

2025-0152 Public Hearing and Request for Preliminary Site Condominium Recommendation for Oak Creek Condominiums, a proposed development of twenty-one (21) single family detached residences on approximately 8.5 acres of land, located at 3249 and 3271 Livernois, Parcel Nos. 15-34-101-053 and 15-34-101-055, located on the east side of Livernois, south of Auburn Rd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential; Mohammed Bahaiddin, Enliven Developers, Applicant

(Staff Report dated 4-15-25, Reviewed Plans, Development Application, Environmental Impact Statement, HOA Letter dated 4-4-24, WRC Letter dated 9-21-23, Tetra Tech Report dated 3-24-25, Notice of Wetlands and/or Floodplain Designation, Off-Site Storm-Wetland Notice, Public Hearing Notice and Public Comment Received had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.

Present for the Applicant were Mohammed Bahaiddin, Enliven Developers, and Joseph Vaglica, GES-Gateway Engineering and Surveying, and Brian Devlin, Landscape Architect.

Chairperson Brnabic introduced this item noting that it is a request for Preliminary Site Condominium Recommendation for Oak Creek Condominiums, a proposed development of 21 single family detached residences on approximately 8.5 acres of land located at 3249 and 3271 Livernois, located on the east side of Livernois south of Auburn Road, zoned R-4 One Family Residential. She invited the applicant to the presenters' table and requested the Staff Report.

Mr. McLeod noted that this is a request for a Preliminary One-Family Detached Condominium Recommendation, Tree Removal Permit, Wetland Use Permit, and a Natural Features Modification Request. He explained that this site is comprised of two different parcels which include about 8.5 acres of land on the east side of Livernois south of Auburn. Currently each one of these parcels are large residential lots which connect into the abutting residential subdivision to the east and just south of the Mosque. He noted that four different requests are before the Commission tonight, and stated that two will stay with the Planning Commission including the Tree Removal Permit as well as the Natural Features Modification Request. Two of the requests will result in recommendations to City Council, including the Condominium request as well as the Wetland Use Permit. Whenever the Planning Commission is ready to make decisions, two of those decisions will be final decisions.

He reviewed the overall site, noting that it is relatively extensively wooded in terms of the back portion of the site, and where the wetland traverses the site. There is a residential subdivision to the south and to the east, and a non-residential place of worship to the north, and place of worship directly to the west across Livernois.

He stated that the site plan provides 21 sites, with access to Livernois and Raffer Dr. to the east. The Tree Removal Permit is requested for the removal of 99 regulated trees and 38 specimen trees, provide 142 required replacement trees on the site, and pay into the City's Tree Fund for a total of 318 trees. He

added that they are proposing to oversize some of the replacement trees to try to bring that number down based on the total number of replacements required.

Mr. McLeod reviewed the wetland impacts as 417 square feet of permanent impact, and the Natural Features Modification setback requested is 542 linear feet or just under 12,000 square feet of permanent impact to natural features.

He reviewed the site plan and landscape plan, noting a simple connection from Livernois to Raffler, and he noted the location on the site of the wetland impact and natural features setback modification, and explained it is a simple crossing of the wetland requested. He mentioned that there are no other impacts to the wetland from any lots. He noted that they are providing open space commons both to the north and to the south side of the proposed roadway to preserve that wetland area and to preserve much of the natural features setback adjacent to the wetland area.

He reviewed the landscape along the Livernois frontage and in terms of replacement trees along the back sides of many of the lots, and in the open space areas with additional tree plantings.

He pointed out the stormwater system is to the far southeast corner of the site, which will have the water traverse the site to the pond and then flow further to the southeast; and he reviewed the lot configuration noting that it is similar to the lots to the south and east of the development.

Mr. McLeod noted the renderings provided, and reiterated that they are single family homes. He stated that they would be similar to what the developer will be providing with the possibility of some custom homes as well, and pointed out that they are typically noted as two-story structures. He noted that standardized floor plans were provided.

Mr. Vaglica reiterated that this is an 8.46 acre site and they are proposing 21 residential lots. He noted that the design intentionally preserves and integrates the site's natural features including existing wetlands which will remain essentially undisturbed. He stated that to further protect the sensitive habitat, they are proposing the installation of a split-rail fence along the wetland to preserve the wetland boundaries.

