The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, July 7, 2021, at 7:00 pm at the Orion Township Community Center, 1335 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, MI 48360.

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

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:**
Vacant position.

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

2. **ROLL CALL**
As noted

**CONSULTANTS PRESENT:**
Eric Fazzini, (Township Planner) of Giffels Webster
Eric Pietsch, (Township Planner) of Giffels Webster
Mark Landis, (Township Engineer) of OHM Advisors
Tammy Girling, Township Planning & Zoning Director

**OTHERS PRESENT:**
Anthony Battalia

3. **MINUTES**
A. 06-16-21, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes
B. 06-16-21, PC-2021-49, M-24 Rezone Request Public Hearing Minutes.
Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker to approve both sets of minutes as submitted. **Motion carried**

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

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

6. **CONSENT AGENDA**
None

Chairman Reynolds recessed the regular meeting and opened the public hearing for PC-2021-50, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance #78 Assemblies, Articles 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, and 14 providing for repeal of the conflicting ordinance and portions thereof; and providing an effective date, at 7:05 pm and closed the public hearing at 7:13 pm.
7. NEW BUSINESS
A. PC-2021-54, Palazzo Di Bocce Garage located at 4291 South Lapeer Road, (parcel 09-35-200-034), Amendment to Site Plan

Chairman Reynolds asked the applicant to state their name and address for the record, and give a brief overview of their project.

Mr. Tony Battalia 2700 W. Gun Rd., Oakland Twp.

Mr. Battalia stated that he was there to get approval for a garage to be built behind Palazzo. He said that Palazzo is a 32,000-sq. ft. building, it is not just a restaurant. They have a lot of moving parts that go in and out of that restaurant all the time. They have bleacher seats, they have their own salt truck, and they take care of the property which is a lot of maintenance. Prior to this time, he was keeping all of his equipment next door at the Aladdin building but that has gone by the wayside now so they had this new building to keep all his stuff.

Planner Fazzini read through his review date-stamped July 1, 2021.

Engineer Landis read through his review date-stamped July 2, 2021.

Chairman Reynolds said that the Fire Marshal recommended approval.

Chairman Reynolds said that in the Public Services review, there were no concerns there.

Chairman Reynolds noted that the Site Walk Committee did submit a report, he thought they had similar observations to what was brought up, just verifying landscape requirements. The other one which he didn’t know was mentioned was parking, there doesn’t appear that those spaces are currently stripped, just making sure parking counts are adequate, he thought that there was adequate parking there, but just the verification of that. The other item was the setback to the detention pond. He thought those were all the items that were brought up from them.

Chairman Reynolds asked if the garage was going to be for private use only? Mr. Battalia replied yes. Chairman Reynolds asked if there were any plans to add any landscaping with the trees that are being removed? Mr. Battalia said that there are four trees that are being removed. He added that the site was way over landscaped as it was right from the beginning. Originally there were 56 trees required on the site, 18 years ago, and they have 98 on the site. He didn’t think they needed to add any more from the ones they are taking out.

Chairman Reynolds asked regarding the lighting they are adding, was there any issue with providing some cut sheets? Mr. Battalia said no that is all pretty standard.

Chairman Reynolds said there was a concern about lot coverage. He thought that seemed like an administrative item to be added to the plans.

Chairman Reynolds stated that the Lapeer Overlay was one discussion item if they want to review that, and they have determined that there were no wetlands that were going to be affected. Engineer Landis stated that he didn’t note any wetlands on the site, and the garage is sitting outside of the 100-year storage elevation and outside of the freeboard of the detention pond, so he didn’t see any impacts there.

Chairman Reynolds said that there was an elevation being presented. Mr. Battalia said he was just adding to the existing building basically.
Vice-Chairman Gross asked if there was any rooftop equipment? Mr. Battalia replied no.

Trustee Urbanowski said that was her only question about the trees being removed, and being close to the wetlands but doesn’t appear that that is a problem.

