

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**\*\*\*\*\* MINUTES \*\*\*\*\***  
**REGULAR MEETING, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2022**

The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, October 19, 2022, at 7:00 p.m. at the Orion Township Municipality Complex Board Room, 2323 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, Michigan 48360.

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Derek Brackon, Commissioner

**1. OPEN MEETING**

Chairman Reynolds opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

As noted above.

**CONSULTANT'S PRESENT:**

Tammy Girling, Township Planning & Zoning Director

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

None.

**3. MINUTES**

A. 10-5-22, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

Moved by Secretary St. Henry, seconded by Commissioner Walker to **approve** the minutes as presented. **Motion carried**

**4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Secretary St. Henry, to **approve** the agenda as presented. **Motion carried**

**5. BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENT – NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY**

None.

**6. CONSENT AGENDA**

None.

**7. NEW BUSINESS**

None.

---

Chairman Reynolds recessed the regular meeting at 7:03 p.m. and opened the public hearing for PC-22-35, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ord. #78, Article XXX, Section 30.09, Performance Guarantees at 7:05 p.m.

Chairman Reynolds closed the public hearing for PC-22-35 at 7:07 p.m. and reconvened the regular Planning Commission meeting.

---

## **8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **A. PC-22-35, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ord. #78, Article XXX, Section 30.09, Performance Guarantees**

Chairman Reynolds said that there was a motion in front of them to recommend to the Board of Trustees to move forward on the text amendment.

Chairman Reynolds stated that everything that they have seen here tonight was discussed over the last year. He was comfortable and he thought that if anything this is a benefit to anyone that was proposing a project within the Township, it gives them another opportunity to keep the project moving forward without tying up cash dollars or lines of credit. It was something that they had heard from small and large projects throughout the Township, so he was in full support of this and looked forward to having it as part of their ordinance.

Secretary St. Henry asked how often do developers typically use bonds as their preferred choice when they are proposing development, projects outside of Orion Township? Chairman Reynolds replied probably three-quarters or better than half will start to use the bond process. It is essentially the insurance policy against their asks. It is going to be a popular take because it is more of a fee ask from the developer versus them tying up cash dollars.

Secretary St. Henry said he was assuming they were treating this as a best practice that they picked up from other communities. Chairman Reynolds stated without divulging specific projects they have had small projects throughout the year of longtime resident business owners that had a small addition on their project. They had to come up with tens of thousands of dollars in a credit line or cash that would potentially sideways their project for the time being versus a bond which would be a fee amount that would cover their asking and cover their ask for essentially the project to still be completed. There is some verbiage in here that obviously still allows them to protect them and still allow it.

Trustee Urbanowski thanked Chairman Reynolds for being thorough over the last year and doing this, and whoever else was on the committee as well.

Moved by Trustee Urbanowski, seconded by Commissioner Gingell, that the Planning Commission **forwards a recommendation** to the Township Board to **approve and adopt** PC-22-35, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance #78, Article XXX, Section 30.09, Performance Guarantees, for the following reasons: it took a year to do, they all researched it well, and it will be a good best practice for them moving forward.

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds said this is a common practice it is not an off-the-beaten-path ask. If anything, they are just bringing themselves up to date with similar communities around them.

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

### **B. PC-21-65, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ord. #78, 2021-2022 Ordinance Updates.**

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated that some of these they have seen already, they started this PC project in 2021. Working through the discussed changes didn't

