

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION PLANNING COMMISSION

******* MINUTES *******

REGULAR MEETING, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 2018

The Charter Township of Orion Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, March 7, 2018 at 7:00pm at the Orion Township Hall, 2525 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, Michigan 48360.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Don Gross, Vice Chairman	Neal Porter, Commissioner
Joe St. Henry, Secretary	Scott Reynolds, Commissioner
Don Walker, PC Rep to ZBA	

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:

Justin Dunaskiss
John Steimel, with notice

CONSULTANTS PRESENT:

Doug Lewan (Township Planner) of Carlisle/Wortman Associates, Inc.

1. OPEN MEETING

Vice Chairman Gross opened the meeting at 7:00pm.

2. ROLL CALL

As noted

OTHERS PRESENT:

Leanna Haun	Jennifer Leale	Craig Collins
Erika West	Melissa Reisler	Regina Eaton
Cathy Milaino	Elizabeth Millard	Keri & Eric Sorenson
Terry Oestti	LouAnne Case	Lynn Harrison

3. MINUTES

A. 2-21-18, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

B. 2-21-18, PC-2018-07, Planet Fitness Special Land Use Public Hearing Minutes

Moved by Commissioner Walker, seconded by Commissioner Reynolds, to **approve** the 2-21-18, Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes and the 2-21-18, PC-2018-07, Planet Fitness Special Land Use Public Hearing Minutes, as presented. **Motion carried**

4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Moved by Commissioner Reynolds, seconded by Commissioner Porter 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-2018-10, 4215 Clarkston Road, located at 4215 Clarkston Rd. (parcel 09-18-104-002); Determination of Use Application

Ms. Leanna Haun, the new owner of the old barn at 4215 Clarkston Road, presented. Mr. Haun noted that she submitted an analysis of what the building is currently zoned for (the uses) and one of the items is a restaurant. The business she is proposing is a combination use of art and wedding venue. She noted those uses are not specifically included in the list of uses in the SP-1 zoning district however it was her position that it (the wedding venue) is similar to a restaurant and has a lot of attributes similar to a business that is allowed.

Ms. Haun noted that while it (the wedding venue portion) is similar to a restaurant, she pointed out that because of its limited use, it will have a much smaller impact on the property. Restaurants are open year-around, 7-days a week with much longer hours; she is only looking to utilize this through the summer and on the weekends. Restaurants “turn their tables” much more frequently, her capacity will be capped at 199 people which is only really providing for 25 to 100 cars entering the facility – minimal amount per year as opposed to the capacity that would be allowed for a restaurant.

Ms. Haun then commented that she did an analysis on the uses that are not allowed in the SP-1 district such as retail establishments, big department stores, gasoline/restaurants, etc. and she found those would bring an exorbitant number of cars. Her interpretation of the district is that the Township is looking for something that has a smaller impact on the area and on the surrounding neighborhood. Ms. Haun asked the Commissioners to look at some of the Planner’s recommendations, take those into consideration and align this as being similar to and allowed in the SP-1 district.

Planner Lewan went over Carlisle/Wortman’s review dated March 2, 2018.

Planner Lewan explained that tonight what the Planning Commission is doing is not reviewing the plan or approval of what the applicant would like to do, what they are considering is the use itself, just the use, and to try and decide if that use is similar to other uses permitted in the Special Purpose-1 Zoning District.

The use as described by the applicant, wedding/art barn is a unique combination, almost a “mixed use”. That combination is not specifically mentioned in any other zoning district. When there is a situation where a use is not specifically mentioned in any other zoning district, the Planning Commission must make, upon the request of the applicant, a determination if the use is similar enough to other uses within that zoning and if it would be compatible with other uses in the SP-1 zoning district.

In the Planner’s review, it was noted that one of the things that was different about the SP-1 district is that it specifically talks about it being a mixed-use district. The other unique thing is that every use in the SP-1 district is a special land use. There is no “out-and-out” permitted use by right in the SP-1 district. If the Planning Commission was to determine that this use was acceptable in this district, there would still have to be a public hearing to go over all the specifics of the proposed use. He noted that he has not yet done a review of those specifics, right now they are trying to look at just the use, wedding/art barn, to see if it is similar to other things allowed within the zoning district.

