1. OPEN MEETING

2. ROLL CALL

3. MINUTES
   A. 10-20-21, Planning Commission Workshop Meeting Minutes
   B. 10-20-21, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes
   C. 10-20-21, Planning Commission Public Hearing Minutes, PC-2021-78, The Woodlands
   D. 10-20-21, Planning Commission Public Hearing Minutes, PC-2021-73, Twp. Text Amendment IP – Industrial Park

4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL

5. BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENT – NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY

6. CONSENT AGENDA

7. NEW BUSINESS
   A. PC-2021-81, C and A Office Site Plan, located at 512 East Silverbell Road (09-35-200-023).

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

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 workshop meeting in person at the Orion Center, 1335 Joslyn Road on Wednesday, October 20, 2021, at 6 p.m.

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

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:**
None

1. **OPEN MEETING**
Chairman Reynolds opened the workshop meeting at 6:00 pm.

2. **ROLL CALL**
As noted

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

**OTHERS PRESENT:**
Lynn Kuczajda  Kellie McDonald

3. **AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL**
Moved by Commissioner Walker, seconded by Commissioner Brackon, to approve the agenda as presented.

4. **NEW BUSINESS/UNFINISHED BUSINESS**
A. PC-2021-07, 5 Year Master Plan Update
Planner Arroyo presented a summary covering the provided material:

- 15-minute Neighborhoods
- Economic Development Chapter with Redevelopment Sites
- Draft Future Land Use Map

The group discussed the Baldwin Rd. corridor (Judah area), Brown Rd., and the Eagle Valley Landfill Future Land Use distinction.

The group then discussed the categories on the proposed Future Land Use Map

5. **ADJOURNMENT**
Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, to adjourn the meeting at 7:00 p.m. Motion carried.
Respectfully submitted,

Debra Walton  
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary  
Charter Township of Orion  

Planning Commission Approval Date
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION PLANNING COMMISSION
****** MINUTES ******
REGULAR MEETING, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2021

The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, October 20, 2021, at 7:05 pm at the Orion Township Community Center, 1335 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, MI 48360.

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

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:
None

1. OPEN MEETING
Chairman Reynolds opened the meeting at 7:05 pm.

2. ROLL CALL/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
As noted

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

OTHERS PRESENT:
Sharon McQueen Alicia Lawson Jim Lepar
Matt Lawson Gordon Cox Susan Carpenter
Tracy Deuman Ken Mihelich Dale Carpenter
Kelley Mihelich Lorita Woznick Jeff Wright
Terry Clissold Susan Johnston Matt Rippin
Desirae Langlois Melissa Slowik Mary Ann Ryan
Richard Stein Linda Stein Wendy Ryan-Doreza
Kim Hunter Lynn Kuczajda Craig Junkin
Chris Krystek Robert Glownia Anne Earle
Steve Eynon Barbara VanRaaphorst Michael Lo
Bev Rolfsen Mary Mansfield Dale Anderson
Robert Bambuel William McNabb Andrea Holt
Pam McNabb John Slocombe Linda Savard
Bill Schmitz Jeff Klett Diane DoByckere
David Gammon Amy Keyzer Kellie McDonald
John Falvo Sue Falvo Mike Rizzola (sp?)
Marcie Ramsey Bob Ramsey

3. MINUTES
A. 10-06-21, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes
B. 10-06-21, PC-2021-70, Grandview Public Hearing Minutes
C. 10-06-21, PC-2021-71, F & D Silverbell Rezone Public Hearing Minutes
Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Gingell to approve all three sets of minutes as submitted. Motion carried
4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL
Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried

Chairman Reynolds recessed the regular meeting and opened the public hearing for PC-2021-78, The Woodlands Planned Unit Development (PUD), located on a vacant parcel located east of 310 Waldon Road, Sidewell #09-23-351-024. The applicant Detroit Riverside Capital, is proposing to rezone the property from Suburban Estates (SE) & Single Family Residential-2 (R-2) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) to construct a 190 multi-family unit development, at 7:08 pm and closed the public hearing at 8:41.

Chairman Reynolds then opened the public hearing for PC-2021-73, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance, #78, Industrial Park (IP), Article 18, Section 18.01 – Land Uses, at 8:44 pm and closed the public hearing 8:46 pm.

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

6. CONSENT AGENDA
None

7. NEW BUSINESS
A. PC-2021-79, Lifted Industrial Site Plan Modification, located at 4611 Liberty Dr., (parcel 09-34-300-018).

Chairman Reynolds asked the applicant to make a brief presentation and to state their name and address for the record.

Mr. Ron Rader 3009 Grand Park, Rochester Hills, represents TDG Architects, the architects on record for the Lifted Industrial Partner project.

Mr. Rader said they were there to request assistance from the Planning Commission to consider the addition of some infrastructure that is key to the operations of the Lifted Industrial project. What they are looking at is basically adding in some CO2 equipment that will assist in the cultivation activities for the program.

Mr. Rader showed them a site plan amendment review that they received from Giffels Webster. He stated that the project is in compliance with all aspects of the overall review that was submitted on October 14, 2021, and it was recommended that they come before the Planning Commission to request assistance with the introduction of a 14x14 footpad that would house a CO2 tank within the 50-ft. setback at the back of the property.

Mr. Rader said that they have added in a dumpster that is compliant, they have added in the pad for the potential future use of a generator, these provide strategic blockers to what would become the CO2 tank infrastructure that then services the adjacent building.

Mr. Rader noted that the pad itself is still 27-ft. 6-inches off of the subsequent lot line, looking toward the north. To the north of them is an existing cannabis grow facility and their parking lot
and their dumpster are in the same location to the northwest of where they plan on placing this unit.

Mr. Rader stated that they already have adjacent parking in the setback area. The location of this is key for the service team that will come and fill the unit, which would typically be done after hours so that they can use these parking spaces to fill it and this location works out very well for them.

Planner Arroyo read through his review date stamped received October 14, 2021.

Chairman Reynolds said that the motion could be to deny with conditional approval based on receiving a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Chairman Reynolds noted that they did have one review from the Fire Marshal who recommends approval without any additional comments.

Commissioner Brackon asked why wasn’t this considered in the initial plans? Mr. Rader said based on the type of cultivation that the team was doing, they weren’t sure exactly what infrastructure would be required. Once they brought the grower on board this came to light, so this was added as part of the cultivation program.

Commission Brackon said nothing changed, was it just missed, or not pondered? Mr. Rader said it wasn’t necessarily missed it was just an item that was added as part of the type of grow that is going to be taking place within the facility.

Chairman Reynolds asked if this was being placed in the rear based on space, mitigating, safety, risk, or regulation? Mr. Rader said it is being placed in the rear based on space and also providing the least possible obstruction to any of the view corridors to the site. They wanted it to keep it as far from the street views as possible.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that the Planning Commission since this does require action by the Zoning Board of Appeals they have no alternative but to deny the site plan approval for PC-2021-79, Lifted Industrial Partners, LLC, Site Plan Modification, located at 4611 Liberty Dr. (parcel 09-34-300-018) for plans date stamped received 9/23/2021 denial is based on the following reasons: that the plans show a structure within the required 50-ft. rear yard setback; the concrete pad with the CO2 tank; however if the variance is received from the Zoning Board of Appeals then the plan would be deemed approved as submitted this evening and plans date stamped 9/22/2021.

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

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chairman Reynolds stated if the applicant would like to make a presentation, state your name and address for the record

Mr. Jeff Klatt with Kreger Klatt Architects 2120 E. 11 Mile Royal Oak.

Mr. Klatt stated that he was here with the owner/developer Jeff Schmitz with JS Capital.
Mr. Klatt said as they were aware they were in front of the Board last month with a similar site plan. They heard some great comments, and they received some great feedback, they were able to incorporate many of those ideas into the revised site plan. They feel that they have a better plan now because of that and they thanked them for their collaboration.

Mr. Klatt showed the Board the revised site plan, and they have several modifications that they made based on those comments. Number one – there was a comment about land banking some of the excess parking, so as they can see on the west hand side of the site, they were able to remove 19 of those parking spaces, so they increased the green-belt in that area, and added a significant amount of green space to the site and cut down that parking by 19-spaces.

Mr. Klatt showed the Board the revised site plan, and they have several modifications that they made based on those comments. Number one – there was a comment about land banking some of the excess parking, so as they can see on the west hand side of the site, they were able to remove 19 of those parking spaces, so they increased the green-belt in that area, and added a significant amount of green space to the site and cut down that parking by 19-spaces.

Mr. Klatt stated number two – there was a comment to connect the internal sidewalk grid or network and they were able to do that adjacent to Brown Rd. and the sidewalk. There is a slight connection there and they have a pedestrian walkway across the parking lot to the building.

Mr. Klatt said item number three – they were deficient on their storefront glazing along Brown Rd. so they do meet that now. They have 60% glazing along Brown Rd., so they were able to lengthen the storefront.

Mr. Klatt noted item number four – simply provide light pole details, their current drawings reflect those details, and he believed that they were compliant.

Mr. Klatt said number five – the same thing, trash enclosure details were missing on their drawings they did modify that to include it and he believed that was acceptable.

Mr. Klatt stated number six – turning radius updates, their civil engineer, last time they did not have civil engineer drawings. Their civil engineer is on board now, he provided documents, took a close look at their plans, and made modifications to increase the turning radius.

Mr. Klatt said that there was a comment too, from the Fire Marshal, about the fire truck template for showing the fire truck on the site. The engineers are confident that the truck will work on the site but they hired a traffic consultant to superimpose that in their drawings, so they will have that to show but is confident that the truck will work because their drive lanes are wide.

Mr. Klatt stated number seven – that wheel stops were added at the parking, so they added wheel stops to the plans.

Mr. Klatt noted that number eight – there was a comment about the vision triangles at Brown Rd., they have incorporated that into the drawing and they have clear vision at the intersection.

Mr. Klatt said number nine – they did reduce some of the interior drive isles on the west side that drive is now 23-ft. versus a much wider drive that they had last time.

Mr. Klatt said that they are still requesting some waivers from them this evening. Number one - is the building setback waiver on the west side. This was a good comment that was received last time, their building is positioned a little bit into that western side yard. After the meeting they did explore that, they showed the building outside of that but their engineer quickly pointed out that they do have a 12-ft. wide water main easement on the east side of the building that they can’t enter or violate, so they had to push the building back to the west within that setback.

Mr. Klatt stated that number two – the front yard parking waiver and again there were comments about that last month and felt it was important to keep that parking from a retail standpoint in front of the building. It is also consistent with the front, Tommy’s Car Wash has paving on that
side to the right and felt it was consistent to keep it in the left, and makes it more convenient for the customer entering the building.

Mr. Klatt noted number three – was a hedgerow to screen the front parking versus a 30-inch-high knee-wall. Their whole point is to keep it consistent they have a similar screen in front of Tommy’s Car Wash space and would like to keep that consistency here, and felt an evergreen shrub would provide adequate coverage for the vehicles in that area, and it is softer too.

Mr. Klatt stated number four – there was a comment about one of the landscape pylons being deficient in size, and they were also deficient by three parking lot trees.

Mr. Klatt said also what was brought up was they actually have more than enough interior lot landscaping, they have more than what is required per the ordinance, and have enough trees to support the required amount, they are just deficient on trees to support the excess that they have provided. They feel that they comply with the spirit of the ordinance, they have broke-up the expansive parking with greenery, and they have site trees within the parking lot and around the perimeter as well.

Mr. Klatt showed the Board the 12-ft. water main easement, they can’t really push the building to the east because it will get into that easement, so they kept the building where they had it originally placed before. From an exterior standpoint the building still looks the same, he didn’t think that there were any comments about the exterior. On the Brown Rd. side they did increase the glazing to reflect that 60% requirement.

Planner Arroyo read through their review date stamped October 13, 2021.

Engineer Landis read through their review date stamped October 12, 2021.

Chairman Reynolds stated that the Fire Marshal had a recommendation for approval with conditions based on an overlay of the turning template to verify an apparatus or engine would fit. On the parcel, there were no immediate concerns from Public Services and there was a review previously and resubmitted for the case for the Water Resource Commission at this point and time just had no influence on the project at this current time.

Vice-Chairman Gross said he appreciated that the applicant went through the revisions necessary to make this plan acceptable.

Commissioner Brackon said he still did not understand the necessity for the front parking waiver? Mr. Klatt said it is more for convenience for the customer entering the building. They also feel it provides some consistency across the frontage of the space too, across that front yard. There is paving in front of the Tommy’s Car Wash site and that extension feels consistent with the development. It seemed logical to have the parking close to that entry point for convenience for the customer.

Commissioner Brackon asked if the entrance would be in the southwest corner by the front parking? Mr. Klatt replied in the southeast corner.

