The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission meeting will be held in-person at the above address. Due to ongoing health concerns arising out of COVID-19 and the possible need to comply with Covid related orders or regulations, the Township may need to hold and reserves the right to convert the in person public meeting to a video conference as explained below. All Persons wishing to attend the meeting should plan on doing so in-person, but should monitor the Township’s website at OrionTownship.org or contact the Township Planning and Zoning Department to obtain updates on the meeting status and whether in person and/or video conferencing will be permitted.

The following is information if the meeting is conducted via video conference. - GoToMeeting Access code 599-669-285 or VIA TELEPHONE 1-(571) 317-3122 Access Code 599-669-285

1. OPEN MEETING
2. ROLL CALL
3. MINUTES
   A. 11-04-20, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes
4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL
5. BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENT – NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY
6. CONSENT AGENDA
7. NEW BUSINESS
   A. PC-2020-25, Silverbell Pointe Wetland Permit, located at 4 vacant parcels south of Silverbell Rd. on the east side of Joslyn Rd. (parcels 09-33-201-001, 09-33-128-001, 09-28-379-001, and 09-28-451-001)
   B. PC-2020-28, Pure Green, LLC, Ord. 154 application (Class “C” Grow Facility), located at 180 Premier Dr., (parcel 09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002)
   C. PC-2020-29, Pure Green, LLC, Ord. 154 application (Class “C” Grow Facility), located at 180 Premier Dr., (parcel 09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002)
   D. PC-2020-30, Pure Green, LLC, Ord. 154 application (Class “C” Grow Facility), located at 180 Premier Dr., (parcel 09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002)
   E. PC-2020-31, Pure Green, LLC, Ord. 154 application (Class “C” Grow Facility), located at 180 Premier Dr., (parcel 09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002)
   F. PC-2020-32, Pure Green, LLC, Ord. 154 application (Class “C” Grow Facility), located at 180 Premier Dr., (parcel 09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002)
   G. PC-2020-33, Pure Green, LLC, Ord. 154 application (Class “C” Grow Facility), located at 180 Premier Dr., (parcel 09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002)
   H. PC-2020-34, Pure Green, LLC, Ord. 154 application (Class “C” Grow Facility), located at 180 Premier Dr., (parcel 09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002)
   I. PC-2020-35, Pure Green, LLC, Ord. 154 application (Class “C” Grow Facility), located at 180 Premier Dr., (parcel 09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002)
   J. PC-2020-36, Pure Green, LLC, Ord. 154 application (Class “C” Grow Facility), located at 180 Premier Dr., (parcel 09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002)
   K. PC-2020-37, Pure Green, LLC, Ord. 154 application (Class “C” Grow Facility), located at 180 Premier Dr., (parcel 09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002)
   L. 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Dates

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
9. PUBLIC COMMENTS
10. COMMUNICATIONS
11. PLANNERS REPORT/EDUCATION
12. COMMITTEE REPORTS
13. FUTURE PUBLIC HEARINGS
14. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS
15. COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS
16. ADJOURNMENT

In the spirit of compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals with a disability should feel free to contact the Township at least seventy-two hours in advance of the meeting when requesting accommodations.
The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, November 4, 2020, at 7:00pm at the Orion Township Community Center, 1335 Joslyn Rd., Lake Orion, Michigan 48360

*Please note this meeting was also available virtually via a “GoToMeeting” #599-669-285*

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

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:**
Justin Dunaskiss, Chairman

1. **OPEN MEETING**
Acting-Chairman Reynolds opened the meeting at 7:00 pm

2. **ROLL CALL**
As noted

**CONSULTANTS PRESENT:**
Eric Fazzini (Township Planner) of Giffels Webster  
Mark Landis, (Township Engineer) of OHM Advisors  
Dan Kelly, (Township Attorney) of The Kelly Firm (via GoToMeeting)  
Tammy Girling, Township Planning & Zoning Director

**OTHERS PRESENT:**
Michael McPherson  
John Gaber  
Mike Rich  
Todd Hamula

3. **MINUTES**
   A. 10-21-2020, Salon Blue Special Land Use Hearing Minutes  
   B. 10-21-2020, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

Moved by Trustee Steimel, seconded by Commissioner Walker, to approve the minutes as presented.

4. **AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL**
Moved by Trustee Steimel, seconded by Commissioner Gross, to approve the agenda as presented.

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

6. **CONSENT AGENDA**
None

7. **NEW BUSINESS**
   A. PC-2018-27, Baldwin Medical, Village Square Major PUD Amendment Site Plan Extension, located on 2 vacant parcels (09-29-301-084 & 09-29-301-085) south of 3520 S. Baldwin Rd.

Acting-Chairman Reynolds asked if the applicant was present.
Mr. Michael Rich 26020 Radcliff Place, Oak Park, MI 48237 the applicant presented.

Mr. Rich noted that he was the attorney for the project. He said that they weren’t sure that they were going to need to be there, they missed by a couple of weeks getting everything done before the approval ran out. He added that in the last year things went slower than usual and that their biggest holdup was getting the amended PUD executed with parties in multiple states. It showed up right as everybody closed down. He said that is now on record, the Township has signed off and it has been recorded. The projects engineer has been working with the Township’s engineering council OHM and they are awaiting to hear back from them. He thought it was very close. He added that once they approve that there are a few more fees to be paid and would be determined by the final engineering, and then pre-construction and soil permits will be pulled.

Acting-Chairman Reynolds asked if there was a timeframe that they were requesting for the extension? Mr. Rich replied one year for the technicalities but expected things would start before winter.

Commissioner Gross said that it appeared that there was been activity relative to moving this project. He said that the delays caused by COVID he didn’t see any reason why an extension wouldn’t be appropriate. He thought that for everybody’s protection the one-year extension should be able to satisfy the schedule. Acting-Chairman Reynolds said that he didn’t have any issues with that, he thought that they were moving forward and it had been a challenging year.

Moved by Commissioner Gross, seconded by Trustee Steimel, that the Planning Commission approves the site plan extension request for PC-2018-27, Baldwin Medical/Village Square Major PUD Amendment Site Plan for one year from the last extension. This approval is based on the following facts: the applicant has been making progress with submissions to the engineering consultants and the delays caused by COVID.

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

B. PC-2020-24, Firestone Complete Auto Care Site Plan, located at 545 N. Lapeer Rd. (parcel 09-02-177-014) and 25 Indianwood Rd. (parcel 09-02-177-013).

Acting-Chairman Reynolds asked if the applicant was present?

Mr. John Gaber 380 N. Old Woodward, Birmingham the attorney for the applicant.

Mr. Michael McPherson with Atwell Two Town Square Suite 700, Southfield presented.

Mr. McPherson stated that they were there before them to ask for site plan approval of the proposed Firestone at the corner of Indianwood and Lapeer Rd. He said this was a site that went through a rezoning process and then concluded with a consent judgment. He stated that the site is zoned GB which would be a permitted use for this particular facility. He noted that the site has access from Indianwood and from the reconstructed Axford St. The plan as submitted does represent the reconstruction that MDOT just undertook this year. He added that they did receive comments from the Township Planner, Engineer, and Fire Department. They went through all of those in detail and addressed those comments. They just got back with the Township staff a couple of days ago. He wanted to run through the comments and outline how they plan to address them.

Mr. McPherson started with the Planner’s comments. The first Planner’s comment was
regarding the rerouted Axford St. He stated that it did represent the reconstruction, so they did have an accurate depiction of how the driveway would connect to Axford. He said that they have been in contact with the OCRC and MDOT and will file for those particular permits as the project moves forward into the engineering stage. The second Planner’s comment was regarding setbacks. He noted that the biggest comment was since this was a corner site there was confusion over side versus rear setback. They have since updated the plan to label each setback as front, side, or rear, and not just the distance. They have two frontage sides on the street sides. The southside they are treating as a side setback and the westside as the rear setback. With all those setbacks applied both the building and the parking will be in compliance with the setbacks. He noted that there were a couple of minor setback comments, one about a parking setback that was dimensioned at 19.7-ft. and they have since complied with the 20-ft. setback. They have confirmed and put a dimension on the new site plan regarding the building setback from Indianwood. The building from Indianwood ROW right now is 68-ft. and from the centerline it is 101-ft. Even in the future if there are additional ROW on Indianwood that the OCRC needs, the building still complies which is in compliance with the ordinance. The next comments were regarding lighting. The packet does not have an updated photo plan yet but they agreed that they will comply with the requirements of the photometric. He stated that they just needed to update a couple of the light fixtures to get the foot candles down at a couple of the property lines. He said the comment about the refuse enclosure, the enclosure is 8-ft. tall the screening around it, the doors on the detail indicate that it is 6-ft. tall they will change those to 8-ft. tall to match the rest of the enclosure. He said regarding the safety path they have proposed a path along Indianwood. They have since proposed to continue that all the way towards Lapeer to the landing that MDOT constructed at the corner and then south along Lapeer to Axford St. and that is reflected in the new plan. The comments regarding the noise, he said during the consent judgment process there were many items that were incorporated into the design to address the noise. There is a 6-ft. tall sound/screen wall along the back of the sight. The building bay doors face north toward the street. They have committed to having the bay doors closed during the first and last hours of operations at all times when the tools are being used. The business is proposed to be closed on Sundays, which is unique to Firestone. Business hours are limited to 7a-7p Monday-Friday and 7a-6p on Saturday. Delivery trucks are not permitted to idol on the property. Refuse pick-up is only during business hours, and there is no amplified sound or music outdoors. He said they have done their best to try to make sure that they address the concerns of noise for this project and felt they did a good job.

Mr. McPherson said regarding the Engineer’s comments the first one regarding the radii from Indianwood Rd. with the truck turning. They have since widened that drive and made it a larger island in the middle for the pedestrian island when using the crosswalk to better the truck turning movement, and was reflected in the plan that was just submitted. He said the safety path was already explained. He noted that detention calculations and the mechanical pretreatment, the preliminary ones, have been placed on the plan. The details for the pavement sections and the sidewalk, there was a detail sheet added in there, on what the retaining walls, screen walls are going to be, and have been added to the plan. The retaining wall will be a typical sedimental block retaining wall, the screen wall will be a panel masonry wall that will be decorative and all tied together with the building and the retaining wall. The last comment was regarding some slopes, there were a couple of areas where the slopes exceeded the 4:1 requirement they have fixed that just extending one of the retaining walls about 10-15-ft. and smoothing up the slope on the west side of the site.

Mr. McPherson stated that those were the comments that they have received from staff. He stated that they have done their best to thoroughly review and address them. He showed the Planning Commission the material board. He described to the Planning Commission the different materials that they will be using. He noted that the building was designed to be in compliance with the Lapeer Road Overlay District architectural standards, even though it is
outside of the overlay area. They wanted to make sure it complied with that and was consistent with the character in the area.

Commissioner Walker asked what law firm that Mr. Gaber was with? Mr. Gaber replied Williams, Williams, Rattner & Pluncket P.C.

Commissioner Walker said that his son was a partner with Williams, Williams, Rattner & Pluncket and he felt that the Planning Commission should recuse him from this matter based on a possible conflict of interest. Active-Chairman Reynolds asked the Planning Commissioners if they had any thoughts, comments, concerns about the conflict of interest being brought forth? Active-Chairman Reynolds said he thought that if there was direct financial gain. Commissioner Walker asked the Board to grant his request.

Moved by Commissioner Gross, seconded by Commissioner Urbanowski to recuse Commissioner Walker due to a conflict of interest.

Roll call vote was as follows: Reynolds, yes; Gross, yes; Urbanowski, yes; Steimel, yes; St. Henry, yes. Motion carried 5-0. (Dunaskiss absent)

Planner Fazzini read through his review date stamped November 4, 2020.

Engineer Landis read through his review date stamped October 23, 2020.

Acting-Chairman Reynolds asked if there were any comments or issues with the traffic impact assessment that was completed? Engineer Landis replied that there were no concerns. The traffic impact study concluded that there were no mitigating measures needed for the proposed development. Initially when it was brought to OHM during the rezoning the access onto Indianwood was a full access, so there were initially some concerns with some turning movements. Since that time, they have made this a right in right out drive only, which eliminates that concern with backups and a need for a left turn lane. The level of service is only going down a fraction of a percentage point he thought on a PM peak, going from a “B” to a “C” which is still acceptable, with very little impact. The improvements that MDOT has made or is proposing to make to the intersection would be the relocation of Axford St. and is drastically helping the situation.