Planner Lewan went over for those in attendance and for the viewing audience the list of uses allowed as special land uses within the SP-1 District. Those were on page 1 of the review and were also on page 21-1 of Zoning Ordinance #78. He reiterated that any one of these uses would require a public hearing, special land use approval and would require all the necessary review standards the Township requires to make sure the use is compatible with the part of the Township it is located in.

Planner Lewan then explained that there are specific standards that the Planning Commission must consider when there is a use that is not specifically mentioned by name in the Zoning Ordinance - the use has to be compatible with other uses permitted within the subject district.

Planner Lewan said the review was broken down into two sections, one being the art class part of it. The applicant makes the case that the art classes that will occur in the barn, presumably in the winter months, would be similar to a photography studio, camera sales-service shop, schools for music, dance, businesses, trades, etc.

Regarding the wedding facility – it is different than a banquet facility that is envisioned within one of the Township’s commercial districts. He suggested that the applicant might want to speak to how this use is different than a banquet facility. From information provided by the applicant, this facility will apparently only operate on a somewhat limited schedule which does appear to be different than a banquet facility that is operates year-round. This wedding facility attached with the art studio part, he believed was different enough from a straight banquet facility.

The other thing Planner Lewan pointed out was the SP-1 District Preamble which was noted on pages 2 and 3 of the review and on page 21-1 of Zoning Ordinance #78. He wanted that noted because there are certainly some similarities between what the applicant is proposing and what the Preamble of the SP-1 District talks about.

Vice Chairman Gross reiterated that as Planner Lewan indicated, this is not a rezoning request, the property is already zoned Special Purpose-1 which allows various uses and/or mixed-use developments and the Commissioners are not dealing with a rezoning request of the subject property. The property is zoned as Special Purpose and has been for quite a while.

Vice Chairman Gross asked if anyone here would like to make a comment?

Craig Collins, 1240 Valley View Dr., the President of the Heather Lakes South Homeowners Association. Mr. Collins had concerns that the subject parcel does not meet the 10 acre minimum, that he doesn’t see the difference between a wedding venue and banquet facility, in his estimation this will bring in about 100 cars and where will they park, and in his opinion the district was set up to help residential areas and does not believe this proposal fits into that. He asked if there was a timeline for the approval process? He understands there is a meeting on March 21st, is that the start of the process? Vice Chairman Gross responded, yes, and at that meeting they would be reviewing the details of the site plan (if there is a positive determination made tonight). It was noted that site plans were submitted to the Planning & Zoning Department but have not been giving to the Commissioners for review.

Melissa Reisler, 1050 Valley View Dr., two houses down from the proposed site. She commented that property was used as residential for many years and now someone wants to use it as a wedding venue and art studio. She commented that there is an art studio already just a mile down the road; does not want a wedding venue in her backyard; said she wasn’t notified of tonight’s meeting; understood that this has already been approved and the only reason why the applicant bought the property; it was her opinion that if this goes through, it will upset about 64 homeowners in that neighborhood; believed this use will initiate more cars and traffic along Valley View Drive; and was concerned that people attending weddings there will not care about those that live in the neighborhood. She said she does not see how this use will be a benefit and, again, the property is much less than 10 acres. This is not a good use for the neighborhood and the property should remain a residential use. She asked the Commissioners to deny all requests to turn this into a commercial building. It was also her opinion that the facility will cause traffic back-ups on Clarkston Road. Ms. Reisler commented that most

weddings occur on the weekends and in the summer - when most people in the neighborhood want to have family time and the kids are out of school.

Keri Sorenson, 1121 Meadow Crest Dr., one of her concerns was that the subject parcel is only 2-acres and doesn't see how 200 people and cars are going to fit on this property, it doesn't make sense to her. She also had concerns about noise; there are no side walks in the subdivision; and there is already a lot of traffic that goes through it and someone was hit by a car last year going to the bus stop. All this needs to be considered - the lack of space for a wedding venue on a 2-acre lot.

