

# CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION PLANNING COMMISSION

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

### REGULAR MEETING, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 2017

The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, March 1, 2017 at 7:00pm at the Orion Township Hall, 2525 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, Michigan 48360.

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Justin Dunaskiss, Chairman	Don Walker, PC Rep. to ZBA
Don Gross, Vice Chairman	Neal Porter, Commissioner
John Steimel, BOT Rep. to PC	Rob Zielinski, Commissioner

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

Joe St. Henry, Secretary; with notice

#### **CONSULTANTS PRESENT:**

Matt Lonnerstater (Township Planner) of Carlisle/Wortman Associates, Inc.  
Jim Stevens (Township Engineer) of OHM  
Tammy Girling, Township Planning & Zoning Director

#### **OTHERS PRESENT:**

Ricky Summers	Maria Lupu	Michael Goscicki
Carol Youngpeter	Dana Bramble	Todd Mack
Jack Clark	Travis Bramble	Kate Zacharevich
Alicia Wilcutts	Alex Pollack	Alina Ashman
Duane Smith	Matt Rama	David Ashman
Mike Thompson	Daniel Haffner	Judy Haffner
Mario Rosini	Leonard Gyselink	John Tucker
Joseph Peterson	Bryan Youngpeter	Lisa Tucker
Deborah Peterson	Fred Rubarth	Misty Godley
James Oliver	Linda Rubarth	Joselyne Villagomez
James Vigne	Martin Kaufman	Grant Fodor
Sheryl Goscicki	Lori Lynch	Brian Brodsky
Adrienne Hassberger	Cathy Goodell	George Hanley
Craig Oliver	Shylah Rosini	Lynn Harrison

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

Chairman Dunaskiss opened the meeting at 7:00pm.

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

#### **3. MINUTES**

##### **A. 2-15-17, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes**

Moved by Commissioner Walker, seconded by Commissioner Porter to approve the 2-15-17 Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes as presented.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

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

Moved by Commissioner Walker, seconded by Trustee Steimel to approve the agenda as presented. **Motion carried unanimously.**

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

None heard

#### **6. CONSENT AGENDA**

None

## **7. NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. PC-2017-04, Powers Distributing Site Plan, located at 3700 Giddings Rd., Parcel #09-27-301-052**

Leonard Gyselink with Dembs Construction presented. Mr. Gyselink said their proposal pertains to the north side of the building that was depicted in red on his presentation slide. He explained there used to be a Grand Trunk spur into the building that serviced that side however beer is no longer distributed by rail. Mr. Gyselink said there is an existing fire lane and that they will not be hampering that. There is also an existing gravel bed that was used by the Grand Trunk spur however the rail has been removed leaving the three docks that were once serviced by that rail. One of those docks is used for a recycling dumpster and one is used by 32 ft. and/or 48 ft. trucks once or twice a week to move recyclables to a recycling facility on site. The third dock is the one they are requesting to extend so they can use it as well to move recyclables to the onsite recycling facility.

Mr. Gyselink pointed out that on their proposal they asked for a 24 ft. dock extension however comments were received from the Township Engineer regarding a watermain and a storm drain located in that area. In order not to penetrate that easement, they reduced the dock extension from 24 ft. to 20 ft.

They are also looking to regrade an approximate 20' x 20' area directly in front of the dock so that the stone grade will abut the new dock extension. Mr. Gyselink said they are requesting that this remain a stone lot because of the infrequent use and that it will only be for trucks onsite owned by Powers Distributing. Mr. Gyselink noted there is also existing storm drains that used to front both sides of the railroad track. Those drains feed into oil interceptors and dump into the pond – that information can be submitted to OHM for confirmation.

Planner Lonnerstater went over Carlisle/Wortman's review dated February 21, 2017. Their main concern regarded the paving of the access drive. Section 27.04.B.2 of Zoning Ordinance 78 states, "*all off-street loading berths and loading dock approaches shall be surfaced with a permanent, durable surface, such as concrete, asphalt, or an equivalent material as approved by the Planning Commission.*" He noted that the review says it has to be paved but after further discussion with the applicant and the Township Engineer, that may not be necessary. The Planning Commission can waive that "paved" requirement with another material approved by them as noted in the aforementioned Section. Planner Lonnerstater deferred to the Township Engineer for more information regarding that.