Acting-Chairman Reynolds noted that there were a couple of other reviews in their packet. The Fire Marshall had a couple of comments he stated approved with requirements and comments. The Fire Marshall’s first comment was that the site plans currently do not show the Fire Department connections and shall be in an area approved by the Fire Department along with that the FDC to be located on the SE of the structure and no parking, fire lane signage shall be provided on the site plan. He noted that previously the Site Walk Committee did complete a site walk and that was back on April 9, 2019.

Trustee Steimel said that there were some items that came up in the consent judgment that was in there like hours of operation, and thought that they would want to see those notes on the plans because that is probably, in the future, where they go to versus having to look up the consent judgment. He asked if it was that hard to add the notes on the first page of the plan? Planning & Zoning Director Girling said she didn’t see any harm in having it added. She noted that they do keep all consent judgments in a binder, so if there was a complaint, they are easily able to reference it.

Mr. Todd Hamula with Zaremba Group 14600 Detroit Ave. Lakewood, OH said that the hours of operation were on the coversheet.
Commissioner Gross said that initially looking at the plan he found it very confusing relative to the traffic patterns and the ingress and egress into the site. He anticipated that the westbound Indianwood traffic may result in a number of U-turns taking place from customers that cannot turn into the site from westbound Indianwood and therefore there may be some impacts on some of the properties further down the road that people are using to turn around. He noted that the plan does comply with the consent judgment that was entered into between the applicant and the Township. He said that it was unfortunate that they have to remove a long-established business from the community and will be a shame to see him go. He said after reviewing the plans and the consent judgment it appears that the revised plans that have been submitted and are dated November 2, 2020, by Atwell appeared to address most of the concerns raised by the planning and engineering consultant. There were a few things that probably need to be included in the motion that are not on the plans but thought they had done a good job relative to fitting the building onsite. Trying to provide some access which is going to be unusual because it is kind of coming in after people pass it. He thought it was an attractive looking building and thought it complied with the ordinances as well as the consent judgment.

Secretary St. Henry said that he was curious and was his understanding that there were a number of concessions made and negotiations at the Township Board level and with the applicant. He asked if all the concessions reflected in this plan? He knew there were conversations with the residents. He wanted to know if there were any other concessions that the applicant agreed to as part of the consent judgment negotiations? Active-Chairman Reynolds stated that he knew that the Township Attorney has reviewed the drawings and will likely review this next submission also to ensure that conformance. Mr. McPherson said that all of the physical items are agreed to, the screened wall, things like that are shown on the plan. The hours of operation are noted on the plan. He said there were a few other items that were not physical items that were reached and are reflected in the Consent Judgment. Everything that is going to be constructed is shown on the plan. Township Attorney Kelly said his review of the plans, he felt it was consistent with the consent judgment. He added that there were preliminary plans and the language in it is going to be enforced, noted on the plans or not, the consent judgment will be enforced by the administration. As far as he could see, in his review, and he didn’t believe that the planner found anything inappropriate with it or inconsistent with the consent judgment, he didn’t see anything inconsistent with it. Planner Fazzini stated that he agreed; he said they reviewed about 50 items in the consent judgment and they went through to pull out any zoning or physical related items for the review.

Acting-Chairman Reynolds said he appreciated the clear and concise response to our plan reviewers. He said the planner and engineer comments just going bullet point by bullet point there are always going to be things to work through, but thought it was nice to have some clear and concise responses. He stated that it appeared to him that the photometric has been agreed to be supplied; the safety paths were supplied tonight. He asked if they had any issues with conforming to the Fire Marshals comments about FDC connections? Mr. McPherson replied that they will comply.

Acting-Chairman Reynolds said that he had a note regarding the Lapeer Road Design Standards and asked if there were any additional concerns about the elevations as proposed? There were none.

Acting-Chairman Reynolds noted that there were a few administrative items in Giffels Websters about lot coverage it didn’t seem like they reviewed that but is an item to be marked and to be re-reviewed. He asked if the 6-ft. retaining wall details had been provided? Mr. McPherson state that there was a detailed sheet added in that set, for the retaining wall detail. Also, the
screen-wall detail to show the intent, segmental block retaining wall, and masonry panel screen-wall.

Acting-Chairman Reynolds thought that there were a few open administrative items that could be handled so he suggested that the reviewers get a chance to get them the plans that were submitted tonight to address any open concerns. He thought that the intent was to agree with all the comments made by the reviewers.

Commissioner Gross asked Planning & Zoning Director Girling if she had a date stamp of the latest plans that they could refer to? Planning & Zoning Director Girling asked if he wanted to use those or if he wanted to use the ones that were actually reviewed with the conditions of everything they have agreed to? Trustee Steimel stated that is what he would do. Acting-Chairman Reynolds said he would use the previous plans even though they received revised, allowing the motion for those comments to be addressed. Acting-Chairman Reynolds said the problem is they have reviews that are based on plans that were previously submitted and not in conjunction because they don’t have a formal response from their reviewers on the plans submitted tonight. Secretary St. Henry asked what the process of formally, inputting these into the record? Acting-Chairman Reynolds suggested that they have the plans date stamped received here tonight with the motions and the comments being made he didn’t think that the applicant had objecting to. He added if they have anything in addition essentially no different than not receiving plans tonight, even though they have those they need to go to their plan reviewers for additional review so that those open items will be administratively handled and addressed.

Moved by Commissioner Gross, seconded by Trustee Steimel, that the Planning Commission for PC-2020-24, Firestone Complete Auto Care Site Plan, that they approve the revised set of site plans dated November 2, 2020, that were submitted this evening subject to the review by our planning and engineering consultants with additional comments relative to the submission of the lighting and photometric plans to be revised to comply with section 14.03 F2 & F3 and that the height of the trash enclosures gate be increased to eight feet, which currently on the plans they show 6-ft.; the plans that have been submitted acknowledge the planner’s comments and the engineer’s comments in their amended letter dated November 3, 2020, by Atwell; this plan does conform with all of the other zoning ordinance requirements and the provisions of the consent judgment entered between the applicant and the Township.

Discussion on the motion:

Acting-Chairman Reynolds asked if it was the intent to then receive the plans that were received tonight? Commissioner Gross replied subject to the final review by their consultants.

Commissioner Gross amended the motion, Trustee Steimel re-supported, to include that the parcels be combined into a single development parcel and also to add the Maximum Lot Coverage.

Roll call vote was as follows: Reynolds, yes; St. Henry, yes; Gross, yes; Urbanowski, yes; Steimel, yes. Motion carried 5-0. (Dunaskiss absent and Walker recused)

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
None

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS
None
10. COMMUNICATIONS
None

11. PLANNERS REPORTS
None

12. COMMITTEE REPORTS
None.

13. FUTURE PUBLIC HEARINGS
None

14. CHAIRMAN’S COMMENTS
Acting-Chairman Reynolds said that he appreciated Trustees Steimel service to the community and to the Planning Commission.

15. COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS
Secretary St. Henry thanked Trustee Steimel for all his knowledge and conversations they have had.

Commissioner Gross noted the time that it takes to serve on the Planning Commission and the Township Board. In order to do the job properly and represent the community, it is not just the hours spent at the table and the hours and days spent elsewhere. He thought Trustee Steimel had demonstrated that and appreciated everything he has done.

Commissioner Urbanowski felt unfortunate that she doesn’t get to learn from Trustee Steimel as much as the other Commissioners’ have. She appreciated his insight and thanked him for his service.

Trustee Steimel said his heart and soul has been with the Planning Commission. He thought it was fun to have the back knowledge of where all the stuff came from and still be aware of how things are changing. He thought there would be one more Planning Commission meeting that he would be attending.

16. ADJOURNMENT
Moved by Commissioner Gross, seconded by Trustee Steimel, to adjourn the meeting at 7:52 pm. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Walton
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary
Charter Township of Orion

Planning Commission Approval Date
TO: The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission
FROM: Tammy Girling, Planning & Zoning Director
DATE: November 12, 2020
RE: PC-2020-25, Silverbell Pointe Wetland Permit

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

Wetland Permit (Ordinance No. 107):
Motion: I move that the Planning Commission approves/denies the wetland permit for PC-2020-25, Silverbell Pointe, located on 4 vacant parcels south of Silverbell Rd. on the east side of Joslyn Rd. (Sidwell #s 09-33-201-001, 09-33-128-001, 09-28-379-001, 09-28-451-001). This approval/denial is based on the following findings of facts:

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

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

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

If approved the approval is based on the following conditions:
Motion maker to insert any conditions.
November 11, 2020

Justin Dunaskiss, Planning Commission Chairperson  
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION  
2525 Joslyn Road  
Lake Orion, MI 48360  

RE: Silverbell Pointe, PUD, PC-2020-25  
Wetland Review #1  

Received: October 23, 2020 by Orion Township  
Revised November 11, 2020

Dear Mr. Dunaskiss:

We have completed the first review for the Silverbell Pointe, PUD wetland submittal. Wetlands on this site are shown in the report prepared by King & MacGregor Environmental. The USACE/EGLE Joint Permit Application was utilized for the township wetland permit application and was included in the submittal. The application was reviewed with respect to the Township's Wetlands Protection Ordinance, No. 107.

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:

The proposed site is located on the southeast corner of Silver Bell Rd. and Joslyn Rd, in the north ½ of Section 33 and the south ½ of Section 28 of the Charter Township of Orion. After conducting a site visit on November 5, 2020, we were able to generally confirm the location of the wetlands as depicted on the plans and in the wetland report.

Wetland Area – see below

The site is covered with sprawling wetlands and areas of open water that are all interconnected. Of the 73.4-acre site, approximately 28 acres are upland/developable. The National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) maps identify two different types of wetlands that surround the developable area within the site parcels. The largest wetland on site is located in the northeast and is part of a 53.2-acre Freshwater Emergent Wetland that is classified as Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent, and Seasonally Flooded (PEMIC). On the southern border of the site, there is a 3.5-acre Freshwater Forested/Shrub Wetland classified as Palustrine, Scrub-Shrub, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, and Seasonally Flooded (PSS1C). In addition to these wetland areas, the NWI maps also identify a 0.3-acre Riverine habitat classified as Unknown Perennial, Unconsolidated Bottom, and Permanently Flooded that is located in the southwestern corner of the site and appears to direct water west to Judah Lake. The site initially drains into Mud Lake which is southeast of the site. Mud Lake outlets to the west under Joslyn Rd and the CN Railway into Judah Lake. Michigan Resource Inventory System (MIRIS) maps confirm the location of these wetlands, water courses, and water bodies. Additionally, the MIRIS maps identified hydric soils in each of the wetlands on-site. The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) maps identify the hydric soils as Houghton and Adrian Mucks. In our opinion, the wetlands on site are part of a large wetland area well over 5 acres and contiguous to an inland lake (Mud Lake) and are therefore are regulated by EGLE as well as Orion Township.
As seen in the pictures below, the vegetation in the on-site wetlands does include typical wetland trees and grasses but also appear to contain common reed (phragmites).
North side of developable area, looking north toward the wetlands
Northeast corner of developable area, looking east toward Mud Lake.
East end of developable area, looking southeast downhill toward Mud Lake
South side of developable area, looking at southern wetlands
IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT ON THE WETLANDS:
Impact to Wetlands:
The applicant is proposing a total of 0.78 acres of impacts to regulated wetlands. In the plans, there are 4 areas that are identified as fill areas. Fill Area 1 is located southwest of Detention Basin #2 and appears to be necessary to facilitate construction of the detention basin and outlet. The other fill areas are located in the rear yards of lots 4-9 (Fill Area #2), 10-13 (Fill Area #3), and 24-25 (Fill Area #4) and appear necessary to facilitate building placement as well as acceptable yard slopes.

Proposed Mitigation:
The applicant is proposing to mitigate for 0.78 acres of the proposed impacts by purchasing into a Michigan Wetland Bank at a ratio of 1:1.5, totaling 1.17 acres.

Per the Ordinance, the wetland application shall not be approved unless the following exist:
1. The action or use is not likely to or will not pollute, impair, or destroy a wetland. While the project does impact wetlands on site, the proposed plan impacts less than 1 acre of existing wetland area and will not negatively affect the drainage pattern in this area.
2. There are no feasible or prudent alternatives to the proposed action. In our opinion, the proposed land use is consistent with the proposed future use of the property.
3. The approval is consistent with public interest, in light of the stated purposes of this Ordinance. Based on the above findings, it is our opinion the requirements of the Wetlands Protection Ordinance are being met.

CONCLUSION:
In our opinion, the wetlands submittal is in substantial compliance with the Township's Wetlands Protection Ordinance.

