

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**\*\*\*\*\* MINUTES \*\*\*\*\***  
**REGULAR MEETING, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15, 2023**

The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, March 15, 2023, at 7:00 p.m. at the Orion Township Municipality Complex Board Room, 2323 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, Michigan 48360.

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Scott Reynolds, Chairman	Don Walker, PC Rep to ZBA
Don Gross, Vice Chairman	Jessica Gingell, Commissioner
Kim Urbanowski, BOT Rep to PC	

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:**

James Cummins, Commissioner  
Joe St. Henry, Secretary

**1. OPEN MEETING**

Chairman Reynolds opened the meeting at 7:01 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

As noted

**CONSULTANTS PRESENT:**

John Enos, (Township Planner) of Carlisle Wortman Associates, LLC  
Mark Landis, (Township Engineer) of Orchard, Hiltz, and McCliment, Inc.  
Tammy Girling, Township Planning & Zoning Director

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Michele Chirco	Mark Perkoski
Frances Rose	Ken Burns
Steve Pangori	Peter Paveh
Daniel Johnson	Demarcas Garrett
Shamik Tripathi	

**3. MINUTES**

- A. 3-01-23, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes
- B. 3-01-23, PC-23-02, Lapeer Rd. & Silverbell Rd. Rezone Public Hearing Minutes
- C. 3-01-23, PC-23-03, Lapeer Road Burger King Rezone Public Hearing Minutes
- D. 3-01-23, PC-23-04, Orion Ridge Major PUD Amendment Public Hearing Minutes

Moved by Treasurer Urbanowski, seconded by Commissioner Walker, to approve all the minutes as presented. **Motion carried.**

**4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Gingell, to approve the agenda as presented. **Motion carried.**

**5. BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENT – NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY**

None.

**6. CONSENT AGENDA**

A. PC-22-29, Baldwin Village, Final PUD, Plan Date Stamped 12-20-22 Approval of Destruction of Documents.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Treasurer Urbanowski, to approve the consent agenda as presented. **Motion carried.**

---

Chairman Reynolds recessed the regular meeting at 7:05 p.m. and opened the public hearing for PC-2021-65, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance Updates, Articles II, III, IX, XI, XIV, XVI, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXVI, XXVII, XXIX, XXX, XXXIV, and XXXV.

Chairman Reynolds closed the public hearing for PC-2021-65 at 7:09 p.m.

---

## **7. NEW BUSINESS**

A. PC-2022-05, Quattro Development Retail Building Site Plan Extension, located on a vacant parcel located north of 4983 S. Baldwin Rd., (Sidwell #09-32-377-057).

Chairman Reynolds asked if the petitioner was present. He asked the applicant to state their name and address for the record and give an overview of their request for an extension.

Mr. Peter Pavek with Quattro Development, 1100 Jorie Blvd. Suite 140, Oak Brook, IL 60523.

Mr. Pavek said he was here about a year ago talking about the same project when they ran into some issues with the stormwater plans for the site and it took them a while to get it all figured out. Now they have their building permits in for review and the site plan has been approved. So, because it has been a year, they needed to come back in front of the Planning Commission and get this reapproved.

Chairman Reynolds said that their approval is still valid they are obviously asking for an extension to continue to seek permitting and further efforts. He asked if they have been working on engineering reviews and things. Mr. Pavek replied yes.

Chairman Reynolds asked what the length of the extension of the request was. Mr. Pavek asked for a year.

Chairman Reynolds asked if the Planning Commission had any thoughts or potential motions. He added since this was the first extension for this, he would be in favor of an extension for no greater than one year, as they are already working through the process, seeing how they are well underway.

Moved by Treasurer Urbanowski, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that the Planning Commission **approve** site plan approval extension request for PC-2022-05, Quattro Development Retail Building Site Plan for one year. This approval is based on the following findings of facts: they are in the process of completing some of their engineering work and they have their building permits already in, so they are underway.

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

## **8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

A. PC-22-29, Baldwin Village Final PUD, located at 4410 & 4408 S. Baldwin Rd. (parcel 09-32-301-001), an unaddressed parcel 09-32-301-014 located at the NW corner of Morgan and S. Baldwin Roads, an unaddressed parcel 09-32-151-020 located north of 4408 S. Baldwin, and 4292 S. Baldwin (parcel 09-32-151-021).

Chairman Reynolds asked the applicant to give an overview of the latest submission.

Mr. Jim Eppink with J Eppink Partners presented.

Mr. Eppink stated that he was representing the Silverman Group, Buzz Silverman who is joining them via YouTube, they have the Mocerri Jacobson team here, as well as Alrig USA, all of their partners in the development.

Mr. Eppink said he wanted to remind them where they left off in January, they were here on January 18<sup>th</sup>. At that point, the Commission made a motion to postpone or table their item and asked for some additional information. They have worked closely with the Township, with the consultants, and with their own internal team and have had additional submissions and were back here to give a brief overview. They have taken up an awful lot of their time over the last year so they would like to give a brief update on where they are at, and where they are hoping to get to.

Mr. Eppink stated that it has been a long road. They have had more than four pre-application meetings, they have had a public hearing, they have been to the Planning Commission four times, and they have been to the Township Board twice. If they remember they were granted conditional PUD in preliminary site plan approval back in the fall. It was determined at that point that the project qualified as a PUD, which it really exemplifies, and it went through the Gingellville Overlay Ordinance, though it was agreed that this plan really exemplifies that ordinance as well. They have worked closely with the Master Plan, and they have discussed in the past how this plan really, they believe, completely meets the Master Plan in terms of this location down along S. Baldwin Road. It really strives to create a 15-minute neighborhood and some of the mixed-use opportunities that they have been talking about.

Mr. Eppink said what they have done from conceptual to final plan, especially over the last 6 weeks or so is they have come back to the Planning Commission tonight, they have finalized the site plan, and they have provided an awful lot more details, and documentation. The last review letters both from the Planner and from the Engineer had a number of conditions all rightly pointed out. They have gone through everything with a fine-toothed comb, and they will talk about some of those tonight but have really been diligent in trying to ensure that they have addressed concerns both the comments from the public and the Planning Commission as well as the consultants and have documented it within the site plan and its documents and will present those to them tonight.

Mr. Eppink stated that they have modified, improved, and made adjustments to the architecture, the architectural elements, the landscape, and the buffers. Really everything that they had previously been working on they really just tried to listen, respond and enhance the plans to do that.

