CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION PLANNING COMMISSION
****** MINUTES *****
REGULAR MEETING, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2021

The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, September 15, 2021, at 7:00 pm at the Orion Township Community Center, 1335 Joslyn Rd., Lake Orion, Michigan 48360

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT
Scott Reynolds, Chairman
Don Gross, Vice-Chairman
Joe St. Henry, Secretary
Jessica Gingell, Commissioner

Don Walker, PC Rep to ZBA
Kim Urbanowski, BOT Rep to PC
Derek Brackon, Commissioner

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:
None.

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

2. ROLL CALL
As noted

CONSULTANTS PRESENT:
Rodney Arroyo, (Township Planner) of Giffels Webster
Matt Wojciechowski, (Township Planner) of Giffels Webster
Mark Landis (Township Engineer) of Orchard, Hiltz, and McCliment, Inc.
Tammy Girling, Township Planning & Zoning Director

OTHERS PRESENT:
Jeff Klatt
Bill Schmitz
Allen Eizember
Dave Murphy

Jeff Schmitz
Ashley Hackman
Tom Beauchamp
Tom Roth

3. MINUTES
A. 09-01-21, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes
B. 09-01-21, Planning Commission Public Hearing Minutes, PC-2021-63, Meijer SLU
Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, to approve both sets of minutes, as submitted. **Motion carried**

4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL

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

6. CONSENT AGENDA
None

7. NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Reynolds asked if the applicant was present?

Mr. Jeff Klatt with Kreger Klatt Architects, 2120 E. 11 Mile Rd., Royal Oak, presented.
Mr. Klatt said he was also there with the developer and owner Jeff Schmitz, and Bill Schmitz as well. He noted that they also own Tommy’s Car Wash which is on the same parcel as the one in question tonight. He stated that they have a brief architectural presentation that they will present. They are also aware that they have not received full approval from the various site plan, comments that they received, and they will address that in their presentation tonight. They are still seeking their approval with a caveat that they will work administratively with the Planning Department, as well, as their consultants to address these items administratively.

Mr. Klatt noted that there were a handful of items that were mentioned in the Giffels Webster letter, he believed that there were five items that were mentioned, that they are looking to gain their approval tonight as well, which they will address in their presentation.

Mr. Klatt said that Planning & Zoning Director Girling and her staff have been very helpful throughout the process, and appreciated their guidance. He said they had a great pre-application meeting which was helpful for their team as well. He thought that the misunderstanding happened because they thought it was a two-part submittal with the heavy engineering taking place at the permit level versus the Planning Commission level.

Mr. Klatt pulled up the presentation for the Commissioners. He stated that the highlighted areas is the property in question, as they are aware this is near the NW corner of Joslyn and Brown Rd. They are adjacent to the Bank of America building as well as Tommy’s Car Wash. The proposed site is about 1.3 acres on the west side near Tommy’s Car Wash. The original plan for Tommy’s Car Wash did suggest a design for the adjacent parcel. It indicated about a 5,000-sq. ft. retail building with the same general and maneuvering lanes that were laid out on the site. The only modification to their plan, the parking is the same, maneuvering lanes are the same, the building footprint decreased a bit, they are about 4,300-sq. ft. as compared to 5,000-sq. ft. In some of the photographs many of the site improvements have been made, there is landscaping in the front right-of-way, site lighting is already in place, a lot of the infrastructure is already in place, a lot of the catch basins are there, some of the landscaping islands are in place as well. The retail use is appropriate in this zoning district. He showed them some of the existing photos, many were shot that day. He said that they could see some of those improvements that he had mentioned, there is the maneuvering lane up the middle, which will be shared for the two uses. They can see the vegetation of the landscape that is already in the front setback. He showed them an existing view to the west looking at the existing sidewalk and some of that landscape that is already in place, and they could see the site lighting. He showed them a picture of one of the curb islands that were already in place.

Mr. Klatt showed the commissioner’s the proposed site plan. He stated that they have made some of the adjustments, they have not submitted formally yet but they had already addressed some of the comments that were in the Giffels Webster write-up. So, #1 this is the actual parcel in question the 1.3-acres highlighted in the yellow, and Tommy’s Car Wash is on the right-hand side. #2 suggests that maneuvering lane which is the blue line up the middle, which will provide access to the Tommy’s Car Wash site, as well as, the Mattress Firm, and that runs right up the center of the site with one access point to Brown Rd. #3 is the proposed building in the darker shade of gray, and #4 is the existing Tommy’s Car Wash Building. #5 is the proposed parking for the Mattress Firm site. They are proposing 56 parking spaces and thought they were over by 36. As they will indicate in the presentation this is a shared site so they thought that the park can be useful for both uses on the site so they are requesting to keep that. #6 is the loading zone; #7 is their new trash area. #8 one important feature, they placed the building here to maintain a consistent building setback, to match the line of the Tommy’s Car Wash building that is in place.
Mr. Klatt showed them the floor plan of the Mattress Firm. The upper right-hand corner is the portion of the building that will face the road, a lot of corner glass a pretty simple layout, 4,300-sq. ft. mostly open space for Mattress Firm. The exterior design is fairly contemporary in nature which is really a play off the Tommy’s aesthetic, straight lines, fairly straightforward, contemporary appearance, one story in height, high-end materials, modular brick with some soldier course accents. They are using a high-quality metal siding which is Longboard replicates wood but of course low-maintenance. They also have some other decorative metals on the buildings for accents. A lot of glazing, which meets the ordinance requirements, was one comment that they adjusted. They had to meet the 60% requirement on Brown Rd., which they did, and there is a canopy as well too.

Mr. Klatt showed them some other views of the building.

Mr. Klatt said in regards to the site plan review letters, one from the WRC, there were no comments that they had to address. They received one from the Fire Department that was approved with no comments. They did receive a letter with various comments from Giffels Webster and they are confident that they can address the majority of them. There are five items that they do need their approval on. From OHM they had nine total comments, and their Tri-County Engineering is confident that they can address all of those requirements. He added that they needed a survey to complete the grading plan, the survey was completed this week, so he is actively working on the grading plan, and they are asking to work administratively with the engineering department on that.