Chairman Reynolds said that he has three concerns. Are the spaces removed on the west side of the parcel being banked or removed from the project? Mr. Klatt replied removed. The second question was just a concern that was brought up in their Planners report for the landscaping across the front of this project. He still has a little bit of concern about the drive aisle widths, as reviewing the drawings he is seeing on the architectural plans that the drive aisle widths at the front are labeled as 28-ft. on the civil plan it is labeled as 29-ft. and they no
longer have a dimension at the rear. He felt that some of those were a little misleading towards the discussions that they had here that don’t really give them all the information of where those drive aisle widths currently are. He wanted to deliberate on that as a Commission and express their comfort between the drive aisle widths and what they are proposed and some clarification whether 28 or 29-ft. is proposed at the front and if they could get a dimension of what is proposed at the rear that would be beneficial to the conversation.

Trustee Urbanowski said it was supposed to narrow down in the back. She said that if she remembers correctly the reason, it did go down somewhat in the rear of the property, but those right next to, they were not going to narrow them because of the vacuums. Chairman Reynolds said he did not see a dimension as provided for the rear of the property.

Chairman Reynolds said between the two plans is there a discussion on which ones are which? Mr. Klatt replied that they don’t see a dimension on their plan here.

Chairman Reynolds asked if they were following architectural or civil for the discussion for the front-drive aisle width. Mr. Klatt replied that they will adhere to the civil engineer’s plan.

Commissioner Brackon said it was 29-ft. in the front, 35-ft. in the middle, and then it goes back down to 32.5-ft.

Engineer Landis said at the very north end it may be necessary to have a little bit wider of a drive to facilitate that turn of the fire truck.

Chairman Reynolds said that there were a lot of discussions last time this came through and he just wanted to make sure they were comfortable with what is being proposed. There is a slight improvement that was proposed but not drastic by any means.

Trustee Urbanowski asked what was the original? Mr. Klatt replied that the drives are very similar the change that took place was on that western maneuvering lane adjacent to the parking that they eliminated, was cut down in size. As they know is that the Tommy’s Car Wash site is already established, the parking is already established there, so now they are reacting to that condition. After last month’s meeting, they did explore pushing the building to the east to accommodate that setback but the water main doesn’t allow it. If they were to move the building, they then could move their walkway and the parking in front of the building to the east to diminish that drive lane but it really didn’t make sense. They have an ample sidewalk in front of the building it doesn’t make sense to make that any wider, so that extra space is helpful from a safety standpoint at those vacuums adjacent to the Tommy’s Car Wash site. It provides that extra bit of maneuverability and comfort at those vacuum stations adjacent to Tommy’s. They are reacting to those existing conditions again they removed the parking on the west hand side, reduced that one drive aisle to make that more in line with the city standards. Now they are a function of the spaces, the spaces are 19-ft. in the center row, and then they have the adjacent space between the Tommy’s Car Wash parking and their parking. It is a bit wider but felt it would offer some safety. It is unique, there are vacuums stations there, it is not just parking all along the Tommy’s Car Wash building they have vacuum stations.

Commissioner Brackon said that he knew one of their concerns of the Planner was speed given the distance that it is almost triple. Would the inclusion of speed bumps, or things like that would that help, is that a possibility? Planner Arroyo said it could slow the speed where the speed bump is, a lot of times people pick up speed in between where they are when they put them in. Narrowing it down would be pretty simple if they look where the wheel stops are if they were to spread that apart and shift those spaces over to the right and introduce a small landscape island there, they could bring those spaces over, and then it would narrow up that
aisle and they would get it close to what is required. The 30-ft. that is three lanes of traffic because they have people vacuuming out their car’s they don’t need an extra 10-ft. of space there, it just didn’t make any sense to him. It does because it is a straight shot, encourage people to travel faster when lanes are wider people do tend to travel faster, when the lanes are narrower, they tend to travel at lower speeds.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked if this were a through site where there was through traffic going from different sites through this site, and if this was a high volume use other than a mattress facility, and a car wash, he would have more concerns but he was satisfied with the 28-29-ft. driveway width. It does provide some visual access for fire department trucks and the two trash locations in the back.

Chairman Reynolds said the landscaping along Brown Rd., that they require a hedge, a wall, a decorative fence, berm, or other landscape elements with a vertical rise of at least 30-inches. Originally the site was proposed with a 30-inch berm. He wasn’t clear on what they would be doing in lieu of there or what is being replaced to address that?

Trustee Urbanowski said with parking in the front something has to be there other than what is already there, either a berm or that knee-wall.

Secretary St. Henry asked what is on the other side in front of the carwash now? Is it a berm and bushes? Chairman Reynolds said to clarify a hedge, a wall, a decorative metal fence, or a berm, or landscape elements with a vertical rise of 30-inches. So, if there is the hedgerow that is addressed there, then that addresses that concern.

Vice-Chairman Gross said that there is an existing hedgerow there and there is one in front of Tommy’s.

Trustee Urbanowski said that was not her recollection from the last time.

Planner Arroyo thought that the issue was on the previous plans there was a berm shown in front of both properties, both Tommy’s and this. It looks like maybe that exists in front of Tommy’s he sees some elevation change there, but based on what they have seen on the subject property he didn’t see where there is a berm there, and that was on the original plans that there would be a berm with a hedgerow, it looked flat there to him.

Chairman Reynolds asked if there was any intent to put a berm in? Mr. Klatt said they would like to match what is at the Tommy’s Car Wash side with the proposed use side for consistency. They feel that the evergreen hedgerow will shield the cars adequately.

Secretary St. Henry asked if they approved it on the Tommy’s Car Wash site with no berm? Commissioner Brackon thought it was approved with the berm although the berm doesn’t exist now.

Trustee Urbanowski said it wouldn’t bother her so much if there wasn’t that parking in front because it is a different condition on the other side.

Chairman Reynolds asked Planner Arroyo if there was a berm previously proposed and they are proposing something different can they propose something different here on that site that also meets that criterion, or are they withheld to that previous approval? Planner Arroyo replied that the previous approval showed the berm so they are not proposing the berm. They could come in, this is obviously a revised plan, so they could propose something different and then they have the ability to waive the requirements because of the district it is located in. They have the
flexibility to decide what they think is appropriate. Just judging from the photograph if that is a true representation it looks like the berm exists in front of Tommy's. He sees a rise in elevation from the sidewalk up to where the plantings are. He hasn't done any measurements of that but it does appear there is a berm there but it doesn’t appear that the berm was constructed in front of the Master Firm site, rather it looks like a hedgerow was put in without a berm, that was his initial observation.

Mr. Jeff Schmitz 155 Romeo Rd. Rochester stated with respect to the plantings on the other side they posted a letter of credit when they finished Tommy's because they didn’t at that time, they didn’t know exactly what was going on that adjacent parcel. They had no irrigation they didn’t want to try to tap into the irrigation from their Tommy's site because they didn’t know who was going to own and maintain it so that is why they posted a letter of credit. He has no problem putting that berm there and matching Tommy’s or if they want it a little higher. He thought a wall would look silly there but he was flexible.

Chairman Reynolds said his general feeling was he thought that a berm with landscaping was appropriate especially with front parking. Especially since it was previously proposed and the applicant is willing to provide that.

Commissioner Walker asked if they had clarified the issue with regard to the Fire Marshal and the truck turning around up there? Engineer Landis said that was one of their concluding comments to be addressed by the applicant as part of any approval that they revise the plan to accommodate the fire truck. Right now, based on their review it can’t be maneuvered through there at the north end. That is something that they could review administratively if they were to approve with a condition.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, that the Planning Commission grants a waiver from the requirement that the ancillary use of a Mattress Retail be developed in conjunction with a larger-scale planned development project having multiple tenants with a total land area of at least 10 acres for the following reasons: that this project does promote the economic development rules of Township as a consolidated plan with the available property per the March 27, 2019 approval.

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

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Secretary St. Henry, that the Planning Commission waives/modifies the following standards of Section 34.03 for PC-2021-67, J.S. Brown Rd., LLC. Based on the economic impact, quality of architectural design, and overall compatibility with the District: with the following waivers being granted; the west side yard setback for the building of 5-ft.; a 5-ft. waiver being adjacent to the development to the west and the fact that moving the building further to the east would be over an existing water main easement; the parking setback waiver is to be split and applied to Tommy’s also; the front yard setback with parking in the front is consistent with Tommy’s Car Wash adjacent to the east, the greenbelt width he thought was reflected on the site plan; and the front yard hedgerow would be in conjunction with the berm and hedgerow combination in the front yard.

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds said a couple of clarifications on the motion if the parcel is to be split the parking setback waiver applies to both. He asked if that was Vice-Chairman Gross’s intent. Vice-Chairman Gross replied sure.
Chairman Reynolds asked the intent is not a berm or knee wall waiver in the design standards but rather to be provided? Vice-Chairman Gross replied to be provided.

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

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, that the Planning Commission grant site plan approval for PC-2021-67, J.S. Brown Rd., LLC site plan, located at 851 & 861 Brown Rd., (parcels 09-33-351-020 & 09-33-351-021) for plans date stamped and received September 27, 2021. This approval is based on the following conditions: that the applicant complies with the OHM conditions on their letter of October 12, 2021, items 1 – 3.

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds asked that the motion maker would clarify for the record that the additional spaces to the west as indicated on the civil plans are to be removed not banked.

Vice-Chairman Gross amended the motion, Trustee Urbanowski re-supported, that the said parking on the west side to the north would be considered as removed and not banked.

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

B. PC-2021-73, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance #78, Industrial Park (IP), Article 18, Section 18.01 – Land Uses

Chairman Reynolds said that there was a general overview provided during the public hearing. Is there further discussion, questions, comments on the agenda item?

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Gingell, that the Planning Commission forwards a recommendation to the Township Board to approve and adopt PC-2021-73, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance No. 78, Industrial Park (IP), Article XVII as submitted: since this is consistent with Ordinance #154.

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

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

Chairman Reynolds said that they had a Workshop earlier today talking about Future Land Uses and a variety of opportunities within the Township. He asked if Planner Arroyo had anything else he would like to add?

Planner Arroyo replied that they had a good discussion just keep those things in mind and he thought that they would continue that. They will have more material at the next study session in a month. He thought that they did a good job covering a lot of information and probably wouldn't be that great to continue in detail at this point in the evening.

Chairman Reynolds said they always encourage public input and obviously those are open meetings on their second meeting of every month to discuss the Master Plan update and keep that moving along for the Township. He added that one item that might be helpful is if they could circle back to some of that data with dwelling units/acre based on some of those types
that they got feedback on from the Open House. He thought that supports some of those discussions that they had just to kind of see the data that supports the typology.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS
None.

10. COMMUNICATIONS
None.

11. PLANNERS REPORTS/EDUCATION
None.

12. COMMITTEE REPORTS
None.

13. FUTURE PUBLIC HEARINGS
None.

14. CHAIRMAN’S COMMENTS
None.

15. COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS
Secretary St. Henry said that the dynamics of this group and the conversations they have on different issues as they review not just the Master Plan but also different applicant presentations. He thought it was great that they can speak their minds find common ground because there are a lot of Boards that don’t. He thought it was very beneficial to this Township that they get along at that level.

Trustee Urbanowski thanked the consultants for assisting them with questions.

16. ADJOURNMENT
Moved by Trustee Urbanowski, seconded by Commissioner Gingell, to adjourn the meeting at 9:36 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Walton
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary
Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission Approval Date
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PC-2021-78, The Woodlands Planned Unit Development (PUD), located on a vacant parcel located east of 310 Waldon Road, Sidwell #09-23-351-024. The applicant, Detroit Riverside Capital, is proposing to rezone the property from Suburban Estates (SE) & Single Family Residential-2 (R-2) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) to construct a 190 multi-family unit development.

Chairman Reynolds asked if the applicant was present?
Chairman Reynolds asked if they wanted to make a brief presentation and to state their name and address for the record.

Mr. Michael Wayne on behalf of Detroit Riverside Capital.

Mr. Wayne said that they have prepared a presentation for the members of the Planning Commission, the Board of Trustees, as well as members of the public.

Mr. Wayne stated what was exciting about the presentation is that it gives them an opportunity to educate all the aforementioned about the Woodlands project. He noted that they had reviewed some of the comments that have been received by the Township to date. They have identified that there is a lot of misconceptions about the project, so this will give them the opportunity to do is to clarify a lot of those misconceptions and educate them on what they intend to do at the site of Waldon and Lapeer.

Mr. Wayne said he is a partner and co-founder of Detroit Riverside Capital and he was joined by his fellow partners Alec Harris and Mark Wayne.

Mr. Wayne stated what is important to know about their team is that they are lifelong members of the Oakland County community. As real estate developers, it is important that they always try to add to the communities and never detract from them and so that is something they intend to do with The Woodlands project.