Trustee Urbanowski stated that when she was looking through the application there was nothing on the application it was just storage, and then on the site plan, there is a car wash. She questioned if that is just going to be for the purpose of them washing their vehicles? Mr. Battalia said that they made a mistake it shouldn’t say carwash it should say power wash. What they are using it for is cleaning all of their equipment. They have two big bars, and a kitchen that has rubber mats and they have to wash them almost every other day. They don’t want to wash them on the cement outside because of the sewer. The power wash is basically to clean and to wash these rubber mats, and the salt truck in the wintertime.

Chairman Reynolds thought that the main concern was is not public or commercial use, it is private. He thought as long as the calculation is provided and they meet the ordinance, he didn’t have an issue between trees, lot coverage those kinds of things.

Commissioner Walker asked how many trees were they going to tear down? Mr. Battalia replied four. Commissioner Walker asked if they would put four new ones in just for the heck of it? Mr. Battalia replied he didn’t know where? The whole place is landscaped.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked if the elevation was submitted with their application? Mr. Battalia replied that he just got it today. Vice-Chairman Gross said he found that elevation acceptable. Mr. Battalia said it mirrored the building the same colors.

Planner Fazzini said that they have sufficient parking with the bocci ball courts that require 70 spaces in addition to the restaurant. They are providing 207, where depending on which calculation you use, they only need 136, or 190, either way, they are over by about 20-spaces. He added that in their review it noted that those spaces were not stripped so they didn’t count those but those were approved parking spaces. Chairman Reynolds said he wasn’t sure when they did the site walk whether they were needed, or just didn’t get restriped so if they weren’t even counted for then that is perfect.

Moved by Trustee Urbanowski, seconded by Secretary St. Henry, that the Planning Commission grants a Lapeer Overlay Design Standard waiver for building facades (repeating 12’ width), and façade colors and trim for PC-2021-54, Palazzo Di Bocce Garage, Amendment to Site Plan, located at 4291 S. Lapeer Road (parcel 09-35-200-034) for plans date stamped received June 18, 2021, based on the consideration of the following and the following findings of facts: with what has been presented here tonight and the fact that it is exactly the same as they have already on the existing site of the restaurant which is already in the acceptable façade, it is keeping with the overlay.

Roll call vote was as follows: Urbanowski, yes; St. Henry, yes; Gingell, yes; Walker, yes; Gross, yes; Reynolds, yes. Motion carried 6-0. (1 vacancy)

Moved by Trustee Urbanowski, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that the Planning Commission grants site plan approval for PC-2021-54, Palazzo Di Bocce Garage, Amendment to Site Plan, located at 4291 S. Lapeer Road (parcel 09-35-200-034) for plans date stamped received June 18, 2021, based on the following findings of facts: that the plans meet all the requirements conditioned upon that they add the lighting information on the cut sheets, that they are verifying the maximum lot coverage on the site plan sheets, and the engineering plan would
be designed in accordance with Zoning Ordinance #78 Storm Water Management and Soil Erosion & Sedimentation Control Ordinance #139, and that the Township’s Engineering Standards shall be submitted to the Township for further review and approval prior to construction. A detailed cost estimate for the improvements shall be submitted with the plans signed and sealed by the design engineer.

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds stated that the only other thing on his list is if they would like to ask for the tree calculation or tree removal calculation to be added. Also, the private use of the power wash was the only other item that might have been a condition. Trustee Urbanowski thought that was already verified. Trustee Urbanowski said as far as the tree calculation, going back to 2003, she wasn’t understanding what he was saying. Chairman Reynolds said that if they added a condition to the motion for the specific items, he wasn’t sure if the tree calculation should have been added or not. Trustee Urbanowski replied she did not, no.

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

B. PC-2021-50, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance #78, Assemblies.

Chairman Reynolds asked if there were any additional questions or comments?

