The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, January 6, 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 Michigan Department of Health and Human Services)

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

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:
Justin Dunaskiss, Chairman

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

2. ROLL CALL
As noted

CONSULTANTS PRESENT:
Rodney Arroyo, (Township Planner) of Giffels Webster
Eric Fazzini, (Township Planner) of Giffels Webster
Eric Pietsch, (Township Planner) of Giffels Webster
Mark Landis, (Township Engineer) of OHM Advisors
Jeff Williams, Township Fire Marshal
Tammy Girling, Township Planning & Zoning Director

OTHERS PRESENT:
Lindon Ivezaj  Pat Williams

3. ELECTION OF OFFICERS
Vice-Chairman Reynolds was nominated to be appointed as Chairman of the Planning Commission for 2021 by Commissioner Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker. No one contested.

Commissioner Gross was nominated to be appointed as Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission for 2021 by Commissioner Walker, seconded by Commissioner Urbanowski. No one contested.

Secretary St. Henry was nominated to be reappointed as Secretary of the Planning Commission for 2021 by Commissioner Gross, seconded by Commissioner Urbanowski. No one contested.

Moved by Commissioner Urbanowski, seconded by Commissioner Hoffman, to appoint Vice-Chairman Reynolds as Chairman, Commissioner Gross as Vice-Chairman, and to reappoint Secretary St. Henry as Secretary.

Roll call vote was as follows: Walker, yes; St. Henry, yes; Hoffman, yes; Gross, yes; Urbanowski, yes; Reynolds, yes. Motion carried 6-0 (Dunaskiss absent)
Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Secretary St. Henry, to reappoint Commissioner Walker as the representative from the Planning Commission to the Zoning Board of Appeals for 2021. No one contested.

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

Moved by Chairman Reynolds, seconded by Commissioner Walker, to reappoint Vice-Chairman Gross, Secretary St. Henry, and Chairman Reynolds to serve as the Site Walk Committee for 2021.

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

4. MINUTES
B. PC-2020-26, WOW Gas Station, Special Land Use Request Public Hearing Minutes.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, to approve the three sets of minutes as presented.

5. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL
Moved by Secretary St. Henry, seconded by Vice-Chairman Gross, to approve the agenda as presented.

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

7. CONSENT AGENDA
None

8. NEW BUSINESS
A. PC-2021-01, Dutton Park Site Plan, located at vacant parcels 09-35-400-048 and 09-35-477-003 located on the north side of Dutton Rd. one parcel east of Interpark N.

Mr. Lindon Ivezaj representing the applicant presented.

Mr. Ivezaj showed the Board the site plans. He stated what they were proposing at the corner of Dutton and Bald Mountain Road, two speculative retail buildings with the intent of building material sales use only. That is their only intended use, and they will be providing ample parking on the entire site. He said they are looking for a 50% parking waiver requirement along road frontages. He added that the hardship for the waiver would be that they have three sides of the building facing a road, making it impossible to accommodate that requirement. The rest of the site plan, they believe, after discussions with staff and with the consultants, he felt that all the comments could be addressed. They have no reservations in providing additional information or working with staff, too, with all their comments, as far as the site plan goes.

Planner Fazzini read through his site plan review dated December 29, 2020.

Planner Pietsch read through his landscape review date stamped January 5, 2021.
Engineer Landis read through his review dated December 29, 2020.

Fire Marshal Williams read through his review dated December 30, 2020.

Chairman Reynolds noted that a site walk was completed by Vice-Chairman Gross and it was verified on an individual basis and by himself. He added that the Site Walk Committee did review the parcel.

Chairman Reynolds said that he would turn it back to the applicant. He added that there were some discussion points. He asked if they could speak to the future development of the parcel, the public roads and access that is being requested by the reviewers, and safety paths.

Mr. Ivezaj stated that he would start off with the comments from the Planner. He said that the entrance coming off of, or near the Culver’s site, there is an existing shared-use agreement in place that they could provide staff with, and the easement is already there. He said that the future phases, as far as the concept goes, they don’t currently have an additional concept plan they are planning on using on the site. The current, existing conform uses would be the building material sales retail buildings that they are proposing and is all they have for the entire site plan. Once they get something else in place, they would be glad to provide to the city, but at this point, all they are proposing is the two retail buildings. He said that they have no issue providing pedestrian paths connectivity between their site and Dutton Road.

