

## **CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION PLANNING COMMISSION**

### **\*\*\*\*\* MINUTES \*\*\*\*\***

### **REGULAR MEETING, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2025**

The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, June 18, 2025, 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  
Kim Urbanowski, Secretary

Don Gross, Vice-Chairman  
Jack Lovat, BOT Rep to PC  
Jim Cummins, Commissioner

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Matt Joshua, Commissioner

#### **1. OPEN MEETING**

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

#### **2. ROLL CALL**

As noted.

#### **CONSULTANTS PRESENT:**

John Enos, (Township Planner) of Carlisle Wortman Associates, LLC  
Mark Landis, (Township Engineer) of Orchard, Hiltz, and McCliment, Inc.  
Tammy Girling, Township Planning & Zoning Director

#### **OTHERS PRESENT:**

Kevin Royston	A Clark	Laurie Rosso
John Cecil	Jerome Howey	Michael Potts
Will Wilsher	Stewart Schneider	Margo Clarfelt
Heather Dixon	Terryl Schneider	Larry Clarfelt
Joe Lehman	Stan & Marthe Uzelac	Pat & Carol Ebner
Mary Jo D'Onofrio	Joan Leshley	Gary Coleman
James Kerby	Gary Jensen	Rick & Pam Dippel
Chris Gilbert	Nanette Millen	Jeff Aisthorpe
Cathy Gilbert	Gloria Aquino Sosa	Gary Coleman
Lisa Duval	Karen Bartreau	Camille Coleman
Steve Pangori	Kait Bartreau	
Michelle Dumeah	Eric Hepprer	

---

Chairman Reynolds recessed the regular meeting at 7:08 p.m. and opened a Joint Public Hearing with the Orion Township Board of Trustees and Orion Township Planning Commission and a Public Hearing with the Village of Lake Orion Planning Commission (being conducted simultaneously) at 7:08 p.m. for Orion Township case #PC-25-27, Eastport Village Planned Unit Development (PUD) Concept and Eligibility Plan, located at 571 S. Lapeer Road Sidwell numbers (09-11-427-004, 09-11-427-006 & 09-11- 427-007), and 545 S. Broadway Street Sidwell numbers (09-11-427-016 & 09-11-427-017). The applicant, Mocer Lake Orion LLC, is proposing to rezone the property from General Business (GB) and Single-Family Residential (R-

3) to Planned Unit Development (PUD). The project will be located in the Village and the Township and includes commercial space (all in the Township), 11 multi-family units (all in the Township), and 48 single-family homes (40 in the Township) AND the Village of Lake Orion Case #VLO-25-01 - Eastport Village Special Land Use Request located on a vacant parcel immediately north of 545 S. Broadway St. (OL-09-11-278-034). The applicant, Mocer Lake Orion LLC, is proposing a site plan for the construction of eight (8) single-family homes within the MU, Mixed-Use zoning district. Single-family, detached dwellings are considered a special land use in the Mixed-Use district.

Chairman Reynolds closed the joint public hearing for PC-25-27 at 8:26 p.m. and opened the public hearing for PC-25-26, F&D Silverbell Rezoning, the request is to rezone an irregularly shaped area that totals approx. 2.17 acres of vacant land (parcel #09-35-100-019) located at the SW corner of Silverbell and Lapeer Roads from Industrial Park (IP) to General Business (GB) at 8:31 p.m. (following a brief recess).

Chairman Reynolds closed the public hearing for PC-25-26 at 8:31 p.m., and reconvened the regular meeting at 8:31 p.m.

---

### **3. MINUTES**

A. 6-4-25, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

B. 6-4-25, PC-25-18, Brown Road Plaza, Special Land Use Requests Public Hearing Minutes

Moved by Sectreaty Urbanowski, seconded by Commissioner Walker, to approve the minutes as presented. **Motion carried.**

### **4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Liaison Lovat, to approve the agenda as presented. **Motion carried.**

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

None.

### **6. CONSENT AGENDA**

None.

### **7. NEW BUSINESS**

A. PC-25-26, F&D Silverbell Rezone request, located at the SW corner of Silverbell and Lapeer Rds (parcel #09-35-100-019).

Chairman Reynolds asked if the applicant was presented. They were not. He turned it over to the Planning Commission for their thoughts on whether to proceed with the consultant reviews or wait for the applicant's request to be present. Vice-Chairman Gross responded to proceed. Chairman Reynolds said that he agreed and since it is a fairly straightforward rezone request, he would turn it over to the consultants for their reviews.

