

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION PLANNING COMMISSION

***** MINUTES *****

WORKSHOP, WEDNESDAY, JULY 21, 2021

The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a workshop meeting in person at the Orion Center, 1335 Joslyn Road on Wednesday, July 21, 2021, at 6 pm.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Don Walker, PC Rep to ZBA	Joe St. Henry, Secretary
Scott Reynolds, Chairman	Jessica Gingell, Commissioner
Kim Urbanowski, BOT Rep to PC	Derek Brackon, Commissioner
Don Gross, Vice-Chairman	

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:

None.

1. OPEN MEETING

Chairman Reynolds opened the workshop meeting at 6:00 pm.

2. ROLL CALL

As noted

CONSULTANTS PRESENT:

Rodney Arroyo, (Township Planner) of Giffels Webster
Eric Fazzini, (Township Planner) of Giffels Webster
Eric Pietsch, (Township Planner) of Giffels Webster
Mark Landis (Township Engineer) of Orchard, Hiltz, and McCliment, Inc.
Tammy Girling, Township Planning & Zoning Director

OTHERS PRESENT:

Caitlyn Habben Nick Habben
Dan Dewey

3. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL

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

4. NEW BUSINESS/UNFINISHED BUSINESS

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

Planner Arroyo said that they have a lot of material to cover, they are going to notice now that their work sessions are going to become a little more intense now as they start diving into the plans.

Planner Arroyo stated that he wanted to briefly go over the Public Input Summary, it will be short. He added that in terms of the preferred development style in rural areas, there was generally more support for the increased setback in the front along major roadways than there was for the status quo. He said in terms of the front setback that was one issue in rural areas. Preferred housing style in some of the denser areas where they were looking at some missing middle, the two housing style types that got the most support were duplexes, and then the cottage court development, which is the smaller detached units that front on a green area rather than fronting on a street. The Cottage Court had 30%, the Duplex had 25%. He thought it was interesting to see some of those responses. He added that the single-family homes the number

one style was the side entry garage, they had 44% support of that. The recessed garage with the detached look they had 27% that were in support of that.

Planner Arroyo said in terms of 15-minute neighborhoods they have a lot of positive feedback for the concept of 15-minute neighborhoods. They had 69% saying the overall support of the idea of 15-minute neighborhoods. The Hamlet concept had 59% support and then the Decker and Friendship Woods locations as being appropriate 52% said yes, 31% said no, and 17% said maybe. He said generally, good support, and some of the comments they heard also from people that have lived in some of the areas, particularly in the Decker area, a lot of positive feedback. He thought that they liked the idea of having a more walkable neighborhood with a few limited retail and entertainment or restaurant type uses that are low key fitting in with the concept of the scale of the neighborhood.

Planner Arroyo noted that in terms of spending priorities, the number one vote-getting was natural resources protection at 20%. Along with that, was shade trees & pedestrian amenities along Major Roads was at 17%, and Bike Paths was at 13%. He thought that they got a lot of participation, they had a nice turnout, and they also had the online turnout as well, which he felt helped as well, being open for an additional four days.

Planner Arroyo asked if there were any questions on the Open House? Trustee Urbanowski asked how much online input was received? Planner Arroyo said that he didn't have that number with him but would have it for them the next time. He thought that they had quite a few.

Planner Arroyo said looking at the Future Land Use plan because it is the foundation for their zoning map, ultimately, because their zoning ordinance is supposed to be based upon a plan. Their plan is very important because all of these applications they will see in the future for rezoning, PUD's, or other related applications they are going to refer back to this document. It is important that they review the Future Land Use plan and be careful about the recommendations and the policies that are included here. He added that it is really a reflection of what they like, and what is working now. So, reflecting that current land use pattern but then looking to the future and saying what needs to change about that land use pattern to reflect the vision that they have established as part of the Master Plan. The goal here is to update that Future Land Use map to reflect the future vision.

Planner Arroyo showed the Board the Future Land Use classifications align with their current zoning classifications. For example, the rural residential Suburban Farms (SF) low single-family density, Future Land Use category which is the one unit for every 2.5-acres in the Master Plan, that equates to their (SF) zoning district at 2.5-acres per unit. The single-family medium-low (with septic) is 1 unit per 1.5-acres, and in the Master Plan that equates to the Suburban Estates (SE) which is the 1.5-acre minimum lot size. The medium (with utilities) is 1.2 dwelling units per acre, and that is the Suburban Range (SR) zoning at 30,000-sq. ft. lots. Then the single-family medium-high 3-5 dwelling units per acre which equal that range of 8,400 – 14,800-sq. ft. lots. Then the multiple-family low, which is 5-7 dwelling units, roughly works out to 6 dwelling units per acre, depending on the number of rooms they have on average. Then with the multiple-family medium, which is 7-9 dwelling units per acres, in the zoning ordinance it roughly works out to about 8 dwelling units per acre but it can vary depending upon the room type that they have.