Mr. Klatt said in the Giffels Webster letter there were five waivers that they needed from the Planning Commission. #1 is the setback waiver for deficient building setback along the west side. He thought that there was a 10% discrepancy they meet that. The ordinance is 20-ft. they have a 16-ft. setback and thought that they were in the ground for approval. #2 is a setback waiver for deficient parking setback along the west property line. They feel they need the parking due to the various uses on the site. They have a landscape buffer on the east side of the site, they are simply proposing to match that on the west side for consistency. #3 is the parking in front of the building. They are holding a consistent building line across the front they feel it is beneficial for the customers to have parking close to the building. Paving wraps around the front of the building, and they are holding a consistent landscape frontage in that area which is consistent with Tommy’s and some of the photos that he showed them earlier so they would keep that parking.

Mr. Klatt stated that #4 the property will be split into two lots, and he believed that was the case, they are requesting to split the property. This has to deal with the deficient parking setback, from his understanding, if they split the lot, they may have a setback issue because they are tight to the lot line in each case, but felt it would be awkward to have an internal landscape island up the middle of the site since these are shared uses. #5 is to be an ancillary use permitted prior to a primary use. Those are the five items that they are seeking their approval for this evening.

Mr. Klatt said that a handful of other items suggested land banking some of the parking but they really want to keep the parking as they feel it is great for the shared uses on the site. He added that the front yard greenbelt that has to do with the parking that they have in the front. They feel that they are consistent with what is already in place for Tommy’s, it is attractive and it works, and it helps to shield the view. The last comment is in regard to the drive aisles, they are in excess of 22-ft. which is the minimum standard. During the pre-application the Fire Marshal actually liked the fact that they had wider drives, so they are requesting to keep the drive aisles a bit wider than they have shown here.
Planner Arroyo read through his review date stamped September 8, 2021.

Engineer Landis read through his review date stamped September 9, 2021.

Chairman Reynolds stated that they had the Fire Marshal’s review of the plan and had no additional comments. They also had the Public Service Director that had no issues or further comments at this point and time. There was a site walk completed by the Site Walk Committee. The RCOC had no preliminary comments at this time. WRC had no comments since there was not any storm proposed on the site or on the plans.

Commissioner Brackon asked if they reduce the aisle widths will that get rid of the need for the side yard setback? Planner Arroyo replied yes.

Commissioner Brackon asked what the purpose of the wider aisles?

Mr. Jeff Schmitz at 155 Romeo Rd., Rochester, MI. He is the developer and owner of the site.

Mr. Schmitz said he didn’t know if any of them have been to their new Tommy’s Car Wash site that is open. They are at 22-ft., it is the Township’s minimum requirement, they are at 28-ft., they are talking 6-ft. Those vacuums are busy all the time, the more space the better, they want to keep that buffer, drive aisle, separated. There is a lot of people that walk around their cars, they don’t want the minimum. They are looking at their own personal liability and safety, they are talking about 6-ft., that is for safety. They have a mom and her two kids, she is vacuuming the kid’s run around the outside, and the back of the car.

Mr. Schmitz stated that when he first brought the Tommy’s concept to them there were three houses that were on those three different parcels. Those three houses were in terrible shape, he bought two of them. He came before them, with his Tommy’s presentation, and in good faith, as a developer the Township said that he had to buy the third house because no one would ever do anything with that third house, it would stay there forever. He said, “okay, I will buy that third house”. That third house was $250,000, he has two kids in college, $250,000 is a ton of money. It was under a handshake that he would buy that house and they would make a small development that fit the community there. Such a small facility they had to put in all the infrastructure for that little facility without harming Tommy’s that is already open, and he thought it was a great development. They put in the underground detention system, so all of the stormwater management, storm sewers, catch basins, and the height of the curbs are all there. He respected the Engineer’s saying they don’t have a grading plan but they are just matching what they have there. They will put that on their construction drawings or for permitting they are just matching. He didn’t think that this was going to be super difficult and tedious to get through. To answer the question, yeah, the 22 versus the 28, he personally told his architect he wanted to keep those aisles as wide as possible for exactly what he is saying. If he has a mom and two little kids are running around the outside as she is vacuuming, he wants that space, it is common sense.

Commissioner Brackon asked why does he want the front parking? Mr. Schmitz replied that he thought that the front parking fits there because those curbs were already there, it was already designed in the first plan, it was already approved that way. He asked if he should go and rip out all of those curbs and start over and start with new grades, and new catch basin elevations? He thought the front parking matches, they follow that line. He asked what do they do with that, make it a front yard for grass? It doesn’t fit the retail motel. They are just trying to use some common sense in what their approach is to develop that site. They are not asking for something that is totally crazy.
Commissioner Brackon said what he heard was that the site plan requires A-Z, and they submitted 16 of the 26 requirements that the site plan requires. He was trying to figure out if they know it is A-Z, why turn it in not finished? Mr. Schmitz said that when they are talking about a cut section of a dumpster enclosure, it is a standard detail that is a permitting issue.

Commissioner Brackon asked if there was a legal description? Mr. Schmitz replied that he has the legal description, they actually have the easement it is all ready to go and fill out. He asked why they would spend the money to pay for the easements to change their financing package today, they are just asking for a site plan. Technically a site plan is, do they like the building, does the parking work, does the landscaping work, that is a site plan.

Commissioner Brackon said he thought that was a simplistic view of what OHM said and what they and the Township are requiring. Mr. Schmitz asked, is it? Commissioner Brackon replied in his opinion yes. Commission Brackon asked what the purpose of the parking numbers being so far in excess of the minimum, the 36 extra spaces, what is the thinking behind wanting those extra spaces, as opposed to land banking? Mr. Schmitz replied that the site plan originally for Tommy’s has all the catch basins and utilities there for it, it was approved from the original inception. They (the Commissioner’s) asked him to buy that property. He didn’t want to buy that property. Not only did he buy that property but he put all the improvements to that property. He is trying to understand what is really different than the original design concept that they gave them, other than they didn’t show a building on there they showed a dotted line of 5,000-sq. ft.

Commissioner Brackon said his question was what is the purpose of the extra spaces versus land banking? Mr. Schmitz said it was there from the original approval. Commissioner Brackon asked what are they going to be used for? Mr. Schmitz said for a lousy 4,000-sq. ft. they want him to start ripping up storm sewer catch basins?

