

NEW BUSINESS

2025-0071

Request for Site Plan Approval - File PSP2024-0008 - for Old Orion Ct. Residential Development, a 32-unit apartment complex and related amenities on approximately 2.4 acres of land, located on the south side of Orion Road, west of Old Orion Ct. and Rochester Rd., Parcel 15-03-476-018 and abutting road right-of-way, zoned R-1 One Family Residential and a portion of the land has the FB Flex Business Overlay; Mark Bismack, Applicant

(Staff Report dated 2-12-25, Reviewed Plans, Krieger Klatt letter dated 1-17-25, Development Application, Environmental Impact Statement, G2 Consulting Group Letter dated 4-11-24, WRC Letter dated 5-10-24, Email to HOAs dated 2-6-25 and Public Meeting Notice had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

Present for the applicant were developers Pat and Mark Bismack, Jeff Klatt, Krieger Klatt Architects, and Paul Tulikangas, Nowak and Fraus Engineers. Also present was the City's wetland consultant, Kyle Hottinger, PEA-ASTI and Jason Boughton, the City's Engineering Utilities Specialist.

Chairperson Brnabic noted this is a request for site plan approval for the Old Orion Court residential development, a 32-unit apartment complex and related amenities, on approximately 2.4 acres of land located on the south side of Orion Road, west of Old Orion Court and Rochester Road, zoned R-1 One Family Residential, with a portion of the land having the FB Flex Business overlay.

Mr. McLeod presented the Staff Report, noting that this request encompasses four different items, site plan approval, tree removal permit, wetlands use permit recommendation, and natural features setback modification ancillary to the wetland use permit. He explained that the site is zoned R-1 with an FB overlay, and pointed out that the very western portion of the site is zoned R-1. He pointed out that the site was a former place of worship and is at the intersection of Orion Road, Maplehill and Old Orion Court, with three different frontages.

He mentioned that there have been two separate site plans approved for the site in the past, one for the Silver Spoon Restaurant in 2017, and one for the 20-unit North Row apartment complex in a similar site layout. He stated that the complex is proposed at 22 two-bedroom and 10 one-bedroom units. The tree removal permit would be for the removal of 30 regulated trees and five specimen trees. There are some other trees being removed that were not in the count based on location in the building envelope or being dead or diseased. He explained that the wetland use permit is for 0.07 acres of wetland impact, about the equivalent of approximately 3,000 square feet. The applicant is requesting to pay for 57 trees into the tree fund; however, 93 trees will be planted on the site pursuant to other ordinance regulations. He pointed out that the 93 trees will be planted to meet buffering, street landscape, and parking lot requirements. The wetland impacted as reviewed by the City's environmental consultant is of medium quality, and the natural features reduction was deemed as base or lower quality. He added that the applicant is requesting one additional modification to landscaping requirements. He explained that whenever a FB

district is developed as multi-family abutting single family residential, they are required to provide a landscape buffer C based on Ordinance. He noted that they are providing that on the western property line; however, on the southern property line they are asking for a reduction. He stated that in lieu of the 20 feet they requesting 10 feet and are providing plantings as well as a four foot wall. He pointed out that across Old Orion Court to the east the zoning is Office District with the FB overlay, along with some RCD which is residential cluster development.

Mr. McLeod noted that the site will be accessed by two driveways, one from Old Orion Court and one from Maplehill, the latter being for emergency access. The building footprint is smaller than the previously-approved North Row development on the site at 17,000 square feet compared to the previous 20,000 square feet. He added that the existing land use is largely single-family residential in each direction other than to the east, and he mentioned that the Master Plan also calls for this area to be largely residential as well.

The plan includes a pedestrian network with amenities like a wetland overlook area, a plaza space, and a bike fixing station. A full conservation easement will be placed over the wetland area to prevent future development. Parking will be provided for 64 spaces, in accordance with the ordinance based on the units being two bedrooms or less, and stormwater will be collected underground in the south end of the site.

