

NEW BUSINESS

2025-0429

Request for Site Plan Approval - File No. PSP2025-0014 - for the City of Rochester Hills to develop Nowicki Park with a community center building, playground, dog park, walking paths, maintenance building, and associated site improvements on approximately 34.5 acres of land, located at 670 N. Adams Rd. and Parcel Nos. 15-08-151-001 and -002, and 15-08-100-006, -007 and -008, on the east side of Adams and south of Tienken, zoned R-1 One Family Residential; Steve Sutton, P.E., Nowak & Fraus Engineers, on behalf of the City of Rochester Hills, Applicant

(Staff Report dated 9-25-25, Reviewed Plans and ASTI Review dated 9-16-25, NF Engineers Letter dated 9-12-25, Wetland Delineation Report dated 4-18-25, Environmental Impact Statement, Development Application, WRC Letter dated 8-6-25, Public Meeting Notice, Email Notice to HOAs dated 9-26-25, and Public Comment Received had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

Present for the applicant were Ken Elwert, Parks and Natural Resources Director, Dennis Andrews, Deputy Parks and Natural Resources Director, George Ostrowski, Nowak and Fraus, and Ed Alonso, A3 Architects.

Chairperson Hooper introduced this item, noting that it is a request for Site Plan Approval, Tree Removal Permit, Wetland Use Permit Recommendation, and Natural Features Setback Modification for the City of Rochester Hills to develop Nowicki Park with a community center building, playground, dog park, walking trails, maintenance building, and associated site improvements on approximately 34.5 acres located on the east side of Adams Road south of Tienken Road, zoned R-1 One Family Residential.

Mr. McLeod explained that there are four separate requests before the Commission this evening, and noted that three of these requests stay with the Commission, while the Wetland Use Permit is a recommendation to City Council. He mentioned that most of the Commissioners know Nowicki Park in its current form, and described the surrounding properties, residential and open space for the abutting subdivision, large lot residential to the north and to the south, and residential to the west across Adams Road. A wider view noted Premier Academy to the north and the Village of Rochester Hills to the south.

He pointed out the site's access from Adams, with a proposed boulevard entry with a single lane coming into the park and a dual lane coming out with dedicated right and left turn exit lanes. He noted that there will be a deceleration lane on the east side of Adams and a bypass lane on the west side, and he commented that the City has been working with the Road Commission in terms of extending the turn lane all the way up to Tienken Road to help address concerns and provide additional efficiency for traffic movement. He described the traffic flow internal to the park, and mentioned that the community building will be used not only for park functions, but can potentially be used for other City functions as well. He reviewed the other areas of the site, including the outdoor pavilion, playground area, restroom facility and two individual dog park areas, one for

small breed and one for large breed dogs. He pointed out that the east side becomes the more natural preservation area, and commented that the walking pathways will be both improved and gravel or another alternative surface. He mentioned the wetland permit and reviewed Wetland Area B, the main wetland central to the site, that the City is looking to modify; and he commented that he thinks of it more as a wet wetland versus a dry wetland. He stressed that it will be a natural looking water feature, but will not be a pristine pool or detention pond as is seen in many developments. He reviewed how the parking needed was estimated relative to how city parks function, noting that the Parks Division estimated the number of spots that will be truly needed.

Mr. McLeod reviewed the proposed landscape plan, and explained that the tree removal permit talks about the potential removal of up to 550 trees; however, there is approximately a 90 tree buffer in terms of additional trees being asked for that most likely will not come down. He commented that the City wanted flexibility in the event that additional trees would have to come down during the establishment of some of the features, and he mentioned that this was a similar scenario to the development of Innovation Hills. He stressed that the City's planting plan is incredibly aggressive, and commented that while there are trees coming down on the site, there is a landscape plan that brings back those trees. He noted that the City is meeting its own ordinances in terms of the preservation requirement of 40 percent minimum, and also in terms of planting as a result of the tree removal.