Township Planner Enos stated this is a pretty straightforward rezoning request. We have been dealing with this area over the last several months with the haulaway, and the Sheetz site. This is what we would call an upside-down flag request or a rezoning based on, the width of Sheetz and other potential future general business along this corridor. He mentioned that of course, it

would have to be submitted. It does meet the Master Plan, Future Land Use map for this mixture of uses here, and he said that he did not see any real issue with this request.

Chairman Reynolds mentioned that there was a review from the Fire Marshal in their packet with no concerns at this time and this is a recommendation for rezone. He turned it over the Planning Commission for their thoughts on the rezone. There were none.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Cummins, that the Planning Commission forwards a recommendation of the Board of Trustees to **approve** PC-25-26, F&D Silverbell Rezoning Request. The request to rezone an irregularly shaped area that consists of approximately 2.17 acres located at the SW corner of Silverbell and Lapeer Rds. (parcel #09-35-100-019) from Industrial Park (IP) to General Business (GB) for the reasons that the request to rezone from IP to GB is consistent with the objectives of the Master Plan, the zoning classification conforms with the properties within the general area of the subject property, the suitability of the property is within the existing zoning classification of the area and is also finding the trend of the development of the general area of the property in question is of the industrial and business land uses.

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds noted that this is an area that we have seen some flip flop and some tweaks here and there and he thought that the GB zoning along M-24 is not only consistent with our Master Plan and what we are looking for on the corridor, but it is also consistent with the area. We are not doing anything that is out of place, so generally favor and his personal take, although either is acceptable, it is nice to see business uses over maybe some industrial uses, especially as we transition north so he thought it is a favorable rezone request.

**Roll call vote was as follows:** Walker, yes; Urbanowski, yes; Cummins, yes; Gross, yes; Lovat, yes; Reynolds, yes. **Motion carried 6-0 (Joshua absent).**

B. PC-25-28, GM Orion BET2 Program Improvements Site Plan Amendment, located at 4555 Giddings Rd., (parcel #09-34-200-006 & #09-34-400-011).

Chairman Reynolds asked the applicant to step up to the podium, state their name and address for the record and give them a brief overview of the request.

Kevin Royston with Wade Trim, along with Gary Jensen with Walbridge, John Cecil with Wade Trim and Lisa Duvall with GM presented. Mr. Royston thanked the Planning Commission for the opportunity to present today. Mr. Royston explained that they were here to discuss the revised plans for the GM Orion Assembly BET plant expansion. The plan set was previously approved under PC-22-46. The building footprint for the northwest general assembly addition has been revised and increased to its square footage from roughly 82,000 square feet to about a 131,000 square feet. Additionally, further information has been provided regarding the Brown Road drainage diversion on the west side of Giddings Road. Mr. Royston said the update on the plans is the repair vehicle parking was inadvertently counted in the parking counts, and those have subsequently been removed and also some landscape changes have been made to accommodate the ITC easement requirements due to planting height restrictions. The site improvements have been thoughtfully designed in line with the current zoning ordinance, stormwater management, soil erosion, and sedimentation control ordinance. He mentioned that

they were committed to working collaboratively with the Township staff and the Commission to ensure the project integrates with the surrounding areas. Mr. Royston said that they look forward to discussing that project further and addressing any questions that the Planning Commission may have.

Chairman Reynolds turned it over to the consultants for their reviews.

Planner Enos read through his review date stamped June 10, 2025.

Engineer Landis read through his review date stamped June 11, 2025.

Chairman Reynolds mentioned that those reviews are in their packet this evening. The Fire Marshal also had a review recommending approval but with requirements. There are a number of requirements listed here as the consultants here this evening had mentioned. He said that this is a living, breathing project that is continuing to evolve as the ever-changing auto markets is always changing too. There are some comments from him and Public Services, same thing, there is a review done and a review done from WRC. Chairman Reynolds stated his is not the first time they have seen this case. It is an effort to keep us in the loop and make sure everything is conforming from a general sense. He turned it over to the Planning Commission for their questions, comments for the applicant or the consultants.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Liaison Lovat, that the Planning Commission **approves** a waiver from the required 6,610 parking spaces to the proposed 3,327 parking spaces for PC-25-28, GM Orion BET2 Program Improvements Site Plan Amendment, located at 4555 Giddings Rd., (parcel #09-34-200-006 & #09-34-400-011 for plans date stamped received May 28, 2025, based upon the evidence that the applicant has indicated that another standard would be more reasonable, based upon the fact that the industrial layouts now are relying more and more on robotics and manufacturing not using manual labor, therefore the reduced parking waiver would be appropriate based upon the applicant's understanding of their needs.

