



June 25, 2025,

Ms. Melissa Bogema  
Ford Land Facilities  
Engineering Manager – BOBPM

**RE: SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR FORD BLUEOVAL BATTERY PARK**

**This letter is to advise that we have reviewed the outstanding site plan review items for the proposed construction of the BlueOval Battery Park Michigan property located at 13700 West Michigan Avenue, Marshall, MI 49068. Previous review letters should be used for reference regarding contingencies and as-built documentation requirements, but this letter provides the required site plan approval per the zoning ordinance.**

**City of Marshall Zoning Ordinance Items –**

**A. Ownership & Responsibility**

The site plan proposes improvements for two property owners, Ford and MAEDA. Can MAEDA confirm that they are a party to this site plan submittal and have agreed to abide by the designs, drawings, and information contained within it?

Site Plan Applications were received documenting ownership relationship for both property owners.

**B. Section 8.3 Districts Established, Zoning Map, and District Boundary**

8.3.A – Purpose and Intent, Section 8.3.A.i - Property boundaries are not clear. Does the legal description on Sheet G-102 correspond to the property boundary/fence?

Addressed in 3.6.25 Site Plan.

**C. Section 8.10 I-3 Industrial and Manufacturing Complex District**

**1. Section 8.10.2 Principal Intended Uses**

There are several associated buildings with the principal pack plant and production building. It must be confirmed as to whether all are all permitted uses (e.g., "recycling processing facilities") and that they support the main building, including the guard shack.

All proposed buildings are structures customarily incidental to permitted use.

**2. Section 10.4 – Accessory Permitted Uses Required**

Again, uses of all accessory buildings need to be confirmed to ensure they are all permitted uses.

All proposed buildings are structures customarily incidental to permitted use.

**3. Section 10.5 – Development Standards**

**a. Section 8.10.5.A - Lot Size of 200 acres minimum**

The legal description on sheet G-102 does not appear to be correct. A legal description with lot size is required.

Addressed in 3.6.25 Site Plan

**b. Section 10.5.B.i – Maximum Lot Coverage**

Final property boundaries along with the percentage of proposed lot coverage are required.

Addressed in 3.6.25 Site Plan

**c. Section 8.10.B.5.C.i – Minimum Front Setback – 50 feet**

It appears the property has two “front” lot lines based on the zoning code definition of front lot line. The setback standard appears to be met, but this impacts fence requirements (see below)..

The requirements were reviewed and met.

**d. Section 8.10.B.5.C.i – Minimum Rear Yard Lot Setback – 30 feet**

Please confirm front yard status to verify required setback.

The requirements were reviewed and met.

**e. Section 8.10.B.5.C.i – Minimum Rear Yard Lot Setback – 30 feet**

Please confirm front yard status to verify required setback.

The requirements were reviewed and met.

**f. Section 8.1.05.D.i - Meet Maximum Height of 50 Feet**

Elevation drawings are required.

Primary building height and location allows adequate setback. Accessory buildings where detailed elevation drawings are not available will require photographic documentation for record purposes.

**g. Section 8.10.5.D.ii - Meet Setback for Heights over 80 Feet**

Again, elevation drawings are required to confirm height.

Primary building height and location allows adequate setback. Accessory buildings where detailed elevation drawings are not available will require photographic documentation for record purposes

**h. Section 8.10.5.D.iii - Meet Fire Control Provisions for Heights over 80 Feet**

Elevation drawings are required to confirm height.

Fire Department review and ongoing coordination will confirm fire control provisions meet expectations.

**D. 8.11 – Notes to District Standards**

**1. Section 8.11.2.D – Accessory Permitted Uses at 15%/20%**

Accessory building uses must be provided.

Addressed with identification of accessory structures on plan.

**2. Section 8.11.2.E – Parcel Subdivision Requirements**

Details regarding existing and future parcel subdivisions are required to be recorded.

Addressed.

**E. Section 8.18 – Signs**

Proposed signage is required. If the intent is to apply for a separate sign permit at a later date, that should be clearly stated in the plans.

Sign permits are required for all site and building signage and can be submitted for review after site plan approval is given.