Engineer Stevens added with regard to the Ordinance, in the LI district it specifically states gavel or crushed concrete as an approved material; in the IP district it does not. This site has a split zoning that is right in the middle of where the docks are located. It was his opinion that based on the infrequent use, the fact that it has been there awhile and that it is adjacent to the railroad, he didn't have an issue if that small portion of lot was left as gravel.

Vice Chairman Gross asked if there had been any problems with the existing gravel drive? Mr. Gyselink replied, none. With the rail being in there, the gavel base is probably 18 to 24". It is a substantial bed and there hasn't been any movement. He said the only reason they are re-grading that is because when the rail tracks were removed, some of the gravel bed was displaced.

Chairman Dunaskiss commented the request looks pretty straight forward. Given the infrequency of use as noted by the consultant, there being no drainage issues and it's a long

drive – it seems like gravel is a fitting material for this particular use. Also given that it is a small area.

Chairman Dunaskiss also appreciated the fact that the applicant worked with the Township and reduced the dock size to be outside the easement; this is a good improvement and Powers Distributing have been good stewards of the property

Moved by Vice Chairman Gross, seconded by Trustee Steimel, that the Planning Commission **grant** site plan approval for PC-2017-04, Powers Distributing site plan located at 3700 Giddings Rd. for plans date stamped received February 6, 2017. This **approval** is based upon the following fact that the proposal meets all the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

Roll call vote was as follows: Walker, yes; Zielinski, yes; Steimel, yes; Gross, yes; Porter, yes; Dunaskiss, yes. **Motion carried 6-0** (St. Henry absent).

### **8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

#### **A. PC-2017-01, Gregory Meadows, Planned Unit Development (PUD) Eligibility & Concept Plan, located on a vacant parcel on the south side of Gregory, west of Baldwin Rd., parcel #09-31-200-001**

Chairman Dunaskiss noted the applicant, Michael Furnari, submitted new plans based on comments that were received from the last meeting where the public hearing had been held. He explained to audience members that if a motion is made and supported, they will have an opportunity to comment.

Mr. Furnari reintroduced the Gregory Meadows proposal. He started by going over changes to the revised site plan from the plans that were originally introduced.

They added a natural 50 ft. buffer along Gregory Road. Within that buffer they are preserving 3 large landmark trees. Also on the site, out of the 79 landmark trees, they will be preserving approximately 56 of them or about 75%.

Mr. Furnari pointed out the amenities that were added to the site plan - on the westerly property line quite a bit of open space was added with a natural preserve, integrated walking trails, fountain ponds, overlook views and benches. He pointed out the trail system on his presentation which starts at Gregory Road and goes all the way through the development. He noted there is another walking trail that is centrally located in the development with street lights, trellises, and a play area. They added quite a bit of amenities and reiterated the fact that the theme for this development is “family housing”.

Additionally, roughly 35% of the site is going to be natural open space. Mr. Furnari said he talked to the Planner regarding the open space, there is 19% after the wetlands and detention basins have been subtracted out however meeting the 20% as one of the requirements for the density bonus shouldn't be a problem - that 1%.

Another community benefit, which he was surprised a lot of residents weren't happy with, was the repaving of Gregory Road that is in substantial disarray. One of the other community benefits proposed was the extension of the watermain from Baldwin Road to the site. He noted however some homeowners had concerns that they would have to hook up if it was provided. Mr. Furnari explained it would just be an “insurance policy”. If a well should fail, homeowners would then have the opportunity to hook up. He reiterated again that the whole natural preservation of the westerly border line of the property would also be a community benefit. He commented that on the Land Use map, the Township considers this “high-valued” wildlife and trees so they really want to preserve that westerly property line.

Planner Lonnerstater went over the Carlisle/Wortman review dated revised January 17, 2017. He reminded the Commissioners that this is the second version of this concept plan. He began by overviewing the main changes that were made. The biggest one was that the number of units were reduced from 167 to 142. Due to the reduced number of units, the street layout was modified and the cross-access point which was previously denoted on the plans was removed.