**Roll call vote was as follows:** Urbanowski, yes; Gross, yes; Lovat, yes; Walker, yes; Cumins, yes; Reynolds, yes. **Motion carried 6-0 (Joshua absent).**

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Liaison Lovat, that the Planning Commission **approves** a waiver from the required landscape screening along Silverbell Road to the proposed distribution of trees along Silverbell Road for PC-25-28, GM Orion BET2 Program Improvements Site Plan Amendment, located at 4555 Giddings Rd., (parcel #09-34-200-006 & #09-34-400-011 for plans date stamped received May 28, 2025, based upon the fact that the applicant has indicated that there are overhead powerlines which restricts the true compliance with the ordinance and has provide reasonable alternatives for a landscape buffer.

**Roll call vote was as follows:** Cummins, yes; Urbanowski, yes; Gross, yes; Lovat, yes; Walker, yes; Reynolds, yes. **Motion carried 6-0 (Joshua absent).**

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that the Planning Commission **approves** a waiver from the required interior parking lot landscaped islands for PC-25-28, GM Orion BET2 Program Improvements Site Plan Amendment, located at 4555 Giddings Rd., (parcel #09-34-200-006 & #09-34-400-011) for plans date stamped received May 28, 2025, based on the fact that this is consistent with the Planning Commission previous approval on May 15, 2024.

**Roll call vote was as follows:** Lovat, yes; Cummins, yes; Gross, yes; Urbanowski, yes; Walker, yes; Reynolds, yes. **Motion carried 6-0 (Joshua absent).**

Moved by Vice-Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Cummins, that the Planning Commission **approves** the amended site plan approval for PC-25-28, GM Orion BET2 Program Improvements Site Plan Amendment, located at 4555 Giddings Rd., (parcel #09-34-200-006 & #09-34-400-011 for plans date stamped received May 28, 2025, based upon the fact that the applicant has made revisions based upon the Planner's and Engineer's review; however, he suggested that the approval be based upon the conditions that any unresolved issues related to the Planner's review letter of June 9, 2025 be incorporated along with any unresolved related to the Township Engineer's letter of June 11, 2025 and any unresolved issues related to the Fire Marshal's review of June 4, 2025 and this is consistent with the Planning Commission approval of August 2022, December 2022, December 2023, January 2024 and May 2024 and that the final revisions based upon the Planner's, Engineer's and Fire Marshal's review being reviewed and approved by the administration.

**Roll call vote was as follows:** Cummins, yes; Urbanowski, yes; Walker, yes; Gross, yes; Lovat, yes; Reynolds, yes. **Motion carried 6-0 (Joshua absent).**

C. PC-25-27, Eastport Village Planned Unit Development (PUD) Concept and Eligibility Plan, located at 571 S. Lapeer Rd. (parcel #09-11-427-004, #09-11-427-006 & #09-11-427-007) and 545 S. Broadway St. (parcel #09-11-427-016 & #09-11-427-017).

Chairman Reynolds knew the applicant was present this evening and asked them to step up to the podium.

Dominic Mocerì stated that he would have his technicians address the comments of the consultants. If it is anything to do with Planning, Dominic Tringale and Dominic Francis Mocerì will address those, as to any engineering questions, traffic, and those infrastructures, Steve Pangori will address them. Mr. Mocerì thought the consultant letters were very thorough and something that is for the most part carries over to would be the next stage is the qualification for a PUD, and this was what they were primarily focused on. He mentioned that they had deep dived into these plans and they have already made a lot of changes as to the consultant's recommendations for what would be the next step to reload at this time and address all those the consultants, in their purview and yours, Mr. Chairman, if you want to go through those, they are here at your request to review. Mr. Mocerì said that they are not going to make light of those things, but, that is what he would consider the next phase. What he would like to concentrate on from the Planning perspective and from a professional consultants, does this qualify for a PUD and that is really why they are here. In regards to Engineer Landis's notes which was very thorough, there are five things that do not conform with the current ordinance, that is why we have to have a PUD. Those changes will be made as part of the contract and going into further steps and also mitigating those things and resolving maybe out of the five, three can be immediately resolved while two of them will have to be part of the PUD contract as to why there are deviations to the ordinance.

Planner Enos read through his review date stamped June 12, 2025.

