

**SOUTH HAVEN CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

Wednesday, December 3, 2025

Approved January 7, 2026

**Workshop meeting 5p**

Brad Kotrba, Williams and Works – ZO update

Reviewed new article 21 non-conform, Art 22 ZBA, Art 23 Administration

**Regular meeting**

**1) Call to Order: 7:00 PM**

**2) Role Call:**

Tippman - present

Kiry – present

Odland - present

Meyer – present

Poole – present

Dibble – absent – excused

Nicol – present

Zoning Administrator: Tasha Smalley

Audience:

Applicants

Township residents

**3) Approval of the Agenda**

Odland stated to move New Business a. Site Plan review up before public hearing. Motion by Poole to approve the agenda as amended, second by Tippman, 6-0 yes, motion passed.

**4) Approval of the Minutes**

Motion by Nicol to approve the minutes as presented, of November 5, 2025, second by Meyer, 6-0, yes motion passed.

**5) Public Comment non-agenda items - none**

**6) Communications / Correspondence** - email receive Dave Wiatrowski regarding Kalamazoo area Battery Energy Storage Facility; neighbor concerns

**New Business –**

- a. Site plan review 10336 Blue Star, 80-17-015-055-00, The Lodge, to construction approx. 30x40 addition to existing restaurant (storage and food prep space). Smalley briefly went over the project. The restaurant has proposed to construct an addition 30x40 to add space for kitchen prep and storage. The existing garage will be removed. The addition will be along the front line of the building facing the road. No additional parking will be required and no parking will be eliminated. Brett, The Lodge, went over the project. The addition will help with kitchen space, it is very small; more prep area, dishwasher area, storage. Remove the garage outside. The outdoor patio area will be reconfigured.

No public comment  
No additional questions from PC

Motion made by grant to approve the revised site plan to construction an addition approx. 30x40 (prep space, dishwashing space, storage) not to include additional seating, second by Poole. No discussion.  
6-0yes, motion passed.

## 7) Public Hearing

Owner, James Bard and Applicant Wallick (Graham Welling) have petitioned for Final PUD (Planned Unit Development) review to rezone the property (MFR) and construct 52 units (2-16 unit and 1-20 unit apartments) at V/L (*approx. 09000*) 73<sup>rd</sup> Ave 80-17-014-039-20/25/30-00; approx. 13 acres.

Smalley briefly went over the project: Final PUD; preliminary was Aug 2024; the plan has changed slightly but approximately same number of units; 2-16 unit buildings and 1-20 unit building, club house/office, and playground. Includes 3 parcels to be combined into one.

Graham Welling, Wallick presented a slide-show presentation. Went over who Wallick is and how long been in business, how many developments. Their general mission “opening doors to homes”. Introduced Jamauri Bogan, Bogan Development; will be doing the construction work and plans. Provided portfolio of past projects. Market study shows need for workforce housing; rent is based on income. Financed through housing tax credits MSHDA. MSHDA oversight for 45 years to make sure in compliance with strict rules. Went over the site plan, building layout, parking, club house. The change from preliminary to final was due to topography and storm water. The land and slopes created some challenge. Moved the club house and play area. Went over the traffic and parking study, done by Fleis and Vandenbrink. Study shows no need to add a turn lane or improve the road. The parking study shows does not need the required number of spaces per the ordinance (119), plan shows 89. The units will have own door and common breezeway. Clubhouse will have office, open area and kitchen for gatherings.

Tippman asked how do you find 1.7 cars? Concerned with the decrease when the property is large enough to accommodate the required parking. Mr. Welling stated do not want to over build the property, extra cost. Tippman stated per a recent meeting with the road commission, was told 4,000 cars per day; study states less.

Brad Watson, WBX Engineer, Bowde`, went over the property challenges; 2 wetland areas to work around, the topography to drain, drop off towards the highway using retaining walls and strategic grading. Geological soil test done, poor drainage so a larger retention is needed. Adding retention walls. Shallow sanitary sewer in the road, need gravity line to get to the road. There will be landscape to block lights, wetland plantings to help with filtration.

