Public Hearing at 7:05 p.m.: PC-2022-10, The River Church, Special Land Use Request for a church, located at 3900 S. Baldwin Road (parcel #09-29-301-029), 3910 S. Baldwin Road (parcel #09-29-301-034), and 3920 S. Baldwin Road (parcel #09-29-301-038).

Public Hearing (immediately following PC-2022-10 Public Hearing): PC-2022-11, CSB Investment, LLC, Rezone Request to rezone approx. 1.7 acres of 1050 W. Silverbell Road, Parcel 09-27-301-050 from Limited Industrial (LI) to Industrial Park (IP).

1. OPEN MEETING
2. ROLL CALL
3. MINUTES
   A. 3-16-22, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes
   B. 3-16-22, Planning Commission Public hearing Minutes for PC-2022-09 Grand Square of Orion
4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL
5. BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENT - NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY
6. CONSENT AGENDA
7. NEW BUSINESS
   A. PC-2022-11, CSB Investment LLC, Rezone Request to rezone approx. 1.7 acres of 1050 W. Silverbell Road, Parcel 09-27-301-050 from Limited Industrial (LI) to Industrial Park (IP).
8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
   A. PC-2021-90, Ridgewood PUD Concept 625 Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-007), the vacant parcel west of 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-006), and the vacant parcel east of 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-008) postponed from the January 5, 2022, PC meeting to resubmit revised plans to the Township within 3 months. The request is for an extension of the revised plans being submitted to the Township.
   B. PC-2021-07, 5 Year Master Plan
9. PUBLIC COMMENTS
10. COMMUNICATIONS
    A. Memo from Charter Township Of Independence - Notice of Intent to Update the Master Plan
    B. Attorney letter
11. PLANNERS REPORT/EDUCATION
12. COMMITTEE REPORTS
13. FUTURE PUBLIC HEARINGS
14. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS
15. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS
16. ADJOURNMENT

In the spirit of compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals with a disability should feel free to contact Penny S. Shults, Clerk, at (248) 391-0304, ext. 4001, at least seventy-two hours in advance of the meeting to request accommodations.
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   A. PC-2021-90, Request for an extension of the 3 months to submit revised plans for PC-2021-90, Ridgewood PUD Concept 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-007), the vacant parcel west of 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-006), and the vacant parcel east of 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-008).
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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, March 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

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

OTHERS PRESENT:
Scott Gabriel

3. MINUTES
A. 3-2-22, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes
Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker to approve minutes as presented. Motion carried.

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

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

6. CONSENT AGENDA
None

Chairman Reynolds recessed the regular meeting at 7:03 p.m. and opened the Public Hearing at 7:05 p.m. for case 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).

Chairman Reynolds closed the PC-2022-09 Public Hearing at 7:16 p.m. and reconvened the regular Planning Commission meeting at 7:16 p.m.
7. NEW BUSINESS
A. 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) and an Amended Site Plan, located west of 637 Brown Rd. (09-32-400-099), 4999 Grand Ave. (09-32-400-098), and 631 Brown Rd. (Sidwell #09-32-400-097).

Chairman Reynolds asked the applicant if they would like to add anything to their presentation?

Mr. Chiesa said there were a few things that he would like to point out. Based on how they designed this, 160-ft. from the east property line and over 200-ft. from the road, plus they will have the road noise which would be louder than the speaker for the order station, they should have no issues with meeting their requirement.

Mr. Chiesa noted that the loading area as he mentioned earlier is screened, it is behind the building which is on the north side of the building, it is not visible from the road. If they look through the documents that they provided in blue it shows the wheel pattern of what it takes for a truck to get into there. They went through that whole thing.

Mr. Chiesa stated that the pedestrian walkway they have widened, they had a 3-ft. walk that extended adjacent to this property to the west. They wanted to create a greenbelt but they were ok with making that all concrete, so it is concrete from curb to curb. They went with 7-ft. if a car overhangs 2-ft. that still leaves 5-ft. for a pedestrian to walk. They improved that aspect of the site. The loading area as he mentioned earlier is screened, it is behind the building which is on the north side of the building, it is not visible from the road. If they look through the documents that they provided in blue it shows the wheel pattern of what it takes for a truck to get into there. They went through that whole thing.

Mr. Chiesa noted that the loading was shown it works that was one of the first things that they always check out when they do a project is to make sure that the fire trucks can get around, so there is no issue with that.

Mr. Chiesa said one of the things that he did want to point out that was unique to how Culvers operates today is this has a single lane that goes to the window where they pay. Most people are familiar with it, that would be where they get their food. That is not the case here, they pull forward staff directs them where to park, and staff will bring out the food, and they direct the cars to move around. That is why they have this “Y” shaped three lanes. He showed them a Culvers at 23 and Hayes Rd. in Shelby Township. They have the three lanes they have the two lanes, outermost, for customers to wait for their food to be brought out. They also have parking spaces in the front which are for online orders. That is very similar to what they have. This location was not as user-friendly as far as vehicles because they have directional parking and then they cut through the drive-thru lane, the drive-thru lane could also block people when they leave. This was an earlier generation of this concept. He showed them the Wixom Culvers location as far as the diagonal parking on the order and drive-thru egress points. It is a “Y” shaped they are splitting it they have a couple of cars up against where the building curb-line is, cars on the opposite side with a lane going through. That is to allow cars to either pull out and get around existing vehicles, again this is all controlled by staff out there, this is not freewheeling. It is much the same as the Chick-Fil-A’s today they have staff outside and they are directing people. This is the concept they didn’t particularly care for this and working with Joe on the design of this they wanted a dedicated drive-thru so they avoid this cross-conflict that they see on both the examples that he had shown them. There is an example of that on Culver’s Corporate website they have this as their prototypical site plan to use in some way, shape, or form applicable to every location. They have the exact same thing that they have got for this location, the stacking at the top and bottom, a dedicated drive-thru lane through the middle so anyone can pull out and they have a road on the perimeter which is conducive for traffic around the site. They have isolated the drive-thru as a separate entity so this concept that they have works.
Mr. Chiesa stated that dealing with some other businesses everyone that has a fast-casual type business is looking for creative ways to do a drive-thru because with COVID and people just wanting to pull up and order and leave for convenience this is not a bad way of doing it. That is their corporate method and wanted to make that clear that that is really what they have done. Their plan was submitted to corporate for approval, they liked it. He wanted to clarify any confusion regarding how that system works.

Mr. Chiesa said that the comments after their reviews that is why they did the 7-ft. walk on their site. He knew that engineering was working with OHM regarding what they needed to do to satisfy the community regarding the civil aspects. With that, they are looking for their approval to keep this project moving.

Planning Wojciechowski read through his review date stamped March 4, 2022.

Engineering Landis read through his review date stamped March 3, 2022.

Chairman Reynolds said that they did have a review from their Fire Marshal who recommends approval without any additional comments at this time. The same goes for the Public Services review by the Director of Public Services. There was a site walk completed by the Site Walk Committee and the report was written by Chairman Reynolds. This is the second report of this property that is currently undeveloped. There was a previous site walk completed prior when it was not a drive-thru that was proposed.

Trustee Urbanowski said they talked about this a little bit when this plan initially came in with the hotels because they have corporate standards and things they have to abide by. She thought they have seen Culver’s color schemes and the way that their buildings are put together, and she was ok with the façade. It is a corporate standard and it fits, and she thought the other Culvers were beautiful buildings and she was sure this one would be too.

Trustee Urbanowski stated that she was concerned about the three lanes as well. She has never been through a Chick-fil-A drive-thru and wasn’t sure how that goes. She asked if there will be people outside physically all the time directing traffic even in the wintertime? She understood the concept of it she saw where they were going with it but the three left turns when there is two-way traffic that is a little scary. She asked him to explain that a little bit more.

Mr. Chiesa replied basically the cars are pulling up they are waiting for their food to be brought out to them. Once their food is brought out to them then the cars are leaving the site they are directed by staff, this is what happens at every Culvers. The two examples that he gave them are the exact same scenario that they have here. They put the left turn lane only as a means of controlling that traffic so everyone is going in one direction. They are not all getting their food at the exact same time, when they are pulling out, they are not trying to merge with the next person, they are coming from a stopped position. He stated that this is not a road that has three cars that are making a left turn at the same time. If they, had it where they could go any direction without a directional arrow that would be more of a conflict because the people that are getting their orders are not moving from the left or the right on their own, they are being dictated by the staff where they should go. If the person in car “A” is directed to the far-right lane they may want to make a left turn, car “B” that is in the closest curb line to the building may want to go right, well now they are forced to make a left so they don’t have this cross-traffic. People are not moving they are stopping and they are proceeding. This is done at the two locations that he had shown them, that is the nature of how that works. It is something that they want it is their corporate method of doing it in that order. It is important that they maintain as well as, their corporate architecture, their corporate policies regarding how they operate. He thought if they looked at today’s McDonald’s where they are incorporating the double drive order position and it
is all merging into one and it is coming around and a lot of times that is blocking traffic, or their loading zone is blocking these order positions, and cars have to merge back. They cleaned that up here, they have a long drive-thru lane, it has a singular purpose, not everyone is getting their food brought out at the same time. Staff is out there to direct this. This is not anything new that is starting at this facility. He showed them two examples because they were trying to show them that this is out there and that is what they do. The plan that he showed them as a concept plan is direct from Culver’s website, that is the method that they would like to see this operate. Personally, an architect looking at traffic flow on a site would rather see everyone going left that was their idea, they didn’t want to have people where they might want to cross and start going the other direction, so it is better to keep them internal on-site. They have two-lane traffic both of those buildings that he showed them also had two-way traffic that those three lanes came out into. This is proven, the Shelby Township one is by his home, he has never heard or seen of an accident with this functioning method that they have.

Mr. Jason Kishmish thought what was very important for them to understand is that not all of these cars are going to be pulling out all at the same time because their food is delivered to them individually. There is usually one staff member out there and they are never going to see six cars stacking unless they are busy. During lunchtime and dinner time they do get filled up but it is very important to note that they would rather control the way the traffic is going to flow than give people the free-for-all to make whatever direction that they want. A lot of times they are better off controlling that than allowing people to make rights and lefts. If there are four cars queuing, one car gets his delivery, by the time the employee goes back and gets the next order that car has already pulled out. They don’t have a situation where they have four cars both looking to exit at the same time making the left. They thought here the left was probably better because if they turn right then they are crossing into the Texas Road House customers and whatever else is going on there. They want the path from when they exit to when they get out of the site to be the closest and cross the least amount of pedestrian traffic or other traffic that they can avoid. This drive-thru lane is prepped for 12-cars but the reality is they will probably add another 12-cars before they get to Brown Rd. because this is all internal, this site is all circulating internal to the pad, in addition to the pad, there is an access drive that comes off of Brown Rd. into the whole development. If Mr. Zimmer has got that much traffic going on he has to charge him more rent but there is a lot of capacity the way this was designed. When they sent this to corporate, they didn’t come back with one change, it was a well-thought-out plan. It is organized and they have enough compacity to handle a high volume. He thought another thing to keep in mind this design was meant for their corporate brand standards, these are sites in Florida, and California where the volumes are sometimes double what they would see in a midwestern Culvers. He doubted that they would ever outgrow the capacity that they are affording them at this site. The middle lane in that stacking is designed for cars to be able, if the car in the back gets their order first, it is designed so that cars can pull out and get out of the way. This design is not for all three that are trying to make a left at the same time, it won’t happen with the way the restaurant operates.

Mr. Chiesa said the other thing to keep in mind is this is a site internal to a larger development versus a stand-alone site where Culver’s has their own property and they can design it with a one-way traffic pattern around. They need to have circulation for emergency vehicles, delivery vehicles heading both ways. To restrict traffic, they hardly ever do any diagonal parking in a one-way direction because it causes confusion and traffic issues. The only place that it works is if they have a McDonald’s or something like that, it is all freestanding they can circulate around the building everyone is going the same direction. Here they could have people coming from the west approach to get into this site, work their way around the drive-thru. They have to have two-way traffic and again he firmly believes in having the left turn only and it is controlled by staff, because they are bringing the food out, so they are directing what is going on. When they did this design after meeting with the owner, they told them what they would be looking for and
corporate did not have any changes. What they did the first time it went through; it went through every level of their approval process. They wouldn’t do something if they didn’t think it worked.

Trustee Urbanowski wanted to clarify something about the decibels. She asked if it is the decibels that they can perceive at a certain distance? Planner Wojciechowski said that the standard is any noise associated with a drive-thru shall not exceed 60-decibels when measured at the property line.

Trustee Urbanowski questioned that they said it was 80-decibels coming out of there? Mr. Chiesa said that at the speaker, they are 60-decibels in this Boardroom. Trustee Urbanowski asked if there was a formula that they could show where they were at? Mr. Chiesa said it comes from the manufacturer, their preset is in an 80-84 dB range. He added that 16-ft. away from those speakers they are already down to 60-ft.

Chairman Reynolds said that is usually a clause that they put in and then if they have an issue then obviously then if there is a complaint or if they are acknowledging that it is louder than that at the property line, that is their measure that is their mark it can’t be louder than that. It is usually just a condition of the Special Land Use.

Secretary St. Henry said when they talk about traffic control in the parking lot, he has been in Culver’s and other fast-food places where they tell you to pull into space “A” or space “4” or whatever, and then the folks come out and bring your food and then they back out and it is typically staggered. He asked if they will have someone in the parking lot directing traffic? Mr. Kishmish replied that is usually how it is done, yes.

Secretary St. Henry said they probably do it when it is super busy. He knew that Mr. Zimmer’s other Culver’s can be very crowded. He has never been there where he has seen people directing traffic into the waiting slots.

Mr. Joe Zimmer the owner of Culvers. He said that when a customer places their order at the window they will tell them where to go based upon that person’s experience the one where the cars are located. For instance, if lane one is full, they will ask that person to pull into that third lane and to keep that center lane available. He has worked in quite a few Culvers and the setup that corporate has given them and the design that Ron has put together is awesome. It is usually the person that works the window is who will tell them because they want to keep that line moving. They deliver the drinks, and the desert at the window where they have three people, one is just doing the drinks and the custard. They get that as soon as they cash or tender out, they leave the window and go to their designated spot. They have a good system, they give a number to the car and actually put it on the car so that the people will run the food out when it is ready. Everything is made to order so a cod dinner could take five minutes and a butter burger could take three minutes, so it doesn’t all come out at once, he thought it was a great system.

Chairman Reynolds said he didn’t have any explicit issue with essentially the other comments that got brought up. Obviously, they would like those other items that are required by their ordinance to be provided and verified by their professional consultants. If 7-ft. wide sidewalks are provided he thought they were fine without wheel-stops since that typically is no greater than a 2-ft. overhang.

Chairman Reynolds said that he sees where his consultants are coming from and it has been a large topic of discussion with other drive-thrus. He questioned would if the center lane was going to be clearly marked as “through traffic only”? His other question was if the western drive was kind of the second opportunity to have vehicles stacking post order, is there any restriction
to essentially guiding that lane back into the through traffic lane so they only have two left-turn lanes? He thought that the issue that they have been observing here was three lanes of traffic turning left into two-way traffic. If it was reduced from three to two that would potentially be a step towards elevating those three lanes all turning left. He understands the process, he was familiar with Culver’s he has been to Culver’s with worse stacking situations than this but there is a very good likelihood here at this location, especially a Culver’s in this location to be busy, both sides of the window. He knows that they did a great job of moving the traffic through but that was his opportunity to essentially improve this traffic flow, can that most outermost stacking or post-order wait be merged back into the thru-traffic lane to then be prompted for a left-turn.

Mr. Chiesa thought that by letting lanes go in different directions they are just creating more problems. Chairman Reynolds said he is not talking about different directions he was talking about still having a left turn but they would go from one to three and have that planned south lane be merged back into the through traffic lane, to only have the through traffic lane or the stacking lane be turning left. Mr. Chiesa asked if he was talking about only having two access points where they are all exiting versus having three? Chairman Reynolds replied correct, but still having three lanes to provide service so they would essentially have the eastern lane be able to turn left, the center lane is through traffic, and the second if he was understanding this correctly, to be secondary overflow to essentially just merge back into that through left lane. They still have the width of three and they have those two left turns there. He didn’t want to speak from a traffic study standpoint but he thought it was the three lanes all turning and the potential for multiple traffic. Mr. Chiesa said the issue, if he was understanding correctly what he is asking, they would have to provide basically an angled curb line to have the people in the western line get into the centerline, with doing that they are also pushing the cars back then further, which could cause a little bit of a bottleneck at the pay window, where right now there is no bottleneck based on how this is setup. This is not a site where it is one way around and they have constant traffic he didn’t think they would have a high volume of traffic in the front of this it is no different than any drive-thru where they have to wait and merge to go left or right. They have some sites that they have designed and they have put the arrows down and people are doing their own thing. If they allow any other type of treatment than what they have, where someone can just pull out again Joe Zimmer has people out there, they are bringing their food and those people are clear to go. It is now up to that individual driver to wait for traffic to clear just like you would at any aisle that they are going down.

Chairman Reynolds asked if the center lane was going to be through traffic only and was it possible for that to still maintain the corporate standard and merge back in? Mr. Kishmish said that he remembers a discussion about this at one time, the issue with that was if the far lane and they want to give them the ability to only merge into the center lane is, the car behind that one that is ready to merge gets there first, how do you then get them to merge? They have to keep it open. The intent here is for everyone to merge into that middle lane to get out of the site. If the front car got there first, they would make a left out, but if the car behind it got its food first it is going to have to merge into that center lane in order to make the left, to get out. If they put a curb line and they force that far lane to merge and if the car behind it got its food first it is going to stay there until the car in front of has moved out. That was a conversation they had with Culvers and that is why they said “ok, they have to do it this way to give people enough flexibility to merge into that middle lane” so if they are not the first car out, they have a way out.

Mr. Chiesa said that if corporate sees that this doesn’t work, this is not going to prolong something, this is what they do on their webpage, and he showed them two other examples. And those locations had no destination whether they could go right or left they just let them decide and they are trying to simplify it by making everyone goes left.
Mr. Kishmish said that they just did a Krispy Kream an experiment of a future store. These drive-thru designs are going to evolve, when they get them, it is going to tell them right on their phone where to go, they are not even going to interact with human beings. That is kind of what these designs are evolving too. When they get their order and it is going to be a mobile order, they might not even see a person it is going to tell them to queue in lane 3 or queue in lane 4. At Krispy Kream they almost designed it like a race track, there were 4 lanes, and that is where this fast-casual business is going, people are not sitting in these restaurants as much anymore.

Commissioner Walker said when he read this stuff he was impressed and he was the one up here that normally says “I’m not going to conditionally approve anything because it should be worked out before they get here”. So, reviewing this material before he got here today, he said “this is great” because there is not a lot for the people that they pay money that they make sure that they do things the right way, are differing from them. He totally agreed with Engineering Landis that the three lanes bother him. He said they can’t figure out some way to just angle that third lane so that there are not three lanes. He was stunned by the whole thing, he thought that they would be done already. He would have voted to give them the conditional approval of this and he was stunned because they are nitpicking over things from a safety point of view. He is not talking corporate Culver’s, Mr. Zimmer, or them but they have their experts saying he was concerned and they are saying it is not a concern. When Engineer Landis says there is a concern, he thinks that there is a concern.

Secretary St. Henry asked Mr. Zimmer what other Culvers do; do they have a three-lane design? Mr. Chiesa said it was a single site use design.

Mr. Zimmer said there is a difference there. There are three lanes, the first lane will stay next to the building usually 4-5 cars, and then they have parallel parking there which is not a real good idea because they have to pull in to the right, and then when they back out, he delivers the food a lot to the customers, so he knows he always directs them to back up. The center lane which in his case would be the drive-thru lane all the time pulls forward and proceeds to the left in this case to the east. They do have three lanes but it is because of the way the site was designed and where it would fit. Every site is different and they have to try to complement it the best that they can. In that case, they have parallel parking to the right which would be bad because they would be backing up. In the second lane, the middle lane, everything is to the left. They even have a one-way only sign, so when they come in, they can’t turn right so there wouldn’t be a head-on collision. It is very important that their drive-thru person, instruct them where to go. They can’t go left at his existing store because if they did, they would be in the swamp. He agreed with Mr. Kishmish and Mr. Chiesa that if that third lane did go right, they are going to be going into another restaurant parking lot and it could be an issue. They are thinking if they go to the left and the person taking out the food indicates to them this is their way out, it won’t be an issue. That center lane must be kept open at all times so that the person in the front of the line is holding everything up because their order was too long, the cars behind it are going to be sitting there not really happy. That is why they have the center lane so they can pull out and go into the center lane and turn left. Most of their traffic is going to be going left.

Mr. Kishmish said if that customer is only custard or a drink they will be stuck there waiting if they don’t have a lane that directly gets out of the site. They are not going to queue that food until it is delivered at the drive-thru window.

Mr. Zimmer said he thought they would have a worse problem if that third lane turned right than if it turned left.

Mr. Chiesa said what they are looking for is if it angles in so that they would have to merge to the middle lane. What the problem with what that does is it limits the number of cars that can be
in that right lane which now they are going to back up the cars because of the window where they pay. So, they need to have an area where cars can keep moving so they are probably only going to have two at the most that would be looking to go out simultaneously and they would have to look at one another and hopefully one will let the other person go. They can’t control how people drive but that is the idea if they are already going from a single lane flared out into two waiting lanes if they put another angled green area at the right side of the west lane, they are going to limit how many cars can go over to that side which now will start blocking the cars leaving the window and they are just going to create a cluster internally. Again, no disrespect to Engineer Landis and his opinion on it but this is corporate that they look at this and study this and they see how this works they would not approve this if they knew that it caused problems.

Vice-Chairman Gross said he thought that they answered all of his questions. He said it made sense and didn’t have a problem with the three lanes. Especially if there was some onsite control over where the cars are going and how they are exiting. He thought that they did a good job of trying to address the issues and provide a good solution.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, that the Planning Commission approve PC-2022-09, Grand Square of Orion Special Land Use for a drive-thru, located on a vacant parcel west of 637 Brown Rd. (Sidwell #09-32-400-099) for plans date stamped received February 17, 2022. This approval is based on the following findings of facts: this is compatible with adjacent uses there are other drive-thru facilities in the area consisting of a car wash, a bank, Checkers, Panda Express, so there are other drive-thru facilities within the area; it is compatible with the Master Plan reflecting combined with other uses for a mixed-use development in the (BIZ) District; adequate public services are available; there is adequate stacking on the site so as to not interfere with any backup onto Brown Rd.; he saw no detrimental effects that this would have on any of the surrounding properties, and therefore would recommend approval of the Special Land Use in accordance with the ordinance.

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

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, that the Planning Commission grants site plan approval for PC-2022-09, Grand Square of Orion Site Plan Amendment, located on a vacant parcel west of 637 Brown Rd. (Sidwell #09-32-400-099), 631 Brown Rd. (Sidwell #09-32-400-097), and 4999 Grand Ave. (Sidwell #09-32-400-098), for plans date stamped received February 17, 2022. This approval is based upon the following conditions: the revisions of the Township Engineer of his letter of March 3, 2022 items in his conclusion items 1, 2, and 4 being the grating plans, increasing the sidewalk width to 7-ft. and the provision of the floor plans for the Culvers. He believed that the applicant had provided adequate information relative to the ingress and egress from the drive-thru area, and the plan does comply with all the other ordinance requirements.

Discussion on the motion:

Secretary St. Henry asked if for whatever reason the store opens up, they have the three-left turn lane traffic flow, and for whatever reason, it is not working, will there be an opportunity, given the design to make changes if necessary? Mr. Kishmish said anything that doesn’t function whether it’s a municipal requirement or a corporate requirement, to hell with the corporate wants at the end of the day, if it doesn’t work, they have to change it.

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

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

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said this item was put on the agenda because if they recall at the last Planning Commission meeting it was sent to the Board of Trustees for them to authorize the release for review by the necessary agencies and surrounding communities. When it was sent to the Board because it was a complete overhaul of the Master Plan, they wanted more time to look it over. At that meeting, they were given the Master Plan to look at and they are going to forward any comments or questions they had, and then when they are satisfied it would be authorized to release. At the Board meeting, they did ask that all comments be into her by Monday so she went ahead and put it on for a discussion of the comments but they all didn’t come in. She has nothing else to add, no discussion, she thought that this line item was an update.

Secretary St. Henry asked Planning & Zoning Director Girling that based on their comments and questions, and let’s say the plan has changed, will they be notified of the changes that the Trustees want? Planning & Zoning Director Girling replied that she would assume that the comments that come in will come back for the Planning Commission to say, thanks for your comments, not interested, so it would make a trip back to them before it was put back on the Board agenda unless no comments come in. If no comments come in then it would go forth as it was directed originally.

B. PC-2022-12, PC By-Laws Amendment

Chairman Reynolds asked Planning & Zoning Director Girling to give a brief overview. They have their memo, the red line, and then the clean version. It seems fairly straightforward but if they could just fill them in a little bit of where this originated from.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that it actually originated at the Zoning Board of Appeals. It was discovered that the ZBA By-Laws had not even been amended when the Zoning Enabling Act had been modified so the by-laws did not follow the law. They were asked to have the Township Attorney look at it. It could have been a short fix just for that one deficiency but these hadn’t been looked at with the Planning Commission either. Plus, there were discussions of maybe they should have a little bit of uniformity on how the by-laws for the ZBA look compared to the PC. Not saying that necessarily they have the same by-laws but if the by-laws of the Zoning Board of Appeals gave what an agenda looks like and what order they do it in then why doesn’t the Planning Commission or vice versa. They looked at them both at the same time, she wrote her recommendations things that she saw and forwarded them to the Township Attorney, and then she worked on it. Anything within here is based on her comments and the legal opinion of the Township Attorney, but of course, these are their by-laws so if there is something that was changed that they have an issue with, this was their starting point. The existing by-laws in addition to the proposed by-laws say for them to adopt it they have to first have a meeting before they say that they want to approve them they have to read the changes. If they think they are close enough and realize because they have to have that one meeting, they would not be approving tonight anyway to give them time. She would ask what they were provided with, and she did check with the Township Attorney, that they can just say the sections that changed they do not have to read the actual changes. She would ask that this evening they would at least do that, read the changes, which would take care of the one meeting prior to being read. If by some chance they look at them and there are big changes then they will look at whether they have to read the changes.
Chairman Reynolds said that he read the by-laws and felt comfortable with the proposed changes. If there is agreeance to that they could make that statement here tonight, if there is a discussion or proposed changes that they would like to make, obviously, this is not their one and only but to start the notification process. Does anyone object to that? No one objected.

Chairman Reynolds read into the record that on their regular Planning Commission meeting of Wednesday, March 16, 2022, under PC case #PC-2022-12 they are proposing to amend their by-laws specifically Article 5, Section 1A, Section 1C, Section 2, 3, & 6, and under Article 8, Section 1, 2, 4, & 5. This would be placed on a future meeting for the formal discussion and to essentially post the amendment and move forward on the process. More than likely if there are any additional comments but more than likely at one of their following meetings in April.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said she would be shooting for the first meeting in April. They can put it on if they have a discussion that is taking too long, they can have a motion to bring it to the next meeting but if there is no discussion let’s get it done. She added that there is approval by the Planning Commission but it is ultimately the Board of the Trustees that approve it also. They would have one more step after the Planning Commission says that they are good with it.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS
None.

10. COMMUNICATIONS
None.

11. PLANNERS REPORTS
None.

12. COMMITTEE REPORTS
None.

13. PUBLIC HEARINGS
A. 04-06-22 at 7:05 p.m., PC-2022-10, The River Church, Special Land Use Request for a church, located at 3900 S. Baldwin Road (parcel 09-29-301-029), 3910 S. Baldwin Road (parcel 09-29-301-034), and 3920 S. Baldwin Road (Parcel 09-29-301-038).

B. 04-06-22 PC-2022-11 (immediately following the PC-2022-10 public hearing at 7:05 p.m.), CSB Investment LLC, rezone Request to rezone approx. 1.7-acres of 1050 W. Silverbell Road, Parcel #09-27-301-050 from Limited Industrial (LI) to Industrial Park (IP)

14. CHAIRMAN’S COMMENTS
None

15. COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS
None

16. ADJOURNMENT
Moved by Chairman Reynolds, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, to adjourn the meeting at 8:14 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,
The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a Public Hearing on Wednesday, March 16, 2022, at 7:05 p.m. at the Orion Township Municipal Complex Board Room 2323 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, MI  48360.

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

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:**
- None

**CONSULTANTS PRESENT:**
- Matt Wojciechowski, (Township Planner) of Giffels Webster
- Mark Landis (Township Engineer) of OHM Advisors
- Tammy Girling, Township Planning & Zoning Director

**OTHERS PRESENT:**
- Scott Gabriel

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).

Chairman Reynolds asked the applicant to make a brief presentation.

Mr. Ronald Chiesa with R.A. Chiesa Architects presented. Mr. Chiesa stated that they were here in 2020 they got the site plan approved for three hotels and two restaurants in the front of the property. The property is 13.26-acres and is zoning sections A, C, & D (BIZ District). During the timing of this, the restaurant building “A” has changed its user so they are there tonight with a new restaurant use for that. They have a 4,450-sq. ft. restaurant that will be taking that site that was previously approved for an 8,000-sq. ft. restaurant. The use with this particular restaurant will require a drive-thru lane. They have designed the building and it has been approved by the corporate office.

Mr. Chiesa said getting into the standards the sit-down dining restaurant is compatible with the site because they had a restaurant that was previously approved for this it just changed what type of restaurant that would be moving into the space. Vehicular circulation on the site is still the same they just dropped it into the same area that the previous restaurant was approved. No approaches are changed, none of the circulations has changed, interconnecting the site with one another.

Mr. Chiesa stated that the dumpster and loading area is located internally so it is not visible from Brown Rd. It is screened with plant material, it is designed on the north side of the building, it is in amongst the parking area for this site. This is for a Culvers that would be moving in. The visual impact is very similar to the adjacent restaurant that was there, as well, as what was going to happen with the 8,000-sq. ft. restaurant. The business hours, the typical Culvers, are 10 a.m. until 11 p.m. seven days a week and would be the hours that this building is in operation. They can verify if there needs to be any amendment with the actual operator and owner who are present tonight.

Mr. Chiesa said that the building itself is designed very similarly to what was approved on some of the things that they presented earlier. It has some stone and fiber cement, they have that on the hotels, and both restaurants had various forms of that material, so they are consistent with that. The footprint has some variations to it, it is staggered it is not just a rectangular box. That is something that is in their ordinance to try to have something that has a little bit of deviation to the façade. They also have some
awnings on the building which is their standard branding, again, that is something that their ordinance speaks to that they like to see those types of building treatments.

Mr. Chiesa noted that the purpose of their Zoning Ordinance they do meet that with the drive-thru. It is an allowed use, it is a Special Land Use, it is allowed in the A & C sections for which they have gotten approval, for this project. A Special Land Use is typical in every community once they have a restaurant with a drive-thru.

Mr. Chiesa said that the public services in the facilities necessary for this building are not a problem. The use is actually smaller than what was proposed here prior. Everything is basically falling along the same lines with the previous building that was designed, as far as, what its intent is, and their design goals for the project.

Mr. Chiesa stated that their proximity to their major thoroughfares, there are no changes here, it is in the same area as the previous restaurant.

Mr. Chiesa said as far as traffic generated this project should have less traffic generated or be very comparable. The previous restaurant would have had two and a half times the seating compacity of this building. Again, even though there is a drive-thru the actual volume should actually be less than what they anticipated originally.

Mr. Chiesa said their site distances nothing has changed going in and out of the project, that has not been changed. Their service road that runs around the complex has not been altered or changed, so the onsite activity still maintains the same. Their vehicular circulation throughout the site, as well as, their parking areas is very similar it is all landscaped. They have screening and trees placed wherever they could. They have some decorative lighting also carried on around this site that they have maintained on the other buildings on the property.

Mr. Chiesa noted that the pedestrian circulation they have a walk that still runs, they have a sign monument structure that is off of Brown Rd. that brings people in from the city sidewalk underneath the structure and they can fan out in 45-degree angles to circulate through walk paths on the site that actually take them from front to back, that hasn’t changed they just modified it to fit with this configuration.

Mr. Chiesa stated that the building itself possesses no detrimental effects on public safety, health, or welfare. It is the same type of use they had prior there should be less activity actually because the seating compacity is two and a half times less than what they originally anticipated.

Mr. Chiesa said, as far as, noise from the order stations the ordinance says nothing more than 60-decibels at the property line or 160-ft. from the property line on the east side, or 270-ft. from the right-of-way which is the street line. Typical speakers are set from the manufacturer at 80-decibels, 60-decibels is a basic conversation at a conference-type room just to give them an idea. They should have probably 0-decibels of anything at the road, as well as, at the east property line.

Mr. Chiesa stated that as far as, the consideration that was given to landscaping and other amenities the site plan again as he has stated they have a smaller restaurant so that gave them the luxury of having more green areas around this. Again, this is defining this, it is not like they have in some locations they see out-lots and they are just dropped into a sea of pavement, so this has landscaping around it, it is a very defined area.

Mr. Chiesa said that one of the criteria, the enhancements of the surrounding environment, is speaking to with the character of the materials on the building, they use fiber cement and stone, which is very consistent with what was previously approved as he has stated earlier.
Mr. Chiesa stated that the Special Land Use they feel is consistent and compatible with the existing BIZ development. Obviously, it is allowed in the BIZ District and they are consistent with what is going on in that area.

Chairman Reynolds asked if there were any citizens that would like to make any comments?

Mr. Scott Gabriel 941Joslyn stated that he was a retired General Manager of The Rainforest Café. He asked that if they are going to put a restaurant in these days and this environment, they have to have a drive-thru. He has no relation but they have to have a drive-thru. His only concern would be is how many cars can be in that drive-thru before it comes onto the road. He thought that Culvers was a great company and have a reputation for treating their employees great, and thought that they would be a good business partner.

Chairman asked the Planning Commissioners if they had any thoughts or concerns during the Public Hearing portion? There were none.

Chairman Reynolds asked the applicant if stacking had been considered? Mr. Chiesa said that was prevalent in the design that they did for this. Stacking is actually to the north side of the building it is internal on the site, it has its own lane, there is no cross-conflict with any traffic. It is not going behind parking spaces that would block circulation and there is really a very limited chance if stacking would go beyond the limits of the property as they have it designed. They thought 12 or 13 stacking spaces, and the way the site is aligned depending on how the cars are coming in they have room for probably half of a dozen or more on top of that number.

Chairman Reynolds closed the public hearing at 7:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Walton
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary
Charter Township of Orion

Planning Commission Approval Date
TO: The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission
FROM: Tammy Girling, Zoning/Planning Director
DATE: March 30, 2022
RE: PC-2022-11, CSB Investments LLC, Rezone Request

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

Rezone Request (Ord. 78, Section 30.04)
Motion: I move that the Planning Commission forwards a recommendation to the Township Board to approve/deny PC-2022-11, CSB Investments LLC, Rezone Request. Requesting to rezone approx. 1.7 acres of the eastern portion of 1050 W. Silverbell Road of parcel 09-27-301-050, from Limited Industrial (LI) to Industrial Park (IP) for the application date stamped received 3/09/22. This recommendation to approve/deny is based on the following findings of facts:

a. The objectives of the Master Plan (Insert findings of facts),
b. Existing uses of property within the general area of the property in question (Insert findings of facts),
c. The zoning classification of property within the general area of the property in question (Insert findings of facts),
d. The suitability of the property in question to the uses permitted, under the existing zoning classification (Insert findings of fact),
e. The trend of development in the general area of the property in question, including any changes which have taken place in the zoning classification (Insert findings of facts).
f. Any additional findings of facts.

If the motion is to recommend approval it is suggested that it be conditioned upon:

a. (insert any additional conditions).
March 24, 2022

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

Rezoning Review
Request: from Limited Industrial (LI) to Industrial Park (IP)

Case Number: PC-2022-11
Address: 1050 W. Silverbell Rd
Parcel ID: 09-27-301-050
Area: 3.31 AC
Applicant: Mark R. James

Plan Date: 03/09/2023
Zoning: Limited Industrial (LI)
Proposed: Industrial Park (IP)
Reviewer: Matt Wojciechowski
Rod Arroyo

Dear Planning Commission Members:

We have completed a review of the request for rezoning referenced above and a summary of our findings is below. Items in **bold** require specific action. Items in *italics* can be addressed administratively. A summary of the requested Planning Commission action is provided on the next page.
30.04 Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance

Findings of Fact and Recommendation of the Planning Commission. Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission shall transmit a summary of comments received at the public hearing and the proposed Ordinance amendments, including any maps and recommendations make written findings of fact and transmit same, together with its recommendation, to the Township Board. The Township Board may hold additional hearings if the Township Board considers it necessary, or if requested.

Where the purpose and effect of the proposed amendment is to change the zoning classification of a particular property, the Planning Commission shall make findings based on the evidence presented to it with respect to the following matters:

a. The objectives of the Township’s Master Plan.

b. Existing uses of property within the general area of the property in question.

c. The zoning classification of property within the general area of the property in question.

d. The suitability of the property in question to the uses permitted under the existing zoning classification.

e. The trend of development in the general area of the property in question, including any changes which have taken place in the zoning classification.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Existing Conditions

1. Site. The site is located on the north side of Silverbell Road, west of Giddings Road. The site is currently split-zoned; the eastern half is zoned Limited Industrial (LI) and the west half is zoned Industrial Park (IP). The properties abutting the site to the north and west are zoned IP, and the property to the south across Giddings/Silverbell (General Motors Orion Assembly) is zoned Industrial Complex (IC).
Items to Consider for Zoning Map Amendment:

1. Is the proposed zoning consistent with the Master Plan?
   
   The Future Land Use Map designates this area as Research/Light Industrial, which supports both the LI and IP zoning classifications.

