

VILLAGE OF CALEDONIA

FINAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, March 24, 2022
250 S. Maple St. SE
Caledonia, MI 49316

Planning Commission Attendees: Sylvia Murphy, Kimberly Peters, Gayle Ott, Bill Robertson, Chad Chambers, Amanda Crozier

Additional Attendees: Jeff Thornton, Village Clerk/Manager, Nathan Mehmed, Village Planner

Missing: Jim Scales, Village Attorney, Gerianne Shuler

1. **Call to Order** at 7:00 pm
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Consideration of the Meeting Agenda**
 - o Motion to Approve by Ott
 - o Seconded by Chambers
 - o Motion Carried
4. **Public Comments –**
 - a. **K. Kaechele** – What is the building being purposed in this location? If there is going to be “hot chocolate” out of this location, why wouldn’t it be closer to the other buildings like the library? There is a natural area and it seems like it would be less disruptive to the wildlife if it wasn’t in that area. Could we consider another location? Consider the runoff of chemicals as well.
 - b. **T. Kaechele** – This building will impact people like us that live in the vicinity. We love living in the village but it’s very private. What will it do to my property value? If they rezone, want to make sure that no home will ever be built there. We’ve heard that in the past, you couldn’t build in there because it was wetlands. With backfill today, they can build anything. We hit water at 6 ft and we had backfill. High water table there. But the biggest concern is property value and how it impacts the consistency. D&W is there, but there are trees to cut down on the view and noise.
 - c. **J. Niles** - Grown up here, lived here all my life. It was set up to protect the wildlife and visual. If you take that away, that’s where the wildlife lives.
 - d. **B. Sullivan** – Questions – when the township gets involved, I get stiffed. Library, on the residential side, that’s where the mechanicals are. Likely to be the say way now. I can’t use my backyard due to the mechanicals of the library. The pay that was sold to me as woodchips, it’s an MDOT road. Not opposed to be able to have a building to maintain the Green, but when the Township gets involved, there is an altera motive. Would like to have stipulations. Why does it need to be rezoned, couldn’t there be a special use permit? We don’t want a bait and switch – they could sell it since they own it for condos, etc.

e. **Closed public comment 7:17 pm**

5. **Consideration of the February 24, 2022 Minutes**

- Motion to Approve with addition of language “**to Vote on Open Positions**” added to the original agenda by Ott
- Seconded by Crozier
- Motion Carried

6. **Inquiry of Conflict of Interest – None**

7. **New Business**

a. **Election of Officers**

i. **Chairman**

- Nomination of Chambers by Murphy
- Support by Peters
- No other nominations were made
- All in favor of Chambers for Chairman

ii. **Vice Chairman**

- Nomination of Murphy by Chambers
- Support by Ott
- No other nominations were made
- All in favor of Murphy for Vice Chairman

iii. **Secretary**

- Nominate Peters by Peters
- Support by Ott
- No other nominations were made
- All in favor of Peters for Secretary

b. **Rezoning Request**

i. **Presentation**

1. **Colin Finch** – Representing Township (as Project Engineer at Vriesman & Korhorn) rezone to R2 to match the rest of the park to construct a maintenance building to maintain the park. Knowing the concern of bait and switch of multi-family site, they would remove the residential part in order to rezone.
2. **Nathan Mehmed** – Sr. Planner, has worked with the Village about 5 years. Looking to rezone and they have offered conditional rezoning. Review standards in the Master Plan (MP). Typically, does the request support the MP. In this case, the property was part of the Township acquisition. This is more housekeeping. No major concern for rezoning. The MP supports it and with the condition, it would be for park maintenance. One thing the standard looks at, is it consistent with the trends of development. Generally speaking, property in the area has been commercially developed.
3. **Jeff Thornton** – When state grant money has been issued, wasn't sure what the stipulations of the money was. Glad to see they have brought forward the condition to remove residential. When the park was purposed, parcels were combined. This last parcel was on the original application but didn't make it into the final approval. It should have been combined, so this is the proper procedure to “correct.”
4. **Nathan Mehmed** - R2 has a set back of 75 ft. It's not within that, more like 175+. Site plan will be reviewed buildings. Creek is a county drain. Setback is

typically from water's edge. Everything else right now is R2. Special use is for R2/R1. Looking at the plan for the building, it would be approximately 2,000 square feet. Drive is purposed that connects to building.

ii. **Public Hearing opened as of 7:35 pm**

1. **Motion to open by Crozier**

2. **Support by Murphy**

- a. **Mr. J. Niles** – Hard to see where they are putting the building since it's so small.
- b. **Mrs. J. Niles** – I understand set back of water to be any water. Where is the actual setback?
- c. **T. Kaechele** – In regards to the rezoning, glad to hear there is a condition. I don't know where they would put housing. What is the dimension of the parcel?
- d. **C. Swift** – If they are going to build, why do they have to change the zoning at all?
- e. **M. Newlin** – Does the whole park have to be rezoned?
- f. **Motion to close by Chambers at 7:41 pm**
- g. **Supported by Murphy**

Nathan Mehmed - Ordinance doesn't have anything in regards to water definition. But in this case, either the lake or "drain," either would be more than 75 ft from water. Parks are permitted, so it should be included. It was an oversight.

