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

The following is information of how to attend the meeting via video conference (GoToMeeting App.). The video conference can be accessed by downloading the GoToMeeting App. The meeting number is 599-669-285. Live comments and questions will be accepted during the meeting at an appropriate time that will be explained by the Chair of the meeting. Your comments may also be given live via GoToMeeting by phoning 1 (571) 317-3122 Access Code 599-669-285, or by email to pc@oriontownship.org.

Public Hearing at 7:05pm: PC-2021-45, Mountain Substation, Special Land Use request for an electrical substation, located at unaddressed parcel, 09-36-300-004 (a parcel north of 4879 Bald Mountain Road).

1. OPEN MEETING
2. ROLL CALL
3. MINUTES
   A. 05-5-21, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes
4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL
5. BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENT – NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY
6. CONSENT AGENDA
7. NEW BUSINESS
   A. PC-2018-15, Stadium Ridge Site Plan Extension – Residential, located at unaddressed parcel 09-14-400-026, on the North side of Stadium Drive, West of Lake Orion High School.
   B. PC-2019-10, Stadium Ridge Site Plan Extension – Commercial, located at unaddressed parcel 09-14-400-025, at the NE corner of Stadium Dr. and Lapeer Rd.
   C. PC-2021-45, Mountain Substation, Special Land Use request for an electrical substation and Site Plan, located at unaddressed parcel 09-36-300-004 (a parcel north of 4879 Bald Mountain Road).
   D. PC-2021-42, FedEx Ground Parking Expansion, Site Plan Amendment, located at 1601 Brown Road (parcel 09-34-300-030) and vacant parcels, parcels 09-34-300-019, 09-34-300-020, 09-34-300-021 and 09-34-300-024 (parcels north of 1601 Brown Road).
8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
9. PUBLIC COMMENTS
10. COMMUNICATIONS
11. PLANNERS REPORT/EDUCATION
12. COMMITTEE REPORTS

13. FUTURE PUBLIC HEARINGS
   A. 6-2-21 at 7:05p.m., PC-2021-47, Orion Village Center, Special Land Use Request for an outdoor café, located at 600 S. Lapeer Road, parcel number 09-11-428-015.

14. CHAIRMAN’S COMMENTS

15. COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS

16. ADJOURNMENT

In the spirit of compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals with a disability should feel free to contact the Township at least seventy-two hours in advance of the meeting when requesting accommodations.
The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, May 5, 2021, at 7:00pm at the Orion Township Community Center, 1335 Joslyn Rd., Lake Orion, Michigan 48360

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

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT (Commissioner location):
Scott Reynolds, Chairman
Don Gross, Vice-Chairman
Joe St. Henry, Secretary
Jessica Gingell, Commissioner

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:
None.

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

2. ROLL CALL
As noted

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

OTHERS PRESENT:
Matthew Stypula

3. MINUTES
A. 04-07-21, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes
Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker to approve the minutes, as originally submitted. **Motion carried**

B. 04-21-21, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

C. 04-21-21, Planning Commission Workshop Meeting Minutes

D. 04-21-21, Planning Commission Public Hearing Minutes for PC-2021-37, Meijer SLU

E. 04-21-21, Planning Commission Public Hearing Minutes for PC-2021-39, Lake Orion Schools Rezone

Moved by Trustee Urbanowski, seconded by Vice-Chairman Gross to approve all four sets of minutes, as submitted. **Motion carried** (3B. – 3E)

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

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

6. CONSENT AGENDA
None

7. NEW BUSINESS

A. PC-2021-43, Orion Manufactured Home Community, Site Plan Amendment to add a community center, located at 47 Bluebird Hill Dr. (Sidwell #09-35-300-001).

Mr. Matt Stypula 5500 New Albany Rd., Columbus, OH, presented.

Mr. Stypula stated that he was there on behalf of the owner of Haven Park Communities who owns the mobile home facility and is looking to put in a community center. He added that with their submission there were a few comments from the Planning Commission and so he put together a brief PowerPoint presentation to go over how they will be addressing these comments in hope of getting conditional approval.

Mr. Stypula went through his PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Stypula stated during his presentation regarding the tree permit for over 4” in size. They are trying to keep as many trees as they can, but there will be some trees that will be required to be removed that are over 4” in diameter and with those they would need obtain a separate tree permit for those items. He noted that none of those were landmark trees but they would be protected trees because they are over 4” in diameter.

Mr. Stypula said that one of the issues that were brought up was open space. They have gone through and analyzed the open space and the requirement is for 5,500-sq. ft. per lot. Based upon the site area they are about 62.5-acres, the site is around 75-acres, there are about 13-acres of easement and right-of-way for the roadways. They are at 62.5-acres, and 420 lots, so they are just under 6,500-sq. ft. per lot. They would meet that requirement and would not be impacting the open space with this development.

Mr. Stypula stated that the other item that was noted was 200-ft. to the furthest parking space, it is 153-ft. to the face of that space, 170-ft. to the back of the space, so they would meet that requirement as well.

Mr. Stypula said that there was a request for the pavement to be 4-inches of asphalt, they have no objections to that, the client is ok with that and they will install that for the parking lot.

Mr. Stypula said each of the individual lots has its own trash dumpster container that gets picked up. There is also bulk refuse just down Meadow Lark Lane from where this building is proposed. They would primarily use the bulk dumpsters, they are used by the maintenance area, if the need arose for smaller pick-ups, they would have the opportunity to use just a small residential side trash can for standard pick-up.

Mr. Stypula said that a couple of grading items were brought up, so they have made a couple of tweaks to the parking grading. Where they have an existing well, they were just over 4% they reduced that down to below 4%, so all grades will be between 1-4% in the parking and 1-6% in the drives. It was noted that 1-4 was the preferred slope for the general area. They generally have 1-4 there are a couple of spaces one along the rear of the building where they have that existing gazebo or overhead structure that they are maintaining where they are 3-1. This is privately owned and maintained, 3-1 is mobile with even a riding lawnmower, they can mow on
that. There is also where they have the walk that winds through the trees, they do have one spot that is 3-1 and that is there simply to try to save as many trees as they can, if they go 4-1, they get into the tree and more into the root zone, that was the justification behind that.

Mr. Stypula said regarding the landscaping, there were a couple of questions that came up regarding screening. They have added screening basically around the entire lot, they originally did not have screening along Blue Bird Hill Drive, the drive that fronts the community center, they will install screening there. They have also added an additional tree, there is 130-ft. of frontage along that parking lot which will require five trees. There are five existing, they are removing one for the entrance drive but will add one back in to meet that requirement.

Mr. Stypula noted that one of the other items was the disturbed area, anything that is disturbed will either receive grass or three inches of mulch as noted in the comments for the planted areas they will be three inches minimum mulch, everywhere else will be stabilized with grass.

Mr. Stypula said that they have one interior island and it was noted that for every 200-ft. they would need a tree. They have not planted one there, there are two existing wells on that island that feed a private water system that serves the site, so they are not planting a tree on that island. They are asked that they are not permitted to not have a tree there. They do have three existing trees that border the east side of that parking lot that they are going to be maintaining. They also have just over 12,000-sq. ft. of open space, they will be planting five trees, they are required to have five as a part of one for every 3,000-sq. ft. or part thereof. There is also one existing tree within that disturbed area so they would have an access tree in the open space requirement to make up for that interior lot.

Mr. Stypula said that is how they are planning on addressing the comments that they received from the Planning Commission. None of those is a significant impact on the scope of the project from the owner’s eyes so they are willing to comply with all of those comments. They are asking for conditional approval.

Planner Fazzini read through his review date stamped April 12, 2021.

Engineer Landis read through his review date stamped April 7, 2021.

Chairman Reynolds noted that they did have a review from the Fire Marshal and had no additional comments and recommended approval.

Chairman Reynolds said that Public Services had no comments and recommended approval.

Chairman Reynolds stated that there was a site walk done by the Site Walk Committee.

Vice-Chairman Gross said that the Site Walk Committee did do a site walk on the project a couple of weeks ago. They found that the development was very well maintained, in fact, it looked like it was undergoing some major improvements. It appeared that the roads had been recently resurfaced. There has been a number of mobile homes that have been removed, and there are vacant lots and appeared that there were new mobile homes being brought in which is improving the overall character of the community. He added that it was an older well established mobile home park. Mr. Stypula said that it has been there for quite a few years. Vice-Chairman Gross said that it has been going through some major renovations and improvements he thought to the benefit of the community.

Chairman Reynolds thought the applicant did a nice job introducing the project.
Chairman Reynolds said that the applicant did touch base on the dumpster. He asked if refuse picked up from individual units by staff and brought to those dumpster locations? Does everyone have dumpster bins? Mr. Stypula said that everyone has an individual residential size dumpster bin for pick-up. Chairman Reynolds asked if that was picked up by the Township trash provider or was it strictly on-site? Mr. Stypula said he would have to confirm that if it was the Township trash or if it is a private company. Chairman Reynolds said he didn’t have an issue with the dumpster being located down the street. He said he knew that a lot of communities like this have on site staff maintenance members that would take the trash down the street.

Chairman Reynolds said he knew that they had a standard for open space and didn’t see a major issue with the existing property and meeting it. He thought that the building was well fitting and thanked the applicant for clarifying the distance to parking and things, but it seemed like a good location for the building and well-fitting, and in his eyes have done a nice job trying to fit things without destroying the nice mature trees that were there too. He didn’t have a major issue with allowing an acceptable deviation from our max grading and things if it means they are preserving some mature trees there.

Trustee Urbanowski said that was the one thing that she was going to agree with him on when they were talking about the 1-4 grading and then he said in that one little section that they will put it to 1-3 to save that tree, she thought that was fantastic. Mr. Stypula said that there were some nice trees out there and obviously they don’t want to go through and clear-cut those down, and thought it was a very nice area back there with the basketball court and they have a volleyball court, and some picnic space, and thought this would enhance the experience back there and be nice access to the community.

Trustee Urbanowski asked Planner Fazzini if he could go over again the overall open space calculation? She asked if it was too far off, is it not taking too much away from the overall open space? She said it is a community center. Planner Fazzini said that typically open space means yard it doesn’t say you can’t have a community center building/structure in an open space area. He said it was more of an existing condition comment if the current site meets open space or not then they could go from there to see what the reduction would be for the building, it is likely minor, building and parking lot would be the area coming out. The requirement is 500-sq. ft. per unit or 25,000-sq. ft. for the whole development whichever is greater. Mr. Stypula said that it was 420-sq. ft. and that it would be the 25,000-sq. ft.

Trustee Urbanowski questioned that the other question that was said something about planting trees over in the open space over a well, or something? She wondered if they needed some kind of waiver for them, are they required to put something there and they need to waive it, or is it not an issue? Chairman Reynolds thought that she was referring to the parking landscape requirements, that interfere with the well location? Mr. Stypula replied yes. Chairman Reynolds said technically speaking he thought that the ordinance speaks to that 200-ft. He thought that if there needs to be something there and they are ok with that one instance, and that is the one instance that prompts it, yes, he would say let’s have a waiver just to have it on record. To him, some of the things that are fitting and some of the creations of the distances are because they are fitting within existing trees in his opinion. Mr. Stypula said that in the comments because they are only a single isle it does note that the Commission can waive that requirement for the interior, and they would ask that that is waived.

Trustee Urbanowski asked if the four units were being put together? Mr. Stypula replied yes. He added that the roof structure is going to be constructed on-site but there will be basically four modular units that are brought in and put together and then the roof structure will be put on. Mr. Stypula thought that it had some nice architectural features, in it, not just a plain box.
Commissioner Walker asked how many trees they would be cutting down? Mr. Stypula replied that there will be eight trees. Chairman Walker questioned what the plans were for replacing them? Mr. Stypula replied that there will be several trees that they will be planting along the perimeter of the parking lot. He said that they have two additional trees that will be planted along the drive and then two planted on the northern part of the parking lot. He said that they have six additional trees planted evenly spaced throughout the open space. Commissioner Walker assumed that these trees will not be the same size trees that they will be cutting down. Mr. Stypula replied no. He said that they will be a two-inch caliper tree. Commissioner Walker asked if he knew the species of tree? Mr. Stypula replied that they have a split between a maple tree and a serviceberry tree. He said that the owner wouldn’t object if there was a preference as far as a tree species, they would be open to that as well. 

