1. OPEN MEETING

2. ROLL CALL

3. MINUTES
   A. 9-2-20, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL

5. BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENT – NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY

6. CONSENT AGENDA

7. NEW BUSINESS
   A. PC-2020-21, Orion Village Crossing PUD, Minor PUD amendment for JPMorgan Chase bank signage, located at 3515 S. Baldwin Rd. (parcel 09-29-326-041)
   B. PC-2020-11, Grand Square of Orion, Site Plan and Wetland, located at 595 Brown Rd. (parcel 09-32-400-077), vacant parcel 09-32-400-076 to the west of 595 Brown Rd., 611 Brown Rd. (parcel 09-32-400-070), 631 Brown Rd. (parcel 09-32-400-069), and vacant parcel 09-32-400-071 to the east of 631 Brown Rd.

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS

10. COMMUNICATIONS
    A. Waterford Township Master Plan Update Amendment

11. PLANNERS REPORT/EDUCATION

12. COMMITTEE REPORTS

13. FUTURE PUBLIC HEARINGS
    A. 10-21-20 at 7:05 p.m., PC-2020-22, Salon Blue Special Land Use Public Hearing for Tattooing

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, September 2, 2020, at 7:00 pm VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE - GoToMeeting Access code 599-669-285 or VIA TELEPHONE 1-(571) 317-3122 Access Code 599-669-285 (Meeting being conducted via video/telephone conference due to the health concern of COVID-19 and the Governor’s Executive Order 2020-15)

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:
Don Walker, PC Rep to ZBA
Don Gross, Commissioner
Kim Urbanowski, Commissioner

Scott Reynolds, Vice Chairman
John Steimel, BOT Rep to PC

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:
Joe St. Henry, Secretary
Justin Dunaskiss, Chairman

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

2. ROLL CALL
As noted

CONSULTANTS PRESENT:
Mark Landis, (Township Engineer) of OHM Advisors
David Goodloe, Township Building Official
Tammy Girling, Township Planning & Zoning Director

OTHERS PRESENT:
Sara D’Agostini
Gene D’Agostini

3. MINUTES
A. 8-5-20, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

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

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

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

6. CONSENT AGENDA
None

7. NEW BUSINESS
A. PC-2020-20, F&D Silverbell Company LLC, Wetland Application and tree inventory waiver requests, for a vacant parcel (09-35-100-019) located at the SW corner of Silverbell and Lapeer Roads.

Building Official Goodloe read through his review dated August 20, 2020.
Building Official Goodloe stated that the applicant submitted an Ordinance #99 and a soil erosion application. The soil erosion application was sent to our Engineer at OHM for their review and it was pointed out that there is a need for a wetland permit. Upon reviewing the ordinance, the Building Official is responsible for the review of tree and woodland permits. The applicant has requested a waiver, and as pointed out in his review letter, he did not believe a permit is necessary for his review. This did not exempt the applicant from submitting the inventory. It provides options and may save costly time and money. He stated that he will know more when he sees the engineering requested by our consultants.

Engineer Landis read through his review date stamped August 27, 2020.

Acting Chairman Reynolds asked if there were any questions from the Planning Commissioners?

Trustee Steimel thought that it was tough because they didn’t get to see anything else other than a wetland permit. They didn’t get to see the grading plans would be given as part of a site plan, then they could have seen some of that. Trustee Steimel added that regarding Engineers Landis review, he felt that the most concerning item was wetland “B”, it’s fairly large but it’s low-grade wetland almost for stormwater management, right now. Trustee Steimel asked Engineer Landis if they are going to, as part of the earth balancing plan, are they going to put in the drainage retention pond on the NE corner? Does that mitigate the one emergent wetland they have there? Engineer Landis replied exactly. Engineer Landis stated that further down and buried into the wetland permit there are grading plans, and stormwater management plans that were in there. Those show the detention basin, 100-year detention basin, per township requirements, up in the NE corner. Engineer Landis added that part of their review will make sure that they are accounting for, not only their site but also some properties to the south that drain across this parcel. They will make sure that all that drainage is picked up and accounted for in the sizing of the pond, that was something they had to do at a later date and should be conditioned with any kind of approval.

Trustee Steimel noted that he knew it was not usually part of the wetland permit, but that was all they had. He added that he knew that corner had a lot of drainage problems and they did some work in the area, the drain underneath Silverbell is clear and functions because it was backing up and Silverbell Rd., and it would flood. He wanted to make sure that what they were doing here wasn’t going to impact that negatively, of what is already there, or it might even improve it as part of their grading plan. He noted that it was not part of the wetlands permit but was part of the grading plan. He said he was going to count on the Engineer and Building Official to keep an eye on. He noted that they have had issues there in the past so that NE corner is a little sensitive as far as what they are doing there. Engineer Landis agreed and remembered that there was some flooding just west of the site. Engineer Landis said that the applicant may need to also seek approval from MDOT and or the Road Commission because they have jurisdiction over the stormwater system.

Acting Chair Reynolds noted that because this was not a site plan approval, it was a recommendation that required approval from the Board of Trustees. They will be recommending the Wetland Permit, but the tree waiver was something that they would be granting or denying.

Trustee Steimel asked regarding the phragmites on the site. He said that if they are doing land balancing and filling, there are processes they follow if they are doing a site, that they file for proper disposal of the phragmites because they don’t want to spread when they are disturbing and diggin it up.
Trustee Steimel asked Building Official Goodloe if this was going under Ordinance #99? Building Official Goodloe replied yes. Trustee Steimel thought that some of those things would fall under his approval that they have to keep an eye on that. Just for general reasons, they want to keep an eye on that. Building Official Goodloe replied absolutely and said he would make a note of that. Trustee Steimel said that that is something they do with PUD’s and site plans, they make sure that they take care of it, and that they are aware of it so there is a plan and that they properly handle it. Because it is not a typical site plan, he wasn’t sure where it comes in, but it was a concern that they take care of it while they are doing it.

Trustee Steimel said that most of the land doesn’t have any trees left on it, except for the little bit along Lapeer Rd., and thought most of it was just brush. He said they took the old barn out of there, and it looked like one of those little wetlands is what was left when they dragged the barn out of there years ago. He thought it would be nice to have something there since Stuart Franco had a site approval there but had been a few years. He appreciated that they were trying to attract something, realizing it is at a gateway type location, and hopefully they will be able to attract something good there.

Commissioner Walker said that there were references in the Engineers report about the applicant will not be proposing any type of mitigation for that wetland. He noted that Engineer Landis mentioned, the detention pond was sort of the set off for that. He questioned if there were other things that could be done by the applicant to help that? Engineer Landis replied that he could answer one part of the question. He believed that the wetlands were storing stormwater and that the detention pond would be the mitigating factor to measure that since they are proposing to fill those. He added that there were other things that they could do on the site to help mitigate the fill. He left it up to the petitioner to speak to that.

Gene D’Agostini with D’Agostini Companiues presented.

Mr. D’Agostini stated that it was their intent to clean up the site. He was sure that many of them were aware of the fact that some of the site was mined for sand and gravel at one point and time. There were piles of dirt, a mix of topsoil, sand, and gravel. His goal was to clean up and window dress the site so that they can attract that desirable end-user a headquarter type user, 400,000-500,000-sq. ft. user, to come on-site. He added that part of what they have to do, and it is a substantial undertaking, is the land balancing. In addition to the land balancing, that has already been indicated, they are going to have to provide detention to offset not only the wetlands area that is somewhat of a detention area, but they are also going to have to be considerate of the runoff from the property to the south a lot of the runoff is from south to north. He added that they are going to also clean up the stormwater issue that he thought had probably exacerbated, what was the flooding at Silverbell. They were hoping that is a contribution that is recognized, and that is what they hoped to do.

Acting Chairman Reynolds thought it seemed straightforward for him regarding the wetland permit. He knew that there were some wetlands on-site but thought that the mitigation that they were choosing to do, some land balancing to improve the site, and prep it for something better to come, he was good with that. He added that the tree inventory in general, and Building Official Goodloe walking the site, and making his statement, he agreed with the need to waive that requirement.

Moved by Commissioner Gross, seconded by Trustee Stemiel, that the Planning Commission recommends to the Board of Trustees the approval of the wetland permit for PC-2020-20, F&D Silverbell Company LLC, for a vacant parcel (09:35-100-019) located at the SW corner of Silverbell and Lapeer Roads for the application date stamped received August 12, 2020, and
August 24, 2020. This recommendation of approval is based on the following findings of facts: that the action will not pollute impair or destroy a wetland; since this proposed project consists of land balancing and filling in on-site wetlands, designated as wetlands A, B, C, & E, which accumulate a combined area of 3.03 acres and retains wetland D, a 5.32 acres of which a major portion of that is located off site; the construction of a stormwater management system will function as the mitigation of the wetlands; further the approval is consistent with the public interest in light of the stated purpose of the ordinance; and as the findings of the Township Engineer, the requirements of the Wetland Protection Ordinance have been met; the following conditions apply that were identified in the Engineer’s report; 1) that the wetland permit application be revised to reflect the 3.03 acres of wetland fill; 2) the grading plans be updated to reflect the wetlands limits as delineated, indicated on the proposed fills; 3) the applicant apply for separate engineering approval of the proposed grading storm water management SESC plans, and obtain a SESC permit from the township.

Discussion on the motion:

Trustee Steimel noted that SESC stands for soil erosion and sediment control.

Acting Chairman Reynolds asked Engineer Landis regarding the four conditions, would that prompt the application or the further engineer review to go back to them as their concern that he had spoken to earlier, or does that need to be an additional motion? He thought that Engineer Landis was asking for a further engineering review on the next set of plans, is that going to actually occur, does that need to be an item that will occur or something that they make sure they call out? Engineer Landis stated that it was included in the motion as a condition, so they will do that administratively as part of the Soil Erosion Permit and then also an engineering review of the stormwater plans.

Trustee Steimel stated that he thought that the gravel that they were seeing on the site was not from mining but thought it was from the Eagle Valley Landfill, they used it to temporarily store their top-fill. They would bring dirt over there and then haul it back to top off their stuff. He thought that it may be, some leftover from when they were piling stuff over there.

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

Moved by Commissioner Gross, seconded by Commissioner Urbanowski, that the Planning Commission grant a waiver from the detailed tree inventory because it has been demonstrated by the Building Official, who has walked the site, that the removal will not impact woodland areas as identified on the woodland map.

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

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
None

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS
Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated that the township has enrolled in an all-inclusive opportunity and education program through MTA and provides free classes that the Commissioners’ can take from home.

10. COMMUNICATIONS
None

11. PLANNERS REPORTS
None

12. COMMITTEE REPORTS
None.

13. FUTURE PUBLIC HEARINGS
None

14. CHAIRMAN’S COMMENTS
None

15. COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS
Commissioner Urbanowski stated that she will look into the online classes from MTA.

16. ADJOURNMENT
Moved by Trustee Steimel, seconded by Commissioner Gross to adjourn the meeting at 7:38 pm. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Walton
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary
Charter Township of Orion

Planning Commission Approval Date
TO: The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission  
FROM: Tammy Girling, Planning & Zoning Director  
DATE: October 1, 2020  
RE: PC-2020-21, Orion Village Crossing PUD, Minor PUD Amendment – Signage  
     JPMorgan Chase Bank  

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 Commission’s findings of facts for the project. Any additional findings of facts should be added to the motion below.

**PUD Minor Amendment – (Ord. No. 78, Section 30.03)**

I move that the Planning Commission approves/denies PC-2020-21, Orion Village Crossing PUD Minor Amendment for a signage for JPMorgan Chase Bank, for plans date stamped received September 16, 2020, located at 3515 S. Baldwin Rd. (Sidwell #09-29-326-041). This approval/denial is based on the following findings of facts:

a. How will the revision be a benefit to the future users of the project and community (Insert findings of facts),

b. How will the revision result in a material increase in the use of public services, facilities and utilities as compared to the existing PUD (Insert findings of facts),

c. Will the revision place an unreasonable burden upon the existing PUD or the surrounding property owners and/or the natural environment (Insert findings of facts),

d. Will the revision keep the existing PUD within the intent and spirit of the Master Plan (Insert findings of facts),

e. Will the revision result in an unreasonable negative economic impact upon the surrounding properties (Insert findings of facts),

f. Does the revision maintain the existing approved open space requirement for the PUD (Insert findings of facts),

g. Does this revision require any waivers from the design standards of this PUD (Insert findings of facts),

h. Will this revision allow the PUD to continue to promote the preservation of any natural resources and features that were in the original PUD (Insert findings of facts).

If motion is to approve:

* This approval is based on the successful agreement between the Township and applicant on the replacement of landscape removed related to the widening of Baldwin Rd.

*Motion maker to add any additional conditions.
Or

Motion 2: I move that the Planning Commission postpone action on PC-2020-21, Orion Village Crossing PUD Minor Amendment for signage for JPMorgan Chase Bank, for plans date stamped received September 16, 2020, located at 3515 S. Baldwin Rd. (Sidwell #09-29-326-041) for the following reasons (insert findings of facts).
DATE: October 1, 2020
TO: Orion Township Planning Commission
FROM: Eric Fazzini, Giffels Webster
SUBJECT: 3515 Baldwin Road – Chase Bank – PUD Revision

The applicant has requested a revision to a Planned Unit Development in order to relocate an existing monument sign and to add a wall sign on the north side of an existing Chase Bank building located at 3515 South Baldwin Road. This request is being considered as a PUD revision as signage for PUD’s are approved as part of the PUD approval, and the request does not meet the requirements of the underlying zoning district. We are not aware of any conditions from the PUD approval that would prevent approval of the request, and two required PUD modifications are listed below. The site is on the southeast corner of the intersection of Baldwin Road and Maybee Road. The application states that the relocation is needed to:

- Provide better visibility of the monument sign and property to patrons,
- Easily identify the property, and
- Increase visibility to the patrons to make them aware of the property to increase use of the branch

Background
The Chase site is located within an older Planned Unit Development that pre-dates the recent improvements to Baldwin Road. As a result of these improvements, the Chase site lost a significant amount of land for right-of-way as shown in grey in the aerial image which pre-dates the road improvements, including a new roundabout at the intersection. The existing monument sign is in the northwest corner of the site and needs to be relocated as it is within the new right-of-way.

Monument Sign
The applicant has submitted plans and photos indicating the effect the road project has had on visibility, due to grade changes, of the existing monument sign. The proposed relocated sign location would be in the southwest corner of the site behind the existing sidewalk and setback 12 feet, 9 inches from the new right-of-way line (highway easement) indicated in red on the aerial site plan submitted.

The relocated sign would be 4 feet tall by nearly 10 feet wide and would have a sign structure area of 39.77 sq. ft. As the Sign Ordinance does not provide a standard for ground signs for PUD’s, we have referenced the below standards for ground signs in the OP, Office Professional district which is the underlying zoning for the PUD indicated on the Zoning Map (old procedure did not rezone PUD sites).

Number of signs: 1 per zoning lot - This standard is met subject to the recommended condition below
Sign area Alternate A: 40 sq. ft. per side; maximum 80 sq. ft.- This standard is met (39.77 sq. ft.)
Setback from ROW: 20 feet from ROW - Not met (12’, 9”), PUD modification may be approved as part of Revision.
If approved, we recommend a condition that the existing monument sign be removed prior to the proposed sign being installed.

Wall Sign
The applicant is also proposing a new wall sign on the north side of the building facing Maybee Road. The sign would be 31.5 inches tall by approximately 14 feet wide and would have an area of 36.86 sq. ft. This would constitute a second wall sign for the site as there is an existing wall sign on the west façade facing Baldwin Road that would remain. The OP district standards for wall signs are as follows:

Number of signs: 1 wall sign per establishment- Not met (2 wall signs), PUD modification may be approved
Sign area: 10% of façade area or 200 sq. ft., whichever is less- *This standard is met

*The proposed wall sign area appears to be well under the 10% of the north façade area where the sign would be located. It may be beneficial for the applicant to submit the exact façade areas of the north and west facades of the building, and corresponding percentages of each wall sign for purposes of the Planning Commission considering the request for a second wall sign that is not permitted in the OP district.

Gingellville Village Center Overlay District
The site is located within the Gingellville Overlay District. As the relocated sign is considered a new sign as far as zoning administration, the overlay standards have been reviewed as indicated below for both the new wall sign and monument sign, in addition to the OP district standards reviewed above.

All signs permitted within the Gingellville Village Center Overlay District shall be subject to the provisions of Ordinance No. 138 unless a stricter provision is provided below. In addition to the overall intent of this section, the intent of this subsection is to ensure that signs within the Gingellville Village Center Overlay District shall be uniform in size, design, appearance and material. Accordingly, all signs within the Gingellville Village Center Overlay District shall be subject to the following requirements and standards:

1. All signs shall be designed so as to be integral and compatible with the architecture and landscaping component of the development. We believe both signs would be integral and compatible with the site. The monument sign is existing on the site and the north façade design appears to have been designed to accommodate a wall sign in the proposed location.

4. Shielded external illumination is encouraged to reduce glare. No portion of the sign shall have a luminance greater than fifteen (15) foot candles measured at four (4) feet perpendicular to any surface. The applicant should verify that no external illumination is proposed for either the monument sign or the wall sign, as appears to be the case based on the application.

5. It is recommended that signs with internal illumination provide a dark background with lighter colored lettering or logo. An internally lit sign with white background will generally exceed the maximum allowable luminance. This standard is met as the monument sign has a dark silver background with white text, and the wall sign background would be brick.

6. The light from illuminated signs shall be shielded at its source in a manner that will not shine light on adjacent properties or onto public streets or sidewalks. The applicant should verify that no external illumination is proposed for either the monument sign or the wall sign, as appears to be the case based on the application.
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION PLANNING COMMISSION
2525 Joslyn Road
Lake Orion, MI 48360
(248) 391-0304 ext. 5000

APPLICATION FOR PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT REVISION

Case Number PC-123

*PROOF OF OWNERSHIP MUST BE INCLUDED IN THE APPLICATION*
(Acceptable documentation includes Warranty Deed, Quit Claim Deed, Land Contract, and Option to Purchase with a Copy of the Warranty Deed. If the applicant is not the property owner, then written authorization from the property owner must be included)

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

The following application must be completed (incomplete applications will be returned to the petitioner) and filed with the Township at least four weeks prior to a scheduled Planning Commission meeting in order to initiate a request for PUD Revision. Regular meetings of the Planning Commission are held on the first and third Wednesday of each month at 7:00 p.m. at the Orion Township Hall, 2525 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion.

Date __________________ Project Name _______ Baldwin Maybee

Applicants Name ________ JPMorgan Chase Bank NA (same as property owner)

Applicants Address _______ 1111 Polaris Parkway

City _______ Columbus State _______ OH Zip Code _______ 43240

Phone# _______ 1-614-213-5982 Fax # _______ N/A E-Mail _______ jennifer.l.carr@chase.com

Property Owner Name ________ JPMorgan Chase Bank NA (same as applicant)

Property Owner Address _______ 1111 Polaris Parkway Columbus OH 43240

Phone# _______ 1-614-213-5982 Fax # _______ N/A E-Mail _______ jennifer.l.carr@chase.com

Name of Firm/Individual who Prepared the plan _______ Icon

Address _______ 1701 Golf Rd, 1-900 Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

Phone# _______ 847-631-3131 Fax # _______ N/A E-Mail _______ jmiller@iconid.com

*Please Indicate Above The Contact Person*
Property Description:

Location or Address of the Property: 3515 S Baldwin Rd Lake Orion, MI 48359

Side of Street  West  Nearest Cross Streets: Maybee Rd and Baldwin Rd

Sidewell Number(s)  09-29-326-041  Total Acreage  1.203 acres

Subdivision Name (if applicable)  N/A

Frontage (in feet)  62 Ft  Depth (in feet)  135 Ft

*Please Attach to the Application a Complete Legal Description of the Subject Property

Zoning Classification:
Subject Property  Chase Bank

Adjacent Properties:

North  CVS  South  Johnny Black’s Public House

East  Housing Subdivision  West  Walgreens

Current Use of Property:  Banking

Describe The Proposed Revision To The PUD  Moving existing monument from bottom of hill to further down the west side of the Chase Property. Also adding Chase letterset on the north side of the building

Please answer the following questions on a separate sheet of paper and attach to the application.