The wetland delineation was done by ASTI in October 2023 and he noted the two different types of wetland represented on the site, and how the wetland traverses the adjacent sites. He noted that the site directly to the west was previously a part of the North Row development when it was originally approved; and he stated that subsequent to that approval, that portion of the property was then sold off in between the time North Row was approved and this application came forward. He explained that crossing the wetland at its smallest area is proposed to provide secondary access to the site.

He noted that the elevations are similar to the previously approved plan, with two-story buildings and brick construction. He pointed out that the previous plan included five separate buildings in a similar road layout, while this plan combines them into one two-story building, aiming for a more efficient design while transitioning to the residential scale of the surrounding area. He explained that the first approved site plan became null and void due to a lack of activity. He added that Jason Boughton from the City's Engineering Department and Kyle Hottinger from ASTI were present to answer any technical questions about wetlands.

Mr. Klatt noted the following in his presentation:

- The development will be a two-story building with 32 total units, a mix of one- and two-bedroom units, near the major intersection of Tienken and North Rochester Road, and includes 64 overall parking spaces, compliant with the Ordinance for resident and guest parking. The site is surrounded by R-1 with office to the east.*
- Major enhancements include new pedestrian sidewalks in the City*

right-of-way, updated lighting, tree preservation, and robust landscaping. A new stormwater management system is proposed.

- The site plan shows the building positioned along the frontage to adhere to setbacks and wetland requirements. Parking is concealed from the public right-of-way and the neighborhood behind it due to the deep wetland. There is a deep buffer along Maplehill. The previous proposed development contained 20 units and the building was positioned much closer to Maplehill. They feel this is a much better design as there is more natural buffer around the building. On the right hand side a bit of a wall as well as heavy landscape is proposed. A pocket park, bike repair station and wetland overlook which includes a pergola structure and platform is proposed. The conservation easement is also considered as an amenity space. The intent is to make the property very walkable and pedestrian friendly.
- The development meets all zoning requirements, including setbacks, height, lot coverage, parking, and amenity spaces.
- There are 16 units per floor with entry spots on front and back, and entry points on the sides of the building to liven up those facades. There are a total of ten one-bedroom units and 22 two-bedroom units, with the two-bedroom units being just over 1,000 square feet and the one-bedroom units just under 700 square feet. Upper level and grade level terraces face both sides of the site.
- The building's exterior is transitional, with simple clean lines and traditional forms, using brick around all four sides and some box-outs trimmed to add some depth to the front facade, and significant glazing. Asphalt shingles, and trim around the windows add interest.
- The interior features nine-foot ceiling heights plus attic space above that for the roof.
- He described the amenities including a pergola and platform overlook to the wetland, pocket park and bike repair station, noting that it is a pedestrian-friendly design.

Chairperson Brnabic summarized the emails received regarding this item, noting that Connor Pytlowany has a strong opposition to this development and feels it should be denied as it fails to adhere to the City's Master Plan and is an improper usage of the FB overlay, which his email listed the reasons that it does not comply. She asked Mr. McLeod to address Mr. Pytlowany's comments.

Mr. McLeod noted the following in response:

- The FB District is generally or largely utilized on commercial, office or in some cases industrial properties; however, there is no restriction to it being utilized solely on a non-residential piece of property. The City has other properties that have the FB District on them. The property in question has been zoned FB for 10 years and has had two developments approved under the FB District. The FB District is able to be utilized here as an overlay district as long as the proposed development meets the requirements of the FB District itself. The FB or multi-family development is located on the front portion of the property, which has the FB Overlay on it.
- Zoning dictates over the Master Plan, because zoning is law versus the Master Plan, which is a guide. As the property is zoned in this manner, it is a permissible use.
- The Planning Commission will review the tree removal permit, the wetlands

use permit, and the natural features modification and setback modification or the green belt modification to the south, and City Council will make a final determination regarding the wetland use permit. In terms of usage, the density of the property as of now is compliant with Ordinance requirements.

