

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION PLANNING COMMISSION

***** MINUTES *****

REGULAR MEETING, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15, 2017

The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, March 15, 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:

Doug Lewan (Township Planner) of Carlisle/Wortman Associates, Inc.
Mark Landis (Township Engineer) of OHM
Tammy Girling, Township Planning & Zoning Director

OTHERS PRESENT:

Teri Donaldson	Fahmi Awdish	Tim Ponton
Michael Donaldson	Michelle Harvath	Gabriel Schuchman
Sgt. D. Zehnpfemic	James Johnson	James Carpenter
Ghassan Abdelnour	Eileen Johnson	Lynn Harrison
Leon Sujak		

1. OPEN MEETING

Chairman Dunaskiss opened the meeting at 7:00pm.

2. ROLL CALL

3. MINUTES

A. 3-1-17, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

Moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Trustee Steimel to approve the 3-1-17 Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes as presented. **Motion carried unanimously.**

4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Moved by Commissioner Walker, seconded by Vice Chairman Gross to approve the agenda as presented. **Motion carried unanimously.**

5. BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENT – NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY

None heard

6. CONSENT AGENDA

None

Chairman Dunaskiss recessed the regular meeting and opened the joint public hearing with the Board of Trustees for case PC-2017-05, Silver Spruce Plaza, Planned Unit Development (PUD) Eligibility and Concept Plan at 7:05pm.

Chairman Dunaskiss closed the PC-2017-05 joint public hearing at 8:00pm

Motion carried by the Board of Trustees to close their Special Meeting at 8:00pm.

7. NEW BUSINESS

A. PC-2017-05, Silver Spruce Plaza, Planned Unit Development (PUD) Eligibility & Concept Plan, 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).

Planner Lewan explained for the public the PUD process and that this project is at the concept stage. He also read the intent section of the PUD from the Zoning Ordinance for the public's information and as a refresher for the Planning Commission.

Planner Lewan noted this project is unique in that it consists of three zoning districts and is why developing this as a PUD was proposed - to consolidate those three zoning districts into a single use so that it might be compatible in this corner.

Planner Lewan went over his review dated March 2, 2017 and concluded it came down to three major topics: does the project meet the intent of a PUD, does it meet the eligibility criteria, and compatibility.

Planner Lewan went over the items on page 16 of his report that need to be addressed.

- Regarding information on the intended commercial use of Parcel B. Planner Lewan commented there was discussion on this during the public hearing. This is something that should be clarified and be very specific on the part of the petitioner. If their intent is for a low intensity use, that could go a long way in showing that this project could be compatible with the adjacent properties.
- Planner Lewan said there needs to be discussion on what uses might be acceptable on Parcel B – what kind of businesses might be allowed. As a PUD those are binding, whatever the Planning Commission and Township Board ultimately determine as a list of uses, it would be binding.
- An open space calculation has to be provided, there is some minimum open space required for a PUD. There is a standard that allows the Planning Commission to consider up to 100 ft. setback when they have commercial properties adjoining residential properties. The Planning Commission has the discretion add additional buffering between these projects.
- In association with the buffering, there should be some consideration given to additional screening between the commercial and residential land uses. This type of screening can be from additional landscape berming to screening fencing.
- The applicant needs to offer additional public benefits to demonstrate that the PUD offers a unique development option which would not be permitted under the current zoning. In the plans the petitioner suggested that the project's building architecture was a benefit. The petitioner needs to provide additional information showing public benefits in order to allow the PUD to move forward.
- All deviations from what would be the underlying zoning designations have to be provided. The report indicated a deviation from building height, if there are any other deviations, they can be folded into the PUD and become part of the review process.
- The petitioner needs to clarify why they are proposing 32 additional parking spaces. The additional paving will mean additional impervious surfaces which then would require additional storm water detention.

- The Planning Commission may request a traffic study as part of the project.
- They would like to see sidewalk connections from the safety paths to the buildings and between buildings.
- The petitioner should consider additional site amenities such as community seating, bike racks, decorative paving and possibly a corner gateway feature.
- That the Township Attorney draft a PUD Development Agreement outlining the conditions identified by the Planning Commission and/or the Township Board.

Planner Lewan commented he also provided five items to be addressed for the final PUD review but would discuss those items when it becomes necessary.

Chairman Dunaskiss asked Engineer Landis to highlight OHM's review dated March 1, 2017.