1. How will the revision be a benefit to the future users of the project and the community?

2. How will the revision result in a material increase in the use of public services, facilities and utilities as compared to the existing PUD?

3. Will the revision place an unreasonable burden upon the existing PUD or the surrounding property owners and/or the natural environment?

4. Will the revision keep the existing PUD within the intent and spirit of the Master Plan?

5. Will the revision result in an unreasonable negative economic impact upon the surrounding properties?

6. Does the revision maintain the existing approved open space requirement for the PUD?
7. Does this revision require any waivers from the design standards of this PUD?

8. Will this revision allow the PUD to continue to promote the preservation of any natural resources and natural features that were in the original PUD?

***11 Sets of the Site/PUD Plan Prepared in Accordance with the Orion Township Zoning Ordinance #78, Section 30.03, Section 30.01 and any other Applicable Township Ordinance Requirements Must be Included as Part of the Application. Planning Commission Review Fees Included In Ordinance #41 Are Also Required When Submitting For A PUD Revision***

I hereby submit this application for Site Plan Approval, pursuant to the provisions of the Orion Township Zoning Ordinance, Ordinance #78, Section 30.03 and 30.01 and any other applicable Township Ordinance requirements. In support of the application, I hereby certify that the information provided herein is accurate and the application that has been provided is complete. As the property owner (or having been granted permission to represent the owner as to this application) and on behalf of all owners of this property, I hereby grant the Planning Commission members and Township Building Department staff permission to perform a site walk on the property, without prior notification, as is deemed necessary.

JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Association,
a national banking association

By: ____________________________

Signature

Date: ____________________________

9/1/2020
1. Better visibility of the Chase Monument and property to patrons. Allows patrons to easily identify the property.
2. It will increase visibility to the patrons to make them aware of the property to increase use of the branch
3. No
4. Yes
5. No
6. Yes
7. Yes
8. Yes
RELOCATE EXISTING M-25 D/F ILLUMINATED MONUMENT SIGN
QTY: 1

ADDITIONAL APPROVAL REQUIRED

SCALE: 1/2" = 1'-0"
LIF-WBO-24 > Illuminated Channel Letters (White Letters/Blue Octagon) - 36.9 Sq.Ft.

OTY 1

NOTE: FIELD VERIFY PRIOR TO FABRICATION

SCALE: 3/8" = 1'-0"

EXISTING

PROPOSED
STANDARD CODE REVIEW
Estimate/Job#: 513269
Store #: 513269

A.) Project Name: Chase Bank

B.) Building Type: Single Building

C.) Address: 3515 S Baldwin Rd

D.) Contact: Joe Piny

E.) Contact Person: Art Taccotis / Chase Bank

WALL SIGNS

1.) Square footage of wall signage allowed:

19% of the facade area on which the sign is to be placed, or 350 sq. ft. per establishment, whichever is less.

Wall Signs or Canopy Signs shall include all of the following and shall be further subject to the following regulations:

a. The entire canopy shall be considered a wall sign when a transparent fabric canopy with signage is internally illuminated.

A projecting sign shall be considered a wall sign.

The measurement of such signs shall include both sides, signage attached to a permanent architectural feature (as reflected on an approved site plan), including rookey or stone walls at the entrance of residential developments, commercial developments, or industrial parks, shall be measured as a wall sign and shall exclude the outside area of the building wall.

b. How many times are wall signs allowed?

1 wall sign per establishment.

c. If signs are allowed on rear or sides of building, is the square footage deducted from the front elevation? No, 1 wall sign per establishment.

d. How is square footage to be calculated? The entire area within a circle, enclosed by the building, or any geometric configuration excluding the building wall, regardless of the height, area or location of the sign.

e. Are design elements or logos a part of the square footage calculation? Yes.

f. May signs be internally illuminated? Shielded external illumination is encouraged to reduce glare. The area of the sign shall be less than fifteen (15) feet cubic per foot. It shall be located in a manner that will not shine light on adjacent properties or onto public streets or sidewalks.

g. Any restrictions to the location of the sign on the wall other than being located on the wall, below awning, or on the parapet? No.

h. Maximum projection for wall signs: 18 inches.

i. MAY SIGNS BE INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED?

Shielded external illumination is encouraged to reduce glare. The area of the sign shall be less than fifteen (15) feet cubic per foot. It shall be located in a manner that will not shine light on adjacent properties or onto public streets or sidewalks.

POLY/PYLON SIGNS

1.) Square footage of polyethylene signage allowed per sign face for a double-sided sign:

The sign area may be increased by one (1) square foot per side for each ten (10) feet by which the sign is not beyond the required setback. The required setback provided that the resulting sign area is not more than three (3) times the sign area permitted in the district and is not greater than one hundred and fifty (150) square feet.

POLY/PYLON SIGNS

1.) Square footage of polyethylene signage allowed per sign face for a double-sided sign:

2.) Quantity per zoning lot or one multifamily sign

Additional ground signs may be permitted for each zoning lot if the following conditions apply:

a. Two (2) ground signs may be permitted on a corner lot that has at least two hundred (200) linear feet of frontage on each of two (2) thoroughfares or collector streets, provided that only one (1) sign is oriented toward each thoroughfare or street.

b. Two (2) ground signs may be permitted on a corner lot, not a corner lot, that has frontage on two (2) thoroughfares or collector streets and has vehicular access via both thoroughfares or streets, provided that only one (1) sign is oriented toward each thoroughfare or street.

3.) Maximum height for polyethylene: See above

4.) Minimum clearance below polyethylene: A sign shall not be located or positioned in such a manner as to interfere with the necessary free and unobstructed view of vehicular or pedestrian traffic.

5.) Are design elements or logos a part of the square footage calculation? Yes.

6.) Address number to be included? Exempt from permit: Non-Residential Street Address Signs (street numbers) not exceeding three (3) square feet in area.

7.) Setback from right-of-way or property line: Triangle setback shall be measured at least ten (10) feet from R.O.W. Also see notes below.

8.) Landscaping requirements: See notes below.

9.) Storage requirements: See notes below.

10.) Architectural height limits: No.

11.) Any other special regulations: Yes.

12.) Size limitations: Yes.

13.) Color limitations: Yes.

VARIANCES

1.) Are variances consistent? Yes.

2.) Process & Timeline: Yes.

DIRECTIONS SIGNS

1.) Number of entries allowed: 4 per occupant

2.) Maximum square footage: 8 sq. ft. or less
Charter Township of Orion  
Planning & Zoning Department  
2525 Joslyn Rd., Lake Orion MI 48360  
P: (248) 391-0304 ext. 5000; Fax (248) 391-1454

TO: The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission
FROM: Tammy Girling, Planning & Zoning Director
DATE: October 5, 2020
RE: PC-2020-11, Grand Square Wetland 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.

Wetland Permit (Ordinance No. 107):
Motion 1: I move that the Planning Commission approves/denies the wetland permit for PC-2020-11, Grand Square of Orion, located at 595 Brown Rd. (parcel 09-32-400-077), vacant parcel 09-32-400-076 to the west of 595 Brown Rd., 611 Brown Rd. (parcel 09-32-400-070), 631 Brown Rd. (parcel 09-32-400-069), and vacant parcel 09-32-400-071 to the east of 631 Brown Rd. for plans date stamped received 9/14/20. This approval/denial is based on the following findings of facts:

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

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

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

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

Modification of the Brown Road Standards (Ord 78, Article 34, section 34.04)
Motion 2: I move that the Planning Commission waives/modifies the following standards of Section 34.03 based on the economic impact, quality of architectural design, and overall compatibility with the District: (motion maker to insert findings of facts for each that are granted)

a. Setback for the Site Monument Structure

b. Parking Calculation

c. Parking setback waiver

d. Greenbelt Width

e. Parking Spot dimension

29
f. Entry Area improvements

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

Motion 3: I move that the Planning Commission grants site plan approval for PC-2020-11 Grand Square of Orion, located at 595 Brown Rd. (parcel 09-32-400-077), vacant parcel 09-32-400-076 to the west of 595 Brown Rd., 611 Brown Rd. (parcel 09-32-400-070), 631 Brown Rd. (parcel 09-32-400-069), and vacant parcel 09-32-400-071 to the east of 631 Brown Rd. for plans date stamped received 9/14/20 based on the following findings of facts (motion make to insert findings of facts).

This approval is based on the following conditions:

a. Approval on land division creating the parcels as shown on the site plan
b. Approval of the deviation to the private road standard by the Board of Trustees.
c. All utilities be buried underground.
d. Separate submittal of tree survey and review of landscape.
e. (Motion maker to list any unresolved issues from Township Planner’s review)
f. (Motion maker to list any unresolved issues related to the Township Engineer’s review letter).
g. (Motion maker to list any additional conditions).

Or

I move that the Planning Commission denies site plan approval for PC-2020-11 Grand Square of Orion, located at 595 Brown Rd. (parcel 09-32-400-077), vacant parcel 09-32-400-076 to the west of 595 Brown Rd., 611 Brown Rd. (parcel 09-32-400-070), 631 Brown Rd. (parcel 09-32-400-069), and vacant parcel 09-32-400-071 to the east of 631 Brown Rd. for plans date stamped received 9/14/20. This denial is based on the following reasons (insert findings of facts).

Or

I move that the Planning Commission postpones site plan approval PC-2020-11 Grand Square of Orion, located at 595 Brown Rd. (parcel 09-32-400-077), vacant parcel 09-32-400-076 to the west of 595 Brown Rd., 611 Brown Rd. (parcel 09-32-400-070), 631 Brown Rd. (parcel 09-32-400-069), and vacant parcel 09-32-400-071 to the east of 631 Brown Rd. for plans date stamped received 9/14/20, for the following reasons (motion maker to indicate outstanding items to be addressed from the Planner’s or Engineer’s review letter(s)).
Site Plan Review
Grand Square of Orion Township – 2nd Review

Case No: PC-2020-11
Site: 595 Brown Road (east of Menards)
Applicant: Ronald A. Chiesa, RA Chiesa Architects
Plan Date: 9/14/2020
Zoning: BIZ (Brown Road Innovation Zone)
Parcel IDs: 09-32-400-069, -070, -071, -076, & -077

Dear Planning Commissioners:

We have completed a review of the application and site plan referenced above and a summary of our findings is below. Items in **bold** require specific action. Items in *italics* can be addressed administratively.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Project Summary

The applicant is proposing the following as indicated on the September 14, 2020, architectural plan set:

A. Restaurant A (east side): 8,000 sq. ft., 1-story
B. Restaurant B (west side): 8,000 sq. ft., 1-story
C. Hotel 1 (east side) Hilton Garden Inn: 63,348 sq. ft. with 114 rooms, 4-story
D. Hotel 2 (west side) Fairfield Inn: 54,822 sq. ft. with 103 rooms, 4-story
E. Hotel 3 (north end) Residence Inn: 86,556 sq. ft. with 120 rooms, 4-story

At the front of the site along Brown Road, two approximate 8,000 sq. ft., one-story restaurants are proposed that would occupy the majority of the site’s frontage. Each restaurant site would have two rows of parking in front of the buildings and two rows of parking between the two buildings. The majority of parking for each restaurant is proposed to the rear of each building as follows based on yard location:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Spaces</th>
<th>Restaurant A</th>
<th>Restaurant B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Restaurants & Access

Both restaurants would include concrete walkways of varying widths along at least three sides, with a pedestrian connection to a proposed tower structure area that is connected to a proposed 8-foot wide asphalt or concrete safety path within the Brown Road right-of-way. Access to each site would be provided by a >26-foot wide private road that would loop from Brown Road around the restaurants. There are now some internal sidewalks and a plan to provide pedestrian links from building to building.

Site Monument Structure (Building)

The site plan indicates a two-story “site monument structure” in front of the restaurant buildings along Brown Road consisting of a covered walkway and bench seating areas with a sign indicated on the south façade of the second story of the structure. The monument would have a concrete block foundation, modular brick piers, two portions of standing seam metal roofing, and engraved limestone signage. An elevation of the sides and rear of the monument structure has been provided.

For purposes of permitting the site monument structure, this structure meets the definition of Accessory Building (Detached) as it has a roof and is intended for the shelter of persons. Therefore, it cannot be considered as only a structure as defined by the Zoning Ordinance, or only as an entranceway structure under Zoning Ordinance Section 27.05 G., as it is considered a building per Zoning Ordinance definitions.

If this site plan request is approved, we recommend a condition be included that requires the site monument structure to remain with the future hotels parcel to be created as part of a future land division. We recommend this as the Zoning Ordinance prohibits accessory buildings/structures from being located on parcels without or prior to a principal building or use being present (§27.02 A.1.-2.); and also prohibits detached accessory buildings/structures within front yards (as proposed) when the accessory structure exceeds the height of the principal building/structure (on the same parcel). The site monument structure can only be permitted per the Zoning Ordinance if it is associated with the hotels parcel and constructed concurrently with a hotel being developed on the rear parcel.
Hotels
The rear two-thirds of the site would consist of three hotel buildings and a detention pond. This area would be accessed by two private access drives that would have two points of access to the private road loop around the restaurant sites to Brown Road. One private access drive would run along the east boundary of the site and through the parking areas of the rear hotel. A second private access drive is proposed running through the middle of the rear of the site terminating at the front of the rear hotel. All hotels would include concrete walkways of varying widths on all sides that would provide access primarily to parking spaces surrounding each building as typical for hotels.

Land Division Plan (sheet A-1, 4)
It is our understanding that the applicant will be pursuing a land division in order to create three parcels for separate ownership at a future date. This is indicated on site plan sheet A-1 as legal descriptions for parcels 1, 2, and 3, and on the Land Division Plan on sheet A-1.4. Land divisions are an administrative review process that do not require Planning Commission approval. This review has not yet occurred and may occur after Planning Commission consideration of this request. If the applicant ultimately decides to pursue a site condominium or plat instead of a land division, an additional Planning Commission review and approval would be necessary. This will be monitored at the administrative level.

Existing Conditions

1. **Zoning.** The 13.26-acre site is zoned BIZ (Brown Road Innovation Zone) and is within BIZ use group types A, C & D (Residential/Regional Commercial/Industrial) as indicated in Zoning Ordinance Figure 34.10. The purpose of the BIZ district is to encourage the development of property in a manner that:
   a. allows mixed industrial and commercial development in a visually cohesive district;
   b. promotes economic development;
   c. encourages collaboration between adjacent property owners in the form of shared access and lot combinations;
   d. promotes employment, and tax base;
   e. promotes redevelopment and new development;
   f. eliminates blighted properties;
   g. incorporates Low Impact Design (LID) practices as well as full or partial ratings for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED);
   h. ensures safe and complementary vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns and best practices for access management;
   i. improves environmental quality and remedies degraded properties; and
   j. provides an attractive transition between residential and non-residential properties.

The proposed development would accomplish several of the items stated in the purpose of the BIZ district as it would continue the physical and economic redevelopment of the Brown Road corridor. Zoning Ordinance Section 34.03 provides the required conditions for development in the BIZ district in order to address the purpose items in detail. A review of these details is on the following pages.

2. **Uses permitted.** The BIZ district permits developments with multiple principal uses if developed in conjunction with a large-scale development with a total land area of at least 10 acres. In the BIZ district, additional principal uses are listed as “ancillary or support uses” in Table 34-1. The proposed uses of the site are permitted as follows:
**BIZ Type C Regional Commercial**

a. Hotels / Motels with conference rooms, banquet facilities and/or a restaurant with a combined minimum area of five thousand (5,000) square feet

**BIZ Type A and Type D Ancillary or Support Uses Allowed (without SLUA):**

b. Restaurants

3. Adjacent zoning & land uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>R-1 – Single Family Residential</td>
<td>Woodlands with large lot single family homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>B-2 – General Business (Auburn Hills)</td>
<td>Big box retail parking and retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>BIZ – Brown Road Innovation Zone</td>
<td>Industrial outdoor storage yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPORTANT: BIZ Waivers or Modifications

As part of a recent Zoning Ordinance amendment related to multiple family development in the BIZ district, the Township Board approved the following additional language that permits waivers or modifications of all standards in Section 34.03. As such, the Planning Commission may consider waivers or modifications of any BIZ compliance issues in this section as identified on the following pages.

NEW: Section 34.04 – Modification of Standards

"The Planning Commission shall have the authority to waive or modify the standards of Section 34.03 based upon the economic impact, quality of architectural design, and overall compatibility with the District."

Section 34.03 – Required Conditions / Flex Zoning (BIZ)

4. Schedule of regulations. Each use within the Brown Road Innovation Zone shall comply with Table 34-3 for area, height, setback and lot coverage. The Planning Commission is authorized to consider a waiver of up to 20% from the Schedule of Regulations of Table 34-3 for larger-scale planned development projects with a total land area of at least 10 acres or for an assemblage of parcels as approved by the Planning Commission. (§34.03 B.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIZ</th>
<th>Use Group A (Restaurants)</th>
<th>Use Group C (Hotels)</th>
<th>Use Group D (Ancillary Restaurants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area</td>
<td>12,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>40,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>40,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width</td>
<td>75 ft.</td>
<td>100 ft.</td>
<td>150 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Front Yard</td>
<td>30 ft.</td>
<td>40 ft.</td>
<td>40 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Side Yard</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Rear Yard</td>
<td>30 ft. (50 ft.1)</td>
<td>30 ft. (50 ft.1)</td>
<td>30 ft. (50 ft.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Height</td>
<td>N/A1</td>
<td>N/A2</td>
<td>N/A2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Where abutting existing zoned or used residential properties which are outside of the BIZ zoning district boundaries.

2Height Limit. The Brown Road Innovation Zone does not contain a height limit. However, all applications for development shall be reviewed by the Building Department and/or Planning Commission for height compatibility with adjoining residential areas. Where parcels abut existing zoned residential areas, maximum height of a building shall not exceed two times the setback dimension from the residentially zoned property line to the edge of the building.

The setback of the rear hotel adjacent to the residentially zoned property to the north is indicated as 77.5 feet from the middle of the building to the north property line. This would permit a building with a maximum height of 155 feet. This standard is met as the peak of the rear hotel building (Residence Inn) would be 60 feet, 9 inches tall.

Site Monument Structure (Building)

The proposed site monument structure is currently partially within the 30-foot minimum front yard setback along Brown Road and should be relocated to be outside of the setback as it is considered an accessory building, or approval of a waiver would be necessary to permit the proposed location. We have no objections to a waiver being granted given that this is a planned development.