Planner Arroyo said that they have not seen 2.5-acre lot subdivisions being built. He noted that there is a question, particularly when there is sewer available if that is a reasonable category to have in terms of minimum lot area. He stated that they wanted to have a discussion with them about whether or not they think that is still valid, and whether or not there could be a potential to modify or just combine into one category, or eliminate the (SF) and maybe focus that area, kind

of move it into the single-family medium-low, which is equivalent to (SE) which would be a 1.5-acre minimum. There are a lot of discussions, he wanted to start with that one because he thought that was a big question. He thought that one of the things that they do need to think about is how viable is that classification. If they are not seeing development occurring, and even in neighboring communities, he didn't know if they are seeing a lot of 2.5-acre lot development occurring from a financial feasibility standpoint. He has heard before that many developers will tell them that it is very difficult for that to be feasible. He wasn't saying that there wasn't somebody that can do it, he is just not seeing examples of it, he didn't know if they were aware of any, that they have seen in nearby areas, but it is a challenge and he wanted to have a discussion about it.

Chairman Reynolds asked for thoughts on combining Suburban Estates (SE), and Suburban Farms (SF).

Vice-Chairman Gross thought that the Suburban Farms (SF) with 2.5-acres designation is more of a reflection of existing large parcels. Not necessarily new subdivisions but large parcels that they inherited over the years from farmsteads. He agreed that they were not going to see a new subdivision of 2.5-acre lot sizes coming forward. If they are thinking of just preserving what is already there that is one thought but if they are looking at the future down the road, what can they expect to see and encourage he thought that they would be fighting an uphill battle trying to enforce 2.5 acre lots in some of those areas.

Secretary St. Henry asked what are the benefits of consolidating these zoning classifications? Right now, with 2.5-acre lots, a developer comes in, puts a proposal in front of them for a (PUD) they sit there and negotiate back and forth, ideally it doesn't become a Consent Judgement and they are able to find some middle ground. Typically, they are able to lower the density a little bit from what they proposed, and they go from there. None of them are fans of (PUD)'s and that whole process and what is involved, although they do gain a certain degree of control and negotiating ability with a (PUD). But what are the benefits of changing that? Does it make it easier for a developer or easier for them? He didn't know if that was really what they want given the character of their community. There are plenty of historic 2.5-acre lot residential parcels.

Planner Arroyo replied that a couple of options could be ultimately when they recraft and rewrite the zoning to implement this, they may maintain a 2.5-acre minimum for lots that are fronting on major roadways, for example, but allow for the reduction if they are not creating new access roads other than an internal roadway. So potentially allowing on internal new subdivision going to a smaller size, that would be unusual, but it is something that they could think about. He added that there was a question of what are the benefits. One of them potentially trying to protect themselves from a future challenge to the 2.5-acre minimum lot size. That is certainly something that could be real, and cost the Township money, that is one reason. Another reason is that if they establish a more reasonable larger lot size that is viable, they may actually start to see development that is occurring at that level, and hopefully reducing the request for (PUD), particularly when if they are careful with the way, they designate these areas on the map and they make sense to be low-density, if someone comes in with a (PUD) then hopefully they are going to try to maintain the spirit of the Master Plan. They may give them a little flexibility if that is warranted but they will still hopefully not be making radical changes in the overall plan density because they have adjusted their map, and their category, to something they believe, is a more accurate vision. He thought that they want to try to not be in a position where they are approving (PUD)s that radically change the vision that is in the Master Plan, so that is another advantage to potentially making the change.