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

Sincerely,

OHM Advisors

Joe Lehman
Project Engineer

cc. Chris Barnett, Township Supervisor
    David Goodloe, Building Official
    Jeff Stout, Director of Public Services
    Tammy Girling, Director of Planning and Zoning
    Lynn Harrison, Planning and Zoning Coordinator
    Andrew Milia, Franklin Ridge Homes, LLC
    John Thompson, PEA, Inc.
    Woody Held, King & MacGregor Environmental, Inc.
Digital EGLE/USACE Joint Permit Application (JPA) for Inland Lakes and Streams, Great Lakes, Wetlands, Floodplains, Dams, Environmental Areas, High Risk Erosion Areas and Critical Dune Areas
version 1.16

(Submission #: HNW-VDM9-BF1G6, version 3)

Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission ID</th>
<th>HNW-VDM9-BF1G6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submission Reason</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>$2,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payments/Adjustments</td>
<td>($2,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Due</td>
<td>$0.00 (Paid)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE (CREATED)**

Conservation Easement

The inclusion of remaining wetland on the site in an EGLE conservation easement will be discussed as a feasible strategy to minimize on-site impacts.
Created on 11/2/2020 4:03 PM by Robert Primeau

Form Input

Instructions

https://miwaters.deq.state.mi.us/nform/app/
To download a copy or print these instructions, Please click this link (recommended).

## Contact Information

### Applicant Information (Usually the property owner)

**First Name**  
Andrew  

**Last Name**  
Milia  

**Organization Name**  
Franklin Ridge Homes, LLC  

**Phone Type**  
Mobile  

**Number**  
248-568-9410  

**Extension**  

**Email**  
amilia@franklinpropertycorp.com  

30180 Orchard Lake Road, Suite 150  
Farmington Hills, MI 48334

### Is the Property Owner different from the Applicant?  
No

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

**Upload Attachment for Authorization from Agent**

AGENT LETTER.pdf - 10/14/2020 11:42 AM  

**Comment**  
NONE PROVIDED

### Agent Contact

**First Name**  
Woody  

**Last Name**  
Held  

**Organization Name**  
King & Macgregor Environmental, Inc.  

**Phone Type**  
Mobile  

**Number**  
734-588-9288  

**Email**  
wheld@king-macgregor.com  

43050 Ford Road Suite 130  
Canton, MI 48187
Are there additional property owners or other contacts you would like to add to the application? 
No

**Project Location**

DEQ Site Reference Number (Pre-Populated)
-7570437455324188129

Project Location
42.724199321749445,-83.2835733267877

Project Location Address
[NO STREET ADDRESS SPECIFIED]
[NO CITY SPECIFIED], [NO STATE SPECIFIED] [NO ZIP CODE SPECIFIED]

County
Oakland

Is there a Property Tax ID Number(s) for the project area? 
Yes
Please enter the Tax ID Number(s) for the project location
09-28-379-001; 09-28-451-001; 09-33-201-001; 09-33-128-001

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

Is this project within Indian Lands? 
No

Local Unit of Government (LUG)
Orion Township

Directions to Project Site
Take I-75 to the north Joslyn Road exit, take Joslyn Road north for a mile, head east on Silverbell Road. Project site is located on the southeast corner of the Silverbell and Joslyn Road intersection, immediately east of the train tracks.

**Background Information**

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

Environmental Area Number (if known):
NONE PROVIDED

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

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

Have any activities commenced on this project?
No

Is this an after-the-fact application?
No

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Type of Approval</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date Applied</th>
<th>Approved/Denied/Undetermined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orion Township</td>
<td>Site plan approval</td>
<td>NONE PROVIDED</td>
<td>NONE PROVIDED</td>
<td>NONE PROVIDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland County</td>
<td>Soil erosion control</td>
<td>NONE PROVIDED</td>
<td>NONE PROVIDED</td>
<td>NONE PROVIDED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
NONE PROVIDED

Permit Application Category and Public Notice Information

https://miwaters.deq.state.mi.us/nform/app/
Indicate the type of permit being applied for.
Individual Permit for all other projects

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

Uploads/Attachments

- Adjacent Property Owners List.pdf - 01/17/2020 01:24 PM

Project Description

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

Project Type (select all that apply):
Development-Condominium/Subdivision-Residential

Project Summary (Purpose and Use): Provide a summary of all proposed activities including the intended use and reason for the proposed project. Place 6,918 cubic yards of material within 0.78 acres of wetland to facilitate the construction of the proposed Silverbell Pointe residential development. Construction activities will include placing 40 linear feet of storm sewer with in wetland to be filled, along with 1.3 cubic yards of rip rap within wetlands to facilitate storm water outfall, at two locations.

Project Construction Sequence, Methods, and Equipment: Describe how the proposed project timing, methods, and equipment will minimize disturbance from the project construction, including but not limited to soil erosion and sedimentation control measures.
Sequence of construction: 1) installation of soil erosion control measures; 2) mechanical clearing of proposed grading; 3) mass grading of building pads, roads and detention basins; 4) install underground utilities, roads, and homes; 5) complete site grading; 6) seed and plant to stabilize upland portions of the property; 7) pave roads and finish landscape plantings; and 8) remove soil erosion control measures after site has stabilized.

Project Alternatives: Describe all options considered as alternatives to the proposed project, and describe how impacts to state and federal regulated waters will be avoided and minimized. This may include other locations, materials, etc. See attached Project Alternative Analysis.
Project Compensation: Describe how the proposed impacts to state and federal regulated waters will be compensated, OR explain why compensatory mitigation should not be required for the proposed impacts. Include amount, location, and method of compensation (i.e., bank, on-site, preservation, etc.) Emergent wetland mitigation credits will be purchased from an approved Wetland Mitigation Bank at a 1:1.5 ratio to compensate for emergent wetland impacts.

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

Comment
NONE PROVIDED

Resource and Activity Type

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

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

Major Project Fee Calculation Questions

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

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

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

Is a subdivision, condominium, or new golf course proposed?
Yes

Wetland Project Information and Impacts

https://miwaters.deq.state.mi.us/nform/app/
Has a professional wetland delineation been completed for this site?
Yes

Attach a copy of wetland delineation report with data form.
A 164 WET.pdf - 10/14/2020 03:14 PM
A 81 WET.pdf - 10/14/2020 03:14 PM
A 187 WET.pdf - 10/14/2020 03:14 PM
UPL.pdf - 10/14/2020 03:14 PM
Comment
NONE PROVIDED

CORRECTION REQUEST (CORRECTED)
Aerial with wetland line if possible
If possible, please provide an aerial image with the wetland boundary and OHWM indicated.
Created on 11/2/2020 3:51 PM by Robert Primeau

1 COMMENT
King and MacGregor Environmental (miwaters@king-macgregor.com)
(11/10/2020 4:52 PM)
An aerial image will be provided, if possible.

Total acres of wetland affected by this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Affected area (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sum: 0.78</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

If your project includes placing fill in wetland then select the proposed activities from the following list. If your activity is not shown, then select “None of the Above” and move to the next question. Only enter an impacted area in one of the impact tables (do not duplicate impact entries).
General Fill

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Length (feet)</th>
<th>Width (feet)</th>
<th>Depth (feet)</th>
<th>Area (square feet)</th>
<th>Volume (cubic feet)</th>
<th>Volume (cubic yards)</th>
<th>Corrected value for complex impact AREAS (square feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>9750</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Fill Material:
Off-site
Please Describe
Clean fill from commercial source.

Type of Fill:
Clay

Is riprap proposed?
No

Select from the following list for Excavation/Dredge Activities (If your proposed project is primarily a structure enter the impact as a structure. Only enter an impacted area in one of the impact tables in one impact section):
None of the above

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

Projects involving Structures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Length (feet)</th>
<th>Width (feet)</th>
<th>Depth (feet)</th>
<th>Area (Sq. feet)</th>
<th>Volume (cubic feet)</th>
<th>Volume (cubic yards)</th>
<th>Corrected value for complex impact AREAS (square feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16260</td>
<td>97560</td>
<td>3613</td>
<td>16262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Length (feet)</td>
<td>Width (feet)</td>
<td>Depth (feet)</td>
<td>Area (Sq. feet)</td>
<td>Volume (cubic feet)</td>
<td>Volume (cubic yards)</td>
<td>Corrected value for complex impact AREAS (square feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10800</td>
<td>64800</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>10739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td>14700</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>4909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum: 31960</td>
<td>Sum: 177060</td>
<td>Sum: 6557</td>
<td>Sum: 31910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

None of the above

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

### Mitigation Project Details for Wetlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Location (include identifier on site plan)</th>
<th>Impact Type</th>
<th>Impact Amount (acres)</th>
<th>Replacement Ratio (include any reduction)</th>
<th>Mitigation Type</th>
<th>Mitigation Amount (acres)</th>
<th>Kind of Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas 1,2,3,4</td>
<td>Emergent</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1:1.5</td>
<td>Emergent</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum: 0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum: 1.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wetland mitigation plan or associated documents
NONE PROVIDED
Comment
NONE PROVIDED

### Intake or Outfall Structures

Is the intake structure associated with an authorized outfall structure?
No
Number of intakes or outfalls:
2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique Identifier</th>
<th>Pipe Diameter (inches)</th>
<th>Invert Elevation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48&quot; storm sewer outlet</td>
<td>48&quot;</td>
<td>NONE PROVIDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot; outfall pipe</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of intake or outfall stabilization:
Riprap

Has the water been treated (outfall only)?
No

Utility Crossings

Select all resource types that are proposed to be crossed by this project:
Wetlands

How many total wetland crossings are proposed?
1

Enter the type and total number of acres of wetland that will be converted from one wetland type to another wetland type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wetland type</th>
<th>Acres of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of Utility Crossing Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique Identifier</th>
<th>Type of Crossing</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Utility Type</th>
<th>Length (feet)</th>
<th>Pipe diameter (inches)</th>
<th>Distance below surface (feet)</th>
<th>Trench width (feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48&quot; Storm Pipe</td>
<td>Wetland</td>
<td>Open Trench</td>
<td>Storm sewer</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>NONE PROVIDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8&quot; Storm Structure</td>
<td>Wetland</td>
<td>Open Trench</td>
<td>Storm sewer</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NONE PROVIDED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upload of Proposed Site Plans

Required on all Site Plan uploads. Please identify that all of the following items are included on your plans that you upload with this application.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Plan Features</th>
<th>Existing and Proposed Plan Set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale, Compass North, and Property Lines</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill and Excavation areas with associated amounts in cubic yards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any rivers, lakes, or ponds and associated Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior dimensions of Structures, Fill and Excavation areas associated with the proposed project</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions to other Structures and Lot Lines associated with the project</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topographic Contour Lines from licensed surveyor or engineer when applicable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upload Site Plans and Cross Section Drawings for your Proposed Project

Wetland Plans-18150.pdf - 10/05/2020 10:29 AM
18150 Silverbell Pointe Wetland Plans 20201106.pdf - 11/10/2020 04:55 PM

Comment
NONE PROVIDED

CORRECTION REQUEST (CORRECTED)

Lake connection in Impact Area 1

Impact Area 1 looks to include a culvert connection between Mud Lake and Judah Lake. Please amend the plans to show the water course and how that connection will be maintained in the proposed development plans.
Created on 11/2/2020 4:01 PM by Robert Primeau

1 COMMENT
King and MacGregor Environmental (miwaters@king-macgregor.com)
(11/10/2020 4:58 PM)
Culvert extension is shown on the plans. No additional fill is proposed.

https://miwaters.deq.state.mi.us/nform/app/
CORRECTION REQUEST (CORRECTED)
OHWM needs acknowledgment

Please amend the plan to include the ordinary high water mark of Mud Lake in the wetland plans. OHWM should be acknowledged in all cross-sections.
Created on 11/2/2020 3:49 PM by Robert Primeau

1 COMMENT
King and MacGregor Environmental (miwaters@king-macgregor.com)
(11/10/2020 4:56 PM)
OHWM has been added.

Additional Required and Supplementary Documents
Alternatives Analysis 02.17.20.pdf - 10/05/2020 10:31 AM
Comment
NONE PROVIDED

Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Project Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+$2000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Fee Amount: $2000.00