Chairman Reynolds said they were not there to debate. He said he would like to not have this back and forth. They are there as a Planning Commission to go down a checklist. Even their personal opinions aside they are there to check those off. He said some of these comments are getting lost in a debate that they are looking for factual information. Their ordinance, for example, requires parking based on retail square footage, they are asking for a significant amount of parking spaces beyond that. It is not uncommon for them to grant that but they normally see a, not just a we want it, but they have X number of employees there is a model behind this Mattress store itself that there is more retail traffic, they have heard nothing factual supporting that yet. He would like to keep it to the facts and put the emotion aside if they could. He understood where they were coming from as a developer and the history of this parcel, and many of these people sitting here are not aware of all of those, and he appreciated them bringing that to the counter but at the same time that is not what they are there to debate.

Mr. Schmitz stated that the Mattress Firm has very few employees maybe two, maybe they see 10 customers per day.

Chairman Reynolds said where they are getting after with some of these, there is a need for additional parking spaces if he was understanding him. Is that because of the parking for employees for the car wash? He wanted to have this as a guided discussion. Mr. Schmitz said there is not a need for those parking spaces, his disappointment is, is that under their original design concept, so let’s assume that he wasn’t buying and creating a separate parcel for myself even though he owns the Tommy’s and creating a separate entity. They probably wouldn’t be having this discussion because all of those things were already in place based on the original approval, and it was just showing a 5,000-sq. ft. building and they would basically show an elevation and where the water and sewer were coming in. Because of the technicalities of having to form a new entity because they keep every new piece of real estate under a new
entity, they are having to go through that whole gambit again. He was really hoping that they
didn't have to do that, he is asking for a site plan approval, he would like their approval tonight,
he likes the drive aisle, he likes the parking in the front, it just matches the whole property. The
whole landscape image is like a horseshoe, they just mirror each other. He thought the drive
aisle was important, safety is really important. If they went out there on a sunny day after a rain
the day before, they will know exactly what he is talking about. They will see moms and kids,
dads and kids, and they are all playing around those cars, he thought it was important as far as
that setback. He added that as far as the land banking, he would really hate to have to tear that
out, all that work that he has already put in.

Secretary St. Henry said in terms of the 28-ft. aisle the applicant provided what he thought was
a rational explanation for that, he said other car washes around town, some have plenty of room
for that reason, others don't have enough and you wonder if you are going to get clipped. He
was comfortable with that because when he did the site walk, he saw that the vacuums were
right there on the side, it makes sense. In terms of the front parking, it is a retail establishment,
people are going to want to see cars in the parking lot. He thought that if they just left that open
something wouldn't look quite right with the overall development. He said that parking in the
back, he was curious what the spaces are but it is true they approved this site plan a year or two
ago and the parking was in the back, the building was a little bigger, they didn't know at the time
what it would be if it was a restaurant he didn't know if they would even question the extra
parking in the back. If they take the applicant’s word that it is needed, if it is going to be needed
for the car wash perhaps employees or whoever, that footprint it there. They are all curious
about the extra space but in his opinion, it is not a dealbreaker. The setbacks on the side,
closing the aisleway a little bit it would adjust the setback on the westside but the need for the
space is a rational need for an additional 6-ft. which means a lot when they got cars coming
through there. He added that perhaps there are other ways to slow cars down if there is a real
concern about the speed going straightaway to the back of the piece of property. It is a
challenging piece of property, when he did the site walk, it is not very wide, and he has a better
feel for what he wants to do now. Overall, he is comfortable with it, assuming that he meets the
other five requirements that were outlined by the Planner that any additional issue with OHM
can be addressed.

Vice-Chairman Gross said that he spent some time looking at the site plan, and he has a
concern as to why a requirement to waive the side yard setback for the building is required, a 4
or 5-ft. variance that is being requested. It is a block warehouse building and there is no reason
why either the building could be setback an additional 4-ft. and if the square-footage is
necessary it be expanded to the north because there is lots of room to the north that it could be
expanded to accommodate the square footage of the building. He found it hard to justify a
waiver of 4-ft. setback for the building.

Vice-Chairman Gross said that he also looked at the front parking, he could see the pluses of
that but he was looking at the traffic conflict between that drive and the exiting drive from the car
wash and the conflict it creates at that intersection right at Brown Rd., and just north of that
where everything comes together. He added that the driveway widths, again, taking a couple of
feet off of a 37-ft. wide driveway and adding that to the landscaping he thought that it is an
acknowledgment of the fact that there is landscaping required along that west property line. He
didn't see what the monument sign was going to look like, although it does have to be moved
out of the sanitary easement. He thought it would be helpful to see what it looks like and where
it is going to be. Mr. Schmitz stated that there will be no monument sign.

Vice-Chairman Gross said that the parking in the front if there were an entrance at the front it
would make a lot more sense to have parking in the front. Anyone that parks there has to park
has to walk around the side of the building to get into the building.
Chairman Reynolds said that they are always looking to be workable with developers and understand that it is a lot of money and a large endeavor to embark on this journey. There is a lot of open comments some very small in nature but in his perspective, there are some things to be addressed. Before hearing the discussion of the car wash and the vacuums he did the same math of, they are asking for a 4-ft. waiver on the setback which if they went back to even an increased aisle width across the board, they would still be greater than their minimums, they would still be 23-ft. 3.5-inches. They would also be at 25-ft. 10-inches at the rear, so there is definitely some opportunity and flexibility there. The same thing goes for the parking setback that they have right now, it is a 27-ft. 6-inch drive aisle but they are also asking for a setback from that. Parking he could understand if there are calculations or discussion to support that, that between the joint properties looking at the parking together that it is needed, he as fine with having the additional parking being proposed. Their comment in the past was just to avoid the seas of parking lots that they see in shopping malls. From a visual standpoint, he didn’t have a strong opinion about the parking in the front except for the conflicts if they are really going to talk about flow through the site, minimal accesses, or minimal opportunities of changes in direction. He added that there were a few things just for them on Brown Rd., if there is parking is it going to be screened? Was that something they were willing to add? He was fine with this property as a whole being ancillary use before the primary because it is occurring the way they want it to be from a development perspective. He stated that he was struggling with some of these setback waivers just from a sense of they could be avoided in some way. Could they stretch the building in a different direction? Is that not an opportunity then so be it but it is obviously something how they are looking at it saying, well why couldn’t you take 4-ft. off and make the building a little deeper, one way or the other, especially since they are in excess of parking, would they miss one less parking spot if all of that shifted to the north?

