

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION PLANNING COMMISSION

***** MINUTES *****

REGULAR MEETING, WEDNESDAY, JULY 21, 2021

The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, July 21, 2021, at 7:04 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
Derek Brackon, Commissioner	

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:

None.

1. OPEN MEETING

Chairman Reynolds opened the meeting at 7:04 pm.

2. ROLL CALL

As noted

CONSULTANTS PRESENT:

Rod Arroyo, (Township Planner) of Giffels Webster
Eric Fazzini, (Township Planner) of Giffels Webster
Eric Pietsch, (Township Planner) of Giffels Webster
Mark Landis, (Township Engineer) of OHM Advisors
Tammy Girling, Township Planning & Zoning Director

OTHERS PRESENT:

Nelli Schmidt	Bennett Donaldson
Mike Lashbrook	Scott Kreutzer
Dave Brinkmeter	Steve Sorensen
Ziad Kassab	David Dedvukaj
Bruce Kopytek	

3. MINUTES

A. 07-07-21, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

B. 07-07-21, PC-2021-50, Township Initiated Text Amendment – Assemblies 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 Commissioner Gingell, 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-2021-55, 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), at 7:06 pm and closed the public hearing at 7:08 pm.

5. BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENT – NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY

None

6. CONSENT AGENDA

None

7. NEW BUSINESS

A. PC-2021-55, Lava Mountain Location Rezone, request to rezone 1472, 1480, and 1488 S. Lapeer Rd. (parcel 09-14-100-074) from Restricted Business (RB) to General Business (GB).

Chairman Reynolds asked if there was anything else that the applicant would like to add? Mr. Ziad Kassab the applicant did not.

Planner Fazzini read through his review date-stamped July 14, 2021.

Chairman Reynolds said it was also reviewed by their Fire Marshal and the Public Service Department, and they didn't have any comments at this point.

Secretary St. Henry asked if the applicant could give a quick overview of what they are thinking at this point in terms of where the drive-thru would be located, how they see the rough traffic patterns? Mr. Kassab said if they are familiar with the building, where Belle Tire is, and the Checkers next to the Belle Tire, then the building next to that. There is one entrance, if you go to the right you go to Checkers, if you go straight, you are in the parking lot of the building. To the north side of that first building is where they would like to put a drive-thru, in along there and the window toward the end of the building to allow enough cars to back up to the road. The entrance is along Lapeer Rd., almost on the property line, just running straight where that greenbelt is, they would the drive-thru to come in straight through there, and toward the end of the building, they would have the window, the mic, and the menu and then the window at the end. If it is backed up if they go to the right they go into where the Checkers is, so they are going to create a traffic path, because he owns both of the properties, if it is backed up there, people will go up to the right and around the Checkers and then come back where that greenbelt is now, so there is no stacking in the road. Secretary St. Henry asked how would they exit after they get their coffee? Mr. Kassab replied that after they get their coffee they would go around the back of the building, and they would be able to exit right there on Casemer or go up to the front through Lapeer Rd. as well. He added that they will have good signage in the site plan and clear paths. Secretary St. Henry asked if Chicago Brothers Pizza was next door? Mr. Kassab said that next to it is Golden Paws, and then next to that is Chicago Brothers.

Commissioner Walker asked if Mr. Kassab said that they will go around Checkers? Mr. Kassab replied that if it gets backed up, there will be signage not to block the entrance into the Checkers so they can go around the Checkers. Mr. Kassab showed the Board on the screen.

Secretary St. Henry asked how many customers did he think would increase? Mr. Kassab replied he hoped a lot. He added that in this day and age with COVID and people don't want to

get out of their cars, and in the wintertime, they need the drive-thru in order to have a good business.

Commissioner Walker asked if it would interfere with the traffic going into the Checker if they have their driveway going around? Mr. Kassab said that the Checkers drive-thru has two lanes his traffic that would go all the way to the north and around, his traffic would go in that first turning lane and they would do a hard turn right out into his drive-thru, where his drive-thru would go on the outside around the greenbelt which some of it would turn to concrete or asphalt and turn right back around and come to the window.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked if they had talked with Checkers about this? Mr. Kassab replied yes.

Chairman Reynolds said Checkers no longer exists it is the Orion Coney Express.

Secretary St. Henry thought it would be a good move for the morning business. Mr. Kassab said yes, for all businesses, Checkers, and Chicago Brothers too because it will bring more traffic to the area. He thought it would decrease the Starbucks and Tim Hortons lines that are always backed up on M24.

Chairman Reynolds said that these were all good thoughts but would it be resolved during a Special Land Use. They have to review all of these comments in general. He thought from his comments here from strictly rezoning component he didn't have any issues with (GB) in this parcel, it is not going to spot zone the adjacent parcel, the Coney Express that is adjacent is also (GB). He didn't see any issues with the proposed uses for this parcel in the sense of (GB).

Trustee Urbanowski said she didn't see any problem with that either. What is next to it and what is along that road, to begin with, seemed to make sense. The property already has a drive-thru on the other side. She added that this building was a coffee shop before this as well, and desperately needed it at the time.

Trustee Urbanowski asked how many cars are they talking about before they have to go around to the Checkers? Mr. Kassab said approximately 6 cars before it starts to back up. Around there they could fit 30 cars, there is plenty of room there.

Secretary St. Henry said that they will be seeing a site plan that will have everything marked very clearly, traffic flows and everything. Mr. Kassab said they are working now on the Alta topo survey and then the site plan is next.

Vice-Chairman Gross said that he thought that Lava Mountain has been a good addition to the community. It has provided substantial employment opportunities for a number of young people.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that the Planning Commission **forward a recommendation** to the Township Board to approve PC-2021-55, Lava Mountain Location Rezone, request to rezone 1472, 1480, and 1488 S. Lapeer Rd. (parcel 09-14-100-074) from Restricted Business (RB) to General Business (GB). This recommendation to approve is based on the following findings of facts: that the request is consistent with the objectives of the Master Plan; being that this is a minor expansion of the zoning from (RB) to (GB) which is consistent with the (GB) zoning to the north; the requested rezoning is consistent with the trend of development in the general area.

Commissioner Walker wanted to add that he has been living in this community for 33-years and he has never heard more people speak more highly of anyone than he has of Mr. Kassab since he has started Lava Mountain. He thanked him and said it had nothing to do with the motion, and thanked him for what he has done. He added that many people come and ask them for stuff and they pretend it is for them, you are asking for stuff and it is for them.

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

B. PC-2021-44, Pearl of Orion Wetland & Site Plan, located at 2401 Judah Rd. (parcel 09-33-301-002), vacant parcel 09-33-301-004, 4738 Joslyn Rd. (parcel 09-33-326-016), and 721 Brown Rd. (parcel 09-33-351-034).

Chairman Reynolds asked the applicant to introduce himself.

Mr. David Dedvukaj with Contour Companies was present with his Chief Architect Bruce Kopytek. He said he was going to let Bruce do the presentation for their multi-family mixed-use development off of Judah and Joslyn Rd.