- Engineer Landis noted that the petitioner has agreed to update their topo survey to reflect the recent improvement to M-24 and Silverbell.
- Regarding water and sewer, both are adjacent and extended within the property to service the proposed development. There are no concerns with capacity.
- Pertaining to stormwater management – the petitioner is proposing to expand the existing detention basin to account for the additional development. They did encourage the petitioner to submit an oil and water separator be installed prior to discharge to the detention basin. Engineer Landis said they envision the detention basin be an outlet to the recently constructed storm sewer on M-24 which will require a permit from MDOT.
- Engineer Landis said they had no real concerns with grading or paving. As the plan progresses, the petitioner would have to add additional detail regarding proposed pavement cross sections, etc.
- Regarding site circulation and traffic – the petitioner is proposing to reuse both existing driveways off of M-24 and then add a third off of Silverbell. As indicated, the pathway along Silverbell was removed and the petitioner has been asked to reinstall it. Engineer Landis said he also understands that the petitioner is also willing to extend the pathway north to fill the gaps that exist off site.
- Although the intersection was recently modeled and reconstructed by MDOT, OHM felt it was appropriate to have the petitioner undertake a partial traffic study to review access management and any potential conflicts with the driveways across the street from the project.

Chairman Dunaskiss asked for comments and questions from the Commissioners.

Trustee Porter asked what the hours will be for proposed operation? Mr. Awdish said the convenience store and the additional franchise would most likely be 24-hours but there is a possible chance it may not be. Regarding the retail, that would probably close at 8pm and opening anywhere from 7 to 10am depending on the type of business. He anticipates whatever is developed on Parcel B will have hours similar to a bank and wouldn't have a lot of traffic at night however he could not say that something wouldn't be 24-hours. Something like a nursing home could be a 24-hour facility but that wouldn't generate a lot of traffic or noise. Trustee Porter indicated that because this is a PUD, this needs to be spelled out.

Commissioner Porter asked Planner Lewan that because there is a mezzanine on the plans, will an elevator be required? Mr. Abdelnour respond that by code it is a very small mezzanine and will only be used for storage so he believes an elevator would not be required but stairs would. Planner Lewan said he would look into it.

Commissioner Zielinski said he understands the need for the gas station but asked for more clarification on the petitioner's purchase of Parcel B. Mr. Awdish replied that he was seeking an entrance off of Silverbell before the road improvements were proposed and was trying to work with the property owner of Parcel B to share an entrance with him but that owner was not interested. To make it all work and to facilitate the easements that were needed by RCOC to be able to provide two right turn lanes, purchasing the property helped him be able to save parking, etc.. It was more so to get a full access entrance. Mr. Awdish reiterated that RCOC would only allow an entrance if it was exactly across from the credit union's entrance.

Commissioner Zielinski asked Mr. Awdish if he had considered leaving Parcel B as residential and putting a house on it? Mr. Awdish said he personally does not see a house working there. Usually you have a business that relies on heavy traffic and then businesses will feed off that such as a bank. Also because of all the residential that was built behind them, a day care would also be a possibility. Mr. Abdelnour said it will probably be a small office building or bank that will look residential. Mr. Awdish added that if a house was put there, the occupants would probably have to share an entrance with their business, he didn't believe RCOC would approve another entrance

Trustee Steimel asked for the petitioner to put up sheet SP100 on the screen, this sheet depicts the plan that could be built as the property is zoned. He pointed out for the public that if the property remains as zoned, a day care or a home could go on Parcel B, either way the woods would most likely be removed. However the petitioner is proposing to develop as a PUD which helps because it then would be under one control but believed that the Township also lost something with this proposal such as some of the buffering. He asked the petitioner what they are doing uniquely to buffer the residential next to them, there were no details provided.

There was some discussion on the creek that runs between two of the residential homes mentioned during the public hearing. Commissioner Zielinski clarified that during their site walk they walked the entire property and noted drainage goes along Morgan on the east and at the time of the site walk there was no evidence of anything flowing through there. There were some low spots however where water probably would collect.

Mr. Abdelnour addressed the additional parking spaces and said they could look at that. Planner Lewan asked them to especially look at those behind the building.

Regarding the height deviation, Planner Lewan said that 25 ft. is the maximum in the RB and GB district and they are proposing 33 ft..

Commissioner Porter asked if there was additional setback required when a commercial use abuts a residential use and has then been met? Planner Lewan responded that the Planning Commission can require up to 100 ft. for a PUD.