Chairman Reynolds said that some of the stuff is low-laying fruit but it is their standard for Site Plan approval. Even if it is a $100,000 project or $50,000 project, himself, personally, and professionally have been through the process and have been held to the same standard. It is a pain sometimes but it is what they ask of everyone. It doesn’t matter if it is 10-million or 100-thousand, it is their standard for Site Plan.

Secretary St. Henry asked Vice-Chairman Gross’s to describe again his thinking on moving the building, he asked him to repeat that. Vice-Chairman Gross stated that if the size of the building is important then taking 4-ft. off of the west side of the building and adding it to the north side of the building can generate the same amount of square footage. If the square footage isn’t that important, the reduction of 4-ft. of the building, would still accommodate the 20-ft. setback for the west side yard.

Mr. Schmitz said that they would be in breach of their potential lease with Mattress Firm, they need some many feet of front area building, and they are already at their minimum. He stated that they looked at those options but he thought what was first and foremost was protecting their Tommy’s asset, and when it come to the drive aisles it was super important.

Trustee Urbanowski stated they have an access of parking, which is already there. She asked if the parking on the side have to be there? She was fine with leaving it upfront but that side parking if that was eliminated then the whole building would fit. They are not losing parking because they have a lot.

Mr. Schmitz said that this is a retail center, he has developed 30 Rite Aids in his lifetime, they require that parking all the way around. He stated that he can’t get out of it. That was the reason why he was so reluctant to do the Tommy’s deal because he was forced to buy all three houses because he knew this was going to be an issue. He knew from a retail standpoint this
would be an issue. If they put in a restaurant, they looked at several different restaurant chains
with this drive-thru, none of those really fit. When they look at retail, they insist on that parking
whether it is a Rite-Aid or a Chick-fil-A, it just doesn’t work, and that was his hesitancy in
spending all the money and the detention system early on because let’s face it how do they put
a detention system on a one-acre parcel like that that is so long and narrow. They went ahead
and he put in the detention system for both lots knowing that this was going to be a very
dramatic and difficult project. He was sure they had the tapes of the last Planning Commission
meeting where they shot him down on the Tommy’s where they required them to buy the third
house, and he said he didn’t know how to make that work. There was nothing they could do
with this. Finally, after 1.5-years of working trying to get something viable here, as they can
sense his frustration when they look at the landscaping plan in front of them, that is the
landscape plan that was approved. Now they are talking about screen walls in the front, and
things like that, he spent so much money on a little house because everyone knew that he had
to have it. He noted that he was really flexible, he can get all the engineering and satisfy the
engineer requirements, he was looking for a Site Plan approval. He was highly concerned
about making that drive aisle smaller. Secretary St. Henry saw it himself, there is a lot of foot
traffic around those cars, he is asking for 6-ft. He was told that the side yard setback issue
would not be a problem, that the Planning Commission would work with him. When they look at
6-ft. it is not that great.

Chairman Reynolds asked about the aisle width behind the building that is 27-ft. in width, does
that need to be 27-ft. in width which is prompting the setback waiver for the additional parking?
He said the setback of #2 right now that is governing that buffer, right now it is 27-ft. 6-inches in
width. Mr. Schmitz said that they were willing to do that.

Chairman Reynolds said from his perspective, they have a project that comes in and they have
a list of not 2 things, they have 25 things, they usually don’t appear. They have 5 waivers and
there is no push and pull on any of them, and there is no support for some of it either. There
has been some discussion here that has come out, arguing life safety, they have a drive aisle at
the rear that 31-ft. 10-inches currently for the vacuums, and then at the front they have it and it
is 27-ft. 3.5-inches, so both of those are significantly larger specifically the rear one is almost
10-ft. larger. There is not a consistent argument here between some of these. Then when they
talk about some of these setbacks, and they say, ok it is narrow they have seen this on Brown
Rd., and there are some of these instances including Tommy’s where they said there is
narrower side yard greenbelt or setback but then they are asking it for across the board and
they are deviating from the ordinance not only on the front, but side, rear, and the islands, and
all of it. From their perspective, it is asking for a lot. There is not really a supporting factor
across the board that says this is why they did it, they have 20-employees rotating every hour
with Tommy’s Car Wash that supports 20 additional parking spots. They already have the
infrastructure in there and there could be peak demand hours of the mattress store that support
that. If they are asking for a parking calculation waiver, they ask that across the board with any
project. That is some of the struggles that he knows himself, plus other Planning
Commissioners are having here tonight, is that there is not a push and pull but there are areas
where they are saying it is important for the car wash vacuums but what about the other areas.
He gets it that maybe a 20-ft. setback is not possible but right now they are talking minimal to
none, and they are also promoting an aisle width that is significantly larger than they typically
hold as a standard for the Township. Mr. Schmitz asked how many parking spaces were they
over? Chairman Reynolds replied 36. Mr. Schmitz asked if possible, and time is of the essence
on this one, it happened fast, is it a project that has to open in June 2022. He was looking for at
least a preliminary site plan approval, if he is at 36 spaces over can he say he will reduce it
down by 20-spaces and make the purple area landscaping they adjust that in the back, handle
that through the engineering process and they compromise. He said that he will rip out all of the
catch basins and redo all the catch basins to conform to that.
Vice-Chairman Gross said that if they want to put in an extra 36 spaces from his standpoint, he said he thought that was ok, but why can’t they reduce some of the aisle widths by 5-ft. instead of a 10-ft. landscape it’s 15-ft., it didn’t make sense to him. Mr. Schmitz said that his consultant architect said that they could do that, but he would like not to have to do that where the vacuums are for safety. He said he will adjust those in the back to make them conforming to their ordinances and he would like a recommendation for at least a preliminary site plan approval subject to addressing all the issues from their consulting engineers and go from there.

Mr. Schmitz liked the front parking he did want that approval on the 4-ft. encroachment on the building, only because that is the lease, he said he would provide it if they want it, they have to have so many feet of frontage.

Secretary St. Henry asked how many spaces are they talking in the front? Mr. Klatt replied that there were 19 spaces on the west side and 5 spaces in the front.