2. What other impact would the requested zoning have on public services, utilities, and natural features?

   Density: Both zoning classifications require the same dimensional standards regarding setbacks, height, and lot area. The only exception is that current LI zoning allows 30% lot coverage and IP allows 35%.

   Public Services: No difference in the impact on public services is anticipated.

Natural Features Map

3. Has the Applicant provided evidence that the property cannot be developed or used as zoned?

   The Applicant stated the property had previously been used for a permitted use (in the LI district) but has been vacant for approximately a year.
4. Is the proposed zoning district (and potential land uses) compatible with surrounding uses?
   
   The surrounding land uses are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td>General Motors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>IP (western half of property)</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Vacant &amp; single family homes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Will the proposed zoning place a burden on nearby thoroughfares? If so, how would this burden compare with the existing zoning district?

   Given the presence of the surrounding IP zoning, this change would not likely produce traffic above and beyond what is anticipated on Silverbell Road, Giddings Road or other adjacent thoroughfares.

6. Is there other land currently available for this use?

   The surrounding land is zoned IP

7. Will development of the site under proposed zoning be able to meet zoning district requirements?

   The site appears to be buildable based on previous and current developments.

8. Is rezoning the best way to address to the request or could the existing zoning district be amended to add the proposed use as the permitted or special land use?

   Yes, the western half of the site is already zoned IP. It would not be practical to amend the LI district to accommodate development.

9. Has there been a change in circumstances and conditions since adoption of the Master Plan that would support the proposed change?

   The future land use designation of Research/Light Industrial is consistent with the adopted 2016 Master Plan as well as the 2022 Draft Master Plan Update.

10. Would granting the request result in the creation of an unplanned spot zone? Spot zoning is the process of singling out a small parcel of land for a use classification totally different from that of the surrounding area, for the benefit of a single property owner and to the detriment of others (Rogers v. Village of Tarrytown, 96 N.E. 2d 731). Typically, to determine if a rezoning would constitute spot zoning a municipality would look to answer three questions.

   - Is the rezoning request consistent with the Master Plan for the area?
     
     The request is consistent with the 2015 (current) Master Plan.

   - Is the proposed zoning district a logical extension of an existing zoning district in the area?
     
     If rezoned, the property would match all surrounding zoning

   - Would approving the request grant a special benefit to a property owner or developer?
     
     The Planning Commission should review and consider whether or not this applies.
Respectfully,

Giffels Webster

Rodney L. Arroyo, AICP  
Partner

Matt Wojciechowski, AICP  
Senior Planner
To: Planning Commission/Planning & Zoning Director  
From: Jeff Williams, Fire Marshal  
Re:  PC-2022-11, CSB Investments, LLC Rezone Request  
Date: 3/21/2022  

The Orion Township Fire Department has completed its review of Application PC-2022-11 for the limited purpose of compliance with Charter Township of Orion Ordinance’s, Michigan Building Code, and all applicable Fire Codes.

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

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

Sincerely,

Jeff Williams  
Jeff Williams, Fire Marshal  
Orion Township Fire Department
Charter Township of Orion Planning & Zoning Department
2323 Joslyn Rd., Lake Orion MI 48360
P: (248) 391-0304 ext. 5000

Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission
Rezoning Application

30.04, Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance: Map amendments may be initiated by any governmental body or any persons having a freehold interest in the subject property, or a possessory interest entitled to exclusive possession, or a contractual interest which may become a freehold interest, or an exclusive possessory interest entitled to exclusive possession or which is specifically enforceable.

Project Name: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Property Owner(s)</th>
<th>Plan Preparer Firm/person</th>
<th>Project Contact Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSB Investments, LLC</strong></td>
<td><strong>Silver Bell Technology Park, LLC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mark R. James</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: CSB Investments, LLC</td>
<td>Name: Silver Bell Technology Park, LLC</td>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 1615 S. Telegraph Rd.</td>
<td>Address: 11 Baymont St., Apt. 1101</td>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>Address: 1615 S. Telegraph Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615 S. Telegraph Rd.</td>
<td>City: Bloomfield Hills</td>
<td>City: Clearwater</td>
<td>City: Bloomfield Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Bloomfield Hills</td>
<td>State: MI</td>
<td>State: FL</td>
<td>State: MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip: 48302</td>
<td>Zip: 33767</td>
<td>Zip:</td>
<td>Zip: 48302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: (248) 230-0382</td>
<td>Phone: (248) 230-0382</td>
<td>Phone: (248) 230-0382</td>
<td>Phone: (248) 230-0382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell: (248) 891-5265</td>
<td>Cell: (248) 891-5265</td>
<td>Cell: (248) 891-5265</td>
<td>Cell: (248) 891-5265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: (248) 382-0000</td>
<td>Fax: (248) 382-0000</td>
<td>Fax: (248) 382-0000</td>
<td>Fax: (248) 382-0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:james@fyblaw.com">james@fyblaw.com</a></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:al@loinsnals.com">al@loinsnals.com</a></td>
<td>Email:</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:james@fyblaw.com">james@fyblaw.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.
Sidewell Number(s): 09-27-301-050

Location or Address of Property: 1050 W. Silverbell Rd., Orion, MI

Side of Street: North
Nearest Intersection: Giddings Rd.

Acreage: 3.31
Current Use of Property: Vacant

Frontage (in feet): ~667'
Depth (in feet): ~260' at deepest point

Subject Property Zoning: Mixed - LI and IP
Adjacent Zoning: N. IP, S. IC & SE, E. IP, W. SE

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

Requested Zoning Classification: IP - Industrial Park

Existing Use of Property: __________________________ Proposed Use of Property: __________________________

Explain why the rezoning is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of the rights of usage commonly associated with property ownership: See attached letter.

Explain why the existing zoning classification is no longer appropriate: See attached letter.

Explain why the proposed rezoning will not be detrimental to surrounding properties: See attached letter.
Pursuant to Zoning Ordinance 78, Section 30.04(H), a sign indicating the requested rezone shall be installed on the parcel(s) no less than 15 days prior to the scheduled public Hearing. Please check one:

☐ I will install the sign(s) as required (see below for specifications).
✓ I would like to lease signage from the Township (including installation) (please complete attached Sign Request Form).

I/We, the undersigned, do hereby submit this application for Rezoning, pursuant to the provisions of the Charter Township of Orion Zoning Ordinance No. 78, Section 30.04 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: 3/9/2022
Print Name: Mark R. James, authorized agent of CSB Investments, LLC

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*: ___________________________ Date: 3/9/2022
Print Name: Al Brendel, sole member of Silver Bell Technology Park, LLC

*If the deed of ownership does not show an individual, ie a corporation, partnership, etc., documentation must be provided showing the individual signing this application has signing rights for the entity.

As per Ordinance 78, Section 30.04(H), a sign shall be installed 15 days prior to the required public hearing. Please see the Ordinance for additional specifications.

The sign shall have the following wording:

ZONING CHANGE PROPOSED
   For more information call:
   Charter Township of Orion
   Planning and Zoning Department
   248-391-0304 ext. 5002
   - (min 8" high letters)
   - (min 3" high letters)
   - (min 4" high letters)
   - (min 4" high letters)

*Please note, the Township does offer the ability to rent the required signage (see attached form). Please contact the Planning and Zoning Department with any questions.
March 9, 2022

Charter Township of Orion
Planning Commission
Board of Trustees
2323 Joslyn Rd
Lake Orion, MI 48360

RE: Rezoning Application Seeking to Rezone 1050 W. Silverbell Rd., Orion, MI (the “Subject Property”) from Limited Industrial District (LI) to Industrial Park District (IP) Parcel ID No.: 09-27-301-050

Dear Planning Commission and Board of Trustees:

This letter supplements the information provided in the Rezoning Application (the “Application”) filed simultaneously herewith by CSB Investments, LLC, a Michigan limited liability company (the “Applicant”).

Background

The Applicant has recently entered into a purchase agreement for the purchase and sale of the Subject Property. The Subject Property is approximately 3.31 acres. A building of approximately 29,400 square feet is located on the Subject Property. The building is currently vacant. The Subject Property is mixed zoned— the west half is zoned IP, while the east half is zoned LI. The Applicant seeks to have the entire Subject Property zoned IP.

Rezoning Standards

Explain why the rezoning is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of the rights of usage commonly associated with property ownership:

Rezoning is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of the rights of usage commonly associated with property ownership for the reason that the current zoning classification is extremely limited. The Applicant seeks to purchase the Subject Property and occupy it. Absent the requested rezoning, the Applicant will not be willing to purchase the Subject Property as it will not be able to occupy pursuant to the current zoning.

The Subject Property is currently vacant and has been for approximately a year. The purchase and sale of the Subject Property will be beneficial to the Applicant, to Silver Bell Technology Park, LLC (the “Owner”), who is selling same to the Applicant, and to the Township.

Explain why the existing zoning classification is no longer appropriate:

The existing zoning, LI, is no longer appropriate for the reason that the majority of the surrounding properties are zoned IP. The Subject Property was zoned LI due to the owner’s specific needs, which, upon information and belief, was the manufacture of precision scales or other measuring equipment.
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Explain why the proposed rezoning will not be detrimental to surrounding properties:

The proposed rezoning to IP will not be detrimental to surrounding properties for the reason that a majority of the surrounding properties are zoned IP (to the west, north and east). Those properties that aren’t zoned IP – SE and IC to the south – are either of a more intensive industrial use (the GM Orion plant) or are in such close proximity to the plant that the rezoning of the Subject Property will be insignificant.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated herein, it is appropriate for the Planning Commission to recommend to the Board of Trustees that the proposed rezoning be granted and for the Board of Trustees to grant the proposed rezoning to IP.

Very truly yours,

Mark R. James
TO: The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission
FROM: Tammy Girling, Planning and Zoning Director
DATE: March 30, 2022
RE: PC-2021-90, Ridgewood PUD Concept & Eligibility Plan Extension

On January 5, 2022, the Planning Commission postponed PC-2021-90, Ridgewood PUD Concept & Eligibility Plan, to revise the plans and bring forth a revised plan back to the Planning Commission within 90 days. The applicant is requesting an extension to the submission of the revised plans for an additional 90 days. Attached please find the minutes from the 1/05/2022 PC meeting, the petitioner’s request for the extension, and a section of the original plan for your reference.

As requested, I am providing a suggested motion for the matter mentioned above. Please feel free to modify the language. The verbiage below could change based upon the Planning Commissions findings of facts.

**Motion 1:** I move that the Planning Commission approves the PUD Concept and Eligibility revised plans extension request for PC-2021-90, Ridgewood PUD Concept and Eligibility Plan for ___________ (insert time frame). This approval is based on the following findings of facts: (insert findings of facts).

Or

I move that the Planning Commission denies the PUD Concept and Eligibility revised plan extension request for PC-2021-90, Ridgewood PUD Concept and Eligibility Plan. This denial is based on the following findings of facts: (insert findings of facts).
March 14, 2022

Ms. Tammy Girling
Director – Planning & Zoning
Orion Township
2525 Joslyn Road
Lake Orion, MI 48360

Re: Letter of Request for Resubmittal Extension
Application for a Planned Unit Development (PUD)
RIDGEWOOD
625 W. Clarkston Road

Dear Ms. Girling:

Following up to our conversation, please accept this Letter of Request for the Planning Commission to extend the period an additional 90 days for resubmittal of a revised Concept Site Plan for the above referenced Project.

We are working on a revised concept plan that addresses feedback received from the Planning Commission at our January 5th public hearing. As I’m sure you are aware, the consultants in the site planning, engineering and design fields are very busy, the pandemic has affected scheduling and our ability to respond completely by April, next month has been affected.

In addition, we understand that the Township’s Master Plan Update is in process. To the extent that this process may inform our Concept Site Plan revisions, we thought it would be prudent to understand the potential implications.

Thank you for your consideration and assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,
IN-SITE LLC

Daniel Johnson
Managing Director

cc: JMF Properties LLC (via email)
Washtenaw Engineering (via email)
The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, January 5, 2022, at 7:00 p.m. at the Orion Township Municipality Complex Board Room, 2323 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, Michigan 48360.

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

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:
Derek Brackon, Commissioner

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

2. ROLL CALL
As noted

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

BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:
Brian Birney, Trustee

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

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

Chairman Reynolds recessed the regular meeting and opened the Joint Public Hearing with the Board of Trustees at 7:05 p.m. for case PC-2021-90, Ridgewood Planned Unit Development (PUD) Concept, located at 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-007), the vacant parcel west of 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-006), and the vacant parcel east of 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-008). The applicant, In-Site LLC, is proposing to rezone the properties from single Family Residential-1 (R-1) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) to construct 50 townhomes on approximately 11.37 acres.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. CONSENT AGENDA
None.

8. NEW BUSINESS
A. PC-2021-90, Ridgewood PUD Concept & Eligibility Plan, located at 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-007), the vacant parcel west of 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-006), and the vacant parcel east of 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-008).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Secretary St. Henry asked the applicant if they had looked at any other locations within Orion Township for this development? What is most attractive to them for this particular location? Mr. Johnson replied that the site has a lot of beautiful natural features. Being able to integrate nice housing into that environment he thought would be a positive thing. There are trends within the country that (R-1) is a negative word in many locations, not necessarily here, but in other locations, single-family residential sprawl is not thought of highly. As they look for density, they look for ways to drive down the prices to enter the housing markets usually, multi-family or single-family attached platforms in order to do that. Once they start going the other direction and the price goes up significantly because they are extending utilities much farther and all the
things that go along with that. He thought from a new home affordability standpoint using a multi-family platform is the best way to get to affordability in his opinion, and he thought in the opinion of many others.

Chairman Reynolds said they have had a lot of discussions as a commission and as you may or may not know they are working on their revised Master Plan and updating that. They have had a lot of discussions on what a (PUD) and why it exists. There has been a lot of discussion on it is not a tool to leapfrog density or to get major density bonuses but to recognize challenging parcels, projects, or to propose developments that recognize weaknesses in our community such as the missing middle, and he had touched on that tonight. For him, their ordinance kind of speaks to, and Vice-Chairman Gross, laid out some of those comments of if they are going to parallel an (RM) density then they should probably be looking at some of those underlying criteria. They talk a lot about does it fit the neighborhood and does it fit adjacent uses? Even though it is a housing type it doesn’t necessarily mean that it fits with where it is currently. It might change in another 30-years but they are looking at the snapshot of right here right now. He hears the discussion of the difference of Master Planning one side of the road to the other. Those are also very different parcel sizes. By having residents that have multiacre lots to the south closer to M-24 those are quarter-acre to half-acre lots. Going further west as they venture towards this property and others there are at least acre properties or at least over ¾ of an acre. Again, those are just outlined from where development occurred back 30-50-years ago. They do have a number of (PUD) developments in the community, they are supportive of development in many ways, and they understand that they need development to kind of connect this cycle and fulfill these needs of the community. He did think that Townhomes and multi-family complexes do have a role in that. The bigger struggle for him is how it fits. He thought that the transitional zoning is a huge piece for him to jump from one to the other without saying that they are bearing the property within it. To go after a variance and then the high-density that is where he was struggling, it is kind of tipped to one side right now in his perspective.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Moved by Chairman Reynolds, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, that the Planning Commission postpones action on PC-2021-90, Ridgewood Planned Unit Development Concept and Eligibility plan, located at 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-007), the vacant parcel west of 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-006), and the vacant parcel east of 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-008) for plans date stamped received December 14, 2021: to allow time for the applicant to revise plans and bring forth a revised plan back to the Planning Commission within 3-months of today date January 5, 2022.

Discussion on the motion:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, that the Planning Commission grant site plan approval for PC-2021-96, Natrabis DBS Society C Site Plan, located at unaddressed parcel 09-34-100-012 for plans date stamped received December 13, 2021, based on the following findings of fact: that the plan meets all ordinance requirements. This approval is based on the following conditions: that it complies with the letter of December 15, 2021, of OHM.

Discussion on the motion:

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

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

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
None.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS
None.

10. COMMUNICATIONS
None.

11. PLANNERS REPORTS
None.

12. COMMITTEE REPORTS
None.

13. PUBLIC HEARINGS
None.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Walton  
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary  
Charter Township of Orion  

January 19, 2022  
Planning Commission Approval Date
The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a joint public hearing with the Board of Trustees on Wednesday, January 5, 2022, at 7:05 p.m. at the Orion Township Municipality Complex Board Room, 2323 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, Michigan 48360.

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

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

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

**BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**
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Donni Steele, Treasurer
Kim Urbanowski, Trustee

Mike Flood, Trustee
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Penny Shults, Township Clerk

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

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

**OTHERS PRESENT:**
Thomas Allen Martelle
Cheryl Hofer
Mike Thomas
Marilyn Hester
Josh Sawicki

John Hofer
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Tom Williams
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The Board of Trustees opened their Special Meeting at 7:05 p.m.

Chairman Reynolds invited the applicant to make a presentation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chairman Reynolds closed the public hearing at 8:03 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

Debra Walton
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary
Charter Township of Orion

January 19, 2022
Planning Commission Approval Date
TO: The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission
FROM: Tammy Girling, Zoning/Planning Director
DATE: March 31, 2022
RE: PC-2021-07 Master Plan Update – sent back from Board of Trustees

If you will recall, on February 16, 2022, the Planning Commission passed a resolution to forward the draft Master Plan update to the Board of Trustees for authorization to release the draft to reviewing agencies and neighboring communities.

At the March 7, 2022 Board of Trustees meeting the Board did not authorize the release but instead they passed a motion giving the Board of Trustees time to review the draft Master Plan and instructing members to forward comments to the Planning & Zoning Department.

This case is on the agenda this evening with the comments received from the Board of Trustees for discussion on their comments.
ORION TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

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," PA 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 its 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 requires 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 Township’s website and via a hardcopy at the Planning & Zoning Department’s offices.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify the foregoing resolution was approved by a majority of the members of the Orion Township Planning Commission at a regular meeting held on April 6, 2022 in compliance with the Open Meetings Act.

Motion by ______________

Supported by ______________

Vote: _______________________

61
Draft Master Plan Review

Overall quality of the graphics, maps, charts, photos is poor and unreadable – partner with OHM, Parks, others to raise the quality.

Front Cover – Photo credits needed

Need page numbers throughout presentation

Introduction photo – Terrible photo of our American Flag.

Page 11 – Remove photo or label it as cover of 2015 Master Plan

Page 13 - Signs are not readable

Page 15 - Where are the 3 photos located (Southwest corner of what roads....)

Page 18 - Sign is not readable

Locations and Regional Setting – Perhaps another photo highlighting business/housing opportunities

Page 20 - Highlight easy access to north south exit from I75 and proximity to M59 – you can get anywhere from Orion

Page 21 - Map unreadable

Existing Land Use cover page – not great

Page 23 – maybe also reference acreage for DNR/Parks

Demographics Page – Why this pic? What does it relate to?

Page 28 – Reference to Race narrative heading and Fig 2 – perhaps say demographics? What does SEMCOG or Census say. Also, I would not highlight that we are predominately white but let the distribution map speak for itself and highlight the diversity that we have and encourage growth in this area.

Local Economy photo...reads more like a Parks Master plan picture. Perhaps highlight some of our business opportunities

Page 40 – Add to the ONTV section. Not all communities have this gem. Perhaps ask Ian Lock for a paragraph

Page 45 – map unreadable

Connect with Aaron Whatley and Jenny Bhatti to see if they can supplement the photos and maps. I love that your highlighting parks, trails, lakes but the photos are not quality. Many of the photos displayed at our new Township Hall are top notch and will help convey the quality of our community resources.

Page 57 - Watershed map has no reference to Orion ??? what are you trying to tell me here?

Page 58 – Need new photo - narrative speaks about phragmites but photo highlights wild grape vine.

Page 59 - Better photo with description – Not sure what the photo represents

Many of the remaining pages have great narratives with poor pictures, maps, charts, etc. This document should be the very best representative collection of Orion.
Appendix C

Updated 2015 Master Plan-Sub-Area Plans
SUB AREA PLANS

As a part of the 2015 Master Plan update, several areas within the Township received more detailed analyses and considerations for future land use. The areas of special focus, described below, provide specific land use recommendations and site design considerations for each. This Appendix includes key concepts carried forward and adapted, as necessary to reflect the vision of the 2022 Plan. These sub areas include:

- Gingellville
- Village of Lake Orion Area
- Brown Road

GINGELVILLE SUB AREA

The Village of Gingellville has had a long history in Orion Township. Originally founded as an agricultural community, the Village has evolved into a collection of shops and residential areas. The land use plan promotes the continued refinement of the Village into a unique enclave. The plan promotes the integration of commercial and residential uses within a well-designed, pedestrian-friendly development.

Due to the size of the Township's population, the historical growth patterns and the close proximity to several regional shopping centers, it is imperative that the development concepts for this sub-area are compatible with the existing development patterns. The congestion problems within the area, the abundance of available land, and the desired intent to preserve the historical hamlet of Gingellville should also be key elements of any new development concepts. Therefore, the Township policies for this sub-area should focus on clustered, mixed use village style rather than strip commercial development land use patterns.

Strip Development vs. Village Center Development

The disjointed character of strip-style development (left) often requires the use of an automobile to get from building to building. In contrast, village center-style development (right) encourages pedestrian connectivity between uses.

Source: http://homesmsp.typepad.com/
A few notes on the master plan:

Thank you again for all the hard work and hours spent on this! The open house style was a fun way to see what our residents liked and didn’t.

1. Middle housing is a must! We need flexible options for our residents.
2. The climate controlled sport facility - this could not only be amazing for our local athletes and teams, but also residents. As a HS teacher, I hear all day about how hard it is to find practices facilities! Also, if this included an ice rink - that could be a huge revenue source as ice time is non-existent here.
3. Love the idea of the incubators for small businesses!
4. Mixed housing - again, we NEED this.
5. I love the excitement of working with GM and building that relationship, but who else can we be working with as well for another huge collaboration?
6. With the incubators, I'm concerned if Wildwood is the correct place to locate them.
7. The idea of a solar farm at Waste MGMT is another example of how we can take a property and transform it.
8. LOVE the ideas with the complete streets. We are a tree city, and have so much natural recreation, that this would be a perfect fit.
9. Love all the spaces for gardens and pocket parks. Having some nice shade and benches as people travel to locations is a perfect match for those spots.
10. The density size for locations and properties is concerning. We do not need an entire community of single family homes and need to make room for more types.
11. The idea of 15 minute neighborhoods is also one I'm thrilled about. I asked my classes today about how many of them could walk to a restaurant from their homes - it was only a few. This type of set up would be a game changer.
12. The changes to have business in front and homes in the back would be nice on our busy roads. Put multifamily in there.
13. Outdoor recreation - this is one I am very passionate about. We have 39 lakes in LO. Think about this, we have an adaptive playground, we built an adaptive baseball field...why do we not have a way for adaptive water play. This is why I feel we need to invest in a splash pad for all kids to play in! And yes, I know it’s expensive, I know it’s upkeep, but why have all this beautiful water that we can’t share with ALL our residents?!

14. The letters at the end of the packet, how do those get decided on for a change?

Thank you!
From: Chris Barnett  
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2022 2:08 AM  
To: Tammy Girling  
Subject: Barnett Master Plan Update comments

Tammy,

I figured I would take the time to transfer all of my handwritten comments to one typed note. Here you go:

- There are a TON and I mean a TON of typos / missed capitalizations, etc. It is my understanding that when “township” is used to describe any township, it is not capitalized, but when “Township” is used in place of “Orion Township” it should be capitalized (ex pg. 56 1st paragraph). It is sometimes capitalized and sometimes not throughout the document and even changes on the same page in multiple locations. Same with “Township Hall”.
- Same for “Master Plan” I believe when it is referring to his actual plan, it should be capitalized. It is sometimes, and sometimes not.
- Same for “Missing Middle” Either capitalize it, or don’t.
- Page 26 – population growth numbers don’t make sense. It shows we will only add 79 people between 2020 – 2030. We already have added that many or more since 2020. Need to check this.
- Page 47 – should add the word “former” before 1974 Township Hall.
- Page 56 – Lakes – 27 lakes – this needs to be verified. We’ve been using 42 as the number of lakes for years.
- Page 58 – references MDEQ – should be EGLE. The image on that page should be phragmites and preferably a pic in Orion. And maybe we should note that the Township has a program to assist in treating phrags.
- Page 59 – What / where is the “Corridor Open Space Preservation District”?  
- Page 66 – Is there no more recent data than 2020? Seems pretty dated.
- Page 71 – need more beer leagues
- Page 72 – already used that trail head pic. Use a different one?
- Page 76 – second line says Independence Two – should be Twp.
- Page 87 – last line of first paragraph says refer to page “xxx”. Need page number.
- Page 87 – Housing values – says housing values have remained stagnant since 2010. This is not accurate and is contradicted in this same document.
- Page 88 – First paragraph says single family housing makes up 66% of all units. Directly below that the chart says 78%.
- Page 89 – Housing Develop Patterns – township has experienced substantial growth. Contradictory to page 88 where it says growth has been “insignificant”. So confused.
- Page 89 – Market Survey – where is this from? Should we include some data from the biannual Community Survey?
- Page 90 – We are forecasting 1375 – 1525 new units by 2030, but only 79 new people (pg. 26)?? Also, should we add a chart or picture in the large blank areas of this page?
- Page 91 – Correct format for “Missing Middle” housing”? It looks strange.
- Page 93 – example of a page with a bunch of missed capitalizations.
- Page 94 – Coats Road is spelled wrong. Waldon Road and ___ (specify where). Clarkston Road (specify where – East Clarkston or West Clarkston).
- Page 103 – General Motors should be mentioned somewhere here as our largest employer and taking advantages of “opportunities in the market”.
- Page 104 – Increase Housing Options section – anticipating a flat trend? Contradicts other areas of the plan. Also, GM changes this.
- Page 105 – update with new GM information that is known.
- Page 107 – When talking about Gingellville Village Center – we created a new “downtown area” with streetscape, fountain, placemaking...
- Page 121 – Gingellville is spelled wrong in second paragraph. Should we note that we are one of the only Pure Michigan Trail Towns in the State?
- Page 124 – I think we are closer to 30 miles north of Detroit.
- Page 125 – there are more road improvements planned. Should we include?
- Page 127 – Auburn Hill needs to be Hills
- Page 128 – The third sentence needs rewording. It is the most traveled road. And travel needs to be traveled.
- Page 130 – same issues as page 94.
- Page 134 – Can we replace dressmakers, upholsterers, tailors and taxidermists with something more realistic and current?
- Page 136 – Special Circumstances and PUD sections reference a figure, but don’t give a number.
- Page 181 – section b seems to contradict other areas of this plan as mentioned above.
- Page 182 – Update paragraph 2 with new GM investment information.
- Page 186 – Housing Market data is confusing to me. And the 52% that may move in five years doesn’t make sense.

Other notes / thoughts:
Vision Statement references a balance of housing options. I agree with the importance of this statement.
Open house summary discouraged uses included large lot residential uses. I agree.
I agree with the focus on the Missing Middle Housing and love the 15 Minute Neighborhoods. I think they can be expanded a bit as well (entire southern half of Baldwin).
Objective 5 (pg. 83) promote full range of housing types. I agree. Chart on page 201 is a good indication of the lack of housing options.
Diversified housing needed (pg. 90). I agree.
PUD (pg. 95) – missing housing types. I agree.
Density along and adjacent to M-24 & Baldwin in the southern half of the Township should be studied and potentially increased. (ex. pg. 106 Strategy 7) (pg. 137)

Thank you,

Chris

Chris Barnett
Township Supervisor
2323 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, MI 48360
O: 248.391.0304, ext. 1001
W: www.oriontownship.org
Thank you, Planning Department, Planning Commission and Giffels Webster for your hard work and diligence on this large document. Below are my comments on pages 1-99, I’m still reviewing.

Pg. 13. In addition to the historical Marker pictures, a picture of Decker Park- maybe during sledding season.

Pg. 15. The old Orion depot- it would be nice to know where that location exists today, maybe a picture of that site today

17- 18. Scripps mansion and Canterbury are rich in history and quite beautiful (past and Present- see attached pictures of Amelia Earhart landing in Orion- see articles below). A current picture of Canterbury, Scripps mansion, past pictures would be great in addition to a picture of historical marker which you can read. Please see below from Program Source International:

“Yes, we’ve documented her visit to the Scripps Mansion to do a test flight on a prototype glider. We have images from the event but I’m out of the office today, so I can check to see what we have when I return. We also do a lecture presentation on the topic of her in Michigan and Al Eicher (my father) wrote this article:
http://www.lakeshoreguardian.com/site/news/1067/When-Amelia-Came-to-Michigan#.X5bJE4hKjJU

This clipping is from the Detroit Free Press of the event: https://www.newspapers.com/clip/8769205/detroit-free-press/

Here’s an article that the Cranbrook Archives published and they would most likely have the highest quality image available, especially if its going to be printed:
https://cranbrookkitchensink.wordpress.com/2015/03/10/amelia-earhart-at-cranbrook/

Hope this helps you out! Dave & Al Eicher

20. Village of Clarkston is incorrect it’s the “City of the Village of Clarkston”

20. Last paragraph “parks and recreation…” should add WATER to the percentage of recreation.

21. Map 1: outlining Oakland County on large scale map.

23. Industrial: what percentage is industrial? Open Space: which percentage is water included in open space?

28. Pontiac omitted in data

32. Income statistics: Median income and per income statics data is 2010—is there a more current resource and there are no dates on 5.8% of household poverty.

35. Modes of trave: Orion Township—should NOTA be included?
37. Police Sub-station mentioned- should have picture. Also new picture of Complex- the rendering is outdated.

40. Orion TV is funded by grants given by the Orion Community Cable Communications Commission (OCCC). OCCC receives their funding from Orion Township who intern receives their funding by franchise fees and peg fees received from – Direct TV- our local cable providers. The purpose is to provide transparency in government through this media outlet.

41. third paragraph, typo: the township

41-44.—Did the DPW review this portion of the Master Plan?

41-44. – A picture of the water tower or a picture of the new DPW garage with a mention of the recent rehabilitation to the building. Also mention our two new water loops we installed recently.

41-44. Is this the section where we need to really talk about drainage issues so during future development discussions and expansion its in the master plan a multitude of times?

44. Map- it would be nice to see NAMES on the: Dams, rivers, water sheds, lakes, streams, drains—I have no idea the differences, and where they are located.

45.-50. —Did Parks and Rec director review this portion?

45. is this an updated map?

46. Number of acres camp Agawam is—better pictures of camp Agawam. Newly recognized as a state campsite for bikers. Better picture of Orion Center.

47. Acres of Civic Center, picture of civic center, also indicating the old township hall will be converted back to parkland which will expand the foot print of this park— # acres? Looking for grant to renovate Sherdy Park. Pictures of all the separate parks. The parks and recreation are our biggest asset and most revered, we should showcase them better. Maybe more information on acreage of Orion Oaks and Bald Mountain?

49. Four natural beauty roads indicated; however, there are only 2 natural beauty roads mentioned on page 53?

50. “uncertified/private Road” there is no key, color or indication of these on the map

52. 17% of area in township is wetland, does that include lakes? Refer to page 23- does this 17% include this total wetland including the lake percentage to total open space in Orion? Also, on page 56 – there are 27 lakes referenced. —is this separate from the 17%?

54. naming the 27 lakes.
56. Lakes—public access—Tommy’s Lake should be added. Lake Boards—Orion Township only has (I believe) one lake Board Indianwood Lake Association.

58. I believe the Invasive species should be addressed more thoroughly so if we choose to make additional ordinances about some additional invasives they can be addressed by the developers. I think we should mention wild grape vines, Autumn Olive, Bittersweet vines, buckthorn and phragmites.

58. picture of wild grape vine, however phragmites are addressed in verbiage should be a phragmites picture—we should have pictures of all the invasives. Also, I believe the Orion phragmites ordinance should be indicated, i.e.: “several communities, in addition to Orion has have recently enacted.

59. Paragraph 5: missing second set of quotes after the word—stream”. Also, in this paragraph last sentence indicates we ‘should’ have and ordinance—again it should be referenced that we do have an ordinance.

60. Paragraph 4—indicates that we do have an ordinance 151 for Phragmites—just trying to be consistent in the previous mentioned pages.

61. Would like to see how sustainability and resiliency ties better into Orion’s master plan, very generic verbiage.

64 Typo—first paragraph, last sentence: “mean” should be “means”

65. Stormwater management—not sure where these creeks are located—maybe a map? Also, do we need a “plan” for storm water—should the “plan” be choreographed better in the master plan?

66. Typo: second paragraph: Therefore, should not be capitalized.

67-68. Maps 13-14: not sure the purpose? Senior and High poverty in comparison to high flood areas?

76. Typo: Indianwood spelled wrong bottom left box. Baldwin spelled wrong bottom right box

77. Figure 11: are the light blue boxes suppose to have the word “maybe” in them? Figure 11 third graph: “Are the Decker and Friendship Woods locations...” not sure what this category means?

81. VISION—where and how was this vision of Orion Township created?

83. Natural and Historic Resources: paragraph 1, 4, 6, 7, 8 seems generic and not really designed and integrated specifically for Orion Township.
87. Housing Plan: first paragraph last sentence: Refer to page XX for—should have page number. **Housing Value:** housing values have remained stagnant..." contradicts data located on page 97. Typo: there should not be a period after $242,700.

88. family homes increased while the other type of housing reduced. ---Figure 15 contradicts this statement? Also, very bland housing pictures- there are beautiful homes in Orion.

94. Typo: under Property Trends #3. Coats road spelled wrong. "See page 129 in the Complete Streets—I think its page 115. Typo: “Purpose and Intent”, first paragraph, second sentence word should the word be “radical” versus radial?

97. Stats in housing costs conflict with page 87 – are median house prices $269,000 or $280,000?
Hi Tammy,
Sorry for my continued delay in review.

Attached are addition comments:

Just wondering if adding Orion Township’s Mission and Vision to the Document would be beneficial?
Also, with some of the typos and inconsistencies, I’m concerned that someone from Giffel’s has not read the entire document from cover to cover?
As a general note, sometimes Township is capitalized, sometimes not- not sure the correct way but should be consistent.
Also, many pages seem very generic to any master plan and not very specific to Orion Township.

Per Page comments:
Pg. 105: Strategy 4. 3 and 4 seem a little odd, not sure where they came from?
112. Not sure what bottom picture represents?
114. Typo:...interested “in” recreation activities...
114. third picture has no caption; should be “Paint Creek Trail”
121. 50 miles of safety path- seems low? Also Safety Path Advisory Committee has been merged into “Parks and Path Advisory Committee”
121. safety paths: Belle Isle in Detroit and Ironwood in the Upper Peninsula.
121. *West extension of Polly Ann Trail, following a stream between... not sure if this is correct word?
126. This map and commentary seems redundant to map on page 50 “national functional classification”
127. Brown Road: “see Appendix ** for design.. I think it’s C
130. Natural beauty roads is redundant to page 49 and page 53- might combine?
130. Distinct Natural Corridors is redundant to page 94 and Coats is spelled wrong

Okay all for now😊

Donni Steele
Treasurer
Treasurer Department
2323 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, MI 48360
O: 248.391.0304, ext. 8001  C: 248.884.1134
W: www.oriontownship.org
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This document replaces the 2015 Orion Township Master Plan and was prepared in accordance with the Michigan Planning Enabling Act. The 2022 Master plan was created on the foundation of an updated community vision statement:

Orion Township, where Living is a Vacation, seeks to guide growth in a rational manner, striving to avoid patterns of “leapfrog” development. Innovative and flexible approaches for growth management and development regulations will be used, with the desired outcome of preventing overcrowding, protecting critical open space and natural resources, preserving a balance of housing options, preserving community character, minimizing traffic congestion, fostering creativity in design, and establishing vibrant places for community interaction, commerce, and recreation.

Goals

The goals from the previous master plan were revised and combined into five broad categories:

1. High-Quality and Diverse Housing (Residential Areas)
2. Natural and Historic Resources (Environmental Resources and Historic Preservation)
3. Economic Development (Economic Development, Commercial, Office and Industrial areas)
4. Community Facilities (Community, Recreation and Complete Streets)
5. Community Character and Aesthetics

The plan addressed each goal above and includes an expanded description of each category along with accompanying objectives and action items for implementation.

Public Engagement

There were several opportunities for public engagement including an online survey, two open houses and a public hearing, as well as monthly workshop discussions with the planning commission.

Housing

The plan introduces new housing concepts that address the missing middle housing gap, which refers to duplex, triplex, quadplex, cottage court and other house-scale style developments, some of which are not explicitly permitted by the current zoning ordinance. These development concepts are used to accommodate and promote attainable housing for all members of the community and support the 15-minute neighborhoods.

15 Minute Neighborhoods

The 15-Minute Neighborhood concept is a key planning element, which is based primarily on how far a person can bike in 15-minutes from each node. Three key core areas in the Township include the Gingelville Village Center, Decker (near Silver Bell and Squirrel), and Friendship Woods (near Friendship Park). The fourth core area is the Village of Lake Orion.

Economic Development Plan

A market assessment was conducted in order to identify specific areas of need and opportunity. The Economic Development Plan summarizes this study and offers 10 strategies that establish the framework for the economic development strategy. The plan also address three specific sites within the township by providing preferred redevelopment scenarios based on the concepts of the land use plan.