necessarily happen rapidly. With a little bit of decline in the work she felt they needed to get this wrapped up even if there are some things that they say that they are still not 100% happy with, they could exclude that and go with what they have. She wanted to present to them what they had discussed before with the tweaks. She had given them the minutes in their packet in case they wanted to read what was discussed.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling added that in addition, there was a Fence Committee that was created at the same time as the Performance Guarantee Committee. The committee wants the attorney to make sure they are good with the language but as long as they were already talking about other text amendments and the fact that even if they like this language the attorney has to review it, she went ahead and incorporated it. Anything related to fences even if they liked it, if the attorney likes it. It has to take a quick trip back to the committee to make sure that they are ready to sign off on it. She has been instructed in the past whenever they are doing a text amendment this elaborate to please give them a hard copy of everything they are discussing so they do have in front of them each of the sections they are talking about, and only the pages that it has redlines for the changes. It might have a page before if it was the beginning of the section or a page after.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated that they are going to go section by section.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said related to, they are talking about the definition of a lot, double frontage. This came about related to fences. On a double frontage lot, meaning they have a road in front and a road in back the ordinance had said they are held to a front setback for a structure off of both roads. This created a problem when people want to put in a 6-ft. fence. If they wanted to, for instance, they have a number of homes that back up to Waldon in the Keatington sub, so their home is held to a front setback off of Orbit, then they would be held to a 35-ft. or 30-ft. for the front setback off from Waldon. If they wanted to put up a 6-ft. fence they were having to come in, 30-35-ft. or go for a variance. When they looked at it all districts in single-family residential, most of them have the same front setback as the rear setback. Some of them have where the rear setback is more than the front setback. This double frontage was really serving no purpose. If you are building a home you are held to a front setback off of Orbit, and you are held to a rear setback off of Waldon, why bother talking about having two front setbacks just because they have two roads. It wasn't really accomplishing anything, but it was hurting those people because a detached accessory can be 10-ft. from the rear. This double front setback was hurting unnecessarily, the committee thought, those properties that have double frontage. They have proposed that they change that definition.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said then they get into the definition of lot lines. You have the definition of double frontage and then when it gets into lot lines, they talk about the front lot line and that is where it is talking about your front lot line where you are in front of a road however if you are a double frontage that is where you are held to having the front setback on both. This verbiage has changed to incorporate fixing that issue. When we finish up Article II, looking to have any discussions or whether they like the way that it is presented.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated the only other change in Article II, they discussed this the last time they talked about this in 2021, they used the definition of other communities use for mezzanine and they had a problem with theirs it was like they almost had a double negative how they stated it. They fixed their definition to be similar to other communities. She added that was it for Article II and asked if there was any constructive criticism, likes, dislikes, or changes. Chairman Reynolds stated he was in support of the changes as proposed.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said what she will do when they get through all of these, she will present it to the attorney, if the attorney is good with it then she will go ahead and set the public hearing for it.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated that Section III, in their list of zoning districts never had BIZ, and BIZ is not an overlay it is an actual district so adding that.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said Article IX, they had a case that was the self-storage being built off of Clarkston Rd. that in their setbacks for greenbelts they had a list of what the width was from a greenbelt if they are not adjacent to residential. Actually, it wasn't non-residential it actually listed everything, industrial, office commercial, and they actually had an attorney challenge it, and our attorney said he was right. They can't, just because you left it out say that it applies. So, they really had no width for that landscape greenbelt necessary for any property that was adjacent that is zoned Recreational. She made the assumption that they would want it to be equal to the residential, meaning that the greenbelt had to be 30-ft. versus being similar to office or commercial. Chairman Reynolds and Trustee Urbanowski both supported this.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated that they will see that change that they just discussed in all of their districts so she will just say ditto, they discussed it once.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said the same with the next clause, which is getting into, they discussed it before, covered trash areas which are now titled Trash Enclosures that title she will be using in all districts. They were talking about the fact that they were calling it an enclosed trash area and they are correcting the terms, they want the trash receptacle to be covered but then they have to have the walls around it. They had said it had to be a brick type and there was a discussion of something similar to the materials of the building so that is what they are proposing, something more not so stringent as long as it is in the character of the area. Chairman Reynolds replied in support.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said regarding Articles XIV & XVI, she said ditto adding recreationally there were two sections that they didn't mention setbacks when they listed the districts, so she added Recreation. Letter I. Trash Enclosures same thing she just carried everything over into all of those districts.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said Article XVIII she had presented to them the last time they discussed it. They have a situation where they have a district called Industrial Park. Looking at the preamble it was talking about trying to create a park-like atmosphere for industrial buildings. They do have a number of parcels in the Township