Ms. Roediger added that the public comment reference to the Ordinance multiplex provisions refer to the R-5 Zoning Districts, which this is not.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that a second email was submitted regarding a concern with the wetland use permit, and suggested that there would be a drastic increase in water flow to the wetlands, and included a statement that the neighborhood can flood quickly. The email provided pictures of flooding after a recent rainstorm. She commented that it appears that less of the wetland is being affected for this proposed development than the previous 20-unit development.

Mr. McLeod responded that the wetland use permit for North Row was approximately 0.18 acres of wetland impact, and the Silver Spoon did not have any wetland impact when it was approved. This particular proposal is for 0.07 acres, or two-and-a-half times less with this current development. He asked Mr. Hottinger to elaborate.

Mr. Hottinger stated that the wetland area to be impacted is very low quality and is a result of stormwater deposition into the more natural area that is in the center of the site. He explained that the center of the site is comprised of mucky soils that have been there for a very long time. He noted that he has delineated the site three times over the last 15 years and it has been the same way every time. He stated that the area of impact is generally dry. He commented that he is not sure how the development would result in any more stormwater directed to the wetland than it already has, and he pointed out the natural swale that is on the plans is dictated by EGLE and the State, and has already been approved by them. He mentioned that the swale may even develop into a pseudo natural area with wetland vegetation and this could vary year to year based on precipitation. He noted that the natural features impact setbacks have not changed. He commented that this is the least impacts that he has reviewed of any of the proposals.

Mr. Tulikangas explained that he is the civil engineer on the project and explained that they are required by EGLE to maintain the swale at the northern part of the site that drains part of those wetland, and he noted that they are basically creating a culvert system that will maintain some of the flows that come from Maplehill and carry them into the wetlands. He stated that while they are increasing the impervious content in the site with buildings and paving, that will all be collected and routed through the large underground detention system in the southern parking lot and will outlet to the road ditch system so there will not be any direct discharges to the wetland from the impervious areas. He stressed that the discharge for the detention system actually goes toward the east and connects into the road drainage system, and continues toward the southeast along Old Orion Road.

Mr. Boughton addressed stormwater, stating that the uploading area is being

collected onsite, being treated, and discharges to Old Orion Road going southbound past Ann Maria and east of the medical office building. He explained that stormwater standards have changed, and the old-school volume has now been modified to a 100-year storm event. He stated that it will alleviate some pressures to the south of Ann Maria and to the houses that back up on the north side of Ann Maria.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that another email was received from Thomas Olmeda questioning the higher density change from R-1 and stating that it will negatively affect the character and home values of the neighborhood, expressing concern regarding the loss of trees and wetlands, increased stormwater runoff, parking lot lighting and noise. She added that Ann Pytlowany, who resides on 26 Mile in Macomb, shared concerns regarding potential criminal activity in the parking lot being close to her son's home.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that there are 290 signatures on an online petition in opposition. She opened public comment and reminded speakers that there was a three-minute time limit, and all questions would be answered together after everyone had an opportunity to speak.

Connor Pytlowany, 241 Maplehill, expressed opposition and commented that he is curious how the developers can use the Flex Business overlay in the Ordinance where parcels need to be over two acres, and multiplex businesses are limited to occupy not more than 25 percent of the total number of lots on a single block. He pointed out that there are five lots from Old Orion Court to Ann Maria and it is proposed to use four of them. He expressed concerns over traffic impacts from 30-60 vehicles, safety, environment, and character. He commented that he owns a portion of the wetlands where discharge will occur and stated that his property will flood.

Thomas Olmeda, 390 Maplehill, stated that adding 32 units will pose a safety concern. He mentioned that children wait for the school bus on his street. He expressed concern over drainage issues, and stated that he has seen his street flash flood with water over the road. He commented that it does not fit the character of the neighborhood.