He stated that they have engaged with an environmental team of Megan Davis from Tetra-Tech, and Brian Devin, their landscape architect. He commented that in alignment with the City's priorities for natural preservation, they also included 22,000 square feet of passive natural park within the development. He noted that this area will feature picnic tables and a play structure for children and was designed to preserve the surrounding wetlands, offering meaningful amenities to the community while reinforcing their commitment to conservation. He added that the detention basin was also a part of their stormwater management and features a 3-foot deep permanent pool in accordance with design engineering practice and City standards.

He stated that the architectural styles and layout of the lots are consistent with the adjacent Pinewood subdivision, to which they are directly connected. He

noted that under the current zoning, they were able to accommodate up to 29 plus-or-minus units and in recognition of the site's natural constraints and their preservation objectives, they are proposing 21 homes, reflecting an environmentally-sensitive approach.

Ms. Neubauer noted that the letter from WRC states that a storm drain permit may be required.

Mr. Vaglica responded that this would be during the construction engineering phase.

Mr. Boughton stated that the Planning Staff submit the plans to the WRC, and they typically provide a boilerplate letter indicating that a permit may be required.

Ms. Neubauer asked if the WRC may present a problem for the applicant to obtain a permit and whether this is just a procedural issue.

Mr. Boughton noted that for the most part the City has the same stormwater standards, and whether a permit is necessary or not should not be a roadblock. He added that it would happen as a part of the construction process.

Ms. Neubauer noted that there were comments by Planning, Engineering and Traffic, with one of the conditions of approval being that they address conditions made by the departments, including Fire, although she did not see a Fire condition listed. She commented that if this goes forward, she would like to specifically include a condition to address the comments from Planning, Engineering, Traffic and Fire just to make sure that all of the bases are covered. She added that based on the last couple of meetings with Council she thinks that it would be helpful if these items were resolved before they come to Council, or at least have an answer as to how those things would be resolved so there are no roadblocks.

She noted that there was another note about separate buildings permits being required for the demolition of all of the structures of each existing parcel.

Mr. McLeod responded that this is for the existing structures on the site. If and when the site receives approval and assurances to the developer that the development will go forward, they would then secure the permits most likely just before the actual construction of the development. He noted that they would have to abandon the existing utilities to those residences and make sure that those structures are all cleared, leading the way for construction of the new development.

Ms. Neubauer asked what the timeline would be from development to completion of construction.

Mr. Vaglia responded that they are probably 80 percent toward the engineering, and they would be able to turn around and submit for permits within 30 days. After permitting, this is perhaps a three-to-four-month type of development.

Mr. Weaver noted that they will need to obtain permits from EGLE, and asked if submission has been made.

Mr. Vaglia responded that these are typical permits for water and sanitary sewer that will be applied for.

Mr. Weaver commented that he would advise they submit sooner than later as these can take a little while to obtain.

Mr. Vaglia responded that as soon as they start the construction phase, all of the permits will go in. He added that the wetland permit has already been submitted for, and the others will be submitted for after City approval.

Mr. Weaver asked if there is a ballpark price point.

Mr. Bahauddin responded that the price point was around \$800,000-\$850,000.

Mr. Weaver asked what street tree was called for, noting that the plans did not specify.

Mr. Vaglia responded that they were told by the City not to specify the variety.

Mr. McLeod responded that since this is a public road, they would give money to the City and the City will actually install the tree.

Chairperson Brnabic asked about the total project timeline.

Mr. Vaglia responded that the development part is three to four months for the roads to be in; and then houses constructed based on sales, which are usually fairly quick in Rochester Hills. He commented that it should be wrapped up in about one year.

Chairperson Brnabic stated that she thought one year seemed a bit short, and pointed out that the EIS projected up to two years to complete the development. She commented that she was happy to hear it could be much quicker. She asked if they were planning on starting this summer.

Mr. Vaglica responded that they are hoping to.

Mr. Gallina stated that like any project where wetlands back up to residences, there are neighbors that have submitted comments; and he asked that concerns be addressed as to how they will prevent water coming onto adjacent property.