Chairman Dunaskiss agreed with Trustee Steimel's comments regarding that it appears that with the proposed PUD, the development would be "downgrading" from what would be allowed if left as currently zoned – there is no open space or green space on the new plans and there is serious concerns on the buffering and distance between the uses. Trustee Steimel clarified that his concern was not the distance between the uses, but between those uses and the residential properties.

Vice Chairman Gross clarified that the current gas station was developed under a PUD. The petitioner indicated, yes. Developing this as a PUD would allow the opportunity to do some access management with the entrances and pose conditions on potential uses. All factors considered, as a concept he would be supportive of the plan although there still has to be a lot of work done to it.

Planner Lewan looked up the setback question and found there is a 30 ft. requirement between RB and single family. This plan does meet the 30 feet however on the R-1 property, there is not a similar buffer requirement.

Chairman Dunaskiss said he was still struggling with the recognizable community benefits other than the combination of two access points. He was not opposed to the redevelopment there however there needs to be more open space and recognizable community benefits. He was not seeing much of an upgrade in the PUD plan from how it could be developed as it is. He believes they are missing the mark a little when it comes to developing the piece to the east.

Commissioner Walker agreed that developing this as a PUD will allow the Township to put some conditions on it and was mainly concerned about the neighbors to the east. He asked about the community benefit and does it have to be for citizens of the Township as a whole?

Planner Lewan responded, the idea is to look at what the Township would be getting above what it would normally get with just a site plan proposal.

Mr. Awdish said they are willing to make sure the safety path that was removed during the road construction is put back and that they intend to extend it 60 ft. beyond their property line to finish it. He believed another benefit was that when the road work was going on, he gave up more easement then he wanted to making sure that residents and their concern about the traffic would be addressed by allowing for two right turn lanes. Mr. Awdish added that he is also moving forward with a traffic study.

Planner Lewan commented that they met with the petitioner at a pre-application meeting, talked to Township staff and looked at the plan. It appears to him that the plan could meet PUD criteria and he would be willing to work with the petitioner to try and do that however that decision is the Planning Commissions.

Commissioner Porter said that if he had his choice between the existing zoning and the PUD he would prefer the existing zoning. It was his opinion that putting a bank on Parcel B would not be acceptable, he would prefer an attorney's office or a doctor's office and would still want screening on both the east and the west from the gas station.

Vice Chairman Gross noted some of his concerns. On Parcel B, as a minimum, would like it to be restricted to uses permitted in OP; relative to the retail on the northern portion, those uses be restricted to RB as opposed to GB uses; the buffering and the setbacks adjacent to the residential properties be intensified to result in a higher quality development than what would be permitted under the current zoning standards; the safety path should also be connected with the path from Lapeer Road to Silverbell; the traffic study that is being done, if there could be an analysis of a right turn out only onto Silverbell Road to see what impact that would have; if a PUD is considered, believes we need to also amend the Master Plan accordingly to reflect the PUD uses; to make sure that any of the zoning ordinance requirements do not reflect a required waiver, that they are looking to maintain zoning standards.

Trustee Steimel said he doesn't have a problem restricting Parcel B to OP uses but would also not have a problem if a day care went there but would not be in favor of any kind of drive-thru on that parcel.

Moved by Vice Chairman Gross, supported by Commissioner Porter, that the Planning Commission **postpone** action on PC-2017-05, for the subject properties to allow the petitioner to review comments made this evening with staff and the planning consultant.

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

It was noted that to make this PUD eligible, it was suggested that the borders on the east and west sides of Parcel B have substantial buffering and that too would become a very recognizable benefit.

Commissioner Walker asked if the public will be notified when this item comes back to the Planning Commission? It was noted that another public hearing notice would not go out but that the public could contact the Planning & Zoning Department and they could let them know when it comes back or they could watch the agendas on Township doors and website.

B. PC-2017-06, 1436 Lapeer Road Retail Building, Site Plan. Located just south of 1320 S. Lapeer, parcel #09-14-100-053.

Mr. Tim Ponton with Stonefield Engineering & Design presented and introduced Mitchel Harvey, one of the designers. He commented they are here tonight to discuss the site located at 1436 S. Lapeer Road. The site is approximately 7.65 acres, undeveloped, to the north of the site is the Lake Orion Family Dentistry, to the south is a retail shopping center; and across Lapeer Road area couple of banks, Dunham Sports and a Dollar Tree.

Mr. Ponton commented the site may contain some potential mapped wetlands, also that a portion of the site is wooded. He commented that the site is split zoned - the portion adjacent to Lapeer Road is RB and the portion to the rear is R-1. This proposal is only for the RB portion which is for a medical office use along with potential for a restaurant and/or retail use. They are not proposing a drive-thru.