Thomas Yazbeck, 1707 Devonwood Drive, stated that this is an example of missing middle housing, which is in between the detached family home and larger apartment building; and commented that there are many people out there who would love to live in these apartments and become a part of the Rochester Hills community. He stressed that unless these properties are publicly-owned the rights of the property owners have to be respected. He urged approval.

Dan Morris, 250 Maplehill, stated that he built a home directly across the street from the previous Sikh Gurdwara temple which was a single-story structure and noted that his view will be changed to 64 parking spots and a two-story 32-unit complex which dumps into his street. He commented that this will affect the value of his home. He presented the signatures from the online petition.

Edward Capa, 270 Maplehill, asked if it would be a gated entrance into Maplehill. He commented that it is dangerous to turn into Maplehill off of Orion Road and

this will make it more difficult. He mentioned that the street sign arrow is constantly destroyed by vehicles. He expressed concern over noise from vehicles coming and going and suggested parking be moved to the front.

Maggie Hay, 471 Maplehill, stated that she moved to Maplehill almost 35 years ago because it was a safe neighborhood and a dead end street for her son in his wheelchair. She stated that this development will destroy a lot of the home values, and expressed concern over children standing at the bus stop at the corner.

Rick Bradin, 160 Ann Maria, noted that he is the second house on the north side of Ann Maria, and when he bought his house 33 years ago people told him that he could not use one-third of his property because it was environmentally-protected wetlands. He noted that when the home to the east of him built, they had to bring in 45 loads of gravel and rock to put one house on the property. He stated that when it rains all of their backyards flood.

Dan Snow, 196 Ann Maria, stated that it is always wet in this area and this development will add to the runoff. He commented that the culvert will be overloaded.

Seeing no additional members of the public wishing to speak, Chairperson Brnabic closed public comment. She asked Mr. McLeod to address the comment regarding the FB overlay not being quite two acres in size.

Mr. McLeod responded that the FB District indicates that parcels to be developed as a part of the FB District have to be over two acres, and in terms of the applicability of that requirement, this parcel is over two acres. He noted that the City has taken the stance that the FB District is applicable in this instance and can be utilized for this development because it has been proposed twice in the past under the similar-type of Ordinance and the lot itself is over that two-acre minimum.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that commentary regarding the multiplex had been responded to by Ms. Roediger that it only applies to the R-5 District. She mentioned a question raised about how the 64 car parking spaces were split up, and commented that she believed that 48 were for residents and 16 were visitors. She asked why the parking was not placed out front.

Mr. Tulikangas responded that the parking calculation is 1.5 spaces per unit for 48 and 0.5 spaces per unit for visitor spaces, adding up to 64.

Mr. Klatt responded that per prior understanding, they were trying to conceal parking from the public right-of-way. He commented that for most urban planning practices no one prefers to look at a sea of parking and they usually try to conceal it for developments. He pointed out that they have a landscape buffer behind the building.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that in response to commentary that the property has not been rezoned, and remains R-1 but it has the FB overlay which is the option being used. She asked Mr. Boughton to comment on water

management.

Mr. Boughton stated that the stormwater management system restricts the flow allowing only a minimum discharge to discharge slowly. He commented that while he cannot speak to the wetlands and discharge of the wetlands, the upper lands of the storm management system will be improving the flows.

Ms. Neubauer stated that the Commission has procedures to follow and must entertain applicants and hear from property owners. She commented that she wants to make sure that everyone knows that the rules and regulations are followed and the Commission has no relationship with the developers. She asked why it is necessary to change the setback on the south side, which is changed from 20 to 10 feet.

Mr. Tulikangas responded that there are things that take up space on a proposed development, and what is proposed here is plenty of screening with a four foot tall screen wall and a trove of trees, and they are basically maintaining the existing trees along the property line.

Ms. Neubauer asked if this modification is something they are willing to reconsider.

