



Andy Schor
Mayor

LANSING PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
May 6, 2026 - 6:30 p.m.
Neighborhood Empowerment Center
600 W Maple Street, Lansing, MI 48906

MINUTES – *Approved 8/5/2026*

1. OPENING SESSION

Chair Mr. Klont called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

- a. Present: Katie Alexander, Monte Jackson, Tim Klont, Spencer Lippert, Shane Muchmore, Bob Noordhoek, Ted O'Dell, John Ruge
- b. Absent:
- c. Staff: Sue Stachowiak, Zoning Administrator; Andy Fedewa, Principal Planner

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA – The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

3. COMMUNICATIONS

Audrey Whaling, MI Green Building Collaborative, letter in support of Churchill Gardens.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS & ITEMS FOR ACTION – None

5. COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Katherine Durand, spoke on her concerns about stormwater runoff, on buffer space between existing houses and the proposed parking lots, placement of the proposed dumpster, and on environmental impacts of PUD-1-2026.

Sherrice Flemming spoke in opposition to PUD-1-2026.

Gregory Jones spoke in opposition to PUD-1-2026.

Nicole Moody spoke on the need for a microphone at Planning Commission meetings, the MSU student practicum project for Churchill Gardens, her communications with the Planning Commission email, public official's emails, and in opposition to PUD-1-2026.

Cameron Smith, representative for the Tabernacle of David Church Board, spoke on the positives of the Churchill Garden development such as expanding local food options and affordable housing, and in support of PUD-1-2026.

Diana Bartlett, Ingham County Housing Trust Fund Coordinator, stated that the Housing Trust fund has committed \$400,000 in predevelopment funds to Churchill Gardens and spoke in support of PUD-1-2026.

Nancy Andrews spoke on the existing conditions of the single-family neighborhood, neighborhood conditions, and in opposition to PUD-1-2026.

Leann Nash stated her support for the goals of a development like Churchill Gardens but spoke in opposition to the location and site layout of PUD-1-2026.

Matt Moody spoke on existing conditions of the neighborhood, the MSU student practicum project for Churchill Gardens, and in opposition to PUD-1-2026.

Jane Hight spoke on neighborhood traffic and her belief that there were other housing options elsewhere in the City of Lansing.

Roxanne Case, Executive Director of the Ingham County Land Bank, spoke on the need for new housing options within Lansing and in support of PUD-1-2026.

Evalora Johnson spoke on existing conditions of the neighborhood, her belief that there were other affordable housing options elsewhere in the City, on the gaps of the sidewalk network in the neighborhood, and Lansing's history.

Darlene Hall, spoke on her belief that the neighborhood did not have an opportunity to comment on Churchill Gardens, on area wildlife, and in opposition to PUD-1-2026.

Ron McCormick spoke on statements made in the trip generation report and in opposition to PUD-1-2026.

Fred McLaughlin spoke on public engagement and in opposition of the street network and minimum parking requirements.

Larry Wright spoke on the development history of the neighborhood and in opposition to the density and parking lots of Churchill Gardens.

Bruce Gillespie stated his belief that PUD-1-2026 will result in crime and spoke on his opposition to housing for persons making low incomes.

6. RECESS

Mr. Muchmore made a motion, seconded by Mr. Noordhoek to recess at 7:15
The meeting resumed at 7:19

7. BUSINESS

A. Consent Items

- (1) Minutes for approval: April 7, 2026
The minutes from the April 7, 2026, Planning Commission meeting were approved without objection.

B. Old Business

- (1) **PUD-1-2026, 2645 West Holmes Road, Churchill Gardens**

Mr. Klont stated that until comments from the audience were entered into the record that he was not made aware that the applicant would eventually seek a variety of funding and tax credits, including programs overseen by his employer, the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA). Mr. Klont requested to recuse himself based on this conflict of interest.

Mr. Muchmore made a motion, seconded by Mr. Noordhoek, to acknowledge Mr. Klont's disclosed conflict of interest and excuse Mr. Klont from participation in the discussion and vote on PUD-1-2026.

Mr. Fedewa briefly reviewed the application for PUD-1-2026 for a mixed-housing development of six detached single-family homes, 18 attached single-family rowhouse units, 40 attached multi-family rowhouse units, a 14-unit apartment building, a multiuse community building, and accessory urban agricultural farm spaces and buildings at 2645 W Holmes Road. At the April 7, 2026 meeting, commission members voted to table the application so that the applicant could provide a trip generation report, estimating the anticipated level of traffic for the proposed development.