Mr. Ivezaj said regarding the Fire Marshal comments, as far as the site goes, they are in very close contact with EGLE. There has been a long history with this entire intersection corner. They are very well aware of any of the environmental impacts on the site. The methane gas is definitely being taken into account. There are currently some vents on the site that were placed there, for good reason. All the buildings, once they come in for building plan review will definitely have a methane detection and a passive mitigation system involved. The secondary access to the eastern property, their engineer Pat Williams, which was also with them, has been in contact with the Fire Department and they didn’t have any issues providing secondary access, especially in order to accommodate the fire apparatus of the city and felt that safety was very important.

Mr. Ivezaj added that as far as engineering goes, the excessive grades on site are definitely accounted for, they are on the northern part of the property along the adjacent site. They will provide more grade lines to make sure that they are within 1 on 3 and stabilized on the site.

Mr. Ivezaj stated that as far as the traffic study, and a couple of the engineering points, he wanted to turn it over to Pat Williams to explain and summarize the traffic, and also address a few more of the engineering comments.

Mr. Pat Williams with Nowak and Fraus Engineers presented.

Mr. Williams said regarding the traffic they have got a few preliminary numbers, and the trip generation data shows that it will be underneath the threshold for needing a traffic impact study, and they were happy to provide the data. The overall C coefficients that have been requested and they were happy to provide that for the development that they are currently proposing but they don’t have any way of providing an overall C coefficient for the future build-on until they know what it is going to be. He stated that it will be built within the parameters of the existing detention and under the C value of 0.8. Until they have a plan for that future development that is really all the information they have. He said that loading zones have been provided they just made a mistake and didn’t label them on the drawing. With the additional grading that they are asking for, they will have no problem providing it. The building will be fire suppressed. The Fire
Department has indicated where they want the FDC and the hydrants and were happy to comply with those exact requirements. They are happy to provide the pathways on all the frontages as requested.

Chairman Reynolds asked about the loading zones, the storm easements, the future easements, and the storm easements that already exist on the parcel? Mr. Williams replied that the proposed easements for the new utilities, they will provide. He said regarding any existing easements, he assumed they were talking about an easement that is on the adjacent property, and stated that they would have to pull that off some of the reference drawings or they will have a title search pulled on the adjacent property. They only have the information for what is on their property and were happy to dig up that information add that information to their drawings, but didn’t have that information readily available. He added that all of the proposed utilities will definitely have the easements, as required by the Township, they didn’t have that depicted on the drawing. He stated that the loading zones are there, they are shown next to the dumpsters, they just didn’t label them on the drawing for the loading zone, but they are there and they have been provided, they just didn’t label them on the drawing by mistake.

Vice-Chairman Gross said that it was a difficult site. The two parcels are separated by a valley, and so, it is difficult to combine the two sites and make them into one. Topo is probably a grade change of 20 to 40-ft. between parcels. He asked relative to the site plan, is there barrier-free access required of the second floor of the two-story building, or an elevator, or some form of means of gaining access for handicapped to the second floor? He said the building height is at 38-ft., which is equivalent to a four-story building with the first floor being 20-ft. in height, the second floor being 18-ft. in height. He didn’t know if it impacts access to the fire department or not? But it is in effect a two-story building and four-story height. As a result of that, the elevations that are shown for the rear and the side are basically flat with little relief on the smooth wood siding and that is a lot of flat wall space without any relief on it.

Vice-Chairman Gross stated that Engineer Landis listed almost 20 items on his report. Most of them appear to be items that can be reflected, in terms of modifications to the site plan, without impacting the integrity of the development. He asked if this was something that could be done on a resubmittal, with those conditions being imposed on a subsequent site plan, or should it be returned to them with all of those items identified? Engineer Landis replied that there are a number of comments, but he thought Vice-Chairman Gross was correct it wouldn’t impact the buildings, setbacks, or parking. He thought that they could handle all of those comments in a straight review if they wanted him to make that a condition of approval.