F. **Section 8.19 - Accessory Structure and Uses**

Details on all structures to determine if they are primary or accessory and their uses is required.

All proposed buildings are structures customarily incidental permitted to use

G. **Section 8.21 Corner Clearance**

Sheets L-102 and L-103 should be revised to verify that required corner clearance is maintained with plantings.

Addressed.

H. **Section 8.24 – Fences, Walls, Hedges or Similar Plantings or Structures**

Fences over four feet are not permitted along a front yard property line. The perimeter fence appears to be unnecessary in many areas as there is additional fencing restricting access to the plant itself.

6' fence has been allowed as it located 1' onto MAEDA property. Fence agreement has been submitted for documentation.

I. **Section 8.25 – Parking Loading and Access**

1. Parking spaces appear to be only 18 feet long, as opposed to the required 20 feet.

Bioswales and additional tree planting considered.

2. Assuming the site is over 500 acres, landscape area(s) must be provided at 8% per acre of surface parking. This needs to be confirmed.

Addressed.

3. It does not appear that the required 5 deciduous trees per landscape area have been provided.

Ford agreed to more trees the south of the parking lot and in areas that are not bio swales- 130 trees added to avoid trees in bioswales

J. **Section 8.26.6 – Landscaping and Screening Standards, Greenbelt Buffer Requirement for I-3 District to Shield Views from Streets and Residential Uses**

The plan set is requesting to use existing vegetation in the NW corner of the site. It is unclear if this vegetation is on adjacent property or on the site.

If property is not purchased within 18 months coniferous trees will need to be added at the owner's (MAEDA) expense.

K. **Section 8.27 – Sidewalks**

Sidewalks on public roads can be required by Planning Commission. It does not appear that any sidewalks are proposed on the site. Will there be any opportunity for pedestrian access?

Site Plan will be approved as is. With the following contingency item: City retains right to require pedestrian paths for future development.

L. **Section 8.28 – Exterior Lighting**

A photometric plan is required to determine whether the site is in compliance.

Photometric plan confirmed light levels dissipate before leaving property. Particular attention was given to the South property line.

M. **Site Layout**

1. Site G-104 does not show usage of Battery Drive North between the employee and primary truck entrances. Not constructing it would help reduce the possibility of high-speed trips around the plant and eliminate superfluous pavement, grading, etc. This was a recommendation no required for approval.
2. Crosswalks are missing from Sheet C-E07-S.

Addressed.

3. It is our understanding that the future rail spur south of the ring road has been removed from this project. This should be confirmed by the applicant.

No rail spur given approval as part of this site plan. Any future change will require a separate approval.

4. Entry roads and parking lots should be designed with curb and gutter to ensure protection of landscape from vehicles and pedestrians on the sidewalk. With the exception of areas around bioswales and on interior drive islands, curb and gutter is not shown on the plans. Please confirm the intent for design.

Storm water design negates the addition of more curb and gutter discussion with Engineering.

**Additional Items:**

The BOBP Site and surrounding MAEDA properties share amenities necessary for site plan approval. These amenities, including berms, trees, and the stormwater management system will require maintenance and, in the case of landscaping and trees, replacement if necessary.

MAEDA, Ford, and the City of Marshall are establishing agreements to clarify the necessary fiduciary and liability requirements. Site plan approval is contingent on these agreements and their recordings. Site elements, like fencing that serves the needs of BOBPM but are located off property also have maintenance and ownership agreements to be established and recorded for long-term. This site plan approval is also contingent on that completion.

A single hard copy and an electronic version of any required as-built information and the compiled set of approved drawings required for site plan approval is required to be delivered to 323 W Michigan Ave to the attention of the Zoning Administrator. Color photographs required for documentation shall be labeled by building with references to the location on a plan.

Congratulations on reaching this milestone in your project! We are appreciative of your commitment to this process and look forward to working together in the future as members of our community.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marcia Strange".

Marcia Strange  
Director of Community Development  
Zoning Administrator

Cc: Derek N. Perry, City Manager, City of Marshall  
Marguerite Davenport, Director of Public Services, City of Marshall  
Erich Smith, Vice President, Wade Trim  
Ralph Welton, Building Official, City of Marshall/McKenna