Chairman Reynolds said his initial thoughts are, he didn't have any pushbacks on combining some of the (SF) low and (SF) medium-low. He said from a Master Plan standpoint, even from

a technical vision moving forward in a zoning instance there is a need for multiple designations, he could respect that. He thought from a big picture of thinking about Master Plan and vision it is more to him about is it small, medium, or large, type of vision. Whether that is an acre or an acre and a half, that is more of the discussion point of is it a tight-knit neighborhood, is a little bit more of a sprawling estate or farm estate lot, and then something a little denser before they get into the multi-family concepts. He said he would be in favor of looking at streamlining some of these for discussion's sake and then if there are caveats or when they get to multi-family where they have talked about in the zoning density bonus based on some of those features, he thought that they could look at something similar for Suburban Farms (SF) or Suburban Estates (SE) certain feature criteria to where they say they want to maintain this aesthetic whether it is technically one acre, one and a half, or even two or greater, that is the bigger vision for him.

Planner Arroyo said that the (SF) medium, which is the equivalent of (SR), the density is still pretty low. They are talking about single-family medium but 30,000-sq. ft. lot is roughly $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre. When you look at the next classification down which is their 14,000-sq. ft. lot, that is a pretty big gap. He added that they were wondering if they had any thoughts on those lot sizes and how they apply. Anything that they would like them to bring back some examples or test out some concepts if there are any concerns, or issues they have with those classifications.

Chairman Reynolds said he saw where they were headed, where they were as a Township 20-years ago is not where they are at with the Township today. The idea of having a third or half-acre lot is few and far between these days. He wanted to think in the bigger vision from a Master Planning standpoint that they are creating some hierarchy and protecting those larger and promoting larger estates even if it is not financially feasible these days but let's move their vision towards, acknowledging that they still want the spread-out neighborhoods and knowing that most of their development effectively an (R-2) or (R-3). He thought that they need to acknowledge that lot sizes have gotten smaller but in the same regard know that as a Township that they probably want to maintain that sprawling kind of rural aesthetic in some areas. He thought that there is some right-sizing that needs to happen just from acknowledging some of the developments that have occurred but not throw away that middle housing component that they've had and was the development type 10-years ago. Some things might pivot it might change, they might start getting back to lots that they want to promote that kind of medium density or there might be a desire for developer to push back towards that (SR) or (SE) style development.

Trustee Urbanowski said that Heather Lake Estates, or even right across there, what is the classification there? Chairman Reynolds replied that a lot of those homes are on 3-quarters of an acre up to 3-acre lots. Some of those back of those developments are one 3-quarter acre lots, the front can be 2-3 acres. Keatington for example is probably 1/4-acre lots, there are others that are even less than that. A 1/3-acre lot in many regards it feels like the houses are comfortably spread apart.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated that Heather Lakes is zoned (SE).

Secretary St. Henry stated that Round Tree is unique, it was built in the mid-'90s and those lots are bigger than any newer subdivision that he was aware of. Planning & Zoning Director stated that Round Tree was (R-1).

The Planning & Zoning Director stated that what she was seeing was Suburban Farms (SF) is pretty much open parcels, not neighborhoods.

Trustee Urbanowski said just from driving into Heather Lakes to her it seemed massive, and she was wondering just in comparison.

Chairman Reynolds said that an acre is large, most lots that they are seeing these days are a quarter, not even. He said he didn't have an issue with the smaller lots but thought that one of the components about when they talk about some of the facts from the Open House is what are the features, what else do they want to promote that supports some of those higher density areas that still keep some of those other features that are kind of important that they started with as a Township 30-years ago.

Vice-Chairman Gross thought that one of the problems that they are going to be seeing over the next few years, and they have seen it in the last 10-years, is they are not going to see subdivisions being built as they once knew them. The process is too lengthy, it is too cumbersome, and a developer can come in under a (PUD) or a cluster and develop the property as opposed to going through the platting process. He added that looking at it in terms of lot sizes he didn't know if they were equating what they are trying to accomplish.

Secretary St. Henry said that they have seen it over and over, over the last 5-6-years that a developer comes in and they have a vision and it doesn't matter what the Master Plan looks like and the Future Land Use. They will move forward with their proposal and go through the process because that is their right and they see what happens if they don't agree with them.

Planner Arroyo said that is still going to happen, however, how they react to it is going to have an impact on how often it happens. If they have a plan that they stand behind and they feel the density recommendations are good and solid then they are likely not going to want to approve something that is substantially deviating from the vision. If they are consistent with that, they will not see as many requests for it because people know that in Orion Township, they stand behind their Master Plan and they will give them some flexibility where they need flexibility but they are not going to deviate substantially from the density recommendation. They do tend to attract more of those (PUD) requests when there is a recognition that maybe the Master Plan is out of date, or the community just prefers (PUD)'s and is always going to want them. If they are telegraphing that message to the development community then they are likely to see more of them. They can control some of it by their actions.