Chairman Reynolds stated he agreed with Vice-Chairman Gross’s comments about the concern of the overall height of the building and their architectural standards. They have some pretty flat renderings and wanted to get more of a description or thoughts on the proposed look of the building as that is part of the Lapeer Overlay District. He asked if there were any comments from the applicant on that topic? Also, is the second floor handicapped accessible via an elevator? Mr. Ivezaj stated that he would answer the questions in order and then he will turn it over to their architect, Tim Brodowski (sp?). He said as far as ADA accessibility to the building, going through the building process, if it is a building code requirement, they would definitely work on providing the ADA access. He added that it is basically a spillover office space within the unit and they will have ample offices on the first floor. This is something they will definitely visit during the building plan review process. If accessibility is required, they will definitely provide it. The height of the building itself is within the permitted height requirements within both districts for (IP) and the Lapeer Overlay District and felt that the height was within a permitted use. He said as far as elevations go, he will turn that over to Tim Brodowski, he will break that out for them, as far as his design. They do want all four sides of the building, especially since three of them are going to be visible from the roadways, to be attractive, and
they want a nice building there. They want a beautiful interior with some glass high ceilings and they want it to look nice.

Mr. Tim Brodowski the Architect for the project stated that that direction was provided initially where they sat down and went through somewhat of a trendy, or modern building facades, with a lot of glass, smooth siding, the steel canopies that are indicated. He understood that the façade size didn’t offer much as far as projections or variations in the building itself, but the front elevation of some of the buildings have a steel canopy detail, which could be translated around the sides as well if that makes more sense to comply with the standards. The comments on the initial review letters about them meeting those standards and the zoning requirements, they would absolutely meet. He knew that there was a note on there that could easily be removed about all materials are subject to change and final selection by the owner, that can definitely be removed as well. He added that he was an Orion resident and has lived there for about 12 years. He wants to not only design a nice building, but obviously, make it attractive and something that everyone can be proud of.

Chairman Reynolds asked if there were any plans for mechanical to be located on the flat roof, and what the plans were for that? Mr. Brodowski replied yes, as the design would be developed further, they would anticipate having equipment which would be screened with a metal material of some sort that matches the building façade or whatever would make that the least visible as possible. They do anticipate roof modern equipment up there.

Commissioner Urbanowski stated that there were still a couple of things from the Planners review that hadn’t been touched on. They might be minor, but there was nothing said about the lighting and resubmitting the photometric plan for the light fixtures on the building. She added that there was something about the covered trash areas that are not included. She thought that there was so much stuff that concerned her, because if they don’t get it all in the motion, even if it is conditioned upon, there is just so much that needs to be address, there are 19 items on the engineering report. She knew that Engineer Landis said it could be handled with a resubmittal, but thought it was a lot and was concerned that they will miss something. She added that there was a separate memo about landscaping. She asked if they have to have a discussion about tree preservation? She questioned if that review was from Giffels Webster? Chairman Reynolds replied yes, the landscape review came from Giffels Webster.

Commissioner Walker agreed with Commissioner Urbanowski. He wondered why these things are not resolved before it comes to the Planning Commission. He knew it was the site plan, but there is just a ton of stuff. He said he was somewhat reluctant to give carte blanche even conditionally because it is so hard to keep track of every one of those things.