Mr. Bruce Kopytek showed the Board the drawing. He stated that essentially what they are proposing, and thought most of the commissioners have seen this before because they have been before them for zoning. He added that they are on an "L" shaped piece of property that connects Joslyn Rd. on the right and Brown Rd. on the south. Their entrance is where the Checkers is across from Meijer's on Brown Rd. Part of the project develops an entryway that will be shared by the Checkers so that their access will be closed on Brown Rd. and customers for Checkers will come in through the shared driveway and enter the Checkers from there. What they are proposing are five buildings that are 4-stories each, the property lies within the (BIZ) zoning district. They had a portion of that property rezoned into (BIZ) to connect the two dogleg pieces of property that they have. They feel that this is one of the first developments in Orion Township that really maximizes and makes the most out of the (BIZ) type of zoning there to make a true mixed-use project where they have buildings, the three floors above are apartments, there are roughly 39 apartments per building and ground floor commercial space that they would envision as a potential restaurant, doctor office, tax office, that sort of thing in there. The roadway connects from Brown Rd. to Joslyn through the development and there is potential for future development to the north, as well. The buildings have been designed to have a character that mixes the commercial and the residential in a village sort of way, and because of the heritage and the history of the area, the design is a little bit more like a coast resort-style architecture with big overhangs, brackets, light colors, and some rough stonework as well. He showed the Board the renderings. He added that in the elevations they could see that the heights are punctuated with high and low areas, roofs, there are arch windows, and the whole commercial level on the ground floor is brick and stone that is carried up into the staircase towers on the building. They feel that this offers them a chance for some really improved character to the area because of the human nature of the architecture. The colors are an earth tone with some coastal color accents. Of the five buildings, the one that is in the corner is all apartments because of the distance from either of the major roads they are using the ground floor there for ground floor garden apartment type living spaces. Also, on the backs of these buildings, there are individual garages that could be part of the lease for anybody that takes an apartment in the building. He said he was in a meeting where a resident questioned the name that they chose which is Pearl of Orion and the reason for that is because most of the property to the north of here was owned by the Dewey family, his grandmother that lived on that site was named Pearl, in honor of that, they decided to name the development Pearl of Orion.

Planner Fazzini read through his site plan review date-stamped July 14, 2021.

Planner Fazzini read through his Tree Survey Review date-stamped July 15, 2021.

Engineer Landis read through his wetland review date-stamped July 13, 2021.

Engineer Landis read through his site plan review date-stamped July 13, 2021.

Chairman Reynolds stated that there was a site walk on April 13, 2021, by the Site Walk Committee.

Chairman Reynolds said that there was a review from the Fire Marshal, he had a comment about modifying/adding a fire hydrant. There were no comments from our Public Services review. RCOC did have a number of engineering comments on the site but there was a review from them.

Vice-Chairman Gross stated that this is a comprehensive mixed-use development, the first one that they really have seen. He thought it was a concept that they had talked about in the Gingellville Town Center Area. Although that this (BIZ) is pretty much adjacent to that or in close proximity to it. Because this is a relatively new phenomenon in our community, it is difficult to develop zoning ordinance regulations that are related to this concept. He thought they would be learning as this progresses, and thought they needed to be somewhat flexible in terms of some of these design considerations.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked if this project was proposed to be built as a single entity or in phases? Mr. Kopytek replied that these five buildings will be a single entity. Vice-Chairman Gross asked if all the utilities and everything will be constructed at one time? Mr. Kopytek replied yes.

Vice-Chairman Gross said he noticed that there is no parking calculation within the complex. He stated based upon what he sees and the number of units provided they are talking roughly 195 units. Mr. Kopytek replied that it was 202 he believed. Vice-Chairman Gross said that the density is roughly 12 units to the acre in terms of the residential aspect of it. Mr. Kopytek said that the parking table was just an oversight when they laid it out, they did those calculations but when it translated to the civil engineering drawings that didn't get on the drawings.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked if there were 15-acres just of this site not anything to the north? Mr. Kopytek replied no, it is just the "L" shape piece.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked if the retail was going to be roughly 40,000-sq. ft. Mr. Kopytek replied correct.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked if it will be retail, office, or whatever happens to come by. Mr. Kopytek replied small chain restaurants, coffee shops, things that will serve the tenants above and the community.

Vice-Chairman Gross said he was confused now about our internal process because they are talking about certain waivers that are required in terms of some setbacks, covered trash areas, loading, and unloading, that they do not have the authority to grant. Chairman Reynolds replied that the items that are being requested here tonight as a waiver are able to be granted as a waiver within the (BIZ) District.

Trustee Urbanowski asked how many parking spaces were being proposed? Mr. Kopytek replied that it is per the ordinance. Trustee Urbanowski said if they are waiving the parking

calculation, that is what she sees? Vice-Chairman Gross stated that they are asking them to provide the parking calculation.

Secretary St. Henry asked how many parking spaces are they allotting for this entire development? Mr. Kopytek said without his architectural drawing, he thought that the ordinance said one per one-bedroom, and two for two bedrooms plus three visitor spaces per apartment, and a certain amount for the retail space, and they met that in terms of laying that site out.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked if they combined the parking for both uses? Mr. Kopytek replied yes. He added that primarily the way it works is that the apartment parking would be in the back, and there are angled spaces in front of the retail, and that would be the retail space, roughly.

Vice-Chairman Gross questioned if they were looking at overlapping parking? Mr. Kopytek said that he thought that there would be some overlap. He added that they are not planning on assigning a space per apartment, except for those garage spaces.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked if they had 12-parking spaces underground, or on the first floor? Mr. Kopytek replied yes behind the building. Vice-Chairman Gross asked who was going to pick those? Mr. Kopytek replied whoever wants to pay for them. If they want a covered space that is an option available to the tenants.

Chairman Reynolds said that if they were to proceed not seeing any calculations being provided tonight if they feel like there is a right to deviate from the ordinance, so be it, but if there isn't they would ask that it meets the ordinance requirements, prove that it meets it, and a review by our consultants. If not, would there be a need to come back for a waiver or a deviation request? Mr. Kopytek said he could issue that, as soon as possible, in terms of the calculation.

Mr. Kopytek said the developer and business operators that are going to lease these spaces for people to live or do business in, they don't want to shirk on parking because it is not going to make their development successful.

Vice-Chairman Gross said that some of the things that they need to verify, one of those things to verify is if a 230-ft. long building is acceptable. He added that with this type of development, he didn't see a problem with adding a 30-ft. to the length of the building to accommodate this development. He said that the lack of verified building heights is acceptable because they are talking about a unified development of a single project. In terms of the design and the architectural guidelines, he felt that they provided sufficient and adequate detailed information. He thought it was acceptable in terms of what they are attempting to accomplish within the (BIZ) District. Because they are working with residential and commercial, he felt that there would be adequate recesses and window projections. He thought that they had done a good job of looking at the ordinance and providing something which is going to be a model in the community.