Implementation

The plan outlines specific action items to achieve the goals and objectives of the plan. These action items will be prioritized by the Planning Commission as it looks to implement the plan. This section also includes a Zoning Plan, which shows how the Master Plan categories align with Zoning Districts in the township.
Introduction
Introduction

Purpose of Master Plan

This 2022 Master Plan Update represents an opportunity to affirm, reevaluate, and update the course of land development within Orion Township as identified and described in the 2015 Master Plan. This Plan contains the community’s updated vision, goals, objectives, and strategies as developed during the collaborative process of updating the Plan that began in the fall of 2020. As with the 2015 Master Plan, the Plan is intended to guide future decision-making processes related to land development, as well as address the community’s quality of life that results from both short-term and long-term planning decisions. Lastly, this Plan seeks to be an informative document for those that may not be aware of the many community-based initiatives that Township leadership, staff, and others have been continually working towards to advance Orion Township since the 2015 Master Plan and prior.

A sound Master Plan promotes a land use pattern that reflects a community’s goals. It addresses planned future land uses and desired development, and other community features and amenities in a coordinated and organized manner. It portrays a clear statement of Orion Township goals and objectives, establishes a vision of the future, and includes a structure to achieve this vision through zoning and other means. If followed carefully, the Master Plan will have a lasting impact on the built and natural environment. Decisions made when the Plan is developed will likely be implemented over short-term, medium-term, and long-term timelines as specified in the Implementation Plan, which functions as an action-oriented conclusion of this Plan. This Implementation Plan should be referenced and considered by township stakeholders on a regular basis as part of day-to-day functions and long-term community planning considerations and initiatives.

While the Master Plan is desired to be a living document, it is long-range in its view and is intended to guide development in the township over a period of 10 to 20 years based on the information we have today, with reviews and any necessary updates occurring every five years in order to maintain required consistency with the Michigan Planning Enabling Act of 2006. The information and concepts presented in this Master Plan are to be used as a guide for local decisions on public and private uses of land and the provision of public facilities and services. This Plan also contains recommendations that directly relate to Township ordinances, specifically the Zoning Ordinance, and may also be of value for regional initiatives and improvements, such as roads and regional parks, that may not be directly controlled by the Township but may be influenced by the information contained within the Plan.

Source: Orion Township (2015)
History

Township Settlement

Orion Township was historically settled for agriculture and forestry. In 1819, Judah Church and John Wetmore purchased land in the midwest portion of the township to harvest timber. This area was once known as “The Big Pinery” due to its abundance of large trees. However, the majority of early township settlement occurred in the southeast portion of the township. Jesse Decker was one of the first pioneers to locate in this area which became commonly referred to as “Decker Settlement” by locals. This was a collection of farms that were created from cleared woodlands that once covered this area, which may have contributed to this location being the first sawmill constructed in the township. A historical marker located on the south side of East Greenshield Road, just west of Kern Road acknowledges the location of Decker’s Settlement and Jesse Decker’s importance to Orion Township’s early formation.

Above: Historical Marker recognizing Jesse Decker
Source: Giffels Webster (2021)

Above: Historical Marker memorializing the settlement and original founders of the township
Source: Giffels Webster (2021)
Impact of Transit

In 1872, the Detroit and Bay City Railroad, later known as the Michigan Central Railroad, was constructed through the northeast portion of the township connecting Detroit to Oxford, with the connection to Bay City completed in 1873. Through Orion Township the railroad was constructed on an old Native American trail that followed Paint Creek. Due to the limited means of transportation during this time, the opening of this railroad facilitated the flow of township agricultural products to larger markets and provided access to needed goods for township residents. In addition to its economic benefit, the unified ownership of the railroad corridor helped to preserve this old Native American trail route for reuse.
Interurban Transit

During the early 20th Century, Orion Township was also accessible using the Detroit United Railway (D.U.R.), which was a consolidated transit company that was in operation from 1900 to the 1920’s operating across the City of Detroit and providing access to suburban communities. Orion Township was part of the D.U.R.’s Flint Division line, which connected Orion with Goodison and Rochester to the south, and several communities to the north, ending at Flint. From D.U.R. brochure “Trolley Rides in City and Country”:

Left: A brochure advertising trolley rides on the Detroit United Railway. Above: All three photos above show the Detroit United Railway Depot Station that was located in Orion.

Source: Detroit United Railway
Paint Creek Trail

In the 1970's, the last rail line operator, Penn Central Railroad, abandoned the line and filed for bankruptcy. With railroad use ending, Oakland County and Orion Township began planning for the use of a trail through the corridor, which consisted of 8.9 miles of former railroad right-of-way connecting Rochester and Lake Orion. In 1981, the Paint Creek Trailways Commission was formed with the purpose of purchasing this land from the railroad for what today is known as the Paint Creek Trail, the first rail-to-trail conversion in the state. Please refer to the Paint Creek Trailways Commission for more information on this historic regional rail trail.

Polly Ann Trail

Another rail to trail project connecting Orion Township to the greater Southeast Michigan trail system is the Polly Ann trail, which connects to the Orion Township Pathway system on Joslyn just south of Waldon. From there, the trail runs north and follows the route of the original R.O. & N. rail line, which was established in 1879 as part of a route that ran from Pontiac to Port Austin. Like many other passenger rail lines in the area, the lightly traveled route was poorly managed and maintained and saw declining ridership throughout the 1900's. The line was eventually closed in 1984 and was purchased by the DNR with federal funds in 1994 from the Grand Trunk Rail Company.

Above: A Map of the Paint Creek Trail, which connects Rochester to Lake Orion and traverses through Orion Township.
Source: Paint Creek Trail

Above: the Paint Creek Trail in Orion Township is a popular destination for those looking to get outdoors all year round.
Source: Giffels Webster (2019)

Above: A sign located along the Paint Creek Trail in Orion Township denotes mile marker 38 of the former Michigan Central Railroad. The line has since been converted to a non-motorized path.
Source: Giffels Webster (2019)
Lake Orion

Lake Orion, known as Lake Canandaigua prior to 1834, is primarily man-made through the use of numerous dams. Prior to 1936, the lake was smaller than its current area and outletted to Paint Creek. In order to provide adequate water flow for water-powered mills, a dam was constructed. Over the years, a number of different dams were constructed as previous ones failed and often destroy mills relying on the water flow.

As the route of the railroad ran along Lake Orion, a new, safer dam was constructed to ensure that the railroad grade would be stable. This new dam was higher and longer than the older mill dams, which enlarged the area of Lake Orion. With this new safer dam, water-driven mills became more practical and were a great benefit to the township's lumber and agriculture industries.

Wildwood Farm (Canterbury Village)

From the Orion Historical Society: “In 1916, William E. Scripps heir to the Detroit News, founded Wildwood Farm as a land reclamation project to make over farmed land productive once again. He eventually acquired 3,830 acres and relocated earlier pioneer barns to a site on Joslyn Road, adding other farm buildings, manager housing, and a school for the farm’s children. He developed one of the foremost stockbreeding enterprises in America, and he developed a strain of disease-resistant Aberdeen Angus (Black Angus) beef. Scripps also raised purebred sheep, cows, swine, and chickens and had a modern dairy operation. Today, the original farm buildings are now incorporated into the unique shopping complex known as Canterbury Village. Visitors there can see the intact manager cottages, an original Hadfeli family farmhouse, and the remains of several barns, including the large dairy barn, now converted to shops. Much of the farm’s land and lakes are now parks and continue to provide for local wildlife as part of Orion Township’s Civic Center Park, Oakland County’s Orion Oaks Park, and Bald Mountain State Recreation Area.”
Scripps Estate (Guest House)

From the Orion Historical Society: “Ten years after establishing the farm, Scripps and his wife Nina Downey Scripps began building a country retreat on part of the estate. Scripps engaged his talented brother-in-law, Clarence E. Day, to design the Norman revival style mansion with all the modern amenities available at the time. The result is one of the most artistically important American country estate homes of the era. After William Scripps died in 1952, the estate was subdivided, and Guest House, Inc., became the owner of the house and a little over 100 acres of grounds in 1956. At the time, the newly formed non-profit needed the right facility to begin its progressive treatment facility for alcoholic priests. The former Scripps house was ideal as a quiet place for clients to begin their recovery. In 1993, the priests moved to a facility in Minnesota, and the Orion Township site became a facility for religious women recovering from addictions. This year (2007), a modern treatment center has been built on the grounds for the clients. The house will continue to be used for treatment but will be more accessible to the public for programs and tours.”

Historical Resources

For additional detailed information on the history of Orion Township, please refer to the Oakland County Historical Resources and the Orion Historical Society. This includes the publication “Orion Since 1818” by Paul M. Scott, which was commissioned by the Orion Township Library Board in 1976 in honor of the American Revolution Bicentennial and is one of the most comprehensive documents on the history of Orion Township. Additionally, the historic Howarth School House, a Michigan State Register of Historic Sites, and Porritt Barn have been relocated to Orion Parks’ Friendship Park for preservation and enjoyment by the public. Please refer to the Orion Township Parks and Recreation Plan for more information on Friendship Park.

Above: A historical marker denotes the site of the William E. Scripps estate.
Source: Giffels Webster (2021)
Location &
Regional Setting
Location and Regional Setting

Established in 1835, the Charter Township of Orion, commonly referred to as Orion Township, is part of Metropolitan Detroit and is situated in northeast Oakland County. Orion Township is approximately 35 square miles excluding the home rule Village of Lake Orion located in the northeast corner of the township. Orion Township and the Village of Lake Orion have a close relationship due to this proximity, and township and village areas are often referred under the same name of “Lake Orion” or “Orion”.

The Village of Lake Orion has a local governance structure that is separate from Orion Township, however, Village residents are also part of the Township, they participate in Township functions, and they vote in Township elections. The Village has a separate Village master plan and zoning functions that are not shared due to this separate governance structure, which is rooted in State of Michigan enabling legislation.

The City of Pontiac, with its downtown located about 5 miles to the south of Orion Township, is the seat of Oakland County and is the closest urbanized area to Orion Township. Pontiac is separated from Orion Township by the City of Auburn Hills, which is formerly part of Pontiac Township and borders the entire south boundary of Orion Township. The City of Lake Angelus is also between Pontiac and Orion Township though it does not share a border with Orion Township.

Notably, Orion Township is equidistant from the City of Detroit, 35 miles to the south, and the City of Flint, 35 miles to the north, and has direct access to both cities via Interstate 75 which crosses near the south boundary of Orion Township. Interstate 75 is highway of regional and national significance, which has a direct local impact on the residents and economy of Orion Township.

Orion Township is bordered by Oakland Township to the east, Oxford Township to the north, and Independence Township to the west. Independence Township includes the Village of Clarkston which is connected to Orion Township by Clarkston Road and Waldon Road, which are significant local east-west corridors through the area. Oxford Township and the Village of Oxford share a close relationship with Orion due to the Village of Oxford’s close proximity and direct access provided by M-24/Lapeer Road, which is a limited access highway of regional and statewide importance. Waterford Township, located directly to the southwest, and Rochester Hills, located directly to the southeast of Orion Township, both offer a variety of retail, recreation, and employment opportunities.

Lastly, land devoted to parks and recreation accounts for over 25 percent of the land area within the township. This area includes township parks, Orion Oaks County Park, and the Bald Mountain State Recreation Area, which includes three large state-owned areas within and to the east of Orion Township.
Existing Land Use

2020 Land Use

Residential
Approximately 37% of the land area in Orion Township is dedicated to residential land uses, which is slightly lower than Oakland County overall ratio of just under 43%. Most the residential development is single family units, with nearly 85% of the single family lots consisting of less than one acre.

Agriculture
As of 2020, the township had one 15-acre parcel of agricultural land, located in the northwest quadrant.

Commercial and Office
Commercial and office development account for 2.7% of the total township area (1.9% of all parcels). The commercial and office land uses are concentrated along the Lapeer, Baldwin and Brown Road corridors.

Industrial
Industrial development is primarily concentrated in the southeast portion of the township around the Brown-Giddings-W. Silverbell-Lapeer Road area.

Open Space
Recreation and Conservation area account for nearly a quarter of the land area (24.3%) in the township. This classification includes public or private-owned parks, golf courses, or areas of which the primary purpose is preservation and conservation of undeveloped natural areas.
Demographics
Population

Understanding the demographics of a community is vital to sound policy making and planning. Demographics inform the trends in population, aging, migration, local economies, and much more. Master Plans rely on demographic analysis to better prepare for the issues and demands facing a community in the present and the future. The demographic makeup of a community contains valuable information that affects the types of resources, programming, and physical infrastructure required to meet the needs of residents and businesses. Proper planning for the future must consider the composition of the population and consider its likely future composition. Understanding where the township has been and where it is likely to go is essential to projecting future needs.

POPULATION GROWTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>30,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>32,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>35,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>35,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>37,269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG) is forecasting slow population growth in the township between now and 2040. With a strong economic development program, excellent freeway access, natural features, and desirable small-town and rural character, the Planning Commission anticipates that growth will surpass these projections. For example, a modest one percent annual compound growth rate in population over 20 years would yield a 2040 population of about 45,400. Also, The Chesapeake Group notes marketable opportunities for up to 1,500 housing units over the next ten years. This would increase the population by approximately 3,800 people.

POPULATION AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-64</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median Age: 40.3
Oakland County: 41

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Than High School</td>
<td>20.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>19.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College, No Degree</td>
<td>20.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>7.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/Professional</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOUSEHOLDS

Total Households: 13,158
Average Household Size: 2.46

Page data source: 2019 ACS data via SEMCOG Community Explorer
Population Cohort Analysis

It is essential to understand the population's composition by age and sex to have a proper insight into demographic conditions and socio-economic trends. Orion has an almost equal distribution of male and female population on average. However, the ratio varies with age (see chart below). As they age, the ratio of females to males is increasing.

Race

The racial composition in Orion Township is predominantly white at 84.6%. Orion's racial distribution is consistent with most of the surrounding communities except for the more diverse city of Auburn Hills. Orion Township also has a higher white population percentage than the county and SEMCOG, whose total population are 72% and 67% white, respectively.

Source: 2019 ACS data via SEMCOG Community Explorer
Surrounding Communities

The demographic composition of Orion Township incorporates data about race, age, housing, population trends, income, education, and employment. This section compares the township’s demographic characteristics to neighboring communities that share a border with Orion.

### TABLE 1. SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES: POPULATION GROWTH (2000-2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland County</td>
<td>1,259,481</td>
<td>1,202,362</td>
<td>1,194,156</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Twp.</td>
<td>20,420</td>
<td>16,779</td>
<td>13,071</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Twp.</td>
<td>18,285</td>
<td>17,090</td>
<td>12,485</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Hills</td>
<td>26,544</td>
<td>21,412</td>
<td>19,837</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orion Twp.</td>
<td>37,177</td>
<td>32,421</td>
<td>30,748</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Twp.</td>
<td>35,003</td>
<td>34,681</td>
<td>32,581</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Orion</td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>2,973</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford Twp.</td>
<td>74,685</td>
<td>71,707</td>
<td>71,981</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2019 ACS data via SEMCOG Community Explorer

Population Growth

Many communities surrounding Orion Township and in Oakland County have been experiencing an increase in population since 2000. Oakland Township (36%), Oxford Township (32%) and the City of Auburn Hills (25%) have experienced the highest population growth between 2000 and 2019, followed by Orion Township.

Persons per Acre

Orion Township maintains a similar density compared to surrounding areas, with density increasing south of the township and decreasing to the north. The graph at the bottom of the page provides a comparison to some surrounding communities.

Older and young adult population

Compared to surrounding communities, Orion Township has a comparable percentage of the aging population over 65 years and a comparable percentage of the population of people between ages 5 to 16. This distribution essentially focuses on dependent people who are unlikely the primary breadwinners. This indicates that the share of people dependent on others' income.

FIG. 3. SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES: POPULATION, DENSITY, OLDER/YOUNG ADULTS

Source: 2019 ACS data via SEMCOG Community Explorer
Educational Attainment

The highest levels of educational attainment result in a higher skill set and ultimately contribute to the local job growth. In general, about 80% of residents older than 25 years have some kind of associate of a higher degree past high school. Orion Township has a comparable percentage of bachelor degrees or higher graduates among the surrounding communities.

Households

In 2019, there are a total of 11,673 households in Orion Township. Nearly half of the households are couples with no children (45%), and approximately 35% of the households are families with children. The remaining percentage is split between adults and elders who live alone. The average household size is slightly higher than the surrounding area, with 2.73 members per household.

### Table 2. Household Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent with Seniors</th>
<th>Percent with Children</th>
<th>Average Household Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE Michigan</td>
<td>28.9 %</td>
<td>28.8 %</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland County</td>
<td>28.8 %</td>
<td>28.5 %</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Hills</td>
<td>21.7 %</td>
<td>23.2 %</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Twp</td>
<td>26.2 %</td>
<td>33.8 %</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Athens</td>
<td>28.9 %</td>
<td>27.8 %</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Twp</td>
<td>28.6 %</td>
<td>41.5 %</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orion Twp</td>
<td>22.4 %</td>
<td>34.7 %</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford Twp</td>
<td>27.5 %</td>
<td>25.4 %</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2019 ACS data via SEMCOG Community Explorer
Local Economy
Local Economy

Identifying trends in employment can help a community project future need for land for certain use categories and assess potential opportunities for economic development. This section provides a brief overview of the township's existing economic base. This plan also includes a market study that looks extensively at commercial demand and employment and businesses.

**WORKFORCE**

- **TOTAL JOBS**
  - 17,033

- **UNEMPLOYMENT**
  - 2.5%

**INCOME**

- **MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME**
  - $98,741
  - 2010: $91,493

- **PER CAPITA INCOME**
  - $44,957
  - 2010: $39,265

- **POVERTY RATE**
  - 5.8%
  - Households in Poverty

Source: 2019 ACS data via SEMCOG Community Explorer

**HOUSING**

- **MEDIAN HOUSING VALUE**
  - $269,000
  - COUNTY: $242,000

- **MEDIAN GROSS RENT**
  - $1,094
  - COUNTY: $1,080

**TRANSPORTATION**

- **CAR POOLING**
  - 6.06%

- **WALKING**
  - 1.01%

- **WORKING AT HOME**
  - 5.05%

- **MEAN COMMUTE TIME**
  - 26.9 minutes
  - COUNTY: 25.6 MIN

**INFLOW-OUTFLOW**

- Employed in Oceon but Living Outside
- Living and Employed in Oceon
- Living in Oceon but Employed Outside

Source: 2019 ACS data via SEMCOG Community Explorer
Workforce

In 2020, Orion Township produced an estimated 17,469 jobs. The chart (below) shows the distribution of employment sectors for the township. There is no dominant sector that contributes majorly to the local economy, however, the public administration, wholesale trade and other service trades comprise about a third of all jobs. The percent contribution of each of these industries to the total employment within the township is relatively identical since 2015 and is projected to remain the same with minimal variation in 2045. The total number of jobs is projected to increase by 398 jobs from 2020 to 2045, which represents a 2.3% rate of jobs growth. Refer to the table below for more details.

A robust economic development program could substantially increase the job forecast from SEMCOG shown in Table 3 below. The Chesapeake Group is forecasting marketable opportunities for 270,000 sf of retail and service space, 100,000 sf of office space and 200,000 sf of industrial space over 10 years. In addition, on January 25, 2022, General Motors announced a $4 billion investment to convert the GM Orion facility to produce electric trucks. This investment is expected to create more than 2,350 new jobs at Orion and retain approximately 1,000 current jobs when the plant is fully operational.

### TABLE 3. EMPLOYMENT SECTORS (PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2045</th>
<th>Change 2015-2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment Numbers</td>
<td>17,033</td>
<td>17,469</td>
<td>17,269</td>
<td>17,179</td>
<td>17,373</td>
<td>17,456</td>
<td>17,431</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>2458</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>2613</td>
<td>2586</td>
<td>2576</td>
<td>2552</td>
<td>2493</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>2885</td>
<td>2576</td>
<td>2415</td>
<td>2224</td>
<td>2102</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>-1005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Financial Activities</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>1,664</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Technical Services &amp; Corporate HQ</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing, &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Services</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources, Mining, &amp; Construction</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Services</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative, Support, &amp; Waste Services</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SEMCOG 2045 Regional Development Forecast
Employment

The total number of jobs in the township makes up 1.7% of the total jobs in the county. The township's unemployment rate is lower than the county's and is lower than the rate in surrounding communities. The labor force participation rate of 70% is higher than the surrounding areas and the national average of 62.8%. A higher labor force participation rate and a lower unemployment rate indicate a successful local job market. These rates are impacted by demographic and economic trends. For example, adults aged 25-64, people who are typically in the workforce make up to 63% of the total township population which explains the 70% labor participation rate.

<p>| TABLE 4. EMPLOYMENT WORKFORCE: SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Jobs</th>
<th>Percent Unemployed</th>
<th>Labor Force Participation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE Michigan</td>
<td>2,774,223</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland County</td>
<td>960,562</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orion Twp</td>
<td>17,033</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Hills</td>
<td>66,539</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Twp</td>
<td>17,024</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Orion</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Twp</td>
<td>5,151</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Hills</td>
<td>41,559</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford Twp</td>
<td>33,441</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2019 ACS data via SEMCOG Community Explorer

<p>| TABLE 5. INCOME DATA: SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>Average Income Per Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE Michigan</td>
<td>$31,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland County</td>
<td>$79,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orion Twp</td>
<td>$88,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Hills</td>
<td>$64,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Twp</td>
<td>$94,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Orion</td>
<td>$90,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Twp</td>
<td>$146,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Hills</td>
<td>$93,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford Twp</td>
<td>$62,321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2019 ACS data via SEMCOG Community Explorer

FIG.6. MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD AND AVERAGE INCOME PER PERSON (2019)

Source: 2019 ACS data via SEMCOG Community Explorer

DRAFT (02-10-2022)
Transportation

In Orion Township, the majority mode of travel to work is by car alone (approximately 87%) which is similar to national trends. This is followed by carpooling at 6%, followed by 5% who work from home; 1% walk to work.

**FIG. 7. MODE OF TRAVEL: ORION TOWNSHIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work at home</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2019 ACS data via SEMCOG Community Explorer

**FIG. 8. INFLOW-OUTFLOW COMMUTE PATTERNS: ORION**

- **9,556** Employed in the township, living outside
- **3,020** Living and employed in the township
- **14,558** Living in the township, employed outside

**TABLE 6. DAYTIME POPULATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>12,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Working Residents</td>
<td>16,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 15 and under</td>
<td>8,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force</td>
<td>7,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1,062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Daytime Population: 29,346

Source: 2019 ACS data via SEMCOG Community Explorer

**Car Ownership**

In Orion Township, there is a total of 13,158 households. A majority of households (79.1%) have at least one car, which is above the county average.

**FIG. 9. HOUSEHOLDS WITH NO CAR**

- **20.1%** SEMCOG: 33.9%
  - Oakland County: 30.4%

**Travel Times**

In 2019, the mean travel time to work for Orion residents was about 26.4 minutes, which is comparable to the county mean (25.6) and United States (26.1).

**Commute Patterns**

Orion Township experiences a decrease in its population during the daytime, as the number of workers that leave the township for work is more than the number that come to the township for work. Overall, the township's daytime population is about 21% smaller than its permanent population. Auburn Hills and Troy are the most common places of employment for Orion residents outside the city.
Community Facilities

Community facilities include both physical facilities located within the township as well as services provided by the township and other governmental or quasi-public entities operating in the area. Community facilities include essential facilities or services like a fire station or public utility, or may be non-essential facilities or services such as a public park or library. Both essential and non-essential community facilities play a vital role in the growth potential of the township and resident retention. A welcoming township hall, the availability of public safety services, attractive recreational and cultural facilities, and strong public school and library systems are some examples of community facilities that can help draw new people to the township and enhance the quality of life of existing residents. As part of the 2015 Master Plan, there was a specific focus on addressing areas of need related to the Township Civic Center, the Orion Center, and fire and police services. Updates on these three community facilities are provided within this section. Additionally, the safety path plan is based on creating connections between the many community facilities located within the township, and references to community facilities related to planning and transportation are provided throughout this Master Plan Update.

New Township Hall and Sheriff Substation

Construction of a new Orion Township Hall began in late 2019 and opened for business in fall of 2021. The new township hall site is located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Joslyn Road and Scripps Road, on township-owned land, and is just to the north of the former township hall on the east side of Joslyn Road south of Greenshield Road.

The new township hall addresses the space needs of Oakland County Sheriff deputies also operated out of the former township hall, providing a separate 8,000 square-foot building dedicated exclusively to policing needs. The main township hall building is about 32,000 square feet housing modern office, meeting, and public spaces for township staff, leaders, residents, and patrons. The new township hall was designed by Auger Klein Aller Architects and was funded through municipal bonds. No taxes were raised to fund construction. Future improvements on the new township hall site include future sports fields and a trail network that includes a connection to the Polly Ann Trail which runs near the east boundary of the site.

Source: Auger Klein Aller Architects (used with permission)
Police and Fire

Police and fire services are funded under the Township's dedicated millage rate of 3 mills. Police services are contracted through the Oakland County Sheriff's Department and staffing and equipment have been adjusted to keep pace with land use. The Township recently opened a new fire station on Giddings Road and renovated a second existing fire station. The township's fire department is ALS certified (Advanced Life Support).

STAION & APPARATUS LOCATIONS

Station 1
93 S. Anderson Lake Orion, MI 48362
Apparatus: Engine 1, Tanker 1, Air 1, Alpha 1, Gator 1

Station 2
3801 Giddings Rd. Lake Orion, MI 48359
Apparatus: Engine 2, Rescue 1, Alpha 2

Station 3 and Fire Administration
3365 Gregory Rd. Lake Orion, MI 48359
Apparatus: Engine 3, Ladder 1, Alpha 3, Command 1

Station 4
465 S. Baldwin Rd. Lake Orion, MI 48360
Apparatus: Engine 4, Engine 5
Orion Township Public Library
(from orionlibrary.org)

The Lake Orion Library, established by the Lake Orion Women’s Club in 1926, was first located on the second floor 37 East Flint Street in the Village of Lake Orion.

- In 1929, Orion Township residents ratified a proposition to levy taxes in support of the Lake Orion Library, renaming it the Orion Township Free Public Library.
- In 1940 it was moved to the Hemingway House on Lapeer Street in the Village of Lake Orion and grew until the floorboards sagged.
- In 1964, the first formal library was built at 845 South Lapeer Road. Opening in 1965, this building met the community’s needs for the next 23 years.
- In 1986, the Orion community passed a bond to create the new Orion Township Public Library to serve the next generation of Orion residents.

The 29,000 square foot building opened at its current location on Joslyn Road in February of 1989. Designed to serve a population of 30,000 and house a collection of 100,000 volumes with a capacity for a 200,000 items per year circulation, the new Orion Township Public Library is spacious and inviting, offering quiet study areas, comfortable seating, meeting rooms for community gatherings, and the latest titles, as well as state-of-the-art computers and other new technologies.
Mutual Aid Agreements/Assessing

As part of Orion Township’s arrangement with the Oakland County Fire Chief Association, a mutual aid agreement was signed with surrounding communities to provide necessary services for fire protection. The mutual aid agreement, known as Mutual Aid Box Alarm Society (MABUS 320) provides for specific responses based on needs and alarm priorities. This mutual aid pact allows for Orion Township to receive and render aid in emergency situations when resources have been placed at their maximum. In the event of serious structure fires or other emergencies, Orion Township will be provided with the necessary aid from all adjacent communities and receive resources from County, State and Federal sources. Orion Township relies upon the Oakland County Equalization Department for assessing and assistance regarding property taxes.

Senior Services

Orion Township offers a number of services and resources for its seniors. Services include free transportation via the North Oakland Transportation Authority (NOTA), senior sports & fitness programs, trips, and senior clubs. Many senior programs are run out of the Orion Center, located at 1335 Joslyn Road. The Orion Center, built in 2011, is home to the Community Programs Department which encompasses general recreation programming and senior services. The building incorporates a variety of recreation facilities, including a senior fitness room, yoga room, and arts and crafts room. The Orion Center also features a wellness center and a branch of the Orion Township Public Library.

Orion Neighborhood Television

Orion Neighborhood Television is a community media outlet. Its mission is to empower community members and groups to create, communicate and connect through television and video production. It is based out of the Orion Center on Joslyn Road.
Existing Utilities

Public Water and Sewer Services

Currently, the township is served by the Detroit Water System. The Detroit Water System has been extended along M-24 to a point north of Indianwood Road and along Brown Road to serve the General Motors plant and the industrial sector in the southeast and south-central part of the township. The Detroit Water System also extends along Brown Road to Baldwin Road, then north on Baldwin Road just north of Clarkston Road.

Existing and planned water service areas are depicted on Map 5 on the next page. A large main was recently installed along Baldwin Road that loops to Indianwood Road. The intent of the loop is to provide alternatives in case of a service disruption, thereby providing for the health, safety and welfare of township residents and businesses. The Township has extended Detroit Water westerly in a loop that follows along Giddings, Silverbell, Joslyn, and Brown Roads. This loop relieves the community well system that did serve the Keatington and Judah Lake subdivisions. An additional loop is planned for Miller, Conklin and Indian Lake Roads.

The accompanying Sanitary Sewers map (Map 6) depicts the areas served in the township and distinguishes between the Paint Creek Interceptor and the Oakland-Orion system. The existing sanitary sewer area in Orion Township covers some residential subdivisions, including the Keatington and Judah Lake subdivisions, the Heather Lake area, and subdivisions surrounding the Village of Lake Orion, the industrial sector in the southeast part of the township and sparsely developed residential areas along M-24 and Waldon Road.

The Water & Sewer Division services over 5,000 water customers and over 7,000 sewer customers. The water and sewer system contains over 150 miles of water mains and over 140 miles of sewer mains; 23 sewer lift stations; 6 pressure reducing vaults; over 1,700 fire hydrants; and a 2.5 million gallon water storage facility.

Drainage

Orion Township lies within the Clinton River Watershed; therefore all surface water eventually works its way to the Clinton River. However, the community is divided into several sub-watersheds. The major sub-watersheds include the Paint Creek and the Main-Clinton, while the Stony Creek covers a small portion of the northeastern corner of the township. Several smaller sub-watersheds are also located within the township and include the following: Sashabaw Creek, Trout Creek, Lake Angelus, Galloway Creek and Galloway Ditch.

There are several Oakland County Drain Water Resources Commission drains (enclosed and open ditch) that serve Orion Township, including: Brown Drain, Dry Run Drain, Reid & Branch Drain, Paint Creek Drain, Axford Drain, Osgood Drain, and the Ballard Drain (see Map 6). There are several other small streams that serve as, tributaries to the township’s major drains.

Drainage for the most of Orion Township is private or non-governmental, and the individual property owners in the township are typically responsible for their own storm water drainage. The Township’s Stormwater Management Ordinance, No. 92, is one of the primary tools in controlling impacts of new developments, as well as providing for other benefits. It is expected that, as Orion Township continues to develop, active maintenance of the Township’s creeks and County drains will be increasingly important to the prevention of future flooding and drainage concerns. While already in place, Orion Township must continuously monitor and update its ordinances and policies to ensure that they meet Federal Clean Water Act requirements.
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Existing Utilities

Public Water and Sewer Services

Currently, the township is served by the Detroit Water System. The Detroit Water System has been extended along M-24 to a point north of Indianwood Road and along Brown Road to serve the General Motors plant and the industrial sector in the southeast and south-central part of the township. The Detroit Water System also extends along Brown Road to Baldwin Road, then north on Baldwin Road just north of Clarkston Road.

Existing and planned water service areas are depicted on Map 5 on the next page. A large main was recently installed along Baldwin Road that loops to Indianwood Road. The intent of the loop is to provide alternatives in case of a service disruption, thereby providing for the health, safety and welfare of township residents and businesses. The Township has extended Detroit Water westerly in a loop that follows along Giddings, Silverbell, Joslyn, and Brown Roads. This loop relieves the community well system that did serve the Keatington and Judah Lake subdivisions. An additional loop is planned for Miller, Conkin and Indian Lake Roads.

The accompanying Sanitary Sewers map (Map 6) depicts the areas served in the township and distinguishes between the Paint Creek Interceptor and the Oakland-Orion system. The existing sanitary sewer area in Orion Township covers some residential subdivisions, including the Keatington and Judah Lake subdivisions, the Heather Lake area, and subdivisions surrounding the Village of Lake Orion, the industrial sector in the southeast part of the township and sparsely developed residential areas along M-24 and Waldon Road.

Drainage

Orion Township lies within the Clinton River Watershed; therefore all surface water eventually works its way to the Clinton River. However, the community is divided into several sub-watersheds. The major sub-watersheds include the Paint Creek and the Main-Clinton, while the Stony Creek covers a small portion of the northeastern corner of the township. Several smaller sub-watersheds are also located within the township and include the following: Sashabaw Creek, Trout Creek, Lake Angelus, Galloway Creek and Galloway Ditch.

There are several Oakland County Drain Water Resources Commission drains (enclosed and open ditch) that serve Orion Township, including: Brown Drain, Dry Run Drain, Reid & Branch Drain, Paint Creek Drain, Axford Drain, Osgood Drain, and the Ballard Drain (see Map 6). There are several other small streams that serve as, tributaries to the township’s major drains.

Drainage for the most of Orion Township is private or non-governmental, and the individual property owners in the township are typically responsible for their own storm water drainage. The Township’s Stormwater Management Ordinance, No. 92, is one of the primary tools in controlling impacts of new developments, as well as providing for other benefits. It is expected that, as Orion Township continues to develop, active maintenance of the Township’s creeks and County drains will be increasingly important to the prevention of future flooding and drainage concerns. While already in place, Orion Township must continuously monitor and update its ordinances and policies to ensure that they meet Federal Clean Water Act requirements.

The Water & Sewer Division services over 5,000 water customers and over 7,000 sewer customers. The water and sewer system contains over 150 miles of water mains and over 140 miles of sewer mains; 23 sewer lift stations; 6 pressure reducing vaults; over 1,700 fire hydrants; and a 2.5 million gallon water storage facility.
2019 Parks and Recreation Master Plan

The 2019 to 2023 Orion Township Parks and Recreation 5-Year Master Plan includes a complete parkland and facility inventory for the township. This inventory includes 19 township recreation sites, which include parks, nature areas, schools, and other properties. The inventory also includes Orion Oaks County Park, Bald Mountain State Recreation Area, and three public boating access sites. Important facilities in the township include inclusive play structures at Friendship Park, Miracle Field, Fire Bowl at Camp Agawam, and the KaBoom! playground. For more information, go to https://www.orionparks.com/
Camp Agawam

Camp Agawam is the Township's largest property. It is nestled along the east side of Tommy's Lake with an access point to the water for swimming and catch-and-release fishing. It was purchased in 2014 and until then it was operated by the Boy Scouts of America, so most of its features are centered on camping and group recreation such as cabins, fire pits, pavilions, lodges, and an outdoor auditorium. The buildings and sites are scattered across the property and connected mainly by natural trails that are not accessible to cars. It is the Township's most rustic recreational property with great potential to serve the community and the region. The site's facilities are also available to rent for large and small events. Most of the site is left in its natural state which makes the terrain difficult to cross. However, there are two major developments that are fully accessible for all levels of mobility: the KaBoom! playground and the walking trail that leads to the fishing dock.

Orion Center

The Orion Center was built in 2011 on Joslyn Road in the heart of Orion Township. On this 11-acre property, the Parks and Recreation Department is housed and much of the recreation and 50 and better programming takes place. It serves as a convenient meeting point to initiate off-site excursions. From this property, there is access to the Polly Ann Trail. Both indoor and outdoor facilities are available for rent. Inside, many rooms feature flat screen TVs, tables and chairs, good lighting, and serve a particular function for classes and programming. The back patio has picnic tables that are covered by umbrellas as well as a gazebo. The building was built with accessibility in mind. Getting into the building can be done with ease, and once inside there is an elevator and handicap accessible restrooms. The Senior Services Division provides a network, events, classes, and resources geared to help both residents and non-residents aged 50 and over. Membership for 50+ adults is free at the Orion Center and hosts a range of social and educational clubs and programming for its members.
Specific facilities addressed within the parkland and facility inventory include the following which are referenced within this Master Plan Update due to their importance related to planning:(from 2019 Parks and Recreation Master Plan)

1. Jesse Decker Park
2. Civic Center Park and Wildwood Amphitheatre
3. Friendship Park
4. Camp Agawam
5. Orion Center

**Civic Center Park & Wildwood Amphitheatre**

As the name implies, this park is situated in the Township’s Civic Center. Adjacent to the (1974) Township Hall and just down the road from the Orion Center, its central location and versatile facilities make it a highly-frequented park. Its size and the variety of activities it provides makes it a popular site for social gatherings in the pavilion and sporting events on its varying types of athletic fields. The Wildwood amphitheater was built since the last Parks and Recreation Plan was completed in 2014. Located within Civic Center Park, it is home to several outdoor cultural events. In the summer, the amphitheater hosts weekly free concerts, in addition to music and film festivals and other public events. It is also available to rent for private events.