Chairman Reynolds agreed with Commissioner Walker. He stated that it is always difficult, he tends to be pro-development with projects when they meet their criteria, especially when the applicants are willing to meet all the items. His specific concerns are in regards to some of the standards, of the Lapeer Overlay District. He questioned how they are actually meeting that criteria for the Lapeer Overlay District, with some of the comments regarding landscaping and grading? He knew they could work through it and understood where OHM was going with even the “C” calculations for the overall development. He understood that some of those items were kind of a stab in the dark but thought that their efforts here are that they are developing two parts of this parcel and there is going to be a connection, they know there is going to have to be fire safety provided in the future when a development comes. He stated that they want to have some thought that at least there is some forethought of what is going to come in and that it is all going to be worked out even if it is to be revised in the future based on a separate development there. He echoed the same concerns of some issues and felt more comfortable with potentially another submittal review before they move forward with the approval or denial of the project.
Commissioner Urbanowski said that there are two motions for this case, one of them is the waiver for some of the Lapeer Road Overlay items. She asked if it was feasible for them to go ahead, for example, the front yard parking, and the building orientation. She said it felt like the whole project might be going in a different way for the moment. She questioned, in order to get those things out of the way, can they do that part of the motion, then work on the other, or does it not make sense? Chairman Reynolds replied absolutely. He said that it does make sense to address the design standards and waivers and things on an individual basis as they move to the approval of the site plan. His only caution with that would be with the number of items that are open and concerns that they have of potential changes that could be brought forth with a revision or incorporation and that his personal stance is to provide some feedback on some of the waivers. He did not have a problem with providing a waiver on the parking location, the front yard, or the 50% rule. He thought that some of the architectural standards, do have some large facades that are pretty flat. He said some of those things in the Lapeer Overlay District might be things that they want to discuss further with the recommendation for a site plan approval. Commissioner Urbanowski said she wasn’t talking about the site plan approval part she was talking about motion #1, which just grants the waiver for certain things. She questioned if they could do that motion to get it out of the way? Commissioner Reynolds replied specifically to the building orientation and connectivity in front yard parking, yes, they could grant that waiver. His only thing with the Lapeer Overlay District design standards is that that does apply to the building aesthetics in the big picture, too. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said to clarify the three items that are listed under the waivers are ones that they are not meeting at all. The design criteria are really at their discretion whether what they are proposing is meeting the design standards, so that is more of a subjective versus the others, they don’t have it. That is why the waiver is asking for the ones they clearly don’t meet versus the others that will determine whether they do or not. She understood what Commissioner Urbanowski was saying and that is totally at the discretion of the Planning Commission. She added that the Chair is saying that if those waivers are given and then they have to move something around related to the other things, then maybe the waiver wouldn’t have been appropriate. She said if she is asking could it be done even if they were choosing to postpone it, yes, they could have a motion that was made and passing at this meeting in spite of postponing the case itself.

Secretary St. Henry said that he was surprised at how many outstanding issues were out there presented by both the engineer and by the planners. He stated that he would be much more comfortable getting the majority of those outstanding issues resolved. He thought that they should hold off on making any approval on each one of the potential motions because he did agree that 19 or so outstanding issues that could impact the overlay direction in some of the decision made there.

Chairman Reynolds stated to the applicant if they had some general thoughts and feedback from the Commissioners and thought that they seemed fairly workable. He thought it sounded like there was a little bit of lack of comfort from the extensive list and not being present on the drawings. He asked what the applicant’s thoughts were? Mr. Ivezaj said they definitely take into account and respected all their comments, and felt they were all very good concerns, and thought they were definitely doing their jobs being Planning Commissioners. He said if he could alleviate some of those concerns, he will do his best. He said he knew there were some concerns about the photometric plan and the trash enclosure. He added that the photometric plan, as it is right now, the revision that they are looking at doing where if they ended up adding additional lights onto the building, which they don’t plan on doing at this point, and most certainly if they do add building lighting onto the site, they would definitely amend the photometric plan and resubmit it for approval. The trash enclosure itself they are missing a detail. The enclosure is actually on the plan itself right now, they are looking for further detail on
the trash enclosure for review, which they can provide in the next submittal. As far as engineering concerns, the site itself, right now, and he didn’t know if they went into too much detail on it, but there is actually already been allocated some stormwater detention across the Dutton Road on the prior development, as Engineer Landis was explaining earlier. He added that the C coefficient that he is asking for is to double-check that there is enough capacity on the site. As it is right now, in their current site plan and their current submittal, they are actually submitting for these two buildings alone. The runoff coming off of these two buildings alone does not impact anything over what is permitted within that regional basin or that regional detention. He said if they move forward with an additional site plan in the future, that will definitely be a concern and would be something to take into account at that point but as of right now, it shouldn’t be a concern with these two sites going in, because the only plan they are going for is these two retail buildings. They are not applying for any additional industrial buildings, or a park, or anything else at this point, nothing else has been accounted for. From their viewpoint, they are not looking at it as they are missing all this information, they are just not sure what they are doing with the rest of the development. It is within their option at this point, and if they do move forward, obviously, they will account for any additional stormwater detention or any additional site requirements. He added that as Engineer Landis has said, he believes with their contact and communications with staff, they believe they can address all these comments within another administrative approval process. He said he wouldn’t be coming in front of them tonight, with a number of comments that could not be addressed, or that he was not comfortable after talking with the staff, that could be addressed in the future. He thought it was for both of their benefits. He believed a lot of the other comments that are out there, he was more than willing, and he respected the opinions and the outlook but would love to clarify any additional comments off of that list that concerns any of the members before they make a vote. They are extremely confident after speaking to staff, it is not just necessarily a don’t worry we will take care of it later, it is more of, they have looked through the list, they have had a meeting on it, and they are extremely comfortable with these comments and addressing them.

