

**Highland Township Planning Commission  
Record of the 1442nd Meeting  
Highland Township Auditorium  
March 19, 2026**

***Roll Call:***

Kevin Curtis, Chairman  
Grant Charlick  
Chris Heyn  
Mary Ray  
Roscoe Smith  
Scott Temple  
Russ Tierney  
Guy York  
Michael Zeolla

***Also Present:***

Elizabeth Corwin, Planning Director

Visitors: 4

Chairman Curtis called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

**Agenda Item #1: Call to the Public: Opportunity for anyone to bring forward issues of interest or concern for Planning Commission consideration. Each participant limited to 3 minutes.**

No public comment offered.

***Public Hearing:***

**Agenda Item #2:**

Parcel #	11-17-300-027
Zoning:	ARR, Agricultural and Rural Residential Zoning District
Address:	2643 Country Acres
File #:	RZ 26-01
Request:	Rezoning to R-3. 3-acre Single Family Residential Zoning District
Applicant:	Jeffrey and Shelby Camerella
Owner:	Jeffrey and Shelby Camerella

Chairman Curtis introduced the request for rezoning of a parcel approximately 6.56 acres on Country Acres from current zoning of ARR, Agricultural and Rural Residential to R-3, Single-family residential, 3 acres zoning district to accommodate a proposed land division.

Mr. Jeffrey Camerella was present to answer questions. He explained that the existing house is situated on the west side of the parcel, and the rezoning will allow for one new building site on the east side of the parcel. All access is from Country Acres. Mr. Camerella noted that he thought this would create no burden on the existing road, which he maintains for the benefit of his neighbors. There is no formal road maintenance agreement.

The public hearing was opened at 7:34 p.m. There was no comment. The public hearing was closed at 7:35 p.m.

**Work Session:**

**Agenda Item #3:**

Parcel #	11-17-300-027
Zoning:	ARR, Agricultural and Rural Residential Zoning District
Address:	2643 Country Acres
File #:	RZ 26-01
Request:	Rezoning to R-3. 3-acre Single Family Residential Zoning District
Applicant:	Jeffrey and Shelby Camerella
Owner:	Jeffrey and Shelby Camerella

Chairman Curtis opened the agenda for discussion among the Planning Commissioners. Mr. Temple asked about the history of the parcels to the west of this site that were already zoned for R-3, Single Family Residential Zoning, 3 acres. Ms. Corwin explained that those parcels were rezoned in 2006. The original request had been for R-1.5 or its equivalent at the time, but that the Planning Commission was unwilling to recommend any zoning more dense than R-3. Apparently, the property owner used the zoning to accommodate a shift of property boundaries between his parcels but did not develop either site.

Mr. Charlick noted that the parcel is an irregular shape as are the neighboring parcels, which does not lend itself to additional divisions. He also asked if there was a formal road agreement. Mr. Camerella explained that there was not an agreement, but the neighbors have been cooperating. The Planning Commission discussed the survey document provided which shows a proposed division. The map indicates that there will be at least 2 acres of buildable area on each lot, and the lot width is at least the minimum of 330 lineal feet.

Mr. York asked about the adjacent parcel, and whether the previous request for division was still valid. Ms. Corwin explained that the property is properly zoned to allow for a land division, but there is no current request.

The Planning Commissioners discussed the Future Land Use Map designations. This property is planned for rural residential, which would typically be only ARR zoning designation, but that the properties due south are designated SFRM, Medium Lot Single Family Residential, which would be appropriate for either R1.5 or R-3 Zoning Designations. Since there is the R-3 Zoning existing on the map west of this property, it would have been appropriate to shift the SFRM line to the north, but this area had not been studied to any great degree when the map was developed. Mr. Charlick thought giving the existing zoning pattern, this current request is concurrent with the Future Land Use Map.

The Planning Commissioners discussed the implication to the landowner of creating new parcels that are not supported by a private road maintenance agreement. The ordinance would require such developments if a new private road easement was being developed. The property owner was urged to work with his neighbors to develop an agreement since lacking an agreement, they could encounter difficulties obtaining financing in the future.