**Friendship Park**

Friendship Park is the Township’s second largest park, behind the recently acquired Camp Agawam. Located in the northwest portion of the Township along Clarkston and Baldwin Roads, and covering about 135 acres, this is a well-used, all-purpose park. The park provides ample space for organized sports leagues, other active recreation on the play structures, and passive spaces where visitors can relax under a shaded pavilion or fish at the beautifully landscaped catch and release pond. The meeting room is one of two facilities in the park system where visitors can enjoy indoor space for events, making this a valuable year-round space. The park features a playscape designed exclusively for individuals with special needs. The swings are accessible for children in wheelchairs, and the smooth surfacing serves wide-ranging mobility needs. In addition, Friendship Park features Miracle Field, a fully accessible baseball field.

**Jesse Decker Park**

Jesse Decker Park is a corner park located at the intersection of Squirrel and Silverbell Roads, directly across from a residential subdivision. Built in 2009, it is a little larger than a “neighborhood park,” but its short distance to a neighborhood means it likely serves a smaller population than Friendship and Civic Center Parks, even with similar facilities. In a smaller space, the park still manages to provide ample active and passive spaces. Its hilly terrain gives it a unique feature: a sledding hill. Using the park’s natural features to keep the park in use during the winter is a bonus for the neighbors and the Parks and Recreation Department.
National Functional Classification

The Transportation Plan presented on the following page lists the hierarchy of transportation routes based upon the National Functional Classification (NFC) System. NFC is a planning tool which has been used by federal, state and local transportation agencies since the late 1960’s. Functional classifications are used to group streets and highways into classes, or systems, according to the character of traffic service they are intended to provide. The NFC designation also determines whether a road is eligible for federal funds, either as part of the National Highway System (usually limited to principal arterials) or through the Surface Transportation Program. Federal-aid roads are, collectively: all principal arterials, all minor arterials, all urban collectors and all rural major collectors. (Source: MDOT)

- **Principal Arterials.** These roadways are at the top of the classification hierarchy. The primary function of such roadways is to carry relatively long distance, through-travel movements. Examples include interstates and other freeways as well as state routes between larger cities.

- **Minor Arterials.** Minor Arterials tend to accommodate slightly shorter trips than principal arterials. There is some emphasis on land access and they may carry local bus routes and provide intra-community continuity, but do not penetrate neighborhoods.

- **Major Collectors.** Major collectors provide access and mobility within residential, commercial, or industrial use and connect local roads to arterials. Major collectors generally carry more traffic than minor collectors.

- **Minor Collectors.** Minor collectors also provide access amongst varying land uses, but generally have less traffic than Major Collectors.

- **Local Roads.** Local Roads provide access to individual properties and typically have moderate to low speeds. The majority of Township roads are classified as local roads.

**Natural Beauty Roads**

Certain roads in Orion Township are classified as Natural Beauty Roads, in accordance with Michigan Act 150 of 1970. The goal of the Natural Beauty Roads Act is to identify and preserve designated roads in a natural, essentially undisturbed condition. Roads considered eligible for this designation are federal local roads that have unusual or outstanding natural beauty by virtue of native vegetation or other natural features. Widening, mowing, spraying and other maintenance or improvement activities may be restricted or prohibited on designated Natural Beauty Roads. Natural Beauty Roads in Orion Township include:

- Kern Road from Orion Road south to Clarkston Road.
- Clarkston Road from 1,000 feet west of the south leg of Kern Road to the north leg of Kern Road.
- Nakomis Road north of Cayuga, almost to the Township line.
- Greensheild Road.
Natural Features

Many residents have settled in Orion Township because they have been attracted by its natural features, such as lakes, wetlands, woodlands, rolling topography, and open spaces. These features are significant not only because of their strong appeal to residents, but also because they constitute a functioning ecosystem that has been largely unspoiled by human activity. While there are many opportunities for enjoyment and utilization of the natural resource base, particular features of the natural environment are incapable of supporting development or are of sufficient significance to be preserved. It is helpful to examine the various natural resource factors in detail to determine the opportunities and constraints for development, as well as to weigh the value of preservation. Sound land use depends on a keen awareness of the township’s natural features. Accordingly, key natural features are highlighted in the text and maps which are included within this document.

Land

Wetlands and Floodplains

Wetlands are a significant component in the water resources system. The term “wetlands” encompasses a variety of ecosystem types, which are classified by the depth of the water and the typical vegetation that grows in each. Examples in the township include inland marshes, wet meadows, mudflats, ponds, bogs, bottomland hardwood forests, and wooded swamps. The township contains approximately 500 acres of emergent wetlands (marshes), over 2,000 acres of forested wetlands, and almost 1,500 acres of scrub-shrub wetlands, for a total of 17% of the township’s land area. Most of these wetlands are adjacent to lakes or streams.

Wetlands play an important role in controlling flooding and treating polluted stormwater runoff to improve water quality. During storm events, wetlands hold runoff and release it slowly to adjacent streams and lakes, which helps to reduce “flashy flows” and reduce stream bank erosion. During wet periods, the wetlands absorb water, thereby reducing shoreline flooding around lakes. During dry periods, the wetlands release water to the lakes to help maintain lake levels. Wetlands also help to maintain water quality by filtering sediment and pollutants before they reach the lakes and streams. Wetlands contribute significantly to the rural character of the community by providing critical wildlife habitat.

Wetlands attract and retain many species of animals, birds, and other wildlife by providing a source of water, nesting, and feeding habitat. In turn, residents often identify the vegetation and animal life characteristically found in wetland areas as bringing a rural feeling to the community. Certain wetlands are unique, “high-value” ecological areas that should be identified and preserved. Excess stormwater flows should not be directed toward such wetlands that have special ecological significance. In addition, any wetland that is used for stormwater detention should only receive treated stormwater, and not in volumes greater than it receives under predevelopment conditions. See Map 10 for wetlands and flood hazard areas and see Appendix A for Priority Conservation Areas.
In accordance with the State law, wetlands are regulated by the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes and Energy (EGLE) if they are any of the following:

- Connected to one of the Great Lakes or Lake St. Clair.
- Located within 1,000 feet of one of the Great Lakes or Lake St. Clair.
- Connected to an inland lake, pond, river, or stream.
- Located within 500 feet of an inland lake, pond, river or stream.
- Not connected to one of the Great Lakes or Lake St. Clair, or an inland lake, pond, stream, or river, but are more than 5 acres in size.
- Not connected to one of the Great Lakes or Lake St. Clair, or an inland lake, pond, stream, or river, and less than 5 acres in size, but EGLE has determined that these wetlands are essential to the preservation of the state’s natural resources and has notified the property owner.
- In addition, Orion Township Ordinance No. 107 provides for the local regulation of certain wetlands greater than two acres in size.

Woodlands

Tree stands and woodlands are another important component in Orion Township’s natural resource inventory. Significant tree stands predominantly consist of hardwoods, evergreens, or lowland brush. Many of the significant tree stands are found in conjunction with other natural resource features, such as wetlands or steep slopes. For example, approximately 50% (2,000 acres) of the township’s wetlands are wooded. The Bald Mountain Recreation Area and Orion Oaks County Park contain hundreds of acres of heavily wooded land. The township’s two (2) designated Natural Beauty Roads, Clarkston Road and Kern Road, on the east side of the township, intersect a densely forested area.
Water

Over the years, the prime residential developments in Orion Township have been built around the township’s many lakes. Most residents appreciate the recreational or scenic value of the lakes. However, the lakes represent only one component of the community’s extensive, interconnected water system that also includes streams, wetlands, and groundwater. The water system provides significant benefits for current and future residents of the township, such as a source of drinking water, stormwater attenuation, water filtration and storage, and aesthetic and recreational benefits.

Watersheds

Orion Township is wholly located within the Clinton River Watershed. The township’s entire land area ultimately drains to the Clinton River, which subsequently drains into Lake St. Clair. Within the township, the Clinton River Watershed is broken down into stream-based watersheds, which include the Upper Clinton Watershed, the Stony/Paint Watershed, and the Clinton-Main Watershed. The watershed divisions were identified to facilitate the work the Township has been doing to comply with the Clean Water Act’s Phase II requirements for regulating stormwater. Since 2002, the Township has participated in watershed planning activities to obtain a stormwater permit from the state through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Because Orion Township is located in three stream watersheds, they participate in three watershed groups to draft and implement watershed management plans for each. While each plan is unique, an analysis of the various watersheds revealed similar conclusions. In general, the streams and lakes within Orion Township have fairly good water quality and support aquatic organisms typically found within urbanizing areas. There are several areas of concern:

- **Square Lake** (in the Upper Clinton Watershed), has problems with excessive algae and other plant growth. This may be due to fertilizers washing from lawns into the lake, waterfowl feces, or failing septic systems.
- Many streams and lakes are impacted by sediments flowing in from gravel roads, construction sites, or “flashy flows” that deposit sediments due to streambank erosion.

- Streams are becoming more “flashy,” or experiencing increased stream flows following storms. This is due to increases in impervious surfaces which keeps storm water from naturally infiltrating the ground and increases in storm intensity. Therefore, more water is reaching the streams (increased volume, runoff), faster.

Lakes

There are twenty-seven (27) natural lakes, covering about 6% (1,700 acres) of the total area of the Township. Many of the lakes are large enough for boating, fishing, swimming, and other water-oriented activities. Most of the major lakes are surrounded by residentially-developed land. Certain lakes have public access, including Lake Orion and Lower Trout Lake, which is located in the Bald Mountain Recreation Area. Lake Sixteen, located within the Orion Oaks County Park, has restricted access from Joslyn Road and from within the park itself. Orion Township’s lake also serve an important function as a natural stormwater detention system.

Lake Boards

Lake Boards can be created around any inland lake, and can cross municipal boundaries. Their most crucial power is the ability to create special assessment districts, which can raise money from lakefront property owners for lake protection and improvements. By creating an authority, with its own funding source, dedicated to protecting the lake, residents can take preservation or protection into their own hands.

Natural Shoreline Dynamics

Runoff is one of the primary concerns regarding the shoreline dynamics and water quality of inland lakes. Runoff can carry fertilizer and other undesirable substances into the water, some of which can cause an overgrowth of aquatic plants and alter the natural ecosystems in these lakes. It is crucial to protect natural ecosystems by managing development on the shoreline and in the watersheds of inland lakes. Communities can create best practices to protect inland lakes from erosion and runoff damage by encouraging the use of permeable pavement and growing native plants along the shoreline and in the watershed.
Invasive Species

Phragmites australis, is an invasive wetland grass that can grow up to fifteen (15) feet in height and spread between thirty (30) and fifty (50) feet per year. The invasive species has spread rapidly throughout Michigan’s coastal and interior wetlands, threatening ecological health and reducing property values. Due to their aggressive growth rate and height, phragmites crowd out native wetland plants, reduce access to recreational areas, and block lakefront views. In addition, dry phragmites material is highly flammable and can create fire hazards.

While difficult to remove, invasive phragmites can be controlled through combined management techniques including the use of herbicides, mowing and prescribed fires. However, an MDEQ permit is required to treat phragmites using herbicides for most inland lakes and wetlands. Clear steps must be taken to properly rid an area of phragmites; improper removal techniques can actually increase the invasive species’ rate of growth.

Several Michigan communities have recently enacted phragmites ordinances that address the control and removal of the invasive plant. Many of the example phragmites ordinances focus on removing the invasive plant along the shores of Lake Michigan. However, there are limited examples of ordinances that address the removal of phragmites from inland lakes and wetlands. Orion Township currently has a phragmites control program and holds a permit for application of approved chemicals. Herbicide treatment for phragmites usually occurs before the first frost of the year, in September or October.
Michigan Natural Feature Inventory

The Michigan Natural Features Inventory (MNFI) maintains a continuously updated information base, of Michigan’s endangered, threatened, or special concern plant and animal species, natural communities, and other natural features. MNFI has responsibility for inventorying and tracking the State’s rarest species and exceptional examples of the whole array of natural communities. MNFI also provides information to resource managers for many types of permit application regarding these elements of diversity.

In July of 2002, the Oakland County Planning and Economic Development Services Department worked with MNFI to identify potential conservation/natural areas within the County. The conclusions of the study were the identification of high, medium and low-ranking areas within each municipality. These rankings are based upon a set of criteria that include size, core area, street corridor, landscape connectivity, restorability and element occurrence.

Based upon the updated study in 2017, Orion Township has five (5) areas identified as priority one (highest ranking), numerous smaller areas ranked as priority two (medium ranking) and the open water/wetland areas identified as priority three (lowest ranking). See the Priority Conservation Areas map in Appendix A.

Portions of this area maybe lost to development, but the preservation of the remaining areas and their associated links to other natural resource sites may be preserved through various land use controls and preservation plan alternatives. To implement the green infrastructure plan, and better integrate ecological systems into development, the following techniques should be considered:

1. Encourage the use of the cluster development on parcels where sensitive ecosystems exist. This technique places roads, lots, and other development on land that is most capable of supporting it, and places the sensitive natural features in commonly-owned open space. The proposed Corridor Open Space Preservation District will also assist in this effort.

2. Create a detailed program to implement the green infrastructure plan, including goals & policies, priorities, action items, schedule, and funding mechanisms.

3. Continue to work towards reduction of impervious surfaces and increases in stormwater infiltration through local, county and state regulations, as well as working with developers during the site plan review process.

4. Enhance the natural feature setback/buffer regulations by allowing a flexible width buffer (larger for more sensitive features, smaller for less sensitive features) rather than a standard distance to help manage development near stream corridors and provide floodplain protection.

5. Adopt native vegetation guidelines that preserve native plants and encourage the use of native plants in landscaping. These plants are particularly helpful in riparian buffers to treat stormwater runoff and provide wildlife corridor links within the Township’s green infrastructure system. The State of Michigan defines riparian rights as “those rights which are associated with the ownership of the bank or shore of an inland lake or stream. These guidelines could be enhanced by an ordinance that prohibits the use of exotic invasive plant species in landscaping, and supplemented by additional invasive species ordinances, such as a phragmites ordinance. These plants tend to take over natural areas and outcompete native species.
Environmental Resources Recommendations

The Paint Creek watershed and other tributaries in the township are recognized as sensitive environmental features. These water courses and their accompanying watershed areas are indispensable and fragile resources that provide public benefits including maintenance of surface and groundwater quality, fish and wildlife habitat, stormwater run-off control, and aesthetic resources. It is inappropriate to consider these fragile resource areas for high or suburban density development. Smaller lots within these areas can degrade natural resources. Clear-cutting, dredging, filling, and other activities associated with higher density development can be harmful to natural systems. It is therefore recommended that areas within close proximity of streams, lakes, and watercourses and without public water and sanitary sewers be reserved for low density development.

Natural features play a vital role in the health of township residents and the natural systems of the township. Overall density and lot size should be closely related to natural features. In general, the Township may consider larger lots for environmentally sensitive areas and smaller or moderate size lots in areas more suitable for denser development. It is recognized that large lots are not always a guarantee of environmental preservation.

1. Large lots consume more land and may diminish local control of wetlands, woodlands, or other environmental features. In general, however, large lot developments have the potential to create fewer environmental impacts.

2. Small lots or cluster residential developments may be sensitively planned to preserve natural features and may be more appropriate than some large lot developments.

3. The enforcement of the Township Wetlands Protection Ordinance, Stormwater Management Ordinance and Woodlands Regulations, provided they are constantly evaluated for accuracy, can help maintain the natural resources within areas planned for higher density development.

4. Orion Township should continue to enforce its phragmites ordinance (No. 151) that addresses the control and removal of invasive phragmites from areas adjacent to inland lakes, wetlands and drainage areas

5. Site plan review environmental assessment.

The Township has an Environmental Resource Committee that is established to communicate with, advise, and make recommendations to the designated Orion Township employee responsible for website information and /or the Board regarding community concerns on solid waste removal, curbside recycling, hazardous waste disposal, and review other Ordinances with content regarding environmental issues.
Sustainability & Resiliency

It is becoming critical to include concepts of resiliency and sustainability into land use plans. Though they are related, resiliency and sustainability are not the same.

**Sustainability** is the well-established concept that focuses on decreasing or eliminating the detrimental future impacts of our current activity.

**Resiliency** recognizes that our built environment will be subject to stresses and is the practice of designing that environment in a way that can endure those stresses. Some threats are ongoing, persistent stresses, while others are sudden shocks or single events that disrupt the day-to-day functioning of the community.

As we plan for the future, many of the challenges we will face are related either directly or indirectly to our place in larger systems, both natural and man-made. We often have little direct local control over these systems, but adapting to change and discovering our role in contributing to the health of these systems is nonetheless essential to planning for a community that can survive and thrive even in the face of the most severe challenges. Resilient communities are not only preparing for weather and climate-related shocks, but are also preparing for economic and health shocks as well. In 2020, we saw the impacts of a global pandemic on local community health, education, recreation, commerce, technology and social connectivity. These impacts touched everyone’s lives in big and small ways and may have lasting impacts in our communities.

**Effects of Climate Change**

A changing climate has far-reaching implications for Michigan’s agricultural and tourism economies, waterfront development, and communities with older stormwater management infrastructure. Locally, within the last decade, Oakland County has experienced multiple heavy rain events that have led to property damage and decreased mobility and must anticipate that more flooding will occur in the future, damaging property, impairing access to parts of the township, and creating financial distress for local residents and businesses.

As the frequency and intensity of severe weather events continues to increase, communities will experience economic disruption. For instance, while the frost-free season has nominally increased, farmers in many of Michigan’s agricultural communities have not benefited in recent years due to abnormally late frosts (such as those in mid-May, 2020) or heavy rain events, which have damaged early crops or delayed planting of late crops. Rising temperatures and more very hot days may affect the timing of summer festivals and tourism.

Communities must be prepared to anticipate the local effects of regional climate trends. According to the United States Environmental Protection Agency, climate change is already impacting many sectors of our communities. At a minimum, increases in air temperature and precipitation, combined with other factors, have caused impacts in the Great Lakes region including:

- Increased risk of heat-stress to equipment, infrastructure, and people, especially those who work outdoors or are otherwise vulnerable.
- Increased flooding and coastal erosion.
- Reduction in water quality due to increased occurrences of toxic algae blooms.
- Changes to the usability of water infrastructure like docks and piers.
- Economic impact to industries like forestry, fishing, crop production, tourism, manufacturing, energy production, and recreation.
- Expanded commercial navigation season as ice coverage continues to decline on the Great Lakes.
This Master Plan recognizes the importance of additional planning efforts needed to ensure the township is resilient and sustainable. Future planning should include a public outreach process in two basic parts: education and input. Education includes making community members aware of potential threats and the process of planning for them, with an emphasis on outreach to the most vulnerable members of the community. The input process should offer the opportunity for residents and other stakeholders such as municipal staff and business owners to engage in detailed, focused conversations regarding resiliency planning issues. It is important for the community to engage in vigorous outreach through multiple channels to get people involved.

**Extreme heat**

Average temperatures in the Great Lakes region rose 2.3 degrees Fahrenheit from 1951 through 2017. Extreme heat is dangerous for vulnerable populations and can also tax electrical infrastructure, leading to power outages, which in turn can increase the risk for the people most prone to succumbing to heat. Designating specific locations with backup power sources (such as municipal halls, libraries, and schools) as cooling stations can provide vulnerable residents with an essential escape from the heat. There may be a need to provide transportation to cooling stations for those with limited mobility options.

**Severe winter storms**

As temperatures rise, winter precipitation levels are anticipated to rise as well, and mixed precipitation events with more heavy ice may become more common. Severe winter storms can result in power outages, impeded mobility, damage to structures and trees, and lost economic productivity. Municipal costs for snow removal should be included in budget planning. While storms are the primary focus of future concern, communities also benefit from planning for extreme cold—locations designated as cooling stations in the summer can become warming stations in the winter.

**Heavy rain and flooding**

Heavy rain events are already more common in Michigan than they were in the mid-to-late 20th Century, having increased by 35 percent from 1951 to 2017, as total annual precipitation increased by 14 percent. They are anticipated to become even more common in the future.

**Public health emergencies**

The 2020 COVID-19 pandemic brought with it unprecedented economic disruption, forced short-term changes in social habits, destroyed numerous small businesses, and led to a very large increase in unemployment in a very short time period. Planning for public health emergencies needs to consider the many dimensions of the social fabric that are heavily impacted, including the availability of medical services, government’s ability to continue functioning under quarantines or stay-at-home orders, and the locations and numbers of vulnerable populations. Local police, fire, and ambulance services may be particularly taxed in a future public health emergency.
Damage to natural systems
Human activity is rarely in balance with the natural systems it occurs within. While resource extraction and pollution offer two very obvious examples of human activity, nearly all modern human development activity has some impact on natural systems, including loss of habitat, interruption of habitat, and increased emissions due to greater travel distances as development moves outward into wild places. A combination of rising temperatures and agricultural runoff that changes the nutrient balance in major water bodies has led to much higher frequency of toxic cyanobacteria and algae blooms, particularly in Lake Erie. These blooms can impair drinking water quality and limit recreational opportunities, including fishing and watersports.

Unanticipated events
No community can plan for every possible future event or scenario. This is why developing resiliency, improving sustainability, understanding vulnerabilities, and identifying emergency resources is so important.

Drought
We most frequently think of drought as a prolonged period without precipitation. While this kind of drought is certainly possible in the future in Michigan, the more likely effects of the changes the state is experiencing will be changes in seasonal distribution of storms with precipitation. Winter rainfall will become more common, snowpack overall may decrease, and stream levels will peak earlier in the year, affecting water availability and the timing of groundwater recharge. Drought is exacerbated by higher temperatures, which lead to increased evaporation rates; even with higher average rainfall, land may become drier, and as rain becomes less frequent in the hottest summer months, mid-summer drought could become a regular challenge. Dry conditions bring with them the possibility of wildfires, which are not uncommon in rural Michigan but could grow in scale and intensity in coming years. It is important to understand the community's water sources and how extended periods of drought might affect water availability.

Food systems
As the climate changes and weather patterns shift accordingly, planting and harvesting conditions become less predictable, and the potential for crop losses increases. In 2019, unusually heavy rains across much of Michigan made planting during the typical time difficult for many farmers. While the number of frost-free days has increased by an average of 16 days across the Great Lakes region from 1951 to 2017, the timing of those extra days has not uniformly added to the growing season. In recent years, unexpected late freezes after earlier-than-usual warm weather lead to the loss of large portions of fruit crops such as apples and cherries.
Regional climate trends indicate that southeast lower Michigan is poised to see stronger and more frequent storms, in addition to higher temperatures. The figure below shows how these two measures have been trending steadily over the last 100 years. With increasing precipitation, more frequent extreme heat days and an overall rise in average temperature, communities should be planning for what this mean locally and how their most venerable populations are situated to survive.

Addressing Resiliency: Identifying Vulnerable Populations

Resilient communities anticipate likely shocks, understand trends in stressors, and prepare for potential worst-case scenarios. Understanding where a community is physically most vulnerable to specific events and understanding which members of the community are likely to be most vulnerable in each case is key to effective planning. Vulnerability assessments have been used across Michigan to identify vulnerabilities within a community and to develop tools communities can use to foster resiliency in their policy decisions. A vulnerability assessment looks at exposure to risk and sensitivity to risk.

**Exposure** demonstrates the land, property, and neighborhoods that are most likely to be impacted by flooding, heat, or other severe weather. Low lying land, land near bodies of water, areas with large swaths of pavement, neighborhoods with few trees, and sections with older homes all suffer from high levels of exposure.

**Evaluating exposure to risk asks:** where is the environmental risk the greatest?

**Sensitivity** demonstrates the members of the population that are most likely to be impacted by severe weather. The most sensitive populations are the elderly, young children, people with medical conditions, those living in poverty (especially the homeless) and people who work outdoors. People who live alone, regardless of their economic status, are also at higher risk.

**Evaluating sensitivity to risk asks:** who in my community is most likely to experience the adverse effects from that risk?
Mitigating Risks

Next to placing land into various zoning districts, site plan review is the most powerful planning and natural resource protection tool. Easily enforced, site plan review is a way for communities to ensure what is approved on a site plan is what will be built. When large projects are proposed or when small projects are proposed in or adjacent to sensitive natural resources, some communities require applicants to submit an environmental assessment, which details the impact of the proposed development on natural resources. Communities that have plans and zoning regulations based on a solid environmental inventory are able to set the threshold for future environmental assessments at a defensible level. Without such a basis, an environmental assessment may be considered arbitrary, as there is little context for the requirement. An environmental assessment can be a valuable source of information, and in some cases an important tool for ensuring that new development is designed in such a way that unavoidable environmental impacts are properly mitigated. Environmental assessment can also be viewed as an affirmative tool for helping a local government meet its responsibility for preventing pollution, impairment or destruction of the environment.

Stormwater Management

The Township’s existing water features play an important role in managing storm water. Several creeks and streams, which connect the townships natural water system, meander through the Township, connecting lakes and wetlands with each other, and then conveying storm water run-off. As described in the referenced watershed management plans, the most prominent streams in the Township are Paint Creek, Clear Creek, Trout Creek and Sashabaw Creek. These creeks have flowing water throughout most of the year and are valued because of their ecological, aesthetic and recreational benefits. Implementing, updating and enforcing a stormwater management ordinance is essential to ensuring the necessary infrastructure is in place to protect the natural assets and health of the community.
Impervious Surfaces

Because development replaces pervious ground with impervious pavement and buildings, water runs off the surface rather than permeating naturally through the ground. As stormwater drains across pavement, it picks up pollutants such as automobile fluids, fertilizers, and sediment and conveys them into a storm drain. If a storm drain is directly connected to a creek, the creek receives polluted water which, in turn, can degrade water quality and wildlife habitat. This, in turn, degrades streams and water quality unless managed in an ecologically-sound manner. Ordinance standards that limit impervious surface coverage, or regulate materials used to construct impervious surfaces, can address this at a site plan individual site level.

Portions of southeast Michigan receive their drinking water from surface water sources. Because stormwater heats up the longer it sits on hot, impervious surfaces, it can also impact aquatic organisms that depend on cool or cold-water habitats. Lastly, water volume is greater for surface stormwater; Therefore, it reaches the stream much faster. The increased volume and speed erode stream banks and impairs the stream’s ability to support aquatic vegetation and wildlife.

An impervious surface analysis was conducted as part of the Upper Clinton and Stony/Paint Watershed Management Plans. This analysis classifies the quality of streams based on the percentage of impervious cover (IC) in their watersheds. The framework classifies streams as sensitive (0-11% IC), impacted (11-25% IC), and non-supporting (>25% IC).

The Stony/Paint results showed that, as of 2000, all of the streams in this watershed passing through Orion Township were classified as "sensitive," with impervious cover at less than 11% (average 7.3% IC). However, the model estimates that this watershed will develop to the "impacted" classification (average 11.2% IC), unless low impact development techniques are used. It is estimated that these techniques could reduce impervious cover in this watershed by almost 4%, and maintain "sensitive" streams.

The Upper Clinton results show streams that are impacted to a greater level by development. The average IC score for 2000 land cover is 18.6% in the township, placing the streams in this watershed in the "impacted" category. Future development will push these streams almost to the "non-supporting" classification with an average IC estimate of 23%. The model also estimates that low impact development techniques (such as pervious pavements, green roofs, natural feature protection, etc, could bring IC down by 5%, which would better maintain current conditions.
Public Input Summary
Leadership Advance Summary

On Tuesday, February 9, 2021, the Giffels Webster planning team met with sixteen Orion Township staff members and stakeholders from various departments to gather their input on the township's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT). Participants were asked what they saw as the township's top three strengths and weaknesses. The results of that exercise are provided in the following pages. Information is compiled using Infogram.

**Strengths**

**PARKS RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE (28)**
- Parks
- Recreation
- Safety paths
- Close to recreational opportunities
- Parks/trees nature

**SCHOOLS (9)**
- Good School system
- Education

**COMMUNITY (8)**
- Volunteer opportunities
- Collaboration with government
- Sense of community
- Nice community & people

**GOVERNMENT (6)**
- Fiscally responsible
- On TV
- Chamber
- Great Staff
- Police and Fire
- Reliable Infrastructure

**LOCATION (6)**
- Freeway access
- Close to I-75
- Near city amenities

Above: Staff wrote strengths on green sticky notes, which were collected and organized into like categories.
Weaknesses

TRANSPORTATION & MOBILITY (12)
Congestion
Road condition
Gravel/dirts roads
No Pedestrian connectivity
No Mass transit

RECREATION (5)
No adult sports beer leagues
No Volleyball
No lake access
No rec center (youth)
No basketball courts

HOUSING (6)
Lack of multiple-family
Affordability
Needs /housing for lake access

Below: Staff wrote weaknesses on pink sticky notes, which were collected and organized into like categories.

LACK OF SHOPPING OPPORTUNITIES (8)
Not enough future business
Unknown to big developers
Too small
Lacks shopping
Lacks destination
Grocery shopping options

LAND USE (6)
Urban/City mix
No downtown
Ugly Industrial
Land Fill
No Business Center
Historic Suburban dev. Style
Opportunities and Threats

After the strengths and weaknesses were discussed, staff were asked to discuss, in small groups of 4-5, what they perceived as the best opportunities and biggest threats to a better future for the township. Each group shared their answers, which are listed below:

**Opportunities**
- Enhancing trails / open space
- Long term recreation millage
- Keeping state lands in control
- Environmentally responsible
- Master Plan Process
- Craft updated zoning to implement Master Plan
- Schools offering trades training
- Safe crossing for pathway system
- Youth/talent retention
- Provide affordable Housing
- Gingellville Overlay
- Pocket parks/walkability
- Mixed use development
- More restaurants
- Updating the Master Plan
- Educating citizens about development process
- Education for boards and commission
- Work with Village of Lake Orion
- Involved businesses in planning process
- Existing business spaces are available (vacancy)

**Threats**
- Lawsuits (land use)
- Village/Twp. governments with different views
- Separate Police Depts.
- Invasive species
- Overtaxing
- Overbuilding/development
- Overcrowded lakes
- Declining population
- Negative perception of rental housing
- Maintain relationship with chamber
- Impact of online business to brick and mortar
- Change in social trends (rural being less attractive)
- Lack of employees to fill available jobs
- Aging population demand for community services
- Lack of population growth
- Consent judgments
- Fences
- Road conditions
- Drainage - residential areas
- Sewage and sanitary capacity

Left: Support and possible expansion of the regional trail system was seen as an opportunity

Right: Phragmites reeds are an example of an invasive species that if not mitigated can pose environmental and engineering challenges
Emerging Trends

Finally, staff were asked to write what emerging trends they thought should be explored as part of the master plan update process. They were asked to write down their favorite "trend" on a large sticky note, which were then all posted on the wall. Each staff member was then given six "votes" (dots) and were asked to vote for their favorite idea. All results were tallied and are shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trends</th>
<th>Votes (Dots)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outbuilding Size</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using technology for safety</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Paths</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Connectivity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-work-play</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of housing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability (green space, cluster housing)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Destination</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkability + transit system</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Minute neighborhood</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to attract talent?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor seating</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor socialization</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversified Housing Types/styles</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work from home</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest vote topic relates to establishing a destination or place that is clearly identifiable in the township. The 10 minute neighborhood comment is similar in that it speaks to creating walkable residential neighborhoods with a core area that provides local goods and services, all of which are accessible within a 10 minute walk. Walkability, outdoor socialization, safety paths, and live-work-play are also related topics that support the destination and 10 minute neighborhood concepts.
Open House Summary

Open House

The township hosted a hybrid open house which included an in-person event at the township hall on June 16th, which is followed by a four-day virtual open house. Both platforms included the same information and allowed participants to engage with information about the community and provide input on several prompts. Input is gathered on major topics as listed below:

- Demographics and local economy
- Sustainability and natural features
- Land use (existing, future, and developments)
- Complete streets (roads and sidewalks)
- Housing (single-family, multi-family, and rural character)
- 15-minute neighborhoods: village and hamlets

Township Now | Demographics, Economy & Sustainability

The feedback included a strong support for requiring developers to preserve more trees and to pay into a tree fund to install trees elsewhere within the township (along roads or within parks).

Majority of the respondents considered wetland and woodland preservation very important. The feedback was split between ‘neutral’ and ‘very important’ when asked about low-impact storm water management practices. Residents recommended that the township should pursue healthcare and educational industries and increasing employment opportunities.

Land Use | Existing, Future & Developments

Majority of respondents do not have positive opinion about recent developments in the township due to increased traffic. When asked to recommend areas for potential redevelopment, property adjacent to Baldwin Commons was recommended.

The property adjacent to Baldwin Commons off Morgan Road would make be well suited for multi family as a transition area from commercial to residential and has great walk ability to the area conveniences.
Housing | Single-family, Multiple-Family & Rural Character

The open house focused on gathering input on housing styles and development patterns. A summary of responses are provided in the images below. The input was gathered using a visual preference exercise. The respondents were asked to place a dot on their favorite image. Respondents recognised the need of alternate housing styles such as ADU's and cottage court housing to cater to the aging population. Only a quarter of the respondents did not consider missing middle housing types appropriate in the more densely populated areas of the township. Majority of respondents (57%) did not support single-family developments on smaller lots.

### FIG.10. PUBLIC INPUT SUMMARY-HOUSING

#### Preferred Development Style in Rural Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Road Character</th>
<th>Front Yard Setbacks</th>
<th>Accessory Dwelling Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preserve Natural Vegetated Buffers</td>
<td>Maintain Suitability</td>
<td>ADU's on larger single-family lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Single-Family Homes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>18%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Side-Entry Garage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recessed Garage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recessed Garage with detached look</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Projecting Garage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked about preferred style of housing among four options presented, the feedback included a strong interest (44%) in side-entry garage style units followed by recessed garage with detached look (27%). Front projecting garages are the least preferred choice (7%).

Almost fifty percent of the respondents supported permitting ADU's on larger single-family lots. Only a quarter of the respondents supported permitting ADU's on all lots. The feedback is split between attached and detached.
**Widen Roads**

- Joslyn Road to alleviate Baldwin traffic
- Waldon M-24 to Independence Two
- Heights Road
- Squirrel Road
- Possibly Clarkston Road (east-west)
- Full rebuild for Brown and Silverbell
- North right turn on Clarkston at Baldwin

**Complete Streets | Roads**

Most respondents considered the current conditions of township roads to be either neutral or poor. The attendees were asked multiple questions about potential locations for road widening or building more roads. There were only a couple of responses for new roads, Maybe Road, Silver Bell by GM plant and another access to I-75 at Clintonville Road.

When asked about how important is proximity school and parks to their decision regarding the desired location of their home, a larger majority of respondents considered proximity to both places equally very important.

**Mobility Enhancements**

- more crosswalks
- bike/walking path
- Safer easier crossing at M-24 and other major roads.
- Little more directional signage, some solar style lighting, commercial sponsors (without gaudy promotion) to generate revenues for the paths.
- sidewalks
- Continuation of safety paths throughout township, safer crosswalks
- Bike lanes or improved shoulders along all major roadways where the road right a ways are too small for paths.
- Joslyn Sidewalk from Indian Woods to Heights Still feels unsafe after repaving

**Complete Streets | Sidewalks**

One of the mobility questions focused more on pedestrian safety and non-motorized improvements. The responses indicate a strong interest for improving walkability and bikeability within the township.

The attendees were asked for recommendations for potential locations for future pedestrian, bike path and pedestrian connections. An excerpt of responses is provided below.

**Future pedestrian, bike path, pedestrian connection**

- Something through or along the Scripps road area
- Elevated or constructed bike paths in the nature and wetland areas.
- Maybe constructed / elevated trails in the nature areas and wetlands
- Joslyn Road from Brown to Silverbell, Brown Rd from M-24 to Joslyn
- Maybe road west of Baldwin
- Indianwood road east of Joslyn. Joslyn road south of Hammerslea
- A way to get all the way down M-24 to Auburn Hills passed I-75. There is no completely finished safety path
- Waldon Rd (once paved) between Blackwell - Clintonville Rd

silverbell and squirrel
15-Minute Neighborhoods

The 15-Minute Neighborhood concept is based primarily on how far a person can walk or bike in both five- and 15-minute increments for each mode of travel based on the average speed of travel. The definition can vary, but for the purpose of this open house exercise, it is a place where you can access some of your daily needs (food, local services, local goods) within a 15-minute bike ride from your home.

The open house presented four potential 15-minute neighborhoods in the township. Each 15-minute neighborhood typically has a village or hamlet at its core. The attendees were asked questions about supporting the concept and preferred uses in these areas.

FIG. 11. PUBLIC INPUT SUMMARY-15-MINUTE NEIGHBORHOOD

Do you support overall idea of 15-minute neighborhoods?

- 69% Yes
- 24% No
- 7%

Do you support the Hamlet concept with buildings with limited setback & low-intensity commercial uses at the neighborhood core to promote walkability?

- 59% Yes
- 24% No
- 17%

Are the Decker and Friendship Woods locations appropriate for Hamlet style developments?

- 52% Yes
- 31% No
- 17% Maybe

What uses would you like to see at the center of each 15-minute neighborhood?

- Connections to dining and shopping from neighborhoods
- Fountain with chairs and benches for families to sit
- Basic needs retailers, dining cultural center of some sort for families, perhaps a young people's area too
- Restaurants
- Dog parks, open spaces restaurants
- 1 or 2 of restaurants/food establishments. Convenience store (without the gas station) and a UPS/Fedex office
- Shopping parks
- Pedestrian crosswalks/overpass to encourage walkability

Refer to page 138 for more details about 15-minute neighborhoods.
Spending Priorities

The participants were given three dots and ten topics, each dot represents one million dollars. They were asked, if they are given three million to spend, what three items would they pick to invest? Responses including majority support for preserving existing natural features and adding more trees and pedestrian amenities along major roads.