Trustee Urbanowski stated that she hadn’t been through a Special Land Use for something like this. She asked what is the reason for changing it? Planner Fazzini said that a Special Land Use is an additional step so if they have zoning in place, they still have to do the Special Land Use that is specific to each proposal so churches are usually Special Land Uses in residential areas because they are residentially zoned but they have some more impacts than a house would. So, a church, schools, similar institutions are usually Special Land Uses in residential districts. The goal of the amendment is to treat all of those places of assembly equally as they go district by district. Whether or not it is permitted by right in a commercial district or a Special Land Use in a residential district each district needs to treat all of those places of assembly equally as far as procedure. Trustee Urbanowski said that she meant specifically for Restricted Business (RB) and General Business (GB) where it was by right but changing it to Special Land Use in those two in particular. Chairman Reynolds said that this purpose he thought the forethought was to treat it all equally and it might have been taken an additional step when it was advertised. If it was advertised, they typically advertise the worst-case scenario. He stated that if they were having a major issue with this item or there is going to be a lot of what-ifs, that is when they make it a Special Land Use, they want the extra step to, not just have the public hearing component of it but require hours of operation, how are they using the outdoor spaces, versus just saying the other if it is permitted and it doesn’t prompt a site plan approval then it just checks the box. It is an extra step that they have the right to just in and say this is a huge courtyard with a huge playground and it is used until 11 pm at night. They could have the condition to say it is only used until 9 pm at night. His personal opinion is they don’t need to modify (RB) & (OP) in those districts. In a residential case, a church is typically allowed in a residential district by Special Land Use because it is fitting of the district but it is not just a straightforward house. They want there to be the opportunity to discuss and say how does it fit within a residential district, how are parking and lighting addressed.

Trustee Urbanowski said she understood all of that. She is saying at (OP), (GB) & (RB), it went from “P” which is permitted by right, and then they are suggesting that they use Special Land Use. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that because she was doing this without
discussion elaborately with the Planning Commission, she wanted to make sure since she was advertising for the public hearing and it was out there for the public to look at, that she met with the extreme. They might discuss and say it has always been a use by right for all of these things, it has been no problem they want to use it as a use by right. Because they had not had the discussion, she wanted to make sure they advertised the most extreme. Trustee Urbanowski asked if it has always been permitted by, right? Chairman Reynolds replied yes. He said that Planning & Zoning Director Girling is throwing it to them to say should it still be, they could argue that it is not. Any use they can initiate a text amendment and say they have had a lot of issues with private clubs and they think that needs to go through an extra step. Chairman Reynolds said how he would look at this one is how is the proposed use work within the district itself. Since a church could be a more impactful use in a residential district, where the others it is like a tattoo parlor, things like that it might just be an eyebrow place but it could be a late night, serving cocktails doing whatever and that is why they have those extra steps. He added that they are not necessarily saying it is, so he felt that the general discussion was to hold tight on what it was before. Trustee Urbanowski said it doesn’t necessarily need to go to Special Land Use for (OP), (GB), and (RB). Chairman Reynolds replied correct, that was his perspective on it, there could be others.

Chairman Reynolds said that the key here is in the amendment they can’t just say churches anymore, places of worship have to be similar to clubs.

Trustee Urbanowski asked if the other ones for industrial will be changed, to come back to them later? Planning & Zoning Director Girling replied that it will come back during a text amendment but all it will be doing is changing the name of it.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that the Planning Commission forwards a recommendation to the Township Board to approve and adopt PC-2021-50, Township initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance #78 regarding, Assemblies, Articles 5, 6, 7, 9,11, and 14 providing a repeal of conflicting ordinances and a portion thereof; in effect by replacing the designation of churches to places of worship, providing that they be special uses within Articles 5, 6, & 7, as special uses but they would be retained as permitted uses in Articles, 9, 11, & 14.