Engineer Landis read through his review date stamped June 10, 2025.

Chairman Reynolds stated that there was a review from the Fire Marshal in the packet this evening. Unfortunately, he does not recommend approval and has a number of comments as it relates to egress and apparatus turning. He said that we did have a site walk report and a public services review.

Chairman Reynolds turned it over to the Planning Commission, he would kick off with some thoughts and then have the opportunity for the applicant to have some conversations with them. He said, overall, as it was mentioned during the public hearing, had some good comments, he thought as it relates to concerns of density and traffic and a lot of good discussion points that he thought the applicant can take and along with the consultant's comments and discuss them and see how we can incorporate that. Chairman Reynolds initially thought that the project has some good foundation here, some makings for a really nice project. As a local architect who has worked here for a number of years and actually looked at this site a handful of times and it got brought up in a public hearing, but they have seen much more dense projects, proposed here on this site, including one that he worked with, and a developer that never submitted; which was significantly more density and specifically more retail. He appreciated the heavy handedness of the single family detached home with the light-handed commercial component to this.

Chairman Reynolds expressed a few things that he felt that they can maybe start as some discussion points for the Planning Commission. He agreed with the Planner's consultant of just a clearer understanding of the concept and eligibility for the PUD. He thought that a PUD is the right move for this parcel, especially that it borders both the Village and the Township but clearly have an understanding the foundation and then also the deviations is important to us. Setbacks and buffers in particular have been a long discussion point for us, so really taking a look at maybe resolving some of the dead end corridors and a few things that that are fire issues can it relate to additional plantings, maybe preservation of existing landscaping, some of the easements and things that Engineer Landis brought up in his review could equate to a better, equation there. Chairman Reynolds thought that there is a little bit of tweaking with some of the transitional density, specifically behind the existing retail, Midas service center there and some of that component to where it is a really harsh buffer and then transition right back to a single-family home and some of those multi-stories. It was not clear to him the exact height of some of those units, so we would like to hear a little bit more about that and also the greater benefit of just the development.

Chairman Reynolds said that he would love to say producing more housing is a public benefit, but it is not a sole benefit. With that say, what else is being done? It looks like there is some connection to the Paint Creek Trail, some opportunity to bring that forth and through to the Village. He mentioned that having worn multiple hats through the years, that is always been a big discussion point is how to bring people up from Rochester down the Paint Creek Trail and into the Village. As Planner Enos mentioned, although it is not one of the Township's formal fifteen-minute neighborhoods, he thought that they always looked at the Village as a fifteen-minute neighborhood and the component that they can cluster some density in an area, but also being respectful of existing development. Those were a few initial discussions points that Chairman Reynolds had, and he personally thought there is some fine tuning and tweaks and maybe some components that can get ironed out here and circle back with a little bit better end proposal for concept and eligibility.

Secretary Urbanowski agreed to everything that Chairman Reynolds just said, however she did have a couple thoughts on it. She was just recently in Chicago and from where she was staying, to where she needed to be, it was a fifteen minute walk, so it is honestly and as she

was looking at this and thinking this is actually what, in her opinion, they were talking about in the first place because it is connecting those neighborhoods, those single family neighborhoods to an amenity that is pretty cool that we said we wanted. Secretary Urbanowski mentioned that when they were talking about the Sheetz gas station, somebody said the words, why couldn't it be a bakery or a coffee shop? She thought that it can be something spectacular and she did have a couple concerns about the same things that some of the other people that were here tonight mentioned density, somewhat. She thought for her and this goes back to Engineer Landis, point number seven of his review, she wondered if the stormwater infiltration, if they could put more bioswales and things like that in, would that alleviate the concern that a couple of people had about the water runoff and drainage to the trout stream? Would that be a helpful thing to alleviate that concern because we did hear a lot when Sheetz came in because it would be landscaping, which would make her really super happy. Engineer Landis responded to answer your question Secretary Urbanowski, yes, it definitely would be beneficial and the whole idea is to try to infiltrate some of that runoff if you have sandy soils, so it is not all downstream. Secretary Urbanowski said that is true because you have to take things down and put things in, so as much as we can build back the better.

Secretary Urbanowski's other big concern is water and sewer for the entire development only because and she was not super familiar with the Village but she was somewhat because she did, as a Board member, go with the public works department to go look at certain things in the Village that we were responsible for such as like lift stations and things like that, which become very expensive for us to maintain, later down the line. She wondered what the Village's current situation in terms of their infrastructure for water and sewer and are they going bolster the infrastructure while they are building this or are there lift stations going in? She was just concerned that it is going impact the Village's infrastructure in terms of water and sewer but since it is a Township property, that it is going be this future issue. Secretary Urbanowski asked how does it not become a future issue where if she is a Township resident, but you are telling me that they got not so great infrastructure when they do have really good water into it.