FIG. 12. PUBLIC INPUT SUMMARY - SPENDING PRIORITIES

- Natural Resource Protection: 20%
- Shade Trees & Pedestrian Amenities along Major Roads: 17%
- Bike Paths: 13%
- New/Improved Parks: 11%
- Sidewalks: 10%
- Police and Fire Facilities: 8%
- Extend Water and Sewer to Undeveloped Areas: 7%
- Expand Transit: 7%
- Widen Roads: 4%
- Community Art Projects: 3%

Township staff, Planning Commission and gifts websters's planning consultants interacting with the residents at the open house.
Welcome to the Orion Township's 2022 Master Plan Update!

We are really looking forward to listening to ideas, comments, observations, and other thoughts from the community.

Questions are provided at the end of each section. Please review the information and provide your input.

What is a Master Plan?

1. A long-range vision for the future of the township
2. Serves as a guide for how the township can become the place it strives to be
3. Provides a framework in making big-picture decisions
4. Directs development in different areas of the community
5. Promotes and strengthens valued community assets
6. Encourages new partnerships and opportunities

The intent of this update is to understand current demographics, economics, and how our land is currently used, and then explore trends and projections on how Orion Township's population and marketplace may change over the next 10-20 years.

In addition to the in-person open house, the township also launched the Master Plan Virtual Open House to provide an extended platform for public input. The virtual platform allowed participants to engage with information about the community and provide input on several prompts. The Virtual Open House was promoted via the township's website and social media posts. This was open for a week following the open house. This chapter includes a summary of public input from the virtual open house and the virtual open house.
Goals & Objectives
Vision

Orion Township, where Living is a Vacation, seeks to guide growth in a rational manner, striving to avoid patterns of “leapfrog” development. Innovative and flexible approaches for growth management and development regulations will be used, with the desired outcome of preventing overcrowding, protecting critical open space and natural resources, preserving a balance of housing options, preserving community character, minimizing traffic congestion, fostering creativity in design, and establishing vibrant places for community interaction, commerce, and recreation.
Goals

High-Quality and Diverse Housing (Residential Areas)
Orion Township will provide and support high-quality housing for residents of all ages through new residential developments and ongoing maintenance and upkeep of existing neighborhoods. A variety of new, high-quality housing types at various densities will be accommodated to welcome younger residents and families as well as allow older residents to age in the community. The quality of life for residents will be enhanced by protecting the natural features and rural suburban atmosphere of the township while encouraging the development of neighborhood parks and open spaces.

Natural and Historic Resources (Environmental Resources and Historic Preservation)
Orion Township will preserve and maintain natural resources and open spaces through growth management techniques that encourage development in specific areas of the community while preserving and protecting natural features of the community. Future development will incorporate innovative storm water management, low-impact design features, and site and landscape design that protect natural resources, preserve high-quality open spaces, minimize stormwater runoff, and reflect the natural character of the township. The Township will maintain and preserve structures of significant historical and architectural value which are key elements in the unique identity and community character of the township.

Economic Development (Economic Development, Commercial, Office and Industrial areas)
Orion Township will support a strong local workforce by maintaining and promoting the proper distribution of commercial, office, industrial and research development in a manner that results in desired economically sustainable developments, land use relationships, high-quality design, and an increase in the community’s tax base. The Township will promote and encourage the concept of 15-minute neighborhoods in desired areas that foster walkable, mixed-use places supported by both non-motorized and motorized transportation infrastructure choices.

Community Facilities (Community, Recreation, and Complete Streets)
Orion Township will support and foster motorized and non-motorized transportation facilities, community recreation facilities, and other supportive community facilities and services desired by residents and businesses in a financially responsible manner that reflects the township’s role and position in the region. These systems will minimize the impact on the Township’s natural features and open space while supporting a high quality of life for residents of all ages, as well as targeted land use recommendations. The township will, when desirable, partner with neighboring communities, other public agencies, and the private sector to maintain, link, and expand infrastructure in an effective, efficient, and economical manner.

Community Character and Aesthetics
Orion Township’s tagline, Where Living is a Vacation, encompasses a wide variety of community qualities and features that make the Township unique and cherished by those that live here. In addition to the goals and objectives noted above, the Township will continue to support retaining community character elements and aesthetic qualities that are consistent with the vision of the Township and promotion of health, safety, and general welfare.
Objectives

High-Quality and Diverse Housing

1. Support healthy communities by improving connectivity and access to green space in new and existing neighborhoods.
2. Ensure adequate housing styles and densities are available to provide options for first time home buyers or those looking to downsize and “age in community.”
3. Develop programs to maintain and enhance existing neighborhood character, especially within older neighborhoods.
4. Encourage land use in accordance with the existing character and Township Future Land Use Plan.
5. Promote adaptability through the use of innovative planning and zoning techniques that will result in a full range of housing types.

Natural and Historic Resources

1. Protect and enhance the township’s woodlands, wetlands, water features, habitats, and open space by enforcing the regulations that preserve natural features and the functions that they provide to the community.
2. Improve storm water management using best management practices; establish appropriate standards for the community in coordination with the Oakland County Water Resources Commissioner.
3. Adopt and enforce policies that minimize pollution and preserve the lakes and watershed areas of the township.
4. Promote and communicate sustainability concepts and incentivize residents and businesses to implement relevant strategies.
5. Encourage energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable development through raising awareness and creating standards that support best practices.
6. Provide resources and guidelines for the development and application of solar, wind, and other alternative energies.
7. Preserve the inherent architectural character of individual historical architecture resources throughout the Township.
8. Promote sustainable practices that craft solutions to today’s challenges that are cognizant of and sensitive to impacts on future generations.
9. Require street tree planting as part of all residential and non-residential development and promote and encourage preservation and, where appropriate, creation of woodland areas in order to foster environmental benefits, enhance property values, and act in support of the Township’s recognition in the Tree City USA program.
Economic Development

1. Achieve a balanced variety of neighborhood-, community-, and regionally-oriented facilities that will meet the shopping and service needs of the community and nearby metropolitan area populations without unnecessary duplication.

2. Promote the physical clustering of commercial establishments by encouraging mixed use, shared parking facilities, non-motorized access, consolidated driveways, pleasant pedestrian spaces, and contextual extensions of utilities.

3. Regulate the physical clustering of industrial businesses in planned industrial parks, such as those within the southern half of the Township along the Brown Road and Lapeer Road corridors, rather than in stand-alone development, thereby providing for minimal extensions and impacts on utilities and nearby residential uses.

4. Support residents of all ages in the local workforce by serving as an information clearinghouse on local and regional training, education, and business needs.

5. Expand the Township's economy and tax base by supporting existing local businesses, encouraging entrepreneurship, and attracting new businesses.

6. Implement incentive programs available through Oakland County and the State of Michigan regarding emerging employment sectors.

7. Continue participation in the Michigan Economic Development Corporation's Redevelopment Ready Communities Program.

8. Continue and refine the practice of identifying and improving key corridors and districts for growth and economic development.

9. Promote the redevelopment of obsolete sites so that they can once again make meaningful contributions to the Township.

Community Facilities

1. Facilitate multi-modal connections that provide access to residential areas, economic destinations and parks & recreation facilities throughout the township in a safe, efficient and effective manner.

2. Ensure civic spaces, utilities and other infrastructure are well-maintained while providing sustainable strategies for growth in a practical manner.

3. Provide community support to ensure Orion Township police, fire and first responders can continue to operate efficiently in a manner that best serves all residents within the community.

4. Pursue new facilities that enhance the quality of life for township residents and businesses, including a new township hall, improved parks, and non-motorized facilities that connect these assets with residential and non-residential areas.

5. Actively promote and, where appropriate, require the installation of non-motorized facilities in accordance with the Township's Safety Path Plan and establishment of the core 15-minute neighborhoods.

6. Deliver outstanding parks and recreation facilities and programs.

7. Encourage Township staff to promote ways in which all Township-owned facilities can conserve energy and serve as a model for energy efficiency in the Township.
Community Character and Aesthetics

1. Enforce Township regulations that reduce glare and preserve the dark sky.

2. Promote the preservation of natural vegetation along rural corridors of the Township through creative zoning regulations and coordination with the Road Commission for Oakland County.

3. Seek out preservation of important viewsheds that permit Township residents to view lakes, streams and other natural resources.

4. Require high quality and durable finishing materials and furnishings, consistent with recommendations and policies in this Master Plan, and recognize that certain districts and corridors require unique and harmonious elements.

5. Support the advancement of the four identified 15-minute neighborhoods and develop regulations that support hamlet and village style development.

6. Encourage the incorporation of design elements into new development that reflect the historic character of the Township.

7. Continue to update and enforce sign regulations to ensure that signage in the Township is an aesthetic asset that effects communication and quality appearance over blight, clutter and oversaturation of messaging.
Housing Plan
Housing Plan

The Housing Plan refines the residential land use designations identified in the Land Use Plan. The housing plan intends to outline a strategy for a township to ensure the housing needs for current and future residents are met, to provide opportunities for residents to age in place and to regulate density for future residential developments. Housing styles and development patterns in the township was the focus of the master plan open house that was conducted in June 2021. The results indicate support for the need of alternate housing styles to cater to a variety of age segments and family sizes in the population. Refer to page xx for a summary of public input on these topics.

Current Housing

Housing represents the strength of the local economy and overall community appeal. Older housing reflects the physical, historic and social context of a community. The age of housing influences local housing policies for rehabilitation and redevelopment. Older houses require additional maintenance and upkeep, and may also require upgrades to ensure energy efficiency, barrier free access and increased livability for aging adults. In 2019, of the township’s 13,880 housing units, 78% were owner-occupied, 19% were occupied by renters and 5% remained vacant. This is consistent with the county rates.

Housing Value

Housing values in the township have remained stagnant since 2010, with a slight (0.1%) median housing value decrease over that time. Overall the township has fared better than Oakland County since 2010, where overall values fell 3.4% from $251,248 to $242,700. the township has a median housing value of $269,000.
Housing Types

Single-family detached housing is the predominant housing type in the township, making up 66% of all units. See the image below for more details. Since 2010, the number of single family homes increased while the other type of housing reduced. However, the change in both cases is insignificant.

FIG. 15. HOUSING TYPES: ORION TOWNSHIP

78% Single Family
2010: 9,640
2019: 10,849

20% Multi-unit
2010: 2,395
2019: 2,716

2% Mobile Home / Other
2010: 268
2019: 315

Source: 2019 ACS data via SEMCOG Community Explorer

Existing housing in Orion Township
Source: Giffels Webster, 2021
Housing Forecast
The following is an excerpt from the market assessment survey conducted in 2020 by the Chespeake Group. Refer to the appendix for more details.

Housing Development Patterns
Both Orion Township and Oakland County experienced substantial growth in housing permits between 2011 to 2020, following the end of the preceding Great Recession. The township contributed approximately 6% of the county’s 25,000 housing permits, consisting of primarily single-family units. The township saw slower non-single-family residential growth and only permitted these types of units in 5 of the 10-year period. The township and county experienced a slowdown in permit activity in 2020 due to the Covid pandemic and other factors.

Property Trends Synopsis
Many factors are driving the significant price escalation for residential property in 2021, including but not limited to:
2. Supply limitations partially resulting from the pandemic.
3. Limited labor supply.
4. Rapidly rising costs of materials. The cost of construction is being driven by the rising cost of materials and limited labor supply.

Summary of the Market Survey
- 52% of the households may or are likely to move within the next five years from their Orion area residences.
- The primary potential reasons for the move include changes in lifestyle, number of household members, and physical or medical conditions.
- 50% of those that may move in the next five years say they will stay in Michigan.
- In addition to those that may move, about 3 in 10 households have an individual that will likely create a new household in the next three years.
- Age is not a factor in considering the availability of housing options in the Orion area, with most defining options as "very good" or "excellent."
- For those that may move, almost one-half envision or desire a unit smaller than their current home. Income is not a contributing factor for those who are likely to move and desire a smaller, same-sized, or larger home in the future. The majority of all sized units have annual household incomes above $100,000, reflecting the potential affordability of moving to a new home.
- 72% of residents define Orion's shopping options to which they can easily walk as being "poor" or "fair". Due to online options, the character of commercial development and its blending with walkability are of increasing importance. Households with primary income earners 25 years of age or younger have the most members who feel the availability of places where they can live, recreate, easily walk, and work at or near one location to be "fair" or "poor." The 15-minute neighborhood concepts included in this plan will help to support more non-motorized connections to core mixed-use areas.
Housing Demand Forecast

The following is an estimate of housing activity for Orion Township. Adjustments have been made to the survey data for demand forecast purposes based on known biases associated with online sampling. The opportunities are not linked to any specific development proposal or site but are a measure of potential within Orion and its core. The defined units and space may be beyond the holding capacity of available land but are for guidance with planning. Also, the ability to accommodate the demand may be limited by community desires and character.

Based on historical patterns in the County, Orion Township, and an additional database derived from The Chesapeake Group’s surveys of residents in other communities of the County, the potential for new housing units in Orion Township is defined.

The forecast estimates a total of roughly 1,375 to 1,525 new units by 2030. Of these units, about 260 to 290 could be non-single-household structures like duplexes, townhomes, and other attached structures. This total does not include any potential for developing an “active adult” community, unique niche opportunities, or the range of assisted living opportunities. This estimate is not linked to the holding capacity of available land, current zoning, or any existing development regulations.
Missing Middle Housing

"Missing Middle" housing is a term coined by Daniel Parolek of Opticos Design, Inc. in 2010. Parolek defines this type of housing as follows:

“Well-designed, simple Missing Middle housing types achieve medium-density yields and provide high-quality, marketable options between the scales of single-family homes and mid-rise flats for walkable urban living. They are designed to meet the specific needs of shifting demographics and the new market demand and are a key component to a diverse neighborhood. They are classified as “missing” because very few of these housing types have been built since the early 1940s due to regulatory constraints, the shift to auto-dependent patterns of development, and the incentivization of single-family home ownership."

Missing Middle Housing is a range of multi-unit or clustered housing types compatible in scale with single-family homes that help meet the growing demand for walkable urban living. Characteristics of these housing types include:

- Walkable (homes are set in walkable context)
- Medium density but lower perceived density
- Smaller, well-designed units
- Smaller footprint and blended densities

FIG. 16. MISSING MIDDLE HOUSING CONCEPT
Missing Middle Housing Types

Duplex Side-by-side
A small (1 to 2-story), detached structure that consists of two dwelling units arranged side-by-side, each with an entry from the street. This type may include a rear yard.

Duplex Stacked
A small (2 to 2.5-story), detached structure that consists of two dwelling units arranged one above the other, each with an entry from the street.

Fourplex Stacked
A detached (2 to 2.5-story) structure with four dwelling units, two on the ground floor and two above, with shared or individual entries from the street. This type may include a rear yard.

Attached Townhouse
A small-to-medium sized attached structure that consists of 2 to 6 multi-story dwelling units placed side-by-side. Entries are on the narrow side of the unit and typically face a street or courtyard.

Cottage Court
A group of small (1 to 1.5-story*), detached structures arranged around a shared court visible from the street. The shared court is an important community-enhancing element and unit entrances should be from the shared court. It replaces the function of a rear yard.

Courtyard Multifamily
A medium-to-large sized (1 to 3.5-story*) detached structure consisting of multiple side-by-side and/or stacked dwelling units oriented around a courtyard or series of courtyards. The courtyard replaces the function of a rear yard and is more open to the street in low intensity neighborhoods and less open to the street in more urban setting.

Multiplex Medium.
A detached (2 to 2.5-story) structure that consists of 5 to 12 dwelling units arranged side-by-side and/or stacked, typically with a shared entry from the street.

Triplex Stacked.
A small-to-medium (3 to 3.5-story) sized detached structure that consists of 3 dwelling units typically stacked on top of each other on consecutive floors, with one entry for the ground floor unit and a shared entry for the units above.

Data & Image source: Opticos Design, Inc.
Recommendations

Missing Middle Housing

The township also recognizes the need for allowing for diverse housing within the township. The township recently amended the zoning ordinance to allow for a diverse type of housing styles within the Gingellville Village Center area. For existing multiple family zoning districts, the current ordinance standards permit senior housing, garden style apartments and attached townhomes.

The market analysis results indicate an increasing demand for smaller units for current residents in order to downsize. In addition, proximity and walkability to retail uses and other services is a primary factor in choosing a location for a future home. According to the survey, for those that may move, almost one-half envision or desire a unit smaller than their current home. Income is not a contributing factor for those who are likely to move and desire a smaller, same-sized, or larger home in the future. Walkability is also an important factor in identifying potential locations for such housing developments. The table below provides a summary of recommended housing styles in applicable future land use categories. Minimum density for developments using ‘missing middle housing styles’ should be guided by the building form, open space standards and other design features consistent with the underlying zoning. Such flexibility in housing styles would allow for residents to age in place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 7. MISSING MIDDLE HOUSING- USE RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex Side-by-side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex Stacked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourplex Stacked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached Townhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtyard Multi-family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplex Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triplex Stacked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only if found to be appropriate as part of the PUD approval process.

Amendments to the zoning ordinance will be necessary for allow all of these types as indicated in the above table.

In addition to the missing middle types above, the multi-family, Village Center, Mixed Use, and, where appropriate, PUD planned areas may also provide for traditional multi-family units in a variety of styles. In mixed-use settings, these may be located over non-residential uses or they may be in stand-alone buildings.
Rural Development Patterns

The Orion Township has longstanding interest in preserving and maintaining natural features and open spaces. The zoning tools that are available to maintain rural character within low-density residential areas include ones that discourage traditional subdivisions where lots are located adjacent to road rights-of-way and to encourage cluster and open space developments with a modest reduction in lot sizes and larger green buffers between the lots and the roads rights-of-way (See image below).

Typically, a minimum width of this type of natural green corridor is 100 feet deep from the right-of-way line on both sides of the road. The Township should consider incentizing rural corridor preservation by permitting flexibility in lot area and width in exchange for corresponding open space along roadways. In addition to modifying lot development standards, the Township may also consider encouraging landscaping elements such as rural fencing. This recommendation received favorable response at the master plan open house. The following corridors are designated as priorities for corridor preservation as described above:

1. Indianwood Road
2. Baldwin Road, north of Indianwood Road
3. Coates Road, north of Indianwood Road
4. Designated Natural Beauty Roads
5. Scripps Road and Greenshield Road through Bald Mountain Recreation Area
6. Waldon Road and
7. Clarkston Road

See page 129 in the Complete Streets chapter for more information.
Planned Unit Development (PUD) is a flexible development tool, authorized by the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act, that promotes innovative solutions that preserves natural features, provides community benefits and builds up the existing community fabric.

Qualifying Criteria

Examples of projects that might qualify for a PUD include the following:

- Projects that create a community catalyst, by providing amenities, mixed housing types and promoting multi-modal transportation.
- Developments that preserve green space, promote green infrastructure, and promote further preservation and enhancement of existing and future (proposed) natural features.
- Projects that require flexibility in parcel size and shapes to develop and improve a site that, under traditional zoning, would be difficult to achieve. Flexibility in zoning should not have a negative impact on existing uses, but rather strengthen the connection of the project to the network of development and overall fabric in the community.

Purpose and Intent

In addition to the qualifying criteria, PUD projects should be consistent with the following:

- The PUD process should not be used to introduce a radial shift away from the vision of the Master Plan; rather, it should be a Master Plan implementation tool.
- PUD projects can be used to assist in providing for transitional zoning from high-intensity areas to lower intensity areas. In some cases, the transition may take place within the PUD itself.
- Where appropriate from a density perspective, PUD projects can assist in the introduction of missing middle housing types, so Orion Township’s community attributes are available to a wide range of people with varying income levels.
- PUD projects should use the opportunity for development flexibility to promote sustainability, community resiliency, and healthier living conditions.
- Where appropriate, PUD should provide for the preservation of natural and rural road corridors by concentrating development interior to the site and preserving and/or enhancing natural vegetation and amenities along rural and natural corridors in Orion Township.
Attainable Housing

When communities have a wide spectrum of housing options to support residents, they can accomplish many goals. The availability of "attainable" housing helps accommodate everyone from young adults who are just beginning to live on their own, to families looking to grow, to older residents looking to downsize while staying in the community. It also provides for workforce housing. While there is no universal definition of "attainable housing," the term was recently defined by the Urban Land Institute as "nonsubsidized, for-sale housing that is affordable to households with incomes between 80 and 120 percent of the area median income (AMI)."

Overview

In many communities, young adults and the elderly have limited housing options due to a combination of their lower income levels along with the pricing and availability of housing. This kind of financial challenge can impact people of all ages.

The general rule of thumb based on guidance from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development is to spend a maximum of 30% of a household's income on housing costs, yet many people find themselves spending more on housing, leaving less of their income available for other household expenses. Finding attainable housing can be challenging and it can stress family finances.

The figure below demonstrates that nearly half of all renter households and about a quarter of owner households are cost burdened. Cost burdened is defined as households spending more that 30 percent of income on housing. In 2001, only slightly more that 40 percent of renters were cost burdened.

Source: Joint Center for Housing Studies at Harvard University. The State of the Nation's Housing 2018
Housing Costs and Supply

Housing costs are on the rise. According to the National Association of Home Builders, the median price of a new-construction home was $375,000 in March 2020, up from $325,100 in October 2018. The median price for existing homes was $280,600, up from $257,500 in 2018. The cost of new construction is driving the overall cost of housing higher.

The supply of multifamily for-sale housing is decreasing. Multifamily for-sale housing has historically represented about 20 to 25 percent of total multifamily permits. This type of housing is often more attainable because of its lower cost. In the past 8 years, multifamily for-sale housing has represented 6 to 7 percent of total permits, reflecting a significant post-Great Recession decline.

New construction has delivered larger homes with more bedrooms even though household size was dropping. “Although one- or two-person households make up more than 60 percent of total households, nearly 50 percent of the homes delivered are four bedrooms or more. Less than 10 percent of the homes offer fewer bedroom options like one and two bedrooms,” as noted by ULI.

The same ULI report notes that small housing, under 1,400 square feet, has historically represented about 16 percent of new construction, but in the last cycle, it has averaged closer to 7 percent. When combined with the next size category, 1,400 to 1,800 square feet, the overall distribution of “small homes” has declined from just under 40 percent to 22 percent. Homes over 2,400 square feet have increased from 32 percent to 50 percent of new construction since 1999, according to the ULI.

Urban Land Institute (ULI) is a leading provider of research and analysis on issues that affect housing. https://bit.ly/AttainableHousing-ULI

What does this mean for Orion Township?

As noted above, attainable housing has been defined as nonsubsidized, for-sale housing that is affordable to households with incomes between 80 and 120 percent of the area median income (AMI). The Detroit metropolitan area median family income for 2020, which is used by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for housing reports and applies to Oakland County, was $78,500. Median family income is typically higher than median household income. A family consists of two or more people compared to a household, which may only consist of one person. The numbers below and in Figure 18 are based on providing attainable housing in the Detroit regional market:

- **MINIMUM VALUE.** 80% of the median family income = $62,800.00. With 30% of income spent on housing, $1,570 per month is available. A home valued about $245,000 is attainable at this income level.

- **MAXIMUM VALUE.** 120% of the median income = $94,200.00. With 30% of income spent on housing, $2,355 per month is available. A home valued about $370,000 is attainable at this income level.

FIG. 18. ESTIMATED ATTAINABLE HOME VALUE FOR ORION TOWNSHIP

---
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$62,800
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$94,200
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$370,000
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$1,570 per month

$2,355 per month
What determines a median housing sale value?

The median sales price for a home in the metro Detroit real estate market in June 2021 was $282,938.00. With 10 percent down, a family income of about $77,600 is necessary for a home of this median price.

The estimated median price for a single-family home of new construction in southeast Michigan was $391,000 (Detroit News, April 29, 2019) and the median price of single family new construction in Michigan is over $330,000 (MSHDA), which is substantially higher than the median home value. These prices have continued to increase with the rising cost of lumber and other materials. Michigan home prices are also higher than the national average of about $325,100 (2018). To buy a new construction home valued at $391,000, a family household income of about $99,700 is required, which is outside the range of attainable housing ($62,800 to $94,200). See figure 18 in the previous page.

In addition to housing costs, transportation costs can also be a substantial economic burden. For the southeast Michigan region (SEMCOG), 29 percent of income is spent on housing and 23 percent is spent on transportation (52 percent total). In Oakland County, where housing costs are higher, on average, than the region, 58 percent of income is spent on housing and transportation (34 percent housing and 23 percent transportation).

The Master Plan addresses attainable housing by targeting a wide variety of housing options that go beyond single-family detached housing. Examples include multi-family dwellings, manufactured housing, and missing middle housing types, which are house-scale building with multiple units (duplexes, quadplexes and cottage court bungalows). This variety of housing types will expand the number of homes available across many price points.

References
Density Plan

The Residential Density Plan map on next page indicates the planned maximum number of dwelling units per acre throughout the township. The density numbers shown on the map correspond to the density maximums and ranges provided for.

Density numbers

Density numbers provided on this plan are not intended to depict actual densities of established residential areas. These are gross densities that apply to the site, excluding regulated wetland areas. If an applicant receives approval from the applicable regulatory agency(ies) for off-site mitigation of regulated wetlands, the Township may consider including the on-site wetland areas in the density calculations. The Township will review unique site characteristics and the surrounding area to establish appropriate density through zoning. Density numbers provided can be organized into the following groups:

Established residential areas
Density ranges indicated for established residential areas primarily reflects previously established density patterns. Significant changes to density in established residential areas are not planned or anticipated.

Established public and semi-public areas
These areas, consisting primarily of public parks, schools, municipal property and similar uses, are not planned for residential development as indicated by the Institutional designation. Density is provided on the Residential Density Plan in the event that the public / semi-public use is no longer viable and the Township determines that residential use is appropriate.

Emerging growth areas
This covers mostly rural and underdeveloped areas of the township. As municipal services are carefully planned for expansion within the township, the Residential Density Plan sets forth a policy guide for future zoning designations. Future water and sewer capability in low density areas of the township will likely result in development at the higher end of the ranges provided on the map.

Build-out analysis

Based on the residential density map, a forecast of buildout population has been conducted. Vacant property and underutilized property was totaled for each subarea and the mid-point of the planned density range was applied. Public park areas were excluded. For mixed use areas, a separate forecast was prepared. Areas that appear to have state-regulated wetlands were not included in the total land area. Once a total number of units was determined, a factor of 2.51 persons per unit (SEMCOG) was applied. This total was then added to the existing population for an approximate build-out population.

- 2020 Population: 35,300
- New dwelling units possible: 4,660
- Persons per unit estimate: 2.51
- New residents possible: 11,697
- Conceptual build-out population: 46,996
MAP 15: RESIDENTIAL DENSITY PLAN
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Economic Development Plan
Economic Development Plan

Introduction

Orion Township has used many available economic development tools in the past. One of the most significant is the formulation of a Corridor Improvement Authority included special zoning districts and overlays. Future success will depend upon taking advantage of opportunities and focusing on mitigating areas that could impact the township’s long-term economic viability. For example, the increasing median age trend, which is shared by much of the region, is conducive to a robust economic development outcome. Actions to expand workforce housing and non-residential job growth in targeted areas could attract or retain young people in the township.

No community will capture all the composite of marketable activity and space. There will be competition. Furthermore, economic conditions continue to change. Purchasing online was growing rapidly prior to Covid-19, resulting in the exportation of dollars; the online purchasing rate sped up since the pandemic. Large proportions of office and workspace were being built in homes, and more people were working from remote locations before Covid-19; as with purchasing, the speed of change has accelerated.

If Orion Township is going to take advantage of the opportunities in the market, it must keep its economic toolbox ready and prepared, with an eye towards effectively and efficiently utilizing limited human and fiscal resources. Also, some potential changes in policies and ordinances activity may be necessary. The following are targeted to enhance economic and fiscal viability and should be explored as part of Master Plan implementation.

FIG. 19. MARKETABLE OPPORTUNITIES OVER THE NEXT 10 YEARS

The identified marketable opportunities over the next 10 years include the following:

- **HOUSING**
  - 1,500 additional housing units

- **RETAIL & SERVICE**
  - 270,000 sq. ft.

- **OFFICE**
  - 100,000 sq. ft.

- **INDUSTRIAL**
  - 200,000 sq. ft.

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.*
Overall Economic Strategy

Orion Township seeks to maintain an economically sustainable community which can support the well-being of its residents and business in terms of services, opportunities, and quality of life. It strives to assure that new investment in the community is in conformance with the Master Plan. It seeks to capitalize on the existing community assets including location, existing business, residential desirability, recreational opportunities, schools and top public safety ratings.

Economic development activity should be focused on the following.

1. Foster entrepreneurship
2. Increase housing options
3. Maximize the relationship with General Motors and the future of electric vehicle production
4. Seek growth of industries that utilize the labor force's skills
5. Create places for business incubators
6. Explore the development of a sports training and climate-controlled activity center
7. Adapt commercial corridors for the future
8. Recruit of outside and local developer investment interests
9. Promote development within the CIA district and designated corridors
10. Promote redevelopment sites and continue to develop new locations

Strategy 2. Increase housing options

Housing is an important element of economic development. Orion Township seeks to increase the number of housing options available to current and new residents, with a focus on ensuring that new housing development is consistent with the community character and housing recommendations in this Master Plan. Labor force reassessment is playing out in all facets of the labor market with people making very different decisions about work than they did pre-Covid. Resignations are high; there are 4.9 million more people in the U.S. who aren't working or looking for work, and there is a surge in retirements. There is a boost in entrepreneurship.

Orion Township is anticipating a relatively flat trend in population over the next 20 years based on current projections. With a growing population 65 years of age or older and a need for younger residents, housing opportunities need to expand and reflect overall market opportunities that are consistent with Township's goals and objectives.

There is ample opportunity to capture new households through growth in the housing stock. Adding rooftops significantly impacts the community's economic viability by expanding the internal commercial market and holding existing seniors in the community by accommodating them in appropriate housing, potentially freeing existing occupied units for younger households, creating new work environments, expanding tax revenues without changes in rates, and others.

Housing expansion, including both the mix of housing types and number of units, will have a significant economic impact on Orion Township. It makes good planning sense to build upon past planning successes such as the Gingelville Village Center planning area, one of the Township's 15-minute neighborhoods.
This village-scale area would benefit from multiple family and missing middle, house-scale attached units that would be attractive to both young people and active empty nesters looking for low-maintenance housing in a walkable setting.

Employment of tools that can assist first-time homebuyers, homeownership stimulation, and zoning and other regulations that foster walkability and community continuity are keys.

**Strategy 3. Maximize the relationship with General Motors and the future of Electric Vehicle Production**

The GM Orion Assembly Plant opened in 1983 and made the transition to manufacturing electric vehicles in 2020. Orion Township is the home to the Chevy Bolt EV production vehicles and Cruise AV test vehicles. This 4.3 million square foot facility employs over 1,100 people and is on the cutting edge of electric vehicle production and testing.

Potential future action facilitated by the Township could include developing a joint effort with GM to expand linked activity. For example, the Township could partner to recruit software developers, battery research entities, EV parts producers, etc.

**Strategy 4. Seek growth of industries that utilize the labor force’s skills**

The following industries have been identified as those that could take advantage of the skills that are already present in the area labor force. These would be attractive industries to pursue to fill vacant or emerging development sites.

1. Drone developer or assemblers
2. Robotics and other advanced manufacturing businesses, including electric vehicle suppliers.
3. Electric bike producers or assemblers
4. Electric scooter manufacturers
5. Information tech providers to the above producers
6. 3D printing operations
7. Computer software application and 3D printing
9. Cannabis growth and production

**Strategy 5. Create Places for Business Incubators**

Orion Township can generate excitement and activity in core walkable areas and other strategic locations, such as Wildwood Amphitheater, by allowing business incubator spaces. These are generally comprised of attractive, constructed pop-up units, not tents, typically sized at about 10’x10’. The purpose of these spaces is not to compete with local businesses, but rather to serve as a place to test a new retail-oriented business or venture or serve as a place for an existing business to test a new location. If they are provided with heating, these unique business incubators could operate year-round. Others may operate only seasonally. In the core 15-minute neighborhood areas, a collection of pop-up incubators could locate under single management control on an in-fill lot, providing a place to visit by foot or bicycle.

*Source: Giffels Webster 2020*
Strategy 6. Explore the development of a sports training and climate-controlled activity center

Orion Township is home to Bald Mountain State Recreation Park with strong outdoor activity such as hiking, mountain biking, fishing, swimming, paddle boating, and picnicking. Also, 90-acre lake in Orion Oaks County Park and the various trails and parks are significant outdoor resources. Current levels of activity are reflected below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT LEVELS OF RESIDENT ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numerous well-known professional athletes, Olympians, professional athletes, sports commentators and personalities came from the Township and nearby area over many years. This provides an opportunity to partner and establish a sports training facility that takes advantage of an active population and local resources to train that population. It also allows for the community to establish partnerships with community sports leagues and advanced sports clubs (soccer, baseball, lacrosse, etc.).

Strategy 7. Adapt commercial corridors for the future

Retail corridors will be sustainable if they adapt to changes in demand and consumer preferences. The following are suggested actions to promote retail sustainability:
- Seek redevelopment of targeted properties
- Expand mixing of uses and walkability
- Expand the activity defined in the market analysis
- Expand housing options integrated into corridors, villages and hamlets

Strategy 8. Recruitment of outside and local developer Investment Interests

As important as local private and public sector investment is to Orion Township, so too is investment generated from private outside sources. If one examines the history of “crowdfunding,” which reached beyond “friends and family” funding, to newer versions of the concept, such as “Start Engine,” outside private funding can generate more considerable financial resources to make things possible that seemed beyond reach.

While not abandoning the regional efforts at business recruitment, Orion Township should prioritize and pursue outside developer and investor interests on a project by project basis. That effort should include the following.
- Advise potential investors of the best opportunities for growth and inform them about the importance of maintaining community character that is unique to the Township.
- Identification of entities to be solicited based on their portfolios.
- Direct solicitation of those entities. It cannot be assumed that the “right” entities are looking for opportunities, know of such in Orion Township even if ad placement is done, and that they will “find” this location.
- Follow-up with those expressing interests.
- Create local partnerships as appropriate to buy property, create lease arrangements, or any number of other diverse fiscal, buyout, or ownership relationships.

Strategy 9. Promote development within the CIA district and designated corridors

Promote the development platforms of the Corridor Improvement Authority (CIA) and other zoned commercial corridors and locations which include an established Industrial Development District in accordance with PA 198 for tax abatement in limited zones. Further the Township supports applicable Brownfield Tax Increment Financing (TIF) opportunities for environmentally challenged sites.
Strategy 10. Promote redevelopment of priority sites

Three sites within the township have been strategically identified as prime areas to focus redevelopment resources in order to achieve future economic vitality and sustainability. The following pages provide an overview and recommendations for these locations.

Redevelopment Site 1:

Judah-Baldwin (Gingellville/BIZ Transition Area)

Background

Location. The approximate 88-acre area is located in the southwest quadrant of the township, on the east side of Baldwin Road, and along both north and south sides of Judah Road. The northeast portion of the site is in close proximity to the Judah Lake wetlands.

History and Existing Development Constraints. The Baldwin Road corridor had recently been reconstructed and expanded from a two-lane, rural thoroughfare to a four-lane boulevard roadway with center landscaped islands, safety paths, and improved lighting on both sides. A signature characteristic of the improvement project are roundabouts at major intersections, including Judah Road, the focal point of the southern boundary of planned Gingellville Village Center District.

Unlike the other two redevelopment sites, the Judah-Baldwin area contains a large number of individual parcels with many property owners, which may prolong the acquisition process in order to implement the long-range vision for the area. Some may choose to remain as single family homes.

Future Land Use Map. The 2015 Future Land Use Map for the designated area consists of the Gingellville Village Center District north of Judah Road. South of Judah Road, the plan establishes Office Research and Industrial, Commercial, and Residential Mixed Use, which aligns with the Brown Road Innovation Zone (BIZ). A portion of single-family residential land uses are identified along Judah Road, extending east of the redevelopment area.

The 2022 Future Land Use map proposes extending the Village Center classification to include this redevelopment area. This will accomplish a number of key objectives:

- adding more rooftops in the vicinity of the Village Center planning area
- provide a variety of housing types not found elsewhere in the township
- provide workforce housing opportunities
- locating housing in reasonable proximity to the Baldwin / I-75 interchange
Public Input. The general consensus of the data collected from the community survey and the February 2021 Leadership Advance meeting is that the Village Center concept is planning opportunity that residents desire and want to develop so that the community can strategically improve upon a sense of place and identity. The Village Center is the largest, walkable mixed-use district planned in the township, and along with the Village of Lake Orion and the two hamlet areas, comprises the four core areas of the planned 15-minute neighborhoods (see pages 135-142). With the framework that the Gingelville Village Center Overlay provides, and the implementation of goals and objectives outlined in the master plan, this potential redevelopment area can serve as a southern Village Center gateway and transition from the BiZ uses to the south to the Village Center area.

Concepts for the Redevelopment

Land Use. With mixed use as the focus for the village center development, low intensity commercial, entertainment, and office uses are permitted to mix with a variety of residential use types. The mixed-use conceptual plan shown below illustrates a layout that is in line with the imagined redevelopment based on the future land use designations.

![Fourplex example](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

Source: Fourplex example (Photo by Michael Kansas Sebastian- Flickr)

Flex buildings along Baldwin Road are retail, mixed use, or townhouse, up to three stories, all depending on market conditions. Gateway areas at the roundabout provide gathering space for plazas, outdoor dining venues, and public art.