Planner Lewan explained that regarding the fact that no one was noticed about tonight's meeting is that this meeting is technically not a public hearing notices are not required. The action taking place tonight is an administrative action allowed by the Zoning Ordinance to determine if a use can be included in a zoning district.

Melissa Reisler asked, doesn't a parcel in the SP-1 district have to be 10 acres? Planner Lewan responded that this parcel is a pre-existing non-conforming lot and explained for everyone what that meant. Ms. Reisler then asked how a zoning district can be changed, it is in the middle of a subdivision? Planner Lewan informed her that a rezoning request has to be initiated by the property owner, the Planning Commission or Township Board.

Terry Oestti, 1066 Valley View Dr., concurred with everyone's comments and said he did get a public hearing notice and found out about tonight's meeting by stopping by the Planning & Zoning Department this week and asking questions about the public hearing notice and the location of the subject property.

Regina Eaton, 1080 Valley View Dr., also concurred and wanted the Planning Commissioners to know that this is important to them that this does not happen. There will be a noise issue, a spillage over of guests, people parking on their street and yards, there are no sidewalks, there are houses on either side of the property, and asked if this is approved, will the applicant be limited to her request or will she be able to do whatever she wants.

Commissioner Walker explained that during public comments, the Commissioners usually do not answer questions and there is no conversation back and forth. They listen and want the public's opinion but there is a process. Ms. Eaton's question would be addressed at the meeting on March 21st when the special land use and site plan are discussed and that is when possible conditions would be put in place if this were to move forward – they would be in writing and more formal.

Jennifer Leale, 1025 Valley View Dr., said she was concerned about traffic; noise; her children being out in the summertime riding bikes, with no sidewalks the road is the only option. She was concerned about the safety of her children – people outside of the neighborhood aren't going to be as careful as those who live in there.

Ms. Haun responded to some of the comments. She said she was happy to see that people showed up to this meeting and they bought up everything that she had considered too. She said she understands everyone's compassion about their homes, where they live and the safety of their children. She then gave some feedback on the design elements she will be putting in place in consideration to these concerns. Ms. Haun said it would not be possible for her to be there unless the neighbors feel good.

Regarding parking and traffic flow – there is a small parking lot at the front of the property that she will be expanding and installing a drivable grate system; she then explained what that was.

This system will meet Township requirement for a hard surface and also make it very green. She commented that this is a gorgeous barn and doesn't want the look of a cement parking lot.

In addition to that, she will have a valet service and proper signage will be put out along Valley View Drive that say, "No Parking for Event". There won't be any exists from the property onto Valley View Dr., there will only be access from Clarkson Road. She also noted that the valet employees will do a walk around to make sure there aren't any event cars parked on Valley View Drive, if so, they will find the owners and move the cars. For self-parking, there is enough space around the perimeter for 100 cars, but she does not plan on there being any self-parking but instead, the valet service.

Regarding sound issues – Ms. Haun will be insulating the inside of the barn and if that is not enough, will be adding acoustic panels. There will be a thorough process and efforts put in place to make sure that guests are being considerate of the surrounding neighbors. An on-site person will always be there to address any issues and she will be there too to make sure everything goes well.

Ms. Haun reiterated that she was happy everyone was here because there hasn't been an opportunity for them to see what she is planning or to personally meet her. She said she is committed to making sure this is nothing more than a beautiful, old historical building that is getting renewed and repurposed and given a life. She noted that if anyone had concerns, they could contact her directly. It was Ms. Haun's opinion that she has thought through everything and hasn't heard anything tonight that she hasn't thought about already and has come up with a solution and operational answer. She asked the residents here tonight to look at it and see the benefit of what is happening here. Ms. Haun commented that the property was becoming an eyesore and now she is committed to the preservation of the building, giving it life, and doing it professionally and courteously. She asked the citizens here tonight to have faith and trust in her; her goal is to make sure every person's concern is thought through and addressed so everyone can co-exist in a great manner.