that are zoned Industrial Park that are going to be one single owner of that land and maybe that owner would have two buildings that they own. A prime example is Ashley Commerce Center southwest side of Lapeer and Silverbell. There are two buildings there and they are owned by the same party. Well, that is not a park. There were restrictions in (IP) that if you were in an industrial park you had to have a 60-ft. private road that came in. If they were owned by the same entity, then really it is just a drive coming in. They created a difference that both could exist in an Industrial Park in spite of calling it, Industrial Park in all instances it is not necessarily a "park". From the notes from that meeting she tried to decipher the many ideas that were suggested but she realized that their input, and that there might be a little bit of a tweak that they might want to make on this. Chairman Reynolds said that he had one proposed tweak. His thought was that he liked the verbiage as it stands except for whether it is comprised of 2 or more parcels or a stand-alone parcel. He asked don't they all need to consist of a provision of roads, utilities, adequate setbacks, greenbelts, and landscaping? So, essentially moving the "or stand-alone industrial users on 1 parcel with 2 or more principal buildings", move that after the first revision comprised of 2 or more parcels. Moving that revision up because don't the statements that follow, follow both of those? He stated his proposed amendment would be to strike or stand-alone industrial users on one parcel with 2 or more principal buildings, and they are going to paste it after "comprised of 2 or more parcels". So, his amendment would be "or stand-alone industrial users on 1 parcel with 2 or more principal buildings with full provisions of roads utilities with adequate setbacks, greenbelt, and landscaping. This district is intended to provide locations for similar activities that are permitted in limited industrial use. Just moving it around.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said going to page number 18-3 under #7 they changed all of the districts to not say churches they have made them places of worship. On page 18-4 they are going with a theme of calling it a subdivision/condominium versus a park even though the district is an industrial park that is how they are differentiating between one owner with multiple buildings versus multiple owners in a subdivision/condominium. This was the language she came up with based on again, the conversation.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said ditto again on #3 recreationally; #4 differentiating a neighborhood/condominium and not with the neighborhood or condominium. Page 18-5 ditto on recreationally. Letter J ditto on trash enclosure. Page 18-6 is just a continuation of the trash enclosure.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated Article XIX ditto on recreationally. Next Page 19-3 ditto on trash enclosures.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said Article XX ditto on trash enclosures.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated that Article XXI #3, they are Special Purpose 1 (SP-1) they have one Special Purpose 1 (SP-1) and one Special Purpose 2 (SP-2) in the Township. Special Purpose 1 (SP-1) is up on Clarkston Rd. west of Baldwin the farm building. They had it on the PC at one point and time to turn it into a wedding venue. With that special purpose, if they look at the uses, which are not given to them,

they have a big array. To have that narrow of parking or drive close proximity to an adjacent property, knowing that all of the other districts that they look at, kind of say well if it is adjacent to residential it should be 30 if it is not, it should be 20 why would they only have 20 here so she copied what other districts had. Chairman Reynolds and Trustee Urbanowski agreed with that.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said landscaping 2, same thing why would they just say 10-ft. in landscaping when everything else is the 20 and 30 so she just copied other districts. She added that "I" ditto on trash enclosures.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said SP-2, Article XXII ditto on recreationally the same thing on #2 why did they have it that narrow and made a common to other districts. "I" trash enclosure ditto.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated Article XXIII #3-D-2 ditto on recreationally. I ditto on trash enclosures.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said Article XXIV Recreation 2 (REC-2) #3 recreational ditto, number 5 recreation ditto, and I ditto on Trash Enclosures.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated Schedule of Regulations Article XXVI when they recently did a text amendment for our (IC) district they changed the maximum height in (IC) to 120-ft. but never updated our Schedule of Regulations, so this is just getting that to coincide with that.

Planning & Zoning Director said Article XXVII General Provisions. This does get into where they start talking about fences. She was hesitant to just read everything, but she thought they really needed to discuss it. There will be a little bit of reading out loud on her part just so they can have that discussion. She then asked if they just wanted to read it and then just discuss it? Chairman Reynolds replied go with the latter, he had read through all of these. He wanted to talk high-level on a couple of them of where their points of concern are. In (A4) it kind of goes back to the double lot revisions. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said it was putting in what was discussed by the Fence Committee and what she is now struggling with. They used to say any detached structure and it gave the setbacks. A fence is a structure by the definition in the ordinance and they want to handle fences differently than detached accessory structures. So, they incorporated taking care of that double frontage so that is what all that language is.