Secretary St. Henry said that he was part of the site walk team, and it is a very heavily wooded lot. They were wondering how it would all fit in there. Based on the site plan and the discussion today, he was very comfortable that the applicant has put together a design that will preserve as many trees as possible, which is great because there is a lot of mature trees there that add to the ambiance of the community center right on the lake. He thought it was good to see that they are only taking out eight trees because there are quite a few trees there.

Chairman Reynolds said that they have had some discussions on their Tree Ordinance, some of these trees are technically allowable to be removed because they are in the building footprint, in the building area. He added that only those that are technically protected or legacy trees are those that need to be replaced, and thought that they did a very nice job. A lot of people would come in and clear-cut this and then build the center and then come back and plant significantly less mature trees and were happy to see what they were doing there.

Chairman Reynolds said that they have spoken regarding the dumpster, he thought it would be good to have a waiver on that. Landscape interior requirements just because they have the opportunity to waive it and he thought that was one item that potentially got brought up in the Planners review. He asked what concerns for the open space or providing a waiver for that increase in open space? He thought if they were in support of it, they should just have those three waivers be made. He felt that it addresses all the open planning comments. He thought that the only item that he would like to add in the motion is that he didn’t have any issue with that they have agreed to meet all OHM requirements but wanted to add that if limiting their grading from 1-3 preserves existing trees he would be fine with that because item #4 speaks to recommending 1-4. Engineer Landis said he was fine with that, 1-4 is the recommended maximum but they do allow 1-3. Chairman Reynolds said that if they say meet OHM comments numbers 1-5 that would address that they don’t need anything additionally.

Moved by Trustee Urbanowski, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that the Planning Commission waive the dumpster requirement as they have a dumpster further away that can be used, and it was also stated that, if necessary, they can use a residential bin in front of the community center.

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

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Hoffman, that the Planning Commission waive the additional or the current open space criteria due to the fact that this an existing development of over 62-acres that is undergoing some major improvements and that the overall landscaping for the complex is being satisfied with the existing open space, the pond in the development satisfies the landscaping requirement.
Roll call vote was as follows: Gross, yes; Urbanowski, yes; Hoffman, yes; Gingell, yes; St. Henry, yes; Walker, yes; Reynolds, yes. Motion carried 7-0

Moved by Trustee Urbanowski, seconded by Commissioner Hoffman, that the Planning Commission waive the landscape requirements for the interior parking of this site.

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds asked if there were any findings of fact? Trustee Urbanowski replied yes.

Trustee Urbanowski amended the motion, Commissioner Hoffman re-supported to include that due to the fact that there is a well underneath that open space in the parking area.

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

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that the Planning Commission grant site plan approval for PC-2021-43, Orion Manufactured Home Community, Site Plan Amendment to add a community center, located at 47 Bluebird Hill Dr. (Sidwell #09-356-300-001) for plans date stamped received March 24, 2021 based on the following findings of fact: that this is an existing project which appears to be undergoing major improvements, it would be difficult and impractical to try to impose and determine all the area and bulk requirements, and the landscaping provisions of the zoning ordinance for the entire 62-acres; this proposal does represent a major improvement to the character and amenities to this community; this approval is based on the following finding conditions: that they have taken into account the planners conditions relative to the dumpster, and landscaping requirements, and that it is in compliance with the items 1-5 of the OHM report of April 7, 2021, and a final review of the landscape by the planners.

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

B. PC-2021-07, Master Plan Update Discussion

Planner Arroyo said he wanted to give them an update on what they showed them last time during the study session. He knew that they had made some comments and they have tried to reflect those. As they know they are preparing for the public Open House, so they thought that they would go through this one more time, and have a final discussion before they actually start to finalize the boards and get ready for the Open House which is coming in June.

Planner Arroyo said that they will be doing two Open Houses as part of this Master Plan. This one is the pre-planning one. Essentially the idea with this one is to get public input before they start to create any idea and planning policies. This is their chance to get some information that they think might be helpful to them as they go into the planning component. He said once they work with them to prepare a draft, they plan on having a second Open House so that they can share the ideas that they have developed and get public input as well on that. He wanted to make sure that they are clear that this is basically a two-part project, for this Open House. One is the pre-planning and the other will be once there is a draft in a position where they feel that they are ready to share that. He thought it was helpful in terms of understanding where they are going with the discussion. He wanted to go through and highlight what some of the changes were.
Planner Arroyo said that he has already talked about the community engagement that is already occurring. They already talked about the stations. One of their boards will be demographics and economics and that is more of an informational board although they are going to ask what type of employment centers and industries should the Township pursue and encourage, and what other comments would they like to offer related to these topics.

Planner Arroyo stated that the next one would be the market assessment survey. This is something that is actively being prepared. The Chesapeake Group who is working with them on this particular element is currently analyzing the information, as they know, there was that survey that went out, and then the data that has been collected, so they are going to have a really good snapshot of what the market can support in terms of looking at commercial, industrial, and housing/office uses. That is information that they will share as soon as they have it but they expect to have a board that will be available so they can share that with the public as well prior to the Open House.

Planner Arroyo said that the next board is housing, they talked about this first one as being more for the rural areas of the Township and talking about rural corridors and how development looks from the roadway. They are going to ask what the preferred road character is in these rural areas, is it maintaining the status quo, which is lots located adjacent to a thoroughfare or providing incentives for a setback so they can potentially preserve so that the development occurs farther from the road right-of-way, where the development isn’t right up to the roadway. Where they might not have natural vegetation but they may have some natural amenity that they might want to provide and then the lots would be behind this, so in exchange for providing that open space there might be a corresponding lot reduction in the lots themselves that is equal to the amount of open space that is being provided, so they are not penalizing. They might even incentivize it by providing a little bit more density to some developer that chooses to provide this type of amenity. That is a detail that comes through with implementation but the concept here is they are trying to get the public’s input on whether they think that this is something that makes some sense in the community.

Planner Arroyo said they will be doing a comparison of what the existing future plan classifications are with what the zoning ordinance calls for. The single-family low rural residential is the one unit for every 2.5-acres which is the equivalent of the Suburban Farms (SF) zoning district. This is more of an informational item because a lot of times at an open house there is sometimes confusion about what is the difference between the Master Plan and the zoning ordinance and these categories, they can start bringing up category names that don’t necessarily match. So, it is more of a helpful reference but they want to identify in particular is the 2.5-acre minimum lot size requirement for rural residential still practical and they want to get some input on that because there is some concern about the viability of, they don’t really see proposals coming in for 2.5-acre subdivisions any more. They do want to get some input and they want to have some discussion about that to see if, in fact, it is really something that the public feels strongly about and also ultimately how the Planning Commission feels about it, so this is an introduction to that process.

Planner Arroyo said also a check and balance on what is going on with certain types of developments with Planned Unit Developments (PUD) and Consent Judgements. These are instances where either someone has gone through the (PUD) process or the Township has settled a lawsuit related to housing, and they want to indicate what projects have been approved and what the density is, and how that actually related to what the future land use called for. He thought it was good information to share in case some questions come up about projects that are active in the community.
Planner Arroyo showed the Planning Commission the Future Land Use Map that they currently have adopted, they would have a current board with that on there indicating that part of this process the Planning Commission will be making updates to that and certainly if people have specific suggestions and they want to write them down they will have different forms people can fill out and they will also have an online opportunity where people can do that too. All the questions that are being asked in person at the Open House people will also be able to do that online. Even if they come to the Open House and they don’t want to touch the paper and the pens they could fill it out online while they are at the Open House, or they can go online through the website and do this without coming here at all. They want to make sure that it is available to everybody regardless if they come here or they attend online.

Planner Arroyo said the next one is getting input on different types of missing middle housing. This is an idea where they can show the public different types of essentially more house scale attached units and ask a few questions. Are these missing middle housing types appropriate in more densely populated areas of the Township? What are the preferred housing types for areas planned for denser development? Would their opinion about multiple family development be more favorable if that development had more open space? They are going to ask that question, that was an add on that was suggested, and he thought that was a good one.

Planner Arroyo said that they are going to talk about the single-family units and whether or not the garages are street facing, side facing, or recessed from the front of the living area. They are going to ask in terms of questions should the Township pursue and encourage different types of housing forms other than traditional single-family housing. Would their opinion change regarding new single-family residential development if smaller lots were built, but there was a corresponding increase in open space. That is another question about that tradeoff would they be willing to accept slightly smaller lots if these new single-family subdivisions had more open space. They would get the same number of units it is just the development scheme that they are looking at might look different and they might have the opportunity to showcase some open space areas.

Planner Arroyo said that they are going to get into their 15-minute neighborhood conversation. They are going to have an introduction as to what that really is and they are showing the hypothetical radii here depending on the type of transportation they are using. They are going to ask people if they support overall the concept of the 15-minute neighborhood. They are going to ask them if they use an electric vehicle whether it is a car, motorcycle, or truck. Then they are going to ask them if they use an electric bike. He thought it would be interesting to get a feel for those that attend if there is a use of those types of vehicles and thought it was an interesting question to ask. They have the 15-minute neighborhoods that they have identified the four different locations and they are showing the existing radii is what it really looks like if they use the current transportation system and try to bike or walk along these quarter-mile 5-minute walk, three quarter mile 15-minute, and then they show the 2-mile 10-minute bike ride, and the 3-mile, 15-minute bike ride. They are going to ask what uses would they like to see at the center of each of these 15-minute neighborhoods. What physical improvements would they like to see in terms of, safety paths, streetlights, bike lanes, and the like to make it easier to get to these. Then any other comments that they want to share about the 15-minute neighborhoods.

Planner Arroyo said that they are going to talk about the Village concept how they have two of these which is really more of the Village concept, feeding off the Village of Lake Orion and taking the area that goes into the Township and funneling it into the Village that becomes one center. And then the Gingellville area which is at Maybee and Baldwin, and that whole Baldwin corridor area that the Township has made a priority in terms of development and becoming more walkable. Also, with new transportation improvements with the boulevard and the
landscaping and a lot of what happened there really supports walkability. They are going to ask them if they support the concept of the 15-minute neighborhoods in these two locations which are village-based.

Planner Arroyo said that they are going to talk about the hamlets. They have two 15-minute neighborhoods the Decker and the Friendship Woods area. They are going to show some imaginies and they are going to ask them if they would support the hamlet concept with the different setbacks, really looking at having more of a front yard, not the zero setbacks or the reduced setback that they might find in a village setting. They are going to ask them if they think these locations are appropriate for it being the center of 15-minute neighborhoods.

Planner Arroyo stated that the natural features and sustainability, they are going to ask people how important sustainable development principles are. They are going to talk to them about what that means. They are going to ask them if the Township should require a developer to preserve large existing trees or require developers to pay into a tree fund, to install trees. They want to see what kind of support there is for some of what they are doing now and if there is continued support to strengthen that and get some information on how people feel about preserving that natural resource.

Planner Arroyo said there was a suggestion to talk about the fact that the Township doesn’t really have much control over the roadways within the Township. So, they will have a board that says the Townships in Michigan have a general lack of authority to build and improve roads, city and villages have that authority. At the Township level, Michigan law has transferred the responsibility primarily to County Road Commissions. There is the ability for the County Board of Commissioners to take that into control if they want, that has happened in Wayne & Macomb County’s but in Oakland County, it is the Road Commission for Oakland County that controls the Township roadways. They indicate that the Road Commissions can’t levy taxes, which some people say why doesn’t the Road Commission levy a tax? They are getting their funding from the gas tax and vehicle registration fees and then Federal and State funds are also there and there are matches that go along with that. That is the educational piece which is part of what they are doing, then they were going to ask for them to describe the condition of roads in the Township, and what their overall impression, and which roads should be widened to increase capacity, to get public input on that and see where some of those priorities are.

Planner Arroyos said complete streets – they are talking about nonmotorized transportation so they are showing proposed pathways, existing pathways, and community facilities that are located and then they have added parks as well. The other element that they were going to add on it was schools, and they are currently working on having that on there as well. So, what enhancements would they make to improve mobility, walkability, and cycling in the Township? Then circle the area on a separate sheet where they think there should be future pedestrian and bike path and bike lane connections. That way people can actually circle roadway segments that they believe is a priority. Another thing they are going to ask is how important is school location to their decision regarding their desired location for their home. Did they make their decision and would they make a decision if they were moving based upon school location? They are also going to ask, how important is close proximity to parks and trails in terms of their choice of home location. Is that something that is driving home location and would it if they were looking to move would they want to move closer to a trail or some type of park facility within the community, is that important to them?