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

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Attachment Name</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/10/2020 4:55 PM</td>
<td>18150 Silverbell Pointe Wetland Plans 20201106.pdf</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>King and MacGregor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2020 3:14 PM</td>
<td>A 187 WET.pdf</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>King and MacGregor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2020 3:14 PM</td>
<td>UPL.pdf</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>King and MacGregor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2020 3:14 PM</td>
<td>A 164 WET.pdf</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>King and MacGregor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Status History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User</th>
<th>Processing Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King and MacGregor</td>
<td>Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and MacGregor</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revision</th>
<th>Revision Date</th>
<th>Revision By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revision 1</td>
<td>1/17/2020 11:48 AM</td>
<td>King and MacGregor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision 2</td>
<td>10/14/2020 3:13 PM</td>
<td>King and MacGregor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision 3</td>
<td>11/10/2020 4:46 PM</td>
<td>King and MacGregor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 12, 2020

Mr. Woody Held
King & MacGregor Environmental, Inc.
43050 Ford Road, Suite 130
Canton, MI 48187

Re: Silverbell Pointe, Orion Township

Dear Mr. Held:

Please consider this letter as authorization for King & MacGregor Environmental, Inc. to act as our agent for the above-referenced project in making application to the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE), including uploading application documents to the Mi Waters database and meeting EGLE representatives on the subject property. Please contact me at your convenience if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

David Steuer
Its: Manager
248.790.4481
Franklin Ridge Homes, LLC  
EGLE Joint Permit Application- Adjacent Property Owners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Name and Address</th>
<th>Name and Address</th>
<th>Name and Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09-33-178-004</td>
<td>Michael Williams 4285 Joslyn Road Orion, MI 48359</td>
<td>09-33-251-013 Allan and Penny Shults 1770 Kinmount Drive Orion, MI 48359</td>
<td>09-28-401-006 Raymond Kreslak and Michelle Tenglia 2070 W. Silverbell Road Orion, MI 48359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-33-178-002</td>
<td>Lloyd and Christy Gearhart 2032 Kinmount Drive Orion, MI 48359</td>
<td>09-33-251-014 Barbara Ealy 1760 Kinmount Drive Orion, MI 48359</td>
<td>09-28-327-003 Raymond Kreslak and Michelle Tenglia 2070 W. Silverbell Road Orion, MI 48359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-33-178-003</td>
<td>Brenda Wilson 2006 Kinmount Drive Orion, MI 48359</td>
<td>09-33-251-011 Daniel Dewey 4290 Cornith Drive Orion, MI 48359</td>
<td>09-28-327-007 Darran and Sherri Powell 2124 W. Silverbell Road Orion Township, MI 48359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-33-251-012</td>
<td>Penni Robertson 1970 Kinmount Drive Orion, MI 48359</td>
<td>09-33-276-023 Pamela Belike 4283 Cornith Drive Orion, MI 48359</td>
<td>09-28-327-002 William Reading 2140 W. Silverbell Road Orion Township, MI 48359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-33-251-017</td>
<td>James M Stokes Trustee 1940 Kinmount Drive Orion, MI 48359</td>
<td>09-33-226-002 Clifford and Roselyn Messing 1680 Nacy G Lane Orion, MI 48359</td>
<td>09-28-327-005 Jose and Midred Ortiz 2158 W. Silverbell Road Orion Township, MI 48359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-33-251-018</td>
<td>William Aschemat 1934 Kinmount Drive Lake Orion, MI 48359</td>
<td>09-28-476-007 George and Gale Mio 3949 Mio Drive Orion, MI 48359</td>
<td>09-28-401-007 Grand Trunk Western Railroad 1 Administration Rd FL 1 Concord on L4K 1B9 Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-33-251-015</td>
<td>William Aschemat 1934 Kinmount Drive Orion, MI 48359</td>
<td>09-28-451-008 Steven and Carol Leach 1851 W, Silverbell Road Orion Township, MI 48359</td>
<td>09-28-326-021 Cindy Magdaleno Yonira Rubio 2188 W. Silverbell Road Lake Orion, MI 48359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-33-251-016</td>
<td>Justin and Crystal Smith 1900 Kinmount Drive Orion, MI 48359</td>
<td>09-28-451-007 Linda and David Mills 2023 W. Silverbell Road Lake Orion, MI 48359</td>
<td>09-28-376-028 David Osterkamp 3812 Joslyn Road Orion Township, MI 48359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-33-251-005</td>
<td>John Block 1870 Kinmount Drive Orion, MI 48359</td>
<td>09-28-451-003 Ricky Tate 2059 W. Silverbell Road Orion Township, MI 48359</td>
<td>09-28-376-031 Great Lakes 3850, LLC 7399 Stonevalley BLF Clarkston, MI 48346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-33-251-006</td>
<td>Charles Chambos 1830 Kinmount Drive Orion Township, Mi 48359</td>
<td>09-28-401-005 Carl and Donna Melinat 209 Remuda Street Clovis, NM 88101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33
WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Midwest Region

Project/Site: Silverbell and Joslyn SE City/County: Orion Township, Oakland
Applicant/Owner: Franklin Ridge Homes, LLC State: MI
Investigator(s): Frances Thompson, James Sallee Section, Township, Range: Sec.26, T4N, R10E
Landform (hillside, terrace, etc.): hillside Local relief (concave, convex, none): convex
Slope (%): 0-6 Lat: 42.72091 Long: -83.28278 Datum: NAD 83
Soil Map Unit Name: Oakville fine sand NWI classification: PEM

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?</th>
<th>Yes X</th>
<th>No _____</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydric Soil Present?</td>
<td>Yes _____</td>
<td>No X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Hydrology Present?</td>
<td>Yes _____</td>
<td>No X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?</td>
<td>Yes _____</td>
<td>No X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks: All three wetland criteria are not met. Sampling point is upland.

 VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft.)</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>Quercus alba</em></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Yes FACU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>Acer rubrum</em></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Yes FAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>Prunus serotina</em></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No FACU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>=Total Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15 ft.)</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</em></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes FACW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>Lonicera morrowii</em></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes FACU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>=Total Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5 ft.)</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>Taxodium radicans</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes FAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>=Total Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size:</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=Total Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominance Test Worksheet:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 3 (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 5 (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 60.0% (A/B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence Index Worksheet:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total % Cover of: Multiply by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL species: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACW species: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC species: 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACU species: 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPL species: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Totals: 160 (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence Index = B/A = 3.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. 2. Dominance Test is &gt;50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prevalence Index is ≤3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Morphological Adaptations (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation (Explain)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes X, No _____

US Army Corps of Engineers Midwest Region – Version 2.0
**SOIL**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Color (moist)</th>
<th>% Color (moist)</th>
<th>% Type</th>
<th>Loc</th>
<th>Texture</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-12</td>
<td>10YR 2/2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loamy/Clayey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-16</td>
<td>10YR 6/2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loamy/Clayey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, MS=Masked Sand Grains. Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.*

**Hydric Soil Indicators:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Histosol (A1)</td>
<td>Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histic Eppedon (A2)</td>
<td>Sandy Redox (S5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Histie (A3)</td>
<td>Stripped Matrix (S6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)</td>
<td>Dark Surface (S7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratified Layers (A5)</td>
<td>Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 cm Muck (A10)</td>
<td>Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)</td>
<td>Depleted Matrix (F3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thick Dark Surface (A12)</td>
<td>Redox Dark Surface (F6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1)</td>
<td>Depleted Dark Surface (F7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)</td>
<td>Redox Depressions (F8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Restrictive Layer (if observed):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Hydric Soil Present?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**

This data form is revised from Midwest Regional Supplement Version 2.0 to include the NRCS Field Indicators of Hydric Soils, Version 7.0, 2015 Errata. (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_051293.docx)

---

**HYDROLOGY**

**Wetland Hydrology Indicators:**

**Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply):**

- Surface Water (A1)
- High Water Table (A2)
- Saturation (A3)
- Water Marks (B1)
- Sediment Deposits (B2)
- Drift Deposits (B3)
- Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- Iron Deposits (B5)
- Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)

**Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required):**

- Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- Other (Explain in Remarks)
- Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- Drainage Patterns (B10)
- Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- Clayfish Burrows (C8)
- Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- Geomorphic Position (D2)
- FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Observations</th>
<th>Wetland Hydrology Present?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water Present?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Table Present?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturation Present?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Remarks:**

US Army Corps of Engineers
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WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Midwest Region

Project/Site: Silverbell and Joslyn SE
City/County: Orion Township, Oakland
Sampling Date: 7/17/19
Applicant/Owner: Franklin Ridge Homes, LLC
State: MI
Sampling Point: A811WET
Investigator(s): Frances Thompson, James Sallee
Section, Township, Range: Sec.33, T4N, R10E
Landform (hillside, terrace, etc.): depression
Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave
Slope (%): 0-1 Lat: 42.72109 Long: -83.28262 Datum: NAD 83
Soil Map Unit Name: Houghton and Adrian mucks
NWI classification: PEM

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

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes [X] No
Hydric Soil Present? Yes [X] No
Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes [X] No
Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes [X] No

Remarks:
All three wetland criteria are met. Sampling point is wetland.

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Stratum</th>
<th>(Plot size: _______ )</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=Total Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sapling/Shrub Stratum</th>
<th>(Plot size: 15 ft )</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Frangula alnus</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FACW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=Total Cover</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herb Stratum</th>
<th>(Plot size: 5 ft )</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leersia ozyoides</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Boehmeria cylindrica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lycopodium americanum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cicutia maculata</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=Total Cover</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woody Vine Stratum</th>
<th>(Plot size: _______ )</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=Total Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

Dominance Test worksheet:
Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 2 (A)
Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 2 (B)
Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (AB)

Prevalence Index worksheet:
Total % Cover of: Multiply by:
OBL species 71 x 1 = 71
FACW species 60 x 2 = 120
FAC species 0 x 3 = 0
FACU species 0 x 4 = 0
UPL species 0 x 5 = 0
Column Totals 131 (A) 191 (B)
Prevalence Index = B/A = 1.46

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
1. Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
   X 2. Dominance Test Is >50%
   X 3. Prevalence Index Is ≤3.0
   4. Morphological Adaptations (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
   5. Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation (Explain)

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes [X] No
### SOIL

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Color (moist)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Color (moist)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Type†</th>
<th>Loc‡</th>
<th>Texture</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>10YR 2/1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muck</td>
<td>Loamy/Clayey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-15</td>
<td>10YR 2/1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Type: C=C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, MS=Masked Sand Grains.
‡Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

**Hydric Soil Indicators:**

- Histosol (A1)
- Histic Epipedon (A2)
- Black Hist (A3)
- Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- Stratified Layers (A5)
- 2 cm Muck (A10)
- Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1)
- 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)

**Restrictive Layer (if observed):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Depth (inches):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hydric Soil Present?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Remarks:**

This data form is revised from Midwest Regional Supplement Version 2.0 to include the NRCS Field Indicators of Hydric Soils, Version 7.0, 2015 Errata. (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_051293.docx)

### HYDROLOGY

**Wetland Hydrology Indicators:**

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

- Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)
  - Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
  - Aquatic Fauna (B13)
  - True Aquatic Plants (B14)
  - Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
  - Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
  - Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
  - Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
  - Thin Muck Surface (C7)

**Field Observations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Water Present?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Depth (inches):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Table Present?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturation Present?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(includes capillary fringe)**

**Wetland Hydrology Present?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Remarks:**

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

US Army Corps of Engineers

Midwest Region – Version 2.0
WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Midwest Region

Project/Site: Silverbell and Joslyn SE  City/County: Orion Township, Oakland  Sampling Date: 7/17/19
Applicant/Owner: Franklin Ridge Homes, LLC  State: MI  Sampling Point: A164 WET
Investigator(s): Frances Thompson, James Sallee  Section, Township, Range: Sec.33, T4N, R10E
Landform (hillside, terrace, etc.): depression  Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave
Slope (%): 0-1  Lat: 42.71965  Long: -83.27994  Datum: NAD 83
Soil Map Unit Name: Houghton and A drain mucks  NVI classification: PEM

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

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes X No
Hydric Soil Present? Yes X No
Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes X No
Is the Sample Area within a Wetland? Yes X No
Remarks:
All three wetland criteria are met. Sampling point is wetland.

