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In the spirit of compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals with a
disability should feel free to contact the Township at least seventy-two hours in advance of
the meeting when requesting accommodations.
The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, February 16, 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
Derek Brackon, Commissioner

Don Walker, PC Rep to ZBA
Joe St. Henry, Secretary
Jessica Gingell, Commissioner

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:
None

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

2. ROLL CALL
As noted

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

OTHERS PRESENT:
Peter Pavek

3. MINUTES
A. 2-2-22, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Gingell to approve both sets minutes as presented. **Motion carried**

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

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

6. CONSENT AGENDA
None.

7. NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Reynolds asked the applicant to introduce himself and state his name for the record.

Mr. Peter Pavek with Quattro Development the applicant presented.
Mr. Pavek stated that they are a commercial real estate developer outside of the Chicagoland area.

Mr. Pavek said that they want to build out a Sleep Number retail store, more of a showroom, at this property site. He knew that they had sent site plans to the Planning Commission, and they had gotten some comments back from different groups. He was there to address some of those comments and keep the conversation going.

Chairman Reynolds turned it over to the consultants for their overview of the project.

Planner Arroyo read through his review date stamped February 9, 2022.

Planner Arroyo asked if they wanted to talk about any low-level lighting that might be provided in that area just as a matter of providing some level of illumination there? He showed them the lighting sheet and showed that there were zero footcandles in the front and that is where their safety path is. He didn’t know if they had any illumination on the front of the building that might illuminate some of that area that may not be reflected in the plan?

Mr. Pavek replied that if there is an exit door on the side, they would have some type of lights there but there typically not shown on the photometric plan. He added that it was actually the back of the building that they were looking at. Planner Arroyo considered it the front because it is facing Baldwin Rd. Mr. Pavek said that they would be happy to add lighting there. Planner Arroyo noted that there may be lighting that is on Baldwin that was not being reflected in what is actually there.

Planner Arroyo stated that a couple of items related to the tightness of the site. The site is a small site it is a good infill project he thought for this type of site. He added that one of the things that he questioned was refuse collection with a truck going in, how is that going to be timed in terms of hours because circulation is tight. He also asked in terms of loading and unloading where will that take place, what are the hours of loading and unloading, how is that going to work? If it is during the off hours then that is a different situation but wanted to hear from the applicant about how the loading and unloading plan works and the same thing with the dumpster and the collection of that.

Mr. Pavek replied that he thought that the Fire Marshall also brought up that this site is a little tight and circulation could be difficult. He added that in terms of the off-loading and loading this store was more of a showroom so there is no actual stock in the back so they will not be making deliveries regularly. Folks will come in try out a mattress find one they like, order it, and then it gets delivered to their house from a warehouse. There will not be any stock or any box trucks coming in and out.

Mr. Pavek added that as far as trash delivery goes, the turning radiuses work for the site. It works, it is tight and awkward but this site, in general, is tight and awkward. From his understanding there was a 30-ft. access easement that based on the site plan from the adjacent site, the Huntington Bank site, that easement has not been finalized yet. He thought that when they develop this space, they have the opportunity to use that easement somewhere. Right now, they have it shown where it has been originally plotted.

Planner Arroyo said that if the dumpster is being emptied during off hours it is not an issue. Those two spaces where the turning has to happen could be employee spaces and they could move their car if they need to.
Planner Arroyo noted that there was a series of waivers that they have identified. They specifically identify the front yard setback 40-ft. to 30 ½-ft. side yard setback 20-ft. to 15-ft. and the waiver to reduce the required parking from 16 to 13 spaces. Some other ones that have been identified include permitting a type “B” Use as a standalone retail, a lot less than 10-acres, and to have it on a lot without a primary use, waiver required to waive the minimum lot width for a group “B” ancillary use, and to reduce the parking setback from 20-ft. to 6-ft.

Planner Arroyo said that this was a tight site, there is not a lot that they are going to be able to do on this without some type of consideration. They like the way the building is placed because it relates well to the buildings to the north, they are aligned fairly closely and thought it made sense to have parking in the back. This is not a really high parking generator they didn’t have a lot of concerns about the waiver of the number of parking spaces given the type of use that it is.

Engineer Landis read through his review date stamped February 11, 2022.

Chairman Reynolds said that they had a review from their Fire Marshal he had a recommendation for approval but had comments. It was noted that the Fire Department has areas of concern regarding the parking lot layout. It was the Fire Departments’ recommendation that the Planning Commission require the applicant to reconfigure the parking lot to allow their ambulance better maneuverability when exiting the site.

Chairman Reynolds noted that there was a public services review, and the Site Walk Committee completed a review of the project.

Chairman Reynolds asked Engineer Landis if he believed that the recommended changes address the Fire Marshals? Was he familiar with the comments that he has put into his review? Engineer Landis replied that they did talk ahead of time so he was familiar with his concerns. He believed that if the applicant were to show some turning movements for an ambulance and realign the driveway to avoid the righthand turn there, the Fire Marshal and he is on the same page, basically.

Chairman Reynolds asked if the applicant would like to make some responses to the reviews? He added that the list from OHM is one of them. Some understanding on the loading and unloading that is to occur, and the hours on which the dumpster would be emptied, and a question on the adding of the illumination to the front façade which is considered the rear from the building use but fronts the primary street.

Mr. Pavek said starting with the Fire Marshal’s comments. He showed them the turning radius for a Ford F150 but thought that it was a little bit smaller than an ambulance. The site is awkward but it is maneuverable. Something that they thought about internally is if they do decide to replan the site entrance, he asked how does that affect the review process that they have already gone through? Do they have to start from zero with the review process? Chairman Reynolds said from a formal standpoint they are there to review the plans as submitted, there are comments being brought forth so there is the potential that a motion may be made to conditionally approve with those comments being addressed and to address their consultant’s reviews. That is a determination that they would make and consider when making a motion.

Mr. Pavek said the turning radius is what they are in this current configuration. They have considered some alternatives, he showed them an alternate plan, shifting the drive entrance to the east, it eliminates those three spots at the entrance but then it smooths things out once you get into the site. They keep the three spots to the north and the trash enclosure where it is and then they block out a couple of spots for the turning radius of the garbage truck. If this is
something along the lines of something that would be more appropriate, they would be happy to explore it a little bit more.

Mr. Pavek said to the engineer’s other comments it was mentioned that the trench drain, underneath the sidewalk and then discharging to grade here. From a feasibility standpoint to do it the alternate way where they tie in 150-ft. down the road to the Baldwin Rd. storm system they would be coming down and across the entrance to the Huntington Bank and then crossing the other public utilities, water, sewer, and electrical. Threading the needle through those to get to the storm basin that is about 150-ft. south of their current site. It is quite a challenge to do so, and they don’t really know what else is under there and what else they might run into. That is why they went with the trench drain idea. They noticed that the neighbor to the north also discharge to grade but they have the elevation to do so they are kind of constrained on elevation with the bottom of the underground detention with the rest of the grade here and thought it was the most constructable solution given the site constraints. He said there is a storm basin to tie into but it goes back to the Huntington Bank that is part of their private storage detention system.

Mr. Pavek said if the engineer could look at it again or consider the site challenge he thought they would all appreciate that.

Engineer Landis thought there would already be storm sewer surrounding Baldwin Rd. and didn’t anticipate them going all the way down to Brown Rd. Mr. Pavek said that as far as they know this was the closest storm sewer that they could tie into that is a public lead available basin. Engineer Landis said he was pretty sure there was storm sewer along Baldwin Rd., he thought that they could help them find those plans or have them reach out to the Road Commission to get a copy of their current plans. He didn’t like what was proposed right now. Mr. Pavek said if OHM would be willing to help find those plans, they would welcome that opportunity.

Mr. Pavek said to the comments on the review 2-5 all the details, they have no problem amending their plans to those comments with the pavement section, the concrete section, the calculations for the storm detention. These are preliminary plans so they would be happy to send that to them as soon as they have it updated.

Mr. Pavek said the detention calculations they would be happy to provide those. The entrance width they would edit the curb to make that minimum 22-ft. They would either make it a mountable curb or cut it short and strip it out to make sure that no one is running over that as they turn into the site. He noted if they go with the other layout then he thought that problem kind of fixes itself.

Engineer Landis said that his recommendation would be to go with this alternative layout that what he was alluding to in his comment.

Chairman Reynolds said he would turn it over to the Planning Commissioners for some additional thoughts and concerns, and then they will discuss some open items.

Commissioner Brackon said his concern was, why is it the goal to make Lake Orion the mattress center of the United States? There is a True Sleep, US-Mattress, a new one that they just approved next to the carwash on Brown Rd., a Sleep Number in Great Lakes Crossing less than a mile from where they are going to put this Sleep Number, Gardener White less than a mile. He asked what the intent was here? Mr. Pavek stated that from his understanding the Sleep Number is in the mall that is across the stgeet, they are looking to get out of that shopping center and have their own standalone location. Sleep Number doesn’t compete with Mattress
Firm, mattress wholesalers, or direct consumers sellers, they have a specified product that people come in and try out, and then it is shipped to their house. He understood that mattress shops pop up regularly. Sleep Number’s intent is to move out of that mall that is across the way. Consumer preferences have been to not go into malls. This is an opportunity to get onto the main frontage, be more visible to the community, and have more visitors that way.

Vice-Chairman Gross said it is a difficult site and completes the development around that corridor. He questioned if there was a showroom window along Baldwin Rd.? Mr. Pavek replied that there would be some windows from the east parking lot, and looking from the west. There are some store window frontages along Baldwin Rd.

Vice-Chairman Gross said but no pedestrian accesses from Baldwin. He asked if it is all from the rear? Mr. Pavek replied correct.

Vice-Chairman Gross said he liked the alternate plan where the drive comes in straight as opposed to curves around, he thought it made more sense. He thought that the suggested waivers are justifiable in terms of the site conditions, the size of the site. In terms of mattresses, it is a lot similar to gas stations one on every corner.

Secretary St. Henry stated at least this is unique in the mattress industry. It is different than the typical mattress store.

Commissioner Walker said he happened to catch a Gardener White ad on the television this afternoon. Under one gentleman’s presentation, it called him a certified bedding specialist. He asked the applicant if he knew what that means? Mr. Pavek replied that he imagined that sleep is a science so maybe somebody that has studied the science behind a goodnight sleep. He added that it was not his course of study.