The revised plan shows several new pocket parks, common areas, a preserved natural area in the southwestern portion and that landmark trees will be preserved in that area and also throughout the site. The internal walking trail has been extended and new amenities have been added to the pocket parks including play structures, swing set and pergola as well as some other additional pedestrian amenities. Planner Lonnerstater also mentioned the 50 ft. buffer along Gregory Road in which several landmark trees will be preserved.

The main issue Planner Lonnerstater had was with the density. The applicant is requesting the PUD option to permit smaller lot sizes as well as a fairly large increase in density over what would be permitted in the underlying zoning district. The site is approximately 70 acres and is zoned Suburban Farms (SF). Under that zoning, 2½ acres is the minimum lot size and the applicant did submit a density plan with the previous submittal which showed that approximately 20 units could be constructed feasibly under that zoning. The 142 units represents approximately 7x the amount of density that would be permitted under the underlying zoning. The 142 units was based on an R-3 zoning district equivalency which is about 5 districts denser than the existing SF zoning.

Regarding the Master Plan density, the site is designated as “medium to low density residential” which is about 1/2 to 1 dwelling unit (du) per acre. The applicant is proposing a net density of approximately 2.6 dus per acre and a gross density of about 2.1 dus per acre. Both those are more than twice the amount that would be permitted under the future land use designation.

Planner Lonnerstater noted the PUD ordinance has 6 criteria that determine if bonus density can be granted. Only two of those have to be met. He explained that criteria as follows:

- A high level cluster development where at least 20% is common useable open space. The applicant said that 19% will be preserved and clarified that excludes wetlands. The applicant indicated that he probably could get to the 20%, if so, this criteria would be met.
- The development has to provide a perimeter transition area or greenbelt around all sides of at least 100 ft.. The revised plan show a 50 ft. greenbelt adjacent to Gregory Road but not on the other sides - therefore this criteria is not met.
- That the proposed plan is designated to enhance surface water quality and ground water quality. Here Planner Lonnerstater deferred to the Township Engineer to see if there are any innovative stormwater techniques proposed. In his view, the plan looks pretty generic but reiterated the fact that wetlands will be preserved.
- Provisions and designs need to be put in place that preserve natural features. The plan does show the southwestern corner being preserved as a natural landscape area and the applicant indicated that 56 landmark trees will be preserved. However he did not receive that information with the revised concept plan. If this moves forward, the final PUD will need to show that.

- A donation or contribution of land or amenities that represent significant community benefit has to be demonstrated. As far as he knows, no land is being dedicated or donated on the site.
- Finally - any other elements as determined by the Planning Commission and Township Board.

Planner Lonnerstater commented that this criteria will be important to discuss - at least 2 of have to be met in order to grant a bonus density and the extent of the density will be dependent upon how many are met and to what extent.

In addition to this bonus criteria, the general PUD criteria needs to be met. The main thing here is the project benefit - what is the benefit of this project and what makes this project better than a project that could be permitted under the underlying zoning? Planner Lonnerstater commented that the applicant has addressed some these such as a portion of Gregory Road from the site to Baldwin Road will be paved, there is some natural preservation, pocket parks, common areas and an extended walking trail – the question to the Planning Commission is do these benefits justify both an increase in density and a decrease in lot size?

Planner Lonnerstater said another consideration that needs to be addressed is sidewalk. A sidewalk was provided however he was not sure if it was for both sides of the street.

Planner Lonnerstater commented that the Fire Chief had some concerns about the street layout especially in regard to the removed cross access point and the entrance boulevard. Possibly the Fire Chief or the Township Engineer can provide more comments on that.

One other PUD requirement is that at least 50% of garages need to be side entry or recessed. The applicant provided some color renderings which depicted all the garages as front entry and didn't appear that any were recessed. This will have to be modified.

For the final site plan, if this moves forward, the Township will need more information about the tree preservation, landscaping, stormwater calculations, and anything else listed under Final PUD Plan requirements.

Engineer Stevens went over OHM's review dated February 21, 2017. He noted that both water and sanitary sewer are available in the area. The applicant is proposing off site extensions to service the site with both public water and public sanitary sewer and those systems have adequate capacity to service the proposed site. Engineer Stevens said however that he does have concern about the style of sewer, in terms of how it's going to be serviced – although a lot of those details would be worked out if the development moves forward.

Regarding stormwater management – the applicant is showing detention basins. Because those would tie into a County drain, they will need to follow County standards. For final PUD review, calculations will need to show they meet County requirements.

