Public Hearing at 7:05 p.m.: PPC-22-18, 3850 Joslyn Rd., Special Land Use for a Gas Station with a Drive-Thru, located at 3850 Joslyn Rd. 09-28-376-031.

1. OPEN MEETING
2. ROLL CALL
3. MINUTES
   A. 6-15-22, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes
   B. 6-15-22, Planning Commission Public Hearing Minutes for PPC-2022-22, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance #78, Industrial Complex, Articles 19 & 27
4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL
5. BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENT - NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY
6. CONSENT AGENDA
7. NEW BUSINESS
   A. PPC-22-18, 3850 Joslyn Rd., Special Land Use request for a Gas Station with a drive-thru and Site Plan, located at 3850 Joslyn Rd., parcel 09-28-376-031
8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
   A. PC-2021-07, 5-Year Master Plan Update
9. PUBLIC COMMENTS
10. COMMUNICATIONS
11. PLANNERS REPORT/EDUCATION
    A. Flyer regarding MTA Events at the Bavarian Inn Lodge in Frankenmuth, MI
12. COMMITTEE REPORTS
13. FUTURE PUBLIC HEARINGS
    A. 07-20-22 at 7:05 p.m. PC-2021-07, 5-Year Master Plan Update Public Hearing
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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The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, June 15, 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
Derek Brackon, Commissioner
Joe St. Henry, Secretary

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:
None.

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

2. ROLL CALL
As noted above.

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:
Alan Hall Josh Yates

3. MINUTES
A. 6-01-22, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes
Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commission Gingell to approve the 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 and opened the Public Hearing at 7:05 p.m. for case PPC-2022-22, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance #78, Industrial Complex, Articles 19 and 27.

Chairman Reynolds closed the PPC-2022-22 Public Hearing at 7:08 p.m. and reconvened the regular Planning Commission meeting at 7:08 p.m.

7. NEW BUSINESS
A. PPC-22-23, BACA Systems Site Plan Modification, located at 101 Premier Dr., (Sidwell #09-35-451-001).

Chairman Reynolds asked the applicant to state his name and address for the record and to give a brief overview of their presentation.

Mr. Andrew Russo representing BACA Systems 101 Premier Dr. the applicant presented.

Mr. Russo stated that they have been in the building since 2018 and they have outgrown the building. They had dumpsters outside since they have been there, and with the compactors, since they moved into the building. They slowly took over more and more of the building and now with the dumpsters outside, they found out that the site plan did not have it originally. They have outgrown the building to where they have to store some stuff outside, they are looking at moving buildings. They have purchased land in Orion Township to build a new manufacturing building of approximately 100,000-sq. ft. on Brown Rd. So, for the time being, until they are able to build that building, they are looking to get a site plan modification to allow the dumpsters on the side as well as some outdoor storage.

Planner Wojciechowski read through his review date stamped June 3, 2022.

Engineer Landis read through his review date stamped June 6, 2022.

Chairman Reynolds said there was a review from the Fire Marshal with no explicit comments. He added that they received a Public Service review, WRC, and they also had a site walk done.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked why on the side yard and not in the rear yard? Mr. Russo replied that if they look at the actual building there is 49-ft. on the rear there is no way to actually have a truck, like a garbage truck, to put a dumpster in the back, or even access the side. It is 49-ft., and it is an embankment that goes up because there is a hill where it is going in. The next building above is about a 20-ft. elevation increase over that 49-ft. There is no actual way to put a dumpster in the back.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked about the outdoor storage on the side as opposed to in the rear? Mr. Russo replied said they need to have forklift access to the outdoor storage, so there is no way to put that in the back without trying to go through a bunch of earth moving and wasn’t sure exactly if that was possible because there is a utility easement back there. There are a lot of high-transmission powerlines that run along the rear of the building.

Chairman Reynolds said he did the site walk on this, keep in mind it is on a corner lot too, so by definition they technically have that side yard to side yard condition. It is technically the rear to Lapeer, but their address is Premier, so it is the side yard.

Chairman Reynolds said he didn’t have any major comments on this, obviously, it is a thriving business in their community, and trying to make something right. He asked if there were any issues with addressing their ordinance as it relates to trash enclosures, and gates, all the comments that their professional consultants came up with? Mr. Russo replied that they were looking for it to be Dura-Crete precast walls, they are located in Warren, and they actually make them. They were going to do that rather than trying to do mason walls from the ground up because this doesn’t impact water flow because they can have them raised off of the ground so water can flow naturally. He added that he believed the gate they were going to do is going to be galvanized metal and then a Trex type of composite wood privacy gates, those are what they had quoted from them.
Vice-Chairman Gross stated procedurally since this requires a variance, he believed they had to deny this site plan and then it goes to the Zoning Board of Appeals, and if the Zoning Board of Appeals approves it, it in effect approves the site plan. Chairman Reynolds said correct.

Mr. Russo asked if this lives with the building, then in perpetuity of the site plan change? Chairman Reynolds replied yes.

Mr. Russo stated they were planning on moving within a year and a half, but they are getting a site plan change, and questioned if that lives with it infinitely? Chairman Reynolds replied correct, so in order to break the ordinance requirement they have to seek a site plan modification, and because it doesn't adhere to the ordinance that is why they are going to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Russo said they are trying to leave the building to move to build another building on Brown Rd.

Chairman Reynolds said that if they were to go back to the way it was before that still is also allowed. What they are applying for is the ability to have storage outside, their dumpster enclosures, and their technical side yard.

Mr. Russo stated that the dumpsters have been there for five years, so if they were to forgo any outside storage. They were trying to move into a bigger building in the same Township.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that this whole issue came up with a fire inspection. So, it was the Fire Marshal that had an issue with the configuration out there. If the applicant is asking to withdraw his request for outdoor storage and everything that he wants to do meets the ordinance and doesn't necessitate a change in site plan that is fine but what was there before and they say five years he didn't know, she is not ordinance enforcement or the Fire Department that visited. What was there if it didn't meet the ordinance, they cannot let them continue on. What is in the plan here is exactly what it looks like today if they go there. They are approving what is in the plan but didn't like what it was today. Chairman Reynolds replied no, it doesn't follow the ordinance as it sits right now. What they are applying for is to gain permission to actually do what was done there previously. It doesn't mean that it can't go back to anything in the side yard but to have a dumpster enclosure and outdoor storage specifically, that needs to seek a variance. They are not the only ones whom this occurred that they have been asked to come back and get legitimate approval for.

Mr. Russo asked if they could apply to not have to put the enclosure around it because this is a lot of money, it is $45,000 for an enclosure. When they leave the building, the enclosure still stays there, and the new tenant may or may not need a compactor and a roll-off and now they have infinitely long mason walls installed. That is the bigger thing, for $45,000 they can put better landscaping on Brown Rd., there are a lot of things that they can do with $45,000.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated that if they are already going to the Zoning Board of Appeals an additional variance could be sought to ask to not screen the outdoor storage. She stated that no one has ever asked, and she had no idea their success rate.

Chairman Reynolds said that their ordinance whether it is in the side yard or not asks for trash to be provided within an enclosure. Whether they seek an additional variance from ZBA that is up to them.

Mr. Russo asked if it was possible to get a temporary variance? Chairman Reynolds replied no, there isn’t a temporary one. There could be a request made to the ZBA to not have a trash
enclosure. He asked if they need to make that within their motion. They are asking if they get approval for outdoor storage and a dumpster in the side yard, they are also asking in addition to what they have seen this evening, no enclosure. They would have to make that part of the motion, correct? Planning & Zoning Director Girling believed that their motion would be to be denied, go to the ZBA for XYZ, and if those are granted then perhaps the plans are approved with the few things that are missing. If they go to the ZBA for XYZ and only get X & Y they might have to come back with the plan reflecting on how they are going to put in Y. Because if he is asking for a variance to not screen it and the ZBA says no they can have their dumpster in the side yard and they will not give them variance to not screen their outdoor storage then they have no choice but to come back and show the screening. Their plan is not going to add any screening to it because that was a requirement that they are not showing.

Mr. Russo asked if the building already had a variance for it in the side yard as it stands today because the enclosure that was on the original site plan was built which was still in the side yard. He didn’t know if there was a variance that it could be on the side yard and that covers the side yard as a whole. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said she could research it, she felt that they would have researched it to this point but will double-check that. If there is already a variance that has been granted on this property allowing a dumpster on the side, and it depends on the motion, if it was a dumpster in the side located “right here” is different than a dumpster, anywhere on the side.

Mr. Russo stated that the site plan originally has it there and this site plan was approved when the building was built. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said it could be a different ordinance the ordinance could have been amended since that time but would research it for him. Mr. Russo said he was just wondering because he didn’t know how it works. They could say it is the side yard and covers the side yard or if it was a variance for the exact location.

Chairman Reynolds said that the Planning staff would be happy to look back at historical records to give them the findings of the motion when it was made.

Planner Wojciechowski stated that the plan up there was not the plan that they reviewed. This plan shows a chain-link fence with slats, the plans they have shows a proposed pre-cast masonry wall. He didn’t know what else was different. Typically, they would like to know if the site plan was going to change.

Mr. Alan Panley 3835 Buckingham Ave. Berkley, MI. He stated that the only difference is the chain-link fence is replaced with a pre-cast masonry wall.

Chairman Reynolds said that with the submitted plan, obviously, there is some discrepancies or suggestion that the plan they are seeing up on the screen is slightly different. They are going to go with the plan that was reviewed.

Planner Wojciechowski said that obviously they would have come a little more prepared if they would have known that they were going to be changing. The Planning Commission does have the ability to waive screening for outdoor storage, but that ordinance envisions it being in the rear yard. He would have to look a little deeper into if the ZBA is granting a variance for outdoor storage do they know it is in the side yard does that then come back to the Planning Commission. He didn’t have the answer for that right now, they only reviewed the plans that were submitted.

Chairman Reynolds stated that they are looking for outdoor storage and a dumpster enclosure in the side yard. He asked if they are also asking if that enclosure can be permitted and not be screened? Mr. Russo said he would like to have four things, the dumpster on the side, outdoor
storage on the side, no enclosure on the outside storage, and no enclosure on the dumpster. If there are four separate things then if one gets shot down, then they have to build an enclosure around the one.

Chairman Reynolds stated that he would be comfortable with no enclosure if it was just a small period of time, temporary.

Secretary St. Henry said these are extenuating circumstances, their plans are to move to a larger facility, they are a longtime Orion corporate entity. He has no problem with granting, or at least being comfortable with no enclosures on either of them, for a year and a half, if that is how long they can get the facility up and running, more power to them.

Mr. Russo stated that they signed on the land in April and as soon as they can get plans through, actually the same group, to get plans submitted and approved to build the other building they want to move out. It is tight when they don't have space to move around, they are as eager to move as they can be.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that the Planning Commission denies the site plan approval for PPC-22-23, BACA Systems Site Plan Amendment, located at 101 Premier Dr., parcel number 09-35-451-001 for plans date stamped received May 20, 2022. This denial is for, 1) the outdoor storage in a side yard is in violation of the Zoning Ordinance requirements; 2) a dumpster location in the side yard; 3) the dumpster screening as a requirement by the ordinance; 4) screening around the outdoor storage. This denial recognizes that this is a modification to a previously approved site plan and the constructed building was in accordance with that approval; the proposed outdoor storage although it is in a side yard is in violation of Section 28.19. Because this is a unique situation with a parcel that has two fronts and this could in effect be considered almost a rear yard but it is still in violation of the ordinance and therefore requires a Zoning Board of Appeals approval on those four items, and if those four items are deemed approved by the Zoning Board with waivers that this would not have to come back before the Planning Commission and the site plan would be considered approved as revised.

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds asked if it was intended that the no screening would be a temporary item or permanent? Vice-Chairman Gross replied that it would be up to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Chairman Reynolds asked if there is a condition or motion by the ZBA to approve will the applicant be required to address the comments per the Planner for plans submitted? Vice-Chairman Gross replied yes.

Vice-Chairman Gross amended the motion, Commissioner Walker re-supported that the temporary screening would be up to the ZBA and that the applicant will be required to address the comments per the Planners review for plans submitted.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling asked what if only a few of the variances are granted? Chairman Reynolds asked if there was a scenario in which if only some of the variances are granted that there would still be a conditional approval? Chairman Reynolds said if they are not provided with the screening requirement is there still a conditional approval on the plan? Vice-Chairman Gross replied then they would be required that they screen it. Chairman Reynolds said as a clarification of the motion if...
there isn’t a variance granted for the screening would have to be provided and therefore
would still be a conditional approval, correct? Vice-Chairman Gross replied correct.

Commissioner Walker said when they come in front of the ZBA he could see pitfalls in
this matter. He is on the ZBA, but he only has one vote on the ZBA. He thought it would
be very important that they make sure that the other members of the Board understand
their unique situation. Without their unique situation, this has no chance of passing. He
thought they might have a good chance to get that passed. When they prepare for that
meeting make sure that they explain the timing of this whole thing. It is not that they are
leaving the building and they are moving to someplace in Tennessee.

Mr. Russo stated that they would like to stay in Orion Township, it has been awesome,
they used to be Macomb County, then Auburn Hills, and now in Orion Township.

Secretary St. Henry said to be very clear that they are staying in the same complex. Mr.
Russo said they are actually moving to the property right next to Esys on Brown Rd. so
they will be building a 100,000 plus sq.-ft. building there. Secretary St. Henry said to
make sure that they spell all that, so they know what their situation is.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said if they go to the ZBA, and so this is denied
unless they get the variances. If there is something besides the screening that they
do n’t get the dumpster screening or the dumpster location, they have a site plan that is
denied, so she would think that the motion might have something saying if one of those
is denied they have to see it back? Do they not want to see it back? Do they not want
to see a plan that contains these things?

Secretary St. Henry asked what would they see different on a site plan if it came back to
them? Sounds like the enclosures are the issue.

Chairman Reynolds said the other issue is when plans come back, and they don’t ask
for their consultant to review it it’s purely on Planning & Zoning Director Girling to
acknowledge that the changes exist and that the plan is still adequate for their approval.

Secretary St. Henry stated that if it is clearly just this enclosure issue, he would trust that
Planning & Zoning Director Girling would be able to handle that and make sure it is done
the right way versus going through the whole process again and having the Planners
review it again, schedule it and get it before them. Chairman Reynolds said that it
doesn’t have anything to do with necessarily appearing back here it is more or less just
checking the boxes. Their plan reviewer is Giffels Webster, so the point is the plan
reviewer is not Planning & Zoning Director Girling is their coordinator. Secretary St.
Henry thought that Planning & Zoning Director Girling could coordinate that with the
Planner. It is not very efficient to go through this whole process again for something as
simple as those if they are denied by the ZBA. Chairman Reynolds said in his statement
he said that he would like it to go to the Planner and Planning & Zoning Director Girling
to coordinate that but not come back here. Secretary St. Henry said yes, that is his
opinion, he didn’t think it was an efficient use of their time.

Commissioner Walker asked Planning & Zoning Director Girling how would she prefer to
handle it? Planning & Zoning Director Girling replied that if they do not want to see it
back, she preferred that the directive is to have the consultants rereview it. They are
already having to look at it for the criteria that they are missing in their review, so looking
for those plus he does the review. If they have one set of eyes that have done it the
entire time versus somebody different, she doesn’t do the reviews the planner does.
Chairman Reynolds suggested on the motion that the administrative review include being reviewed by their professional consultants.

Vice-Chairman Gross amended the motion, Commission Walker re-supported that the administrative review includes being reviewed by their professional consultants.

Chairman Reynolds said it is a motion to deny based on the following findings of fact: the outdoor storage and the screening of outdoor storage, the outdoor dumpster enclosure, and the screening of the outdoor dumpster enclosure being in the side yard with the condition that it would be approved if the variances are sought if essentially the enclosure requirements are not granted that they would still be approved and the applicant would have to provide the screening of those enclosures. The condition of their approval would be that it would be an administrative approval with a review from their professional consultants, and the applicant is required to address the concerns in the Planners review.

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

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
A. PC-2022-10, The River Church Site Plan & 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).

Chairman Reynolds asked the applicant to give a brief overview of their application.

Mr. Alan Hall with Architectural Planners Incorporated (API), at 5101 Williams Lake Rd. Waterford, MI. They also had Pastor Yates from The River Church that could ask any questions based on the Church.

Mr. Hall said that The River Church has recently acquired the existing church that has been there for a while.