Lovejoy Community Services contracted Fleis & Vanderbrink to conduct the trip generation report. This report utilized the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 12th Edition, to estimate the number of daily trips of the development based on the different forms of land use; single-family housing detached and attached, and multi-family housing, as well as the number of trips during the peak morning, evening, and weekend hours. The report estimates the proposed development could have up to 592 trips a day with 50-55 during the peak morning, evening, or weekend hours. The trips would be split between the two entrances, S Catherine St. and Gibson St. which do not connect internally.

Since the subject site could be platted as a single-family subdivision similar to the surrounding neighborhood without any approval processes, the report also estimated the number of trips of an in-fill single-family subdivision within the site. For this use the consultant estimated the subject site could develop 37 dwellings, which could result in up to 564 trips a day and 30-44 trips during the morning, evening, or weekend hours. The report concluded that the proposed development is comparable to a single-family in-fill subdivision and that the existing circulation network has the capacity to accommodate the projected traffic volumes.

Planning and Zoning Office staff stated their continued support of the proposed development and recommend approval of PUD-1-2026.

Mr. O'Dell made a motion, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to approve PUD-1-2026, 2645 West Holmes Road, Churchill Gardens.

Mr. Jackson asked what ownership model would be utilized for the single-family dwellings. Hope Lovell, Lovejoy Community Services, applicant, stated that the six detached dwellings are meant to be homeowner-occupied and the rowhouses could be homeowner-occupied or rent-to-own.

Mr. Muchmore stated that his belief that the estimated traffic level and accessory uses will impact the neighborhood. Brandon Chaney, Nederveld, representative for the applicant, clarified that the report only covers an estimation of daily one-way trips based on the intensity of the proposed land uses. The consultant did not conduct a traffic count to compare to current traffic. Mr. Chaney reiterated that S Catherine and Gibson Streets dead-end into the site, demonstrating that expected traffic will be split between the two entrances, and that the site was always meant to be developed.

Mr. Ruge stated that he understood no resident likes the amount or noise of the traffic on their street, but that he does not believe the proposed development will be excessive compared to what could be developed as single-family residential.

Mr. Muchmore spoke on the parameters of the Planning Commission's land use review as outlined in the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Muchmore stated he may be personally unfavorable toward the

proposed development but that he believed that it met the criteria for recommended approval as outlined in the ordinance.

Mr. Jackson asked for more details about how stormwater runoff would be handled on-site. Mr. Fedewa stated that while the applicant has shared some details about how runoff would be directed on-site through the improved wetland and a retention pond, there are details included in the preliminary concept plan pages. All stormwater, sanitary, and sewer utilities would be permitted during the final site plan review process which is reviewed by the City's Public Service Department in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations.

Mr. O'Dell asked for clarification between the concept plan approval and site plan review processes. Mr. Fedewa stated that the applicant is seeking approval of the concept plan as outlined in the zoning ordinance detailing the proposed land uses, the general housing density and layout, and eligibility and benefits from the owner. If approved by City Council the applicant has up to two years to submit final site plan review, which must align with local, state, and federal standards as enforced by City departments and the Board of Water and Light. The applicant held a preliminary meeting with City staff earlier this year and has already been made aware of some necessary changes such as wider maneuvering aisles and opaque fencing/landscaping between parking lots and driveways within 20 feet of adjacent residential. These type of minor changes would be handled during that final administrative review process.

Donald Lovell, Lovejoy Community Services, stated that they have planned additional community engagement events including a charrette to solicit input on the development's design.

Ms. Alexander stated her appreciation for neighborhood feedback but echoed Mr. Muchmore's comments about the parameters of Planning Commission's review as outlined in the Zoning Ordinance.

On a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously (7-0).

C. New Business – None

8. COMMENTS FROM THE PLANNING AND ZONING OFFICE – None

9. COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIRPERSON

Ms. Alexander thanked those who attended and made public comments, and encouraged residents to consider volunteering for a City board or commission.

10. COMMENTS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS

Mr. Ruge recommended the book *Escaping the Housing Trap* to Commissioners and the public.

11. PENDING ITEMS: FUTURE ACTION REQUIRED – None

12. ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.