1. OPEN MEETING
2. ROLL CALL
3. MINUTES
   A. 1-5-2022 Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes
   B. 1-5-2022, PC-2021-90, Ridgewood PUD Concept Public Hearing Minutes
4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL
5. BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENT - NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY
6. CONSENT AGENDA
7. NEW BUSINESS
   A. PC-2022-01, Lake Orion Stadium Ridge Elementary School Wetland Permit, 244 Stadium Dr., (Sidwell #09-14-400-013)
   B. PC-2022-02, Ferndale Maize LLC., Ord. 154 Application Medical Processing, 163 Premier Dr., (Sidwell #09-35-476-001)
   C. PC-2022-03, Ferndale Maize LLC., Ord. 154 Application Adult Use Processing, 163 Premier Dr., (Sidwell #09-35-476-001)
8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
   A. PC-2021-07, 5-Year Master Plan Update
9. PUBLIC COMMENTS
10. COMMUNICATIONS
11. PLANNERS REPORT/EDUCATION
    A. Michigan Association of Planning - Upcoming Events
12. COMMITTEE REPORTS
13. FUTURE PUBLIC HEARINGS
    A. 02-02-2022 at 7:05 p.m. PC-2021-78, The Woodlands Planned Unit Development PUD Concept, located on a vacant parcel located east of 310 Waldon Road, (Sidwell #09-23-351-024) and 3030 S. Lapeer Road, (Sidwell #09-26-101-021).
14. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS
15. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS
16. ADJOURNMENT

In the spirit of compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals with a disability should feel free to contact Penny S. Shults, Clerk, at (248) 391-0304, ext. 4001, at least seventy-two hours in advance of the meeting to request accommodations.
1. OPEN MEETING

2. ROLL CALL

3. MINUTES
   A. 01-05-22, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes
   B. 01-05-22, PC-2021-90, Ridgewood PUD Concept Public Hearing Minutes

4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL

5. BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENT – NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY

6. CONSENT AGENDA

7. NEW BUSINESS
   A. PC-2022-01, Lake Orion Stadium Elementary School Wetland Permit, 244 Stadium Dr., (Sidwell #09-14-400-013)
   B. PC-2022-02, Ferndale Maize LLC, Ord. 154 Application Medical Processing, 163 Premier Dr., (Sidwell #09-35-476-001)
   C. PC-2022-03, Ferndale Maize LLC, Ord 154 Application Adult Use Processing, 163 Premier Dr., (Sidwell #09-35-476-001)

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
   A. PC-2021-07, 5-Year Master Plan Update

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS

10. COMMUNICATIONS

11. PLANNERS REPORT/EDUCATION
    A. Michigan Association of Planning – Upcoming Events

12. COMMITTEE REPORTS

13. FUTURE PUBLIC HEARINGS
    A. 02-02-2022 at 7:05 p.m. PC-2021-78, The Woodlands Planned Unit Development PUD Concept, located on a vacant parcel located east of 310 Waldon Road, (Sidwell #09-23-351-024) and 3030 S. Lapeer Road, (Sidwell # 09-26-101-021). The applicant, Detroit Riverside Capital, is proposing to rezone the properties from Suburban Estates (SE), Single Family Residential-2 (R-2), and General Business (GB) to Planned Unit Development (PUD).

14. CHAIRMAN’S COMMENTS

15. COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS

16. ADJOURNMENT

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.
The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, January 5, 2022, at 7:00 p.m. at the Orion Township Municipality Complex Board Room, 2323 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, Michigan 48360.

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:**
- Scott Reynolds, Chairman
- Don Gross, Vice Chairman
- Kim Urbanowski, BOT Rep to PC

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:**
- Derek Brackon, Commissioner

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

2. **ROLL CALL**
As noted

**BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**
- Chris Barnett, Township Supervisor
- Donni Steele, Treasurer
- Kim Urbanowski, Trustee

**BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**
- Brian Birney, Trustee

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

**OTHERS PRESENT:**
- Thomas Allen Martelle
- Cheryl Hofer
- Mike Thomas
- Marilyn Hester
- Josh Sawicki
- John Hofer
- Ben Puraj
- Tom Williams
- Mike Howard
- Ken Gutelius

Chairman Reynolds recessed the regular meeting and opened the Joint Public Hearing with the Board of Trustees at 7:05 p.m. for case 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.

Chairman Reynolds closed the PC-2021-90 Joint Public Hearing at 8:03 p.m. and reconvened the regular Planning Commission meeting.
3. ELECTION OF OFFICERS
Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that the current officers maintain their current positions. All agreed. (Chairman Reynolds, Vice-Chairman Gross, & Secretary St. Henry)

Roll call vote was as follows: Urbanowski, yes; Gross, yes; Reynolds, yes; St. Henry, yes; Walker, yes; Gingell, yes. **Motion carried 6-0 (Brackon absent)**

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Chairman Reynolds, that the current representative maintains his position (Chairman Reynolds, Vice-Chairman Gross, & Secretary St. Henry).

Roll call vote was as follows: Gross, yes; Urbanowski, yes; Gingell, yes; St. Henry yes; Walker, yes; Reynolds, yes. **Motion carried 6-0 (Brackon absent)**

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Secretary St. Henry, that the current members of the Site Walk committee be continued in their current capacity, being Secretary St. Henry, Chairman Reynolds, and Vice-Chairman Gross. All agreed.

Roll call vote was as follows: Walker, yes; Gross, yes; Urbanowski, yes; St. Henry, yes; Gingell, yes; Reynolds, yes. **Motion carried 6-0 (Brackon absent)**

4. MINUTES
A. 12-15-21, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes
B. 12-15-21, Master Plan Workshop Minutes

Moved by Secretary St. Henry, seconded by Commissioner Walker to **approve** both sets minutes as presented. **Motion carried**

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

6. BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENT – NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY
None.

7. CONSENT AGENDA
None.

8. NEW BUSINESS
A. PC-2021-90, Ridgewood PUD Concept & 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).

Chairman Reynolds stated that since they have had a brief overview of the project earlier, he asked the applicant if they had anything else that they would like to add? Mr. Johnson replied that he would be happy to answer any questions that they have as they go forward with the consultant review letters.

Planner Arroyo read through his review date stamped December 22, 2021.
Secretary St. Henry asked if Planner Arroyo could repeat the density numbers that he gave out in terms of what it would be like if it was (R-1) neighborhood versus what is proposed. Planner Arroyo replied under the (R-1) it came out to 1.32 dwelling units/acre. What their plan is proposing is 4.4 dwelling units/acre.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked in terms of the number of units how many were there? Planner Arroyo replied it was 14. Vice-Chairman Gross said 14 units versus the 50 units be proposed? Secretary St. Henry said there were 14 units but 50 dwellings. Planner Arroyo said there are buildings versus units, they are talking about units, not buildings. These are individual dwelling units, 50 dwelling units is what is proposed under this plan. Vice-Chairman Gross said versus 15 which would be allowed under the current zoning as lots.

Chairman Reynolds said they did have a review from OHM Advisors and that it was in their packet tonight. They reviewed the content and their opinion of the Concept PUD was it was in substantial completion with the Township Ordinances and Engineering Standards.

Chairman Reynolds stated that there were preliminary reviews from Fire Marshal, and the Building Official their initial concept reviews. There was a review from RCOC in which a few of those items were mentioned tonight, and along with the Water Resources Commissioner (WRC), there was a review of the project from them also. As previously mentioned, there was a wetland supplement that was provided, and a preliminary re-evaluation of those environmental items. They did complete a Site Walk it was written by himself, obviously, they go out as a Planning Commission to observe properties prior to them appearing on the agenda, so they are familiar both physically and then also with what was submitted in front of them tonight.

Chairman Reynolds said that there were citizen letters that were read into the record during the Public Hearing portion.

Secretary St. Henry said for folks that have followed the Planning Commission over the last several months, they have seen a few multi-family developments proposed around the township. If they have listened to him, they know that he is a big proponent of housing options for this community for different demographics, not just to attract young professionals that are working within 20-miles of Orion Township, but also empty-nesters, of which he is one, and seniors like his parents. Like his parents they had to move out of Orion because they could not find a place to live so now, they live in Clarkston. As a Planning Commission, and a Board of Trustees they have to balance the need for an attractive community and housing options with the character of their community, and he has stated this many times. The historical character of their community and what their residents want. They have to respect the concerns of their residents that have been here for many years. He has lived here 40 years there are plenty of other folks in the Township that have lived here even longer. He is 100% in favor of increasing the type of housing options that they have for residents but they have to be in the right place within the Township. He has driven millions of times up and down Clarkston Rd. over the years, growing up here and as an adult, and he can tell them it is a busy road. He has had good friends that have lived off Hemmingway, way before it was developed to where it is at today. Given the neighborhoods that are there now, the neighborhoods that are proposed, single-family home neighborhoods, he is not convinced that this is the right location for a significant townhome development at this time. He tends to recognize that there are other options for that property. At one point it will be developed but he wasn’t sure that a townhome development was the right place, similar to some of the other projects that they have looked at over the last 6-months, or a year or two. He doesn’t think much of formal traffic studies versus reality. This area, Clarkston and Lapeer Rd., Clarkston and Joslyn Rd., during rush hour traffic is a significant issue. For people that have lived thea long time, they have had to deal with it for the last 25-30 years as this Township has grown.
Trustee Urbanowski said she agreed with Secretary St. Henry. She thought that looking at what would be allowable as it was zoned 14 or 15 units, going up to 50 units is too much, it doesn’t fit in the character and what was surrounding it. She lived off of Heights Rd. between Hemmingway and Fairledge, and she was sorry to say that she used those roads once or twice to get to Clarkston Rd., it was convenient. She understood what they were saying and she has seen it firsthand. The density is an issue, and then she also has concerns about the wetlands. She understands that the recognizable benefit, always comes back to them at this point that it is wetland conservation when she thought in reality, they really can’t do anything with it. Is it a choice that they are making to conserve that wetland as part of the benefit or is it just a convenient thing to say? If they look at the property there are a lot of trees that are being removed, and a lot of them are heritage trees. They have all talked and they have even put it into the new Master Plan that is coming up, and they are a Tree City USA, and she thinks they need to remember that and respect that. She would like to see fewer trees coming down, and she knew that they don’t have an option all the time but if it wasn’t as dense, they wouldn’t have to take as many trees down. She also had concerns and she was looking at reviews from their Public Services department that says there are no issues with this but they have new developments coming in and they all need lift stations. Them as a Township take care of those lift stations so that is actually not a benefit to the Township it is something that they are going to have to handle moving forward each time they put one in. Which is fine, they want people to move here, obviously. She recently had family move here and they didn’t have many options for places to go. As part of the Master Plan, our economic development and stability rely upon new housing for people of all different styles. She was concerned that they keep seeing developments that are sort of not really cohesive with what is going around them. There are plenty of places that she has been looking at, the BIZ, and Baldwin, and all of these other places. She thought that there were better areas for development not on Clarkston Rd.

Vice-Chairman Gross said this is a concept plan submitted under the Planned Unit Development regulations. There are certain things that they have to abide by when they review the concept plan. The first one that comes up is the density and for the life of him he can’t figure out how 50-units were arrived at. It doesn’t correlate to anything relative to the current zoning, any density credits, and it is more aligned to a multi-family density. If they use the multiple-family regulations then they get into what the multiple-family setbacks would be and they don’t fit this plan either because there is a 75-ft. setback when multiple-family abuts single-family, and they are dealing with a 35-50-ft. setback on the west. Then there is a request for a variance or waiver on the Clarkston Rd. frontage. For the last year, they have been talking about creating vistas along our major thoroughfares, and the first project out of the shoot is reducing the density or the area along Clarkston Rd. for putting buildings closer to it as opposed to creating some form of setback. The regulation for 50% side yard entries on a (PUD) can be adjusted with a 5-ft. rule on how the garage is offset. He thought that there was an attempt at that, he thought it failed but it was an attempt. He was at a loss to find reasons that this complies with the ordinance requirements under a (PUD) designation.

Chairman Reynolds said he tends to agree with most of everything that has been so far. (PUDs) are obviously a beneficial tool but also a difficult tool, there are a lot of items that were up here deliberating about and discussing and reviewing. Not to mention it is a multifaceted process and involves a lot of both the Planning Commission and also the Board of Trustees. From his professional background of architecture and understanding planning, he was struggling. A couple of big items for him was the capability with adjacent zoning right now. It seems like it is a pretty steep leap from what is there presently. They have the Master Plan that currently lays out he believed medium-low density in that area, and medium-high is to the north. Again, that kind of further gaps the proposed density versus what is there presently. He thought that there needs to be another look at the recognizable benefit to the community, it seems like
there are a lot of things that are more than likely required by the ordinance that is being considered a community benefit. Where he thought that the (PUD) process is really encouraging a lot more of a thoughtful contribution in that manner. Just a feasibility range with other projects that he has done in the Township that they have had many discussions about safety paths on Clarkston Rd. and recognize that it may or may not work right now but the goal is that if everyone contributes and installs it that’s how we end up with a connected path, not to mention trees and things like that. Yes, they have the opportunity to contribute to the tree fund but that is not something that they are really looking for, as a Township to do. They want developments to resolve that within themselves to maintain the character and the nature of our community. He was struggling with a few main pieces. There has been a lot of professional development and services that have been put forth to this project. He appreciated the nice plans and renderings and things that have been brought forth to them. There is clearly a lot of thought here. He did think that with some modifications and recognizing some of the comments this could really be a great project for our community. Whether it is the best fit here on this parcel or not he was still trying to recognize that if that is the location for it. Those were some of the initial kneejerk reactions just about (PUD) eligibility which is what they are discussing here tonight, but there seems to be a gap there for him. Although the presentation and the prints that were brought forth to them were very thoughtful it is difficult because they are going from an (R-1) zoning in a Master Plan of medium-low density and then they are jumping to 50-units. He was not necessarily following, and there are some tools like the parallel density plans to say that is not feasible there are items that limit us on this property. He did see at this point and time the firm information to say that the property couldn’t be developed as it sits right now with its current zoning. Even if it is a less popular development density that is being brought forth currently.