Melissa Reisler said she agreed that Ms. Haun may have thought through these things but asked why Ms. Haun didn't hand out letters to residents explaining to them what her plans were. It was Ms. Reisler's opinion she should have done this before she bought the house. It was also Ms. Reisler's opinion that the Commissioners have already made their decision that Ms. Haun can go ahead with her plans otherwise she wouldn't have bought the property. Ms. Reisler said, she does not doubt that Ms. Haun will make the property look better. She again reiterated that she believes there will be a huge influx of traffic in a spot that it is not suitable for; there is no room on Clarkston Road for people to go around cars turning left onto the property; and was concerned where the cars are going to be valet parked. She noted that they bought in this subdivision to be away from commercial activities.

Vice Chairman Gross brought the discussion back up to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Porter asked if this property is intended to be a facility for wedding ceremonies, wedding receptions or both? Ms. Haun responded, both.

Commissioner Porter said he agreed with all the concerns that were raised tonight and that he also runs a wedding facility. He commented that he can see some potential site plan issues, however, that is not what they are here for tonight. Regarding the art portion of this request, it was his recollection that this is what it has been used for.

Commissioner Reynolds said he appreciated all the comments tonight, however there is a process and wants to hear everyone's concerns - from the applicant, the neighbors and the

public. He clarified that they are not reviewing the site plan for the proposed use specific to this property, they are reviewing if the proposed use of a wedding barn is similar and a permitted use within the SP-1 district. He encouraged everyone to bring their concerns forward whether this is or isn't approved. If it is, there is additional steps, but they are specifically talking about uses in SP-1 tonight. He asked everyone to focus the conversation on that. He said he understands the concerns of the adjacent neighborhood, but the task tonight isn't to review safety paths, parking, the number of occupants, etc. This case is specific to, is a wedding barn an acceptable use in SP-1?

Secretary St. Henry added that the Site Walk Committee did a site walk of the property and they had the same issues and concerns that were brought up tonight. Those will all be taken into consideration, if this moves forward, especially at the next phase when they look at a site plan and see how this is going to be laid out; it has to meet several requirements.

Commissioner Walker concurred with Commissioner Reynolds' comments and they (the Commissioners) are not here to pass judgement on the plans themselves. They are here to determine whether the applicant's proposal fits what the property is zoned for. There is a lot here, to him, that says that it is. Just because it may be, doesn't mean it would be approved for anything at all like the applicant wants. He assured the residents that the Commissioners have listened to what they have said. He did, however, take offense at a comment that indicated the Commissioner had already determined that this was going to pass. They have not and do not talk about these things; they are not in cahoots with anybody. The Commissioners are commissioned to do what is right for the Township according to the Ordinances.

Commissioner Porter asked if the property across the street from the Township, Canterbury Village, is zoned SP-1? Planner Lewan said that it was. Commissioner Porter then clarified that they hold weddings there so then how can they say that weddings are not allowed in SP-1 on Clarkston Road but if it is on Joslyn, it is allowed.

Ms. Reisler brought up the fact this parcel is not 10 acres and the SP1 district has a minimum 10-acre parcel requirement. Planner Lewan reiterated that this parcel is a legal preexisting non-conforming lot and explained what that means.

Terry Oestti, 1066 Valley View Dr., spoke and said he didn't see how this property can be compared to Canterbury Village. Canterbury Village is not embedded in a residential neighborhood.

Planner Lewan explained they are just looking at the zoning, the proposed use as it was presented to the Township. The Township didn't ask for this determination, someone came to them and requested this and therefore the Township must "react" to the request. They are looking at is the use that was requested by a property owner or an applicant - does the use fit within the written zone; we are not looking at specifics yet. The specifics will be looked at during the next stage. All the comments tonight will be discussed at the next meeting – setback distance, noise, parking, traffic, etc. He noted that even if it is determined that this use is acceptable in the SP-1 district, all that means is it allows the applicant to move forward with an actual application. The application she is requesting is a discretionary approval which means the Township can deny it, it is not a "permitted use by right". For that use to be approved, the applicant has to show, and the Planning Commission has to agree that certain criteria were met and many of that criteria have to do with how the use will impact the neighboring properties. All the comments raised are valid, but this isn't when those are considered, the Commissioners will be considering those if this move on. If a positive motion occurs tonight from the Planning Commission, that a wedding/art barn is acceptable in the SP-1 district then we get into the details and the nitty gritty of the plan and will be considering that in more detail.