Commissioner Walker said that he agreed, but this is his normal complaint. He stated that they have a lot of small things but they have so many small things. He said that the petitioner is asking them to grant this saying that all of this will be done administratively, he thought that everything that the planner said he thought could be done administratively. He didn't like the fact that there were so many of them, that they are saying it is ok. He didn't see what it was that they were agreeing to.

Trustee Urbanowski asked if the reason the "L" shape happened was because of concerns of the neighbors behind them? Planner Fazzini replied that the applicant voluntarily reduced the

rezoning area after they applied initially to pull it back from Judah Rd. Trustee Urbanowski thought that it was an interesting shaped space. She thought it would depend on the businesses that they intend on having there. She asked what the square footage of retail spaces? Mr. Kopytek replied there are four buildings that are about 10,000-sq. ft. per building. He said that those spaces are broken by an apartment entrance right in the middle. They are going to be small-scale businesses, for the most part, the type that might have a UPS truck pull up and drop off some boxes. He added that in the case of a restaurant it could be a little bit different but he believed as Planner Fazzini said there is an awful lot of paved area. The whole site is walkable with sidewalks, the roads are kept separate from the sidewalks, so a truck could pull up beside a sidewalk and drop some things off and get it into the restaurant easily enough. They might even entertain something like if that were to happen, they could take one of the garage spaces on the back that wasn't leased and turn that into a place where a drop-off could occur for a restaurant or something like that.

Secretary St. Henry asked Engineer Landis that the issues that Commissioner Walker brought up with his checklist; he asked how many of those are legit administrative issues that could be resolved internally? Engineer Landis replied that he would be comfortable with reviewing all of those administratively.

Secretary St. Henry said this is one of the first if not the first developments where they are looking at a 4-story building in the Township. He asked what the height restrictions were at this point? Planner Fazzini said in the (BIZ) District it is flexible, 2.5-story if it were not (BIZ) is the height limit. Secretary St. Henry stated that they could see more developments like this especially in the (BIZ) area possibly, and where else the property is appropriate. Chairman Reynolds said that they have seen some higher story developments with a couple of the hotel projects that have been reviewed previously. He didn't remember if they were equal in height but in the same range of 3-4-stories. Secretary St. Henry said his point is if they are going to entertain those types of developments, to him, this is where they belong in their Township.

Trustee Urbanowski said that the fact that it is set back farther. Secretary St. Henry said yeah it is set back 1,000-ft.

Secretary St. Henry asked if they felt there was enough buffer for the neighborhood? Chairman Reynolds replied most of the parcel is vacant adjacent to Judah Rd. at least.

Chairman Reynolds said some of the comments that were brought up by their professional consultants and fellow Planning Commissioners he agreed, he was not that worried about the 200-ft. in elevation length, just due to the nature that architecturally there is a lot of relief, undulation, and materials that break that up it is not one continuous elevation, so that is not a huge concern for him. The general sense is that they are promoting different buildings since there are some nice architectural features to the buildings that split things up. He thought that there was at least some variation for him within the one building that between five of them there is some relief there it is not one big massive façade. His concern about consideration of architectural standards there was not a huge concern for him. He was happy to hear that it was a single-phase, that is nice to hear, to kind of have it go and run with everything. He didn't have a major concern with wetlands that were brought up, he knew that it was pretty limited, and thought they should discuss that before any motion were considered. He added that there was a discussion that was brought up by the tree review and the concern about it coming from a licensed individual that was brought up by their civil engineer from those plans and then also from their tree survey. He wanted to make sure that that was a requirement that was meant by the surveys that were completed by the property. He didn't have a major issue with the loading conditions just because if they are going to promote walkability and a foot-friendly community that requires some flexibility on loading zones he did think that there were some uses in here

that would be more of a concern. Typically, the loading if it is a hindrance is more so on the space or the user than some of the public. If there was blockage from emergency access or things, he imagined that would be addressed from the appropriate manors here in the Township.

Chairman Reynolds said he would be in support of contributing toward the original traffic study, he knew that they had some thoughts there, and some work already in the works there. He would like to see the tree calculation being provided for them along with the parking calculations he would like to see all of those trees be replaced if not there is the option of paying in lieu of that they don't typically exercise but at least that is an opportunity. Lighting, he didn't have a huge issue for their ordinance, in many parts is straightforward as long as their ordinance is agreeable to be met. There were a couple of other hanging fruit from site coverage and things that he thought were just an administrative item to check off and if not then they are obviously agreeing to the project as they see fit here tonight.

Chairman Reynolds asked the applicant if they had any issues with adding the parking calculations assuming it meets the ordinance, the same thing with lighting, and site coverage. The Fire Marshal had some minor comments, the same thing with the trees. Mr. Kopytek said that they were all respectful comments, and things that they would like to push forward and agree to and move forward on this project.

Chairman Reynolds said that there are some variances from their greenbelt waivers and wanted to make sure that they were comfortable with that. (BIZ) is one of those districts where they have looked friendly upon some developments just in the sense that there is a lot of long narrow lots that lead back to these larger parcels that promote this development. He understood why, but it is a review and it is something that is an ordinance standard. He asked if there were any thoughts to trees, and setback waivers, from the Planning Commissioners.

Planner Fazzini said if they look at the zoning map where the site is adjacent to the (R-1) it is a 30-ft. greenbelt setback and then within the (BIZ) so the east-west boundaries are 20-ft. They substantially meet the 30-ft. except for two points where there are drives for the (R-1) and then within the (BIZ) it is significantly reduced to a few feet because of the paved areas and retaining walls that are on the property line.

Chairman Reynolds said regarding the renderings. He said if the rendering itself there is going to be building color reference but there are some other color swatches. He asked what the intended colors were? Mr. Kopytek said that they were meant to be the same but obviously when computers print, they print things and scan things with different colors. The buildings themselves would be a buff greyish beige color. The dark tones in the picture are just an accent line, and then the dull blue-green color would just be an accent freeze at the top of the building that pulled in that sense of resort, lakeshore, lakeside type community.

Mr. Kopytek said that they had started off at one point with the buildings, they were asked to flip the whole site over so that the entrance boulevard was on the right as opposed to the left side. In order to accommodate, to have that entrance be a decent boulevard kind of look with trees in the center, and make a very strong village type of statement there, and the widening of the roads to accommodate the Fire Marshal's needs which are a given, in order to provide the requirements of the parking ordinance and all that, it ended up with a much more compromised buffer on the two sides of that narrow leg. He added that they will have a wider piece of property at the top, they have hit the 30-ft. except for the portion which is potentially looking at future access to the north if need be. That is essentially what happened along the edges of that site. The parking lots along the back, they have broken them up with some landscaped areas, also, the dumpster locations are there but rather than running a 2,000-ft. long row of parking

they broke it up with some landscaped areas that they can concentrate trees and things like that there to still mitigate that effect as much as possible.