Mr. Wayne said that every great development really needs a multi-disciplinary development team and they have that, so between the Towns Tower construction who has built 250 million dollars, worth of multi-family assets. Design Haus Architectures conducted over a thousand designs on projects throughout their tenure. Through their property management company KMG Prestige who has over multi-thousands of units under management. They have really insulated themselves with a team that is capable of fulfilling a project like this.

Mr. Wayne showed them a presentation and stated that it is not the project that they are proposing. It was a previous group’s design on this same parcel. He showed them 215 units which on a 27-acre parcel works to be about 8-units/acre. What is different versus what The Woodlands project will propose is the sprawling nature of the development. The one in front of them utilizes the entire 27-acres and leaves very little room for any open space and that is different from what The Woodlands can provide to the community.

Mr. Wayne said that the Woodlands has been designed completely around the idea of nature preservation. There are 13-acres of this parcel that are being dedicated to nature preservation. They would even explore the options of a conservation easement on this parcel to ensure that in perpetuity this particular piece of this property remains a nature preserve for both their residents and other community members alike to enjoy.

Mr. Wayne stated that the total parcel size of the (PUD) proposed is 21-acres, 13-acres of which acts as a nature preserve and the other 8 acres is where the building is contained. The unit mix within The Woodlands would be a mix of one-, two-, and three-bedroom units ranging in size from 850-sq. ft. up to 1,250-sq. ft. One of the most important things he would like to emphasize about The Woodlands is the high-end nature of the development. This is not a typical apartment community and is unlike anything that exists here in Orion Township, or throughout the rest of Oakland County, it is unique and the high-end nature of it adds to that. That is seen in a lot of the amenities and features of the project, so within the two buildings there is a swimming pool, hot tub, a 13-acre nature preserve, there will be carports located throughout the parking lot to provide covered parking for their residents within a 68,000-sq. ft. amenity space will feature a state-of-the-art fitness center, it will also have a number of different dog parks both within the interior of those buildings, as well as, throughout the nature preserve. They will also have some
entertainment areas with TVs, grills, cornhole, firepits, gazebos, offices and conference rooms, tenant storage facilities, as well as, a lot of high-end interior apartment amenities like stainless steel appliances, quartz countertops, soft-close cabinetry, so forth. The building will also feature an electronic access system and various other technology components, as well. The point he was making is this is unlike any other apartment community in the sense that it is enormously high-end, and it really acts as more of a resort feel for the residents and is featured throughout all of the natural space, as well as, the interior space, featuring the pool, walking promenade, outdoor patios for some of the first-floor residents to enjoy, and all of that connects within the nature preserve.

Mr. Wayne said that he mentioned that the nature preserve is not just for their residents. They intend to offer access to this nature preserve to all abutting properties to The Woodlands. They thought that was something that was really unique and as they can see from the previous design something that is not possible with a development that covers the entire space. They look forward to the opportunity and felt it was an enormous public benefit for both their residents, as well as, the other community members surrounding the project.

Mr. Wayne showed them some design inspiration, they were not final renderings, they were very much in an early conceptual phase with this. What they look forward to doing is eliciting the feedback of the public tonight to help them incorporate that into the design and ensure that there is a significant opportunity to admit any concerns that they may have with exterior façades, setbacks, views, noise, all of that. The design inspiration in front of them is really just to exemplify the high-end nature and the overall look and feel of the project.

Mr. Wayne showed them some interior renderings in a former community that they just finished building in Auburn Hills. He thought they were very high-end finishes and much similar to what they would be providing in The Woodlands in terms of the quartz countertops, stainless steel appliances, and so on.

Mr. Wayne said that they have heard the concerns of the community and they look forward to hearing more of them. In reviewing the letters and also speaking with a number of the community members in the Summerfield Condo Association, they summarized the concerns into seven categories.

Mr. Wayne said that there seems to be an overwhelming concern that there will be some sort of negative impact on property values in the neighboring community, and they feel that is not the case, and they have some evidence to support that. There is a sentiment that this will provide increased crime, noise, and disruption and that there would be some negative impact on the view and surroundings, utility infrastructure overburdening, there were some concerns about the resident profile and who will live at this property. There seems to be a big semblance that they are destroying nature and wildlife, 13-acres will be preserved in perpetuity for that purpose. He stated that the last piece is why do they need more apartments and there is a very specific reason for that.

Mr. Wayne said the resident profile exemplified some potential residents that were within the target demographic of The Woodlands. He showed them an example of a single 27-year-old woman, an engineer at American Battery Solutions, and her annual income is roughly about $80,000. The next is a man and woman newly married couple 33-34 years old, the woman is a nurse at Beaumont and the man is a senior underwriter at United Wholesale Mortgage, and their annual income combined is about $140,000. Man and wife that are empty nesters they are in their 50’s their account executives at Stellantis and a paralegal at a local law firm with an average income of $200,000.

Mr. Wayne said that when they consider the quality level of this apartment community the result of that is a rent level that inherently requires a certain income level to qualify for. An example a one-bedroom apartment at The Woodlands might cost somewhere around $1,500/month. That would require an income level of roughly $60,000 which is based on a 3 to 1 income to rent ratio that they utilize when screening residents for the community. They also look for credit scores roughly in the 700 range which eliminates half of the population in terms of creditworthiness. The assemblage here is these are neighbors just like
what already exists all around them in the community, they are just living in a modern twist on the existing residential options in the community.

Mr. Wayne said that they have also taken an example of say a $375,000 condo, if they consider the mortgage payment along with the taxes and insurance cost of owning that condo, they could have monthly costs somewhere the $2,000 mark. So, as they can see from the average rents it is somewhat preparing residents to be able to become purchasers of said condos and homes within the Orion Township community in their future. It brings residents in and gives them a reason to become inundated and fall in love with the Orion Township community and as a result, when they decide to grow their families, they need to upsize their living accommodations and they become homebuyers in the community, helping to preserve and increase property values.

Mr. Wayne said that they had a study that was published by the Joint Center of Housing at Harvard University. It talks about the impact of multi-family housing on surrounding property values. The result of that is that houses with apartments nearby actually enjoy a slightly higher appreciation rate than houses that don’t have apartments, about 3.6% growth as compared to almost 4% growth in communities that feature more multi-family. It also states that in general multi-family rental housing does not cause neighboring property values to decline.

Mr. Wayne said that there is also an assemblage amongst community members that the rental population is somewhat transient, there are here and then they are gone and they are not members of the community in the traditional sense. There is some data that supports that apartment residents are actually almost twice as likely to socialize with their neighbors as single-family homeowners and that they also are just as likely as homeowners to be involved with structured social groups, say a sports team or a book club in the area. These are participating members of the community just like many others.

Mr. Wayne stated that there was also an assemblage that there is an infrastructure burden of this project. What the studies found is that high-density development is often more efficient than low-density development and it doesn't require that Fire Departments and other municipal resources drive long distances to access the members of the community, and given the high-density of nature it allows them to service those people more efficiently.

Mr. Wayne said that the last piece in the Harvard study talks about a fiscal burden, in that apartment owners often pay more in property taxes than owners of a single-family house. This is due to the fact that apartments are taxed as a commercial entity as compared to homesteads, or single-family homes. In Orion Township, as an example, the millage rate for homeowners is about 33.5% as compared to the millage rate for a non-homesteader or commercial application of 51.5%. What this means is that the tax revenues of an apartment could be nearly 50% higher than that of a single-family home. When it comes to paying their fair share for these public infrastructures, he hoped that that helps demonstrate that this community will do exactly that. Naturally, when a 3-story apartment building gets proposed near their home or condo there is going to be a concern about what will it do to my view and surroundings.

Mr. Wayne showed them a section cut of what The Woodland would look like relative to its neighbors.

Mr. Wayne said there is not a significant change in the height of the condo in the Summerfield complex as compared to The Woodlands and that has to do with the grade change that happens in between those properties. When they add in tree coverage there is virtually no chance that with leaves on the trees that the apartments could even be visible to the adjacent condo owners.

Mr. Wayne showed them setbacks of the design. He said the backdoor of the closest condo at the Summerville Apartment Complex to the building of The Woodlands is over 140-ft. There are also 25-ft. setbacks from their property line before the parking lot that they intend to include a significant amount of nature buffer, as well as, some physical berms as well. This will help mitigate the impacts of the view on neighboring properties as well.
Mr. Wayne said to the south the same 25-ft. setback exists there as well with the same idea and then there is about a 45-ft. setback to the west side of the adjacent single-family home near the south entrance off of Waldon.

Mr. Wayne said that there is a significant amount of existing trees that are in between and around The Woodlands property compared to the neighboring residents. They intend to save every last one of those trees as they can. It would make no sense to remove these trees only then to replace them with newly planted trees. Once they get to the next phase of the project and are able to conduct a tree survey, they will know exactly how many of those they will be able to save and utilize but their intent is to maximize those savings.

Mr. Wayne said that the building itself in terms of footprint relative to the overall 20-acre property only represents about 8.5% lot coverage. There is a 230-ft. front setback off of Waldon Rd., about a 68-ft. side yard setback, and a 70-ft. rear setback. They would need to go three stories on this project and the rationale behind that is it is exactly what allows them to provide the nature preservation to the NW of the property. If they consider the original design that he showed them those were two story walk-up concept with a significant amount of parking. In those cases, there is really no opportunity to save as much nature as they are able to by going to the three-stories and it is only about 12-ft. different from the underlying regulation.

Mr. Wayne said on parking they sit at about 1.7 unit to parking ratio. That is something that they worked with their design team and felt very comfortable about, and thought that the Planning Commission may agree.

Mr. Wayne stated in terms of loading, fencing, and landscaping they will have two loading zones, 6-ft. high fencing predominantly on the west perimeter of the property which is where the setback is the smallest. As far as the landscaping they will do everything they can to preserve every last tree possible, as well as, add in a significant amount of landscaping on the interior amenity space and throughout the property, so as to insulate The Woodlands from all of its surroundings. The whole ambiance of this place is it feels like you are at a resort. The only way to do that is to provide a significant amount of landscaping, and that is what they intend to do.

Mr. Wayne said traffic is naturally a big concern anytime there is a project proposed. Lapeer experiences a significant amount of traffic and they understand that. What is important to consider about their project is that a traffic study uncovered that the total entering vehicles at the intersections of both Lapeer and Waldon and Lapeer and the southbound to northbound at Eagle Rd., the impact and AM peak hours on total entry vehicles from The Woodlands project according to the traffic studies is about 2.5% at Lapeer and Waldon and about 2.7% at Lapeer and southbound to northbound at Eagle Rd. These numbers in the PM are about 3.1% and 2.2% respectively. He added that there is somewhat of an observational fact within the traffic consultant industry where they typically consider 5% to be a rough number of average number traffic fluctuation. If they consider the total entry vehicles are beneath that figure it is reasonable to suggest that the amount of impact on those roads could be summarized with the average daily fluctuation of those roads already.

Mr. Wayne said the traffic study uncovered the in-and-out traffic of the multi-family portion of the project. There was concern about the number of cars that will be utilizing Waldon and Lapeer as a result of the project. What is important to consider is that this study found that there are only about 64 total cars that are projected to influence those in rush hours and then about 82 in the PM. So, despite 190 units, this doesn’t result in two to three hundred cars, which was some of the feedback that they read about in the letters.

Mr. Wayne said the question of why they need more apartments? The answer is a lack of supply. There are 6 apartment communities within Orion Township or neighboring areas. The occupancy of all of these
apartments are at or near 100%, and in a lot of cases, there are waitlists. What that suggests to them is that there is more supply needed and they would like to fulfill that need. Another reason that there is more supply needed is that there has been a change in demand. As the millennial generation has evolved there has been a change in things like marriage patterns, or the idea of buying homes may not be as attractive to this demographic and so naturally the demand for apartments will increase due to some of the flexibility that it provides to that demographic.

Mr. Wayne said that they are extremely excited about the project, he thought it provides a great benefit to the community. Their goal at this point is to listen to what members of the public have to say and do what they can to incorporate those comments into their design and they look forward to doing that.

Chairman Reynolds asked if he would state his address for the record. Mr. Wayne replied 3250 Auburn Rd. Auburn Hills, MI.

Chairman Reynolds said this is a public hearing there are many of them here tonight. A public hearing is for both them the public the Planning Commission and the Board of Trustees to allow their opportunity to provide comments and questions. Their comments and questions are directed to himself as the Commissioner. The code of public hearings is listed on the backside of their agenda. That is to provide equal opportunity for everyone there to state their case.

Chairman Reynolds said that each speaker will have 3-minutes to make their comments, all comments and questions should be directed to himself not the petitioner nor other public people in the room.