Myers asked if they thought two driveways would be necessary. Welling stated the study showed only one driveway is sufficient. Also asked if adding an lane for incoming traffic. Welling stated the traffic study did not require a deceleration lane.

Chairperson opened the public hearing, 8:00pm.

Rita Ferrell, 73<sup>rd</sup> St – lived in area 23years, the plow has destroyed mailbox. 55mph too fast. Fears walking across street to get mail. 73rs is a service road.

Laura Czerkies, 73<sup>rd</sup> St – I am a runner and cannot run on 73<sup>rd</sup> St, not safe to walk. The people in the development will want to walk too. The foot traffic is not safe.

Barrett Mills 73<sup>rd</sup> St – not anti-development, in favor of people doing what they want with their land. But the road is still a concern. I have seen so many accidents, broken wheels, rollovers, etc. Need a better

road, infrastructure. There will be more issues if the road is not fixed. This development is spot zoning. Lower the speed limit, stop adding things to street making it worse.

James Bard, Bailey St – need for housing. The speed should not be 55 mph. The road is a road commission issue not with housing.

Nick Stegman 66<sup>th</sup> St – this development could be thing to get the road fixed; the site plan was changed from preliminary to make the project more compact,

Chairperson closed the public hearing, 8:16pm.

**8) New Business –**

b. review, discuss/decision – final PUD

Fact of Finding discussion

Section 16.09 The Planning Commission shall determine and shall provide evidence in its report to the Township Board to the effect that the application, site plan and supplementary informational materials submitted by the applicant meet the following standards:

- A. The proposed development shall conform to the Township Master Plan or any part thereof, or represents land use policy which, in the Planning Commission’s opinion, is a logical and acceptable change in the adopted Township Land Use Plan. – yes conforms, no issues, Tippman stated using a PUD to get around the rules of MDR.
- B. The proposed development shall conform to the intent and all regulations and standards of a “PUD” District.- Yes conforms, Tippman stated this is to circumvent the residential district
- C. The proposed development shall be adequately served by public facilities and services such as: highways, streets, sidewalks, street lights, police and fire protection, drainage courses, water and sanitary sewer facilities, refuse disposal; or that the persons or agencies responsible for the proposed development shall be able to properly provide such facilities and services. – concern for the road 73<sup>rd</sup> St, the road conditions have been discussed by the PC several times and with the road commission. Other Services are ok.
- D. Common open space, other common properties and facilities, individual properties, and all other elements of a “PUD” are so planned that they will achieve a unified open space and recreation area system, with open space and all other elements in appropriate locations, suitably related to each other, the site and surrounding lands. -Yes, the site plan is clustered, buildings are close to each other and approx. 7 acres will be open.
- E. The applicant shall have made provision to ensure that public and common areas will be or have been irrevocably committed for that purpose. Provisions shall have been made to provide for financing of improvements shown on the plan for open space and other common areas and facilities, and that proper maintenance of such improvements is ensured. -the funding received requires strict with maintenance of grounds and buildings. The developer has many complexes dating back with good standing.

- F. Traffic to, from, and within the site will not be hazardous or inconvenient to the project or to the surrounding area. In applying this standard, the Planning Commission shall consider, among other things, convenient routes for pedestrian traffic; relationship of the proposed project to main thoroughfares and street intersections; and the general character and intensity of the existing and potential development of the surrounding area. – 73<sup>rd</sup> traffic is a concern; not wide enough, speed too fast, no pedestrian walk area. The road commission is in charge of the road, not the planning commission. The PC has met with the road commission to tell them of the concerns of 73<sup>rd</sup> St. a lack of money to fix the road is the main issue.
- G. The mix of housing unit types and densities, and the mix of residential and non-residential uses shall be acceptable in terms of convenience, privacy, compatibility, and similar measures. -yes complies. Multi-unit housing
- H. The Planning Commission shall determine, where applicable, that noise, odor, lighting, or other external effects which are connected with the proposed use, will not adversely affect adjacent and surrounding area lands and uses. – the site plan shows retaining walls and screening from adjacent neighbors. Yes, complies.
- I. The proposed development shall create a minimum disturbance to natural features and land forms. – lot of engineering to work around the topography and drain issues, will disturb as least as possible. Yes, complies
- J. Streets shall follow topography, be properly spaced, and be located and aligned in accordance with the intended function of each street. The property shall have adequate access to public streets. The plans shall provide for logical extensions of public streets and shall provide suitable street connections to adjacent parcels, where applicable. No new streets created, just 1 driveway and parking lot. Yes, complies

PC comments:

Kiry – can deceleration lane(s) be added? The road commission needs to be involved, 55 mph is too fast. Regulate the no thru truck, there are signs but not regulated.

