Raisin Charter Township
Special Meeting Planning Commission
Minutes of 09/10/2025
Submitted by Laura VanSickle

McNamara called the Raisin Charter Township Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:30pm.

Members Present: Laura VanSickle, Marcus McNamara, Dale Witt**,** Mike Bartolo, Mark Spohr

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Will Nicholson and Crystal Tonemah, (Sutton II), Dove Waynick and Dreyson Waynick (DJW Development)

Roll Call:
Witt – here
Spohr – here
Bartolo – here
McNamara – here
VanSickle – here

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Motion to approve the agenda as presented by McNamara, Witt as amended support.
Reverse the unfinished business order to: DJW, Sutton Place II, then ordinances.
Motion carried unanimously

MINUTES
Motion to approve the August 19, 2025 meeting minutes as submitted by Spohr, Bartolo support.
Motion carried unanimously

PUBLIC COMMENT - (Please state your name, address and limit comments to (3) minutes)

Jake Meyers, 5102 N. Adrian Hwy., Adrian Township. Oakwood Road is our family farm. Representative for Electrician workers. Worked on Blue Elk Project and used licensed electricians per the law. DTE Solar project, Barton Malow. These electricians do not hold a license to perform electronical work in Township. Beecher Solar Project unlicensed electrical work being performed not meeting the law. Inspection fees on solar fees on each panel. Blue Elk used licensed electricians.

PUBLIC HEARINGS – None

COMMUNICATIONS

1. Township Board – Board met on 9/8/2025. Approved Creek Enterprise for providing IT services. DTE Energy submitted amendment documents for the PA116 properties in the Beecher Solar project. Approved some budget amendments.
2. Board Of Appeals – none
3. Other – none.

Approved

NEW BUSINESS – None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. DJW Development. The application is for 8-unit apartment building at 2000 Gady Road block; Parcel RA0-117-2200-00. There was more information submitted and distributed to members at the PC meeting.

   McNamara, reviewed the information and the application was incomplete and non-compliant with ordinances. Specifically, Section 9.80.1 Open space & landscaping. Per the ordinance you have to submit with plan. Section 9.90.3H Fencing, no application details. Waynick, Landscaping plan will be provided later and not included. Section 9.90.4C Recreation open areas not identified. Section 8.10; Needs to meet the set-back requirements. Section 9.40.2 parking space and isle requirements not compliant. Submittal information came in after the revised package. The last site plans submitted do not match the previous site plans submitted.

   Waynick comments, presented documentation on the record from the meeting. Site Plan Review. Ordinance indicates he has 90 days to submit additional documents for approval. It is unfair to him to have to compile all these documents. Submitted completed application. Has approval from Health Department and Road Commission. If you don't give us a full unconditional site plan approval, we aren't reading the plan. If there is anything deficient with our site plan at all, call out what part of the ordinance is missing and details. This is the last time I'm playing games. If the board feels we are lacking any information, please give us a conditional approval. If they don't give the submittal information, then you can pull the permit.

   McNamara, sited 5 ordinances that are not met. Set-backs are not met, too close to neighbors.

   Waynick comments, Submit the landscaping plan, I have 90 days after site plan submitted. Parking stalls, egress, sidewalks not required, no fencing required, square footage, open space has been met per the ordinance. Have Road Commission approval and Health Department conditional approval. Dumpster and lighting not regulated by the ordinance. It appears that what you want is minor. Deficient items have not been sent or given to them. You need to follow the ordinance if you want me to follow it.

   McNamara, set back, parking lot, driveway location are all missing on the last site plan.

   Waynick comments, we want to make it compliant. RM1 does require 25-foot set-back, not 20.

   McNamara, we do need to have a site plan that delineates the open space so that other building developments won't encroach. This needs to be on the plan 9.90.4C set-back lines.

   Witt, there have been 3 different site plans that have been submitted and that don't match. Current site plan submitted shows the site and grading plan encroaching onto the neighboring property, Camp Sequoia. No dimensional information for the Cul-de-Sac. Ingress / Egress to property off Gady Road is not shown correctly on the site plan based on LCRC information. Is dimensional information (15 ft.) for the disposal field from the property line correct? The Health Department letter dated July 8, 2025 has status of approval pending; no approval

Approved

submitted. Why does the DJW website for this Gady Pines project show single family homes for this parcel?

Waynick comments, we are not encroaching any neighbors in compliance with the site plan. Items that are lacking a little deficiency, we will make the changes that need to be done. Please consider conditional approval. If we don't you can pull the permit.

McNamara, we react to the site plan application that is in front of us. There needs to be additional information. 9.40.6K surfacing, not correct on site plan. A/C units not listed on the plan.

Waynick comments, open landscape, no fencing. Lighting conforms to the ordinances. We are not going to shed light out into other areas. You tell us what you would like on the plan and give us conditional permit; we have plan approval from Health Department and Road Commission.

,
Witt, our ordinance provides criteria for the health, safety and welfare for the Township residents.

Waynick comments, if you can give us a conditional permit, we stay in Raisin Township and deliver. If not, we will pull out of Raisin Township in 60 days and won't do business here.