Mr. Eppink said that there are also an awful lot of technical clarifications. What is interesting about a project like this, it goes from the very visionary of what is it going to feel like when it is built and when people are living here, walking through, or shopping within it. And then what does the ordinance say, and what are those technical deviations from the setback, to building height, and all of those things? They have submitted another package, this time they put about seven sheets in the front which are kind of an executive summary. Hopefully, they have at least had a chance to not only review the entire package but the kind of cheat sheet of the highlights of the plans, as well as these modifications.

Mr. Eppink said he appreciated the time of their professional team. Planning & Zoning Director Girling and the Planning Department and her staff have really worked tirelessly, they appreciated that, and they provided direction, and really frank feedback to them to make sure they are delivering what is needed. The Planner at Carlisle Wortman, Mr. Enos, the Engineer Mr. Landis, and the OHM team, and they appreciated their time. The Fire Department responded as well as the Public Services. Obviously, they will hear from those consultants tonight, but they did receive their letters and they were appreciative of the fact that after their careful analysis. He believed that with all four reviews that their Commission can consider a recommendation to the Township Board.

Mr. Eppink said their request is to answer any of their questions and provide any additional information to the public or the Commission. Should they find that everything is in order to make a favorable recommendation to the Township Board for the final PUD and final site plan. Obviously, that is not the last stop in the process, but it is an important step that will then take them to the Township Board really for the first and second readings. After that, there is final engineering, there is continue review, there are Road Commission, DEQ, EAGLE reviews, and everything else. It is an important step, and they appreciated the opportunity to request that tonight.

Mr. Eppink stated that he won't spend a lot of time going through the plan but for those on TV or those in the audience, they are proposing a site plan development, a mixed-use plan, on the west side of Baldwin Rd. just north of Morgan. It is really envisioned to be four villages. The first village, what they are calling Uptown Village, is a commercial village, walkable, as well as retail restaurants, and grocery. The other villages are all residential. Uptown Village is a rental apartment community, the other North and South Villages are townhomes that will also be for rent. They have different size townhomes, different styles, and all complimentary architecture right down to one-story duplex units which are closer to that SW corner as they abut to the Peppermill neighborhood.

Mr. Eppink said they worked closely again with Gingellville Village Center Overlay District, as well as the Master Plan. They talked earlier in the process their Master Plan identified that more than 50% of the community is looking to in the next several years to move to actually smaller homes, duplexes were specifically mentioned in the ordinance, attached townhomes, things that are different than single-family homes. Obviously, Orion Township is always going to be a community-oriented neighborhood, a series of neighborhoods, mostly single-family. But, as they are working through different communities in SE Michigan more and more communities are identifying that same thing that they want to keep their residents where they are both the younger spectrum as kids grow here and they want to stay in the community, or as kids move out and they are empty nesters and they either want to stay in a condo, townhome, or a duplex but still within the community.

Mr. Eppink stated that also interestingly the Master Plan said that the number one survey request, and he thought that the Supervisor mentioned this, the number one survey request over and over again is a small unique grocery store, so they were proud to be able to offer that.

Mr. Eppink said that their package offers an awful lot more detail, hopefully, a little more organized so that it was easier to get through. What specifically they have addressed since their last meeting, there is a longer list included both in their packet as well as in their Engineer and the Planners review but things that were mentioned last time that they really have specifically doubled down, and there are a lot of sidewalk connections. That seems like a small detail but when they are really striving to build a walkable community their Commission, the consultants, and even the public had said that it would make sense to add some additional connections to the Baldwin safety path, and to other areas. There is quite a bit more pedestrian

activity throughout the plan. They are requesting tonight, and they have been consistent that their road width that they would like to meet the Oakland County Standards which is a 60-ft. wide right-of-way on their private roads with a 27-ft. back of curb. He believed that the ordinance in Orion is a 30-ft. They are specifically 27-ft (a) to be consistent with Oakland County but (b) they believe to slow traffic down. There will be parking on one side of the street, but it really forces people to slow down because their goal is that this is a walkable community and so that is one of the deviations that they have listed out. They have added things like EV (electric vehicle) charging stations both within the clubhouse area, and within the retail area, and they are also within the garages providing conduit and proper size panels to add EV charging stations in the future as the auto economy evolves.

Mr. Eppink stated that they have worked closely with the Fire Department as far as fire circulation, truck access, and garbage truck access to ensure that that has been streamlined and there are details of that in the plans. Parking lot islands have been added as well as they have consolidated those to take advantage of pedestrian movement so in some cases, they have taken multiple parking lot islands, gathered those together, and created these walkways through the parking lots so that people can walk either from the Cottages at Gregory through their neighborhood all the way up to the retail.

Mr. Eppink said in the PUD Agreement they will start to see, it is called for in there and there will be a shared Parking Agreement, shared Maintenance Agreement, Access Agreement, and utility and stormwater easements. They are moving again from that live style design to the technical design, so it is important as they look at parking, access, maintenance, and all of those easements and utilities are in place. That PUD Agreement will live with the project it essentially becomes that unifying governing agency and so that is important that that continues to be in there. They have submitted a draft of the PUD Agreement. He knew that the Township Attorney was reviewing that and that would be a back-and-forth getting the details right before it goes to that second reading at the Township Board.

Mr. Eppink stated that another deviation that they are requesting, and they had updated some of the language in their ordinance earlier tonight, one thing that the Township will consider in the future is looking at some of their lighting standards. The Gingellville Overlay District specifies specific lighting standards, a kind of an old-style acorn light very popular with an incandescent bulb. What they are proposing or recommending within their village they think is large enough that can really create its own identity is a light fixture that matches kind of that more modern farmhouse architecture that they have provided real crisp yet elegant and traditional architecture. The light fixture that they are proposing he thought was more consistent with that architecture compared to the old acorn-style lighting. They are also proposing a 3,000 Kelvin LED bulb as opposed to the incandescent which again is just that new modern standard.

Mr. Eppink said that they provided a sign package both for the residential and the commercial. All of the monument signs are out at Baldwin as well as the monument signs within each of the villages. One will say Uptown Village, North, and South Village.