Mr. Johnson said that he appreciated their thoughts and input. Clearly part of the genesis of what they put together related to their Master Plan. Some of the goals and objectives were contained within that. That was the kick-off for where they went and with what they tried to do with it. With respect to the density issue, he knew that was the tough one, and they expected that it would be but it is not unreasonable to say that in their Future Land Use Map right across the street they have a medium-high density proposed in their land-use plan. They are on the south side of the street that is not too much of a stretch in terms of looking at the 3-5-unit/acre range, in their opinion with respect to the (PUD) process. They did discuss several of the density bonus provisions that could apply to their project, and clearly, they go from the 15 on the (R-1) to 50, they could look at the density bonus provisions and does it get them all the way, he didn’t know but that was part of the rational in combination with what future land plan illustrated for right across the street. Because they are on the north side of the street you are one thing and on the south side you are something else and it is a little bit arbitrary from a definition perspective now. Obviously, they are sensitive to the neighbor’s comments and the comments received and respectful of those, and he thought that perhaps if they could give them some guidance in terms of density then they might be able to respond in a different fashion for them to look at now. If that is not possible and this is the wrong location then that is certainly their prerogative. They think that they could potentially approach it with some refinements but in the absence of some sort of guidance, it is hard to do.

Secretary St. Henry asked the applicant if they had looked at any other locations within Orion Township for this development? What is most attractive to them for this particular location? Mr. Johnson replied that the site has a lot of beautiful natural features. Being able to integrate nice housing into that environment he thought would be a positive thing. There are trends within the country that (R-1) is a negative word in many locations, not necessarily here, but in other locations, single-family residential sprawl is not thought of highly. As they look for density, they look for ways to drive down the prices to enter the housing markets usually, multi-family or single-family attached platforms in order to do that. Once they start going the other direction and the price goes up significantly because they are extending utilities much farther and all the
Chairman Reynolds said they have had a lot of discussions as a commission and as you may or may not know they are working on their revised Master Plan and updating that. They have had a lot of discussions on what a (PUD) and why it exists. There has been a lot of discussion on it is not a tool to leapfrog density or to get major density bonuses but to recognize challenging parcels, projects, or to propose developments that recognize weaknesses in our community such as the missing middle, and he had touched on that tonight. For him, their ordinance kind of speaks to, and Vice-Chairman Gross, laid out some of those comments of if they are going to parallel an (RM) density then they should probably be looking at some of those underlying criteria. They talk a lot about does it fit the neighborhood and does it fit adjacent uses? Even though it is a housing type it doesn’t necessarily mean that it fits with where it is currently. It might change in another 30-years but they are looking at the snapshot of right here right now. He hears the discussion of the difference of Master Planning one side of the road to the other. Those are also very different parcel sizes. By having residents that have multiacre lots to the south closer to M-24 those are quarter-acre to half-acre lots. Going further west as they venture towards this property and others there are at least acre properties or at least over ¾ of an acre. Again, those are just outlined from where development occurred back 30-50-years ago. They do have a number of (PUD) developments in the community, they are supportive of development in many ways, and they understand that they need development to kind of connect this cycle and fulfill these needs of the community. He did think that Townhomes and multi-family complexes do have a role in that. The bigger struggle for him is how it fits. He thought that the transitional zoning is a huge piece for him to jump from one to the other without saying that they are bearing the property within it. To go after a variance and then the high-density that is where he was struggling, it is kind of tipped to one side right now in his perspective.

Chairman Reynolds said it was a multi-step process, they are purely a recommendation here tonight, the Planning Commission. There is also the opportunity to postpone and come back in future steps. Just proposing that as an opportunity and discussion point for them based on the discussion that they have had. They are also willing to make motions as they see fit.

Mr. Johnson said he appreciated the input. As far as, postponing it, that would imply that they would come back with something else. Conceptually if there is an issue with that then it begs the question of why bother. If there is some type of guidance potentially in terms of the community recognizes that a variety of housing options are important. What form that takes if there is flexibility there, if the density is the issue, is there a comfort level. If they look at the baseline currently (R-1) and they look at the (PUD) provisions for density bonuses, and what that could imply from a density standpoint is it 30, 40, is it something less than 50? Are there some guidelines that they could offer in terms of a range of flexibility there?

Chairman Reynolds said obviously they are there to review and discuss projects as they are presented to them. All of them have their own perspective, and they could go down the line but that is not what they are there to do.

Chairman Reynolds stated that he thought that they had heard some comments about their initial concerns about compatibility with adjacent uses and understanding about utilizing the (PUD) tool to get to a density that obviously is beneficial for the development but also the community itself. He didn’t think there was a magic number in their head. He thought that there needed to be some thoughtful review on what that number could be. They have heard comments on what is proposed right now, and he also thought that there were some other criteria there that as they have spoken to with a community benefit and a few of those other
things that might influence the transition, setbacks, all of those criteria. If they are going to look at it as an (RM) density what are some of those tools that they are implementing there that are making sure that that is recognizable. There are a number of good comments that were brought forth by the public tonight that probably echo a lot of their concerns. Whether they feel they are warranted or not, it is a conversation as a community. He thought that there was some opportunity to have some thought there to come back to them.

Mr. Johnson said in light of that then perhaps a postponement request would be the thing to do.

Chairman Reynolds asked if there was a timeframe? Mr. Johnson asked if it was possible for him to get back to the Township offices to give them a reply on that? Chairman Reynolds said what they normally do within the motion is they at least state a reasonable timeframe so it is not an open case floating out there. They would provide them a reasonable time to have time to revise, discuss, and review. He was open to a larger timeframe if that is needed within reason if there is something that he was looking for. Mr. Johnson replied he would like to have 1-3-months. Chairman Reynolds said he would be in favor of 3-months.

Moved by Chairman Reynolds, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, that the Planning Commission postpones 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: to allow time for the applicant to revise plans and bring forth a revised plan back to the Planning Commission within 3-months of today date January 5, 2022.

Discussion on the motion:

Secretary St. Henry said they are asking for a postponement from them for up to 3-months, do you truly believe that they can come back with a new plan that would initiate them making a rezoning change that is going to address all of these issues that they have brought up today and their concerns? His point is he didn’t want to waste his time, and their time to just drag this out. If he can tell them tonight that he was going to make a good faith effort then fine. They have had other developers come before them over the course of a year, year, and a half with last-minute changes to plans and thinking that would be enough. They are asking for significant changes and his mindset for this piece of property. He didn’t want them to come back and expect that minor changes are going to sway any of their feels.

Mr. Johnson appreciated the frankness and the transparency. He said that he will go back to his team and see what ideas they could generate that would address the comments that they have heard from the Trustees and the public at large. If there is something that they think would do that, in a way that still makes the project feasible. The challenges for this particular parcel are significant given the topography. One of the primary objectives was to create new housing that was affordable, and they have to do that within a platform that is not single-family. If they are firm on single-family is the only thing, they are going to except then that may be a different answer. It could go to a duplex approach, or a different configuration on attached that would be more sensitive to the other broader issues that were raised than he thought that was possible. If it is single-family or the highway then that is another answer.

Secretary St. Henry said he didn’t have an answer on that. This community is different from other communities in Metro Detroit. (R-1) is not a bad word in this town, (R-1) has to be put in the right place. Multi-family housing units are not a bad word in this town, he
thought they were realists on what is happening but they have to be put in the right place. He appreciated any developer coming in right now. With (PUDs) he is not a huge fan of (PUDs) but he understands how the tool is used. 25 years ago, there were open spaces all over Orion that were easy to develop and it made total sense. Every piece of property that they have looked at the last couple of years seems to have plenty of challenges. Any developer that takes a shot at it he appreciates, and he thinks they all appreciate it. There are challenges for a reason and they have to balance all of those. Mr. Johnson said that balancing is a good word, he agreed, it is balancing many elements.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said on the motion for the 3-month timeframe just with stacked agendas, they saw they had to cancel one meeting for a tragedy it makes it much easier on calculating if it is, submit within the 3-months and then by the natural flow if it ends up on an agenda when it can fit.

Chairman Reynolds amended the motion, Trustee Urbanowski re-supported to re-submit within the 3-months understanding that there are other processes in place that might make that a little bit longer.

Chairman Reynolds said that residents can always reach out to the Planning & Zoning office. There isn’t going to be necessarily a public notice for the project but the Planning & Zoning office is always willing to keep them up to date or notify them when it is going to appear on an agenda. Their goal here isn’t to move it along so they can’t be part of the conversation but rather make sure they and the applicant have the appropriate time and therefore they have an opportunity to reappear if desired.

Roll call vote was as follows: St. Henry, yes; Walker, no; Urbanowski, yes; Gross, yes; Gingell, yes; Reynolds, yes. Motion carried 6-0 (Brackon absent)

B. PC-2021-96, Natrabis DBA Society C Site Plan, located on the south side of Delta Court, on the west side of Giddings, (Sidwell #09-34-100-012).

Mr. Michael Thompson one of the co-founders of Natrabis, they do business as Society C.

Mr. Thompson said this is kind of a déjá vu other than a new building. Their general contractor, who he hasn’t seen since before Christmas because he had COVID, and he just informed him a few hours ago. If they would like them to put anything on the screen, he did email Planning & Zoning Director Girling the elevations and site plan.

Mr. Thompson said they had submitted in early December. It was suggested that they go through and do revisions so that the plans are more acceptable. This is going to be for a retail provisioning center located right behind the cultivation facility that they just finished about 6-months ago. The site they are building at the development there sat vacant for over 20-years. 2.5-years ago when they were before the Planning Commission and they were approved for that site plan, they started construction last June, the entire development was sold out. Fed-Ex built out their parking lot there are some other cannabis-related businesses there and they purchased one of the last remaining vacant lots for a provisioning center.

Mr. Thompson said they looked at Orion Township really as a flagship for their company, and they have really wanted to be a part of the community. They spent a lot of additional time and money to try and put additional details and beautification of their cultivation facility. They thought when they wanted to break down the preconceived notion when they hear of a cannabis cultivation facility and they think that it is going to be some giant metal warehouse. He didn’t
know if any of them had driven by, they are right off of Giddings Rd. just west of GM. They spent a lot of money to make the place look really nice, and it was kind of a proof of concept for them. They invested over 25 million dollars in their cultivation facility, they now have over 90 employees there. Their proof of concept has turned out to work for them. They have had Senators, State Attorney Generals, they have had multiple Representatives of the House there and they all said wow, this is what always envisioned they couldn’t even envision this, this is really the pinnacle. With their dispensary location, this will be their first retail dispensary in the state of Michigan. They have designed and built this to be our flagship location so this will be much larger than they would typically see, it is also a 3.5-acre lot. The city guidelines required is 53 parking spaces, they have included 78 parking spaces there. They may have seen driving by other provisioning centers throughout the state the lack of parking is a major issue. There are lines trying to get in so they almost doubled the required parking spaces. They do have room for expansion in the back or just an additional storage area. They figured they would try to utilize the site as best as possible.

Chairman Reynolds pulled up the plans that were submitted in their packet.

Mr. Thompson said that there is a front elevation. Because this is right behind their cultivation facility, they tried to somewhat mirror the look. It will be a fairly grand entry he believed that the height is 24-ft. at the doors. He showed the Planning Commissioners a rendering.

Mr. Thompson said they hope to employ another 30-35 people there. Between both facilities, they will have approximately 120-130 employees there. Some of them are very well-paying positions. Again, this will be a flagship, so they had people fly in from all over the country and it really has served them not only as a benchmark and to show what they can do but also to introduce people to the industry that would not typically be interested in touring a facility. They plan to do the exact same thing with the provisioning center. They believe this will be one of the nicest in the country.

Planner Arroyo read through his review date stamped December 22, 2021.

Chairman Reynolds stated that OHM was unable to attend this evening. He read through their concluding comments and that the plan was in substantial compliance with Township’s ordinances other than that they recommend the following conditions as part of their approval: that they provide a copy of the preliminary approval from DTE for the proposed improvements located within their easement; and that the engineering plan, needs to be designed in accordance to Ord. #78, and #138, and the Engineering Standards will be reviewed and by the Township prior to any construction. He added that is a typical common note that acknowledges our engineering review phases as a project if it were to proceed.

Chairman Reynolds said that there was a review from our Fire Marshal, he had no additional comments. The same things go for Public Services and the Building Official. WRC had a review just acknowledging that any sewers of 8-inches or larger need to be permitted through them the rest would be submitted through the Township. Those are typically acknowledged through those engineering reviews that OHM was mentioning in theirs. There is also was a site walk completed by the Site Walk Committee. Vice-Chairman Gross completed the report, just an outline of the general areas which the petitioner gave a brief overview in their presentation.

Vice-Chairman Gross stated that light pole height 25-ft. versus 20-ft. He asked if there was any reason? Mr. Thompson replied no reason. He thought they were fine with 20-ft. They do have a lot of parking there so they do have a large parking lot that may have something to do with it. He was not included in that discussion, so it was not a deal-breaker for him.
Chairman Reynolds said that odds are it was just an oversite. He has done it himself. His guess was that a 20-ft. pole will more than meet their needs.

Vice-Chairman Gross said since this site is 20-ft. lower than the traveling road, he thought Giddings Rd., he asked if there was rooftop equipment? Mr. Thompson replied that there is no rooftop equipment.

Secretary St. Henry said his understanding was that this will be the first dispensary in Orion Township, not the Village the Township. For the record, he wanted an overview of the security setup for this facility. Mr. Thompson said that they were 1 of 4 licensees. He didn’t know what process they were in as far as site plan approval, or construction. Their cultivation facility is directly behind this site. They run a 24-hour shift they have armed security there all the time. This would be the same exact thing where they have armed security. They have secured doors, areas, and everything in that site, except the bathroom, is monitored both remotely and onsite.

Secretary St. Henry asked if customers had to register? Mr. Thompson replied yes, they do, state regulations. Whether it be for medical and then they would have to register their medical card. If they go down the road to other cities, for adult use, they are taking their photo identification.

Chairman Reynolds said in Giffels Webster’s review said that the dumpster screen wall appears to be a poured concrete brick texture if that is acceptable. It does appear to be a 6-ft. dumpster screen wall with a wooden gate. He wanted to point that out, that was one of the items in the review to discuss. He didn’t have any major issues with it.