(BIZ setbacks may be waived/modified per Section 34.04)
5. **Off-street parking (BIZ §34.03 D.).** Parking requirements shall be based upon the following schedule:
   a. One parking space per 200 square feet of gross floor area for general retail uses, personal services, banks, offices, auto sales, etc. The Zoning Ordinance does not include a specific parking requirement for hotels. The applicant has proposed a parking ratio of one space for each hotel guest room, with no additional parking spaces provided. As no requirement is provided, the Planning Commission should determine if the proposed ratio is acceptable. Based on our experience, hotels rarely operate at full capacity and ridesharing services impact the parking demand for hotel uses. The proposed parking ratio should meet anticipated demand.
   b. One parking space per 100 square feet of gross floor area for restaurants.  
   *This is met with at least 80 spaces provided for each restaurant.*

6. No parking area or driveway shall be closer than 30 feet to the adjacent property lines when the parcel abuts residentially zoned or used property. However, when the parcel abuts commercial/office or industrially zoned property, no parking area or driveway shall be closer than 20 feet to the adjacent property lines. These standards are not met as follows:
   a. Along the north property line abutting R-1 zoning to the north, the applicant has proposed a varying parking area/driveway setback that is less than 30 feet in width along the majority of the north property line.

   The applicant’s response letter #4 states that the north setback is less than 30 feet in width as there is a 500-foot deep wooded tree line to the north of the development. Off-site landscaping is not normally permitted to count towards development requirements unless easements or other means of ensuring off-site buffer areas will remain in the future are established. *See below for waiver option.*
   b. Along the east and west property lines abutting BIZ zoning, the applicant has proposed a 10-foot parking area/driveway setback that is less than 20 feet along the entirety of each property line. The applicant should address why this standard cannot be met on the sides. The amount of pavement proposed on the site would need to be reduced in order to meet the parking area/driveway setbacks as required by the Zoning Ordinance.

*The required setback for parking may be reduced in width or waived by the Planning Commission, subject to landscaping or screening requirements.*

7. The above parking area/driveway setbacks correspond with the BIZ greenbelt requirements. Greenbelts for Use Group A and C shall be 20 feet in width (hotel sites). (§ 34.03 E.7.e.). This standard is not met along the perimeter boundary of the entire site as stated above given the amount of pavement proposed. The applicant’s response letter #5 is requests discretion on this item that would normally be associated with a Planned Unit Development, which has not been requested.
   a. Additionally, interior site greenbelts between Parcels A, B, and C are not indicated on the site plan or landscape plan. It is unclear if this is being requested to be waived.
   b. In consideration of the overall design and impact of the landscape plan, the Planning Commission may reduce or waive the requirements outlined herein for General Landscaping, or for landscaping in greenbelt areas, on berms, or as part of a screen, provided that any such adjustment is in keeping with the intent of the Ordinance, and more specifically, with the intent of Section 27.05.
We defer to the Planning Commission’s consideration of reducing/waiving the perimeter and interior parcel greenbelts. The intent of Section 27.05 is provided below for consideration:

“Landscaping, greenbelts, and screening are necessary for the protection and enhancement of the environment and for the continued vitality of all land uses in the Township. Landscaping and greenbelts are capable of enhancing the visual environment, preserving natural features, improving property values, and alleviating the impact of noise, traffic, and visual disruption related to intensive uses. Screening is important to protect less-intensive uses from the noise, light, traffic, litter, and other impacts of intensive non-residential uses. The purpose of this section is to set minimum standards for the protection and enhancement of the environment through requirements for the design and use of landscaping, greenbelts, and screening.”

8. **Off-street parking (BIZ §34.03 E.4.).** In an effort to reduce impervious surfaces and roadway conflict points due to multiple driveway access points, where possible, shared parking and common access drives are required unless waived by the Planning Commission for all properties within the BIZ District. Waivers may be requested due to topographic or use incompatibility between properties. See Figure 34.1 for example access management and shared parking layout.

Shared parking between the two restaurants and/or the three hotels located on the same rear parcel is not indicated. As the applicant is proposing 213 parking spaces total for the two restaurants where only 160 total spaces are required, the applicant should address if the impervious surface for the two restaurants could be reduced through a reduction in parking spaces through shared parking as stated in this section. The amount of proposed impervious surface is directly related to the inability of the development to meet the Zoning Ordinance parking setback and greenbelt requirements as stated in previous sections. The applicant’s response letter #6 states that they have no ability to reduce the (restaurant) parking based on occupant needs. This response does not specifically address shared parking.

No action is required by the Planning Commission as this is not a strict requirement based on the language in this section.

9. **Off-street parking (ZO).** All off-street parking shall conform to the standards set forth in Section 27.04 of this Ordinance. ADA parking spaces will be reviewed in detail as part of the building permit process. Section 27.04 requires all 90-degree parking spaces to be 9 feet in width, 19 feet in depth, and have an adjacent maneuvering lane of at least 22 feet for two-way traffic. Wheel curb offsets are permitted within parking spaces but do not reduce the required parking space length of 19 feet.

The front row of restaurant parking spaces along Brown Road as well as multiple rows of spaces along the middle private drive are only 18 feet in depth where 19 feet is required. This space dimension requirement is not unique to the BIZ district and but applies to all districts. Section 27.04 does not specify that the Planning Commission may grant a waiver of the required parking space depth.

We defer to the Township Attorney and Planning Director on the ability of the Planning Commission to grant a waiver for parking space depth by reference to the new BIZ district waiver provision. If granted, it could also apply to the spaces flanking the proposed sidewalk so that it can be widened to 5 feet. Bumper blocks would be needed at this location to maintain a clear 5' width.

The plan has been modified to provide 7-foot building walkways instead of wheel stops/bumper guards, in order to prevent vehicles from overhanging these spaces.
BIZ General Design Standards (§ 34.03 E.).
All proposed development and construction within the Brown Road Innovation Zoning District shall comply with the following standards:

10. Pedestrian pathways and sidewalks. Emphasis shall be placed on providing a pedestrian circulation system which promotes safety and connects mixed use areas. Vehicular access and circulation shall be planned to ensure safe pedestrian movement by means of safety paths within the development.

BIZ Figure 34.1 below indicates a sample pedestrian path connecting two buildings as separated from vehicular travel ways. This type of pedestrian path that is clearly secured from traffic, with the exception of crosswalks only at access drives near building entrances, should be considered the preferred method of pedestrian connections.

We have provided guidance to the township and applicant on how the pedestrian circulation system could be designed to promote safety and connect all buildings. The latest submittal is an improvement over the previous submittal. While not optimal, it has added a 3’ wide sidewalk system to connect the restaurant area with the hotel area. Our recommendation is that this sidewalk should be 5’ wide in order to accommodate two people walking side-by-side or two people passing in opposite directions. If the wider 3’ width is accepted, wider passing spaces will be needed every 200’ to comply with ADA.

(Pathways and sidewalks may be waived/modified per Section 34.04)
11. **General Site Design/Architectural Guidelines.** It is the intent of the District to provide an environment of high quality and complementary building architecture and site design. Special emphasis shall be placed upon methods that tend to reduce the visual impact of large buildings, to encourage tasteful, imaginative design for individual buildings, and to create a complex of buildings compatible with the Brown Road corridor. See below.

12. **Specific Site Design/Architectural Guidelines.** Specific Site Design/Architectural Guidelines for properties fronting Brown Road. In an effort to provide a transition and continuity from Brown Road to the Gingelville area to the north, the following architectural guidelines shall be incorporated into the design of principal and ancillary structures along Brown Road. (§ 34.03 E.7.)
   a. Architectural interest shall be provided through the use of repetitious patterns of color, texture and material modules, at least one of which shall repeat horizontally. Each module should repeat at intervals of no more than fifty (50) feet. Plain 8" x 16" concrete masonry units shall be avoided. Textured, split face or patterned masonry units shall be used. The applicant should address what texture and material modules are proposed as it is not apparent on the submitted elevations. No concrete masonry units are proposed.
      i. Two of the proposed hotels are proposed to be primarily E.I.F.S. (synthetic stucco) which is not considered a durable building material as brick and other masonry units. E.I.F.S. would not be similar in appearance to decorative masonry units described in the ordinance. The other hotel would have a more durable exterior finish that includes brick and cementitious board (Hardee Plank). The Planning Commission should determine if E.I.F.S. is an acceptable building material as far as this texture and materials modules requirement.
   b. Building facades greater than one hundred (100) feet in length shall incorporate recesses, projections and or windows along at least twenty percent (20%) of the length of the façade. Varying roof lines, projections/recesses etc. are encouraged. Windows, awnings, and arcades must total at least sixty percent (60%) of a façade length abutting a public street. Neither restaurant includes a façade that exceeds 100 feet in length (excluding the dumpster enclosure for Restaurant B). The applicant should address how the proposed hotels would comply with this section.
   c. Standardized, pre-engineered metal sided industrial buildings shall be prohibited unless approved by the Planning Commission. Neither restaurant includes metal siding. Metal roofing and awnings are proposed, which are not typically considered siding.
   d. Primary building entrances should be clearly defined and recessed, or framed by a sheltering element such as an awning, arcade or portico in order to provide shelter from the summer sun and winter weather. Each restaurant includes an internal vestibule with minimal external entrance features. The entrance to Restaurant B would provide minimal shelter from weather as no entry-specific features have been proposed. The design of entrances for both restaurant buildings could be enhanced at the discretion of the Planning Commission. Chain restaurants typically have three or more levels of standard building architecture that could be submitted by the applicant for reference.

   (Architectural guidelines may be waived/modified per Section 34.04)
13. **Interior access roads.** New roads providing interior access to two 2 or more lots shall provide a right-of-way of at least 66 feet. This standard is not met along the internal loop private road around the restaurant sites as the right-of-way width varies primarily from 43 feet along the sides to 51 feet along the rear. The Zoning Ordinance does not specify that private roads are exempt from this 66-foot right-of-way requirement.

However, it is our understanding that this requirement can be reduced by the Township Board as part of the Land Division process. We defer to the Planning Director on if site plan approval should be conditioned on the Township Board reducing the required right-of-way width.

14. **Interior access roads having connections with either Joslyn Road, Brown Road, or Jordan Road shall** be provided with entry area improvements including enhanced landscaping and masonry knee walls as depicted in BIZ figures. Each side of the entry area and designated right of way shall contain a minimum of the following features:

   a. 4 ornamental or shade/street trees
   b. 12 shrubs
   c. 24 lineal feet of 30'' high knee wall
   d. Knee wall and landscaping shall comply with the sight visibility and corner clearance requirements of Section 27.03G.

The above entry area improvements as required by the Zoning Ordinance are not indicated on the site plan or landscape plan at either of the two private drive connections with Brown Road at each end of the site. The proposal includes brick accent walls with piers “to picture frame the site monument”. Additionally, the applicant’s response letter #11 states that they are not aware of other sites in the BIZ district that have entry area improvements. As proposed, a waiver or modification would be required for the proposed entry area improvements. We defer to the Planning Director and Planning Commission on not providing the entry area improvements as required as this is a key element of the BIZ district general designs standards.

(Entry area improvements and landscaping may be waived/modified per Section 34.04)

15. **Signs.** All signs shall comply with the standards set forth in Orion Township Sign Ordinance No. 153. Site plan sheet A-1 provides a note that states “all site and building signage to be submitted to Orion Township for approval and permit as the project is developed.” *All signs will be considered as part of a separate review. This site plan review letter does not constitute any review or approval of any signs indicated as part of this site plan application. All plan notations or details regarding signage should be removed from all plan sheets to avoid confusion with future permitting.*

16. **Lighting.** A lighting plan shall be submitted with all site plans as set forth in Section 27.11 of this Ordinance. All other Zoning Ordinance regulations shall apply unless otherwise noted in this Ordinance.

   a. Exterior site lighting shall be fully shielded and directed downward to prevent off-site glare. *This standard is met.*
   b. Site illumination on properties adjacent to residential properties shall not exceed 0.3 foot-candle along property lines, or 1.0 foot-candle along non-residential property lines. Parking lot lighting shall be governed by Section 27.11. *This standard is met.*
c. Ornamental lighting shall be provided within the greenbelt adjacent to Brown Road. Specifically, lights within this area shall be compatible with the DTE "North Yorkshire" poles and fixtures. Compatibility shall be determined during site plan review. All lights shall be spaced 125' apart and shall be 18.5' in height. This standard is met.

d. Lighting fixtures within the interior portion of the BiZ district and not within the greenbelt of Brown, Joslyn or Jordan Roads shall be bronze color, shoebox style LED on a square pole. This standard is met. Interior light poles would be square with a bronze finish. The light fixture is an updated LED version of the traditional shoebox style light.

17. Knee wall. Where required, a 30" high knee wall as illustrated in Figures 34.2 and 34.3 shall be installed. The knee wall shall adhere to the following standards.

a. Decorative knee wall shall be located within the greenbelt, parallel to the R.O.W. and adjacent to the entry planting.

b. Columns shall be located at each end of the fence with a brick base and limestone cap.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Material Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick Column</td>
<td>Belden, Face Brick, Century Reds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone Cap</td>
<td>Limestone Cap, 4&quot; thick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Columns shall be have an overall height of 36 inches with a wall height of 2 feet 6 inches.

d. Maintenance and repair of the knee wall shall be the responsibility of the property owner.

The above required entry area improvements are not indicated on the site plan or landscape plan at either of the two private drive connections with Brown Road at each end of the site.

(Entry area improvements and landscaping may be waived/modified per Section 34.04)

18. Utilities. All utilities servicing the buildings or structures shall be buried underground. The submitted utility plans do not indicate proposed overhead electric or telecommunication lines in the utility legend or on the drawing. The applicant's response letter #14 states that all utilities are to be underground servicing all buildings. If approved, we recommend this be a condition of approval.

(Underground utilities may be waived/modified per Section 34.04)

19. Covered trash / recycling or compactor areas. Covered trash receptacles, recycling receptacles or compactors shall be surrounded on three (3) sides by masonry brick-type walls one (1) foot higher than the receptacle and shall be provided in the rear yard of the building or principal use structure.

This standard is not met. A dumpster enclosure for Restaurant A has been proposed within the Brown Road front yard, and a dumpster enclosure for Restaurant B has been proposed in the west side yard. Both dumpster enclosures should be relocated to the rear yards of each site. A combined rear yard dumpster area could also be proposed. We defer to the Planning and Zoning Director on if the dumpster enclosure location requirement can be waived to permit the locations as proposed.

20. Loading and unloading. Loading and unloading areas shall be located in the rear or side yard of a non-residential district. Loading and unloading areas shall not be located where they will interfere with parking or obstruct ingress and egress.
a. Restaurants. Designated delivery areas (loading areas), that is not a loading berth, is permitted by Section 27.04 B.3.b.i. for the restaurants as they are each under 10,000 GFA. No action is needed.

b. Hotels. Hotels under 100,000 sq. ft. GFA and containing retail shops, convention halls, auditoriums, exhibition halls, or business or professional offices are required to provide one loading berth. The applicant should address if any of these accessory uses are proposed for the hotels, which would warrant a loading area.

Waiver. The Planning Commission may, at their discretion, modify or waive the loading and unloading requirements upon finding that the proposed use will require infrequent deliveries and/or deliveries will usually be made by automobile, van or small truck. However, no action may be needed for the hotels depending on the proposed accessory uses.

21. Safety paths. Construction of safety paths for pedestrian use and use by non-motorized vehicles shall be required in conjunction with the development of all parcels in this zoning district. The safety paths shall conform to the specifications outlined in Section 27.06 and Ordinance No. 97. An 8-foot wide asphalt or concrete safety path is proposed within the Brown Road right-of-way. Safety paths are not present on abutting parcels to the west or east.

22. Landscaping & Tree permit. A complete review of landscaping requirements cannot be completed at this time as a tree survey has not been submitted, which is directly related to the amount of landscaping required for the development.

The tree permit requirements apply to developments in this BIZ district, according to the terms of Section 27.12. Section 27.05 D.2. requires site plans show all existing trees that are located in the portions of the site that will be built upon or otherwise altered and are four inches or greater in caliper measured 12 inches above grade, except prohibited trees. Additionally, protective measures should be implemented such as the placing of fencing or stakes at the dripline around the perimeter of plant material. No vehicle or other construction equipment shall be parked or stored within the dripline of any plant material intended to be saved. The applicant has stated that a tree survey of the site has not yet occurred. Therefore, compliance with Sections 27.12 and 27.05 cannot be verified.

23. Wetland setbacks. The wetland setback requirements apply to all developments in this District, according to the terms of Section 27.17. Wetlands are indicated through the middle of the site and at the north end on the below map. No wetlands setbacks are indicated on the proposed plans and it is unclear if a waiver of this section is requested. The applicant has stated that a wetland application will be submitted. We defer to the Township Engineer’s review of wetland impacts.

For all wetlands as defined in Article II of this ordinance and by Ordinance No. 107, setbacks for all structures, parking lots, streets or driveways shall be in accordance with the following regulations:

**Required Setbacks**
- All structures or buildings: 25 ft.
- All decks: 10 ft.
- Parking lots: 25 ft.
- Streets, roads, driveways: 25 ft.
Waivers. The Planning Commission has the discretion to decrease the above required setbacks upon demonstration of the appropriateness of a lower setback and compliance with one (1) or more of the following criteria:

1. Demonstrated habitat preservation.
2. Demonstrated water quality preservation.
3. Demonstrated storm water quality retention.
4. Existence of a legal lot of record.
CONCLUSION

1. Site Monument Structure. If approved, we recommend a condition be included that requires the site monument structure to remain with the future hotels parcel to be created as part of a future land division. We recommend this as the Zoning Ordinance prohibits accessory buildings/structures from being located on parcels without or prior to a principal building or use being present (§27.02 A.1.-2.); and also prohibits detached accessory buildings/structures within front yards (as proposed) when the accessory structure exceeds the height of the principal building/structure (on the same parcel). The site monument structure can only be permitted per the Zoning Ordinance if it is associated with the hotels parcel and constructed concurrently with a hotel being developed on the rear parcel.

2. The proposed site monument structure is currently partially within the 30-foot minimum front yard setback along Brown Road and should be relocated to be outside of the setback as it is considered an accessory building, or approval of a waiver would be necessary to permit the proposed location. We have no objections to a waiver being granted given that this is a planned development.

   (BIZ setbacks may be waived/modified per Section 34.04)

3. Hotels Parking. The Zoning Ordinance does not include a specific parking requirement for hotels. The applicant has proposed a parking ratio of one space for each hotel guest room, with no additional parking spaces provided. As no requirement is provided, the Planning Commission should determine if the proposed ratio is acceptable. Based on our experience, hotels rarely operate at full capacity and ridesharing services impact the parking demand for hotel uses. The proposed parking ratio should meet anticipated demand.

4. Parking/Driveway Setbacks. Along the north property line abutting R-1 zoning to the north, the applicant has proposed a varying parking area/driveway setback that is less than 30 feet in width along the majority of the north property line. Along the east and west property lines abutting BIZ zoning, the applicant has proposed a 10-foot parking area/driveway setback that is less than 20 feet along the entirety of each property line. *The required setback for parking may be reduced in width or waived by the Planning Commission, subject to landscaping or screening requirements.

5. Greenbelts. Greenbelts for Use Group A and C shall be 20 feet in width (hotel sites). (§ 34.03 E.7.e.). This standard is not met along the perimeter boundary of the entire site given the amount of pavement proposed. Additionally, interior site greenbelts between Parcels A, B, and C are not indicated on the site plan or landscape plan. It is unclear if this is being requested to be waived. In consideration of the overall design and impact of the landscape plan, the Planning Commission may reduce or waive the requirements outlined herein for General Landscaping, or for landscaping in greenbelt areas, on berms, or as part of a screen, provided that any such adjustment is in keeping with the intent of the Ordinance, and more specifically, with the intent of Section 27.05.