Secretary St. Henry asked how many people typically visit this mattress store on a given day? Mr. Schmitz replied that he would say, not including employees, 20. It is not a lot, but the future use is what if the Mattress Firm all go bankrupt, does it become a restaurant, then they need the parking again.

Commissioner Walker said that the representative when he opened up about an hour ago indicated that he wasn’t aware that this could be a two-step process. Does that mean he has never applied for a Site Plan approval before? Mr. Schmitz replied that his architect has his engineering firm because of the way the construction industry is right now, and he thought that their consulting engineers will tell them, they had to move around, they have used Nowak & Fraus Engineers on numerous projects. Their consulting engineer who is not there actually represents a dozen municipalities and he was not under the impression because all of the infrastructure were already there. He assumed that everyone knew that they would match grades, use the same cross-section of asphalt, 3-inches of asphalt, 6-inches of stone, he assumed that they would use the same dumpster section, and water and sewer was already permitted there at the site. Commissioner Walker asked if he remembered his question? Mr. Schmitz replied he did, did he not know that it was not a two-step process? Commissioner Walker said that it could be a two-step process? Mr. Schmitz said that he can’t speak for him.

Commissioner Walker said that one of his pet peeves when it comes to these site plans is when the applicant comes and asks for things. He thinks that sometimes their two consultants are almost too nice to the applicants. Where he says look if you can’t do it now, come back another time after talking, they get a letter from both of their consultants, they explain what they feel their discrepancies are in their application. In spite of that, they are here tonight asking them to grant them a site plan on the if come, assuming that all of the 25 they are going to fix, they will give them the plan, they can go do it but they might come back another couple of times because they didn’t do it. He heard from him today, that he is not willing to do some of those things that they asked for in those reports. They hire them to help them make decisions for the citizens of Orion Township, and he for one, likes to listen to them. He has not heard him refute much of what they said in those reports.

Chairman Reynolds asked Engineer Landis, their general fire lane even at our greatest widths, he knew that there was a couple of different standards that get applied, but what is that aisle width that is typically applied to the site? Engineer Landis replied the standard aisle for two-way traffic is 22-ft. His understanding is that the Fire Marshal requires 26-ft. in the vicinity of fire hydrants, where he is anticipating setting up an aerial appropriates, so 26-ft. would be the max. Mr. Schmitz replied that they are 27-ft.
Trustee Urbanowski said that they haven’t said anything about what would happen with the landscaping knee wall berm if the parking stays in the front. She knew that they have existing plants there, she did see that the idea is that they don’t see that parking very much.

Planner Arroyo said that the previously approved plan showed a 30-inch-high berm across the front of this portion of the property for the car wash. It actually showed a berm going across the front but does not appear that it has been constructed. Secretary St. Henry asked in front of the car wash? Planner Arroyo replied no in front of this property.

Trustee Urbanowski said that there is a lot to be resolved. She stated that she understood the point about the 27-ft. aisle between the vacuums. She was not aware that the parking spaces in the back were already there. Mr. Schmitz said that the grading and the catch basins are there. Chairman Reynolds stated that there was underwater storm that had been installed. Mr. Schmitz said that the subgrade is there, they could have paved it. Chairman Reynolds stated that there is an asphalt curb right now that splits that side of the property, some of it is primed and ready to go, but it is a pad site. They are strictly talking about modifying infrastructure. There are some curbs, light poles, and a few things that would be modified down the road.

Trustee Urbanowski said that the reason that all of this information that they are asking for to be put into these plans is to avoid something like this in the future. All plans have to have all of these things because 20-years down the line someone pulls the plans for this and it is not on there they are not going to know to go to the Tommy’s Car Wash original plan set, so they have to be on here.

Chairman Reynolds said when a retail establishment is looking for parking, safety is always an important concern, he would still circle back to, if it is about having a comfortable width in their mind that comfortable width is at the front is 27-ft. and then at the rear it’s 31 or almost 32-ft. it is not a consistent argument. Then they move over to an aisle that is not in front of those, those waivers would change if it was reworked. The 27-ft. aisle that is in the parking that is not across from the parking but rather where the #1 is shown that is worsening. There they have 31-ft. 10-inches, at the front they have 27-ft. 3.5-inches, if they go to the west of this, they have 27-ft. 6-inches. All of these endeavors are adding to some of these waivers.

Mr. Schmitz said aren’t those two separate pieces of property, they are two separate owners. Chairman Reynolds said he is just getting after the sake of they are making a waiver worse by having a nonstandard drive aisle width. He would agree with having a larger aisle width here adjacent to a very active parking spot, but why on the west? If they were to come to him and say hey, here it is wider, here is your minimum, here is slightly wider so they can fit a truck through the site, and here is your minimum, and this is the product, that to him is a reasonable waiver. But here they are asking for additional parking, wider drive aisles, all of these pieces and it is adding up to a difficult puzzle to put together. He thought as a whole from a Planning Commission they are usually pretty workable and understandable from life safety issues and reasonable asks when it comes to the function of a property but there are some of these that are not supported by much. In his opinion, there is a long list here and he would like to see some of these things attempted to be worked out before they make an approval. A list of 30 items is a very long list and rarely if not ever do they grant a conditional approval on 30, or even 25. Especially with waivers that are going to push and pull based on some of these discussions here tonight.

Mr. Schmitz asked if anyone on the Planning Commission has an issue with the elevation? Other than the fact that they have addressed the glass issue in the front. He thought it was important to know now before they come back and address the 25 issues. Chairman Reynolds
said that it was an attractive building if the revised elevation meets that requirement or exceeds it, he didn’t believe their professional consultants have had a chance to look at it but he welcomes retail establishments like this on Brown Rd., and was happy to see them coming. Mr. Schmitz said he said that because coming back next month he would like to make sure they could address all of the comments and if there was something they didn’t like he would like to be able to modify it in the last go around. Chairman Reynolds said that they are happy to be constructive and that is typically what they do as just trying to push projects forward and they are not there to just shoot the thing down for fun.

Secretary St. Henry said when he looked at the original plans and the comments from the Planner, and the Engineer, there are 30 items out there, it was good to hear that some of them have been addressed but there are still plenty of outstanding. His initial reaction was this was going to be postponed just knowing how as a Planning Commission what they think of proposals that have a lot of issues. He thought that a postponement made sense, let’s get them addressed, knocked off, and get everybody on the same page, and move forward from there.