Commissioner Walker said he normally says, if it is not done, they are not going to give conditional approval or anything. In this case, he thought that the difference between what has happened and what is going to happen according to our experts is minor league. Also, the building that they built looks like it should be in the middle of a Netflix series or something. Mr. Thompson said that the first income that they received was 2.5 months ago, two gentlemen stopped by their door, and asked if they could do a photoshoot here? He asked them if they know what they did there? They didn’t care they were doing a photo shoot for their new electric van line. It was Ford Motor Company, their new electric van line, all the photoshoot was done at their facility outside.

Commissioner Walker said that he has no problem with conditional approval.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that the Planner pointed out the question on the safety path. This has been discussed before within Liberty Tech, research had been done, there were old deed restrictions. They reached out to the developer because there are parks that did not have the safety path that the developer has agreed to go back and put in. She did believe that the safety path within there was determined to be necessary, per the ordinance.

Vice-Chairman Gross said they are suggesting that this should be a condition?

Chairman Reynolds said that it does appear that there was an asphalt path proposed on the plan on Delta Ct.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that they have Giddings and then there is a green area that belongs to the GM Plant. Technically along Giddings, it is not their responsibility but within the park themselves along that road frontage it is.
Vice-Chairman Gross asked if that was shown on the plan? Chairman Reynolds replied that it was shown on the plan.

Vice-Chairman Gross stated with the provision that the light pole height is revised to 20-ft. instead of 25-ft.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, that the Planning Commission grant 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 December 13, 2021, based on the following findings of facts: that the plan meets all ordinance requirements. This approval is based on the following conditions: that it complies with the letter of December 15, 2021, of OHM.

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds said the motion was to approve the plans as submitted with the amendment of the light poles and address the two items on the OHM review.

Roll call vote was as follows: Urbanowski, yes; Gross, yes; Gingell, yes; Walker, yes; St. Henry, yes; Reynolds, yes. Motion carried 6-0 (Brackon absent)

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
None.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS
None.

10. COMMUNICATIONS
None.

11. PLANNERS REPORTS
None.

12. COMMITTEE REPORTS
None.

13. PUBLIC HEARINGS
None.

14. CHAIRMAN’S COMMENTS
Chairman Reynolds thanked everyone for the discussion on PUDs. He asked that they do some reading on the Master Plan since they are considering a recommendation to go into the formal review period which kind of locks and loads at least as a firm draft format of their Master Plan. He knew that there were comments that they kind of plan to bring forth himself of how things are presented. They had a couple of general comments as they thumb through the major topics. Just verbiage, how things are said. Are the goals and criteria that are presented in there does that hit everything that they want to hit and make sure they are outlining all of that.

Planner Arroyo asked them to please review it and come to the next work session with their final draft comments so that they can get this into the next stage. They will be incorporating the changes that they talked about at the last meeting.
Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that she will be providing hard copies with the next version which would be the 6 p.m. at the next meeting, however, if someone has the time now that they want a copy of what is out there already get ahold of her and she will get them a hard copy.

15. COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS
Trustee Urbanowski said she had some free time after graduating from college to read a Master Plan update. She thought what sparked it was when they had the conversation about tourism and she wanted to read a little bit more into that. She did have some notes, and asked if she could send them to the Planner? She said it was 100’s of pages but going back when they are personally writing something they are going to miss a ton of things/typos. The more eyeballs that they have on it.

Vice-Chairman Gross said if they haven’t had a chance to read it, the mathematics of sign design in the latest Michigan Planner by our Planner Arroyo is very interesting reading.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that she gave them another reminder about a webinar on woodland preservation. They talk about the woodland section of the ordinance on a regular basis and they really have talked about the fact that it needs to be altered. She encouraged any of them to entertain that. She asked them to let her know. She will send out an email to confirm but right now she had Walker, Reynolds, Urbanowski, & Gingell.

16. ADJOURNMENT
Moved by Commissioner Reynolds, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, to adjourn the meeting at 9:16 p.m.  Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,
The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a joint public hearing with the Board of Trustees on Wednesday, January 5, 2022, at 7:05 p.m. at the Orion Township Municipality Complex Board Room, 2323 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, Michigan 48360.

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

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:
Derek Brackon, Commissioner

BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
Chris Barnett, Township Supervisor  Mike Flood, Trustee
Donni Steele, Treasurer  Julia Dalrymple, Trustee
Kim Urbanowski, Trustee  Penny Shults, Township Clerk

BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:
Brian Birney, Trustee

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

OTHERS PRESENT:
Thomas Allen Martelle  John Hofer
Cheryl Hofer  Ben Puraj
Mike Thomas  Tom Williams
Marilyn Hester  Mike Howard
Josh Sawicki  Ken Gutelius

The Board of Trustees opened their Special Meeting at 7:05 p.m.

Chairman Reynolds invited the applicant to make a presentation.

Mr. Daniel Johnson with In-Site, LLC presented.

Mr. Johnson said they did have a pre-app meeting last summer with the Township representatives, and consultants and they took that input into what they are going to describe. More recently they received various review letters from the consultants and have taken those into account. Given the postponement from the December 2021 meeting, they were able to incorporate several of the OHM comments.

Mr. Johnson stated that they refer to this project as Ridgewood it is on Clarkston Rd. south side, 625 W. Clarkston. One of the driving reasons for the project is the housing shortage and that is not a surprise to anyone here. Zillow in November indicated that the housing situation is quite tight. Similarly, Oakland Press, Tribune, earlier last year had the same headlines. National Publication referred to as Urban Land which is written for many real estate professionals and people in the planning world reiterates that need as well. Every year Harvard University does a housing study that incorporates projections, and demographics for the housing, and in 2021 they reiterate this particular issue with the housing shortage
and it is getting worse as time goes on. He added that part of that study talks about demographic trends, and the population growth is going up but the share of the demand for household growth is really under 35 so you start to see the millennials coming into the picture in terms of housing needs and ownership. In the Wall Street Journal, it said that millennials are supercharging the housing market. They have a combination of things going on in terms of demographic changes, empty nesters coming in as well. SEMCOG which is a publication that is referenced in their Master Plan shows regional growth for southeastern Michigan and underlining there is a population growth expected.

Mr. Johnson stated that they looked into their Master Plan, and he knew that it was going through a review right now. He did pull a few things from the 2015 Master Plan for reference when they started to look at this project. He added that the Executive Summary referenced a community goal is provide a variety of high-quality housing types at a range of density and lot sizes. That was one of the “q’s” that they took in putting this proposal together. In terms of the next point would be to encourage alternative housing styles. They referenced empty nesters here condominiums but also attached single-family dwellings.

Mr. Johnson stated getting into ordinance exerts again referencing alternatives to traditional subdivisions encouraging innovation and flexibility in land use, and encouraging a less sprawling form of development. Those were all keys that they took in terms of putting this proposal together.

Mr. Johnson said a couple of specific points from the Master Plan about Future Land Use. Within the proximity to the site or the location of the property, they have single-family medium high-density use that is planned for immediately across the street. In general, commercial uses about a quarter mile to the east on Clarkston. There are some other things going on that would be considered higher-density in nature.

Mr. Johnson showed the Board an aerial photo. He pointed out the western portion of the property is primarily open space and then as they go to the SE there is a wetland area. The use to the west is partially used and Clarkston Rd. is on the north. There are three parcels that comprise the site. The site generally falls from north to south or north to southeast. He showed the Board photos of the property they were taken in late November before the leaves fell. He showed them the existing structure that is on Clarkston immediately to the west of the property, a neighboring property photo.

Mr. Johnson said at the pre-app meeting in the summer they came with a concept plan and they got input from the Consultants and from the Township Officials. Three main things came out of that discussion, there were others but primarily three that would affect planning. One was that the Fire Department suggested/requested another access point onto Clarkston. Two more of a visitor parking inclusion in terms guests that would be visiting the neighbors. Three was an architectural component of the plan, within their ordinance there are considerations for garage frontage and elevation setback ordinance requirements, they will take those into account when they get into the architecture. He said that they incorporated those things, to begin with, and in doing that the number of units was reduced.

Mr. Johnson said when they got comments in November from both consultants, and from OCRC, there was a comment to do an alignment change for the west entrance, so they incorporated that. They eliminated one of the buildings that were located at the NE corner.

Mr. Johnson showed the Board the concept site plan. He said they tried to take full advantage of the western portion of the site which was primarily open in terms of land area. He said in the very lower righthand corner or SE corner was a wetland area which is preserved. The units are a combination of four or five townhouse-type units that are located around the site. In all cases, they have greenbelts that are along the west property line, the south property line to the extent that there are new constructions, and then across the north property line, the east property line is pretty much natural existing. Respecting the neighbors, wetland, and the environment that is there.

Mr. Johnson said in terms of some of the site design amenities, they have incorporated a walking path along the south side adjacent to the wetland areas as a natural feature for the future residents of the
development. The meandering walking path was a site feature, a gazebo element that kind of ties to that condition.

Mr. Johnson noted that in terms of the architectural concept this speaks a little bit to the ordinance requirement for the garage elevation offset. It is a combination of the front door being located 5-ft. in front of the garage doors, and then beyond that, there is a porch covering. The ordinance refers to that at least for 50%, they have done it for 100% of the units.

Mr. Johnson said with respect to stormwater considerations it is a big deal. Recently, your community adopted the new Oakland County Standards for that. They have incorporated that into the design that they have proposed for the stormwater and their consultants can speak to that. Basically, the new standards have been incorporated and are contained in the proposal.

Mr. Johnson said that environmental considerations are a big deal in many communities including theirs. Using stormwater best management practices or BMP’s as they are referred to, those generally are contained within Oakland County Standards, focus on infiltration, and planting to accomplish those things, infiltration rain gardens are proposed. The project would provide for planting over 325 trees as part of the impact of the project, and in addition to that, as they go through the calculations on the planting that would also involve a contribution for 98 trees for the community. They are proposing to use LEED Certification for the buildings/units, or the townhouses. That features a whole range of things like water-saving plumbing features, high-efficiency HVAC systems, insulation, and appliances. Also providing EV connections in each townhouse unit for the future use of electric vehicles coming to the market.

Mr. Johnson said with respect to traffic which is always a consideration for these projects, he showed the Board a summary of the excerpt that was on the submission, indicating that it would not contribute significantly and would not propose a negative impact to Clarkston and Lapeer. If they look at their ordinance given the volume that was straight out on the submission in detail, doesn’t really trigger a TIS or a Traffic Impact Statement unless the Planning Commission were to request the same. There was a reference to the lefthand turn warrant analysis by the Road Commission and by OHM, and they would intend to do that following any action tonight going in and have that analysis done which involves doing traffic counts. If the lefthand turn lane is required then they would incorporate that into the Clarkston Rd. right-of-way.

Mr. Johnson added that the west location shift was updated as a result of the comments that they received.

Mr. Johnson said within their ordinance refers to optional provisions for a concept plan and in the context of density credit provisions. There are various points within the ordinance and they have attempted to address those as they have gone through the project. For example, there are at least 20% of the PUD is a common use of open space, which would be technically something that would be considered as a density credit. In the case of their proposal, their engineers have calculated that 38% usable open space if they factor in the other open areas in 62% for the whole project.

Mr. Johnson said as he had mentioned earlier the Oakland County Stormwater design guidelines have been taken into account and again that focuses on BMP’s for the stormwater management system.

Mr. Johnson said that preserving natural features they have attempted to do that with the preservation of the wetlands, the significant number of trees including many landmark trees that are located there, and as he mentioned earlier planting over 325 trees and contributing to the Township Tree Fund.

Mr. Johnson said that in terms of land amenities that would represent a benefit to the community they contemplated the creation of the land conservation easement to incorporate the wetland areas into perpetuity. Then there would be some right-of-way on Clarkston Rd. that would be dedicated back to the Township or the right-of-way.
Mr. Johnson stated in terms of the metrics of the site he would focus on the units/acre on a net property basis is less than five. The walking path that they have proposed is almost 1/3 of a mile long. The open space if they take all it into account is over 62% which they believe is pretty significant.

Mr. Johnson said what are the considerations that they look for in terms of the project. Of course, he mentioned the millennials entering the market, these are demographic changes. There is a work-from-home trend as a result of the pandemic, and empty nesters looking for smaller, low-maintenance locations, all those types of things, that empty nesters look for.

Mr. Johnson stated from a marketability standpoint these are considerations in terms of inventory levels are very low from a housing standpoint, affordability, and supply and demand implications all tie into all of that.

Mr. Johnson said from the community benefit standpoint they tried to summarize what they thought were the key things. Number one is being responsive to some of the Master Plan objectives that they saw in their 2015 Master Plan. It provides further housing options for the Township, over 6-acres of open space and land conservation, the stormwater management system, the contribution to the tree fund. They would consider a proportional monetary contribution to the community pathway system relative to the size of their project. The dedication for the street right-of-way, the job creation that comes along with these kinds of projects, and then generally responsive to the housing shortage that the communities are experiencing in southeastern Michigan.

Chairman Reynolds asked if there was anyone from the public that would like to speak?

Mr. Mike Howard, 606 W. Clarkston Rd., directly across the street from this new improvement here. He said they are already putting in a subdivision over on Bald Mountain Rd. behind Meijer. Now they have the Meijer’s thing coming in and they have this. The increase in traffic with just Meijer alone coming down Clarkston is going to be an awful lot. Since they got that road paved a few years ago the traffic has been miserable it has been fast, nobody goes 45 or 50 MPH down there. He has seen kids set up their motorcycles on their back wheel, or some guys that come around that curve from Elk Lake there and, they just nail it. This to him is going to be more traffic, it doesn’t look like there is going to be traffic control, as the one exit where Fairledge Rd. comes out he thought where they just added that exit or moved it down. Is there going to be traffic control at that light? That is the thing that concerns him. He asked if this was a senior citizens townhouse development, or is it a family development where they would have kids there and to grow their community and have people grow up in the community instead of just moving here and finish their last years? It is a nice community he moved out here, he coached wrestling at a couple of other schools and he has gotten to know the area here and he really enjoys it. They do have a lot of emergency traffic coming down Clarkston Rd. He didn’t know why that was, he thought that there was Fire Department but usually 2-3 of those vehicles coming down at high-speed. He was concerned about the number of people and the new traffic especially with Meijer coming in because they are going to have more people come eastbound on Clarkston than they have now. If they get Meijer and he thought it was 90,000-sq. ft. he thought that was a pretty big grocery store. The farthest they go now is to Kroger it was great having Hollywood there but that is gone. He thought that traffic control was going to be the biggest important thing there. Getting in out and traffic is difficult some mornings anyway except before COVID because everyone is going to work, now there are not as many people going to work but it is still difficult at times to get out there. He would ask that they take that into consideration. He asked, how many families would there be in there? Will it be two cars/family at 50 units is 104 cars going to be coming in and out of there or is this going to be families with teenagers and then add another 50-75 cars. He thought that would be a lot of cars dumping out of two sections because there is no other way in that area to go a backdoor.