Ms. Reisler asked that if Canterbury Village is zoned SP-1 and weddings are allowed there, then why aren't they automatically allowed on this property that is zoned SP-1? Secretary St. Henry said there is a process that must be followed every single time. Secretary St. Henry said they have not made any decisions, the site walk visit yesterday was the first time they've seen it. They have not seen any site plan, which is critical, the site plan will spell out what this development will look like – that will be at the next meeting if this moves forward.

Commissioner Reynolds encouraged everyone to be involved in the zoning process, if it doesn't make sense tonight, they have an administration that is wonderful and can help everyone understand how the process works. They (the Commissioners) are trying to focus on a specific task tonight which is reviewing, specifically, the application and if this "use is similar in nature with other SP district uses. They are not reviewing all the details of the proposal yet.

Moved by Commissioner Porter seconded by Commissioner Reynolds, that in the case of PC-2018-10, 4215 W. Clarkston Rd., requesting a determination that a requested use of a wedding barn **is similar in nature** to the uses listed in Ordinance #78, Article XXI, Section 21.01 based on the following facts: it is similar to a restaurant without a drive-thru facility and other SP-1 parcels have been approved for weddings.

Roll call vote was as follows: Walker, yes; Reynolds, yes; Porter, yes; Gross, yes; St. Henry, yes. **Motion carried 5-0** (Dunaskiss and Steimel absent)

Moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that in the case of PC-2018-10, 4215 W. Clarkston Rd., requesting a determination that a requested use for art classes **is similar in nature** to uses listed in Ordinance #78, Article XXI, Section 21.01 based on the following findings of facts: it is similar to a photo studio which is an approved use.

Roll call vote was as follows: Reynolds, yes; Porter, yes; Walker, yes; St. Henry, yes; Gross, yes. **Motion carried 5-0** (Dunaskiss and Steimel absent)

Vice Chairman Gross said the next meeting will be on March 21st and at that time the site plan will be under consideration which they should be receiving over the next week or so along with the reviews from the Township consultants. He suggested that the applicant try and organize a meeting with the residents to go over the site plan and some of the other details. This may alleviate or address some of the concerns raised this evening.

It was clarified that a special land use must be approved first prior to the site plan discussion.

Commissioner Reynolds commented that all this information is public, someone can go to the Township and request to look at it or receive copies of it.

It was asked if the Township has a copy of the site plan? Ms. Haun said she had one with her and would show it to anyone that would like to see it.

Craig Collins, 1240 Valley View Dr., asked about the timeline. It was explained that it will come back to the meeting on March 21st for a special land use public hearing, then the Commissioners will discuss the special land use request and either approve, deny, or postpone it. If approved, then the site plan will be discussed. Planner Lewan made it clear that a special land use approval or denial is done by the Planning Commission and does not need to go to the Board of Trustees. Planner Lewan then said that an applicant can ask for a special land use and site plan concurrently.

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. PC-2016-34, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance #78, Schedule of Regulations

Commissioner Reynolds said he was asked by Planning & Zoning Director Girling to go over the submitted language for the Articles involved being that she was not able to attend the meeting.

Commissioner Reynolds went over the last couple of things that needed review in the affected Articles that were provide to everyone. The goal tonight is to submit a motion that would provide a timeline of when the amendment can be brought back for a final motion to have it presented to the Township Board and then eventually for the Planning Commission to schedule a public hearing. In going through this tonight, the Commissioners were asked to ignore any errors to numbering or grammar, those will be taken care when it is finalized.

Commissioner Reynolds went through each Article and noted if there was anything that need attention:

Article II – on pages 2-14 and 2-15 there was a graph and title that didn't fall correctly on the pages, that will be taken care of.

Article V – there were some general changes and moving around. He asked that everyone look through it - it pertained to consolidating the districts into a matrix.

Article VI – under Accessory Land Uses, private swimming pools are noted as an item that requires a public hearing. After Planning & Zoning Director Girling's review of it, there weren't any other precedents that showed why a pool should be a special land use topic that would require a public hearing. The Commissioners agreed to strike it.