He pointed out a berm that will surround the playground area in an effort to help reduce noise, noting that it will be heavily landscaped with evergreens to help encapsulate the active area. He noted that the City's Parks team has had meetings with the general public and has worked to increase the number of plantings in the passive area of the park where it starts to abut the single family residential lots.

He explained that there are eight wetlands on the site, and he reviewed the most impacted wetland, stressing that the wetland is not being filled to create landscape, parking or structures. He noted that the wetland is being filled to create a wetter wetland/water feature that will service the overall site, and he stressed that these areas have all been fully vetted by ASTI. He stated that a representative from ASTI and the City's Engineering team are in attendance to answer any questions.

Mr. McLeod reviewed the renderings showing the park and stressed that it is not an urban or heavily developed park, and commented that the intention is to respect the feel and character of the park as it stands today, while making it more modernized by providing a number of amenities to the residents. He commented that the dog park area includes a dog wash, and the community building will be a very natural building, using stone and wood to fit well into the character of the park.

Mr. Elwert explained that this has been a two-and-a-half year process and noted that they started gathering public input during the Parks Master Plan and Department Master Plan in 2022, where this was one of the significant elements. He noted that over that process they undertook randomized surveys throughout

the entire city that established a need for some of the elements in this particular park, as well as conducted multiple focus groups in different locations regarding the conceptual plans.

Chairperson Hooper noted that he would be calling for public comment on this item, limited to three minutes each, and mentioned additional emails received from Steve Yuhasz, and Max and Marianna Larroquette.

Theresa Pounders, 3172 Devondale, stated that while she is all for making the parks beautiful, 550 trees is a lot. She asked why the park couldn't be developed and left more natural.

Matthew White, 754 Snowmass, stated that he is the President of the Shadow Woods Subdivision Association, and represents 419 homes. He commented that the residents have been very happy with the evolution of this park plan from its earliest incarnation, which most of the residents had found objectionable. He commented that Mr. Elwert and Mr. Andrews have worked with the board and the residents to allay their concerns and have moved walking paths away from the backyards and have modified the screening. He stated that their residents look forward to the interconnection of the park with the proposed enhancements, and to work with Mr. Elwert to ensure that light pollution and sound pollution are eliminated in their neighborhood from the development.

Molly Barth, 624 Rolling Green Circle N, commented that Mr. Nowicki was really the Green Space person. She stated that she does not know how animals will be displaced. She asked for additional screening with trees or berms to buffer Brookdale Woods on the west side of Adams Road. She thanked staff members for what has come of the design process, noting that many people suggested baseball diamonds or a pool.

David Thomas, 580 Rolling Green Circle N, stated that he backs up to Adams Road and would prefer that Nowicki Park stays exactly how it was in its natural state. He thanked Mr. Andrews for his efforts to help explain things, and he asked that the parking lot lights be as far back from Adams Road as possible to decrease light pollution and vehicle noise.

Thomas Yazbeck, 1707 Devonwood Drive, asked for information regarding the programming that would occur at the community building. He stated that he thinks that this is awesome and has been waiting for Nowicki Park to be a real park for his whole life. He commented that he has a large active dog and the dog park will be great and is desperately needed.

Seeing no additional public comment cards or anyone wishing to speak, Chairperson Hooper closed Public Comment. He asked that questions raised be addressed and started with comments regarding the tree removal and the option of some supplemental tree removal.

Mr. Elwert responded that removing trees is hard, and explained that they have gone through and adjusted many of the trail locations along with the parking lot corners in some cases to focus on saving specimen trees. He commented that it is a balance of providing more access to the public and understanding

what the public amenity is meant for. He mentioned the dog park, noting that they believe that they can clear out enough so that there is a sight distance where dog owners would be comfortable with dogs running in between trees. He added that they are continuing to work with residents on other items, especially near Shadow Woods, where they adjusted the trails to fit between large trees. He commented that they are trying to focus on saving large specimen trees as a priority.

Chairperson Hooper noted that an issue was raised regarding screening on the west side of Adams, and pointed out that the City does not own Adams Road and cannot plant trees on the Road Commission for Oakland County's right-of-way.

