The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a workshop meeting in person at the Orion Center, 1335 Joslyn Road on Wednesday, September 15, 2021, at 6 pm.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:
Don Walker, PC Rep to ZBA  Don Gross, Vice-Chairman
Scott Reynolds, Chairman  Jessica Gingell, Commissioner
Kim Urbanowski, BOT Rep to PC  Derek Brackon, Commissioner

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:
Joe St. Henry, Secretary

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
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

3. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL
Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, to approve the agenda as presented.

4. NEW BUSINESS/UNFINISHED BUSINESS
A. PC-2021-07, 5 Year Master Plan Update

Planner Arroyo said he was going to continue their review section by section of the Future Land Use Plan. He stated that this would wrap up the northern tier. When he gets done with this, he was going to give them a look ahead, in terms of, where they go from here.

Planner Arroyo showed the Commissioner’s the differences between the Future Land Use categories and the Zoning categories. He noted that the very top of the Township is Sections 1-12, and that is what they will be covering.

Planner Arroyo stated with Section #1, the very far northeast corner of the Township. He noted that in this particular section they didn’t have a whole lot to comment on. They do have designated SC developments that will need to be called out. Their long-range plan, the land use plan, and zoning seem to be pretty much in alignment here, so they didn’t really have any significant observations on this one. Chairman Reynolds questioned the Rec-2 parcel from the zoning map, he asked if that was private or public Rec-2? Planner Arroyo thought it was Bald Mountain, it was just a little piece that sticks up. Planner Arroyo said that they would probably want to designate the Future Land Use with the recreation in that corner.
Planner Arroyo moved on to Section 2, there is a portion of the Village of Lake Orion in this section, and there are several other areas. There is commercial, office and industrial zoning is generally found along Lapeer Rd., on the righthand side. Parcels on the east side of Lapeer Rd. are zoned (SC). The (R-1) component on the northeast corner would typically align with single-family medium-high density rather than low-density. Since that is developed that would make a logical change there. The parcels on the east side of Lapeer, just north of the Village boundary have been developed with commercial development, and he thought they needed to reflect those because there was an (SC) project that had components that were residential and then frontage commercial, and office on the north side. The northern one is more office, the southern one is more retail. They would want the Master Plan to reflect that those frontage parcels on the east side of Lapeer are no longer planned for single-family development.

Chairman Reynolds said he was good with that comment. He said looking at some of the corridors and labeling them as institutional or general office. He asked what does that mean? He thought it was a different aesthetic than what is at the south end of M24. He thought that they needed to look at some of the corridors and even the institutional parcel that is on the Future Land Use Map that is also (OP) that is St. Joe’s Church it is a landmark historical piece so there are other signifiers that say in that area they want to maintain a certain aesthetic. He knew it wasn’t zoning per se but it does drive some of those features.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that they do have the new (CJ) on the south side of Indianwood, Firestone. They have the red there which was the first parcel and then the first to the west was part of the development for the Future Land Use. Planner Arroyo said that it is Master Planned for General Office but it is clearly developed in more of a commercial manner so that might be another if they want to recognize that, they could reflect that as well.

Commissioner Walker said that kind of got bogarted in there, and he wouldn’t be keen on changing any kind of designation because that is there. Planner Arroyo said that is why they are asking the question. He said some of them made sense some of them he didn’t think was a great idea. Commissioner Walker said he would consider that more of an outliner. Chairman Reynolds agreed.

Planner Arroyo said next is Section 3, here they have another residential classification where the single-family medium should be medium-high to align with the R-1 & R-3 zoning. He thought that the rest seems to be mostly in alignment. Chairman Reynolds agreed.

Planner Arroyo stated in Section 4, there are areas where the R-1 and R-2 zoning don’t align with the single-family low-medium density. Basically, the two sides if they were going to try to reflect that existing pattern and zoning and show it in the Master Plan, they would change that to single-family medium-high density. Then if they do that then it begs the question, do they really want to continue to have the single-family medium-low density in between or, does it make sense really to bump that up to single-family high density so they have a continuous flow through these sections along the northern boundary?