Chairman Reynolds asked them to state the name and address for the record, and it would be noted that no answers or comments are directly answered at this point but are noted into the record and they will get the chance to have the petitioner respond to those comments and questions later on. Both themselves as a Planning Commission will have an opportunity to speak to those, and then also the Board of Trustees that are present.

Chairman Reynolds said a brief comment on disorderly conduct there is an order of operation here again to have everyone have an equal opportunity to speak their comments and questions. Failing to do so is obviously out of order so they ask that they don’t go down that road here tonight, and keep an orderly fashion.

Chairman Reynolds stated that if they have submitted a letter that is going to be dually noted for the record and all of them of the Planning Commissioners are in receipt of those at this point and time.

Mr. Robert Glownia, with Michaeline Glownia, 194 Four Seasons Dr. He stated that they have a lot of single-family and condo units in the same location, they don’t necessarily agree with trying to change the deal. If they are planning to change the deal, they should be getting a proposed actual accounting system to say how many units would be there, how many units would normally be placed, and to see if there is any possibility of any bankruptcy being recorded with that facility.

Mr. John Slocombe 3066 Waldon Meadows Dr., said that they moved from California, and he knew that everyone endeavors with good intentions but sometimes the obvious is things are in front of them and they just don’t see it. He didn’t think that many people here had to put up with what they had to watch on TV every night, there would be helicopters flying over Los Angles. All of these 3-4 level buildings all roped off with caution tape, the Fire Chiefs, the EMTs speaking on the television that they cannot control the virus in these buildings. Single dwellings next to each other that is fine, but once they get an apartment then in the hallways, they cannot control this situation. They got to see on the TV every night so many body bags they were in tears, and they just left California they couldn’t watch it on the news anymore. He was so upset to think that they might see this next to them. He knew people want development but they got the COVID. Three level buildings in Los Angles are a disaster and he hoped that this insanity and they can go to a two level or can the project, but three-level he thought was like putting a gun to your head. Hedidn’t
want to ever see those scenes again that he had to watch in California. The beds were so overwhelmed that they had to send patients up to the Bay area where they lived. They couldn’t even go to the hospital because it was so overwhelmed because of all these high-density areas in LA. All intentions were good and they were beautiful areas but not for the COVID. They could walk down a corridor half an hour later they are going to catch it. He thought that they should consider the COVID aspect of this thing. He questioned how can they quote statistics on traffic?

Mr. Gordon Cox, 248 Four Seasons Dr. He moved here in October 2018 from Rochester and Rochester Hills living there for 22 years. His purpose was to move here to live, retire, to enjoy his grandkids and other amenities that this area looked to provide, which seems to be changing now. He didn’t send in a letter but wanted to read his concerns. He knew that some of the things expressed by the developer. He is concerned about the density in terms of the height of the building blocking the sunlight which he gets to enjoy going to the back of his patio each day to lookout. He didn’t know how it would affect it he didn’t know the plans, he has heard what he has heard, he thought it was going to be a problem. The sight-line of 190 units when they are looking out, he didn’t know what he was going to see, he knew it was expressed as being something very nice, but he has seen renderings before. Where he lived, he built two houses and he has seen renderings of the areas of developments, they are not always the same. He understood that planning things will change. They effect the privacy; he would like to maintain privacy he wasn’t sure that would be possible. They are going to have people on balconies, he didn’t know how high the buildings were going to be, are they going to be looking down on him or is he going to be looking up at them? The noise, traffic, high-density all of that, trash bins where are those going to be positioned within the complex? Are they going to be on the side towards where they are at in teh Summerfield Condo area or is it going to be somewhere on the west side of the unit? Pollution exhaust emissions, overuse of lighting in the area it is going to the lighting up so it is going to change the ambiance of the area. They are probably will be looking at sunlight all the time. He really enjoys the wildlife and is what really attracted him to Lake Orion, the naturalness the beauty of this area. He is really seeing a real quick change this is a second rezoning of the area within their close proximity and didn’t know what it is going to become later on. How much is this going to cost taxpayers? He knew they talked about that there is no impact. There is always impact to everything to development-wise and so forth. He is concerned about the development of roads, utilities, electrical power grids are not strong enough to handle what they do have. They have allergists by the bit, and that is another thing he didn’t know if that would be a cost to the taxpayers as well. The quality of the aesthetics of this building of this proposed plan, how is that really going to bow well with the current aesthetics of the area. If it was him, he would vote no, but it depends on how things go.

Ms. Tracy Deuman 270 Waldon Rd. her property is the single home that is immediately in front of the proposed element. She wanted to share her concerns with them and urge them to vote no on the rezoning. Even though she does support progress but not when it creates more concerns. The property value is a problem for her, she will have two sides of her property around the development. She purchased her childhood home from her parents as an investment for herself. She is also concerned about her rural environment. She has a half-acre pond on her property of 2-acres, what is the liability of her pond? She is very concerned about having a lot of people living behind her, as well as, security as well, with upwards of 400 people in her backyard. Logistics and traffic, they all know that Waldon Rd. is crazy to get out in the morning. Drainage is one of her number one concerns as well. In the last rainfall her pond overflowed, her neighbor’s property overflowed, and then it did water damage in her basement. What is going to happen when they start developing? They know they have very high-water tables where the proposed development is going to be, they are going to have to bring in a lot of soil to build there. Where is the reservoir? Is it going to be her pond? She is very concerned about that. Are they going to invest in new drainage? Privacy is a huge one, headlights coming into the apartment are going to shine on the front of her house, people are going to park behind her in the parking lots, and shining on the back of her house. They are going to be three stories up looking down in her bedroom window. She was also concerned about the fact that she hasn’t been approached by anyone about her property. She understood that the developers were lobbying the condo owners and trying to explain to them what they are putting in, nobody has approached her. Instead, she has had random weird emails on Facebook asking her to sell
her home for a very low amount, it is an insult and she couldn’t even go out and find the property for that same amount. They have also been encouraged to take legal action to rezone her property. Why would she do that? They said to take legal action in order to preserve the value of her property. Why would someone do that? It is threatening and she is worried.

Ms. Kim Hunter 310 Waldon Rd., directly in front of the proposed development. She stated that she has a lot of concerns, traffic on Waldon especially during high school time, student drivers, traffic is backed up past her house every morning. They hardly can get out easily. There is a bus stop right at the front of her driveway, they have had several instances with the high traffic on Waldon Rd. causing scary instances where her son and herself have almost been hit. She has her high schooler out in the dark, getting on the bus. Busing and safety concerns with the schools are one of her big concerns. The traffic on that road is astronomical it is not ideal. If they add a huge apartment complex, she wasn’t really believing the traffic study, she didn’t understand how it is only increased 2.7% when they have that many units behind them. Drainage is a huge concern, her back yard completed flooded out with the last rainstorm. She understood that was not a normal rain event but even moderate rain floods out her backyard. If they have all that extra property that is not going to absorb that water and it is all concrete, is it going to go into the crick and wash out their trampoline, fire pit, their kid’s place to play? Privacy is a huge issue with all those people behind them, are they going to be able to use their backyard? Are they going to be able to have the same lifestyle they do now? Property value, noise, is it always going to be daylight outside are they going to be able to have that evening feel with the lighting of the property behind them? They love the wildlife, they understand that it needs to be developed it is not always going to be vacant, she didn’t think that a three-story property unit surrounding these single-family homes that have been there for years is the ideal situation for any of them that live directly on Waldon Rd. and have to look at this daily.

Ms. Melissa Slowik 310 Waldon Park Dr. also has concerns about the traffic on Waldon Rd. She knew that there was a study done on Lapeer Rd., was the study also including Waldon Rd? She takes her daughter to school and pick her up, she leaves at 8 a.m. she is stuck in traffic every morning. She leaves at 3 p.m. to picks her up, it is even worse at 3 p.m. to go pick her up trying to get onto Lapeer Rd. She also from reading the renderings to her it looked like there was one entrance onto Waldon Rd. nothing going to Lapeer Rd. That means there is one entrance for fire, emergency vehicles, for all these vehicles to come in and off of Waldon Rd. She thought that would be some legal problem. There are also destroying some of the wooded property, as well as, wetlands. They can’t currently hear Lapeer Rd. from their home but she would assume that the insulation of these currently provided would be gone. She did read the proposal and she saw it also said that they are contracted to purchase 7-acres on the corner of Lapeer Rd. and Waldon Rd. as well which was not in any of these renderings. She was also concerned if this goes through then what happens to the 7-acres? Are they going to build more apartment complexes on that 7-acres as well?

Ms. Desirae Langlois 3053 Waldon Park Dr. Her first concern is the traffic which she knew quite a few people have already brought up. She wanted to reiterate how bad the traffic is at Lapeer and Waldon Rd. She also wanted to point out that there are always accidents at the intersection at the intersection of Lapeer and Waldon Rd. If each unit has 1.5 cars there are 285 additional cars, if the average is 2 cars it is 380. She knew that they had mentioned the cap should be 327 but that is still a significant increase to the number of cars. She knew that they mentioned their plan to preserve 13-acres of wildlife, however, they are still removing 21-acres of nature. What will they do with the animals that live there and the nature there? It is a very wet area how would that look? She knew sometimes they move animals in nature elsewhere to kind of make it an easier process, how would that work? She said that they mentioned that it actually increases the value of their homes but she did not believe that. She and her husband bought their home three years ago and part of the thing that they love about their home is the natural feeling that they have within their subdivision, there is a lot of space between the houses, their subdivision backs up to a wetland, and that is a huge selling point to their area. She doesn’t agree, she is technically a millennial and she didn’t necessarily agree with the fact that millennials always want to rent and didn’t think that would add value to their homes. She also wanted to point out, one inch of rain on one acre of forest or wetland creates 750 gallons of runoff. One inch of rain on one acre of a parking lot creates 27,000 gallons
of runoff. Her house is a little bit of distance from the new development although they are on Waldon Rd.,
even where they live, they have quite a wet backyard and she knew that is a huge issue within their area,
that is also a concern. She does not believe that this will add value to their homes.

Ms. Mary Ann Ryan 301 Waldon Rd. said that most of them have lived on this road for many years. In
some instances, their children and grandchildren have continued to live in their neighborhood. Some have
moved back to Waldon because of the freedom and support that they enjoy. There are no restrictions in
their neighborhood they are truly free. Suburban enough to allow them to access the amenities that
surround them but rural enough for them to enjoy the peace, and quiet and the gifts of nature that
surround them. When this parcel of land known by the neighbors as the Gayheart property went up for
sale they knew that the family itself would strive to maintain their neighborhood to the best of their ability.
All the neighbors that she has spoken to expected single-family houses to be constructed there. No one
had an issue with that kind of development. Essentially the neighborhood would not be disrupted to any
significant degree. After receiving a notification concerning the rezoning of the Gayheart property. They
realized that their neighborhood was at risk of losing the characteristics that has made it home for them. A
builder has proposed a rezoning that would allow 190 apartments to be built on a relatively small parcel of
land, thereby ruining their safe and precious environment. The plan requires rezoning, the only way that
this project can go forward is if this commission allows for that rezoning to take place. Considering that it
is doubtful that their infrastructure can accommodate such large increases in population, Waldon Rd. is at
a standstill during rush hour as it is, to say of nothing of the impact 190 apartments will have on Township
emergency services it is unwise to let this project go forward. She is concerned about how the proposed
development will affect her property value, considering that the access road is directly across from her
home. There are many neighborhoods in Orion Township on roads like Waldon that have populations
devoted to low-density and single-family houses. Please send a message to other builders who consider
their profits to be more important than their quality of life - deny this rezoning. By the way, the creek that
goes right in the middle of this project, she believed, is part of the Clinton River Watershed and she
wondered if that had been addressed.