Planning & Zoning Director stated on page 27-11 within their charts for detached accessory buildings it says the square footage they can have based on acre size. They had one that was up to ½ acre and the next one started with a ½ acre so what does someone do if they are exactly ½ acre, so they changed that, so they didn't have the exact same numbers.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said on page 27-15 G3 per building code that is the size that residential addresses have to be, they can't have something different than building code, so she was correcting that. The Fire Protection Water Supply Standards,

this was the verbiage they came up with when they last talked about it which is basically talking about per adopted fire code. That way no matter what code they have adopted it covers it.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said on page 27-16, they get a number of questions on setbacks for generators. They are in section C which is projections. If somebody has a side yard setback of 10-ft. projection section would say if you had a bay window you can project two feet into that setback, if you have a fireplace, it can project 2-ft. into that. One of the questions that they had gotten was mostly generators. There was another section that says that a generator or any mechanical equipment can't be adjacent to a habitable window or a window in a habitable space. It can't be adjacent to a bedroom or a living room. This goes on further to say if they meet that that if my house is at 10-ft. how can they have their generator at 10-ft. It is now saying that in all yard's mechanical equipment can project 5-ft. into whatever the required setback is. She added that they also discussed at the last meeting on window wells. Just because it is below grade it is still a question they get, and it is still considered a structure, so they are allowing those, after talking to the Building Official to go 3.5-ft. into the yard. The window wells can be in rear or side yards.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated page 27-36 this is where they get into the fences. They have two types of fences they have a lot line fence or a wall. She keeps saying fences because that was what the Fence Committee was created to work on, but walls are following the same criteria. Basically, if you have a 4-ft. fence you can be on the property line. However, it does get into if they are not going to put it right on the property line then they need to meet the setback. Because if you have a fence between you and your neighbor on the side and they put it on the lot line you are able to use the weedwhacker and maintain it. If you come in 2-ft., 2-ft. is not enough to go on the other side of the fence and maintain it. You have two choices you take that 4-ft. you put it right on the property line, or you meet whatever your district's setback is.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said then they get into a privacy decorative fence or walls. Which is anything taller than 4-ft. no taller than 6-ft. They used to say that they had to meet the setbacks. So, they could have Suburban Farms (SF) that has a side setback, and they would have to have 20-ft. She suspects that the reason it said the setbacks were for maintenance. Well, you don't need 20-ft. just because you are an (SF) zoning 10-ft. is ample. They are saying that they need to have the 10-ft. on all sides including the rear. If they are backing up to a road, then that 10-ft. has to have some type of landscape. She left a question mark about what they would want. She put in what the Fence Committee discussed. As she typed it up and was explaining it to staff saying they are the ones that communicate to citizens does this make sense. If they visualize it they got a lot, and they have a fence at 10-ft., the Waldon situation, and your neighbor wants a fence at 10-ft. and then the next neighbor wants a fence at 10-ft. She heard the Planning Commission say, and she has heard many people say they don't want to be a Fort Knox. Although they changed the ordinance to say you don't have double frontage so you don't have to have 35-ft. they will let them be at 10-ft. what is the difference between Fort Knox on the property line and Fort Know coming in 10-ft. They are still creating Fort Knox by allowing it by right. The one thing that makes it more palatable is possibly saying in that situation they have to have the landscape in

that 10-ft. She wanted to point that out because when she first wrote it, it didn't dawn on her until she started talking to staff about it that they still end up with what they have heard they don't want in the Township which is fence after fence after fence completely surrounding that is 6-ft. in height.