Mr. Josh Sawicki 1169 Hemmingway Rd. directly south of the Planned Unit Development. When he showed the Board the picture directly south, he was that house with a red roof. That is where he and his
wife Caroline live with their two young children. He was there to tell them why he was against this and his personal feelings on it. He stated that in their area, and he knew for sure that on Fairledge they are not allowed to build on more than 25% of their property. They are at 38.8% of the buildable land is going to be used. He didn’t that that was fair. He knew that there was a guy on Merritt who had to take his roof off to take it down two inches to be to code. If they are going to do that to someone that is going to be right across from where this unit is he didn’t think it was fair that he can only build on 25% of my land but they are going to common build on 38.8% of this land. He said there were 10 multi-unit developments in Orion Township, there is not a single one that is contingent on a residential-1 (R-1) zoning, not one, this development has two. He said he was not against progress he understood that it had to be developed and things had to be done, not this though. If they want to do a bunch of storage units and zone it commercial and have it secure, that is fine. To piggyback off the traffic, that is a safety concern as well for all of them that live around there. Changing the grade of that swamp, he personally sees there are probably 50 turkeys that live back there. They are talking about conservation, he didn’t know if a retention pond and putting in 50 units with 50 people, people bring garbage they bring different things. He didn’t know if there was really a conservation angle to this. They talked about the traffic on Hemmingway. Directly to the east is not all commercial zoning, it is directly to the east. This would be the only development not only with (1) him, but his neighbor down (2), this person directly to the east is zoned residential-1 (R-1). If you look at all the rest of the developments in Orion Township there are not even residential ones across the street. If they take that into account, they have this development is now going to be covered on three sides with residential-1 (R-1) areas. That is a major concern, he didn’t think that was fair to them that buy and pay taxes, and what to live in residential-1 (R-1) areas to have a huge 50 units coming in on more than it is supposed to be. If, God forbid this was to go through one thing that he would personally ask the developer and anyone else there give them more space of coming back. The second design was better, and he asked that there is either a concrete wall 8-ft. high or some type of berm that is going to block noise, and with softwood trees that are not going to be like 2-ft., 6-ft. live trees that are going to be a buffer.

Ms. Cheryl Hoffer, 1195 Hemmingway Rd. said she is not opposed to new development her family has been in this area since 1939. Properties along Clarkston and the surrounding areas have single-family large lots. The townhomes that they want to go up is not inclusive it doesn’t fit the area. Traffic flow is already heavy at times. Hemmingway now is used as a fast shortcut from Clarkston, she used to walk it, she doesn’t walk it anymore. Her sister lives across from Basketball America she looks out, traffic is backed up from the light at M24 all the way back there and that is a distance. The area is also abundant with wildlife, she has tree frogs, Michigan blue tail lizards, sandhill cranes, wild turkeys, turtles, too many birds to mention. She believed that the zoning would hurt this. She believed that single-family homes are more suitable for this area.

Ms. Marilyn Hester 1207 Hemmingway stated that she was the neighbor south of Mr. Josh Sawicki. She said that they have a lot of wetlands. They have the water table and runoff from Clarkston Rd. that comes into their backyard that they own the whole swampland/pond/natural preserve, whatever they sold the Walden Woods subdivision on. They have been there since 1996 and that pond has always been there. They are concerned it is going to become a river with all the water drain-off from the roofs. She knew that there was going to be water retention but she was concerned that they are going to have a river coming from Clarkston Rd. all the way down through Casemer Rd. through her backyard she is really concerned about that water. She was worried about her well, and what that impact is going to have. They are all on wells in that area, they are not on city water, they were told that they will probably be the last people to get city water through there. The surrounding area is single-homes and they are all residential, this is not characteristic of what is around. They want to see people that take pride in their yards grow gardens, and this development doesn’t have that opportunity for people to have gardens, plant flowers. They are going to have this really beautiful landscaping but it is not going to be homes like currently exist right now. This probably will impact the wildlife they had a coyote on their frozen pond today and it is so natural back there and they love their property. Also, in the presentation, they are doing all of these contributions what about for the fire and police, are they going to need to increase that? He didn’t think that there was a fire station close enough if there should be a disaster in that place. Even in their homes, they have a hard time
coming down the road and getting to their places with the traffic. The traffic will be impacted very much. She hoped that they would leave it single-family dwellings and not this big building.

Mr. Tom Williams 1160 Hemmingway, 1180 Hemmingway, 1198 Hemmingway, and 1212 Hemmingway. When there is a problem on M-24 the traffic backs up on Hemmingway so far it is a half-mile of people bumper to bumper trying to get onto Clarkston Rd. For him, it is a 15-20-minute wait. He is on a dirt road and to leave his driveway to go to Clarkston Rd. it is a 15-20-minute wait just to get out there. This development is not going to help that at all. He has lived here for 62 years and he has been around the community a while. The last time when they put those apartments up on Casemer and M-24 the police log of cops having to go up there all the time is crazy. He looks at the newspaper, this seems awful close for their small community he really didn’t want it in his neighborhood. He has 40-acres and there are no multiple dwelling homes in that area. They are all single-family residential-1 (R-1) and he didn’t think it was right to change it he thought it should stay (R-1). After 62 years he would hate to see it change.

Ms. Patricia Hamilton 719 Fairledge and has lived there for 50 years. They were the ones that had to pave the road but being Fairledge it is the first street that goes straight through from Clarkston to Heights so they get all those people tearing through there now. Their driveway is directly across from Heights Rd. They have handicapped children on this street, and a lot of the neighbors are out walking their dogs, the kids are riding their bikes. What is this going to do to these kids? How safe is this to have 100 or more cars? They are going to fly through there, they do now, it is already a cut-through for everybody. For them to get off of Fairledge onto Clarkston Rd. sometimes they have to wait for 5-10-minutes to make a lefthand turn to go to M24 now. What is going to happen then? She is not against development houses would be fine but 50 buildings are a bit much. It is going to put too much traffic and be too dangerous to these children.

Mr. Tom Martelle 1128 Walloon Way, just recently moved here, he and his family moved in at the end of 2019 early 2020. They have been blessed to have a very nice community to come into and thrive. When they got this information passed out to them it kind of caught them off guard because when they first came into the area and they did some exploring they realized that they thought it was a very nice serine secluded area, they have a lot of woods and waters that kind of kept them away from the city but still had that hometown feel to it. One of the things that they had done was they walked around the entire sub and they had noticed that there were many lots that are not even developed in the rear part of that subdivision. He didn’t know the history or the story behind that, and he is for progress. He asked why are they even considering building new buildings when they have yet to address these eyesores and these eye blights sit in the back of their current facility that poses not only blight but it is also a health concern for his 6- and 4-year-old, who are often are out there playing in the pile of woods and things like that. Another concern that he had was the watershed. His property is adjacent to the low land, the protected water land, he would like to know what type of guarantees are afforded to them to prevent any incidental damage caused by flooding that could potentially take place if they were to get too much water into their facility. He stated that he saw the plans they look beautiful but it does look like they have a lot of hard surfaces, a lot of high albedos which could certainly impact the way that the new development would impact their way of life in the community. In addition to the wildlife, his wife has a hobby of trying to catalog everything that they see. They have numerous wildlife, they have seen the fox, the coyotes, deer, turkey, wood duck, where would all of these go? Where is the home of the plan for these people if they relocate them somewhere else to a different area? His concern would be let’s find a better spot he is not against progress he thought that they need to continue to develop the community he just didn’t think that this specific location is the right one at this time.

Secretary St. Henry stated that they had four letters submitted from a Kate Erdman, Raymond Grech, Rocky Stout, and Neal Porter who owns Vet Products of Michigan. They are all opposed to the development for many of the reasons that were brought up by the public over the last ½ hour.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked how they arrived at 50 units on the site? It doesn’t seem to correlate to anything.
Chairman Reynolds stated that he echoed a couple of those concerns himself on the density. Obviously, they want to be respectful of adjacent zoning, especially when they are larger properties in residential (R-1).

Trustee Shults asked if they could give the public benefit that they are providing? She asked Planning & Zoning Director Girling regarding the Master Plan what is it zoned for in that area? She asked when they lined up the driveways was that the recommendation of the Road Commission to do that and what had they thought of the traffic that it would bring to the area? What is the market value for each unit and are they intending to sell them or will they be renters?

Trustee Flood asked if the traffic study would be required? Is the sewer lift station going to have to be put in? What is the compatibility with the current (R-1) zoning, how many houses can be put in there as it currently exists compared to the (PUD)?

Trustee Steele said she didn’t know if she saw the internal sidewalks? She did not see a benefit to the community other than an internal benefit that benefits the homeowners or the developer? Overall, she thinks that changing the underlining zoning which is (R-1) and they go closer to a multi-family they increase the use of public services which would include the police, fire, road, and utilities. In general, she stated that she is not in favor of the (PUD) changing to a multi-family versus the residential. She would like to see it remain to what is consistent around the area which is all single-family, which is a lot of the same sediments of the homeowners that live around there. The preservation of the open space looks more like it is wetlands and they can’t use it anyways and that is what they are preserving is just wetland which they would have to preserve anyways based on the land study of the wetlands. She asked if these were going to be sold or if they were going to be rentals. She felt that the rentals do weigh even more heavily on their services which are their police and fire. Over the years she has seen single-family to be less intense on their services whereas multi-family is more intense, she was concerned about that as well. She would say overall that she was not in favor of this development because of the zoning.

Supervisor Barnett said that as far as questions go, he thought those outlined most of them. He knew that they will hear from their consultants and their reviews. Typically, they hear from the people that live right around it, and obviously, they are not anxious for anything to go in typically, so they are empathetic to that. They also have to balance the property rights but certainly, there is a long process here. He stated that this will not be decided tonight even by chance they were able to get a preliminary recommendation for approval they still have to get a final.

Chairman Reynolds said he would like to turn it back over to the petitioner to answer some of the questions. He stated that he had tallied up some of the general comments that have come through that he can reiterate. There were a number of comments speaking to the traffic in the area and just the general safety of the traffic that would be presented.

Mr. Johnson said there was a traffic impact or traffic excerpt that was included in the submittal. Running through the numbers and he thought it was there but it didn’t trigger a full-blown traffic impact statement per se. Now the Planning Commission solely has the right to request that as he understood it. The numbers were because they were less than he thought than 100 occupancy space. It was spelled out in the submittal. They did get comments from the Road Commission, the primary one was the alignment of the west entrance. Secondarily they wanted to have a warrant analysis done for a lefthand turn location and they were more than willing to have done in conjunction with traffic counts that would go along with that. They were not opposed to that but thought that it would be more appropriate to defer that until after the action to whatever was decided this evening and to move forward with that right-of-way.

Chairman Reynolds stated that there were questions about who is the development intended for seniors, families, is it for rent or purchase? Mr. Johnson said it is definitely for purchase, and they keyed off sort of
the single-family attached approach to the project. They are for-sale units and they are not age-restricted in any way for seniors or millennials, it is meant to be whoever desires to live in Orion Township.

Chairman Reynolds said there were questions about wildlife conservation, wetland conservation, can they touch base on specifically the wetland conservation, and anything else that they are doing for wildlife conservation. Mr. Johnson said with respect to the wetland and wildlife there was an analysis done by a wetland consultant three or four years ago he believed which formed the basis of the boundary for the wetlands. According to their ordinance, there is also a 25-ft. setback from that so that was all taken into account in terms of the layout so nothing within that area was going to be disrupted in any way. More recently one of the comments that came from OHM had to do with a question about another potential wetland on the site so they had their wetland consultant go out again and look at that and right an opinion and that was in the package that was submitted in December after the initial comment letter was received. Basically, the resolution of that or the findings was that this particular small area was not a wetland that was taken into account.

Chairman Reynolds said there were a number of questions about compatibility with adjacent uses and existing land uses. Mr. Johnson said that part of this goes back to their Master Plan which was adopted by the community and if they look at the Future Land Use Map. He said on the north side of Clarkston Rd. the Future Land Use Map refers to a single-family medium-high density use. Which from a unit/acre basis is five and up, with respect to that metric, their medium-high density is 3-5 units/acre, and they are talking about land just across from Clarkston Rd. They are within that 3-5 units/acre range for what they are proposing. They did through the course of their pre-app meeting the number of units came down in the course of realigning the driveway, the number of units came down so they have made some adjustments along the way in response to various comments that they received.

Chairman Reynolds asked if there were any discussions at this point and time about utilities that would be required for the facilities on this development? Mr. Johnson replied that he did know that there would be a lift station required for the project, and then there is an upstream or downstream within the Townships system there were some improvements to a pump station that would have to be taken into account and they would certainly take care of whatever that requirement is based on the Engineer's analysis. Something beyond the boundary of the property that is on the current cities system would be taken care of with a lift station.

Chairman Reynolds stated that there was a question about internal and external sidewalks? Mr. Johnson pulled up the site plan and pointed them out to the Board. He said within the development itself there are sidewalks on both sides of the streets. There is a walking path along the southeast side of the project there is an internal walking system for the future pedestrians which connects to a gazebo, so the residents could walk their dogs and enjoy nature. This was all outside of the wetlands the wetlands are not being touched there are setbacks to that. Along Clarkston Rd. they have a pathway system and they are required to put something in which they have illustrated here now whether that actually makes sense or not because it doesn’t connect to anything is a question and maybe as a suggestion maybe the value of that is used somewhere else in the Township rather than connecting to nothing. There is a pathway across the street, which he was sure the neighbors are well aware of. With respect to the sidewalk/walkway that would be the response.