![Cottage Court Bungalow example](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

Source: Cottage Court Bungalow example - Ingelhock in Carmel, Indiana

East of the flex buildings, a new, north-south public road will separate townhomes from ranch-style, detached cottage court bungalow units north of Judah Road and cottage court duplexes south of Judah. These units would be one-story ranches, ranches with a ½ story bonus bedroom/ bathroom upstairs, and possibly with two-story units mixed in.

The cottage court bungalows north of Judah Road are planned to potentially accommodate fourplex units at the ends of each block. These units are envisioned as being designed to appear as larger single family homes (see photo example), but include two units on each of two levels.

Also planned, are 100’ wide greenways along each side of Judah Road will beautify and buffer the residential neighborhoods on Judah Road as well as provide an attractive transition to the residential areas beyond the district. Rain gardens and a walking trail will wrap around the development on the north, east, and south sides, connecting to the safety path along the east side of Baldwin Road.
Building Form. Urban design will play a key role in the redevelopment of this area. Design features should deviate away from suburban style and auto-centric layouts and exemplify a more human scale, sustainable, and resourceful presence within the limitations of the buildable area (rights-of-way, wetlands, woodlands, etc). Reduced setbacks, incorporation of open space, and placemaking elements planned in this area will foster a sense of community. The look and feel of the built environment can, with appropriate buffers, achieve harmony with and transition to less dense land uses to the east.

Transportation. The site should take advantage of the investments that included safety paths as part of the Baldwin Road improvement and expansion project. The conceptual layout explained above is intended to be served by non-motorized transportation facilities that connect to adjacent sidewalks, roadways, natural areas, and sites as identified in the Township’s Thoroughfare Plan.

Sustainability. With its close proximity to Judah Lake and its surrounding natural features, the redevelopment site has an opportunity to engage in sustainable building practices with sensitivity to the natural environment as well as alternatives to transportation, as mentioned above. The future land use framework has been established for a mix of uses to maximize economic productivity, evolve as a sense of place, while honoring the natural surroundings that will enhance the quality of life for residents and non-residents alike.

Development of the District. The connectivity of the Gingellville Village Center Overlay and BIZ District are a clear indication that the township has strategically set aside an area where it is believed the goals and objectives identified in the master plan can be successfully implemented through sound public policy and careful, forward thinking planning. The adopted master plan should provide the guidance required to develop the area in a manner. There will need to be a new zoning district or modified Village Center District to make this plan possible, accounting for more missing middle housing types and cottage court style development patterns.
Redevelopment Site 2:

**Background**

**Location.** The 277.5-acre site is located in the southeast quadrant of the township and abuts the north side of Silverbell Road and the east side of Giddings Road.

**History and Existing Development Constraints.** The Eagle Valley Recycling and Disposal Facility is an operable, Type II landfill that has been an important presence serving the immediate and surrounding Southeast Michigan community since 1985. The facility produces renewable energy from harnessing methane gases produced from the state-of-the-art collection of solid waste. According to reports from Waste Management, the company that owns the facility, the amount of renewable energy the site produces, which produces power for nearby homes and businesses, is one of the factors that contributed to the company’s decision to maintain its operation for the foreseeable future.

**Future Land Use Map.** The Future Land Use Map designates this redevelopment site as recreation. Properties east of the site are currently within the Lapeer Road Overlay District and are planned for a mixed use of Industrial, Commercial, and Residential.

Natural features along the northern boundary of the site provide buffering from existing and planned medium residential lots to the north. Beyond the Giddings and Silverbell Roads, along the west and south sides respectively, future land use designations of research and light industrial remain comparable to the existing limited industrial and industrial park districts. The General Motors Orion Assembly Plant lies south of the landfill and continues to utilize the renewable energy resources generated by the landfill operations as well as solar power.

**Public Input.** The data gathered from the Leadership Advance regarding the landfill site is that it is, or is perceived to be, a weakness within the community. Key components of its purpose were identified in the “Emerging Trends” commentary; those being green infrastructure and sustainability. The takeaway is that the owner and operator of the landfill, as an existing facility, publishes a wide variety of information explaining its role as a leader in environmental stewardship, protection, and practice.
Concepts for the Redevelopment

Land Use. The current and future use of the Eagle Valley Recycling and Disposal facility represents a unique opportunity to remain a purposeful community asset for many years to come, while also planning for transition to a new use once the facility ceases to operate as a landfill. By recognizing and understanding the level of environmental protection and regulation that currently takes place at the facility, the community will be better positioned to analyze, prepare for, and implement the next lifespan of the former landfill and future recreation site.

The vision for this site is expanded to include both recreational and renewable energy land uses. In addition to the methane gas potential that is currently being realized on this site, this site is adaptable to harness clean solar power as a commercial solar farm. These would particularly be an attractive use if portions of the overall site prove difficult to mitigate for recreational uses.
Redevelopment Site 3:

**Background**

**Location.** The site is located in the southwest quadrant of the township, along the north side of Brown Road, between Baldwin and Joslyn Roads. It is a central site within the Brown Road Innovation Zone District.

**History and Existing Development Constraints.** This redevelopment site is in a prime location along Brown Road, a corridor shared by Orion Township and Auburn Hills to the south and has experienced rapid and expansive commercial growth in the recent past. There is not much in the way of known constraints to develop the site other than to market it for the types of mixed uses intended under the future land use map. The site is currently used by an excavating company and there is significant outdoor storage of vehicles and equipment on the site.

**Future Land Use Map.** The Future Land Use Map for the designated area consists of a mix of uses as industrial, commercial, and residential, which parallels the present-day Brown Road Innovation Zone (BIZ). Here, these types of developments and land uses are encouraged within the existing BIZ zoning district.

**Public Input.** Future land use designation allowing for a mix of uses parallels that of the current Brown Road Innovation District. The area, coupled with the extension of the Village Center classification, north along Baldwin Road, is intended to address the desire for a more diversified approach to development with sensitivity toward sustainability and place-based design standards.
Concepts for the Redevelopment

Land Use. In keeping with the characteristics of the current BIZ District and the goals of the master plan, a conceptual approach to redeveloping the site would be to divide the land according to future needs and provide a single-point, common access to each parcel via Brown Road to the south. A secondary access connection to the west and/or east could also be explored. The future use should be compatible and consistent with the shared Brown Road commercial corridor with Auburn Hills.

The concept plan envisions redevelopment as a research office complex with individual pad sites for users. The frontage on Brown Road could develop with a restaurant or retail pad. This redevelopment concept would complement the planned hotel and restaurant uses to the east and Menards to the west.
Leisure Recreation

In Michigan, many state parks are a principal tourist attraction and host millions of visitors each year. State parks, such as Bald Mountain Recreation Area in Orion Township, are also home to spectacular landscapes, historic structures and sites, sensitive habitats, and rare plants and wildlife. This, in turn, attracts visitors from around the region who are interested in leisure recreation activities within the park. Because some visitor activities have the potential to harm these resources, balancing recreation use with resource protection requires specific care. The MDNR guides development, use, and protection of its park lands according to a general management plans (GMP), which are prepared specifically for each park. This resource is worth exploring at the community level, where popular local parks contain sensitive habitats and other resources. This approach provides thoughtful management to sustain the uses and benefits of resources while balancing recreation use and resource protection.

For Orion Township, it is important that there be a balance between residents and visitors enjoying the natural features in the community. It is recognized some township amenities have a regional draw that goes beyond the boundaries of Orion Township. It is also recognized that visitors to these nature features can help support local businesses. If natural features and amenities become too popular to those outside the community, it could negatively impact enjoyment by residents. By studying visitation patterns and usage rates, the township can adjust its marketing efforts accordingly.
Safety Path Plan

Complete Streets Policy

‘Complete Streets’ is a term used to describe a transportation network that includes facilities for vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists, and other legal users of all ages and abilities. In 2010, Michigan passed Complete Streets legislation to encourage and justify the development of Complete Streets in communities. At that time, Michigan’s Planning Enabling Act was also amended to require comprehensive plans to address Complete Streets. Communities that adopt Complete Streets policies recognize that

- Complete Streets provide transportation choices, allowing people to move about their communities safely and easily.
- Complete Streets policies acknowledge the problems with current transportation facilities.
- Implementing Complete Streets strategies will make communities better places to live and work.

An important element of the Comprehensive Plan process is the planning for the overall system of streets and roads in a community that provide for the movement of people and goods from places both inside and outside the community.

The National Complete Streets Coalition (NCSC) compiled a list of ten principles that makes an ideal Complete Streets policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision and intent</th>
<th>Includes an equitable vision for how and why the community wants to complete its streets. Specifies need to create complete, connected, network and specifies at least four modes, two of which must be biking or walking.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diverse users</td>
<td>Benefits all users equitably, particularly vulnerable users and the most under-invested and underserved communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Directs the use of the latest and best design criteria and guidelines and sets a time frame for their implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use and context sensitivity</td>
<td>Considers the surrounding community’s current and expected land use and transportation needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance measures</th>
<th>Establishes performance standards that are specific, equitable, and available to the public.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment in all projects and phases</td>
<td>Applies to new, retrofit/reconstruction, maintenance, and ongoing projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear, accountable expectations</td>
<td>Makes any exceptions specific and sets a clear procedure that requires high-level approval and public notice prior to exceptions being granted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Requires inter-agency coordination between government departments and partner agencies on Complete Streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project selection criteria</td>
<td>Provides specific criteria to encourage funding prioritization for Complete Streets implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIG. 24. Elements of Complete Street Design

**GREEN SPACE**
Green spaces encourage community interaction and provide opportunities to rest.

**BIKE LANES**
Protected bike lanes increase the level of comfort and encourage more users.

**ROAD DIET**
This involves reducing either the width or number of travel lanes to make space for shoulder or bike path.

**TRANSIT STOPS**
Our dependence on the automobile increases air and water pollution resulting from motor vehicles and the impervious surfaces of roads.

**SIDEWALKS**
Sidewalks for pedestrians to link neighborhoods, schools, civic uses, and other destinations together.

**CROSS WALKS**
Crosswalks, pedestrian pavement markings, and crosswalk signals make it safer for pedestrians to help slow motorized traffic.

**TRANSPORT SIGNALS**
Traffic signals with pedestrian signal heads and audible crossing signals for visually impaired pedestrians to safely cross major roadways.

**STREETScape**
Protective streetscape including trees and street lights to provide shade, create buffer and contribute to a sense of safety and security.

**WAYFINDING**
Wayfinding signs help people on foot or bicycles to identify the route to important destinations and civic spaces.

**TRAFFIC CALMING**
Curb extensions or bump-outs and other traffic calming devices slow vehicular traffic, and alert drivers to the presence of pedestrians.

*Image Source: Street Mix; Exhibit prepared by: Giffels Webster*
FIG. 26. BENEFITS OF COMPLETE STREETS

Safety
1. Reduce pedestrian accidents by increasing the safety factor.
2. Perceptions of the safety of non-motorized travel strongly influence decisions about alternative modes of travel for many.
3. Reducing either the width or number of travel lanes to make space for shoulder or bike paths will improve safety (road diet).
4. Refer to 'Level of Stress' on the following pages.

Health
1. Walking or biking to school will result in reduced child obesity rates.
2. Sedentary lifestyles have been shown to be associated with a host of long-term health problems.
3. Sidewalks, bike paths and access to transit increases level of physical activity.

Access
1. Walking or biking to school will result in reduced child obesity rates.
2. Sedentary lifestyles have been shown to be associated with a host of long-term health problems.

Environment
1. Our dependence on the automobile increases air and water pollution resulting from motor vehicles and the impervious surfaces of roads.
2. Studies have shown that 5 to 10 percent of urban automobile trips can reasonably be shifted to non-motorized transport.

Economy
1. Designing residential and local business districts are redesigned with traffic calming measures and provide safe pedestrian access increases consumer activity.
2. Implementing Complete Streets will be a good placemaking strategy for economic development and community revitalization.

On an average, a pedestrian was killed in the US every 88 minutes in traffic crashes in 2017.

Between 1989 and 2018, child obesity rates rose dramatically, while the percentage of walking or biking to school dropped.

54% of older American living in inhospitable neighborhoods say they would walk and ride more often if things improved.

Carbon-dioxide emissions can be reduced by 20 pounds per day or more than 4,800 pounds in a year per each commuter by using transit instead of driving.

40 percent of merchants reported increase in sales, and 60 percent more area residents shopping locally due to reduced travel time and convenience.
The usage rate of any non-motorized facility by diverse groups of users depends on the level of comfort the path provides. Level of comfort typically depends on various stress factors such as vehicular traffic speed, volume and the time of the day. Safely designed pedestrian/bicycle lanes lead to more users and less accidents. The recommended non-motorized routes in this area are rated based on the following criteria:

**Level of Traffic Stress**

The Mineta Transportation Institute developed a rating system to rate the "stress levels" users experience. The 'Level of Traffic Stress' (LTS) ratings range from 1 (lowest stress) to 4 (highest stress and discomfort) and are based on factors such as the speed and volume of vehicle traffic, the number of travel lanes, the size and complexity of intersections, and the types of bicycle facilities provided.

**Type of Ridership**

A study completed by Roger Geller for the Portland Office of Transportation identified four type(s) of users which correlates with the LTS ratings. The type of riders are categorized by their level of comfort riding on different types of facilities.

**All Ages and Abilities**

National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) developed an 'All Ages & Abilities' criteria for selecting and implementing bike facilities. All Ages and Abilities facilities are defined by three primary factors: safety, comfortability and equitability. This guide helps communities design facilities with appropriate traffic calming measures based on contextual factors such as vehicular speeds and volumes, user type and level of comfort to reduce accidents and increase ridership. Another good resource for determining the right type of facility for a particular route is the 'Bikeway Selection Guide' created by US Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration.
FIG. 27. LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS AND TYPE OF RIDERSHIP

**LTS-1**
*Interested, but Cautious Riders*
1. Shared use paths are used by pedestrians as well as bicycle users
2. 8 feet min. width with 5-10 feet planted buffer
3. Ideal traffic speeds less than 25 miles per hour
4. Wider Right-of-way widths
5. Pavement surfaces should be based on anticipated usage volumes
6. **Comfortable for all ages and abilities**

**LTS-2**
*Interested, but Concerned Riders*
1. Bike lanes separated by buffers defined by pavement markings and parallel parking
2. 8 feet min. two-ways or 5 feet min. one-way with 5 feet painted buffer
3. Ideal traffic speeds from 20-25 miles per hour
4. Limited Right-of-way widths
5. Add vertical delineation such as candlestick bollards for increased level of perceived protection
6. **Comfortable for most adults**

**LTS-3**
*Enthused and Confident Riders*
1. Dedicated bike lanes that are adjacent to traffic lanes
2. 8 feet min. two-ways or 5 feet min. one-way with 5 feet
3. Ideal traffic speeds more than 25 miles per hour
4. Dedicated bike lanes that are adjacent to traffic lanes
5. Limited Right-of-way widths
6. Reduce curbside and intersection conflicts through access management
7. **Comfortable for confident bicyclists, who prefer not to share with the vehicles**

**LTS-4**
*Strong and Fearless Riders*
1. Identifying a specific route as a ‘Bike Route’ is the simple alternative when immediate infrastructure improvements to roadway network are not feasible
2. Wayfinding signage such as ‘share the road’ or directional signage can be installed to guide the users to destinations or other connections
3. Traffic calming measures are required to manage speeds
4. **Uncomfortable for most users**
Safety Paths/Trails

Orion Township’s safety path program is a constantly expanding network of over 50 miles of asphalt paths that provide safe, designated areas separated from roadways for pedestrians, cyclists, and other users in areas where sidewalks were not historically present along county or state roadways throughout the township. The safety path program was first established as a plan in 1978 and has since grown with the direction of the Safety Path Advisory Committee to be a model program for other developing townships wishing to provide this essential community facility for residents and visitors through local initiative. Funding for safety paths is provided primarily by a millage originally approved in 1988, with the quarter mill tax re-approved by voters in 1998, 2008, and again in 2018 to last until December 2027. These funds go into the Safety Path Fund and a General Capital Improvement Fund.

Safety Paths as Transportation Facility

A primary function of the safety path program is to provide a direct community facility for residents that otherwise may not have safe pedestrian access along main roads at the boundary of residential areas. Providing these main road safety paths is crucial to connecting the many residential areas within the township to other community facilities or commercial areas such as Gingelville. While the automobile is still the primary means of travel in metro Detroit, safety paths provide an alternative for people that may wish to travel this way, either by necessity or choice, such as children, senior citizens, or people simply without access to an automobile.

Safety Paths as Recreation Facility

Safety paths also play a key role in Orion Township’s position as a central recreation area in Oakland County due to the presence of numerous township, village, county, and state park facilities within the township. While safety paths function as an essential nonmotorized community facility at the boundary of residential areas, safety paths are also specifically intended to provide links with park facilities, two regional trails, the Paint Creek Trail and Polly Ann Trail, and other community facilities such as schools through a comprehensive safety path network that provides benefits beyond the township boundary.

An example of this is the recent fall 2020 completion of a safety path linking the Polly Ann Trail, which runs near Joslyn Road, with the Paint Creek Trail, which cuts across the northeast area of the township for five miles. This linkage was accomplished through the township’s installation of a safety path along Clarkston Road, east of Lapeer Road, ending at Kern Road and a new landmark bridge over Paint Creek connecting the new safety path to the Paint Creek Trail. Through this connection, the township safety path network is now directly linked with these two regional trails, and through the Pain Creek Trail, the safety path network is linked with the statewide Iron Belle Trail system, which is planned to ultimately connect Belle Isle in Detroit with the Upper Peninsula.

Oakland County Trails Master Plan

The 2008 Oakland County Trails Master Plan, Oakland County Pathway Concept provides additional policy support for township safety paths and regional trails through Orion Township. The County Trail Concept states: “The county pathways system is comprised of a vision to link pathways and greenways throughout Oakland County and Southeastern Michigan. The county concept envisions a hierarchy of pathways consisting of primary and secondary pathways.” The Pathway Concept map indicates paths and trails within the township that have an impact at the countywide trail level. In addition to supporting the Paint Creek Trail and Polly Ann Trail, the County Pathway Concept calls out trails for the areas listed below.

West of Joslyn Road/Polly Ann Trail
- Clarkston Road to Independence Township
- West extension of Polly Ann Trail, following a stream between Waldon Road and Maybee Road, to Independence Township

East of Joslyn Road/Polly Ann Trail
- Waldon Road, through Bald Mountain State Rec Area, to Oakland Township/Kern Road
- Clarkston Road to M-24/Lapeer Road
Implementing Safety Paths through Zoning

Through the Zoning Ordinance and Safety Path Ordinance, the township has historically required property developers to install safety paths as part of development or permitted contribution to the safety path fund for use on projects in other township locations. These ordinances have been crucial to the continued expansion of the safety path network and for providing the substantial funds and easements necessary for expansion of the network. While all safety path missing links and gaps cannot be closed by developers alone, these ordinances are a valuable part to improving the safety path system and should remain in place going forward. Additional opportunities for ordinance amendments may be needed to require safety paths that are not adjacent to roadways as has been traditionally required. This could include paths through the middle of property to complete key connections, such as a path through mid-blocks that would provide more direct routes for pedestrians to schools or other community facilities, or other direct connections through non-residential areas that again may be more impactful for pedestrians than paths only along roadways. Please refer to the Implementation Plan for more information on this.

FIG. 28. 2008 OAKLAND COUNTY TRAILS MASTER PLAN

2008 Oakland County Trails Master Plan

It should be noted that as the County Trails Plan and these concepts are from 2008, some of these connections, specifically the Walton Road connection, may no longer be considered a preferred trail route due to township safety path improvements which have occurred since 2008, such as the Clarkeston Road safety path connecting the Polly Ann Trail and Paint Creek Trail.
An important and obvious element of the Complete Streets includes the development of a plan for the overall system of streets and roads in a community to improve mobility. This system provides for the movement of people and goods from places both inside and outside the community and make regional connections. The township is located approximately 20 miles north of Detroit and located in the northern portion of Oakland County. Interstate 75 (I-75) and Lapeer Road provide regional access to the township, while Joslyn, Baldwin, Waldon, Squirrel and Silverbell provide more local access from adjacent communities.

The Master Plan includes an overview of the township’s transportation network as it relates to land use. The transportation system provides for the movement of people and goods from places both inside and outside the community. Road rights-of-way also provide places for various public utilities such as water lines, gas lines, sanitary and storm sewers, cable television lines, electrical power, and telephone lines. Because of this combined function, the system of roads in a community can impact economic conditions, environmental quality, energy consumption, land development, and overall quality of life in a community.

**Functional Classification**

Over the years during which the majority of roads and freeways were constructed in the United States, the concept of “functional classification” was developed by the Federal Highway Administration (see page 48 for the existing national functional classification). This involved two main elements: mobility and access. Mobility relates to how vehicular traffic is able to flow through or around an area. Access relates to how travelers of the streets access adjacent land uses (primarily through intersections and driveways). At higher levels of mobility, travel speeds and volumes are higher; as a result, access to these roads becomes more limited. Conversely, lower classification roads often feature slower speeds and provide more access points to adjacent land uses.

While this system of classification worked in the past, it is clear that the functionality of roads only takes one type of user into consideration: motorized travelers. Assessing the function of roads in conjunction with non-motorized users is not as clear. Motorists learn to drive understanding the tradeoffs of roadways: freeways run faster than surface streets, but they can’t be used to get directly to their destination. However, with non-motorized uses, the function of roads isn’t as black and white. For example, if a pedestrian or cyclist wants to go somewhere, generally speaking, their travel time may not be impacted by the type of road on which they travel. The decision of what route to use depends largely on what the destination is, the directness of the route, how safe it is to get there, and the availability of transportation facilities like pathways/sidewalks, crosswalks, and bike paths. The idea of mobility for non-motorized users goes beyond simply the efficiency of roadway travel and includes a wider range of barriers to mobility that partly correspond with functional road classifications, but also correspond to land uses, overall community safety, and the condition of transportation facilities.

**Jurisdiction**

The maintenance and improvement of all roads serving the township are primarily controlled by the Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC). Some roads are under the jurisdiction of the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT). However, the developments that generate the traffic on these roads are approved by the township. The township should continue the on-going collaboration with the county and state for funding sources, planning and implementation to serve future needs of the residents.
Long-Range Street Classification

For the purpose of long-range planning, including designation of future right-of-way widths, roads are classified as follows:

**Interstate Highway / Regional State Trunkline.** Divided highways under that jurisdiction of MDOT or FHWA that principally serve to move large volumes of vehicular traffic over long distances, providing connections within and beyond Orion Township. Right-of-way varies but is typically 180 feet or more.

**Major Thoroughfare.** An arterial road of great continuity which is intended to serve as a large volume traffic-way for both the immediate municipality area and region beyond, and which is designated on the Thoroughfare Plan / Future Right-of-Way map as a major thoroughfare. Major thoroughfares shall also have an existing or proposed right-of-way of one hundred twenty (120) feet or more.

**Collector Road.** A road used primarily to carry traffic from a minor road to a major thoroughfare, and which is designated on the Thoroughfare Plan / Master Right-of-Way map as a collector. Collector Roads shall have an existing or proposed right-of-way of 86 feet or more, but less than 120 feet.

**Local Road.** A road of limited continuity primarily providing access to abutting properties and, and which is designated with an existing or proposed right-of-way of less than 86 feet.

**Thoroughfare Plan / Master Right-of-Way Plan**

The Thoroughfare Plan / Master Right-of-Way Plan consists of a map that indicates the existing or planned right-of-way widths for roads in Orion Township. Right-of-way widths are established based on research that indicates the required road specifications to provide various levels of service, functionality, and public use in furtherance of protecting the health, safety, and welfare of the public. The foundation for this plan is the Master Right-of-Way Plan published by the Road Commission for Oakland County. While the Road Commission publishes this Master Right-of-Way Plan, Orion Township believes that further study may be required on some roadways to justify the additional width proposed for some of the right-of-way designations. This may lead to future amendments of this map after these studies are complete. The right-of-way plan is an important planning document because setbacks and other development standards should be established in relationship to the existing or future right-of-way width. The Master Right-of-Way Plan also sets forth distinct classifications based on right-of-way width.

**Planned Road Improvements**

According to SEMCOG’s 2045 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program, a number of roadway improvements are planned or are being studied for Orion Township as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Proposed Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orion Road</td>
<td>Stoney Creek Road</td>
<td>Roundabout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverbell</td>
<td>Lapeer to Giddings</td>
<td>Resurface</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Corridor Planning

There are several key corridors within the township that have unique characteristics that should be considered as new development or redevelopment of adjacent land occurs. These considerations are unique to each corridor, as the function, volume of traffic, ownership and land uses adjacent to these roads varies and plays an important role in the regulation and development of these areas.

Brown Road

Brown Road is a unique east-west corridor within the community in that it has several characteristics that are not shared with other corridors in the township. Serving as the township’s southern border, with Auburn Hill bordering Orion Township to the south, only the developments located on the northern half of this right-of-way are regulated by Orion Township standards. The properties within this area are currently zoned Brown Road Innovation Zone (BIZ) and are subject to unique design standards that distinguish the corridor along the northern side. These flexible standards encourage building frontages along the roadway (instead of parking), screening when parking is permitted in the front yard, as well as standards to encourage multiple buildings on a single lot. See the Appendix for design recommendations for the areas in the mixed use area known commonly known as the BIZ district.

As the area has developed under the BIZ standards, which was amended after the 2015 Master Plan, there have been significant developments that file in key portions of the corridor. The township has identified one of the few remaining vacant parcels for redevelopment (Economic Development Plan pg. 97), meaning future endeavors may require redevelopment of older structures or land use patterns. This process will need to promote collaboration between adjacent property owners in the form of shared access and possibly lot combinations. Other key elements to accomplish in this area include the completion of the safety path along the north side of Brown Road and the further consolidation of curb cuts to eliminate vehicular-pedestrian conflicts.
Lapeer Road

Lapeer Road is a major north-south trunkline thoroughfare located on the eastern half of the township, beginning at the south end at Interstate 75 (I-75) providing access to the Village of Lake Orion, Oxford and other communities further north in the thumb area. The route terminates at M-26 in Unionville, just east of Bay City near Saginaw Bay. This MDOT owned and operated road is one of the most heavily travel routes in the township, and its proximity to I-75 means this corridor serves as the gateway to many regional visitors, and those traveling through may only traverse this corridor. In addition, many local residents and businesses that rely on this corridor depend on traffic flow and design standards to accommodate their developments and provide a blueprint for the future of corridor. This plan seeks to identify key areas and standards enforced along the corridor that are in need of refinement in order to provide a better experience for all users.

One key landscape feature that would enhance the transformation of this area would be the introduction of street trees within the right-of-way Lapeer Road. There are two challenges to this: one is safety standards used by the Michigan Department of Transportation for separation of roadside objects from moving traffic and 2) overhead power lines along both the east and west sides of the thoroughfare. As this area evolves, the township should explore the potential to introduce entryway design standards and screening elements that feature smaller tree species or preferred hedges that are less of a roadside hazard and will not grow into power lines. There are other landscape and streetscape amenities that can enhance the corridor including tall ornamental grasses and vertical art installations. Also, larger deciduous trees should be planted within the private frontage, close to sidewalks and pathways, to provide shade and protection from the elements provided they are not in the impact area from overhead power lines. The concept sketch below is an example of how screening can incorporate low hedgerows to screen parking areas, decorative fencing and brick posts to define driveway entries and parking lot corners, deciduous trees and ground cover.

FIG.29. LAPEER ROAD SCREENING CONCEPT
Baldwin

Baldwin Road has seen perhaps the most physical change among all of the township’s corridors since the last master plan updated. Between 2017 and 2020 the roadway was widened from two to four lanes and five roundabouts were added at key intersections. These changes, along with the continued development of the safety pathway along the corridor, have piqued development interest for both residential and non-residential development.

The southern portion of this corridor from Judah to Maybee is located in the Gingellville Village Center, which regulated by the Gingellville Village Center Overlay District. This district is envisioned as a mixed-use village area that will incorporate and preserve the existing historic elements while providing design guidelines that require a complementary architectural style. New developments are encouraged to provide a transition from commercial or multiple family to lower density residential uses including single family detached through appropriate screening while maintaining pedestrian linkages. Missing middle housing types are envisioned in this area. As village-style development occurs along the south end of this corridor, the township may begin to see increased pressure for similar developments further north along the corridor. Steps should be taken to ensure that and the recommendations in this Master Plan are implemented and that high intensity developments do not encroach on existing areas planned for lower density land uses. Additional screening, facade and design standards may be appropriate for other areas of this corridor (outside of Gingellville) to promote a harmonious streetscape design. Baldwin Road, north of Indianwood, has a much different character. See appendix for an overview of the corridor treatment for this area.
Distinct Natural Corridors

There are several corridors in the township where trees, natural vegetation and views create unique experiences for those passing through by vehicle, bicycle or by walking. Preservation of the natural features near the road right-of-way by use of open space development techniques is envisioned. In exchange for preservation of road frontage with natural features, lot size reductions can be allowed so that there is not loss of dwelling unit yield. Exemplary projects could qualify for density bonuses.

The following corridors are designated as priority for natural corridor preservation:

1. Indianwood Road
2. Baldwin Road, north of Indianwood Road
3. Coates Road, north of Indianwood Road
4. Designated Natural Beauty Roads
5. Scripps Road and Greensfield Road through Bald Mountain Recreation Area
6. Waldon Road and
7. Clarkston Road

Natural Beauty Roads

Certain roads in Orion Township are classified as Natural Beauty Roads, in accordance with Michigan Act 150 of 1970. The goal of the Natural Beauty Roads Act is to identify and preserve designated roads in a natural, essentially undisturbed condition. Roads considered eligible for this designation are federal local roads that have unusual or outstanding natural beauty by virtue of native vegetation or other natural features. Widening, mowing, spraying and other maintenance or improvement activities may be restricted or prohibited on designated Natural Beauty Roads.

Natural Beauty Roads in Orion Township include:

- Kern Road from Orion Road south to Clarkston Road.
- Clarkston Road from 1,000 feet west of the south leg of Kern Road to the north leg of Kern Road.
- Nakomis Road north of Cayuga, almost to the Township line.
- Greensfield Road.

The Department of Natural Resources and the County Road Association have developed a list of guidelines and criteria for designating natural beauty roads. The criteria for designation, available on the Michigan DNR website (http://michigan.gov/dnr), include:

1. **Character of Road:** Must have outstanding natural features along its borders, including native trees, shrubs, wildflowers, grasses, or natural vistas.
2. **Length:** Normally a minimum of one-half mile.
3. **Roadside Development:** Should have little to no development along them.
4. **Road Bed:** May be dirt, gravel or hard surface.
5. **Function of the Road:** Should function as a local access road.
6. **Speed:** Intended to be low speed roads (25-35 mph).

Source: Guidelines for Designation of Natural Beauty Roads (http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/).
Future Land Use
Future Land Use Designations

Residential Districts

The residential category includes a number of districts based primarily on density as expressed in dwelling units per acre. The primary land use in the residential categories is detached single-family dwelling units, while other types of land uses such as schools, places of worship, parks, and attached single-family dwelling units, such as attached condominiums are appropriate in certain locations. In multiple family districts, other building types include townhouses, stacked flats, triplex and fourplex units, cottage court bungalows, and carriage houses are permitted.

It is intended that development in the residential land use categories be tied to overall density in terms of units per gross acre, rather than minimum lot sizes. This will permit greater flexibility in the development and redevelopment of land and presents an opportunity to create parks, open space, and other types of neighborhood features without reducing the overall potential yield on any particular piece of property. Final density yield will depend upon the unique environmental features of a site. For example, a single family detached residential project with regulated wetlands or steep slopes will like not have the same final unit count as a site in the same planning area that does not have these environmental constraints.

Providing vehicular and non-motorized connectivity between adjacent developments is a priority. Stub streets should be provided in all residential developments that abut vacant land or compatible land with redevelopment potential.

Single Family Low Density Residential is planned for areas with existing and low and medium density development and are primarily located in the north and west portions of the township. These areas are planned to develop at a density of 0.55 dwelling units per gross acre, with a range of 0.3 to 0.7 dwelling units per gross acre. As an example, a 10-acre parcel without environmental limitations could yield about 5 lots with 1.5 acres per lot under conventional development. With open space development techniques, lot sizes may be reduced but the same effective unit yield would be realized unless the zoning district provided for a density bonus.

Some of the areas in this planning category that are rural and semi-rural in nature lack municipal sewer and water, are accessed from unpaved roads, or have similar challenges in terms of site development. Areas that are more capable of supporting development will remain rural residential and support new homes and, in some cases, small farming operations. The correlating zoning classification is the SE, Suburban estates zoning district.

Single Family Medium Density Residential is planned for areas with existing moderate density development and areas most capable of supporting development due to adequate utility services (municipal sewer and water) and paved roads. Because some of these areas border lakes, cluster developments are encouraged to preserve open space areas and lake access. The density in these areas is planned at 1.2 dwelling units per gross acre, with a range of 0.7-1.5 units per acre. However, the actual density may vary depending on the area needed for the street right-of-way and the impact of environmental constraints. The correlating zoning classification is the SR, Suburban Ranch zoning district with a minimum lot size of 30,000 square feet.
Single Family High Density Residential is the highest density single family category with a density range of 3 to 5 dwelling units per acre. While the actual density will depend on the area needed for the street right-of-way, lot sizes in such areas range from 8,400 to 14,000 square feet each. A majority of the areas planned for Single Family High Density residential are clustered around the Township's lakes, near Gingellville Village Center and the Village of Lake Orion, and located adjacent to the township's major corridors. Much like the medium density areas, the clustering of residential homes around lakes allows more people to take advantage of the amenity while also providing sufficient recreation space. These areas are typically flatter and can thus accommodate a greater number of units. The presence of adequate roads and utilities are also of importance. The correlating zoning classifications include the R-1/R-2/R-3, Single Family Residential zoning districts at a minimum lot size of 14,000 square feet, 10,800 square feet and 8,400 square feet respectively. This classification also includes the Orion Lakes Manufactured Home Community zoned MHP, Mobile Home Park. However, the classification does not provide for the expansion of mobile home parks in other portions of the Township.

Multiple Family Medium Density Residential is planned for areas primarily within the southwestern portion of the Township with some limited areas also identified along Lapeer Road and south of the Village of Lake Orion. Some of these areas have pre-existing development, with limited available land for expansion. Other areas are targeted closer to the Village Center district where higher residential densities are supported. These areas planned at a density of between 7 to 12 dwelling units per acre at a density of up to 38 rooms per acre (defined in the Zoning Ordinance). The proximity to a major thoroughfare, utilities, commercial amenities and the limited presence of significant nature resources has made these areas suitable for higher-density residential development. The correlating zoning classification is the RM-2, Multiple Family Residential zoning district, which will require updates to reflect more rooms per acre and to provided regulations for missing middle residential dwelling types. Currently the district is structured to permit traditional garden apartment units.

Multiple Family Low Density Residential is planned for selected areas along Lapeer Road (M-24) as a buffer from the more rural residential neighborhoods to the east and west of the corridor. The planned density for these areas is between 5 to 7 dwelling units per acre, depending on the number of rooms per unit (defined in the Zoning Ordinance). Proximity to a major thoroughfare, utilities, commercial amenities and the limited presence of significant natural resources makes these areas viable for multi-family uses. The correlating zoning classification is the RM-1, Multiple Family Residential zoning district at a density of 21 rooms per acre.
Office Districts

The Orion Township Future Land Use Plan identifies areas for office developments of two (2) types: General Office and Office Research. Office uses are limited to those which function during daytime business hours, have limited truck traffic and have no outside activities. Because of their limited impact, General Office uses can be placed as a transition between single family residential areas and more intensive nonresidential areas.

Office Research uses are primarily located within the south Lapeer Road corridor, within the northern portions of the Brown Road Innovation Zone and scattered throughout the industrial parks along Silverbell and Giddings Roads. These kinds of uses seek locations on major thoroughfares where there is good access for employees, viable truck routes, and close proximity to an interstate.

These areas are intended to provide employment opportunities in many varied research fields, but all with the characteristic of having little or no impact on nearby residential areas. Intended uses include research, computer applications, pilot manufacturing, administrative, automotive technologies, etc. The classification is also intended to encourage the development of planned office and business parks; to promote excellence in the design and construction of buildings, outdoor spaces, transportation facilities and streetscapes; to direct the development of workplaces consistent with the availability of public facilities and services, and; to continue to complement the vitality and quality of life in nearby residential neighborhoods. Development in these areas should take place on larger parcels of land with generous setbacks intended to create an open space setting. Correlating zoning districts include the Brown Road Innovation Zone (BIZ), Office and Professional (OP) and Industrial Park (IP).

General Office uses in the township are implemented through use of the Office and Professional District (OP) of the Zoning Ordinance and located predominantly within the Lapeer Road corridor. General Office areas are intended to provide for development on small sites and to be limited to uses that will be relatively compatible with residential uses. Direct access to a major thoroughfare or collector street is key to the viability of these uses, which include administrative offices of all types. Professional offices for administrative services, including medical, are anticipated to be the predominant office use, while service type uses are also permitted under certain situations. Additionally, it is recognized that these areas need to be flexible to accommodate other low-impact commercial uses. Examples are personal service establishments (e.g., hair salons), small low-impact specialty retail shops, restaurants (sit-down and carryout restaurants, but no drive-through operations), day care uses, pharmacies, recording studios, and studios for painters, photographers, decorators, dressmakers, artists, upholsterers, tailors, taxidermists, and similar vocations. The standards applicable to these areas reflect the intent to be able to place the uses on small parcels of land, with comparable small setback requirements (see the Zoning Ordinance).
Commercial and mixed-use areas

The Future Land Use Map includes four commercial or mixed-use categories to accommodate a range of residential, office, commercial and industrial uses as standalone uses, or within mixed use buildings or areas. The majority of areas planned for these areas currently have a mix of these uses, which are permitted to improve, develop or redevelop as permitted by the Zoning Ordinance or the use guidelines in this plan.