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
<th>Dominance Test worksheet:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Acer saccharinum</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FACW</td>
<td>Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 5 (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15 ft)</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
<th>Prevalence Index worksheet:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fraxinus pennsylvanica</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FACW</td>
<td>Total % Cover of: OBL species 10 x 1 = 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Frangula alnus</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FACW</td>
<td>FACW species 185 x 2 = 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Acer negundo</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>FAC species 10 x 3 = 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FACU species 0 x 4 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UPL species 0 x 5 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Column Totals 205 (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence Index = B/A</td>
<td>410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5 ft)</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
<th>Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Phleum arundinace</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FACW</td>
<td>X_1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Phragmites australis</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FACW</td>
<td>X_2 - Dominance Test is &gt;50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Boehmeria cylindrica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>X_3 - Prevalence Index is &lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Carex leucos</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>4 - Morphological Adaptations (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation (Explain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes X No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cover = 110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: )</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Color (moist)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Color (moist)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Type¹</th>
<th>Loc²</th>
<th>Texture</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>10YR 2/1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muck</td>
<td></td>
<td>Loamy/Clayey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>10YR 2/1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, MS=Masked Sand Grains.
²Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

**Hydric Soil Indicators:**
- Histosol (A1)
- Histic Epipedon (A2)
- Black Histic (A3)
- Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- Stratified Layers (A5)
- 2 cm Muck (A10)
- Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1)
- 5 cm Mucky Peel or Peat (S3)

**Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils:**
- Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- Iron-Manganese Masses (F12)
- Red Parent Material (F21)
- Very Shallow Dark Surface (F22)
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

**Restrictive Layer (if observed):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Hydric Soil Present?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Remarks:**
This data form is revised from Midwest Regional Supplement Version 2.0 to include the NRCS Field Indicators of Hydric Soils, Version 7.0, 2015 Errata. (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_051293.docx)

### Hydrology

**Hydrology Indicators:**

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

**Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required):**
- Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- Presence of Benthic Invertebrates (D10)
- Cozomorphic Position (D2)
- X FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

**Field Observations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Water Present?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Depth (inches):</th>
<th>Wetland Hydrology Present?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Table Present?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Depth (inches): 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturation Present?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Depth (inches): 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Includes capillary fringe:**

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

**Remarks:**
WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Midwest Region

Project/Site: Silverbell and Joelyn SE  
Applicant/Owner: Franklin Ridge Homes, LLC  
City/County: Orion Township, Oakland  
Sampling Date: 7/17/19  
Investigator(s): Frances Thompson, James Sallie  
Section, Township, Range: Sec 33, T4N, R10E  
Landform (hilside, terrace, etc.): depression  
Slope (%): 0-1  
Soil Map Unit Name: Houghton and Adrain mucks  
Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave  
Long: 83.28179  
Datum: NAD 83  
NWI classification: PEM  
Sampling Point: A187 WET

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

Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes X, No

Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

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

Remarks:
All three wetland criteria are met. Sampling point is wetland.

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Acer saccharinum</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FACW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rhamnus alnifolia</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>OBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15 ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Frangula alnus</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FACW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5 ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Impatiens capensis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FACW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30 ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Vitis riparia</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FACW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dominance Test worksheet:
Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 5 (A)
Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 5 (B)
Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:
Total % Cover of: Multiply by:
OBL species 60 x 1 = 60
FACW species 210 x 2 = 420
FAC species 0 x 3 = 0
FACU species 0 x 4 = 0
UPL species 0 x 5 = 0
Column Totals: 270 (A) 480 (B)
Prevalence Index = B/A = 1.78

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
2 - Dominance Test is > 50%
3 - Prevalence Index is ≤ 3.0
4 - Morphological Adaptations' (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)

Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation' (Explain)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes X, No

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Color (moist)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Color (moist)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Type¹</th>
<th>Loc²</th>
<th>Texture</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>10YR 2/1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, MS=Masked Sand Grains.

²Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

**Hydric Soil Indicators:**

- **X** Histosol (A1)
- **_** Histic Epipedon (A2)
- **_** Black Histic (A3)
- **_** Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- **_** Stratified Layers (A5)
- **_** X 2 cm Muck (A10)
- **_** Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- **_** Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- **_** Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1)
- **_** 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)

**Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils²:**

- Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- Iron-Manganese Masses (F12)
- Red Parent Material (F21)
- Very Shallow Dark Surface (F22)
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

**Restrictive Layer (if observed):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches):</th>
<th>Hydric Soil Present?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Remarks:**

This data form is revised from Midwest Regional Supplement Version 2.0 to include the NRCS Field Indicators of Hydric Soils, Version 7.0, 2015 Errata. (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_051293.docx)

### HYDROLOGY

**Wetland Hydrology Indicators:**

**Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply):**

- Surface Water (A1)
- High Water Table (A2)
- X Saturation (A3)
- Water Marks (B1)
- Sediment Deposits (B2)
- Drift Deposits (B3)
- Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- Iron Deposits (B5)
- Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)

**Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required):**

- Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

**Field Observations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Depth (inches):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water Present?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Table Present?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturation Present?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Water Table present includes capillary fringe)

| Wetland Hydrology Present?    | Yes | X | No |

**Remarks:**

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

**US Army Corps of Engineers**

Midwest Region – Version 2.0
Alternatives Analysis

The Applicant reviewed multiple site planning options which are included with this application. These alternative site plans included the Parallel - Preservation Plan, which included 31 large single family lots covering approximately 76 percent of the 74-acre property. A PUD - Preservation Plan included 54 smaller single family home sites covering approximately 54 percent of the property. Ultimately the PUD-2 Conceptual Site Plan was developed, which became the basis for this permit application. The PUD-2 plan proposes 46 home sites, a 4-acre land donation to the Township, and the preservation of approximately 70 percent (49 acres) of the remaining property which includes emergent/open water wetland, forested upland and a portion of Mud Lake.
LEGAL DESCRIPTION
(Per Oakland County Assessment Records)

Parcel No. 09-28-379-001
Town 4 North, Range 10 East, Section 28, That Part of the Southeast 1/4 of Southwest 1/4 lying south of highway and east or Grand Trunk Western Railroad.

Parcel No. 09-28-451-001
Town 4 North, Range 10 East, Section 28, That Part of West 20 acres of Southeast 1/4 Lying south of public highway.

Parcel No. 09-33-201-001
Town 4 North, Range 10 East, Section 33 Northwest 1/4 OF Northeast 1/4 Except Beginning at northwest corner of Lot 14 of "Lakewview Subdivision" thence North, 95.05 ft more or less to water's edge of Mud Lake, thence along water's edge S70°15′40″E, 24.20 ft and N64°38′19″E, 74.39 ft and South 119.60 ft more or less to point on north line of said Lot 14, thence N89°27′10″W 90 ft to Beginning, also except beginning at northwest corner of Lot 12 of "Supervisors Plat of Lakewview Sub", thence North 100.45 ft more or less to waters edge of Mudlake, thence along waters edge S8°00′38″E 121.30 ft, thence N81°44′07″E 81.02 ft, thence South 95.05 ft more or less Northeast Corner of Lot 13 of said "plat", thence N89°27′10″E 200 ft to Beginning.

Parcel No. 09-33-128-001
Town 4 North, Range 10 East, Section 33 That part of Northeast 1/4 of Northwest 1/4 lying easterly of highway and Grand Trunk Railroad Right-of-Way.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION
(Combined parcel as surveyed by PEA Inc.)

Part of the southeast and southwest 1/4 of Section 28, together with part of the northeast and northwest 1/4 of Section 33, Town 4 North, Range 10 East, Orion Township, Oakland County, Michigan being more particularly described as:

Commencing at the South 1/4 corner of said Section 28, thence N00°54′08″E, 1037.64 feet along the north-south 1/4 line of said section to the south line of Silverbell Road (66' wide) and the Point of Beginning; thence along said south line N81°37′08″E, 336.39 feet; thence S00°54′11″W, 1087.57 feet to the east-west 1/4 line of said section; thence along said line S89°44′45″E, 999.50 feet; thence S00°20′21″E, 1319.24 feet to the north line of "Supervisor's Plat of Lakewview Subdivision" as recorded in Liber 53, Page 21, Oakland County Records; thence along said north line, N89°37′34″W, 293.09 feet; thence N00°30′08″W, 119.60 feet; thence the following four courses along the waters edge of Mud Lake, S84°19′49″W, 74.39 feet and N70°02′23″W, 24.20 feet and S81°31′02″W, 81.02 feet and N81°09′09″W, 121.30 feet to the northerly extension of the west line of Lot 12 of said supervisor's plat; thence along said extension, S00°30′08″W, 100.45 feet to the aforementioned north line of said supervisor's plat; thence along said north line, N89°37′34″W, 768.31 feet to a 3/8" iron in a 4" square concrete monument; thence continuing along said north line, N89°55′57″W, 363.34 feet to the east line of Joslyn Road (66' wide) as recorded in Liber 36264, Page 120, Oakland County Records; thence said east line, 508.14 feet along the arc of a curve to the left having a radius of 1903.85 feet and a chord that bears N05°17′23″W, 507.83 feet to the east line of the Canadian National Rail Road Right-of-Way (50' wide); thence the following two courses along said east line, 580.44 feet along the arc of a curve to the left having a radius of 3299.18 feet and a chord that bears N03°05′37″W, 579.69 feet and N08°08′02″W, 1187.11 feet to the south line of said Joslyn Road; thence along said south line, N81°37′17″E, 644.53 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Containing 73.419 acres of land, more or less.
EX. END SECTION TO BE REMOVED. EX. 3' x 8' ELLIPTICAL PIPE TO BE EXTENDED 32'.

PR. 8' DIA. CATCH BASIN
48" OF 48" RCP PIPE

DETENTION BASIN

END SECTION AND RIPRAP PER DETAIL ON SHEET W-6.0.

EXISTING WETLAND TO REMAIN

SILT FENCE PER DETAIL ON SHEET W-6.0.

GRADING/DISTURBANCE LIMIT.

IMPACT AREA 1:
FILL TOTAL: 1,970 SF (0.045 AC)
AVERAGE FILL DEPTH = 5'
AVERAGE LENGTH = 75'
AVERAGE WIDTH = 26'
PROVIDE 361 CY OF FILL
SEE SHEET W-2.1 FOR PROFILES
IMPACT AREA 2:
FILL TOTAL: 16,292 SF (0.37 AC)
AVERAGE FILL DEPTH = 6'
AVERAGE LENGTH= 271'
AVERAGE WIDTH= 60'
PROVIDE 3,813 CY OF FILL
SEE SHEETS W-3.1 AND W-3.2 FOR PROFILES
IMPACT AREA 2 PROFILE A-A

VERT. SCALE: 1"=5'
HORIZ. SCALE: 1"=50'

FILL IN WETLAND

CLEAN FILL FROM A COMMERCIAL SOURCE
MUD LAKE AVG. WATER ELEV. 993.0

PROPOSED GRADE

EXISTING GRADE

REFER TO SHEET W-3.0 FOR IMPACT QUANTITIES.
IMPACT AREA 2 PROFILE B-B

VERT. SCALE: 1" = 5'
HORIZ. SCALE: 1" = 50'
FILL 57' WETLAND

PROPOSED GRADE

EXISTING GRADE

PR. SILT FENCE

CLEAN FILL FROM A COMMERCIAL SOURCE

MUD LAKE AVG. WATER ELEV. 993.0

REFER TO SHEET W-3.0 FOR IMPACT QUANTITIES
IMPACT AREA 3:
FILL TOTAL: 10,739 SF (0.25 AC)
AVERAGE FILL DEPTH = 6'
AVERAGE LENGTH = 300'
AVERAGE WIDTH = 36'
PROVIDE 2,400 CY OF FILL
SEE SHEETS W-4.1 AND W-4.2 FOR PROFILES

SILT FENCE PER DETAIL
ON SHEET W-6.0.

MUD LAKE
AVERAGE WATER ELEV. 993.0

EXISTING WETLAND TO REMAIN

GRADING/DISTURBANCE LIMIT.
WETLAND BOUNDARY

005

000

995

990

985

PROPOSED GRADE

EXISTING GRADE

MUD LAKE
AVG. WATER
ELEV. 993.0

CLEAN FILL FROM A
COMMERCIAL SOURCE

IMPACT AREA 3 PROFILE A-A

VERT. SCALE: 1"=6'

HORIZ. SCALE: 1"=60'

FILL IN WETLAND

REFER TO SHEET W-4.0
FOR IMPACT QUANTITIES
IMPACT AREA 3 PROFILE B-B

VERT. SCALE: 1"=5'
HORIZ. SCALE: 1"=50'

FILL IN WETLAND

1010
1010
1005
1005
1000
1000
995
995
990
990
985
985
WET AND BOUNDARY

PROPOSED GRADE

1
4

EXISTING GRADE

MUD LAKE
AVG. WATER
ELEV. 993.0

CLEAN FILL FROM A
COMMERCIAL SOURCE.