Ms. Kelley Mihelich 275 Waldon Rd. her house is on the south side of Waldon. She is the last residence
before M-24. She wanted to address a couple of things that the applicant had spoken about. One of them
was how this development would increase their property values. She has spoken to a number of real
estate people and she has asked them that specific question, she did not have anybody tell her that her
property value would be increased by this development. She was given figures that her property
value would be decreased by 25-50% depending on the development. She doesn’t plan to move anytime
soon but this still is not acceptable to her. They have put a lot of money and hard work into their property
to make it nice and go well in the neighborhood. To see her property, decrease in value because of a
development is not acceptable. Where she is located if they are not out of their driveway by 6:20 a.m.
they are going to sit there forever just waiting for someone to let them out just to get down to M-24. It has
been that way for a number of years now, it has just gotten worse. Waldon Rd. cannot handle an increase
of another 200-300 cars trying to get out onto it in the morning, or in the afternoon either. As a
neighborhood, she found, that they have never gone up and fought against people wanting to build
something other than single-family homes. They supported the Orion Kennel Club, they supported the
Orion Vet Center, they fit very well into the neighborhood. And they provide necessary and important
services not only in their neighborhood but for everybody else. They are great neighbors to have, she has
no complaints at all and she is right next door. She encouraged them to please give heavy consideration
to not approving this rezoning request. It would take a toll on all of the people that are in single-family
dwellings on Waldon and on the subdivisions that are being built and have been built right off of Waldon.
There is nothing positive about this development, as far as, their neighborhood is concerned and she can’t
say anything but negatives about this development. If it was going to be the original single-family homes
that were going in there, they expect that they are not against development but it is what is going to fit well
in their neighborhood, not decrease their property values, not give them a lot of extra traffic to have to deal
with it just makes no sense at all to even to consider this rezoning.
Ms. Wendy Ryan-Doreza 301 Waldon Rd., she grew up on Waldon Rd. Over time she has seen several subdivisions built and she thought that property was going to be zoned for a subdivision. She was shocked to find out that there was going to be an apartment complex on this property. She would like to request that this board vote no on this rezoning. She finds this building project to be very inappropriate for this property and their street. The traffic on Waldon Rd. is bad and this would double the problem. Their neighbors look out for one another and each other’s safety and security, and they respect each other’s space. She wasn’t sure this would remain the same if this complex came in. If they continue to build every square inch of Lake Orion and Orion Township the less likely people are going to believe that living is a vacation.

Ms. Susan Johnston 348 Four Seasons Dr. said she did submit a letter but two points have come up tonight that she wanted to highlight. Number one, Summerfield also has water issues on the southern side of their property. That is going to border the parking lot building plans that they have seen. It certainly is going to make that worse. They have basements there that flood, they have standing water a number of times this summer. Their lawn service could not mow because it was so wet. The other thing that she wanted to bring up as it was mentioned about preserving trees for privacy, they have a lot of sick trees, so they are not going to afford much privacy in the next few years, they have a lot of Blue Spruce. Even healthy trees are not going to block light pollution. Please keep the zoning as it is.

Mr. Bill McNabb 350 Waldon, the Master Plan indicates that it is low-density single-family so it seems to be quite a jump to go to a high-density multi-family. When he has followed other developments in the Township to where they even have a struggle going down from Suburban Estates (SE) even down to the next level, so this is quite a jump. People have talked about the traffic, he didn’t want to spend much time on that other than he is not a traffic engineer, he is not going to try to contradict their study, however, he drives on that road every day, he lived on that road when it was dirt, he knows the traffic, he has watched it. When you sit down there trying to get out on M-24, now they say not too many cars are going to use Waldon, he is probably correct. His concern is that drive north of Waldon that comes out is their primary egress is going to when the light turns, they are going to pile out and the people on Waldon aren’t going to get out. Right now, they have to wait for that light to change by the Home Depot, where they are not getting out on M-24. They put that drive in that primary drive now all those cars get out and they are still sitting there. He didn’t know what the answer was to that but that was his take on the driving. Water run-off to him is a big thing, he has that crick that runs right through his property and when it rains it pours. He has had water up to a few feet from his house at different times, it is still flowing water. It comes from the dump area through the landfill right by his property funnels into the Dooman Pond and then goes across M-24 towards the lakes over there on Bald Mountain. When they put in that new subdivision which isn’t shown on the map anywhere just to the west of him, he now gets all their runoff, they said it would never happen but they get all their runoff running down his driveway. He has photos of a river going down his neighbor’s driveway across his backyard to the crick. He sees nothing in their documentation that has anything to do with the environment. He was sure that would have to be addressed and he would applaud them if they take the appropriate actions to make sure that he addressed. If they put all that other water into that crick it is bound to back him up. They talk about the vehicles that will be there and he can’t argue with the number, however, higher incomes, means more vehicles, teenagers, 3-bedroom, driving, a family could have up to three vehicles or more. The other indication people talked about the property values he didn’t want to go there, he didn’t think they were going to go up, they are high right now, but in two years when the bottom falls out in the market what is going to happen to the property values. The other thing that he would like to mention is the infrastructure. Try to go out to eat, he was sure that everyone there has tried to go to G’s at 6 p.m. and that area there is one restaurant and one gas station being built that is it. They have to drive in a different direction any place, there is just no infrastructure to support, in his opinion, 190 families. It might be one person it might be two, three, or four people. He hoped that do what is correct.

Mr. Robert Style 164 Four Seasons Dr. their condominium would not look directly at their development but he was not in favor of it, for a lot of reasons. Some of which will be a repeat of what they have heard tonight but he felt the need to say it. Low-density single-family housing is a far cry from what is being
proposed here. Just that reason alone he would beg them to vote this no because they are going to change the living quality of all the people that live there. All of the lighting from a three-story and all that parking is going to be horrible for the residents that do live there and want to enjoy that nice quietness that they get in Lake Orion today. There is one thing that bothers him more than anything and that is the word resort, and it was used a number of times tonight. He lived there because of the peace and quiet he doesn’t live there because there is a resort in his backyard and he doesn’t want a resort in his backyard so please vote this no.

Mr. Bob Ramsey 335 Waldon Rd. the first third of this presentation seems more like a sales pitch and he didn’t believe that any of the long-term residents of Waldon Rd. would be interested in moving into this development. He was concerned about the water the creek runs right next to his property. He knew that the residents of a high-end elite development like that will demand security and lots of lighting. As him and his wife drifted off to sleep the other night listening to the owl’s he knew that would be detrimental to the wildlife in the area. The traffic concerns have been addressed he has the same concerns. They are certainly opposed to this development.

Mr. Steve Eynon 369 W. Greenshield wanted to start off with some of the caveats he has heard. They intend to save trees, consider lifetime nature easement, feel comfortable with 70% parking, longtime Oakland County residents. This is a big County, so unless they are living in the development it is an empty statement. He has many objections the first being the proposed DRC project is on EGLE DNR designated protected wetland pond greater than 5-acres. It includes two connecting creeks and a second 5 plus acre pond draining into turtle creek which is a Clinton Water Shed. The transient stormwater runoff when it rains along the wetland system will flood yards and basements. The proposed 5-ft. privacy berms will further impact stormwater runoff from neighboring properties into wetlands with higher water levels already caused by the planned urban development, increasing transient water tables on neighboring properties flooding yards and basements. Where are transient non-pseudo-states rain water studies done? Did the study take the increased runoff rate transient wetland expansion and water table increase impact to the existing homes into consideration? Did the DNR or the DRC apply for wetland permits with transient wetland expansions? Zoning requirements - DRC variance request for a 42-ft. tall structure negates any notion 5-ft. berms will ensure neighboring privacy. 500 neighbors on little more than 7-acres, 71 people per acres effectively in a Township with a current population density of about 2-people/acre is not supported by comparison to Herron Springs Townhouse living with a lower occupant density, parking of 1.72/unit 70% of suburban requirement based on developers urban living concept. The DRC project requires walkability to amenities stores, services, and entertainment, primarily in cities downtowns. DRC only development history is the Jordon in downtown Auburn Hills on July 21, with 36-48 units leased. How does a larger 190 unit (PUD) in a rural suburban area fit the reality of the developers stated envision and purpose - it does not. Leaving the plan underserved for parking and pedestrian access. Their neighbor on W. Greenshield was killed this May crossing a 55 mile/hour not walkable M-24 with zero crosswalks 500-yards from the (PUD). How is this walkable, who will make this development walkable, we the taxpayers? Plans show access walkways through the DNR-protected wetlands will interfere with nesting waterfall. Now they are being told that a dog park will be added to further annihilate the wildlife. The plan does not show any independent retention ponds required to regulate wetland levels. This results in wetland mismanagement flooding of neighboring properties on behalf of a for-profit corporation a 5th amendment taking, illegal. Plans state 5-ft. berms and 6-ft. fences between (PUD) and neighbors with no placement details provide privacy or barriers that are adequate. The petitioner forgets that deciduous trees that are supposed to help lose their leave every fall. Additional questions regarding retaining walls to block parking and raccoons secured dumpsters are not shown in the plan. People that don’t live in our area forget about what raccoons can really do to a garbage can. Has DRC applied for indirect taxpayer funding? The road traffic study shows that two new entrances are needed on an already congested M-24 contradicting their statements. What other essentials have DRC provided their stated intent, are they all inaccurate? A request is not about the developer’s feelings it is about accuracy. What is the Township’s expectation for high-tech paying homeowners would have their low-density country living collide with the proposed transient renter (PUD)? The fair market value for every house near this development will fall behind the market. DRC assertion based upon a Harvard joint study for housing for a housing study was
paid for by a developer, with a study performed in a disparate real estate market making a pause of impact to neighboring properties dubious at best.

Mr. Ken Mihelich 275 Waldo said he has lived there for 38 years. When they moved there it was a gravel road with a tunnel of trees. They understand life progress the subdivisions, three main ones that have come off their road, and a lot of the people that are here that live there, they are great neighbors. They come by their house every day on their bikes and their strollers, they enjoy living there it has been great living there. They want them to vote no for the zoning because 200 apartments are a far cry from 20 – 30 homes, help them preserve their way of life.

Mr. Matt Lawson 3077 Waldon Meadows Dr. and it is actually a new development still under construction. His wife and he moved here a couple of months ago to kind of get away from what is actually being planned and proposed here today. They moved from Royal Oak to get away from all the noise, commotion, packing a bunch of people into a small area. It just seems out of place in Lake Orion. Someone mentioned that living every day as a vacation unless you slap an apartment complex in the middle of a residential neighborhood. They understand, and he feels bad for the people that have been there for a long time, they haven’t been there very long and they are very much against this. He is a millennial he is very much against this, build homes, use the land for what it was originally intended for it to be used for and zoned for. That seems much more in line with what they think of Lake Orion to be. The reputation of Lake Orion, the perception of it, this is an eyesore, it is out of place, it doesn’t fit in. Do something like this in downtown Royal Oak. It is not something that belongs here. Everyone else mentioned the traffic thing, with all due respect, he doesn’t know what traffic study these gentlemen looked into but 2%, the math doesn’t add up there. They appreciate them taking the time and what they do for the city and listening to them today as a new resident he is very much against this. He hopes they vote no, and keep it as is and build homes here.

Ms. Pam McNabb 350 Waldon and has lived on Waldon Rd. since she has been five. In addition to the traffic and the infrastructure and everything else that is being talked about today, she wanted to come back to the creek that runs through their properties. The overflow on this creek has the potential to do great damage to at least five homes. There are five homes that cannot handle any more water than that is being pushed into this. Any change in the water table they are going to have five homes that are totally destroyed and unlivable, that is a lot. In addition, there is a subdivision that is under construction now, there are 22 new homes in the area. It is added a huge amount of water they addressed it with the County at the time that they were working on it and they were told it would have no impact. It doesn’t matter how little rain they get they are flooded they cannot handle anymore. She thought that the most important thing if they look at the Master Plan that is posted at the Township, and she knows it is being revised at this point, she has a copy of it and it clearly states on the Master Plan it is a single-family low-density 190 apartments on 7-acres is not single-family and it is certainly not low-density.

Linda Savard 362 Waldon lives right next door on the west side of this project. She already has water in her backyard she is glad that she has no basement. This is an insane thing no matter what she does there is no way they can keep the trees to protect her side from not seeing that. There are no trees, she has some trees but they are not going to cover all that up. Please do not let this happen to us.

Secretary St. Henry stated that the Township received 25 letters from local residents. All 25 were opposed to the development. He read their names into the record* (see attachment).

Chairman Reynolds asked if any Planning Commissioners had any comments and questions. There was none.

Chairman Reynolds turned it over to the Board of Trustees for comments and questions.

Trustee Flood thanked the residents for coming out tonight. Throughout the Township depending on where you live, when these developments come through, this is what they usually see. He just wanted to
let them know that this is just one part of the process, and he was sure that the Chairman would explain to them how this process works. Some are probably familiar with it and some are not. The Planning Commission all live here too and have all seen the changes they have been through, and some live in the same communities where change has happened. The way the process works is they will make a recommendation to the Township Board of Trustees. The Township Board of Trustees will have the final say, the buck stops with the Board. But they will be doing their due diligence plus their paid consultants, engineering firm, planners, he just wanted them to know that this is a long-drawn-out process, and they hear them. He has written down their names and every one of their concerns.