Planner Arroyo said regarding land use, they are going to suggest that folks mark areas of the Township that have a potential for redevelopment. Is there an area that maybe has developed that they see as a resident or a business person where maybe there could be some redevelopment occurring to take a different approach to how something has already occurred?
Are there any missing land uses that should be in the Township, is there something here that is really missing? Someone may answer a certain store, or a certain type of industry, or a housing type. They don’t really know but it is kind of an open-ended question. Are there any land uses that the Township should discourage? Do they believe that they have enough of a certain type of land use, or they don’t want to see any more of a certain type of land use? He thought that he would get some good feedback on that.

Planner Arroyo showed the Planning Commissioners the developments that have occurred from 2019 through current. It was a development map that was helpful to show where development is happening and what type of development it is and what the requests are. He thought that would be helpful to people and then they can ask them their opinion of the recent developments in the Township. Do they see them as being positive, neutral, negative, and why? People can respond to them, they are reviewing site plans, they are applying the ordinance standards, he wants to hear what the public says about the quality of new development that is occurring within the Township.

Planner Arroyo said they have their spending priorities where people will have the opportunity to pretend, they have six million dollars in their hand and they can set priorities on how they would like to spend it. This is more of a capital improvements recommendation that deals with how the Township would spend money if they could spend money to improve certain public facilities, so this will, he thought, give them interesting insight on spending priorities.

Planner Arroyo stated that the next steps are finalizing these boards, they will have the QR codes to help with online participation. They have the date set for the Open House on June 16, 2021.

Chairman Reynolds said he wrote down when they were talking about population and just general demographics the question mark of trends, which he thought that he had addressed in some of the developments, he thought that was an interesting piece of info that maybe they have in the back of their minds. When people speak to something and then actually live it sometimes are two different things especially when it comes to development. He encouraged the use of some different kinds of language tools whether that be a postcard, infographics, or just visuals that speak to some of these ideas of like hamlets. He knew a lot of people have difficulty understanding the term but when they see a picture they would say “I like this”. He thought that was sometimes a good comment piece especially even for them as Planner Commission members, if it is not the Master Plan but if it is ordinance updates and the future to talk about bonus criteria and when they were talking briefly about density. What are those features that people really value and therefore what other criteria are they willing to compromise whether that be density, garages, or architectural significance if the landscaping and open space become more of a prevalent topic? He was looking forward to the Open House. He asked if the Open House was all in person? Planner Arroyo said that it will be in person but there will be an online option, so, they don’t have to come.

Trustee Urbanowski said that she agreed with finding out what the trends are what people would prioritize so that they know. If they are presenting one thing and it is an amazing thing but they are stuck on something else that they know where that creativity could come in, in terms of, incentivizing. She liked the Land Use map because sometimes people do get a little wrapped around the axel thinking that there is so much happening, it is nice to see what is happening and where it is and putting it into a visual. She was surprised that it was not fuller.

Secretary St. Henry said that it is only since 2019, and 2020 was kind of a wash. He asked if it was possible to have a map like this from the last time, they did the Master Plan until now? Like the last five years of development? Planner Arroyo replied that they don’t have it available. The
data is since they became their Planners, they track this and map it so they can pull it up and map it. Secretary St. Henry asked if the Township had some sort of graph or data? Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that they have the annual report. Chairman Reynolds asked if these were all active projects on the map or any project from 2019 – 2021? Planner Arroyo replied anything that was sent in for their review. Chairman Reynolds asked if this was on the website or they are working to put this on our website? Planner Arroyo said what will happen is that the Open House will be on the website, it will be in the Open House format, prior to June 16, 2021.

Trustee Urbanowski asked since they are doing that live and people can participate online, would it be that it would be open for a time after the Open House, or would this be that this is live now please take the opportunity now or will they have a chance later on? Planner Arroyo said that they would typically suggest that it become live the morning of the Open House because they want to create some excitement for the Open House and for people actually come that can come and are willing to come. They would suggest keeping it open for several days beyond that, but it is not meant to be long-term, it is really a short few day’s iterations where they want people to get on and do it. Probably 5 business days would be the maximum that they would want to have it available. People can come the day of the Open House and then have another four more days to go online if they didn’t get a chance to and then close it out so they can summarize it and start moving on to a plan. Chairman Reynolds said that the goal is to get them to come in person.

Trustee Urbanowski asked if they have done other Open Houses in other communities that were just outstandingly successful and they were like how did all these people get here? Planner Arroyo said that the best way is for them and for the Township Board Members to invite people they know. Just like with the survey, people respond to personal invitations more than they do to seeing something on social media or on a website. If they have five or ten people that they know that they think should participate in something like this and be active and call them, is probably the best thing. He thought that was the most effective thing and thought that is what has worked in a lot of the communities that they have seen a good turnout is personal invitations. They want to hear from them, they are planning the next 20-years of how this community is going to grow do they want to participate in that? Do they want to have input on what the Planning Commission is going to do with the direction of future growth? Most people will probably say yes.

Trustee Urbanowski said she sent an email to the board of her owners Home Owners Association and she put in the email line, something about their yearly dues, and they shared it on the Facebook page. Planner Arroyo said that they almost have to create something mildly controversial to get people’s attention.

Secretary St. Henry asked if he could walk them through briefly if someone was too long into the website for the Open House, what would they experience from home versus coming here? Planner Arroyo said what would happen is they would log on and there would be an introduction, just a page describing what this was all about. It will likely be going to be scrolling, he was going to have to verify, it will probably be a story map scroll is how they typically do it. They would then be able to scroll down and they would come to the very first board, and like the demographic board, they would be able to see that information zoom in on it and read it, and then they would get to the point where the questions are being asked. So, the questions would be there and they would click and they can actually answer those questions by clicking on their response. Then that would register and they would have that recorded once they do that. Then they would scroll to the next board read that board, then the questions would popup. It is kind of like they are scrolling through this information presented topic by topic as if they were walking from station to station. Because the way it is going to be here, they will have a table and it is
going to be the demographic table and it is going to have a couple of posterboards with the information on it and then there is going to be a couple of sheets down here where they can fill out the answer to the questions that are being asked. It is trying to replicate that same process of being at the Open House in person. Secretary St. Henry asked if there was any interactive chat with the Planning Commission members? Planner Arroyo replied no, not like at the Open House, they have to be at the Open House to have the chat component.

Vice-Chairman Gross said he wished they could get some age demographics because they are planning for the future and they don't know what they are planning for yet. Is it going to be an aging community? Will it maintain itself as a middle-aged community? Unfortunately, they don't have that information through the census because he thought it would be very helpful in assisting them in terms of giving them a heads up of what they are looking at in the future relative to their population makeup. Planner Arroyo said that they do have some pretty decent forecast from SMC about that that they can use to plan he thought. I will help, but at the same time with the Master Plan, they are also asking the question, do they want to try to attract a certain demographic that maybe is underrepresented or they would like to see more of. They can then decide whether a priority or not. He thought that was something that they are thinking about too as they go through this process and they are listening and they are there at the Open House and listening to what people say is that something that is important, should the Township be trying to attract to more young people, or people that are older, or in the middle, is that important and why is it important. Then they can think about things that they may want to do from a land use plan perspective that might foster that type of thing. Vice-Chairman Gross said it is going to be first home buyers, empty nesters, those types of housing things that he thinks they are going to be faced with in the future.

Secretary St. Henry asked Planning & Zoning Director Girling that years ago somebody presented information along those lines of projections of population ages and so forth to them and it looked out like ten years? Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that the former Planner did make a presentation. Perhaps the census information was available at that time.

Chairman Reynolds said all the more reason to encourage people to come, they don’t have to have qualifications, they don’t have to know even what a Master Plan is. Get them here, they have professionals to help facilitate the conversation. He thought that a lot of people are scared to speak up or get involved and this is exactly what this process is for is to connect resources and receive community input. He thought that was one of the leading ones and this is the time to speak up and they want to hear from them. Planner Arroyo said this is the perfect opportunity because they are not coming to a Planning Commission meeting and standing in front of a bunch of people and having to give a presentation where they might be intimidated. This is a place where they can come in and talk one on one with someone at a table. That is probably the most comfortable opportunity other than being online for trying to share their opinion. This is not something that they are going to be standing up in front of a bunch of people giving their opinion they are going to be able to walk around from table to table and talk to Planning Commissioners one on one and it is very welcoming environment.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said if they wanted to add a picture on their webpage where they are announcing the date. She asked if they had a picture that shows the tables too so they can see what it looks like. So, they can then see this is representative of what the format would be and maybe alleviate some of the anxiety on how this is being conducted. Planner Arroyo said that they will get them that.

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
None.
9. PUBLIC COMMENTS
None.

10. COMMUNICATIONS
None.

11. PLANNERS REPORTS/EDUCATION
None.

12. COMMITTEE REPORTS
None.

13. FUTURE PUBLIC HEARINGS
A. 5-19-21 at 7:05 p.m., PC-2021-45, Mountain Substation, Special Land Use Request for an electric substation located at unaddressed parcel 09-36-300-004 (a parcel north of 4879 Bald Mountain Road).

14. CHAIRMAN’S COMMENTS
None.

15. COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS
None.

16. ADJOURNMENT
Moved by Trustee Urbanowski, seconded by Commissioner Hoffman to adjourn the meeting at 8:11 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Walton
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary
Charter Township of Orion

Planning Commission Approve Date
TO: The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission

FROM: Tammy Girling, Planning and Zoning Director

DATE: May 13, 2021


The Planning Commission conditionally approved PC-2018-15, Stadium Ridge Residential Site Plan in 2019. On August 19, 2020 the applicant received a site plan extension of one year from the original approval date of May 15, 2019 (an excess of one year was administratively allowed due to Covid). The applicant is now requesting an additional extension to the expiration of the Site Plan. The applicant is very close to being able to pull a soil erosion permit (which would stop the site plan expiration clock).

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

**Site Plan Extension (Ord. 78, Article XXX, Section 30.01,C,11)**

**Motion 1:** I move that the Planning Commission **approves** the site plan extension request for PC-2018-15, Stadium Ridge Residential Site Plan for __________ (insert time frame). This **approval** is based on the following findings of facts: *(insert findings of facts)*.

Or

I move that the Planning Commission **denies** the site plan extension request for PC-2018-15, Stadium Ridge Residential Site Plan. This **denial** is based on the following findings of facts: *(insert findings of facts).*
TO: The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission
FROM: Tammy Girling, Planning and Zoning Director
DATE: May 13, 2021
RE: PC-2019-10, Stadium Ridge Commercial Site Plan Extension

The Planning Commission conditionally approved PC-2019-10, Stadium Ridge Commercial Site Plan on May 15, 2019. The applicant requested and received a one-year site plan extension on August 19, 2020 (administratively allowed to be over a year due to Covid). They are now requesting an additional extension to the expiration of the Site Plan. The project has made progress and is very close to being able to have their soil erosion issued which would stop the expiration of the site plan.

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

Site Plan Extension (Ord. 78, Article XXX, Section 30.01,C,11)

Motion 1: I move that the Planning Commission approves the site plan extension request for PC-2019-10, Stadium Ridge Commercial Site Plan for __________ (insert time frame). This approval is based on the following findings of facts: (insert findings of facts).

Or

I move that the Planning Commission denies the site plan extension request for PC-2019-10, Stadium Ridge Commercial Site Plan. This denial is based on the following findings of facts: (insert findings of facts).
TO: The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission
FROM: Tammy Girling, Planning & Zoning Director
DATE: May 13, 2021
RE: PC-2021-45, Mountain Substation SLU and Site Plan

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

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

**Motion 1:** I move that the Planning Commission approve/deny PC-2021-45, Mountain Substation, Special Land Use request for an electrical substation, located at unaddressed parcel, 09-36-300-004 (a parcel north of 4879 Bald Mountain Road) for plans date stamped received April 21, 2021. This approval/denial is based on the following finding of facts:

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

If Approved:
This approval is subject to the following conditions (insert any additional conditions).