PR SILT FENCE

REFER TO SHEET W-4.0
FOR IMPACT QUANTITIES.
IMPACT AREA 4 PROFILE A-A

VERT. SCALE: 1"=5'
HORIZ. SCALE: 1"=50'

FILL IN WETLAND
IMPACT AREA 4

PROFILE B-B

VERT. SCALE: 1" = 5'
HORIZ. SCALE: 1" = 50'
FILL IN WETLAND

PROFILE C-C

VERT. SCALE: 1" = 5'
HORIZ. SCALE: 1" = 50'
FILL IN WETLAND
PROFILE D-D
OUTFALL SECTION

VERT. SCALE: 1"=5'
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SILT FENCE JOINT DETAIL
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.

PLEASE NOTE: THIS SUGGESTED MOTION CAN BE USED FOR PC-2020-28 THROUGH PC-2020-37. EACH CASE REQUIRES A SEPARATE MOTION.

Ordinance #154

I move to grant/not grant approval of the application, as required per Ord. #154, for PC-2020-___, Pure Green, LLC, for a Class “C” growing facility, located at 180 Premier Dr., (parcel 09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002) based on the finds of fact that the operation does/do not meeting the following location requirements:

- Is located in and IP zoning district
- Is located in a building that meets all the distance requirements shown in Ord. 154
- Is located in a building that has an ingress/egress road with less than 6,000 vehicles/day.
- Is located in a building that has an ingress/egress road that does not service as a road that also serves for residential zoning.

If motion is grant approval - conditioned upon:

1. The applicant meets all applicable Township Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board.
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION
ORDINANCE No. 154 APPLICATION REVIEW

Planning Commission Case:  PC-2020-28
Parcel Number:  09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002
Property Address:  180 Premier Drive
Applicant:  Pure Green
Request:  Class “C” Grow
Date:  November 1, 2020

The aforementioned application was reviewed for compliance with the location requirements of
Article VI of Ordinance No. 154 and the finds are detailed below:

Article V, 1. – The Facility must be located in the Township’s IP (Industrial Park) district:  The parcels are zoned IP (Industrial Park) as required.

Article V, 2 – The Facility cannot be within one thousand five hundred (1,500) feet of a “church” in the Township:  Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge.  The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 1,500 feet.  Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest church and it was over 1,600 feet.

Article VI, 3 – The Facility cannot be within two thousand (2,000) feet of a residence located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district:  Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge.  The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,000 feet.  Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest residential property line (for simplicity) and it was 2,500 feet.

Article VI, 4 – The Facility cannot be within two thousand five hundred (2,500) feet of a registered “school” within the Township:  Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge.  The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,500 feet.  The closest school is over 2 miles from the parcel.  (Scripps and Stadium Rds.)
Article VI, 5 – The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that has an average traffic volume in excess of six thousand (6,000) vehicles per day, as calculated by averaging the three (3) most recent Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) counts (as available), as reported by Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG). The building has ingress and egress off of Premier Drive. SEMCOG’s website does not contain any traffic count reports for Premier Dr.

Article VI, 6- The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that directly also serves as an ingress or egress to a residential road or property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district. The building has both ingress or egress off of Premier Dr. Premier Dr. does not serve as an ingress and/or egress to any property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district.

Article VI, 7 - Distances specified in this Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The measurements, unless noted differently, were measured from building edge to proposed building edge.

Article VI, 8 – If the Facility shall need a variance from what is set forth in Article VI Sections one (1) through six (6) above, the Applicant may submit a formal request for a variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals (“ZBA”). The ZBA shall only consider a variance request that is no more than fifteen percent (15%) out of compliance with the above location regulations: The applicant is not requesting any variances from the ZBA.

Article VI, 9 – It is the Township’s intention that Growers, Processors, Safety Compliance Facilities and Secured Transporters may operate within the same building under the following conditions: each licensed entity remains distinct and separate within different working area and separate record keeping systems: The applicant is requesting a Class “C” growing facility only.

Article VI, 10 –The location shall meet all applicable Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board:

ITEMS TO BE ADDRESSED: These items are unknown at this time. It is recommended that any approval be conditioned upon this requirement.

Article VI, 11 – The Facility location shall conform to all standards of the zoning district in which it is located: This condition has been met. The building itself has received site plan approval.
Article VI, 12 – If the Facility location is currently vacant land, the applicant must submit a site plan and building plans with the Application: The application is for an improved parcel that has received site plan approval.

Article VI, 14 – Based upon an application for or amendment of a Conditional Rezoning, PUD, or other use Development Agreement of sufficient specificity, it is within the sole discretion and judgment of the Township Board of Trustees to consider and waive any or all of the Location Requirements of this Article VI based upon any or all of 3 factors listed in Article VI 14 a,b, and c.: The applicant is not requesting any waivers.

Summary: I have reviewed the application as it relates to Ordinance No. 154 Article VI – Location Requirements. I am agreeable with the recommendation to approve this application with the conditions that:

1. The applicant meets all other applicable Township Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board.

Tamara Girling
Planning & Zoning Director
Planning Commission Case:  PC-2020-29
Parcel Number:  09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002
Property Address:  180 Premier Drive
Applicant:  Pure Green
Request:  Class “C” Grow
Date:  November 1, 2020

The aforementioned application was reviewed for compliance with the location requirements of Article VI of Ordinance No. 154 and the finds are detailed below:

Article V, 1. – The Facility must be located in the Township’s IP (Industrial Park) district: The parcels are zoned IP (Industrial Park) as required.

Article V, 2 – The Facility cannot be within one thousand five hundred (1,500) feet of a “church” in the Township: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 1,500 feet. Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest church and it was over 1,600 feet.

Article VI, 3 – The Facility cannot be within two thousand (2,000) feet of a residence located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,000 feet. Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest residential property line (for simplicity) and it was 2,500 feet.

Article VI, 4 – The Facility cannot be within two thousand five hundred (2,500) feet of a registered “school” within the Township: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,500 feet. The closest school is over 2 miles from the parcel. (Scripps and Stadium Rds.)
Article VI, 5 – The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that has an average traffic volume in excess of six thousand (6,000) vehicles per day, as calculated by averaging the three (3) most recent Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) counts (as available), as reported by Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG). The building has ingress and egress off of Premier Drive. SEMCOG's website does not contain any traffic count reports for Premier Dr.

Article VI, 6- The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that directly also serves as an ingress or egress to a residential road or property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district. The building has both ingress or egress off of Premier Dr. Premier Dr. does not serve as an ingress and/or egress to any property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district.

Article VI, 7 - Distances specified in this Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The measurements, unless noted differently, were measured from building edge to proposed building edge.

Article VI, 8 – If the Facility shall need a variance from what is set forth in Article VI Sections one (1) through six (6) above, the Applicant may submit a formal request for a variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals (“ZBA”). The ZBA shall only consider a variance request that is no more than fifteen percent (15%) out of compliance with the above location regulations: The applicant is not requesting any variances from the ZBA.

Article VI, 9 – It is the Township’s intention that Growers, Processors, Safety Compliance Facilities and Secured Transporters may operate within the same building under the following conditions: each licensed entity remains distinct and separate within different working area and separate record keeping systems: The applicant is requesting a Class “C” growing facility only.

Article VI, 10 – The location shall meet all applicable Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board:

ITEMS TO BE ADDRESSED: These items are unknown at this time. It is recommended that any approval be conditioned upon this requirement.

Article VI, 11 – The Facility location shall conform to all standards of the zoning district in which it is located: This condition has been met. The building itself has received site plan approval.
Article VI, 12 – If the Facility location is currently vacant land, the applicant must submit a site plan and building plans with the Application: The application is for an improved parcel that has received site plan approval.

Article VI, 14 – Based upon an application for or amendment of a Conditional Rezoning, PUD, or other use Development Agreement of sufficient specificity, it is within the sole discretion and judgment of the Township Board of Trustees to consider and waive any or all of the Location Requirements of this Article VI based upon any or all of 3 factors listed in Article VI 14 a,b, and c.: The applicant is not requesting any waivers.

Summary: I have reviewed the application as it relates to Ordinance No. 154 Article VI – Location Requirements. I am agreeable with the recommendation to approve this application with the conditions that:

1. The applicant meets all other applicable Township Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board.

Tamara Girling
Planning & Zoning Director
The aforementioned application was reviewed for compliance with the location requirements of Article VI of Ordinance No. 154 and the finds are detailed below:

Article V, 1. **The Facility must be located in the Township’s IP (Industrial Park) district:** The parcels are zoned IP (Industrial Park) as required.

Article V, 2. **The Facility cannot be within one thousand five hundred (1,500) feet of a “church” in the Township:** Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 1,500 feet. Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest church and it was over 1,600 feet.

Article VI, 3. **The Facility cannot be within two thousand (2,000) feet of a residence located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district:** Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,000 feet. Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest residential property line (for simplicity) and it was 2,500 feet.

Article VI, 4. **The Facility cannot be within two thousand five hundred (2,500) feet of a registered “school” within the Township:** Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,500 feet. The closest school is over 2 miles from the parcel. (Scripps and Stadium Rds.)
Article VI, 5 – The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that has an average traffic volume in excess of six thousand (6,000) vehicles per day, as calculated by averaging the three (3) most recent Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) counts (as available), as reported by Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG). The building has ingress and egress off of Premier Drive. SEMCOG’s website does not contain any traffic count reports for Premier Dr.

Article VI, 6- The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that directly also serves as an ingress or egress to a residential road or property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district. The building has both ingress or egress off of Premier Dr. Premier Dr. does not serve as an ingress and/or egress to any property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district.

Article VI, 7 - Distances specified in this Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The measurements, unless noted differently, were measured from building edge to proposed building edge.

Article VI, 8 – If the Facility shall need a variance from what is set forth in Article VI Sections one (1) through six (6) above, the Applicant may submit a formal request for a variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals (“ZBA”). The ZBA shall only consider a variance request that is no more than fifteen percent (15%) out of compliance with the above location regulations: The applicant is not requesting any variances from the ZBA.

Article VI, 9 – It is the Township’s intention that Growers, Processors, Safety Compliance Facilities and Secured Transporters may operate within the same building under the following conditions: each licensed entity remains distinct and separate within different working area and separate record keeping systems: The applicant is requesting a Class “C” growing facility only.

Article VI, 10 – The location shall meet all applicable Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board:

ITEMS TO BE ADDRESSED: These items are unknown at this time. It is recommended that any approval be conditioned upon this requirement.

Article VI, 11 – The Facility location shall conform to all standards of the zoning district in which it is located: This condition has been met. The building itself has received site plan approval.
Article VI, 12 – If the Facility location is currently vacant land, the applicant must submit a site plan and building plans with the Application: The application is for an improved parcel that has received site plan approval.

Article VI, 14 – Based upon an application for or amendment of a Conditional Rezoning, PUD, or other use Development Agreement of sufficient specificity, it is within the sole discretion and judgment of the Township Board of Trustees to consider and waive any or all of the Location Requirements of this Article VI based upon any or all of 3 factors listed in Article VI 14 a,b, and c.: The applicant is not requesting any waivers.

Summary: I have reviewed the application as it relates to Ordinance No. 154 Article VI – Location Requirements. I am agreeable with the recommendation to approve this application with the conditions that:

1. The applicant meets all other applicable Township Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board.

Tamara Girling
Planning & Zoning Director

[Signature]
Charter Township of Orion  
Planning Division  
2525 Joslyn Rd., Lake Orion MI 48360  
P: (248) 391-0304 ext. 5000; Fax (248) 391-1454

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION  
ORDINANCE No. 154 APPLICATION REVIEW

Planning Commission Case: PC-2020-31  
Parcel Number: 09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002  
Property Address: 180 Premier Drive  
Applicant: Pure Green  
Request: Class “C” Grow  
Date: November 1, 2020

The aforementioned application was reviewed for compliance with the location requirements of Article VI of Ordinance No. 154 and the finds are detailed below:

Article V, 1. – The Facility must be located in the Township’s IP (Industrial Park) district: The parcels are zoned IP (Industrial Park) as required.

Article V, 2 – The Facility cannot be within one thousand five hundred (1,500) feet of a “church” in the Township: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 1,500 feet. Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest church and it was over 1,600 feet.

Article VI, 3 – The Facility cannot be within two thousand (2,000) feet of a residence located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,000 feet. Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest residential property line (for simplicity) and it was 2,500 feet.

Article VI, 4 – The Facility cannot be within two thousand five hundred (2,500) feet of a registered “school” within the Township: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,500 feet. The closest school is over 2 miles from the parcel. (Scripps and Stadium Rds.)
Article VI, 5 – The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that has an average traffic volume in excess of six thousand (6,000) vehicles per day, as calculated by averaging the three (3) most recent Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) counts (as available), as reported by Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG). The building has ingress and egress off of Premier Drive. SEMCOG’s website does not contain any traffic count reports for Premier Dr.