Engineer Landis stated that he was sure the applicant may have some feedback from the Village engineer already on this, but he would have to defer to them because he was not familiar with their system although he was pretty sure it is not going to involve a pump station. Secretary Urbanowski said she wanted to put a thumbs up to what Mr. Gibb said about the less curb cuts, that is actually a good thing, proven developer and that he was correct, fire and police millages are going up going up. It is not because there are too many people, but because services become expensive and we did not have any say so really in the millage for the police from Oakland County. It is not a reason to build, but there would be a positive in that.

Chairman Reynolds said that he wanted to clarify one point Secretary Urbanowski, specific to Mr. Kerby's public comment of decks and things, he thought that they have started to learn about some of these PUDs and multi-family developments or residential developments, and they get passed through the years, and then decks come back and they come an issue. He knew that is something that they have spoken to as a Planning Commission and our staff and things that we roll through specifically with the PUD. He stated that part of the PUD agreement is the clarification of the eligible deck area, and that it cannot be granted a variance or as simple as the language that they have essentially been grounding or at least it is within that footprint, so they have clarified that over the years or at least try to mitigate some of those future issues.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling replied that was correct. Some of it comes up after it has gone through the whole thing and we realize, oh, wait a minute, it was not really discussed and

it is discussed during the PUD agreement. She would just have to ask that, as we are looking at projects going forward, that that is one thing that is on our little hit list is you got your building envelope and does that involve a patio at grade? Does that involve a deck? Is that deck outside of it? Is it deck within the building envelope? Planning & Zoning Director Girling stated that it should be discussed at this level versus further on in the process. Chairman Reynolds said that it circles back to his comment of setbacks. Typically, if you were any other property, the setback would include your deck face and there is a couple provisions that allow a little bit something, but the bigger idea is that building an envelope is inclusive of that. We find people being upset that they cannot have a deck, especially when it is a walk out lot so it is something that comes up. Secretary Urbanowski said that she thought it is a beautiful project, and it has a lot of potential.

Vice-Chairman Gross said that he was having trouble at the outset of defining the public benefit as the Planner has indicated of defining what the public benefit is for this project. In the past, we have indicated amongst ourselves and to others that the PUD should not be a tool to increase density. Here we are with a plan that is increasing the density three times to what the base site plan would permit, basically, from 20 units to almost 60 units, 59 units. Another area that they have identified as a public benefit that could be utilized is the plan to support younger families or elderly into the development. He heard some comments to that but based upon what he has seen with the development, these are not going to be basic young family type housing developments, it is going to be basically, older families and not elderly. Vice-Chairman Gross mentioned that there are as indicated, there are a number of issues on the site plan that need to be addressed, and he did not think this is the forum to address the site plan is because there is a lot of those. He said that there is a 11-foot front setback from Lapeer Road, parallel parking, dead end drives, tree preservation, the site mass grading. Vice-Chairman Gross thought those are issues that will come forward to us if the plan gets approved as an eligible PUD project, but his issue is defining public benefit, the open space, and there is no open space in the development that would be either community oriented or project oriented. He was having trouble defining this as having a public benefit at this point.

Chairman Reynolds said that he would echo some of Vice-Chairman Gross' comments. He thought it has the potential to and where he was referring to with open space, there is the criteria that we speak to of what is not calculated in open space. It is not setbacks, not wetlands, it is the other thing, so to him, he thought that is where those transition zones that he would be looking for, the increased landscaping could all be opportunities to meet just that one criteria, but also, the criteria PUD eligibility. He was not 100% clear on all the parts and pieces and he thought that some are clear and some are not. Chairman Reynolds said that specifically the higher density components, the seven plex and the four plex, but also, the general public benefit and whether it is purely driven on, just the missing housing component, from the Master Plan if there is more to it than just that.