Mr. Eppink said they provided and appreciated Planner Enos and his team going through and looking at each of the deviations, he has provided tables for setback deviations. He added that it was his experience that with Planned Unit Developments these deviations are almost standard, as opposed to just a straight zoning. What is interesting about a project like this is that they do it in phases they actually kind of self-created a lot of places where they need deviations or setbacks. Whenever they create a phase one and a phase two, the two buildings next to each other with a sidewalk in between them that imaginary phase line now becomes a setback issue. They have shown in their plans, and he believed that Planner Enos had picked up on his review letter which of those are internal, a lot of them say either internal or some of

those are to the church just to the west of them is technically zoned residential but it is a church and so their setback is a little closer there, they are asking for a deviation. A number of their setbacks are actually along Baldwin Road when they expanded the road and they created the right-of-way, unlike almost every right-of-way, which is just parallel lines this has all sorts of jogs and notches out of it. They have, for example, one 12-ft. easement where the right-of-way actually incorporates a light pole. There is a list of setbacks, what they are really proud of is none of the perimeter setbacks against any of the adjacent residential either to the north or to the west they are not asking for any setbacks against any existing residential. In fact, in each case they exceeded. There are a couple of different ways to measure those setbacks, either the Gingellville Ordinance or the PUD Ordinance. What they have done is taken the worst case or the most restrictive of any of those ordinances and made it greater. They have taken the most conservative of their ordinances as it relates to setbacks. For example, in the back, it is a 40-ft. setback their closest building is 52 feet. They have exceeded all of those.

Mr. Eppink said they have provided updated Traffic Studies and circulation plans. He knew that Engineer Landis and his team at OHM have spent a lot of time that will ultimately go to the Road Commission of Oakland County, but they have provided, he thought twelve different design scenarios looking at traffic measuring impact, coming up with some suggestions that will ensure that this development operates well and doesn't put extra stress onto the newly created Baldwin Road.

Mr. Eppink stated that he had a lot of images, and they have seen them before, he was happy if they wanted to talk about architecture and what it is going to look and feel like. He can go through those. Really what he wanted to do was just explain where they have been, what they have done in the last 6 weeks, and request after any questions they have, consideration of a recommendation.

Chairman Reynolds said since they did see it a couple of weeks ago, they will go ahead and proceed with their reviews and then they can dig into visuals. At this time, they will turn it over for their Planner's review.

Planner Enos read through his review date stamped received March 13, 2023.

Engineer Landis read through his review date stamped received March 9, 2023.

Planner Enos said that if they do decide to move this to the Township Board this evening the package of information moving to the Board not only includes his review, the Engineer's review, and the Fire Departments review, they are all attached to all of the modifications that are requested create this. This is all tie-barred together with the modifications on setbacks and a mixture of uses and types of uses. Those modifications create this. Don't think that if they do make a recommendation of approval, they are just moving this plan forward, they are moving a whole package of information forward.

Chairman Reynolds said as mentioned by the applicant and some of their reviewers, this a PUD, and it is a multi-step process that involves themselves as a Planning Commission and the Township Board. So, although this is the final PUD that they have here in front of them this evening, they are just a recommending body to the Township Board, and that recommendation can obviously be made with a number of comments or conditions.

Chairman Reynolds said he was happy to see the resubmission addressed a long list of comments, items, and concerns that they had. He thought that their professional consultants have narrowed it down to some clear and concise topics of concern and that he thought that if the project were to move forward it could easily be addressed with their administration. This is a

very large project with a lot of things going on with it but in a good way. He generally supports some of the deviations and modifications that the PUD proposes. He thought this was one of those tools where the PUD is not being used to circumvent ordinance requirements but rather come together as a creative solution. If they were to look at these, for example, some of the setback modifications “that are being proposed” as the applicant had mentioned in the presentation are created via boundaries between the separation of uses. When they see numbers that are zero, they are not necessarily a zero setback it has been generated because of the lines that divide the various components but are still, as required with the PUD, jointly unified via an agreement. He was good with that.

Chairman Reynolds stated that he also thought the product being proposed here has come a long way in a good way. He didn’t have any issues with the variation of the Baldwin Gingellville Overlay Design Standards for lighting because this is such a large parcel and it has more than one component to it, it is not like they are proposing one property that deviates, it is a whole district or village as they would say. He was in support of that.

Chairman Reynolds said he thought the big thing, as the plan review mentioned, as this moves forward there is still obviously still a couple of little things here and there and he would make sure that 1-10 from the Planner is included in any motion tonight. The same thing goes with the OHM review letter of 1-6. Then there are some comments from both their Fire Marshal and their Public Service Director reviewed this without major comment, but the Fire Marshal wanted an additional requirement to be met.

Vice-Chairman Gross said as he indicated earlier this is the first real Planned Unit Development, mixed unit development that they have been able to review in the Township, in his tenure, anyways. He thought they have done an exceptional job of providing a mix of uses both residential and different styles of residential, with commercial, and identifying some of the issues that have been raised in their Master Plan hearings about some of the uses that the community was looking forward to having with grocery stores, and restaurants to service the community. He also noticed that the setbacks along Baldwin Road have been, he thought, purposely designed so that the buildings are on the frontage and that they are not separated by Baldwin by a series of parking lots from the public view of driving up and down the street. There are setbacks that are landscaped without isles of parking in front of them. They have spent a lot of time on this, and their consultants have spent more time than they have on this. Planning & Zoning Director Girling can show them the plans there are over 140 sheets of documents that have been reviewed by their consultants and he thought they had done an exceptional job of going through the plans reviewing them with the ordinance and with the intent of what a Planned Unit Development is designed to do.

Commissioner Walker said when he saw this plan the first time a year ago, he thought this was dreadful. He couldn’t figure out why he thought it was dreadful, it is not Mocerri they do great work. They have the skills, the power, the wherewithal to do a good job. He thought this was a good job for someplace else. When he thinks of this, and maybe because he is old and doesn’t know any better, his concept of the Township has always been the Township together. He thinks what he doesn’t like about this is that it is different. They were talking about lighting, the acorn lighting and things, and he thought that was what this does. This is Orion Township 2.0 and perhaps he has the wrong view of it, but it seemed to him it was going to be like the TV show Westworld or something like that where everybody gets up at the same time and goes to bed at the same time and puts on their hat and drives to the same place, and everybody stays in this little loop, other than to go to work they will stay there. He didn’t see people going into Steak ‘n Shake and the Chick-fil-A that don’t live there. He sensed a division by doing this. He thought they satisfied all the requirements, there is no question about that. They have worked

very hard, and their consultants have worked very hard, and they have changed it up a lot since the first time he saw it, but he still thinks of it the same way.

Chairman Reynolds said that obviously, they are at the point of the final PUD and the PUD process, so the concept has been approved. So, the general use that is where they are sitting now as per the site plan. That is part of why there are multiple boards involved too. They have a lot of different thoughts and opinions but just a reminder that they are here at the final site plan not at the concept.