Trustee Steele thanked everyone for coming out tonight. She said she didn’t see at this time a community benefit? She is concerned about the safety paths, and the sidewalks surrounding the unit. The parking is a concern. She also is not crazy about the three stories because she wanted to reiterate that she thinks that the three stories are more in line with a walkability downtown area that they see around Brown Rd. She thought that this might be a little bit much where it is located. She said she has lived in Orion for a very long time too and what she really appreciates about Orion is the semi-ruralness that it has to offer and that the zoning that they have of the present and the future zoning takes into consideration these semi-rural areas because they have to pay attention to our services, our infrastructure. When they put something bigger in a semi-rural area it has not taken that into consideration. She does believe in personal property rights and she did believe that they have the right to develop their property just provided that it is in line with what the zoning is and it doesn’t take away from other people’s property rights. She thought that some of these comments that were brought up tonight do infringe on some of their rights, and she thought there was always a good balance and then maybe with a lot of work that maybe they can come to a compromise but right now she thought that they were a little far of what is in the surrounding area. She did believe that yes, they do have the apartments across the street, and then they have Herron Apartments down off of Silverbell, however, she was not necessarily in favor of those either. She looks forward to seeing what they can bring back, and the consultants will have their work cut out ahead too.

Commissioner Gross said as a Commission they have a lot of work to do on this project. There has been a lot of good information that they have received from the applicant, as well as, from the public. They will be spending a lot of time looking at the plans in detail and trying to arrive at some conclusions on some of the issues that were brought before them this evening. He asked the number of dwelling units at 190, which does not seem to correlate with any of their residential zoning districts and he was curious as to how that number was arrived at.

Chairman Reynolds said this is the public hearing as Trustee Flood outlined, this is a multi-step process they always appreciate public comments and everyone coming out to either support, express concerns, express opposition to projects, that is what the process is here for. They are all citizens and residents themselves they couldn’t be here on this board if they weren’t. They always appreciate the feedback. He noted with a (PUD) this is a multi-step process, tonight is strictly the public hearing, there is no further discussion or deliberation within their general meeting minutes. The joint hearing was held here tonight as the first step of the formal process. The next step would be the case appearing on the PC agenda for deliberation essentially as a concept (PUD). That gets a recommendation from here at this board gets discussed and then forward either a recommendation to support or deny the project, it gets forwarded to the Board of Trustees and then ultimately there are further steps that get involved that essentially include site plan approval all of those details and things. So, this is a multifaceted process it is not one and done by any means, so if they ever need additional information or anything like that the Planning & Zoning Department is always willing to provide that along with PC information is posted online too. He will do his best to summarize some of the comments that were brought forth. If the Planning Commissioners can bring forth as they ask the petitioner to come back to the podium to address some of the comments and concerns. He knew some of which were presented in their comprehensive presentation. Maybe as an overview starting with Vice-Chairman Gross, where this fits within the Master Plan. Trustee Steele stated the case of the community benefit, so some of our (PUD) criteria. There were concerns about heights and sightlines. Traffic was an ongoing topic, is there any mitigation of those traffic risks along with lighting, and privacy. Waterflow was a topic of discussion, noise pollution, tree preservation. There was along with the
drainage and discussion within water remediation was also about the protected wetland that potentially exists on the property at this point, and some of the measures and design measures that they are mitigating other opportunities such as berms may help or hurt that concern. How is the compatibility with the adjacent neighborhood being single-family and larger lots? Safety path if that is something that they intend to provide or not. And then just general services amongst the community along with emergency services that would be required by this development.

Chairman Reynolds asked the applicant to come back up to the podium to address some of these concerns. He added that this is the public hearing and some of these concrete topics would come out in future deliberation too.

Mr. Wayne stated that he enjoyed hearing some of the concerns that the residents have and he understood that they exist. He thought there was always a residence to change regardless of where and what is being built and that his naturally a headwind that they face as developers but it is always their goal to do their best to work with the Planning Commission, The Board of Trustees, and the members of the public to address their concerns as best as they can.

Mr. Wayne said that there was a lot of concern about drainage. He said it sounded to him that there is some understanding that there won’t be a stormwater management system within the development, that is not the case, that is going to be a requirement and there will be a number of storm drains all throughout the parking lot of this project, all of those will connect into the city storm drain and, in their opinion, actually improve the drainage that exists there. Right now, the rain falls in the vacant land and goes wherever it wants, in this case, it falls on a parking lot and goes to the storm drains, and heads into the storm sewer.

Mr. Wayne said there are two entrances, there was a comment made that there was only one entrance, there are two. They are under contract to also purchase the 7-acre parcel that exists on the corner of Waldon and Lapeer. The sole reason that they wanted to purchase that parcel was to allow them to put the road onto Lapeer, so as to not overburden the Walden entrance. It was their understanding, and general logic would tell them that if there were significant traffic volumes on Waldon Rd. so much so that they are backed up past the entrance no wise person is going to voluntarily exit their development onto Waldon rather than onto Lapeer. It is important to know that there are two entrances.

Mr. Wayne said there was also a comment made that there were 21-acres being affected, there are only 8-acres being affected in terms of where the building itself is being constructed. There are 21 total acres of land within the land that is being requested for (PUD), 8 of those will contain the building and the parking lot and about 13 of those will contain the nature preserve.

Mr. Wayne said there were a lot of comments that people would love to see single-family homes here, and it is understandable it is zoned for that. Single-family homes on this particular parcel are not feasible. He thought that if they were Pulte, they would have ended up building on this site as they wanted to originally. They ran into some issues with high-water tables which indicated that they couldn’t build basements, which is a significant detractor from any single-family development in terms of value on sale. He also knew that there was some effort from the Fire Department where they wanted to sprinkle the insides of these homes, meaning adding fire suppression systems and it is very cost prohibited in a single-family environment. That was the extent of his knowledge on that issue but to his understanding, those are some of the complications with single-family homes, and for that reason, this is an alternative to that that it is keeping with the spirit of providing residential options for the community just in a different capacity.

Mr. Wayne stated that there was a comment made those values of a home could decrease by 25-50% he was not sure that that was rational. He didn’t know exactly what that was rooted in but from their perspective, they have never seen that occur based on any multi-family development. As it relates to property values on a broader standpoint, they don’t mean to suggest that because this project gets built their home is going to skyrocket in value, what they mean to suggest is that data shows that in communities that have more multi-family dwelling units it creates a more balanced community. It provides
people with different goals and objectives to be members of that community, and contribute to that community, and participate in that community. As a result, that community becomes more desirable to live in. That is why property values increase over time when there is more presence of multi-family.

Mr. Wayne stated that they recognize traffic is a concern they have heard it a number of times tonight. He respectfully suggest to everyone in the room that has been an issue long before they arrived here tonight. In fact, in their research, they found a comment posted on a public forum that asked for a traffic light at the corner of Waldon and Lapeer 10 years ago. Obviously, they are not creating the problem, it already exists.

Mr. Wayne noted that they had no solicitations on Facebook. Not sure where those came from but no one from their camp.

Mr. Wayne noted that as it relates to a traffic light at Lapeer and Waldon that is not a decision that they can influence that is the responsibility of RCOC and MDOT. If that is the direction that the Township would like to go then they would be in full support of helping to peruse a traffic light that would help to reduce the traffic burden of this project. As it relates to that traffic study there is evidence that suggests that even with that development built and that improvement made by RCOC or MDOT that the traffic volumes on Lapeer and Waldon will significantly improve to a factor of 10x of what they are today even with their project built. Again, they will walk arm and arm with all of the Planning Commission and the Board of Trustees to aid in providing the resource and that public infrastructure but is not something that they can build themselves.

Mr. Wayne said that they conducted environmental testing on the site, it returned that there was no presence of (REC)’s Recognizable Environmental Conditions present on the site. They intend to work with EGLE and go through the wetland permitting process and intend to explore that more at the next phase of the project. At this time, they understand that those conditions exist and through their additional research they will be able to uncover exactly how to attend to those situations.

Mr. Wayne stated that there was a comment made that there were not a lot of infrastructures to support 190 more residents. He knew vacant or mostly vacant retail buildings that exist at Silverbell and Lapeer and perhaps if there were more residents in the area the more retail business could join that retail development and perhaps it would encourage others along the Lapeer and Waldon corridors so as to provide more restaurants dining entertainment, retail options for all the members of Orion Township.

Mr. Wayne said that they feel a huge community benefit of this project is in fact the nature preserves. He said that it is their intention to share this resource with all neighboring properties. As it relates to property values if their condo has access to a 12-acres nature preserve that is immediately adjacent to it he thought it was a reasonable assumption to assume that that is more desirable than if it did not. They look forward to working with all the neighboring properties to grant them access to utilize this beautiful resource.

Mr. Wayne stated that as it relates to height, the only way to create that beautiful resource is through three stories. They would not be able to fit the necessary amount of density that is required to make this project viable by reducing it to 2-stores and keeping the nature preserve where it is located, there simply isn’t enough space. In exchange for increasing the building to a 3rd story, they are able to create the 13-acre nature preserve, which in their opinion is a huge benefit to the community.

Mr. Wayne stated that there was a mention of a safety path along Waldon Rd., again, that the majority of that is not their property and a piece of public infrastructure that they would love to support the creation of but not something that they are in control of.

Mr. Wayne stated that in closing he would like to reiterate that clearly there is some opposition to this project from members of the community, they understand that, and with any development, it is always going to be that way. They want to continue to hear those comments and continue to refine their plan in a
way that is going to allow them to elevate a lot of those concerns, and work with the Planning Commission and the rest of the Township Board to create a project that is a benefit for Orion Township for years to come.

Trustee Steele asked if they planned on keeping the development after it is built and if they will be managing it? And the total value of the entire project?

Mr. Wayne replied that the total value of the project they estimated it in the ballpark of 36 million. That encompasses all land acquisitions, soft costs, and constructions costs. As far as ownership is concerned it is currently their intention to continue to own the property and manage it for a given period. There are always changes in market situations that might suggest selling the project so they always evaluate those but at this time it is their intention to build this project and to continue to own and operate it in the Orion Township community.

Chairman Reynolds closed the public hearing at 8:41 p.m.

Trustee Shults closed their public hearing at 8:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Walton  
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary  
Charter Township of Orion  
Planning Commission Approval Date

*Attachment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Owner of (address)</th>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael &amp; Alina Caldwell</td>
<td>336 Four Seasons Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Cunningham</td>
<td>226 Four Seasons Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norbert &amp; Sylvia Saje</td>
<td>212 Four Seasons Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Cunningham</td>
<td>266 Four Seasons Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Sweeney</td>
<td>170 Four Seasons Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Brown</td>
<td>378 Four Seasons Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Mansfield</td>
<td>177 Four Seasons Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Earle</td>
<td>354 Four Seasons Dr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Querro</td>
<td>254 Four Seasons Dr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Rolfsen</td>
<td>103 Four Seasons Dr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara VanPaaphorst</td>
<td>134 Four Seasons Dr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John and Sue Falvo</td>
<td>242 Four Seasons Dr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Stein</td>
<td>289 Four Seasons Dr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon McQueen</td>
<td>229 Four Seasons Dr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathon Zupancic</td>
<td>413 Waldon Meadows Ct.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Reynolds</td>
<td>419 Waldon Meadows Ct.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Welshans</td>
<td>419 Waldon Meadows Ct.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Clissold</td>
<td>322 Four Seasons Dr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Zakalowski</td>
<td>Vacant parcel in Waldon Meadows subdivision</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Schoenstein</td>
<td>3093 Waldon Meadows Dr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Haataja</td>
<td>321 Waldon Ridge Dr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Bann</td>
<td>2800 Waldon Park Dr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard &amp; Ashley Zettel</td>
<td>2829 Waldon Park Dr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan L Johnston</td>
<td>348 Four Seasons Dr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a Public Hearing on Wednesday, October 20, 2021, at 8:44 pm at the Orion Township Community Center, 1335 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, MI 48360.

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

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:**
- None

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

**OTHERS PRESENT:**
- Sharon McQueen
- Alicia Lawson
- Matt Lawson
- Gordon Cox
- Tracy Deuman
- Ken Mihelich
- Kelley Mihelich
- Lorita Woznick
- Terry Clissold
- Susan Johnston
- Desirae Langlois
- Melissa Slowik
- Richard Stein
- Linda Stein
- Kim Hunter
- Lynn Kuczajda
- Chris Krystek
- Robert Glownia
- Steve Eynon
- Barbara VanRaaphorst
- Bev Rolfsen
- Mary Mansfield
- Robert Bambuel
- William McNabb
- Pam McNabb
- John Slocombe
- Bill Schmitz
- Jeff Klatt
- David Gammon
- Amy Keyzer
- John Falvo
- Sue Falvo
- Marcie Ramsey
- Bob Ramsey
- Jim Lepar
- Susan Carpenter
- Dale Carpenter
- Jeff Wright
- Matt Rippin
- Mary Ann Ryan
- Wendy Ryan-Doreza
- Craig Junkin
- Anne Earle
- Michael Lo
- Dale Anderson
- Andrea Holt
- Linda Savard
- Diane DoByckere
- Kellie McDonald
- Mike Rizzola (sp?)

PC-2021-73, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance #78, Industrial Park (IP), Article 18, Section 18.01 – Land Uses.