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

**Motion 2:** I move that the Planning Commission grants site plan approval for PC-2021-45, Mountain Substation, located at unaddressed parcel, 09-36-300-004 (a parcel north of 4879 Bald Mountain Road) for plans date stamped received April 21, 2021. (motion maker to insert findings of facts). This approval is based on the following conditions:

a. (Motion maker to list any unresolved issues).
Or

I move that the Planning Commission **denies** site plan approval for PC-2021-45, Mountain Substation, located at unaddressed parcel, 09-36-300-004 (a parcel north of 4879 Bald Mountain Road) for plans date stamped received April 21, 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-2021-45, Mountain Substation, located at unaddressed parcel, 09-36-300-004 (a parcel north of 4879 Bald Mountain Road) for plans date stamped received April 21, 2021 for the following reasons (motion maker to indicate outstanding items to be addressed from the Planner’s and Engineer’s review letter(s)).
Special Land Use Review
Mountain Substation – DTE (Essential Service)

Case No: PC-2021-45
Site: 4879 Bald Mountain Rd
Applicant: DTE Electric Company
Plan Date: 04/24/2021
Zoning: Special Purpose 2 (SP-2)
Parcel ID: 09-36-300-004

The applicant is requesting special land use (SLU) approval to permit an unmanned electric substation on the east side of Bald Mountain Road, approximately 900 feet north of Premier Drive. Bald Mountain Road north of Premier Drive is an unpaved gravel road. The proposal meets the Zoning Ordinance definition of an essential service as it would be an electric public utility. Section 28.01 Essential Services states that such uses are exempt from the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance. However, under this section electrical substations shall be subject to the SLU provisions of Section 30.02.

Site Plan Review
As essential services are exempt from non-SLU regulations of the Zoning Ordinance, a site plan review of compliance with the Zoning Ordinance SP-2 district standards and General Provisions is not required. However, a site plan has been submitted as this is a requirement of special land use requests within the State of Michigan. Proposed improvements indicated on the plan set may be considered by the Planning Commission under the Section 30.02 requirements, specifically Section 30.02 13. a. through g. provided below. If desired, the Planning Commission may only require certain improvements or revisions under these standards (a. through g.) for granting special land use approval. Additionally, the Planning Commission may request additional information related to these standards.

30.02 – Special Land Use Procedures and Standards

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

13. Standards for Granting Special Land Use Approval. The Planning Commission shall approve special land uses upon determination that the proposed use will comply with all applicable requirements of the Ordinance, applicable standards for specific uses, and the following general standards.
a. Compatibility with Adjacent Uses. The proposed special land use shall be designed, constructed, operated and maintained so as to be compatible with uses of adjacent land. The site design of the proposed special land use shall minimize the impact of site activity on surrounding properties. In determining whether this requirement has been met, consideration shall be given to:

1) The location and screening of vehicular circulation and parking areas in relation to surrounding development.
   
   **SLU Application:** “This site will not impact activity on surrounding properties. It will be an unmanned substation with limited parking enclosed in fenced area.”
   
   **Planner Comments:** If desired, the Planning Commission may consider requiring additional landscaping along Bald Mountain Road to screen the proposed service drive area. Any additional landscaping required should be compatible with the propose utility use, such as additional shrubs instead of trees.

2) The location and screening of outdoor storage, outdoor activity or work areas, and mechanical equipment, in relation to surrounding development.
   
   **SLU Application:** “There will be no storing at the substation site will be enclosed with a fence.”
   
   **Planner Comments:** If desired, the Planning Commission may consider requiring additional landscaping along Bald Mountain Road or other perimeter property lines to screen the proposed equipment.

3) The hours of operation of the proposed use. Approval of a special land use may be conditioned upon operation within specified hours considered appropriate to ensure minimal impact on surrounding uses.
   
   **SLU Application:** “24 hours 7 days a week this substation is an unmanned facility”

4) The bulk, placement, and materials of construction of the proposed use in relation to surrounding uses.
   
   **SLU Application:** “All power lines will be within fenced area of substation grounds.”

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

   **SLU Application:** “This site is to add power to the Orion Township community, which will reduce the number of power usage in the surrounding areas.”
   
   **Planner Comments:** The Future Land Use Plan classifies the site as Research/Light Industrial. The FLU Plan does not align with the existing SP-2 zoning of the site and surrounding area to the southeast (Ajax).

   “Research/Light Industrial areas are intended to provide locations for research, laboratory and light industrial development including scientific research and development, training, and production of prototype products, plans or designs. Accessory commercial and office uses are also encouraged. Such uses are intended to be enclosed within a building and any external effects are not to be experienced beyond the property boundaries. This classification is further intended to encourage the development of a campus-type setting; to promote excellence in the design and construction of buildings, outdoor spaces, transportation facilities and streetscapes; to direct the development of workplaces consistent with the availability of public facilities and services, and; to work within the confines of the existing natural features. Correlating zoning classifications include Limited Industrial (LI) and Industrial Park (IP).”

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

   **SLU Application:** “This site will not impact any of these systems.”
   
   **Planner Comments:** We defer to other review agencies (Twp. Engineer, Sherriff, and Fire Dept.) on the review of adequate service by other essential public facilities and services.
d. Impact of Traffic. The location of the proposed special land use within the zoning district shall minimize the impact of the traffic generated by the proposed use on surrounding uses.
In determining whether this requirement has been met, consideration shall be given to:

1) Proximity and access to major thoroughfares. SLU Application: “The property is not on a main road and
   it will have no impact on traffic, this is an unmanned substation.”
2) Estimated traffic generated by the proposed use. SLU Application: 0
3) Proximity and relation to intersections. SLU Application: 20 to 75 feet
4) Adequacy of sight distances. SLU Application: 20 to 50 feet
5) Location of and access to off-street parking. SLU Application: None
6) Required vehicular turning movements. SLU Application: No
7) Provision for pedestrian traffic. SLU Application: No

Planner Comments: We defer to the Township Engineer on the review of traffic impacts.

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

   SLU Application: “No it will not impact the community, minimum noise for a substation”

   Planner Comments: If desired, the Planning Commission may request that the applicant address anticipated noise resulting from the facility given the proposed electric use. This could include anticipated decibel levels at the boundary of the site or beyond based on similar substations.

   Additionally, we defer to the Township Engineer on any potential dust impacts as the site would be paved with a combination of crushed stone and crushed limestone, which may need to be treated regularly to mitigate dust from any vehicles that may access the site.

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

1) The provision of landscaping and other site amenities. Provision of additional landscaping over and above the requirements of this Ordinance may be required as a condition of approval of a special land use.
   SLU Application: “Trees and fencing will be added to site”

   Planner Comments: If desired, the Planning Commission may consider requiring additional landscaping along Bald Mountain Road or other perimeter property lines to screen the proposed equipment.

The Planning Commission may wish to consider the appropriateness of the proposed 7-foot tall chain link fence capped with barbed wire to surround the stone area, specifically as the fence would be viewed from Bald Mountain Road. A detail of the proposed fence is provided on the plot plan. Barbed wire fencing is not prohibited by the Zoning Ordinance as this is an essential service.

However, the proposed fencing materials and landscaped screening of the fencing may be considered under this section. It may be beneficial for the applicant to address if other types of security fencing, such as wrought iron security fencing, have been used at other DTE sites that may be more attractive than chain link and barbed wire fencing. Thought Bald Mountain Road is unpaved and undeveloped in this area, it may be paved and developed in the future, which could increase the visibility of the site from the road.

2) The bulk, placement, and materials of construction of proposed structures in relation to surrounding uses.
   SLU Application: “Will be on DTE property only”
g. Isolation of Existing Land Use. The location of the proposed special land use shall not result in a small residential area being substantially surrounded by non-residential development, and further, the location of the proposed special land use shall not result in a small non-residential area being substantially surrounded by incompatible uses.

SLU Application: “This site is for an unmanned substation that's designed to bring power to the area to lessen the load on other substations in the community.”

Planner Comments: The proposal would not result in the isolation of any small residential areas as there are no existing residential uses within the immediate area.

Respectfully,

Giffels Webster

Eric Fazzini, AICP, CNU-A
Senior Planner
May 5, 2021

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

RE: Mountain Substation, PC-2021-45
    Site Plan Review #1

Received: April 21, 2021 by Orion Township

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

We have completed our review of Mountain Substation plan set. The plans were prepared by Black & Veatch LTD 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 with the understand that the proposed improvements are considered an Essential Service per Ordinance 78.

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:
The site is located on Bald Mountain Rd. north of Premier Dr. within the southwest ¼ of Section 26 of the Charter Township of Orion. The site is zoned Special Purpose (SP) and bound by parcels to the north of the property zoned Suburban Farms (SF), and parcels to the west zoned Industrial Park (IP), and parcels to the south and east zoned Special Purpose (SP).

The existing site is 3.69 acres and covered in trees and brush. There appears to be a 12-foot-wide overhead easement located along the west side of the site. The site has a local high point near the southern property line. There is a wetland and water of body located at the parcel boundary in the southwest of the parcel. There is also a swamp just east of the parcel boundary.

The proposed site includes a DTE substation surrounded by a gravel lot and gravel service drives. Two retaining walls are proposed to facilitate the construction of the site. A crane staging area and oil containment area are proposed on site as well.

WATER MAIN AND SANITARY SEWER:
The nearest water main is located around the nearest building on Premier Dr. and the nearest sanitary sewer is also located along Premier Dr. The applicant is proposing no water main or sanitary sewer on site.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT:
There are currently no stormwater facilities on site. The applicant is proposing to add a forebay and detention basin on the east side of the site that has an ultimate overflow to the northeast. Detention calculations were provided and an allowable outflow of 0.20 cfs/acre was used and appear acceptable.
The applicant has proposed collection via 6-inch diameter perforated pipe below the gravel yard which will outlet into the forebay. Off-site drainage will be routed through the site. The applicant has proposed two yard basins to capture the off-site drainage and then convey it northwest of the site where the water will outlet one of two end-sections. This matches the existing drainage pattern, as water currently flows from south to north.

There appears to be a discrepancy between the outflow pipe callouts on the Stormwater Management Plan. The inverts are called out as 18-inches in diameter, however the pipe callout calls for a new 12-inch storm outlet. Please clarify the discrepancy.

**PAVING/GRADING:**
The proposed site has a single access point located on Bald Mountain Rd. The service drive is proposed as 12” of crushed stone, 21AA.

Drive slopes appear to be highest at the drive approach with a slope of 8%. Pavement slopes are recommended to remain between 1% and 6% for drive areas, and between 1% and 4% for parking areas. Proposed pavement on site is all gravel. There is 21AA for the drive aisles and 17A for the areas around the substation units and other structures. The gravel section thickness for the 17A shall be identified in the plans.

Existing grades on site were provided via 1-foot contours. Proposed grades were shown primarily with 1-foot contours and wall grades. The site appears to maintain an average site slope of 1:4 with the exception of the northwest corner where some slopes reach 1:3 to match existing grades at the property border. The site grading appears to be acceptable.

Two retaining walls are proposed on site with fence located on the high side of the wall. At engineering, a retaining wall submittal package containing elevations and calculations shall be submitted for review.

**TRAFFIC & CIRCULATION:**
This site will experience minimal traffic and no traffic assessment is necessary. We defer any comment on internal site circulation to the Township Fire Department as it pertains to firetruck access and circulation.

**LANDSCAPING:**
A landscaping plan was included in the plan set. The proposed trees appear to be in locations that will not compromise the integrity of any of the retaining walls or underground utilities.

**NATURAL FEATURES:**

**Wetlands:**
There is a wetland located in the southeast corner of the site. The applicant does not appear to be proposing any work within the limits of the wetland, however, there does appear to be minor grading proposed within the 25-foot wetland buffer. The wetland buffer must be included in the plans and any impacts to this buffer must be summarized and quantified.

**Woodlands:**
No tree survey was included in the plans. The existing site appears to contain significant amounts of trees and vegetation. It is our understanding the applicant is exempt from providing a tree survey since the use is an Essential Service.

**CONCLUSION:**
In our opinion, the site plan as submitted is in substantial compliance as noted with the Township’s ordinances and engineering standards. We ask that any approval include the following:
1. The 25-foot wetland buffer and any associated impacts to the buffer must be shown in the plans.
2. A retaining wall submittal package must be provided for review at engineering.
3. 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 Gifling, Director of Planning and Zoning  
Lynn Harrison, Planning and Zoning Coordinator  
Jeff Williams, Township Fire Marshal  
Bill Basigkow, Water and Sewer Superintendent  
Saundra Roberts, DTF Energy  
Gregory Eskola, Black & Veatch LTD  
File
To: Planning Commission/Planning & Zoning Director  
From: Jeff Williams, Fire Marshal  
Re: PC-2021-45, Mountain Substation Special Land Use and Site Plan  
Date: 5/3/2021

The Orion Township Fire Department has completed its review of Application PC-2021-45 for the limited purpose of compliance with Charter Township of Orion Ordinance's, Michigan Building Code, and all applicable Fire Codes.