Poole – The township needs funds for road repairs

Motion by Nicol to recommend approval to the Township Board for the proposed Planned Unit Development, rezone to multi-family with conditions: 1. All required permits/approvals are obtained: Federal, State, County, local, 2. Must comply with all the standards in the PUD ordinance (Article 16) 3. And strong concern for condition of 73<sup>rd</sup> St (resolution for Township Board); second by Kiry. No further discussion. Roll Call vote: Poole-Yes; Dibble-absent; Tippman-Yes; Odland-Yes; Nicol-Yes; Kiry-Yes; Meyer-Yes. 6-0yes, motion passed.

Resolution for Township Board: The Planning Commission expresses strong concern of 73<sup>rd</sup> Street. During multiple meetings for different projects 73<sup>rd</sup> St had been brought up as a concern. Please consider and discuss these with the Township Board and other appropriate agencies.

Possible solutions:

- Safety – traffic flow is too fast, speed limit lowered to 35MPH
- Pedestrian traffic – install sidewalk or wider shoulder for pedestrians
- Truck traffic – prohibit thru truck traffic, the signs posted are not per an enforcement ordinance
- Deceleration lanes – add decel lanes in high turning areas
- Slow traffic – add rumble strips at cross streets to slow traffic
- Improve road – rebuild road to handle to high volume of traffic

- c. 2026 meeting calendar – continue with same meeting day and time. 1<sup>st</sup> Wednesday at 7pm. Motion by Poole to approve the 2026 meeting calendar, 1<sup>st</sup> Wednesday of each month starting at 7pm, second by Nicol. No discussion. 6-0yes, motion passed.

**9) Unfinished Business - none**

**10) Staff & Subcommittee report**

- a. Board report – Poole – approved the budget
- b. Zoning Board of Appeals – 2 meetings Nov 6 and Nov 17

Nov 6<sup>th</sup> – 2 apps 1. Eric and Emily Austin variances to construct a covered front porch and a garage addition at 12688 Blue Star Hwy. Required front setback is 110ft centerline of Blue Star Hwy; garage addition request is for 8ft of relief (102ft from center line); covered front porch request is for 5ft of relief (105ft from center line). Requests were approved  
2. Phillip and Kandace VanReken variance to enclose an existing screen porch at 16626 77<sup>th</sup> St. Required side setback is 10ft; request is for 2ft 3 ½in of relief (to be 7ft 8 ½ in from property line). Requests were approved.

Nov 17 – 3 apps Cottage Home 1. 78006 20<sup>th</sup> Ave; House - Required front setback 35ft; request 15ft of relief (to be 20ft from front property line). Required rear setback is 50ft; request 14.5ft of relief (to be 35’6” from rear property line). Required side yard is 15ft; request 4.5ft of relief (to be 10’6” from west side property line). Detached garage – Required rear setback 15ft; request 1ft of relief (to be 14ft from rear property line). Requests were approved  
2. 78000 20<sup>th</sup> Ave; House – Required rear setback 50ft; request 30ft of relief (to be 20ft rear property line); Detached garage – Required front setback 35ft; request 23ft of relief (to be 12ft from front property line). Requests were approved  
3. 78268 20<sup>th</sup> Ave, House – Required front setback 35ft; request 23ft of relief (to be 12ft from front property line). Requests were approved.

- c. Zoning report – Smalley – as of today, nothing for Jan meeting

**11) Commissioner Comments and Public Comment**

**12) Adjournment**

at 9:00 pm

*Respectfully Submitted by:*

*Tasha Smalley*

*Zoning Administrator/Recording Secretary*