Mr. Elwert stated that they are looking to the RCOC to find a way to allow more planting sites around the city, and he noted that this may be a good sample case. He mentioned that there are challenges as there is a sewer line on that side of the road, and it would be difficult to plant trees on top of it. He addressed the comment regarding berms, noting that while this is something that could be looked at, there are wetlands and other things on the property that make it more challenging.

Chairperson Hooper addressed a question on lighting, and pointed out that the City's ordinance does not allow exceeding one foot candle at the property line, and the proposed photometric plan goes well below that standard.

Mr. Elwert responded that the whole parking lot will not be lit, and the night activity areas will be the community building and the dog park. He explained that the entire south parking lot will be gated and there will not be lighting in that area.

Chairperson Hooper asked about programming for the community building.

Mr. Elwert responded that there are not a lot of meeting spaces in the city and it would provide approximately 2,000 square feet, similar in size to the Museum's Calf Barn space. He explained that it could host approximately 100 to 125 people, and would be available for the public to rent for a birthday or graduation party. He commented that they have already been in discussion with RARA for summer camp usage, noting that they are currently bursting at the seams for their camps. He added that the City's Outdoor Engagement unit is excited about the possibility of having space to run nature programs. He stated that it will be a variety of City programming and availability to the public, including the possibility of hosting HOA meetings.

Chairperson Hooper asked about other communities utilizing the park facilities and whether that would be legal.

Mr. Elwert responded that in general, if there are no grant funds on the property, there aren't necessarily restrictions on what can and cannot be done on accessing public parks. He noted that they have been looking at dog parks and plan to limit the number of memberships on a fob-based system, starting with residents and then seeing how much space they have. He noted that the fee

structure will be further discussed with City Council and internally with staff.

Chairperson Hooper asked if this location will have paid parking.

Mr. Elwert responded that they are looking at all options as possibilities, and noted that this is a different model than Innovation Hills, being a community park nestled within the neighborhoods and not near the expressway. He stressed that it is not meant to bring people from long distances to visit. He explained that typically they look at a cost recovery of between 20 and 30 percent for operations, and he pointed out that Bloomer and Spencer have charged entry for years, while Borden charges for field rentals.

Chairperson Hooper asked if there was anything else Mr. Elwert wanted to address before opening discussion up to the Commission.

Mr. Elwert responded that they are trying to be good neighbors and have had many public meetings and walks with the neighbors to make adjustments where possible while still maintaining the public purpose of the park which is for everybody.

Ms. Neubauer stated that she sits on City Council and is proud of the fact that the City has acquired at least four new parcels of green space since she has been on Council, making 142 acres of green space in Rochester Hills. She commented that this City Council, administration and Parks Department are big in preserving natural features and as much green space as possible. She pointed out that Rochester Hills has one of the strictest and most aggressive tree ordinances in the area, and mentioned that the trees that are being removed area actually being replaced and planted throughout the city, which in this situation is more generous of a give back than just paying into the Tree Fund which is what a lot of developers do.

Mr. Elwert confirmed that approximately 465 trees will be planted on the site.

Ms. Neubauer added that in addition to the building being used for the community, the City has been having issues with having a voting site in Rochester Hills and hopefully one of the uses for the building would be for an early voting site. She pointed out that the Rochester Hills Public Library is not conducive to continuing as an early voting location with the population growing the way that it is, and she stressed that the City does not want to be at the mercy of Oakland County when it comes to voting. She suggested an additional condition that staff will investigate with the Road Commission to find out what might be able to be done with berms and extra plantings.

Mr. Elwert responded that he doubts very strongly that berms will be allowed on the right-of-way, although he has hope for some trees.

Ms. Neubauer suggested that it be an investigative ask, requesting a solid response before voting on it at City Council. She stated that she wanted to move for approval with the additional condition. The motion was supported by Mr. Struzik.