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

- Approved
- Approved with Requirements (See below)
- Not approved

Requirements:

- A Knox Box shall be located near or on the card reader stanchion. This will allow the fire department to gain access past the slide gate in the event of an emergency.

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: May 6, 2021  

Re: PC-2021-45 Mountain Substation Special Land Use and Site Plan  

Dear Tammy,

Department of Public Services has no objections or concerns on the above-mentioned project.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeffery T. Stout  
Director  
Department of Public Services
Charter Township of Orion Planning & Zoning Department
2525 Joslyn Rd., Lake Orion, MI 48360
P: (248) 391-0304 ext. 5000; Fax: (248) 391-1454

Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission
Special Land Use Approval Application

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

Project Name: Mountain Class "T" Substation

Name of Development/Business if applicable: DTE Electric Company

Name: DTE Electric Company
Address: One Energy Plaza
City: Detroit
State: MI
Zip: 48228
Phone: 
Cell: 
Fax: 
Email: 

Name: 
Address: 
City: 
State: 
Zip: 
Phone: 
Cell: 
Fax: 
Email: 

* 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.

Name: Neal Sklareczyk
Address: One Energy Plaza
City: Detroit
State: MI
Zip: 48228
Phone: 
Cell: 
Fax: 
Email: Neal.Sklareczyk@DTEEnergy.com

Name: Sondra Roberts
Address: One Energy Plaza
City: Detroit
State: MI
Zip: 48228
Phone: 313 335-8040
Cell: 
Fax: 
Email: Sondra.Roberts@DTEEnergy.com
Sidwell Number(s): 09-36-300-004

Location or Address of Property: Bald Vit

Nearest Intersection: Dutton

Acreage: 3.69

Current Use of Property: Jagen

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

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

Give a detailed description of the proposed use, if applicable please indicate the number and size of the buildings or units being proposed. Install a Skid mount substation to service customer’s requested load of 15.85MVA for a three building business park for indoor agriculture facility on the NW corner of Bald mountain and Dutton road in Orion township. The use of the Skid mounted substation allows for quicker connection in the initial substation configuration of a Class 12 with one transformer and two load carrying circuits. The work is necessary to serve new business load that cannot be sustained long term by the COLRD substation.

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 and proof of delivery.

AT&T
54 Mill St.
Pontiac, MI 48342

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

DTE Energy
37849 Interchange Dr.
Farmington Hills, MI 48335

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

Oakland County Water Resources Commission
wrcpermitting@oakgov.com
(electronic submittal only)

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

Road Commission of Oakland County (If applicable)
2420 Pontiac Lake Rd.
Waterford, MI 48328
The proposed special land use shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained so as to be compatible with uses of adjacent land. The site design of the proposed special land use shall minimize the impact of site activity on surrounding properties. In determining whether this requirement has been met please describe the consideration given to the following:

**Compatibility with Adjacent Uses**
- This site will not impact activity on surrounding properties. It will be an unmanned substation with limited public access in a fenced area.

**Location and Screening**
- Location and screening of outdoor storage, outdoor activity or work areas and mechanical equipment, in relation to surrounding development. There will be no storage at the substation site. The substation will be enclosed with a fence.

**Hours of Operation**
- The hours of operation of the proposed use: 24 hours, 7 days a week. This substation is a unmanned facility.

**Bulk, Placement, and Materials of Construction**
- The bulk, placement and materials of construction of the proposed use in relation to surrounding uses. All power lines will be run within the fenced area. Substation grounds will be enclosed with a fence.

**Compatibility with Master Plan**
- Describe how the proposed special land use is compatible with and in accordance with the general principles and objectives of the Orion Township Master Plan and how it promotes the intent and purpose of Zoning Ordinance 78.
- This site is to add power to the Orion Township community, which will reduce the number of power outages in the surrounding area.

**Public Services**
- Describe how the proposed special land use is located so as to be adequately served by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage systems, water and sewage facilities, and schools.
- This site will not impact any of these systems.
The location of the proposed special land use within the zoning district shall minimize the impact of the traffic generated by the proposed use on surrounding uses. Describe the consideration given to the following:

Proximity and access to major thoroughfares

The property is not on a main road and it will have no impact on traffic just a unman substation

Estimated traffic generated by the proposed use

Zero

Proximity and relation to intersections

80 - 15 feet

Adequacy of sight distances

26 - 50 feet

Location of and access to off-street parking

None

Required vehicular turning movements

No

Provision for pedestrian traffic

No

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

No it will not impact the community, minimal noise for a substation

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

Landscaping & other amenities

Trees and Fencing will be added to site

The bulk placement and materials of construction of proposed structures in relation to surrounding uses will be on the property only
Explain how the location of the proposed special land use does not result in a small residential area being substantially surrounded by non-residential development, and further, the location of the proposed special land use does not result in a small non-residential area being substantially surrounded by incompatible uses:

This site is for a woman who is designing and building a home to live in the area. No advertising or other business in the community.

Pursuant to Zoning Ordinance 78, Section 30.02 D a sign indicating the requested special land use shall be installed on the parcel(s) no less than 15 days prior to the scheduled public meeting. Please check one:

☑ I have reviewed Section 30.02 D and will install the sign(s) as required.
☐ I would like to lease signage from the Township and for it to be installed as required (please complete attached Sign Request Form).

I/We, the undersigned, do hereby submit this application for Special Land Use, pursuant to the provisions of the Charter Township of Orion Zoning Ordinance, Article 78, Section 30.02 and applicable ordinance requirements. In support of this request the above facts are provided. I hereby certify that the information provided is accurate and the application that has been provided is complete.

Signature of Applicant:  

[Signature]  

Date:  

Print Name:  

[Print Name]

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

Signature of Owner:  

[Signature]  

Date:  

Print Name:  

[Print Name]
Explain how the location of the proposed special land use does not result in a small residential area being substantially surrounded by non-residential development, and further, the location of the proposed special land use does not result in a small non-residential area being substantially surrounded by incompatible uses:


Pursuant to Zoning Ordinance 78, Section 30.02 D a sign indicating the requested special land use shall be installed on the parcel(s) no less than 15 days prior to the scheduled public meeting. Please check one:

☑️ I have reviewed Section 30.02 D and will install the sign(s) as required.

☐ I would like to lease signage from the Township and for it to be installed as required

(please complete attached Sign Request Form).

If/We, the undersigned, do hereby submit this application for Special Land Use, pursuant to the provisions of the Charter Township of Orion Zoning Ordinance; No. 78, Section 30.02 and applicable ordinance requirements. In support of this request the above facts are provided. I hereby certify that the information provided is accurate and the application that has been provided is complete.

Signature of Applicant: [Signature]
Print Name: [Print Name] Date: 3/31/2021

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: [Signature]
Print Name: [Print Name] Date: 3/30/2021
Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission
Site Plan Approval Application

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

Project Name: Mountain Class "T" Substation

Name of Development if applicable: ______________________________________________________________________

Name of Applicant: ____________________________
Address: 1 Energy plaza 1510WCB City: Detroit State: MI Zip: 48226
Phone: (313) 235-8040 Cell: (313) 460-8442 Fax: ____________________
Email: Saundra.Roberts@dteenergy.com

Name of Property Owner(s): ____________________________
Address: 1 Energy plaza 1535 WCB City: Detroit State: MI Zip: 48226
Phone: (313) 235-8440 Cell: ____________________ Fax: ____________________
Email: ____________________

* 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.

Name of Plan Preparer Firm/Person: ____________________________
Address: 1 Energy plaza City: Detroit State: MI Zip: 48226
Phone: (734) 552-9313 Cell: ____________________ Fax: ____________________
Email: neal.sklarczyk@dteenergy.com

Name of Project Contact Person: ____________________________
Address: 1 Energy plaza 1510WCB City: Detroit State: MI Zip: 48226
Phone: (313) 235-8040 Cell: (313) 460-8442 Fax: ____________________
Email: saundra.roberts@dteenergy.com
Sidwell Number(s): 09-36-300-004

Location or Address of Property: unknown

Side of Street: West Side of DTE property  Nearest Intersection: Bald mountain and Dutton

Acreage: 3.69  Current Use of Property: Vacant - Brassy with some trees

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

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

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

________________________________________

Give a detailed description of the proposed development, including the number and size of the buildings or units being proposed: Install a Class “T” substation to serve customer’s requested load of 15.8 MVA for a three building indoor agriculture facility on the northwest corner of Bald Mountain and Dutton Rd.

The use of a Class “T” substation allows for quicker connection in the initial substation configuration with one transformer, 2 position POC and two load carrying circuits.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AT&amp;T</th>
<th>Oakland County Water Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54 Mill St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wrpermitting@oakgov.com">wrpermitting@oakgov.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac, MI 48342</td>
<td>(electronic submittal only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consumers Power Company</th>
<th>Oakland County Health Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>530 W. Willow St.</td>
<td>Building 34 East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing, MI 48906</td>
<td>1200 N. Telegraph Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pontiac, MI 48341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DTE Energy</th>
<th>Road Commission of Oakland County (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37849 Interchange Dr.</td>
<td>2420 Pontiac Lake Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington Hills, MI 48335</td>
<td>Waterford, MI 48328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Signature of Applicant:  [Signature]

Print Name:  [Name]

Date:  4/23/2021

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:  [Signature]

Print Name:  [Name]

Date:  [Date]

Version 12/7/20
TO: The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission
FROM: Tammy Girling, Planning & Zoning Director
DATE: May 13, 2021
RE: PC-2021-42, Fed-Ex Site Plan Modification

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

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

Motion 1: I move that the Planning Commission grants site plan approval for PC-2021-42, Fed-Ex Site Plan Amendment, located at 1601 Brown Road (parcel 09-34-300-030) and vacant parcels, parcels 09-34-300-019, 09-34-300-020, 09-34-300-021 and 09-34-300-024 (parcels north of 1601 Brown Road) for plans date stamped received 4/26/21 based on the following findings of facts (motion make to insert findings of facts).

This approval is based on the following conditions:

· (Motion maker to list any unresolved issues related to Township Planner’s review).
· (Motion maker to list any unresolved issues related to Township Engineer’s review).
· (Motion maker to list any unresolved issues related to Fire Marshall’s review).
· Approval of the combination of the parcels.
· Approval of the lots being vacated from the Liberty Tech Plat.
· RCOC approval of Liberty Drive changes.
· (Motion maker to list any additional conditions).

Or

I move that the Planning Commission denies site plan approval for PC-2021-42, Fed-Ex Site Plan Amendment, located at 1601 Brown Road (parcel 09-34-300-030) and vacant parcels, parcels 09-34-300-019, 09-34-300-020, 09-34-300-021 and 09-34-300-024 (parcels north of 1601 Brown Road) for plans date stamped received 4/26/21. 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-2021-42, Fed-Ex Site Plan Amendment, located at 1601 Brown Road (parcel 09-34-300-030) and vacant parcels, parcels 09-34-300-019, 09-34-300-020, 09-34-300-021 and 09-34-300-024 (parcels north of 1601 Brown Road) for plans date stamped received 4/26/21 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)).
Site Plan Review #2
FedEx Ground Parking Expansion

Case No: PC-2021-42
Site: Liberty Drive South
Applicant: J.D.C. Developments, LLC
Plan Date: 04/26/2021
Zoning: IP Industrial Park
Parcel ID: 09-34-300-019, -020, -021, -024

Dear Planning Commission Members:

We have completed a review of the application referenced above and a summary of our findings begins on the following page. Items in **bold** require specific action. Items in *italics* can be addressed administratively.
SUMMARY OF REVIEW

Administrative
1. **Liberty Drive South.** If approved, it may be beneficial for the Planning Commission to consider a condition of approval that ties permitting the proposed improvements within the current Liberty Drive right-of-way to the applicant obtaining the required RCOC approvals to ensure that improvements within the right-of-way would not be permitted should the applicant be unable to satisfy RCOC requirements for eliminating this portion of the Liberty Drive right-of-way and road.

2. **Liberty Techne Center Subdivision.** We defer to the Planning Director and Township Engineer on if any modifications are required to eliminate this portion of Liberty Drive as it relates to the approved subdivision, and if the proposed safety path along the east side of Liberty Drive satisfies any existing subdivision requirements for sidewalks along Liberty Drive adjacent to the proposed site.

3. **Brown Road Access Drive.** We defer to the Fire Department and Planning Director on the proposed removal of the gated Brown Road access drive as this access may have been an improvement required as part of the previous site plan approval for FedEx.