Commissioner Gingell said she will fill in the words that Commissioner Walker was looking for was crisp and elegant is the words he used for the lighting. When she thinks of Gingell and the Gingellville area it just doesn't fit with crisp and elegant. They are Lake Orion barefoot people, brick and barefoot, she didn't know how else to say it. She thought it was beautiful, it definitely fits all of the criteria it just doesn't fit the area. She thought they talked about preserving the history and she didn't see any of that there she sees the last name thrown into a random word as a street, Gingellridge Lane. She didn't think that was preserving history at all. She thought it was just using the name in there because they can't use the full name technically. She thought that the grocery store is not a local small grocery store, she said the first time they saw this plan. It is not a small gourmet market it is a big grocery store. She said she wanted to know where the 3<sup>rd</sup> drive-thru was. Chairman Reynolds said it was the third building from the left.

Mr. Eppink said the southern two the Chick-fil-A and the Shake Shack would be what they would all think of as a drive-thru. What is proposed here is intended to be what today's stores call a pick-up window. Where there typically isn't stacking most pick-up windows now prepare foods or coffee or whatever might be through apps now. So very often depending on the tenant there may not even be a signboard but an electronic app and then a pick-up window. A lot of that came became more popular through COVID as people didn't want to get out of their cars, and it seems to be working for a lot of restaurants. Commissioner Gingell asked for an example. Mr. Eppink said a lot of sandwich shops will do that now. Commissioner Gingell asked if it was a small mom-and-pop sandwich shop. Mr. Eppink replied it could be a mom-and-pop sandwich shop, it could be any type of smaller coffee shop. Kirk Catellus is starting to open some up in Clarkston, not exactly mom-and-pop shop, but more of a regional operator. There are different ones coming to be as opposed to having a signboard.

Treasurer Urbanowski said she heard what Commissioner Gingell and Commissioner Walker were saying, and she acknowledges it. She has only lived here since the mid-90s, so she didn't have the history that they had and didn't want to not acknowledge what the two of them are saying. She also wanted to acknowledge that this has been a long process and she believed that they have listened to what they have said. She did believe that this is the true PUD and that they were hoping for someone to actually use it the way it was supposed to be used. She can see both sides but for her, she will support it because it is what they put out there. This is what they built Baldwin Road for. She has grown to like it.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Treasurer Urbanowski, that the Planning Commission **forward a recommendation to the Board of Trustees to approve** PC-22-29, Baldwin Village Planning Unit Development (PUD) Final Plan, for property located at 4410 & 4408 S. Baldwin Rd. (parcel 09-32-301-001), an unaddressed parcel 09-32-301-014 located at the NW corner of Morgan and S. Baldwin Roads, an unaddressed parcel 09-32-151-020 located north of 4408 S. Baldwin, and 4292 S. Baldwin Road (parcel 09-32-151-021) to rezone the properties from Single Family Residential-1 (R-1), Suburban Farms (SF) and Brown Road Innovation Zone (BIZ) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) for plans date stamped received March 6, 2023. These plans have incorporated the conditions and variances from the previously approved Concept plan of April 20, 2022. This recommendation to approve is based



on the following findings of facts: that it is compliant with the PUD Concept by providing a 58-acre site with a planned mixed-use development of a variety of residential, retail, restaurants, and office uses; it is compatible with the adjacent land uses with the residential properties to the west and to the north; the impact on traffic has been addressed and is oriented exclusively to Baldwin Road which was recently approved with the multi-lane boulevard section; the protection of the natural environment is identified with the retention of the protected wetlands and the 20% of the open space and buffering adjoining the properties with open space and landscaping within the parking areas; it is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Future Land Use Plan and the Master Plan that was recently adopted by the Planning Commission. The recommendation is subject to the conditions of the Planners review of March 8, 2023, and those conditions be incorporated into the plan; that the applicant comply with the report of OHM dated January 12, 2023, and the assembly of conditions be incorporated in the final plans; secondly, the condition is at the review and approval of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Agreement by the Township Attorney and the approval of the land division creating the parcels as depicted on the plans.

Discussion on the motion:

Treasurer Urbanowski stated that she thought that the January's date for OHM's review it should be the March 9, 2023. She also wanted to include the request from the Fire Marshal.

Vice-Chairman Gross amended the motion, Treasurer Urbanowski re-supported that the OHM review is the review from March 9, 2023, not January 12, 2023, and that the Fire Marshal's review comments be added as a condition.

Chairman Reynolds asked if there were any comments from the applicant or from the public. There was none.

**Roll call vote was as follows:** Gross, yes; Urbanowski, yes; Gingell, no; Walker, yes; Reynolds, yes. **Motion carried 4-1 (Cummins and St. Henry absent).**

B. PC-2021-90, Ridgewood Final PUD, located at 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (parcel 09-15-226-007), the vacant parcel west of 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (parcel 09-15-226-006), and the vacant parcel east of 625 W. Clarkston Rd (parcel 09-15-226-008).

Chairman Reynolds asked the applicant to state their name and address for the record and give an overview of their final PUD.

Mr. Daniel Johnson with IN-SITE, LLC presented.

Mr. Johnson said from the last meeting in December there were three main comments that came out of their discussions. One was minor engineering review comments that they needed to address which they have done. There was a discussion about the left turn or passing lane provision at Clarkston, and they have addressed that. And there was a discussion about the safety pathway in terms of its inclusion of the project or some sort of quid pro quo monetary program for that, and they have addressed that as well.

Mr. Johnson stated that from a process standpoint, it started with the concept plan process, and they are at final PUD, and December 21, 2022, was their last meeting. They have worked on revisions they have had discussions with OHM and the Road Commission, and they were there tonight to brief them on the changes that they have put together.

Mr. Johnson said there were some engineering comments that they have referenced in the OHM letter and thought that they had addressed all of those for the most part. They have included a left turning lane inclusion in the Clarkston Road right-of-way, after discussion with the Oakland County Road Commission. They have also illustrated the safety path inclusion on Clarkston Road as well, in lieu of some sort of monetary quid pro quo thing.

Mr. Johnson said the new items they did receive a letter last Friday from Carlisle Wortman which they have not addressed they are trying to do that briefly as they go through this.

Mr. Johnson stated that the site plan is essentially the same as what they saw in December with two modifications, one is the pathway they see along Clarkston Road, and two there is a left turn passing lane provision there at the main entrance of the project on the west side. He added that the only other minor change was after going through an infiltration analysis they were able to downsize the detention area slightly. Those are essentially the two changes on the plan.