They are looking at approximately a 7,300 sq. ft. building split between two separate tenants – 5,300 sq. ft. for the medical office and 2,000 sq. ft., along with proposed outdoor seating, for the restaurant. They are not proposing any new accesses along Lapeer Road. They have an existing access easement in place to the north along with what was approved to the south for future cross access.

They are proposing 52 parking space where 46 spaces are required.

In terms of trees, this is going to be a very highly landscaped site. There are a number of existing trees however they would be looking to eliminate some of those that would be within the proposed building and parking lot areas. Mr. Ponton noted that all the trees that were depicted in the darker green on the plans would remain. He explained that seven frontage trees are required and they are proposing that. In addition, six parking lot trees are required and they are proposing twelve. The reason they are proposing double the amount of trees within the northern portion is because they are seeking a waiver from the zoning ordinance for the parking buffer to the adjacent property - 15 ft. is required, they are proposing just under 7 ft.. It was his opinion that everything else is in compliance, there would be 68 trees on the site overall.

They are, pending on the final wetland survey, looking to go with an above ground basin to the rear. If that area is determined to be wetlands, they would go with a combined basin and/or store everything underground.

Mr. Ponton noted there will be sidewalks all around the building, there will be full circulation for safe deliveries and fire access. Circulation will be two-way on the north and to the east and one-way on the south and to the west.

Regarding comments to the building and the architecture – they did work on some color elevations, there is a good mixture of materials, some elevation drops along the front of the building, some material changes, and brick columns and canopies to offset the front from the back.

Mr. Ponton said they were in receipt of Engineer Landis's review letter dated March 8, 2017 and responded to his concerns as follows:

- Once they flag the wetlands and make that determination, they will deal with the retention basin construction.
- They will provide a wetland delineation survey once the weather allows.
- They will finalize the pond sizing and calculations once they determine the final location of the basin. This should not have any impact to the overall geometry, they will still meet all requirements of the Township and Oakland County.
- They will provide that the public sanitary sewer and water main will be extended into the site with separate service leads provided to each user.
- They agree that the asphalt pavement cross-section needs to be revised to reflect Township requirements of 4" of asphalt over 8" of aggregate base and is amendable to doing that.
- They will provide a pavement cross-section for the loading area.
- And they did not have an issue with trash enclosure being reoriented to facilitate pick-up access.

Regarding Planner Lewan's review letter dated March 9, 2017:

- They will extend out the "area of development" line to be outside of the trees to be preserved and will use tree protection fence. He noted they did do a tree survey and none of the trees were identified as landmark.
- Again, they will provide a wetland delineation survey and will acquire MDEQ permits of needed.
- They are asking the Planning Commission to waive the required parking lot setback from 20 ft. to 6.7 ft.. They will be providing 5 additional feet to the south and doubling the amount of trees to hopefully mitigate that for the Commissioners.
- In regards to item 6 of the Items To Be Addressed, Mr. Ponton said there is no future plans for the property to the west. Behind the proposed building and parking lot there is a significant amount of green space, trees, and is somewhat wooded. They are not looking to

do any additional development on the RB portion and there are no plans or no discussion on what will happen to the west. Mr. Ponton said he knows they would have to come back before the Planning Commission for anything that might go there.

- They will submit a separate sign application.
- They have provided more detailed elevation drawings outlining exterior materials and colors.
- There will be rooftop equipment proposed and there will be a parapet and it will be screened.

Being the petitioner went through and addressed all of the consultants' concerns, Chairman Dunaskiss asked for comments or questions from the Commissioners.

Trustee Steimel said the petitioner did agree to address all of the consult concerns but those will still have to be shown.

Regarding the waiver for the parking and setback to the north, Trustee Steimel said he would be in favor of it. He said that he is also glad that they are not asking for another access and noted the architecture would be consistent with the buildings to the south.

Chairman Dunaskiss asked Engineer Landis if the petitioner's responses to his review concerns could be taken care of or does there need to be more detail on the plans before this can move forward? Engineer Landis said he was glad to hear the petitioner has agreed to look at the wetlands; it certainly could impact the pond location but believes there is adequate room if there is an issue, he could provide underground retention.

Planner Lewan noted there are several things the Planning Commission has to consider tonight. One is a parking lot setback and a side yard greenbelt setback. They also need to consider additional buffering to the vacant residential zoned property to the west however per his review, didn't believe that would be necessary. He had asked for more detailed elevation drawings and the petitioner did provide this. Other items could be addressed with the building department prior to permits being issued. He noted his biggest concern was the "area of development" line, some of the trees they showed to be preserved were in the development area. However the petitioner did say they would move that line to make sure the preserved trees would be outside the development area.