Neighborhood Commercial uses are located primarily along Baldwin and Lapeer Road (M-24) corridors with the greatest concentration planned for the M-24 corridor. These areas are intended to be located in close proximity to the residential neighborhoods in order to meet the day-to-day shopping needs of nearby residents. Neighborhood commercial activities may be located either individually or in small centers that serve one or more neighborhood trade areas. Planned uses include food stores, hardware and drug stores as well as personal service establishments, all of which can be found within the Restricted Business (RB) zoning district.

General Commercial is planned along the Baldwin and Lapeer Road corridors and is intended for commercial uses that supply a larger and more diversified number of goods than those in the Neighborhood Commercial classification. The intended character of these areas is comparable to those permitted within the General Business (GB) zoning districts which includes a wide range of regional commercial uses such as large-format retail, supermarkets and drugstores, discount stores, department stores along with facilities such as automobile dealers, other vehicle related services, and commercial recreation.

Village Center is planned for the Gingellville sub area exclusively. This portion of Baldwin Road between Maybee and Judah Roads is one of the oldest commercial/residential centers in the Township and has a rich history. The intended mix of uses includes those in the Neighborhood Commercial, General Office, Multiple Family Residential and Single-Family Residential land use categories. Also, missing middle development, which envisions many house-scale building types such as triplexes, fourplexes, small townhouse cluster, and cottage court bungalows is anticipated to be part of the residential mix in this area. Density will vary in this district and is controlled by form-based zoning. The classification intends for the integration of commercial and residential uses in an attractive and well-designed environment. The classification is also intended to encourage the development of a pedestrian friendly atmosphere, an attractively landscaped boulevard and sidewalks, rear and side parking lots, unified architectural theme and streetscape, and aims to continue the vitality and quality of life in nearby residential neighborhoods through the creation of public spaces and amenities. These developments should be designed with placemaking and pedestrian amenities as an integral component of site development. The correlating zoning district is the Gingellville Village Center Overlay District. See the Gingellville Sub-Area in this Chapter for additional land use considerations regarding the Village Center.

Industrial/Commercial/Residential Mixed-Use

Development is planned to provide a mix of industrial, commercial and residential uses in the area near Brown Road between Baldwin and Joslyn and along Lapeer Road between Brown and Waldon. The intent is a mix of industrial, residential, commercial, medical and office uses and ancillary commercial uses within a well-planned business setting. Large-format retail may be considered along the Brown Rd. frontage. Density will vary in this district and is controlled by height, bulk, and setback regulations in the applicable zoning district. The Township will also promote economic development initiatives for the area. Economic incentives may include Brownfield Redevelopment, Local Development Finance Authority (LDFA), Industrial Facilities Tax Exemption (IFT), Tax Increment Financing (TIF), infrastructure investments and State grant programs. Redevelopment projects will be reviewed by way of a Planned Unit Development for those projects which deviate from the listing of permitted/special uses. Specific zoning regulations are incorporated within the Light Industrial (LI), Brown Road Innovation Zone (BI) and Lapeer Road Overlay zoning districts.
Industrial

Research/Light Industrial areas are intended to provide locations for research, laboratory and light industrial development including scientific research and development, training, and production of prototype products, plans or designs. Accessory commercial and office uses are also encouraged. Such uses are intended to be enclosed within a building and any external effects are not to be experienced beyond the property boundaries. This classification is further intended to encourage the development of a campus-type setting; to promote excellence in the design and construction of buildings, outdoor spaces, transportation facilities and streetscapes; to direct the development of workplaces consistent with the availability of public facilities and services, and to work within the confines of the existing natural features. Correlating zoning classifications include Limited Industrial (LI) and Industrial Park (IP).

Heavy Industrial is planned for the General Motors plant exclusively which is located at the southeast corner of Giddings and Silverbell Roads. The classification is intended to accommodate manufacturing and non-manufacturing uses that, in contrast to research and light industrial uses, may negatively impact the environment and adjacent land uses. Presently no additional land is proposed to be included within this land use classification. The correlating zoning classifications is the IC, Industrial Complex zoning district.

Other

Institutional is located where existing schools, places of worship, public buildings and cemeteries are currently in operation within the Township. Because such uses are permitted in a variety of zoning districts, the correlating zoning classifications are too numerous to mention. Institutional uses are permitted within nearly any zoning district within the Township.

Recreation is the second largest land use within the Township. The State and County own and operate three very large tracts of land, while several smaller pieces are owned and operated by the DNR and/or the Township. This category also includes private recreation, the majority of which is associated with a golf course and/or a private conservation easement. These uses are scattered throughout the Township, with the greatest concentration within the northern portions of the community. The correlating zoning classifications are the REC-1, and REC-2, Recreation zoning districts.

Special Purpose is a very limited land use category and is presently only planned for the area known as Olde World Canterbury Village. While the correlating zoning classifications (SP-1/SP-2, Special Purpose) permit a mixture of uses, the only site taking advantage of this classification consists of gift shops, a restaurant, cider mill and church.

Utility Owned land is located exclusively within the DTE utility corridor that extends from the western parcel perimeter to Giddings Road just south of Waldon Road. However, there is no correlating zoning classification because the above noted area is actually zoned for REC-2 use.

Special Circumstance land use designations indicate areas that have legal agreements that regulate the density and layout of the subdivision. These areas are typically single family or attached residential in nature. The density map (figure __) provides the regulated density of the residential developments included in this designation. This category also includes areas that have conditional rezoning agreements in place.

Planned Unit Developments are sites that have been approved through the Township’s Planned Unit Development process and have established development agreements. The density map (figure __) provides the regulated density of residential developments included in this designation.
### Table 9. Planned Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLU</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Density*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF Low Density</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>0.3 - 0.7 units / acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Medium Density</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>0.7 - 1.5 units / acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF High Density</td>
<td>R-1/R-2/R-3</td>
<td>3 - 5 units / acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF Low Density</td>
<td>RM-1</td>
<td>5 - 7 units / acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF Medium Density</td>
<td>RM-2</td>
<td>7 - 12 units / acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Office</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Research</td>
<td>BiZ / OP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Gingelville Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res/Comm/Ind Mixed Use</td>
<td>BiZ / Lapeer Overlay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Industry</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industry</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* per gross acre excluding regulated wetlands. Note: Planned density is not a guarantee of development yield. This future land use map is intended to show generalized land use and is not intended to indicate the precise site, shape or dimension of areas. These recommendations have a long-range planning horizon and do not necessarily imply that short-term zoning decisions are appropriate.
15-minute neighborhoods

Introduction

As part of the township's analysis of land use and transportation, a new concept has been introduced as part of this Master Plan Update known as the 15-Minute Neighborhood. This is an accepted planning concept that is becoming more mainstream; it focuses planning efforts on areas that are larger than individual neighborhoods. The difference between the 15-Minute Neighborhood concept and typical planning focus areas or corridors that may have special considerations, is that 15-Minute Neighborhoods are defined solely by travel time and distance to a core mixed-use center by either walking or biking.

The 15-Minute Neighborhood concept is based primarily on how far a person can walk or bike from a core mixed-use center. It could be measured in 5, 10 or 15-minute increments for each mode of travel based on the average speed of travel. Five minutes (1/4 mile) is generally a reasonable amount of time a person may choose to travel by walking for a short trip in a mixed-used setting, and 15 minutes is representative of a 3 mile easy bike ride. These travel areas are indicated as concentric circles radiating from a defined center, with darker shaded areas closer to the center and lighter shaded areas as you move away from the center towards the 15-minute travel boundaries.
In reality, 15-minute travel time is dependent on the existing sidewalk/pathways network. When you take existing paths into consideration, the 15-minute neighborhoods appear more of an organic nature as shown above. The concentric rings show how these areas could grow if more robust non-motorized paths are provided. As part of this Master Plan Update, four service core areas have been identified as center of 15-Minute Neighborhoods.
Village and Hamlets

As the 15-Minute Neighborhood is a larger area than individual neighborhoods or subdivisions, the center of these areas can be prime locations to provide facilities that serve multiple neighborhoods and these centers should also be accessible by vehicular travel, though this does not define the concept. The primary purpose of the concept is to provide a central area, either a “village” center or “hamlet”, that provides some or all of your daily needs and amenities (food, services, goods, parks, etc) by walking or biking for 15 minutes or less from your home.

- **Village.** A mixed-use area with a small-town downtown character: Lake Orion (Flint & Broadway) & Gingellville (Maybe & Baldwin). The Village of Lake Orion is governed by its own Master Plan and Zoning Map. As such, the Orion Township Master Plan Update will not address areas within the boundaries of the village. It will address non-motorized connections to the village, and it will consider the Gingellville/Village Center 15-Minute Neighborhood area.

- **Hamlet.** A small settlement with some mix of uses, but containing a form that is more rural in character: Decker (Squirrel & Silverbell) & Friendship Woods (Clarkston & Baldwin)
Applying 15-minute neighborhood strategies in Orion Township

A key consideration when applying the 15-Minute Neighborhood concept is choosing one or more centers or core areas within the township. An informal way to think about the concept is that of a central area where you could complete some or all of your Saturday morning errands without having to drive to from your home. This could range from a small mixed use area that provides access to a few amenities like a café, small market or ice cream shop and a park, to a more robust village setting with many shops and restaurants. While some of these uses may not be as critical to resident needs as a grocery store, they are still important community facilities that can help identifiable places within the township. In order for a 15-minute neighborhood to be sustainable and foster walkability, several key ingredients are needed. This includes:

1. **Land Uses.** The core of 15-minute neighborhoods includes mixed use areas where at least some basic everyday local commercial and service needs can be fulfilled. This may range from a small market to get milk, bread and basic goods in a hamlet setting to much more extensive commercial and local service offerings in a village setting.

2. **Placemaking.** The walkable core area with placemaking elements. This needs to be a desirable destination with places to gather, things to do, and places to shop.

3. **Zoning Implementation.** A zoning district with contextual form and use regulations. A hamlet district differs from a village or traditional downtown because it recognizes a relaxed, small-town feel where buildings have modest setbacks in all yards, some retail uses may take place in buildings that were formerly homes, and retail uses are limited to meeting convenience needs, not comparison shopping, and

4. **Complete Streets.** A complete streets network that directs walking, biking, and vehicle trips to the core areas. This includes sidewalks, bike paths, bike lanes, and roads connecting people living in working within a 15-minute bike ride to the core area.

The 15-minute neighborhood concept will be implemented by establishing a new zoning district or overlay district for hamlet areas and refining the Gingellville Village Center Overlay District to reflect the current Master Plan vision. It will also require amendments to the Complete Streets / non-motorized plans. This concept creates the framework for recommendations and implementation strategies in this Master Plan.
Gingellville Village

Background

The township has existing policies in place through the 2015 Master Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and Zoning Map which guide and dictate development within the Gingellville Area.

The 15-Minute Neighborhood Concept for this area continues the township’s focus on this area as an emerging village center. Rather than taking the corridor approach as existing policies have done, the Gingellville Village is centered from the intersection of S Baldwin Rd and Maybee Rd. The walk sheds spread fairly evenly in all directions from this area, and the bike sheds stretch to the west and south beyond the township’s boundaries.

Anticipated Uses

Permitted uses within the area outlined are listed in the Gingellville Village Center Overlay District – Section 33.01 Principal Uses Permitted. Following are the list of uses currently permitted/restricted in this overlay district.

- Low intensity retail, office or professional uses
- “Big Box” or intensive commercial uses shall be restricted
- Mixed use developments including residential and commercial uses are encouraged as part of a PUD.
- Deep parcels shall be reserved for residential uses, but may have frontage retail or flex space that could be townhouse, retail or other similar uses. Single-family residences are favored as the predominant land use at the edges of the district. In mixed use projects, it is expected that detached and attached units would be interspersed with local business uses along the frontage of the property. Missing middle housing types are also encouraged in this area.
Decker Hamlet

Location
The Decker Hamlet is centered from the intersection E Silverbell Rd and N Squirrel Rd in the southwest corner of the township.

Walksheds and Bikesheds
The walksheds remain primarily within Orion Township, stretching east into the developed southwest corner of Oakland Township.

The bikesheds stretch further into Oakland Township and continue into Auburn Hills and Rochester Hills to the south. While the immediate area around this intersection is developed with single-family housing or undeveloped, there are three community facilities present near the center: Jesse Decker Park, The Goddard School of Lake Orion (private), and Eagle Creek Academy (private- Oakland Twp).

Anticipated Uses
This Hamlet envisions a small settlement with some mix of uses not currently present in the area, but containing a form that remains compatible with the existing residential and rural character of the area.

Uses and development could include small-scale commercial uses in one or two-story buildings, potentially through the repurposing of single-family buildings or new buildings that are compatible with single-family uses.
Friendship Woods Hamlet

Location
The Friendship Woods Hamlet is centered from the intersection of S Baldwin Rd and W Clarkston Rd in the northwest corner of the township.

Walksheds and Bikesheds
The walkshed is entirely within Orion Township. The bikesheds stretch further west into Independence Township with small portions continuing to the north into Oxford and Brandon Townships.

Anticipated Uses
Friendship Park is a major attraction to this location offering many amenities and continuing to evolve with the addition of historic structures relocated from other areas in the township and other community amenities. Across S Baldwin Rd to the southwest of Friendship Park is an existing commercial area that has existing uses and buildings that are desirable to include within a hamlet, though these uses are primarily service-oriented.

The Baldwin Commons shopping center at the southeast corner of Baldwin and Clarkston has a variety of convenience and restaurant uses and services including Great Harvest Bread, indoor and outdoor dining at Ignite Tavern, a cleaners, ice cream / frozen custard store, dry cleaners, nail salon, and more. It also has an existing pedestrian linkage to the Orion Oaks Assisted Living and Memory Care facility.

Additional uses should be pursued within this area to strengthen the existing hamlet-quality of this area. This could include infill development within this immediate area, or additional small-scale development along Clarkston Rd in both directions and S Baldwin Rd to the south.
Hamlet Placemaking Ideas

Creating people-oriented design elements is key to offering an authentic sense of place with the core of each neighborhood. These elements can be simple, like high quality chairs and benches, or they can be elaborate, with outdoor fireplaces, pop-up shops, and more.

Encouraging mixed use and, where appropriate, missing middle or more dense housing developments in the core helps to sustain a Hamlet style development.
Public Space Activation

“...I end then in praise of small spaces. The multiplier effect is tremendous. It is not just the number of people using them, but the larger number who pass by and enjoy them vicariously, or even the larger number who feel better about the city center for knowledge of them. For a city, such places are priceless, whatever the cost.”

— William H. Whyte

Community Gardens and Pocket Parks

As the township seeks to promote public spaces in walkable areas, there should be a consideration for developing community gardens and pocket parks to promote placemaking and enhance community ties. Community gardens and pocket parks are typically small spaces, but they provide many benefits for communities, including beautification, creation of a sense of public culture and wellbeing, and pulses of interest along a non-motorized pathway. While community gardens and pocket parks can function in a variety of locations throughout the township, this plan suggest the Orion Township seek out and identify locations within public parks, corridors and non-motorized paths that can be serve as a collective gathering place.

While early community gardens throughout the U.S. functioned to provide food for communities during WWII (see Fenway Victory Garden to the right), the concept has more recently been used to promote creative placemaking and encourage intergenerational ties throughout the community.

Above: Located within Frederick Law Olmsted’s famed Emerald Necklace, the Fenway Victory Gardens hold more than 500 gardens for City of Boston residents. Spanning 7.5 acres along Boston’s Muddy River, the gardens are tended by a community of more than 375 members from every neighborhood in Boston, reflecting the diversity of the city and its rich history and culture. (Fenwayvictorygardens.com)
Following adoption of the Master Plan, there are many potential paths towards the creation of new community gardens and pocket parks. These amenities could become a part of new developments. A mail pocket park incorporated along a public pathway along a street would serve to benefit all users along that pathway. Township staff within the Parks and Recreation and Planning should collaborate to identify areas within township parks or on township owned land that would serve as appropriate locations. Places within the 15-minute neighborhood core areas: Friendship Woods Hamlet, Decker Hamlet and Gingellville Village Center could serve as logical starting points for this endeavor.
Zoning Plan

The Zoning Ordinance is one of the primary tools for implementing the Master Plan. Many of the land use recommendations, goals and objectives found in this plan can be aided by amendments to the Township’s Zoning Ordinance. Amendments can range from minor changes to text all the way to the creation of new districts.

Aside from the modification of existing districts (e.g., updating multiple family districts to including missing middle housing), some objectives of the Master Plan will be addressed with text amendments. The table below is the Zoning Plan. It shows how master plan categories align with zoning categories in the township.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Category</th>
<th>Future Land Use Category</th>
<th>Zoning District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single Family Low Density</td>
<td>SF – Suburban Farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Family Medium Density</td>
<td>SE – Suburban Estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Family High Density</td>
<td>SR – Suburban Ranch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Family – Low Density</td>
<td>R-1/R-2/R-3 - Single Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Family – Medium Density</td>
<td>RM-1 - Multiple Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>General Office</td>
<td>OP - Office and Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office Research</td>
<td>BIZ – Brown Road innovation Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OP – Office and Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>RB – Restricted Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>Gingelville Village Center Overlay District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>GB – General Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Industrial/Commercial Mixed Use</td>
<td>BIZ – Brown Road innovation Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lapeer Road Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Industry</td>
<td>LI – Limited Industrial Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IP – Industrial Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heavy Industry</td>
<td>IC – Industrial Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Not a specific district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Recreation</td>
<td>REC-1/REC2 - Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Purpose</td>
<td>SP-1/SP-2 – Special Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utility Owned</td>
<td>Railroad Freight Yard and other districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Circumstance</td>
<td>Typically the result of Consent Judgments or other Court Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planned Unit Development</td>
<td>Planned Unit Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DRAFT (02-10-2022)
Action Strategies

The thoughtful preparation and adoption of any plan would be of diminished value without a program of implementation strategies. The implementation strategies of this chapter will assist the township in putting the key recommendations of the master plan to work. The implementation program is based on the goals and objectives discussed earlier. A specific Zoning Plan outlines steps that can be taken toward implementation through amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.

The best plans are those that are implemented in a consistent, incremental, and logical manner. The implementation matrix that follows is designed to show how the goals of the master plan are fulfilled by action strategies. All boards, commissions, and authorities are encouraged to read through all of the strategies to understand how they all work together to create a better community to live, work, and play.

Implementation Matrices

In order to illustrate the connection between goals, objectives and action strategies, each of the implementation matrices that follow align with the goals, which are noted at the top of each matrix. Within each matrix, the action items are broken into subcategories intended to assist with identification and prioritization. Not all goals contain action items within each subcategory and some goals are repeated as they can advance more than one goal. The matrix subcategories include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Strategy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>These are items requiring zoning amendments and will generally be led by staff and the Planning Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>These will be items involving education of the community, including residents, business owners, property owners, developers and design professionals. They will be led by a combination of staff, boards and commissions. This may also involve township staff and officials working with county and state officials to coordinate plans and funding, as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvement</td>
<td>These involve large capital investments, such as equipment, projects or studies, that require inclusion into the township’s Capital improvement plans in order to determine the most efficient time and method of completion and may involve multiple municipal departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other items may involve research, study and further evaluation by staff and/or other boards and commissions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After adoption, the Planning Commission will assign time frames or priorities to the action items. These time frames are intended as guides and may be adjusted as resources allow or as other issues arise. Generally, short time frames are intended as three years or less; medium-to-long time frames are more than three years.
The tables that follow assign actions to the goals and objectives, leaving room to establish priority levels for short-term, mid-term, and long-term items as the next step following adoption of this plan. This chapter should be reviewed periodically and at least annually to assess progress and adequately budget for specific strategies. Each action should have a "lead," a board, commission, group, or individual who is responsible for project initiation and coordination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix Categories</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Strategy</td>
<td>The actions necessary to carry out goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Body</td>
<td>Identifies the primary party responsible for accomplishing the action strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time frame</td>
<td>Identifies and prioritizes the time frame for the action strategy to be implemented,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Partners</td>
<td>Identifies other parties involved in the accomplishment of the action strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin - Planning Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC - Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB - Township Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA - Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High-Quality and Diverse Housing (Residential Areas)

Orion Township will provide and support high-quality housing for residents of all ages through new residential developments and ongoing maintenance and upkeep of existing neighborhoods. A variety of new, high-quality missing middle housing types at various densities will be accommodated to welcome younger residents and families as well as allow older residents to age in the community. The quality of life for residents will be enhanced by protecting the natural features and rural suburban atmosphere of the township while encouraging the development of neighborhood parks and open spaces.

Objectives

- Support healthy communities by improving connectivity and access to green space in new and existing neighborhoods.
- Ensure adequate housing styles and densities are available to provide options for first time homebuyers or those looking to downsize and "age in community."
- Develop programs to maintain and enhance existing neighborhood character, especially within older neighborhoods.
- Encourage land use in accordance with the existing character and Township Future Land Use Plan.
- Promote adaptability through the use of innovative planning and zoning techniques that will result in a full range of housing types.
Goal 1 | HIGH-QUALITY AND DIVERSE HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Strategy</th>
<th>Lead Body</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Supporting Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Develop zoning standards for &quot;missing middle&quot; housing, including but not limited to duplex, triplex, quadplex and cottage court bungalow dwellings in multiple family districts. This will require updating existing zoning districts (see the Zoning Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Enable residents to age in place by creating zoning standards that encourage the development of active adult housing in a variety of styles, including detached and attached single-family homes and mixed-use development. Complement these developments with entertainment and community recreation opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Assess and amend the ordinance as needed to ensure open space required within developments offers adequate public amenities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Review and, if necessary, update standards for buffering of non-residential uses from residential uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td>Apply standards for street and subdivision design that require connections between neighborhoods that improve residential access, promote public safety access and minimize traffic congestion. Require new developments to provide connections to adjacent pedestrian and non-motorized facilities as practical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f</td>
<td>Promote residential retrofits for accessibility in order to help seniors remain in their homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1g</td>
<td>Pursue strategies to make Orion Township an age-in-place friendly community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Improvement Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1h</td>
<td>Continue public investment in new and existing pathways, sidewalks, parks, roads, and street trees to improve the quality of life in existing neighborhoods and along thoroughfares.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitate rehabilitation or removal of blighted residential structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Natural and Historic Resources
(Environmental Resources and Historic Preservation)

Orion Township will preserve and maintain natural resources and open spaces through growth management techniques that encourage development in specific areas of the community while preserving and protecting natural features of the community. Future development will incorporate innovative storm water management, low-impact design features, and site and landscape design that protect natural resources, preserve high-quality open spaces, minimize stormwater runoff, and reflect the natural character of the township. The Township will maintain and preserve structures of significant historical and architectural value which are key elements in the unique identity and community character of the township.

Objectives

- Protect and enhance the township’s woodlands, wetlands, water features, habitats, and open space by enforcing the regulations that preserve natural features and the functions that they provide to the community.
- Improve storm water management using best management practices; establish appropriate standards for the community in coordination with the Oakland County Water Resources Commissioner.
- Adopt and enforce policies that minimize pollution and preserve the lakes and watershed areas of the township.
- Promote and communicate sustainability concepts and incentivize residents and businesses to implement relevant strategies.
- Encourage energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable development through raising awareness and creating standards that support best practices.
- Provide resources and guidelines for the development and application of solar, wind, and other alternative energies.
- Preserve the inherent architectural character of individual historical architecture resources throughout the Township.
- Promote sustainable practices that craft solutions to today’s challenges that are cognizant of and sensitive to impacts on future generations.
- Require street tree planting as part of all residential and non-residential development and promote and encourage preservation and, where appropriate, creation of woodland areas in order to foster environmental benefits, enhance property values, and act in support of the Township’s recognition in the Tree City USA program.
## Goal 2 | NATURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Strategy</th>
<th>Lead Body</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Supporting Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt a Corridor Open Space Preservation Overlay District or similar zoning mechanism that the Township can use to protect important corridor vegetation and rural character, as well as environmentally sensitive areas, but without requirement for 50% open space that is currently in the Open Space Preservation regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess the Zoning Ordinance and amend as needed to promote green development that are consistent with Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Standards or the equivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow alternative energy systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the addition of a historic overlay zone to recognize and preserve the recognized historic assets within the township</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and amend the Zoning Ordinance as needed to update lighting standards to lower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update the zoning ordinance standards to ensure they align with the county's best practice standards for stormwater management and low impact design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require electric vehicle charging station conduits in both public and private parking lots so that charging stations can be added as demand increase without the need to tear up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend landscaping provisions to encourage more natural stormwater management practices, increase tree canopy, and reduce overall impervious surface on developed sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate the development community about the benefits of LEED certifications for both residential and non-residential buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to promote and publicize the township’s participation in the Tree City USA program by exploring additional opportunities for recognition, such as the Growth Award for communities that demonstrate increased levels of tree care and community engagement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Improvement Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and budget for grant and funding opportunities to acquire and enhance parcels adjacent to the environmentally sensitive areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the creation of a “Friends of Orion Parks” volunteer group to assist with identification and removal of invasive species and identification and protection strategies for wildlife habitats.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner with Orion Schools and local environmental professionals to understand important environmental issues in the township and region and make recommendations for educating parks and recreation users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Economic Development
(Economic Development, Commercial, Office and Industrial areas)

Orion Township will support a strong local workforce by maintaining and promoting the proper distribution of commercial, office, industrial and research development in a manner that results in desired economically sustainable developments, land use relationships, high-quality design, and an increase in the community’s tax base. The Township will promote and encourage the concept of 15-minute neighborhoods in desired areas that foster walkable, mixed-use places supported by both non-motorized and motorized transportation infrastructure choices.

Objectives

- Achieve a balanced variety of neighborhood-, community-, and regionally- oriented facilities that will meet the shopping and service needs of the community and nearby metropolitan area populations without unnecessary duplication.
- Promote the physical clustering of commercial establishments by encouraging mixed use, shared parking facilities, non-motorized access, consolidated driveways, pleasant pedestrian spaces, and contextual extensions of utilities.
- Regulate the physical clustering of industrial businesses in planned industrial parks, such as those within the southern half of the Township along the Brown Road and Lapeer Road corridors, rather than in stand-alone development, thereby providing for minimal extensions and impacts on utilities and nearby residential uses.
- Support residents of all ages in the local workforce by serving as an information clearinghouse on local and regional training, education, and business needs.
- Expand the Township’s economy and tax base by supporting existing local businesses, encouraging entrepreneurship, and attracting new businesses.
- Implement incentive programs available through Oakland County and the State of Michigan regarding emerging employment sectors.
- Continue participation in the Michigan Economic Development Corporation’s Redevelopment Ready Communities Program.
- Continue and refine the practice of identifying and improving key corridors and districts for growth and economic development.
### Goal 3 | ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Strategy</th>
<th>Lead Body</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Supporting Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a Amend the Zoning Ordinance to add mixed use designations that align with the goals of the Hamlet, Village Center and mixed-use designations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b Update industrial zoning to accommodate a modern mix of tech, research, and light industrial uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c Review and amend the Zoning Ordinance as needed to ensure the development review process is as efficient and effective as possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d Develop flexibility in parking standards and other site standards for redevelopment sites to enable new uses on physically constricted sites. Lower barriers to positive redevelopment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e Use frontage landscaping standards to improve the appearance of commercial and industrial areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f Consider permitting additional height and or density in the RM-2 district. Review and consider appropriate buffering of taller structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3g Implement corridor-specific landscape and streetscape design concepts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3h Explore public/private partnership opportunities for corridor improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3i Develop a guidebook showing placemaking ideas for private development sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3j Develop annual survey to better understand the needs of the business community and ways in which the Township can provide support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3k Work with MDOT to encourage provisions that allow context-appropriate landscaping within state-controlled rights-of-way, like those along Lapeer Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3l Strive to target development to corridors with recent public investments including, but not limited to, Brown Road and Baldwin Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m Work with property owners and the development community to explore implementation of identified redevelopment site concept plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3n Work towards development of a plan to promote Orion Township's leisure recreation amenities by highlighting natural beauty with important Township, County and State Parks and Recreation Areas, non-motorized pathways, and access to shopping and entertainment. Monitor the success of these efforts to ensure that the priority is on local residents having access and reasonable use of these facilities, striking an important balance so that natural amenities are not overburdened by too many visitors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Improvement Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3o Annually review and update the CIP to target capital spending to priority areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p Establish a beautification award program, with categories for individual residential and commercial/mixed use properties, as well as collective neighborhood efforts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Facilities  *(Community, Recreation, and Complete Streets)*

Orion Township will support and foster motorized and non-motorized transportation facilities, community recreation facilities, and other supportive community facilities and services desired by residents and businesses in a financially responsible manner that reflects the township’s role and position in the region. These systems will minimize the impact on the Township’s natural features and open space while supporting a high quality of life for residents of all ages, as well as targeted land use recommendations. The township will, when desirable, partner with neighboring communities, other public agencies, and the private sector to maintain, link, and expand infrastructure in an effective, efficient, and economical manner.

**Objectives**

- Facilitate multi-modal connections that provide access to residential areas, economic destinations and parks & recreation facilities throughout the township in a safe, efficient and effective manner.
- Ensure civic spaces, utilities and other infrastructure are well-maintained while providing sustainable strategies for growth in a practical manner.
- Provide community support to ensure Orion Township police, fire and first responders can continue to operate efficiently in a manner that best serves all residents within the community.
- Pursue new facilities that enhance the quality of life for township residents and businesses, including a new township hall, improved parks, and non-motorized facilities that connect these assets with residential and non-residential areas.
- Actively promote and, where appropriate, require the installation of non-motorized facilities in accordance with the Township’s Safety Path Plan and establishment of the core 15-minute neighborhoods.
- Deliver outstanding parks and recreation facilities and programs.
- Encourage Township staff to promote ways in which all Township-owned facilities can conserve energy and serve as a model for energy efficiency in the Township.
# Goal 4 | COMMUNITY FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Strategy</th>
<th>Lead Body</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Supporting Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and amend the Zoning Ordinance as needed to accommodate autonomous vehicles, ride-sharing and other forms of transportation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt a Complete Streets policy that establishes non-motorized transportation as a policy priority, reflecting that the Township will consider opportunities for improvements to non-motorized connections and facilities whenever new construction projects take place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the creation of an ad hoc committee tasked with evaluation of sharing facilities and services between adjacent communities, schools, the county and private businesses with a goal of providing effective and efficient community amenities and services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Improvement Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the priority installation of non-motorized facilities in accordance with the Township's Safety Path Plan and establishment of the core 15-minute neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize required street pavement width, where possible, based on need to support travel lanes, street parking and emergency, maintenance service vehicle access.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to update the Township's recreation master plan every five years to ensure the adopted plan is recognized by the DNR and the Township remains eligible for grant and assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Character and Aesthetics

Orion Township's tagline, Where Living is a Vacation, encompasses a wide variety of community qualities and features that make the Township unique and cherished by those that live here. In addition to the goals and objectives noted above, the Township will continue to support retaining community character elements and aesthetic qualities that are consistent with the vision of the Township and promotion of health, safety, and general welfare.

Objectives

- Enforce Township regulations that reduce glare and preserve the dark sky.
- Promote the preservation of natural vegetation along rural corridors of the Township through creative zoning regulations and coordination with the Road Commission for Oakland County.
- Seek out preservation of important views that permit Township residents to view lakes, streams and other natural resources.
- Require high quality and durable finishing materials and furnishings, consistent with recommendations and policies in this Master Plan, and recognize that certain districts and corridors require unique and harmonious elements.
- Support the advancement of the four identified 15-minute neighborhoods and develop regulations that support hamlet and village style development.
- Encourage the incorporation of design elements into new development that reflect the historic character of the Township.
- Continue to update and enforce sign regulations to ensure that signage in the Township is an aesthetic asset that effects communication and quality appearance over blight, clutter and oversaturation of messaging.
## Goal 5 | COMMUNITY CHARACTER & AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Strategy</th>
<th>Lead Body</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Supporting Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>Review and amend the Zoning Ordinance as needed to require high quality building materials and design standards for all new development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Review and amend the Zoning Ordinance as needed to encourage preservation and reuse of historic structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>Review and update the lighting ordinance to meet the Michigan Dark Skies regulations; consider lighting zones to accommodate all uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d</td>
<td>Establish architectural design, signage, and landscaping of key entryway features at the township's borders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5e</td>
<td>When property is developed or redeveloped, explore opportunities to link the front and back of the building by pedestrian passages that are open to the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Improvement Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5f</td>
<td>Update the township’s CIP plan annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Action Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Michigan Natural Features Inventory
Priority Conservation Areas
Michigan Natural Features Inventory
Priority Conservation Areas

Charter Township of Orion
Oakland County

Source: Oakland County Potential Conservation/Natural Areas Report, Michigan Natural Features Inventory, MDNR + MSU, 2004

Map by:
Carol J. Dvorak Associates, Inc.

<Diagram of Michigan Natural Features with key colors and priorities>
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Appendix B

Oakland County Programs
# County Programs and Services

## Oakland County Department of Economic Development Programs and Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Service / Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brownfield Redevelopment Authority (OCBRA)</td>
<td>Provide assistance in the County's Brownfield initiative to clean-up and redevelop contaminated properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Stewardship</td>
<td>Provide information, plans and options to promote conservation of the natural environment while supporting sustainable economic growth, development, and redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Assistance</td>
<td>Support local efforts to maintain and enhance architectural and heritage resources through sustainable practices to enrich the quality of life for all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use &amp; Zoning Services</td>
<td>Prepare and provide land use, zoning, and Master Plan reviews for communities to enhance coordination of land use decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street Oakland County (MSOC)</td>
<td>Help local governments develop their downtowns as vibrant, successful districts that serve as the heart of their community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland County Household Hazardous Waste Program (NoHaz)</td>
<td>Help Oakland County residence to have an option for the proper disposal of household hazardous waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Zoning and Development Training</td>
<td>Encourage communities to capitalize on their strengths and refine their economic development processes to implement their community vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail, Water &amp; Land Alliance (TWLA)</td>
<td>Become an informed, coordinated, collaborative body that supports initiatives related to the County's Green Infrastructure Network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Updated 2015 Master Plan-Sub Area Plans
SUB AREA PLANS

As a part of the 2015 Master Plan update, several areas within the Township received more detailed analyses and considerations for future land use. The areas of special focus, described below, provide specific land use recommendations and site design considerations for each. This Appendix includes key concepts carried forward and adapted, as necessary to reflect the vision of the 2022 Plan. These sub areas include:

- Gingellville
- Village of Lake Orion Area
- Brown Road

GINGELVILLE SUB AREA

The Village of Gingellville has had a long history in Orion Township. Originally founded as an agricultural community, the Village has evolved into a collection of shops and residential areas. The land use plan promotes the continued refinement of the Village into a unique enclave. The plan promotes the integration of commercial and residential uses within a well-designed, pedestrian-friendly development.

Due to the size of the Township's population, the historical growth patterns and the close proximity to several regional shopping centers, it is imperative that the development concepts for this sub-area are compatible with the existing development patterns. The congestion problems within the area, the abundance of available land, and the desired intent to preserve the historical hamlet of Gingellville should also be key elements of any new development concepts. Therefore, the Township policies for this sub-area should focus on clustered, mixed-use village style rather than strip commercial development land use patterns.

Strip Development vs. Village Center Development

The disjointed character of strip-style development (left) often requires the use of an automobile to get from building to building. In contrast, village-center-style development (right) encourages pedestrian connectivity between uses.

Source: http://homsmlsp.typepad.com/
Table A-1. Characteristics of Typical Strip Development vs. Village Center Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPICAL STRIP DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>VILLAGE CENTER DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disruption of traffic flow from multiple curb cuts.</td>
<td>Shared access to minimize the number of curb cuts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not pedestrian friendly due to multitude of cars in front of the buildings.</td>
<td>Parking encouraged in the side or rear to make the street side for pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of coordination of commercial uses and building styles.</td>
<td>Compatibility of uses and architecture through specific guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires the continued use of the automobile to shop in multiple stores.</td>
<td>Buildings located close to the street to slow vehicles and encourage pedestrian use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often has blighting effect on contiguous residential land.</td>
<td>Pedestrian connectivity between buildings and uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of uniformity in signs, lighting, landscaping and other amenities.</td>
<td>Uniform sign, lighting and landscape requirements result in a uniform and well maintained product.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intent of the Gingellville sub area is to create a "village-like" atmosphere with areas of various uses that are interconnected, pedestrian-friendly, and blend community-oriented business development with residential uses. Commercial uses shall be of neighborhood scale and shall not include intensive commercial uses which are incompatible with surrounding residential uses. A new zoning overlay district – the Gingellville Village Center Overlay District – has been established to accomplish the intent of this land use category.