Mr. Hall said that The River Church has eight locations in the state of Michigan. Their headquarters are in Holly, MI and the newly acquired facility is in Orion Township at 3920 S. Baldwin Rd. The project is on the NW corner of Gregory and Baldwin Rd. He showed them an older aerial to show them the original Baldwin Rd. and there were two existing buildings right at the corner that have been demolished. The church is the brown-roofed building right to the north of that. The property is three separate parcels that combine into one that is approximately 5.5-acres. The existing church used to be Gingelville Community Church, they have been in the community for over 70 years, and it is still acting as a church, and they are still worshiping and doing the same thing that Gingelville Community Church did in the past. The only change in the church itself was the administration.

Mr. Hall stated that The River Church now has possession of it. They already have a permit to do the façade improvements of the building. He showed them the construction pictures right on Baldwin Rd. They may have seen some of the improvements as they go up and down Baldwin Rd. They have a building permit for all four facades right now. Architecturally they were instructed to take a look at the property and basically solve two separate items, one was to wayfinding the site and the other is the handicap accessibility issues inside the church and on the site. He showed them an up-to-date aerial, it shows a round-a-bout at Gregory at Baldwin and the configuration of Baldwin Rd. The main entrance is right off Baldwin through a boulevard-type entrance. The church is very close to Baldwin Rd. now and so they are now
making it look modern. There is an existing egress access corridor that goes from the parking lot to Gregory Rd. This was an item on the Fire Department letter that says they are approving the plan, based conditional upon the church having permission to use that access road. They have since then got the easement, and they looked at it and the church wasn’t listed properly on the easement. So, that now is at Oakland County Road Commission at their legal department, and they haven’t given them a sway either way but didn’t see why they would deny it at this point.

Mr. Hall said that the addition that they are presenting today is in the back of the building and is pretty much blocked by the existing building from Gregory Rd. and Baldwin Rd. They really can’t see the addition from either road.

Mr. Hall said they are trying to solve the problem of wayfinding the site. Currently, on the site, it is difficult to see where the front door is. This plan will give them an entry that everyone can see, and it will be at the lower level so it will be an easy handicap accessible on the lower floor, and the elevator that goes to the second floor.

Mr. Hall stated that on the floor plan the only additions are stairs and an elevator. The stairs are a little bit wider than what is existing right now, and the elevator is large enough to have a casket in it because the sanctuary is on the second floor. Right now, they can’t enter the fellowship hall directly from the outside without going through a ramp, so now they can go right through the front door right to the fellowship hall on the same level. They are also adding unisex ADA restrooms on that level.

Mr. Hall showed them the second floor with the elevator and the stairs and then directly into the narthex. To the right is where the existing sanctuary is, and it can hold a maximum of 300 people. To the left is a kid’s area that has seven new unisex type ADA restrooms.

Mr. Halls said that the addition is basically a split-faced block, very modern looking with metal facia, and it is 26-ft. 8-inches tall. There was a comment on the Planners review about the roof pitch, the ordinance states that it has to be a 4/12 pitch or greater in the area. They are asking for a waiver on this for a flat roof because they can’t see it from any direction from the public except on the site itself. They are trying to screen their RTU units that are on the roof, so they won’t be able to see the RTUs.

Mr. Hall said that the site plan itself the gray area of the parking lot is what is being adjusted. In the perimeter of the parking lot, there are gray areas that are to get to the isles in the existing parking lot to meet the ordinance. The gray area in the center is being modified to have handicap parking and to get the entrance so it is active with the cars and the grades are all situated that way.

Mr. Hall said there is future ground-mounted units side discharge, into the building that will be screened by a screen wall that is part of their landscaping now they will put the units in later and put the screen walls there.

Mr. Halls stated that the Fire Department when they had their review, they wanted the building to be sprinkled which it is, it is fully suppressed. The existing right now is not, so that is a major cost to get it suppressed. Being that the water service is coming from Baldwin Rd. and the Fire Department is requesting that that be transferred to the west side of the building, that is going to remove a parking space. Right now, they have 101 parking spaces on the property, and they have 300 people in the sanctuary, so they are only required to have 100 so by losing that one space they are still within the tolerance of the ordinance.
Mr. Hall said that right now there are two existing Detroit Edison power poles on the property, they have lights on them. The one to the north they put a green island around there and some landscaping to make that safer because right now they could hit it. The other pole to the south they modified to make it safer with the grades. They are also adding retaining walls, the highest part of the retaining wall for grade differences of 30-inches or less so there is no need for any guardrails.

Mr. Hall noted that the Fire Department also asked if their pumper truck could make it to the entrance. Their civil engineer did this before the meeting so it is not in their packet, but they wanted to show them that it does meet so it can get around there through the entrance and back out again.

Mr. Hall said that they are putting in seven pole lights to make the existing parking lot brighter. Then they do have more lighting on the canopy.

Mr. Hall said on the landscape plan they are showing six new trees in the parking lot in the back, and they have three new trees by Baldwin. When the road was put in and the existing church was there, there is just no room so there is a drain in there, and the way the boulevard entrance is there is not a lot of room to do anything, so they are asking for some waivers on some of the planning comments. They did bring the sidewalks down from either side of the south and north sidewalks to connect to the public sidewalk. There is a grade differential there because of what the road is now, so there are steps being added.

Planner Wojciechowski read through his review date stamped June 7, 2022.

Engineer Landis read through his review date stamped June 8, 2022.

Chairman Reynolds stated that the Public Services did review without any major comment, similar to OHM’s overview. Their Fire Marshal did have a number of comments, the pumper truck overlay template was something to be reviewed which was shown here this evening. They were also talking about the Fire Department connection being located at the SW corner of the existing structure near the secondary access drive that leads to the site. Department access is similar to what was mentioned in the review that the existing alley is critical because the 30-ft. in height, or three stories high structure shall not have fewer than two means of Fire Department access for each structure. Without that alleyway, the site plan should not be approved. The fourth item was access roads being marked per their ordinance at 20 to 26 feet being posted with NO PARKING FIRE LANE on both sides, and if it is greater than 26-ft. at least one side posted.

Commissioner Brackon asked if that easement is ultimately not granted which means that the whole thing has to be denied? Chairman Reynolds replied that per the Fire Marshal and the fire code he was guessing that the latest that they have adopted does require two means of access.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated that if everything else is rectified it could be a condition of the approval. That they are approved conditioned upon getting granted an easement or a party to the existing easement, allowing them access off of Gregory.

Chairman Reynolds said that if the easement wasn’t provided, no, they can’t grant site plan approval per their adopted fire code. If they go down that road maybe they can address other opportunities or talk through what the solution would be, at least the way they see it in front of them right now.
Chairman Reynolds said obviously Special Land Use to him doesn’t seem to be a major issue it is a church that has been around for over 50 years. Gingellville Overlay Standards he felt that the thought that one area doesn’t have a roof pitch to him inherently the building as a whole meets that criterion, so he was ok with that. Specifically, the addition going after the screening of mechanical units and that the pitch as it relates to the existing building would exceed their allowable height. The sign amenities he was ok with, the church is the closest if not one of the closest structures to the Baldwin corridor per its improvements, and site lighting and everything like that he didn’t have any major issues because of the finding that it is an existing structure. He would like to make sure that the Fire Marshal’s comments get addressed which is echoed by the engineer.

Commissioner Walker asked if there were any questions about any safety aspect of the one section of the roof being flat as opposed to a non-flat roof? Chairman Reynolds replied from his experience as an architect, no.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Gingell, that the Planning Commission approve PC-2022-10, The River Church Special Land Use request for a church located at 3900 S. Baldwin Rd. (parcel 09-29-301-029), 3910 S. Baldwin (parcel 09-29-301-034) and 3920 S. Baldwin Rd. (parcel 09-29-301-038) for plans date stamped received May 24, 2022. This approval is based on the following findings of facts: that this represents an expansion of an existing church that has been at this location an excess of 50 years, and it is therefore compatible with the adjacent uses and it is also compatible with the Master Plan; there are adequate public services available demonstrated by the fact that the church has been using the facilities and is relocating some of the public services to accommodate fire, and the engineer’s request. Since the sanctuary is not being expanded there will be no additional impact on traffic in the area; the enhancement of the surrounding environment is improved by the architectural and aesthetic appearance of the facility as demonstrated by the new construction.

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

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Brackon, that the Planning Commission approve the waivers from the Gingellville Village Center overlay standards because the applicant has demonstrated the following finding of fact. the waivers of the roof pitch recognizing that this is an expansion in the rear of the building, and is an addition to the roof pitch of the primary building that the roof pitch being a flat roof would be acceptable; the fact that the site is limited in terms of its ability to add additional site public amenities is waived; and the fact that the building is basically on the Baldwin Rd. lot line; site lighting has been demonstrated to be sufficient; and the parking in the rear of the site the parking lot screening is not necessary.

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds said to clarify they have a motion to approve the waivers for the Gingellville Village Center overlay standards and the applicant did demonstrate the following finding of fact.

Roll call vote was as follows: Urbanowski, yes; Gross, yes; St. Henry, yes; Walker, yes; Brackon, yes, Gingell, yes Reynolds, yes. Motion carried 7-0
Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, that the Planning Commission approve waivers from the landscape required adjacent to roads based on: limited parcel depth, existing vegetation on the site would limit the practical application of landscaping standards.

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

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that the Planning Commission grants site plan approval for PC-2022-10, The River Church located at 3900 S. Baldwin Rd. (parcel 09-29-301-029), 3910 S. Baldwin Rd. (parcel 09-29-301-034) and 3920 S. Baldwin Rd. (parcel 09-29-301-038) for plans date stamped received May 24, 2022, based on the following findings of facts: that there be a condition for the easement for emergency vehicle access across the property to the south and connecting to Gregory Rd. be apart of the approval; that the Township Engineers review letter comments of June 8, 2022, be incorporated into the final approval.

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds asked if they could include all of the Fire Marshal’s comments as it relates to the overlay template, and the signage is provided. The access agreement was a double-dip between the two but thought they were valid concerns.

Vice-Chairman Gross amended the motion, Commissioner Walker re-supported that the Fire Marshal’s comments regarding the overlay template and signage be provided.

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

B. PPC-2022-22, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance #78, Articles 19 (Industrial Complex-IC) and 27 (General Provisions)

Chairman stated that they are forwarding a recommendation to the Township Board to approve and adopt if they see fit for the intended text amendment.

Chairman Reynolds asked if there was any discussion. There was not.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to the Township Board to approve and adopt PPC-2022-22, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance No. & 78, Industrial Complex (IC), Article XIX, as presented this evening by the Planner at their public hearing on June 15, 2022, that draft being considered. The reason that this proposed text amendment to the Industrial Complex Zone has been prepared is to reflect the necessary improvements to accommodate the retention and expansion of the property and a major employer within the Township. The ordinance addresses the promotion and protection of the health, safety, and welfare of the existing and proposed use as well as the impact and protection of the Township as a whole.

**Roll call vote was as follows:** St. Henry, yes; Gingell, yes; Brackon, yes; Urbanowski, yes; Walker, yes, Gross, yes Reynolds, yes. **Motion carried 7-0**
C. PC-2021-07, 5-Year Master Plan Update
Chairman Reynolds said in their packets this evening there was the item on their goals charts. It was provided to them previously if anyone has any questions or comments.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked that in case he missed it when reviewing this do they need a definition of what the S & L means in the charts? Chairman Reynolds thought that would be a comment for the bigger picture of the Master Plan during its final resolution and it could just have a little key legend. Planner Wojciechowski said he will make a note it might be on the page before he wasn’t sure but will note that.

D. Discussion on Fences
Chairman Reynolds said at the joint meeting they had earlier this year it was brought up and formed some sub-committees one of which was a committee on fences. Because the ZBA was hearing a number of cases there was discussion on potential amendments.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated that they had a few meetings they were very staggered with COVID surges, sickness, and schedules. If they recall it was first discussed at the Planning Commission because it was brought forward from their ZBA rep that they were hearing numerous fence cases. They discussed it here and as they discussed it, they didn’t feel there was any need to change it, they didn’t want to be Fort Knox was a comment that was heard. ZBA continued to see a surge in cases so when they had the joint meeting with the Board of Trustees, and the ZBA a committee was formed. As they had their different meetings most of the attendees had their own little flavor on it. It didn’t ever come here as our recommendation. They haven’t disbanded, they decided to kick it back to the PC with some of their thoughts to see if they have any input that they would like to offer. There are a few limited ones, are they happy with those few limited ones, or do they feel they should go back and try to tackle more? They can go over the individual pages, she had previously given them all of the pages encouraging them to prep for this very evening. One of the attachments is dated April 6, 2022, and she thought those comments were created by JoAnn Van Tassel. There was a comment about making the good side of the fence facing out. On the second page were some comments from Trustee Flood, and some talking points that he felt should be discussed. None of these are enormous changes. One of them involves requiring a neighbor’s permission if they are going to put it up, recording something with the Register of Deeds. She didn’t know what direction they wanted to go, she knew that the Planning Commission prefers for her to present them with a proposed text, and she got that message strongly. Since the Planning Commission had requested that it comes back, and then they said whatever comments there are from the Planning Commission they want to see them back again. She didn’t know if they had any initial thoughts from what they have read here, strongly opposed to anything they have to say. She was looking for their comments to direct back to them.

Chairman Reynolds asked for the Planning Commissioner’s thoughts.

Commissioner Walker stated that he learned a long time ago not to be critical of the work someone else is doing because then they will want you to help do it. He has probably more exposed to this fence stuff than the rest of them because of the ZBA, and it is really a pain in the neck. Not much came out of those meetings that they had but he wasn’t sure what could be done. Trustee Flood at the ZBA meeting on Monday brought up again the arborvitae kinds of replacement things but he didn’t know if they wanted to do that to make that part of the ordinance to say that one of the options that they have is to put live trees on instead of a fence. He thought that would be much better for everybody. Is that something that they want to legislate?

Commissioner Brackon asked if they needed approval from anybody to put live trees in?
Commissioner Walker replied he didn’t think so, but they are trying to convince them that it is a better idea than a fence, that is the issue. The latest occurred on Baldwin with a bunch of fences on Baldwin and part of the Board gave them the first fence and then it snowballed and suddenly there were like ten fences or eleven fences all there, and then some of them never put the fences in. It is an issue, but he still wanted to stress the trees as an alternative somehow. He thought trying to keep it to a four-foot fence is still the best idea because they can have the four-foot fence right on the lot line.

Secretary St. Henry stated that there were no easy answers, and the couple of meetings that he sat in did go round and round. He was probably the one that brought up the Fort Knox comment back when they had the joint meeting. Talking about the Baldwin Keatington area there. He is 100% adamant about not appearing to be Fort Knox, the entire perimeter of the neighborhood is fenced off just because of traffic issues. He thought that the 4-ft. fence is reasonable, and he did agree with Commissioner Walker that somehow it would be so much nicer and accomplish the same goals with trees or landscaping to provide privacy, and shade or a barrier from traffic lights. He just wished there was a way that they could strongly encourage that.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that one of the first attachments they had heard over and over was how many cases in the last year the ZBA had heard on fences. She wanted to clarify and didn’t remember the number that Trustee Flood had quoted. When they researched it that was counting the number of variances, so if they had a home that wanted it and it impacted the rear setback and their side setback that counted as three. There were truly only 24 cases involving fences versus a very elevated number that each one of these cases might have had three variances so take that number times three and that is why it seemed very elevated. The chart also shows that because there was discussion of if they don’t want to look like Fort Knox from the road in passing perhaps the ordinance would allow the 6-ft. on the property when it is internal. So, this chart is saying whether it is an internal or main road, and so it would say this is a main road on Baldwin, Joslyn, and Waldon. Then below, ones that were all internal their fence that they were requesting was within a subdivision versus a main thoroughfare which cuts the number of cases in half. As she has been talking through this she has been saying, just from her exposure over the years coordinating the ZBA doesn’t matter what you give someone always wants more. As far as, the landscape working as a fence her feelings were if someone is saying they want a fence because of a dog or a child, would have an ordinance that is implying a tree instead of a fence she would have to check with the attorney. Would that set up a life safety thing that a tree cannot necessarily enclose and hold in a neighboring vicious dog or a wandering child?

Trustee Urbanowski asked on the second page was it not from JoAnn Van Tassel? Planning & Zoning Director Girling replied that JoAnn’s was the one with the red at the bottom and then the Orion Township Fence Ad Hoc Committee formed July 29, 2021, is a two-page document signed by Trustee Flood.