Chairman Reynolds said he would like some constructive conversation as it goes to the last 5 items if they could get some feedback. He didn’t have any issue with the ancillary use before the primary. The screening for the front parking does anyone disagree that is an ordinance requirement that they would like to see maintained if there were parking to be maintained in the front.

Secretary St. Henry asked did they not require any sort of buffer or wall on the Tommy’s side? Planner Arroyo showed them the concept plan came forward and there is a 30-inch-high berm with 1:3 side slopes along the entire frontage on both sides. He also pointed out that there was a lot less parking than that, there was only one aisle with parking severed on either side, which is much less than what is being proposed now, a lot more. There was also a substantial separation of the parking on the side.

Chairman Reynolds asked for some big picture thoughts on waivers for setbacks and buffers. Vice-Chairman Gross thought that there was still the opportunity to maintain the side yard setback on the building, one way or another, either it is shrinking the size of the building, moving the building to the east into the sidewalk area, or expanding the building to the north. He thought that there were some options there that he would like to have some response to. Chairman Reynolds said that if it is not for the building, he appreciated the life safety issue, but thought there was some compromise there. He didn’t think from a drive aisle engineering standpoint that 32-ft. makes sense, it is suggesting three ways of transportation, and would like those brought down. If a fire apparatus is planning on pulling up alongside two cars on either way and having space to operate in 26-ft. he didn’t see why they weren’t closer to standards such as that.

Mr. Schmitz said no, he appreciated it and thought that Jeff Klatt from Kreger Klatt, will handle these issues before the next meeting.

Moved by Secretary St. Henry, seconded by Commissioner Brackon, that the Planning Commission postpones site plan approval for PC-2021-67, J.S. Brown Rd., LLC site plan, located at 851 & 861 Brown Rd. (09-33-351-020 & 09-33-351-021) for plans date stamped received August 24, 2021, for the following reasons: that there are a number of outstanding issues that have been presented by both the Township Planning Consultant and the Township Engineering Consultant and that the Planning Commission feels need to be addressed, as well as, other comments from the Planning Commission that needs to be taken into consideration as they develop a second version of their Site Plan.
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-2021-68, Dutton Park Site Plan Amendment, located at vacant parcel 09-35-400-048 and 09-35-477-003 located on the north side of Dutton Rd., 1 parcel east of Interpark N.

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

Mr. Tom Beauchamp with Henry Yandt Construction, 4865 Broomfield Way, Orion Township. He was representing Premier Dr., LLC for the Dutton Park project. He said he had with him his associate Ashley Hackman, their engineer Allen with Nowak and Fraus, and David with DRN Architects if questions come up.

Mr. Beauchamp said that they have been in front of them before on this, and this is an amendment to a site plan that is currently being approved. He showed the plans to the Planning Commissioners. He said the west building increased from a 5,000-sq. ft. footprint to a 10,000-sq. ft. footprint. That is basically what this is about is amending that west building.

Mr. Beauchamp said it has increased the parking from what the initial one was, and if they look at Giffels Webster’s review it has side by side comparisons of what has changed, and did a nice job of explaining that, which will hopefully make his job easier in getting though this.

Mr. Beauchamp said that part of that package, a little bit more detail on the building elevations renderings that they have. He did provide them with a summary of the review comments and then their responses too. He didn’t know if they were aware of the history to get an explanation of where they are at, other than it is just that the west building is getting bigger, and they are looking to go to the next step with final engineering if this is all acceptable to them.

Chairman Reynolds disclosed that the applicant stated that he is working for Premier Dr., LLC, his firm also works for Premier Dr., LLC, no interest in this property or this proposal here. He has also worked with Mr. Beauchamp before in the past. He wanted to disclose that and didn’t think that there was any conflict of interest but if they felt that there is, he would be happy to recuse himself. Commissioner Walker felt that there was no conflict.

Planner Arroyo read through his review date stamped September 9, 2021.

Engineer Landis read through his review date stamped September 9, 2021.

Chairman Reynolds said they had an additional comment from the Fire Marshal. He did recommend approval with comments, specifically referencing the letter that they have in front of them tonight and that was added to their packets, from the applicant in response specific to modifications to the existing gas collection system that there were some discussions and there would still be some pending outcomes and investigations in that progress. Also, that that gas collection system be reviewed and inspected by the Building Department at the time of construction. There was a review by Public Services, no issues there. A site walk was completed by the Site Walk Committee nothing explicatively called out there. The Water Resource Commission did ask that permits be applied for in the future and prior to any start of construction.

Chairman Reynolds said that a couple of things that got brought up was excess parking, drive aisle widths, and also now that they are over square footages recommending a traffic study.
Secretary St. Henry asked the applicant to explain the extra-wide width of their lanes? Mr. Beauchamp said that it comes from the first round of comments where the Fire Marshal noted an NFPA 1 requirement that they require 26-ft. clear unobstructed aisleways around the building. When they did their revision, they maintained that aisleway clearance. He did speak with Fire Marshal Williams and he said that something that exists on one review doesn’t exist on others, there was a reason for it and it had to do with at one point they had the one entrance egress for the building and now there are actually two. They extended the drive and there are two ways to get out, and so that negates the need for the 26-ft. aisleways. He has no problem going back to 22-ft. they just have to redraw it, or if it is an issue the Fire Marshal would prefer it but, in this case, it is not an NFPA 1 requirement that he can enforce, they left it on the drawings for right now.

Vice-Chairman Gross said that the building is oriented to the east, and their access is from the west, so the entrance to the complex is really to the back of the building. Mr. Beauchamp said coming off of Interpark there is actually two ways to get in, there is going to be the future development, on the overall development of the property is going to incorporate a shared parking lot, and that is going to be more of the front of the building with a building that is going to be adjacent to it to the east. The overall master plan is why this orientation changed.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked if there was screening for the loading zone to the rear? Mr. Beauchamp replied that the loading is the area on the left which is the west-facing toward Lapeer they are quite a way back, facing towards Culvers. Currently, there is no screening called out for that. He added that if that is an issue, they need to address that as a team.