Article VI, 6- The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that directly also serves as an ingress or egress to a residential road or property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district. The building has both ingress or egress off of Premier Dr. Premier Dr. does not serve as an ingress and/or egress to any property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district.

Article VI, 7 - Distances specified in this Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The measurements, unless noted differently, were measured from building edge to proposed building edge.

Article VI, 8 – If the Facility shall need a variance from what is set forth in Article VI Sections one (1) through six (6) above, the Applicant may submit a formal request for a variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals (“ZBA”). The ZBA shall only consider a variance request that is no more than fifteen percent (15%) out of compliance with the above location regulations: The applicant is not requesting any variances from the ZBA.

Article VI, 9 – It is the Township’s intention that Growers, Processors, Safety Compliance Facilities and Secured Transporters may operate within the same building under the following conditions: each licensed entity remains distinct and separate within different working area and separate record keeping systems: The applicant is requesting a Class “C” growing facility only.

Article VI, 10 – The location shall meet all applicable Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board:

ITEMS TO BE ADDRESSED: These items are unknown at this time. It is recommended that any approval be conditioned upon this requirement.

Article VI, 11 – The Facility location shall conform to all standards of the zoning district in which it is located: This condition has been met. The building itself has received site plan approval.
Article VI, 12 – If the Facility location is currently vacant land, the applicant must submit a site plan and building plans with the Application: The application is for an improved parcel that has received site plan approval.

Article VI, 14 – Based upon an application for or amendment of a Conditional Rezoning, PUD, or other use Development Agreement of sufficient specificity, it is within the sole discretion and judgment of the Township Board of Trustees to consider and waive any or all of the Location Requirements of this Article VI based upon any or all of 3 factors listed in Article VI 14 a,b, and c.: The applicant is not requesting any waivers.

Summary: I have reviewed the application as it relates to Ordinance No. 154 Article VI – Location Requirements. I am agreeable with the recommendation to approve this application with the conditions that:

1. The applicant meets all other applicable Township Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board.

Tamara Girling
Planning & Zoning Director

[Signature]
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION
ORDINANCE No. 154 APPLICATION REVIEW

Planning Commission Case: PC-2020-32
Parcel Number: 09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002
Property Address: 180 Premier Drive
Applicant: Pure Green
Request: Class “C” Grow
Date: November 1, 2020

The aforementioned application was reviewed for compliance with the location requirements of Article VI of Ordinance No. 154 and the finds are detailed below:

Article V, 1. – The Facility must be located in the Township’s IP (Industrial Park) district: The parcels are zoned IP (Industrial Park) as required.

Article V, 2 – The Facility cannot be within one thousand five hundred (1,500) feet of a “church” in the Township: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 1,500 feet. Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest church and it was over 1,600 feet.

Article VI, 3 – The Facility cannot be within two thousand (2,000) feet of a residence located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,000 feet. Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest residential property line (for simplicity) and it was 2,500 feet.

Article VI, 4 – The Facility cannot be within two thousand five hundred (2,500) feet of a registered “school” within the Township: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,500 feet. The closest school is over 2 miles from the parcel. (Scripps and Stadium Rds.)
Article VI, 5 – The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that has an average traffic volume in excess of six thousand (6,000) vehicles per day, as calculated by averaging the three (3) most recent Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) counts (as available), as reported by Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG): The building has ingress and egress off of Premier Drive. SEMCOG’s website does not contain any traffic count reports for Premier Dr.

Article VI, 6- The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that directly also serves as an ingress or egress to a residential road or property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district. The building has both ingress or egress off of Premier Dr. Premier Dr. does not serve as an ingress and/or egress to any property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district.

Article VI, 7 - Distances specified in this Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The measurements, unless noted differently, were measured from building edge to proposed building edge.

Article VI, 8 – If the Facility shall need a variance from what is set forth in Article VI Sections one (1) through six (6) above, the Applicant may submit a formal request for a variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals (“ZBA”). The ZBA shall only consider a variance request that is no more than fifteen percent (15%) out of compliance with the above location regulations: The applicant is not requesting any variances from the ZBA.

Article VI, 9 – It is the Township’s intention that Growers, Processors, Safety Compliance Facilities and Secured Transporters may operate within the same building under the following conditions: each licensed entity remains distinct and separate within different working area and separate record keeping systems: The applicant is requesting a Class “C” growing facility only.

Article VI, 10 – The location shall meet all applicable Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board:

ITEMS TO BE ADDRESSED: These items are unknown at this time. It is recommended that any approval be conditioned upon this requirement.

Article VI, 11 – The Facility location shall conform to all standards of the zoning district in which it is located: This condition has been met. The building itself has received site plan approval.
Article VI, 12 – If the Facility location is currently vacant land, the applicant must submit a site plan and building plans with the Application: The application is for an improved parcel that has received site plan approval.

Article VI, 14 – Based upon an application for or amendment of a Conditional Rezoning, PUD, or other use Development Agreement of sufficient specificity, it is within the sole discretion and judgment of the Township Board of Trustees to consider and waive any or all of the Location Requirements of this Article VI based upon any or all of 3 factors listed in Article VI 14 a,b, and c.: The applicant is not requesting any waivers.

Summary: I have reviewed the application as it relates to Ordinance No. 154 Article VI – Location Requirements. I am agreeable with the recommendation to approve this application with the conditions that:

1. The applicant meets all other applicable Township Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board.

Tamara Girling
Planning & Zoning Director
Charter Township of Orion
Planning Division
2525 Jolyn Rd., Lake Orion MI 48360
P: (248) 391-0304 ext. 5000, Fax (248) 391-1454

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION
ORDINANCE No. 154 APPLICATION REVIEW

Planning Commission Case: PC-2020-33
Parcel Number: 09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002
Property Address: 180 Premier Drive
Applicant: Pure Green
Request: Class “C” Grow
Date: November 1, 2020

The aforementioned application was reviewed for compliance with the location requirements of Article VI of Ordinance No. 154 and the finds are detailed below:

Article V, 1. – The Facility must be located in the Township’s IP (Industrial Park) district: The parcels are zoned IP (Industrial Park) as required.

Article V, 2 – The Facility cannot be within one thousand five hundred (1,500) feet of a “church” in the Township: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 1,500 feet. Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest church and it was over 1,600 feet.

Article VI, 3 – The Facility cannot be within two thousand (2,000) feet of a residence located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,000 feet. Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest residential property line (for simplicity) and it was 2,500 feet.

Article VI, 4 – The Facility cannot be within two thousand five hundred (2,500) feet of a registered “school” within the Township: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,500 feet. The closest school is over 2 miles from the parcel. (Scripps and Stadium Rds.)
Article VI, 5 – The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that has an average traffic volume in excess of six thousand (6,000) vehicles per day, as calculated by averaging the three (3) most recent Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) counts (as available), as reported by Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG): The building has ingress and egress off of Premier Drive. SEMCOG’s website does not contain any traffic count reports for Premier Dr.

Article VI, 6- The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that directly also serves as an ingress or egress to a residential road or property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district. The building has both ingress or egress off of Premier Dr. Premier Dr. does not serve as an ingress and/or egress to any property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district.

Article VI, 7 - Distances specified in this Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The measurements, unless noted differently, were measured from building edge to proposed building edge.

Article VI, 8 – If the Facility shall need a variance from what is set forth in Article VI Sections one (1) through six (6) above, the Applicant may submit a formal request for a variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals (“ZBA”). The ZBA shall only consider a variance request that is no more than fifteen percent (15%) out of compliance with the above location regulations: The applicant is not requesting any variances from the ZBA.

Article VI, 9 – It is the Township’s intention that Growers, Processors, Safety Compliance Facilities and Secured Transporters may operate within the same building under the following conditions: each licensed entity remains distinct and separate within different working area and separate record keeping systems: The applicant is requesting a Class “C” growing facility only.

Article VI, 10 – The location shall meet all applicable Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board:

ITEMS TO BE ADDRESSED: These items are unknown at this time. It is recommended that any approval be conditioned upon this requirement.

Article VI, 11 – The Facility location shall conform to all standards of the zoning district in which it is located: This condition has been met. The building itself has received site plan approval.
Article VI, 12 – If the Facility location is currently vacant land, the applicant must submit a site plan and building plans with the Application: The application is for an improved parcel that has received site plan approval.

Article VI, 14 – Based upon an application for or amendment of a Conditional Rezoning, PUD, or other use Development Agreement of sufficient specificity, it is within the sole discretion and judgment of the Township Board of Trustees to consider and waive any or all of the Location Requirements of this Article VI based upon any or all of 3 factors listed in Article VI 14 a,b, and c.: The applicant is not requesting any waivers.

Summary: I have reviewed the application as it relates to Ordinance No. 154 Article VI – Location Requirements. I am agreeable with the recommendation to approve this application with the conditions that:

1. The applicant meets all other applicable Township Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board.

Tamara Girling
Planning & Zoning Director

[Signature]
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION
ORDINANCE No. 154 APPLICATION REVIEW

Planning Commission Case:  PC-2020-34
Parcel Number:  09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002
Property Address:  180 Premier Drive
Applicant:  Pure Green
Request:  Class “C” Grow
Date:  November 1, 2020

The aforementioned application was reviewed for compliance with the location requirements of Article VI of Ordinance No. 154 and the finds are detailed below:

Article V, 1. – The Facility must be located in the Township’s IP (Industrial Park) district: The parcels are zoned IP (Industrial Park) as required.

Article V, 2 – The Facility cannot be within one thousand five hundred (1,500) feet of a “church” in the Township: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 1,500 feet. Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest church and it was over 1,600 feet.

Article VI, 3 – The Facility cannot be within two thousand (2,000) feet of a residence located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,000 feet. Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest residential property line (for simplicity) and it was 2,500 feet.

Article VI, 4 – The Facility cannot be within two thousand five hundred (2,500) feet of a registered “school” within the Township: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,500 feet. The closest school is over 2 miles from the parcel. (Scripps and Stadium Rds.)
Article VI, 5 – The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that has an average traffic volume in excess of six thousand (6,000) vehicles per day, as calculated by averaging the three (3) most recent Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) counts (as available), as reported by Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG). The building has ingress and egress off of Premier Drive. SEMCOG’s website does not contain any traffic count reports for Premier Dr.

Article VI, 6- The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that directly also serves as an ingress or egress to a residential road or property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district. The building has both ingress or egress off of Premier Dr. Premier Dr. does not serve as an ingress and/or egress to any property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district.

Article VI, 7 - Distances specified in this Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The measurements, unless noted differently, were measured from building edge to proposed building edge.

Article VI, 8 – If the Facility shall need a variance from what is set forth in Article VI Sections one (1) through six (6) above, the Applicant may submit a formal request for a variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals (“ZBA”). The ZBA shall only consider a variance request that is no more than fifteen percent (15%) out of compliance with the above location regulations. The applicant is not requesting any variances from the ZBA.

Article VI, 9 – It is the Township’s intention that Growers, Processors, Safety Compliance Facilities and Secured Transporters may operate within the same building under the following conditions: each licensed entity remains distinct and separate within different working area and separate record keeping systems. The applicant is requesting a Class “C” growing facility only.

Article VI, 10 – The location shall meet all applicable Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board:

ITEMS TO BE ADDRESSED: These items are unknown at this time. It is recommended that any approval be conditioned upon this requirement.

Article VI, 11 – The Facility location shall conform to all standards of the zoning district in which it is located: This condition has been met. The building itself has received site plan approval.
Article VI, 12 – If the Facility location is currently vacant land, the applicant must submit a site plan and building plans with the Application: The application is for an improved parcel that has received site plan approval.

Article VI, 14 – Based upon an application for or amendment of a Conditional Rezoning, PUD, or other use Development Agreement of sufficient specificity, it is within the sole discretion and judgment of the Township Board of Trustees to consider and waive any or all of the Location Requirements of this Article VI based upon any or all of 3 factors listed in Article VI 14 a,b, and c.: The applicant is not requesting any waivers.

Summary: I have reviewed the application as it relates to Ordinance No. 154 Article VI – Location Requirements. I am agreeable with the recommendation to approve this application with the conditions that:

1. The applicant meets all other applicable Township Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board.

Tamara Girling
Planning & Zoning Director
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION
ORDINANCE No. 154 APPLICATION REVIEW

Planning Commission Case: PC-2020-35
Parcel Number: 09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002
Property Address: 180 Premier Drive
Applicant: Pure Green
Request: Class “C” Grow
Date: November 1, 2020

The aforementioned application was reviewed for compliance with the location requirements of Article VI of Ordinance No. 154 and the finds are detailed below:

Article V, 1. - The Facility must be located in the Township’s IP (Industrial Park) district: The parcels are zoned IP (Industrial Park) as required.