Motion to deny the approval of the DJW 8-unit apartment site plan application for RA0-117-2200-00 based on non-compliance with the ordinance requirements or missing information including but not limited to the 5 areas:

Section 9.80.1 : Open space & landscaping. Per the ordinance you have to submit with plan.
Section 9.90.3H : Fencing, no application details. Waynick, Landscaping plan will be provided later and not included.
Section 9.90.4C : Recreation open areas not identified.
Section 8.10 : Needs to meet the set-back requirements.
Section 9.40.2 : Parking space and isle requirements not compliant.

and clarification on the entrance to drive in location and geometry
until a complete site plan and application is submitted McNamara, Spohr support.

Discussion: The PC decision to deny/reject was based on specific criteria:

1. Non- compliance with various sections of the ordinance. Section 9.90 Site Plan Requirements and Procedures, set backs, open space, landscaping, parking were not adequately addressed.
2. Inadequate design. Submitted site plan design does not provide adequate privacy, lighting, or circulation for vehicles and pedestrians.
3. Insufficient information. Submitted site plan lacks the necessary details to provide an accurate description of the proposed use and structures.
4. Public safety concerns. Submitted site plan raised concerns about emergency vehicle access and traffic flow.

Approved

Roll Call:
Witt – yes
Spohr – yes
McNamara – yes
Bartolo – yes
VanSickle -yes

Motion carried unanimously.

2. Sutton Place No. 2 – Final Site Plan approval.

Witt, reviewed concerns with the documentation, master deed and bylaws. Reviewed by attorney and found compliant. Suggestion to add a date on the by-law document to note latest document. Final Site Plan by Mannik/Smith provided per MCL559.116. Have all of the outside agencies seen the Final Site Plan and given approval? Per ordinance, Board members have to have final approval letters from Health Department, Drain Commission, and Road Commission before approval is given by the Board for the Final Site Plan. Board reviewed some of the PC preliminary site plan concerns and requested the PC to review the Final Site Plan for Sutton place No. 2.

McNamara, PC did a good job documenting our concerns. Retention and infiltration areas exits all over the property. Sutton detention field, is awkward to have this part of someone's property.

Nicholson, Drain Commission says that you can't have it as a common element. If you don't sell the property, it's the developers responsibility. Doesn't see anything that doesn't meet ordinance requirements.

Witt, lot sizes on 6/16/2025 site plan meet ordinance requirements. Nicholson stated, not planning to do signage.

Bartolo, it has been sufficiently addressed

Motion to approve Final Site Plan, with recommendations, for Sutton Place No., 2 with the understanding that the applicant will submit all approving letters from outside agencies for Sutton Place No. 2, Parcels RAO 116-3305-00 and RAO 116-3605-00 by Bartolo, Witt support.

Discussion: McNamara, What's your plan for build out? Nicholson, not sure can talk later about it. Met with Road Commission, need to file the Warranty Deed with Road Commission.

Roll call
Witt – yes
Spohr – yes
McNamara – yes
Bartolo – yes
VanSickle - yes

Motion carried unanimously.

Approved

3. Ordinance Amendment to Section 10.70.22, Version 1, May 1, 2025 Draft (Continued Deliberation)

   Witt has offered up to the Board, to meet together regarding ordinance gravel pit concerns. There is at least one operator that has an interest with input. This would require a public hearing. Resident requested to have it published in the Tecumseh Herald.
   PC will hold a Public Hearing for the revised ordinance. Moratorium extended to January, 2026.
   Requested to have the PC members submit their concerns by the October meeting.

4. Ordinances Revisions to Region II

   Witt, Region II is working on accessory buildings, attorney to review chicken permit and illumination.
   a. Solar – Witt, working on the battery storage ordinance.
   b. Accessory Buildings – Witt is working with Region II and meeting with Thomas Boss.
   c. Sign Illumination ordinance text to be revised to reflect that requirements to be reviewed by 3rd party, such as OHM, and not the PC.
   d. Chicken Permit – off to attorney to review.

2nd PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Robin Elkins, 2968 Gady Road. We have questions for them and they up and left. Water usage for DJW. How does that get measured, how do I know that this isn't going to get worse? Who handles the water amount usage? McNamara, there's a threshold on a residential well Type I or Type II community well. There is a certain number of customers that need state recommendations. Witt, it starts with the Health Department and the numbers provided by the applicant. EGLE involvement in communities, can go in and get FOIA and wanting to send information to EGLE. Witt, all FOIA requests go to the Clerk.

Janet Ruhl, John Ruhl 2780 Gady Road. There is a change with the easement and the location of the driveway. McNamara, there's more than one version of the driveway, property owners. When a complete application comes in and shows all the details. He has stakes put in the ground and our son loses his driveway and barn entrance. McNamara, there is a sight distance with the Road Commission. Someone bought the easement. Terms of the easement, ingress and egress. This is a private road access he doing. What about all of the other parcels that he is going to build in there? McNamara, we are encouraging the applicant to be forthright on what he intending to do. There are different thresholds pertaining to this development.

COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Bartolo, good meeting
Spohr, do we need to do more than the minutes and motion?
VanSickle, Next meeting October 14

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn at 8:44pm Witt, Bartolo support.
Motion carried unanimously

Approved