Pertaining to paving - the site is proposed to be paved with asphalt roads, 27 ft. wide which is adequate. There is a pathway indicated along Gregory Road and the width of that pathway needs to be shown. Engineer Stevens also spoke about considering internal sidewalks as well.

Regarding traffic – Engineer Stevens reiterated that at the first meeting a traffic study was submitted. The highlight of that study showed that levels of service would not significantly be impacted - which their traffic department agreed. However given the character of the area, in terms of traffic, it would significantly change. The current peak hour trips is about 99 in the am

and 115 in the pm. Those trips would more than double with this proposed development. From a traffic engineering standpoint and how their models are ran regarding levels of service, one development does not necessarily have a significant impact but from a traffic volume with the character of that area - there would be a significant change.

Engineer Stevens concluded that the Township will need to determine if the PUD meets eligibility requirements. With regards to the water and sewer infrastructure, they did have a number of comments for the Commission to consider. Again, some of the details could be worked out at a final stage.

Mr. Furnari added that in regards to traffic and the revised site plan, the reduction in units would bring a reduction of about 16% of trip generations.

Commissioner Porter disclosed that he did meet with the applicant and expressed his views on the project with him.

Chairman Dunaskiss asked if there will be sidewalks in the site? Mr. Furnari responded, yes, on both sides of the street. He also added that on the easterly property line, they did leave a 10 ft. natural buffer between the development and the adjoining property owner.

Commissioner Porter asked if the project could be serviced entirely with a gravity system instead of a pump system. Mr. Furnari said he would have to defer to his Engineer but thought there might possibly be a way if they can secure some easements along Sherstone, to tap into the Rolling Meadows sewer. Commissioner Porter commented that pump stations are very expensive to maintain. Mr. Furnari said they would look into it but the reason they didn't propose that was because residents on Sherstone were against having sewer run down their street.

Vice Chairman Gross said he appreciated the applicant attempting to reduce the density to be more in line with the Master Plan unfortunately it was his opinion they were not successful in doing that. One of his concerns was the single entrance onto Gregory Road. He noted there was a recent concept plan before them with 18 units that was off Baldwin Road, the Planning Commission required them to have 2 drives for that small development. Here the applicant is proposing 147 units with a single entrance. As he indicated at the last meeting, the proposal is still not consistent with the recently adopted Master Plan and as the Engineer noted, even with the 16% reduction in potential traffic it is still almost doubling what is existing on the roadway now. He does not support the revised plan.

Commissioner Walker said he appreciated the work the applicant did with regard to eligibility criteria, he has made steps in the right direction. However he shares Vice Chairman Gross's concern regarding the density. Coming down 25 units is a step but a relatively minor step in his opinion. He believed the density as proposed by the applicant is still way over the top.

Trustee Steimel commented one of the problems he has when looking at the plan's current configuration is it appears there will be a lot of variances on setbacks and lot sizes. Many of the lots would not even comply with R-3 zoning requirements which goes back to density.

Trustee Steimel noted that community benefits are also tough to provide. The applicant has added some nice things inside the site but who will see it – just the people in that neighborhood.

Trustee Steimel said that one of the negative impacts he sees is that traffic will be increased and the change in "openness" - how do you balance that? The applicant has indicated they will pave 3,600 ft. of Gregory Road. As heard from some of the citizens at the public hearing - who

would benefit from that? Those residents didn't consider that a benefit. He too didn't see where this would benefit the entire community. Trustee Steimel also commented that for him, it is tough to make this jump from what the property currently is zoned to what the applicant is proposing; even considering the density bonus – the jump isn't usually this big.

Commissioner Porter said he also sees several problems – the front facing garages, not having a double entry onto Gregory Road, insufficient open space, setbacks and complying with the Master Plan's density. If the lots were cut in half, all of these concerns would just about fix themselves. Again, the whole problem relates to density.

Trustee Steimel commented on the reference to the Planning Commission requiring a recent project proposal with less units to have two entrances. That requirement wasn't just based on the number of units, it is also based on how long a road is with only one access – it can't be longer than 600 ft. without another access.

Chairman Dunaskiss asked for Planner Lonnerstater to further explain density and the density bonus credit.