Chairman Reynolds said there were a few items that he would like addressed. He would support having conditional approval pending the rework that has been requested by their consultants. He thought that the drive as proposed is awkward, and thought that the amended potential solution was much improved. He encouraged even further exploration if there is that access easement about what can and can’t occur there.

Chairman Reynolds stated that it wouldn’t be a bad thing to be proposing façade lighting along Baldwin Rd. along with the eastern portion. He thought that was a reasonable request to have something on that side. A couple of other things that were not noted that he thought was important to this plan are a potential condition on loading and unloading, and the same thing with dumpsters because they see it all the time where they have a limited site. He fully supports that it is restricted and there are a lot of these that are justifiable. He thought loading and unloading and off-hours, same thing with the dumpster because they get into these where if there was a public safety issue here, they have a limited parking lot, there is already a turning radius. What happens when they get two things in there? There are already multiple turning movements to get into this development. It is parallel with the safety access issue but he thought it was pertinent to understand that loading and unloading would occur in off-hours or those are spaces marked as employee parking, something that there is a plan of attack in place because he wouldn’t be in favor of saying “I hope it works out”.

Chairman Reynolds asked if there was a thought in mind of loading and unloading, and the same thing with dumpster about how that is approached versus just an open-ended, hope it works out? Mr. Pavek said that they would be happy to work with Sleep Number and figure out their hours of operation and work with the trash collection company and figure out their timing and make sure that they can have them out there before or after working hours. Again, as far
as unloading and loading they don’t anticipate a lot of traffic in that regard once the building is up and running. They set up their showroom and very rarely do they turnover products there. They are not storing anything on site they are not making any sales from the site there. Very minimal traffic, very minimal waste, overall once it is all set up. Of course, as they are setting up, they are going to have trucks in and out of there making deliveries and setting up the showroom, but once it is up and running there will be minimal trucks coming in and out. They can work with the tenant and the collection agency and make sure they can work around their schedules.

Planner Arroyo asked based on the description where they make no sales, it is just a showroom, how often in a typical store do they have the dumpster emptied? Mr. Pavek replied very rarely. Planner Arroyo said it could be every couple of months, it doesn’t sound like they generate waste, if people are not going there to buy products that are boxed. Mr. Pavek said there maybe have two employees that work full or part-time, maybe they have lunch, but minimal waste.

Chairman Reynolds said he is open to whatever the end solution is that fits the tenant in his mind to say there is no loading zone. There is usually proof behind that of what is being provided so at least that in a sense that it is a retail-only location, there is no backstock other than setup and takedown, there are no deliveries per se. With the understanding that there are going to be changes out of the showroom but it is not a daily reoccurring thing, just something to note on this potential approval here. Understanding what the scope is and why they got to that conclusion. Chairman Reynolds asked if the loading zone needs to be waived? Vice-Chairman Gross thought it was too small for a loading zone. Planner Arroyo said that they could identify one in the parking field potentially just to show one because there is ample space there as long as it was an off-hour one. They have had a couple of other plans that have done that and would prefer to see an off-hour loading zone.

Chairman Reynold said his only other comment was they really didn’t talk in-depth about landscaping. He asked if there were any planning concerns on landscaping requirements here? It is a limited site, especially with setbacks any other considerations that they want to discuss for reduced parking setbacks. He understood that there is space to the east.

Planner Arroyo said that they did ask them to update some landscape calculations just to verify that all of the requirements were being met. Certainly, where there is a reduction, they could ask for some additional screening. In this case, they don’t have the same type of sensitive uses necessarily to address. When they grant a waiver if they feel that there is a reasonable condition, they can do that.

Vice-Chairman Gross said that this is going to have more landscaping than the other projects along there.

Secretary St. Henry asked Engineer Landis if he was comfortable with an administrative review and approval of the drainage system issues that have come up? Engineer Landis replied yes. He added that he would strongly work towards getting them to connect to the existing storm sewer. He was not in favor of an open discharge that would go through a trench drain that could be potentially be clogged and cause an unsafe condition on the safety path.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said it does present a problem at times when she gets to the point of signing off on plans when it contains signage because that is done under a separate review. If the motion happened to be a conditional approval if one of those conditions could be removing any reference to signage. Chairman Reynolds said he understood that signage would be completed under a separate signage application.
Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that relative to the Multi-tenant/10-acre requirement he moved that the Planning Commission grants a waiver from the requirement that the ancillary use of a Mattress Retail be developed in conjunction with a larger-scaled planned development project having multiple tenants with a total land area of at least 10 acres for PC-2022-05, plans date stamped received 1/26/22: that the waiver be approved since the parcel is the last remaining parcel in a development consisting of seven other tenants, and does promote the economic goals of the Township.

Roll call vote was as follows: Gross, yes; St. Henry, yes; Urbanowski, Walker, yes; Gingell, yes; Brackon, no; Reynolds, yes. **Motion carried 6-1**

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, that the Planning Commission waives the following standards of Section 34.03 for PC-2022-05, Quattro Development, for plans date stamped received January 26, 2022, based on the following: economic impact, quality of architectural design, and overall compatibility with the district, that the following waivers are granted relative to the minimum side yard, the side yard setback, front yard setback, parking calculation, and the parking setback waiver. Based upon the limited site size of the parcel, it is consistent with the properties to the north, and provides for the basic historical parking demands of mattress stores; further, the parking is all provided in the rear of the building consistent with the developments to the north.

Roll call vote was as follows: Walker, yes; St. Henry, yes; Gross, yes; Gingell, yes; Brackon, no, Urbanowski, yes; Reynolds, yes. **Motion carried 6-1**

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Gingell, that the Planning Commission grants conditional approval of the site plan submitted for PC-2022-05, Quattro Development Retail Building, located on an unaddressed parcel 09-32-377-057 (a parcel north of 4983 S. Baldwin Road) for modifications to the plans date stamped received January 26, 2022, based on the following: that the access drive on the south be relocated to the east as shown on an alternate plan submitted this evening; that there be façade lighting on Baldwin Rd.; there be no loading zone required due to this being a showroom only with no cash and carry products requiring a consistent loading zone; and that the signage is a separate ordinance and will be reviewed separately; that the applicant complies with the Township Engineers review letter of February 10, 2022, reflecting Engineering Standards required for the development.

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds asked that they also include there was a comment in the Engineer's review for the landscape calculations to be updated. He would also prefer that the Fire Marshal’s review comments be incorporated in that for ambulance turning movements.

Vice-Chairman Gross said he believed that they have reviewed the Fire Marshal’s comments in their revised plans but if they are comfortable with having that included, he would include that in the motion.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling didn’t believe that the motion mentioned that it is to be re-reviewed by the consultants. It was a conditional approval adding that but it does need to be re-reviewed by the consultants.
Vice-Chairman Gross amended his motion, Commissioner Gingell re-supported to include the comment in the Engineers review for the landscape calculations to be updated, that the Fire Marshal’s comments, and that the plans need to be re-reviewed by the consultants.

Roll call vote was as follows St. Henry, yes; Gingell, yes; Brackon, no; Urbanowski, yes; Walker, yes; Gross, yes; Reynolds, yes. Motion carried 6-1

B. Discussion of possible text amendment – Open Air Business

Chairman Reynolds said the overview of Open-Air Businesses currently is presented to the ZBA instead of the Planning Commission. There was a discussion on whether that was appropriate or not, that they feel that that should be reviewed by the Planning Commission currently in their Township and in their ordinance currently, the definitions defer to it back to the ZBA.

The Planning & Zoning Director Girling said this came up because there was discussion of another ordinance being written that would add another category to these Open-Air Businesses. As she was working with the Township Attorney on that ordinance and they were contemplating adding a change to Ordinance #78, the Zoning Ordinance, and as she read it and looked at the criteria for an Open-Air Business, like not taking vital parking spots. The ZBA does not normally look at a site plan and analyses it. Before she starts modifying Ord. #78 to incorporate the other changes that are coming, she thought they should discuss if it was even appropriate for it to be ZBA or whether it would be more appropriate to be the Planning Commission.

Planning & Zoning Director noted that she didn’t know if Commissioner Walker who sits on both the PC and the ZBA has any feelings on that? Commissioner Walker said he could see how it fits on either side. He thinks that it fits better on the ZBA, he thought.

Chairman Reynolds said when he read it, he would have thought it was if it is more related to a planning purpose that it would be brought to the Commission. He also was considering that there are events and temporary event permits, and asked aren’t they granted through the Board of Trustees? Planning & Zoning Director Girling replied correct. She added that they have public gatherings which are one-day events with a tent, that is one-day public gathering. These are for permitted timeframe, the examples they give are a Christmas Tree lot that is there for a month, a flower tent that is there for 4-months, they have the fireworks for a month. That is the difference between a public gathering involving a tent and an Open-Air Business, which is not to be confused with an Outdoor Display, an Outdoor Display that has a couple of Christmas Trees outside. It is somebody that does not run that business that is having something in their parking lot or a permit for a number of days.

Chairman Reynolds asked if it should be exclusively defined in this way versus just saying if they change their permit process or is there a certain threshold on that permit that prompts it to go to the Planning Commission, should they be setting that in this definition? He thought that there were some Open-Air Businesses, do they all go to the ZBA now? Secretary St. Henry said it goes to the ZBA and the ZBA makes a recommendation to approve? Planning & Zoning Director Girling replied it is not a recommendation they approve it or not. Secretary St. Henry said it was mentioned that the Board of Trustees. Chairman Reynolds said that the Board of Trustees there is an event permit that the Board of Trustees does. He added that there is a parallel to this but it is not the same thing.

The Planning & Zoning Director stated this was more about what are their feelings on it. Then there would be a change in the wording based on adding the other type of use that is under discussion right now and anything that needs to change relevant to it coming to Planning Commission versus ZBA.
Chairman Reynolds thought that not all of those are necessarily prompt coming to the Planning Commission but there would be a point if it reaches a certain size or purpose that it would. If they want everything to go to a Board or Commission then fine if the ZBA was uncomfortable going to them. Planning & Zoning Director Girling replied that she hasn’t talked with the ZBA at all.