6. Interior access roads. New roads providing interior access to two or more lots shall provide a right-of-way of at least 66 feet. This standard is not met along the internal loop private road around the restaurant sites as the right-of-way width varies primarily from 43 feet along the sides to 51 feet along the rear. However, it is our understanding that this requirement can be reduced by the Township
Board as part of the Land Division process. We defer to the Planning Director on if site plan approval should be conditioned on the Township Board reducing the required right-of-way width.

7. Entry area improvements. The entry area improvements as required by the Zoning Ordinance are not indicated on the site plan or landscape plan at either of the two private drive connections with Brown Road at each end of the site. The proposal includes brick accent walls with piers "to picture frame the site monument". Additionally, the applicant's response letter #11 states that they are not aware of other sites in the BIZ district that have entry area improvements. As proposed, a waiver or modification would be required for the proposed entry area improvements. We defer to the Planning Director and Planning Commission on not providing the entry area improvements as required as this is a key element of the BIZ district general designs standards.

(Entry area improvements and landscaping may be waived/modified per Section 34.04)

8. The required entry area improvements are not indicated on the site plan or landscape plan at either of the two private drive connections with Brown Road at each end of the site.

(Entry area improvements and landscaping may be waived/modified per Section 34.04)

9. Utilities. All utilities servicing the buildings or structures shall be buried underground. The submitted utility plans do not indicate proposed overhead electric or telecommunication lines in the utility legend or on the drawing. The applicant's response letter #14 states that all utilities are to be underground servicing all buildings. If approved, we recommend this be a condition of approval.

(Underground utilities may be waived/modified per Section 34.04)

10. Landscaping & Tree permit. A complete review of landscaping requirements cannot be completed at this time as a tree survey has not been submitted, which is directly related to the amount of landscaping required for the development. The applicant has stated that a tree survey of the site has not yet occurred. Therefore, compliance with Sections 27.12 and 27.05 cannot be verified.

11. Wetland setbacks. The wetland setback requirements apply to all developments in this District, according to the terms of Section 27.17. Wetlands are indicated through the middle of the site and at the north end on the below map. No wetlands setbacks are indicated on the proposed plans and it is unclear if a waiver of this section is requested. The applicant has stated that a wetland application will be submitted. We defer to the Township Engineer's review of wetland impacts.

12. See 9. in the body of the letter for parking dimension requests and 10. for pedestrian pathway dimensions requested by the applicant.

Respectfully,

Giffels Webster

Rod Arroyo, AICP
Partner

Eric Fazzini, AICP, CNU-A
Senior Planner

www.GiffelsWebster.com
September 29, 2020

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

RE: Grand Square of Orion, PC-2020-11
Site Plan Review #3

Received: September 10, 2020 by Orion Township

Dear Mr. Dunaskiss:

We have completed our review of Grand Square of Orion plan set. The plans were prepared by R.A. Chiesa Architects, P.C. and Designhaus Architecture 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 595 Brown Rd. in the southeast quadrant within Section 32 of the Charter Township of Orion. The site is zoned Brown Rd. Innovation Zone (BIZ) and bound by parcels to the north of the property zoned Single Family Residential (R-1), and parcels to the east and west of the property zoned Brown Rd. Innovation Zone (BIZ). Parcels on the south side of Brown Rd. are located within the City of Auburn Hills and zoned General Business, (B-2).

The existing site is made up of Lot 3 through Lot 8 of the Highland Farms Subdivision Plat. The site consists of two single-story buildings and a shed. There are multiple wetlands in and adjacent to the site. The applicant has identified Wetlands A through H on the ALTA/NSPS Land Title Survey. The site ranges in elevation from approximately 1055 in the north of the site to 1007 on the south side. There are many trees throughout the site, with the highest concentration located in the northwest and southeast of the site adjacent the larger wetlands. The remaining site area consists primarily of drivable gravel surface. Consumers Energy and Detroit Edison Company both appear to have easements/utilities that run through the property and are identified on the ALTA Survey. Relocation of these easements and utilities appears necessary to facilitate construction for this project. Approval for work within their easements and relocation of said easements and their associated utilities must be obtained from DTE and Consumers.

We understand the applicant intends to complete lot splits rather than create a condominium for this development. Proposed legal descriptions for the proposed parcels needs to be included in the plans.

In addition, any phasing of the site will need to be included in the plans for review and approval. A comprehensive phasing plan should be provided in the plan set including the required construction of utilities, storm water management and pavement for circulation of emergency vehicles.
The existing survey plan was omitted from 2nd submittal. The applicant shall submit a comprehensive set of plans as one package including architectural, civil, survey, landscaping plans. In addition, the cover sheet should include a complete index of all plans included in the Site Plan.

**WATER MAIN AND SANITARY SEWER:**

There is 16-inch water main that runs along the frontage of the property in the Brown Rd. right-of-way. The applicant is proposing to connect to the water main in two locations along Brown Rd. From those connections, 8-inch water main will be extended around the perimeter of the site, forming a looped connection. Gate valve spacing appears to have been revised, but the gate valve layer appears to be shifted, as several gate valves appear to be floating in locations not attached to the water main. Please align the gate valves properly to the water main alignment so that gate valve spacing may be assessed. The internal loop shall have the gate valves spaced such that a break in the line will not put more than 2 hydrants out of service at one time. A 12-foot easement was included on the water main. Water main easement and stubs extend all the way to the east and west site borders for future connection to adjacent parcels. FDC locations were shown on the plans. A 3-foot wide area has been striped out in front of each of the FDC’s where adjacent to parking. The loading zone for the eastern restaurant has been relocated in front of the FDC for that building. This conflict needs to be resolved. We defer further comment on the FDC’s and hydrants to the Orion Township Fire Department. Per the Township’s Water Main Model, there is sufficient capacity to serve the proposed development.

10-inch sanitary sewer is present along the north side of Brown Rd. The applicant is proposing to extend 10-inch sanitary sewer through the center of the site with an 8-inch lead for each of the five buildings. Monitoring manholes have been provided for each building. Please label the monitoring manholes as such at engineering. The restaurant buildings require external grease separators on their leads prior to discharging into the sewer main. The hotel buildings will also require a grease separator if they include full kitchens. A 20-foot sanitary sewer easement appears to be provided for the proposed sewer. Storm and sanitary sewer alignment may require slight adjustment to ensure a 10-foot horizontal separation from the center of the sanitary sewer to the edge of any storm appurtenance. A preliminary BOD calculation has been provided for the site. Per the Township’s Sanitary Sewer Model, there is sufficient capacity to serve the proposed development.

**STORMWATER MANAGEMENT:**

The site is located within the Brown Drainage District which has an allowable outflow of 0.1 cfs/acre. The existing site has a high point of approximately 1055 in the northeast. From there, some runoff is directed north to the wetland directly adjacent the site, and the rest follows the general drainage pattern of the site, directing water from the north to the south. The existing site generally drains from the north to the southeast of the site, with some intermittent low points like Wetland B. Wetland H and Wetland D are connected by a 24-inch pipe underneath the gravel lot. From Wetland D, excess runoff appears to be directed to a 12-inch storm inlet that directs water into the storm sewer along Brown Rd. and acts as the ultimate outlet for the site. There is an existing catch basin in the location of the proposed approach on the east side of the site. This structure must be removed or reconstructed to accommodate the new approach.

A series of catch basins and storm sewer network is proposed to capture the runoff for the site. The applicant is not proposing a forebay with the detention basin. Therefore, mechanical pretreatment devices will be required upstream of the end-sections that outlet into the detention basins. These structures must be spatially accounted for at site plan. Sizing calculations supporting the choice and type of structure must be provided at engineering. Conveyance and restrictor calculations will be required at engineering. Preliminary detention calculations were included in the plan set. The applicant has provided a C-value calculation as well which appears acceptable, finding the post-development C-value to be 0.82.
The architectural site plan shows the detention basin as a wet basin with a fountain in the center. The minimum depth for wet basins is 4 feet below the bottom of storage. Therefore, the bottom of detention basin needs to be lowered 4 feet below the outlet elevation.

The existing drainage map previously included was omitted from this submittal. Per previous review, there appears to be runoff from ~4.1 acres off-site that, via the existing drainage pattern, enters the site. This off-site drainage must be diverted around the site, or additional detention provided to accommodate this additional runoff. Currently, the plans do not indicate how the off-site drainage will be accommodated.

At engineering, roof conductors shall be shown on the plans. Also, the method of installation for the portion of storm sewer crossing Brown Rd. should be called out as installed in a casing via jack and bore, as Brown Rd. was recently paved as part of the Brown Rd. Widening Project.

**PAVING & GRADING:**
The existing site currently has five approaches directly on Brown Rd. which were originally set up for future lots within the Highland Farms Subdivision. Three of the approaches have driveways attached, and two of them appear to have been used regularly. The applicant is proposing to remove all approaches and install two new concrete approaches on Brown Rd. The private road throughout the site is proposed as asphalt with a minimum drive aisle width of 26 feet. Internal drive aisles appear to be a minimum of 22 feet wide between parking stalls. Parking stalls are primarily 9 feet by 19 feet, except for some parking stalls adjacent green space which are sized 9 feet by 18 feet.

Pavement slopes were provided using spot grades and rim elevations and generally appear acceptable. Pavement slopes are to remain between 1% and 6% for drive areas, and between 1% and 4% for parking areas. More detailed grading information will be required at engineering to fully assess pavement grades. Detailed grades will be required to assess sidewalk and ramp grades for ADA compliance. Cross-sections were included for the internal concrete sidewalk, the concrete dumpster pad, and the asphalt lot and drive aisles and appear acceptable. A cross-section for the 8’ wide pathway along Brown Road per Orion Township standards needs to be included in the plan set.

The site’s internal sidewalk now extends down the center of the site on a thin strip of green space between the detention basin and the private road. The sidewalk is represented as a 3-foot wide concrete walk in an 11 to 15-foot green space. The minimum sidewalk width for internal walks is 5 feet. Given the T/C and T/W grades on either side of the walk, the grades do not allow for a 1:4 green space slope and a 2% maximum cross-slope sidewalk. This internal walk is unacceptable. The walk also extends across the parking lot between parking stalls north of the eastern restaurant. This sidewalk needs to be a minimum of 5 feet wide. Additional measures such as curb or bumper blocks would be required to address the bumper overhang.

Proposed grading is shown via contours and spot grades. Proposed slopes outside paved appear to be kept at 1:5 which is acceptable, however there appear to be some slopes between the detention basin and the curb that are 1:3. A fence with a gate is shown around the detention basin. Grades outside the fence should maintain a slope at or below a 1:4. A fence and gate detail shall be provided at site plan. It appears grading is required outside the limits of the property. A temporary grading easement will be required for each parcel where off-site grading is taking place.

A retaining wall is proposed around the detention basin with a max height of approximately 5-feet. A retaining wall submittal package complete with detailed calculations will be required for review at engineering. Coordination will be required between the retaining wall and the storm water overland relief route for the detention basin. The retaining wall shall be spatially represented accurately in the site plan.

**TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION:**
A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was not included in the plans. We recommend that the applicant be permitted to contribute to the regional TIS currently underway in lieu of completing their own separate TIS.
Pedestrian connections should be provided on surfaces designated to pedestrian use. While reconfiguration to provide sidewalks may result in a reduction of parking spaces, it appears that more parking spaces are being proposed than required. Where sidewalks are provided adjacent to parking spaces the sidewalk walk width should be increased to 7 feet to accommodate vehicle bumper overhang.

Pedestrian facilities connect to the pathway along Brown Road using a walkway connecting to a site monument before continuing into the site. The internal intersection near the site monument includes two diagonal crosswalks to provide access to the two restaurants. The applicant should remove one proposed parking space on both sides of the site monument. The intersection area should be raised to provide a tabletop style speed hump intersection to reduce speeds and improve visibility of the area.

Property access points across Brown Rd. should be shown on the Site Plan sheet. Driveway spacing in this area is a concern as the large number of commercial driveways has the potential to create multiple conflicts.

A swept path turning template plan for the Orion Township Fire Apparatus was included in the plan set and appears acceptable.

The applicant is proposing to combine and split the existing parcels rather than create a condominium. As such, the plan will be subject to the Ordinance 60 - Land Division & Private Roads. This ordinance requires the split parcels to front a public or private road. The applicant is proposing three (3) resulting parcels. Two (2) of the parcels will front Brown Road, and the third will be to the north and have access via two (2) private roads connecting to Brown Road and looping through the site. The ordinance requires this private road easement to be 60 feet wide. It is our opinion that the intent of the ordinance is the require 60 feet in width to accommodate a typical 2-way road, space for ditches/drainage, water main, sanitary sewer and franchise utilities. As noted on the plan, the private road width is currently listed as 26 feet wide at its narrowest locations and the private road right-of-way is now called out as 43 feet wide. This still does not meet the 60' width requirement and would require approval by the Township Board. However, since the Site Plan includes sufficient space for drainage, water main, sanitary sewer and franchise utilities, it is our opinion the intent of the ordinance would be met and could be approved.

**NATURAL FEATURES:**

**WETLANDS**

There are several wetlands on site. A wetland impact permit application has been submitted and reviewed separately. A 25-foot wetland buffer from the existing wetlands has been represented on the plans. Impacts to the wetland buffer will need to be approved as part of the site plan.

**WOODLANDS**

A landscape plan was included in the plan set, however a tree survey was not and one is required for site plan approval. Landmark trees must be identified and a calculation for replacement trees must be included. There are several dense pockets of trees located on the site.

**LANDSCAPING:**

Proposed trees are located along the perimeter green space and interior parking lot islands. Trees shall be kept out of proposed utility easements wherever possible. Trees shall not be located directly over any water main or sanitary sewer in any circumstance.

**CONCLUSION:**

In our opinion, the site plan as submitted is not in substantial compliance with the Township's ordinances and engineering standards. We ask that the following items be addressed:
1. Revise the plan to account for off-site drainage. Either add additional detention to accept this drainage or route the drainage around the site.
2. Increase the proposed 3-foot-wide internal sidewalk to the township standard minimum of 5 feet wide.
3. Revise the grading between the detention basin and the curb from 1:3 to a maximum of 1:4.
4. A tree survey shall be included in the plan set. The tree survey must include the number of landmark trees as well as a tabulated list, identifying which trees are to be removed.
5. Legal descriptions for the proposed lot splits need to be included in the plans.
6. Obtain a wetland impact permit from Orion Township for the proposed wetland filling.
7. The proposed main drive is shown within a 43-foot-wide right-of-way which is below the minimum 60-foot width requirement. This deviation will need to be approved by the Township.
8. Provide preliminary approval from Consumers Energy to work within and modify their easement as shown.
9. A comprehensive phasing plan shall be included in the plan set. The plan shall address the required construction of utilities, storm water management and pavement for circulation of emergency vehicles.
10. We recommend the applicant be permitted to contribute to the regional Traffic Impact Study currently underway in lieu of preparing a separate TIS.
11. Increase the parking stall depths from 18 feet to meet the minimum 19-foot depth requirement.
12. Provide a cross-section for the 8’ wide pathway along Brown Road per Orion Township standards.
13. Lower the bottom of the detention basin to provide a minimum of 4’ of permanent storage below the outlet to accommodate the wet basin with fountain shown on the architectural site plan.
14. Align the gate valves properly to the water main.
15. Provide a detail for the fence and gate surrounding the detention basin.
16. Resolve the conflict between the loading zone and the FDC on the eastern restaurant.
17. Resubmit a comprehensive set of plans as one package including architectural, civil, survey and landscaping sheets with a complete sheet index.

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

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 Haagkow, Water and Sewer Superintendent
    Jason Kishnish, Grand Management and Development
    Ronald Chiesa, RA Chiesa Architects
    Joseph Dumlao, Dumlaoa
Justin Dunaskiss, Planning Commission Chairperson

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION
2525 Joslyn Road
Lake Orion, MI 48360

RE: Grand Square of Orion, LLC, PC-2019-11
Wetland Review

Received: September 16, 2020 by Orion Township

Dear Mr. Dunaskiss:

We have completed the first review for the Grand Square of Orion wetland submittal. Wetlands on this site are shown in the report prepared by BWA Consulting. The USACE/EGLE Joint Permit Application was utilized for the township wetland permit application and was included in the submittal. The application was reviewed with respect to the Township’s Wetlands Protection Ordinance, No. 107.

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:
The proposed site is located on the north side of Brown Rd. between Baldwin and Joslyn Rd. in the southeast ¼ of Section 32 of the Charter Township of Orion. After conducting a site visit on July 8, 2020, we were able to generally confirm the location of the wetlands as depicted on the plans and in the wetland report.

Wetland #1 – see below: The applicant’s wetland plan identifies the on-site portion of this wetland as 0.08 acres in size. The Michigan Resource Inventory System (MIRIS) maps and the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) maps identify the on-site portion of this wetland as part of a 0.43 acre freshwater forested/shrub wetland extending off-site to the north, described as a palustrine, forested broad-leaved deciduous wetland that is seasonally flooded (PFO1C). The NWI Maps show this wetland connecting to a larger off-site 5.31-acre wetland (5.74-acre total) that is palustrine scrub-shrub broad-leaved deciduous. The applicant also identified hydric soils in this area which is consistent with the NRCS soils map for this site. The applicant’s survey also identified standing water within this wetland. This wetland is regulated by the Township as it meets the criteria outlined in section 5.B.5. The site provides flood and storm control by the hydrologic absorption and storage capacity of the wetland. Due to the overall size of this mostly off-site wetland, we recommend the applicant inquire with EGLE if this wetland may be state regulated.

Wetland #2 – see below: The applicant’s wetland plan identifies this wetland as 0.28 acres in size. The Michigan Resource Inventory System (MIRIS) maps and the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) maps do not identify this wetland area; however, open water was present in this area during our site visit. The applicant describes this area as an isolated, forested depression containing hydric soils. It is our understanding that this wetland is not regulated by EGLE as it is less than 5-acres in size and not contiguous to a lake, stream or pond. This wetland is regulated by the Township as it meets the criteria outlined in section 5.B.5. The site provides flood and storm control by the hydrologic absorption and storage capacity of the wetland.
**Wetland #3 — see below:** The applicant’s wetland plan identifies this wetland as 1.02 acres in size. The Michigan Resource Inventory System (MIRIS) maps and the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) maps identify this wetland as a 1.71-acre freshwater forested/shrub wetland, described as palustrine scrub-shrub broad-leaved deciduous and seasonally flooded (PSS1C). It should be noted that this wetland and Wetland #6 (0.54 acres) are connected via an existing culvert. The inventory maps show these wetlands as one larger continuous wetland area extending off-site to the west (4.95 acres total) that also encompasses Wetlands #4 and #5 (0.014 acres and 0.014 acres respectively). This larger wetland area appears to have been broken up by filling operations sometime between 1980 and 1990 with only Wetland #3 and Wetland #6 remaining. There also appears to be an end-section on the south side of the wetland that connects to the storm sewer located in Brown Rd. The applicant identifies this area as an isolated, forested, scrub shrub and emergent depression with hydric soils and standing water. NRCS soil maps confirm the existence of hydric soils in this location. It is our understanding that this wetland is not regulated by EGLE as it is less than 5-acres in size and not contiguous to a lake, stream or pond. However, it is our opinion that this wetland is regulated by the Township since it meets the criteria outlined in section 5.B.5. The site provides flood and storm control by the hydrologic absorption and storage capacity of the wetland.