Secretary St. Henry said his opinion on the variances that they are asking for, he felt they were reasonable because they did ask them to make some changes. He thought to the average person that is looking to move here, to the average citizen driving by this development, they are not going to know the difference between a variance of this distance and what the ordinance states. They are going to see nice landscaping, attractive buildings, a modern development. He thought that everyone agreed that it was attractive for this part of the Township. Things like variances in his opinion are acceptable. Trustee Urbanowski agreed.

Chairman Reynolds stated that there were a significant number of trees per the replacement ordinance so he would like that to be met in his perspective. He asked Planner Fazzini if the calculation isn't provided? Planner Fazzini replied that they provided the calculation but it looked like the replacement trees looked like they were short. Chairman Reynolds asked their thoughts on adding additional trees to meet the replacement requirements, pay in lieu of? Mr. Kopytek thought that the calculation was about 1,500 trees to be taken down, they wanted to fill that to make it again greenspace walkable Lake Orion type feel and thought that was something that they could look at it and figure out everything.

Secretary St. Henry said when they did the site walk a couple of months ago, there were pockets of trees that looked like they were legacy trees, that would be kept in place. He thought that the needed to be realistic, what this property was before, there was a lot of scrub trees, unkempt. He thought that in this particular case if they are taking down trees and putting trees back in a professionally landscaped manner, he felt it was acceptable.

Chairman Reynolds stated that in a big picture sense as they are moving down the list of items that would lead them to consider site plan approval. He asked them for their thoughts, issues, along with the wetland permit. He said that there was a small amount here that were not necessarily considered to be high-quality wetlands. Many of them were for stormwater and there is obviously going to be new stormwater management proposed. Since they are small in nature, he knew just from a visual inspection standpoint they are hard to see from a standpoint if they are regulated or not. The small nature at least from this proportion of the development he didn't see major issues with. Larger areas he thought would be more of a concern for him if they were high quality or habitat of some sort.

Trustee Urbanowski asked if he was looking at the wetland application to be revised to be that specific? Chairman Reynolds replied correct. He knew that there were some comments there but the general sense of it.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, that the Planning Commission **approve** the wetland permit for PC-2021-44, Pearl of Orion, located 2401 Judah Rd. (parcel 09-33-301-002), vacant parcel 09-33-301-004, 4738 Joslyn Rd. (parcel 09-33-326-016) and 721 Brown Rd., (parcel 09-33-351-034) for plans date stamped received 6/30/2021. This approval is based on the following findings of facts: that the action and use are not likely to and will not pollute, impair or destroy a Wetland; there are no feasible or prudent alternatives to the proposed action; the approval is consistent with public interests, in light of the stated purposes of the ordinances, in accordance with the report of their OHM Engineer.

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds asked that they consider the condition or item in the OHM wetland review letter that the wetland application is to be revised to specify the onsite .02-acres of wetlands per their comment in item #2 of the review letter.

Vice-Chairman Gross amended the motion, Trustee Urbanowski re-supported to specify the onsite .02-acres of wetland per the OHM review letter of item #2.

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

Chairman Reynolds said that addresses the wetland permit component to site plan in front of them. He asked about their thoughts on the Brown Road Standards, which include some of the greenbelt width, dumpster locations, loading and unloading, setback waivers, and parking calculations. His thoughts were that he agreed with the applicant's discussion points that there are some limited opportunities here with the entrance of the site that led to the setback, he didn't remember that when they were speaking earlier of how tight some of these interactions are. He thought that the rest of the greenbelt widths are addressed. He would not be in favor of deviating from our ordinance on parking.

Vice-Chairman Gross said that most of these items have been incorporated into their submitted site plan. It is just a matter of reflecting that they are already reflected in the site plan with the exception of the parking calculations.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Gingell, that the Planning Commission waives the following standards of Section 34.03 for PC-2021-44, Pearl of Orion based on the economic impact, quality of architectural design, and overall compatibility with the District and the plans identified of June 30, 2021, and including that the parking calculations be provided on a revised site plan and that they are consistent with the ordinance relative to the subject use that they are not reflecting any waivers of parking standards. The parking waiver setback is a result of the mixed uses on the site. The greenbelt is a recognition of adjacent uses in the (BIZ) District; the dumpster locations will be located to support the respective businesses; the loading and unloading requirements are not required due to the small size of the retail establishments.

Discussion on the motion:

Secretary St. Henry said that from experience these large apartment developments, despite their best efforts to calculate the number of parking spaces, there is never enough. They need to make sure that they at least meet the ordinance and if there is an opportunity to add more spaces of any kind do it because they will be used. This is a large development, ideally, with young professionals, young people, and in their area, they have to drive because they don't have public transportation, there will be a lot of cars. What they don't want are complaints of cars parked on the boulevards, parked illegally, people complaining about getting their cars towed. He knew this from experience from his daughter that lives in Seattle with a development similar to this. They can never have enough parking, and let's do our best to make sure that there is plenty of it.

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

Chairman Reynolds said that they have the wetland permit granted, along with some modifications to the Brown Road Standards. There has been a number of discussion items,

parking calculations, site coverage, lighting, some review comment in the sense of OHM and Giffels Webster, from a planning standpoint, a discussion on trees. He said that those items can be addressed administratively if they don't meet or exceed the ordinance requirements, he would just see the project back for an additional review here at the Planning Commission.

Secretary St. Henry said he wanted to see one thing, he agreed with Commissioner Walker, that every one of those items that are on the engineer's list and planning list gets checked off and addressed with no exceptions.

Chairman Reynolds thought it just needed to be a condition of the motion if they decide to approve.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, I move that the Planning Commission grants site plan **approval** for PC-2021-44, Pearl of Orion, located at 2401 Judah Rd. (parcel 09-33-301-002), vacant parcel 09-33-301-004, 4738 Joslyn Rd. (parcel 09-33-326-016), and 721 Brown Rd. (parcel 09-33-351-034) for plans date stamped received 6/30/2021 be approved based upon the following findings of fact: approval is based upon the land division creating the parcels as shown on the site plan; that the Township Planners review be checked off administratively to make sure that the items are complied with a specific reference to tree replacement to be met; that the Township Engineers items 1-9 in their OHM review of July 13, 2021, also be reviewed and approved; that the Fire Marshall's request regarding fire hydrant location in his review letter of July 13, 2021 be acknowledged and shown on the site plan; that the traffic signal for the Oakland County Road Commission approval be adhered to.

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds asked if it was the intent that they contribute or for the traffic study component? Vice-Chairman Gross said that was in the OHM review.

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

C. PC-2021-56, Esys Consolidation Project Site Plan, located at 1427 Brown Rd (parcel 09-34-300-002) and vacant parcel west of 1427 Brown Rd. (09-33-426-039)

Chairman Reynolds asked the applicant to state their name and address for the record.

Mr. Bennett Donaldson with J.B. Donaldson & Co., 37650 Hills Tech Dr., Farmington Hills, MI presented.