Vice-Chairman Gross asked if he knew what type of tenants that they will have in there? Mr. Beauchamp replied that it is meant to be retail and office. They do not have a tenant, currently. Vice-Chairman Gross questioned if he knew what kind of delivery or loading, they will be using it for then? Mr. Beauchamp said they are trying to remain flexible as they can but potentially, he wasn’t sure how to answer that right now. Vice-Chairman Gross said he would like to see some sort of screening for the Culvers side. Mr. Beauchamp asked if it would be a buffer to the left of the parking lot where they did it with trees and landscaping or a berm. Vice-Chairman Gross replied yes. Chairman Reynolds said in his review of the plans there is a landscape plan proposed and in that 20-ft. buffer there are trees proposed. He said they are looking at a plan without landscaping. He said if it is helpful to bring up sheet L7 for the discussion. He added that there was a 20-ft. buffer provided with landscaping.

Chairman Reynolds said that he doesn’t have any major issues with what is being proposed. He would maybe just ask as a condition amongst addressing just the open comments from outside entities and their Fire Marshal, maybe there is a way for aisle widths to their minimum while maintaining fire access. So, if there are some of those outside lanes, if the ones around the building need to be 26-ft. maybe the outside ones can be pulled in a little bit. He thought that was something he was comfortable with being between Engineer Landis and Fire Marshal Williams that they can work out to shift that and address those. He appreciated them meeting the ordinance requirement and when they have pre-application meetings the Fire Marshal is sitting there and is always looking at fire safety. He understood where this was coming from but it might be helpful, one of his closing comments was to maybe get a memo or something from the Fire Marshal to speak to some of this, so they can be on the same page of where 26-ft. really wants to be. Or unless Engineer Landis can make a quick presentation one evening to help them understand that it doesn’t need to be everywhere, or does it?

Chairman Reynolds said he was fine with the increased square footage. He thought that there was a lot that was going to change in this site, so, he thought that just being over the threshold for the traffic study he was ok with deferring that for now. If someone else feels otherwise he
was kind of indifferent right now. Mr. Beauchamp said they are expecting the Traffic Study to be complete by that first week of October. He added that the plan for that is if they know what the future stuff is going in there to try to do it, where it breaks it out what they are doing right now and future too.

Chairman Reynolds said that if the applicant pretty much addresses the comments as outlined in the letter, he was ok with that.

Secretary St. Henry said that the additional parking spaces that has to do with the fact that they are not sure what is going on the other side? Mr. Beauchamp said that there are going to be four industrial buildings that are going to fill out the balance of the space and some of that parking is meant for that but while they are here to have the staging and different things for future construction is going to help out as well.

Trustee Urbanowski asked if they have to do the Lapeer Overlay Design Standards again? Chairman Reynolds replied correct.

Moved by Trustee Urbanowski, seconded by Commissioner Gingell, that the Planning Commission grants a Lapeer Overlay Design Standard waiver for building orientation, façade colors as presented, facades greater than 100’ (west side), and dumpster location for PC-2021-68, Dutton Park amended site plan, for plans date stamped received 08/25/21 based on consideration of the following and the following findings of facts: the building doesn’t come close to Lapeer it is set back, the front of the building is basically facing Dutton and the façade is attractive.

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

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that the Planning Commission grants site plan approval for PC-2021-68, Dutton Park Site Plan Amendment, located at vacant parcel 09-35-400-048 and 09-35-477-003 located on the north side of Dutton Rd. one parcel east of Interpark N. for plans date stamped received 08/25/21 based on the following findings of facts: that the Site Plan complies with all the ordinance requirements; it is a welcome addition to this area; the Overlay Design Standards have been already approved. This approval is based upon the following conditions: that any resubmittal of the plans and review be to the satisfaction of the consultants containing the issues listed in the Planners, Engineers, and Fire Marshal reviews; if there is a modification to the plan as a result of the Traffic Study that they get a copy of that.

Discussion on the motion:

Planning & Zoning Director Girling asked if he wanted a copy of the Traffic Study when it comes in? Vice-Chairman Gross said if there was required modification to the Site Plan. He didn’t care to see the study. If the consultants indicate that there are revisions needed of the Site Plan that they would see those. Planning & Zoning Girling asked if they wanted to see the actual plan back before them? Vice-Chairman Gross said just for the record.

Mr. Beauchamp said he wanted to make sure he understood when the report comes back if there is mitigation requirement’s they will have to redo the drawings to include that, and they will come back to them with that. Chairman Reynolds said the Traffic Study is going to be completed, if it recommends changes for essentially giving that empowerment to their professional consultants and they will implement or work with
them to implement those changes. They just want for record purposes to be aware of what modified. It is not a reapproval it is strictly for the record for them to see what happened.

Mr. Beauchamp said that he also had Tom Roth with his company present.

**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**

C. PC-2021-73, Township Initiated Text Amendment, Industrial Park (IP)

Chairman Reynolds said that there is a current reading to amend Ord. #154. That could potentially promote retail establishments within Ord. #154, that reading is occurring at the Board level currently. This minor text amendment just clarifies that if retail were to be allowed within an (IP) zoning it would be because of Ord. #154. It is kind of a bookkeeping effort to keep up with that reading.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that the Board is a step ahead of them. They have had one reading on theirs, that is why she quickly added this to the agenda so that they weren’t surprised when they see a Public Hearing scheduled in a month. They will have one more meeting, the first meeting in October, that she may or may not. They may remember not too long ago they had a slow meeting and they talked about some potential text amendments. There were some things that they were talking about in (IP). There is a cost incurred when they are advertising a text amendment. She stated that there were a number of things talking about if they are a single parcel versus in a park. She didn’t know if she could get to that, if she can it would be before them on the first meeting in October, and be included within this text amendment, if not, the public hearing will be strictly what is shown here in red which is accommodating for the changes in Ord. #154.

Chairman Reynolds asked if they needed a motion to file and receive, or any motion required on this? Planning & Zoning Girling replied no, it was just on there to discuss so they know what is coming. If they read the Public Hearing in the newspaper and they didn’t even talk about it, you are going to be wondering what we are doing. This is letting them know why they see that.