**Wetlands #4 and #5 — see below:** The applicant’s wetland plan does not identify the acreage of these two very small wetlands, but they scale to be approximately 0.01 acres each. The Michigan Resource Inventory System (MIRIS) maps and the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) maps include both these areas in the larger wetland area associated with Wetlands #3 and #6. This area is described as palustrine scrub-shrub broad-leaved deciduous and seasonally flooded (PSS1C). A dirt drive/path currently separates these smaller wetlands from the larger Wetland #3. A portion of Wetland #5 extends off the east border of the site. The applicant identifies these areas as isolated scrub shrub and emergent ditches with hydric soils. It is our understanding that these wetlands are not regulated by EGLE as they are less than 5 acres and not contiguous to a lake, pond, or stream. These wetlands are also not regulated by the Township as neither wetland falls under the descriptions listed in Article V of the ordinance.

**Wetland #6 — see below:** The applicant’s wetland plan identifies this wetland as 0.54 acres in size. The Michigan Resource Inventory System (MIRIS) maps and the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) maps include this area in the larger wetland area associated with Wetland #3. This area is described as palustrine scrub-shrub broad-leaved deciduous and seasonally flooded (PSS1C). The applicant has identified this area as an isolated, scrub shrub and emergent depression with hydric soils. As mentioned above, this wetland is connected to Wetland #3 via a culvert. NRCS soil maps confirm the existence of hydric soils in this location. It is our understanding that this wetland is not regulated by EGLE as it is less than 5-acres in size and not contiguous to a lake, stream or pond. However, it is our opinion that this wetland is regulated by the Township since it meets the criteria outlined in section 5.B.5. The site provides flood and storm control by the hydrologic absorption and storage capacity of the wetland.

As noted in the below pictures, the vegetation in the on-site wetlands does include some wetland trees and grasses but have become overgrown with common reed (Phragmites). While the wetlands provide local flood and storm control by absorption and storage (item 5.B.5), they do not appear to be of high-quality meeting other criteria listed below:

2. The site represents what is identified as a locally rare or unique ecosystem.
3. The site supports plants or animals of an identified local importance.
4. The site provides groundwater recharge documented by a public agency.
5. The site provides flood and storm control by the hydrologic absorption and storage capacity of the wetland.
6. The site provides wildlife habitat by providing breeding, nesting, or feeding grounds or cover for forms of wildlife, waterfowl, including migratory waterfowl and rare, threatened, or endangered wildlife species.
7. The site provides protection of subsurface water resources and provision of valuable watersheds and recharging groundwater supplies.

8. The site provides pollution treatment by serving as a biological and chemical oxidation basin.

9. The site provides erosion control by serving as a sedimentation area and filtering basin, absorbing silt and organic matter.

10. The site provides sources of nutrients in water cycles and nursery grounds and sanctuaries for fish.

Looking north at Wetland #1
Looking northwest toward the north end of Wetland #2
West of Wetland #3, looking north
Wetland #6 from east of existing building
North of Wetland #3, west of Wetland #4, looking south
North of Wetland #3, looking southeast toward Wetlands #4 and #5
IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT ON THE WETLANDS:

Impact to Wetlands:
The applicant is proposing to impact all on-site wetlands. The impacts include filling for placement of buildings/parking lot and excavating for the construction of the proposed detention basin. This amount to 1.92-acres of impacts to Township regulated wetlands. As previously noted, we recommend the applicant inquire with EGLE if Wetland #1 may be state regulated which could have further permitting requirements.

Proposed Mitigation:
The applicant is not proposing any wetland mitigation for the proposed 1.92-acres of impact. Per review of the proposed site plan, there does not appear to be sufficient room for on-site mitigation. The Planning Commission should determine if mitigation will be required.

Per the Ordinance, the wetland application shall not be approved unless the following exist:
1. The action or use is not likely to or will not pollute, impair, or destroy a wetland. While the proposed project does impact all on-site wetlands, it appears these wetlands are only providing storm water management. Since the applicant is proposing to construct a replacement storm water management system, it is our opinion that the function of these wetlands will be mitigated.
2. There are no feasible or prudent alternatives to the proposed action. In our opinion, the proposed land use is consistent with the proposed future use of the property.
3. The approval is consistent with public interest, in light of the stated purposes of this Ordinance. Based on the above findings, it is our opinion the requirements of the Wetlands Protection Ordinance are being met. The applicant intends to provide the required storm water management facilities.

CONCLUSION:
In our opinion, the wetlands submittal is in substantial compliance with the Township’s Wetlands Protection Ordinance. However, we request that any Wetland Permit approval be contingent upon the following:

1. The Planning Commission should decide if mitigation is required.

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

Sincerely,

OHM Advisors

Joe Lehman
Project Engineer

Mark A. Landis, P.E.
Project Manager

cc: Chris Barnett, Township Supervisor
    David Goodloe, Building Official
    Jeff Stout, Director of Public Services
    Tammy Girding, Director of Planning and Zoning
    Lynn Harrison, Planning and Zoning Coordinator
    Jason Kishkush, Grand Management and Development
    Ronald Chiesa, RA Chiesa Architects
    Joseph Dattilo, Designhaus
To: Planning Commission/Planning & Zoning Director  
From: Jeff Williams, Fire Marshal  
Re: PC-2020-11, Grand Square of Orion Site Plan  
Date: 9/24/2020

The Orion Township Fire Department has completed its review of Application PC-2020-11 for the limited purpose of compliance with Charter Township of Orion Ordinance's, Michigan Building Code, and all applicable Fire Codes.

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

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

Requirements:

Restaurant Building A:
- The Fire Department Connection is currently obstructed by the proposed loading zone. The fire department will require the FDC be relocated to the North side of the building where it shall not be obstructed by proposed parking spots.

General Site Requirements:
- All access points located in the parking lots that lead to each Fire Department Connection shall be increased from 3' in width to 5' in width.

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

Sincerely,

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

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

Date: October 1, 2020

Re: PC-2020-11, Site Plan Review #3 Grand Square of Orion

Dear Tammy,

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

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeffery T. Stout
Director
Department of Public Services

RECEIVED
OCT 01 2020
Orion Township Planning & Zoning
May 6, 2020

Orion Township
Attn: Tammy Girling
2525 Joslyn Rd
Lake Orion, MI 48360

RE: R.C.O.C. PRELIMINARY PLAN REVIEW 20P0024
LOCATION: BROWN RD, ORION TOWNSHIP
PROJECT NAME: GRAND SQUARE OF ORION TWP

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) Remove or relocate all fixed objects prior to excavation. Fixed objects shall be no nearer than 5 feet from back of curb, or 12 feet from lane line.
B) Any pedestrian facilities shall be constructed in accordance with current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) guidelines.
C) The proposed drive approaches should include 50 foot long accel taper and 75 foot long decel taper.
D) Drive approaches 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) Adjust/reconstruct existing storm structure as warranted.
H) Proposed 12” storm sewer crossing the road to be jack case and bore.
I) Excavations within a 1:1 influence of the roadway will require MDOT Class II backfill compacted to 95% maximum density.
J) Provide 1 on 3 Max slope between existing sidewalk and proposed curb on the west side of Joslyn Rd.
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, 5 for signal permit) 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) Drive approaches  
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,

Scott Sintkowski, P.E.  
Permit Engineer  
Department of Customer Services

SS/mac  
Enclosure
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: GRAND SQUARE OF ORION TOWNSHIP

Name of Development if applicable: 

Applicant:
Name: RONALD A. CHIEGA BA CHIEGA ARCHITECT
Address: 4926 MARRFIELD RD CITE: CLINTON TWP, MI Zip: 48038
Phone: (586) 223-5519 Cell: Fax: 
Email: rchiega@chiegaarchitect.com

Property Owner(s):
Name: JANON KISHMISH
Address: 9199 MOUTHFIELD RD CITE: BEVERLY HILLS, MI Zip: 
Phone: Cell: (248) 217-1294 Fax: 
Email: jkishmish@grandmd.com

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

Plan Preparer Firm/Person:
Name: BA CHIEGA ARCHITECTS RONALD A. CHIEGA
Address: 4926 MARRFIELD RD CITE: CLINTON TWP, MI Zip: 48038
Phone: (586) 223-5519 Cell: Fax: 
Email: rchiega@chiegaarchitect.com

Project Contact Person:
Name: JANON KISHMISH
Address: 9199 MOUTHFIELD RD CITE: BEVERLY HILLS, MI Zip: 
Phone: Cell: (248) 217-1294 Fax: 
Email: jkishmish@grandmd.com
Sidwell Number(s): 09-32-400-076, 077, 070, 069 + 071

Location or Address of Property: 595 BROWN RD

Side of Street: NORTH Nearest Intersection: W. OF JOYNT & BROWN

Acreage: 12.20 Current Use of Property: VACANT

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)

Give a detailed description of the proposed development, including the number and size of the buildings or units being proposed: MULTI-USE DEVELOPMENT W 5 BUILDINGS- 2 HOTELS & 2 RESTAURANTS

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

Oakland County Water Resources
One Public Dr.
Waterford, MI 48328

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: [Signature]
Print Name: RONALD A. CHIERA
Date: 3/19/20

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: [Signature]
Date: 3/19/20
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**RECEIVED**

**SEP 14 2020**

Orion Township
Planning & Zoning
Digital EGLE/USACE Joint Permit Application (JPA) for Inland Lakes and Streams, Great Lakes, Wetlands, Floodplains, Dams, Environmental Areas, High Risk Erosion Areas and Critical Dune Areas
version 1.20

(Submission #: HP1-T21H-QRA65, version 1)

Details

Submission ID: HP1-T21H-QRA65
Submission Reason: New
Status: Submitted

Fees

Fee: $2,000.00
Payments/Adjustments: $0.00
Balance Due: $2,000.00 (Due)

Form Input

Instructions

To download a copy or print these instructions, please click this link (recommended).

Contact Information

Applicant Information (Usually the property owner)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Kishmish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organization Name
Grand Management & Development

Phone Type: Business
Number: 2485945939

Email
jkiishmish@grandmd.com

31333 Southfield Road
Suite 160
Beverly Hills, MI 48025

Is the Property Owner different from the Applicant?
No

Has the applicant hired an agent or cooperating agency (agency or firm assisting applicant) to complete the application process?
No
Are there additional property owners or other contacts you would like to add to the application?
No

Project Location

DEQ Site Reference Number (Pre-Populated)
-5177501288749764078

Project Location
42.708031, -83.293795

595 Brown Rd, Lake Orion, MI 48359, USA

Project Location Address
595 Brown Road
Orion Township, MI 48359

County
Oakland

Is there a Property Tax ID Number(s) for the project area?
Yes
Please enter the Tax ID Number(s) for the project location
0-09-32-400-071, 0-09-32-400-069, 0-09-32-400-076, 0-09-32-400-077

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

Is this project within Indian Lands?
No

Local Unit of Government (LUG)
Orion Township

Directions to Project Site
Site is located on North side of Brown Road in between Jostyn and Baldwin Road.

Background Information

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

Has the EGLE completed a Wetland Identification Program (WIP) assessment for this site?
No

Environmental Area Number (if known):
NONE PROVIDED

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

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

Have any activities commenced on this project?
No

Is this an after-the-fact application?
No
Are you aware of any unresolved violations of environmental law or litigation involving the property?
No

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Type of Approval</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date Applied</th>
<th>Approved/Denied/Undetermined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orion Township</td>
<td>Site Plan Approval</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5/8/2020</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orion Township</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5/8/2020</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orion Township</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5/8/2020</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orion Township</td>
<td>Soil Erosion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5/8/2020</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
NONE PROVIDED

**Permit Application Category and Public Notice Information**

Indicate the type of permit being applied for.
General Permit for wetlands, lakes, streams, or Great Lakes

If you are applying for a general permit, which project type(s) is being proposed?
NO GP CATEGORY (MP Category only)

**Project Description**

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

Project Type (select all that apply):
Development-Commercial/Industrial

Project Summary (Purpose and Use): Provide a summary of all proposed activities including the intended use and reason for the proposed project.
A proposed multi-building development that includes two 8,000 SF restaurants. Towards the back of the property 3 hotels are also proposed (83,348 SF Hilton Garden Inn, 54,822 SF Fairfield Inn, and 86,556 SF Residence Inn).

Project Construction Sequence, Methods, and Equipment: Describe how the proposed project timing, methods, and equipment will minimize disturbance from the project construction, including but not limited to soil erosion and sedimentation control measures.
Project is estimated to start construction in Fall 2020 or Spring 2021. Cut and Fill analysis has been done to determine how to minimize soil disturbance and gradation changes of the site. Soil Erosion methods required by the township will be implemented during construction. Existing gas line at the rear of the site has been avoided in the design of the site.

Project Alternatives: Describe all options considered as alternatives to the proposed project, and describe how impacts to state and federal regulated waters will be avoided and minimized. This may include other locations, materials, etc.
None of the wetlands on the site per our wetland study report are subject to regulation by the EGLE. An attached wetland plan shows the encroachment of the proposed site on the wetlands.

Project Compensation: Describe how the proposed impacts to state and federal regulated waters will be compensated, OR explain why compensatory mitigation should not be required for the proposed impacts. Include amount, location, and method of compensation (i.e., bank, on-site, preservation, etc.)
None of the wetlands on the site per our wetland study report are subject to regulation by the EGLE.
Upload any additional information as needed to provide information applicable to your project regarding project purpose sequence, methods, alternatives, or compensation.

NONE PROVIDED

Comment

NONE PROVIDED

Resource and Activity Type

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

Other Project Type

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

Wetland

Major Project Fee Calculation Questions

Is filling of 10,000 cubic yards or more proposed (cumulatively) within wetlands, streams, lakes, or Great Lakes?

Yes

Is dredging of 10,000 cubic yards (cumulatively) or more proposed within streams, lakes, or Great Lakes? (wetlands not included)

No

Is new dredging or adjacent upland excavation in suspected contamination areas proposed by this application?

No

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

No

Wetland Project Information and Impacts

Has a professional wetland delineation been completed for this site?

Yes

Attach a copy of wetland delineation report with data form.

17-588 Report Final.pdf - 08/06/2020 10:47 AM

Comment

NONE PROVIDED

Total acres of wetland affected by this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Affected area (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum: 1.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is filling or draining of 1 acre or more (cumulatively) of wetland proposed?

Yes

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

Emergent

Forested

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

Driveway
Parking Area
General Fill
Path/Sidewalk

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Length (feet)</th>
<th>Width (feet)</th>
<th>Depth (feet)</th>
<th>Area (square feet)</th>
<th>Volume (cubic feet)</th>
<th>Volume (cubic yards)</th>
<th>Corrected value for complex impact AREAS (square feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot 1</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62400</td>
<td>436800</td>
<td>16178</td>
<td>NONE PROVIDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot 2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29000</td>
<td>290000</td>
<td>10741</td>
<td>NONE PROVIDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot 3</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18150</td>
<td>127050</td>
<td>4706</td>
<td>NONE PROVIDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot 4</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>43200</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>NONE PROVIDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td>Sum: 114950</td>
<td>Sum: 897050</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum: 33225</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum: NaN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Fill Material:
On-site (show on plan)

Type of Fill:
Other: Engineered Fill

Is riprap proposed?
No

Select from the following list for Excavation/Dredge Activities (if your proposed project is primarily a structure enter the impact as a structure. Only enter an impacted area in one of the impact tables in one impact section):

None of the above
Basin - Stormwater Basin

If your project includes EXCAVATION/DREDGE IN WETLAND then select all of the proposed activities in the following list. If your activity is not shown, then select None of the Above and move to the next question. Only enter an impacted area in one of the impact tables (do not duplicate impact entries):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Length (feet)</th>
<th>Width (feet)</th>
<th>Depth (feet)</th>
<th>Area (sq. feet)</th>
<th>Volume (cubic feet)</th>
<th>Volume (cubic yards)</th>
<th>Corrected value for complex impact AREAS (square feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detention Basin</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10800</td>
<td>32400</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>NONE PROVIDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td>Sum: 10800</td>
<td>Sum: 32400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum: 1200</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum: NaN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spoils Disposal

Will the excavation/dredge spoils be disposed of on site or off site?
On site

Describe any measures used to retain sediment:
NONE PROVIDED
If your project includes STRUCTURES IN WETLAND then select all of the proposed activities in the following list. If your activity is not shown, then select None of the Above and move to the next question. Only enter an impacted area in one of the impact tables (do not duplicate impact entries):

Building - non-residential new, Commercial/Industrial/Public

Projects involving Structures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Length (feet)</th>
<th>Width (feet)</th>
<th>Depth (feet)</th>
<th>Area  (Sq. feet)</th>
<th>Volume (cubic feet)</th>
<th>Volume (cubic yards)</th>
<th>Corrected value for complex impact AREAS (square feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building 1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>36000</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>NONE PROVIDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>17325</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>NONE PROVIDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum: 5925</td>
<td>Sum: 53325</td>
<td>Sum: 1975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum: NaN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

None of the above

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

No

Explain why no mitigation is proposed.

Wetlands are isolated and not regulated by EGLE.

Upload of Proposed Site Plans

Required on all Site Plan uploads. Please identify that all of the following items are included on your plans that you upload with this application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Plan Features</th>
<th>Existing and Proposed Plan Set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale, Compass North, and Property Lines</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill and Excavation areas with associated amounts in cubic yards</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any rivers, lakes, or ponds and associated Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior dimensions of Structures, Fill and Excavation areas associated with the proposed project</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions to other Structures and Lot Lines associated with the project</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topographic Contour Lines from licensed surveyor or engineer when applicable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upload Site Plans and Cross Section Drawings for your Proposed Project

2020.07.14_C3.0 Site Layout and Paving Plan.pdf - 08/06/2020 11:12 AM
Grand Square of Orion-COLOR PLOT.pdf - 08/06/2020 11:17 AM

Comment

NONE PROVIDED

Additional Required and Supplementary Documents

NONE PROVIDED

Comment

NONE PROVIDED

Fees

74
Major Project Fee
+$2000.00

High Risk Erosion Areas Fee:
+$undefined.00

Total Fee Amount:
$2000.00

Is the applicant or landowner a State of Michigan Agency?
Yes

Will the State of Michigan agency identified as the Applicant or Land Owner be paying by an Internal Exchange Transaction (IET, previously known as IAB) in SIGMA?
No

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Attachment Name</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/6/2020 11:17 AM</td>
<td>Grand Square of Orion-COLOR PLOT.pdf</td>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>Greg Ezzo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Processing Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
December 8, 2017

Jason Kishmish
Grand Management & Development
31333 Southfield Rd Suite, 250
Beverly Hills, MI 48025
Via email: jkishmish@grandmd.com

Dear Mr. Kishmish,

This document with associated field mapping is a determination of the existence and extent of any wetlands, ponds, lakes, or streams on four parcels located at 595 Brown Road, Orion, Michigan (Figure 1). The purpose of this work was to delineate, with flagging, the boundaries of any wetlands, ponds, lakes, or streams present on the parcels and determine whether or not these are subject to the following regulations:

a) Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act (1994 P.A. 451),
   - Part 301, Inland Lakes and Streams Protection;
   - Part 303, Wetland Protection;

b) Any regulation of wetlands, lakes, and streams by the Orion Township (Township).

The wetland and water features on the parcels were delineated at the request of Mr. Jason Kishmish of Grand Management & Development. This work revealed that six (6) wetland areas are present on the parcels. It is our opinion that none of the wetlands are subject to regulation by the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ). However, it is our opinion that Wetland #1 is subject to regulation by the Township. A Permit will likely be required by the Township for construction activities involving the regulated area.