Chairman Reynolds asked the petitioner to touch base on the community benefits that they are providing with a (PUD) development? Question about what is being proposed? Mr. Johnson replied taking their Q’s from the Master Plan there were certain objectives that were stated that that had to do with housing, they were keying on those that may not be a benefit per se but are a guide to what they have done. It does give the Township more housing options, which options are always good for people in the housing market. The open space and land conservation are again requirements but they are also amenities to the property and certainly preserve the area to the SE the wetlands, and they again would put that to a conservation area into perpetuity make an easement out of it. The stormwater system is all that is required so not necessarily a benefit but he thought from an overall watershed standpoint this project would control the
Stormwater with the latest and greatest standards from Oakland County which involves infiltration and rain gardens, and those kinds of things. A contribution to the Tree Fund he thought was derived from the tree calculations so they are doing that as a requirement. It would be a benefit to the broader community. They talked about the pathway system before whether they could move or put the pathway that they are obligated to construct somewhere else and then add onto that, that is a discussion point. Right-of-way dedication, job creation, and the general response to the housing shortage that society is dealing with.

Supervisor Barnette said in the packet regarding square footage it looks like they were 2,700-sq. ft. units. He asked what the market value would be? Mr. Johnson said the sale price that they are targeting would be in a range of low $300,000-$400,000 depending on the upgrades that would be involved in a particular unit. They think that the 2,700-sq. ft. is on the high side and as they get into the refiner of the project that would probably come down a little bit from a size standpoint. They are basically either 2 bedrooms and an office or 3 bedrooms.

Chairman Reynolds said that there is an opportunity to provide additional questions from Planning Commission Members or citizens. He asked if there were additional comments or questions that they are looking to ask that were not brought up previously?

Mr. Mike Howard 606 W. Clarkston Rd. said that they mentioned a 3-5-houses on an acre. He said he lives directly across and Evans Rd. comes in. There are two houses in the back and there are two houses on the front of Clarkston Rd. That is a total full acre but he thought they were still zoned (R-1).

Mr. Josh Sawicki 1169 Hemmingway Rd. asked when was the traffic study done? He said if it was done during a pandemic, he didn’t think that amounts to anything. At the very least he would request a traffic study, it seems they are trying to circumvent that but at least that would be helpful.

An unknown citizen asked if the DEQ had a chance to look at this? Chairman Reynolds replied that there will be further steps there is a preliminary wetland study that has been completed and they will get into further deliberation later in the agenda. The unknown citizen stated that it is part of the approval is to have DEQ come in and give their approval. Chairman Reynolds said that there will be wetland reviews at future stages including later on in this meeting. The unknown citizen asked if that was part of the Township or was it part of the DEQ? Chairman Reynolds replied that based on what the wetlands are regulated by is who reviews that so there are multiple review steps there so all the wetlands will be reviewed.

Mr. Tom Martelle 1128 Walloon said he noticed in the adjacent properties they have a lot of invasive species both insect and plant, plant examples would be buckthorn, mosquitoes, and other insects. He asked if there were any plans to abate some of them from coming from the higher land that is being developed and putting them closer to their facility?

Chairman asked the petitioner to respond to the invasive species, any measures that are planned for in the development at this point and time? Mr. Johnson replied in general if they are invasive, they would try to deal with them as part of the project. Supervisor Barnett said that actually require that too in the ordinance so they would get to that.

Moved by Supervisor Barnett, seconded by Trustee Flood that the Board of Trustees adjourn their special meeting of the Township Board at 8:03 p.m. Motion carried

Chairman Reynolds closed the public hearing at 8:03 p.m.
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: January 13, 2022
RE: PC-2022-01, Stadium Drive Elementary Wetland Permit

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.

**Wetland Permit (Ordinance No. 107):**

**Motion:** I move that the Planning Commission approves/denies the wetland permit for PC-2022-01, Stadium Drive Elementary, located at 244 Stadium Dr. (parcel 09-14-400-013). This approval/denial is based on the following findings of facts:

a. The action or use is not/is likely to or will not/will pollute, impair, or destroy a Wetland (insert findings of facts).

b. There are no/are feasible or prudent alternatives to the proposed action (insert findings of facts)

c. The approval is/is not consistent with public interest, in light of the stated purposes of the ordinances (insert findings of facts).

If approved the approval is based on the following conditions:
Motion maker to insert any conditions.
January 12, 2022

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

RE:    Stadium Drive Elementary School – Phase 2, PC-2022-01
       Wetland Review #1

Received:  December 15, 2022 by Orion Township

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

We have completed the review for the Stadium Drive Elementary School wetland submittal. Wetlands on this site were shown on plans prepared by GMB Architecture and Engineering. A wetland evaluation report prepared by PEA Group, dated August 27, 2020 was also included. The USACE/MDEQ Joint Permit Application was utilized for the Township wetland permit application. The application was reviewed with respect to the Township’s Wetlands Protection Ordinance, No. 107.

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:
The proposed site is located on the south side of Stadium Drive, just east of Lapeer Road (M-24) in the southeast ¼ of section 14 of the Charter Township of Orion. Based on previous site visits for adjacent developments and aerial imagery, we were able to generally confirm the limits of both wetlands (Wetland A & B) as shown on the application.

Wetland (Wetland A): This wetland is not shown on the Michigan Resource Inventory System (MIRIS) map, or the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) map. The National Resources Conservation Service Soils Survey (NRCS) indicates that the on-site soils are Marlette sandy loam (10B). This wetland is located along the fence south of Stadium Drive in the northern portion of the site. The wetland is approximately 4,063 SF (0.09 acres) in size (see below image from GMB). The wetland contained numerous indicators of hydrology including inundation visible on aerial imagery and drainage patterns. This wetland is also connected to the regulated wetlands on the north side of Stadium Drive as depicted in the below image. In our opinion, Wetland A is regulated by the EGLE due to being within 500 feet of the linking Riverine stream. This wetland is also regulated by the Township per ordinance.

Wetland (Wetland B): This wetland is not shown on the Michigan Resource Inventory System (MIRIS) map or the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) map. The National Resources Conservation Service Soils Survey (NRCS) indicates that the on-site soils are Marlette sandy loam (10B). This wetland is located along the fence south of Stadium Drive in the northern portion of the site. The wetland is approximately 259 SF (0.006 acres) in size (see below image from GMB). The wetland contained numerous indicators of hydrology including inundation visible on aerial imagery and drainage patterns. This wetland is also connected to the regulated wetlands on the north side of Stadium Drive as depicted in the below image. In our opinion, Wetland B is not regulated by the EGLE due to...
being farther than 500 ft of an inland lake, pond, river or stream; and is also not more than 5 acres in size. However, it is our opinion that this wetland is regulated by the Township per ordinance.
Please be advised the information provided by KME, Inc., regarding wetland boundaries is an estimate of the wetland boundary. The ultimate decision on wetland boundary locations and jurisdictions thereof rests with the MDEQ and, in some cases, the Federal government. As a result, there may be adjustments to boundaries based upon review of a regulatory agency. An agency determination can vary, depending on various factors indicating, 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 and management activities on adjacent parcels or other events. Any of these factors can change the nature/extent of wetlands on site. This wetland determination is defined by the boundary flags depicted on this drawing. It is valid for one growing season from the date flagged. There is no assurance given herein or otherwise implied that the KME, Inc. wetland boundary will be accepted by any regulatory agency. Reliance on KME, Inc.'s opinion is at the client's risk. Further, it has been our experience that site conditions are likely to change over the course of one year. Therefore, KME, Inc. strongly recommends that the client have no reliance on our opinion after one growing season.

Be aware the manufacturer of the G.P.S. (Global Positioning System) used by KME, Inc., has opined that the equipment has, at best, sub-meter accuracy. The location of the actual wetland boundaries may therefore vary somewhat if a professional survey of the wetland flags is conducted.
IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT ON THE WETLANDS:
It appears the applicant is proposing to impact approximately 0.09 acres of Wetland A including 203 cubic feet of fill to facilitate construction of the proposed development. Additionally, the applicant is proposing to impact approximately 0.006 acres of Wetland B including 121 cubic feet of fill to facilitate construction of the proposed development.

In addition, several encroachments into the township’s required 25’ wetland buffer are shown on sheet C3.01 of the plans. The full buffer is impacted as the proposed construction is a parking lot over this existing section of wetland.

The applicant does not propose to mitigate the wetland impacts as EGLE typically requires mitigation for alterations larger than a 1/3 acre. The Planning Commission should decide on whether the lack of proposed mitigation for the impacted regulated wetlands is sufficient. Note that an enclosed storm sewer system is proposed with the new parking lot and pavement additions.

Per the Ordinance, the wetland application shall not be approved unless the following exist:

1. The action or use is not likely to or will not pollute, impair, or destroy a wetland. In our opinion, the proposed improvements are unlikely to pollute, impair, or destroy the existing wetland to the north.
2. There are no feasible or prudent alternatives to the proposed action. In our opinion, the proposed land use is consistent with the zoning of the property and the proposed methods of construction are the least impactful possible to the wetlands and natural features of the site.
3. The approval is consistent with public interest, in light of the stated purposes of this Ordinance. Based on the above findings, it is our opinion the requirements of the Wetlands Protection Ordinance are being met. The applicant is providing the required storm water management facilities and will not impact any major characteristics of the wetlands to the north.

CONCLUSION:
In our opinion, the wetlands submittal for the Stadium Drive Elementary development is in substantial compliance with the Township’s Ordinances and Engineering Standards.

Please note the soil erosion and sediment control measures will be reviewed during the engineering review phase to ensure that the wetlands are protected from adjacent construction practices. Further measures such as multiple rows of silt fence, outlet filters, and vegetative buffers may be required as part of that review.

Please feel free to contact us with any questions at (248) 751-3107 or mark.landis@ohm-advisors.com.

Sincerely,

OHM Advisors

Mark A. Landis, P.E.
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
    Wes Goodman, Lake Orion Community Schools
    Theresa Partridge, PEA Group
Digital EGLE/USACE Joint Permit Application (JPA) for Inland Lakes and Streams, Great Lakes, Wetlands, Floodplains, Dams, Environmental Areas, High Risk Erosion Areas and Critical Dune Areas

version 1.27

(Submission #: HPC-9R1S-ZDMWF, version 3)

Details

Submission ID HPC-9R1S-ZDMWF
Submission Reason New

Form Input

Instructions

To download a copy or print these instructions. Please click this link (recommended).

The EGLE/USACE "Joint Permit Application" (JPA)

READ THOROUGHLY BEFORE STARTING THE FORM
It is recommended to download a pdf of this page at www.michigan.gov/jointpermit for reference while filling out the form. Please also refer to this website for additional information regarding this form, including a glossary and other helpful resources on information required to be submitted in this form.

This is the Joint Permit Application (JPA) for construction activities where the land meets the water. This application covers permit requirements derived from state and federal rules and regulations for activities involving:

Wetlands
Floodplains
Marinas
Dams
Inland Lakes and Streams
Great Lakes Bottomlands
Critical Dunes
High Risk Erosion Areas

This application prevents duplication of state and federal forms for these activities and provides concurrent review under all pertinent state and federal laws. In the case of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) jurisdiction, the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy will also send a copy of this Joint Permit Application to the USACE for simultaneous processing. The Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy will provide coordination between state and federal agencies during the application review.

This application form is set up with the following sections to be completed by the applicant (note that it is recommended to gather all this information prior to starting this form):

Contact Information:
Applicant, Property Owner(s), Consultant(s), and any other Authorized Representative(s)
Authorizations are required from the property owner for:
- when the applicant is not the owner,
- when there is a consultant/representative for the applicant,
- when spoils disposal locations are not on site,
- when other permissions are necessary based on project specifics and are identified by the form.

Project Location Information:
Address, coordinates, and directions to the site, etc.

Background Information:
Existing site conditions, other related permits, existing easements/encumbrances, other related application numbers (pre-application meetings, Wetland Identification Program, etc.)

Permit Application Category and Public Notice Information:
This section asks what permit application category you believe fits your project. While this is not required to submit the application, knowing this will also help you submit the right permit application fee and avoid a correction request and processing delays.

The choices of permit application categories to select in the form are:
Minor Project, $100 fee (https://www.michigan.gov/documents/deq/wrd-minor-project-categories_555829_7.pdf)
Public Notice Individual Permit, range from $500-$4,000 depending on type of activity. For High Risk Erosion Areas and Critical Dune Areas fees for Public Notice individual permit applications can range from $50-$4000. Additional fees may be applied for some special project requirements such as hydraulic analysis, dam projects, and a special exception application in a critical dune area. See Fee Schedule on website for more information.

Unsure, select this and the permit reviewer will make the determination on permit type after the application is submitted based on the project details. However, some fee is required to be submitted with the application. If an additional fee is required, the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy will send a correction request that will show the remaining amount required. The application will not be considered complete without the proper fee.

Adjacent Landowner contact information for Public Notice projects is required by law. This includes any parcels touching the project parcel and parcels across the street.

Project Description:
Information on the Proposed Use and Purpose of the project (who and what the project is intended for and why is it needed). This includes a written summary of the project as well as a list of project uses and types to select from as follows:

Project Use Selections:
Private
Commercial
Public/Gov/Tribal
Federal/State funded
Non-Profit
Other

Project Type Selections:
Agriculture
Airport
Development- Condo/ Subdivision/Residential
Development-Commercial/ Industrial
Drain-County
Drain-Private
Drawdown
Lake, Drawdown
Wetland Forestry
Landfill
Marina/Mooring Facility
Marine Railway
Mining-Mineral,
Mining-Sand and Gravel
Private Residence
Restoration-Wetland
Restoration-Stream
Transportation
Septic System Surveying or Scientific Measuring Device
Utility-Electrical, Fiber optic
Utility-Oil and gas pipelines
Utility-Sewer/water line
Other

Construction Details including sequencing, timeframes, SESC rMeasures, etc.
Alternatives Analysis detailing all options considered and why this is the least impactful feasible and prudent proposal. The depth of this analysis is typically commensurate with the size and purpose of the project and at minimum should include variables such as alternate locations (including other properties), configurations and sizes (layout and design), and methods (construction technologies), and other constraints (local regulations, resource issues). Discussion should also include why the do nothing alternative is not feasible or prudent.

