



**THE CITY OF THE VILLAGE OF DOUGLAS  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2026 AT 6:00 PM  
415 WEST WILEY RD, SUITE 103, DOUGLAS, MI  
49406**

---

**MINUTES**

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER** – Chair Balmer called the meeting to order at 6:01pm

**2. ROLL CALL**

Present:

Chair Matt Balmer

Vice-Chair Patty Hanson

Commissioner Paul Buszka

Commissioner Thomas Hickey

Commissioner Jennifer Ludwick

Commissioner Steven Merouse

Commissioner John O'Malley

Commissioner Neal Seabert

Also Present

Planning & Zoning Administrator Sean Homyen

A. Approval of Agenda - February 12, 2026 (additions/changes/deletions)

Motion by Seabert, seconded by Hickey to approve the February 12, 2026 agenda. – Motion carried by unanimous vote.

B. Approval of Minutes - November 13, 2025 (additions/changes/deletions)

Motion by Seabert, seconded by O'Malley to approve the November 13, 2025 regular meeting minutes. – Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Hickey requested an amendment to the roll call to swap Merouse with Hickey for attendance.

Chair Balmer provided a history of the Westshore development before opening the floor for public comment.

**3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION – VERBAL**

Elaine Isely (Saugatuck Dunes Coastal Alliance) – Spoke about her experience working with local communities on environmental best practices and noted she could assist the City of Douglas if needed.

Kurt Wittenburg (711 Golfview Dr.) – Asked whether the 2012 PUD approval carries over.

Peter Kennelly (355 McVea) – Expressed concerns regarding access to the development and stated that many residents in the surrounding area share similar concerns. Also noted there is confusion about when the public is able to ask questions regarding the development.

David VanHoof (499 Center St.) – Suggested maintaining the proposed 65% reduction in units within the plan until it is guaranteed.

Karen Pulick (554 Artisan Row) – Expressed confusion as to why the matter is being reconsidered, referencing the November 7, 2022 resolution and the phasing of the development if the open space was not approved.

#### **4. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION – WRITTEN**

- A. Ron and Mira Levine - Letter
- B. Mark Macheca - Letter
- C. Charles E. von Brecht - Letter
- D. Chris Baker - Letter
- E. Heather Foderingham - Letter
- F. Charles Baker – Letter

Additional written communication received after the agenda packet was distributed was also provided to the Commission.

#### **5. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Westshore PUD Amendment - Consideration of a Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) Amendment and Preliminary Site Condominium Plan

Motion to open the public hearing

Motion by Seabert, seconded by Hickey to open the public hearing – motion carried by unanimous vote.

- a. Planning and Zoning Administrators Report – Planning & Zoning Administrator Sean Homyen noted that the information had been outlined in the staff memo and that any questions from the Commission could be directed to the applicant.
- b. Applicant Presentation –

Jack Barr (Nederveld) noted that the Chair provided an accurate summary of the project history and referenced the information contained in the staff memo. He explained that the original PUD encompassed approximately 78 acres and allowed up to 67 units. Currently, 26 units have been developed within the existing phases, including 14 on Artisan Row, 2 on Center Street, and 10 on Golfview Drive. The current proposal includes an additional 39 units on approximately 46 acres to

the west. Mr. Barr also stated that the road connection between Center Street and McVea Street was included in the original PUD plans and that the proposed layout navigates around existing wetlands. He further asked the City to clarify whether utilities associated with the development would be public or private.

c. Public Comments -

Karen Pulick (544 Artisan Row) – Commented on the anticipated costs associated with Center Street and stated that she does not believe the proposed 65% reduction should be considered. Also suggested reviewing prior resolutions.

Tim Smith (749 Golfview Dr.) – Asked how open space is calculated, noting that designated open space reduces the size of individual yards.

Charity Noose (719 Golfview Dr.) – Noted that the report states the City may not be able to take over the private road and questioned whether the taxable value of the land could support the City accepting the road. Expressed concerns about the road becoming a permanent through street and suggested that access should come into the development from Center St with McVea being emergency access only. Also noted pedestrian traffic using the street and raised concerns about reducing the open space requirement by 65% if the City does not accept the road as public.