Mr. Donaldson said this is a 267,000-sq. ft. R&D building, implementation building for JR Automation Company and Esys Corporation. They are a robotic implementation team that puts together solutions for the automotive industry so that they can then implement those into their manufacturing lines. Basically, teams come together, they have a robotic solution on the manufacturing line, in which they build these lines at this facility, make sure that they are all working, get the bugs out, and then they would move those on to the actual manufacturing floor. The representatives from JR Automation are here if he screwed that up, but essentially is what he understood it to be.

Mr. Donaldson stated that it was roughly an 18-acre site, challenging site, there is about a 50-ft. of fall from Brown Rd., to the rear of the site. The northern boundary as far as development goes is bordered by a wetland conservation easement, to the east is Fed-Ex, to the west is a wetland stream with a bit of wetland, and then obviously the south is Brown Rd.

Mr. Donaldson said that they placed the building as best as they could, as it relates to the grades, trying to get them to work. They are in a box, he described the borders of this because they are in a box and they have done the best they can to bleed off some of the grades from Brown Rd., using the building to help retain some of the earth, and when they move north into the site, the grade steps, down and down. When the consultants go through their letters, they do have a couple of variances that they will be asking for as it relates specifically to the grade, and one for the asphalt thickness. He can either cover those now or wait until the consultants go through their letters. Chairman Reynolds said to have the consultants read through their letters first.

Mr. Donaldson noted that PEA their Civil Engineers were there, along with Foudy Architecture, and a few others from his team that were there.

Planner Arroyo read through his review date-stamped July 15, 2021.

Engineer Landis read through his review date-stamped July 15, 2021.

Chairman Reynolds said that there were a couple of comments from the Fire Marshal, he knew that they were addressed in the OHM review to be addressed on the plans. It looks like signage requested to be posted for the narrower access roads, along with, an FDC connection, and an additional fire hydrant being required to be added to the plans.

Chairman Reynolds noted that there was a site walk completed on this project, and there was a review from the Public Service Director that stated there were no major concerns.

Mr. Donaldson said that a couple of the items that they will be asking a variance on, the first one being the 1:3 to 1:4 slope at the front of the building. He said that in absence of raising the site up by about 5-ft. to meet that requirement, they would have to push the building back approximately 100-ft. to make that happen. He added that the consultants suggested that they could bring dirt in to raise the site up, and that is true they can, but there is one thing bringing in 5,000-yd., there is another thing about bringing in 100,000-yd. In addition, that has downstream impacts of additional walls, these are big long walls as it is. They are trying to use the building and the site the best they can to grade this off and have the most functional site plan that they have. As an example, they would also ask to keep the 10% grade on the truck lane only, that lane will see very little traffic. JR Automation has about one semi a day, they are not a huge trucking operation, they bring robotics in, they work on them for months, and then they ship them out. It is not a trucking-intensive operation. As their facility is on the other side of the street this is a duplicate operation for the most part. The other issue for the building piece about the 10% to 6% grade on the west side it puts more earth on the building which impairs their ability to get egress out of the building from the inside. If they can imagine there is dirt piled up on the outside of the building and they have to have so many exits on the inside of the building to get out of the building, they bring on the inside of the building to get people out of the building. Those are some practical difficulties noted in the consultants' letters. He added that the last items are, they build industrial buildings all over town and they have never had a paving detail of 9 inches of asphalt over an aggregate base. They are suggesting and what they typically do is in the pedestrian areas or the pedestrian parking areas is their detail would be 4-inches of asphalt and 8 inches of stone and their heavy-duty detail would be 5-inches of asphalt and 10-inches of stone. The maneuvering lanes, when the trucks would actually turn into the truck-wells and maneuver out that would all be 8-inch concrete in the back. That is their normal detail and straight drive lanes, he has never installed 9-inches of asphalt anywhere and he has built millions-sq. ft. of industrial space all over town. They are asking to waive that in lieu of the detail that he outlined based upon their experience and what they do in numerous communities.

Mr. Donaldson said that the irrigation in the front yard, he said not a problem, that should be irrigated and he didn't know why it wasn't.

Secretary St. Henry asked if the other side irrigated in the front? Mr. Donaldson replied yeah. He added that he is adding a ton of trees there, and he is putting irrigation in, they have to live.

Commissioner Brackon asked regarding the 1:3 and 1:4, what detriment could stay at the 1:3 have versus the 1:4 that they are requiring? Engineer Landis replied the concern is the vehicles driving down Brown Rd. 1:3 is considered a non-recoverable slope in the event that they veer off the road. They could get 1:4 or less if they terraced that slope with some retaining walls. Or they could raise the finished floor, there are options. Certainly, they wouldn't want to have a 1:3 if they envision the slope on the backside of Menards going up to the gas main, which is a 1:3 and that is relatively steep. Commissioner Brackon asked if the only concern was the traffic veering off? Engineer Landis said also the pedestrians on the safety path it is coming right off the edge for both. Mr. Donaldson said that they could put a guardrail in. Engineer Landis said that is an option but he didn't know if they wanted to introduce a guardrail on a brand-new site, it is not extremely attractive. Mr. Donaldson said that they have put in guardrails on the front of sites before, and they plant boxwoods in front of them, to screen them. Commissioner Brackon said what he is hearing, in order for them to do that, they have to move the building back 100-ft., is that what they are saying? Mr. Steve Sorensen with PEA Group, 2430 Rochester Ct., Troy, MI replied that it is a big site, the site is well over 20-acres but most of it is a protected wetland. They are limited in the area that they are using, and to make up 50-ft. of fall across the site they are pushing the limits as compared to what is standard is normal, with a 6% slope or the 1:4 slopes. They are not doing things that are not acceptable in other areas of southeast Michigan. They are doing things that are pushing the limits, what are the standards of Orion Township but they are things that they have done in other municipalities. They have designed the site to separate car and truck traffic. On the area that they are steep and steeper than normal, it is limited to the truck traffic, and those vehicles only. On the other side of the site where the pedestrian vehicles will be it will be within normal compliance, that will not be an issue. With only one semi a day coming in and out of that truck area which is limited to those drivers. The other part of this site is there is a 12-ft. difference between the east and the west drive. Trying to not bury that building to be able to get the people in and out of the building they need to get that grade down as quickly as they can. They are pushing it; he doesn't disagree that they are pushing it but didn't think they were being irresponsible. Commissioner Brackon thought that it was engineers battling with engineers, and he respected everybody's opinion.

Chairman Reynolds said that the few comments that got brought up by the Planner, irrigation, he thought that criteria could be met. He didn't have any issue with loading criteria, the loading zone for the sake of office. Neither with the trash compactor in his perspective.