Chairman Reynolds stated that this public hearing is for an initiated text amendment to amend their Industrial Park (IP) zoning ordinance for updated ordinance #154, that allows Provisioning Centers. The language under uses not permitted is essentially being corrected to include components that would be allowed and authorized under Ord. 154, which would be licensed marijuana facilities including retail components under that ordinance.

Chairman Reynolds said similar function to what they had previously that is their overview since it is a Township initiated text amendment, there is not a petitioner here tonight. He asked if there were any citizen comments or questions on the Township Initiated Text Amendment? There were not.
Chairman Reynolds said that they have not received any citizen’s letters. He asked if there were any comments from the Planning Commissioners? There was not.

Chairman Reynolds closed the public hearing at 8:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Walton
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary
Charter Township of Orion

Planning Commission Approval Date
Charter Township of Orion
Planning & Zoning Department
2525 Joslyn Rd., Lake Orion MI 48360
P: (248) 391-0304 ext. 5000; Fax (248) 391-1454

TO: The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission
FROM: Tammy Girling, Planning & Zoning Director
DATE: October 27, 2021
RE: PC-2021-81, C and A Office Site Plan

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

Site Plan (Ord. No. 78, Section 30.01)
Motion 1: I move that the Planning Commission grants site plan approval for PC-2021-81, C & A Office Site Plan, located at 512 E. Silverbell Road (parcel 09-35-200-023) for plans date stamped received 10/04/2021 based on the following findings of facts (motion make to insert findings of facts).

This approval is based on the following conditions:

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

Or
I move that the Planning Commission denies site plan approval for PC-2021-81, C & A Office Site Plan, located at 512 E. Silverbell Road (parcel 09-35-200-023) for plans date stamped received 10/04/2021. This denial is based on the following reasons (insert findings of facts).

Or

I move that the Planning Commission postpones site plan approval for PC-2021-81, C & A Office Site Plan, located at 512 E. Silverbell Road (parcel 09-35-200-023) for plans date stamped received 10/04/2021 for the following reasons (motion maker to indicate outstanding items to be addressed from the Planner’s, Fire Marshall’s, or Engineer’s review letter(s). Postponement to Planning Commission meeting date or within noted number of days: ____________________________
October 18, 2021

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

Site Plan Review #1
C and A Group New Office

Case No: PC-2021-81
Site: 512 E. Silverbell Road
Applicant: Annette Battaglia
Plan Date: 10/05/2021
Zoning: OP Office & Professional
Parcel ID: 09-35-200-023

Dear Planning Commission Members:

We have completed a review of the site plan referenced above and a summary of our findings is on the following page. We recommend the applicant provide clarification to the one item listed in the summary below.
SUMMARY OF OUTSTANDING REVIEW COMMENTS

27.05 Landscaping.

A.3.a.iv. All landscaped areas shall have an underground irrigation system or shall be provided with a readily available and acceptable water supply with at least one (1) hose bib within one hundred (100) feet of all planted material to be maintained.

   i. The applicant should address if an underground irrigation system is proposed or if a readily available and acceptable water supply would be provided instead. Plan notes irrigated seed lawn but method of irrigation was not found.

Project Summary

In early 2021, Board of Trustees approved the conditional rezoning of the subject site from single-family residential (R-2) to Office Professional (OP). The applicant is proposing to construct a one-story, 9,870 square foot office building, consisting of four tenant spaces, and a retention basin at the rear of the property. Access to the corner parcel and 44 surface parking spaces is proposed from E. Silverbell Road on the north and Bald Mountain Road on the east.

Existing Conditions

1. Site. The 2.3-acre site is located on the south side of E. Silverbell Road and on the west side of Bald Mountain Road. As of September 28, 2021, the current survey shows a vacant, two-parcel property. Records indicate a single-family home, with driveway access along Bald Mountain Road, had previously occupied the site.

2. Zoning. The site is zoned OP (Office and Professional). The OP district permits “professional offices”, and “financial and insurance service” uses by right with no use-specific footnote conditions. The site is not located within any overlay districts.

3. Adjacent zoning & land uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>R-1 SF Residential (14,000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>Single-family homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>R-1 SF Residential (14,000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>Howarth United Methodist Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Zoning Ordinance Compliance Table

4. **OP District.** The below table indicates compliance with the OP district requirements in Article IX. The standards in this table are a summary of Zoning Ordinance standards. Please refer to the individual sections referenced below for the full Zoning Ordinance text. Text in green indicates waivers or modifications that may be considered by the Planning Commission as part of the site plan review process. Text in red indicates variances required through the Zoning Board of Appeals prior to site plan approval. Details regarding proposed compliance are provided in the summary of review on page two.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article IX – Office &amp; Professional (OP)</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.01 – Use Matrix</strong></td>
<td>(9.02 Footnotes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and medical offices (no overnight patients)</td>
<td>Permitted (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and insurance services (with or without drive-thru)</td>
<td>Permitted (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical or dental laboratories</td>
<td>Permitted (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data processing and computer centers</td>
<td>Permitted (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools/Studios for music, dance, business, or trade</td>
<td>Permitted (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service or government facilities</td>
<td>Permitted (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate/property management services</td>
<td>Permitted (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel/ticket agencies</td>
<td>Permitted (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacies (incidental to primary use)</td>
<td>Permitted (footnote “H”)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical supply stores (incidental to primary use)</td>
<td>Permitted (footnote “H”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**9.03 – Required Conditions (see 2O for full text)**

**C. Off-Street Parking**

2. General office: 1 parking space per 300 square feet of GFA  
   Met (46 spaces proposed)

4. Parking area/driveway setback: 30’ abutting res. zoning/use  
   Met (to east)

P0arking area/driveway setback: 20’ abutting comm./ind. zoning  
   N/A

5. Driveways and parking shall be curbed and hard surfaced  
   Met (per site plan)

6. Compliance with 27.04  
   See 5. General Provisions

7. Parking setback may be reduced/ waived abutting comm./ind. when existing parking, drives, and/or structures are within setback area  
   N/A

**D. Landscaping**

1. Landscape plan required in compliance with 27.05  
   See 5. General Provisions

2. Greenbelts (perimeter): 20’ abutting comm./ind. zoning  
   Met

Greenbelts (perimeter): 30’ abutting res. zoning/use  
   Met (no adj. residential)

3. Off-street parking screened from res. property (berm/wall/landsc.)  
   Met (no adj. residential)

4. Landscaping and screening maintenance  
   Administrative

5. Greenbelt may be reduced/ waived abutting comm./ind.  
   N/A

**E. Sign Regulations – Ordinance No. 153**

Not reviewed with SPR

**F. Lighting Regulations**

1. Lighting plan required in compliance with 27.11  
   Met

2. Site lighting fully shielded and directed downward to prevent glare.  

3. Illumination (max): 0.3 fc along res. PL or 1.0 fc along non-res. PL  

**G. Public Road Access.** Direct access to public road with min. 86’ r/w  
   Met (prop. r/w 60’)

**H. Utilities.** All servicing buildings/structures buried underground  
   Met (Sheet C-6.1)

**I. Covered Trash Areas**

1. 3-sided masonry brick-type wall 1’ higher; located in the rear yard  
   Met

2. Opaque lockable gate same height as brick-type wall  
   Met

3. PC may waive requirement (or need) for an outside trash receptacle  
   N/A

---

¹ The listed accessory uses shall be permitted subject to the standards and requirements set forth in Section 27.02, provided they are located within the building to which they are accessory and do not have a direct outside entrance for the use of the public.
J. Loading and Unloading

1. Located in the rear/side yard of a non-residential district  
   N/A (no loading proposed)
2. Shall not interfere with parking or obstruct ingress and egress  
   See 5. General Provisions
3. Compliance with 27.04  
   Administrative

K. Performance Guarantee (Twp Clerk) – 30.09

L. Safety Paths – Ordinance No. 97 (overrides SP Map)
   Met (defer to Twp. Engineer)

M. Tree Preservation – 27.12
   See 5. General Provisions

N. Wetland Setbacks – 27.17
   See 5. General Provisions

9.04 – Area and Bulk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback (from future ROW line) 30 ft (+ 60 ft future ½ r/w)</td>
<td>Met (30 ft N)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setback (opposite front) 30 ft</td>
<td>Met 155.15 ft S (Note: site plan incorrectly labels rear yard as a side yard)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Setback (any non-front/rear) Exterior Side Yard 20 ft on each side 30 ft (+ 43 ft future ½ r/w)</td>
<td>Met (93.81 ft W) Met (30 ft N; 30 ft E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area 20,000 sf</td>
<td>Met (73,430 sf – net of proposed right-of-way)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage 30%</td>
<td>Met (13.44%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height of All Structures 25 ft</td>
<td>Met (18 ft-6 in)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Clear Space Around Structures 15 ft</td>
<td>Met (defer to Fire Dept.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. General Provisions. The below table indicates compliance with the General Provisions in Article XXVII. The standards in this table are a summary of Zoning Ordinance standards. Please refer to the individual sections referenced below for the full Zoning Ordinance text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article XXVII – General Provisions</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.04 – Parking and Loading Regulations (see ZO for full text)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Off-Street Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.a. Minimum setback of 20’ shall be maintained for parking areas</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.b. Parking Spaces for Physically Handicapped</td>
<td>Defer to Building Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b. Maneuvering Lanes. 25’ setback from res. zoning</td>
<td>Met (no adj. residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.c. Surfacing and Drainage</td>
<td>Defer to Twp. Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.d. Lighting</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.e. Screening and Landscaping. Parking screened from res. prop.</td>
<td>Met (no adj. residential)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Parking Chart</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Off-Street Loading and Unloading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.b.i. Less than 10,000 GFA shall be provided with adequate facilities</td>
<td>None proposed. Approved by PC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.05 – Landscaping, Fences, and Walls (see ZO for full text)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Landscaping</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a.i. Suitable plant material surfacing</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a.ii. Landscaped open space area</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a.iii. Underground irrigation or acceptable water supply</td>
<td>Appears Met – Applicant to demonstrate method of irrigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parking Lot Landscaping Adjacent to Roads (20’ r/w greenbelt)</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Screening for Conflicting Land Uses</td>
<td>Met (no adj. residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interior Parking Lot Landscaping (greater than 20 spaces)</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Materials Standards and Specifications</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Installation and Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>Defer to Building Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Regulations Pertaining to Existing Plant Material</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Prohibited Plant Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Entranceway Structures</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>27.06 – Streets, Roads, and Other Means of Access (see ZO for full text)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Acceleration/Deceleration/Passing Lanes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defer to Twp. Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defer to Twp. Engineer. Sidewalk needs to extend to west property line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Safety Pathways. Construction specifications</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>27.11 Lighting Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Lighting Plan Submittal Requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>27.12 Tree and Woodlands Protection (see ZO for full text)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met (Sheet T-1.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>27.17 Wetland Setbacks (see ZO for full text)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All structures or buildings: 25’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lots: 25’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets, roads, driveways: 25’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met (no wetland present on property)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully,

Giffels Webster

Rod Arroyo, AICP
Partner

Eric Pietsch
Senior Planner

www.giffelswebster.com
October 20, 2021

Scott Reynolds, Planning Commission Chairperson
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION
2525 Joslyn Road
Lake Orion, MI 48360

RE: C and A Office, PC-2021-81
    Site Plan Review #1

Received: October 5, 2021 by Orion Township

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

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

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:
The site is located along on the southwest corner of E. Silverbell Rd. and Bald Mountain Rd. within Section 35 and 36 of the Charter Township of Orion. The site is zoned Office and Professional (OP) and bound by parcels to the south and west of the property zoned Recreation 2 (REC-2), parcels northeast of the intersection zoned Special Circumstances (SC), and parcels to the north and east of the property zoned Single Family Residential (R-1).

The existing site appears to have been recently altered. The existing house and detached garage have been demolished and the existing wooded areas noted on the survey partially cleared.

The site is comprised of two parcels. Parcel 1 is located at the intersection surrounded on the south and west borders by Parcel 2. Parcel 2 has a large amount of brush extending along the western and southern borders that was not removed. The Topographic Survey also shows a water shut off rim and a street-light existing south of Parcel 1.

The applicant is proposing to construct a 9,870 square-foot building with one access point on Bald Mountain Road and another on E. Silverbell Road. The applicant is showing the future right-of-way along both Silverbell Rd. and Bald Mountain Rd.

WATER MAIN AND SANITARY SEWER:
There is existing 12-inch water main that extends along the south side of E. Silverbell Rd. as well as the east side of Bald Mountain Rd. There do not appear to be any existing easements on site for water main. The applicant is proposing a 3-inch domestic service via 12-inch by 3-inch cut-in-tee on the water main located along the south side of E. Silverbell Rd. A single hydrant is proposed on site, extending from the water main north of the site. It appears to be a 55-foot-long dead-end-hydrant with a diameter of 6 inches. This exceeds the Township maximum allowable dead-end length for 6-inch hydrant leads (50 feet) and will need to be increased to 8-inch water main at engineering. A 12-foot-wide easement is provided for the portion of the hydrant lead that extends into the site and appears...
acceptable. It is our understanding the building will not require fire suppression. We defer further comment to the Township Fire Department.