Trustee Urbanowski said a couple of the comments seemed interesting to her. She thought requiring a gate those kinds of things are important. She asked if it is a 6-ft. fence and it shall not extend past the front of the house foundation, so they are just talking about the side yard fences? Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated that a 4-ft. fence can be on the property line all the way around, so they can completely enclose, obviously they have to have their driveway, but it can go around the entire property. The ordinance says they can have a 4-ft. on the property line. This proposal is saying if they are going to allow a 6-ft. on a property line that it is never in their front yard and front yard is defined as once they don’t have a house anymore. So, they have the back, side, and front of the house, and the road, and between the corner of the house and the road is the front yard. They were saying it would not go past that front corner of
the house. Now, if the ordinance says they have to meet setbacks in order to put a 6-ft. fence a house should meet the front yard setback, so they would never have a fence further than where the front of the house was unless the house itself got a variance to be closer to the road than the front yard setback requirement.

Trustee Urbanowski said she just wanted to pull out these talking points to see how everyone felt about them. No fence shall be attached or placed adjacent to an existing fence on the lot line, like butting up right next to each other. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said then they get the maintenance in between. She thought that is why this ordinance was written the way it was written, she pictures a 4-ft. fence they are able to use a weedwhacker and reach over and do some type of maintenance on the other side without going on an adjacent property. If they are 6-ft. and it is enclosing, it and its wood they can’t do that. If they don’t have a setback of a least 10-ft., how are they going on that side of the fence to maintain grass that grows. In SE, SR, and SF, they have a 20-ft. side yard, and she thought the 20-ft. might be too much and maybe the ordinance would just say the 10-ft. which gives them the ability to maintain it. The back-to-back fence is the same thing if it is not butted up then they get the growth, weeds, and the inability to maintain it.

Chairman Reynolds stated that he is not a huge fan of fences in general. He does understand that there needs to be a division between property owners, separate uses, and privacy created in certain circumstances. He encouraged the committee to consider saying the natural forms or reiterate that. If there is a safety access concern that maybe it is a combination of, and one of those thoughts of the combination of is if it were along a primary roadway and they are not putting it on the property line between two owners that there is landscaping required. Maybe 10-ft. or 6-ft. or landscaping where they could do some arborvitaes to be where the fence itself is shielded from view. He would be in favor that they need the fence for the dog that likes to jump over the fence, but the rest of the public is not essentially having to look at that. He would be open to the fact that it doesn’t just have to be a wall of arborvitaes, but it could be 70% landscaping or only 30% in view of something like that. He didn’t think what has occurred along Baldwin Rd. is favorable to the look of their community and specifically to this vision of the Master Plan that they have about the importance of corridors too. He thought that there were some rules for him that could be added here but wanted to strongly encourage the natural buffers. He agreed with Trustee Urbanowski in the sense of access, that would be important for him. If anything, if they are going to ask for this then let’s raise the bar a little bit versus just slapping a 6-ft. fence up on the property line. He was in favor of not needing a survey if they are in agreement with the two. These things are going to be requested but he thought that they need to have some parameters to it.

Trustee Urbanowski said under number seven fence specification is crossed out. Then it says fences constructed of chain-link, wood, vinyl, or similar materials are crossed out and it only leaves it as constructed of man-made materials are permitted. She felt they should be very specific about what is allowed so that someone doesn’t construct concrete with bottles in it, that are man-made. She was in favor of being very specific about what is allowed as opposed to just free forming it.

Chairman Reynolds agreed with that comment, he thought that man-made was a bit too open-ended. He thought that the idea of the good side out, that is a typical requirement in a lot of cities. He felt the good side out was a great comment. He thought additional talking points of yes to number one, and not past the front of the house, the ordinance supports that. Utility meters he would go either way on that, a gate or fire access or at least a means of access to be provided if they are getting over a solid fence. No double fences he agrees with that.
Trustee Urbanowski said registering with Oakland County too. She asked if that was a thing that they do. Planning & Zoning Director Girling replied that they can have a document recorded at the Register of Deeds. If it is an agreement between two property owners related to giving permission, then that is a document that can be registered.

Chairman Reynolds asked if that was to avoid a survey? Planning & Zoning Director Girling replied that was their idea to avoid a survey. If they are going to let them do this, then you get your neighbor’s permission and it stays with the land so that when someone is going to buy the property and they search the deeds and the history of it they are going to see this document that has been recorded saying there is a fence and the fence has to stay and has all the information contained in it.

Chairman Reynolds said if there isn’t a survey provided, he would be in support of that. A survey a lot of times can rectify that to prove that it is on their own property but that is $1,500 - $4,500 that everyone isn’t always willing to spend.

Trustee Urbanowski said she appreciated the committee coming together to do that, taking their personal time.

Chairman Reynolds said his biggest takeaway would be encouraging the natural buffer for fences and can they even do a hybrid, can they do a mix of something to where like Baldwin Rd. require in a certain corridor that there is 5-ft. of landscaping to where they don’t just have a wall of everything.

Commissioner Walker said that Trustee Flood had suggested perhaps having the Township put some natural vegetation along the Community Center’s drive as an example, they would have that to show them how that looks.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that Tony Cook on the ZBA had come to her months ago in between one of the meetings with that suggestion. He had suggested it here and she told him that they had the formal landscape done and she would reach out to if the committee wanted, Aaron the Park and Rec Director. She thought of Jesse Decker because they do have the adjacent residential right there. Mr. Cook didn’t favor that he thought it should be here so that the minute they walked to the counter they could send them out there. She discussed with him if they say this is what buildings are supposed to look like they don’t necessarily have that visual she suggested a handout with some different types that work that same way as a buffer. That is just an item to follow up on. She also said that if they create that it has to be maintained and he felt that a group of volunteers could do that. It is something that they could look into, but she thought that a park that was actually adjacent to residential to prove how it serves as that buffer. She didn’t think of the Orion Center and how it is up against a school which is a type of residential.

Chairman Reynolds said he was either way on a physical example. He thought that if they had a nice kind of encouragement of an article or a couple of examples. Like the landscape buffers that are proposed at Lavender Ridge. Some of these other examples of good ideas, encourage people to say they have solutions that are not just going for a variance and ask for your fence.

Secretary St. Henry said they mentioned the internal fence issue and internal streets. Are people trying to get around HOA, or their by-laws? Planning & Zoning Director Girling said they can’t police the by-laws. When somebody comes in, they tell them to check with their HOAs. When they go to the ZBA it asks on the application if there is an HOA. She believed that the ZBA usually asks if they have HOA. She thought it was more that people with the way the world is wanting to barricade themselves in. Secretary St. Henry asked so they don’t care if there is
an HOA by-law in the neighborhood. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said if it is a real active one, she thinks they are warned, she didn’t think they were going against the HOAs. She thought that they know enough and didn’t think that was their purpose.

Secretary St. Henry said he thought most HOAs if there are any by-laws a fence would be one that they enforce as much as possible. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said or an Architectural Committee and whoever is sitting on it, those three people, it depends on what the flavor is at the time.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS
None.

10. COMMUNICATIONS
None.

11. PLANNERS REPORTS
A. Solar Farms on Closed Landfills Article

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated that it was an article that Planner Arroyo provided.

Chairman Reynolds said as the Master Plan outlines some of those forward-thinking items as it relates to what to do with properties as their use is being closed out, specifically landfills.

Secretary St. Henry asked if they found out when their landfill in their Township is going to be at least contractually closed out? Commissioner Brackon thought it was 2042.

12. COMMITTEE REPORTS
None.

13. PUBLIC HEARINGS
A. 07-06-22 at 7:05 p.m. PPC-22-18, 3850 Joslyn Rd., Special Land use for a Gas Station with a Drive-Thru, located at 3850 Joslyn Rd. (parcel 09-28-376-031).

14. CHAIRMAN’S COMMENTS
None.

15. COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS
Commissioner Gingell said she was excited to see the Gingellville Community Church transform into The River Church to grow and stay a church.

Secretary St. Henry said he would like to see the applicants get some sort of guide before they start talking about Gingellville and to call it how it is supposed to be called.

Trustee Urbanowski said if anyone likes to golf the Orion Chamber of Commerce has a golf outing on Monday, July 18th and they are still taking golfers.

16. ADJOURNMENT
Moved by Chairman Reynolds, seconded by Vice-Chairman Gross, to adjourn the meeting at 8:35 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,
The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a Public Hearing on Wednesday, June 15, 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:
Scott Reynolds, Chairman
Don Gross, Vice Chairman
Kim Urbanowski, BOT Rep to PC
Derek Brackon, Commissioner

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:
None.

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:
None.

PPC-2022-22, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance #78, Industrial Complex, Articles 19 and 27.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling noted that all changes were in Article 19. She explained that the public hearing notice included Article 27 but there ended up being no changes to that article, so it is only Article 19. She then gave a list of all sections that were proposed to change.

Chairman Reynolds asked if there were any public comments. There were none. Chairman Reynolds asked Planning Commission members if there were any questions. There were none.

Chairman Reynolds closed the public hearing at 7:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Walton
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary
Charter Township of Orion

Planning Commission Approval Date
TO: The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission
FROM: Tammy Girling, Planning & Zoning Director
DATE: June 29, 2022
RE: PPC-22-18, 3850 Joslyn Rd. Special Land Use and Site Plan

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

**Special Land Use (Ord. No. 78, Section 30.02)**

**Motion 1:** I move that the Planning Commission **approve/deny** PPC-22-18, 3850 Joslyn Rd. Special Land Use Request for a gas station with a drive-thru, located at 3850 Joslyn Rd. (parcel 09-28-376-031) for plans date stamped received April 21, 2022. This approval/denial is based on the following finding of facts:

a. Compatibility with Adjacent Uses (Insert any findings of facts),  
b. Compatibility with Master Plan (Insert findings of facts),  
c. Adequate Public Services (Insert findings of facts),  
d. Impact on Traffic (Insert findings of facts),  
e. Detrimental Effects (Insert findings of facts),  
f. Enhancement of Surrounding Environment (Insert findings of facts),  
g. Isolation of Existing Land Use (Insert findings of facts).

**If Approved:**
This approval is subject to the following conditions (insert any additional conditions such as hours of operation, times of year, etc.)

**Off-street Parking Calculation Waiver (Ord. No. 78, Section 14.03 C)**

**Motion 2:** I move that the Planning Commission **approve/deny** a parking calculation waiver for PPC-22-18, 3850 Joslyn Rd. Site Plan for plans date stamped received April 21, 2022 based on the following: (motion maker insert findings of facts)

a. The applicant **did/did not** provide evidence that indicates that another standard would be more reasonable, because of the level of current or future employment and/or the level of current or future customer traffic (insert how they did or didn’t demonstrate).  
b. (motion maker to insert any additional findings of facts)
**Interior Parking Lot Landscaping Waiver (Ord. No. 78, Section 27.05 A. 6)**

**Motion 3:** I move that the Planning Commission approve/deny an interior parking lot landscaping waiver for PPC-22-18, 3850 Joslyn Rd. Site Plan for plans date stamped received April 21, 2022 based on the following: (motion maker insert findings of facts)

a. The applicant did/did not provide evidence that the parking lot consists of only one (1) aisle and the area surrounding the parking lot is heavily landscaped – or – there is existing off-street parking drives and/or structures are located on the parcel (insert findings of facts).

b. (motion maker to insert any additional findings of facts)

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

**Motion 4:** I move that the Planning Commission grants site plan approval for PPC-22-18, 3850 Joslyn Rd. Site Plan, located at 3850 Joslyn Rd. (parcel 09-28-376-031) for plans date stamped received April 21, 2022 based on the following findings of facts (motion make to insert findings of facts).

This approval is based on the following conditions:

- (Motion maker to list any unresolved issues related to the Township Planner’s review letter).
- (Motion maker to list any unresolved issues related to the Township Engineer’s review letter).
- (Motion maker to list any unresolved issues related to the Fire Marshal’s review letter)
- (Motion maker to list any additional conditions).

Or

I move that the Planning Commission denies site plan approval for PPC-22-18, 3850 Joslyn Rd. Site Plan, located at 3850 Joslyn Rd. (parcel 09-28-376-031) for plans date stamped received April 21, 2022. This denial is based on the following reasons (insert findings of facts).

Or

I move that the Planning Commission postpones site plan approval for PPC-22-18, 3850 Joslyn Rd. Site Plan, located at 3850 Joslyn Rd. (parcel 09-28-376-031) for plans date stamped received April 21, 2022 for the following reasons (motion maker to indicate outstanding items to be addressed from the Planner’s, Fire Marshal’s, or Engineer’s review letter(s)).
June 20, 2022
Planning Commission
Orion Township
2525 Joslyn Road
Lake Orion, MI, 48360

Special Land Use & Site Plan Review no. 1
Oakland Fuels

Case Number: PC-2022-18
Address: 3850 Joslyn Road
Parcel ID: 09-28-376-031
Area: 0.91 AC

Applicant: Keith Ford
Plan Date: 01/02/2022
Reviewer: Matt Wojciechowski
Rod Arroyo

Dear Planning Commission Members:

We have completed a review of the application referenced above. Items in bold should be revised; items in italics should be discussed by the planning commission.
SUMMARY OF PROJECT

The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing retail establishment and replace the structure with a new 6,217 square foot building that includes multiple tenant spaces and a drive through window on the south side of the building. The existing gas station canopy is also proposed to be expanded to accommodate two additional pumps. The drive through operation is a regulated as a special land use in the General Business (GB) district.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Deficient Zoning standards requiring ZBA Approval
1. Drive through building setback of 100’ required; 30’ proposed
2. Drive through maneuvering lane setback of 50’ required; 20’ proposed
3. A landscape greenbelt of at least thirty (30) feet in width except where ingress or egress drives are located, is required
4. Covered trash areas are required within the rear yard; two trash enclosures are proposed, one in the south front yard and one in the north side yard
5. Loading and unloading areas shall be located in the rear or side yard of a non-residential district
6. The building exceeds the 25’ maximum height limit within the GB district
7. No interior parking lot landscaping is proposed

Planning Commission waivers required
1. The site currently proposes 28 compliant parking spaces; 31 are required
2. The Planning Commission may, at their discretion, waive or modify the requirement for interior landscaping in cases where the parking lot consists of only one (1) aisle and the area surrounding the parking lot is heavily landscaped or where existing off-street parking drives and/or structures are located on the parcel. (none shown)

Additional Information and Revisions
- Speaker box not shown; applicant shall add location and decibel levels to plan
- Three spaces along the north side do not comply with the 30’ residential district setback
- Applicant shall provide building coverage
- A mixture of evergreen and deciduous trees shall be planted at the rate of one (1) tree for each three thousand (3,000) square feet, or portion thereof, of landscaped open-space area
- The proposed greenbelt areas should be located on the subject property and not within the ROW
- Seven trees are required on the site within the Joslyn Rd greenbelt and seven trees are required on site within the Hammerslea greenbelt in addition to a wall or fence (14 required; three proposed)
- No interior parking lot landscaping is proposed
- Applicant shall update photometric plan to show light levels at property lines and provide average light levels for the site and parking area according to 27.11
- Applicant shall include light timing scheduled on updated photometric plan
- Engineering should determine the appropriate number of driveways, as the four two-way drive cuts proposed to remain exceed the amount deemed necessary by the ordinance
## Zoning Ordinance Compliance

