THE CITY OF THE VILLAGE OF DOUGLAS
PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 08, 2026 AT 6:00 PM
415 WEST WILEY RD, SUITE 103, DOUGLAS, MI 49406

MINUTES (DRAFT)

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Chair Hickey called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT
Chair Thomas Hickey
Vice-Chair Matt Balmer
Secretary Paul Buszka
Commissioner Patty Hanson
Commissioner John O'Malley

Not Present
Commissioner Jennifer Ludwick
Commissioner Steven Merouse
Commissioner Laura Peterson
Commissioner Neal Seabert

Also Present
Planning & Zoning Administrator Sean Homyen
Planning Consultant Tricia Anderson (Williams & Works)

A. Approval of Agenda - October 8, 2026 (additions/changes/deletions)

Motion by O'Malley, seconded by Buszka to approve the October 8, 2026 agenda. – *Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.*

B. Approval of Minutes - September 10, 2026 (additions/changes/deletions)

Motion by Balmer, seconded by O'Malley to approve the September 10, 2026 regular meeting minutes – *Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.*

3. **PUBLIC COMMUNICATION - VERBAL (LIMIT OF 3 MINUTES)** – Tracy Shafroth, 299 Water St, read a letter from Greg Plow expressing concerns about rezoning 64 Wiley Road, including traffic and emergency access, environmental impacts near Tannery Creek, stormwater management, and the loss of a site-specific PUD review process.

Ms. Rininger, 274 Water St expressed concerns regarding the property's history as an orchard, possible arsenic contamination, runoff, natural features, traffic speeds, and additional development.

Chuck Arida, 254 Water St, speaking remotely, identified adjoining Water Street properties and expressed concerns regarding development intensity, traffic on Water Street, the roadway curve, environmental impacts, and the lack of a proposed development plan.

4. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION – WRITTEN – For the record

5. NEW BUSINESS

A. DDA Survey Results Presentation – Randy Walker presented results of a Downtown Development Authority survey with 289 responses. Respondents valued restaurants and dining, walkability, and small-town character, and identified interest in additional lunch options, retail, a bakery, live music, year-round businesses, and expanded hours. Walker requested that the Commission consider the survey as community input when reviewing future downtown proposals. The DDA will continue communicating with property owners and prospective businesses.

B. Public Hearing - 64 Wiley Rd – Rezone Request from R-1 PUD to R-3 Neighborhood Conservation District

Motion by Balmer, seconded by O'Malley to open the public hearing. - *Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.*

a. Applicant Presentation – David Schermer (Applicant) and Kelly Kuiper (Eastbrook Homes) explained the reasoning behind the request to rezone the property from R-1 PUD to R-3, with the intention of returning with an R-3 PUD application. Schermer discussed the updated Phase I and Phase II environmental assessments, traffic and utility studies, topography, wetlands, and survey. Kuiper reviewed the seven rezoning criteria under Section 28.06, including changed conditions, potential precedent, infrastructure, environmental impacts, permitted uses, consistency with the Master Plan, and reasonable economic use. The applicant stated that the proposed rezoning would better align with the Urban Residential designation in the Master Plan and allow for additional housing opportunities.

b. Planning and Zoning Administrators Report – Sean Homyen explained that the Planning Commission should focus on the rezoning criteria outlined in Section 28.06. City Planner Tricia Anderson explained that the existing PUD had not been developed and discussed the City's authority to rezone the property. Anderson also discussed the existing R-3 district intent language and the ongoing zoning ordinance amendments intended to align the ordinance with the updated Master Plan. She explained that the applicant could wait until the ordinance amendments are adopted, but doing so could delay the proposed development. Anderson further discussed the Urban Residential designation in the Master Plan and how the R-3 district could provide additional housing opportunities, while noting that R-1 and R-2 are also compatible zoning districts.