Liaison Lovat mentioned that the common thread was that most of these residents brought up was traffic. He asked Engineer Landis if he could talk a little bit about what needs to be changed from that traffic study just a little bit more depth. Engineer Landis responded that he did not think there were any deal breakers in the study, a lot of is fine tuning. The ordinance does speak to the need to have the proposed trip generation estimates use, one standard deviation above average. He said if he was not mistaken, this study did not do that and that is just a statistical way of looking at and is the proposed traffic being generated, the mitigation proposed and does it have better than a fifty-fifty chance of working or not. Engineer Landis explained that they are try to say, okay one standard deviation and maybe we have a 75%



chance now of that mitigation. With that being said, the number of trips being proposed here are pretty small and yes, traffic on M-24 is horrible and the average daily traffic on M-24 is over 2,000 trips, at the peak going in both directions, in the peak hour. Engineer Landis said that, however an additional hundred trips in the PM is somewhat negligible. His point is even by bumping up that that trip generation a little bit, it is not going to probably change much in the way of outcome. The study does speak to the need for adding that fourth leg, on the east side to signalize the proposed driveway, which should be included and noted in here, and then some slight geometric improvements to Odanah on the west side of M-24. He stated that other than that, it was just some fine tuning of some other modeling and whatnot. Liaison Lovat echoed to what Chairman Reynolds said, and that this project does have great potential. He thought that even the commercial use is a little bit lighter, for sure lighter than a strip mall. He liked the idea, but it does need some work.

Commissioner Walker stated that in his view, this is a good-looking project that he was seeing for the first time today. As he reviewed the recommendations from both of the experts, there are at least 30 recommendations on this. He was hesitant, and some were small, but some are big, including the definition of a PUD, so he was not comfortable if you were thinking of voting on this today, he was not comfortable to vote yay or nay on this today because he did not think he did not have enough information to vote.

Commissioner Cummins commented that he believed that the project does have a good ways to go to get where it needs to be. He thought it could end up being a very good project for the community, the architecture works real well. The only problem he had was that one, he did not see how they can meet the 15% open space, meet the greenbelt requirements with 51 units on the Township side. Commissioner Cummins thought that that density is too high and that the density as zoned works probably well and you can probably fit what you need in there. You can get your green belts, your open space and provide a better benefit to the community with less units because it will let you open up the spaces that you need. He mentioned that everyone does have the right to develop the properties in accordance to Township's ordinances and plans. They do not have necessarily the right to expect to increase the zoning if they cannot meet those requirements. Commissioner Cummins said that with some work or some massage, a little less density and a little less traffic he believed it could be a great development.

Mr. Mocerri said that he concurred with all the infrastructure comments and will work within getting as much eco swells and the stormwater management. However, there is also a balance with the trees and the landscaping and there has been some deviations. He stated that one part with the PUD, why there is a PUD is you have deviations, and we will address those and there is a series of them as we have in the other PUDs. Mr. Mocerri explained that as to community benefits, there are significant community benefits and there are neighborhood benefits that are both hand in hand, and connectivity to the Paint Creek Trail. The idea of the safety network, if people are concerned about making a left hand turn at the unlighted intersection at Glanworth and M-24, there is the ability to go to the lighted portion here and it is about safety, welfare, and concerns. In regards to the contract, this is where we go deep in the weeds and he did concur with Vice-Chairman Gross that we need to verbalize and demonstrate the community benefits better. Mr. Mocerri went on to say that one of those things is through the contract, which is really through a next phase by reducing these to ranch units and to not having more what he would call a buffer to the neighborhoods and the neighbors. If they are larger lots, larger homes, and multi-story homes, and then the dissatisfaction of the immediate neighbors as to what they will be seeing. These are designed for starter homes and designed for a universal design, they could demonstrate through these floor plans that the universal

design age in place. He has been in his home for thirty-five years and he was a relatively young man and was planning it on being his last house, his forever home. These with universal design can be both and the ideas of you hear the stories and nauseam and it is just noise with some developers, but to have these unique features and to put it over more land per lot, and then we do not have the attainability. He did not want to say that these are not affordable homes, however, it is attainable for the region, for the area, yes. It is certainly more attainable than the new subdivision homes being built, throughout the Township, but we have to better demonstrate that.

Mr. Mocerri said that in regards to Commissioner Cummins' comments to reduction of density, that comes with a great cost to consumers who are we trying to provide the housing for. There needs to be for the new generation and the current generation people to continue to reside, in Orion Township where they could move up or move down and certainly it could reduce the number of units but then the commercial segment gets much larger and then the traffic does not get less, it gets more. We have several really unique markets that want to come in and do a 40,000 square foot specialized market or 25,000 and no one is biting on the 8,400 square feet. What we are doing is we want to retain, and we have in discussions with Fogler's remaining within the property and doing the coffee and bakery with local proprietors. We could reduce this number of single-family, but he did not think that is beneficial to the community because then the commercial component gets larger and there is a balancing act here.