Commissioner Walker said in the last few years there has been almost none of that. They used to be inundated with fireworks, and Christmas Trees and weren’t sure that it would come back post COVID. They were very busy and now when was the last time they had anything? Planning & Zoning Director Girling replied that it has been quite a while and that is why she didn’t look at it until she was diving into it and thought ok it says no vital parking spots. The ZBA one of their requirements was that they have to have for the Fire Department they have to have the proper buffers. When Suzy gets out of her car with her mom in the parking lot sees the pretty flowers, she doesn’t go through a vital circulation area to go look at the pretty flowers so they are using not vital parking spots, and then asked who looks at a site plan? Who knows parking spots and circulation better than the Planning Commission?

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that when they go to the ZBA they are public hearing. If they were to say it comes to the Planning Commission, they wouldn’t necessarily say it is a Special Land Use because then they are held to the Special Land Use criteria but they did feel that it would be a public hearing. They currently have a public hearing when they go to the ZBA because every ZBA case is a public hearing with a 300-ft. notice.

Chairman Reynolds said he thought that in the interest of their very full agendas and the interest of nothing prompting it. There hasn’t been any concern yet of Commissioner Walker and his teammate’s capabilities. He would move that at this point and time to keep it as it sits. As they further prompt discussions with this kind of business incubator and other things maybe there is a point in which it is a collaborative effort or it is a threshold to where it gets punted over to the Planning Commission.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said by the nature of it she is working with the Township Attorney on this new use that they are discussing they are going to see the text anyway. Maybe when they see the text, they will start thinking that it is them. She knows not to go full force in that direction and if they end up going that direction in the long run, then they do.

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

Chairman Reynolds said that they have had some thoughtful discussions over the last year, and that leads them to their hopeful next steps as discussed in their Planning Commission Workshop to move forward on their 63-day draft review period.

Moved by Trustee Urbanowski, seconded by Vice-Chairman Gross, that a resolution requesting Township Board authorized distribution of draft Master Plan to review agencies, adjacent municipalities, and the general public, whereas, the Michigan Planning Enabling Act (MPEA) (Public Act 33 of 2008) authorizes municipal Planning Commissions’ to prepare a Master Plan pertinent to the future development of the municipality and whereas the Orion Township Planning Commission has prepared a draft Master Plan for the Township to update and replace it with the previous Master Plan, meeting all statutory requirements set forth in the MPEA and whereas the MPEA requires that the Planning Commission seek authorization from the Township Board for the distribution of the draft Orion Township Master Plan to the various entities listed in the MPEA for review and comment purposes. Now, therefore, the Orion
Township Planning Commission hereby resolves that the Planning & Zoning Director forward a
formal request to the Township Board for staff to distribute the draft Master Plan including the
new Future Land Use map to neighboring communities and reviewing agencies as specified in
the MPEA and to make the draft available for review by the public on the Townships website
and via hard copy at the Planning & Zoning Department offices. I hereby certify the foregoing
resolution was approved by a majority of its members of the Orion Township Planning
Commission at a regular meeting held on February 16, 2022, in compliance with the Open
Meetings Act for the plans dated February 10, 2022, as amended by the discussion during the
study session.

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

Chairman Reynolds stated that there will be upcoming information published by the Township
for a future Open House that will further discuss the draft that they just voted to publish and
disperse, along with a future public hearing date which will lead them, hopefully, very close to
their adoption of the Master Plan that they have been working on for the last year or so.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS
None.

10. COMMUNICATIONS
None.

11. PLANNERS REPORTS
A. Giffels Webster – Home Occupations Community Planning Update Flyer

Planner Arroyo stated that he thought that there was some interesting information in here.
There was also a recent Planning & Zoning news article on this topic. They have seen as they
know with the pandemic a rapid increase in the number of people teleworking, working from
home. They also see a significant increase in start-up business for people who have
participated in the great resignation are now looking for other opportunities for business and
they are starting businesses in their home. It is just a really good time to potentially somewhere
down the road to take a look at their Home Occupations regulations. Their regulations are set
up where they can’t use more than 30% of the floor area. That covers most teleworking
conditions where most people who are doing teleworking now are probably ok. There is also
the ability to do some lite manufacturing with the home occupation. There are different levels of
home enterprises depending on how far they want to go. It is something they could consider
whether or not under certain conditions they would want to allow a slightly more intensive level
of home occupation business, maybe in more of the village areas where they might be more
tolerant of having a higher level of intensity. Also recognizing that there are some home
occupations that they can’t regulate at all because they have been preempted by state statute
including the instruction of fine art music which has to be treated like a residential use.

Vice-Chairman Gross thought they had to make a distinction between home occupations and
working from home. He thought there were a lot of people that have other places where they
are working but they are working from home and there is a distinction there. There is also an
issue of taxability, what properties are being taxed for home occupations versus other things.

12. COMMITTEE REPORTS
None.
13. PUBLIC HEARINGS
None.

14. CHAIRMAN’S COMMENTS
Chairman Reynolds thanked everyone for their input and thoughts on the Master Plan.

15. COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS
Commissioner Walker said they had a murder mystery at the library last Friday night. They are going to do it again. The next book fair is going to be in May.

16. ADJOURNMENT
Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, to adjourn the meeting at 7:59 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Walton
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary
Charter Township of Orion

Planning Commission Approval Date
The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a workshop meeting in person at the Orion Township Municipality Complex Board Room, 2323 Joslyn Road on Wednesday, February 16, 2022, at 6:00 p.m.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:
Don Walker, PC Rep to ZBA
Scott Reynolds, Chairman
Kim Urbanowski, BOT Rep to PC
Jessica Gingell, Commissioner
Derek Brackon, Commissioner

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:
None.

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

2. ROLL CALL
As noted.

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

OTHERS PRESENT:
None.

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

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

Planner Arroyo went over a PowerPoint presentation showing the changes since the last Workshop. He suggested that we are looking at April 20, 2022 as a possible second open house date and the public hearing possibly on May 18, 2022.

Secretary St. Henry questioned how would the public hearing work if there are changes?

Planner Arroyo pointed out that if there were major changes, then there could be another public hearing. However, if there were minor changes, then they would make the changes. He mentioned that any comments made from the sixty-three (63) day period will be discussed at the public hearing.

Trustee Urbanowski questioned who receives the draft Master Plan for the sixty-three (63) days?

Planner Arroyo explained who receives it. He went on to explain that when the Master Plan goes to the Township Board of Trustees after the Planning Commission approves it, the Township Board has to pass a resolution, if they want it back after the Planning Commission
approves it. Planner Arroyo explained that when we adopt it and the Board of Trustees also adopts it, it could be a joint meeting.

The group discussed a couple of additional small changes.

Vice-Chairman Gross summarized how we have gathered public comment and analyzed it over a year while working to this point in the draft Master Plan.

Secretary St. Henry felt that this is more comprehensive than the last Master Plan Update. He voiced concern on expanding housing options and public response. He is wanting a unified understanding by the Planning Commission members for the public hearing.

5. ADJOURNMENT
Moved by Trustee Urbanowski, seconded by Secretary St. Henry, to adjourn the meeting at 6:40 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Courtney Keisman
PC/ZBA Clerk
Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission Approval Date
TO: The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission

FROM: Tammy Girling, Planning & Zoning Director

DATE: February 24, 2022

RE: PC-2022-07, Edgar Development Site Plan Modification

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

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

Motion 1: I move that the Planning Commission grants site plan approval for PC-2022-07, Edgar Development Site Plan modification, located at 3805 S. Lapeer Rd., (Sidwell #09-26-451-005) for plans date stamped received 02/09/2022 based on the following findings of facts (motion make to insert findings of facts).

This approval is based on the following conditions:

a. (Motion maker to list any unresolved issues related to the Township Planner’s review letter).
b. (Motion maker to list any unresolved issues related to the Township Engineer’s review letter).
c. (Motion maker to list any unresolved issues related to the Fire Marshall’s review letter)
d. (Motion maker to list any additional conditions).

Or

I move that the Planning Commission denies site plan approval for PC-2022-07, Edgar Development Site Plan modification located at 3805 S. Lapeer Rd., (Sidwell #09-26-451-005) for plans date stamped received 02/09/2022. This denial is based on the following reasons (insert findings of facts).

Or

I move that the Planning Commission postpones site plan approval for PC-2022-07, Edgar Development Site Plan modification located at 3805 S. Lapeer Rd., (Sidwell #09-26-451-005) for plans date stamped received 02/09/2022 for the following reasons (motion maker to indicate outstanding items to be addressed from the Planner’s, Fire Marshall’s, or Engineer’s review letter(s)).
February 23, 2022

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

Site Plan Review no. 1
Wally Edgar Chevrolet expansion

Case Number: PC-2022-07  Plan Date: 02/08/2022
Address: 3805 S. Lapeer Road  Zoning: General Business (GB)
Parcel ID: 09-26-451-005  Reviewer: Matt Wojciechowski
Area: 4.219 AC  Rod Arroyo
Applicant: Jeffry Edgar

Dear Planning Commission Members:

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

Project Summary

1. The applicant is proposing to add 344 new parking/display spaces to accommodate additional inventory on the northern portion of the site. The applicant is also proposing additions to both buildings on site; a 2,000 square-foot addition to the main building and a 3,800 square-foot addition to the storage building located on the southern portion of the site. New site landscaping and lighting is proposed within and adjacent to the new parking area.