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

C. Discussion on Fences

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that she hears on a regular basis from the ZBA that they are seeing, as they see in their memo, numerous cases on fences that are taller than 4-ft. that they want to be on a property line up to 6-ft. no taller. When they have something that is going to the ZBA on a regular basis and on a regular basis with the exception of one over the last 2 1/2 years the ZBA has granted. What she did was she went out and looked at other communities and she had given them those communities she was looking for a directive. She said looking at the other communities, the other communities allow 6-ft. on the property line. She had no problem formulating the actual text she just wanted to make sure they were in favor of that change. Right now, the ordinance says 4-ft. can be on the property line anything over 4-ft. up to 6-ft. must adhere to setbacks. She just wanted to know before coming up with the language and that they like that. She knew that Commissioner Walker had had articles on bushes and shrubs working as a fence and he might feel that they don’t do this and he rather have her research maybe another community that uses those. She was looking for a directive on what they want her to do to go further on this.
Commissioner Walker said he would never ask Planning & Zoning Director Girling to do more research. He said he is almost as much anti-fence as he is pro-tree. He doesn't like the idea of privacy fences. He thought that it destroys the neighborhood community. He doesn't want us to be Rochester, Troy, Royal Oak, he wants them to be Orion.

Secretary St. Henry asked what kind of fence was turned down? Planning & Zoning Director Girling replied that it was one that went all the way down to the water. From the research, it was already fenced in and they were not willing to just remove the section that went to the water so it ended up being denied.

Commissioner Walker stated what has fired this thing up lately is the Baldwin Rd. fencing. Everywhere along Baldwin Rd. north of the roundabouts, everyone is putting in for privacy fences because of the traffic, the traffic is too much. The traffic is too much everywhere in this Township. He was against those fences initially he finally caved because it was a 4-1 vote all the time. It will be one wall of fences all the way from the edge of the last roundabout to Indianwood. He doesn't think he is going to like how that looks, but people said too much traffic, and people running on the bike path can see into their houses, that is when he suggested the hedges and the trees to no avail.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said ultimately it is the Planning Commission who makes the recommendation to the Board. They had a slow meeting and this comes up over and over so she thought it was a good time to discuss it.

Secretary St. Henry asked if they are putting a row of fences in their front yards? Commissioner Walker replied no; they back up to Baldwin, Keatington.

Trustee Urbanowski said she lives in one of the Keatington’s as well, and according to her by-laws, they are not allowed to have fences anyway. Commissioner Walker replied that the Home Owners Association agreed to these fences. He added that most Home Owner Associations don’t want fences but they bought into the spurious theory that there is too much traffic and too many peeping toms running past their houses.

Chairman Reynolds said his general view is he doesn’t mind fences but he agreed that there has to be some direction given to them. He doesn’t have a fence in his yard he has arborvitaes, there is a 4-ft. fence on the other side. He thought that there is some balance there, he didn’t know how that was addressed in ordinances across the board. He didn’t think that they were a Royal Oak where they are going to have every yard fenced in. He wanted to prompt Giffels Webster on what their thoughts are. Maybe it is an item that they consider when they are looking at road types along those roadways what their vision is for the Township moving forward as a Master Plan. Is it something that they do want to see is there a couple of parameters that are a condition upon not having a 6-ft. fence on the property line? There are some related topics being prompted from this Master Plan too.

Vice-Chairman Gross said of the items that were provided to them different ordinances in different cities, he liked the Auburn Hills which provided some options. It said fences, hedges, berms, and walls may be constructed as opposed to giving some alternatives. He did not like the Independence Township one, he thought it was very cumbersome, restrictive, and he didn’t understand it. A 6-ft. high farm-type fence of #9-gauge top wire, 12-gauge bottom wire, 12-gauge stays, and intermediate wires and spacing of six inches vertically by 12 inches horizontally. He also thought that the Rochester Hills had some good parts that they could extrapolate from.
Planner Fazzini said what he thought might be causing this issue, and he was not involved in the ZBA or the permitting, in the ordinance, to have a privacy fence it can’t be within a required yard setback. A property owner comes in for a fence and naturally, they want to put it on the property line, well they can’t per the ordinance it has to be on the setback line or behind it. This is different from the same codes that have been provided, so that could be what is prompting the number of ZBA requests is not the type of fence but that setback requirement, which is a bit unique. There are other approaches they could pursue looking at certain corridors, communities that are more on the waterfront, like on Lake Saint Clair they have decorative fence requirements where they can only use the fake wrought iron or white picket, so there are some requirements but they can’t do the full privacy fence but they can do other types of fences that may be more open or attractive looking. There are other specific approaches they could take if there are concerns with certain corridors, but that would make the code more complicated to write that language.