Chairman Reynolds said that their concerns are mainly an extensive list, that would potentially influence the project, and that is not at the discretion of their reviewers, but at their discretion, and thought that there needed to be some comfort level. He knew that some of the items could be worked out with them, and they entrust in their professional consultants and they meet with them on a frequent basis. The big picture of grading not being proposed, and some items that could be addressed administratively, but there is only so far that comfort level is going to take them. He knew a couple of feedback items here that would bring some more comfort to them, is more clarification on them meeting or exceeding the architectural standards through the Lapeer Overlay District. He added that they didn’t address the comment about the mechanical being screened, dumpster enclosure, those details being added for them. They had a good discussion about the parking location being located in the front or street frontage, they mentioned safety paths, they were in support of adding per their reviewer’s comments. There are a number of general landscape review items to be addressed and the building photometric to be revised to their comments. He thought one of the larger items that would kind of check off some things is in regards to how the future parcel would be developed and maintaining access and proving to them that the stormwater detention could be addressed in the future, with a future development, along with addressing both the future storm easements and also the existing easements. He thought that there were a couple of items with the incorporation of either to accept or deny how the Dutton Corporation Center and Retail Development would be addressed. There were a couple of comments from the Fire Marshal. He thought that there needed to be some revisions brought forth to them to address those concerns. He thought that they were comfortable moving forward.

Commissioner Reynolds felt that they could have a brief discussion on the parking, if the Planning Commissioners were in support of the current layout of parking, being Lapeer Road
Overlay and asking for a waiver on that. Vice-Chairman Gross stated that he didn’t see that as being a major issue relative to this particular site because of the constraints of the site, location, and boundaries of it. He thought that there were a lot of things that the applicant has indicated that could be taken care of, so it shouldn’t be a long delay if they can revise the plans and get them back to them, reflecting that. He added but the engineer has 19 or 20 issues, the planner has 5 or 6, and the Fire Marshal has 5 or 6 issues.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Hoffman, to postpone this case to allow the applicant to incorporate the reports of the engineer of December 29, 2020, the planner report of December 29, 2020, and the Fire Marshal report of December 30, 2020, so that they can get everything on one plan before them, and then other comments that they talked about, relative to the architectural features of part of the building and the barrier-free access if it is not going to be, just take it off the plans, take the floor plans off altogether because they don’t want to deal with building department issues and building codes.

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds wanted clarification from the motion maker of the timeframe included with the motion to postpone? Vice-Chairman Gross replied as soon as they can get it back to them.

Mr. Ivezaj thanked the Commissioners for their feedback and time.

Commissioner Urbanowski thought that there should be a timeframe. At least before 90 days from today.

Vice-Chairman Gross amended the motion, Commissioner Hoffman re-supported, that the applicant is to come back to the Planning Commission within 90 days.

Planner Fazzini asked if they would like to see the rooftop mechanical equipment on the renderings for the next meeting, or is that something that doesn’t need to be provided? Chairman Reynolds thought that a rendering, or a note that addressed the comment that the mechanical would be screened, per the zoning ordinance or a rendering that proves that, would be helpful.