Standards not met (Variance or revision required)

2. The applicant shall revise the lighting plan to show the fc levels at the north property line
3. The 29.0 fc measurement at ground level exceeds the 20.0 fc maximum
4. The free-standing light poles proposed at 30’ exceed the 20’ maximum height
5. The applicant shall add a note to the plan indicating underground irrigation or other acceptable water supply

Zoning Ordinance Compliance Tables

7. **General Business (GB) District Standards.** Automobile dealerships, used car sales facilities, and showrooms are permitted uses in the GB district. The table below indicates compliance or required waivers with respect to the applicable standards for this site and proposed use within the GB district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article XIV – General Business (GB)</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.01 – Use Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile dealerships, used car sales facilities, showrooms</td>
<td>Existing Auto dealership</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.03 – Required Conditions (see ZO for full text)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Off-Street Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. General retail, personal services, banks, etc.: 1 space/200 sf GFA</td>
<td>78 required 1,126 proposed</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parking area/driveway setback: 30’ abutting res. zoning/use</td>
<td>30’</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking area/driveway setback: 20’ abutting comm./ind. zoning</td>
<td>30’</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Driveways and parking shall be curbed and hard surfaced</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Compliance with 27.04</td>
<td>See general provisions table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Landscaping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Landscape plan required in compliance with 27.05</td>
<td>See general provisions table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Greenbelts (perimeter): 20’ abutting comm./ind. Zoning</td>
<td>20’</td>
<td>See general provisions table for detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenbelts (perimeter): 30’ abutting res. zoning/use</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Off-street parking screened from res. property (berm/wall/landscape)</td>
<td>Landscaping to north and east</td>
<td>Abuts mixed use PUD; appears sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PC may require buffer/berm/wall/combo for comm. abutting res.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Lighting Regulations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Lighting plan required in compliance with 27.11</td>
<td>See general provisions table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Site lighting fully shielded and directed downward to prevent glare</td>
<td>Fully shielded</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Illumination (max): 0.3 fc along res. PL or 1.0 fc along non-res. PL</td>
<td>Plan does not show values along property line</td>
<td>Applicant shall revise plans to show values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Public Road Access.</strong> Direct access to public road with 120’ ROW</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Met (Lapeer Rd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. Utilities.</strong> All servicing buildings/structures buried underground</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Appears compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Covered Trash Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 3-sided masonry brick-type wall 1’ higher; located in the rear yard</td>
<td>Existing structure to remain</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Opaque lockable gate same height as brick-type wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Source: Giffels Webster]
3. PC may waive requirement (need) for an outside trash receptacle

J. Loading and Unloading
1. Located in the rear/side yard of a non-residential district
2. Shall not interfere with parking or obstruct ingress and egress
3. Compliance with 27.04

K. Performance Guarantee (Twp Clerk) – 30.09

L. Safety Paths –Ordinance No. 97 (overrides SP Map)

M. Tree Preservation – 27.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14.04 – Area and Bulk</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback (from future r/w line)</td>
<td>30 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setback (opposite front)</td>
<td>30 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Setback (any non-front/rear)</td>
<td>20 ft on each side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area</td>
<td>12,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height of All Structures</td>
<td>25 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Clear Space Around Structures</td>
<td>20 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliant

8. General Provisions. The standards in the table below are a summary of the applicable Zoning Ordinance standards in Article XXVI; please refer to the individual sections referenced herein for the full Zoning Ordinance text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article XXVII – General Provisions</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.04 – Parking and Loading Regulations (see ZO for full text)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Off-Street Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.a. Minimum setback of 20’ shall be maintained for parking areas</td>
<td>20’</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.h. Parking Spaces for Physically Handicapped</td>
<td>Existing to remain</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b. Maneuvering Lanes. 25’ setback from res. zoning</td>
<td>30’ +</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.d. Lighting not to exceed 3.0 fc at PL</td>
<td>Does not show values at PL</td>
<td>Add to plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.e. Screening and Landscaping. Parking screened from res per 27.05</td>
<td>See 27.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Parking Chart</td>
<td>90’ Spaces 10’ x 20’ 24’ drive aisle</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 27.05 – Landscaping, Fences, and Walls (see ZO for full text)

**A. Landscaping**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.a.ii. One tree required per 3,000 sf of open space (107,797 / 3,000 = 36 required)</td>
<td>Existing to remain</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a.iv. Underground irrigation or acceptable water supply</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Applicant add note to plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parking Lot Landscaping Adjacent to Roads (20’ greenbelt) One tree per 30’ (27 required) plus hedgerow or wall</td>
<td>27 trees plus hedgerow</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Screening for Conflicting Land Uses. Where non-residential uses abut residential uses the Planning Commission may require a greenbelt buffer, berm or obscuring wall or combination</td>
<td>White spruce and Skyline locust along N and E property lines abutting PUD to N/E</td>
<td>PC should determine this screening is adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interior Parking Lot Landscaping – 35 trees required; 12 within interior islands</td>
<td>35 provided; 23 within interior islands</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 27.06 – Streets, Roads, and Other Means of Access (see ZO for full text)

**F. Safety Pathways**

Pathway to remain | Compliant

### 27.11 Lighting Regulations

**E. Non-Residential Lighting Standards**

1. Fully shielded and directed downward to prevent glare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum intensity 20 fc at base of light fixture</td>
<td>29.0 max proposed</td>
<td>Exceeds maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.a. Illumination (max): 0.3 fc along res. PL or 1.0 fc along non-res. PL</td>
<td>Not shown at PL</td>
<td>Add to plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum light intensity at ground level 0.3 fc anywhere</td>
<td>1.4 fc</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot Average Minimum Illumination 0.9 fc</td>
<td>6.2 fc</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.d. Maximum height of pole fixtures 20’ from ground level</td>
<td>30’</td>
<td>Exceeds Maximum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 27.12 Tree and Woodlands Protection (see ZO for full text)

**H. Tree Relocation or replacement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. One (1) landmark tree shall be replaced at a rate of one (1) inch of replacement tree for each d.b.h. inch of landmark tree removed.</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Landmark trees removed; 105&quot;</td>
<td>35 evergreen trees @ 3&quot; each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 27.14 – Access Management (see Zoning Ordinance for full text)

**F. Driveway Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Clear Vision Areas and Buffer Areas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff will be available to discuss this review at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Respectfully,
Giffels Webster

Rodney L. Arroyo, AICP
Partner

Matt Wojciechowski, AICP
Senior Planner
February 23, 2022

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

Site Plan Review #1

Received: February 9, 2022 by Orion Township

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

We have completed our review of Wally Edgar Chevrolet Parking Lot Expansion plan set. The plans were prepared by PEA Group and were reviewed with respect to the Township’s Zoning Ordinance, No. 78, Stormwater Management and Soil Erosion & Sedimentation Control Ordinance, No. 139, and the Township’s Engineering Standards.

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:
The site is located along South Lapeer Road, north of East Silverbell Road and south of Waldon Road within Section 26 of the Charter Township of Orion. The site is zoned General Business (GB) and bound by parcels to the north, east and due south of the property all zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD), and parcels to the southeast of the property zoned Single Family Residential (R-1). The opposite side of M-24 (Lapeer Road) that is west of the site is zoned Office and Professional (OP) and General Business (GB).

The existing site is currently developed as the Wally Edgar Chevrolet site. The proposed site work includes a parking lot addition of 344 spaces for inventory storage and a 2,496 sqft building north of the existing main building on site and additionally a 3,816 sqft building addition on the existing single story used car service building on the southern portion of the site is proposed. In addition to the parking stalls, the applicant is also proposing a new access drive off M-24, roughly 600 feet north of the southwest property corner. An MDOT permit will be required for all work within the M-24 Right-of-Way.

WATER MAIN AND SANITARY SEWER:
The site is currently connected to the municipal water system from an 8-inch water main extension from the existing M-24 (Lapeer Road) water main. An on-site hydrant is serviced from this 8-inch water main as well. The proposed building addition to the Used Car Service Building is shown over an existing 8-inch water main on site. The applicant is proposing to relocate this 8-inch main toward the east, outside of the influence of the proposed building addition. The relocated portion of 8-inch water main is shown within a 12 ft public easement.

There is existing 8-inch sanitary sewer stub on site that is servicing the current buildings from M-24 (Lapeer Road). The applicant does not show any newly proposed sanitary sewer for the building additions, therefore is assumed these building additions will be plumbed internally and no change to the current sanitary sewer system is proposed.
The applicant shall show both the existing water main and sanitary sewer casements on the plans and also show the existing leads for both the existing water main and sanitary sewer. A monitoring manhole will be also required to be installed over the existing sanitary sewer line, at the lead connection, to allow for future sampling and as needed testing. Preliminary Basis of Design calculations shall be provided for the proposed building additions.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT:
The existing drainage system includes a detention basin along the west edge of the site and an existing storm sewer pipe network. The existing pond will be filled in, as the proposed parking expansion is within the current pond area. The adjacent parcel to the north, Hills of Woodbridge Development, sold this parcel to the Wally Edgar Dealership. Part of the purchase agreement included the Hills of Woodbridge providing a detention system large enough to account for the Wally Edgar parcel being purchased. The Hills of Woodbridge development accounts for 8 acres of drainage from the Wally Edgar site, at a C factor of 0.90. The entire site drains toward the northeast where runoff is collected by a 48-inch storm sewer. That 48-inch storm sewer is outlet into 24-inch storm sewer that is to be provided by the Hills of Woodbridge Development. The northern parking lot addition contains nearly 2 acres of impervious surface and only two catch basins are provided on the western side of the new lot. The applicant shall add additional storm sewer pipe and catch basins to collect sheet flow for this area.

It should be noted that if the Hills of Woodbridge development has not completed the installation of their proposed storm water system by the installation of the Wally Edgar parking lot expansion, additional temporary soil erosion measures and storm water management techniques may be needed. The applicant shall provide a draft of the shared use agreement with the Hills at Woodbridge development for their detention system. The applicant shall also provide separate detention calculations for each drainage area (Areas A, B, & C). Calculations shall be provided for the existing drainage Area C that show current detention calculations (existing C factor) and the future proposed calculations (proposed C-factor) with the building and parking additions. The ultimate outlet for drainage Area C shall be identified on the plans as well. Conveyance calculations and oversize pipe storage volume calculations will be required for engineering submittals.

PAVING/GRADING:
Current access to the site is provided by a driveway along M-24 (Lapeer Road), south of the existing detention pond. The applicant is proposing an additional new access drive 31 ft in width from M-24, roughly 600 feet north of the southwest property corner. This would provide the site with two access drives off M-24. It is acknowledged that the proposed driveway and the commercial driveway from the Hills at Woodbridge are shown at an acceptable distance apart (roughly 319 ft) and meeting the township minimum required spacing standard of 275 ft.

Proposed pavement slope shown are within the proposer tolerances of 1% and 6% for drive areas, and between 1% and 4% for parking areas. The average pavement slope shown is 3% toward the northeast. Proposed cross sections provided for the curb and asphalt pavement are acceptable. The detail for the shared use pathway shall include the treatment of the subgrade with Pramitol C Soil Stabilant prior to paving, per Township Standards. The detail for concrete pavement shall be revised to a minimum thickness of 7-inches per the site’s zoning and a minimum thickness of 8-inches is required for all loading zones and dumpster pads. Additionally, proposed dumpster locations shall be included on the plans. The applicant shall also revise the parking stall depth to be a minimum of 20 ft for all stalls proposed, exclusive of curb and gutter.