Mr. Johnson said that in terms of the Carlisle Wortman letter, he knows them well and respects them very well, they thought given the timeframe they wanted to address these as best they could tonight. Public benefits, they talked a little bit about it at their last meeting and certainly they have been summarized in terms of the plans that were submitted. The same thing would go for the open space calculations, and they will get to those in a minute. In terms of the setback discussion, it was mentioned here in the prior project, they discussed this point at their December meeting, and he read the meeting minutes and he thought the understanding was they were ok with what they were proposing to do. The duplexes really are not like a multi-story apartment building that you would find in a multi-family zoning district, it is more like an attached single-family residence, it is one story it is minimal.

Mr. Johnson stated that in terms of the open space calculations again they reviewed those at the last meeting, and he will run through that quickly again. They have excluded the wetland and detention areas and that has been addressed.

Mr. Johnson said that the safety path width was noted on sheet C 2.0 for the width of 8 ft. There was a cross-section note information on sheet C 4.1. As far as the on-street parking measures they added, based on some comments from the prior review letter they added a fire lane sign and depiction, etc., to the plan.

Mr. Johnson said regarding the irrigation there was noted on sheet C 04 that irrigation was included.

Mr. Johnson stated lighting there was a fixture cut on the plan, but it is dark side compliant fixture.

Mr. Johnson said that as far as the streetlights there was depicted on the plan, that needs to be cleaned up a little bit, and the photometric plan, they haven't really had a chance to address that it didn't come up in prior reviews, but it is in process at this point. He didn't see any issues with the objectives or what is in the ordinance and meeting those requirements.

Mr. Johnson stated that monument signage was depicted on sheet L1 showing the setback dimensions from the right-of-way and also the overall dimensions on the elevation on sheet L4.

Mr. Johnson said in terms of the elevations, they presented those at the last meeting, and he will run through those quickly again.

Mr. Johnson stated that as far as the last five or six items, they have acknowledged the lot combination has to happen. They believe the Township Engineer and the Road Commission reviews are ok on the access points, those were discussed at the previous Planning meetings. The Fire Department letter they have received, they received the utility department letter as well, all indicating that there is no problem.

Mr. Johnson said as far as the discussion with the replacement trees, they discussed specifics last time when they talked about proposing a monetary fund because there wasn't enough room on the site to plant the additional 80 trees.

Mr. Johnson stated as far as the development documents, the Development Agreement, and the Master Deed, etc., those have all been communicated to the Township last year. Their attorneys are prepared to meet with the Township Attorney whenever that needs to happen.

Mr. Johnson said as far as the open space calculations metrics they essentially haven't changed at all. As far as feasible open space includes all the walkway areas and the pathways throughout the south part of the site. In terms of the total open space percentage, it is a pretty high percentage, and as far as units per acre as they have had discussions and is well within reason in the particular location.

Mr. Johnson stated that they covered these at the last meeting but wanted to go through them quickly, in terms of the illustrations for the project. An interesting statistic came through on a publication last week he thought they would share with the Commission. They went through all based on the US Census data, they went through all the counties in Michigan, and they pulled out the Oakland County data for this. The observations he would make are that the majority of the housing in Oakland County, the highest percentage was from 1960-1975. It tends to indicate that perhaps the age of housing is certainly not new. The other observation he would have been if they look at what happened in 2009, 2010-2019, in terms of what activity he thought what is evident is the large reduction as a result of the great recession that occurred 2007-2009. The point of all of this is he thinks there is still a housing shortage and that is really what this project is all about.

Mr. Johnson said in terms of community benefits just to summarize what they talked about last time, adding in the item at the bottom, they feel that the project is a response to the Master Plan objectives, it provides additional housing options for the Township open space however you want to define it is 67%. He had mentioned the contribution to the Township Tree Fund. The project dedicates well over half an acre to the right-of-way. It creates jobs, expands the Township tax base, and responds to the general housing in the area. It also incorporates right-a-way improvement which also is a community benefit to those traveling onto Fairledge coming from the west.

Chairman Reynolds said that this is a final PUD, so it involves the Board of Trustees along with the Planning Commission they are a recommending body. Also dually noted that they had a Planner change in the process so there were obviously some fresh eyes looking at some of the plans which generated some of these comments.

Planner Enos read through his review date stamped received March 10, 2023.

Engineer Landis read through his review date stamped received March 8, 2023.

Chairman Reynolds stated that they did have a review from their Fire Marshal with no specific comments. The same thing goes for the Public Service review, with no specific comments.

Chairman Reynolds turned it over to the Planning Commission for initial thoughts. He asked them if they could just from the Planner's review make sure that they hit on some of the open items, the items that weren't addressed in the plans. He knew there were a number of items in their review. They did receive a follow-up letter and he wanted to be clear about what is provided, so it is clear moving forward. He asked if they are intending the whole list is to still be a condition. Planner Enos replied at least at this point he did not see the attached letter, but he did see what the applicant provided there and most of those if not all are correctable. The one thing that he did want to say, and they made a note about the trees, is that they have other options available and that can either be trees donated to the Township for planting elsewhere. They made that option, but he would consider other options as well. He knew that they needed to plant a significant number of trees but they took a significant amount out and so they will figure out that 80 tree difference in some form.

Chairman Reynolds asked for some clarification. The presentation showed an amount equal to \$200/tree, but the letter shows \$250. Mr. Johnson replied the number is intended to be \$200, not \$250.

Vice-Chairman Gross stated that two of their concerns at the last meeting were the traffic on Clarkston Rd. and the addition of a passing lane addresses that. It was one of their concerns that there not be any disruption to through traffic on Clarkston. The other one was the issue of the safety path on the south side of Clarkston Rd. This will be the first safety path to be constructed on the south side of Clarkston and it is not going to be going anywhere. He added that it was part of the ordinance, but it seemed like it was kind of silly. He thought it was nice to see a one-story development as opposed to the continual two-story because it does provide an alternative to lifestyles for existing residents and future residents.

Chairman Reynolds said he likes the changes that have occurred in favor of their comments. They have this idea of a Tree Fund, and he thinks they have had some discussion and thought that the Parks and Recreation had some solutions to have a tree nursery. He thought he would be in support of that being presented there, especially with the acquisition of a lot of additional parkland from this property to others in the Township that will go to good use. He would see that as a favorable component.