c. Public Comments (limit 3 minutes each, please) – Ronna Alexander, 265 Water Str expressed concerns regarding the existing R-3 district intent language, infrastructure, traffic, short-term rentals, and rezoning without a development plan. Tracy Shafroth, 299 Water St, requested that the Planning Commission deny or table the rezoning request due to concerns regarding traffic, density, environmental impacts, and the loss of oversight through the PUD process. Chuck Arida, 254 Water St, reiterated his concerns regarding the rezoning process, potential precedent, and changes to the character of the surrounding neighborhood. Elizabeth Eckhardt, 65 Randolph St expressed concerns regarding increased density, roadway conditions, emergency access, and protecting existing neighborhoods. Ms. Rininger, 274 Water St, expressed concerns regarding continued development,

environmental impacts, short-term rentals, and preserving the character of Douglas.

d. Commissioner Questions- Commissioner Buszka questioned the existing R-3 district intent language and whether the ordinance should be amended before considering the rezoning. Commissioner Balmer discussed the two-step process of rezoning the property before submitting a new PUD application. Commissioner Hanson discussed the proposed text amendment, consistency with the Master Plan, and the potential precedent. The applicant clarified that the proposed development would be owner-occupied, with rental restrictions incorporated into the master deed. Commissioner O'Malley expressed concerns about rezoning without seeing a conceptual development plan, including the proposed layout and density. Commissioner Buszka requested that the City Attorney review the existing R-3 ordinance language before the request proceeds to City Council.

Motion by Balmer, seconded by Hanson to close the public hearing – Motion carried unanimously

Motion by Balmer seconded by Hanson to recommend approval of the request made by David Schermer, on behalf of Tan Creek, LLC, for the amendment to the zoning ordinance and map in reference to a parcel of land located at 64 Wiley Road (PPN 59-016-096-00), from R-1, Planned Unit Development (PUD) to R-3, Neighborhood Conservation District based on the outline in the staff report.

- Motion carried by a 3–2 roll call vote. Commissioners Balmer, Buszka, and Chair Hickey voted yes. Commissioners Hanson and O'Malley voted no.

C. Westshore PUD Amendment

Motion by O'Malley, seconded by Balmer to open the public hearing – Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote

a. Applicant Presentation - Jack Barr of Nederveld, representing BDR Inc., presented the proposed amendment to the Westshore Planned Unit Development (PUD), requesting removal of the western development area from the existing PUD boundary. The amendment would reduce the required open space to approximately 42% and provide relief from the 25-foot buffer requirement behind units 16–21. The applicant discussed the proposed changes to the PUD, existing open space, and the relationship between the development and surrounding properties.

b. Planning and Zoning Administrators Report - Tricia Anderson of Williams and Works reviewed the proposed PUD amendment and applicable requirements under Article 27 of the Zoning Ordinance. Anderson discussed the proposed modification to the PUD boundary, reduction in open space, and requested relief from the 25-foot buffer requirement. Anderson also discussed the need to revise the master deed, Exhibit B drawings, and recorded open space easements, subject to City Attorney review.

c. Public Comments – Marc Newman, 745 Golfview Dr, expressed support for the proposed PUD amendment and stated that the buffer requirement was already being met. Karen Pulick, 554 Artisan Row, expressed concerns regarding the existing PUD, open space easements, and potential impacts to residents. She requested that the City, BDR, and property owners work together to ensure that the existing easements remain protected. Adam Klingher, 301 McVea, discussed the existing pathways and requested clarification regarding their continued maintenance. Dan Broekhuizen, 20 Ferry Street, expressed support for the concerns raised by Karen Pulick and Adam Klingher. Andrew Knecht, 702 Golfview Drive, expressed support for the proposal and discussed the safety easement and access to Golfview Drive from Campbell Road. Mark Lauterbach, 13 Wildwood Lane, expressed support for the proposed PUD amendment but questioned the open space requirements, Homeowners Association representation, and whether the HOA would vote on the proposed changes. Paul Lewer, 707 Golfview

Drive expressed support for the proposal and encouraged relief from the 25-foot buffer requirement.

d. Commissioner Questions - Commissioner Hanson discussed the ongoing coordination with the City Attorney regarding the proposed changes. Commissioner Balmer questioned whether the prospective buyer had contacted the Homeowners Association and discussed the existing open space easements. Peter Schmidt, BDR's attorney, explained that the HOA would need to approve certain changes but would not be required to vote on future development plans. Schmidt also explained that the existing easements would carry over to future property owners. Jeff Parker, representative of the potential buyer, discussed the survey conducted regarding the proposal. City Planner Tricia Anderson explained that staff had encouraged BDR and the prospective buyer to communicate with the HOA regarding the proposed changes.