Chairman Reynolds said he was in support of this 10-ft. off the property line with landscaping. The reason for it would be is it supports what they have kind of talked positively about in their Master Plan about landscape corridors and having buffers. He thought this was a good solution to maybe promote the landscape buffer over the fence and if they still want the fence, they are seeing the landscape buffer that they desire to see. Planning & Zoning Director Girling asked if he was talking when it backs on a road? Chairman Reynolds replied correct. He added that like a corridor they are talking about down a corridor they would love to see plantings and not understand that there is development right there. He thought that is what this accomplishes, and it is a decent compromise of some of the ins and outs of this topic that they have been struggling with for many years. It provides them with at least one solution that they commit to that might lead them in the right direction. He said that he had some actual text amendment stuff but a discussion of being in support of the verbiage as they see it here doesn't fit or any disagreement with it? Vice-Chairman Gross said it should just say it shall be landscape period. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said if they are backing up to a road and somebody puts a hedge that is not tall, do they not still look like Fort Knox with 6-ft. tall fences?

Chairman Reynolds said there are two amendments that he would propose (H-2). One of which was when the second line item of when they start talking about the fence/wall shall meet the same front yard setback as a principal structure, but he was changing "at no time can it be closer". He was saying but in no instance, he thought that was more of a technical or legal response. He said at the end of this where there is a question mark his purposed verbiage was on a double frontage or corner lot, the 10-ft. area between the fence and the property line abuts a road shall be landscaped with natural plantings 4-6-ft. in height to obscure direct visibility of the fence from the right-of-way, coniferous plantings are suggested but are not the sole plantings allowable. What he means by that would be that there are of some sort of height to block the majority of the fence and he was suggesting essentially pines, arborvitaes, or something of that nature but not saying that is the only thing they would allow. He would be open to changing that language, but they want to block the visibility is really what they are trying to say. Trustee Urbanowski thought that the height requirement was important because they could just put in holly bushes or something like that. Something a little higher to obstruct the fence itself. Commissioner Gingell asked if it needed to block the entire fence? Planning & Zoning Director Girling said for example one every 3 linear feet. Chairman Reynolds said that he was saying natural plantings 4-6-ft. in height to obscure the direct visibility of the fence. Planning & Zoning Director Girling asked who determines that? At the discretion of? Chairman Reynolds said he would be fine with putting a percentage or something like that. Commissioner Walker said he didn't think they could put a percentage he thought the language is ambiguous enough that it would work. Chairman Reynolds said he was trying to point it in a direction but was also saying it is not. Commissioner Walker said having heard at least 500 people demand a 6-ft. fence on the property line over the last 5-10 years, even though they have the



option of moving it in 10-ft. they don't. Nobody wants to give up 10-ft. of their property for this fence. He didn't think that it wasn't necessary, but it is better because they won't do. Chairman Reynolds said his immediate desire would be to address it with landscaping. He thought that was what they were trying to encourage. To him, if they indeed what the fence they still got to put what their desire is first. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said they lose their 10-ft. and they put what our desire is. Commissioner Walker said it is a compromise and he can hear the Zoning Board of Appeals saying to the next generation of people that want this, look the Township took into consideration all of this stuff, and here is what the compromise that they decided to enforce. You can make a logical argument for that. Chairman Reynolds said he thought they all encourage natural buffers. If there was anything that needed to be added it would be that, but they are talking about the strict rules of a fence. He was trying to say here is our groundwork. That was the verbiage that he came up with. He didn't know if anybody else had any thoughts. He was ok with it being partial visibility, he was ok with seeing part of the fence it was more about setting a priority of what is more important in this matter. Commissioner Walker said it is not the starkness of a naked fence it is broken up by stuff with growing things.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said if they are not backing to a road, and they set their rear fence back 10-ft. they have to be able to get back there so if they don't have a fence on a side, they would have to ability to get back there to maintain it. She just envisioned an older neighborhood with back-to-back houses that somebody puts up a 6-ft. fence with a 10-ft. on the other side, and she knew that it says they are responsible for the maintenance of it, that 10-ft. on the other side of that 6-ft. fence is going to be long forgotten. Chairman Reynolds said he thought they were, especially talking about double frontage and corner lots. He thought it pointed them in a better direction, maybe it doesn't solve all of their issues but at least they created some options and if they need to go back. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said the problem with coming back is it is a hot issue. It is a very hot issue so she thought that they opened up a can of worms. She really liked what they had come up with on the double frontage. She thought it left a question on by saying a fence that is 6-ft. tall can be 10-ft. from the rear lot line. They don't say that anything has to be in there because it is not backing to a road. Chairman Reynolds said the only other solution that he foresaw was a fence on the property line that was agreeable to both adjoining property owners that would be the only other thing that he sees adding this would fix that. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said then you get into recording the document because then when you have a change of ownership. Chairman Reynolds said to him this is verbiage that points them in the right direction and then hopefully it would cut down on the number of variances that they see. It might not eliminate all of the instances in which someone would say, that doesn't make sense here. That is how he was looking at it, here is a step in the right direction, it should cut back on a number of them. He asked if they see a lot of them in the discussion of if they pull it back what is going to happen behind it? Commissioner Walker said that occurs occasionally but that is not the driving force, the driving force reason they won't do it is that they don't want to give up the 10-ft. of property. He added that they have denied fences because of that very issue because they can't get back in there. Somehow this was going to create a one- or two-foot alleyway between two fences so they would say no they can't because who is going to decide whose property is that who is going to take care of that, you just can't let that go.