Mr. Tulikangas responded that he did not think that it could be changed without reducing units or reducing parking.

Ms. Neubauer asked how many units it would have to be reduced to do that.

Mr. Klatt responded that it would be hard to say without assessing it properly. He noted that the circulation is mandated and they need emergency vehicular flow and maneuverability around the site.

Ms. Neubauer asked if a reduction of four units would be able to preserve the setback.

Ms. Klatt responded that this was the challenge of the previous development, and it simply did not work out as there was not enough density to make it work. He stressed that the underground development costs, retention systems, landscape requirements and amenity spaces are extreme.

Ms. Neubauer commented that going from 20 to 32 is a big difference, and asked about going from 32 to 28. She noted that every property in the City of Rochester Hills, unless it is designated as green space, belongs to an owner and that owner has the right to build and develop as long as it is within the Ordinances. However, she is trying to figure out the best way to be neighborly without depriving the owner of his rights. She commented that she has to trust the Engineering Department when it comes to water flow, and she was trying to figure out if there is a way to reduce the development by four units or change from one to two bedroom or two to one, so that they do not have to have a variance in the setback. She stated that if they are unable to answer these questions tonight there is a procedure for them to return without a full approval or a full rejection this evening. She stated that the City has a traffic committee

and suggested that the residents email their concerns to her or the District 2 Council Representative David Blair to ensure that traffic concerns are addressed. She commented that Rochester Hills has consistently gone up in property values at a larger incremental and exponential rate than almost every other city in Oakland County; and she stressed that there has not been a single development in Rochester Hills that has lowered property values.

She noted that the Commission is actively in the middle of updating its Master Plan and has conducted extensive research, and there is a demand for one to two bedroom apartments and housing. She stated that she hates change too, but it is something that the majority of the residents have asked for. She commented that she is not asking them to go back to 20 units, but would ask the developers whether it would be feasible for them to reduce units to preserve the setback. She asked if they had met with the neighbors at all, and suggested a neighborhood meeting to come to a more agreeable situation.

Mr. Klatt stated that his team worked hard with the Planning Staff; and noted that when they looked at the 2019 development, the buildings were positioned closer to the north end of the site and there were potential issues with that as well. He noted that the buildings were right on the walkway, and they tried to pull that back to maintain the setback and provide a bigger buffer; and that, in turn, shortened the distance on the south end.

Ms. Neubauer asked for the price points of the units.

Mr. McLeod noted that their application materials stated that prices would be \$1,900 to \$2,800.

Ms. Neubauer stressed that this is a very safe city and she is confident that safety is a priority of the police and fire. She commented that in order to move on with approval tonight, a condition would have to be added that it would be reduced by four units and the setback would be preserved.

Chairperson Brnabic noted that it could be conditioned tonight or postponed.

Mr. Klatt suggested that for the option to postpone, they would go back as a team and review and consider the comments that had been brought up.

Ms. Neubauer stressed that if it is postponed, that is not a denial. She noted that a no vote tonight would result in the developer not being able to come back for another year.

Mr. Tulikangas pointed out that the previous North Row development was shifted further toward the northwest, and he added that there are also wetland considerations in that area. He noted that they were trying to maintain that as natural as possible; however, if they were able to shift that further to the northwest, they could possibly maintain the number of units and move the buildings further away from the southern property line.

Mr. McLeod explained that one of the FB Ordinance changes that occurred since the original North Row approval is that the setbacks have increased. He

commented that he does not believe that it can be shifted further north as there are no longer modifications to building setbacks within the FB District. He pointed out that the North Row development actually received a waiver to go even closer to the road than what the ordinance required at that time, and stated that the option for a waiver has been eliminated and the setbacks have actually increased. Furthermore, going northward will further impact the wetland and then be closer to the original wetland use permit that was requested under North Row.

Mr. Tulikangas noted that a door was added because it was considered a front setback, so it was technically 15 feet per the Ordinance.