These findings represent the opinion of BWA Consulting. Wetland delineation in the field conforms to currently accepted State of Michigan (State) wetland definitions and procedures.

**Wetland Definition and Methodology**

The State and local municipalities, if applicable, are bound by P.A. 451 of 1994, Part 303, Wetland Protection, as “…land characterized by the presence of water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support and that under normal circumstances does support wetland vegetation or aquatic life and is commonly referred to as a bog, swamp, or marsh…”

The methodology used in defining the location of wetland areas and their boundaries within the...
County Soil Survey

The Oakland County Soil Survey was reviewed prior to the site visit. Five (5) soil mapping units are shown on the parcels (Figures 2a, 2b). These are Marlette loam (10E), Napoleon muck (38), Houghton and Adrian mucks (27), undulating udipsamments (50B), and Spinks loamy sand (15B/E).

Of these five units, two are hydric. The Napoleon and the Houghton and Adrian series are listed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as hydric. A hydric soil is a soil that is saturated, flooded, or ponded long enough during the growing season to develop anaerobic conditions that favor the growth and regeneration of hydrophytic (wetland) vegetation.

Wetland Delineation Results and Site Description

The referenced parcels were delineated November 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th}, 2017. Six (6) wetland areas were identified on the parcels. The wetland/upland boundaries were flagged with fluorescent pink and blue survey ribbon. The wetland limits are identified on the attached map with flag numbers (Figure 3).

Please note that this map shows only an approximate location of wetland–upland boundaries, lakes, ponds, or streams. We recommend that the delineation flagging be surveyed and incorporated into the site plan once development or sale of the property is being considered. The wetland delineation results are briefly described below:

Wetland #1

This area is an isolated, forested, and emergent depression. Dominant wetland vegetation includes button bush (Cephalanthus occidentalis), black willow (Salix nigra), and reed canary grass (Phalaris arundinacea). Wetland hydrology is indicated by water stained leaves and soils saturated near the surface. Hydric soils are present within the wetland boundaries. The adjacent upland vegetation includes tall goldenrod (Solidago altissima), red oak (Quercus rubra), and black raspberry (Rubus occidentalis).

Wetland #2

This area is an isolated, forested depression. Dominant wetland vegetation includes green ash (Fraxinus pennsylvanica) and black willow. Wetland hydrology is indicated by open water and water stained leaves. Hydric soils are present within the wetland boundaries. The adjacent upland vegetation includes amur honeysuckle (Lonicera maackii), sugar maple (Acer saccharum), and red oak.
Wetland #3

This area is an isolated, forested, scrub shrub and emergent depression. Dominant wetland vegetation includes silver maple (*Acer saccharinum*), broadleaf cattail (*Typha latifolia*), and common reed (*Phragmites australis*). Wetland hydrology is indicated by standing water and soils saturated near the surface. Hydric soils are present within the wetland boundaries. The adjacent upland vegetation includes tall goldenrod, staghorn sumac (*Rhus typhina*), and amur honeysuckle.

Wetlands #4 and 5

These areas are isolated, scrub shrub and emergent ditches. Dominant wetland vegetation includes silky dogwood (*Cornus amomum*), glossy buckthorn (*Frangula alnus*), and common reed. Wetland hydrology is indicated by soils saturated near the surface. Hydric soils are present within the wetland boundaries. The adjacent upland vegetation includes mowed lawn, tall goldenrod, and amur honeysuckle.

Wetland #6

This area is an isolated, scrub shrub and emergent depression. Dominant wetland vegetation includes silky dogwood, reed canary grass, and common reed. Wetland hydrology is indicated by standing water and soils saturated near the surface. Hydric soils are present within the wetland boundaries. The upland vegetation includes tall goldenrod, sugar maple, and amur honeysuckle.

**Wetland Regulation by the State of Michigan**

Pursuant to P.A. 451 of 1994, Part 303, Wetland Protection, the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) assumes authority over wetlands that are contiguous to an inland lake, pond, or stream, within 500 feet of an inland lake, pond, or stream, or within 1,000 feet of a Great Lake, Lake St. Clair, the St. Clair River, or the Detroit River. Isolated wetlands five acres in size or greater are also regulated.

The MDEQ may also exert regulatory control over isolated wetlands less than five acres in size "...if the department determines that protection of the area is essential to the preservation of the natural resources of the state from pollution, impairment, or destruction and the department has so notified the owner".

Additionally, the wetlands may also be regulated by the State under Federal guidelines. According to the current document outlining Federal criteria for wetland regulation, *Draft Guidance on Identifying Waters Protected by the Clean Water Act*, a wetland is regulated if: it is adjacent to or abuts
navigable/interstate waters (or their tributaries) or relatively permanent waters; if there is a “significant nexus” between the wetland and navigable/interstate waters. Please note that these guidelines are not yet in official use, but could become so at any time.

In our opinion, none of the wetlands are subject to regulation by the MDEQ.

Regulation of Inland Lakes and Streams by the State of Michigan

P.A. 451 of 1994, Part 301, Inland Lakes and Streams Protection, regulates natural or artificial inland streams that have definite banks, a bed, and visible evidence of a continued flow or continued occurrence of water; and natural or artificial lakes or ponds with a surface area of five acres or greater. The Great Lakes and Lake St. Clair are not considered to be inland lakes under this act.

No inland lakes or streams were identified on site.

Please note that the following activities are prohibited within regulated inland lakes and streams without a MDEQ permit:

1. Dredging or filling bottomland;
2. Constructing, enlarging, extending, removing or placing a structure on bottomland;
3. Erecting, maintaining or operating a marina;
4. Creating, enlarging or diminishing an inland lake or stream;
5. Structurally interfering with the natural flow of an inland lake or stream;
6. Constructing, dredging, commencing, extending or enlarging an artificial canal, channel, ditch, lagoon, pond, lake, or similar waterway where the purpose is ultimate connection with an existing inland lake or stream, or where any part of the artificial waterway is located within 500 feet of the ordinary high-water mark of an existing inland lake or stream;
7. Connecting any natural or artificially constructed waterway, canal, channel, ditch, lagoon, pond, lake or similar water with an existing inland lake or stream for navigation or any other purpose.

Regulation by Orion Township

Under the authority of Ordinance No. 107 (adopted May 16, 1994), Orion Township regulates wetlands that are:

a. Contiguous to an inland lake or pond, or a river or stream.
b. Not contiguous to an inland lake or pond, or river or stream; and more than two acres in size.
c. Not contiguous to an inland lake or pond, or a river or stream; and five acres or less if the Department of Natural Resources determines that protection of the area is essential to the
preservation of the natural resources of the state from pollution, impairment, or destruction and the Department has so notified the owner.

d. Two acres or less in size if the Township determines that the protection of the area is essential to the preservation of the natural resources of the Township from pollution, impairment or destruction and provided that the Township has made a determination that the wetland meets at least one of the following criteria:

2. The Site represents what is identified as a locally rare or unique ecosystem.
3. The site supports plants or animals of an identified local importance.
4. The site provides groundwater recharge documented by a public agency.
5. The site provides flood and storm control by the hydrologic absorption and storage capacity of the wetland.
6. The site provides wildlife habitat by providing breeding, nesting, or feeding grounds or cover for forms of wildlife, waterfowl, including migratory water fowl and rare, threatened, or endangered wildlife species.
7. The site provides protection of subsurface water resources and provision of valuable watersheds and recharging groundwater supplies.
8. The site provides pollution treatment by serving as a biological and chemical oxidation basin.
9. The site provides erosion control by serving as a sedimentation area and filtering basin, absorbing silt and organic matter.
10. The site provides sources of nutrients in water cycles and nursery grounds and sanctuaries for fish.

In addition, for all platted subdivision developments (residential, commercial, industrial), the Township requires a 25-foot setback from wetlands for building construction, and a 10 foot setback from wetlands for driveways or parking areas (per the Township’s Subdivision Regulations Ordinance No. 27).

Note: because Orion does not define "contiguous" in its ordinance, for purposes of determination of jurisdiction we assume the State definition of "contiguous"

In our opinion, Wetland #1 is subject to regulation by the Township as it is greater than two acres in size (including off-site portions).
Confirmation by Regulatory Agencies
Numerous natural environmental factors and human induced changes may cause changes in the extent of wetland on a parcel over a period of time. The water resources identified on the property represent what this firm believes the MDEQ would consider to be wetland, lake, pond, or stream based on the condition of the site at the time of inspection and recent regulatory policies and attitudes.

In BWA’s opinion, any work done within the State regulated wetland boundaries will require a permit from the MDEQ. However, please note that the MDEQ has the final determination of the presence of wetlands and their respective jurisdictional statuses. If questions arise, a jurisdictional confirmation from the MDEQ should be requested. Purchase or detailed planning should generally be considered only after receiving written confirmation.
## Map Unit Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Unit Symbol</th>
<th>Map Unit Name</th>
<th>Acres in AOI</th>
<th>Percent of AOI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10E</td>
<td>Mariette loam, 18 to 35 percent slopes</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15B</td>
<td>Spinks loamy sand, 0 to 6 percent slopes</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15E</td>
<td>Spinks loamy sand, 12 to 35 percent slopes</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Houghton and Adrian mucks</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Napoleon muck</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50B</td>
<td>Udipsamments, undulating</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals for Area of Interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>43.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site-Walk Memorandum

Subject:   Grand Square of Orion Township
Property:  611 Brown Road

Date of Site-walk:
July 21st, 2020 5:30 pm

Orion Twp. Attendees:
Scott Reynolds
Don Gross
Joe St. Henry

Memo Prepared By:
Scott Reynolds

The following items were discussed/observed during the planning commission site-walk:

A new Multi-Use Development is proposed along Brown Road within the BIZ district. The develop appears to include two one-story restaurants and three four-story hotels.

The proposed development is comprised of multiple parcels. Existing uses vary from undeveloped to commercial uses.

Some grade change is present with the most significant variation located at a ridge along the north parcel line.

The parcel(s) contains existing trees and vegetation. The committee was unable to determine if any legacy trees are present.

The development appears to propose new combined curb cuts along Brown road and shall reduce the number of access drives on the north side of brown road.

End of Memorandum
To: Planning Commission

From: Deb

The following documents were response letters to a set of plans received prior to the plans date stamped received September 14, 2020. These documents are just for reference.
Sept 10, 2020

OHM
Tammy Girling, Director of Planning and Zonning
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION
2525 Joslyn Road
Lake Orion, MI 48360
Attn. Joe Lehman

Re: Grand Square of Orion
Address: 595 Brown Rd, Orion Township, MI 48359

Ms. Tammy Girling
Please see below the responses to the comments sent to us on July 31, 2020.

Conclusion
1. a) lot lines are shown on architect site plan. Once site plan approved, we will submit lot split and descriptions for parcel.
   b) see the architect site plan for main drive

2. phasing details see the architect site plan. Phase 1 will be restaurant & pond construction. Future phase will be building in back. We design utility accordingly.

3. Attached wetland impact drawing, wetland report & application.

4. Client is working on.

5. See the architect drawing.

6. See the architect drawing.

7. Fire hydrant & FDC moved as per Fire Marshall comments

8. Water main shown to west property line.

9. See the architect drawing for fence detail

10. Client is working

11.

12. See the architect drawing

13. See the architect drawing
14. Client is working with Neighbor to get easement

15. See the architect drawing

Regards,

Greg Ezzo
Civil Engineer
SM Engineers, LLC
September 9, 2020

Joe Lehman, Project Engineer
OHM Advisors
1827 North Squirrel Rd.
Auburn Hills, MI 48326

Re: Application PC-2020-11 Grand Square of Orion Township

Dear Joe,

The following comments address the review letter from your office regarding the above project. Our responses should address your concerns &/or questions you have regarding the design of the Architectural Site Plan. The Civil Engineering plans were prepared by others and they will address your comments separately. Our responses follow the order of the 15 items in your review letter. From the architectural viewpoint our comments are as follows:

1. Lot split information is shown on our plans. Legal descriptions will be provided by others for each parcel as the project moves forward. The Private Road (U Shaped) is indicated on the plans, as well as, the ROW area. Please note that the typical ROW area that is needed for utilities does not apply for this project as there is access for utilities throughout the development vs typically only at the ROW areas. That is why we have reduced ROW widths.

2. If the project is Phased a Phasing Plan will be provided detailing information regarding building construction, paving, utilities etc.

3. Wetland information and plans are to be provided by Civil Engineer.

4. A Tree Survey will be provided by others per the Townships requirements.

5. We have revised our Site Plan to limit the 18' deep parking spaces to only along the Private Drive and along the berm area adjacent to Brown Rd. These spaces abut greenbelts which will allow for a 12' vehicular overhang if needed. We prefer to have more green areas than pavement at these locations for aesthetic reasons. We are aware of other developments in the community where the same parking design has been allowed. A 2' space reduction is allowed in most communities when abutting a greenbelt or 7' of concrete walk.

6. The vehicular circulation as shown on our plans for the fire truck template in the ordinance and semi-truck movement is clear of all curbs. As per the plan design the overhang of the vehicles is only at the gutter line.

7. The FDC & fire hydrant locations have been addressed on the plan for the Fire Marshal.
8. To be addressed by Civil Engineer.

9. A decorative black aluminum fence a minimum of 42" h. is shown on the Architectural Site Plan. The plan also shows 2-5' wide gates on the east side for maintenance purposes.

10. Easement information to be provided by others.

11. No comment necessary.

12. We do not propose any changes to the plan design at the monument area. The pedestrian and vehicular movement at this area should be very minimal. There is only 4% of the available parking spaces on site in this area. The design of this area is an aesthetic feature that is important to maintain as currently designed. The south side of the restaurant locations are anticipated as primarily staff parking since this area is at the rear of the buildings and away from the entry road. The principal vehicular access points and most visible parking area (north of restaurants) is conveniently located off the Private Road.

13. A dedicated pedestrian walkway has been re-designed into the site per the included plans.

14. To be addressed by Civil Engineer.

15. The decorative fence around the pond is described and detailed on our Architectural Site Plan.

I believe the above comments should address the items noted in your review letter regarding architectural concerns or clarifications. If you have any further questions or need additional information regarding this project please contact my office.

Sincerely,

Ronald A. Chiesa, AIA
President
September 9, 2020

Rod Arroyo, AICP
Giffels Webster
1025 E. Maple  Suite 100
Birmingham, MI  48009

---

Re: Application PC-2020-11 Grand Square of Orion Township

Dear Rod,

The following comments address the review letter from your office regarding the above project. Our responses should address your concerns &/or questions you have regarding the design of the Architectural Site Plan and Building Package. Our responses follow the order of the 18 items in your review letter. Our comments are as follows:

1. **The Site Monument is to be a featured landmark for the 13 acre development. It is designed as an Entranceway Structure.** The monument is located in Parcel 3, which includes the three four story hotels. The height of the monument is considerably lower than the hotels on the same parcel. Ordinance Section 27.02 primarily refers to buildings or structures which are associated with a residential use. We viewed this as following Section 27.05 G1. Our design fits the criteria as described in the ordinance as allowable.

2. **The required setbacks for all 5 buildings on the site are shown for the 3 parcels on the plan (A-1) and in a table on the sheet also.** The Private Road is U-Shaped and all front setbacks are measured off the east-west section of the Private Road.

3. **The parking we have designed for the hotels is based on the actual requirements & standards of the hotels based on their nationwide guidelines.**

4. **The project is designed with greenbelts (10'w.) along the east and west property lines with grass, trees and plant material at 40' o.c. and along the north property line we have grass with evergreen trees planted at 30' o.c. The north property line greenbelt varies from 15' to 30'.** This area also adjoins a wooded tree line to the north that is a minimum of 500' deep. We feel we have met the intent of the ordinance regarding screening and green areas at the common property lines to create an aesthetically pleasing site.

5. **The parking throughout the entire site is shared with cross access agreements for all 5 buildings.** We have many green areas throughout the development to create a visually pleasing environment. The design also allows for controlled vehicular & pedestrian movement safely. The development is large in scale but the plan does not give the appearance of a sea of pavement because of the green areas. We believe that we have met the intent of the ordinance.

43260 Garfield • Suite 210 • Clinton Township, Michigan 48038 • (586) 263-5519
6. The parking shown on the plan is based on the Township Ordinance and also the requirements of the actual users. The restaurants have a parking criteria that they require and we are at the minimum of those numbers. We have no ability to reduce the parking based on occupant needs. The site has a dedicated pedestrian walk designed into the plan to assist movement throughout the project.

7. The site has been revised with the parking spaces meeting the required 19' depth at most areas. The 18' deep parking spaces are limited to only along the Private Drive and along the berm area adjacent to Brown Road. The areas with the 18' deep spaces abut greenbelts which will allow for a 12" vehicular overhang if needed. We prefer the larger green areas than more paving at these locations. We are aware of other recent projects in the Township that have been allowed to use 18' deep spaces (Hyatt) with green areas or 7' wide walkways. Most communities allow for a 2' length reduction when parking spaces are abutting a 7' wide walk or green areas. We feel we have met the intent of the ordinance.

8. We have redesigned the site to include a pedestrian pathway from the Marriott to the restaurants along Brown Rd. The walk also has 3 bench areas for pedestrian use adjacent to the pond area, which is at the middle point of walking the site from front to back. The site is a large development that most likely will not have a lot of pedestrian activity. Vehicle use will most likely be the method of circulation internally on this development. Smaller sites are more likely to see pedestrian circulation i.e. between 2 buildings vs the 5 on this deep site.

9. The building materials are called out on all of the elevations. The hotels are designed per the national standards of each user. They have a typical architectural branding that they prefer to use for identification purposes. All 3 are using exterior materials in different combinations. Decorative stone and brick as well as composite siding and EIFS are the materials of choice. The use of EIFS is very common on multi-story buildings and can be applied in many different methods to achieve a strong finish. The lower level use of the material can be troweled over that must be a durable substrate for a strong finish.

The hotels have varying roof lines and walls that have a stepping effect to create visual breaks. The elevations also feature vertical and/or horizontal material banding to provide aesthetic interest. The number of windows shown on the elevations are a derivative of the room design and total for each hotel. The hotels do not abut on a public street, they all are located off a Private Road and Private Drive.

The restaurants both have entry protection from weather. Restaurant 'A' has awnings and Restaurant 'B' has a 3 foot overhang at the roof over the entry. The designs also have requirements of the user that must be maintained per corporate specifications.

10. The internal U-Shaped Private Road has varying ROW dimensions from 43' to 60'. The ROW is less than the typical required width of 66'. The ROW is used for the location of underground utilities in a standard project. The ROW for this project does not need to be used for utilities as they are running elsewhere throughout the site as shown on the Civil Engineering Plans. There will be easements described for the utilities required for this Development.

11. We have designed entry area improvements at the east and west property lines of the development. We have a brick wall per ordinance standards with plant material in front of the wall visible to traffic into the site. The wall is only shown at 1 side of the entry points to picture frame the site monument. We are aware there are no other sites in the BIZ District that have the entry area improvements but we wanted to include them for aesthetic reasons. This is shown on the Site Plan and Landscape Plan.
12. Signage will be approved per Township requirements and procedures by others later in the project development.

13. We have incorporated the DTE North Yorkshire pole lights along Brown Rd. These lights (4) are located per the spacing shown on the Site Plan. The poles are indicated on the Photometric Plan also. The decorative post lights we have placed internally on the site will remain as they are an aesthetic feature at each building entry/facade. All pole lights on the site are with a bronze finish.