Chairman Reynolds said that in general, he was not making this an easy topic. They really don't want to see it in the first place. They want to see natural buffers they don't necessarily want to see fences. When there are they create an avenue for it. Without hearing every specific case in which they are not addressing that has been vocalized, he liked what they had here as a step in the right direction.

Secretary St. Henry said in general if they don't like a fence, they have to find some middle ground that they are comfortable with, they have to live with that, that is the bottom line. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that the goal was to cut down the number of cases going to the ZBA. If they are not wanting to lose any, it is not going to, and if they are happy with only losing 10-ft. then it should cut back the number of cases. That was the biggest thing, it came from the ZBA saying they are getting so many cases and anytime you get that many cases it is supposed to come to the Planning Commission to look at a text amendment. Chairman Reynolds said he thought that they have looked at it and have said they are still going to allow fences but with compromise. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said OK they will give that a try and the attorney might say that there is an issue.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said line #4 used to say that large acreage was excluded from all of these specifications, and they saw no reason to exclude large acreage, so they are deleting that.

Chairman Reynolds said in line #6, he thought instead of saying the good side, a technical side would be the finished face. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said thanks, got it.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated on line #7, this was a recommendation from the Building Official, that fences don't require any building permit. How do they know that they are only doing 4-ft., how do they know where they are going to put it. So, they were saying they would have to do a zoning compliance letter, they would come into Planning & Zoning with just a simple diagram, here is my property lines put xx's on it and they are putting the 4-ft. fence right here. Or they are putting a 6-ft. and they are reflecting that they are putting it in 10-ft. here 10-ft. here and then we sign off on it and then they sign that it is the proper reflection of what they are going to do, and it goes on record within our systems.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that Article XXIX, Chairman Reynolds was not here for this, but she had brought it up at the last meeting to make sure that everyone wasn't strongly opposed to it. It has been suggested that the ZBA variances are good for one year from the date they were given. With the state of things, that year goes really fast. Instead of having to get on a ZBA agenda and prepare for it a month ahead of time, it was suggested that staff or the Planning & Zoning Director be able to issue a one-year extension for the first year and then anything after that would have to return to the ZBA. Chairman Reynolds supported. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said it must be in another section that they would get into doing the same thing with site plans.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated in Article XXX, she changed a number of

places where, Planning & Zoning used to be within the Building Department, and then Planning & Zoning became its own department. Looking at areas saying that the Building Department determines if the site plan is an administrative review, it is not the Building Department it is Planning & Zoning Department. So, for a number of areas, she changed it to Planning & Zoning. She added page 30-5 #10 getting with the times why kill trees, why incur postage, applicants typically don't want a hard copy of their approved site plans so they will be ordinance provide them with an electronic set with the approval stamp. If they want to give us a paper copy and come in, they can do it but the only commitment they have is electronic. There is no need for it to be forwarded to the Building Department they get one but by ordinance, there is no need. So, basically saying one copy is retained in the Planning Commission files.