4. **Previous Approvals.** This review did not consider any conditions of approval that may have previously been imposed on the FedEx site by the Planning Commission, if any.

Zoning Ordinance Compliance
5. **18.03 C. & 27.04 A. Off-Street Parking Setbacks.** No parking area or driveway shall be closer than 20 feet to the adjacent property line. The required setback for parking may be reduced in width or waived by the Planning Commission only when existing parking or drives are located within the setback area.

6. **18.03 D. Landscaping Greenbelt.** A landscaped greenbelt at least 20 feet in width shall be provided along the entire perimeter of the zoning lot when the parcel abuts industrial zoned property. The landscaped greenbelt may be reduced in width or waived by the Planning Commission only when existing parking or drives are located within the setback area.
   a. The proposed setback and greenbelt from the north parking expansion area is indicated as 16.5 feet immediately to the east of the proposed Liberty Drive access point. The plan should be revised to provide 20 feet adjacent to the three affected spaces in this area as these two sections cannot be waived by the Planning Commission in this instance.

7. **18.03 I. Covered Trash Areas.** The Planning Commission may, at their discretion, waive the requirements for a covered trash receptacle as described herein, if, after considering the nature of the operation being proposed, the Commission determines that the amount of trash generated can be adequately disposed of without use of an outside trash receptacle.
   a. A covered trash receptacle is not proposed. Approval of a waiver is required to not provide.

8. **18.03 M. Safety Paths.** The Township Safety Path Map indicates a proposed safety path along Giddings Road and along Brown Road just south of its intersection with Giddings Road. To the west of this location along Brown Road, the map indicates a safety path along the south side of Brown Road and not along the north side of Brown Road, which is the majority of the site’s frontage.
a. The site plan does not appear to be in compliance with the safety path map for the portion of Brown Road frontage just south/west of its intersection with Giddings Road (see image). Previous township action regarding the requirement of safety paths along Brown Road in this location should be considered as it is likely that safety paths were reviewed as part of previous site plan approvals for FedEx. We defer to the Township Engineer as far as any determination that a safety path is required along the north side of Brown Road.

![Diagram of Brown Road area showing safety paths and trails]

**Project Summary**

The applicant is proposing to reconfigure and expand parking for the FedEx Ground facility located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Brown Road and Giddings Road. The majority of proposed improvements are to the north of the existing building, with a small parking expansion area to the southwest of the building along Brown Road.

**North Parking Reconfiguration & Expansion**

The proposal would eliminate the existing trailer parking area to the west of the existing Liberty Drive cul-de-sac and also eliminate the existing vehicle parking area to the east of the same cul-de-sac, both of which are detached from the main FedEx site but connected to it through an access drive from the trailer parking area. All existing parking and access improvements within this area north of the building would be eliminated in favor of a new larger parking area with 137 trailer spaces and 197 van/auto spaces. Direct access would be provided from Liberty Drive and an additional south access drive to the main building site is indicated. Access from Liberty Drive would be restricted with a 15-foot dual overhead truss gate and an 8-foot tall fence would enclose the entire perimeter of the parking area. Three retaining walls are proposed along the south and rear boundary of the parking area. A sidewalk is proposed along the east boundary of the site near Giddings Road, and a safety path is proposed along the east side of Liberty Drive.

**Liberty Drive South**

As part of the north parking expansion, the south approximate 500 feet of Liberty Drive right-of-way and road improvements would be eliminated to accommodate the proposed parking area. A note on the preliminary site plan sheet C-3.0 states that all work within the Liberty Drive right-of-way is under the jurisdiction of the Road Commission for Oakland County and requires a permit.
As the site plan includes improvements within a portion of area that is currently right-of-way for Liberty Drive, we defer to the applicant and Township Engineer on verification that RCOC permit requirements will be satisfied as it relates to these improvements and any vacation of right-of-way for this portion of Liberty Drive that will be required to permit private improvements within this area. If the site plan is approved, it may be beneficial for the Planning Commission to consider a condition of approval that ties the site plan improvements within this area to the applicant obtaining the required RCOC approvals. This would be to ensure that improvements within the right-of-way would not be permitted should the applicant be unable to satisfy RCOC requirements for eliminating this portion of the Liberty Drive right-of-way and road.

**Liberty Techne Center Subdivision**

The expansion area includes four new lots (six total) within an existing industrial subdivision known as Liberty Techne Center. We defer to the Planning Director and Township Engineer on if any modifications are required to eliminate this portion of Liberty Drive as it relates to the approved subdivision. This consideration should also include any previous requirements for sidewalks within this subdivision along Liberty Drive. We defer to the Township Engineer if the proposed safety path along the east side of Liberty Drive satisfies any existing requirements for sidewalks within this subdivision adjacent to the proposed site.

**South Brown Road Parking Expansion**

The proposal also includes the expansion of the existing parking area that fronts Brown Road. This parking area would be expanded by 41 spaces on the west end and requires the removal of an existing gated asphalt access drive and curb cut onto Brown Road. This expanded parking area would have the same depth and layout as the current parking area along Brown Road. We defer to the Fire Department and Planning Director on the proposed removal of the gated Brown Road access drive as this access may have been an improvement required as part of the previous site plan approval for FedEx.

**Existing Conditions**

1. **Site.** The main existing FedEx building site is indicated on the overall site plan as 25.72 acres. With the north expansion area known as phase II included in this area, the entire site is indicated as 39.15 acres. The existing main FedEx building is indicated as 240,164 sq. ft. A smaller building is indicated to the south of the main building with an undescribed area and use. It appears that the existing main FedEx site and north expansion area around the Liberty Drive South cul-de-sac previously obtained Planning Commission site plan approval. As information on previous Planning Commission site plan approvals has not been provided for reference, this review does not consider any conditions of approval or other requirements that may have previously been imposed on the site by the Planning Commission, if any.

2. **Zoning.** The site is zoned IP Industrial Park. The IP District permits “packaging and/or parcel delivery services” and “warehousing and wholesale establishments, storage and transfer facility” uses by right with no use-specific footnote conditions. The site is not located within any overlay districts.

3. **Adjacent zoning & land uses (from boundary of FedEx property).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>IP Industrial Park</td>
<td>Liberty Techne Center Industrial Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>IP Industrial Park</td>
<td>Transmission Line Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>I-1 &amp; I-2 (Auburn Hills)</td>
<td>Auburn Hills DPW &amp; County Animal Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>IP, OP, and LL</td>
<td>CB Steel Group and Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

www.giffelswebster.com
Zoning Ordinance Compliance Table

4. IP District. The below table indicates compliance with the IP district requirements in Article XVII. 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 beginning on page two.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article XVII – Industrial Park (IP)</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>18.01 – Use Matrix</strong></td>
<td><strong>(18.02 Footnotes)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging and/or parcel delivery services</td>
<td>Permitted (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing and/wholesale establishments, storage and transfer facilities</td>
<td>Permitted (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18.03 – Required Conditions (see ZO for full text)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Off-Street Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 1 space per 1,000 sf GFA or 1 space per employee (greater) +</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 additional space per every 4 required spaces if more than 1 shift</td>
<td>(558 spaces proposed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parking area/driveway setback: 20’ to adjacent property line</td>
<td>Not met (16.5’ at c-d-s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Internal roadway setback: 100’ to adjacent property line</td>
<td>N/A (none proposed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. All internal roadways and driveways in front yard cont. curbed</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All roadways, driveways, and parking hard surfaced</td>
<td>Approved by PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Compliance with 27.04</td>
<td>See 5. General Provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Parking setback may be reduced/waived abutting comm./ind. zone</td>
<td>N/A (no existing parking/drives in setback)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. When existing parking, drives, and/or structures are within setback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Landscaping</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Landscape plan required in compliance with 27.05</td>
<td>See 5. General Provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Greenbelts (perimeter): 20’ abutting comm./ind. zoning</td>
<td>Not met (16.5’ at c-d-s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Off-street parking screened from res. property (berm/wall/landsc.)</td>
<td>N/A (no adjoining res.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Landscaping and screening maintenance</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Greenbelt may be reduced/waived abutting comm./ind. when</td>
<td>N/A (no existing parking/drives in setback)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existing parking, drives, and/or structures are within setback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Sign Regulations – Ordinance No. 153</strong></td>
<td>Not reviewed with SPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Lighting Regulations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Lighting plan required in compliance with 27.11</td>
<td>See 5. General Provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Site lighting fully shielded and directed downward to prevent glare</td>
<td>Met (full cutoff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Illumination (max): 1.0 fc along non-residential property lines</td>
<td>Met (along non-internal PL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Public Road Access</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Internal public road minimum r/w of 60 feet</td>
<td>Met (Liberty Dr 70’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Direct access to major thoroughfare with min. r/w 120’</td>
<td>Met (existing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. Utilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All servicing business structure buried underground</td>
<td>N/A (no proposed structures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Covered Trash Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 3-sided masonry brick-type wall 1’ higher; located in the rear yard</td>
<td>Waiver: to not provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Opaque lockable gate same height as brick-type wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PC may waive requirement (or need) for an outside trash receptacle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J. Loading and Unloading</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Shall not interfere with parking or obstruct ingress and egress</td>
<td>N/A (no proposed loading and unloading areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Located in the rear/side yard</td>
<td>N/A (no proposed truck wells)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Truck wells prohibited in front yard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K. Performance Guarantee (Twp Clerk) – 30.09</strong></td>
<td>Administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L. General Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Operational Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M. Safety Paths – Ordinance No. 97 (overrides SP Map)</strong></td>
<td>Giddings Road: Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Road: Incomplete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### N. Tree Preservation – 27.12

### O. Wetland Setbacks – 27.17

See 5. General Provisions

The below table indicates compliance with the IP district requirements for the expansion areas only. Please refer to the Site Data Table on sheet C-2.0 for compliance related to existing improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback (from future r/w line)</td>
<td>50 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setback (opposite front)</td>
<td>50 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Setback (any non-front/rear)</td>
<td>20 ft on each side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area Total Industrial Park</td>
<td>20 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area Each Principal Structure/Use</td>
<td>2 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height of All Structures</td>
<td>40 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Clear Space Around Structures</td>
<td>15 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A (no proposed structures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met (39.15 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A (no proposed structures)</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>Not met (16.5’ at c-d-s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.b. Parking Spaces for Physically Handicapped</td>
<td>Defer to Building Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.c. Maneuvering Lanes. 25’ setback from res. zoning</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.d. Surfacing and Drainage</td>
<td>Defer to Twp. Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.e. Lighting</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.f. Screening and Landscaping, Parking screened from res. prop.</td>
<td>Met (no adjoining res.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Parking Chart</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Off-Street Loading and Unloading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.c. Industrial Districts</td>
<td>N/A (no proposed loading and unloading areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.d. Suitable plant material surfacing</td>
<td>Met (seed lawn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.d.i. Landscaped open space area</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.d.iv. Underground irrigation or acceptable water supply</td>
<td>Met (irrigated)</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 (abutting res.)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interior Parking Lot Landscaping (greater than 20 spaces)</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Materials Standards and Specifications</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Installation and Maintenance</td>
<td>Defer to Building Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Regulations Pertaining to Existing Plant Material</td>
<td>See Tree Protection memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Prohibited Plant Materials</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Acceleration/Deceleration/Passing Lanes</th>
<th>Defer to Twp. Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. Safety Pathways. Construction specifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.11 Lighting Regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Submittal Requirements</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Non-Residential Lighting Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Fully shielded and directed downward to prevent glare</td>
<td>Met (full cutoff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum intensity 20 fc at base of light fixture</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.a. Illumination (max): 1.0 fc along non-residential property lines</td>
<td>Met (along non-internal PL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum light intensity at ground level 0.3 fc anywhere</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot Average Minimum Illumination 0.9 fc</td>
<td>Met (3.6 fc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.b. Fixture types</td>
<td>Met (LED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.c. Planning Commission may approve decorative/historic fixtures</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.d. Maximum height of pole fixtures 20’ from ground level; 30’ permitted where fixtures no closer than 200’ from res. district</td>
<td>Met (30’ setback from res.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Building-Mounted Lighting</td>
<td>N/A (no proposed structures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Prohibited Lighting Types</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.12 Tree and Woodlands Protection (see ZO for full text)</td>
<td>Permit included with SPR (see Tree Protection memo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.14 – Access Management (see Zoning Ordinance for full text)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.1-6. Driveway Standards</td>
<td>Defer to Twp. Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Clear Vision Areas and Buffer Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.17 Wetland Setbacks (see ZO for full text)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All structures or buildings: 25’</td>
<td>Met (no wetlands present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lots: 25’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets, roads, driveways: 25’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully,

Giffels Webster

Eric Fazzini, AICP, CNU-A
Senior Planner
May 12, 2021

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

RE: FedEx Parking Expansion, PC-2021-42
Site Plan Review #2

Received: April 26, 2021 by Orion Township

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

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

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:
The site is located at 1601 Brown Rd. south of the cul-de-sac at the end of Liberty Dr. in the southwest quadrant of Section 34 of the Charter Township of Orion. The site is zoned Industrial Park (IP) and bound by parcels to the north, east, and west of the property zoned Industrial Park (IP). There is one parcel southwest of the site zoned Office and Professional (OP). The site is located on the southern border of the Township, with the City of Auburn Hills on the opposite side of Brown Rd.

