expenses?

X YES

NO

4. Have you experienced a correlation between preservation of natural areas and quality of the development or sales volume?

YES

X NO

5. Have you implemented State recommended Best Management Practices (BMPs), such as bio-retention, vegetated swales, or porous pavement in past developments?

X YES

NO

Over Please
SURVEY FOR BUILDER/DEVELOPERS

6. Would you be interested in participating in future surveys or volunteer committees?

YES   NO

Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Michael Thomas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>4601 Liberty Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>239-247-3344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mike@natrabis.com">mike@natrabis.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>