14. All utilities are to be underground servicing all buildings.

15. The dumpster enclosures for both restaurants are located in the side yards of each building. The locations are well screened with plant material both from the Private Road entry points and at the enclosures themselves. The enclosures are designed to blend into the building facades. We believe we have met the spirit of the ordinance to visually screen the enclosures and locate them in the best place available.

16. The loading areas indicated for the restaurants are located at the side area service aisles of each building. Loading for restaurants typically occurs during the closed hours. Once open restaurants have no productive way to accept deliveries. No loading will occur during hours of operation.

The hotels shown on this project do not require loading berths as they do not meet the criteria as listed i.e. restaurants, conventions, retail etc. The hotels typically have box truck delivery only vs. semi traffic. The loading is indicated in the rear of each building near the service points. These areas of the Private Drive will have minimal vehicular traffic.

17. A Tree Survey is to be provided by the owner as required.

18. The Wetlands information is provided by the Civil Engineer.

I believe the above comments should address the items noted in your review letter regarding the architectural concerns or clarifications. If you have any further questions or need additional information regarding this project please contact my office.

Sincerely,

Ronald A. Chiesa, AIA
President
September 9, 2020

Orion Township
Planning & Zoning

Jeff Williams, Fire Marshal
Charter Township of Orion
3365 Gregory Rd.
Lake Orion, MI 48359

Re: Application PC-2020-11 Grand Square of Orion Township

Dear Sir,

The following comments address the review letter from your office regarding the above project. Our responses should address your concerns &/or questions you have regarding the Site Plan. The civil engineering plans were prepared by others but we will address the comments in your letter regarding any civil concerns. Our responses follow the order of your letter.

Restaurant Building 'A' -
- The fire hydrant is located adjacent to the building (NE) and close to the FDC location.

Restaurant Building 'B' -
- The fire hydrant is located adjacent to the building (NE) and about 60' away from the FDC location.
- We have shifted the parking to create a 'No Parking' cross hatched area directly opposite the FDC location for clear access.

Fairfield Inn & Suites -
- The FDC location is at the NE corner of the building and has a 'No Parking' cross hatched area directly opposite the FDC location for clear access.

Hilton Garden Inn -
- The south side drive aisle has been widened to 26' as requested.
- We have shifted the parking to create a 'No Parking' cross hatched area directly opposite the FDC location for clear access.

Residence Inn -
- The FDC location has been moved to the SW wing of the building.
- The fire hydrant is located in the landscape island adjacent to the FDC.

General Comments -
- All required signage shall be in accordance with the International Fire Code.
- The internal crosswalks between buildings have been redesigned and located per the Site Plan included with this correspondence.
I believe the above comments should address the items noted in your review letter. If you have any further questions or need additional clarifications regarding this project please contact my office.

Sincerely,

Ronald A. Chiesa, AIA
President
PC-2020-11, GRAND SQUARE OF ORION TOWNSHIP – SITE PLANS

PLEASE CONTACT ORION TOWNSHIP PLANNING & ZONING DEPARTMENT TO VIEW HARD COPY OF THE SITE PLANS
Planning Commission Chair  
Orion Township  
2525 JOSLYN RD  
LAKE ORION MI 48360

Re: Charter Township of Waterford Master Plan Update Amendment  
- Opportunity for review and comment by October 9, 2020  
- Notice of Public Hearing for October 27, 2020 at 4:30 PM

Dear Planning Commission Chair,

Enclosed for your review and comment as provided for in the Michigan Planning Enabling Act is a proposed Update Amendment to the Township’s 2003-2023 Master Plan. Per Sections 41 and 45 of that Act, you may submit any comments on this proposed Update Amendment to the Township Planning Commission on or before Friday, October 9, 2020. Such submittals may be by personal delivery, first class mail, or email and should be addressed/directed to the following:

Charter Township of Waterford Planning Commission  
C/O Jeffrey M. Polkowski, AICP  
Superintendent of Planning and Zoning  
5200 Civic Center Drive  
Waterford, MI 48329  
jpolkowski@waterfordmi.gov

Also, please note that the Planning Commission has scheduled a public hearing on this proposed Master Plan Update Amendment for Tuesday, October 27, 2020, at 4:30 PM, which is the date and starting time of a regular Planning Commission meeting. Due to the uncertainty caused by the COVID-19 state of emergency and Governor’s Executive Orders, at this time it is not known if the meeting and public hearing will be in person in the Auditorium of the Township Hall at the above address or be conducted remotely. That will be included in the newspaper publication for the public hearing and on the Agenda for the meeting that will be posted on the Township’s website.

If you have any questions, they should be directed to Mr. Polkowski.

Thank you.

Matt Ray  
Secretary  
Charter Township of Waterford  
Planning Commission
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF WATERFORD
OAKLAND COUNTY, MICHIGAN
MASTER PLAN 2003 – 2023
UPDATE AMENDMENT

Planning Commission approval for submission to Township Board: July 28, 2020

Township Board approval of distribution: August 24, 2020

Commission Secretary distribution: August 28, 2020
   With notice that review comments due by: October 9, 2020
   With notice of public hearing for: October 27, 2020 at 4:30 PM

Newspaper publication of Notice of Public Hearing: __________________, 2020

Planning Commission Public Hearing held on: __________________, 2020

Approved by Planning Commission: __________________, 2020
Executive Summary of 2020 Master Plan Update Amendment

The Township’s current Master Plan was adopted by the Planning Commission on January 2, 2003, when the Township Planning Act was in effect. That Plan was developed over the course of three (3) years (2000 – 2002) with significant citizen involvement, research, analysis, and subcommittee work on nine (9) areas which were transportation and commercial corridors; environment; recreation and open space; historic district and neighborhood nodes; capital improvements and municipal services; economic development; education and public services; housing and demographics; and zoning ordinance and landscape aesthetics. The result was a Master Plan to guide Waterford’s future land use and development patterns during the next 20 years, titled “Waterford Township Master Plan 2003 – 2023.”

The Township Planning Act was replaced by the Michigan Planning Enabling Act (Public Act 33 of 2008) that took effect September 1, 2008. Under that Act, a more detailed process was provided for master plan adoptions, extensions, additions, revisions, and amendments. That Act also added a new requirement that planning commissions periodically review their master plan to determine if the procedure for amending it or adopting a new plan should be commenced.

Although the Master Plan had been adopted before the new Planning Enabling Act and runs through 2023, the Planning Commission reviewed and decided to go through the process to update it. In doing that, the Commission focused on Chapter 9, Implementation, which addresses the Master Plan Goals and their associated objectives and strategies for implementation. The Commission determined that some of those objectives had been realized and others were in need of refinement based upon the changes in the community since 2003.

For this Master Plan Update, there were no new background studies and no subcommittees were appointed. The Commission’s review did confirm that some Appendices listed in the Master Plan should be deleted because they identify items that have not been completed or that are no longer necessary or appropriate for inclusion. Finally, for this Master Plan Update, the Commission did not review the current master plans incorporated by reference in the Master Plan as the following Appendices:

R. Waterford Recreation Plan
T. Wellhead Protection Plan [now Article V of Chapter 8 of Township Ordinance Code]
U. Oakland County International Airport Master Plan
V. Waterford School District Master Plan
W. Oakland County Service Center Complex Master Plan

The format of this Master Plan Update does not involve editing or amending language in the 2003 - 2023 Master Plan. Rather, it is to supplement that existing language as appropriate to reflect changed conditions or information by reference to the Chapters and Appendices of the Master Plan.
Chapter 2 - Introduction.

Is updated and amended to delete the reference to and quote from the Township Planning Act, P.A. 168 of 1959, which is no longer in effect, and to include the following in its place.

As of September 1, 2008, the Township Planning Commission’s authority and procedures for master plans has been provided by the Michigan Planning Enabling Act, Public Act 33 of 2008.

Chapter 3 - Geography and Brief History of Waterford Township.

Is updated to amend and add to the language at the end of the Chapter so it reads as follows:

The year 2000 saw the population of the Township increase by 9.7 percent, to 73,150 persons. The average household size declined again, this time to 2.42 persons per household.

A slowdown in the American economy began in late 2007 and ended in the summer of 2009. The 2010 Census showed that the Township’s population dropped to 71,707 persons. The average household size dropped to 2.40 persons per household. The median value of all owner-occupied homes in the State fell by nearly 20 percent, to $123,000. The number of people employed in Michigan declined by 440,000.

In 2014, the Waterford Board of Education closed four (4) elementary schools. Adams, Burt, Sandburg and Waterford Village elementary schools will be closed permanently due to out-migration and the aging of Michigan’s population. The number of K-12 students has since declined by 8.98 percent. Since 2010, the Waterford School District has seen a decline of 1,000 students.

On November 13, 2017, with the adoption of Ordinance 2017-006, the Historic District Commission Ordinance was repealed and the Historic District that had been created by the Ordinance was repealed for purposes of the need to comply with any restrictions, limitations, or certificate, approval or other requirements under the State Local Historic Districts Act, Public Act No. 169 of 1970.

After years of decline and all businesses eventually closing, the Summit Place Mall fell into serious disrepair to the point where it had to be demolished. That demolition was substantially completed in 2019. In anticipation of that demolition and recognition of the reduced demand for brick and mortar retail stores, in 2019, the Township adopted a Summit Place Overlay District Zoning Ordinance Amendment to provide more flexibility with respect to uses and approval procedures to encourage redevelopment of the site.
On March 23, 2020, Emergency Amendments to the Township Emergency Preparedness Ordinance were adopted, which among other things, provided for the Township to fully and independently exercise its separate powers and authority under the Emergency Management Act and terminated the Township’s participation in Oakland County’s emergency management plan without limiting or restricting the Township’s ability to cooperate with the County and other political subdivisions in emergency situations.

The development phase of the Township is nearing its end, with over 92 percent of the land being developed. As it looks to its future, the Township must now face the challenges of redevelopment, economic development, and quality of life issues. The Planning Commission began the current Master Plan process to guide Waterford to successfully meet these new challenges and continue the progress that has guided Waterford throughout its history.

**Chapter 4 - Organization of Waterford Planning and Zoning.**

Is updated and amended to change the number of Planning Commission members from nine (9) to seven (7), change the number of Zoning Board of Appeals members from five (5) to seven (7), delete the CDBG Citizen Advisory Committee, and make the following changes in job titles and descriptions:

**Community Planning and Development Director changed to Development Services Director**

Responsible for the implementation and daily administration of all planning, zoning, community development, economic development and code enforcement activities. Acts as the liaison between the Township, citizens, news media, other governmental agencies, developers, and municipal professionals regarding Development Services Department issues. Prepares and presents annual budget requests, administers departmental budget, and ensures that the authorized budgetary procedure is properly used. Responds to development related violation inquiries from residents, contractors and other parties. Keeps abreast of modern engineering practices and changes in regulations through continued education and professional growth. Reviews plans and blueprints for new commercial, residential, and municipal developments. Ensures compliance with Township codes, and professional engineering standards relating to water, sewer, grading, drainage, public safety and other issues. Approves permits as warranted. Administers the Community Development Block Grant Program. Oversees staff processing of site plans, rezoning and plan approval use applications, subdivisions, site condominiums, and special land use applications. Responds to questions from applicants and the public regarding the Township’s planning and development processes.
Building and Engineering Director changed to Superintendent of Building Division

Manages and directs the activities of the Building Division to ensure projects are constructed in accordance with applicable laws, codes, ordinances, and accepted practices. Responds to building related violation inquiries from residents, contractors and other parties. Reviews residential and commercial building plans and blueprints. Ensures compliance with Township codes and professional building standards relating to framing, footings, electrical, plumbing, fire protection, accessibility and other related issues. Oversees the building construction and inspection process of new and existing buildings, and other construction projects. Oversees the registration process and license approval for contractors interested in working within the Township. Oversees the Dangerous Building processes and hearings. Keeps abreast of changing regulations and policies through continued education and professional growth.

Superintendent of Planning and Zoning Division

Manages and directs the activities of the Planning and Zoning division to ensure projects within the Township are constructed in accordance with applicable laws, codes, ordinances and accepted practices. Administers the Township’s site plan review process, the Township’s lot/acreage land division review process and the Township’s subdivision and condominium review process. Coordinates development projects with consulting engineers, developers, architects, builders and regulatory agencies. Oversees preparation of agendas and minutes of Planning Commission meetings and Economic Development Corporation (EDC) meetings along with reviewing materials to be included in the public record. Responds to zoning related violation inquiries from residents, contractors, and other parties. Coordinates work activities with other departments and outside agencies when projects require joint efforts. Oversees and directs the Township’s code enforcement activities.

The Township also employs engineering, planning, and legal services on a consulting basis to achieve its planning and development goals.

Chapter 9 - Implementation.
The objectives and strategies to achieve them for the seven (7) implementation goals in the Master Plan, and the Fiscal Tools, Legislative Policy Making, Administration and Enforcement, Citizen Education and Promotion, and Evaluation Sections of Chapter 9 are updated and amended to read as indicated on the following pages:
GOAL ONE
TO MAINTAIN, IMPROVE, AND ENHANCE CAPITAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND PUBLIC SAFETY FOR THE HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE OF WATERFORD CITIZENS

Objective 1-1
Maintain and Enhance Existing Level of Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

Strategies to Achieve Objective 1-1
a. Continue the maintenance, update, and effective fire-fighting coverage of Township fire hydrants.

b. Ensure sufficient facilities, staffing, equipment, and training levels for effective and prompt fire-fighting and EMS coverage of all areas in and served by the Township.

c. Investigate and adopt, when economically feasible, new technologies which enhance and expand fire-fighting, prevention, detection, and emergency medical response capabilities.

d. Maintain and enhance the use of the Township GIS for analysis of fire prevention, fire-fighting, and EMS capabilities.

e. Provide continuing education and training in fire safety and prevention, first aid, and CPR to all citizens.

f. Advocate the installation of affordable medical and fire safety technologies in all homes and workplaces.

g. Implementation of the Township’s full and independent exercise of its separate powers and authority under the Emergency Management Act, discontinuing its direct participation in the Oakland County disaster and emergency operations plans but without limiting or restricting cooperation with the County and other political subdivisions as necessary for effective handling of and coordinated responses to potential natural and man-made disasters as provided in Ordinance 2020-004.

h. Require effective fire safety and prevention systems in all development and redevelopment efforts.

Objective 1-2
Maintain and Enhance Existing Level of Water and Sewer Services

Strategies to Achieve Objective 1-2
a. Ensure sufficient facilities, staffing, equipment, and training levels for the safe and effective operation and maintenance of the Township’s water and sewer systems.

b. Utilize the Township capital improvement planning process to plan for necessary water and sewer system capacity improvements.

c. Utilize the Township capital improvement planning process to plan for necessary preventative water and sewer line maintenance and replacement.

d. Maintain and enhance the use of the Township GIS and other appropriate electronic information systems for the effective operation, analysis, and capital maintenance tracking of the Township water and sewer systems.
e. Identify and implement economically feasible new technologies which enhance and expand efficient, effective, safe, and healthy water and sewer systems.
f. Promote and enforce the installation of water line loop systems.
g. Implement and enforce ordinances and policy measures to protect and enhance the environmental quality of the Township’s water supply.

Objective 1-3
Review the Storm Drainage System

Strategies to Achieve Objective 1-3
a. Develop a master storm water management plan in accordance with State of Michigan and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency guidelines and the existing facilities and future storm drainage capacity needs of the Township.
b. Consider, as necessary to compliance with State of Michigan and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency requirements, the feasibility of creating and implementing an administrative structure and funding authority which provides an effective unified approach to managing, maintaining, and improving the storm drainage system within the Township.
c. Maintain and enhance the use of the Township GIS and other appropriate electronic information systems to map and analyze all storm drainage systems within the Township.
d. Enforce effective policies and best management practices wherever applicable to ensure the maintenance, capacity, and quality of the storm drainage system with the assistance and support of all governmental agencies responsible for stormwater management in the Township.
e. Ensure that all new development and redevelopment projects are thoroughly evaluated and constructed to accommodate and not overburden the storm drainage system capacity within the Township along with encouraging improvements to the system capacity.
f. Investigate and adopt the most effective means of enforcing updated engineering storm water discharge standards.
g. Require the utilization of best management practices, including requirements for detention/retention, for new development and redevelopment projects within Waterford.

Objective 1-4
Support the Enhancement of the Power and Communication Utilities Infrastructure within the Township

Strategies to Achieve Objective 1-4
a. Promote the conversion of overhead utility wires to underground lines.
b. Require that utility and communication companies demonstrate the capacity to provide modernized, full and uninterrupted service for proposed land uses.
c. Map in GIS the location and capacity of all utility lines.
d. Develop a map of prioritized areas where existing overhead utilities should be installed underground.
e. Develop a map of all communication lines.
Objective 1-5
Maintain and Enhance Existing Level of Police Protection

Strategies to Achieve Objective 1-5
a. Ensure sufficient facilities, staffing, equipment, and training levels for effective and prompt police protection and safety coverage of all areas of the Township.
b. Investigate and adopt, when economically feasible, new technologies that enhance and expand crime prevention, detection, and public safety.
c. Maintain and enhance the use of the Township GIS for analysis of crime prevention, detection, and solution.
d. Make education and training in public safety available to Township residents.

Objective 1-6
Improve and Enhance the Township's Capital Facilities and Infrastructure Planning

Strategies to Achieve Objective 1-6
a. Establish an annual capital improvement planning process to implement the requirements of the Michigan Planning Enabling Act for a capital improvements program to be prepared, showing the priority of public structures and improvements that will be needed or desirable and can be undertaken in a 6-year period and which is based on lists, plans, and cost estimates obtained from Township Departments for such capital improvements and the time frame within which those improvements should be made.
b. Develop capital improvement planning strategies to provide guidance to the Township Board on accomplishing Master Plan Goals.
c. Establish and maintain a database containing information on the available public infrastructure (water, sanitary sewer, storm sewer, etc.) capacities within the Township to assist Township staff in making decisions on proposed land uses.

GOAL TWO
TO IMPROVE AND ENHANCE THE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK WITHIN WATERFORD

Objective 2-1
Maintain and Encourage Road Improvements Within Waterford Township

Strategies to Achieve Objective 2-1
a. Continue to improve and expand the proactive and effective partnership between the Township and the public road agencies to achieve quality public road improvements, maintenance, traffic flow, and safety in Waterford Township.
b. Develop a Waterford Township Transportation Plan to identify road maintenance and improvement priorities to be considered in Township decisions necessary to achieve the Master Plan Goals.

c. Develop and maintain a road needs review process as part of the Waterford Township Transportation Plan.

d. Incorporate priority road maintenance and improvements into the capital improvements program in accordance with Objective 1-6.

e. Require dedication of road right-of-way in connection as a condition of approval for development and redevelopment projects as necessary to provide a right-of-way width consistent with the Road Commission of Oakland County Master Right-of-Way Plan.

Objective 2-2
Encourage North-South Mobility in Waterford Township

Strategies to Achieve Objective 2-2

a. Explore, facilitate, and encourage feasible realignment, extensions, widening, and other improvements of existing roads to eliminate or reduce safety hazards and improve traffic flow.

b. Identify and incorporate in the Transportation Plan, unimproved sections of the primary road network where traffic safety or flow could be improved by paving or other improvements.

c. Identify and pursue non-Township funding sources for primary road network improvements.