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

9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
None

10. PUBLIC COMMENTS
None

11. COMMUNICATIONS
None

12. PLANNERS REPORTS
A. Community Planning Update Winter 2020 Issue

Planner Arroyo read through the Community Planning Update – Winter 2020 Issue.
Planner Arroyo said this issue is about changing winter attitudes. Winter comes whether they like it or not, and what they are seeing more this year, and more communities are taking advantage of, and embracing it given some of the restrictions with COVID, particularly restaurants. He stated that he has dined out, both in December and January outside, and had pleasant experiences, with a coat on, and a heat source nearby, and it was something he probably would not have done in the past.

Planner Arroyo added that some communities are creating special zones where they can close down streets and open them up to dining, retail, and pedestrian activity. Others have amended their ordinances to allow for more outdoor dining on individual private sites, as well as, public sites. Changes to the Michigan Liquor Control Regulations due to emergency changes that allow for even communities to designate zones where people can walk with open alcohol within defined areas.

Planner Arroyo stated that other communities have been active in promoting unifying businesses as a group. In Ferndale, they did “Unbox the Holidays” and they had a website, and there was a gift card they could buy that was good for a variety of businesses within the city, there were bonus cards available. All of the restaurants that had outdoor dining were listed on there, so really, getting the word out to folks interested in what is happening and what is available.

Planner Arroyo said that there is a lot of different things that could be done, and hopefully, they can keep those in mind as they are going through the Master Plan updates and the zoning amendments. What can they do to make their community more flexible, and make it more adaptable to changes in, climate, and or changes in weather? Both are actually areas that need to be addressed.

Planner Arroyo said that Eric Pietsch joined them about 3 months ago. He is a Wayne State Graduate but was in Houston for about 11 years working in the Planning Department there. He added that they recently had Stephanie Osborne join them, she was also from Wayne State, another planner.

13. COMMITTEE REPORTS
None.

14. FUTURE PUBLIC HEARINGS
01-20-21 at 7:05 p.m. PC-2021-02, Milosch Project Rezone Request, 4.293 acres of unaddressed parcel 09-26-300-013 located at the corner of Silverbell and Lapeer Roads from General Business (GB) to Industrial Park (IP).

Public Hearings will be virtual-only.

15. CHAIRMAN’S COMMENTS
Chairman Reynolds welcomed Commissioner Hoffman to the Planning Commission.

16. COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS
Secretary St. Henry wished everyone a Happy New Year. He said he is going to be a grandfather his oldest daughter is having a little boy. He welcomed Commissioner Hoffman.

Commissioner Walker welcomed Commissioner Hoffman. He recommended, for an outdoor dining experience, Northville for that. They have closed down 4-5 of their blocks, and all of the restaurants have these Eskimo things.
Commissioner Urbanowski welcomed Commissioner Hoffman. She wanted to congratulate the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and Secretary for their appointments and thanked them for stepping up to do that. She thanked Planning & Zoning Girling for all of her hard work and keeping them on track. She thanked the Engineer & Planners. She also congratulated Planner Arroyo for being elected Secretary of Giffels Webster Board of Directors, and at the Michigan Association of Planning, he was congratulated for 40 years as a member. She welcomed Planner Pietsch.

Commissioner Gross welcomed Commissioner Hoffman. He hoped that in 2021 they can all get together and meet as a Planning Commission.

Commissioner Hoffman thanked the Commissioners. He was excited to be a part of the PC and stated that he loved this community. He said he was also a part of the Chamber he is the president of the Board, and also on his HOA Board for Keatington. He stated that he owned several businesses and had a fourth child on the way in May.

Secretary St. Henry said that now that it is 2021, he was looking forward to looking at the Master Plan, and redoing it.

**17. ADJOURNMENT**
Moved by Commissioner Urbanowski, seconded by Commissioner St. Henry to adjourn the meeting at 8:20 p.m. **Motion carried.**

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Debra Walton  
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary  
Charter Township of Orion  

January 20, 2021  
Planning Commission Approval Date