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated that right adjacent is a private golf course which isn’t necessarily making it these days, so whatever they are thinking here does that set the trend to that. Planner Arroyo stated what they would propose to do is that on the density plan which they are going to see soon, the density plan is going to reflect a density on that golf course. So even though it is planned for recreation, if that use goes away, the same thing with a school, they will have density recommendations, if the school were too close then they would already have a density recommendation for residential that is in place. It basically covers them from that perspective. Golf courses are a good example a lot of them are going away so it is good to
have a backup in their plan in terms of what the Master Plan recommendation would be if that use goes away. That is how they would handle that.

Chairman Reynolds said that his personal take is to transition the FLU Map on the eastern portion to the high-density marker and keep the lower designation or medium-low density on the western portion as it works its way away from M24. He thought it became a little more obvious with section 5 that there is a lot less density as they continue to the west.

Planner Arroyo moved on to section 5, here they are getting into a lower density area, and is interesting with this Light Industrial (LI). They have some industrial uses that are currently established but they also have an area that has the #1 on it that is planned for residential that is currently in use as industrial as well. He added that the industrial zoning actually goes a little farther west if they look at the zoning that actually includes some undeveloped parcel west of the developed industrial. There are a couple of industrial users here, it seems odd that they are just there in the middle of residential but they are established and there is some additional land planned where they could either see a new use or an expanded use. He asked if they want to have the FLU plan acknowledge that zoning pattern and extend it all the way to the west to create a larger planned industrial area?

Commissioner Brackon stated that it is kind of in the middle of nowhere and he was sure, he wouldn’t speak for all the citizens in that area, they would prefer that that not be there so why expand it?

Vice-Chairman Gross thought that the industrial was really out of place.

Secretary St. Henry said that it is only there because it has been there for 40-years. Well before any of the neighborhoods.

Planner Arroyo said you don’t think of Indianwood being industrial.

Chairman Reynolds said he agreed with those comments. He added that even right now the Future Land Use Map is recognizing the school there but even then, they know that schools can be in residential zoning on larger parcels. He said to him it is just a key feature in the bigger picture of zoning of what they want to see. Indianwood especially as they continue west is two lanes, it is less of a thoroughfare, they are a lot farther from M-24, and I-75. He thought that they were creating a home for those closer to the south end of the Township and also along the major thoroughfares. They are promoting some traffic and density along somewhere there is an island use right now if they look at the FLU as it sits currently.

Planner Arroyo said that they will match the designated land use area with the actual developed industrial.

Chairman Reynolds thought they were saying to keep it as it sits right now. As a future endeavor, they are saying low-density even though it sits as a light industrial use. From a Master Plan standpoint, they would see that going less dense instead of denser. Planner Arroyo questioned even the existing developed industrial piece they want designated for residential because that #1 area actually has an industrial use on it? Chairman Reynolds said he believe so yes.

Chairman Reynolds added that as they move forward if someone were to propose a rezone, they want something that is compatible with low-density. There are a few instances of just an old school it has always been there, a nonconforming use. Planner Arroyo asked if they wanted to eliminate all of the purple? Chairman Reynolds said yeah, right now the purple
historically was just recognizing the school. He didn’t know how they were going to recognize that in this Master Plan but thought that from a zoning perspective they treat it as low-density and know that whether it is an overlay or a marker of sort that they know there is a school there and they support that. The bigger picture they wouldn’t see that becoming denser or highly intensive institutional use even.

Planner Arroyo said that they can designate that as an appropriate designation for a school and then there would be a density under it as well on the density map.

Planner Arroyo moved on to Section 6 all the way over on the northwest corner. He said that there were a number of things going on here they have several areas, single-family low-density areas 1 & 2 are zoned Suburban Estates (SE), so they would change those to single-family medium-low if they are going to align them with the underlying zoning. Single-family low-density areas that are zoned (R-1) & (R-2) which are areas 3, 4, & 5, would be changed to single-family high-density to match the underlying zoning. He added that the PUD is #6, which is a gas station that is currently planned for residential but was approved as a PUD for a gas station.

Chairman Reynolds said this is one of those areas where even more of a discussion of section 5 occurring in section 6. They have the general feel of what they are going for Future Land Use versus reality, so do they catch that up to speed, or does that promote higher density starting to sprinkle into this area, versus just saying “future land use is a less dense designation than the current zoning”. He said that there have been other spots that it is obviously clean and clear and there is the stepdown but right here they have a lot of low-density and they have a sprinkling of other things and he thought that those were more of the outlier conversation than the vision that he sees for section 6 of the Township.

Planner Arroyo said that this is an area that they would think of as being much more rural and open.