Prior to Planner Lonnerstater's explanation, Chairman Dunaskiss noted the several letters and emails the Township received pertaining to this case. Each of the Commissioners were provided with copies and they will be part of record and on file at the Township.

Planner Lonnerstater went over *Table 2* on page 8 of the Carlisle/Wortman review. This was an overview of the proposed density and the densities of various other zoning districts. He explained that Net Density excludes 20% of the site dedicated to roads, infrastructure and utilities. The proposed PUD comes out to a Net Density of 2.6 dwelling units per acre; the net density for the parallel zoning of SF is 0.36 dwelling units per acre and the parallel plan for R-3 is 3.1 dwelling units per acre which the applicant is using as an equivalency. According to the chart, the applicant's proposed PUD plan and the R-3 district are fairly aligned. The proposed density fits in more with the R-1, R-2 and R-3 whereas the site is zoned SF and is Master Planned for an equivalent of about an SE. The site is planned for much less density than what is proposed.

Mr. Furnari said he disagrees with some of the comments made earlier. He believes that repaving Gregory Road is a substantial community benefit. Also, if you look at the surrounding zonings such as Rolling Meadows, Westlyn Homes and Morgan Pines, he believed this development fits within that same class of zoning. He noted that back about 30 years this property was zoned R-3 and disagrees with its current zoning - it is in the southern part of the Township, close to I-75, by a major north/south thoroughfare and the improvements of Baldwin Road will incorporate well with this development. For this reason and his proposed community benefits, believes there is justification for this density. He further commented that Gregory Road comes up annually at Board meetings, about getting it paved and that there is no money to pave it - this is a good opportunity to get that done.

Moved by Vice Chairman Gross, seconded by Commissioner Porter that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to the Township Board to **deny** PC-2017-01, Gregory Meadows Planned Unit Development Concept and Eligibility plan for parcel 09-31-200-001 for plans date stamped received February 1, 2017. This recommendation to **deny** is based on the following findings of facts:

1. The Planned Unit Development concept plan does not meet a number of the required criteria for eligibility including density impact, consistency with the Master Plan and open space.

2. The Planned Unit Development proposal does not meet the intent of the Planned Unit Development Ordinance to permit a creative use of the property using the existing zoning classification and density by preserving natural features of the site and creating a planned development.
3. The proposal increases the density from an allowable 20 to 25 units under Suburban Farms (SF) to 142 units, comparable to R-3 zoning or 7x denser than that permitted under the base zoning district; and is 2 to 3x denser than the intervening zoning districts of SE and SR.
4. The request is inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the recently adopted Township Master Plan and surrounding properties.
5. There is insufficient benefit to consider a residential density credit under Section 30.03.E of the Zoning Ordinance.

Being a motion was made and supported, Chairman Dunaskiss asked if there were any comments from those in attendance?

Daniel Haffner, 3517 Gregory Rd., said he believed it would have saved a lot of time if surrounding residents were asked what they would allow. It was his opinion that 1 home per acre would be sufficient.

Bryan Youngpeter, 3744 North Oaks, commented it was his opinion the applicant was cheating on open space especially on the northern side of the property – they limited some of the home size creating more common area between homes where they could have just made larger lots. The commented that the majority of the 56 trees they are preserving are in the southwest corner leaving only about 15 of them spread out within the rest of the property. Regarding repaving Gregory Road – currently there is only 90 to 100 trips per day in the morning and in the afternoon which he believed could be supported by a dirt road. Paving the road really only supports no improvement for existing people it would only be an improvement for the people in this subdivision. Regarding asphalt roads instead of concrete – he sees a major concern with plowing. He commented that the majority of lots are still only .192 acres and as far as Baldwin Road improvements, those are to correct existing problems with traffic in the area not to add additional capacity. Comparing the density to Rolling Meadows - 142 homes on 67 acres is 2.16 sites per acre; if he did that for Rolling Meadows phase I which was 95 homes on 64 acres - it comes out to 1.48, much higher than Rolling Meadows.

Todd Mack, 3464 Gregory Road, commented the idea of repairs to Gregory Road is like saying “I want this approved because I want to put plumbing in the houses” – the road has to be fixed if the applicant wants to sell the houses. The interior amenities are great if you live there, but if you are walking along Gregory, you are taking your life into your hands. If he gets approval even for a lesser density, he should be required to put a safety path along Gregory Road from Baldwin to southbound Rohr so other people can walk to those amenities that are so nice.