The existing site consists 240,164 SF industrial FedEx building with a large multi-parcel parking lot that is currently connected via concrete sidewalk along the west side of Giddings Rd. Some parking is accessible from Liberty Dr. and the rest is accessible from the approach at the intersection of Brown and Giddings. Currently, two parcels north of the building in Liberty Technic Center are used for parking associated with the FedEx building.

The applicant is proposing to construct additional parking (197 van/auto and 137 trailer) in six Liberty Technic Center parcels north of the building and extend the southern parking lot off Brown Road further west to construct additional parking (41 car spaces). The plans include shortening Liberty Dr. and installing a new cul-de-sac further north. The approach for the FedEx parking will be located on the southern tip of this cul-de-sac. The proposed work also includes utility work to facilitate the additional parking and removal of an asphalt access drive located in the southwest corner of the site.

Some of the proposed site features (such as light poles, storm structures, etc.) are located adjacent to the Consumers 22-inch gas line and will require approval from Consumers Energy.

Liberty Dr. Right-of-Way is under the jurisdiction of the Road Commission for Oakland County. Therefore, the proposed modifications to Liberty Dr. and its Right-of-Way will require a permit from the RCOC.
WATER MAIN AND SANITARY SEWER:
The existing water main on site consists of 8-inch main that surrounds the building with two connections to the 16-inch main located along Brown Rd. There is also 12 inch water main that extends south along Liberty Dr. There appear to be nine hydrants on site around the building, with another hydrant adjacent the existing trailer to located north of the building on Liberty Dr. The applicant is not proposing any changes to the water main around the building at this time. The applicant is proposing to reconfigure some of the hydrant locations along Liberty Dr. south to accommodate the new parking lots. Existing and proposed easements have been included for the water main. At engineering, grades shall be provided to confirm that there will be sufficient cover overtop the water main.

There is existing 8-inch sanitary sewer that extends around the west side of the building. The 8-inch sanitary connects to a 12-inch sanitary that runs down the east side of Liberty Dr. before heading west just north of the building. The applicant is proposing to adjust and reconstruct some structures to match the proposed pavement elevation, but no changes are proposed to the alignment. The existing sanitary sewer easements have been included in the plans.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT:
The site has an existing storm water network that outlets into one of two detention basins north of the site. The Liberty Techno Center industrial park has been developed to detain the stormwater runoff from these lots up to a C-value of 0.9 which the applicant has noted in the plans.

The site plan has included a drainage area map showing the proposed tributary area to each basin confirming the original design for each respective basin will not be exceeded. The parking expansion in the southwest corner of the site appears to be ~0.2 acres. At engineering, it will be necessary to verify the two catch basins located east of the parking expansion near Brown Rd. are sufficient to capture the added capacity and the existing detention has capacity. Conveyance calculations will be required at engineering.

TRAFFIC & CIRCULATION:
The site currently has direct access to Liberty Dr. as well as the intersection at Giddings and Brown Rd. The proposed plan has essentially the same access with the exception that the access to Liberty Dr. will be relocated further north to make room for more parking area. The applicant is proposing to shift the cul-de-sac on Liberty Dr. further north and will install a 15-foot overhead truss gate for secured access. Gate access throughout the site should be reviewed and approved by the Orion Township Fire Department. The van/auto parking spaces in the northern parcel are proposed at 12 feet wide by 30 feet deep. The trailer parking spaces are proposed at 11.5 feet wide by 60 feet deep. Minimum drive aisle widths appear to be 31 feet in the northern parking lots. The car parking spaces near Brown Rd are proposed 9 feet wide by 19.5 feet deep. The drive aisles in the car parking lot appear to match the existing drive aisle width of 21 feet which should be acceptable given the extra depth of the parking stalls.

The applicant has provided safety path along the east side of the Liberty Dr. cul-de-sac extending from the concrete sidewalk near the dual overhead truss gate to the northern limits of the property frontage. Safety path should also be provided on the west side of the cul-de-sac to the northern property limits including a crossing at the south end of the cul-de-sac. The pathway pavement section is shown at 8 feet wide with a pavement section of 3 inches of HMA over 4 inches of aggregate base but should include the required soil sterilant.

It is our understanding the additional parking is needed due to an increase in operations at the existing facility. Semi-trailers will continue to enter the site through the signal at Brown/Giddings, be loaded inside the facility and then leave the site through the same signalized intersection. It appears the existing left turn lane on Brown Road has sufficient storage. The vans for the new northern parking area will enter the site from Giddings/Liberty Tech Dr, be loaded inside the site and exit through the signalized intersection on Brown Rd. Similarly, the existing left turn lane on Brown Road appears to have sufficient storage. Based on this understanding, we do not believe a traffic impact study is warranted.
PAVING & GRADING:
Proposed pavement grades appear to be between 1% and 6% for drive areas, and between 1% and 4% for parking areas. The applicant has included several different pavement sections within the parking areas. A summary of the proposed sections vs. required pavement sections and/or comment has been provided in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Area</th>
<th>Proposed Pavement Section</th>
<th>Required Pavement Section/Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Dr. cul-de-sac</td>
<td>8” deep strength asphalt</td>
<td>Subject to RCOC approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Rd parking (41 car)</td>
<td>Std duty (4” asphalt over 8” 21AA aggregate)</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van/Auto parking</td>
<td>Heavy duty (4” asphalt over 10” 21AA aggregate)</td>
<td>Recommend drive isle from trailer lot to Liberty to be 9” asphalt over approved base. Applicant matching Phase 1 section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailer parking</td>
<td>8” concrete over 6” 21AA aggregate</td>
<td>Recommended 9” concrete over approved base. Applicant matching Phase 1 section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete sidewalk</td>
<td>4” concrete over 4” aggregate base</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety path</td>
<td>3” asphalt over 4” aggregate base</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing grades are shown via a combination of one-foot contours and spot grades on curbs and rims. The drainage pattern for the undeveloped northern parcels generally flows from Liberty Dr. outward to either a wetland on the west side of one of two detention basins located on either side of Liberty Dr.

The proposed grades are shown via contours in green space and spot grades in paved areas. The proposed grading east of the safety path adjacent to the cul-de-sac is shown at 1:3. Since this slope is adjacent to the existing detention pond, the slope should be increased to 1:4 or a fence provided. Slopes beyond the parking lot are shown at the township maximum 1:3 to avoid impacts to the wetlands.

More grading information will be required for the concrete sidewalk and the public pathway at engineering.

There are two retaining walls proposed around the parking lots in the northern parcel. Retaining wall plans, elevations and design calculations must be provided at engineering for any wall over 3 feet in height.

LANDSCAPING:
A landscaping plan was included in the plan set. Proposed trees have been relocated to avoid utility easements to the extent possible.

NATURAL FEATURES:
WETLANDS:
There are existing wetlands and a conservation easement to the west of the northern parking lots. The applicant shows no work proposed within the easement or within the limits. If work were to take place within the easement, a permit would be required from the Township and EGLE.

WOODLANDS:
A tree survey was included in the plans. Landmark and replacement trees were tabulated and summed on sheet T-1.4. The proposed parking expansion requires significant tree clearing in the northern parcels.

CONCLUSION:
In our opinion, the site plan as submitted is in substantial compliance with the Township’s ordinances and engineering standards. We ask that any approval include the following:
1. The proposed grading east of the safety path adjacent to the cul-de-sac is shown at 1:3. Since this slope is adjacent to the existing detention pond, the slope should be increased to 1:4 or a fence provided.

2. Extend safety path along the west side of the cul-de-sac to the northern frontage and include a crossing at the south end of the cul-de-sac.

3. 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
    J.D.C. Developments, LLC
    Jim Butler, PFA Group
    File
To: Planning Commission/Planning & Zoning Director  
From: Jeff Williams, Fire Marshal  
Re: PC-2021-42, FedEx Ground Parking Expansion, Site Plan, 2nd Submittal  
Date: 05/07/2021

The Orion Township Fire Department has completed its review of Application PC-2021-42 for the limited purpose of compliance with Charter Township of Orion Ordinance's, Michigan Building Code, and all applicable Fire Codes.

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

- Approved
- X Approved with Requirements (See below)
- Not approved

Requirements:

- The Dual Overhead Truss Gate shall have emergency siren activation feature and comply with International Fire Code, UL 325 and ASTM F2200.

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

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

Sincerely,

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

Department of Public Services has no objections or concerns on the above-mentioned project.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeffery T. Stout
Director
Department of Public Services
March 25, 2021

Orion Township
ATTN: Tammy Girling
2525 Joslyn Road
Lake Orion, MI 48360

RE: R.C.O.C. PRELIMINARY PLAN REVIEW 21P0014
LOCATION: LIBERTY DR, ORION TOWNSHIP
PROJECT NAME: FEDEX GROUND PARKING EXPANSION

Dear Ms. Girling:

At your request, the Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC) has completed a preliminary review for the above referenced project. Enclosed you will find one set of plans with our comments in red. All comments are for conceptual purpose only and should be incorporated into detailed construction plans. Below you will find a listing of the comments generated by the RCOC review:

A) Liberty Drive is a public road and under the jurisdiction of RCOC. Property owner needs to submit a petition to RCOC-Legal Department to abandoned Liberty Drive due to the proposed development. Please contact Henderson Jeniffer, Legal Supervisor, at (248) 645-2248.

B) Relocate all fixed objects prior to excavation. Fixed objects shall be no nearer than 6 feet from back of curb, or 12 feet from edge of pavement.

C) The proposed Cul-De-Sac must be designed as per RCOC Industrial Cul-De-Sac detail (attached).

D) Drive approach should include a detail M curb line to provide controlled drainage across the driveway.

E) Pavement cross section shall consist of a minimum 2 inches of MDOT 5E HMA, over 3 inches of 4E, over 4 inches of 3E, or 9 inches of MDOT 35-P concrete, with epoxy coated rebar lane and curb ties over a suitable base, as determined in the field by RCOC.

F) Match and tie proposed curb to existing curb. Epoxy coated #4 bar required.

G) Excavations within a 1:1 influence of the roadway will require MDOT Class II backfill compacted to 95% maximum density.
Once the comments above are addressed, plans should be submitted to this office with completed RCOC permit application(s) Form 64a, signed by the owner (or his agent), three sets of plans per application and the appropriate application fee(s).

All future correspondence related to the above referenced project will be sent to the address provided by the applicant. Separate applications will be required for:

a) Road improvement and drive approach
b) Utility connections

Upon receipt of the appropriate application packet, RCOC will provide a more detailed review. Please contact this office at (248) 858-4835 if you have any questions, or if we may be of further assistance.

Respectfully,

Simon Yousif, P.E.
Permit Review Engineer
Department of Customer Services

SS/mc
Enclosure
FEDEX GROUND PARKING EXPANSION
1601 BROWN ROAD
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION, OAKLAND COUNTY, MICHIGAN

SITE PLANS

RECEIVED
MAR 26 2021
Orion Township Planning & Zoning
BROWN ROAD
(66' WIDE)
Site Walk for Fed Ex, 1601 Brown Road was conducted on April 13, 2021 by Commissioners Scott Reynolds, Joe St.Henry, and Don Gross.

Fed Ex is a major warehousing and delivery service in the region and recently expanded its employee parking and truck parking and storage on its site. The proposal is to expand its employee parking on adjacent property to the north. The adjacent property is zoned IP, is vacant and at the end of the cul-de-sac of Liberty Drive. There is no significant foliage on the property.

It appears that the proposal is to extend the parking on both sides of Liberty Drive and utilize existing right-of-way as part of the parking by removing the cul-de-sac and relocating it to the north of the new parking.