Secretary St. Henry stated that the issue is not putting up a decorative fence, it is a privacy fence because of the traffic, and the noise, people running by along the bike paths. He added that if you put up a fence like, in Keatington, along Waldon that changes the entire look of that area, if every person puts up a 6-ft. privacy fence. He said that there are a lot of other options out there to gain privacy, look around your neighborhoods where no fences are allowed. Arborvitaes and other landscaping give them that privacy that they want and it buffers the noise to a certain extent. He didn’t know if he liked the idea of putting up 6-ft. wooden privacy fences up and down these main corridors that are supposed to be showcase corridors for some of these neighborhoods, there are other options. He was shocked that they allowed that many fences over the last few years. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said yes, they have, and that is their option to allow variances and they have. She added that she was hearing them as a Planning Commission, they are saying there are other alternatives and they don’t want to change the code because maybe the ZBA should be looking at saying deny these because you have other alternatives. Again, she is looking whether she puts more time into it, and as Planner Fazzini said, it is not the type of fence it is the height of the fence and they don’t want to waste 10-ft. they want it right on the property line. They could, by the ordinance, as it is they can have a 6-ft. that is still enclosing a neighborhood and it is setback 10-ft., yes, they lose that 10-ft. but they still have the Fort Knox look to it. She asked do they want to say that they want to change it or do they want to say they still feel that it should be 4-ft. on the property line, and up to 6-ft. if they are setback? Trustee Urbanowski said that she lives on a corner lot in a fishbowl and she just planted privets because she doesn’t have the option for a fence and she knew that buying the house.

Secretary St. Henry said that these roads have seen an increase in traffic every year for the last 25 years. The property owners in the past have had to abide by certain HOA standards. There are other options other than putting up 6-ft. fences on the property line or off the property line. He thought that it was important to maintain the character of certain parts of their community that they don’t let the neighborhoods get boxed in with these fences. Trustee Urbanowski said thinking back from when they were doing the Master Plan/Open House that one board that was there about, “how do they want things to look moving forward for new subdivisions”, do they want them to be pushed back farther from the road so this doesn’t become an issue, to begin with. If they don’t want to have this problem with new developments maybe then they need to encourage or incentivize however that was, she didn’t know what the incentive is but making sure that they are encouraging not being so close to the roads.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that they see it every day from the perspective of prepping for PC and prepping for ZBA. They go through a lot of things scrutinizing plans with a developer and they get 10-years down the road and the developer is long gone, the property owners and it is their property and they want what they want. It is a hot issue right now related
to the roundabouts right at Baldwin & Waldon, but if you look at her memo prior to the roundabouts they have numerous not on the main road that are requested also it is just a common neighbor is not getting along with neighbors, barking dogs, the whole gambit that a 4-ft. does not give them the closed-in feeling that they want. She loved their idea and they can have things related to the Master Plan. The ZBA had mentioned fences and accessory buildings and in a conversation with one ZBA Member, he said that he hoped that the Master Plan takes care of this. She ran it by the Planner Arroyo and he said as they are talking about the community get into big scope, they are not going to be talking about whether you should have one size larger on an accessory building and whether a 6-ft. fence should be allowed on a property line. She added it is not going to be part of the Master Plan she hears it perpetually so she wanted to have a conversation. Maybe she is hearing PC say one thing and ZBA doing another, and they have the Joint Meeting coming up on July 29th at 12N. She could have it on the agenda so the two main Boards with the Board of Trustees, who ultimately have the decision, she thought this, it is two different groups that deal at it from a different perspective. They have had it on the agenda before and they were like they should talk about a text amendment on fences, and that is all that happened. She thought it needed to be more related to what they are doing here tonight.

Planner Fazzini said that the way the code is written, usually one property owner puts the fence on the property line it becomes both neighbors’ fence, where if they have a setback, they could be creating these like alleyways between neighbor’s fences because they have the setback requirement. That could be something that is not desirable. He added that a general split for communities is whether or not they want a privacy fence in the side yard or only the rear yard. Some communities allow a side and rear yard, some are only a rear yard, which is more restrictive so that could be another thing to think about, should it only be a rear yard fence or are they going to allow front and side. There are easy ways to divide where they allow fences.