Mr. Struzik stated that he was excited to have such a great design before the Commission. He commented that he is kind of spoiled living near John R and Auburn and being walking distance to Borden and Spencer, a short bike ride to Wabash and Bloomer, and a short drive to Innovation Hills. He stated that the northwest side of the city needs something like this and he was glad to see Shadow Woods Subdivision working with the City. He commented that this will be a wonderful asset to the City and will increase property values. He stated that the City's slogan is Innovative by Nature and he thinks this is exactly what the plan is.

Ms. Denstaedt stated that it is exciting to see this as the Commission has gone through and worked on the Master Plan, and green space and recreational venues have been asked for. She concurred with investigating trees and potentially berms. She liked the idea of having two dog parks broken out.

Mr. Weaver questioned whether the gated parking lot would have hourly times and asked about park hours.

Mr. Elwert responded that it is not a 24-hour dog park, and noted that there would be a gate in the south lot. He likened the park to Borden, where the park opens at 10 or 11 a.m., with a closing at 10 p.m. and starting to move people out of the park at 9:30 p.m. He noted that renting the room opens another element.

Mr. Weaver asked if there was any idea of the membership structure for the dog park and how many people would be allowed.

Mr. Elwert responded that they are probably looking at a membership somewhere in the neighborhood of 1,000 people, and he mentioned that Sterling Heights has a smaller dog park and caps their membership at 700 or 750. He noted that not everyone will come at the same time, and only a certain percentage will use it in a given day.

Mr. Weaver stated that he is not worried about it being too crowded, but wants to know the odds of getting a membership as he lives across the street.

Mr. Elwert responded that in the beginning they intend to limit it to residents for annual passes to see where it goes from there.

Mr. Weaver stated that there was a comment of a need to maintain a natural area based on Mr. Nowicki's desires, and he stated that he thinks the plan before the Commission does a good job of presenting this as a passive park and not a destination park like Innovation Hills. He stressed that the activity is based along Adams Road which is relatively busy. He pointed out that the planting plan tries to get rid of all of the invasive species such as the buckthorn and olive. He suggested removing the cottonwoods.

Mr. Elwert mentioned that there is a Nowicki daughter that lives in the City that they have been in contact with, and she has seen the plans. He commented that this fits and tries to respect Mr. Nowicki's wishes and balance that with allowing access to everyone.

Mr. Hetrick stated that it has been some time for this to come to fruition and it is outstanding to see something that has been planned for a number of years come to a point where it will be implemented. He asked if removing some of the parking spaces in front may allow clearance to plant more trees outside of the right-of-way.

Mr. Elwert responded that they hesitate to remove parking spots; however, there may be some opportunities for berms on this side along with more tree plantings. He noted that this could be reviewed in the construction drawing phase.

Mr. Hetrick noted that there was a question of funding, and he stated that this will be funded through the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for Rochester Hills.

Mr. Elwert responded that it has been in the CIP for quite a while and is also in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan since 2023. He pointed out that this project was moved into the budget for next year per City Council's direction. He added that they are also working on solidifying several large partnerships or fundings to help support the project.

Mr. Dettloff expressed his appreciation to staff, noting that this has been a labor of love and what makes Rochester Hills the great community it is.

Chairperson Hooper asked about the dog park fencing and stated that he would assume it is not opaque.

Mr. Elwert responded that they are still researching a few options and stated that there is a desire to use a material that is more appealing than a chain link fence. He mentioned that based on citizen comments they were trying to do more solid walls on the east and west ends to block sound, but aesthetically that is challenging and it is probably not headed that way. He stressed that it had to be small enough where dogs could not push through it.

Chairperson Hooper suggested decorative woven wire that is black in color which would look beautiful and not detract from the park. He pointed out that the playground will eventually have equipment in it.

Mr. Elwert responded that they are working with a playground vendor who will be putting a number of proposals together. He noted that there will be a berm or a mini bridge to the playground equipment which will allow for wheelchair access. He mentioned that they are looking at rock wall equipment and a shade area.

President Hooper called for a roll call vote on the motion to approve the site plan. After the vote, he noted that it passed unanimously.