There is existing 10-inch sanitary sewer located on the north side of E. Silverbell Rd. and along the west side of Bald Mountain Rd. There do not appear to be any existing sanitary easements on site. A single 6-inch sanitary service lead is proposed on the east side of the building. The applicant is proposing to extend the service from the existing 10-inch sanitary sewer located along the west side of Brown Rd. Per OCWRC, a monitoring manhole is required upstream of the proposed connection to the public sanitary sewer. At engineering, the proposed clean out can be changed to the required monitoring manhole.

**STORMWATER MANAGEMENT:**
The applicant is proposing to apply the new OCWRC storm water design standards recently adopted by the Township. The site will maintain the existing drainage pattern by draining southward to concrete spillways through a bioretention basin. A roof conduction for the building is also proposed to drain to the basin. The bioretention basin will allow sediment to settle out and promote infiltration. The plan also includes a required detention basin. The use of the bioretention basin is dependent on results from the soil boring test results. A copy of the geotechnical report should be provided to support the proposed infiltration. The preliminary storm water calculations appear acceptable with one correction needed. The detention basin needs to be increased in size to a volume of 2,677 cf meeting the V100d calculation. There appears to be sufficient area to accommodate the increased basin size without impacting the current layout.

**PAVING/GRADING/CIRCULATION:**
The site previously had a concrete driveway which appears to have been removed prior to the Topographic Survey as it shows no existing driveway or approach. The applicant is proposing to provide an approach on both E. Silverbell Rd. and Bald Mountain Rd. The applicant has identified in the plans that a permit will be required from the RCOC for work within the right-of-way along both roads. An 8-foot-wide public pathway is shown across the site frontage for both roadways, however, the pathway needs to be extended all the way to the western property border on Silverbell Rd. ADA ramps should be provided at the NW corner of the intersection of E Silverbell Rd and Bald Mountain Road. In addition, ADA receiving ramps should be provided on the north side of E Silverbell Rd and the east side of Bald Mountain Rd. The pathway is located within the proposed additional right-of-way and will not require an easement provided the right-of-way is dedicated to RCOC.

Pavement slopes provided within the site plan appear acceptable. Pavement slopes are to remain between 1% and 6% for drive areas, and between 1% and 4% for parking areas. Four pavement sections were provided in the details, including a Standard Duty Asphalt Detail (4 inches HMA atop 8 inches of aggregate), a Heavy-Duty Asphalt Detail (4.5 inches of HMA atop 10 inches of aggregate), an Asphalt Pathway Detail (3 inches of HMA atop 4 inches of aggregate), and a Heavy-Duty Concrete Pad Detail (8 inches of concrete atop 6 inches of aggregate). At engineering, a note is required on the Asphalt Pathway Detail calling for the use of Pramitol 25E or approved equal soil sterilant to be placed on the subbase prior to placement of the aggregate base. The HMA standard duty and heavy-duty details both have at note stating that they are not for use in the right-of-way. The pavement section intended for use within the RCOC right-of-way shall be included in the plans.

Existing grades were provided via one-foot contours and several spot grades. Proposed grades were provided via one-foot contours in green space along with several spot grades in paved areas as well as along swales and at the site border. Slopes shown within the site appear to be acceptable with a max slope of roughly 1:4.

The site appears to accommodate the Orion Fire Department aerial apparatus without conflicts. Parking spaces are proposed at 9’ wide x 19’ deep meeting township requirements. Drive isles meet the minimum width of 22’ for 2-way traffic.
LANDSCAPING:
A Landscape Plan and tree list were included in the plans. The location of the landscaping as shown on the plans appears acceptable. Trees appear to be reasonably spaced from the site utilities, and there should be no conflicts.

NATURAL FEATURES:
Wetlands:
There do not appear to be any regulated wetlands within the boundary of the site. The nearest wetland appears to be a riverine located southwest of the site.

Woodlands:
A tree survey was included on the Topographic Survey along with a Tree Preservation Plan. The applicant has indicated no trees are required to be replaced due to the site being under 5 acres in size. We defer further review to the Township Planner.

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

1. Extend the safety path to the west property line.
2. Add ADA ramps to the safety path to provide crossings of E Silverbell Rd and Bald Mountain Rd.
3. Provide a geotechnical report to support the proposed infiltration.
4. Increase the volume of the detention basin to meet the V100d calculation.
5. The engineering plan, designed in accordance with Zoning Ordinance No. 78, Stormwater Management and Soil Erosion & Sedimentation Control Ordinance No. 139, and the Township’s Engineering Standards shall be submitted to the Township for review and approval prior to construction. A detailed cost estimate for the improvements shall be submitted with the plans signed and sealed by the design engineer.

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

Sincerely,
OHM Advisors

Joe Lehman
Project Engineer

Mark Landis, P.E.
Project Manager

cc: Chris Barnett, Township Supervisor
David Goodloe, Building Official
Jeff Stout, Director of Public Services
Tammy Girling, Director of Planning and Zoning
Lynn Harrison, Planning and Zoning Coordinator
Jeff Williams, Township Fire Marshal
Bill Basigkow, Water and Sewer Superintendent
Annette Battaglia, C and A Office Group II
James Butler, PEA Group
To: Planning Commission/Planning & Zoning Director
From: Jeff Williams, Fire Marshal
Re: PC-2021-81, C and A Office Site Plan
Date: 10/12/2021

The Orion Township Fire Department has completed its review of Application PC-2021-81 for the limited purpose of compliance with Charter Township of Orion Ordinance’s, Michigan Building Code, and all applicable Fire Codes.

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

X  Approved
    Approved with Requirements (See below)
    Not approved

Comments: NONE

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

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

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Williams
Jeff Williams, Fire Marshal
Orion Township Fire Department
To: Tammy Girling
Planning & Zoning Director

From: Jeffery T. Stout
Director, Department of Public Services

Date: October 27, 2021

Re: PC-2021-81 C and A Office Site Plan

Dear Tammy,

After review, Public Services has no further concerns or issues with this project.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeffery T. Stout
Director
Department of Public Services
October 6, 2021

Lynn Harrison
Orion Township
Planning & Zoning
2525 Joslyn Road
Lake Orion, MI 48360

Reference: C and A Office – CAMS #202100826
Part of the NE ¼ of Section 35, Orion Township

Dear Ms. Harrison,

This office has received one set of plans for the C and A Office Project to be developed in the Northeast ¼ of Section 35, Orion Township.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Brian Bennett, P.E.
Civil Engineer III
A site walk was conducted on Oct. 12 by Scott Reynolds, Joe St. Henry, and Don Gross. The site located at the southwest corner of Silverbell and Bald Mountain Roads is vacant. It was previously occupied with a vacant residential structure that has been demolished. There are between 4 and 6 mature trees that have been left standing after the demolition.

Directly to the east on the opposite side of Bald Mountain Road is a church. The north side of Silverbell Road is an entrance to the Hi-Hill residential subdivision.

The site is in the general proximity of what is being discussed as a "Hamlet" of uses to support the surrounding community in a 15 minute walking radius.

Respectfully submitted
Donald Gross
Planning Commissioner

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

RECEIVED

OCT 13 2021
Orion Township
Planning & Zoning
Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission
Site Plan Approval Application

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>C and A Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Development if applicable:</td>
<td>C and A Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Annette Battaglia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 2790 West Gunn Road</td>
<td>City: Rochester State: MI Zip: 48306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 586-665-7050</td>
<td>Cell: Fax:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:ACCESSOANNETTE@GMAIL.COM">ACCESSOANNETTE@GMAIL.COM</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Same as Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Property Owner(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PEA Group**

| Name: |
| Address: 2430 Rochester Court, S-100 | City: Troy State: MI Zip: 48083 |
| Phone: 248-689-9090 | Cell: 248-821-4841 Fax: |
| Email: jbutler@peagroup.com |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Contact Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: James P. Butler (PEA Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sidwell Number(s): 09-35-200-023

Location or Address of Property: 512 East Silverbell Road

Side of Street: South Nearest Intersection: Bald Mountain

Acreage: 2.34 Current Use of Property: Vacant

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

Subject Property Zoning: [ ] OP [ ] N. SF [ ] S. REC [ ] E. SF [ ] W. MF

Adjacent Zoning: [ ] N. SF [ ] S. REC [ ] E. SF [ ] W. MF

List any known variances needed (subject to change based on Township consultant’s review) None

Give a detailed description of the proposed development, including the number and size of the buildings or units being proposed: Construction of a single story office building (9870 Sq ft)

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

AT&T 54 Mill St. Pontiac, MI 48342

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

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

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

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

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

Oakland County Water Resources To Be Submitted by the Township

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

Signature of Applicant: [Signature]

Print Name: Annette Battaglia

Date: 10-4-2021

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

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

[Signature]

Print Name: Annette Battaglia

Date: 10-4-2021
Proposed Exterior Rendering for:

Silverbell Spec Building
Proposed Exterior Rendering for:

Silverbell Spec Building
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KEY:
- = IRRIGATED SEED LAWN
- = EXISTING TREE / TAG TO REMAIN
- = BUFFER TREES
- = TREE PROTECTION FENCING
- = INTERIOR PARKING LOT TREES
- = PARKING LOT ADJACENT TO ROAD TREES AND SHRUBS
- = ECONOMY PRAIRIE SEED MIX BY: CARDNO NATIVE PLANT NURSERY 574.586.2412 PROVIDE EROSION MAT ON SLOPES
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- = STORM WATER SOD
- = STORM WATER PLANTS
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DEciduous Tree Plant list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>SPECIFIC NAME</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>SPEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>Quercus rubra</td>
<td>3.25' Dia. 56B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Black Oak</td>
<td>Quercus velutina</td>
<td>3.25' Dia. 56B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>White Oak</td>
<td>Quercus alba</td>
<td>2.5' Dia. 08A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
<td>Acer saccharum</td>
<td>2.5' Dia. 08A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>River Birch</td>
<td>Betula nigra</td>
<td>2.5' Dia. 08A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tulip Tree</td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>2.5' Dia. 08A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Honey Locust</td>
<td>Gleditsia triacanthos</td>
<td>2.5' Dia. 08A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ExtraordinarY Tree Plant list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>SPECIFIC NAME</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>SPEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>White Pine</td>
<td>Pinus strobus</td>
<td>6.0' Dia. 08A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eastern White Pine</td>
<td>Pinus strobus</td>
<td>6.0' Dia. 08A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TREES PLANTED:

1. Red Oak
2. Black Oak
3. White Oak
4. Sugar Maple
5. River Birch
6. Tulip Tree
7. Honey Locust
8. White Pine
9. Eastern White Pine

GENERAL PLANTING NOTES:

- All plants shall be installed according to the planting diagrams and specifications provided.
- Plants shall be properly staked and braced to ensure stability during installation.
- All plants shall be watered daily until established.
- Eroson control mats shall be placed on all slopes.
- Storm water plantings shall be installed as per specifications provided.
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LUMENS: P1 & P2

D-Series Size 1
LED Area Luminaire

Introduction
The D-Series is a styling family of energy efficient LED area luminaires. It has been designed to provide uniform illumination over a wide range of outdoor applications. A variety of lens options provide versatility in installation. The long-life LED technology offers high performance, high efficiency, long life and compliance with future lighting regulations.

Specifications

SL 1.2

Photometric Details

Example: D401 LED PT 60“ Trim which includes PAR36 (2x2)

Table 1


drawings, dimensions, and other data shown herein are not intended to be used as a basis for the preparation of construction bids. They are to be used only for the purpose of evaluating proposals and awarding contracts. No representation is made as to the correctness of the data shown. The contractor shall assume full responsibility for the design, engineering, and construction of the project to be bid. The contractor shall check all data and information and shall be entirely responsible for the interpretation thereof.
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EXTERIOR MATERIAL SCHEDULE

1. BRICK VENEER
2. STONE VENEER
3. ALUMINUM COMPOSITE METAL PANEL SYSTEM (ACM)
4. 1" LOW 'E' INSUL. GLAZING IN ANOD. ALUM. THERMAL BREAK FRAMES.
5. ANOD. ALUM. ENTRY DOOR W/ TEMPERED GLASS
6. PREFINISHED METAL COPING
7. VERTICAL METAL ROOFING SYSTEM
8. CONCRETE TRENCH FOOTING BELOW
9. PRECAST ACCENTS
10. VERTICAL METAL PANEL SIDING (ROOF SCREENING)