Mr. Vaglica responded that all of the water is going to be directed into a catch basin, which will then flow to the pond. He pointed out that all of the backyards will have catch basins and the lots will be graded to manage all of the water on site through gravity. He stated that they feel that it will not impact any of the neighboring properties. He added that they have been working with the City for a few years trying to manage all of the stormwater issues.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing, noting that she had a number of speaker cards. She reminded speakers that they would have three minutes and all questions would be answered together after everyone had an opportunity to speak.

Robin Wright, 3239 S. Livernois, stated that her house is north of the proposed development. She commented that they have lived there 25 years and will be sad to see the loss of the wooded area, and appreciate the fact that they have taken density into consideration versus the maximum density that could have been proposed. She noted that staff answered some of her questions in advance relative to the landscape plan and stormwater and it is her understanding that there will not be any surface water discharge from sumps and no backup due to lack of maintenance onto properties that exist. She expressed concern that while DTE is responsible for the design of the power poles, wiring, and high power lines, there is a proposed routing that would have a line go from the front of her house on Livernois straight back to their house over their shed and deck, causing a safety and aesthetic concern. She asked if they could be a part of DTE discussions, and asked if there was a possibility of burying those lines.

Chairperson Brnabic asked if Ms. Wright received answers to her concerns about the water discharge and maintenance prior to the meeting.

Ms. Wright responded yes.

James Cooper, 3327 Hazelton Avenue, stated that he appreciates Enliven's efforts to make this as least disruptive as possible. He expressed concern about construction noise and invasion of privacy, noting that his home has floor to ceiling windows that are not curtained. He noted that adjacent homes would have a straight line of sight into his home. He mentioned that there are a couple of recent developments such as Pine Creek that have not taken off as quickly as expected, and commented that their timeline might be a bit aggressive. He stated that his property has flooding issues when it rains, and expressed concern for the 100-year-old trees in the back where any replacements will take time to mature and fill in. He mentioned one tree up against his fenceline that is slated for removal and asked if it could be considered to remain.

Chairperson Brnabic asked Mr. Cooper how many sales he thought have occurred in Pine Creek.

Mr. Cooper responded that he did not have a good estimate but thought it was two or three.

MaiLia Kue, 3307 Hazelton, stated that her backyard overlooks the proposed project, and stated that she has three children all under the age of 10 and a basketball court out front. She expressed concern over increased traffic due to 21 homes. She commented that with two religious centers and the Mosque on Auburn often a police officer is directing traffic. She stated that there should be a level of respect for the current residents.

Chairperson Brnabic referenced Ms. Wright's concerns regarding utilities lines

and asked if they could possibly be buried.

Mr. Bahauddin responded that when they get to that phase they will definitely contact her as a part of the discussion, noting that they definitely do not want to route lines over any sheds or structures.

Mr. Vaglica commented that once the roadway is installed and a proper curb and gutter put in, no more water from that property will be going onto anyone else's property, and noted that this is the design intent. He commented that they will be fixing the current issues. He added that as they will be regrading the property to ensure proper drainage, sometimes trees will have to go. He commented that obviously if they can save a tree, it is less money that will have to be paid to the City and it would be a positive thing for the developer.

He commented that as far as hours of construction, the City has an ordinance that people can only work there during the day and they will not be working on the weekends. He added that relative to traffic concerns, they should be improving traffic as right now with Pine Wood, all of the construction traffic is going through the subdivision to the south and once the road is connected, at least 50 percent of that traffic should be diverted.

Chairperson Brnabic noted comments relative to privacy.

Mr. Bahauddin responded that Lots 17 and 16 have additional trees planned which will add more of a privacy fence.

Mr. Vaglica noted that all of the trees were upped to three-inch calipers and 12 to 15 feet high to get more benefit from the Tree Fund.

Ms. Denstaedt asked if the detention pond would be fenced, noting that she was a little nervous for a three-foot pond with children in the neighborhood.

Mr. Vaglica responded that it would be three feet deep in the middle, but the slope is one on six, and likened it more to a depressed lawn area. He stated that there will be extensive landscaping around it and fencing is not required.