Project Compensation:
Narrative of how proposed impacts will be compensated (mitigated or other minimization measures), including amount, location, and method; or why mitigation should not be required. This can be traditional mitigation and/or other techniques used to minimize overall loss of functions.

Resource and Activity Type. This section is intended to determine what additional sections of the application are generated (as seen on the left side of the screen) for further information gathering. This includes questions regarding what Resource feature is involved (e.g., wetland, stream, floodplain, pond, dam, critical dune, etc.) and if there are identified Special Activities (i.e., activities requiring a specific series of questions to be answered). Be sure to choose all that apply to your project. If your activity is not listed, choose None of the Above and move on to the next question. More specific activity questions will appear later based on the resource section answers.

Resource Information and Impacts Sections (Multiple Sections). These are a series of sections that will appear on the left side of the screen based on your answers to the Resource and Activity Types section. You will input further information on the existing resources to be impacted (e.g., wetland type, permanent or temporary impact, water elevation data, drainage area, etc.) and all proposed Project Activities with their Dimensions (e.g., length, width, depth, square footage). For example, when Wetland is selected as a resource that your project will involve, a Wetland Project Information and Impacts section will appear on the left side of the screen that includes questions specific to gathering information about the wetland.

For projects including Floodplains, Marinas, Dams, Critical Dunes, or High Risk Erosion Areas individual sections will appear on the left side of the screen that include different sets of specialized questions as required by those programs. These sections do not share a specific format. Help tips will guide you in filling out these sections.

For projects including wetlands, ponds, inland lakes, streams, or the Great Lakes resources, individual sections will appear on the left side of the screen that are similar in format to each other. Each of these resource sections asks initial general information and then has additional questions regarding the Types of Activities proposed for each resource. The outline for these resource activity impacts questions is Activity Type, Dimensions Table, and Special Questions.

There are four overall Types of Activities groups for wetlands, ponds, inland lakes, streams or the Great Lakes:
Fill Activities
Dredge Activities
Structure Activities
Other Activities

Under each of these Types of Activity questions, specific activity lists will be shown that are typical for that type (fill, dredge, structure, other) and resource (wetland, lake, stream, etc.). Follow these steps to accurately fill out the Activity Type Questions:

1. Start with the Fill question and choose any activities on the list that is included in your project. If your activity is not shown, then select None of the Above and move to the next question.

2. When you select an activity listed under Fill, Dredge, Structure, or Other, a dimensions table will appear under that question. This table is where you enter EACH activity of the type you selected and associated dimensions. Be sure that all the activities you selected are also listed in the table with the dimensions. Multiple activities covering the same footprint may be combined on one line in the table (for example, riprap on slopes of driveway fill can be entered on the same impact dimensions line and does not necessarily need to be broken out).

3. Continue to answer the Activity Type questions (Fill, Dredge, Structure, Other) until all have been answered with either a specific Activity listed under that Type or None of the Above. If you did not find your activity in any list then select Other and provide a description of your activity in the space that appears. Please be as descriptive as possible.

Proposed mitigation questions may appear within specific resource types sections based on your answers. Enter any proposed mitigation in the appropriate section (wetland, stream, etc.) and if no mitigation is proposed you must provide commentary with an explanation as to why it is not required. Mitigation plans according to the mitigation checklist are required for a complete application. When mitigation is proposed be sure to also select mitigation in the Permit Application Type section under the second question.

In the above sections, uploads will be prompted as required by the answers to questions. These should be uploaded in these location (ex, mitigation plans should be uploaded in the mitigation section). Please do not wait to upload one large document with all plans combined at the end. Note that each individual upload is limited to 10M.

Upload of Proposed Site Plans.

Any plans or explanatory narratives not requested in previous sections should be uploaded in this section. Construction Plans
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including overhead view, cross sections, and profiles showing each impact either to-scale or with dimensions are required and typically would be uploaded here. Plan labels should correspond with labels entered in the form for each activity selected. The application will not be complete without the proper site plans. If drawings are not received with all required dimensions and resources identified, then the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy will send a correction request and your application processing will be delayed. However, please limit drawings, plans, and narratives submitted to the items necessary for permit review. For example, entire bid package documents and CAD drawings are often not helpful for permit review and may cause delays from wading through extraneous information. Plans, profiles and cross sections specific to the resource impacts are the most helpful.

Review:
This section allows you to see the entire form with the answers you entered. Please review for accuracy prior to hitting the submit button. A print option is provided on this screen (print to PDF is recommended). Once the application is submitted you may not make changes to it until the application has been assigned to a staff person.

Certify & Submit:
This is the final section of the application form. The ✅Submit Form✅ button selection certifies that all information in the application is true and accurate and that you have the authority to apply for the permit as indicated. This application will become part of public record.

We recommend that you have the above information ready prior to starting this application. You will be able to save in-progress applications and come back later, but all required uploads and questions are necessary before the system will allow submittal of the application. Some sections of this application form load faster than others depending on the complexity of the questions. Thanks for your patience while you work through the application. For assistance with this form visit:
https://www.michigan.gov/jointpermit

Click here for additional information on maps, drawings, and other attachment

Contact Information

 Applicant Information (Usually the property owner)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wes</td>
<td>Goodman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarkston and Lake Orion Community Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2486238020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:wgoodman@clarkston.k12.mi.us">wgoodman@clarkston.k12.mi.us</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6389 Clarkston Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkston, MI 48346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the Property Owner different from the Applicant?
No

Has the applicant hired an agent or cooperating agency (agency or firm assisting applicant) to complete the application process?
Yes

Upload Attachment for Authorization from Agent

AGENT AUTHORIZATION LETTER_ LO SCHOOLS.pdf - 10/26/2021 09:42 AM

Comment
NONE PROVIDED
Agent Contact

First Name  Last Name
Theresa  Pardington

Organization Name
PEA Group

Phone Type  Number  Extension
Mobile  3138158191

Email
Tpardington@peagroup.com

Address
2430 Rochester Court
Suite 100
Troy, MI 48083

Are there additional property owners or other contacts you would like to add to the application?
No

Project Location

DEQ Site Reference Number (Pre-Populated)
6902203424203247018

Project Location
42.75462630773989,-83.24143486871719

Project Location Address
244 Stadium Dr
Orion Charter Township, MI 48360

County
Oakland

Is there a Property Tax ID Number(s) for the project area?
Yes
Please enter the Tax ID Number(s) for the project location
09-14-400-013

Is there Subdivision/Plat and Lot Number(s)?
No

Is this project within Indian Lands?
No

Local Unit of Government (LUG)
Orion Township

Directions to Project Site
From interstate I-75 traveling North- Take the Lapeer road exit, travel 4.7 miles to Stadium Drive road, turn right (east) and the school will be on the right (south side).

Background Information

Has the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE) and/or United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) conducted a pre-application meeting/inspection for this project?
No

Has the EGLE completed a Wetland Identification Program (WIP) assessment for this site?
No
Environmental Areas are coastal wetlands on the shorelines of the Great Lakes. Enter this number only if a designated Environmental Area is in the proposed project area. Environmental Areas are designated locations along the Great Lakes shoreline. If you don't know whether there is an environmental area within the project area, leave blank. Additional information on Environmental Areas can be found by clicking the following link:

[Click Here for Link]

Environmental Area Number (if known):
NONE PROVIDED

Has the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) completed either an approved or preliminary jurisdictional determination for this site?
No

Were any regulated activities previously completed on this site under an EGLE and/or USACE permit?
No

Have any activities commenced on this project?
No

Is this an after-the-fact application?
No

Are you aware of any unresolved violations of environmental law or litigation involving the property?
No

Is there a conservation easement or other easement, deed restriction, lease, or other encumbrance upon the property?
No

Are there any other federal, interstate, state, or local agency authorizations associated with this project?
Yes

List all other federal, interstate, state, or local agency authorizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Type of Approval</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date Applied</th>
<th>Approved/Denied/Undetermined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SESC</td>
<td>NONE PROVIDED</td>
<td>NONE PROVIDED</td>
<td>NONE PROVIDED</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
NONE PROVIDED

Permit Application Category and Public Notice Information

Project Category Selection:
The Permit Application Category you apply under is dependent on the type and scope of activities you are undertaking and the resources affected. There is a three-tier permitting process to aid in expediting permits for regulated activities that occur on wetlands, inland lakes and streams, and the Great Lakes (Parts 301, 303, and 325): General Permit, Minor Project, and Individual Permit.

Additionally, Minor Project categories exist for floodplains under the authority of Part 31.

General Permit and Minor Project categories generally meet specific Best Management Practices criteria that have been shown to minimize impacts to resources if followed correctly. If you select a General Permit or Minor Project Category you must select the specific category(ies) that your project fits under. Any project that does not fit a General or Minor Category are Individual Permit projects. All projects in Critical Dunes, High Risk Erosion Areas, or Dam Safety projects will be Individual Permit Projects.

Indicate the type of permit being applied for.
Individual Permit for all other projects

This type of permit application requires that you include contact information for the adjacent landowners to this project. If you are only entering in a small number of bordering parcel owners contact information, please select "Enter list of recipients". If there is a rather large number of affected property owners such as a project that significantly affects lake levels, please upload a spreadsheet of the property owners. Please include names and mailing addresses.

Upload a list.
Project Description

Project Use: (select all that apply - Private, Commercial, Public/Government/Tribal, Receiving Federal/State Transportation Funds, Non-profit, or Other)
Receiving Federal/State Funds
Public/Government/Tribal

Project Type (select all that apply):
Other: Public School site improvements, creation of new bus and staff parking.

Please enter your answers in the text box for the next four questions. If you have a long description, please use the document upload at the end of the section. Please make every effort to enter your information directly into the application text boxes. If the answer is in an attachment, please identify that in the text box below.

Project Summary (Purpose and Use): Provide a summary of all proposed activities including the intended use and reason for the proposed project.
Lake Orion schools is updating their vehicular circulation system on their campus. This plan provides the installation of bus drop off loop separated from new staff parking which will provide a safer environment for the students/parents and staff at Stadium Drive Elementary.

Project Construction Sequence, Methods, and Equipment: Describe how the proposed project timing, methods, and equipment will minimize disturbance from the project construction, including but not limited to soil erosion and sedimentation control measures.
1.) Acquire all permits 2.) Install all SESC control measures 3.) demolition 4.) mass grading 5.) construct parking lots 6.) fine grading 7.) install seeding/permanent site stabilization.

Project Alternatives: Describe all options considered as alternatives to the proposed project, and describe how impacts to state and federal regulated waters will be avoided and minimized. This may include other locations, materials, etc.
Due to the program elements of the bus loop and parking it needs to be near the main and existing resources no prudent or other feasible options exist.

Project Compensation: Describe how the proposed impacts to state and federal regulated waters will be compensated, OR explain why compensatory mitigation should not be required for the proposed impacts. Include amount, location, and method of compensation (i.e., bank, on-site, preservation, etc.)
Impacts are under 1/3 acre, no mitigation is proposed.

Upload any additional information as needed to provide information applicable to your project regarding project purpose sequence, methods, alternatives, or compensation.
NONE PROVIDED

Comment
NONE PROVIDED

Resource and Activity Type

Important! Answer all questions completely. Properly identifying your project in this section generates the proper application sections. Incomplete applications will require corrections before they can be fully processed.

SELECT THE ACTIVITIES from the list below that are proposed in your project (check ALL that apply). If you don’t see your project type listed, select “Other Project Type”. These activities listed require additional information to be gathered later in the application.

Other Project Type
The Proposed Project will involve the following resources (check ALL that apply).

Wetland

Major Project Fee Calculation Questions

Is filling of 10,000 cubic yards or more proposed (cumulatively) within wetlands, streams, lakes, or Great Lakes? No

Is dredging of 10,000 cubic yards (cumulatively) or more proposed within streams, lakes, or Great Lakes? (wetlands not included) No

Is new dredging or adjacent upland excavation in suspected contamination areas proposed by this application? No

Is a subdivision, condominium, or new golf course proposed? No

Wetland Project Information and Impacts

PLEASE READ
This section is for entering information regarding the impacts to Wetlands only. Do not input information that pertains to other resources (inland lakes, streams, floodplains, etc.). The initial questions are related to wetlands on the project site in general. The Proposed Activities questions are grouped into Fill, Dredge, Structures, Other and are only for wetland impacts related to these activities.

Click HERE for more information on Wetlands Protection Program.

Has a professional wetland delineation been completed for this site? Yes

Attach a copy of wetland delineation report with data form.