Mr. McLeod countered that it is against residential, and discussions had settled on the fact that it was not going to be a primary entrance. He commented that if they chose to postpone this item, staff could sit down and do some further analytics of the Ordinance and what it does to the development.

Mr. Klatt stated that it makes sense to postpone as they do not want to design on the fly. He stated that they wished to work with staff and speak with the neighbors.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that it looks like they are moving toward postponement, which she would agree is the best option.

Mr. Hetrick concurred with postponing, and asked about the egress or entrance onto Maplehill and asked if it would be a right turnout only. He asked if it was their expectation that most of the traffic would enter from Old Orion Court.

Mr. Tulikangas responded that there is a sign proposed that says right turn only, and commented that he cannot envision most residents of this new development regularly turning left out onto Maplehill as it is a dead end street. He added that traffic coming off of Maplehill would be able to turn into the development. He commented that entrance would likely be split depending on which unit people would be going to.

Mr. Hetrick suggested that a fire gate could be explored where it could stay locked and closed unless there was need for emergency access. Regarding wetlands and runoff, he commented that it is his understanding that any detention or stormwater on the site must be detained on the site before it goes anywhere.

Mr. Boughton confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Hetrick stated that there would not be additional water runoff into the wetland or into adjoining properties unless the area experienced a 200-year storm.

Mr. Struzik stated that he had some concerns about parking, and commented that in this case if there is insufficient parking, people would be parking on the adjacent road, which would be Ann Maria or Maplehill. He asked if it would be written into the tenant contracts to keep parking from spilling out onto these roads, and asked how to ensure parking is sufficient and does not negatively

impact neighbors.

Mr. Klatt responded that the parking requirements for multifamily developments in Rochester Hills are quite high, and they are seeing across the state ratios as low as 1.33 or 1.5 spaces per unit without the guest parking ratio. He commented that he thinks it is sufficient and is actually a lot of parking, so he does not think they will have an issue with cars spilling out onto the streets.

Mr. Struzik stated that he likes the walkability features of the site and proximity to shopping and jobs right down Old Orion Court and Rochester Road. He added that he believes the preservation of the wetlands to the southwest of the site is a big bonus. He noted that this development would offer some housing diversity, and commented that these are people that are young teachers, firefighters, retail workers and managers, and other individuals that currently work in the community. He pointed out that he lives in a neighborhood that has over 1,500 apartment units as well as single family home rentals and he does not perceive any crime issues. He stated that a lot of the renters in his neighborhood decide to make a commitment to Rochester Hills and become owners.

Ms. Denstaedt stated that the Commissioners are residents too and hear what the residents are saying. She commented that the development is beautiful and fits nicely within Rochester Hills. She expressed concerns over the location of the bike area fairly close to the road and asked if it should be moved back or a barrier installed that could prevent a car from going into that area.

Mr. Klatt responded that this is in the City right-of-way, and they would work with City staff to adjust the location.

Mr. Gallina reiterated that as Commissioners they are fellow citizens. He pointed out that he visited the site yesterday and asked if he lived there, is this something he would want in his backyard. He added that they also have to weigh the opportunity that this is land that can be purchased and developed. He commented that he is relieved that they are going to go back and tweak this a bit and have a chance for the developer to talk with the neighbors. He stated that this is a chance to work together to build something that will add value to the city and will allow the developers to prosper and will not become a nuisance. He stated that it is a nice looking building and is harmonious to what they are doing in the city and will be a great opportunity for those who can afford to live in that type of housing. He stated that he is glad that they can go back and look at ways to minimize some of the concerns and effectively look at how to work on safety and screening to provide neighbors some peace of mind.

Mr. Dettloff commented that in all his time on the Planning Commission, he has yet to see a development approved that had a negative impact on property values; and while he has heard those concerns tonight, he thinks it will be a wonderful development filling a void in the city. He suggested coming to a compromise and stated that the end result will be a good thing.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that it is true that they are all residents on the Commission; and stressed that the Commissioners have ordinances to follow.