Article VII – the question here circled back to storage. The intent was to take storage out of all the individual districts and point to only one section that speaks to storage, 27.19. The highlighted language in this Article can be taken care administratively. He explained, however, that if there are specific storage parameters that apply only to a couple of uses, a footnote would be included noting the parameters. Also, it was determined during previous discussions, the chart within the Article indicated whether storage was an accessory or a principle use, the Commissioners had determined that storage was only a principle use in IC and IP districts.

Article VIII – had highlighted language that was the same as above however a footnote was added that said, "no combustible material shall be permitted beneath any mobile home". It was noted that it was the intent to take this footnote out but that this language was only applicable to this zoning district.

Article IX – it was noted here that storage is permitted but as an accessory use only.

Article XI – on page 11-4, there was a strike through item #4. Item #4 said, "The use of outdoor display and sales areas shall not exceed ninety (90) days in any calendar year". This language was missed during previous discussions. It was changed but there was still some verbiage in GB and RB that spoke to this 90-day range. As an example: Kroger allowing pumpkins or wood to be sold outside of the store year-round and not specific to a 90-day period. This language is not speaking to a fireworks sales tent that might be a temporary use. The Commissioners agreed to strike this.

Article XIV – same as Article XI, again it was agreed to strike G.4. on page 14-4.

Articles XVI & XVIII just need to be reviewed by the Commissioners.

Article XIX – at the top of page 19-4 was language, “No parking area or driveway...”. Commissioner Reynolds said this was discussed by the Commissioners previously and is highlighted so the Commissioners can see how it now reads. The Commissioners were ok with the language.

Article XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV & XXV – had some general revisions and just need to be reviewed by the Commissioners.

Article XXVII, General Provisions – page 27-20 talks about parking and loading regulations and there was a parking chart that talks about accessible spaces. This was an amendment suggestion made by one of the Township consultants regarding the size of the parking space and ADA compliance standards. This language now brings the ordinance in line with that. The Commissioners agreed with that.

Article XXXV – circling back to outdoor storage as it relates to the Lapeer Overlay District. The Lapeer Overlay District includes some additional outdoor storage parameters and the verbiage on page 35-2 summarizes that and brings it in alignment with the structuring of everything else.

Moved by Commissioner Reynolds, seconded by Commissioner Porter, regarding case PC-2016-34, Township Initiated Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance #78 Schedule of Regulations, Articles II, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, XI, XIV, XVI, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXXV, that the Planning Commission review the proposed text and provide to the Planning & Zoning Director comments by March 21, 2018; if the changes are minor then the text will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees and Township Attorney for their comments and a public hearing scheduled; if the Commissions’ comments are major the case will come back to the Planning Commission for further discussion.

Roll call vote was as follows: St. Henry, yes; Walker, yes; Porter, yes; Reynolds, yes; Gross, yes. **Motion carried 5-0** (Dunaskiss and Steimel absent)

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

10. COMMUNICATIONS

Memo from Clerk Shults regarding the Board of Trustees conditionally approving the creation of a four-unit condominium of an existing development and the associated condominium documents for PC-2018-08, Gingellville Crossing Condominiums

Memo from Clerk Shults regarding the Board of Trustees holding the second reading and conditionally approving PC-2017-05, Silver Spruce Plaza Final PUD Rezone Map Amendment and Agreement.

11. COMMITTEE REPORTS

The Site Walk Committee performed a Site Walk for PC-2018-12, 4215 Clarkston Road, located at 4215 Clarkston Rd. Special Land Use and Site Plan request – Report to be submitted at the March 21st meeting.

12. PUBLIC HEARINGS

3/21/18 at 7:05 pm - PC-2018-12, 4215 Clarkston Rd., Special Land Use Request for the following uses: Residential, Wedding Venue, and Art Class facilities, located at 4215 W. Clarkston Rd. (parcel 09-18-104-002).

13. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

None

14. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

None

15. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Commissioner Reynolds, seconded by Commissioner Porter, to adjourn the meeting at 8:23pm. **Motion carried.**

Respectfully submitted,



Lynn Harrison
PC/ZBA Recording Secretary
Charter Township of Orion

March 21, 2018

Planning Commission Approval Date