Mr. Mocerri stated that they did not expect to vote tonight, one way or the other and they do need to come back with more information. We received the consultant's letters last week and if we were to hurry up and address those, there is not time for them to rereview them to make a recommendation even if we change them. They did not go through that process, but they are well aware of their comments and they will be addressing them at the next stage and at the next meeting. He thanked the Planning Commission for having the public hearing and joint public hearing at the same time and they will be diving deep into those comments of both the commissioners and the consultants.

Commissioner Walker asked Mr. Mocerri if he had the estimated market value of these homes. What do you put them up for sale for assuming this would go in as is? Mr. Mocerri responded that they would hope to start below 500,000, which our townhomes in Auburn Hills and in the Pontiac School District are starting at 500,000 and that is a big number twenty years ago. However, that is the entry level of most of the single-family homes in this market they might say, it is \$495,990, but it is 500,000. Mr. Mocerri said that what has pushed this in Auburn Hills, they have had the same floor plans and they started those homes in 2018. The home prices were at \$345,000 and then the customers add options that drive them up, custom cabinetry, custom flooring, all the extras, extras that they add on, and then push that price point to 500,000. What they are trying to do is not nickel down the customer and have it all inclusive. Mr. Mocerri stated that they could strip it down, but then by the time you add all the extras, it is not fair to the consumer that you are going to false market and say they are at \$395,000. Mr. Mocerri said that they can do that, but that is really not going to be the price by which they will be purchased. They also have the townhomes that will be for sale, and they will be much less and they also the live work options, along the entry street. They have the same building, different elevation that they built in Birmingham, Michigan on Eaton Street, where the first floor is live work and so it gives us a greater housing choice. He said that these same homes eight years ago would been in the \$300,000 range but today that \$350,000 home is \$500,000. It has gone with inflation and valuation increases in the Township. Mr. Mocerri did not know if there is any builder that is offering anything for single family homes new, in the 4 hundreds in the Township. He hoped to

be starting there, but this they are two years off. If they were to put a shovel in the ground to build and if they had all the approvals in the perfect world, their first delivery would be at the earliest, 2027, if not 2028. That is almost two and a half, three years off and he did not know what inflation is going to bring. Mr. Mocerri said if you just take a point in time right now, we would say it is in the low five hundreds.

Moved by Chairman Reynolds, seconded by Commissioner Cummins, that the Planning Commission **postpone** action on PC-25-27, Eastport Village Planned Unit Development (PUD) Concept and Eligibility Plan, located at 571 S. Lapeer Rd. (parcel #09-11-427-004, #09-11-427-006 & #09-11-427-007) and 545 S. Broadway St. (parcel #09-11-427-016 & #09-11-427-017) for plans date stamped received May 27, 2025 for the following findings of fact: an opportunity for the applicant to address and clarify the proposal and its PUD eligibility components and also its public benefit, also providing an opportunity for the applicant to address comments and concerns brought forth our consultants, the Commission this evening and also the public hearing held by both the Village and the Township Board of Trustees including by not limited to density, setback, landscaping buffers and transitions between both the developments within the developments itself and adjacent to the development.

Discussion on the motion:

Chairman Reynolds amended his motion to add that the postponement is for a time frame of no greater than 1 year. Commissioner Cummins amended his support.

Bill Wilsher, 915 Buckhorn Dr. He said the only thing that he would like to mention is he knew for the PUD, it had to add some more green space and how the houses were over in the southeast corner there. You have the road that goes off into a dead end and he thought that would be a Fire department thing too. He asked why couldn't they create a park in that area? He did not live in that area, but he has got family that is in that area and the density on Glanworth, he would like to try to see that matched a little bit better. Mr. Wilsher understood that they have to build stuff to make money and said that the development looks really good. His other concern is the condos or townhouses, right behind the Midas muffler shop, he did not see that as a good fit there. He could not live there if he was buying it, but he knew people that probably would, but knowing that area that is really tight in there. He could see the person that now is going to have a corner lot probably have some issues with headlights and that in the driveways, especially if they pack in.