No problematic traffic patterns appear present on the proposed site additions. The applicant should include two pedestrian connections from existing M-24 pedestrian facilities to both buildings on site. The applicant should show anticipated loading/unloading zones and any anticipated turning movements with the largest vehicle proposed to access the site.

Both the existing and proposed grading is shown with 1 ft contours and spot grades. The site for the parking addition
is currently undisturbed and generally flows toward the north. The proposed grading does not significantly change the drainage pattern for the site.

No retaining walls are proposed with this parking lot expansion and build additions.

**LANDSCAPING:**
The landscaping plan that is shown is acceptable from an engineering standpoint as it does not conflict with any proposed utilities.

**NATURAL FEATURES:**

**Wetlands:**
There are no wetlands within the proposed area for development and no wetland permits will be needed.

**Woodlands:**
A tree survey has been included this submission and landmark trees were summarized and totaled in the tree removal tabulation.

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

1. The storm water management calculations shall be revised to provide preliminary detention calculations. The calculations need to account for the entire site as The Hills at Woodbridge is only providing detention for a portion (8.01 acres) of the Wally Edgar site.
2. Detention calculations for the existing pond and tributary drainage area C shall be provided on the plans. The ultimate outlet for drainage Area C shall be identified on the plans as well.
3. The applicant shall revise the parking stall depth to be a minimum of 19 ft, exclusive of curb and gutter.
4. The applicant should include two pedestrian connections from existing M-24 pedestrian facilities to both buildings on site.
5. The applicant should show proposed/existing loading/unloading zones.
6. Proposed and/or existing dumpster locations shall be included on the plans.
7. The plans should include a turning template using the Orion Township Fire Apparatus.
8. The northern parking lot addition contains nearly 2 acres of impervious surface and only two catch basins are provided on the western side of the new lot. The applicant shall add additional storm sewer pipe and catch basins to collect sheet flow for this area.
9. The applicant shall show both the existing water main and sanitary sewer casements on the plans and show the existing leads for both the existing water main and sanitary sewer.
10. The applicant shall include a monitoring manhole to be installed over the existing sanitary sewer line, at the head connection, to allow for future sampling and as needed testing.
11. Preliminary Basis of Design calculations and expected use shall be provided for the proposed building additions.
12. The applicant shall revise the detail for the shared use pathway shall include the treatment of the subgrade with Pramitol C Soil Stabilant prior to paving, per Township Standards.
13. The applicant shall revise the details for concrete pavement to a minimum thickness of 7-inches per the site’s zoning for standard pavement and a minimum thickness of 8-inches is required for all loading zones and dumpster pads per Township Standards.
14. The engineering plan, designed in accordance with Zoning Ordinance No. 78, Stormwater Management and Soil Erosion & Sedimentation Control Ordinance No. 139, and the Township’s Engineering
Standards shall be submitted to the Township for review and approval prior to construction. A detailed cost estimate for the improvements shall be submitted with the plans signed and sealed by the design engineer.

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

Sincerely,

OHM Advisors

Kimberly Kieber, EIT
Project Engineer

Mark Landis, P.E.
Project Manager

cc: Chris Barnett, Township Supervisor
    David Goodloe, Building Official
    Jeff Stout, Director of Public Services
    Tammy Gurling, Director of Planning and Zoning
    Lynn Harrison, Planning and Zoning Coordinator
    Jeff Williams, Township Fire Marshal
    Bill Baglow, Water and Sewer Superintendent
    Jeffrey Edgar, Waldo Enterprises, LLC (via e-mail)
    James Butler, P.E. A Group (via e-mail)
To: Planning Commission/Planning & Zoning Director  
From: Jeff Williams, Fire Marshal  
Re: PC-2022-07, Edger Development, Site Plan  
Date: 02/23/2022

The Orion Township Fire Department has completed its review of Application PC-2022-07 for the limited purpose of compliance with Charter Township of Orion Ordinance’s, Michigan Building Code, and all applicable Fire Codes.

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

X Approved
Approved with Comments (See below)
Not approved

Comments: NONE

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

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

Sincerely,

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

The Department of Public Services has reviewed the above-mentioned project. We have ample capacity to meet the needs of this expansion.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeffery T. Stout  
Director  
Department of Public Services
A site walk was conducted on Feb. 21, 2022 in reference to the expansion for Edgar Chevrolet at 3805 S. Lapeer Road.
The site is adjoining the existing dealership to the south and is a part of the carved out retail site from the approved apartment development to the north and east (not constructed).
The site is heavily wooded and has an undulating grade from Lapeer Road easterly.
The proposal is to use the west one-half of the site facing Lapeer Road exclusively for parking. Additional parking is proposed for the existing frontage on Lapeer Road by adding an additional 2 tiers off parking (approximately 65 feet) along Lapeer Road. Without any additional buildings being proposed the parking will probably be used for outdoor storage and display of vehicles.
An additional entrance is proposed on Lapeer Road north of the existing entrance and it does not appear to represent any conflicts with existing crossovers.

Respectfully submitted.

Donald Gross
Planning Commissioner

____________________

Donald Gross, Planning Commissioner

Charter Township of Orion

2323 Joslyn Rd., Lake Orion MI 48360

dgross@oriontownship.org

http://www.oriontownship.org
Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission
Site Plan Approval Application

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

Project Name: **EDGAR DEVELOPMENT**

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

**Applicant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Jeffrey Edgar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>3805 S. Lapeer Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td>Lake Orion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip:</td>
<td>48360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>(248) 210-0199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jedgar@wallyedgar.com">jedgar@wallyedgar.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Owner(s)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Waldo Enterprises, LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>3805 S. Lapeer Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td>Lake Orion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip:</td>
<td>48360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>(248) 210-0199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jedgar@wallyedgar.com">jedgar@wallyedgar.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Plan Preparer Firm/Person**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>PEA GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>2430 Rochester Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td>Troy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip:</td>
<td>48083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>(248) 528-7369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jbutler@peagroup.com">jbutler@peagroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Contact Person**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Samuel Ashley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>28970 Cabot Drive Suite 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td>Novi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip:</td>
<td>48377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>(248) 489-2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sashley@clc.build">sashley@clc.build</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sidewell Number(s): 09-26-451-005

Location or Address of Property: 3805 S. Lapeer Road, Lake Orion, MI, 48360

Side of Street: East Nearest Intersection: Silverbell Road & Lapeer Road

Acreage: 4.219 of total parcel Current Use of Property: Undeveloped

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

Subject Property Zoning: General Business (GB) Adjacent Zoning: N. RB S. PUD E. RB W. GB & OP

List any known variances needed (subject to change based on Township consultant’s review)

Give a detailed description of the proposed development, including the number and size of the buildings or units being proposed. A parking lot is to be constructed for additional parking of inventory. Two (2) building additions are to be constructed. A 2,000 sf addition on to the main building and a 3,800 sf addition on to a storage building.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AT&amp;T</th>
<th>Consumers Power Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54 Mill St. Pontiac, MI 48342</td>
<td>530 W. Willow St. Lansing, MI 48906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTE Energy Co.</td>
<td>Oakland County Health Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTENTION: NW Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>Building 34 East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 Orchard Lake Rd. Sylvan Lake, MI 48377</td>
<td>1200 N. Telegraph Rd. Pontiac, MI 48341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Department of Transportation (if applicable)</td>
<td>Road Commission of Oakland County (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 Vanguard Dr. Pontiac, MI 48341</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ssinkowski@rcoc.org">ssinkowski@rcoc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland County Water Resources</td>
<td>(electronic submittal only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:wrcpermitting@oakgov.com">wrcpermitting@oakgov.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Signature of Applicant: Jeffrey Edgar

Print Name: Jeffrey Edgar

Date: 8-4-21

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

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

(date)

Print Name: Jeffrey Edgar

Version 12/7/20
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Project Name: EDGAR DEVELOPMENT
PC#: ______________________ Parcel#: 09-26-451-005

Please select an option below:

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

[Signature]
Signature of Applicant

8-4-21
Date

[Printed Name: JEFFREY A. EDGAR]
Printed Name of Applicant

☑ Do not want plans posted on Web Site
TO: The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission

FROM: Tammy Girling, Planning & Zoning Director

DATE: February 24, 2022

RE: PC-2022-08, Peninsula Development LLC., Site Plan

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.

**Lapeer Overlay Design Standards (Ord. No. 78, Section 35.04, A)**

**Motion 1:** I move that the Planning Commission grants/denies a Lapeer Overlay Site Design Standard waiver for *the 10’ planting bed setback and *50% threshold for front yard parking, for PC-2022-08, Peninsula Development Site Plan located on a vacant parcel located east of 210 W. Silverbell Rd., (Sidwell #09-26-300-014) for plans date stamped received 02/09/2022 based on consideration of the following and the following findings of facts:

a. The standards of this Section would prevent reasonable use of the site (insert findings).

b. Existing site design including architecture, parking, driveways, etc. are placed in a manner which makes application of standard impractical (insert findings).

c. Limited lot area and the arrangement of existing features provide inadequate space to accommodate design requirements (insert findings)

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

**Motion 2:** I move that the Planning Commission grants site plan **approval** for PC-2022-08, Peninsula Development Site Plan located on a vacant parcel located east of 210 W. Silverbell Rd., (Sidwell #09-26-300-014) for plans date stamped received 02/09/2022 based on the following findings of facts (**motion make to insert findings of facts**).

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

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

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

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

d. (Motion maker to list any additional conditions).
Or
I move that the Planning Commission **denies** site plan approval for PC-2022-08, Peninsula Development Site Plan located on a vacant parcel located east of 210 W. Silverbell Rd., (Sidwell #09-26-300-014) for plans date stamped received 02/09/2022. This **denial** is based on the following reasons (insert findings of facts).