Chairman Reynolds agreed that it was a challenging site. He knew that there had to be some compromises to make this work versus their Engineering Standards. What he was struggling a little bit with is, he is all for conditions and items that tweak, he was just seeing a lot of domino effect items here that he was concerned with. He was not explicatively clear on the wetland component and the setbacks from that, just yet. He could see where that has been driving some of the reduced parking debits. Some of them, even with curbs, and they could buy it is hanging over a sidewalk they are reduced by 2-ft. There is a ripple effect from Brown Rd. to the north, from grading being an issue, the size of the building, the parking widths being reduced, and then also he wasn't sure where these wetlands setbacks come in. He hears them that egress and life safety is an important component to any building, but he also could see some of the concerns where 1:3 is a steep slope. He asked if there had been any consideration to terracing even the front component of that and then transitioning to a deeper slope? He asked

what happens when they ask them to meet their parking distance requirements, which at the north side of the building are reduced by at least 6-feet on that side right now, and then they are also going into the wetlands. Maybe they can talk about these three items as it is going to affect the building as it moves it north towards the wetlands. Mr. Donaldson said it is possible, the building itself is acting as a wall right now, so they are taking a building that is acting as a wall to put in a separate wall, so they would lose some efficiencies. He added as far as the parking goes in a lot of ways it is a design consideration that has come into favor in recent years and limiting the amount of impervious area. The area external to the parking lot to use a 2-ft. reduction in space whether they have an overhang of the car to just pave less, and to be responsible citizens. He thought that they could lose some green space along the building then they could expand those to make it work. He thought that every foot helped them in their grade transition. They would appreciate that consideration but he believed that was something that they could take care of and comply with that. He said that the wetland setbacks are not encroaching, there is one area of additional impact, there was a little finger that stuck down on the northeast corner, previously has gone through with the previous property owner, that is being asked to be permitted as part of their wetland permit that has already in process. The remainder of the wetland setbacks they are adhering to.

Commissioner Brackon asked if they would want to reduce the greenspace to comply with the parking space depth by 2-ft? He added that it seems to go against what they promote here in Orion. Chairman Reynolds said he would agree with that statement. He didn't think that the answer was to reduce limited greenbelt setbacks. He thought it looked like out by the building that there is 8-ft. right now, it is not overly generous. It is not like they are reducing it from 40 to 20, they are talking feet here, unfortunately, it is a tight site.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked if that was what they needed for parking or was it for extra parking? Because they have like 36 spaces over what the ordinance requires. Mr. Donaldson said it was needed because there are 175 employees to start, there is 250 wrapping up, and then there are contractors that bring it up close to 300. Vice-Chairman Gross said it was something that they need in terms of usage.

Chairman Reynolds said to the applicant's point, that is something that adjacent community ordinances address and say a certain percentage of contact spaces are allowable. He said he would reference for example. He showed them the one subject area that they were talking about, there is 19-ft. which is their ordinance being provided in the middle, there is 17-ft. up by the building, and then there is 17.5-ft. in the back. He was familiar with ordinances that would allow reductions based on certain criteria and things. His struggle was it is all tight, so they are going to have 17-ft. is the compact spaces all across the front, approximately 20, which are over their ordinance requirement but based on need are being installed by the number of employees in the building. He thought that the further north spaces they could justify because they are going to have some overhang of a vehicle, center spaces are addressed, and the one's upfront they are going to reduce if they have a car overhang it might be a foot or 18-inches if they back in 2-ft. but then they are reducing that sidewalk with 4-5-ft. He said that they don't have a compact spot ordinance, they say all of their spots need to be 9'x19'. Commissioner Brackon said that he thought that the applicant said that he could get to 19' but they lose greenspace. Mr. Donaldson asked if they would be acceptable to increasing those spaces to 19-ft. with a 5-ft. walk? He added that essentially the integral walk acts as a curb-stop, is what that does, so they have a 2-ft. overhang of a vehicle but they maintain that 5-ft. maneuvering space for the sidewalks, that was the intention of it. Engineer Landis said that they are not going to get everybody to take advantage of that overhang. They are always going to have some vehicles that are going to stick out on the aisle. If the Fire Marshal is requiring a 26-ft. wide drive aisle, they have compromised that.

Chairman Reynolds asked regarding the wetland setback to the north, are they at that 25-ft. limit at this point? Engineer Landis replied that it was not labeled on the plan so he was not able to verify that. Mr. Donaldson said that they will label that and comply with that. They had no intention to breach that, and they are at it with the use of walls and their grading.

Secretary St. Henry thought it was a tough site, they are talking up to 300 cars, he didn't think that they would have every spot filled but will be a tight space as it is even if it goes to 19' it is going to be tight. They all know what these parks are like. Mr. Donaldson said they get that many cars when customers come to work collaboratively with their engineers. Secretary St. Henry said right, it is reasonable. He said in his opinion, yeah, they like greenbelt space but this space is tight it is challenging, in his opinion, it would be reasonable to give up a couple of feet of greenbelt to accommodate safe maneuverability and traffic flow in that parking lot if that is the issues they are wrestling with. He said he would go before anybody and make the argument of why they cut 2-ft. of green space in this particular case because these are tight spaces, it is a large building on a tough lot. All of these developments in the (BIZ) district are challenging.

Chairman Reynolds said that the 5-ft. sidewalk, greenbelts, it is really the fire access is the main point, creating that net clear. He added that looking at the east side of the site, there are 17, 26, 38, 22, and 17.5 provided there too. They are rolling with these standards but they are addressing these dimensions on both sides of the parcel. It is not just the back grade it is also east, west that they are promoting this to be the standard that they are using here. Mr. Donaldson said that they have 8-ft. greenbelts, 7-ft. sidewalks, certainly the greenbelt could be reduced if they needed to go to 6-ft. to get the space, or reduce the sidewalk, or take a foot out of each. Chairman Reynolds said that they have 450,000-sq. ft. building what is 2-ft. to meet ordinance standards. He said he would be willing to work with some of these engineering components, there are some of them that obviously, he thought needed to be met, the safety widths of egress lanes, and at least if they were even to consider reducing parking widths, he thought that was a variance request. He understood that it is complicated but they are also looking at a very big building on this complicated site. What are some of the creative thoughts to address a couple of these comments, the safety path adjacent at the road with some of the gradings, he wouldn't think that a guardrail is really what they desire. He understood that a retaining wall ends up being extra but thought that if there was a flattened component of that a small stepdown that took out some of that grade and then went to a 1:3 he thought he would find that acceptable in his opinion but they are talking about a lot of engineering standards here being deviated from. He got a large amount of fall on the site but they are talking grade for lanes, grading for the building, paving cross-sections, parking distances, so there is a lot of stuff here. He was in favor of development and making things work especially on some of these complicated sites but not to the tune of everything being deviated against. He thought that there needed to be some thought and especially since they are going in blind with some of the wetland stuff, he knew they were saying it would be addressed but that is a component to this movement north-south in his opinion.

Mr. Donaldson said hearing what he is saying he thought that they could probably work in some sort of wall somewhere midway down the slope or something along that western side to flatten that out and make up some of that grade. What he wanted to propose is maybe to meet somewhere in the middle on the slope of that drive, 10 is out they are now at 6, but if they could hold to 8 somewhere in that range with 8 max. Give a wall to ease up on that corner and work with an 8% slope. He thought they could make that work. Chairman Reynolds asked about the parking standard requirements? Mr. Donaldson said that they have to give them direction, they know that they can reduce the green space in between the building, or reduce the sidewalk. They could increase a foot on either side of it so that way or they could meet their standard they would just be reducing greenspace and their grade but they could do either.