Colin Finch – R2 rezoning is an easier process than PUD process. This site was chosen as the "back" of the park, more out of sight. No issue with addressing the building location right now.

Jeff Thornton – the building is straddling 2 different zones. To rezone would be an easier process to address than the PUD update. The decision tonight goes to The Council for approval.

- o Motion to approve the rezone with the condition that it is never used for residential by Chambers
- o Seconded by Robertson
- o Motion Carried

c. **Site Plan Review – Community Green Maintenance Building**

i. **Presentation**

C. Finch – Township is purposing a maintenance building of 2,000 sq ft. The building will be located outside of the wetland area. The driveway is through a piece of the wetland with an application in for wetland disturbance. The location was chosen to minimize the disturbance to the land. Stormwater retention basin is purposed as well to minimize flooding. This would all need to be approved by the Village Engineer. One question about hot cocoa to be served from the building, it's not currently being set

up that way. But any other approved use of the building would need to come back through the PC.

N. Mehmed – any change, would need to come back through for approval.

C. Finch - Current proposal is for park with a maintenance building erected. Lighting is being proposed for the over the doors. No stand alone posts, or in the direction of the residential areas. Office space requires 1 spot for parking, and that's all that's being proposed. Additional sidewalk is being proposed.

J. Thornton– As a maintenance building, will service other Township areas?

C. Finch - This is one of the largest and nicest areas they maintain. It makes the most sense to have it there.

N. Mehmed/J. Thornton– proposed as a maintenance building, if something was considered for this space (“venue”), they would need to bring that forward into the application. Or come back to PC with changes.

J. Thornton- Wetland mitigation is tough to get approved. They will have to go through the process. Application has submitted and this is minimal so likely to be approved. But a Drain Commissioner could show as Drain vs wetland.

C. Finch - They have considered other areas, but desire to keep green space green, especially if there might be a splash pad there someday. There appears to be a parcel by McDonald's that the Township owns.

ii. Staff Recommendation

Thornton's Recommendations - Stipulation on the use. Stipulations on trees removed. Wall pack lights, they need to be downward. Need clarification on use of the building. Or have the option to table discussion.

iii. PC Discussion

Comment by Peters – Disappointed that the Township didn't have anyone present to discuss, answer questions, hear public comment.

- Motion to table this topic and see if a Township representative is available for dialogue by Chambers
- Seconded by Robertston/everyone
- Motion Carried

8. Other Matters –

a. Updates by J. Thornton

- i. **Car Wash** – Moving forward, but still no open date. Site plan to be enforced. Trees were to be left and they seem to.

- ii. **Legacy Village** – Closer to signing leases. Event with soil erosion issues. Pictures and comments have been provided. Roof drains and other drains were not proper. They have been reported to Eagle due to spilling into wetlands.
- iii. **Hanover** – Signing leases on most recent buildings. Other buildings happening on Phase 1. Kinsey needed to be done before Phase 2.
- iv. **Enforcement** – Recent ordinance changes, there has been a lot of discussion on social media. Ordinances are meant to be respectful for everyone. People need to come to the meetings if they want to be heard. Tickets and Citations are being given. It's more about getting things fixed (compliance) than fined. Leave at property, mail, and original is sent to the courts. Courts then handle it from there. Phone messages seem to be effective now too. Parking is being addressed.

9. Old/Unfinished Business

- a. **Master Plan Review** – Has been going on since 2019. DRAFT after the process (local meetings, workshops, survey). Updated census data, mapping, eliminated some things that had been completed since last review.
 - i. Wetlands around water treatment plant – in Plan to remain quasi-public space. Township is being scaled down, so could review in the future. But at this point, remains the same.

10. Public Comments

- a. **C. Swift** – Latest ordinance passed, literature was about temporary buildings in the public comment, but nothing on the parking. Wants to see more about that to understand what is and isn't legal. Hanover Place was turned down by PC. In the beginning it was purposed as condos for sale, then it went to apartments. That was approved by the Council. With Phase 2 coming, are you going to be allowing apartments. Permits are typically for 1 year. Found out during construction, they were not being built to Townhouse/Condo specs.

11. Commissioner's Comments

- a. **Peters & Chambers** – thank you to those that have come out and provided comments.

12. Adjournment

- o Chambers called for the meeting to be adjourned at 9:02 pm

Respectfully Submitted,



Kimberly Peters
Planning Commission, Secretary