Or
I move that the Planning Commission **postpones** site plan approval for PC-2022-08, Peninsula Development Site Plan located on a vacant parcel located east of 210 W. Silverbell Rd., (Sidwell #09-26-300-014) for plans date stamped received 02/09/2022 for the following reasons (motion maker to indicate outstanding items to be addressed from the Planner’s, Fire Marshall’s, or Engineer’s review letter(s)).
February 24, 2022

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

Site Plan Review no. 1
Peninsula Development

Case Number: PC-2022-08
Address: Silverbell Rd – W/ of Lapeer
Parcel ID: 09-26-300-014
Area: 4.29 AC
Applicant: Sharpe Engineering
(plan preparer)

Plan Date: 02/09/2022
Zoning: Industrial Park (IP)
Lapeer Road Overlay
Reviewer: Matt Wojciechowski
Rod Arroyo

Dear Planning Commission Members:

We have reviewed the above application and site plan, landscape plan, and tree survey and a summary of our findings is below. Items in **bold** require specific action by the Planning Commission. Items in *italics* can be addressed administratively.
Project Summary
The applicant is proposing to construct a two-story, 6,779 square foot building on the north side of Silverbell Road, west of Lapeer Road. The facility would serve as a marijuana provisioning center on the first floor, featuring two drive-up/pick-up lanes in the rear of the facility. The second floor will serve as future office space.

SUMMARY OF REVIEW

Revisions & Additional Information

1. The maximum number of employees is needed to confirm the parking calculation (18.03.C)
2. Applicant shall confirm no rooftop equipment is proposed
3. The pickup lanes and maneuvering lanes on the northern portion of the site appear to propose a circulation conflict; engineering should review internal circulation of site as a whole
4. The applicant shall add wheel stops to the site plan (27.04.A.3.f.)
5. The applicant shall add a note to the site plan indicating security lights and those lights which are intended to be turned off or dimmed during non-business hours

Planning Commission Discussion & Waivers

6. Materials proposed include decorative prefinished metal siding, brick veneer, colored cmu veneer, and aluminum glass façade. Planning Commission to review and determine if consistent with Section 35.04 Design Standards

7. The planter boxes on south and east side of building are closer than 10’; PC should discuss and consider waiving the 10’ setback requirement (35.04.A.3.b.)

8. The number of parking spaces located within the front yard exceeds the 50% threshold and requires planning commission approval (35.04.A.4.c)

9. The planning commission should discuss and approve the lighting plan per comment 5 (above)

10. The PC should discuss the pickup operation.

Zoning

Industrial Park (IP)
Zoning Ordinance Compliance Tables

11. IP Industrial Park Standards. The Planning Commission is permitted to waive or modify the standards of Section 34.03 (required conditions) based upon the economic impact, quality of architectural design, and overall compatibility with the District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.00 Preamble</td>
<td>It is intended that the effects of any industrial activity in an IP District should be confined within the IP District, so as to not create any nuisance or hazard for adjacent or nearby uses. It is further intended that Industrial Park Districts shall ... have direct access onto an existing or proposed major thoroughfare.</td>
<td>The site is located on and has access to Silverbell Road; this condition is met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.01 Use Matrix</td>
<td>Licensed marihuana facilities that include a retail component as authorized under Ordinance No. 154</td>
<td>Use is permitted pending review of standards in Ordinance No. 154 (Staff Review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.03 Required Conditions</td>
<td>Off Street Parking</td>
<td>Required: Need number of employees Provided: 58 spaces (Appears compliant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. One (1) parking space per one thousand (1,000) square feet of gross floor area or one per employee 1 per 200 (retail*) = 4,618/200 = 24 1 per 300 (office) = 1,975/300 = 7 1 per employee @ ? employees = TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Landscaping 2. A landscaped greenbelt at least twenty (20) feet in width shall be provided along the entire perimeter of the zoning lot, except where ingress or egress drives are located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Site illumination on properties adjacent to residential properties shall not exceed 0.3 foot-candle along property lines, or 1.0 foot-candle along non-residential property lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Public Road Access 1. Any industrial park developed or proposed in the Industrial Park District shall have an internal public road having a minimum right-of-way of at least sixty (60) feet. 2. The internal public road shall have direct access onto an existing or proposed major thoroughfare having a thoroughfare having a right-of-way of at least one hundred twenty (120) feet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Covered trash receptacles, surrounded on three (3) sides by masonry brick-type walls one (1) foot higher than the receptacle shall be provided in the rear yard of the building or principal use structure.

2. The fourth side of the trash receptacle enclosure shall be equipped with an opaque lockable gate that is the same height as the masonry brick wall.

Loading and Unloading

All loading and unloading areas shall be in conformance with the requirements set forth in Section 27.04

See 27.04

M. Safety paths
See 27.06

N. Tree Preservation
See 27.12

O. Wetland Setbacks
See 27.17

18.04 Area and bulk Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IP</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard</td>
<td>50'</td>
<td>157'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>50'</td>
<td>70'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>56'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min lot area for principal structure</td>
<td>2.0 AC</td>
<td>4.29 AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max lot coverage</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max height</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>24'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Space</td>
<td>15’</td>
<td>15’ min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Lapeer Overlay Standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35.04 Development Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Site Design</td>
<td>3. Pedestrian Circulation</td>
<td>Provided; Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Safety paths shall be provided in accordance with the Safety Path Ordinance No, 97.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Internal sidewalks of no less than five (5) feet in width shall be provided connecting the safety paths to the principal customer entrances and adjacent to all parking areas. <strong>No less than ten (10) feet shall exist between the building façade and the planting bed for foundation plantings.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parking</td>
<td>1. One (1) parking space per one thousand (1000) square feet of gross floor area or one per employee</td>
<td>Required: Need number of employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. 1 per 200 (retail*) = 4,618/200 = 24</td>
<td>Provided: 58 spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 300 (office) – 1,975/300 = 7</td>
<td>(Appears compliant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per employee @ ? employees = TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. Design Standards

#### 1. Facades and exterior walls

- **b.** Ground floor facades that face public streets shall have arcades, display windows, entry areas, awnings or other such features along no less than fifty percent (50%) of their horizontal length.

- **c.** Building facades must include repeating patterns of color, texture, and architectural or structural bays of twelve (12) inches in width (i.e. offsets, reveals or projecting ribs).

These standards appear to be met

#### 2. Building Entrances

- **a.** Each principal building shall have clearly defined, highly visible customer entrances consisting of a variety of architectural features such as:
  - Canopies, porticos, or overhangs;
  - Recesses/projections;
  - Raised, corniced parapets above the door;
  - Peaked roof forms;
  - Display windows;
  - Integrated tile work and moldings;
  - Integral planters;
  - Pavement/material changes for pedestrian crosswalks

The elevations show a brick veneer and prefinished metal panel at the entrance along with planters and pavers; this standard appears to be met. Planning Commission to review materials.

#### 3. Roofs

- **a.** Flat Roofs. Incorporate parapets to conceal rooftop equipment from public view. The heights of the parapets shall not exceed one-third (1/3) of the height of the supporting wall

Applicant shall confirm no Rooftop equipment is proposed

#### 4. Materials and Colors

- **a.** Predominant exterior building materials shall be high quality material, including, but not limited to brick, stone, and integrally tinted/textured concrete masonry units.

Materials proposed include decorative prefinished metal siding, brick and cmu veneer and aluminum glass façade. Planning Commission to review.
b. Façade colors shall be low reflectance, subtle, neutral or earth tone colors. The use of high-intensity colors, metallic colors, black or fluorescent colors shall be prohibited.

The green, brown and grey façade colors proposed appear to meet the intent of this standard.

c. Building trim and accent areas may feature brighter colors, including primary colors, but neon tubing shall not be an acceptable feature for building trip or accent areas.

Subject to PC review; building is a mix of predominantly brick and cmu veneer with metal siding accents.

d. Exterior building materials shall provide texture on at least fifty percent (50%) of the façade but shall not completely consist of smooth-faced concrete block, tilt-up concrete panels or prefabricated steel panels.

5. Covered Trash Areas

Covered trash receptacles shall be surrounded on three (3) sides by masonry brick-type walls one (1) foot higher than the receptacle in the rear yard of the building or principal use structure

This standard is met

The Planning Commission shall have the authority to waive or modify the standards of Section 35.03 and 35.04 upon consideration of the following:

1. The standards of this Section would prevent reasonable use of the site

2. Existing site design including architecture, parking, driveways, etc. are placed in a manner which makes application of standard impractical

3. Limited lot area and the arrangement of existing features provide inadequate space to accommodate design requirements.