Secretary St. Henry asked what do they prefer? Do they prefer they go half on each or just take the greenspace? Chairman Reynolds thought that there was a compromise about reducing the greenspace and pushing and pulling on this. He added that he can't really say this is where I push and pull it from because there is a ripple effect here. He is not the one driving to say that the building has to be 450-ft. deep. There is a setback from the road with major grading issues, there is the building being 450-ft., and then landscape and parking. If they are within the 25-ft. setback on wetland, obviously, there is some push and pull there. Mr. Donaldson asked what he meant by that if they are within the 25-ft.? Chairman Reynolds said he was not seeing any wetland setbacks shown on the plan right now. He asked if they are at that wetland setback? Mr. Donaldson asked if they had the grading plan that they could pull up? Mr. Donaldson said that there are spots where the wetland lines go further to the north, and they are farther away from there, the tight spots are right at 25-ft.

Engineer Landis said that they did just submit their wetland permit application so they will have to come back before them another time anyway.

Chairman Reynolds said that they are all for compromises, obviously, if it is compromised on parking, he would want to make sure that is a variance request because it doesn't meet our standards. He thought it didn't even meet the criteria of the ordinance, and they don't allow a deviation. Planner Arroyo said that in the Industrial Park District it says that the Planning Commission may, at their discretion, modify the numerical requirements of off-street parking, based on evidence provided by the applicant that indicates that another standard would be more appropriate. He added that he thought generally interpreted as being a number of spaces. Chairman Reynolds asked if there were even an option to meet a different dimensional standard for parking? Planner Arroyo said he said didn't see that. Commissioner Brackon said he thought that they were willing to meet the 2-ft. Mr. Donaldson said that they will put the standards of parking in but the cost is less green space. Chairman Reynolds said that if it meets the ordinance, he is good with that.

Secretary St. Henry said this is part of the Township, where these types of developments we want, there is going to be a little give and take.

Commissioner Brackon asked if they owned the building across the street? Mr. Donaldson replied yes. Commissioner Brackon noted that it was huge.

Secretary St. Henry asked if they are consolidating by moving an operation from another part of the Detroit area? Mr. Donaldson said that they have new business and they have a temporary facility off of Mound Rd. They are out of space at the building across the street.

Chairman Reynolds said it comes down to how they want to proceed from here with some of the discussions.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked when will the wetland permit be reviewed? Engineer Landis replied within the next two weeks. Vice-Chairman Gross said they have to come back for that anyway. He added that they could get the revised plans to show the parking, wetlands, and grading compromise in two weeks. Engineer Landis said that the wetland review will be done in two weeks, and then obviously it will take them time to revise the plans and then they will need time to review them again too.

Commissioner Brackon asked if they would be interested in coming back in a month, all at once, where these issues have been resolved? Mr. Donaldson replied yeah, it would be great if they could resolve some of these issues tonight, the ones they can resolve if they have to come back anyway. He thought that the parking was resolvable, if the terrace is something that is

acceptable then they will redraw that plan showing the terrace. If they could resolve the 8% from 10%, he didn't see that being able to change a month from now, it is a condition site. Engineer Landis said he was more concerned with the slope in the front of the building than on the side. He added that it is about 140-ft. of the drive where that 10% is. There is ample room to the north if somebody was to be traveling down to that truck dock to be able to recover if they were traveling down that, and lose control. The standard is 6% it is a challenging site it is a huge building but there is a relatively flat area up at the approach of Brown and then down by the truck dock. It is just kind of an intermediary steep area, he was not as concerned with that, if that was something that they wanted to let go of. Commissioner Brackon asked if Engineer Landis would be ok with the 8% that they proposed? Engineer Landis replied that they could even leave it at 10% if that was something that they wanted. He added that his main focus and concern was really the safety along Brown Rd.

Chairman Reynolds said it is currently proposed as 10%, there is a standard of 6%. Do they want to request an improvement towards meeting that ordinance? It doesn't sound like it could be met fully. Secretary St. Henry thought that 8% was a nice compromise if it is doable. Mr. Donaldson said that he thought that they could work with Engineer Landis and find something that is agreeable to him and work through that.

Chairman Reynolds thought it was the conclusion to move towards a postponement of this case and giving them some direction on items and feel free to speak up if he is not speaking correctly, but it looks like they are looking for them to address the engineering concerns and comments from the review letter, an attempt for an 8% slope, the parking spaces be revised per the ordinance, a terrace be introduced along Brown Rd., wetland setbacks be added. He thought the one item that they have not explicatively addressed is the paving cross-sections, so there is some discussion there. There was some thought that from their development standards they don't address any of those versus their standard paving cross-sections for the (IP) district. He stated that he has not heard a request to deviate from those standards so he was surprised to hear that it was out of the norm. He hasn't heard major pushback in other (IP) proposals that they have had.

Commissioner Brackon said he didn't understand the purpose of the 9-inches versus what they are proposing? Engineer Landis said it is intended to meet the loading requirements in an industrial development. They have much higher loads than they would in a residential subdivision. They are looking not just for the initial but 10-15 years down the road they don't want to have a site that is falling apart and nobody wanting to repave it. Mr. Donaldson said every site has a geotechnical report done, the geotechnical report recommends, based on soil conditions, what the pavement section should be. The design of the site is meant to separate truck and car traffic. There will be a heavier duty section where the trucks are but they are only having the car and pedestrian traffic they are not looking at heavy traffic loading and that is the way the site is designed. To enforce a 9-inch section across the entire site, he thought seemed excessive. The biggest problem with the parking lots is they put the catch basins in the middle of the parking lots. If they put the catch basins outside of the curbs, they don't get those big dips which are the first things to go. The water going down this run, they are not going to getting the water sitting and pooling to desegregate the asphalt either. He said he has never put in 9-inch asphalt.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked if this was a spec industrial building, he would be a little concerned about that, but this is a single-use owner-occupied building. He added that it is on their site and they are going to be living with it.

Secretary St. Henry asked what the standard for regular parking lots in front of these buildings in terms of the depth of the asphalt for industrial? Engineer Landis replied 9-inch, they have

allowed a section over the parking spaces. If they have the main drive aisles to be 9-inches, and then the parking spaces could be 4:8. Secretary St. Henry said that is what they are talking about right? Mr. Donaldson said yes, it is. Secretary St. Henry asked what the actual loading areas are? Mr. Donaldson said 5:10 is what would be their section for the driveway and then they transition into concrete for the maneuvering areas, where there are actually turning movements.

Chairman Reynolds asked Engineer Landis if there have been any projects where they have deviated from that standard? Engineer Landis replied they are design standards, he did think that Oakland Business Park had a deviation, so they could hold to that deviation as a benchmark, and they could work that out with them.