Chairman Reynolds said versus catching it up to speed with current zoning they are maintaining the vision here to say yes there are some exceptions but overall, this is a lower density area.

Secretary St. Henry thought that their vision is to not encourage and make it easier for higher density developments.

Chairman Reynolds thought that these were their outliers. He said that in section 5, he thought it was good to go through this, the conversation of Future Land Use versus reality but there is also maintaining that vision.

Secretary St. Henry stated some of these neighborhoods went in 20-30 years ago, this Township is much different. They could drop a neighborhood somewhere in one of these Suburban Estates (SE) areas and they wouldn’t even know but they are at a point now that it is important to maintain some of those outlying areas just for the character of the community.

Chairman Reynolds stated that on #6 that gas station that (PUD) that is there does serve a valid purpose for that intersection and that area. There aren’t many amenities around there and maybe it is appropriate to maintain that but maybe there is a way to look at some of these thoroughfares and intersections to say maybe it is not the hamlet idea but maybe it is just a very low-density designation of community support. You can get gas and some basic groceries but if you need everything you go to the main thoroughfare. He felt that supported the walkable and 15-minute neighborhood concept too. All of those neighborhoods that are in there where do they go, can they get to a park. When you go miles without something there maybe needs a little bit of a community corner or a hamlet concept.
Commissioner Walker said he didn't know when the original gas station was built but he thought it had been there a long time before they remodeled it. There is nothing on any road around that Indianwood/Baldwin Rd. intersection except that gas station. He thought if he lived near there, he would want that to stay. Not necessarily grow any bigger but for what it is like groceries and things of that nature.

Chairman Reynolds said something that is fitting to a Suburban Farm (SF) low-density residential designation to provide some of those community amenities that people are looking for. Yes, you are agreeing that everyone has an acre lot so they might have to go a few acres more to get to something but, nonetheless, there are those opportunities.

Secretary St. Henry said that the vast majority of people that live in this part of the Township have no problem driving for serious groceries or other retail.

Planner Arroyo went on to Section 7. He said here they have a single-family low-density area zoned (R-1) that could be changed to single-family medium-high to match the existing zoning or they could treat as an outlier, however, in this particular instance they can see that that area goes east if they look in the upper-righthand corner, that single-family the area in red is called single-family potentially high-density which has got the (SR) zoning, that zoning continues on in a larger block in Section 8. That might be an area that they consider making the Future Land Use change because it seems to be a larger pattern of zoning and development.

Chairman Reynolds asked if that was medium-high because of the lot size or because of the density?

Planner Arroyo replied it is medium-high because of what the underlying zoning is now. That zoning would align with the single-family medium-high Future Land Use category that is why the suggestion is being made.

Chairman Reynolds said that technically on that property there is a lot of guaranteed open space, he asked isn’t there in that development? Planner Arroyo replied it looks like it.

Chairman Reynolds said that even though the lot size is smaller it is just a common space. He wondered if it is not technically still medium-low? Planner Arroyo replied that the overall density should still match what the zoning is, he assumed it was developed at that level, so even though there is open space the density would be consistent with the zoning.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling felt that it was a (PUD) but before they used to physically rezone it to a (PUD), so they could have agreed, it was an older (PUD).

Planner Arroyo said that one other observation that would support that higher density classification too is it is basically just north of the Friendship/Hamlet area which is right at the very southern portion of this, they could see in area #1 that is part of that hamlet area. So, trying to support some more and acknowledging more density is not probably the worst thing in the world.

Chairman Reynolds asked to flip to #8. Planner Arroyo said they can see that the pattern continues they have zoning that reflects a higher classification than the Master Plan and it is all developed or somewhat developed.

Secretary St. Henry asked where section #8 was? Planner Arroyo replied Friendship Park is right at the very western edge of it. Clarkston Rd. and Baldwin Rd. it the lower left-hand corner
of the screen. Secretary St. Henry thought that they shouldn’t be encouraging denser developments moving forward anywhere in the Township. He said across the street they have Heather Lake Estates. They should be cognizing of that and how that is laid out as much as anywhere.

Vice-Chairman Gross said the property to the north of that should be the same as medium-low.

Secretary St. Henry said they already have the development on the other side of that intersection it supports the hamlet in the corner there. Moving forward they should not encourage higher density development especially in outlying areas of the Township.