Mario Rosini, 3890 Gregory Road, lives across from the development. He noted that in the initial proposal there was a privacy berm and now he understands there is going to be green space of 50 ft. – the requirement is 100 ft.. He did not understand why that isn't being met. During the applicant's initial meeting with neighbors, he explained there would be a berm but was unsure of the height and girth that would be needed to shadow out light and noise. Green space would be great but berm would be better. He was also concerned if there would be a sidewalk on both sides of Gregory Road – living across from the development that sidewalk would be in his yard. Will that be imposed on everyone, will they be compensated for it, will they have a say about it? He noted that with there on being

one entrance and exit what will happen if there is an emergency that that entrance/exit is impacted at the time and why he feels there should be more than one. He commented that if another entrance was added, it would decrease some of the density.

Fred Rubarth, 4137 Gregory Road, noted that other than the density and traffic issues, he was concerned about water runoff onto his property. The way it is proposed with the retention pond on the west side, that would come right up to his property line and it is very low land there. He was afraid the development would flood out his property. Regarding traffic - no matter what the numbers indicate, it is worse even at today's rate and is not acceptable but tolerable. If anymore buildings are added, it will really make that a dangerous area which is already dangerous. The benefit of repaving Gregory Road does not extend to his property He said the biggest hit to him is the possibility of his property being flooded. He requested the Commissioners to say no.

Linda Rubarth, 4137 Gregory, said she understands the importance of PUDs relative to economic growth. However is Orion Township at the mercy of any developer to be granted permission to build under a PUD? There are good and bad developers and builders. She was also concerned when she heard some details will be figured out later - some of those details need to be known now before the Planning Commission accepts or denies anything. The applicant has a bad record and that the Commissioners were copied with that information. She asked why does Orion Township have to enter into an agreement with this developer?

Michael Stark, 4423 Homesite Drive, was opposed to the development because there are too many homes for the parcel. Currently he has one neighbor on each side, should this be approved he would gain 7 more neighbors. If he wanted to live in a city, that's where he would have moved. He asked the Commissioners to please keep Lake Orion the charming place that makes him love living here.

Fred Rubarth, 4137 Gregory Road, asked if anyone was concerned with 142 units coming in, that the level of crime might go up? He was not sure how that questioned could be answered.

Joselyne Villagomez, 3720 Gregory Road, clarified that sidewalk is not actually going in on Gregory Road, that it is just going to be in the sub on both sides? She had concern that that there are a lot of joggers and active people who use Gregory Road, if there are many more cars added to it, it would be a safety hazard.

Roll call vote on the motion was as follows: Zielinski, yes; Gross, yes; Porter, yes; Walker, yes; Steimel, yes; Dunaskiss, yes. **Motion carried 6-0** (St. Henry absent).

Chairman Dunaskiss explained the Planning Commission is a recommending body and it was recommended that the Township Board deny the Gregory Meadows PUD concept and eligibility Plan. The subject will now move to an upcoming Township Board meeting.

## **9. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None

## **10. COMMUNICATIONS**

RCOC Road Report, 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2017  
Michigan Association of Planning Newsletter  
Planning & Zoning Newsletter

**11. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

PC-2017-04, Powers Distributing Site Walk Report

**12. PUBLIC HEARING**

A. 3/15/17 at 7:05pm – Joint Public Hearing with Township Board of Trustees and Planning Commission regarding: PC-2017-05 Silver Spruce Plaza PUD Request, located at 3901 S. Lapeer Rd. (parcel #09-26-452-017) and a vacant parcel to the east of 3901 S. Lapeer Rd. (parcel #09-26-452-009). The applicant is proposing to modify the existing gas station site with a redeveloped convenience/service building and pumps, and two additional retail buildings.

**13. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS**

Chairman Dunaskiss commented that he appreciates the public's input at meetings and with their letters and emails.

**15. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS**

None

**16. ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Trustee Steimel to adjourn the meeting at 8:00pm. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Respectfully submitted,



Lynn Harrison  
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary  
Charter Township of Orion

March 15, 2017  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Planning Commission Approval Date