Commissioner Brackon thought that the typical industrial complex too when you think about a Fed-Ex or something like that they are talking about hundreds of semi-trucks coming in a day in and out of there, where they are saying maybe one. This is a unique scenario here where it is industrial but because of the engineering and robotics component of it, there is only one semi-truck coming in a day. Chairman Reynolds asked if it was limited deliveries? Mr. Donaldson said that it is limited deliveries, will it always be one truck, it may be two. He added that he just got done doing the Chryslers Distribution Center in Sterling Heights, and they have trailer parking for 210 trailers and they have 42 truck wells, it is 5:10. Chairman Reynolds said if there have been reasonable deviations in the Township based on findings of fact for soil reports that would justify that, he would be in favor of parking areas, obviously deviated to their parking standard. He didn't see a solid reason to say you are a special case. They have not gotten into this in other buildings. His struggle here is they are creating a one-off spin-off to say you are special from the standard. Now if there is solid justification that there are soil improvement techniques and different things that are saying, you have bearing capacity that's crazy and it is rock solid earth, let's go for it. Mr. Donaldson said that they would choose to go concrete at 9-inches they would go concrete it is cheaper.

Mr. Donaldson asked Engineer Landis what would a typical office building parking section. Engineer Landis thought that 6-inch is the standard. He added that these are details that they would normally work out at engineering they just brought it up. They try to point out items that not only impact layout but also site costs so that there are no surprises when they go to engineering. Chairman Reynolds said that he only brought it up because he wanted to provide some direction based on revisions. He added that if there is reasonable information to support a different cross-section or paving-section he would entertain it but it sounds like the final deliberation would be another conversation anyway if there are some data to support that. He said they haven't deviated from this in the past.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that if the motion is to postpone, how fast do they think they can work on it? Let's look at an actual date so they are in agreement with where they are at. The biggest hurdle being the review time needed for the consultants. The packets go out a week early, she was just trying to come up with ways to save time, they have their reviews in their packet a week early if it was that they got their packet but they didn't have their reviews until a couple of days before, she was just looking to see where they could save time. Chairman Reynolds said he would be fine with condensing some of their received dates, seeing how they are talking about these major items. He thought it would come down to how fast the OHM & Giffels Webster could turn around their reviews, there are not that many Planning comments but there would need to be a review. He was fine with whatever date and he would be happy to work with them as fast as they can to get them back on the agenda. Engineer Landis said that he had it in his calendar that they were shooting for the wetland and traffic study reviews by August 4, 2021, just two weeks from now. If they could get revised site plans by this coming Monday the 26th, they could have all three reviews on the 4th if they had revised

plans this coming Monday. Mr. Donaldson asked if they could meet tomorrow? He thought that they could work this out over the next few days. Engineer Landis said that is fine.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling asked if the review would be on the 4th, that they would be getting the review the night of the meeting? Engineering Landis said that he could get it to them the day before on the 3rd. Secretary St. Henry said they have talked about it they can read it on their own or they can present the highlights on the 4th and hopefully, they can accommodate their needs and they cover themselves. Chairman Reynolds said that he knew that everybody is working like crazy but they would definitely entertain having them back in a couple of weeks.

Mr. Donaldson said in his opinion the review letters were basically saying that they are in substantial compliance subject to a couple of things, and he thought the couple of things they talked about tonight. He didn't expect the plans to change much except for those couple of things. He asked if there is any way they could have a couple more days, that just helps them get that stuff together and make sure that they don't miss something. He would ask for that if possible. He said the 4th is two weeks away, they should be fine with that.

Chairman Reynolds asked if that would work for the Planner Arroyo. Planner Arroyo replied yes.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Brackon, that the Planning Commission postpones site plan approval for PC-2021-56, Esys Consolidation Project Site Plan, located at 1427 Brown Rd. (parcel 09-34-300-002) and vacant parcel west of 1427 Brown Rd. (09-33-426-039) for plans date stamped received 6/30/21 for the following reasons: to resolve issues regarding the engineer's review regarding slope considerations, parking, wetland setback, and pavement section standards, with hopefully an expedited review.

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

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. PC-2021-07, 5-Year Master Plan Update

Planner Arroyo said that they will be covering a lot of territory, and he mentioned that before. He thought as they spoke tonight it raised a number of issues. He asked them to keep thinking of those as they drive around and they are considering different areas of the Township because as they go through the next iteration of the Future Land Use Map they will likely go back and visit the conversation they had tonight on section 31 & 32, and they might find that is applicable in other locations. He asked them to be thinking about that and they will continue to move forward and he looked forward to the discussion.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling asked if everyone is still feeling that the second meeting of the month, and one hour, and rushed, is this still working on the Master Plan? She knew that it causes a little bit of delay in kicking off the meeting but wanted to check in and make sure that this is still working best, and as they delve into the Future Land Uses is an hour enough, or is it cutting it off abruptly not working? Planner Arroyo said ideally, they will have some agendas that are not so heavily loaded with plans. He added if they went back into the discussion now, everyone is tired. If they only had an hour worth of site plan, they could get back to the discussion he thought it fruitful. He thought maybe they will try to time some of the additional heavier loads for the Master Plan when they know that the agenda is lighter. Then they can adjust if that doesn't work.

Chairman Reynolds commented that he had is he has done workshops with the Board, he knew they were trying to social distance, but he wanted to facilitate conversations so his suggestion he had it is an open meeting, do they have it similar to their joint meeting to where they are doing a presentation at a table or tables in the back so they can flip through or point out review. He thought that would be helpful, not with today's specific conversation, but laying out some maps and looking at some stuff and get some markers on a page, he thought that would help to get hands-on.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

10. COMMUNICATIONS

Memo from Planning & Zoning Coordinator Lynn Harrison dated June 28, 2021, regarding Joint Meeting on July 29, 2021 12p-2p.

11. PLANNERS REPORTS/EDUCATION

Planner Arroyo stated that this was Planner Fazzini's last regular meeting with them.

12. COMMITTEE REPORTS

None.

13. FUTURE PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

14. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

Chairman Reynolds encouraged everyone to be part of conversations and to be comfortable with motions no matter where they are at. It does help that he is a talker and he circles back on comments and things like that but it is helpful to ask questions, and when there are things that pop up in their packet that are questions, they have staff to reach out to prior to the meeting if they don't feel comfortable. He added that they are looking at complex sites. He feels sometimes that they have limited conversations sometimes on some of these complex projects. He thought it would be helpful to make everyone's voice is heard because they all represent different thoughts, opinions, and skillsets.

15. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Trustee Urbanowski said that they will be miss seeing Planner Fazzini.
Chairman Reynolds welcomed Derek Brackon to the Commission.

16. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Trustee Urbanowski, seconded by Commissioner Gingell, to adjourn the meeting at 9:25 p.m. **Motion carried.**

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Walton
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary
Charter Township of Orion

Planning Commission Approval Date