Secretary St. Henry stated that an (SF) classification of 2.5-acres, a developer looks at that and says that is out of date people don't buy homes like that anymore, so if push comes to shove, they could convince somebody that that is not legit. Planner Arroyo replied absolutely. He added that they see it all the time. Secretary St. Henry said they see it. He asked if they combine those, and increase the density by 1 or 1.5, that a developer says, ok they are more in line with contemporary planning thinking of what is really going on, so we will not have as much wiggle room. Planner Arroyo said particularly if they know that they are not going to approve something that is sustainably different. He added that even the 1-1.5-acre lot is really at the edge of what is likely going to be developed. There is not a lot of 1.5-acre lots subdivisions going in. There are some 1-acre lot subdivisions in this region that have gone with water and sewer in the last 10-15-years you see them, they don't see them often but they have happened they have been very attractive there have been some good ones that have happened. Once you start getting beyond 1-acre then the financial feasibility of the expenditure and once again the desirability of those lots in the market, because once you up the acreage you are getting the price way up. If you are building estates lots that are targeted to the very wealthy, yes, you may have the right mix they may be successful. Beyond that, it becomes very challenging to then pay for that and demand the price they need to put all the amenities, and utilities that are necessary to support it.

Planner Fazzini stated that they can rewrite the classification. So, to combine single-family low and medium-low could be a whole new description of what they want there, it is primarily

agriculture, septic only, no (PUD)s things like that. They can tweak the numbers but also tweak the important description that goes with that.

Chairman Reynolds thought it would be worthwhile taking it through the lens of the last 10-years of development to evaluate and to set some of their goals and proprieties within some realism of what they have seen. Then be able to within reach push back and maintain some of those features that have always been important. It is kind of working with tools that they have been presented because they are moving away from the large lots but they also have a lot of (SF) zoning that is out there that is being swallowed up by (PUDs) that go, hey to your point, it is not realistic, but I want to be R-3, and they are like that is a pretty far venture. He was not so hung up on dwelling units per acre, he knew a lot of times that is one factor from the Future Land Use calculation, he thought for him it was more the aesthetic and the general concepts that are pulled together that establish that zoning type. If that meant (SE) larger lots, less public amenities but if they are going to start getting into squeezing some of these lot sizes down some of the basic features and set the bar to say they want to have some of the setbacks from the road and things that are not going to have a major effect on their community visual and impact but they know that may be the right size development that fits a budget, price point, and a future point for those people that are in the missing middle. How do they get the early starters here? If it is a higher density development maybe that is where they are saying ok, they get this but here are some of the criteria walking into it. There is the wooded drive access or things that they don't visually impact. Although it affects themselves as a community it is not a stark contrast to some of the other aesthetics there is a nice blend through those features. He did think that they need to get realistic with some of the lot sizes but he also thought that they have the right if they are playing a little bit to raise the bar too. What does this mean by getting realistic and are they throwing away our vision for the last 30-years, are they maintaining it, he didn't know or do they need to add some other features to kind of counteract those changes.

Secretary St. Henry said that they hear on a regular basis, that people move to this community because they want to get out of Troy, Sterling Heights, Rochester, and some of the other southern more-high density much more congested communities, they want to come out and see woods, and long stretches with no homes. Now, what they are talking about here is realistic, it is real, it is what the market bears now, it is what is going on across the country, and he gets that. He asked how do they balance that with the demand for people that have not only lived here for decades but even more recent families that have moved into this community that like space, they don't want any more traffic, how do they find that middle ground? Because as soon as they start messing with this and get rid of these 2.5-acre designations, people are going to notice that, and even though we know it is realistic, they know that people don't think realistically when it comes to things like this. Planner Arroyo thought that a lot of it comes down to the perception of the development, what do people notice. He thought that they have the potential that if they are going to allow for a reduction in the minimum lot size and a slight increase in the density that they can do that but in order to get that there are things that they have to provide, and that could mean those additional setbacks from the main road so that it still has the rural look when they drive down the roadway. It doesn't look like the homes are jammed up against it. Other types of amenities and site development features that will change the perception so that instead of people driving by and saying, oh my gosh that looks like a regular subdivision in the middle of this rural area, they are going to drive by and just see an entryway, and wooded areas, or split rail fence and have the look that has always been there. Maybe a little further back that is where those homes are, and it doesn't have the same impact. A lot of people don't like to see change, and they don't like to see development. He thought that they could be creative in terms of how they craft that and allow it to happen so that they minimize the impact on the community character that they see in the rural portions of the Township. He thought that it would be an interesting challenge to craft that into a zoning ordinance and turn it into

something attractive to the development community, and at the same time preserve that community character.