Chairman Reynolds said his opinion of #7 is to leave it low in the areas of yellow. He said what about the (R-2) that is currently designated as medium-low, truly speaking (R-2) is high. He added so what they are saying is keeping the upper left-hand corner of Section 8 medium-low. He asked what do they feel about the (R-2) area?

Commissioner Brackon said this was on the north end of Clarkston. He asked how is that currently medium-high? Planner Arroyo said because the underlying zoning is (R-2) and the density of the (R-2) zoning aligns with the medium-high density classification on the land use map. Commission Brackon asked if they didn’t want that and wanted to keep it low how would they change it? Planner Arroyo replied they would keep it as it is currently planned which is medium-low but that is not consistent with the way it is zoned. He added if they wanted to maintain something of a lower density than what the current zoning is they would maintain what the current designation is on the Future Land Use Map which is single-family medium-low density.

Chairman Reynolds asked if they could go to #9. Planner Arroyo said in this case they have an area that is surrounded by the red that once again suggests that it should be single-family medium-high based on the underlying zoning. Secretary St. Henry said they keep referring to the underlying zoning. He asked when was that underlying zoning established? He said if they acknowledge the fact that perhaps in the recent past that they didn’t take a close enough look at some of the zoning issues as it relates to the updates to the Master Plan. At some point and time, this is the underlying zoning that was agreed upon by the Township but times have changed, that may have worked 20 or even 10 years ago but today he was not convinced that the underlying zoning should be what it is. This is their opportunity to make these zoning changes.

Vice-Chairman Gross said not to make the zoning changes necessarily but at least reflect it on the Master Plan how they envision future development. Secretary St. Henry said yes maybe that is what he was getting at, that may have been the vision 10-20 years ago as this area was the next great booming area, that is not what they think they desire anymore, and this is the chance to make those type of changes to set this up for the next 5-20 years just like they did back then.

Vice-Chairman Gross said he didn’t think that the Master Plan or the Future Land Use Map has to reflect what the underlying zoning is, it should be what they would envision when a future development is going to come in and what they would like to see it look like.

Planner Arroyo said that one observation that he would make is that can work in many areas but if they look at that (R-3) area on the east side those lots are already there and they are at a higher density and if they continue to plan it for low density it is pretty unlikely that someone is going to go in there and assemble lots and develop at a lower density. He said sometimes they have a sprinkling of different lot sizes and they still have some larger lots and they can suggest
that they want to keep a lower density even though there might be some outlying small lots, and 
he thought that they could say, yes, that is a possibility. Once you are in an area where lots are 
all pretty much developed at that higher density, is it practical if they are ever going to see 
anything of a lower density in that area if there is a house on every lot and all of those lots are 
split.

Chairman Reynolds said that he looks at it from a planning standpoint of transition. This is a 
little more of a struggle because they have some sprinklings of higher density and he thought 
they were all envisioning this as sprawling estates. He said if they go back to #8, he would 
agree with the sense of even though those are (R-2) they can see a lot of those parcels, in 
general, are larger. Here he would support it being low density even recognizing the current 
zoning of that. He thought that they wanted to maintain those larger lots. He asked what the 
road was that has the rows of (R-2) alongside it? Even though those lots are smaller, and it 
goes back to there is a zoning designation and there is the vision for that area. He thought that 
there were envisioning that similar concept that they are set back from the street, it is not 
recognizing it really as an (R-2) use but rather some smaller lots or some micro-lots within 
suburban. Now as they move forward with #9, he would agree with catching some of these up to 
speed but they are also along a secondary corridor of Joslyn versus venturing west on 
Clarkston which is significantly more rural.

Secretary St. Henry said that they can’t be surprised that there is high density around the lakes, 
those lots have been there forever. That is why that was developed that way.

Planner Arroyo said that one option might be to just designate the single-family medium-high 
where the (R-3) is and leave the rest at the low.

Chairman Reynolds said or leave along Joslyn Rd., just how they envision some of these 
corridors. Joslyn Rd. is a different density to him than Clarkston Rd. rolling west of Joslyn. He 
would support recognizing the medium density to the west of Joslyn and recognize the medium-
high east of Joslyn because that is what is existing but this outlier that they want to maintain that 
as a residential road, not a primary corridor where they are promoting density. He thought there 
were those couple of segments that are “outliers”. As they move further east to M24 he thought 
that recognizing the density was appropriate.