Mr. Curtis offered a motion to recommend approval of the rezoning request for parcel 11-17-300-027, 2643 Country Acres from its current zoning designation of ARR, Agricultural and Rural Residential to proposed zoning of R-3, Single Family Residential, 3 Acres, upon finding that the request is concurrent with the Master Plan and is compatible with its surrounding neighborhood. Mr. York supported the motion. Roll Call vote: Tierney – yes; York -yes; Zeolla -yes; Charlick -yes; Curtis -yes; Heyn -yes; Smith -yes; Ray -yes. Motion carries (9 yes, 0 no)

**Agenda Item #4**

Parcel # 11-21-426-011  
Zoning: C-2, General Commercial Zoning District  
Address: 700 Highland Road  
File #: PLU 26-0004  
Request: Temporary Land Use Permit for outdoor sales  
Applicant: Bryan Vajiloff, Granny's Attic  
Owner: Highland Commons Shopping Center, LLC

Chairman Curtis introduced the agenda item for temporary outdoor sales.

The applicant was not present to explain the application. Mr. Charlick moved to table the item for future consideration when the applicant could be present. Mr. York supported and the motion passed by voice vote (all ayes, no nays)

**Agenda Item #5:**

Parcel # 11-01-351-002  
Zoning: ARR, Agricultural and Rural Residential Zoning District  
Address: 2075 Oakland  
File #: SPR 26-04.  
Request: Site Plan for Golf Course improvements  
Applicant: David Dowling, Yukon Building Company  
Owner: SIGA Corp

Chairman Curtis introduced the application for site plan review for golf course improvements at the Highland Hills Golf Course, 2075 Oakland Drive. Ms. Corwin explained that the Board has already approved the Special Land Use, for which a permit has not yet been drafted, and the rezoning for the housing proposal. This is a conceptual site plan, which provides the developer an opportunity to discuss a new proposal for indoor golf simulators to replace the outdoor driving range and practice areas that had not gained acceptance in the previous proposals.

Mr. David Dowling, Yukon Building Company was present to explain his proposal. His new plan shows a proposed new building located just north of the clubhouse to house six enclosed golf simulators which will be served by the clubhouse as far as toilets and food service. The plan still includes facelifts of the clubhouse and cart barn and parking lot modifications as discussed previously.

Mr. Temple asked about the housing proposal. Ms. Corwin affirmed that the Board had approved the conditional rezoning request. The housing will be processed under a separate site plan. While the Planning Commission had previously seen the preliminary engineering for the golf course improvements, it will not be possible to finalize the engineering details until the septic systems and drainage for the housing is designed since the engineering for the two projects is intertwined. The applicant is seeking adequate assurances that the Planning Commission accepts the concept and location of the enclosed simulator building so that he can proceed with the engineering for both projects.

Mr. Dowling explained that he has retained Powell Engineering to design the septic systems for the housing. Each unit of the duplexes will be served by an individual septic system and an enlarged drainage pond, located on and around the third green. He has already completed test pits to verify the adequacy of the soils. Once the septic systems are designed and approved, he will have the parameters of what must be retained by

the homeowner's association as common space and be able to have the surveyors determine the final boundary of the housing component of the proposal. He is not anticipating any major changes from what has already been presented to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Temple noted that based on his understanding of the topography and the operations of the golf course, he supports the new proposal for the enclosed simulators. They should be unobtrusive for the neighboring property owners. Mr. Heyn agreed that the location is far superior to the previous proposals.

Mr. Tierney asked if the proposal still includes improvements to the golf greens. Mr. Dowling explained that they have already started investing in improvements and developing a new program to maintain the greens.

Mr. Charlick asked if there were any thoughts about expanding parking closer to the clubhouse and proposed simulator. Mr. Dowling said he still needs to evaluate whether there are any opportunities to create a narrow drive and turnaround for a vehicle up to drop equipment at the clubhouse. Currently, the golfers obtain a golf cart at the barn and would take their equipment up to the clubhouse with the cart.

Mr. Charlick and Mr. Temple verified with the applicant that this is a all season, heated simulator building.

Mr. Charlick noted that these improvements will likely initiate a requirement to meet the current Oakland County Water Resource Commissioners drainage standards.

Mr. Charlick noted that his understanding is that the applicant is seeking a preliminary approval but still needs the flexibility and fluidity to make some changes to the parking and driveways. Mr. Charlick asked the applicants timeline and wondered if the applicant needed the preliminary approval to move forward.