As a mixed land use concept, low intensity commercial and office uses are allowed to mix with residential land uses within the Gingellville sub area. The following land use design principles shall apply to the Village Center land use classification, the Gingellville sub area and the correlated Gingellville Village Center Overlay District:

- Mixed-Use Village Center developments shall be reviewed as part of a Planned Unit Development (PUD).
- Commercial uses shall be limited to low intensity retail, office or professional uses similar to the Restricted Business zoning district (RB).
- "Big Box" commercial uses shall be prohibited. Maximum floor area for commercial use shall be limited and shall be consistent with the Village character.
- Deep parcels shall be reserved for residential uses, but may have frontage retail or flex space that could be townhouse, retail or other similar uses. Single-family residences are favored as the predominant land use at the edges of the district. In mixed use projects, it is expected that detached and attached units would be interspersed with local...
business uses along the frontage of the property. Missing middle housing types are also encouraged in this area.

- Land uses should transition from commercial, or multiple-family, to lower density residential uses including single family detached units to the east and west of Baldwin Road, with appropriate buffers and screening on the perimeter.
- Village Center developments shall promote pedestrian connection and linkage.
- Secondary access shall be required either by parallel access roads or perpendicular access roads from Baldwin Road.
- Rear yard and side yard parking shall be encouraged.
- Pedestrian amenities such as street furniture, benches, lighting, pavers and extensive landscaping shall be required.
- All projects shall demonstrate quality architecture and landscaping consistent with the Village Center.

The conclusion from this analysis is that the Township needs to maintain the existing Gingellville Village Center Overlay District in order to ensure that strip development land use patterns are halted and that new "Village"-style development concepts can take hold. As noted above, this development concept is a traditional village concept that successfully integrates commercial and residential uses. Special emphasis will be placed upon high-quality architecture and landscaping within a pedestrian-friendly environment.

*Village Center Development*

Pedestrian-friendly mixed-use projects are encouraged within the Gingellville Village Center. Village Center developments should promote linkages between various land uses, including neighborhood-oriented retail (left), multi-family residential (right), and single-family residential.

Source: activeain.trulia.com
Pedestrian Plaza as a Public Space Amenity

Sign Design Continuity for Multi-Tenant Commercial Developments
(Complementary colors, common lettering, similar location, uniform materials, size, proportion and background panel)

Gingellville Planning Concepts
Pedestrian Lighting Detail
Antique Street Lamps Mfg. Inc.
(Model # DS7K)

Parking Lot Screening
Pillar Detail

Gingellville Planning Concepts

Parking Lot Screening
Fence Detail
VILLAGE OF LAKE ORION AREA

The Master Plan recognizes the importance of the Village of Lake Orion to the Township. The Village is a commercial and residential center with an attractive downtown and waterfront. The Township and Village share a unique identity within the overall region.

Much of the commercial activity prevalent within this sub-area of the Township is in a linear pattern on Lapeer Road as opposed to larger commercial areas or shopping centers. While understanding that this portion of the Township promotes a mix of office and commercial facilities in close proximity to several neighborhoods, the depth of the commercial land use prohibits regional shopping centers. These smaller-scale commercial centers are also not intended to compete with the larger regional shopping centers in Auburn Hills, Pontiac and Novi.

BROWN ROAD SUB AREA

The Brown Road sub area is geographically consistent with the Brown Road Innovation Zone (BIZ) zoning district. The sub area and BIZ district encourage mixed industrial and commercial uses, and supporting ancillary uses, within large-scale planned developments. The sub area promotes economic development as well as redevelopment, and encourage the elimination of blighted properties. The Master Plan promotes “flex” zoning concepts which will help facilitate redevelopment and minimize impediments to future growth. The Brown Road Area is also intended to encourage collaboration between adjacent property owners in the form of shared access and lot combinations. Parcel consolidation and interior loop roads are encouraged and are represented in the proposed Brown Road Redevelopment Plan illustrated on the following page.

Development within the Brown Road sub area should incorporate low impact design (LID) and participate in Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) practices. New developments shall plan for sale and complementary vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns and improve environmental quality. Special consideration should be given to projects that provide an attractive transition between residential and non-residential properties, and projects which feature a mixture of uses in a well-designed land use arrangement.
Figure A-1. Brown Road Innovation Zone (BIZ) and Brown Road Redevelopment Plan
Access Management / Shared Parking

Interior Road Entrance Area Example

Brown Road / BIZ District
Planning Concepts
Representative Interior Access Road
With Knee Wall and Landscaping

Interior Road Entrance Area

Interior Access Road
Minimum Design Requirements:
4 Ornamental/Shade/Street trees
12 Shrubs
30 Inch knee wall, 24 foot length
20-30 Foot greenbelt landscaped per Section 34.03

Brown Road / BIZ District
Planning Concepts
Street Frontage Landscape Requirements

Planting Requirements:
Road Frontage: 150 feet
Ornamental/Shade/Street Trees @1/30 feet: 5
Shrubs @1/10 feet: 15
24 - 30 inch berm and/or 30 inch knee wall

Buffering between Residential and Non-residential Uses

Planting Requirements:
Property Boundary: 250 feet
Shade Trees @ 1/30 feet: 9
Flowering Trees @ 1/75 feet: 4
Combination of shrubs @ 1/5 feet: 50, wall, fence, or berm 6 feet high

Brown Road / BIZ District Planning Concepts
Buffering Between Use Type D and All Other Use Types

Planting Requirements:
- Property Boundary: 250 feet
- Shrub Trees @ 1/10 feet: 9
- Evergreen Trees @ 1/50 feet: 5
- Flowering Trees @ 1/75 feet: 4
- Combination of shrubs @ 1/5 feet: 50, wall, fence or berm 6 feet high

Buffering Between All Other Use Types

Planting Requirements:
- Property Boundary: 250 feet
- Shrub Trees @ 1/10 feet: 9
- Combination of shrubs @ 1/10 feet: 25, wall, fence or berm 6 feet high

Brown Road / BIZ District
Planning Concepts
Brown Road / BIZ District
Planning Concepts
Appendix D
Market Assessment Survey Summary
Orion Township Market Assessment Summary

The following is a market assessment for Orion Charter Township. The focus is on market conditions and is based on data mining, analytics, and analytical methods. The indicated demand is based on historical data, new data developed on area property sales and rentals, data mined from a survey of area residents, analytics from surveys of several thousand households in neighboring areas of Michigan conducted in the past two years by The Chesapeake Group for other public and private sector clients, and demand forecasting for residential and non-residential activity.

Housing Development Patterns

Orion Township is situated within Oakland County, which provides context for market opportunities within the Township.

a. **Oakland County.** Oakland County has seen substantial growth in households since 2011, or the close of the Great Recession. More than 25,000 new housing units were permitted in Oakland County between 2011 and 2020. Of these units, about 20,500 were single-family homes, and roughly 4,700 were multi-family units. The latter represents 19 percent of all units permitted from 2011 to 2020. The average number of all units permitted between 2011 and 2021 was above the permit number permitted from 2004 through 2010. However, the numbers of units permitted in Oakland County peaked in 2004 and 2005 before the "housing bubble" collapse that followed. There was a statistically significant drop-off in new units permitted in 2020. Several unique factors resulted in the drop-off, not the least of which was the Covid Pandemic. Both single and non-single-family housing unit permits fell.

b. **Orion Township.** Orion Township reported substantial growth in housing units permitted between 2011 and 2020. The Township permitted a total of 1,527 new homes during those years. The increase represents about 6 percent of the Oakland County total. As was the case in Oakland County, there was a statistically significant drop-off in new units permitted in 2020. Furthermore, non-single-family units permits were not issued in five of the ten years in the Township.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oakland County</th>
<th>Orion Township</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Units</td>
<td>Single-family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,155</td>
<td>20,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2011-20</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>1,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per year 2011-20</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>2,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17,170</td>
<td>14,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2004-10</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per year 2004-10</td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>2,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Institutional Influence

The institution that has the most significant impact on the area is General Motors. The Orion GM assembly plant began production almost 50 years ago in the early 1980s. The plant was at a time idled and has changed the type of vehicle produced several times since its inception.

The future of the plant appears to be brighter than the recent past. Several hundred million dollars was and is being reinvested to secure its future. The plant’s production is being based on electronic vehicles. While electronic vehicles represent a small share of all manufactured fleet at this time, it is expected to become a substantial if not dominant share of production by 2025 and beyond.

Resident Survey Analytics

Fundamental to the market assessment is a survey of area residents conducted online. More than 600 "unique" households, defined by IP addresses, responded to the survey. The following are characteristics of the households that responded to the survey.

1. Sample Characteristics

- About 38 percent of the responding households live in zip code 48360, while another 36% live in 48362. An additional 18 percent live in zip code 48359, with the remaining distributed in eight other zip code areas.
- The average number of people per responding household is 2.84.
- Just over one in ten households have only one member.
- The average age of the primary income earner is 54. However, 57 percent of the households have a primary income earner below 54 years old.
- About two in ten responding households have a primary income earner at least sixty-five years of age.
- About 58% of the respondents have a primary earner in the household between 45 to 64 years of age. Age of the Primary Income Earner in the Household is between 45-54 years for about 31% of the respondents.
- The average household owns or leases 2.4 vehicles.
- One-third of the households own two or more vehicles at least five years old, typically associated with lesser monthly loan payments.

2. Employment Conditions

- More than eight in ten households have one or more members employed full-time. Nineteen percent have no one employed full-time, closely paralleling the households where the primary income earner is at least 65 years of age.
- Eleven percent of the households have a member either under-employed or not now employed full-time but would like to be employed full-time.
- About four in ten households’ employment conditions have been impacted by the Covid pandemic.
- The majority of the individuals (71%) impacted by Covid working part-time are between the ages of 35 and 64.
- The majority of the individuals (79%) impacted by Covid wanting full-time work are more concentrated between 45 and 64.
- About 10% of those wanting full-time work impacted by Covid have a high school education or less. The preponderance of those affected has a college degree.
Those impacted are most often associated with the foodservice, automotive, educational, and medical sectors or industries.

Despite Covid, the annual average (mean) total annual household income is $126,000. The mean average is often fifty or more percent greater than the median employed in government statistics but is much more meaningful in demand forecasts. The mean better reflects purchasing power for all goods and services.

3. Spending Analytics
Households generally spend income and assets on three essential commodities.

1. Food
   Grocery spending is a surrogate for convenience shopping in general.
   - The average amount spent weekly on groceries and related merchandise is $146 per household.
   - Three-fourths of the households have not changed their food shopping patterns since the Covid pandemic. Many others will go back to their former practices once the threat of Covid diminishes.
   - Kroger and Meijer are dominant in the market, with a combined market share of 84 percent. Food is also purchased from food service and preparation establishments generally for consumption outside of the home.
   - Before Covid, the majority ate lunch (59%) or dinner (67%) outside the home, purchasing the meal at foodservice operations at least once each week. The frequency of lunch trips may indicate of opportunities for food service establishments to operate during the day and in the evenings.
   - Roughly one-half preferred to eat lunch at "local, non-chain full-service" operations. An even larger proportion of households chose such establishments for dinner.
   - Sixty-two percent defined their frequented foodservice establishment for lunch as being in Orion Township.
   - Sixty-nine percent defined their frequented foodservice establishment for dinner as being in Orion Township.
   - Most dinner trips (86%) were made to food establishments fifteen minutes or less from home, with almost one-half of these within a five to ten-minute drive.

2. Shopping
   Apparel shopping is a surrogate for non-convenience shopping in general.
   - The primary entities most often frequented or from which apparel purchases are made include Kohls and Amazon/other online sources.

   Before the Covid pandemic, substantial online purchases were made by Orion area residents. Online purchases increased during the pandemic.
   - More than one-third (42%) shopped online at least once per week before Covid. About 68 percent shopped online at least twice per month. Therefore, both convenience and non-convenience shopping dollars are exported from the area with regularity prior to Covid.
   - Since Covid, those shopping at least once per week increased to 60 percent. Those shopping online at least twice per month rose to 78 percent.
   - Based on the changes with convenience shopping associated with groceries, post-Covid online sales are expected to be roughly 50 percent weekly and 73 percent at least twice per month.
Because of online options, the blending of commercial development with entertainment is of increasing importance.

- About one in four households had a member partake of or participate in some form of entertainment at least twice each month before Covid.
- About one-fourth of the households had a member that went to see movies at a theater before Covid.
- The frequency of most forms of outdoor recreation activity is substantially above non-participatory entertainment. At least 17 percent of the households have members that participate in an outdoor recreational activity during season or year-round, including all forms of walking, running, boating, and bicycling.
3. Transportation

Across all age groups, the majority defines the availability of places that they can live, recreate, easily walk, and work at or near one location to be good. However, households with primary income earners 25 years of age or younger have the most members who feel the availability of places where they can live, recreate, easily walk, and work at or near one location to be "fair" or "poor."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characterization</th>
<th>Under 25</th>
<th>25 to 34</th>
<th>35 to 44</th>
<th>45 to 54</th>
<th>55 to 64</th>
<th>65 to 74</th>
<th>75 or over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Poor</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Fair</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Good</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Very Good</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Excellent</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, due to online options, the character of commercial development and its blending with walkability are of increasing importance. The majority of residents (72%) define Orion's shopping options to which they can easily walk as being "poor" or "fair."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing options</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of professional and personal services</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping options to which I can easily walk</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orion's shopping experience</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orion's restaurant options</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking experiences that are safe, comfortable, and interesting</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The availability of places that I can live, recreate, easily walk, and work at or near one location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Property Trends Synopsis
Before 2021, residential sales indicated a range of prices per square foot. Factors included location, age of units, and many other factors.

- The average per square foot residential unit sales ranged from a low of $160 to a high of $246 in the general Orion area.
- The average condominium sales ranged from $143 to a high of $186 per square foot.
- Condominium fees ranged from $200 to $225 per month.
- The average sales price for condominiums ranged from a low of $195,000 to a high of $337,000.
- A sampling of retail space sold during the same time frame indicates that the average sale price per square foot was $109. Property or units sold ranged from a low of 600 square feet to a high of more than 48,000 square feet.
- A recorded sampling of office space sold during the same time frame indicates that the average sale price per square foot was $206. The average publicized rent per square foot was 429.
- There are very limited industrial space sales. For those sold, the average sale price was about $93 per square foot.

It is noted that there has been a significant price escalation for the residential property during 2021. Many factors are driving the increases, including but not limited to extremely low mortgage rates, supply limitations partially resulting from the pandemic, limited labor supply, and rapidly rising costs of materials. The cost of construction for non-residential is being driven by the rising cost of materials and limited labor supply.

Housing Market Analytics/Segmentation
The survey of residents indicates the following.

- Ninety-nine percent live in their home full-time.
- Ninety-four percent live there about ten months of the year.
- Ninety-four percent own their homes, and six percent rent.
- Ninety-one percent describe their housing unit as being a single-family home.
- About one-third have lived in their current home for 20 years or more.
- Almost one-fourth have only lived in their current home for less than five years.
- More than one-half (52%) of the households may or are likely to move within the next five years from their Orion area residences.
- The primary potential reasons for the move include changes in lifestyle, changes in the number of household members, and changes in physical or medical conditions.
### Table 21 - Primary Reasons for Move for Those That May or Are Likely to Move in the Next Five Years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lifestyle changes</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decrease in the number of people living in the residence</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes in a household member's physical conditions/medical change</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes in my or other household member's employment likely to result in leaving the area</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes in fiscal conditions</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase in the number of people living in the residence</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing market conditions</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rental conditions</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate from a higher education institution with a degree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- About one-half of those that may move in the next five years say they will stay in Michigan.
- In addition to those that may move, about three in ten households have an individual that will likely create a new household in the next three years.
- Age is not a factor in considering the availability of housing options in the Orion area, with most defining options as "very good" or "excellent."

Not all existing households have monthly payments. There are many reasons households do not have monthly payments, including those living in homes where mortgages are paid off.

- The average monthly payment, including those without payments, is $1,185.
- About 20 percent of the households have no monthly payments reflecting tenure, living with other relatives, and different situations.
- The average monthly payment is $1,490 when those without payments are excluded.
- About one-half of all households have monthly payments between $1,000 and $2,000.
- There is a strong correlation between household income and monthly payments. In general, higher monthly payments are associated with higher-income households.
- Also, and in general, the more bedrooms in the home, the larger the unit in square feet.

![Pie chart showing percentages of move intention: Smaller (20%), Same (33%), Larger (47%)]

For those that may move, almost one-half envision or desire a unit smaller than their current home.
- Whether the desire for a smaller, same-sized or larger home in the future for those likely to move, income is not a contributing factor. The majority for all sized units have annual household incomes above $100,000, reflecting the potential affordability of moving to a new home.
- For the majority seeking a larger home, the unit would likely be greater than 1,500 square feet, with many being 2,000 square feet or more.
- For those likely to move to a smaller unit, the preponderance would seek a home likely in the range of 1,500 to under 2,000 square feet.
- Seventy percent of those who may move define living near shopping as "very" or "extremely" important.
- About two-thirds define living near recreational areas to walk as being "very" or "extremely" important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>19%</th>
<th>23%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>31%</th>
<th>43%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing the importance of various factors.]

**Demand Forecast**

The following are estimates of marketable activity for Orion Township. Adjustments have been made to the survey data for demand forecast purposes based on known biases associated with online sampling. The opportunities are not linked to any specific development proposal or site but are a measure of potential within Orion and its core. The defined units and space may be beyond the holding capacity of available land but are for guidance with planning. Also, the ability to accommodate the demand may be limited by community desires and character.

**a. Housing**

Based on historical patterns in the County, Orion Township, and an additional database derived from The Chesapeake Group's surveys of residents in other communities of the County, the potential for new housing units in Orion Township is defined.

Two scenarios are presented. One is defined as "Continued Trends," while the other is defined as "Market Share." Market share is an important economic concept implying "holding one's own" or maintaining economic parity. To reiterate, neither estimate is linked to the holding capacity of available land, current zoning, or any existing development regulations.
1. In the Continued Trends alternative, Orion Township will support a total of roughly 1,375 new units by 2030. Of the 1,375 units by 2030, 260 units could be non-single-household structures like duplexes, townhomes, and other attached structures. This total does not include any potential for developing an "active adult" community, unique niche opportunities, or the range of assisted living opportunities.

2. In the Market Share alternative, Orion Township will support a total of roughly 1,525 new units by 2030. Of the 1,525 units by 2030, about 290 units could be non-single-household structures. As is the case for the other alternative, the Market Share alternative total does not include any potential for developing an "active adult" community, unique niche opportunities, or the range of assisted living opportunities.

The majority of the units would likely be in the 1,250 to 1,750 square foot range.

b. Retail Goods & Related Services Space

New rooftops result in increased spending and demand for retail goods and related supportable space. It is noted that no jurisdiction can be expected to capture all demand created by any market. Spending will occur in many places, including operations near home and work. Online purchases, vacation spending, and other activity diminish local sales. On the other hand, people working within the area, employed nearby, and those coming to the area for a range of purposes will spend money in Orion. Some dollars are exported, while others are imported. Currently, the survey indicates an opportunity to diminish the exportation of dollars from Orion and other portions of the County residents, particularly in food, food services, and linked entertainment activity.

Based on the anticipated growth in rooftops and derived only from current and future residents of the County, Orion is expected to capture an additional 272,000 square feet of retail goods and related services space by 2030. Excluding transportation and vehicle service space, the figure is about 227,000 square feet.

Other than transportation and vehicle services space, most of the commercial opportunities are appropriate for land/parcels/structures associated with the future core of Orion's commercial areas or neighborhoods. Retail and entertainment are today and will continue to be in the future linked to "entertainment" so that one creates an experience, not merely a shopping trip or a trip to go to a restaurant. Much of the space will be in food services, with smaller regional chains and independent operations likely to garner the largest market share.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 29 - Retail Goods and Related Services*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat/Drink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugstore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc. 2021.

c. **Multi-tenant Office Space**

The office market continues to change with the increased emphasis on flexible work arrangements, safe co-working space, and in-home live/work activity. Added rooftops increase demand for professional services and related space derived from the new households. Rooftop growth and the desire of people to work near home also provide the opportunity for office space growth.

New demand generates between 165,000 and 183,000 square feet of multi-tenant office space by 2030 in the Orion Township. Of this space, between 100,000 and 110,000 square feet can be captured and located outside of the home in existing or new spaces.

Some office space could be targeted toward software development linked to electronic and autonomous vehicle production and electronic vehicle charging systems.

d. **Multi-tenant Industrial Space**

Based on the market share concept and Oakland County’s Economic Development Plan, between 195,000 and 215,000 square feet of new industrial space opportunity exists in Orion Township by 2030. “Flex space” is indicated to be marketable.

Areas of focus for the new activity would include those that follow.
- Start-up entrepreneurial activity in general.
- Electronic vehicle software, battery research or manufacturing, battery storage research and development for both vehicles and solar.
- Digitized software development.
- Drone/aerial autonomous vehicle enhancement and product development.

e. **Composite Opportunities**

In total and without consideration of potential opportunities, such as a large-scale active adult community or the attraction of a major manufacturing or warehouse distribution entity, Orion Township has the opportunity to capture about 1,500 new housing units, 270,000 square feet of new retail and personal services space, and 110,000 square feet of office space.
Orion Township Appendix

Oakland County Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Permits</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Single-family</th>
<th>Non-single</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 thru 2020 total</td>
<td>25,155</td>
<td>20,459</td>
<td>4,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per year</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>2,046</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 thru 2010 total</td>
<td>17,170</td>
<td>14,255</td>
<td>2,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per year</td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>2,036</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>2,842</td>
<td>2,642</td>
<td>3,707</td>
<td>3,196</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>2,705</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>1,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in Single-Family Structures</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>1,976</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>2,744</td>
<td>2,143</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>2,296</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>1,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in All Multi-Family Structures</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in 2-unit Multi-Family Structures</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in 3- and 4-unit Multi-Family Structures</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in 5+ Unit Multi-Family Structures</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>2,462</td>
<td>4,638</td>
<td>6,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in Single-Family Structures</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>1,984</td>
<td>4,050</td>
<td>5,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in All Multi-Family Structures</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in 2-unit Multi-Family Structures</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in 3- and 4-unit Multi-Family Structures</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in 5+ Unit Multi-Family Structures</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>1,179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

Orion Township Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Permits</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Single-family</th>
<th>Non-single</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 thru 2020</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per year</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 thru 2010</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per year</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in Single-Family Structures</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in All Multi-Family Structures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in 2-unit Multi-Family Structures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in 3- and 4-unit Multi-Family Structures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in 5+ Unit Multi-Family Structures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in Single-Family Structures</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in All Multi-Family Structures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in 2-unit Multi-Family Structures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in 3- and 4-unit Multi-Family Structures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in 5+ Unit Multi-Family Structures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

**Single-family Residential Per Square Foot Sale Price in Orion Area 2019-2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Sq. Ft. Sale Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48359</td>
<td>$171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48360</td>
<td>$180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48362</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48362 lakefront</td>
<td>$246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

**Condominiums**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Sq. Footage</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Sq. Ft Cost</th>
<th>Homeowners/condo fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48359</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>305000</td>
<td>$186</td>
<td>$225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48360</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>$195,540</td>
<td>$143</td>
<td>$222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48362</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>$337,000</td>
<td>$178</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.
Retail space Real Estate Transaction Examples

Sale price of about $109/square foot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sq. Ft</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office/Retail</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Retail</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>14,820</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>47,063</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>48,362</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>39,503</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sq. Ft</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3,841</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3,194</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3,347</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>6,705</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Retail</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Retail</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.
Industrial limited examples. Sale price average of about $93/square foot

Zip Codes from Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48360</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48362</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48359</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48348</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48371</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48326</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48370</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48363</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48369</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47362</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48320</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

Number of People Living in The Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of People</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

Age of the Primary Income Earner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cluster</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 or over</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.
Number of People in the Household Employed Full-time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-time Employment</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

Number in Household Employed Full-time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
<th>4 or More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 or over</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

Anyone in the Household Not currently employed or Underemployed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not certain</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone would like to work part-time</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

Whether Employment in Household Impacted by Covid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacted</th>
<th>Percent of HH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.
### Age Category of those Wanting to Work Part-time Impacted by Covid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cluster</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 or over</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

### Age Category of those Wanting to Work Full-time Impacted by Covid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cluster</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 or over</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

### Industry or Area Previous to Covid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry/Area</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foodservice</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/Sales</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.*
### Vehicles per household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of HH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

### Number of Personal Vehicles Owned or Leased per Household and Percent at least Five Years old

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>All Vehicles Percent of HH</th>
<th>Percent of HH with Vehicle at least 5 yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

### Walk or Bicycle for Employment Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Once/wk or more</th>
<th>Few X/mon</th>
<th>Once/mon</th>
<th>Few/yr</th>
<th>Less often</th>
<th>Rarely/never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

### Average Household Incomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,500 to $9,999</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 to $249,999</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000 or more</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

General Amount Spent on Food/Grocery-related Merchandise in a Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $35</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35 to $44.99</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45 to $59.99</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60 to $74.99</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75 to $99.99</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 to $124.99</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125 to $149.99</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150 to $199.99</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200 to $249.99</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250 to $299.99</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300 or more</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

Change in Pattern Since Covid and Belief that Change is Permanent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Grocery Shopping &amp; Permanence</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change from before.</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now have most groceries delivered and will likely be permanent.</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now have most groceries delivered but not likely to continue after the threat of the virus has diminished.</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now use pick-up service versus shopping myself and will likely continue after virus threat has diminished.</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now use pick-up service but will go back to shopping once the threat of the virus has diminished.</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not certain or applicable.</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

Store frequented/Market Share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kroger</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meijer</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldi</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Foods</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costco</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trader Joe's</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood Market</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam's Club</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walmart</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.
Frequency of Eating Outside the Home at a Foodservice Establishment pre-Covid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Dinner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A few times/week</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once/week</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About twice/month</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once/ month</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 9 times/year</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice/year</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often than once/year</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

Type of Foodservice establishment Frequentated for Lunch and Dinner Pre-Covid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Establishment</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Dinner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A national or regional chain full-service, sit-down restaurant</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A local non-chain independent full-service, sit-down restaurant</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A local non-chain independent limited-service restaurant</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast casual operation (like Chipotle or Noodles)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food operation (like McDonalds or Taco Bell)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All you can eat buffet</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub shop</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

Orion Location of Lunch and Dinner Establishment Pre-Covid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Orion</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Dinner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.
Drive Time to Dinner Establishment Frequented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drive Time</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 minutes</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 minutes</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 minutes</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 25 minutes</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 25 minutes</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not certain or applicable</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of the Operation and Market Share for Apparel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kohl's</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon/Online</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costco</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Navy</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordstrom</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macy's</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loft</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie Bauer</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshalls</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meijer</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Crew</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stitch Fix</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbots</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walmart</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Taylor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banana Republic</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Jill</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCP</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lululemon</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athleta</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass Pro Shop</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckle</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicos</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evereve</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Bryant</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam's Club</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrid</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice Blessed</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exportation of Dollars Via the Internet Pre and Since Covid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Online or Catalog PRIOR to Covid</th>
<th>Since Covid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A few times/week</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once/week</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About twice/month</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once/ month</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 9 times/year</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice/year</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often than once/year</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Current Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of the Home</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>single-family home</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duplex</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>townhouse</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loft</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>condominium</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farm</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student housing on the campus of a higher education institution</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenure in Current Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 years or less</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4 years</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 years</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more years</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.
Potential to Move in the Next Five Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely to Move</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

Primary Reasons for Move

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life-style changes</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decrease in the number of people living in the residence</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes in a household member's physical conditions/medical change</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes in mine or other household member's employment likely to result in leaving the area</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes in fiscal conditions</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase in the number of people living in the residence</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing market conditions</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rental conditions</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate from a higher education institution with a degree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

Likelihood of Staying in Michigan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stay</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

Potential for Generation of a New Household from Existing Families in the next three Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New household created in 3 years</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, one person</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, more than one person</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure or maybe</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.
### Housing Options in Orion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>25 to 34</th>
<th>35 to 44</th>
<th>45 to 54</th>
<th>55 to 64</th>
<th>65 to 74</th>
<th>75 or over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Fair</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Good</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Very Good</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Excellent</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

### Current Monthly Payments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Range</th>
<th>Percent of HH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $750/month</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$750 to $999/month</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 to $1,249/month</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250 to $1,499/month</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500 to $1,749/month</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,750 to $1,999/month</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000 to $2,249/month</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,250 to $2,499/month</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500 to $2,999/month</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000 or more/month</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

### Housing Monthly Payment and Average Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$20,000 to $29,999</th>
<th>$30,000 to $49,999</th>
<th>$50,000 to $74,999</th>
<th>$75,000 to $99,999</th>
<th>$100,000 to $149,999</th>
<th>$150,000 to $199,999</th>
<th>$200,000 to $249,999</th>
<th>$250,000 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $750/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$750 to $999/month</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 to $1,249/month</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250 to $1,499/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500 to $1,749/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,750 to $1,999/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000 to $2,249/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,250 to $2,499/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500 to $2,999/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000 or more/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Bedrooms and Square Footage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Square Footage</th>
<th>1-Bedroom</th>
<th>2-Bedroom</th>
<th>3-Bedroom</th>
<th>4 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 750 square feet</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750 to 999 square feet</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 1,499 square feet</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 1,999 square feet</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 to 2,499 square feet</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 to 2,999 square feet</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 to 3,499 square feet</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500 square feet or more</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

Number of Bedrooms and Monthly Payment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Payment</th>
<th>1-Bedroom</th>
<th>2-Bedrooms</th>
<th>3-Bedrooms</th>
<th>4 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $750/month</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$750 to $999/month</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 to $1,249/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250 to $1,499/month</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500 to $1,749/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,750 to $1,999/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000 to $2,249/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,250 to $2,499/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500 to $2,999/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000 or more/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

Monthly Payment by Square Footage of Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Payment</th>
<th>Under 750 Square feet</th>
<th>750 to 999 Square feet</th>
<th>1,000 to 1,499 Square feet</th>
<th>1,500 to 1,999 Square feet</th>
<th>2,000 to 2,499 Square feet</th>
<th>2,500 to 2,999 Square feet</th>
<th>3,000 to 3,499 Square feet</th>
<th>3,500 square feet or +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $750/month</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$750 to $999/month</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 to $1,249/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250 to $1,499/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500 to $1,749/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,750 to $1,999/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000 to $2,249/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,250 to $2,499/mon</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500 to $2,999/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000 or more/month</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

For Those That Are Likely or May Move, desired Size of the Next Home Compared to Current Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Scale</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smaller</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

Income Level of Those Likely to Move By Desired Relative Size of the Next Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Cluster</th>
<th>Smaller</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Larger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,500 to $9,999</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 to $249,999</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000 or more</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

Current Square Footage and Desired Scale if the Next Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Home Size</th>
<th>Smaller</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Larger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 750 square feet</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750 to 999 square feet</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 1,499 square feet</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 1,999 square feet</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Importance of Select Characteristics for the Next Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Live few minutes from work</th>
<th>Near Rec Areas to Walk</th>
<th>Near Shopping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely important</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35.38%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30.73%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23.28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so important</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7.82%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2.79%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation of the Availability of Places that One Can Live, Recreate, Easily Walk, and Work at Or Near One Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characterization</th>
<th>Under 25</th>
<th>25 to 34</th>
<th>35 to 44</th>
<th>45 to 54</th>
<th>55 to 64</th>
<th>65 to 74</th>
<th>75 or over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Poor</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Fair</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Good</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Very Good</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Excellent</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation of Orion's Characteristics Prior to Covid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing options</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of professional and personal services</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping options to which I can easily walk</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orion's shopping experience</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orion's restaurant options</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking experiences that are safe, comfortable, and interesting</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The availability of places that I can live, recreate, easily walk, and work at or near one location</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.
### Entertainment & Leisure Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Covid Frequency</th>
<th>Movies</th>
<th>Profess Sports</th>
<th>College Sports</th>
<th>Shows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A few times/week</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once/week</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About twice/month</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once/ month</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 9 times/year</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice/year</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often than once/year</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

### Frequency of Outdoor Recreational Activity in which One or More Household Member Participates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>More than once/wk</th>
<th>Once/wk</th>
<th>Few X/month</th>
<th>About every month</th>
<th>4-9 X/yr</th>
<th>Few X/yr</th>
<th>Once/yr</th>
<th>Less often or never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birding/Nature Walks</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running/Jogging</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

### Types of activity or business desired in order of frequency noted

Another grocery store than Kroger (Ninos style**, Whole Foods, Trader Joes)
Fresh food or Farmers Market
Hospital & Related
Better/Healthy Restaurants
24 hour urgent care
Tech industry
Bakery
Butcher
Manufacturing
Household growth (conservative Estimate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units/year</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Single-family</th>
<th>Non-single</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continued Trends</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market Share</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

Retail Goods and Related Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2021 Sales</th>
<th>2030 Sales</th>
<th>2021-30 Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>167,700</td>
<td>182,668</td>
<td>14,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat/Drink</td>
<td>241,390</td>
<td>262,933</td>
<td>21,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise</td>
<td>729,628</td>
<td>794,743</td>
<td>65,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>60,663</td>
<td>66,076</td>
<td>5,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>388,072</td>
<td>422,704</td>
<td>34,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugstore</td>
<td>87,703</td>
<td>95,529</td>
<td>7,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>154,260</td>
<td>168,025</td>
<td>13,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>384,918</td>
<td>419,266</td>
<td>34,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service</td>
<td>239,558</td>
<td>260,938</td>
<td>21,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>596,951</td>
<td>650,224</td>
<td>53,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>3,050,843</td>
<td>3,323,106</td>
<td>272,270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2021 Sales</th>
<th>2030 Sales</th>
<th>2021-30 Sales</th>
<th>2021 Space</th>
<th>2030 Space</th>
<th>2021-30 Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>$105,424,000</td>
<td>$114,833,000</td>
<td>$9,408,000</td>
<td>167,700</td>
<td>182,668</td>
<td>14,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat/Drink</td>
<td>101,384,000</td>
<td>110,432,000</td>
<td>9,048,000</td>
<td>241,390</td>
<td>262,933</td>
<td>21,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise</td>
<td>122,931,000</td>
<td>133,902,000</td>
<td>10,971,000</td>
<td>729,628</td>
<td>794,743</td>
<td>65,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>26,356,000</td>
<td>28,708,000</td>
<td>2,352,000</td>
<td>60,663</td>
<td>66,076</td>
<td>5,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>118,410,000</td>
<td>128,977,000</td>
<td>10,567,000</td>
<td>388,072</td>
<td>422,704</td>
<td>34,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugstore</td>
<td>89,457,000</td>
<td>97,440,000</td>
<td>7,983,000</td>
<td>87,703</td>
<td>95,529</td>
<td>7,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>55,598,000</td>
<td>60,560,000</td>
<td>4,962,000</td>
<td>154,260</td>
<td>168,025</td>
<td>13,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>94,459,000</td>
<td>102,888,000</td>
<td>8,430,000</td>
<td>384,918</td>
<td>419,266</td>
<td>34,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Service</td>
<td>98,402,000</td>
<td>107,184,000</td>
<td>8,782,000</td>
<td>239,558</td>
<td>260,938</td>
<td>21,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>149,479,000</td>
<td>162,819,000</td>
<td>13,340,000</td>
<td>596,951</td>
<td>650,224</td>
<td>53,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$961,900,000</td>
<td>$1,047,743,000</td>
<td>$85,843,000</td>
<td>3,050,843</td>
<td>3,323,106</td>
<td>272,270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>2021 Sales</th>
<th>2030 Sales</th>
<th>2021-30 Sales</th>
<th>2021 Space</th>
<th>2030 Space</th>
<th>2021-30 Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>12,107,799</td>
<td>13,188,339</td>
<td>1,080,540</td>
<td>44,028</td>
<td>47,958</td>
<td>3,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper/Paper Prod.</td>
<td>6,427,597</td>
<td>7,001,217</td>
<td>573,620</td>
<td>32,138</td>
<td>35,006</td>
<td>2,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts/Cards/Novel.</td>
<td>21,375,497</td>
<td>23,283,117</td>
<td>1,907,620</td>
<td>71,252</td>
<td>77,610</td>
<td>6,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsstands</td>
<td>1,195,832</td>
<td>1,302,552</td>
<td>105,720</td>
<td>2,392</td>
<td>2,605</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Rent/Sales</td>
<td>19,432,270</td>
<td>21,166,470</td>
<td>1,734,200</td>
<td>97,161</td>
<td>105,832</td>
<td>8,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>29,895,800</td>
<td>32,563,800</td>
<td>2,668,000</td>
<td>119,583</td>
<td>130,255</td>
<td>10,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$961,900,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,047,743,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$85,843,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,050,843</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,323,106</strong></td>
<td><strong>272,270</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2021.*
MEMORANDUM

TO: Contiguous Municipal Legislative Bodies, Oakland County Planning, Public Utilities, and Railroads

FROM: Independence Township Planning Commission

DATE: March 14, 2022

RE: NOTICE OF INTENT TO UPDATE THE MASTER PLAN

In accordance with the Michigan Planning Enabling Act (PA 33 of 2008 as amended), the Charter Township of Independence is preparing an update to the existing Master Plan and requests your cooperation and comment on the Plan. Please note that all submittals of this Plan are to be made electronically via e-mail unless we hear otherwise from those being sent notice.

Please be aware that you will be receiving a digital draft of the update for comment upon completion of the draft plan. Hard (paper) copies may be provided upon request. At the time the Master Plan update is ready for your review, we will provide a second notice and directions on where to send comments and time limits for doing so.

We thank you for your consideration in this matter. If you have any questions or comments on the Independence Township Master Plan update process at this time, please contact the Township offices at:

Independence Township Planning & Zoning Department
6483 Waldon Center Drive
Clarkston, Michigan 48346
(248) 625-8111 (Option 2)
Attn: Brian Oppmann, Director
boppmann@indtwp.com