Wetland Report_2020-0299.pdf - 10/15/2021 01:38 PM
Comment
NONE PROVIDED

Total acres of wetland affected by this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Affected area (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is filling or draining of 1 acre or more (cumulatively) of wetland proposed? No

Select all wetland types that will be affected by this project:

Emergent

The following questions gather information on the specific Types of Activities your project includes that will impact WETLANDS. There are four overall Types of Activities: Fill, Dredge, Structure, Other. Under each of the Activity Type questions, specific activity lists will be shown. If the activity is not shown in the list given, select None of the Above and move to the next question. When you select an activity under Fill, Dredge, Structure, or Other, a table will appear under that type. Only enter the dimensions of the activity that are within wetland. Multiple activities covering the same footprint may be combined on one line in the table. Continue to answer the Activity Type questions (Fill, Dredge, Structure, Other) until all have been answered with either a specific Activity listed under that Type or None of the Above. If you did not find your activity in any list then select Other, Other and provide a description of your activity.
If your project includes placing fill in wetland then select the proposed activities from the following list. If your activity is not shown, then select ❌ None of the Above and move to the next question. Only enter an impacted area in one of the impact tables (do not duplicate impact entries):

- General Fill
- Parking Area

Complete this table for projects involving Fill. Enter each activity/location that corresponds with each activity selected in the previous question and enter the dimensions. Activities may be entered in one line of the table if they occupy the same impact footprint and cannot be broken out separately (Example: Activity - Driveway and Riprap slope). Multiple activities in different locations should be listed on different lines of the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Length (feet)</th>
<th>Width (feet)</th>
<th>Depth (feet)</th>
<th>Area (square feet)</th>
<th>Volume (cubic feet)</th>
<th>Volume (cubic yards)</th>
<th>Corrected value for complex impact AREAS (square feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Impact #1</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3657.92</td>
<td>5486.88</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3657.92</td>
<td>Sum: 5486.88</td>
<td>Sum: 203</td>
<td>Sum: 3660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Fill Material:
- Off-site
- Please Describe
- Bring in Clean ordinary fill

Type of Fill:
- Other: Clean ordinary fill

Is riprap proposed?
- No

Select from the following list for Excavation/Dredge Activities (if your proposed project is primarily a structure enter the impact as a structure. Only enter an impacted area in one of the impact tables in one impact section):

- Excavation (wetlands)

If your project includes EXCAVATION/DREDGE IN WETLAND then select all of the proposed activities in the following list. If your activity is not shown, then select ❌ None of the Above and move to the next question. Only enter an impacted area in one of the impact tables (do not duplicate impact entries):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Length (feet)</th>
<th>Width (feet)</th>
<th>Depth (feet)</th>
<th>Area (sq. feet)</th>
<th>Volume (cubic feet)</th>
<th>Volume (cubic yards)</th>
<th>Corrected value for complex impact AREAS (square feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Impact #2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>404.16</td>
<td>121.248</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>404.16</td>
<td>Sum: 121.248</td>
<td>Sum: 4</td>
<td>Sum: 404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spoils Disposal

Will the excavation/dredge spoils be disposed of on site or off site?
- On site

Describe any measures used to retain sediment:
- NONE PROVIDED

If your project includes STRUCTURES IN WETLAND then select all of the proposed activities in the following list. If your activity is not shown, then select ❌ None of the Above and move to the next question. Only enter an impacted area in one of the impact tables (do not duplicate impact entries):

- None of the above
If your project includes Other Activities in WETLAND not listed in this section, then select from the proposed activities in the following list. If your activity in Wetland has not been listed in this Wetland Section, then select Other and enter a description of your activity. Only enter an impacted area in one of the impact tables (do not duplicate impact entries). If you selected a Fill, Excavation/Dredging, or Structure activity above in this section, but do not have an activity listed as Other, then select None of the Above for this question.

None of the above

**Wetland Mitigation**

EGLE may impose as a condition of any wetland permit, other than a General permit, a requirement for compensatory mitigation. The wetland mitigation requirement may be waived for projects affecting less than one-third of an acre of wetland if no reasonable opportunity for mitigation exists.

Mitigation plans according to the mitigation checklist (link) are required for a complete application.

**Wetland Mitigation Information**

Is Wetland Mitigation being proposed as part of this proposed project?

No

Explain why no mitigation is proposed.

Wetland Impact is under 1/3 acre, no mitigation is proposed.

**Upload of Proposed Site Plans**

**REQUIRED Application, maps, and drawings:**

*Overall Project Site Plan*

*Cross-Sectional Drawings*

For Part 315 Dam Safety applications attach detailed signed and sealed engineering plans for a Part 315 dam repair, dam alteration, dam abandonment, or dam removal.

[Examples site plan and cross-sectional drawings](#)

For additional information on maps, drawings, and other attachments visit michigan.gov/jointpermit

Required on all Site Plan uploads. Please identify that all of the following items are included on your plans that you upload with this application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Plan Features</th>
<th>Existing and Proposed Plan Set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale, Compass North, and Property Lines</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill and Excavation areas with associated amounts in cubic yards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any rivers, lakes, or ponds and associated Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior dimensions of Structures, Fill and Excavation areas associated with the proposed project</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions to other Structures and Lot Lines associated with the project</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topographic Contour Lines from licensed surveyor or engineer when applicable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Upload Site Plans and Cross Section Drawings for your Proposed Project**

5-4749 C0.01 Existing Conditions Plan.pdf - 10/26/2021 09:45 AM
5-4749 Wetland Permit-SECTION 1.pdf - 10/26/2021 09:45 AM
5-4749 C3.01.pdf - 10/26/2021 09:45 AM
5-4749 Wetland Permit-SECTION 2.pdf - 10/26/2021 09:45 AM
20211022_5-4749 Wetland Permit-AREA 1.pdf - 10/26/2021 09:45 AM

**Comment**

NONE PROVIDED

**Additional Required and Supplementary Documents**

NONE PROVIDED

**Comment**

NONE PROVIDED

**Fees**
The application fee identified in this section is a calculation based on answers to the questions in this application. This calculation is an estimate of the total fee and will be reviewed by the application processor to determine if any additional fees are required for a complete application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Permit Fee:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+$500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Fee Amount:  
$500.00

Is the applicant or landowner a State of Michigan Agency?  
No

Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revision</th>
<th>Revision Date</th>
<th>Revision By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revision 1</td>
<td>10/7/2021 2:29 PM</td>
<td>Theresa Pardington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision 2</td>
<td>10/15/2021 2:55 PM</td>
<td>Theresa Pardington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision 3</td>
<td>10/26/2021 9:40 AM</td>
<td>Theresa Pardington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SECTION 1

Sheets 2 of 4
October 22, 2021

Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes and Energy
SE Michigan District Office
27700 Donald Court
Warren, MI 48092

RE: MiWaters Electronic EGLE/USACE Joint Permit Application Authorization

EGLE:

As Applicant and Owner for the EGLE/USACE Joint Permit Application for parcels listed within the permit plans, please accept this letter as authorization for PEA Inc., to act as our agent for a Part 301, Part 303, and/or Part 31. In addition, this letter authorizes EGLE to enter the property for the purposes of obtaining an EGLE/USACE joint permit.

I acknowledge that I am certifying to all of the following: I am applying for a permit to authorize the activities described herein. I am familiar with the information contained in this application; that it is true and accurate; and, to the best of my knowledge, that it is in compliance with the State Coastal Zone Management Program. I understand that there are penalties for submitting false information and that any permit issued pursuant to this application may be revoked if information contained in this application is untrue. I agree to allow representatives of the EGLE, USACE, and/or their agents or contractors to enter upon said property in order to inspect the proposed activity site before and during construction and after the completion of the project. I understand that I must obtain all other necessary local, county, state, or federal permits and that the granting of other permits by local, county, state, or federal agencies does not release me from the requirements of obtaining the permit requested herein before commencing the activity. I have the legal authority to undertake the activities proposed in this application if a permit is granted. I understand that the payment of the application fee does not guarantee the issuance of a permit.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Wes Goodman
Director, Operations
wes.goodman@lok12.org

Lake Orion Community Schools
455 E. Scripps Road
Lake Orion, MI 48360
(248) 814-1798
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NAME</strong></th>
<th><strong>PIN</strong></th>
<th><strong>ADDRESS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Baptist Church</td>
<td>09-14-400-017</td>
<td>255 E SCRIPPS RD Lake Orion, MI 48360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Judith</td>
<td>09-23-203-004</td>
<td>2120 Chestnut Cir Lake Orion, MI 48360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael A &amp; Terri M Fabbri Living Trust</td>
<td>09-23-203-003</td>
<td>2104 Chestnut Cir Lake Orion, MI 48360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings, John C</td>
<td>09-23-203-002</td>
<td>2088 Chestnut Cir Lake Orion, MI 48360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kettman Family Living Trust</td>
<td>09-23-203-001</td>
<td>2072 Chestnut Cir Lake Orion, MI 48360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antosh, James J</td>
<td>09-23-228-001</td>
<td>2056 Chestnut Cir Lake Orion, MI 48360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzzy, Bradford</td>
<td>09-23-228-002</td>
<td>2040 Chestnut Cir Lake Orion, MI 48360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brodoski, Timothy A</td>
<td>09-23-228-003</td>
<td>2024 Chestnut Cir Lake Orion, MI 48360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soto, Adiel Je Jesus Astudillo</td>
<td>09-23-228-004</td>
<td>2016 Chestnut Cir Lake Orion, MI 48360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell, Jeffery</td>
<td>09-23-228-005</td>
<td>2000 Chestnut Cir Lake Orion, MI 48360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham, David</td>
<td>09-23-227-002</td>
<td>2001 Huntington Dr Lake Orion, MI 48360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slone Ill, Walter</td>
<td>09-23-227-038</td>
<td>382 E Scripps Rd Lake Orion, MI 48360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Tree Homeowners Assoc.</td>
<td>09-23-227-037</td>
<td>2216 Marie Dr Lake Orion, MI 48360-2296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Orion Community Schools</td>
<td>09-14-400-018</td>
<td>471 Scripps RD Lake Orion, MI 48360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJC Stadium Ridge LLC</td>
<td>09-14-400-026</td>
<td>Address not listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 27, 2020  
PEA Project No: 2020-0299  

Wes Goodman  
Lake Orion Community Schools  
315 Stadium Drive  
Lake Orion, MI 48360  

**RE:** Wetland Delineation (PIN 09-14-400-013)  
Lake Orion Elementary Stadium Campus  
315 Stadium Drive  
Lake Orion, Oakland County, Michigan  

On August 19, 2020 PEA Group evaluated the subject property for the field indicators of the presence of wetlands as defined by the State of Michigan. Pink wetland survey ribbons were used to delineate a wetland boundary on the site when all three wetland indicators were present (wetland hydrology, hydric soils, and hydrophytic vegetation) as defined by USACE wetland delineation manual (1987) and the Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Midwest Region (Version 2.0).  

The evaluated area consisted of approximately one acre of the overall approximate 165-acre school campus. The property is located off of Stadium Drive, east of Lapeer Road (M-24) and north of East Scripps Road. The area of the wetland evaluation was limited to the area surrounding Stadium Elementary. This property consists of the existing elementary school with associated drives and parking areas. The area north of Stadium Drive Elementary consists of an undeveloped woodlot. Lake Orion Baptist School and its associated parking areas is found to the west. The areas to the south and east contain other Lake Orion Community School buildings, parking areas, and athletic/ open fields. Two (2) wetlands were found on the property. The following report summarizes the characteristics of the wetlands on the property as they appeared at the time of the delineation.
Wetland ‘A’: Flags A-1 to A-42

This wetland is located along the fence south of Stadium Drive in the northern portion of the site. The wetland is approximately 4,063 SF (0.09 acres) in size. It contained wetland vegetation including fringed willowherb (*Epilobium ciliatum*), Torrey’s rush (*Juncus torreyi*) and joint-leaf rush (*Juncus articulatus*). The wetland contained numerous indicators of hydrology including inundation visible on aerial imagery and drainage patterns. The wetland contained the hydric soil indicators (F3) Depleted matrix and (S5) Sandy redox. Upland species including Canadian thistle, queen Anne’s lace, tall goldenrod was found along the wetland boundary. The wetland boundary was found where the hydrology indicators were no longer present and the vegetation switches to primarily upland species.
This wetland is located along the fence south of Stadium Drive in the northern portion of the site. The wetland is approximately 259 SF (0.006 acres) in size. It contained wetland vegetation including black willow (*Salix nigra*), black bent (*Agrostis gigantea*) and fox-tail sedge (*Carex vulpinoidea*). The wetland contained numerous indicators of hydrology including inundation visible on aerial imagery and drainage patterns. The wetland contained the hydric soil indicator (F6) Redox Dark Surface. Upland species including Russian olive, tall goldenrod, queen Anne's lace was found along the wetland boundary. The wetland boundary was found where the hydrology indicators were no longer present and the vegetation switches to primarily upland species.
NRCS Web Soil Survey Map
Soil found in wetland area -10B Marlette sandy loam, 1 to 6 percent slopes
EGLE Wetland Mapper
Green areas are wetlands as identified on national wetland inventory and MIRIS maps. Yellow areas are areas which have wetland soils. Green/yellow areas are areas identified on NWI and MIRIS maps and soil areas which include wetland soils.
**Wetland Map (approximate locations)**

---

**Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy**

Wetlands within 500’ of an inland lake, pond, river, or stream, as defined by Part 303 of the Wetlands Protection Act are considered a regulated wetland.

Wetlands that are not within 500’ of an inland lake, pond, river or stream, but are more than 5 acres in size are considered regulated wetlands.

Wetlands that are listed within the rare or imperiled MDEQ list found on the Michigan’s Rare Wetlands section of the website (26 of the 33 wetland communities are rare; 8 of the 26 rare are imperiled).

Wetlands with a documented presence of a threatened or endangered species.

**Mitigation**

EGLE typically requires that only wetland alterations that total over 1/3 of an acre in size be mitigated per the EGLE-USACE Joint Permit Application language, EGLE may also require mitigation of smaller areas of disturbance at their discretion per the Wetland Protection Act that calls for zero net loss wetlands. Mitigation may be constructed on-site, off-site or credits may be purchased from pre-approved EGLE wetland mitigation banks.
Opinion of Regulatory Status

Many factors influence the extent of a wetland boundary, including weather patterns, drainage, changes in vegetation, and activities on the site or on adjacent properties at the time of the investigation. The wetland observations completed by PEA for the subject parcel are based on the conditions at the site at the time of our investigation and current policy regarding the procedures used to delineate wetlands.

Please be advised that EGLE, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency regulate wetlands and ultimately reserve final judgement on the extent of wetlands on any given site. The determination of a wetland on a specific site can vary depending on the conditions offered above as well as on the agency representative conducting the determination, and current wetland regulations.

The following regulatory status of the wetlands is the opinion of PEA Group based on the field conditions at the time of the wetland delineation of August 19, 2020.

**Wetland A:** Regulated – within 500 feet of a stream (refer to image).
**Wetland B:** Non-Regulated – fails all rules of Part 303.

---

**Orion Township, MI Wetland Protection Ordinance No. 107**

Based upon Orion Township’s Wetland Ordinance No. 107, Wetland A will most likely be regulated by the Township. Wetland B would likely not be regulated by the Township. Wetland A would only be regulated if the Township deems that Wetland A meets one of the criteria within Section 5.0. Based upon Section 5.0 criteria, Wetland A may meet the following items:
5. The site provides flood and storm control by the hydrologic absorption and storage capacity of the wetland.

8. The site provides pollution treatment by serving as a biological and chemical oxidation basin.

9. The site provides erosion control by serving as a sedimentation area and filtering basin, absorbing silt and organic matter.