Treasurer Urbanowski stated that she agreed with the tree situation and the donation of the trees. There are some projects that are coming that could use some plantings.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that the Planning Commission **forward a recommendation to the Board of Trustees to approve** PC-2021-90, Ridgewood Planning United Development (PUD) Final Plan, located at 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-007), the vacant parcel west of 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-006), and the vacant parcel east of 625 W. Clarkston Rd. (Sidwell #09-15-226-008) to rezone the properties from Single Family Residential-1 (R-1) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) for plans date stamped received February 22, 2023. This recommendation to approve is based on the following findings of facts: there is compliance with the PUD concept; it is providing for 30 dwelling units which equates to 2.6 dwelling units per acre, which is consistent with their Zoning Ordinance; it is compatible with the adjacent uses which are single-family residential and this provides for 15 duplexes of 1-story buildings; the impact on traffic has been mitigated with the provision for a center lane or a passing lane on Clarkston Rd.; there is a protection of the natural environment with the 2-acres of wetland and 67% of the site is designated to some form of open space; it is in compliance with the applicable regulations and in accordance with the Township Master Plan. The recommendation for approval is based upon the following conditions: that the items addressed in the OHM review of March 8, 2023, and of the Carlisle

Wortman review of March 10, 2023, be reviewed and incorporated where necessary; that the review and approval of the PUD Agreement by the Township Attorney; and emphasize the importance and value of having a designation to a tree fund for the lack of 80 replacement trees.

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds asked for clarification Vice-Chairman Gross was intending for the condominium documents to be reviewed by all parties. Vice-Chairman Gross replied correct.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling asked for clarification on it being listed to the tree fund. She believed that they were not looking to add to the tree fund they were looking for the physical trees that Parks and Rec would keep and use throughout the Township.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that in clarification there were a number of items that were within the answer from the applicant that if the Planner is able to verify that those are incorporated then those are taken care of. So, it would just be the Planner looking at that to verify those issues are resolved.

Vice-Chairman Gross amended the motion, Commissioner Walker re-supported, that the value of having 80 replacement trees do not go to a Tree Fund but would be physical trees that Parks and Rec would keep and use throughout the Township.

**Roll call vote was as follows:** Walker, yes; Gross, yes; Urbanowski, yes; Gingell, yes; Reynolds, yes. **Motion carried 5-0 (Cummins & St. Henry absent)**

C. PC-22-37, Stadium Ridge Apartments Site Plan, located at 101 Stadium Dr. (parcel 09-14-400-025) and unaddressed parcel east of 101 Stadium Dr. (parcel #09-14-400-026).

Chairman Reynolds asked the applicant to state his name and address for the record and give an overview of where they are at.

Mr. Mario Izzi with MJC Companies, 46600 Romeo Plank, Suite #5, Macomb Twp., presented.

Mr. Izzi stated that it has been a few weeks since they had the honor to be in front of them. They have resubmitted and they have gotten several reviews back. He believed that they had a recommendation from the Public Works office, the Fire Department. They have several comments from the Township Engineer and the Planner that they would like to discuss this evening. He thought it was all very doable. What they walked away from at the last meeting, and he thought they listened very intently to them. Some of the big issues, obviously, was safety, Stadium Dr. certainly for the pedestrians.

Mr. Izzi said another issue was the landmark trees, there were two on-site. The additional landscape and berm along Lapeer Rd. From those items, they have kind of expanded and he thinks they have improved the plan and hoped that their Planner and their Engineer will concur with that. They looked at the fence detail that they had on the original plan, and they upgraded that to a four-foot double-railed top fence at the top of the retaining wall, they believe that is an upgrade. Unfortunately, the two landmark trees that were questioned from the last review were removed as part of the tree removal, so he wanted to be forthright and transparent about that. They were right on the border of the boundary of the grading limits, and they were removed, so those are no longer on the site.

Mr. Izzi stated that the Stadium Dr. crosswalk that was an item that was discussed in some detail they have added a flashing beacon signage on both sides, on the north and the south side as well. That was a suggestion from one of the Planning Commission members, that is solar power, and he believed that was an accepted detail.

Mr. Izzi said they added a landscape berm along Lapeer Rd., and several trees along that berm and he thought twelve specifically on the berm if he was not mistaken. Overall, they added about 66 more trees to the site which is about a 34% increase in the overall landscape on the site. Ornamental grass was added for additional enhanced screening, to the boundaries on the south and the east plus some additional trees that were already mentioned in the parking areas.

Mr. Izzi stated that the photometric study or grid that they did not include, hopefully, they will give them some consideration on that, that that would not be required. They do agree that the photocell, exterior lights, and coach lights, are within the Township maximum, the 3,000-degree Kelvin LED lights. They acknowledge and agree that they could adhere to that. Those will have to be placed in a horizontal position as well.

Mr. Izzi said that they would still ask for their blessing or at least their recommendation for going in front of the ZBA for the setback variation that they are going to ask, for some latitude on that.

Mr. Izzi stated that those are some of the highlights but that is not everything but can discuss some of the details.

Chairman Reynolds said he will turn it over to their consultants for their reviews.

Planner Enos read through his review date stamped received March 9, 2023.

Mr. Izzi said that they can address the variety of trees on a revised plan and resubmittal for their review. As far as the screening for the church they can certainly booster that up to the north and he was sure they could give them something that they will look satisfactorily on. Planner Enos said they can do that administratively if they have agreed to it. Mr. Izzi replied thank you, yes sir.

Engineer Landis read through his review date stamped received March 10, 2023.

Chairman Reynolds stated that there were a number of reviews from additional parties, and the Fire Marshal and Public Services had no explicit comments at this point and time. There was a WRC review, and a site walk report completed.

Vice-Chairman Gross said that they had a lot of discussion at the last meeting about the traffic in and out. He said he thought a little about this and the apartment complex is going to have reverse peak times than the incoming school traffic. Typically, the apartments will be exiting the complex in the a.m. when the schools are entering the road. He thought that will relieve some of the concerns that they had previously about the conflict with the traffic, and then in the afternoon it is going to be just the opposite, people are going to be coming into the complex with the school is letting out or roughly those amounts of times.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked regarding the small grasses on the east border adjacent to the high-school playfield. Planner Enos replied that those are adjacent to it, they will call the security fence because of the significant slope. Vice-Chairman Gross said he hoped that they will not attract phragmites. Planner Enos said he can speak with his landscape architect about that.

Vice-Chairman Gross stated that he liked the berm along Lapeer Rd. and the additional landscaping there, and the completion of the pedestrian path along the north side of Stadium Dr. He thought they had addressed the concerns that he had with the plan.

