Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes Draft – APPROVED

June 18, 2026, at 6:30 P.M.
Saugatuck City Hall, 102 Butler St, Saugatuck, MI 49453

1. Call to Order / Roll Call
The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chair Manns.
Members Present: Baldwin, Bagierek, Gardner, LaChey, Manns, Marineau (Out at 7:22pm), Raphael
Members Absent: None
Staff Present: Planning & Zoning Director Moore, Deputy Clerk Williams
Others Present: Trent Cunningham (Fahey Schultz Burzych Rhodes PLC)

2. Approval of Agenda
Motion by Baldwin, supported by LaChey, to approve the agenda as presented for the June 18, 2026, meeting. Via voice vote, motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes
Motion by Bagierek, supported by Baldwin, to approve the May 21, 2026, minutes as presented. Via voice vote, motion carried unanimously.

4. Public Comment
None

5. New Business

A. <u>150 Dunegrass – Site Plan Review</u>
Planning and Zoning Director Moore explained that the proposal – a two-story single-family home with walkout basement, pool, and attached garage with second story living space – is part of a 2013 special land use resolution and meets all applicable PUD dimensional standards and site plan criteria. Moore noted that a vegetation/revegetation plan was provided and the fire department had approved the height, with some remaining technical items including final landscaping details which will be reviewed administratively. Commissioners asked for clarification that revegetation was indeed covered in the landscaping plan, which staff confirmed, and Chair Manns pointed out a staff-report error that described the roof as flat, when the drawings show a peaked roof-staff acknowledged this was a carryover from a previous 195 Dunegrass case. Commissioners commented that the project appeared straightforward and consistent with several similar Dunegrass site plans they have reviewed, and Chair Manns added he would have asked construction-method questions about the driveway if the builder had been present, though he recognized those details are outside the scope of site plan approval.

Motion by LaChey, supported by Bagierek, the site plan for the proposed dwelling and site improvements at 150 Dunegrass Ridge Drive based on a review against the Conservation, Recreation and Camp District (CRC) requirements, general zoning requirements, Resolution No. 131203-A, Resolution No. 150610-A, and Section 154.063 Standards for formal Site Plan Approval, as documented in the June 12, 2026, staff report. Approval is contingent upon the following:

1. *Satisfy all City engineering review comments.*
2. *Secure public water service approval.*
3. *Provide compliant residential exterior light fixture specifications.*
4. *Provide the landscaping plan sheet for administrative review.*

Upon roll call vote, motion carried unanimously.

B. 510 Butler/120 Mary (Wickwood Inn) – Public Hearing for a Text Amendment:

Public Hearing

A. Hearing was called to order by Chair Manns on 6/18/26 at 6:36 p.m.

B. Summary by Zoning Director
Moore summarized the proposed text amendment requested by Wickwood Inn. He explained that the applicant seeks to create a new lodging use called a "boutique inn" that would allow multiple accommodation buildings and a broader set of accessory services and amenities – such as expanded dining options and event spaces – that could serve both overnight guests and the general public. He noted the amendment would have broad implications, because it is drafted to be allowed in nine zoning districts. As proposed, the use would be permitted by right in all commercial districts, as a permitted use in some residential/marine districts, and special land use review required in others. In particular, he highlighted staff's primary concern about the R-4 district, which was created as a residential district with very limited non-residential uses; allowing restaurants open to the general public and event facilities not limited to overnight guests may exceed what has traditionally been allowed there. Moore also clarified that, under the current draft, converting the Wickwood to a boutique inn in R-4 would be permitted by right, removing the Planning Commission's discretionary review of site-specific impacts and operations. He then referenced the staff memo included in the packet materials and indicated the applicant would provide a more detailed overview.

C. Presentation by the Applicant
Kyle Mucha (McKenna, representing Wickwood Inn) presented the proposed "boutique inn" text amendment on behalf of Wickwood. He explained that a boutique inn is intended to sit between a bed and breakfast and a hotel/inn – more amenities that a B&B, but less auto-oriented than a motel – so they drafted a new definition largely by pulling language from the city's existing lodging definitions. Like a B&B, it would be a lodging use for short-term transient guests and must be occupied by an owner or on-site manager; like a hotel, it could include guest-only amenities such as a pool, game room, or exercise facilities. The definition would also allow restaurants and event facilities that operate primarily, but not exclusively, for overnight guests, and it would clarify that a boutique inn is not to be treated as a hotel, motel, B&B, or multifamily dwelling. He then outlined where the use

would be permitted vs. special land use across districts, including a framework for R-4, and proposed parking standards (one space per three guest units, with some commercial-district exemptions consistent with existing rules). He summarized use standards largely modeled on B&B regulations (guest limits, building/fire code, no in-room cooking, signage limits, guest-stay caps, noise/nuisance controls) and described additional boutique-specific standards: conversion of existing accessory guest units without a special use in some cases, maximum guest-room density by lot area, rules for food and beverage service open to the public, capped seating, limited hours of operation, and event rules (event host must be an overnight guest, ratio-based event capacity, and time limits). Finally, he compared these proposed standards to current code treatment of hotels, B&Bs, and Wickwood's existing approvals, showing where Wickwood already complies or would fit within the new boutique-inn framework.