Secretary St. Henry said what he doesn't want is an open door. He doesn't want to change the Master Plan to the point that people think that developers can come in and do whatever they want. He wants them to have to work a little bit because this community has been around for a long time. They must keep the character of this community as much as possible.

Planner Arroyo said that he thought that they needed to consider some adjustments to the multi-family. He thought particularly the upper end needs to bump up some. He saw in the market a lot of products that are three stories, in the traditional apartment realm. They can't really do that there; they are limited to 2 ½. That equates to a number that is a little bit higher in terms of density. He wasn't talking about doing this all over the place, they can have some targeted areas, when they get around to fine-tuning the map, maybe it is a third classification, or spreading out the multiple family medium to give it a little more range. Maybe there are incentives that enable that to happen, in order to get to this level, they have to do X. He wanted their thoughts on that but that would be his thought as they would come back to them with some ideas for how they could accommodate some different styles of multiple-family housing but at the same time also maybe get some more of the amenities and other components that would look attractive in the community.

Chairman Reynolds stated that dwelling unit per acre has never been one of his favorite increments. He knew it is a standard but there are some desirable multi-family housing types that pinched out based on that factor. He thought they are a little low especially when they reviewed the Baldwin district, and maybe the BIZ district, that they looked at some bonus criteria there. He thought there was an opportunity to raise those numbers again with not putting caveats and conditions on everything but a dwelling unit of on small nice unit that might promote young professional or a development that promotes young professionals might have a very high dwelling unit per acre piece that would be desirable to those young professionals trying to move into this town, verses, dwelling unit per acre that is a three-bedroom development. In his perspective, they could have the same load of citizens or public utility use in both of those but he sees a very different dwelling unit per acre numbers. He thought that there were some criteria or thought put towards what types they want to see especially since they acknowledged some of those missing components especially the beginning half of the Township, that they are pinching them out. With the right mindset, they could promote that development and not see something that is necessarily hundreds of units, a massive development with super wedged in lots. He felt that there was a little bit more there than just that one statement.

Secretary St. Henry said this is Orion Township, northern Oakland County is the home to a ton of auto suppliers, they are starting to see a lot of retirements, more and more younger engineers, younger professionals, that have opportunities to come here. The robotics field is just growing beyond belief in southeast Michigan. Young people have a much different perspective on what appealing housing is all about compared to their older generation of parents, and grandparents. They must take that into consideration or they will go elsewhere. He said that he has seen these massive developments out in Seattle, these 6-8 story apartment complexes packed with young people, mixed-use developments, but it is congested and there is a lot of people. He doesn't necessarily think that is what he envisions for their community but in certain places, these types of living areas could be very desirable to young single professionals, but it has to be in the right place.

Trustee Urbanowski agreed. She remembers when she started at the chamber and they were trying to work on the young entrepreneurs and that was the point was trying to foster relationships with the students in the High School and the younger college folks, telling them not

to leave, stay here contribute to your community. She said she didn't know what the numbers are in the schools but she felt their enrollment is down, not just this last year, but it feels like it has been declining anyway. Tiny homes were a thing for a while, she thought people are trying to focus on different priorities, at least young people. She has a child that is 28 and there is no way that a big is in the cards, they want to travel. She thought that they needed to address and acknowledge that as well.

Trustee Urbanowski said she would be interested in knowing what Chairman Reynolds was talking about. She thinks they should keep the aesthetics that they are talking about and having it look a certain way. They are very specific about them showing the materials, and they want a certain look to the facades.

Chairman Reynolds said some of the types that they looked at in the Open House can drive up that dwelling unit per acre and when they consider what a dwelling unit is that would be one unit versus how many bedrooms or the square footage or the number of people truly that are attracted by that unit might look completely different. They might live in a 1,200-sq. ft. unit but it is one or two-bedroom and it is just fitting to a young professional lifestyle. When they promote it to being a three-bedroom place yes there is a little bit different there but they might find young professionals or people they want to attract do not want a one- or two-bedroom place maybe they want three bedrooms to have a home office, a guest bedroom, and then their master bedroom but there is only one person living in that unit.