This would require the vacation of a portion of Liberty Drive (cul-de-sac area) and the rededication and construction of a new cul-de-sac to accommodate the termination of Liberty Drive. There is an existing fire hydrant in the Liberty Drive cul-de-sac that would either need to be protected or replaced.

Respectfully submitted

Don Gross
Planning Commission

RECEIVED
APR 14 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.

Project Name: FEDEX GROUND PARKING EXPANSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Name: J.D.C. Developments, LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address: 4520 Madison Ave #100</td>
<td>City: Kansas City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 816-389-5709</td>
<td>Cell: 913-461-5528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner(s)</th>
<th>Name: HRN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address: 25480 Telegraph Road, Ste. 100</td>
<td>City: Southfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 248-356-4060</td>
<td>Cell: 248-321-3461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Preparer Firm/Person</th>
<th>Name: Scott Sieg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address: 2430 Rochester Court - Suite 100</td>
<td>City: Troy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 248-528-7378</td>
<td>Cell: 248-890-3551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Contact Person</th>
<th>Name: James Butler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address: 2430 Rochester Court - Suite 100</td>
<td>City: Troy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 248-528-7369</td>
<td>Cell: 248-821-4841</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sidwell Number(s): 09-34-300-019, 09-34-300-020, 09-34-300-021, 09-34-300-024

Location or Address of Property: Brown and Giddings road

Side of Street: NW Nearest Intersection: Brown and Giddings road

Acreage: 14 acres Current Use of Property: open lots

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


List any known variances needed (subject to change based on Township consultant's review) none anticipated

Give a detailed description of the proposed development, including the number and size of the buildings or units being proposed. No bldg's are being proposed. Parking expansion for 197 van/auto parking, 137 trailer parking and 41 car parking.

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 and proof of delivery.

AT&T
54 Mill St.
Pontiac, MI 48342

Consumers Power Company
538 W. Willow St.
Holly, MI 48442

DTE Energy
37849 Interchange Dr.
Farmington Hills, MI 48335

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

Oakland County Water Resources Commission
wrpermitting@oakgov.com
(electronic submittal only)

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

Road Commission of Oakland County (if applicable)
2420 Pontiac Lake Rd.
Waterford, MI 48328

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

Signature of Applicant: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

Print Name: ______________________________________

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

Signature of Owner: ____________________________ Date: 3-16-21

Print Name: Armen Kalandjian

Version 10/19/18
Sidwell Number(s): 09-34-300-019, 09-34-300-882, 09-34-300-021

Location or Address of Property: Brown and Giddings road

Side of Street: NW Nearest Intersection: Brown and Giddings road

Acreage: 14 acres Current Use of Property: open lots

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


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

Give a detailed description of the proposed development, including the number and size of the buildings or units being proposed No bldg’s are being proposed. Parking expansion for 197 van/auto parking, 137 trailer parking and 41 car parking.

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 each of the following agencies. Please provide the Township with a copy of each transmittal and proof of delivery.

AT&T
54 Mill St.
Pontiac, MI 48342

Oakland County Water Resources Commission
wrcpermitting@oakgov.com
(electronic submittal only)

Consumers Power Company
530 W. Willow St.
Holly, MI 48442

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

DTE Energy
37849 Interchange Dr.
Farmington Hills, MI 48335

Road Commission of Oakland County (if applicable)
2420 Pontiac Lake Rd.
Waterford, MI 48328

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

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

Signature of Applicant: Nicholas C. Janus

Date: 3-10-21

Print Name: Nicholas C. Janus

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

Signature of Owner:

Date: 

Print Name: 

Version 10/19/18
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewell Number(s):</td>
<td>09-34-300-019, 09-34-300-021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location or Address of Property:</td>
<td>Brown and Giddings road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side of Street:</td>
<td>NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest Intersection:</td>
<td>Brown and Giddings road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage:</td>
<td>14 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use of Property:</td>
<td>open lots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Is the complete legal description printed on the site plan? | Yes | No |

| Subject Property Zoning: | I-P (industrial park) | N. I-P | S. I-P | E. I-C | W. I-P |
| Adjacent Zoning: |  |
| List any known variances needed (subject to change based on Township consultant's review) | none anticipated |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give a detailed description of the proposed development, including the number and size of the buildings or units being proposed.</td>
<td>No new buildings are being proposed. Parking expansion for 197 van/auto parking, 137 trailer parking and 41 car parking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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 and proof of delivery.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>Oakland County Water Resources Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Mill St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wrcepermitting@pokgov.com">wrcepermitting@pokgov.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac, MI 48342</td>
<td>(electronic submittal only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumers Power Company</td>
<td>Oakland County Health Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530 W. Willow St.</td>
<td>Building 34 East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly, MI 48442</td>
<td>1200 N. Telegraph Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTE Energy</td>
<td>Pontiac, MI 48341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37849 Interchange Dr.</td>
<td>Road Commission of Oakland County (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington Hills, MI 48335</td>
<td>2420 Pontiac Lake Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Department of Transportation (if applicable)</td>
<td>Waterford, MI 48328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 Vanguard Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac, MI 48341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Signature of Applicant: [Signature]  
Date: 3/3/2021

Print Name: Nicholas C. Junior

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: [Signature]  
Date: 7/4/2021

Print Name: Michael Rashad

General Counsel

Version 10/19/18
REVISIONS

CAUTION!!

THE LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AS SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING ARE ONLY APPROXIMATE. NO GUARANTEE IS EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED AS TO THE COMPLETENESS OR ACCURACY THEREOF. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE EXCLUSIVELY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE EXACT UTILITY LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION.
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ELECTRIC U.G. CABLE, MANHOLE, METER & HANDHOLE

TELEPHONE U.G. CABLE, PEDESTAL & MANHOLE
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TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY

C-1.0
CAUTION!!

THE LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AS SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING ARE ONLY APPROXIMATE. NO GUARANTEE IS EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED AS TO THE COMPLETENESS OR ACCURACY THEREOF. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE EXCLUSIVELY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE EXACT UTILITY LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION.
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THE LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AS SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING ARE ONLY APPROXIMATE. NO GUARANTEE IS EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED AS TO THE COMPLETENESS OR ACCURACY THEREOF. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE EXCLUSIVELY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE EXACT UTILITY LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION.
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FEDEX ORION EXPANSION
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SCALE: 1" = 80'
CAUTION!!
THE LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AS SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING ARE ONLY APPROXIMATE. NO GUARANTEE IS EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED AS TO THE COMPLETENESS OR ACCURACY THEREOF. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE EXCLUSIVELY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE EXACT UTILITY LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION.
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JONES DEVELOPMENT COMPANY
4520 MADISON AVENUE, SUITE 100
KANSAS CITY, MO 64111
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THE LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AS SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING ARE ONLY APPROXIMATE. NO GUARANTEE IS EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED AS TO THE COMPLETENESS OR ACCURACY THEREOF. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE EXCLUSIVELY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE EXACT UTILITY LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION.
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LEGEND
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GUARD RAIL

POST INDICATOR VALVE
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STORM SEWER, CLEANOUT & MANHOLE
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SCALE: 1" = 20'
CAUTION!!

THE LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AS SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING ARE ONLY APPROXIMATE. NO GUARANTEE IS EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED AS TO THE COMPLETENESS OR ACCURACY THEREOF.

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE EXCLUSIVELY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE EXACT UTILITY LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION.
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THE LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AS SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING ARE ONLY APPROXIMATE. NO GUARANTEE IS EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED AS TO THE COMPLETENESS OR ACCURACY THEREOF. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE EXCLUSIVELY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE EXACT UTILITY LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION.
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THE LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AS SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING ARE ONLY APPROXIMATE. NO GUARANTEE IS EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED AS TO THE COMPLETENESS OR ACCURACY THEREOF. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE EXCLUSIVELY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE EXACT UTILITY LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION.
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CAUTION!!

THE LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AS SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING ARE ONLY APPROXIMATE. NO GUARANTEE IS EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED AS TO THE COMPLETENESS OR ACCURACY THEREOF. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE EXCLUSIVELY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE EXACT UTILITY LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION.

NORTH
REVISIONS

CAUTION!!
The locations and elevations of existing underground utilities as shown on this drawing are only approximate. No guarantee is either expressed or implied as to the completeness or accuracy thereof. The contractor shall be exclusively responsible for determining the exact utility locations and elevations prior to the start of construction.
CAUTION!!
THE LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AS SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING ARE ONLY APPROXIMATE. NO GUARANTEE IS EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED AS TO THE COMPLETENESS OR ACCURACY THEREOF. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE EXCLUSIVELY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE EXACT UTILITY LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION.

NOTE: NO TREES ARE TO BE PLANTED WITHIN ANY EXISTING OR PROPOSED UTILITY EASEMENTS.
REVISIONS

CAUTION!!
The locations and elevations of existing underground utilities as shown on this drawing are only approximate. No guarantee is either expressed or implied as to the completeness or accuracy thereof. The contractor shall be exclusively responsible for determining the exact utility locations and elevations prior to the start of construction.

Original Issue Date: February 10, 2021

Key:
- = Interior parking lot trees
- = Irrigated seed lawn
- = Field verify limits of disturbance
- = Parking lot adjacent to road trees and shrubs
- = Open space area trees
- = Existing tree / tag to remain with tree protection fencing
- = Replacement trees
- = No trees are to be planted within any existing or proposed utility easements.
- = Existing tree to be relocated
- = Proposed location of transplanted tree

Scale: 1" = 20'
REVISIONS

CAUTION!!

THE LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AS SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING ARE ONLY APPROXIMATE. NO GUARANTEE IS EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED AS TO THE COMPLETENESS OR ACCURACY THEREOF. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE EXCLUSIVELY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE EXACT UTILITY LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION.
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CAUTION!!

THE LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AS SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING ARE ONLY APPROXIMATE. NO GUARANTEE IS EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED AS TO THE COMPLETENESS OR ACCURACY THEREOF. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE EXCLUSIVELY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE EXACT UTILITY LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION.
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KEY:

EXISTING TREE / TAG TO BE REMOVED
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SCALE: 1" = 40'
REVISIONS

CAUTION!!

THE LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AS SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING ARE ONLY APPROXIMATE. NO GUARANTEE IS EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED AS TO THE COMPLETENESS OR ACCURACY THEREOF. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE EXCLUSIVELY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE EXACT UTILITY LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION.
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PROJECT TITLE

CLIENT

ORIGINAL ISSUE DATE:

DRAWING TITLE

DRAWING NUMBER:

PEA JOB NO.

P.M.

DES.

SWS

www.peagroup.com
t: 844.813.2949

TREE SURVEY

PLAN

T-1.1

BROWN ROAD

(66' WIDE)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat.</th>
<th>CURB</th>
<th>DRAWING NAME</th>
<th>LIST NAME</th>
<th>Codec</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>DRAWING NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>REVISIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Blue Spruce</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>2020-0404</td>
<td>4-21-21</td>
<td>PEA JOB NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>White Pine</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>2020-0404</td>
<td>4-21-21</td>
<td>PEA JOB NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>2020-0404</td>
<td>4-21-21</td>
<td>PEA JOB NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Yellow Birch</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>2020-0404</td>
<td>4-21-21</td>
<td>PEA JOB NO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revision Note:**

*THE LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AS SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING ARE ONLY APPROXIMATE. NO GUARANTEE IS EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED AS TO THE COMPLETENESS OR ACCURACY THEREOF. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE EXCLUSIVELY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE EXACT UTILITY LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION.*
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## CAUTION!!

The locations and elevations of existing underground utilities as shown on this drawing are only approximate. No guarantee is either expressed or implied as to the completeness or accuracy thereof. The contractor shall be exclusively responsible for determining the exact utility locations and elevations prior to the start of construction.
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---

**EXISTING TREE LIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
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CAUTION!!

THE LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AS SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING ARE ONLY APPROXIMATE. NO GUARANTEE IS EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED AS TO THE COMPLETENESS OR ACCURACY THEREOF. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE EXCLUSIVELY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE EXACT UTILITY LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION.
CAUTION!!

The locations and elevations of existing underground utilities as shown on this drawing are only approximate. No guarantee is either expressed or implied as to the completeness or accuracy thereof. The contractor shall be exclusively responsible for determining the exact utility locations and elevations prior to the start of construction.
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