Mr. McLeod responded that the City actually discourages fencing around detention ponds, and this is the reason why slopes are designed to be a safe and recoverable. He added that someone would have to be fully committed to get to the center where the deep portion is. He noted that if the Commission felt it was a concern that could be a conversation, but reiterated that it has been designed pursuant to the regulations.

Mr. Weaver asked if any of the trees could be upped to five or six inch caliper, pointing out that while it is at a higher cost, it would reduce the amount to the Tree Fund and appease the neighbors. He stated that the selected trees are great and will get big; however, the canopy will be sparse at planting.

Mr. Devlin responded that availability would be a problem, and with so much development going on there are not many large trees available. He added that spading in trees will be considerably more expensive, and the cost would be at

least double a three-inch tree. He commented that they could consider a 3-1/2 or four-inch caliper tree.

Mr. Weaver suggested evergreens, noting that they might provide more privacy.

Mr. Devlin noted that they have tried to show evergreens where it seemed appropriate, with the others being deciduous.

Mr. Struzik asked whether they would plan to have construction traffic enter the site from only Livernois, noting that he does not want traffic to go down Hazelton as it would be unfair for the residents. He suggested that he would request construction traffic enter and exit from Livernois only.

Mr. Vaglica responded that they only have access to their site from Livernois.

Mr. Struzik stated that he appreciates a less intense development, and commented that he would anticipate that if the road were completed, some of the existing neighborhood traffic would use the new road instead of Hazelton.

Mr. Hooper commented on maintenance of the split rail fence proposed for the natural features setback and asked if a boulder wall instead of a fence could show the delineation, as that would not be easily removed.

Mr. Vaglica responded that the split rail fence was actually suggested by the Planning Staff. He suggested that it could be written into the condominium documents that the fence belongs to the site and not to the individual lots. He commented that he did not understand how a boulder wall would be implemented.

Mr. Hooper responded that they have done this in the past on several developments, with one or two-foot diameter boulders in a continuous row to protect the natural feature as the fence won't last. He mentioned units 17, 18, 19 and 20 and the adjacent neighbors.

Mr. Vaglica stated that this is something he can discuss with the landowners.

Mr. Bahauddin stated that they will have a serious look at this.

Mr. Hooper noted that traffic is always a concern, and asked if there was any discussion with Staff on adding any traffic calming to Cordoba Drive.

Mr. Vaglica noted that they had a raised pavement bumper, and Traffic asked them to remove it. He noted that an alternative suggestion would take away from the park and take down additional trees.

Ms. Roediger commented that this is a touchy subject and there is currently an internal disagreement amongst Fire and other Departments. She stated that they will have an ongoing discussion internally to determine what the process will be going forward as they continue to have traffic calming as a goal for the community that can also meet the criteria established by Fire.

Chairperson Brnabic asked if anyone else wished to speak, and seeing no other member of the public requesting to speak, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Hooper made the motion in the packet for the Preliminary Site Condominium Recommendation to City Council with the six preprinted findings and two conditions. The motion was seconded by Ms. Neubauer.

After calling for a roll call vote, Chairperson Brnabic announced that the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Hooper made the motion in the packet to approve the Tree Removal Permit with the two preprinted findings, two preprinted conditions, and added a third condition that the Developer is to review with Staff the ability to save the three trees on the back of lot number 17 from removal. The motion was seconded by Ms. Neubauer.

Chairperson Brnabic asked Mr. Vaglica if he would confirm to agree to discuss saving those trees.

Mr. Vaglica confirmed that if they could make it work with Engineering, he would absolutely agree.

Chairperson Brnabic called for a voice vote, and after the vote noted that the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Hooper made the motion in the packet to approve the Natural Features Modification with the two preprinted findings and three preprinted conditions, and added a fourth condition that the developer work with staff on the ability of providing an alternative protection method for the wetland feature setback from a split rail fence to a single continuous boulder wall for the lots that impact private property and the new future lots. The motion was seconded by Ms. Neubauer.

After calling for a roll call vote, Chairperson Brnabic announced that the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Hooper made the motion in the packet to recommend the Wetland Use Permit, with the two preprinted findings and five preprinted conditions. The motion was seconded by Ms. Neubauer.