D. Public comment regarding the application
   1. Supporting Comments: None
   2. Opposing comments: None
   3. General Comments: None
   4. Repeat Comment Opportunity: None

E. Public comment portion closed by the Chair at 6:54 p.m.

F. Commission Deliberation

During deliberation on the Wickwood text amendment, the commission was divided. Commissioners LaChey and Gardner raised strong concerns about expanding the event and public-restaurant activity in the R-4 transitional residential district, emphasizing resident impacts (noise, parking, livability), the risk of "event-center" creep, and the fact that the proposal is driven by a single business; LaChey also questioned the direct-to-Planning-Commission process and the need for a boutique-inn category at all. Vice-Chair Baldwin shared discomfort with large events and with treating boutique inns as a use by right, suggesting any such use must remain a special land use and that event capacity should be much lower than the proposed six-to-one guest-to-room ratio. Commissioners Marineau and Bagierek were more open to the concept as a way to modernize lodging regulations, but only under strict limits (clear caps on even size, strong special-use review, and careful differentiation from more deeply residential areas like Mason Street). Chair Manns tried to balance business and neighborhood interests, noting R-4 in formally a traditional, non-static district and Wickwood sits at its commercial edge, but he insisted any boutique-inn use must be discretionary (special land use) with tighter capacity and impact controls and drafted to work even if ownership changes. In the end, the commission agreed that the draft was not ready for action, and they tabled the item to allow staff, legal counsel, and the applicant to return with revised options and more analysis.

G. Commission action

Motion by LaChey, second by Baldwin, to table the discussion and public hearing on the zoning text amendment until the July 16th meeting of the Planning Commission.
Upon roll call vote, motion carried 5-1.

Yes: Baldwin, Bagierek, Gardner, Manns, Raphael
No: LaChey
Absent: Marineau (out at 7:22pm)

6. Old Business

A. Master Plan Discussion
The commission's master plan discussion focused on timeline, capacity, and work plan. Members acknowledged their earlier informal goal of having a draft master plan by September with a public presentation in October, but several (particularly Gardner and LaChey) expressed doubt that this is realistic given the amount of work left and the recurring time demands from applicant-driven items like the Wickwood text amendment. They agreed the plan must be high-quality and broadly vetted, ideally presented when more residents are in town (late spring or summer), even if that means slipping into 2027. Manns and Baldwin stressed that much of the document (demographics, economic profile, housing and land-use data) needs to be drafted by the consultant (David), and that the commission's role is to give direction, react to drafts, and focus especially on future land use, zoning consistency, and priorities. Commissioners asked staff to have the consultant bring concrete draft sections – e.g., population/demographics, economic profile, and community character – to the next meeting, and Planning & Zoning Director Moore noted he has received CVB data and has prepared a survey for the commissioners to rank priorities prior to the next regular meeting. There was general support for possibly holding a special meeting devoted solely to master-plan content (e.g., mobility/sidewalks, zoning/use cleanup).

7. Communication

None

8. Reports of Officers and Committees

A. Parking Improvements Task Force: Commissioner Marineau noted that he would have an update after the next meeting scheduled for June 30th.

9. Public Comments

None

10. Commissioner Comments

- Bagierek: He welcomed Raphael as the new commissioner, said it was good to have a full commission again, and voiced support for "moving some things forward" and getting work done. He added that he is supportive of holding a special meeting on the master plan once there is some data or draft material to work from.
- Baldwin: He echoed the welcome to Raphael as the new member, said it was good to have a full commission, and thanked him for volunteering to serve, noting that Chris's zoning experience will be a benefit to the body.
- LaChey: He welcomed Raphael to the Planning Commission, commented that it was nice to have him at the table and encouraged him to reach out to any of the commissioners with questions. He noted that Raphael had already spoken with Baldwin for some background and reiterated that all members are available as resources as he gets up to speed.
- Gardner: He welcomed Raphael and said that it is good to have a full commission again.

- Raphael: He thanked the commissioners for the warm welcome, noted that he already reached out to a couple of commissioners, askes whether he is scheduled for the Michigan State training (Moore said that he would finalize it after the meeting), and asks about whether the commission holds work-session style meetings – prompting a brief explanation that any such gatherings must be noticed as special meetings under the Open Meetings Act.
- Manns: He formally welcomed Raphael to the commission and noted it's helpful to have a full commission, especially at a time when the group is in the middle of both the master plan and complex items like the Wickwood request. Manns says all members are available if Raphael has questions, thanked the commissioners for a productive discussion – particularly on the master plan direction.

11. Adjournment

Motion by Gardner, supported by Bagierek, to adjourn the meeting at 8:38 p.m. Motion carried 6-0 (Marineau not present for vote).

Submitted by:
Sara Williams
Deputy Clerk
City of Saugatuck