Planner Arroyo asked east of Joslyn to do the medium-high and keep the rest at medium-low? 
Down at the southwest quadrant there keep that all medium-low? Chairman Reynolds said 
correct. Planner Arroyo said then they have single-family medium density above. He asked if 
they wanted that to go to medium-high directly north? Commissioner Brackon asked if those 
were existing lots that have split already? Planner Arroyo replied yes and developed. 
Chairman Reynolds asked isn’t medium appropriate, isn’t that recognizing the current zoning? 
Planner Arroyo said medium-high recognizing the current zoning they are not medium. 
Chairman Reynolds asked where it says (SF) medium density what would that say? Planner 
Arroyo replied that would say medium-high like the area to the east of it.

Chairman Reynolds said the way he looks at it is that Joslyn Rd. has the density it is not those 
other thoroughfares, once they step away from Joslyn Rd. it changes. He thought that 
Clarkston Rd. west of Joslyn merits the low-density.

Secretary St. Henry said regarding the underlying zoning. He asked when the public looks at a 
development and their issues over zoning, they are looking at the underlying zoning and how it 
is set up not the Future Land Use Map. It doesn’t make any sense to make any adjustments to 
the underlying zoning so that it is either clearer to the public when a piece of property or are 
they ok with the fact that the underlying zoning may be much different?
Chairman Reynolds thought he was saying that he wanted to guide the process but that is what the Future Land Use Map is for. Secretary St. Henry said that people first look at the zoning. Chairman Reynolds said that they cannot propose a mass rezone that has to be a property owner. He added that the underlying zoning is what it is zoned. They can't say sorry you are now (R-3) or (SE) but they can say from a Master Plan vision they could say that they don’t envision it being high density even if it is currently high density.

Vice-Chairman Gross said what they don’t want to be confronted with is showing something on the Master Plan that says its single-family high-density when it is zoned low-density. Then a developer comes in and says but your Master Plan says I can put high-density in, then they are caught between a rock and a hard place because they are reflecting on the Master Plan as being high-density.

Chairman Reynolds says they always say that they can’t set a president or (PUD) is different but at the same time it is looked at. He thought that when they look at some of these areas right now are going parcel by parcel but what about a corridor what about an area that they are going to promote some density because they are have thought about when and where they don’t want it. So, then someone can’t just come in and railroad them into a (PUD) and they say they did it way over there. Then they can say that they have tastefully looked at these corridors and they don’t want the density here. Secretary St. Henry agreed. Chairman Reynolds said that is why when they are looking at some of these outlying sections they are saying “no” they don’t want to catch it up to the zoning and then there are other areas where they look at some of these sections where the Future Land Use map is kind of out of date. So, then when they get a (PUD) someone that bundled up a bunch of parcels they say, well sorry you just told me no but how are you going to argue otherwise.

Secretary St. Henry said that Vice-Chairman Gross made a good point about when a developer comes in and looks at the disparities between the zoning and the future land use. He added that it seemed that they come into a lot of issues where the public perception of a piece of property and what it is zoned and when the developers come in are 180 degrees different and they try to find some middle ground. Maybe there are no options. They don’t know who set this zoning up, to begin with, but they can’t adjust the zoning every 5-years or take a close look at how did that happen to begin with. Some pieces of property in the Township are zoned, they may have been zoned appropriately before but it doesn’t make sense now. So, how do they make those changes for the future? Or if they can’t do that, ok.

Chairman Reynolds said the answer is the Master Plan, just for the sake of having the vision, this is the guidelines of what they want to see. It is hard to combine lots but if they in their vision say that they don't want density out there then they are kind of grandfathered in they are not going to roll to a denser format. He added that when someone comes in and says, hey it aligns or it doesn’t align with our future land use when they have a rezone that gives them some grounds to go on to say, no go, or go. They can’t control every little piece but they can layout the guidebook to say here is what they want to see. There might be those outliers from time to time. With corridors and areas, maybe it is not section 7 versus 8 but rather the region. He knew that they were going to probably look at that with other layers.