Trustee Steimel pointed out that the property is actually bigger than what they are proposing to develop and reminded the Planning Commissioners that if they approve the site plan, they are approving it for the entire property.

Chairman Dunaskiss asked what their timing was for this development and if they already had a tenant for this space? Mr. Ponton responded, they do have one tenant, Henry Ford for the medical space and they are supposed deliver them the space by November 1st.

Chairman Dunaskiss commented that given the developments to the north and south, it is applicable that the petitioner be granted the waiver they are requesting, if they had to meet the requirement, it would squeeze the site and make it less desirable.

Moved by Commissioner Porter, supported by Vice Chairman Gross, that in regards to PC-2017-06, Lapeer Road Retail Site Plan, that the Planning Commission **grants** a 13.3' parking lot setback waiver and an 8.3' greenbelt waiver on the north side for the plans date stamped

received 2/22/17 based on the fact they are providing extra landscaping and extra open space to the west.

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

Trustee Steimel said he did not see a photometric grid. Planner Lewan said that one was provided, it was sheet C-9. Mr. Ponton said they are proposing 6 new area lights which will be LED along with 8 new building lights also LED so they will be in compliance from a lighting standpoint.

Moved by Vice Chairman Gross, supported by Commissioner Porter that the Planning Commission grants site plan **approval** for PC-2017-06, Lapeer Retail site plan located at vacant parcel #09-14-100-053 for plans date stamped received 2/22/17 based on the conditions that snow fencing around the trees to be saved will be installed, that the access management agreement is reviewed and approved by the Township Attorney, that the plan complies with all other Zoning Ordinance requirements and complies with the Planner's and Engineer's report.

Roll Call Vote: Steimel, yes; Gross, yes; Zielinski, yes; Porter, yes; Walker, yes; Dunaskiss, yes; motion carried 6-0 (St. Henry absent)

Planner Lewan clarified the area of development line and that the intent is to preserve some of the trees in that area. Vice Chairman Gross said he covered that in the motion's condition that a snow fence will be required. Planner Lewan believed there is a difference and explained there is a required building envelop or site grading that once designated on a site plan, the developer can clear any of the trees within that envelop, he suggested that the petitioner alter that envelop to preserve some of the additional trees and the petitioner did indicate they would do that.

Trustee Steimel reiterated concerns about there being potential wetlands and that even though it may not appear wet, the soil itself has to be considered too.

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. PC-2016-17, Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance #78, Article XXXIV, BIZ Design Standards

Planner Lewan explained the history of this text amendment. Tonight he provided the Commissioners with a memo that he worked on with Planner Wortman. Planner Lewan said he and Planner Wortman discussed the best way to handle this at this point and there is a provision in the Planning Enabling legislation, PA 33, that allows a Township to look at a "sub area plan" which is short of a Master Plan amendment. A sub area plan is for a specific area that needs a little more study. One of the benefits of a sub plan is the approval process can be much quicker than a Master Plan amendment. The sub plan should be about 5 to 10 pages and he went over what areas would be reviewed which were outlined in his memo dated March 8, 2017. He noted that in Planning & Zoning, typically you plan first and zone second. Planner Lewan added that Planner Wortman has already done some of the preliminary work. He then asked for additional direction or comments from the Commissioners.

There was a lengthy discussion on this topic as follows:

Commissioner Porter believed that taking another look at this area of the Township is a necessity not an option. He reiterated his thoughts that right now in that area you could have something residential and then right next to it a "stamping Plant", both are allowed. They need to step back and look at this again and "get it right" He then asked if the Township Board approved a budget to do this? Planner Lewan said that he did give Supervisor Barnett a budget and he emailed him to proceed.

Chairman Dunaskiss said he did like the sub area plan approach and likes the flow of what Planner Lewan described.

Trustee Steimel commented the sub area plan sounds similar to an overlay district and it appears like it will involve another study and more time. Trustee Steimel also said that he disagreed with Commissioner Porter and didn't feel this district needs to be looked at again. The Township keeps looking at this area and changing it and no sooner is it done that it comes back seeking other changes or updates which is usually precipitated by a developer coming in and proposing something that doesn't fit.

Chairman Dunaskiss asked for opinions from the other Commissioners on which direction they would like to go – to be more expansive by looking at this whole thing again or looking more at just narrowing down the design guidelines. He does see Commissioner Porter's view but how far does the Township go to do that?