Ms. Neubauer moved the motion in the packet to approve the tree removal permit. The motion was seconded by Ms. Denstaedt. After calling for a roll call vote, Chairperson Hooper noted that the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Neubauer moved the motion in the packet to grant the Natural Features Setback Modification, and the motion was seconded by Ms. Denstaedt. After

calling for a roll call vote, Chairperson Hooper noted that the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Neubauer moved the motion in the packet to recommend City Council grant the Wetland Use Permit, and the motion was seconded by Mr. Gallina. After calling for a roll call vote, Chairperson Hooper noted that the motion passed unanimously.

Following the vote, Mr. McLeod noted that depending on the Parks team's availability, this item would appear at the October 20, 2025 City Council Meeting for the Wetland Use Permit recommendation.

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

Aye 8 - Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Brnabic

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. PSP2025-0014 (Nowicki Park), the Planning Commission approves the proposed Site Plan, to allow for the construction of an upgraded City Park, including a community building, open air pavilion, restroom facilities, dog park area, outdoor playground, pathway systems, parking areas, and associated infrastructure systems in the R-1 One Family Residential District, based on plans received by the Planning Department on September 11, 2025, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions:

Findings

1. The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that all applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as other City Ordinances, standards, and requirements, can be met subject to the conditions noted below.
2. The proposed project is being constructed in a manner that provides for dedicated parking areas that provide adequate parking and the site will be accessed via an entrance/exit with dedicated exit turn lanes, directly to Adams Road, which is a major roadway, thereby promoting current and future safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and the general area.
3. Off-street parking areas for the general public are being provided for the park site based on the occupancy of the proposed buildings and structures in addition to general attendees of the park.
4. The proposed development and associated improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the existing development in the adjacent vicinity since the park is being left largely natural with structures taking up a small portion of the site area, is being heavily landscaped, and design accommodations in excess of ordinance requirements have been made in an attempt to reduce impacts to surrounding neighbors.
5. The proposed development will not have an unreasonably detrimental or injurious effect upon the existing characteristics and features of the site or those of the surrounding area. The proposed improvements will bring newly desired recreational opportunities, including a

dog park, to a portion of the City that has not historically had an improved park and the Parks department has determined that 90 additional parking spaces over those required for building occupancy onsite will be sufficient to accommodate parking needs generated by general park users.

6. The Planning Commission finds that a modification to allow the required number of allowable parking spaces to be exceeded is appropriate, given the size and unique nature of the park that requires additional parking above and beyond those spaces solely required for the buildings.

Conditions

1. The applicant shall address all remaining comments and notations as depicted on the reviewed site plans.
2. Staff will investigate with the Road Commission for Oakland County the possibility of adding screening on the west side of Adams Road.

2025-0430

Request for Tree Removal Permit - File No. PTP2025-0010 - to removal up to 550 regulated trees (including specimen) with up to 527 replacement trees required associated with plans for the City of Rochester Hills to develop Nowicki Park with a community center building, playground, dog park, walking paths, maintenance building, and associated site improvements on approximately 34.5 acres of land, located at 670 N. Adams Rd. and Parcel Nos. 15-08-151-001 and -002, and 15-08-100-006, -007 and -008, on the east side of Adams and south of Tienken, zoned R-1 One Family Residential; Steve Sutton, P.E., Nowak & Fraus Engineers, on behalf of the City of Rochester Hills, Applicant

See Legislative File 2025-0429 for discussion.

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

Aye 8 - Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Brnabic

Resolved, in the matter of File No. PTP2025-0010 (Nowicki Park) the Planning Commission grants a Tree Removal Permit based on plans received by the Planning Department on September 11, 2025, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions:

Findings

1. The proposed removal of regulated trees is in conformance with the City's Tree Conservation Ordinance.
2. The applicant is proposing to remove a total of four hundred and sixty-six (466) regulated trees and twenty-two (22) specimen trees as a part of site development, and replant a total four hundred and sixty-five (465) trees onsite.
3. Further, the applicant has requested an overall blanket approval to remove an additional number of trees to not exceed an overall total of five hundred and fifty (550) trees and with that have a total potential replacement total not to exceed five hundred and twenty-seven

(527) trees, to allow additional flexibility in overall site development. Given the scope of this project, the public benefit being provided, and the City's desire to work with abutting property owners to address concerns that may require minor modifications to the plans, the Planning Commission finds that this flexibility is necessary to allow the appropriate development of the site.