Secretary St. Henry said can they do a quick summary of what Ord. #154 is? Trustee Urbanowski said that Ord. #154 is a Licensed Marijuana Facilities Ordinance. The changes to this covered putting caregiver operations under this as well. They were previously unable to have any kind of regulation on that but there was a court case that made it possible for them to be able to do that. If there are caregivers moving forward that want to have facilities they have to be in the (IP) District and go through the same process of applying as the bigger folks. It is adding the retail provisioning centers for medical marijuana in (IP) Districts. Secretary St. Henry asked if it was standalone buildings or adjacent or connected operations? Trustee Urbanowski said they would be standalone buildings. There are quite a few different stipulations in here in terms of location requirements. Chairman Reynolds said that there are still setback distances to schools, residences, there are some modifications proposed within this text reading. That was all available on the 9/7/2021 BOT meeting. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that if they go to the Townships webpage under the BOT packets, they can see the proposed text changes they can find that on BOT.

Chairman Reynolds said that there are many regulations at the State level too that they are essentially trying to keep up or adding to those requirements to make sure that they fit within the Township, setback distances, the number of licenses, where they are going to be. There are some regulations where they can’t be back-to-back from a state standpoint.
Secretary St. Henry asked what is the difference between what the Township is proposing in terms of medical marijuana dispensing facility and what is being proposed in the Village of Lake Orion in a couple of locations? Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated that she would suggest that if anyone has any questions that they contact the Supervisors office. This was a text that was worked on by the BOT, not the Planning Commission. Trustee Urbanowski said that she didn’t know what the Village is doing now. Planning & Zoning Girling said they are Ord. #78 so they are having that one small difference in Ord. #78 but it was not something that was worked on by the Planning Commission because it is Ord. #154.

Chairman Reynolds said that some of the differences here are that it is being initiated by the Township, and some of these discussions of what they want, there was a referendum vote in the Village to allow that, so some of it was written in stone and the people did vote upon that. It is a little bit different than it was initiated by signatures and voted upon it wasn’t discussed with Public Hearings in the same manner, it wasn’t on a public ballot. In the big picture sense, there are different distances and things but they are also considering provisioning centers for the retail component, the Village at this point and time only has provisioning licenses and only in certain districts, so that is a little different between the Township and the Village is that they are also going to allow retail in the current text amendment but within the same distance and requirements and in (IP) district that meet only certain setback distances from schools, churches, and residences.

Secretary St. Henry said so while it is called retail it is not retail as in a party store. What they are proposing from the Township perspective is different and a dispensary or recreational use. Chairman Reynolds said it is a very controlled retail environment.

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
PC-2021-07, 5-Year Master Plan Update

Planner Arroyo said that the little (OP) section there at Kern & Orion is interesting. He showed them an aerial of the Knights of Columbus building. So, it is an (OP) and thought it was a good topic of whether or not that is the appropriate district for that piece of property. They could even look at this as a potential redevelopment site.

Chairman Reynolds said that they have an island use of (OP) along Orion Rd. surrounded by medium-high density, thoughts on maintaining medium-high or essentially transitioning to what it is currently zoned. Vice-Chairman Gross thought it should be medium-high, and they will review it when it comes along.

Chairman Reynolds said he lives in the Village and he goes to Rochester on a daily basis to the office so he drives Orion multiple times a day, and he struggles with that parcel, Knights of Columbus has been there for a long time, even if it wasn’t that what they want to be there. He struggles to even think that many office/professional pieces would fit well there but thought that maintaining the residences is the obvious answer to him. He would be open to it considering it is one of those network support areas. They are close to the Village they have parks because of the Village they have Bald Mountain Recreation Area to the north and south around Kern Rd., it wants to be more of a transitional back a house zoning on a residential side.

Commissioner Brackon asked how big is that piece? Planner Arroyo replied 4.3-acres.

Chairman Reynolds thought that there might be an opportunity but it has to have some creative thinking. He thought medium-high to go along with the surrounding zoning.
Planner Arroyo said that what they would like to do next month is have their little, at the table work session. They are going to try to go ahead and update the Future Land Use Map to accommodate everything they talked about to date. They may have some other areas for discussion for them based on some evolving thought as they look at the overall Township.

Planner Arroyo added that they are also planning on introducing the economic development plan chapter, so they will be talking about that. They are going to go into a discussion of redevelopment sites, one of the things that they need to do to be compliant with redevelopment ready communities from EDC just to look at three different redevelopment sites so they are working on assembling some information for them on that.

Planner Arroyo said that they are going to introduce some of the thoughts on the complete streets plan as well, at the study session meeting in October at the second meeting. That is what is coming their way, what they have been working on.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS
None.

10. COMMUNICATIONS
None.

11. PLANNERS REPORTS/EDUCATION
None.

12. COMMITTEE REPORTS
None.

13. FUTURE PUBLIC HEARINGS
A. 10-6-21 at 7:05 p.m., PC-2021-70, Grandview – Lapeer Road Rezone Request, the request is to rezone approx. 17.44 acres of 3120 S. Lapeer Road (parcel 09-26-151-019) from Recreation 2 (Rec-2) to Multiple Family Residential (RM-2), and approx. 4.21 acres from Recreation 2 (Rec-2) to General Business (GB).

B. 10-6-21 PC-2021-71 (immediately following the PC-2021-70 Public Hearing at 7:05 p.m.), F&D silverbell Rezone Request, the request is to rezone approx. 23.05 acres of vacant parcel (09-35-100-019) located at the SW corner of Silverbell and Lapeer Road from Office Professional (OP) to Industrial Park (IP), and approx. 7.02 acres from Office Professional (OP) to General Business (GB).

14. CHAIRMAN’S COMMENTS
Chairman Reynolds asked if they could get an overview on aisles widths and maybe get some comments from the Fire Marshal on clarification from the 30-26, is that all the way around? He didn’t know if that as the Fire Marshal a memo or they can kind of help walk them through. Planner Arroyo had a meeting and they got a lot more clarification on it.

15. COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS
Commissioner Walker mentioned that next weekend, is the first in 19 months, for a used book sale at the library.
Trustee Urbanowski said that they have waited a long time for Lo Palooza on 9/18/2021. Wildwood Amphitheater gates open at 11:30a music starting at 12n goes until 10p. It is $25 a ticket at lopalooza.org they raise money for things like the Miracle League Field.

16. ADJOURNMENT
Moved by Commissioner Walker, seconded by Commissioner Gingell to adjourn the meeting at 8:58 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Walton
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary
Charter Township of Orion
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