Chairman Reynolds said he agreed with the Planner one of the areas that he was still concerned with was the north property buffer between buildings 13 & 14, the two buildings that are closest to Lapeer Rd. That buffer when they look at the landscape plan, it was spoken to this evening that there are some ornamental grasses woven in there, but it still seems very sparse. He thought per the ordinance it is a 10-ft. wide buffer, but it doesn't seem very constituting a buffer at this point and time with the way it is landscaped. He wanted to make sure that that is bolstered up. He would like to see some additional plantings in there, he appreciated the additional plantings through the site, but he thought those adjacencies are important especially since that is a per ordinance reduced buffer, and thought it was worthwhile making sure there is a stronger intent of buffering that.

Chairman Reynolds said it appeared that the building elevations are something they have seen in the Township previously. They haven't seen really any material samples or renderings so that would be something just to confirm moving forward and he would be comfortable with their Planner taking a look at that. Part of that discussion was specifically he thought that building 13 was the one building that is not a mirrored project it just has the one endcap, and they didn't see an elevation for that, and that is the one that is facing west towards M24. He can imagine those units having additional windows or something. What he doesn't want to foresee is something similar to the garage elevation, which is very utilitarian, there isn't something of the nature of that front door. He would like to make sure that that is addressed, and he thought that the Planner could review that for them to make sure that is adequately provided. The goal here is not a blank or invidious façade but rather one that looks pleasant and appealing similar to the other kind of entry facades of those units.

Chairman Reynolds stated that although he thinks there are some bits and pieces of information that need to be clarified or added he was comfortable with that being in the hands of their consultants as they work through final engineering and the rest of the process.

Commissioner Gingell said they usually worry about the noise created by a development; she is worried about the noise created for the development. So, building 6, 7, and 8, are going to be really loud, and not just on Friday nights. She would encourage a bigger buffer there just to dampen the noise, it is going to be loud all weekend long, every practice and band practice. It is going to be really loud for those three buildings. Chairman Reynolds stated that the Planner pointed out that the eastern buffer needed to be addressed. He thought that was something a lot of them are on the same page. Commissioner Gingell thanked them for the crosswalk, and she hoped will be communicated to their young drivers.

Mr. Izzi said he liked the point about more screening for noise, light, and sound, at the eastern property line. He wanted to check with Shimik their engineer to see if there is any ability to maybe move that retaining wall off the property line to give them more room for some boulder trees there. He didn't think they would ever be able to accomplish what they think them, and the Planning Commission truly want there, but it is the nature of the beast. The stadium is going to be there, there is going to be band practice. He thought it was kind of cool, he is not living there. He remembers where he grew up the memories of band practice and that kind of echoing, and it is part of the character of the area, he thought. Are there going to be some people that might complain, unfortunately, there probably will. He thought it was part of the character there. He added that they can certainly look and see if they can add some more trees there to the property line. If they could maybe, through the engineering process, when they are looking at the details of this retaining wall, and precisely how high it has to be, and how much

relief they have to have, if they could add some trees there it would probably be in their best interest as the landlord to add those trees there. He thanked them for that suggestion.

Mr. Izzi said as far as the materials go for the building, they have had that situation in the past where they build a ½ of 12 so they add windows there, they do enhance the materials, and they are happy to propose those to the Planning and Building Department, and the Planning Commission if they want them to come back, they can do that. They do run into that instance, and they do enhance that façade, it is not just a blank you chop a building in half.

Chairman Reynolds thought that as long as that comment is addressed via their Planning Department and the Planner, he would be ok with that.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said she wanted to point out that in their suggested motion she did miss the wetland setback waivers. She did have the page of the ordinance that talks about the criteria for those waivers. Chairman Reynolds asked if they were making a fresh motion or are they acknowledging that the existing approval is still valid. Planning & Zoning Director replied that it is two issues, one is to allow the old wetland permit, to carry on to this project and the other was the second comment in the Engineer's review that they needed setback waivers from the wetland, and that is what she neglected to put in their suggested motions.

Chairman Reynolds asked if the setbacks are similar to what they were talking about before or of similar nature. Engineer Landis said they are in similar nature to the previous site plan although there are some give and take. There are some additional impacts and some less so they just kind of moved around a little bit, in general, they are mostly the same.

Chairman Reynolds stated that there were previous proposals made on this property and this reverts it back to its underlying zoning of multi-family. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said it has to go back to the Board of Trustees for that. Chairman Reynolds apologized. He added essentially for the reversion, correct? Planning & Zoning Director Girling replied yes. Chairman Reynolds said this is part of this the retraction and proceeding. Planning & Zoning Director Girling replied it is in the motion.

Mr. Izzi said just a point of clarification he wanted to make sure that he understood. The current site plan doesn't get invalidated until the Board of Trustees approves it. Chairman Reynolds said they cannot have two proposed site plans active. If they were to receive approval on this from the Board the previous part of that has to be retracted.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that the Planning Commission **approve** an interior parking lot landscaping wavier for PC-2022-37, Stadium Ridge Apartments Site Plan for plans date stamped received February 22, 2023, based on the following: that the applicant did provide evidence that the parking lot consists of only one aisle and the area surrounding the parking lot is heavily landscaped, and there is existing off-street parking drives and structures located on the parcel with interior parking lot landscaping and heavily landscaped through with 66 additional trees.

**Roll call vote as follows:** Walker, yes; Urbanowski, yes; Gross, yes; Gingell, yes; Reynolds, yes. **Motion carried 5-0 (St. Henry & Cummins absent)**



Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that the applicant relative to PC-2022-37, Stadium Ridge Apartments be allowed to utilize the previously approved wetland permit and the wetland setback waivers are acceptable as submitted on the revised plan.

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds asked if that sufficed for both conditions and do they need to clarify the setback. Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated that they said setback waivers. Chairman Reynolds said he wanted to make sure that was good, and that they didn't need to separate motions.

**Roll call vote was as follows:** Urbanowski, yes; Gross, yes; Gingell, yes; Walker, yes; Reynolds, yes. **Motion carried 5-0 (St. Henry & Cummins absent)**

Moved by Vice-Chairman, seconded by Treasurer Urbanowski, that the Planning Commission grants site plan approval for PC-2022-37, Stadium Ridge Apartments, located at 101 Stadium Dr. (Sidwell #09-14-400-025) and on a vacant parcel east of 101 Stadium Dr. (Sidwell #09-14-400-026) for plans date stamped received February 22, 2023 based on the following findings of facts: that the plan complies with the ordinance requirements; the plan is based upon the following conditions: that there be a combination of the two parcels; that the applicant receive a waiver from the Zoning Board of Appeals for a side yard setback; and if the waiver denied that the plan return to the Planning Commission; that the plan for PC-2019-10, Stadium Ridge Commercial and PC-2018-15 Stadium Ridge Residential be withdrawn and revoked by the Board of Trustees; that the applicant delivering written notice to the Board of Trustees to terminate the Conditional Rezone and Board of Trustees declaring the property to be reverted back to RM-1 Zoning; and that the Planners review of March 8, 2023, items 1-23 on page 13 be incorporated with required revisions as necessary; that the Engineers review of March 9, 2023, items 1-4 also be incorporated into the approval of this plan.