Conditions

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

2025-0432

Request for Natural Features Setback Modification - File No. PNFSM2025-0003 - to modify the required natural features setbacks by approximately 3,200 lineal feet associated with plans for the City of Rochester Hills to develop Nowicki Park with a community center building, playground, dog park, walking paths, maintenance building, and associated site improvements on approximately 34.5 acres of land, located at 670 N. Adams Rd. and Parcel Nos. 15-08-151-001 and -002, and 15-08-100-006, -007 and -008, on the east side of Adams and south of Tienken, zoned R-1 One Family Residential; Steve Sutton, P.E., Nowak & Fraus Engineers, on behalf of the City of Rochester Hills, Applicant

See Legislative File 2025-0429 for discussion.

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

Aye 8 - Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Brnabic

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. PNFSM2025-0003 Nowicki Park, the Planning Commission grants a natural features setback modification for approximately 3,200 linear feet of permanent impacts to two (2) different wetland areas identified on the site plans to construct the proposed building and associated overlook area, parking areas, and pathways, and associated development infrastructure, based on plans received by the Planning Department on September 11, 2025, with the following findings and subject to the following 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.

2. ASTI has reviewed the subject plans and proposed impacts to the natural features setbacks associated with Wetland B and Wetland F 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 a 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 September 16, 2025 prior to final approval by staff.

2025-0431 Request for Wetland Use Permit Recommendation - File No. PWEP2025-0003 - to impact approximately 1.26 acres of wetlands associated with plans for the City of Rochester Hills to develop Nowicki Park with a community center building, playground, dog park, walking paths, maintenance building, and associated site improvements on approximately 34.5 acres of land, located at 670 N. Adams Rd. and Parcel Nos. 15-08-151-001 and -002, and 15-08-100-006, -007 and -008, on the east side of Adams and south of Tienken, zoned R-1 One Family Residential; Steve Sutton, P.E., Nowak & Fraus Engineers, on behalf of the City of Rochester Hills, Applicant

See Legislative File 2025-0429 for discussion.

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

Aye 8 - Denstaedt, Dettloff, Gallina, Hooper, Neubauer, Hetrick, Struzik and Weaver

Excused 1 - Brnabic

Resolved, in the matter of City File PWEP2025-0003 (Nowicki Park) the Planning Commission recommends to City Council approval of a Wetland Use Permit to permanently impact approximately 1.26 acres of wetlands to construct Nowicki Park, including the proposed building and associated overlook area, parking areas, and pathways, and associated development infrastructure based on plans received by the Planning Department on September 11, 2025, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions.

Findings

1. Of the approximate 4.6 acres of regulated wetland on site, the applicant is proposing to impact approximately 1.26 acres.

2. The most significant area of wetland impact, being the area where the main building and wetland viewing area will be constructed and the associated modifications to the overall wetland depth and makeup, is within the low quality portion of the wetland. In addition, the soil borings that were provided and analyzed by the City environmental consultant indicate the soils are conducive to isolating impacts to other areas of wetland area B and finally, much of the impacted area of wetland area B will remain a water feature, with overall wetland-like qualities.

3. In part, the proposed wetland impacts to construct a boardwalk system over the wetlands will help long term preservation of the wetland by providing access to additional areas of park and not requiring at grade pathways or users to traverse the area outside of defined raised pathway areas.

4. The proposed wetland impacts required as a part of the parking lot construction are limited and are located within a low-quality portion of the wetland.

5. ASTI has reviewed the subject plans and proposed impacts to Wetland B 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 September 16, 2025.