### General Business (Article XIV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.01 Use Matrix</td>
<td>Restaurant (drive-thru)</td>
<td>Special Land Use Footnotes A &amp; I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Extended hour uses and drive-thrus shall be subject to the following regulations:</td>
<td>Proposed building setback of 30' does not meet the 100' requirement Proposed drive land setback of 25 feet does not meet the 50' requirement Speaker box not shown; applicant shall add location to plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Setback. All buildings, drive-thru canopies or speaker boxes shall be set back no less than one hundred (100) feet from the lot line of a single-family or multi-family zoned and/or used parcel. Associated parking lots, maneuvering lanes, drive-thru lanes (if applicable) shall be set back no less than fifty (50) feet from the lot line of single-family or multi-family zoned and/or used parcels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Buffering. All parcel perimeters which abut a single family zoned and/or used parcel shall have no less than a six (6) foot continuous buffer. The buffer may consist of a solid fence or wall, a double staggered row of evergreens and/or a combination of each.</td>
<td>Existing 6’ masonry wall proposed to remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Noise. Any noise associated with an extended hour use shall not exceed sixty (60) decibels when measured at the property line. The noise shall also not be intermittent in nature, high frequency, or that which causes vibration.</td>
<td>Applicant shall add information to plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Lighting. Any operation or activity which produces glare shall not cause illumination in excess of 0.3 footcandles when measured along the lot line of a single family zoned and/or used parcel. Between dusk and dawn, the light levels shall be further reduced to 0.0 foot-candles when measured at the same property lines.</td>
<td>Values not shown at property line; applicant shall revise photometric plan to show light levels at property lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Drive thru facilities as permitted in this Section shall be subject to the landscaping and screening wall requirements of Section 27.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.02 Footnotes to Use Matrix</td>
<td>1.a One (1) parking space per two hundred (200) square feet of gross floor area for general retail uses, personal services, banks, etc.</td>
<td>3,783 / 200 = 19 required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.a One (1) parking space per one hundred (100) square feet of gross floor area for restaurants</td>
<td>1,142 / 100 = 12 required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.03 Required Conditions</td>
<td>C. The site requires 31 spaces and 31 are proposed; however, three of the spaces along the north side are located within the required 30’ parking setback from residential meaning 28 spaces are compliant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The Planning Commission may, at their discretion, modify the numerical requirements for off-street parking, based on evidence provided by the applicant that indicates that another standard would be more reasonable, because of the level of current or future employment and/or the level of current or future customer traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A landscape plan shall be submitted to the Planning Commission for approval. The landscape plan shall specify plant materials and landscape treatment, based on the requirements of Section 27.05 of this Ordinance for such items. This landscape plan shall be part of, or accompany, the site plan.</td>
<td>See general provisions table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A landscaped greenbelt at least twenty (20) feet in width shall be provided along the entire perimeter of a GB District, except where ingress or egress drives are located when the parcel abuts commercial/office or industrially zoned property. However, when the parcel abuts residentially used or zoned property, the landscape greenbelt shall be at least thirty (30) feet in width except where ingress or egress drives are located.</td>
<td>North and west side requires a 30’ landscape buffer; 5’-6’ is proposed East and south require a 20’ greenbelt; none are observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The off-street parking areas and access driveways shall be screened from view from any adjoining residential property. Such screening shall consist of earth berms, permanent walls or evergreen landscaping subject to approval of the Planning Commission.</td>
<td>Greenbelt abutting residential properties cannot be waived by the planning commission; the applicant shall revise or seek a variance from the ZBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The landscaped greenbelt required along with the perimeter of the parcel may be reduced in width or waived by the Planning Commission when the parcel abuts commercial/office or industrially zoned property. The Planning Commission may, at their discretion, modify or waive certain landscaping requirements in accordance with the considerations outlined in Section 27.05.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Where commercial uses abut residential uses, the Planning Commission may require a greenbelt buffer, berm, or obscuring wall or combination of the aforementioned methods of screening in accordance with Section 27.05 (A)(5)</td>
<td>Two trash enclosures are proposed in the south front yard and north side yard; Applicant shall revise to comply with rear yard requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Covered trash receptacles, surrounded on three (3) sides by masonry brick-type walls one (1) foot higher than the receptacle shall be provided in the rear yard of the building or principal use structure. The fourth side of the trash receptacle enclosure shall be equipped with an opaque lockable gate that is the same height as the brick-type wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **General Provisions.** The below table indicates compliance with the General Provisions in Zoning Ordinance Article XXVII. The standards in this checklist are a summary of Zoning Ordinance standards, please refer to the individual sections referenced below for the full Zoning Ordinance text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.04 Parking and Loading</td>
<td>3. e. all off-street parking areas shall be screened from view from any adjoining residential property. Such screening shall consist of earth berms, permanent walls, or evergreen landscaping, subject to approval of the Planning Commission and in accordance with the provisions set forth in Section 27.05</td>
<td>Existing 6’ wall is proposed to satisfy this requirement; PC shall discuss preferred screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.05 Landscaping</td>
<td>In cases where the use of an existing building changes or an existing building is changed or otherwise altered, all of the standards set forth herein shall be met</td>
<td>Not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.a.ii. A mixture of evergreen and deciduous trees shall be planted at the rate of one (1) tree for each three thousand (3,000) square feet, or portion thereof, of landscaped open-space area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A greenbelt separation area is required between the right-of-way property line and the nearest portion of any off-street parking area, for parcels fronting roads but excluding single family residential uses.</td>
<td>The greenbelts should be located on the subject property and not within the ROW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.a. One (1) tree for each thirty (30) lineal feet, or fraction thereof, of required greenbelt separation area (including driveways). Such trees shall be located between the abutting right-of-way and the off-street parking area or vehicular use area.</td>
<td>The site has approximately 200' of frontage along Joslyn and 190' along Hammerslea; seven trees are required on site within the Joslyn RD greenbelt and seven trees are required on site within the Hammerslea greenbelt in addition to a wall or fence. Three trees are proposed in Joslyn ROW (no wall or fence).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.b. In addition, a hedge, wall, decorative metal fence, or berm, or other landscape elements with a vertical rise of at least thirty (30) inches shall be developed within said separation zone.</td>
<td>The ordinance does not suggest planting trees within the ROW; rather, these areas should be maintained with grass cover.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.e. Landscaping of Right-of-Way and Other Adjacent Public Open Space Areas. Public rights-of-way and other public open-space areas adjacent to required landscaped areas and greenbelts shall be planted with grass or other suitable ground cover and maintained by the owner of the adjacent property as if they were part of required landscaped areas and greenbelt.</td>
<td>Add information to site plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.f. Regulations Pertaining to Landscaping Areas Used for Sight Distance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Planning Commission may at their discretion waive or modify the requirements of this section subject to one or more of the following conditions: limited parcel depth, existing vegetation or other site factors which limit the practical application of landscaping standards.**

5. Where non-residential uses abut residential uses or where multi-family uses abut single family uses, the Planning Commission may require a greenbelt buffer, berm or obscuring wall or combination of the aforementioned methods of screening. The methods of screening for conflicting lands uses are:

- a. Greenbelt Buffer.
- b. Berm
- c. Obscuring wall

PC should determine if any of these are required in addition to the existing screenwall and maple trees (in the 5' greenbelt).

6. Interior Parking Lot Landscaping. Off-street parking areas shall be landscaped as follows:

- a. Off-street parking areas containing greater than twenty (20) spaces shall be provided with at least twenty (20) square feet of interior landscaping per parking space. A minimum of one-third (1/3) of the trees required in Section 27.05 (A)(5) shall be placed on the interior of the parking area and the remaining may be placed surrounding the perimeter parking lot within ten (10) feet, as illustrated on the following figure. No parking lot landscaping is shown or proposed; applicant shall revise the plans to comply with this standard.
- b. A minimum of one (1) tree shall be planted per two hundred (200) square feet or fraction thereof of interior parking lot landscaping. At least fifty percent (50%) of each interior landscaped area shall be covered by living
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Non residential lighting standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.11 Lighting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Properties adjacent to residential properties shall be designed and maintained such that illumination levels shall not exceed 0.3 foot-candle along property lines. Lighting for uses adjacent to non-residential properties shall be designed and maintained such that illumination levels do not exceed 1.0 foot-candle along property lines. The light intensity provided at ground level shall be a minimum of 0.3 foot-candle anywhere in the area to be illuminated. Parking lot illumination shall average 0.6 over the entire area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant shall update photometric plan to show light levels at property lines and provide average light levels for site and parking area according to 27.11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Except where used for security or safety purposes, as approved in advance by the Planning Commission, all outdoor lighting fixtures, existing or hereafter installed and maintained upon private property within commercial districts shall be turned off or reduced in lighting intensity between 11:00 p.m. and sunrise, except when used for, such as in sales areas, where such use continues after 11:00 p.m., but only for so long as such use continues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant shall include light timing scheduled on updated photometric plan</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 27.14 Access Management

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a. Building-mounted lighting shall be fully shielded and directed downward to prevent off-site glare. Light shall not exceed 0.3 foot-candle along new and existing residential property lines and 1.0 foot-candle along non-residential property lines.</td>
<td>Applicant shall update photometric plan to show light levels at property lines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Access controls

The number of driveways shall be the minimum necessary to provide reasonable access for regular traffic and emergency vehicles, while preserving traffic operations and safety along the public roadway. No more than one (1) driveway (or a one-way pair) is allowed per property, unless appropriate documentation is provided demonstrating the need for additional driveways.

Two (2) one-way driveways may be permitted along a frontage of at least one hundred twenty-five (125) feet, provided that the driveways do not interfere with operations at other driveways or along the road.

---

### 30.02 – Special Land Use Procedures and Standards

8. **Planning Commission Determination.** The Planning Commission shall make the final determination on the application for special land use approval. Such determination shall be based on the requirements and standards of this Ordinance. In making the final determination, the Planning Commission shall consider the reports and recommendations from the Enforcement Officer, Water and Sewer Department, Township Planner, Township Engineer, Township Fire Chief, the Road Commission for Oakland County, the Oakland County Health Department, the Oakland County Drain Commission, appropriate utility companies, and the Michigan Department of Transportation, where applicable.

13. **Standards for Granting Special Land Use Approval.** The Planning Commission shall approve special land uses upon determination that the proposed use will comply with all applicable requirements of the Ordinance, applicable standards for specific uses, and the following general standards. The applicant has addressed items a. through g. in detail in their SLU application letter dated March 24, 2021.

a. **Compatibility with Adjacent Uses.** The proposed special land use shall be designed, constructed, operated and maintained so as to be compatible with uses of adjacent land. The site design of the proposed special land use shall minimize the impact of site activity on surrounding properties. In determining whether this requirement has been met, consideration shall be given to:

1) The location and screening of vehicular circulation and parking areas in relation to surrounding development.
2) The location and screening of outdoor storage, outdoor activity or work areas, and mechanical equipment, in relation to surrounding development.
3) The hours of operation of the proposed use. Approval of a special land use may be conditioned upon operation within specified hours considered appropriate to ensure minimal impact on surrounding uses.
4) The bulk, placement, and materials of construction of the proposed use in relation to surrounding uses.

**b. Compatibility with Master Plan.** The proposed special land use shall be compatible with and in accordance with the general principles and objectives of the Orion Township Master Plan and shall promote the intent and purpose of this Ordinance.

**c. Public Services.** The proposed special land use shall be located so as to be adequately served by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage systems, water and sewage facilities, and schools.

**d. Impact of Traffic.** The location of the proposed special land use within the zoning district shall minimize the impact of the traffic generated by the proposed use on surrounding uses. In determining whether this requirement has been met, consideration shall be given to:

1) Proximity and access to major thoroughfares.
2) Estimated traffic generated by the proposed use.
3) Proximity and relation to intersections.
4) Adequacy of sight distances.
5) Location of and access to off-street parking.
6) Required vehicular turning movements.
7) Provision for pedestrian traffic.

**e. Detrimental Effects.** The proposed special land use shall not involve any activities, processes, materials, equipment, or conditions of operation, and shall not be so located or designed, as to be detrimental to public health, safety, and welfare. In determining whether this requirement has been met, consideration shall be given to the production of traffic, noise, vibration, smoke, fumes, odors, dust, glare, and light.

**f. Enhancement of Surrounding Environment.** The proposed special land use shall provide the maximum feasible enhancement of the surrounding environment and shall not unreasonably interfere with or discourage the appropriate development and use of adjacent land and buildings or unreasonably affect their value. In determining whether this requirement has been met, consideration shall be given to:

1) The provision of landscaping and other site amenities. Provision of additional landscaping over and above the requirements of this Ordinance may be required as a condition of approval of a special land use.
2) The bulk, placement, and materials of construction of proposed structures in relation to surrounding uses.

**g. Isolation of Existing Land Use.** The location of the proposed special land use shall not result in a small residential area being substantially surrounded by non-residential development, and further, the location of the proposed special land use shall not result in a small non-residential area being substantially surrounded by incompatible uses.
The plans should be revised for compliance with the items listed on pages 2 of the letter before being considered by the planning commission. We are available to answer questions.

Respectfully,
Giffels Webster

Rodney L. Arroyo, AICP
Partner

Matt Wojciechowski, AICP
Senior Planner

www.giffelswebster.com
June 22, 2022

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

RE: Renovations to Existing Service Station for Keith Ford, PPC-22-18
Site Plan Review #1

Received: June 7, 2022 by Orion Township

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

We have completed our review of the Renovations to Existing Service Station for Keith Ford plan set. The plans were prepared by Creekwood Architecture, Inc. and were reviewed with respect to the Township’s Zoning Ordinance, No. 78, Stormwater Management and Soil Erosion & Sedimentation Control Ordinance, No. 139, and the Township’s Engineering Standards.

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:
The site is located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Joslyn Rd. and Hammerslee Rd. within southwest quadrant of Section 28 of the Charter Township of Orion. The site is zoned General Business (GB) and bound by parcels to the south of the property zoned Restricted Business (RB), and bound by parcels to the north, west, and east of the property zoned Single Family Residential (R-2).

The existing site is a gas service station that includes three (3) double-sided gas pumps and a small convenience store and attendant building. The site has an existing masonry screen wall along the north and west sides of the property. The site currently has green space between the existing parking and service area and the screen wall.

An existing site survey is included in the plan set. No benchmarks are provided. A benchmark table shall be added to the plan set, identifying a minimum of two benchmarks that will be available throughout construction of the proposed project. The location map on the Cover Sheet does not appear to match the site location. Please update the location map.

The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing building on the property and build a new 4,021 sq. ft. service station with convenience store and an attached 1,259 sq. ft. leased space with a drive-through window. The applicant proposes to add an additional gas pump to the existing 3 pumps on site and to replace the canopy that currently covers the existing gas pump stations to include extension over the new pump station.

It appears that there are existing overhead electrical lines that run across the north side of the site. The applicant should verify that no easement currently exists for the overhead lines. Coordination with DTE may be required for work within their easement.

The existing 6-foot screen wall does not appear to be represented on the Survey sheet and should be shown.
The Soil Erosion Sequence notes on the Survey sheet should be removed as they do not appear to pertain to this site, and no soil erosion measures are indicated on this sheet.

**WATER MAIN AND SANITARY SEWER:**
There is an existing 16-inch water main that runs along the west side of Joslyn Rd. as well as a 12-inch water main that runs along the north side of Hammerslea Rd. The site plan shows an 8-inch watermain along Hammerslea, please verify the size of this water main. The existing water lead to the property is shown on the demolition plan and appears to tap the 12-inch water main along Hammerslea, please show the existing water service to the property on the existing conditions sheet. The existing water main along Hammerslea is shown connecting to the sanitary sewer located along Joslyn. Please correct the connection point to show the water main on Hammerslea connecting to the water main on Joslyn.

There is no proposed water service shown on the site plan. The applicant shall show the location of the proposed water lead to the proposed building on the site plan. A proposed FDC was not shown on the site plan and the nearest hydrant does not appear to be represented in the plans. We defer further comment on the FDC and hydrant coverage to the Fire Department of Orion Township.

There is an existing 21-inch sanitary sewer that runs along the west side of Joslyn as well as an 8-inch sanitary sewer that runs along the south side of Hammerslea. The existing sanitary sewer lead to the property is shown on the demolition plan and appears to tap the 8-inch sanitary sewer along Hammerslea, please show the lead on the existing conditions survey sheet.

There is no proposed sanitary sewer lead information on the site plan. The applicant shall show proposed sanitary lead location. A separate grease interception structure shall be provided for the drive-through lease space. The grease interceptor must be separate from the municipal sanitary lead from the proposed building. The grease interception lead may join with the municipal sanitary lead at a manhole structure before tapping the existing sanitary sewer. The Site Plan sheet notes that sanitary sewer cleansouts will be provided at maximum 90-foot interval on site, though no cleansouts are shown on the plan. The applicant shall provide locations of the municipal and grease interceptor leads, grease interceptor structures, and clean outs on the site plan. Per OCWRC requirements, a monitoring manhole is required on the sanitary lead upstream of the connection point to the public sanitary sewer.

Basis of Design calculations for the anticipated water and sanitary usage are required at site plan. Please calculate and include the sanitary and water Basis of Design using 100 gal/day/person and an average 3.5 persons/REU.

**STORMWATER MANAGEMENT:**
The existing site stormwater management consists of sheet flow across the grass and parking lot areas to an existing 12-inch corrugated metal culvert running underneath Hammerslea Rd. into a roadside ditch along Joslyn Rd. There appears to be an existing storm sewer system on Joslyn but is not shown on the site plans. An existing catch basin in the curb line of Joslyn Rd. is proposed as the ultimate outlet of the proposed detention system. The applicant shall verify the size and invert of the existing storm sewer system on Joslyn Rd. and include this information on the site plan. The applicant should verify that there is downstream capacity to handle the proposed storm runoff from this site.