Chairman Reynolds asked if they could back up to 6B page 30-4. His question was is there a reason that they are not submitting to these departments electronically or outside agencies? That would be a recommendation he would make. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said it is actually within the application which ones are electronic and which ones take electronic and which ones don't. This saying two copies is a wrong reflection because if they are doing it electronically there is technically not two copies. The Road Commission and MDOT take it electronically, Water Resource takes it electronically, Health Department does, and utility departments don't. They could add in there please refer to the application for the proper delivery method. Chairman Reynolds said he would like that; he thought the applicant shall be responsible to submit a physical electronic copy to the following agencies as required. Some sort of verbiage. Planning & Zoning Director Girling said by having it in their application and referring them to their application it gives them the ability to modify their application whatever the trend is. Chairman Reynolds said he was in support of that. This is like one of those things where they are mailing in applications and then they are like why are you mailing it versus emailing it. Plus, they don't always get responses back.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said that page 30-6 is talking about site plan completion, and this is again the suggestion, that they see on a regular basis, her sending them cases that have hit the one-year mark, and there has been no change in the text, and they just can't get all the way through where they need to get to and have the building permit within one year. She was suggesting that they have one year to complete it she is able to look to see if there has been a text amendment and if there have been any changes. She is able to give them the first extension, and then anything after that they would have to come to the Planning Commission. Chairman Reynolds said support.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said the same page just changing Building Official to Planning & Zoning Director. Chairman Reynolds said support.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated page 30-7 is the same thing. Page 30-13 same thing; Page 30-14 same thing. Page 30-17 again says that they are going to get an electronic copy of the approval. Completion of site design is on Special Land Use, and she is able to give them the extension. Chairman Reynolds replied support.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated Article XXXIV #3 ditto on recreationally, and

ditto on trash enclosures.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling said Article XXXV ditto on trash enclosures.

Moved by Chairman Reynolds seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, that they proceed with these amendments as discussed and proposed in tonight's meeting at the discretion of their Planning & Zoning Director. **Motion carried.**

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds said that might mean it comes back right away or it ends up coming back in a couple of parts based on the fence discussion. He thought that could be at the discretion of Planning & Zoning Director Girling and her team. If they see fit or what is the best fit for them and their agenda.

#### **9. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **10. COMMUNICATIONS**

None.

#### **11. PLANNERS REPORTS**

None.

#### **12. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

None.

#### **13. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

None.

#### **14. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS**

None.

#### **15. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS**

Secretary St. Henry said he wanted to provide a quick summary of a very successful event that Oakland County Work Force Development completed a couple weeks ago. For the first time in three years, they held an in-person manufacturing day across the County. They had 765 students visit 32 manufacturing facilities around Oakland County including a couple here in Orion. Lake Orion High School participated by sending a class. This was the first time they have been back in person since 2019. The schools were very excited to send kids back in person and so were all of the employers that participated, and they got strong sponsorship support to help pay for some of the costs involved. It was a huge success. He tipped his hat to Ascent Aerospace on Indianwood they participated in, and they really appreciated it and he was looking forward to it again. A lot of people are asking in the community if they are going to be hosting his Career Quest which is a huge career exploration event for high school students around southeast Michigan. Just for the record, they will be bringing it back in November 2023 and the planning is already started.

Trustee Urbanowski asked if that was the one with the 4-quadrants? Secretary St. Henry replied yeah. He added that the event will feature a construction quadrant, an advanced

manufacturing quadrant, a healthcare quadrant, and an information technology quadrant. They expect between 6,000-8,000 students in one day at the Suburban Collection Showplace, three sessions. They typically have about 125-150 employers between the four sections from all over southeast Michigan. Over 1,000 employee volunteers work with the kids in a variety of hands-on activities to teach them about the different occupations and skillsets needed and educational backgrounds. If they have a chance, go to oaklandcountyworks.com and go to the Michigan Career Quest. They held two events in 2018 and 2019 and because the pandemic hasn't had one, they are bringing it back in 2023 it takes a year and a half to plan.

**16. ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by Chairman Reynolds, seconded by Trustee Urbanowski, to adjourn the meeting at 7:54 p.m. **Motion carried.**

Respectfully submitted,



Debra Walton  
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary  
Charter Township of Orion

November 16, 2022

---

Planning Commission Approval Date