She stated that developers have the right to develop, and they ask how they can balance the best possible development for any piece of property. She noted that she is happy they have chosen to postpone to allow the option to go over everything and feel secure and meet with the neighbors. She noted that Ms. Neubauer had moved a motion to postpone and asked for a second. She recognized Mr. Struzik as seconding the motion.

After calling for a roll call vote on the motion to postpone, Chairperson Brnabic announced that the motion passed unanimously and this item along with the subsequent three items were postponed. She noted that speakers will receive a mailed or emailed notice when this item returns to a meeting.

Ms. Roediger added that notice will also be posted on the City's website and residents would be welcome to call the Planning and Economic Development Department if they had any questions.

Mr. Dettloff mentioned that the petition document circulated contained many signatures that were not in the city and included some individuals from out of state.

Chairperson Brnabic asked Connor Pytlowany to answer that question.

Mr. Pytlowany responded that it was an online petition and they also walked door to door to utilize their best time in the 10 days they had after receiving notice of this. He stressed that it is from Change.org, and pointed out that 70 percent of the people who signed it live within Rochester Hills.

Mr. Dettloff suggested for the future that while he understands the time crunch he would suggest weeding out those names that would not be relevant.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Struzik, that this matter be Postponed. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Neubauer, Hetrick and Struzik

Excused 2 - Hooper and Weaver

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills Planning Commission hereby postpones the request for Site Plan Approval for Old Orion Ct. Residential Development (City File PSP2024-0008), the Request for Tree Removal Permit (City File PTP2025-0001), the Wetland Use Permit Recommendation (City File PWEP2025-0001), and the request for Natural Features Setback Modification (City File PNFSM2025-0001) to allow the Applicant to reduce the number of units in order to preserve the setback subject to staff approval and preserve the Type C buffer along the southern property line, and meet with the neighbors.

2025-0072

Request for Tree Removal Permit Approval - File PTP2025-0001 - to remove thirty (30) regulated trees and five (5) specimen trees and to provide zero (0) replacement trees and to pay the required fifty-seven (57) replacement trees into the City's Tree Fund for Old Orion Ct. Residential Development, a 32-unit apartment complex and related amenities on approximately 2.4 acres of land, located on the south side of Orion Road, west of Old Orion Ct. and Rochester Rd., Parcel 15-03-476-018 and abutting road right-of-way, zoned R-1 One Family Residential and a portion of the land has the FB Flex Business Overlay; Mark Bismack, Applicant

See Legislative File 2025-0071 for discussion and motion to postpone.

Postponed

2025-0073

Request for Wetland Use Permit Recommendation - File PWEP2025-0001 - to impact approximately 0.07 acres of wetlands for Old Orion Ct. Residential Development, a 32-unit apartment complex and related amenities on approximately 2.4 acres of land, located on the south side of Orion Road, west of Old Orion Ct. and Rochester Rd., Parcel 15-03-476-018 and abutting road right-of-way, zoned R-1 One Family Residential and a portion of the land has the FB Flex Business Overlay; Mark Bismack, Applicant

See Legislative File 2025-0071 for discussion and motion to postpone.

Postponed

2025-0074

Request for Natural Features Setback Modification - File PNFSM2025-0001 - to modify the required natural features setback by approximately 398 linear feet for Old Orion Ct. Residential Development, a 32-unit apartment complex and related amenities on approximately 2.4 acres of land, located on the south side of Orion Road, west of Old Orion Ct. and Rochester Rd., Parcel 15-03-476-018 and abutting road right-of-way, zoned R-1 One Family Residential and a portion of the land has the FB Flex Business Overlay; Mark Bismack, Applicant

See Legislative File 2025-0071 for discussion and motion to postpone.

Postponed