

HASTINGS CHARTER TOWNSHIP
Minutes of June 23, 2026 Meeting of the
INDIAN HILLS SUBDIVISION IMPROVEMENTS SPECIAL ASSESSMENT DISTRICT

Call to Order: 6:30 pm by Supervisor Jim Partridge followed by Trustee Wetzel leading a moment of prayer and the pledge to the flag.

Roll Call: Supervisor J. Partridge (Board Chair), Clerk D. Olson, Treasurer J. Phillips, Trustees D. Eichholz, B. Scheck, B. Westveer and W. Wetzel.

Also Present: 13 guests, members of the Subdivision: Stephen Williams, Krystyna Dailey, Thomas Dailey, Bob Main, Ellyn Main, Kyle Pohja, George Becker, Roselyn Becker, Lesli Becker, Donna Brown, Debbie Jensen, Karen Hoffman, Justin Peck.

Approval of June 2, 2026 Meeting Minutes: Supervisor Partridge called for an approval of the minutes from the first public hearing on the Indian Hills Special Assessment District. Trustee Westveer motioned, seconded by Trustee Scheck to approve minutes. Motion carried.

Supervisor Opening Comments: Supervisor Partridge gave a review of the general process for forming and approving a Special Assessment District (SAD). He encouraged the residents to contact the Road Commission, should they have any questions regarding the construction process, environment or drain issues. Public was invited to comment.

Public Comment

Comments from residents (**in red**), included from named individuals, as well as general comments / questions:

Kyle Pohja – Clarified that his comments were recorded in the last meeting. When does the 30 days begin for being able to file a protest with the Michigan Tax Tribunal. Today. Do I need legal representation? No.

Thomas + Krystyna Dailey – Is there a form online to use? Yes, will research with the Tax Tribunal. Note that our parcel has no address, list as parcel number only. Noted. We were raised here and lived here for many years. We received this letter while we were out of state. We have never had this type of assessment before and find this situation to be very unique. Has this type of taxation been assessed in the township before? Not for road improvements. The city is not on board. For a cost-effective approach, my opinion is that all should be onboard. I'm a property owner and I'm not seeing other properties being assessed. We're very thankful to the Road Commission for the work they do. But I would like to know the weight restrictions, because I see [listed several large vehicles] on that road. I've had snow pushed on my property and damage to my property. The weight restrictions are the same as typical county roads. Also, the cul-de-sac / turn around – concerns of storm water run-off. I assume there are records of annual road assessments. We contacted Barry County tax office – we support general (taxes) – schools and other. I don't support special taxes. We're paying for the county. I have a question on the assessment and the amortization schedule. Supervisor reviewed schedule. The SAD lists 57 lots. I figure the cost to be less than what is shown. The additional is Township administrative fees. So, if the SAD had to be redone – there would be additional legal fees as well. There were two other meetings that explained the processing cost of the township that would have to be included. I wasn't invited to the Road Commissioner meeting. It is understood that you were out of state. The road is not "unsafe" but would eventually become so without the improvement. If the Road Commission cost is actually lower, will the unneeded money go back to the homeowners? Yes, it will be subtracted from the total. What other townships have a SAD? Prairieville, Irving, Rutland. Has it ever been challenged, to your understanding? No. If the township initiated the SAD, it would only take 20% of the road frontage opposition, in writing, prior to a first public meeting to stop it. A SAD would also not proceed, by initiative of the people of the subdivision, if the signed petitions in favor did not reach over 50% of the road frontage. I understand if people want to do that but why are we being brought into this? It feels like our family is being pulled in.

Roselyn Becker – We forwarded to all residents prior to the first meeting; we sent emails and George Becker sent text messages back in April to request addresses.

Thomas Dailey – I would expect information to be brought to our community from a government agency, not a neighbor. The township did bring information, when the time came for it to do so.

Krystyna Dailey – Will all new assessments be based on the original amount? No, they will be assessed to the reduced amount left, at the year they begin.

Kyle Pohja – Clarifying last meeting's comment, that of concern that those with greater frontage on the road would have more interest in equal assessment than those with less. What I am reading in the assessment, there is no wording of assessment to proportional property value. My priorities are my family and their future, not the road.

Discussion on undeveloped parcel 06-006-022-00, which was included in the assessment, based on the understanding that construction was soon to be in progress. Since found out that a no building permit was applied for. Thus, there is no immediate future of a building on the parcel.

Motion made by Trustee Westveer, seconded by Trustee Eichholz, to remove parcel 06-006-022-00 from the roll of assessed properties.

Thomas Dailey – Wanted to repeat that he is not opposed to the improvement, but not all lots are being assessed. Supervisor Partridge likened to Leach Lake Drain, another SAD in the township: the same assessment is given to all households, but empty lots are not using the sewer system of the drain SAD.

MOTION CARRIED by roll call vote – 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Stephen Williams – the petition he signed said, “Property owners”. If the Board is going to change that, his understanding is that there must be an entirely new petition. If the board is going to those kind of make adjustments, then he would protest the SAD. Supervisor Partridge reread aloud relative portions of the petition “each real land owner”. Discussion followed regarding the inevitable delays to starting over with a new petition, that it would cause the entire project to be too late this year. The Road Commission would not be able to address again for another 2 years, due to work on gravel roads in the odd years. The Supervisor offered that it would be in the best interest to recall the vote, to adjusting the assessment roll, and allow the Tax Tribunal to decide. Trustee Eichholz moved to call back the previous vote due to the wording in the original petition, seconded by Supervisor Partridge. MOTION CARRIED by roll call vote – 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Debbie Jensen – Stated that it was her observation from the previous meeting that all properties should be assessed, in order to be equal. Question regarding the legal fees. Supervisor Partridge stated that a new assessment roll would bring about additional legal fees attached to the SAD. Mrs. Jensen pointed out that, at the first meeting, where some were present who had properties not being assessed, this wording in the petition was not mentioned by the Board and now the Board is forcing the residents to pay for the Township's error.

Ellyn Main – Called into question the ethical issues involved in the handling. Supervisor Partridge stated that it was fine to admit error, but that the Board was trying to do right by the subdivision.

Stephen Williams – Asked then if the roll was still at 50 landowners. Yes.

Motion made by Trustee Westveer, seconded by Trustee Eichholz, to leave the assessment as is written and move forward without changes. Motion carried.

Resolution 4 of 4: Having received public comment, Supervisor Partridge presented and read through Township Resolution No. 2026-05, which, acknowledges the petitions submitted, the public hearings conducted, the assessment roll created with associated costs, the Clerk retaining said records and the Treasurer charged with collections for the stated period. Discussion followed with additional public comments:

Krystyna Dailey – This resolution goes against the 8 properties not included, since they all have their own parcel numbers. What if a property becomes developed? It will be added to the assessment roll. That will be our protest; that is special interest. Board members commented on the responsibility to delay the project no further, of lessons learned and the wisdom of informing other subdivisions of the need for long term planning.

Kyle Pohja – The way the petition was set up, it already leaned in favor of it passing.

Trustee Westveer moved, seconded by Trustee Scheck, to approve the Resolution as presented. MOTION CARRIED by roll call vote – 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Adjourn: Motion by Trustee Wetzel, seconded by Trustee Eichholz. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned 8:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
David J. Olson – Clerk

Approved _____ Clerk

Date _____.