The applicant is proposing to allow some of the site runoff from to sheet flow off site, as it does under current conditions. It appears that runoff from proposed new impervious area is collected and managed on site. The applicant proposes two new catch basins in the parking area. Each catch basin is proposed to discharge into two separate underground detention systems which ultimately outlet into the existing catch basin on Joslyn Rd.
Preliminary detention calculations and means of sediment pretreatment were not provided and are required at site plan. Detention volume shall be provided for the entire site, as the current site does not have any storm management systems in place. Since the site is handling hazardous material, i.e. gasoline and oil, the storm management system must include a method of oil water separation within the system prior to detention.

**PAVING/GRADING:**
The existing site has four approaches, two to Joslyn and two to Hammerslea. The applicant does not propose to alter or remove the existing driveway approaches to the site. The extent of pavement changes is limited to the property line and no pavement modification is proposed in the right-of-way. Any work within the right-of-way on either Hammerslea or Joslyn will require permit and approval from RCOC.

Proposed pavement slopes appear to be acceptable. Pavement slopes are to remain between 1% and 6% for drive areas, and between 1% and 4% for parking areas. The applicant is proposing to save the existing concrete located around the pumps and underground tanks, resurface the existing asphalt, and provide new asphalt and concrete in the existing green space on site. Pavement sections were provided for the standard-duty asphalt, heavy-duty asphalt, reinforced concrete, concrete sidewalk, and resurfaced asphalt. The Standard Bituminous Pavement Section needs to be revised to include 8-inches of aggregate base. The Heavy-Duty Bituminous Pavement Section calls for two lifts of 13A asphalt. 13A cannot be placed in a lift greater than 2.5-inches and is not typically recommended for a wearing course. The Reinforced Concrete Pavement Section does not meet Township Standards and needs to be 7-inches of concrete over an approved base. The Resurfaced Bituminous Pavement Section appears to call for only 1.5 inches of new wearing course, however 2 inches are proposed for milling. The applicant should clarify the 0.5-inch difference in the existing vs proposed pavement section. The Concrete Sidewalk Detail shall identify a base course material for the sidewalk. The cross-slope on the sidewalk shall also be limited to a 2% maximum slope rather than call for a 0.25-inch/foot slope (2.083%). Additionally, 1100T and 700-20C are no longer in common use as pavement mixes. We recommend updating the pavement mixes to Marshall or Superpave pavement mixes. Please update all proposed pavement sections to meet Township Engineering Standards per site zoning. Pavement sections that meet Township Standards are also required for the loading zone, and the dumpster pad.

The sidewalk adjacent the parking stalls on the east side of the building needs to be a minimum of 7 feet in width to account for vehicle overhang and still provide a 5-foot walkable area. Otherwise, bumper blocks may be added to the parking stalls to ensure a minimum 5-foot width walking area on the sidewalk. The Sidewalk Ramp Detail is not ADA compliant. A 5-foot by 5-foot landing area with a maximum slope of 2% in any direction is required with ramps that do not exceed 8.33% longitudinal slope.

There is existing safety path along the frontage of the property along Joslyn Rd. however, it appears that the ramps need to be replaced to meet ADA compliance on each side of the existing approaches. A new ramp is required on the north side of Hammerslea with truncated domes (detectable warning surface). Per ADA requirements, a receiving ramp will be required on the south side of Hammerslea when the existing ramp is reconstructed.

Existing grading is indicated on the site plan with spot grades. Proposed grading is indicated on the Grading Plan with spot grades. The applicant appears to be matching the existing grade at the extent of the work area, which appears to be consistent around the property line.

There is an existing 6-foot-tall masonry screening wall along the north and west sides of the property. The applicant is proposing to extend the wall at the proposed dumpster enclosures on site.

**TRAFFIC & CIRCULATION:**
The applicant states in the Special Land Use Approval Application (PPC-22-17) dated March 7, 2022 that the estimated traffic generated by the proposed site improvements is 100 cars per day. Trip generation estimates per ITE Manual and Township Ordinance shall be provided to determine if a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) is warranted.
The applicant is proposing a 9-foot wide drive aisle for the drive-through lane which makes its final turn around the building at an inner radius of 10 feet. Given the constraints of the site, the applicant should make the drive aisle on the west side of the building a one-way drive aisle (north to south) and widen the proposed drive-through lane to provide a more navigable drive-through. Widening the drive-through aisle to 11 feet in width would still allow for a roughly 11-foot-wide lane at the narrowest location west of the drive-through lane near the southwest corner of the building. Please note, the 20-foot dimension in this location on sheet C2 only scales to roughly 13 feet.

**LANDSCAPING:**
A landscaping plan was included in the plan set. It appears that multiple trees are proposed to be planted in the right-of-way along Jolsyn Road, this would require approval from RCO. The trees appear to be in close proximity to the existing sanitary sewer along Jolsyn Road. The applicant shall verify that the proposed trees will not impact the existing sanitary sewer. It is our recommendation that a smaller tree such as an arborvitae or bushes be used along the west side of the existing screen wall to minimize potential structural impacts to the wall, and for minimizing necessary maintenance from the adjacent property owner.

**NATURAL FEATURES:**

**Wetlands:**
The site is already developed and there are no wetlands on the site that could be impacted by further development of the property.

**Woodlands:**
The plan set does not include a tree survey, however, there appears to be one landmark tree on site, a 36-inch Cottonwood, which is proposed to be removed.

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

1. Preliminary detention calculations shall be included in the plans. Detention should be provided for the entire site.
2. Trip generation estimates per ITE Manual and Township Ordinance shall be provided to determine if a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) is warranted.
3. Existing ramps at the approaches on Jolsyn Rd. shall be replaced to meet ADA compliance. New ADA compliant ramps with detectable warning surfaces need to be provided for the crossing at Hammerslea Rd.
4. The applicant shall verify the size, invert, and downstream capacity of the existing storm water system on Jolsyn Road and show the information on the site plan. (i.e. the catch basin proposed as the detention system outlet).
5. Sedimentation pretreatment and oil/water separation shall be included in the storm management plan.
6. Include a grease interceptor system to service the leased building space that is separate from the municipal sanitary sewer service. Show the location on the proposed site plan.
7. Pavement sections must be updated to meet the Township Engineering Standards.
8. Sidewalk adjacent parking stalls shall be widened to 7-feet wide, or bumper blocks shall be provided in the parking spaces adjacent the building to ensure a minimum walking area width of 5 feet.
9. The sidewalk ramp detail shall be updated to be ADA compliant.
10. The drive-through aisle around the back of the building should be widened to a minimum of 11-feet in width and the outer aisle shall be made one-way (north to south).
11. Show the location of the proposed water, sanitary, gas, and electric services to the proposed site plan sheets. A Basis of Design for water and sanitary usage shall be included in the plans.
12. The location map on the cover page does not reference the proposed site location, please update the map.

13. Include two benchmarks that will be available for the duration of the proposed project.

14. Verify the size of water main on Hammerslea Road and denote on proposed site plan sheets. Per Township records, the water main on Hammerslea is 12-inch main.

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

Sincerely,

**OHM Advisors**

___

Connor Lamb
Engineer

Mark Landis, P.E.
Project Manager

cc: Chris Barnett, Township Supervisor
   David Goodloe, Building Official
   Jeff Stout, Director of Public Services
   Tammy Gurling, Director of Planning and Zoning
   Lynn Harrison, Planning and Zoning Coordinator
   Jeff Williams, Township Fire Marshal
   Bill Haugkow, Water and Sewer Superintendent
   Keith Ford, Oakland Fuels
   Bruce Calhoun, Creekwood Architecture
   File
To: Planning Commission/Planning & Zoning Director  
From: Jeff Williams, Fire Marshal  
Re: PPC-22-18, 3850 Joslyn Road Renovation Site Plan for Gas Station and SLU for a Drive Thru  
Date: 06/21/22

The Orion Township Fire Department has completed its review of Application PPC-22-18 for the limited purpose of compliance with Charter Township of Orion Ordinance’s, Michigan Building Code, and all applicable Fire Codes.

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

   X Approved with Comments (See below)
   Not approved

Comments:

   - The proposed canopy shall be at least 13’ 6” tall meeting the requirements of International Fire Code.

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

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

Sincerely,

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

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

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeffery T. Stout
Director
Department of Public Services
July 1, 2022

Lynn Harrison  
Orion Township  
Planning & Zoning  
2323 Joslyn Road  
Lake Orion, MI 48360

Reference:  
3850 Joslyn Rd – Existing Gas Station – CAMS #202200548  
Part of the SE ¼ of Section 35, Orion Township

Dear Ms. Harrison,

This office has received one set of plans for the 3850 Joslyn Road Project to be developed in the Southwest ¼ of Section 28, Orion Township.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Brian Bennett, P.E.  
Civil Engineer III
A site walk was conducted on June 18, 2022 for PPC-22-18, 3850 Joslyn Road.

The site is currently being operated as a Sunoco gasoline filling station. The gasoline pumps are located on the Joslyn frontage and are under a canopy. There are 2 curb cuts on Joslyn and 2 curb cuts on Hammerslea Road. There is a concrete wall separating the adjoining properties to the north and west. There is one large tree on the site north of the existing building. The property to the south consists of a small retail center with a party store and carry out restaurant.

Respectfully submitted,
Donald Gross, Planner Commissioner

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

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

Project Name: **RENOVATIONS TO EXISTING SERVICE STATION FOR KEITH FORD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Development if applicable</th>
<th>MR OAKLAND FUELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong> KEITH FORD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Address:** 3943 AIRPORT RD  
| City: WATERFORD  
| State: MI  
| Zip: 48329 |
| **Phone:** 248 623 9610  
| **Cell:** 248 249 6058  
| **Fax:** 248 623 9610 |
| **Email:** kfordin@oaklandfuels.com |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Property Owner(s)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Name:** KEITH FORD  
| **Company:** GREAT LAKES 3850, LLC |
| **Address:** 3943 AIRPORT RD  
| City: WATERFORD  
| State: MI  
| Zip: 48329 |
| **Phone:** 248 623 9610  
| **Cell:** 248 249 6058  
| **Fax:** 248 623 9610 |
| **Email:** kfordin@oaklandfuels.com |

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Preparer Firm/Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong> BRUCE CALHOUN CREEKWOOD ARCHITECTURE INC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Address:** 1111 CREEKWOOD TR  
| City: BURTON  
| State: MI  
| Zip: 48509 |
| **Phone:** 810 742 0480  
| **Cell:** 810 919 8555  
| **Fax:** 810 742 8393 |
| **Email:** bcalhoun@creekwoodarch.com |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Contact Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong> BRUCE CALHOUN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Address:** 1111 CREEKWOOD TR  
| City: BURTON  
| State: MI  
| Zip: 48509 |
| **Phone:** 810 742 0480  
| **Cell:** 810 919 8555  
| **Fax:** 810 742 8393 |
| **Email:** bcalhoun@creekwoodarch.com |
Sidwell Number(s): 0-09-28-376-031
Location or Address of Property: 3850 JOSLIN ROAD
Side of Street: HAMMERSLEA Nearest Intersection:
Acreage: .91 Current Use of Property: SERVICE STATION
Is the complete legal description printed on the site plan? ☑ Yes ☐ No (if no please attach to the application)
Subject Property Zoning: GB Adjacent Zoning: N. R3 S. GB E. GB W. R3
List any known variances needed (subject to change based on Township consultant’s review)
GREEN BELT
NORTH SIDE YARD 22 FT REDUCTION, WEST (REA) 24 FT REDUCTION
Give a detailed description of the proposed development, including the number and size of the buildings or units being proposed
Pursuant to Zoning Ordinance 78, Section 30.01 C. a copy of this application and two copies of the site plan must be submitted to the each of the following agencies. Please provide the Township with a copy of each transmittal as proof of delivery.

| AT&T 54 Mill St. Pontiac, MI 48342 | Consumers Power Company 530 W. Willow St. Lansing, MI 48906 |
| DTE Energy Co. ATTENTION: NW Planning & Design 1970 Orchard Lake Rd. Sylvan Lake, MI 48320 | Oakland County Health Department Building 34 East 1200 N. Telegraph Rd. Pontiac, MI 48341 |
| Michigan Department of Transportation (if applicable) 800 Vanguard Dr. Pontiac, MI 48341 | Road Commission of Oakland County (if applicable) ssintkowski@rcoc.org (electronic submittal only) |
| Oakland County Water Resources To Be Submitted by the Township |

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

Signature of Applicant: ____________________________ Date: 3/16/22
Print Name: KEITH JOED

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

Signature of Owner (if the deed of ownership does not show an individual, ie is a corporation, partnership, etc., documentation must be provided showing the individual signing this application has signing rights for the entity): ____________________________ Date: 3/16/22
Print Name: KEITH JOED

Version 12/1/21
Charter Township of Orion
Planning & Zoning Department
2323 Jodlyn Rd., Lake Orion MI 48360
P: (248) 391-0304 ext. 5002; Fax (248) 391-1454

Project Name: **RENOVATIONS TO EXISTING SERVICE STATION FOR KEITH FORD**
PC# ___________________________ Parcel#(s) 0-09-28-376-031

Please select an option below:

☑️ **Permission to Post on Web Site**

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

__________________________________________  __________________________
Signature of Applicant                        Date

**KEITH FORD**

Printed Name of Applicant

☐ **Do not want plans posted on Web Site**
Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission

Special Land Use Approval Application

30.02, A. Intent: Special land use procedures and standards are instituted to provide consistent and uniform guidelines for the Planning Commission to follow in arriving at any special land use decision over which it has jurisdiction. Special land uses are uses that may be permitted in a district, but only if certain specified conditions are met, and only after review and approval by the Planning Commission. The review procedures which are conditions for approval are intended to provide protection for adjacent uses and ensure full compliance with the standards contained within Zoning Ordinance 78 and other applicable local ordinances and State and Federal laws.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>RENOVATIONS TO EXISTING SERVICE STATION FOR KEITH FORD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Development/Business if applicable:</td>
<td>OAKLAND FUELS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: KEITH FORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 3943 AIRPORT RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: WATERFORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State: MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip: 48329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 248 623 9610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell: 248 249 6058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: 248 623 9610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:kf@oaklandfuels.com">kf@oaklandfuels.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Property Owner(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: KEITH FORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 3943 AIRPORT RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: WATERFORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State: MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip: 48329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 248 623 9610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell: 248 249 6058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: 248 623 9610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:kf@oaklandfuels.com">kf@oaklandfuels.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Preparer Firm/Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: BRUCE CALHOUN CREEKWOOD ARCHITECTURE INC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 1111 CREEKWOOD TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: BURTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State: MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip: 48509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 810 742 0480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell: 810 919 8555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: 810 742 8393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:bcalhoun@creekwoodarch.com">bcalhoun@creekwoodarch.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Contact Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: BRUCE CALHOUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 1111 CREEKWOOD TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: BURTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State: MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip: 48509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 810 742 0480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell: 810 919 8555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: 810 742 8393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:bcalhoun@creekwoodarch.com">bcalhoun@creekwoodarch.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12-1-2021
Sidwell Number(s): 0-09-28-376-031

Location or Address of Property: 3850 JOSLYN RD

Side of Street: HAMMERSLEA Nearest Intersection:

Acreage: .91 Current Use of Property: SERVICE STATION

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

Subject Property Zoning: GB Adjacent Zoning: N. R3 S. GB E. GB W. R3

Give a detailed description of the proposed use:

**RENOVATIONS TO EXISTING SERVICE STATION**
**NEW BUILDING 6,217 SF**
**TO REPLACE EXISTING**
**(2) ADDITIONAL GAS PUMPS.**
**SERVICE STATION WITH C-STORE.**
**NEW LEASE SPACE WITH DRIVE-THRU WINDOW**

Pursuant to Zoning Ordinance 78, Section 30.02(B), a copy of this application must be submitted to the each of the following agencies: Please provide the Township with a copy of each transmittal and proof of delivery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>54 Mill St. Pontiac, MI 48342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTE Energy Co.</td>
<td>ATTENTION: NW Planning &amp; Design 1970 Orchard Lake Rd. Sylvan Lake, MI 48320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumers Power Company</td>
<td>530 W. Willow Rd. Lansing, MI 48906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland County Health Department</td>
<td>Building 34 East 1200 N. Telegraph Rd. Pontiac, MI 48341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland County Water Resources Commission</td>
<td>Road Commission of Oakland County (if applicable) <a href="mailto:ssinkowski@rcoc.org">ssinkowski@rcoc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(To be submitted by the Township)</td>
<td>(Electronic submittal only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Department of Transportation</td>
<td>800 Vanguard Dr. Pontiac, MI 48341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed special land use shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained so as to be compatible with uses of adjacent land. The site design of the proposed special land use shall minimize the impact of site activity on surrounding properties. In determining whether this requirement has been met, please describe the consideration given to the following:
Location and screening of vehicular circulation and parking areas in relation to surrounding development:

* Asking for a reduction of greenbelts on north 22' west 24' ft.
* There is a existing 6' HT Masonry Screen Wall along both property lines. The North has existing mature deciduous trees. The West 10 maple trees will be added.