Article V, 2 - The Facility cannot be within one thousand five hundred (1,500) feet of a “church” in the Township: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 1,500 feet. Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest church and it was over 1,600 feet.

Article VI, 3 - The Facility cannot be within two thousand (2,000) feet of a residence located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,000 feet. Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest residential property line (for simplicity) and it was 2,500 feet.

Article VI, 4 - The Facility cannot be within two thousand five hundred (2,500) feet of a registered “school” within the Township: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,500 feet. The closest school is over 2 miles from the parcel. (Scripps and Stadium Rds.)
Article VI, 5 – The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that has an average traffic volume in excess of six thousand (6,000) vehicles per day, as calculated by averaging the three (3) most recent Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) counts (as available), as reported by Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG). The building has ingress and egress off of Premier Dr. SEMCOG’s website does not contain any traffic count reports for Premier Dr.

Article VI, 6- The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that directly also serves as an ingress or egress to a residential road or property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district. The building has both ingress or egress off of Premier Dr. Premier Dr. does not serve as an ingress and/or egress to any property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district.

Article VI, 7 - Distances specified in this Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The measurements, unless noted differently, were measured from building edge to proposed building edge.

Article VI, 8 – If the Facility shall need a variance from what is set forth in Article VI Sections one (1) through six (6) above, the Applicant may submit a formal request for a variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals (“ZBA”). The ZBA shall only consider a variance request that is no more than fifteen percent (15%) out of compliance with the above location regulations: The applicant is not requesting any variances from the ZBA.

Article VI, 9 – It is the Township’s intention that Growers, Processors, Safety Compliance Facilities and Secured Transporters may operate within the same building under the following conditions: each licensed entity remains distinct and separate within different working area and separate record keeping systems: The applicant is requesting a Class “C” growing facility only.

Article VI, 10 – The location shall meet all applicable Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board:

ITEMS TO BE ADDRESSED: These items are unknown at this time. It is recommended that any approval be conditioned upon this requirement.

Article VI, 11 – The Facility location shall conform to all standards of the zoning district in which it is located: This condition has been met. The building itself has received site plan approval.
Article VI, 12 – If the Facility location is currently vacant land, the applicant must submit a site plan and building plans with the Application: The application is for an improved parcel that has received site plan approval.

Article VI, 14 – Based upon an application for or amendment of a Conditional Rezoning, PUD, or other use Development Agreement of sufficient specificity, it is within the sole discretion and judgment of the Township Board of Trustees to consider and waive any or all of the Location Requirements of this Article VI based upon any or all of 3 factors listed in Article VI 14 a,b, and c.: The applicant is not requesting any waivers.

Summary: I have reviewed the application as it relates to Ordinance No. 154 Article VI – Location Requirements. I am agreeable with the recommendation to approve this application with the conditions that:

1. The applicant meets all other applicable Township Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marijuana Licensing Board.

Tamara Girling
Planning & Zoning Director

[Signature]
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION
ORDINANCE No. 154 APPLICATION REVIEW

Planning Commission Case: PC-2020-36
Parcel Number: 09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002
Property Address: 180 Premier Drive
Applicant: Pure Green
Request: Class “C” Grow
Date: November 1, 2020

The aforementioned application was reviewed for compliance with the location requirements of Article VI of Ordinance No. 154 and the finds are detailed below:

Article V, 1. — The Facility must be located in the Township’s IP (Industrial Park) district: The parcels are zoned IP (Industrial Park) as required.

Article V, 2. — The Facility cannot be within one thousand five hundred (1,500) feet of a “church” in the Township: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 1,500 feet. Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest church and it was over 1,600 feet.

Article VI, 3. — The Facility cannot be within two thousand (2,000) feet of a residence located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,000 feet. Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest residential property line (for simplicity) and it was 2,500 feet.

Article VI, 4. — The Facility cannot be within two thousand five hundred (2,500) feet of a registered “school” within the Township: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,500 feet. The closest school is over 2 miles from the parcel. (Scripps and Stadium Rds.)
Article VI, 5 – The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that has an average traffic volume in excess of six thousand (6,000) vehicles per day, as calculated by averaging the three (3) most recent Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) counts (as available), as reported by Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG). The building has ingress and egress off of Premier Drive. SEMCOG’s website does not contain any traffic count reports for Premier Dr.

Article VI, 6- The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that directly also serves as an ingress or egress to a residential road or property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district. The building has both ingress or egress off of Premier Dr. Premier Dr. does not serve as an ingress and/or egress to any property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district.

Article VI, 7 - Distances specified in this Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The measurements, unless noted differently, were measured from building edge to proposed building edge.

Article VI, 8 – If the Facility shall need a variance from what is set forth in Article VI Sections one (1) through six (6) above, the Applicant may submit a formal request for a variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals (“ZBA”). The ZBA shall only consider a variance request that is no more than fifteen percent (15%) out of compliance with the above location regulations. The applicant is not requesting any variances from the ZBA.

Article VI, 9 – It is the Township’s intention that Growers, Processors, Safety Compliance Facilities and Secured Transporters may operate within the same building under the following conditions: each licensed entity remains distinct and separate within different working area and separate record keeping systems. The applicant is requesting a Class “C” growing facility only.

Article VI, 10 – The location shall meet all applicable Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board:

ITEMS TO BE ADDRESSED: These items are unknown at this time. It is recommended that any approval be conditioned upon this requirement.

Article VI, 11 – The Facility location shall conform to all standards of the zoning district in which it is located: This condition has been met. The building itself has received site plan approval.
Article VI, 12 – If the Facility location is currently vacant land, the applicant must submit a site plan and building plans with the Application: The application is for an improved parcel that has received site plan approval.

Article VI, 14 – Based upon an application for or amendment of a Conditional Rezoning, PUD, or other use Development Agreement of sufficient specificity, it is within the sole discretion and judgment of the Township Board of Trustees to consider and waive any or all of the Location Requirements of this Article VI based upon any or all of 3 factors listed in Article VI 14 a,b, and c.: The applicant is not requesting any waivers.

Summary: I have reviewed the application as it relates to Ordinance No. 154 Article VI – Location Requirements. I am agreeable with the recommendation to approve this application with the conditions that:

1. The applicant meets all other applicable Township Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board.

Tamara Girling
Planning & Zoning Director

[Signature]
Planning Commission Case: PC-2020-37
Parcel Number: 09-35-477-001 & 09-35-477-002
Property Address: 180 Premier Drive
Applicant: Pure Green
Request: Class “C” Grow
Date: November 1, 2020

The aforementioned application was reviewed for compliance with the location requirements of Article VI of Ordinance No. 154 and the finds are detailed below:

Article V, 1. – The Facility must be located in the Township’s IP (Industrial Park) district: The parcels are zoned IP (Industrial Park) as required.

Article V, 2 – The Facility cannot be within one thousand five hundred (1,500) feet of a “church” in the Township: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 1,500 feet. Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest church and it was over 1,600 feet.

Article VI, 3 – The Facility cannot be within two thousand (2,000) feet of a residence located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,000 feet. Using GIS, a measurement was taken from the edge of the property where the building is located (for simplicity vs. from edge of building which is further) to the edge of the closest residential property line (for simplicity) and it was 2,500 feet.

Article VI, 4 – The Facility cannot be within two thousand five hundred (2,500) feet of a registered “school” within the Township: Article VI, 7 states that the distances specified in the Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge. The applicant stated within their application that the facility is more than the required 2,500 feet. The closest school is over 2 miles from the parcel. (Scripps and Stadium Rds.)
Article VI, 5 – **The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that has an average traffic volume in excess of six thousand (6,000) vehicles per day, as calculated by averaging the three (3) most recent Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) counts (as available), as reported by Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG):** The building has ingress and egress off of Premier Drive. SEMCOG’s website does not contain any traffic count reports for Premier Dr.

Article VI, 6- **The Facility shall not have an ingress or egress on a street or road that directly also serves as an ingress or egress to a residential road or property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district.** The building has both ingress or egress off of Premier Dr. Premier Dr. does not serve as an ingress and/or egress to any property located in a R-1, R-2, R-3, SF, SE, SR, RM or MHP zoning district.

Article VI, 7 - **Distances specified in this Ordinance shall be measured from building edge to building edge.** The measurements, unless noted differently, were measured from building edge to proposed building edge.

Article VI, 8 – **If the Facility shall need a variance from what is set forth in Article VI Sections one (1) through six (6) above, the Applicant may submit a formal request for a variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals (“ZBA”).** The ZBA shall only consider a variance request that is no more than fifteen percent (15%) out of compliance with the above location regulations: The applicant is not requesting any variances from the ZBA.

Article VI, 9 – **It is the Township’s intention that Growers, Processors, Safety Compliance Facilities and Secured Transporters may operate within the same building under the following conditions: each licensed entity remains distinct and separate within different working area and separate record keeping systems:** The applicant is requesting a Class “C” growing facility only.

Article VI, 10 – **The location shall meet all applicable Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board:**

**ITEMS TO BE ADDRESSED:** These items are unknown at this time. It is recommended that any approval be conditioned upon this requirement.

Article VI, 11 – **The Facility location shall conform to all standards of the zoning district in which it is located:** This condition has been met. The building itself has received site plan approval.
Article VI, 12 – If the Facility location is currently vacant land, the applicant must submit a site plan and building plans with the Application. The application is for an improved parcel that has received site plan approval.

Article VI, 14 – Based upon an application for or amendment of a Conditional Rezoning, PUD, or other use Development Agreement of sufficient specificity, it is within the sole discretion and judgment of the Township Board of Trustees to consider and waive any or all of the Location Requirements of this Article VI based upon any or all of 3 factors listed in Article VI 14 a,b, and c.: The applicant is not requesting any waivers.

Summary: I have reviewed the application as it relates to Ordinance No. 154 Article VI – Location Requirements. I am agreeable with the recommendation to approve this application with the conditions that:

1. The applicant meets all other applicable Township Ordinances and promulgated standards of the Township and, prior to opening, shall demonstrate to the Township that it meets the rules and regulations promulgated by the State Medical Marihuana Licensing Board.

Tamara Girling
Planning & Zoning Director

[Signature]
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION PLANNING COMMISSION

2021 REGULAR MEETING DATES RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the By-Laws of the Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission provide for the scheduling of regular meetings on the first and third Wednesday of each month; and,

WHEREAS, the State of Michigan has enacted Public Act No. 267 of 1976, Open Meetings Act, which requires the specific designation of the dates, times, and places of all regular meetings of the Planning Commission; and,

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission to conduct all of its business in an open forum, in compliance with said Act; and,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission will hold its regular meetings on the first and third Wednesday of each month of the calendar year beginning on January 6, 2021 and ending on December 15, 2021.

The following are the dates of the regularly scheduled meetings, which will begin at 7:00 p.m. and will be held at the Orion Center Board Room, 1335 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, Michigan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>6 &amp; 20</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>7 &amp; 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>3 &amp; 17</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>4 &amp; 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>3 &amp; 17</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>1 &amp; 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>7 &amp; 21</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>6 &amp; 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>5 &amp; 19</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>3 &amp; 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>2 &amp; 16</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>1 &amp; 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this notice of regular meeting dates is to be published in The Lake Orion Review and to be posted at the Charter Township of Orion Hall.

PC approved XXXXXXX
TO: Planning Commission Chair  
Orion Township  
2525 Joslyn Rd.  
Lake Orion, MI 48360-1951

DATE: October 29, 2020

RE: Notice of Intent to Develop a Community Master Plan

Dear Adjacent Community/Public Utility/Public Agency/School District

On behalf of Brandon Township Planning Commission and in accordance with MCL 125.3839(2) the Michigan Planning Enabling Act (PA 33 of 2008 as amended), Brandon Township is starting the process for a new Master Plan and requests your cooperation in its review.

Please be aware that in the near future you will be receiving a draft of the new Master Plan for comment. At the time, the new draft Master Plan is ready for review, we will provide a second notice and directions on where to send comments and the time limits for doing so.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter. If you have any questions or comments on the Brandon Township Master Plan process, please contact the Township at the address listed below:

Master Plan  
Brandon Township Planning Commission  
395 Mill St.  
P.O. Box 929  
Ortonville, MI 48462

OR

Douglas J. Lewan, AICP  
Carlisle/Wortman Associates, Inc.  
117 N. First St., Suite 70  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104  
dlewan@cwplan.com