13. General Provisions. The standards in the table below are a summary of the applicable Zoning Ordinance standards in Article XXVI; please refer to the individual sections referenced herein for the full Zoning Ordinance text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.04 Parking &amp; Loading</td>
<td>3.b. Maneuvering lanes shall have adequate width to permit safe one-way traffic movement, with the exception of the 90 pattern, which shall provide for safe two-way traffic movement</td>
<td>The pickup lanes and maneuvering lanes on the northern portion of the site appear to propose a conflict; engineering should review internal circulation of site as a whole. The PC should discuss the pickup operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. f. Wheel Stops. Except for those serving single and two-family dwellings, all parking lots shall be provided with wheel stops or bumper guards so</td>
<td>Applicant shall provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>2.a. Loading and unloading facilities shall not be so located as to interfere with ingress or egress or off-street parking. The 10’ x 50’ loading zone appears to conflict with parking spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parking Lot Landscaping Adjacent to Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A greenbelt separation area is required between the right-of-way property line and the nearest portion of any off-street parking area, for parcels fronting roads but excluding single family residential uses. Said area shall be a minimum of twenty (20) feet in width</td>
<td>Compliant; three trees plus 3’ hedgerow proposed to screen along Silverbell Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>One (1) tree for each thirty (30) lineal feet, or fraction thereof, of required greenbelt separation area (including driveways). Such trees shall be located between the abutting right-of-way and the off-street parking area or vehicular use area.</td>
<td>3 required; 3 provided along Silverbell Road front yard (south)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>In addition, a hedge, wall, decorative metal fence, or berm, or other landscape elements with a vertical rise of at least thirty (30) inches shall be developed within said separation zone. The hedge, wall, fence, or berm shall have the effect of reducing the visual effect of parked cars. If the developer decides to construct a masonry wall or decorative fence, he/she shall in addition plant one (1) shrub or vine for each ten (10) lineal feet of masonry wall on the street side of the wall.</td>
<td>A 36” tall hedge row along the southern edge of the parking lot to screen the lot from view of Silverbell Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>The Planning Commission may at their discretion waive or modify the requirements of this section subject to one or more of the following conditions: limited parcel depth, existing vegetation or other site factors which limit the practical application of landscaping standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.06 Access</td>
<td>Safety Pathways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>1. Required pathways shall be eight feet in width and shall be located in the road right-of-way, with a setback of one (1) foot from the property line</td>
<td>An 8’ pathway is shown along the ROW line; this standard is met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.11 Lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Lighting Plan Submittal Requirements. The following information must be included on all site plan submissions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Show on sheet P-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Location of all free-standing, building-mounted and canopy light fixtures on the site plan and/or building elevations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provided: see photometric sheet 1 of 1 (02/09/22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Photometric grid overlaid on the proposed site plan, indicating the overall light intensity throughout the site (in foot-candles)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>3. Specifications and details for the type of fixture being proposed, including the total foot-candle output, type of lamp, and method of shielding.</td>
<td>Lights are fully shielded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Free Standing Light Poles</td>
<td>Parking Lot Lighting. Parking lot illumination shall average above 0.6 fc (parking lots 11-99 spaces)</td>
<td>Plan shows avg 2.6 fc in parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The maximum height of pole fixtures shall be twenty (20) feet, or the height of the building, whichever is less, measured from the ground</td>
<td>Building = 24’ Proposed pole height = 20’ Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Except where used for security or safety purposes, as approved in advance by the Planning Commission, all outdoor lighting fixtures, existing or hereafter installed and maintained upon private property within commercial, industrial and office zoning districts, shall be turned off or reduced in lighting intensity between 11:00 p.m. and sunrise, except when used for commercial and industrial uses, such as in sales, assembly, and repair areas, where such use continues after 11:00 p.m., but only for so long as such use continues</td>
<td>The applicant should add a note to site plan indicating what lights are used for security and what lights (if any) can be reduced in intensity during off hours This should be discussed with the planning commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Building Mounted Lighting</td>
<td>Building-mounted lighting shall be fully shielded and directed downward to prevent off-site glare</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Respectfully,

Giffels Webster

Rodney L. Arroyo, AICP
Partner

Matt Wojciechowski, AICP
Senior Planner
February 24, 2022

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

RE: Peninsula Developments, LLC, PC-2022-08
Site Plan Review #1

Received: February 9, 2022 by Orion Township

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

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

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:
The site is currently undeveloped and located along the north side of Silverbell Road, just west of M-24 within Section 26 of the Charter Township of Orion. The site is zoned Industrial Park (IP) and bounded by parcels to the east of the property zoned General Business (GB), and both north and west of the property are zoned Industrial Park (IP).

The current site is an undeveloped parcel that drains primarily to the north and northeast. The easterly portion of the site does not have any existing trees. The parcel to the northeast is developed and has a 6 ft high chain link fence along a portion of the property line border for this development.

WATER MAIN AND SANITARY SEWER:
An existing 12-inch water main runs along Silverbell Road that the applicant proposed to tap for an 8 inch water main extension through the site. The proposed 8-inch watermain runs north along the west side of the proposed building and then is proposed to run east to end with a stub for future connection on the east side of the property. The proposed water main shall be shown within an exclusive 12-ft wide easement per Township Standards. The applicant shall clarify if a stub is also proposed within the property, northwest of the proposed building, where the 8-inch main goes N/S and turns E/W as there is not a callout. The dead end lines shall include a hydrant and the end for blow off purposes. The proposed domestic service line size needs to be included on the plans. A PRV has not been included indicating the applicant is not proposing to suppress the building. Preliminary Basis of Design calculations for both water and sewer shall be provided for the proposed building.

The applicant is currently proposing a 1.5-inch sanitary sewer lead connecting to an existing sanitary manhole on the south side of Silverbell Road. A 4-ft monitoring manhole has been provided as required along the sanitary sewer lead, prior to connecting to the mainline along Silverbell, to allow for future sampling and as needed testing per WRC requirements.

OHM Advisors
1827 NORTH SQUIRREL ROAD
AUBURN HILLS, MICHIGAN 48326
T 248.751.3100
F 248.364.3001
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT:
The applicant is proposing an enclosed storm system on site that will ultimately outlet to an existing storm system. The system being outlet to was installed with the Milosch Dealership expansion to accommodate for future developments. The storm system calculations were provided and “Future Development B” have been included in the submittal and account for 3.76 acres at a C-factor of 0.750. Preliminary calculations shall be provided to show the proposed impervious acreage calculation is less than anticipated in the original design. The applicant will be required to provide conveyance calculations for the site into the existing 24” RCP pipe and C-factor calculations for the proposed site at engineering.

PAVING/GRADING:
Existing site grading is shown with 1 ft contours and spot grading. No proposed grading is shown on the plans currently and therefore proposed pavement slopes cannot be verified. Drainage arrows included on the plans show water being directed toward the catch basins in each drainage area. The applicant shall provide proposed grading for the site including elevation for the finished floor grade of the building.

Proposed cross sections are provided for the proposed HMA Safety Pathway, Concrete Sidewalk, Integral Curb and Walk, Curb and Gutter (3 types), Parking Stall Pavement, Driveway Pavement, Dumpster Pad Pavement, and an HMA Approach/Roadway detail. The applicant shall update the plan view and include a detail that shows proposed loading/unloading zone at minimum thickness of 8-inches in concrete, per Township Standards.

No retaining walls are proposed for this development.

TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION:
The site currently does not have existing curb cuts or access drives and is currently curbed along the Silverbell Road frontage. The proposed site layout includes two driveways from Silverbell Road that are ~164 ft apart from center line to center line. Per ordinance, the driveways are to be spaced at least 275 ft apart for roads with a posted speed limit of 50mph. The plans will need to be revised to provide the required separation. The westerly driveway is shown as an exit only and the easterly driveway shown as entrance only. Both driveways are 27 ft in width from back of curb to back of curb. Travel lanes in the proposed parking lot vary from 26 ft in width for the north lane and 22 ft in width for the southern lane. All non-ADA parking spaces are proposed at a 9 ft by 19 ft dimension. Two ADA spaces are proposed for the site with one of those being a van accessible ADA space.

The architectural plans show two (2) proposed curbside pickup queuing lanes on the north side of the building. The northern queuing lane and associated stacking appears to interfere with Orion Fire Department Apparatus turning movements. The inclusion of the northern queuing lane effectively reduces the drive with to approximately 12’ wide. The applicant shall confirm with the OTFD that this width is adequate for site circulation. We defer to the planner for further review on queuing length requirements for curbside pickup lanes.

Proposed trip generation estimates should be provided to determine if the proposed site will require a Traffic Impact Study.

The applicant shall include signage proposed for the one-way traffic lanes/aisles proposed on site to clarify intended customer routes on site.

The proposed safety path along Silverbell Road should be shaded to clarify limits and match the legend. The proposed 5’ wide sidewalk adjacent to the head in parking spaces should be increased to 7’ wide to account for vehicle overhang.
**LANDSCAPING:**
It does not appear any proposed plantings are within the influence of proposed public utilities. What is currently proposed for landscaping appears acceptable from an engineering standpoint.

**NATURAL FEATURES:**

**Wetlands:**
The applicant indicates approximately 37,000 square foot of “wetlands” on the parcel. A copy of the wetland delineation completed by Brooks Williams and Associates in 2019 shall be provided for review. No permitting is anticipated for either the Township or EGLE.

**Woodlands:**
A tree survey has not been included with this submittal but it appears that tree removal won’t be needed as the portion of the site proposed for development does not have any existing trees.

**CONCLUSION:**
In our opinion, the site plan as submitted is not in substantial compliance with the Township’s ordinances and engineering standards. We ask that the following be addressed:

1. Per ordinance, the driveways are to be spaced at least 275 ft apart for roads with a posted speed limit of 50mph. The plans will need to be revised to provide the required separation.
2. The applicant shall provide proposed grading for the site including elevation for the finished floor grade of the building and to verify that pavement slopes remain between 1% and 6% for drive areas, and between 1% and 4% for parking areas.
3. Revise the plans to eliminate apparent conflicts with the Orion Township Fire Apparatus and the proposed two (2) curb side pickup queuing lanes.
4. Hydrants shall be added to the proposed dead-end lines per engineering standards.
5. The proposed 5’ wide sidewalk adjacent to the head in parking spaces should be increased to 7’ wide to account for vehicle overhang.
6. The proposed water main shall be shown within an exclusive 12-ft wide easement per Township Standards.
7. Preliminary Basis of Design calculations and expected use for the water and sewer shall be provided for the proposed building.
8. The applicant shall update the plan view and include a detail that shows proposed loading/unloading zone at minimum thickness of 8-inches in concrete, per Township Standards.
9. Preliminary calculations shall be provided to show the proposed impervious acreage calculation is less than anticipated in the original design.
10. A copy of the wetland delineation completed by Brooks Williams and Associates in 2019 shall be provided for review.
11. Proposed trip generation estimates should be provided to determine if the proposed site will require a Traffic Impact Study.
12. The applicant shall include signage proposed for the one-way traffic lanes/aisles proposed on site to clarify intended customer routes on site.
Please feel free to contact us with any questions at (248) 751-3100 or mark.landis@ohm-advisors.com.

Sincerely,

OHM Advisors

Kimberly Klieber, EIT
Project Engineer

Mark Landis, P.E.
Project Manager

cc: Chris Barnett, Township Supervisor
    David Goodloe, Building Official
    Jeff Stout, Director of Public Services
    Tammy Gieling, Director of Planning and Zoning
    Lynn Harrison, Planning and Zoning Coordinator
    Jeff Williams, Township Fire Marshal
    Bill Basigkow, Water and Sewer Superintendent
    Ronald Miosch, Peninsula Developments, LLC (via e-mail)
    Jan Sharpe, Sharpe Engineering (via e-mail)

File: P:\0101_0125\SITE_OroonTwp\2021\012121371 Peninsula Developments, LLC Provisioning Center\MUNI\Site\1st Review\PeninsulaDevLLC_ProvisioningCenter_SPRev1.docx
To: Planning Commission/Planning & Zoning Director  
From: Jeff Williams, Fire Marshal  
Re: PC-2022-08, Peninsula Development LLC., Site Plan  
Date: 2/24/2022

The Orion Township Fire Department has completed its review of Application PC-2022-08 for the limited purpose of compliance with Charter Township of Orion Ordinance’s, Michigan Building Code, and all applicable Fire Codes.