After calling for a roll call vote, Chairperson Brnabic announced that the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. McLeod noted that if Councilperson Neubauer's recommendation was for these items be resolved prior to them appearing before Council, it would only give two days to resolve these issues in order for it to be on Council's agenda on April 28.

Ms. Roediger suggested that as this is a condominium, this is only the preliminary phase, and noted that the intention of preliminary is to lay out lot

locations and roads. She explained that many of these details are handled during final. She commented that this could delay the project a couple of months and make starting in the summer unlikely.

Ms. Neubauer responded that she did not think full resolution has to be made; however there should be a good faith effort so there is no question of whether something is approved or not approved.

Ms. Roediger suggested working with the applicant to have an updated letter based on the conditions from today and their intention to meet them, and the details would be hammered out during final.

Ms. Neubauer responded that this was more than fair. She commented that the next meeting is the 28th.

Mr. McLeod responded that the packet deadline is short one day due to Good Friday.

Ms. Neubauer suggested that they work closely with Ms. Roediger and Mr. McLeod so that it goes smoothly at City Council.

A motion was made by Hooper, seconded by Neubauer, that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 9 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. PSC2023-0001 Oak Creek Condominium, the Planning Commission recommends approval of the Preliminary One Family Residential Detached Condominium Plan, based on plans received by the Planning Department on March 13, 2025, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions.

Findings

1. The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that the proposed development will promote the intent and purpose of the ordinance, as well as other City Ordinances, standards, and requirements; and those requirements can be met with the exception of the acceptable modifications shown below and subject to the conditions listed below.
2. The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that the proposed development will be designed, constructed, operated, maintained and managed so as to be compatible, harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing or planned character of the general vicinity, adjacent uses of land, the natural environment, the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the land use, and the community as a whole. The proposed project will be accessed primarily from Livernois Road, thereby promoting safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and on adjacent roadways. The preliminary plan represents a reasonable street, building and lot layout and orientation.
3. The development will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as major roadways, streets, police and fire protection, drainageways, refuse disposal, and utilities.
4. The proposed development will not be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to existing

or future neighboring uses, persons, property or the public welfare.

5. The proposed development will not create additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services that will be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.

6. The proposed improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the development onsite as well as existing development in the adjacent vicinity and act as an extension of the residential development to the east out to Livernois Road.

Conditions

1. Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, including the Fire Department Streets review, prior to final detached condominium approval.

2. Provide a landscape bond in the amount as determined by an updated landscape cost estimate to be provided by the applicant and verified by city staff, plus the cost of inspection fees, as adjusted by staff as necessary, prior to the preconstruction meeting with Engineering.

2025-0153

Request for Tree Removal Permit approval for Oak Creek condominiums, to remove 99 regulated trees and 38 specimen trees and to provide 142 replacement trees and pay the remaining 318 required trees into the City's Tree Fund, located at 3249 and 3271 Livernois, Parcel Nos. 15-34-101-053 and 15-34-101-055, located on the east side of Livernois, south of Auburn Rd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential; Mohammed Bahauddin, Enliven Developers, Applicant

See Legislative File 2025-0152 for discussion.

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

Aye 9 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Resolved, in the matter of File No. PTP2025-0005) (Condominium Tree Removal Permit) the Planning Commission grants a Tree Removal Permit (PTP2025-0005), based on plans received by the Planning Department on March 13, 2025, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions:

Findings

1. The proposed removal and replacement of regulated trees is in conformance with the City's Tree Conservation Ordinance.

2. The applicant is proposing to remove 99 regulated trees and to provide 142 replacement trees onsite, with the remaining 318 required replacement trees to be paid into the City's Tree Fund.

Conditions

1. Tree protective fencing, as reviewed and approved by the City staff, shall be installed prior to temporary grade being issued by Engineering.

2. Provide payment, equal to the current required fee for replacement trees, along with any additional fees associated with such, into the City's Tree Fund for the remaining 318 trees identified on the site plan.