Planner Arroyo stated that the next thing was on (PUD)'s and Consent Judgements. He said he would rather focus more on the map because they are running out of time on this but will come back to this at a later meeting.

Planner Arroyo said that one of the concepts that he wanted them to think about is potentially designating their approved (PUD)'s on the Future Land Use map, just indicating and maintaining where they are, so everyone knows that it is a separate designation that has already been agreed to by contract and that might be something to include in this. Secretary St. Henry questioned if it was existing developments, not that it was a (PUD) so people when they look at the map? Planner Arroyo replied that even though the underlying zoning may be whatever it is there is going to be a hatched area over that and it is going to say (PUD) and they will know that it is an approved (PUD). He added for all of them carrying forward they would then be there and that would be a designation. The other option is to go in and look at what is approved in those (PUD)'s and start to adjust the Future Land Use classification to reflect what they approved. They don't have to settle that tonight but for them to think about it and they will dive into that a little more. The Planning & Zoning Director asked if it was labeling (PUD) on the Future Land Use Map? Planner Arroyo replied correct. The Planning & Zoning Director Girling said so the current zoning map already shows (PUD)s but he was talking about the Future Land Use Map.

Planner Arroyo said they are looking at sections 31 and 32. He added in on the slides a segment of Independence Township just so they could see what is going on across the border. He added that Independence Township has a Rec area and then has a one-acre lot minimum category. When they start looking at section 31 which is the corner, they have 2.5-acre and then they have 1.5-acre and then they have the 30,000-sq. ft., that is their Master Plan as it currently exists, on the zoning map. This is the very far southwest corner 2.5-acre, 1.5-acres, and 30,000-sq. ft. is what makes up section 31. He showed them side by side the Future Land Use Map and the Zoning Map. He showed them that there is an existing (R-1) zoning classification that should be reflected on the Future Land Use map but also this kind of raises that question of 2.5-acres. Independence Township on the other side of the street they are at 1-acre. They got Baldwin Rd. to the east, and they got (GB) and some fairly intense density there, then they go to real low density then the density bumps up as they move west and go into

Independence Township. He thought that was a good area to spend some time looking at how these classifications and their Future Land Use plan can ultimately be potentially changed to reflect a density, development pattern that they consider to be desirable and appropriate.

Secretary St. Henry asked if Independence Township adjust their classifications at some point, maybe they were at 2.5 acres 30-years ago? Planner Arroyo did not know that for sure but could find out. Secretary St. Henry said to tighten it up so there is less wiggle room and is that why that area hasn't been developed that much. He added that he was just curious if they were more proactive than they have been in the past, and saw the same issue. Literally from here to Clarkston 10-miles up the road, they have a lot of these historical lots that are bigger rural.

Planner Arroyo showed them a map of sections 31 & 32. He said there is I-75 on the south side, the Baldwin Rd. interchange, there is Brown Rd., they have (GB), the (BIZ) district, there is a lot of intensity right near this. This is the southern end of the Township and when he looks at it, it doesn't scream 2.5-acre lots.

Chairman Reynolds said he thought acknowledging some of the discussions they have had about right-sizing some of the Future Land Use components, he thought was one part of it. Also, acknowledging are larger lots the best fit, maybe to the west on Morgan, there is a decent fit for some of those larger lot sizes. But maybe there is a middle ground of really what is the aesthetic, there is one thing for the facts on paper but there is another of how it translates into reality and he thought that is the important part. Do they want to maintain some of those private corridors and that rural feel? He thought it could occur with even a half or third acre lots but there are some of those pieces that need to be modified or that vision to be supportive of that designation. He thought it was interesting to see just right across the border to see one acre kind of being right then and there. He felt it might be something to evaluate and acknowledge the fact that the I-75 corridor is just naturally become denser and a hub for a lot of different things.

Secretary St. Henry said that they could keep everything the way it is and for the next 5-years at least within the borders of Orion Township they have to wrestle with what they have been dealing with developers coming in and seeing what they can do. He added that he is to the point where there has got to be a way to change the rules so they have more legit control over what goes in, how it goes in, and it doesn't end up in front of a judge. He is very frustrated with that.

Vice-Chairman Gross said do they want to plan the future or do they want to negotiate the future.

Secretary St. Henry stated that they have seen that when they try to negotiate if a builder doesn't like what they are hearing they escalate the situation.