Motion by Balmer seconded by O'Malley to close the public hearing – Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote

Motion by Balmer, seconded by Hanson to recommend to City Council to approve with conditions of the Planned Unit Development amendment submitted by Ric Dyk on behalf of BDR Inc. for the removal of the western development area resulting in the modification of the PUD boundary, reduction in open space to 42%, and the relief from the 25' buffer from units 16-21 for the Westshore Planned Unit Development, pursuant to Article 27 of the City of the Village of Douglas Zoning Ordinance subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall make any necessary revisions to the master deed and Exhibit B drawings for the remaining condominium areas within the Westshore PUD, and for the removal of the western development area from the PUD boundaries, subject to the review by the City Attorney.

2. The applicant shall make any necessary revisions to the recorded open space easement documents associated with the Westshore PUD, subject to the review by the City Attorney.

3. The amendment to remove the western development area from the PUD is subject to an approval of the rezoning of the land within the western development area from PUD to a zoning district that aligns with the City's future land use plan in the Master Plan.

4. The applicant shall have paid any required escrows and complete any obligations subject to performance guarantees prior to being reimbursed for said escrows or performance guarantees.

- *Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.*

D. Westshore PUD – Rezone Request from R-1 PUD to R-1 Residential District

Motion by Balmer, seconded by Buszka to Open Public Hearing. – *Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.*

a. Applicant Presentation - Jack Barr of Nederveld, representing BDR Inc., presented the request to rezone approximately 46 acres of property located on Center Street from R-1 PUD to R-1 Residential District. The property consists of the western development area proposed to be removed from the existing Westshore PUD. The applicant explained that the prospective purchaser intends to use the property for a single-family residential use.

b. Planning and Zoning Administrators Report - Staff clarified that the rezoning request would be reviewed based on the applicable rezoning criteria and that no development plan was associated with the request.

c. Public Comments (limit 3 minutes each, please) – Karen Pulick, 554 Artisan Row, clarified that neither the City nor BDR had contacted the Homeowners Association regarding the proposed changes. Marc Neumann, 745 Golfview Dr, expressed support for the rezoning request and discussed the open space calculations, noting that the existing public trails remain protected by recorded easements and should be considered when evaluating the amount of open space.

d. Commissioner Questions – None

Motion by Balmer, seconded by Buszka to Close the Public Hearing. – *Motion Carried by unanimous roll call vote.*

Motion by O'Malley, seconded by Balmer to recommend approval to City Council of the request submitted by Lakeside Pastures, LLC, with authorization from Douglas Property Dev LLC, to amend the Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map for approximately 46 acres of property located on Center Street (PPN 59-830-000-02) from Planned Unit Development (PUD) to R-1 Residential District, based on the findings outlined in the staff report. – Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None

7. REPORTS

A. Planning and Zoning Administrator Report – Planning & Zoning Administrator Homyen reported on an inquiry concerning a prior bed-and-breakfast approval at 89 South Washington Street and ongoing research into the City's records. He also reported that revised plans for the 105–107 property near Blue Star Café remained under review due to concerns raised by the Fire Department and City Engineer.

B. Planning Commissioner Remarks – Commissioners discussed including a conceptual development plan with future rezoning requests, scheduling review of additional zoning ordinance articles, and handling major applications when several commissioners are absent. A commissioner raised concerns about landscaping and fencing within a right-of-way and clear-vision area on Washington Street. Chair Hickey advised that he expected to be absent at the next meeting.

8. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION – VERBAL (LIMIT OF 3 MINUTES) - None

9. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by O'Malley seconded by Balmer to adjourn the meeting. – *Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.*