Discussion on the motion:

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said she believed it had to be denied so it can go to the ZBA, however, usually what they say is if they receive their variances they are approved if not they have to come back. Technically they have to be denied in order to go to the ZBA.

Vice-Chairman Gross amended the motion, Treasurer Urbanowski re-supported, that the Planning Commission **deny** the plans subject to the fact that there is an insufficient setback that the applicant needs to get reviewed and approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals, and if approved the plan would be considered approved with all of the previous conditions of the motion.

**Roll call vote was as follows:** Urbanowski, yes; Gross, yes; Gingell, yes; Walker, yes; Reynolds, yes. **Motion carried 5-0 (St. Henry & Cummins absent)**

D. PC-2021-65, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance #78, 2022 Zoning Ordinance Updates, Articles II, III, IX, XI, XIV, XVI, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXVI, XXVII, XXIX, XXX, XXXIV, and XXXV.

Chairman Reynolds said they went over a number of these items during the public hearing in-depth talking about trash and more trash enclosures. At this point and time, they obviously do

quite a bit of their homework, they have discussed these amendments at good length at previous meetings. This is the technicalities of having multiple readings and public advertising before it proceeds. Keep in mind that this is also a recommendation to the Board of Trustees for these amendments, so there is one more set of eyes here. He would be in favor of forwarding a recommendation to approve and adopt.

Moved by Commissioner Walker, seconded by Vice-Chairman Gross, that the Planning Commission **forward a recommendation to the Township Board to approve and adopt** PC-21-65, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance #78, Articles II, III, IX, XI, XIV, XVI, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXVI, XXVII, XXIX, XXX, XXXIV, and XXXV, 2022 Zoning Ordinance Updates, for the following reasons: set forth by Planning & Zoning Director Girling and her previous recommendations.

**Roll call vote was as follows:** Gingell, yes; Gross, yes; Urbanowski, yes; Walker, yes; Reynolds, yes. **Motion carried 5-0 (St. Henry & Cummins absent)**

#### **9. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **10. COMMUNICATIONS**

None.

#### **11. PLANNERS REPORTS**

A. RRC Virtual Academy for Local Officials.

Chairman Reynolds said they are working towards a redevelopment-ready community. Part of that is there is a process that essentially allows that they are open to development that they have a number of procedures and processes in place. This is trying to say that they have a nice flow to welcome developers into their community. As part of that, there is a training opportunity for themselves that is free of charge, it is virtually starting May 8<sup>th</sup> – June 22, 2023. They are only an hour a piece. He asked Planning & Zoning Director Girling if she needed an RSVP or how they became registered for this. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said she didn't know. If anyone is interested and wants her to look at how to get them registered considering it is free her guess was, they just respond to the flyer that she gave them. Unfortunately, she didn't look any further into it. If it doesn't give them how to, and they are interested, reach out to her and she will figure it out for them. Chairman Reynolds said there was a QR code here so it was something that he would be interested in at least just to have the link and if he can make all of the meetings or just make sure he can attend most of them. It appears they are kind of stretched on different days working through the months of May and June.

#### **12. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

None.

#### **13. FUTURE PUBLIC HEARINGS**

4-5-23 at 7:05 p.m., Pc-23-13, Platinum Toy Vault Luxury Boat and RV Storage, Special Land Use Request, located west of 3020 Indianwood Rd. and east of 3200 Indianwood Rd.

#### **14. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS**

Chairman Reynolds said a lot of these developments that they see are points of contention and obviously, there is a balance here that they have as appointed officials in the Township and being representatives of the ordinance. He does have concerns about various developments but obviously the difficulty that he has been wearing multiple hats of a resident and then also

representative of their ordinance are those conflicts. He thought they had seen some nice projects, very large and it is going to have an impact on the area, but he did like the mix of some of the PUDs. He was appreciative that a couple of the PUDs that they saw tonight were utilizing the PUD as a tool for a creative solution versus an opportunity to circumvent density. For example, Ridgewood along Clarkson Rd. is utilizing pretty much the underlying zoning and creating some that fits better than coming in and saying we are proud and in charge of what they would want to see as a modern housing type. He encourages people to get involved and lets them know what their thoughts are. There are Township-initiated text amendments that they always propose and are all ears as they were through the entire Master Plan process.

#### **15. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS**

Treasurer Urbanowski said just one observation. She has never thought so much about lift stations in her life. A couple of weeks ago Trustee Pfeiffer and her did a public works tour with Bill Basigkow and in the rain, they checked out a few lift stations, they are interesting. She understood them a little better than she ever did. They are expensive and maintenance is crazy and thought that the Township had 23 of them. So, every time she sees that now it pops into her head that there is going to be maintenance on these things forever and ever. They went to the one that is over by Pine Tree, the really old one that is going to need to be fixed. When she sees them, she cringes a little bit, even though they are perfectly fine. She also stated that the Polly Ann Trail Manager Linda Moran stopped by and said that tomorrow they are having a public input meeting for the Polly Ann Trail that is going to be at Friendship Park from 5-6:30 p.m. They are looking for public input.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked if they still have the joint meeting next Wednesday. Planning & Zoning Director Girling replied that they do, and by first thing tomorrow morning if they had any agenda items that they would like to ask, get ahold of her because they are going to come up with that agenda.

Chairman Reynolds said he thought that they are going to make some mention of some of the objectives that they had in the Master Plan, a little overview, and talk about some of those other components to see if there are any impacts from LO boards or commissions.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said just a reminder that everyone should have received a notice if they have not done their quarterly IT training please do so. She wanted to thank everyone on the Commission and the consultants, she realized this was a very full agenda, for taking on so many cases and they did an excellent job.

#### **16. ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by Chairman Reynolds, seconded by Commissioner Walker, to adjourn the meeting at 8:58 p.m. **Motion carried.**

Respectfully submitted,



Debra Walton  
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary  
Charter Township of Orion

April 5, 2023

---

Planning Commission Approval Date