Chairman Reynolds thought that Vice-Chairman Gross's comments were right. If they take a look at a lot of things it is the move of these visionary pieces that guide where they are heading. He was going along, although it is not residential it is a similar platform in the commercial sense along Big Beaver if they have seen how that corridor has changed significantly. It went from they acknowledged it was a boulevard, it was four or five lanes in multiple directions and they promoted a walkable, there is a street-face right up along the road, that is a Master Plan tool, that is what they want to see, and then, therefore, a zoning tool that got implemented there. It takes a little time to get there but it does work. He thought it was something to say what do they want to see, and then, therefore, let's follow it up with the actual tools to get there.

Planner Arroyo said that was his plan, that was a fun project and it has been interesting to see it happen. It was supposed to be a lot denser than what has happened but it was 2008 and everyone knows what happened in 2008 things didn't go so well for the development community. They can direct a lot of that themselves.

Planning & Zoning Director said that she remembered that when they were looking at one of their projects off of Joslyn that crossed the railroad that was primarily wet had a little bit of upland, she heard comments that when they are working on the Master Plan maybe they should at where they see blue and maybe a little bit more thought should be put into those that have large pockets of wet. How that fits in she just wanted to throw that comment out there as she was looking and see streams through this area that they are talking about. She wanted to remind the Planning Commission of that comment and Planner Arroyo of what to do with that.

Planner Arroyo showed them Section 32 with Baldwin Rd. interchange at the southern end. This is the Future Land Use plan including the Village Center area. The (BIZ) is essentially what they are seeing in the purple, it is called industrial commercial residential mixed-use in the Master Plan. Then they see 30,000-sq. ft. lots south of Judah and then north single-family medium-low 1.5-acre lots. He added that one of the observations in question particularly looking at the east side of Baldwin Rd., he drove it again just to refresh himself, could the Village Center actually be expanded a little more to go into that area that is currently is the (BIZ) that sticks up and goes along the east side of Baldwin Rd. there. He added that now that the boulevard is in it almost seems like the east, and west sides of the road should have a similar character. He thought he would raise that question or observation to see if they felt that might be something that could belong in the Village Center.

Chairman Reynolds stated that he likes the (BIZ) zoning he thought that there were some similarities between the Village Center and (BIZ). He tends to agree that the Village Center may be a better fit to come south down as seeing that some of that is developed. He was less concerned about that transition along Baldwin than the one along Joslyn, that one to him seemed more of the issue. (BIZ) to Village Center seems to maybe relate the other stepdown from more (BIZ) to (R-1) is more his struggle right now. Especially, without that corridor being developed yet, and he didn't know in any sense if that should be developed.

Vice-Chairman Gross said looking at the current land use plan that shows single-family medium-low and single-family medium; he didn't know what the distinction is, it didn't seem to make sense? Planner Arroyo replied that if they were trying to support their Village Center area which they would want to have more obviously retail/restaurant uses is this an area when maybe a little more density might make some sense to get some more rooftops there to support those businesses. Vice-Chairman Gross didn't know if the single-family medium on the south side of Judah Rd. makes any sense? Planner Arroyo stated that was one of the questions he had as well. Vice-Chairman Gross said versus keeping them the same on both sides.

Chairman Reynolds thought that they did need to look at some of the transition areas if they are picking at some of these driving uses and corridors. How do they have a nice transition from that (BIZ) use or the Village Center use to (SF), naturally that isn't what they want to see, he knew that sometimes it does occur. He didn't know if they were promoting that to occur within those uses or introducing uses that split those two zoning designations?

Planner Arroyo said that next month, they are going to have a larger area to look at they are going to be diving in.

Secretary St. Henry said regarding section 32 unless he is mistaken, they are already seeing a much more higher-density housing developments going in there right now. There is a condo

development directly across from church property on Baldwin Rd. leading into the (BIZ) area. They have some developments on the dockets that they are going to be talking about later today. He is curious to see how those play out over the next few years and to see if that vision for how that area looks behind Menards. If it works, to him, it would be natural for that whole area to be the higher density portion of their community right off the highway. They are starting to see that now with a few developments that have gone in and they are coming up and they thought that they were comfortable with and to see where that takes them.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Trustee Urbanowski, seconded by Commissioner Brackon to adjourn the meeting at 6:59 p.m. **Motion carried.**

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Walton
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary
Charter Township of Orion

Planning Commission Approval Date