Prepared by:

PEA Group

Theresa Pardington, PLA, PWS, ISA-CA
Project Coordinator | Wetland Scientist
### WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Northcentral and Northeast Region

**Project/Site:** 2020-0299 Lake Orion Stadium Elementary  
**City/County:** Orion / Oakland  
**Sampling Date:** 8/19/2020

**Applicant/Owner:** Wes Goodman Lake Orion Community Schools  
**State:** MI  
**Sampling Point:** A

**Investigator(s):** T. Pardington  
**Section, Township, Range:** 04N10E14

**Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.):** Flats on till plains  
**Local relief (concave, convex, none):** none

**Slope (%):** 1-6  
**Lat:** 42.75516  
**Long:** -83.24031  
**Datum:** none

**Soil Map Unit Name:** 10B- Marlette sandy loam, 1 to 6 percent slopes  
**NWI classification:** nonw

Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? **Yes**  
If no, explain in Remarks.

Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology significantly disturbed?  
Are “Normal Circumstances” present? **Yes**  
If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydric Soil Present?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Hydrology Present?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, optional Wetland Site ID: 

Remarks: (Explain alternative procedures here or in a separate report.)

---

### HYDROLOGY

**Wetland Hydrology Indicators:**

- Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)
  - Surface Water (A1)
  - High Water Table (A2)
  - Saturation (A3)
  - Water Marks (B1)
  - Sediment Deposits (B2)
  - Drift Deposits (B3)
  - Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
  - Iron Deposits (B5)
  - Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
  - Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)

- Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)
  - Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
  - Aquatic Fauna (B13)
  - Marl Deposits (B15)
  - Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
  - Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
  - Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
  - Thin Muck Surface (C7)
  - Other (Explain in Remarks)
  - Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
  - Drainage Patterns (B10)
  - Moss Trim Lines (B16)
  - Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
  - Clayfish Burrows (C8)
  - Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
  - Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
  - Geomorphic Position (D2)
  - Shallow Aquitard (D3)
  - Microtopographic Relief (D4)
  - FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

**Field Observations:**

- Surface Water Present? Yes | No  
  - Depth (inches): 
- Water Table Present? Yes | No  
  - Depth (inches): 
- Saturation Present? Yes | No  
  - Depth (inches):  
  (includes capillary fringe)

**Wetland Hydrology Present?** Yes | No

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

Remarks:
VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

### Dominance Test worksheet:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC:</th>
<th>3 (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata:</td>
<td>3 (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC:</td>
<td>100 (A/B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prevalence Index worksheet:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total % Cover of:</th>
<th>Multiply by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBL species</td>
<td>15 x 1 = 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACW species</td>
<td>60 x 2 = 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC species</td>
<td>10 x 3 = 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACU species</td>
<td>85 x 4 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPL species</td>
<td>165 x 5 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Totals:</td>
<td>165 (B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prevalence Index** = B/A = 1.941

### Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
  - Dominance Test is >50%
  - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0
- Morphological Adaptations
  - Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet
- Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation

**Definitions of Vegetation Strata:**

- **Tree** – Woody plants 3 in. (7.6 cm) or more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless of height.
- **Sapling/shrub** – Woody plants less than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall.
- **Herb** – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.
- **Woody vines** – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in height.

### Absolutes

#### Absolute Dominant Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30')</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Absolute Dominant Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15')</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fraxinus pennsylvanica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>FACW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Absolute Dominant Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5')</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Epilobium ciliatum</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>FACW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Juncus tenuis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Juncus articulatus</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>OBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Juncus torreyi</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>FACW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30')</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:** (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)

Upland vegetation found along wetland boundary: Canadian thistle, queen Anne’s lace, tall goldenrod
**SOIL**

**Profile Description:** (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Redox Features</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Color (moist)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Color (moist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>10YR 4/2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7.5YR 4/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in soil pit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains.  
2Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

**Hydric Soil Indicators:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydric Soil Indicators:</th>
<th>Indicators of Problematic Hydric Soils:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>__ Histosol (A1)</td>
<td>__ Polyvalue Below Surface (S8) (LRR R, MLRA 149B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ Histic Epipedon (A2)</td>
<td>__ Thin Dark Surface (S9) (LRR R, MLRA 149B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ Black Histic (A3)</td>
<td>__ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) (LRR K, L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)</td>
<td>__ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ Stratified Layers (A5)</td>
<td>__ Depleted Matrix (F3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)</td>
<td>__ Thin Dark Surface (S9) (LRR K, L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ Thick Dark Surface (A12)</td>
<td>__ Redox Surface (F6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1)</td>
<td>__ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)</td>
<td>__ Redox Depressions (F8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sandy Redox (S5)</strong></td>
<td>__ Iron-Manganese Masses (F12) (LRR K, L, R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ Stripped Matrix (S6)</td>
<td>__ Red Parent Material (TF2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ Dark Surface (S7) (LRR R, MLRA 149B)</td>
<td>__ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>__ Other (Explain in Remarks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

**Restrictive Layer (if observed):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>Depth (inches):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hydric Soil Present? Yes [] No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**
WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Northcentral and Northeast Region

Project/Site: 2020-0299 Lake Orion Stadium Elementary  City/County: Orion / Oakland  Sampling Date: 8/19/2020
Applicant/Owner: Wes Goodman Lake Orion Community Schools  State: MI  Sampling Point: B
Investigator(s): T. Pardington  Section, Township, Range: 04N10E14
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flats on till plains  Local relief (concave, convex, none): none
Slope (%): 1-6  Lat: 42.75526  Long: -83.24004  Datum: none
Soil Map Unit Name: 10B Marlette sandy loam, 1 to 6 percent slopes  NWI classification: nonw

Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ☒ No ☒ (If no, explain in Remarks.)
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology significantly disturbed? Are “Normal Circumstances” present? Yes ☒ No ☒
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?</th>
<th>Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes ☒ No ☒</td>
<td>Yes ☒ No ☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks: (Explain alternative procedures here or in a separate report.)

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)  Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- Surface Water (A1)  > Water-Stained Leaves (B9)  > Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- High Water Table (A2)  > Aquatic Fauna (B13)  > Drainage Patterns (B10)
- Saturation (A3)  > Marl Deposits (B15)  > Moisture Cracks (A16)
- Water Marks (B1)  > Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)  > Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- Sediment Deposits (B2)  > Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)  > Clayfish Burrows (C8)
- Drift Deposits (B3)  > Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)  > Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- Algal Mat or Crust (B4)  > Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)  > Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- Iron Deposits (B5)  > Thin Muck Surface (C7)  > Geomorphic Position (D2)
- Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B7)  > Other (Explain in Remarks)  > Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)  > FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:
Surface Water Present? Yes ☒ No ☒ Depth (inches):________
Water Table Present? Yes ☒ No ☒ Depth (inches):________
Saturation Present? Yes ☒ No ☒ Depth (inches):________
Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ☒ No ☒

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

Remarks:
VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

### Dominance Test worksheet:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC:</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>(A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata:</td>
<td></td>
<td>(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC:</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(A/B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prevalence Index worksheet:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total % Cover of:</th>
<th>Multiply by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBL species</td>
<td>80 x 1 = 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACW species</td>
<td>20 x 2 = 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC species</td>
<td>10 x 3 = 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACU species</td>
<td>4 x 4 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPL species</td>
<td>5 x 5 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Totals:</td>
<td>(A) 150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prevalence Index = B/A = 1.364

### Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
- **X** Dominance Test is >50%
- **X** Prevalence Index is ≤3.0
- Morphological Adaptations (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
- Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation (Explain)

1. Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

### Definitions of Vegetation Strata:

- **Tree** – Woody plants 3 in. (7.6 cm) or more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless of height.
- **Sapling/shrub** – Woody plants less than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall.
- **Herb** – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.
- **Woody vines** – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in height.

### Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?

Yes **X** No

### Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30’)</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Salix nigra</td>
<td>30 Y</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>30 = Total Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15’)</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Salix nigra</td>
<td>15 Y</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>15 = Total Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5’)</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Agrostis gigantea</td>
<td>20 Y</td>
<td>FACW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Carex vulpinoidea</td>
<td>20 Y</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rumex crispus</td>
<td>5 N</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Juncus articulatus</td>
<td>15 Y</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>15 = Total Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30’)</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vitis riparia</td>
<td>5 Y</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5 = Total Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
**Profile Description:** (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Redox Features</th>
<th>Texture</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Color (moist)</td>
<td>% Color (moist)</td>
<td>% Type¹</td>
<td>Loc²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-12</td>
<td>10YR 3/2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7.5YR 6/6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5YR 4/6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>———</td>
<td>———</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. ²Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

**Hydric Soil Indicators:**

- Histosol (A1)
- Histic Epipedon (A2)
- Black Histic (A3)
- Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- Stratified Layers (A5)
- Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1)
- Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- Sandy Redox (S5)
- Stripped Matrix (S6)
- Dark Surface (S7) (LRR R, MLRA 149B)

**Indicators of Problematic Hydric Soils:**

- Polyvalue Below Surface (S8) (LRR R, MLRA 149B)
- Thin Dark Surface (S9) (LRR R, MLRA 149B)
- Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) (LRR K, L)
- Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- Depleted Matrix (F3)
- Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- Redox Depressions (F8)
- Red Parent Material (TF2)
- Iron-Manganese Masses (F12) (LRR K, L, R)
- Piedmont Floodplain Soils (F19) (MLRA 149B)
- Mesic Spodic (TA6) (MLRA 144A, 145, 149B)
- Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

**Restrictive Layer (If observed):**

- Type: ____________________________
- Depth (inches): ____________________

**Hydric Soil Present?**  Yes □  No □

**Remarks:**

Upland vegetation found along wetland boundary: Russian olive, tall goldenrod, queen Anne's lace
EXISTING CONDITIONS & DEMOLITION PLAN

DEMO AND REMOVE EXISTING ASPHALT PAVING.

SAWCUT CONCRETE/ASPHALT FOR CLEAN EDGE/JOINT, REMOVE TO NEAREST JOINT LINE.

DEMO AND REMOVE EXISTING CONCRETE PAVEMENT. INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: FLATWORK, CURBING, STAIRS, WALLS, ETC.

DEMO AND REMOVE EXISTING VEGETATION, LANDSCAPE EDGING AND MATERIALS.

DEMO AND REMOVE EXISTING UTILITY STRUCTURES. INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: CATCH BASINS, MANHOLES AND CONNECTED PIPING, ETC. REMOVE EXISTING SITE LIGHTING.

SALVAGED BENCH & MEMORIAL BRICK TO BE RELOCATED IN PHASE 2

REMOVE PAVEMENT MARKINGS

REMOVE EXISTING FENCE

DEMO AND REMOVE EXISTING CONCRETE SITE FURNITURE

PROTECT EXISTING VEGETATION

REMOVE EXISTING FLAGPOLE

DEMO AND REMOVE EXISTING CONCRETE SITE FURNITURE

REMOVE & SALVAGE PLAY EQUIPMENT FOR RELOCATION

AREA TO BE MILLED (TYPICAL OF HATCH)

ALL RAISED GARDENBEDS – TYP (5) TABLES – TYP

AREA TO BE MILLED (TYPICAL OF HATCH)

WETLAND IMPACT #10.09 ACRE

WETLAND IMPACT #20.006 ACRE

WETLAND B

NON-REGULATED

10.09 ACRE

20.006 ACRE

NON-REGULATED

December 23, 2021

Orion Township Planning & Zoning
From: Michigan Association of Planning <kelly@planningmi.ccsend.com> on behalf of Michigan Association of Planning <avansen@planningmi.org>
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2022 12:01 PM
To: Tammy Girling
Subject: Upcoming Events | Register Today

---

**MAP Events**

**Sign Guidebook Live Q and A**

*Wednesday January 12*
12:30 PM to 1 PM
Member Price $25

Details here

**Floodplains 101 Webinar**

*January 11*
10:00 to 11:30 AM

Details here
Woodland Preservation Webinar

January 25
5:30 PM to 7 PM
Member Price $25

Call for Sessions

The 2022 Michigan Transportation Planning Association Conference will be held in Flint, July 26-29, 2022. Session proposals are due January 28, 2022.

Read more here

Student MAP Conference

February 5
10 AM to 4:30 PM

Details here
Food Systems
Planning: Resilience, Relationships & Policy
Webinar

February 11
12 PM to 1:30 PM
Details here

Transportation
Bonanza 13

February 16
9 AM to 4:30 PM
Member Price: $50

Register

Managing Risk
March 8
via Zoom
6 to 8:30 PM

Member Price: $70

Zoning Administration
March 1 & March 2
via Zoom
2 to 4 PM

Member Price: $95

Zoning Ordinance: A to Z
March 10
via Zoom
2 to 4:30 PM

Member Price: $80
Zoning Board of Appeals
March 15
via Zoom
6 to 8:30 PM

Member Price: $80

Planning and Zoning Essentials
March 16 in Frankenmuth
12 to 4:30 PM

Member Price: $115

March 21 & 22 via Zoom
6 to 8 PM

Member Price: $80

Capital Improvements Program
March 16 in Frankenmuth
5:30 to 8 PM

Member Price: $115
* * * * NOTIFICATION OF PUBLIC HEARING * * * *

The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission will hold a Joint Public Hearing with the Board of Trustees on Wednesday, February 2, 2022 at 7:05 p.m., at the Orion Township Municipal Complex Board Room, 2323 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, Michigan 48360, on the following matter:

PC-2021-78, The Woodlands Planned Unit Development (PUD), located at a vacant parcel east of 310 Waldon Road, (Sidwell #09-23-351-024) and 3030 S. Lapeer Road, (Sidwell # 09-26-101-021). The applicant, Detroit Riverside Capital, is proposing to rezone the properties from Suburban Estates (SE), Single Family Residential-2 (R-2), and General Business (GB) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) to construct a 166 multi-family unit development and a restaurant.

If you are not able to attend, you may send correspondence to the Orion Township Hall, 2323 Joslyn Rd. addressed to the Planning Commission to express your concerns and comments. A copy of the proposed Planned Unit Development is on file in the Planning & Zoning Department office and the Township Clerk’s office and may be examined during normal business hours, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday until the date of the public hearing.

Orion Township will provide necessary and reasonable auxiliary aids, and services for individuals with disabilities at the public hearing upon advance notice by writing or calling Penny S. Shults, Township Clerk, 2323 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, Michigan 48360; (248) 391-0304, ext. 4001. Please contact the Clerk’s office at least 72 hours in advance of the public hearing.

Scott Reynolds
Planning Commission

Penny S. Shults
Township Clerk