Vice-Chairman Gross stated that the Secretary St. Henry subdivision has fences along Lapeer Rd. Secretary St. Henry replied that is a 6-ft. fence but that was put up by the builder. Vice-Chairman Gross said his point is the fence is consistent along the entire length of the subdivision, so there are not varying types of fences. He added that there is a decent landscape setback from the street to the fence. Properly done the fences can be ok. Secretary St. Henry said it is a heck of a lot easier when it is done when the subdivision is going in. Vice-Chairman Gross said exactly, but if they are getting into a situation where there is one neighbor and another neighbor and another neighbor coming in and they want different types of fences he thought that was a problem.

Secretary St. Henry said that along Scripps Rd., they have houses backing up to Scripps, and if they think that they have heavy traffic on Waldon or Baldwin, Scripps Rd. is 10x’s worse every day with the traffic in and out of the school building. There are 400-600 cars every day at least. Now there they have a significant berm, and landscaping, all done when the builder put in those homes 30-years ago. He added that there are alternatives.

Chairman Reynolds stated that it sounds like they are differing from ZBA’s actions. He thought that the Joint Meeting coming up on July 29th is a good action item, maybe they can encourage themselves and also that Board to do some critical driving visuals of how things are going to change if they start changing the ordinance. His take is he agrees that there might be an opportunity, he wasn’t a big fan of making things so complicated but in the same regard if there is a general look along corridors or something like that where they consider rear yards or consistent fencing, just a couple of provisions. He doesn't have a problem with there being a 6-ft. privacy fence but he would almost be more apt to say let's push it closer to the property line if there is landscaping on either side. He thought that there was a compromise between a fence but make it look like it still has that corridor look and if that means it is 5-ft. or breaking it in half
so there is a little buffer on either side and within the fortress. He agreed that they need to keep that visual in tack especially Orion Township’s sprawling community and trees. He didn’t think they had a direction tonight but they had some general consensus of what their thoughts are and the direction they would like to head in. Maybe they can look at some other communities that they drive around to and say not this but this and then they can have another discussion on this and plan on digging into the topic deeper than let’s initiate a text amendment on fences at our Joint Meeting.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling asked that they all remember this conversation and at the Joint Meeting that each one of them that have spoken up please speak up there so they don’t end up with the same thing, where they have ZBA saying why are they not rewriting this and they are all in one room. So, they can see their side and they can see our side and come up with a general consensus whether they continue to send them to the ZBA and it should be a case by case or whether they as a community can come up with something that is close. Maybe they do 6-ft. on the property line but leaving room for landscape. Even if they say they are not going to change it, it is going to continue down the same road that it keeps going to the ZBA and they are frustrated and they are giving it and they are no further along.

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
None.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS
None.

10. COMMUNICATIONS

11. PLANNERS REPORTS/EDUCATION
None.

12. COMMITTEE REPORTS
None.

13. FUTURE PUBLIC HEARINGS
A. 7-21-21 at 7:05 p.m., PC-2021-55, Lava Mountain Location Rezone Request, the request is to rezone 1472, 1480, and 1488 S. Lapeer Rd (parcel 09-14-100-074) from Restricted Business (RB) to General Business (GB).

14. CHAIRMAN’S COMMENTS
None.

15. COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS
Trustee Urbanowski said that there is a ribbon-cutting tomorrow for Tommy’s Car Wash on Brown Rd. from 5:30p-8:30p, but the actual ribbon cutting is at 6:30p.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated that Commission Hoffman had to step down and at last night’s BOT meeting Mr. Brackon who was serving on the ZBA will be moving over to the Planning Commission. With the short notice, he was not able to come this evening.
16. ADJOURNMENT
Moved by Trustee Urbanowski, seconded by Vice-Chairman Gross, to adjourn the meeting at 8:03 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Walton
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary
Charter Township of Orion

Planning Commission Approval Date