Location and screening of outdoor storage, outdoor activity or work areas and mechanical equipment, in relation to surrounding development:

* Masonry screening of dumpsters, screen walls along both North/West property lines.
* No outside storage of goods.

The hours of operation of the proposed use:

- 5AM - 10 PM M-F
- 7AM - 10 PM Weekends

The bulk, placement, and materials of construction of the proposed use in relation to surrounding uses:

* Building will be located in the same spot as the existing.
* In the middle of site.
* Brick stone & cement board siding similar to most residential homes.

Describe how the proposed special land use is compatible with and in accordance with the general principles and objectives of the Orion Township Master Plan and how it promotes the intent and purpose of Zoning Ordinance 78:

* The existing use is the same as proposed. Rebuilding building & site to better serve the community.
* The new facility will be a major improvement to the corner.

Describe how the proposed special land use is located so as to be adequately served by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage systems, water and sewage facilities, and schools:

* The existing facility is located on the intersection of a main road & side street allowing access to the site from multiple locations.
The location of the proposed special land use within the zoning district shall minimize the impact of the traffic generated by the proposed use on surrounding uses. Describe the consideration given to the following:

Proximity and access to major thoroughfares

TRAFFIC WILL HAVE TWO ROADS TO ACCESS A EGRESS FROM, THIS REDUCING THE IMPACT ON JUST (1) ROAD, SITE IS EXISTING

Estimated traffic generated by the proposed use

100 CARS PER DAY

Proximity and relation to intersections

LOCATED ON INTERSECTION OF JOSLYN RD & HAMMERSLEY RD

Adequacy of sight distances

CLEAR VISION ZONE ON CORNER. LOW LANDSCAPING & GREEN AREA.

Location of and access to off-street parking

OFF STREET PARKING IS LOCATED IN THE FRONT & SIDE OF THE BUILDING.

Required vehicular turning movements

TRAFFIC FLOW WITHIN THE SITE SHALL MEET ALL STANDARDS OF THE TOWNSHIP

Provision for pedestrian traffic

SIDEWALK LOCATED ALONG EAST JOSLYN RD.

The proposed special land use shall not involve any activities, processes, materials, equipment or conditions of operation, and shall not be so located or designed, as to be detrimental to public health, safety, and welfare. Describe the consideration given to the production of traffic, noise, vibration, smoke, fumes, odors, dust, glare, and light.

SCREEN WALLS ARE LOCATED ON REAR & SIDE PROPERTY LINES TO BLOCK NOISE & LIGHT FROM TRAFFIC & BUILDING.

The proposed special land use shall provide the maximum feasible enhancement of the surrounding environment and shall not unreasonably interfere with or discourage the appropriate development and use of adjacent land and buildings or unreasonably affect their value. Describe how consideration was given to:

Landscaping & other amenities

LARGE AMOUNTS OF LANDSCAPE HAVE BEEN ADDED (NON EXISTING)

The bulk placement and materials of construction of proposed structures in relation to surrounding uses

THE BUILDING WILL BE LOCATED IN THE SAME SPOT AS THE EXISTING MIDDLE OF SITE. BRICK, STONE, CEMENT BOARD SIDING.
Explain how the location of the proposed special land use does not result in a small residential area being substantially surrounded by non-residential development, and further, the location of the proposed special land use does not result in a small non-residential area being substantially surrounded by incompatible uses:

**THE USE & FACILITY IS EXISTING. RENOVATING FACILITY TO BETTER SERVE THE COMMUNITY IT IS CURRENTLY SERVING. EXISTING SCREEN WALLS.**

Pursuant to Zoning Ordinance 78, Section 30.02(D) a sign indicating the requested special land use 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 Special Land Use, pursuant to the provisions of the Charter Township of Orion Zoning Ordinance No. 78, Section 30.02 and applicable ordinance requirements. In support of this request the above facts are provided. I hereby certify that the information provided is accurate and the application that has been provided is complete.

Signature of Applicant:

(must be original ink signature) __________________________ Date: 3/11/23

Print Name: __________________________

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

Signature of Owner*:

(must be original ink signature) __________________________ Date: 3/10/23

Print Name: __________________________

*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 30.02(D), Special Land Procedures and Standards, 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:

**SPECIAL LAND USE 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.
Charter Township of Orion
Planning & Zoning Department
2323 Joslyn Rd., Lake Orion MI 48360
P: (248) 391-0304 ext. 5002

Project Name: RENOVATIONS TO EXISTING SERVICE STATION FOR KEMH FUND
PC# Parcel#(s) 0-09-28-376-031

Please select an option below:

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

__________________________________________  ____________________________
Signature of Applicant                      Date

__________________________________________
Printed Name of Applicant

☐ Do not want posted on Web Site
RENOVATIONS TO
EXISTING SERVICE STATION
FOR
KEITH FORD
3850 JOSLYN ROAD
ORION TWP. MI.
SECTION 28

tax no. 0-09-28-376-031

Likely, this document contains details about a renovation project for a service station. The location coordinates and contact information for Keith Ford are also included. The legal description, building information, and site plan are also provided in the document.
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

Lots 33 and 101, Dawson Woods No. 1, parts of the Southeast 1/4, Section 29, Southwest 1/4, Section 28, Northwest 1/4, Section 33, and Northeast 1/4 of the Northeast 1/4, Section 32, Town 4 North, Range 10 East, Orion Township, Oakland County, Michigan, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Liber 74, page 38 of Plats, Oakland County Records.
SIDEWALK RAMP DETAIL

* IF THE LEVEL LANDING AT THE TOP OF THE RAMP IS LESS THAN 48" THEN THE SLOPE OF THE FLARED SIDES SHALL NOT EXCEED 1:12

NO SCALE

* 1:10 SLOPE

* 1:12 SLOPE

ON ALL SLOPED SURFACES CROSSHATCH GROOVING

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

Lots 33 and 101, Dawson Woods No. 1, parts of the Southeast 1/4, Section 29, Southwest 1/4, Section 28, Northwest 1/4, Section 33, and Northeast 1/4 of the Northeast 1/4, Section 32, Town 4 North, Range 10 East, Orion Township, Oakland County, Michigan, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Liber 74, page 38 of Plats, Oakland County Records.
Know what's below before you dig.
Call 811 first.
TO: The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission
FROM: Tammy Girling, Zoning/Planning Director
DATE: June 29, 2022
RE: Future Land Use Draft Master Plan

I recently received a phone call regarding a parcel in the Township which it was believed the draft Future Land Use map had an error related to the property.

The parcel that is in question is currently zoned Railroad Freight Yard and the draft Future Land Use map has it as Utility Owned. I have verified that the parcel is privately owned and is not owned by a utility company. In addition, while looking at the FLU map it was found that an area owned by the utility company is listed Recreation (vs. utility owned).

The information is in front of you to determine the proper future land use distinction for the parcel that is being questioned (and perhaps the adjacent parcel that appears incorrect also).

For your reference to the attached document:
Parcel 09-28-401-008 is privately owned
Parcel 09-28-401-007 is owned by the railroad
Parcel 09-28-251-008 is owned by ITC (utility)

If you have any questions, please feel free to reach out to me.
This 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.
To whom ever it may concern,

I am writing you today on July 6, 2022 to openly reject the 5 year Master plan that is being put into action in Lake Orion Michigan. All my life my family and I have lived here and loved that it was like living a vacation and yes there might be a big lake you'd consider to be the reason why it's like living a vacation when in reality it's the beauty of the wetlands and being able to have that relaxation to escape to nature. If you decide to build on those lands is this place really what you like to call a vacation. I'm sure many of us people of lake orion wouldn't be calling it where living is a vacation, you might as well change it to where living use to be a vacation. This town deserves to be left alone and left in its glory not destroyed for greed and what you consider a investment towards a Brighter future.

Yours sincerely,
One pissed off resident of lake orion
Reject the 5 year plan and protect the natural beauty of Orion. Recent acceleration of development in the township has already begun to destroy the unique charm of the place we call home.
I disagree with your 5yr Master Plan. I moved here from W.Bloomfield in 2004 specifically because it wasn't W.Bloomfield. M24 traffic is horrible now, road noise is constant, and it goes against "Where living is a vacation"

We don't need to be a Royal Oak, Birmingham or Ferndale or even Rochester. We don't need a ton of shops and restaurants. They're all accessible from our area.

What we do need is continued green spaces, low congestion and Low Taxes.

Development adds to over utilization of existing infrastructure and with increase in population comes increase in societal problems.

Keep "Where Living is a Vacation" just that.

Thank You
Dear To whom it may concern,

I am a citizen in Lake Orion township.
I have read about the plan to use our natural resources, woodlands, and wetlands for more urbanization.
I reject this plan and prefer to preserve the lands
We have enough places for people to live here in Lake Orion.
It is already too congested.
We need to focus on plans to preserve our lands and the animals to.

If you need to follow up with me, you can call me: 810 310-0141

Sincerely,

Tina Hein

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
-----Original Message-----
From: Karen K <kkoneda24@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 3, 2022 11:36 AM
To: Tammy Girling <tgirling@oriontownship.org>
Subject: Master Plan

To whom it may concern,
The Orion Township Master Plan in regards to housing seems to be more a reflection of external influence versus a reflection of those within the community. The Master Plan’s disproportionate support for urban cluster homes IE townhomes and apartments, is not in correlation with the lifestyle people seek when living in Orion Township. While urban sprawl is inevitable, we chose to live in this community because of green space and water limiting an over abundance of growth. Building congestion is evident in other communities. This plan seems to be more accommodating to transient living versus those who build a life here spanning over years. A more appropriate cultural fit for this community is middle class homes with integrated green space. If prospective home buyers prefer cluster transient living conditions, they can live in Troy.

Sincerely,
Karen Koneda

Sent from my iPhone
I guess I need to ask who’s master plan? We’ve lived in lake orion 30 years. We moved here for the nature, lakes and small town feel. It is kinda like living up north without the drive. Reading about this 5 year urban master plan without getting public opinion is wrong. If I wanted to live in a crowded urban city I would have moved to one. Please re-think this agenda.

Sent from Proton Mail for iOS
I am totally apposed to the "attainable" housing and design fitting URBAN areas.
I have lived here 42 years, since 1980. I also lived here from 1963 to 1967. I graduated Lake Orion High.

I am very against the WEF and every single thing they stand for. I hope someone has investigated all they stand for. They are Global Predators. Don't let your pocketbook get ahead of your future. Lake Orion is a wonderful place to live right now.

I am disgusted with Oakland County for sending them 3 million. And now they can buy up wetlands?? Oh! After the "first right of refusal"

So much for protecting Wetlands.

If you let this happen, this will not be the county I grew up in. The WEF doesn't want you to own anything. But they think we will be happy.

Please do your research before you buy into this plan.

Linda Greer
42 year resident
Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone
I agree with you that the whole Master Plan should be rejected. Who ever thought that changing are community to coincide with the communist elites of the World Economic Forum is a good idea. I would like to know the individuals responsible for this dumb idea because I would like to vote them out of office.
From: amratza@yahoo.com <amratza@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2022 10:14 PM
To: Tammy Girling <tgirling@oriontownship.org>
Subject: Orion Twp. 5-Year Master Plan - July 6 Agenda

Greetings,

Please accept this letter as a plea to reject the Orion Township 5-Year Master Plan on the July 6th Agenda. A plan that serves the interests of the globalists of the World Economic Forum (WEF) is something we simply cannot stand for and expect to flourish in the long-term. The WEF is the proverbial wolf in sheep’s clothing. Their boilerplate language for their goals of forging public-private partnerships sounds innocent enough, but behind their word salad is nothing short of fascism. As Kathryn Kennedy accurately pointed out in the letters to the editor of the Lake Orion Review, if WEF has their way, our 5-Year Master Plan will include us all owning nothing and being “happy”.

I find it abhorrent that the Oakland County Board of Commissioners approved sending $3 million to the WEF, even if it comes in the form of a donation to the U.S. Centre for Advanced Manufacturing. These funds are likely to be laundered towards one of their many shady initiatives under the guise of public-private partnership. We are flirting with disaster in any plan that bends to this criminal organization.

Over the generations, this community has been built into a treasure and something we can all be proud of. This treasure must continue to be nurtured, and any false step taken can be devastating to the biological and economical ecosystem that we’ve been able to cultivate. A Master Plan aligned to a WEF-supported agenda will devastate this community by design. This organization has a goal of one world government, sacrificing American sovereignty in the process. If we don’t stand up at a local level, the snowball will be too large to stop at the national level. We must rise up here and now. Please reject this 5-Year Master Plan; there must be a better way forward, because I couldn’t think of a worse way forward for our community and our families.

Thank you for your consideration,

Adrian Ratza
My family and I moved to the area over 20 years ago essentially due to what the marketing slogan for Orion states, "Where living is a vacation".

Over the last several years we have seen a substantial increase in densely populate, Multi family developments which has had an unmistakable negative impact on traffic and the general quality of life in the Orion area.

At a very basic level, the infrastructure, especially the roads are simply not capable of sustaining these huge spikes in dense population.

By all appearances it appears that our local government representatives are caving, or worse are willing advocates of implementing an agenda driven by the leftist Federal government to densify populations in rural and suburban areas in a blatant attempt to change voting demographics for political purposes.

This is insidious, wrong and undeniably an unmistakable form of dereliction of duty in favor of furthering a political agenda.

As a 20+ year resident and taxpayer of Orion, I can’t state strongly enough how opposed I am to this densification population of low-cost housing in our neighborhood to further a political agenda.

Sincerely,

Kevin Breslin
Hi Tammy, these are the components I disagree with. Regional transit, diversified attainable housing, higher density zoning status. More traffic. Keep our natural resources, woodland, wetlands for the wildlife that live here. I moved from Chesterfield Township to Orion Township 9 years ago for the same reasons that Chesterfield did there, which this township is trying to do.
Thank you for your time

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

On Thursday, June 30, 2022, 2:39 PM, Tammy Girling <tgirling@oriontownship.org> wrote:

Hello,
Thank you for your comments. Just as a side note, by law we have to discuss the master plan every 5 years. The document itself is about an 1.5” thick with a great deal on information. Is there a particular component that you are opposed to?

Tammy Girling
Director
Planning & Zoning
2323 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, MI 48360
O: 248.391.0304, ext. 5000  C: 248.978.2132
W: www.oriontownship.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Timothy Munsell <munselltimothy@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2022 2:32 PM
To: Tammy Girling <tgirling@oriontownship.org>
Subject: 5year master plan changes

I just read about it in the Lake Orion Review. None supporter of changing master plan. Keep Orion Township a place where living is a vacation. Make my interest in this matter a solid no.
Sent from my iPhone
June 27, 2022

Commissioner Gwen Markham, Chairperson
Oakland County Coordinating Zoning Committee
1200 North Telegraph Road
Pontiac, MI 48341

SUBJECT: County Code No. MP 22-06, Oakland County Department of Economic Development, Division of Planning & Local Business Development’s staff review of the Orion Township Draft Master Plan Update.

Dear Chairperson Markham and Committee Members:

On May 10, 2022, the Oakland County Department of Economic Development (OCED), Division of Planning & Local Business Development (PLBD) received a mailed letter from Orion Township, dated May 5, 2022, that initiated the review and comment period for the proposed Orion Township Draft Master Plan Update, (County Code Master Plan No. 22-06). Under the Michigan Planning Enabling Act, which took effect September 1, 2008, Oakland County, adjacent municipalities, and other jurisdictional authorities have 63 days to submit comments on Master Plan updates.