Commissioner Walker asked how do we do this – decide how much is going to be commercial and how much is going to be residential, where do we put it, and then what do we do once it's laid out and someone comes in and doesn't fit where they want to go? We are then back to a rezoning request or a PUD; doing the same thing we always do.

It was Commissioner Porter's opinion that residential and "stamping plants" should both be completely removed from this area. He believed it all should be commercial. This would require more thinking - there is road right-of-way and 75 ft. lots that are 1,300 ft. feet deep, nobody can develop that. His thought was the only way to do this would be to put a roadway back there, approximately 800 ft. back from Brown Road. That would divide the parcels into three - frontage on Brown Road and then on both side of the new road.

Planner Lewan said ultimately this "sub area plan" would end up with an amendment to the BIZ zone and is not intended to be a replacement for the zoning. The proposal is a planning effort. He added that if they were to remove the residential and the "stamping plants" the Master Plan would have to be amended, this is why they are suggesting the sub plan approach.

Commissioner Porter added that the acreage on the Township's side is almost double the amount on the Auburn Hills side; this is a serious issue and the Township needs to get it right.

Vice Chairman Gross said he too felt that residential doesn't fit here and agreed that the sub plan is probably the best way to approach this. It was his recommendation to look at this separately and come back with a "master plan" for that area with recommendations for both land uses as well as design criteria.

Trustee Steimel felt this would take us back to the beginning because there were studies done that said this area shouldn't be all commercial. He said we have looked at this 5 times before and thought we had it right each time. He is not against this but has already been down this road too many times; maybe we start first with determining a goal.

Commissioner Porter said one of the things he thinks is needed here is restaurants; given the size of Great Lakes Crossing and what is on Brown Road, there is not enough restaurants to supply the area. Again however, the size of the lots hinders this.

Chairman Dunaskiss suggested some type of survey to find out what type developments developers have been looking at for this area and where the Township might be "missing the mark" or scaring people away; this is a very challenging area. He asked Planning & Zoning Director Girling what she has encountered?

Planning & Zoning Director Girling responded there has been conversation for a number of uses. A lot are hovering but she believes they are waiting to see what happens with the road and with Menard's. She agreed with Commissioner Porter that now might be the time to look at all the uses; are there any that we really don't want that might detour what we really do want? It was her opinion that a lot of developers are trying to "assemble" properties.

The Commissioners discussed the pros and cons of Commissioner Porter's suggestion of getting a road back between the properties. They also discussed if the prices of the properties in that area are priced right, would a developer get a return on their investment?

Vice Chairman Gross suggested they go back to the basics of establishing goals and objectives and then do some design criteria to encourage that. It was suggested that maybe we have Gary Roberts come back in and speak to this. Vice Chairman Gross said he believed that Menard's will be the "seed", we will begin to see what real interest there is; there are a lot of uses that follow Menard's. It was suggested that we get with the Township Consultants and someone from the County.

Planner Lewan was asked if this conversation has given him enough information to come back with something? Planner Lewan responded that he has heard enough to want to start over. To do a more formal goal setting session as an agenda item, to look at the current Master Plan in a little more detail, to look at current BIZ standards and noted that a little more standardized streetscape on Brown Road was the key outlined by Supervisor Barnett. He suggested possibly taking a step back and doing some goal setting sessions that may determine the district is fine the way it is.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling was concerned that decisions on this might be coming from all different directions – from the Planning Commission, Township Board, Mr. Roberts. She suggested this might be a good discussion to have at the joint meeting that is usually held around this time of year – so that it won't be so disconnected. Being that Supervisor Barnett wanted to get going this, she felt she needs to get with him and let him know this is going in two different directions and how he would like to handle it.

Planning & Zoning Director Girling commented that she would get with Planner Lewan and figure out how to proceed with this after listening to this discussion.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

10. COMMUNICATIONS

Michigan Planner January/February 2017 Newsletter

11. COMMITTEE REPORTS

PC-2017-05, Silver Spruce Plaza Site Walk Report

PC-2017-06, Lapeer Retail Plaza Site Walk Report

12. PUBLIC HEARING

None

13. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

Chairman Dunaskiss said he appreciated everyone's input and feedback tonight.

15. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

None

16. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Trustee Steimel, to adjourn the meeting at 10:35pm. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Respectfully submitted,



Lynn Harrison
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary
Charter Township of Orion

April 5, 2017

Planning Commission Approval Date