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

Approved

X Approved with Comments (See below)
Not approved

Comments:
- Fire department access roads 20 to 26 feet wide shall be posted with NO PARKING FIRE LANE signage on both sides of the fire apparatus access road (D103.6.1). Fire department access roads greater than 26 feet shall only require posting on one side of the road way.

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

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

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

The Department of Public Services has reviewed the above-mentioned project. We have ample capacity to meet the needs of this expansion.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeffery T. Stout
Director
Department of Public Services
Orion Township Planning Commission
2022 Site Walk Report

PC-2022-08 Peninsula Developments

Applicant is proposing a 4,800-square foot cannabis retail outlet at the southwest corner of Lapeer and Silverbell Roads in Orion Township.

The location is bordered by the Milosch Palace automobile dealership and the applicant’s existing cannabis grow facility to the north, the Eagle Valley landfill to the west, a gasoline station/retail commercial development under construction to the east and an industrial park under construction to the south.

There are woodlands on the west side of the proposed development that do not appear to be impacted, with the building footprint on the east side of the parcel covering generally flat, barren land. The site plan indicates entrance/exits off of Silver Bell Road. The plan also indicates no wetlands will be impacted by the development. More parking spaces than required by ordinance are noted on the site plan, as well as landscape trees.

Submitted by:

Joe St. Henry
Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission

Site Plan Approval Application

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Peninsula Developments, LLC Provisioning Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Development if applicable</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Peninsula Developments, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 3800 S. Lapeer Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:miloschbrian@gmail.com">miloschbrian@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Peninsula Developments, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 3800 S. Lapeer Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:miloschbrian@gmail.com">miloschbrian@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Preparer Firm/Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Sharpe Engineering - Jim Sharpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 248.877.2102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:jim@sharpe-engineering.com">jim@sharpe-engineering.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Contact Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: AKA Architects Inc. - Brad Klein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 303 E. Third St., Ste. 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 248.287.7277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:b.klein@aka-architects.net">b.klein@aka-architects.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sidewell Number(s): 09-26-300-014

Location or Address of Property: North side of Silverbell Rd. just west of M-24 / Lapeer Rd.

Side of Street: north Nearest Intersection: M-24 / Lapeer Rd. and Silverbell Rd.

Acreage: 4.293 Current Use of Property: Vacant / Undeveloped

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

Subject Property Zoning: IP Adjacent Zoning: N. IP / GB S. IP E. GB W. IP

List any known variances needed (subject to change based on Township consultant’s review) NA

Give a detailed description of the proposed development, including the number and size of the buildings, or units being proposed: A single 6,779 sq. ft. 2-story building to be used as a marijuana provisioning center with future office space planned for the second floor.

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

AT&T
54 Mill St.
Pontiac, MI 48342

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

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

Oakland County Water Resources
To Be Submitted by the Township

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

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

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

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

Signature of Applicant: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

Print Name: ____________________________________

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

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

______________________________ Date: ____________________________

Print Name: ____________________________

Version 12/1/21
Project Name: ____________________________________________

PC# ______________________ Parcel#(s): ______________________________

Please select an option below:

☐ **Permission to Post on Web Site**

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

Signature of Applicant ___________________________ Date __________

Printed Name of Applicant __________________________

☐ **Do not want plans posted on Web Site**
February 9, 2022
Site Plan Approval

Project
Peninsula Developments, LLC
Marijuana Provisioning Center
Silverbell Road
Lake Orion, Michigan

AKA Architects Inc. Project Number 2138.00

Civil Engineer
Sharpe Engineering, Inc
101 N. Washington
Oxford, WI 48371
voice 248.877.2102

Applicant
Peninsula Developments, LLC
2800 S. Lapier Road
Lake Orion, MI 48359
voice 248.496.1441

Project Description
A single 0.75 story, 2-story building to be used as a marijuana provisioning center with future office space planned for second floor.
WETLAND DELINEATION
PROVIDED BY:
Brooke Williamson & Associates
33000 Park Road
Wixom, MI 48393
248-634-9100
JOB NUMBER: 06-046
DELINEATION PERFORMED: Nov. 29, 2019

TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY
PROVIDED BY:
Kornell Surveying Inc.
136 N. Washington St.
Cortland, OH 44410
248-629-4541
JOB NUMBER: 18-2031
DATED: October 21, 2021

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION
FILE: 06-046
PAGE: 1

IMPROVEMENT NOTES:
- NO Boring METHODS SO AS NOT TO DISTURB ANY WETLANDS OR ROADWAYS.
- ALL LAWN AREAS WITHIN DRIP EDGE OF EXISTING TREES. NO MACHINERY IS TO BE USED WITHIN THE DRIP LINE OF EXISTING TREES. HAND GRADE ONE-SIDED TREES OR THOSE WITH THIN OR OPEN CROWNS SHALL NOT BE ACCEPTED.
- ALL SINGLE TRUNK SHADE TREES TO HAVE A CENTRAL LEADER. TREES WITH FORKED OR MULTIPLE TRUNKS ARE NOT ALLOWED.
- LANDSCAPE CONTRACTOR SHALL VISIT SITE, INSPECT EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS AND CHECk WEATHER TO DETERMINE WHAT TYPE OF SEASONAL PLANTING MATERIALS WILL BE USED.
- UNDERGROUND IRRIGATION SYSTEM. DESIGN OF IRRIGATION SYSTEM TO BE PROVIDED BY ACP LANDSCAPING.
- ALL HMA PAVEMENT, CONCRETE PAVEMENT, CONCRETE CURB, AND SIMILAR PAVEMENT ITEMS TO BE PROVIDED PER CONTRACT/ELECTRONIC DATA TRANSFERS AND USE OF THIS DOCUMENT.

NOTES:
- FENCE POST: 3 PER TREE.

http://www.sharpeengineering.com

COPYRIGHT © 2022 OF SHARPE ENGINEERING, PC

PROPOSED TREES:
- COMMON NAME
- NAME
- SIZE
- TOTAL
- 1. NORWAY SPRUCE
- 2. SUGAR MAPLE
- 3. PENN SUGAR MAPLE
- 4. 2 H.B. PLUM
- 5. CHINESE HUCKLEBERRY

DEVELOPMENT NOTES: (ZONE X) AS DENOTED BY FEMA PANEL 26125C0376F DATED 09/29/2006.

LANDSCAPE OPEN SPACE CALCULATION:

SITE PLAN

SILVERBELL ROAD 120 FT. WD. (TRACT)

SURVEY LEGEND

IMPROVEMENT LEGEND

SANITARY LOAD
SANITARY MANSION
WATER MAIN
WATER PUMP
GATE VALVE
STORM SEWER
CAVITY-BARRIER
SEGMENT CONTROL FENCE
LIGHT POLE
DRAINAGE PATTERN
HVA PORT
CONSUMPTION
CURB & GUTTER - STD.

BENCHMARKS

WETLAND DELINEATION PERFORMED: Nov. 29, 2019

Brooke Williamson & Associates
33000 Park Road
Wixom, MI 48393
248-634-9100

WALTER C. SHARPE, PE.

PENNELLA PHOTOGRAPHY
General Note:
1. USE SCALES FOR LIGHTING MOUNTING HEIGHT.
2. CALCULATIONS ARE SHOWN IN FOOTCANDLES @ 3' - 5'
3. LIGHTING ALTERNATIVES REQUIRE NEW PHOTOMETRIC CALCULATION AND RESUBMISSION TO CITY FOR APPROVAL.

THE ENGINEER AND/OR ARCHITECT MUST DETERMINE APPLICABILITY OF THE LAYOUT TO EXISTING / FUTURE FIELD CONDITIONS. THIS LIGHTING LAYOUT REPRESENTS COMPUTATIONAL LEVELS ASSOCIATED WITH APPROVED LIGHTING TOLERANCES IN LAMPS, AND OTHER variable FIELD CONDITIONS. MOUNTING HEIGHTS INDICATED ARE FROM GROUND AND/OR FLUSH UP.

THESE LIGHTING CALCULATIONS ARE NOT A SUBSTITUTE FOR INDEPENDENT ENGINEERING ANALYSIS OF LIGHTING SYSTEM ENSUITY AND SAFETY. THE ENGINEER AND/OR ARCHITECT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ENSURING FOR MINIMUM ENERGY CODE AND LIGHTING QUALITY COMPLIANCE.

UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED, PROJECT MUST COMPARE WITH LIGHTING CONTROLS REQUIREMENTS DEFINED IN ASHRAE 90.1-2013. FOR SPECIFIC INFORMATION CONTACT GBAL CONTROLS GROUP AT GBALGREENBUSH.COM OR 734-266-9755.

FOR ORDERING INQUIRIES CONTACT GROSSER BUSH AT QUOTES@GROSSERBUSH.COM OR 734-266-6705.

THIS DRAWING WAS GENERATED FROM AN ELECTRONIC IMAGE FOR ESTIMATION PURPOSE ONLY. LAYOUT TO BE VERIFIED IN FIELD BY OTHERS.

MOUNTING HEIGHT IS MEASURED FROM GRADE TO FACE OF FIXTURE. POLE HEIGHT SHOULD BE CALCULATED AS THE MOUNTING HEIGHT LESS BASE HEIGHT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Catalog Number</th>
<th>Lamp</th>
<th>Light Loss Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ENERGY STAR</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENERGY STAR</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENERGY STAR</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENERGY STAR</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ENERGY STAR</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ENERGY STAR</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max/Min</th>
<th>Avg/Min</th>
<th>Avg/Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade @ 5’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING AND DRIVES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>33.7:1</td>
<td>8.7:1</td>
<td>0.3:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, March 16, 2022 at 7:05 p.m., at the Orion Township Municipal Complex Board Room, 2323 Joslyn Rd, Lake Orion, MI 48360 on the following matter:

Public Hearing on PC-2022-09, Grand Square of Orion, Special Land Use Request for a drive-thru restaurant, located on a vacant parcel, west of 637 Brown Rd. (Sidwell #09-32-400-099).

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.
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