This review of the draft Master Plan will go before the Oakland County Coordinating Zoning Committee (CZC) on July 6, 2022. This date falls within the community’s specified comment period. It is assumed that the adjacent Oakland County Communities were notified about the proposed draft Master Plan and review period by Orion Township. The draft Master Plan can be found at: https://www.oriontownship.org/departments/planning_zoning/master_plan_update.php

Staff Recommendation

Based on the review of the surrounding communities’ master plans, the Orion Township Draft Master Plan proposed update is not inconsistent with the plan of any city, village, or township that received notice of the draft plan. Oakland County has not prepared a countywide development plan, so there is no countywide plan with which to compare the draft amendment. Following is a detailed analysis and summation of the draft Master Plan update.

Select Summary Analysis of Content

The focus of this report is to present a clear understanding of the draft master plan document and describe changes in border land use through an analysis of the plan. Recommendations that may help make the document stronger are offered as a result of the analysis. The information included herein represents a summarized analysis of the proposed Orion Township draft Master Plan. Select sections are highlighted in this review with a focus on changes to borderline conditions and future land uses. Planning Staff at Oakland County last reviewed changes to the community’s Master Plan in 2015, which was later adopted by Orion Township that same year. Communities adjacent to Orion Township include the City of Auburn Hills, Village of Lake Orion, Independence Township, Oxford Township and Orion Township. The adjacent communities’ master plans were used in the border compatibility analysis portion of this report.
Demographics
The proposed master plan has updated all demographic information using data from the 2019 U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS), and the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG). Orion Township has experienced 5% population growth since 2000. Staff recommendations below will address utilization of 2020 Census data.

Existing Land Use
Existing land uses were updated to reflect changes through 2020. Classifications have been modified to reflect additional density or intensity of land use details; however, they do not reflect actual use changes. Existing land use patterns along the community’s borders remain essentially unchanged, with the new classification categories simply reflecting more detail regarding existing density patterns.

Community Facilities
This section is focused on the township’s infrastructure and services. The section has been widened to include non-motorized transportation and other forms of mobility. Sidewalk and bicycle safety paths are promoted in the plan, both as part of existing and proposed trails, as well as components of complete streets. The infrastructure portion focuses on the utility systems recent expansion and growing/stabilized capacity.

Environment
This section includes a focus on the protection and preservation of natural features remaining within the township. Information developed by Michigan Natural Features Inventory (MNFI) is included along with best practices related to preventing the spread of invasive species as encouraged by the Oakland County Cooperative Invasive Species Management Area (CISMA). The Sustainability & Resiliency sub-section focusses on the planning implications of severe weather, long-term climate change, impervious surfaces and flood areas, stormwater management, and disaster mitigation planning for vulnerable populations.

Public Input
The township held three (3) public input opportunities during development of the draft Master Plan. In February of 2021 the township hosted a “Leadership Advance” session which included a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis with township staff and select stakeholders. An in-person Master Plan Open House was held in June of 2021 which was followed immediately by a 4-day virtual open house. A Draft Master Plan Open House was hosted on May 18, 2022. The results of the sessions are outlined in the Plan and provide background and basis for many of the Master Plan goals and objectives.
Housing
Over three quarters of the township’s dwelling unit inventory is made up of single, detached units, with almost 70% of the housing stock valued at over $200,000 in 2019. The section touches on “missing middle housing”, attainability and affordability. The Master Plan seeks to address 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). By supporting a variety of housing types the Plan seeks to expand the number of homes available across many price points.

Future Land Use
The proposed Future Land Use (FLU) plan, when compared to the FLU plan of 2015, includes several changes to the descriptions of FLU classifications. The FLU plan has been simplified by combining “Private Recreation” and “Recreation”, and consolidating four single family designations into three, with minor changes to the underlying planned densities.

The Plan also includes two new classifications:

1. “Special Circumstances” are land use designations that have legal agreements in place that regulate the density and layout of the subdivision. These areas are typically single family or attached residential in nature. There is a density map providing the regulated density of the residential developments included in this designation. This category also includes areas that have conditional rezone agreements in place

2. “Planned Unit Development” designates sites that have been approved through the Township’s Planned Unit Development process and have established development agreements. The density map provides the regulated density of residential developments included in this designation.

Several of the highlighted border changes below involve new classifications that do not reflect an actual change in land use. Rather, they reflect their status as “Special Conditions” or “Planned Unit Developments”.

Finally, the Plan includes “Core Area of 15 Minute Neighborhood” designations. These are 15-Minute Neighborhoods 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. All four of these planning areas extend beyond the township’s borders, reflecting the interconnectedness of communities and the need for pedestrian and other non-motorized planning within and among communities.

Our review of the FLU map along the borders of the township have been identified changes in nine (9) separate locations. An analysis of the change to FLU classification of select properties is provided as follows:

1. East Border with Oakland Twp.: East of Squirrel Road and south of Silver Bell the designation changed from Single-Family Medium Density (1-3/ac) to Special Circumstances (No density noted). This does not reflect a future land use. It reflects an existing single-family development that meets the new definition of the Special Circumstances designation. It is similar to area residential developments and constitutes a compatible border.

2. East Border with Oakland Twp.: Southeast corner of Silver Bell and Squirrel. Designation changed from Single-Family Low Density (1-5 / ac) to Planned Unit Development (4.8 / ac). This change reflects a Planned Unit Development approved by the township (County Code RZ 20-01). The residential character of this PUD blends well with nearby land uses and constitutes a compatible border.

3. East Border with Oakland Twp.: Decker 15 Minute Neighborhood. The designation does not denote any proposed land use changes on the plan map. Instead, the Plan notes: "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 re-purposing of single-family buildings or new buildings that are compatible with single-family uses.”

This designation constitutes a **compatible border**.

4. East Border with Oakland Twp.: Along Kern Rd. – Designation changed from Private Recreation (a golf course) to Planned Unit Development to reflect an approved PUD which resulted in a single-family type housing development identified as the Estates at Bald Mountain that began construction in 2016. It is generally consistent with residential development patterns in the area and constitutes a **compatible border**.

5. North border with Oxford Twp.: Designation changes from Single Family Medium High Density (3-5 / ac) and Single-Family Medium Density (1-3 / ac) to Single Family High Density (3-5 / ac). This change reflects existing development patterns in the area, is generally consistent with the residential development densities, and constitutes a **compatible border**.

6. North border with Oxford Twp.: West side of M-24 – Designation changes from Institutional and General Office to Special Circumstances. The Plan is reflecting an approved development pattern that is based on legal agreements related to conditional zoning. This rezoning case was reviewed by the CZC in 2018 (County Code RZ 18-05). This is a **compatible border**.

7. Border with Lake Orion, north of village: Designation change from single family medium density to Special Circumstance. This area consists of a single-family development and a commercial/retail development known as The Shores of Long Lake. The commercial uses are along the M-24 corridor while the residential uses create an extension of the village’s street system which connects to the commercial development. All uses are existing and well established since the late 1990’s when the development was created. This remains to be a **compatible border**.

8. South border with Auburn Hills: East side of Meadowbrook Ln. – Designation change from Single-Family Medium Density (1-3 / ac) to Multiple Family Medium Density (5-7 / ac). The southern property line abuts I-75, with Auburn Hills south of the I-75 freeway and right of way. Existing multiple family residential development is situated south of I-75 in Auburn Hills. This is a **Compatible Border**.
9. South border with Auburn Hills: Northeast Corner of Dutton and Lapeer Rd. – Designation change from Research / Light Industrial to Planned Unit Development. This reflects an already approved and partially built commercial development through a PUD. Commercial / industrial land uses are predominant along Lapeer Rd. This is a compatible border.

Recommendations

As stated throughout this review, recommendations have been made to strengthen the plan as a usable tool for the community. The following are staff recommendations for the Draft Master Plan:

1. Update the demographic data to include the 2020 Census information.

2. Consider referencing Map 14 – Residential Density Plan on the Future Land Use Map for the new Special Circumstances and Planned Unit Development designations so users have an easy reference to determine approved densities for these designated properties.

3. Add the Recreational Future Land Use (FLU) designation to the recreational trails in the township. This recommendation is based on County Code 18-04 (Orion Township PC-2018-20) which was a rezoning of the Polly Ann Trail and Paint Creek Trail systems to have a zoning of Recreation-2 (REC-2) an outdoor recreation classification. The Proposed FLU map continues to show the trails without a use classification.

Oakland County Technical Assistance

A summary of programs offered by the Oakland County Economic Development Department that are relevant to Orion Township have been included on the final page of this review.

Oakland County Technical Resources

Oakland County compiles existing and future land use statistics for the county as a whole and for each community using generalized land use definitions. These documents are included as reference and to provide a snapshot of the Township's existing land use and development patterns.

Conclusion Summary

The Orion Township Draft Master Plan is very comprehensive and expands on strategies to include a strong emphasis on housing, healthy growth, hazard mitigation and the environment. The plan is well written, has obtainable goals, and should prove to be a useful tool to guide forecasted growth and natural preservation within the township.

Our review includes three non-binding recommendations that we hope will strengthen the plan. Oakland County does not have a Planning Commission or County Master Plan, so a full comparison and contrast of the information to County-wide Plans is not possible. Our staff review of the proposed Master Plan and a cursory review of adjacent communities’ Master Plans have found the Orion Township Draft Master Plan to be not inconsistent with those plans.

Orion Township has received a copy of this review. Additional copies have been emailed to adjacent municipalities and other reviewing jurisdictions for their review and/or comment. On July 6, 2022, this review will go before the CZC which will consider a motion on the recommendation of the submitted draft Master Plan. If there are any questions or comments about this review and analysis, please do not hesitate to contact me at (248) 858-0389 or email me at krees@oakgov.com.

Respectfully,

Scott E. Kree
Senior Planner
CC:
Gary McGillivray, Oakland County Commissioner, CZC Vice-Chair
Phil Weipert, Oakland County Commissioner, CZC Member
Tammy Girling, Orion Township Planning & Zoning Director
Rod Arroyo, Planning Consultant at Giffels Webster
Matt Wojciechowski, Planning Consultant at Giffels Webster
Shawn Keenan, Auburn Hills City Planner
Brian Oppmann, Independence Township Planning & Zoning Director
Susan Galeczka, Clerk at Village of Lake Orion
Donald Mende, Oakland Township Planning Coordinator
Cheryl Lotan, Oxford Township Planning Coordinator
Brad Knight, Road Commission for Oakland County Director of Planning Environmental Concerns
Lori Swanson, Oakland TSC-MDOT Manager
Jim Tedder, ITC Area Manager
Jennifer Whitteaker, DTE Regional Manager
Brandon Hofmeister, Consumers Energy Senior VP of Government Affairs
# Oakland County Planning Resources

The Oakland County Department of Economic Development (OCED), Division of Planning & Local Business Development (PLBD) offers a variety of programs to support Oakland County communities with innovative programming and assistance to create attractive destinations in which to live, work and raise a family. The chart below details those programs offered by the PLBD (a division of the OCED). Current participation in these programs and opportunities for future involvement are noted on the right of the chart. Additional information on all OCED programs can be found at [www.oakgov.com/advantageoakland](http://www.oakgov.com/advantageoakland).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Orion Township’s Opportunities and Current Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<td>Orion Township supports development that is cognizant of natural resource protection and management. County staff members are able to act in a supporting capacity with grant application identification, open space protection, and sustainable development practices as requested.</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>
<td>County staff is able to assist with potential design concepts for adaptive reuse of any historic structures within the community.</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>
<td>Orion Township continues to send Master Plan Updates and Amendments to the County for review fulfilling the legislative requirements. Other coordination services are available upon request.</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>
<td>The County fully supports the expansion of non-motorized facilities and protection of the natural environment. Oakland County can aid the community in non-motorized planning efforts through education and the identification of potential funding sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownfield Redevelopment Authority (OCBRA)</td>
<td>Provide assistance in the County’s Brownfield initiative to clean-up and redevelop contaminated properties</td>
<td>The OCBRA can assist and coordinate with the State of Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes and Energy (EGLE, formally MDEQ) along with the Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC), as needed, in an effort to prepare designated brownfields for redevelopment with the County’s BRA.</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>
<td>Brandon Township is a participating community in the NoHaz program. Township Residents currently have access to this program which allows them to participate and properly dispose of household hazardous waste.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 3, 2022

Tammy Girling
Orion Township Planning Commission
2323 Joslyn Road
Lake Orion, MI 48360

Reference: 2022 Notice of Intent to Plan
Charter Township of Orion

Dear Ms. Girling:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Orion Township’s Master Plan proposed amendments.

There are multiple County Drains maintained and operated within Orion Township. The restoration and protection of the various Drainage Districts are an important objective of this office. Please be aware that my office is prepared to assist the Township in this endeavor under the relevant sections of the Michigan Drain Code.

Additionally, the County Drains located in Orion Township are within the Federal Phase-II Storm Water Program’s “Urbanized Area,” and therefore are subject to applicable Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit requirements. Specifically, Post-Construction requirements include site plan review, water quality performance standards, channel protection performance standards, long-term operations and maintenance and an enforcement/tracking procedure.

Also worth mentioning is the goal of the Oakland County Water Resource Commissioner to be a leader in stormwater quality in the State of Michigan. WRC’s new stormwater standards went into effect on May 31, 2021. Our new stormwater design standards can be found here:

My office is prepared to assist the township with the design and construction of future sewer extensions and drainage facility improvements. We will continue to cooperate with timely reviews of plans and the issuance of permits relating to utility construction. I look forward to continuing our success in working with Orion Township.

Sincerely,

Jim Nash, Oakland County Water Resources Commissioner

C: Ryan Dividock, AICP, PCP – Oakland County Planning & Economic Development Services
   Joe St. Henry, Secretary – Orion Township
June 1, 2022

Tammy Girling, Planning and Zoning Director
Orion Township
2323 Joslyn Rd
Lake Orion, MI 48360

Re: Orion Township Draft Master Plan Review

Dear Tammy,

The Road Commission for Oakland County has reviewed Orion Township’s Draft Master Plan. Below are comments on the plan and suggested edits.

- Page 48 – In the “Natural Beauty Roads” section, it is stated that “roads considered eligible for this designation are federal local roads…” but it is recommended that it say county local roads. Federal designation does not play a role in the eligibility of roads for natural beauty designation and county local roads is consistent with Part 357 of Act 451 (NREPA).

- Page 123 – Under “Jurisdiction”, we recommend including a statement mentioning that when appropriate, information will be shared regarding developments that are expected to significantly increase traffic. It is important to coordinate with RCOC early in the development process so that future safety or congestion concerns can be proactively addressed.

- Page 124 – Under “Planned Road Improvements”, Table 8 is missing some information for the Silverbell project. The full limits of the project are Brown, Giddings, Silverbell from Jamm Rd to M-24 (Lapeer Rd).

- Page 125 – Thoroughfare Plan / Master Right of Way Plan Map
  - Attached is the RCOC’s updated MROWP Map.
  - The legend shows “60 feet ROW” for local roads but the state legal minimum is 66 feet.
  - S Newman Rd (above Cole Rd and W Clarkston Rd) is shown in yellow but has a 120-foot ROW.

- Page 153 – Under High-Quality and Diverse Housing “Zoning Action Items”, item 1e, we recommend adding something to the effect of “coordinate with RCOC to ensure developments implement traffic safety measures and congestion mitigation strategies.”

- Page 157 – Under Economic Development “Advocacy Action Items”, item 3k should include “…work with MDOT and RCOC…” to ensure that the RCOC is also included in activities associated with Oakland County roads.

We appreciate the opportunity to review and comment. Please let us know if you have questions. Best wishes as you move forward with adopting and implementing your plan.

Sincerely,

Brad Knight
Director of Planning & Environmental Concerns
Debra Walton

From: Kathy <kmae690@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 1, 2022 4:30 PM
To: Debra Walton
Subject: Why does Planning Commission want to change Orion Township’s Motto “Where living IS a vacation” to “Where Living WAS a vacation?”

Deb:

Could you please distribute this letter to the Planning Commission members please. Thanks!

Kathryn Kennedy

Dear Commissioner:

PLEASE UNDERSTAND, WE THE PEOPLE OBJECT TO THE URBANIZATION of our region; This MASTER PLAN Is detrimental to ALL CITIZENS and WILDLIFE currently living in Lake Orion. The fact that the entire Plan was done by a Subcontracted firm that appears to have listened to global and external influences is shocking. This plan does not represent the needs or wants of the community. I have only recently started attending Orion Township meetings, but another citizen advised me that only 16 employees participated in planning that started in 2020, but was not shared with the public until 2022. How many citizens were involved in the development of the Orion Township Master Plan? Waterford enlisted guidance from 70 citizens BEFORE having the Master Plan presented to the citizens. I saw the 5-Year Master Plan for the first time on May 18, 2022 at the Orion Township OPEN HOUSE TO REVIEW THE MASTER PLAN!