Objective 2-3
Diversify Transportation Options

Strategies to Achieve Objective 2-3

a. Encourage and facilitate dependable and safe transportation options for prospective users who are housebound, such as senior and disabled citizens.

b. Assess public transportation needs for Waterford Township.

c. Develop and implement policies and programs to allow residents and visitors to travel freely in Waterford without unnecessary delays by both motorized and non-motorized modes of transportation.

d. Promote an advisory committee consisting of local business owners, transportation officials, and residents, to review and recommend public transportation options for Waterford residents.

Objective 2-4
Improve Traffic Safety

Strategies to Achieve Objective 2-4

a. Assist road agencies through the use of GIS and other analytical tools to prioritize, develop, and fund plans and programs to eliminate existing traffic hazards and conflicts between different modes of transportation.

b. Identify key intersections for design improvements to increase transportation efficiency within the Township.

c. Develop and implement traffic impact and access management standards in ordinance requirements and policies for new development and redevelopment projects.
d. Promote efforts to partner with traffic safety organizations and utilize all Township communication resources to educate citizens on traffic safety.

e. Actively enforce traffic safety laws.

**Objective 2-5**

**Enhance the Safety of the Waterford Village Historic District**

**Strategies to Achieve Objective 2-5**

a. Research, develop, and implement traffic calming and walkability measures in and adjacent to the District (*Please refer to Map 10 on Page 7-47 in Chapter 7 for the location of the District*).

b. Evaluate, promote, and implement methods that slow down and discourage through traffic while maintaining continuous access for residents and public safety personnel.

**GOAL THREE**

**To Enhance the Walkability of Waterford**

**Objective 3-1**

**Maintain, Expand and Improve Safety Paths**

**Strategies to Achieve Objective 3-1**

a. Develop, identify and pursue sources of funding and implement a master safety path construction and maintenance plan, incorporating priority projects into the Township’s Capital Improvements Plan.

b. Construct connections between existing segments of safety paths.

c. Facilitate and encourage connection of all Waterford parks and schools to the safety path system.

d. Install and maintain safety path links between neighborhood nodes (*Please refer to Figure 8-10 on Page 8-22 in Chapter 8 for the location of the nodes*).

e. Maintain existing segments of safety paths.

f. Inventory existing safety paths to determine Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance and provide for required ADA compliance in any upgrades or repairs.

g. Establish and utilize a GIS database for evaluating the condition of the existing safety path system components in Waterford Township based on an objective scoring criteria.

h. Promote efforts to utilize all Township communication resources to educate citizens on the benefits of walking using non-motorized paths.

**Objective 3-2**

**Develop and Promote a Waterford Riverwalk Pedestrian Pathway**

**Strategies to Achieve Objective 3-2**

a. Complete and promote implementation of a Riverwalk Master Plan for safety paths and other improvements for the area from the Waterford Towne Center area to the Drayton Plains Nature Center, to provide access to and encourage enjoyment of the Clinton River.
b. Pursue and apply for alternative funding sources, whenever possible, to complete the remaining segments of the Riverwalk Master Plan.

c. Explore opportunities to link the Waterford Riverwalk system to safety path systems in adjacent communities.

d. Incorporate Riverwalk project components in the Capital Improvements Plan.

**GOAL FOUR**

*TO CREATE AN ECONOMIC CLIMATE CONducive TO THE ATTRACTION, RETENTION, AND EXPANSION OF BUSINESS WITHIN WATERFORD*

---

**Objective 4-1**

*Develop and Utilize Township Capacity for Proactive Economic Development*

**Strategies to Achieve Objective 4-1**

a. Township staff to undertake and facilitate economic development activities and programs.

b. Develop and utilize printed and electronic information to guide citizens and businesses through the Township’s development processes.

c. Encourage Township staff to analyze, and revise when necessary, the current procedures and policies involving services to the Waterford business and development community for effectiveness, efficiency, and consistency with the Master Plan goals and objectives.

d. Develop, promote, and implement conceptual plans for areas within the Township to focus redevelopment efforts.

e. Explore and aggressively utilize all available economic development, planning, and analysis tools to actively promote business retention and the relocation of new businesses and technology-based companies to Waterford.

f. Develop cooperative partnerships, use flexible planning and zoning tools, and actively utilize economic development tools to ensure the continued redevelopment and economic viability of the regional destinations located in the Township.

g. Encourage and promote the provision of safe, high-speed, and cost-effective modern communication and information systems for use by Waterford businesses.

h. Establish a rational tax abatement incentive policy.

---

**Objective 4-2**

*Market Waterford Township as a Destination for Business Activities*

**Strategies to Achieve Objective 4-2**

a. Identify and establish partnerships with other governmental agencies and business organizations to actively promote and market Waterford as a prime business location.
b. Develop and disseminate marketing materials promoting Waterford Township utilizing all available media.

c. Promote Waterford as a “One Stop Ready” community, a member of Automation Alley, home of the Oakland County International Airport, and other notable points of interest.

Objective 4-3
Educate and Inform All Township Boards, Commissions, Committees, and Authorities on Economic Development Tools and Efforts

Strategies to Achieve Objective 4-3
a. Research, develop, and implement ongoing processes to keep the Township Board and all appointed committees involved with economic development fully informed on the various economic tools and funding resources available to Waterford Township.

b. Provide staff training and development to gain knowledge and awareness of current economic development tools, funding sources, best practices, and innovative techniques and programs.

Objective 4-4
Promote furthering the Physical Appearance and Functional Character of the Township’s Commercial Corridors

Strategies to Achieve Objective 4-4
a. Develop and implement ordinances, policies, and planning tools to assist with the aesthetic, social and functional improvement of the Township’s commercial corridors.

b. Investigate and, if appropriate, create a Downtown Development Authority to assist in the redevelopment and improvement of the commercial corridors.

c. Develop, implement, and promote traffic calming and access management regulations and policies as a means of enhancing the commercial corridors.

d. Pursue and maintain cooperative relationships with the public road agencies to investigate, plan, and construct aesthetic and functional improvements of the Township’s commercial corridors.

e. Promote commercial corridor infrastructure for both motorized and non-motorized transportation.

f. Develop partnerships with governmental agencies, business organizations, and business owners to improve the aesthetic, social and functional qualities of the Township gateways and commercial corridors.

g. Establish and support the Corridor Improvement Authority created by Township Ordinance in the exercise of its powers to correct and prevent deterioration, promote economic growth, development and redevelopment, and enhance the commercial corridor development areas described in the Ordinance.

h. Identify priority corridor and gateway improvements for possible incorporation into the Capital Improvements Plan.

Goal Five
To Increase and Improve Recreational Opportunities for Waterford Citizens
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Objective 5-1
Develop, Construct, and Maintain in One Central Location a Full-Scale Community Center to Serve All Age Groups

Strategies to Achieve Objective 5-1
a. Propose and promote a phased plan of development and funding to create a dynamic recreation center that will be supported by the citizens and serve the community for the foreseeable future.
b. Provide indoor/outdoor swimming facilities to meet the community’s recreation, fitness, therapeutic, and scholastic swim needs.
c. Provide a playground area for younger children.
d. Secure public input on all other recreational, fitness, and service facilities that would be supported by Township residents as part of a new community center.
e. Research and analyze all potential funding sources and options.

Objective 5-2
Promote Recreational Utilization of the Clinton River

Strategies to Achieve Objective 5-2
a. Educate the community about the presence, importance, and threats to the Clinton River.
b. Sponsor and promote projects, programs, and annual events to clean up, restore, preserve, and protect the Township’s river resources.
c. Sponsor and promote Clinton River educational and recreational projects, and programs such as canoeing, kayaking, and fishing.
d. Work with the Clinton River Watershed Council to sponsor an adopt-a-river program by businesses and service organizations for different segments of the river.
e. Identify and recognize the importance and potential uses of or related to the Clinton River in the Riverwalk Master Plan described in Objective 3-2.
f. Partner with the local schools in developing curriculum centered on the importance and ecological fragility of the Clinton River.

Objective 5-3
Promote Increased Access and Use of Existing Parks

Strategies to Achieve Objective 5-3
a. Provide and maintain effective safety path access to all Township parks.
b. Develop and implement a playground equipment maintenance and improvement schedule to ensure child safety and modernized facilities.
c. Explore opportunities for creating dog parks, or using a portion of an existing park for the purpose of developing and maintaining pet run areas.
d. Conduct periodic studies and analyses of existing parks’ utilization to assess use patterns and evaluate implementation of other recreational uses.
e. Create better access to, and promote utilization of, Elizabeth Lake Woods, including trails and interpretive observation areas.
f. Develop and maintain directional signage to the parks and identification signage for natural features, river and stream crossings, and watershed boundaries.
g. Ensure that the area currently occupied by the Drayton Plains Nature Center is linked to the Waterford Riverwalk system.

h. Preserve and protect the area currently occupied by the Drayton Plains Nature Center as a nature center.

i. Include passive recreation areas and activities in the Recreation Plan.

j. Develop and disseminate marketing materials promoting Waterford Township Parks utilizing all appropriate media.

Objective 5-4
Encourage Playground Areas in Neighborhoods

Strategies to Achieve Objective 5-4
a. Investigate opportunities for establishing and maintaining small playground or picnic areas within, or adjacent to, neighborhoods.

b. As necessary, revise and strengthen Zoning Ordinance requirements for the establishment and maintenance of neighborhood park areas within new developments.

c. Investigate the development of a neighborhood enhancement grant program that utilizes state and federal funding sources to enable neighborhood associations to create neighborhood parks.

Objective 5-5
Encourage Diverse Recreation Opportunities for Waterford Citizens

Strategies to Achieve Objective 5-5
a. Provide for staff training and development to gain knowledge and awareness of innovative recreational facilities and programs.

b. Research and analyze deficiencies in the provision of recreation services within the Township to assess the feasibility of establishing and funding new facilities and programs.

c. Promote establishment of innovative and diverse recreational facilities and programs.

Goal Six
To Ensure and Enforce Land Use Development Practices that are Sensitive to Waterford’s Natural Environment

Objective 6-1
Promote Open Space Developments

Strategies to Achieve Objective 6-1
a. Research and identify possible revisions to the Township ordinances which provide tools for housing developments that preserve substantial areas of open space and reasonable and flexible requirements, such as measured adjustments in zoning bulk regulations.

b. Encourage and promote the preservation of some uplands for common use as a requirement in open space and cluster developments.
c. Encourage and promote private preservation of open space through conservation easements, dedications, and stewardship programs.

d. Encourage and preserve natural resource corridor links between natural areas, recreation areas, parklands, and schools.

e. Research, evaluate, implement, and enforce revisions to the Zoning Ordinance to require that within new housing developments, a sufficient amount of property be dedicated for quality of life features such as parks, open space, natural areas, and native landscaping.

**Objective 6-2**

**Ensure All Development Efforts Respect, Preserve, and Protect Waterford’s Natural Characteristics and Constraints**

**Strategies to Achieve Objective 6-3**

a. Continue the enforcement of rational wetland protection to preserve wetlands in their natural state as a high priority, protect water quality, stabilize stormwater runoff, recharge groundwater, and provide fish and wildlife habitat.

b. Enforce ordinance requirements for practical woodlands conservation to protect water and soil quality, improve air quality, buffer noise, moderate climate hazards, preserve wildlife diversity and habitats, and enhance community aesthetics.

c. Promote, inform, and encourage citizens on the use of native plant material to minimize the hazardous effects of invasive species.

d. Encourage preservation of natural contours and minimize mass grading alterations.

e. Require the preservation and protection of groundwater recharge areas as open space or low density uses to retain as much permeable surface and water holding characteristics as possible.

f. Promote and enforce the protection of groundwater recharge areas from pollution through the regulation of land uses which may discharge wastes into the hydrological cycle.

**g.** Promote the preservation of natural vegetation and topographical features along stream corridors and waterways by restricting these areas to uses offering little danger of topographical disturbance, water quality degradation, stream channel alteration, runoff or sedimentation increase.

h. Utilize appropriate communication methods to educate the community on the care and use of herbicide and fertilizer sprays to preserve and protect stream corridors, waterways, and the natural drainage and runoff pattern associated with them.

i. Develop and maintain natural area inventories that include assessments for quality, location, health, and species provided by other governmental agencies.

j. Preserve, and protect the natural areas essential to maintaining Waterford's unique heritage and character, which provide a diverse high-quality wildlife habitat.

k. Advocate the establishment of a prohibited planting materials list based upon invasiveness and ecological impacts.

l. Maintain strict enforcement of requirements for soil and sedimentation control during development.

m. Actively work with responsible agencies to maintain an accurate list of leaking underground storage sites.

n. Develop and utilize a Township Open Space and Natural Area Management Plan to assist in evaluating future rezoning and site plan approvals as well as potential open space acquisition.
GOAL SEVEN
TO RETAIN, ENHANCE, AND PROMOTE WATERFORD'S UNIQUE CHARACTER, SENSE OF COMMUNITY, AND IDENTITY

Objective 7-1
Enhance and Improve the Aesthetics and Historic Preservation of the Waterford Village Historic District

Strategies to Achieve Objective 7-1
a. Research and plan for the installation of decorative lighting, signage, and barrier-free safety paths along District streets (Please refer to Map 10 on Page 7-47 in Chapter 7 for the location of the District).
b. Inventory and evaluate existing vacant land in the District and evaluate and recommend adaptive reuse of existing structures that will enhance the District as a community destination.
c. Explore, develop, and utilize stable funding sources and financing tools for restoration, improvement, and small business development in the District.
d. Develop, promote, and implement a conceptual Historic District area plan to focus and guide redevelopment efforts.

Objective 7-2
Plan and Encourage Development of Neighborhood Nodes

Strategies to Achieve Objective 7-2
a. Develop, promote, and implement a conceptual plan for each area identified in the Master Plan as a neighborhood node to focus and guide development and redevelopment efforts.
b. Develop, promote, and maintain the Township Civic Center area as a community gathering place.

Objective 7-3
Establish and Enforce a High Standard for the Physical Condition of the Township Housing Stock

Strategies to Achieve Objective 7-3
a. Revise and enforce Township ordinances as necessary to require inspections of rental housing, property maintenance code enforcement, and elimination of blighting effects and influences.
b. Research, evaluate, and revise the Zoning Ordinance to include flexible planning and zoning tools, and requirements which encourage and promote quality redevelopment of the Township’s existing housing stock.

Objective 7-4
Assist Service Organizations to Expand and Market Programs and Services

Strategies to Achieve Objective 7-4
a. Develop and implement an information gathering and dissemination process using appropriate media to inform new and current Waterford residents of area community services.

b. Advocate the elimination of public service duplications of effort, promote consolidated and partnering public service efforts, and work to eliminate service gaps.

c. Develop and maintain a current database of community service organizations and the services they offer within Waterford Township.

d. Publicize and promote volunteer opportunities and efforts using appropriate media.

---

Objective 7-5

Strengthen Communication Partnerships between the Township and Governmental Agencies, the Waterford School District, Oakland Community College, Private Schools, and Service Organizations

---

Strategies to Achieve Objective 7-5

a. Implement dedication of Township staff, website, and cable resources to the expansion of community communication efforts.

b. Develop and maintain partnerships between the Township, Waterford School District, Oakland Community College, the business community, and community agencies to promote the Waterford community and the quality of life for citizens and visitors, utilizing appropriate media.

c. Develop and maintain partnerships between the Township, Waterford School District, Oakland Community College, the business community, and community agencies to implement cooperative cultural planning efforts that will encourage and expand cultural programs and services in Waterford.

d. Continue and expand proactive communication and information exchange between the Township, Waterford School District, and Oakland Community College to facilitate and achieve common goals.

e. Continue and expand proactive communication and information exchange between the Township and Oakland County International Airport to facilitate airport land use issues and noise study implementation.

f. Research, develop, and implement partnership programs between the Township, Waterford School District and/or Oakland Community College to educate students about importance of local government.

---

FISCAL TOOLS

Waterford Township can increase the effectiveness of its Master Plan implementation efforts by reasonable utilization of available financing tools. The financing of all Township activities is determined through the annual budget process based on available revenues from property taxes, state revenue sharing, fees, the annual federal Community Development Block Grant program, federal, state, county, or foundation grants, and other sources. Providing for a prioritized implementation of the Master Plan goals and objectives as part of the annual budget process will be a key to realizing those goals and objectives over time.

The Township has also established an Economic Development Corporation and Brownfield Redevelopment Authority, has provided for a Corridor Improvement Authority, and has established Commercial Rehabilitation and Industrial Development Districts for parts of the Township, to assist with economic development policy and to finance projects which meet the established criteria. There may be other existing or future legislation that provides the Township with similar tools, all of which should be reviewed and
considered as related to furthering the goals and objectives of this Master Plan. The adoption of a rational
tax abatement policy, use of the Township’s special assessment authority, and the selling of municipal bonds
are additional tools that could be used to facilitate or fund activities consistent with Master Plan Goals and
objectives in appropriate situations.

The Township can also increase the fiscal effectiveness of the Master Plan implementation through strategic
planning and the active participation by the Township Board and Departments in the annual capital
improvements planning process the Planning Commission is responsible for under the Michigan Planning
Enabling Act as described in Objective 1-6, the results of which could be considered in determining
expenditures as part of the annual budget process

LEGISLATIVE POLICY-MAKING

The Township Board will play a critical role in the implementation of the Master Plan. It is recommended
that the Township Board actively promote the Master Plan by public communications, working with the
Planning Commission, and providing the funding necessary to implement the Master Plan goals, objectives,
and strategy items.

ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

In addition to following all Master Plan implementation policies established by the Township Board, the
Development Services Department staff should facilitate Master Plan implementation by educating all
Township personnel about the Master Plan as a Township-wide policy document that needs to be actively
implemented and promoted. The Development Services staff should also actively involve other departments
in Master Plan implementation efforts, including program and project development. Township departments
should also focus on reviewing and revising department procedures and actions to ensure Master Plan
implementation. The review and development of proposed ordinances necessary to implement the Master
Plan is another important task that the Township administrative departments need to pursue. Finally, each
department should actively enforce the laws, policies, and procedures established to accomplish Master Plan
goals and objectives.

CITIZEN EDUCATION AND PROMOTION

It is essential that ongoing education efforts be undertaken to ensure that citizens are aware of and support
Master Plan implementation, to educate citizens on the Master Plan, and promote Master Plan goals and
objectives. An active planning education program should be promoted and established as part of the public
school curriculum.

The Development Services Department should take an active role in utilizing appropriate media, such as the
Township website, cable, printed brochures, community calendars, and new resident packets.

EVALUATION

Although the Michigan Planning Enabling Act calls for a Planning Commission review at least every five
(5) years to determine whether to commence the procedure to amend this Master Plan or adopt a new master
plan, on at least an annual basis, the Planning Commission will review the progress toward implementation
of the Master Plan and evaluate whether any adjustments to the implementation process or amendments of
the Master Plan are or may be appropriate under an evaluation process that may include an ongoing strategic
planning process, progress reports, proposed or desired timelines for accomplishing the strategy items, and
staff reports on areas of concern identified by the Planning Commission.
APPENDICES

The following Appendices described in the 2003 - 2023 Master Plan are no longer considered part of the Master Plan because they were not completed as contemplated, or are no longer necessary or appropriate for inclusion:

J. Zoning Ordinance and Landscape Aesthetics Subcommittee Minutes
L. Traffic Analysis
M. Transportation Plan
O. Capital Improvements Plan
P. Neighborhood Node and Area Concept Plans
Q. Zoning Ordinance and Landscape Aesthetics Subcommittee Final Report
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