Heather Dixon, 682 Pleasant Ridge, who is at the corner of Summer Street and Pleasant Ridge. She mentioned that Secretary Urbanowski had mentioned the Sheetz development and she was here for that and one of the things her neighbor down the street said is, there was about 20 some elementary school kids on that street. Her concern is with the access onto Glanworth, she understood that it has been said it is a requirement from the Fire department. Ms. Dixon explained that what happens then is M-24 backs up and people use Clarkston Road, and they cut through Parkview. They go flying down Pleasant Ridge right by her neighborhood where there is a kid in a ditch who is no her kid looking for frogs right on the corner of the road. We have a flooding issue in the neighborhood and that is why everyone talked about flooding, so we have people who are not really living in the neighborhood trying to avoid traffic on M-24. That is one of the biggest concerns with that road and what is that going to do to the feel of the neighborhood? She asked what is that going to do to the kids who are able to bike

down the street to their friend's house because they do not have sidewalks, it is down the street. Ms. Dixon said aside from that some people talked about flooding, she is going to go home and she is not going to know where the road is. The entire road is going to be flooded over and it is gone on Pleasant Bridge. Her yard had water 70 feet into it today.

She said that this is their life, we were on old dirt roads, we are a small community, but we are a tight knit community in John Winter Sub. There are comments, we cannot make left turns out of M-24, none of us do, we do not try to. We go down to Clarkson Road, and that is why she knew other people will also go down to Clarkson Road because that is the only way we can get out to those houses in the neighborhoods. Ms. Dixon mentioned that for access to the Paint Creek Trail, the John Winter Subdivision has two access points. It is not something we are looking to use and it is not something we need. There was also a comment about Village water while being a Township resident. That is half of the John Winter Sub. Ms. Dixon said that last year, they had a week of brown water and nobody knew why. She called the Village, they said they did not know, they were looking. She got sick of it and I called the Township, and she begged them, please call the Village and work something out because she was not getting anywhere. There was a week of brown water, a week of undrinkable water and this is the John Winter Sub, we are an old development. She said that they were affordable housing, truly affordable housing and understood that prices have gone up. Ten years ago, our houses were a 100, a 150,000 and now they are 200,000. You want affordable housing, you are looking at the John Winter Sub.

Ms. Dixon stated that all of them are stuck here, they are priced out of Lake Orion, and we cannot move and this is what we have in the John Winter Sub. She would like everyone to consider that when we are looking at the site plans, consider the density, consider the condos that are right next to Midas and consider the house that will now be across the street from a road with headlights blinding their living room. She knew the neighbor who could not be here tonight she was unfortunately home sick. The neighbor had told Ms. Dixon that she parked her truck over there and it is like daylight in her living room when someone pulls out of that road that is proposed. She understood that this project is going to happen and there is going to be development and that is great. Ms. Dixon said that did not see wooded areas as a bad thing, but we need some more open space. We need to make sure that the flooding does not get worse in the neighborhood, so we do have a road left and that is why everyone is so concerned about they have to drive down a road that is flooded over. She invited everyone that the next time there is a rainstorm, come and see what we are talking about because there is not going to be a road that goes 70 feet in either direction and it is both sides of the road. Ms. Dixon stated that she looks forward to continuing the conversation and to development that fits both with the John Winters and within the bigger community.

**Roll call vote was as follows:** Urbanowski, yes; Gross, yes; Walker, yes; Cummins, yes; Lovat, yes; Reynolds, yes. **Motion carried 6-0 (Joshua absent).**

#### **8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None.

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

None.

**10. COMMUNICATIONS**

None.

**11. PLANNERS REPORT/EDUCATION**

None.

**12. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

None.

**13. FUTURE PUBLIC HEARINGS**

None.

**14. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS**

Chairman Reynolds appreciated everyone coming out this evening and thanked everyone for listening out loud and respecting the process. He reiterated that they are citizens themselves, they are appointed, yes as a Township, they do get some compensation, but he highly doubted it would cover the babysitting charge that he would have for sitting through most of these meetings for his child. Chairman Reynolds also thanked everyone for respecting them. They do value everyone's comments, and we are put in a tough position because there are development rights, there are zoning rights, and they do their best to make sure these developments are the best they can be.

**15. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS**

Vice-Chairman Gross said that a well-respected Planner once said we do not plan communities, we negotiate.

Liaison Lovat mentioned that he got an email at 8:51 p.m. from a resident for the Eastport Village project.

Commissioner Cummins said that it was good to be back.

**16. ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by Chairman Reynolds, seconded by Secretary Urbanowski, to adjourn the meeting at 9:40 p.m. **Motion carried.**

Respectfully submitted,

Courtney Keisman  
PC/ZBA Clerk  
Charter Township of Orion

July 16, 2025

---

Planning Commission Approval Date