WE NEED NO NEW CONSTRUCTION, FREEZE ALL ZONING CHANGES and ABSOLUTELY NO PUD DEVELOPMENTS that appear to prioritize developers above citizens!
We do not want the Urbanization and destruction of natural resources this Agenda includes. This Agenda includes (3) more NEW BUSINESS ITEMS including a Hyatt proposal – likely one of 3 Hotels planned to be built across from Costco that will create blight since we are entering into a recession, whether you realize or not, and everything I have researched so far is not good.

SCHOOL EXPANSION LIKELY NEEDED IF THESE MUTI-UNIT PROJECTS ARE APPROVED. Pine Tree Elementary was recently converted for Special Education, but with all the Multi-Unit “Attainable Housing” options listed as a Weakness in the Master Plan (Pages 70-71), these urbanization projects would force the need for more schools and all public services, increasing taxes further

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
CLARKSTON ROAD- INSIGHT LLC ZONING CHANGE PROPOSAL – only residents within 300 feet of property were notified, even though surrounding community has estate sized lots and it is a wildlife refuge and breeding area in the region. It appears to me converting this natural, rolling, wildlife filled 11.5 acres would have NO BENEFIT FOR CITIZENS and would forever eliminate the nature currently expected by the longtime residents and taxpayers. It appears this is part of the concept to promote low-income “Attainable Housing” into our communities, but that would change our motto from Where Living is a Vacation, to Where Living WAS a Vacation!

The proposed zoning change involves Insight LLC as the purchaser and that itself is concerning for several reasons. According to the State of Michigan LARA website, this LLC had only been in good standing for three years since 2008. This LLC was not in good standing since 2011, changed ownership with Resident Agents in Muskegon first, now
Jenison, then on 5-19-2020 filed 2016 through 2020 Annual Reports late to “Restore” the Corporation Certificate the next day? Why in the world would we want to rely on that proven mismanagement to protect our sensitive environment surrounding our Lakes community?

RIDGECOOD APARTMENTS PROJECT 625 Clarkston– This “Attainable” Housing project eliminates natural land (between Clarkston and Casmer Roads) and is not what is best for our community. In Ypsilanti, the developer’s project is considered a “Value” apartment. These parcels are surrounded by longtime resident taxpayers with large lots who were not even notified unless they were within 300’. Most lots in the region have a single lot dimension exceeding 300’; this is not a reasonable proposal and WOULD PERMANENTLY DAMAGE OUR COMMUNITY in the name of Greed. In effect, all citizens North of Clarkston in the Subdivision most impacted by the elimination of the natural environment DID NOT RECEIVE DIRECT NOTICE. This development is in between multiple lakes – all surrounded by wetlands, water fowl habitat, Deer, Sandhill Cranes, Red Winged Blackbirds, Orioles, Turkeys and much more wildlife.

There is No infrastructure, Roads, or Sewer currently on the property and residents do not want our environment and community altered. This specific proposal would create a need for Infrastructure and road where none is possible. Especially in between Pine Tree and Joslyn, that curved section of road between the lakes certainly does not need more traffic, and there is no place where a road is viable. In fact, since last year when they added a lane to LAPEER ROAD that pushed more concrete towards Buckhorn Lake, for this FIRST TIME since 1998, the Lake overflowed onto Lapeer Road, Clarkston Road, the commercial property at NW corner and WATER WAS PUMPED OUT OF THE LAKE INTO THE STORM SEWERS!!

This is not an acceptable project and is not suitable for the community. I believe a LAND CONSERVANCY not run by politicians is the best way the region maintains the environment the residents appreciate and support. Our tax money has been wasted and wetlands should not be developed since those always become flood zones.

OAKLAND COUNTY RECENT RESOLUTIONS

Perhaps you are unaware, but on (5-12-22) the Oakland County Board of Commissioners VOTED FOR (12-9) a Resolution to pay $3 million of our tax dollars to “accept the invitation” of the World Economic Forum to join the Third pillar of the “Automation Alley” global initiative they claim to have promoted in 1999. In fact “Automation Alley” was a marketing strategy created in Oakland County Michigan in 1987 to ADD JOBS in Oakland County coming out of a recession. WEF has redefined “Automation Alley” with the OPPOSITE INTENT designed to ELIMINATE JOBS with the stated Digital Transformation of Manufacturing, eliminating zoning, and making us all hackable. You may have seen the global elitists who had their once a year meeting in Davos, Switzerland recently – these are the rich people who take their private jets around the world to try to sell us on the non-recyclable, battery powered, “green energy” they invested too heavily in and cryptocurrency designed to replace US currency so they don’t have to repay US deficit.

WE THE PEOPLE CHOOSE FREEDOM – WE OBJECT TO ALL DIGITIZING OF OUR IDENTITY, VOTING, REAL ESTATE, MEDICAL RECORDS and other RECORDED DOCUMENTS. You see, they know the top 1% (like them) pays 40% of all US taxes and except for America, the socialist agenda dominates the globe, for them it is all about POWER and CONTROL.

Oakland County has been chosen as a guinea pig for the WEF social experiment to see if adding disadvantaged into perceived richer neighborhoods creates Fair Housing. Is this enabling Real Estate Investment Trusts to control residential housing since recorded documents are being pushed into a “Digital Transformation” AS WE SPEAK? Whoever controls the digital data will control everything and that appears to be the globalist/socialist plan.

AECOM was hired by Oakland County to find environmental solutions, but after $675,000 budget added to “Parks”, and about 1 year later, the first presentation merely copied the illogical UN theory of “green energy” which includes Item 1 as “No Poverty”. This Oakland County Board already created an “Attainable Housing Trust” and all sorts of new programs, in spite of having mismanaged the COUNTY INTO A DEFICIT BUDGET in 2021. They still continue funding Oakland Together free education and workforce training for residents and prospective residents, not just citizens! Conservation, not importation of disadvantaged residents from elsewhere, is the only logical solution.
THE ORION TOWNSHIP MASTER PLAN NEEDS TO BE DONE WITH THE INPUT OF THE CITIZENS WHO PAY FOR IT ALL; THIS GLOBALIST AGENDA MASTER PLAN IN UNACCEPTABLE. Thank you very much for your consideration. PLEASE REJECT Urbanization of our community.

Longtime Resident,

Kathryn Kennedy
248-981-9185

Sent from Mail for Windows
Donni Comments

MASTER Plan

Comments.

Pg. 181 - Is the
Non Single Family units
Signify as 1 dwelling
or 1 Apartment Building?

Pg. 182-183 - Are Cooling Statistics
Necessary? This is
A 5-Year Master Plan.
Will Cooling Be Relevant as
a Past Statistic in
2022-2027?

Page 147

The Picture is a
Terrible Tribute
to Fenway Victory Garden
Hi Tammy, I know you sent this April 1 but sorry I didn’t realize I was late typing up my notes. If there is any chance to pick up some of these comments if not done already that would be good.

Master plan:

1. There are a number of typos but probably already picked up.

2. History of trails has nice feature on map of Paint Creek but Poly Ann is hard to pick out if there. Pg 16

3. Existing Land use % numbers don’t add up. Suggests way too much industrial which isn’t labeled. Pg 23

4. Demographics don’t agree with the MEDC numbers on our website. Pg.27 (I don’t know which is better but they should agree)

5. Parks map is weak and hard to read. Pg 45

6. The watershed lines map need some township lines or some frame of reference Pg. 57

7. The words "Discourage Heavy industry" appear. I realize that we aren’t promoting that but, in light of the recent GM announcement maybe those words could just disappear. Pg. 74

8. The Preferred Housing numbers as presented are confusing to me. Seems like they should add to 100%. Pg. 75

9. The "Vision" which I’ll take to mean the vision of this Mater Plan, should include the phrase "promoting high quality new real estate investment in the community". Pg. 81

10. We need a specific target to replace or redevelop underutilized properties to align with the vision and prominence of the community. Pg 84

   (really thing of Estes, Huston, Georgia area)

11. ECON dev Strategy #3 should include a statement about leveraging the great GM investment in terms of retail, commercial, hotel and service support opportunities for downstream investment. Pg. 105

12. Retail Incubators in Strategy #5 creating these small temporary structures is odd to me. We don’t really have a place for that and regardless of what is stated, they would compete with our real retailers.

13. Econ Dev strategy #8 also a little strange to me in that using "crowd funding" for community promotion is not really a master plan matter in my mind. Maybe a Chamber of Commerce thing?
14. The Landfill needs analysis of surrounding land (owned by them) for development and goals for reducing the visual impact in terms of covering it with trees and plan material. We won't hide it but large eroded areas and trash blowing around behind a chain link fence are just basic things. South facing solar arrays are good idea. Pg 110.

15. Future Land use: I really was hoping for serious consideration of my suggestion made to the planner for extending the BIZ zoning to the south side of Judah. We are seeing that the BIZ is attractive to new developers in terms of higher density development and this area of the community is the best place for that investment long term, in my opinion. Pg. 136 +

16. Future land use maps on new neighborhoods seem right but the maps are just hard to read. Pg 141 +

17. Our IDDs are referenced in the doc but a map enlarging where they currently exist should be in the appendix or someplace.

Gary D. Roberts AIA
Strategic Communication Solutions
Orion Township Economic Development Consultant
9864 E. Grand River #110 -299
Brighton, Mi. 48116
734.604.4628

From: Tammy Girling <tgirling@oriontownship.org>
Sent: Friday, April 1, 2022 3:06 PM
To: Gary Roberts <groberts.us@gmail.com>
Subject: FW: Master Plan Draft

Here is the link to the draft (unreleased).

Tammy Girling
Director
Planning & Zoning
2323 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, MI 48360
O: 248.391.0304, ext. 5000  C: 248.978.2132
W: www.oriontownship.org

From: Tammy Girling
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2022 2:21 PM
To: David Goodloe <dgoodloe@oriontownship.org>; Aaron Whatley <awhatley@oriontownship.org>; Jeff Stout <jstout@oriontownship.org>; Ashley Coyle <acoyle@oriontownship.org>; ofiarad@oakgov.com; Robert Duke <rduke@oriontownship.org>; Deanna Calloway <hr@oriontownship.org>; Samantha Timko <stimko@oriontownship.org>
Subject: FW: Master Plan Draft

It was suggested that I forward the draft master plan to all directors. This plan will help lead development in the Township for the next 5 years (we update the plan every 5 years). Although not directly involved, each of you will see results from it. I would appreciate if you would look the document over and let me know if you have any comments, questions, suggestions, etc.. There is a table of contents that may assist you in not having to read every page.
Please let me know your comments or if you have no comments please let me know that. Also, please let me know if you think to yourself “what is a master plan?”

The link is below.

Tammy Girling  
Director  
Planning & Zoning  
2323 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, MI 48360  
O: 248.391.0304, ext. 5000  
C: 248.978.2132  
W: www.oriontownship.org
Driving directions
Bavarian Inn Lodge Conference Center
One Covered Bridge L., Frankenmuth (855) 652-7200

The meeting will be held in the Conference Center on level one.

From I-75 (northbound): Take Exit 136 and head east on M-54 to M-83. Turn left onto M-83 and travel into Frankenmuth. Turn right at the second stoplight and continue over the covered bridge.

From I-75 (southbound): Take Exit 144 and turn left onto Dixie Hwy. Turn left onto Junction Rd., continue approx. five miles and turn right onto S. Main St. Turn left onto Covered Bridge L. and continue over the covered bridge.

Lodging and special needs
Discounted lodging is available; contact the Bavarian Inn Lodge directly at (855) 652-7200 and reference MTA group code 13G2AQ. Participants with special dietary or accessibility needs should call MTA at (517) 321-6467, ext. 230 or email kristin@michigantownships.org at least a week in advance.

Cancellations and substitutions
Written cancellation requests received at MTA by June 27 will receive a full refund. No refunds will be issued thereafter. Cancellations after June 27 will receive access to a recorded version. You may substitute another individual from your township for your registration at any time without incurring a charge; please notify MTA of the change. Substitutions are not allowed for registrations made using Township Governance Academy (TGA) scholarship funds.

MTA recommends these courses for township officials at every level. Each qualifies for credit in MTA’s Township Governance Academy (TGA). It’s not necessary to be part of TGA to participate. Those that are earn credit as follows:
Land Use (P-102; 6 foundations credits); Strategic Planning (B-104; 4 boardmanship credits); Effective Meetings (B-105; 4 boardmanship credits).

MTA classes that qualify for TGA credit promote new ideas, offer “best practices” in township government and a hands-on approach to help you handle everyday issues facing you (and your board) with confidence.

To learn more about TGA, log in to MTA’s website (www.michigantownships.org), look under the Training tab and select “Township Governance Academy.”
MTA can help your board understand the elements of strategic planning, structure more effective meetings and learn techniques for making sound land use decisions. Join us at the Bavarian Inn Lodge in Frankenmuth this July for one (or all!) of the courses described below:

**Defining Your Township's Land Use Future**
Land use expert and author of MTA's planning and zoning guidebooks Steve Langworthy takes you in depth exploring issues that must be confronted if your township planning efforts are to be successful. Learn the purpose, process and legal requirements of your master plan, and gain insights into a broad range of day-to-day and emerging land use issues.

**Strategic Planning for Townships**
Strategic planning is critical to achieving real results in your township. Governance expert Susan Radwan reviews what strategic exploration entails, as well as the voices that must be heard, in order to develop a solid plan that aligns the township's resources and creates favorable outcomes.

**Making Meetings More Effective**
Learn strategies for structuring your meetings to achieve more in less time, with fewer headaches! Uncover techniques for tackling differences around the board table while staying focused on results. Susan Radwan explores practical ways for your board to define and implement its own "rules of engagement" so your meetings will be orderly and productive.

---

**To Register**
Send completed form with payment to MTA, P.O. Box 50078, Lansing, MI 48908-0078. Payment via credit card may be faxed to (517) 321-8908. Register online at www.michigantownships.org.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Title</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Strategic</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Title</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Strategic</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Title</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Strategic</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rates apply to MTA members. Non-members, call for rates.

Wondering what a premium subscriber is or whether your township is one? Visit www.michigantownships.org/mtaonline.asp to learn more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Early-Bird Rate*</th>
<th>Regular Rate*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expires June 27</td>
<td>Effective June 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium subscribers pay</td>
<td>$125/attendee</td>
<td>$145/attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100/attendee</td>
<td>$110/attendee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Early-Bird Rate*</th>
<th>Regular Rate*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premium subscribers pay</td>
<td>$89/attendee</td>
<td>$109/attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$71/attendee</td>
<td>$87/attendee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Meetings</th>
<th>Early-Bird Rate*</th>
<th>Regular Rate*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premium subscribers pay</td>
<td>$89/attendee</td>
<td>$109/attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$71/attendee</td>
<td>$87/attendee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALL SESSIONS</th>
<th>Early-Bird Rate*</th>
<th>Regular Rate*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premium subscribers pay</td>
<td>$303/attendee</td>
<td>$363/attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$242/attendee</td>
<td>$290/attendee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# of Attendees  x  Registration Fee = Total

---

NOTE: Payment must accompany form in order to be processed.

- [ ] Check enclosed (payable to MTA) OR  [ ] Charge to credit card (below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Card #</th>
<th>Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Card Holder's Name  CSV 3-digit  Signature
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION MASTER PLAN
(PC-2021-07)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on Wednesday, July 20, 2022, beginning at 7:05 p.m. in the Municipal Complex at 2323 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, MI 48360 there will be a Public Hearing before the Orion Township Planning Commission. The purpose of the Public Hearing is to hear comments relating to the draft Master Plan for Orion Township prior to formal action by the Planning Commission. The Master Plan includes text, charts, tables, graphics, illustrations, maps and plans that describe the Planning Commission’s recommendations for the future physical development of the community. This update includes existing conditions information, vision, goals and objectives, future land use plan, housing plan, economic development plan, complete streets plan (thoroughfare plan and non-motorized safety path plan), zoning plan, and implementation plan (action strategies).

This notice is made pursuant to authority granted by PA 33 of 2008, the Michigan Planning Enabling Act.

A copy of the Master Plan Update is available for inspection at the Township Clerk’s office during regular business hours, 8:30 am to 4:30 pm, Monday through Friday and may be examined until the date of the Public Hearing. The plan is also available online at https://www.oriontownship.org/departments/planning___zoning/master_plan_update.php. All interested parties will be given an opportunity to comment. Written comments may be submitted up to the meeting time.

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

Scott Reynolds
Planning Commission Chairperson

Penny S. Shults
Township Clerk