3. Developer to review with City staff the ability to save the three trees on the back of Lot Number 17 from removal.

2025-0155

Request for Natural Features Setback Modification Approval to impact the natural features setback by approximately 542 linear feet/11,872 square feet for Oak Creek condominiums, a proposed development of twenty-one (21) detached single family residences on approximately 8.5 acres of land, located at 3249 and 3271 Livernois, Parcel Nos. 15-34-101-053 and 15-34-101-055, located on the east side of Livernois, south of Auburn Rd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential; Mohammed Bahauddin, Enliven Developers, Applicant

See Legislative File 2025-0152 for discussion.

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

Aye 9 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. PNFSM2025-0002 Oak Creek Condominium, the Planning Commission grants a natural features setback modification for 542 linear feet/11,872 square feet of permanent impacts to the identified Wetland area A identified on the site plans to construct the proposed public road providing service to the proposed single family residential units, and associated development infrastructure, based on plans received by the Planning Department on March 13, 2025, with the following findings and conditions:

Findings

1. The impact to the Natural Features Setback area is necessary for construction activities related to the proposed development; further, the applicant has minimized the impacts to the natural features and associated natural features setbacks by maintaining much of the sensitive area as common open space or edges of proposed units and the applicant has provided for the future protection of the natural features setback by providing split rail fencing and appropriate signage to define the area for future residents, workers, etc.

2. ASTI has reviewed the subject plans and proposed impacts to the natural features setbacks associated with Wetland A and the unnamed watercourse along with the proposed mitigation efforts to help reduce the impacts to those natural features and has indicated that the plans as proposed are satisfactory.

Conditions

1. Work to be conducted using best management practices to ensure flow and circulation patterns and chemical and biological characteristics of wetlands are not impacted.

2. Site must be graded with onsite soils and seeded with City approved seed mix.

3. Those areas identified as "Temporary Impacts" must be restored to original grade with original soils or equivalent soils and seeded with a City-approved seed mix where possible, and the applicant must implement best management practices as detailed in the ASTI

review letter dated February 27, 2025 prior to final approval by staff.

4. Developer to work with City staff to provide an alternative protection method for the natural features setback, changing the method from a split rail fence to a single continuous boulder wall on those lots impacted by the natural features setback.

2025-0154

Request for Wetland Use Permit Recommendation to impact approximately 417 square feet of wetlands for Oak Creek Condominiums, a proposed development of twenty-one (21) detached single family residences on approximately 8.5 acres of land, located at 3249 and 3271 Livernois, Parcel Nos. 15-34-101-053 and 15-34-101-055, located on the east side of Livernois, south of Auburn Rd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential; Mohammed Bahauddin, Enliven Developers, Applicant

See Legislative File 2025-0152 for discussion.

A motion was made by Hooper, seconded by Neubauer, that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council Regular Meeting,. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 9 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Resolved, in the matter of City File PWEP2025-0001 (Oak Creek Condominium) the Planning Commission recommends to City Council approval of a Wetland Use Permit to permanently impact approximately 417 square feet of wetland to construct the public road to service the single family units, and associated development infrastructure based on plans received by the Planning Department on March 13, 2025, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions.

Findings

1. The proposed permanent impact of 417 square feet of wetland area on site is minimal, the wetland is of a medium ecological quality, the crossing of the wetland and watercourse area is the minimum impact that allows the property to be developed pursuant to city plans and regulations, and minimization and mitigation efforts pursuant to the City's environmental consultant have been implemented on the proposed site plans.
2. ASTI has reviewed the subject plans and proposed impacts to Wetland A and the unnamed watercourse along with the proposed mitigation efforts to help reduce the impacts to those wetlands and has indicated that the plans as proposed are satisfactory.

Conditions

1. City Council approval of the Wetland Use Permit.
2. That the applicant receives an EGLE Part 303 Permit (as applicable) prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.
3. That the applicant provides a detailed soil erosion plan with measures sufficient to ensure ample protection of wetlands areas, prior to issuance of a Land Improvement Permit.
4. That any temporary impact areas be restored to original grade with original soils or equivalent soils and seeded with a city-approved wetland seed mix where possible, and the applicant must implement best management practices, prior to final approval by staff.

5. The applicant shall abide by all conditions and recommendations as outlined in ASTI's review letter of February 27, 2025.