Chairman Reynolds asked Planner Arroyo how do they say they are going down the wrong path, how do they regroup and go somewhere else? Planner Arroyo said he thought in this section they are going to have the medium-high on the east side closer to the corridor and then maintain that lower density there to the southwest. They are going to be pressed with people wanting to make changes all the way along. That is why he thought it was helpful to have taken the time to go through and study this because they will remember that they had some of these
discussions when they get a proposal for zoning that is not consistent with the Master Plan. He thought that will help them in coming to their recommendation by going through this process and understanding why they did it and how they looked at these relationships between parcels, patterns, and what is happening.

Commissioner Walker said from a future negotiation point-of-view with the developers, he asked if they would be better off by having it as less dense as they can now. That would give them bargaining chips or a way to mediate those disputes if they were to occur further down the road. Planner Arroyo thought that they were better off identifying a practical density that reflects their vision that is defensible and saying this is our vision and they are not going to budge from that. They may allow for creativity in the way like having some lots be smaller in exchange for open space but the density is still the same, and they are going to allow for that creativity but overall, this is our plan and they brought it through and they are generally going to stick with it because that is really what their vision is. He thought that if they showed that consistency and start to act that way and when the proposal comes in and everyone says “hey, they are really not going to budge they are sticking to their plan”, then they will see less of these. When the word on the development street is that they can come in and propose something that is radically denser then as long as they do X, Y, & Z, they will let them have it then they will see more of those too. They can control some of that by the decision-making process and making sure that the decision-making process is founded in the Master Plan that their Master Plan is solid. He thought that was one of the key reasons why the Township wanted to go through this type of process is to really study it so they can feel much more comfortable with the plan when they see these future suggestions for change.

Secretary St. Henry asked what was the word on the street for the last several years amongst developers and planners as it relates to opportunities in Orion Township? Planner Arroyo thought that there was a feeling that the way to get things done is to propose a (PUD) that is the sense that he got in Orion Township. If they are looking to do something that is greater density than what the Master Plan suggests then they come up with a (PUD) and they come up with some type of plan that the Township can except and they might get what they want. Secretary St. Henry said if the Township doesn’t accept it then they will just go ahead and take it to court. Planner Arroyo said that they can always do that but here is what they want to have happen, is once this plan is in place and people come before them and ask for changes and if they are making those solid decisions that are founded in the Master Plan then when someone takes them to court they are going to go to the judge and they are going to say ok they had someone ask for zoning A, B, C, & D, this is what they did, this is how it relates to the Master Plan, they implemented the Master Plan the judge is going to say, hey, they did this Master Plan update they believe in it they are making decisions based on it. If they are not following then they are more likely to have a judge say, wait a minute they are not following the Master Plan anyway, and grant what they are looking for. That has happened in other communities that have been challenged, a judge will look at their pattern of what they have done in other cases.

Chairman Reynolds said if Planner Arroyo’s recommendation is to align, he asked what are some of the other important factors that they want to maintain. Are there limitations, he didn’t want to get complicated and start proposing overlays, is there a corridor vision that they have for certain areas versus others? It doesn’t really matter what “the density is” as long as that is somewhat maintained or those other features are provided in lieu of. He thought there were a couple of areas where it is complicated, they got both, and then they have kind of outliers in both directions so what are they going to support moving forward, one or the other, or recognize it is there, or just stick our heels in the ground and say they are going to stick with low and that is what they see for a vision. Is there some sort of middle ground, a transitional district, or a way to recognize that it is medium-high density but it is a different kind of medium-high than a subdivision? Planner Arroyo replied that he thought that some of these corridors they have
talked about it particularly in this section of the Township where they might want to encourage that open space style development so that the actual homes could be pulled away from the roadway and preserve the corridor. He thought that some of that language could reflect in the Master Plan and have that as an implementation strategy.

Planner Arroyo moved on to Section 10. He said another area with some (R-2) zoning and they go single-family medium. This is a little different they have a much more established pattern of development in this medium density area really should be medium-high to reflect that. Chairman Reynolds agreed.

Planner Arroyo went on to Section 11. He noted that they have talked about how the General Business doesn’t really support the Restrict Business zoning but they wanted to expand that description anyway, so that is something they will do when they bring that back to them.

Planner Arroyo moved on to Section 12. He said that they do have the single-family medium-density that really should be high to reflect the (R-1). Single-family medium-low in that one area. Then they have one parcel that is zoned (OP).

Chairman Reynolds suggested doing section 12 under their agenda item under their regular meeting.

5. ADJOURNMENT
Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, to adjourn the meeting at 6:54 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Walton
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary
Charter Township of Orion
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