Peter Kennelly (355 McVea) – Stated that he does not see a compelling reason to reduce the open space.

d. Commissioner Questions -

Tom Hickey thanked those in attendance and asked for clarification regarding the proposed road connection and the open space requirements. Commissioner Seabert expressed a preference for maintaining the 65% open space requirement. Commissioner Buszka responded to comments regarding the private road and discussed long-term responsibilities related to maintenance, the bridge, and potential replacement costs. He noted that surrounding property owners would likely be responsible for those costs and stated that condominium documents and the master deed should clearly identify maintenance responsibilities. He also noted that converting the road to a public street could create additional burdens for future property owners and referenced Ferry Street as a comparison.

Commissioner O'Malley stated that the open space requirement should remain at 65% and noted that the development should maintain access, whether through a private or public road. Commissioner Hanson thanked those in attendance and referenced written correspondence supporting maintaining the 65% open space requirement. He also suggested conducting a traffic study during the peak summer season and asked questions regarding the proposed lot layout and whether the lots were intended for single-family homes. Concerns were also expressed regarding whether the road would be private or public.

Commissioner Ludwick echoed concerns regarding potential traffic impacts and supported maintaining the 65% open space requirement. Commissioner Meroose asked that the public be informed about when questions may be asked during the process and suggested that additional dialogue may be helpful to clarify the review process. Questions were also raised regarding how the proposed unit count was determined, how the plan may change if the 65% open space requirement remains, and how open space relates to development density.

Jack Barr of Nederveld explained that wetlands influenced the layout of the development and noted that earlier concepts considered a higher unit count but projected buildout over a longer timeframe. He also discussed how the number of units could change if the 65% open space requirement remains in place. Commissioner Seabert also raised concerns regarding the proposed road alignment and site topography. Commissioner Buszka referenced Section 27.04(8) of the City's Zoning Ordinance, noting that the ordinance requires 65% open space within a PUD to be protected through a conservation easement and discussed the importance of clearly defining the legal description of the open space areas.

Motion to close the public hearing

Motion by Seabert, seconded by O'Malley to close the public hearing – motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Hickey to recommend to City Council approval of the preliminary Planned Unit Development amendment plan and preliminary condominium plans submitted by Ric Dyk on behalf of BDR, Inc. for the Westshore Planned Unit Development, pursuant to Article 27 and Section 16.24 of the City of the Village of Douglas Zoning Ordinance, based on the findings outlined in the staff report for the parcel identified as P.P. 59-830-000-02, located on Center Street. No second was received and the motion failed.

No second was received, and the motion failed. The Planning Commission therefore made no recommendation to City Council.

## **6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **7. REPORTS**

#### **A. Planning and Zoning Administrator Report –**

Planning & Zoning Administrator Sean Homyen provided an update on the zoning ordinance update and the property located at 13 S. Union Street.

#### **B. Planning Commissioner Remarks –**

Commissioner Hickey commented on the overall process and discussion. Commissioner Buszka stated he would like to see the calculations prepared by the City Engineer. Commissioner O'Malley noted that the Planning Commission will continue to review the matter to determine next steps. Commissioner Hanson thanked staff, specifically Sean and Matt, for their preparation and noted discussion regarding potential road connections. He also referenced the zoning ordinance update and suggested a future workshop to discuss short-term rental regulations. Commissioner Ludwick had no additional comments. Commissioner Meroose thanked those involved for the additional effort in preparing the materials and asked whether documents could be submitted earlier for future meetings. Chair Balmer thanked members of the public for their participation and noted the importance of continuing to improve dialogue and communication with the community.

### **8. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION – VERBAL (LIMIT OF 3 MINUTES) –**

David VanHoof (499 Center St.) stated that he would like clarification regarding how the 65% open space requirement is calculated and whether wetlands are included. He also suggested preparing a traffic study to evaluate traffic impacts and expressed interest in seeing what the proposed homes would look like. He noted that events such as Bayou to Beach could increase traffic along the route.

Charity Noose (719 Golfview Dr.) commented on the pathway and suggested that additional signage may be needed. She also requested documentation regarding the proposed road connection between Center Street and McVea Street.

Tony Pastor (10 Wildwood Ln.) raised additional concerns that should be discussed, including issues related to short-term rentals.

## **9. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Seabert, seconded by Hickey to adjourn the meeting. – Motion carried unanimously