Mr. Dowling believes he will have a solid understanding of the project parameters in about 30 days and that he is proceeding with the engineering.

Ms. Corwin explained that it is not necessary to grant a preliminary approval, since the goal of tonight's presentation was to seek some feedback.

Mr. Charlick offered a motion to grant preliminary approval of the site plan for golf course improvements including a 10 by 32 foot enclosed simulator building located northeast of the clubhouse, façade improvements to the golf club building and cart barn and modifications of the parking lot as per the proposed site plan by Meier Architect with the understanding that more information is needed for dimensions and engineering and other site details, but that the applicant can move forward with confidence that the Planning Commission will accept a site plan in generally conformance with the concepts presented. Mr. Zeolla supported the motion. The motion passed by voice vote: (all ayes, no nays)

**Agenda Item #6:**

Parcel #	11-02-436-002
Zoning:	ARR, Agricultural and Rural Residential Zoning District
Address:	2115 White Lake Rd
File #:	URSA 26-01
Request:	Use requiring Special Approval for small scale institutional use for BARN 45
Applicant:	James A Lee, IV
Owner:	Lee Family Foundation

Chairman Curtis introduced the agenda item for Use Requiring Special Approval for Barn 45 at 2115 White Lake Road. The discussion was tabled following a public hearing on February 19, 2026.

The applicant, Jamie Lee explained his supplemental application materials.

Mr. York complimented the applicant on the resubmittal. He thought the use proposal was well presented, although there are still details of the site plan that need to be addressed. As to the hours of operation, he asked for clarification of the seven days per week, from 11:00 a.m. to 9:45 p.m. He was also concerned as to whether the existing/proposed parking could adequately accommodate the 300-person attendance that was noted in the narrative.

Mr. Lee explained that the young adult events on Sunday evenings would not anticipate 300 persons each week or all day during the hours of operation. The tendency has been for the participants to begin arriving at the site around 6:00 p.m. on Sunday evening. They drift in over the course of an hour and leave over the course of an hour. Officially the event ends at dusk, always by 9:00 p.m. The 300-person limit is an aspirational goal, and not the number of attendees today. Also, the attendance builds from a low in May to a high in August and starts declining as students return to college.

Mr. Charlick asked if there was any more correspondence that has come in since the public hearing that is not in the packet. Ms. Corwin noted that there is no new information to present. She did explain that she has pulled the building permit record and has the floor plan of the barn available for review. She has discussed the occupancy calculation with the Building Official. He based the occupancy limit of 110 on the net floor area of the ground floor only, assuming standing room and deducting mechanical space, the bathrooms, private office and counter areas.

Mr. Charlick asked if the Township has ever approved a Special Land Use that would include amplified sound outdoors. Ms. Corwin affirmed that this is not typically considered, although there are exceptions to the noise ordinance that may be granted by the Board of Trustees, typically for construction or a one-day event. However, the sheriff will still enforce noise limits if a nuisance is created and neighbors call in complaints, even if the Board grants such an exception.

Mr. Lee explained that they would not use outdoor amplified sound on the Sunday evening gatherings but would comply with the requirement to seek a special event permit for the annual praise and worship concert. He would notify the Sheriff when planning these events also.

Mr. Temple asked about noises associated with the haunted house that was approved by Special Use not far from this site. Ms. Ray noted that she lives very near the Bonadeo site where the haunted house operates and has not been disturbed by noise.

Mr. Lee explained that there are adult members of their board who supervise and oversee the young adult events and they work to keep noise levels down and behavior under control. Mr. Charlick asked about the public comment from a neighbor on Horseshoe that he could hear what sounds like a concert on his deck most weekends. Mr. Lee stated that aside from the annual event, there should be no music sounds carrying off the site. Mr. Charlick noted that if there are enough people present, it would not be necessary for loudspeakers to amplify the sound to carry off site, especially at night. Mr. York noted that the standard should be noise carrying beyond the property line. He believed a few small speakers reaching a few hundred people is much different than 100's of large speakers blaring for a larger crowd.

Mr. Lee explained that the track that surrounds the site forms a sort of "bowl" where the barn and its yard is much lower than the neighbors, which helps to contain the noise. This is also aided by dense foliage.

Mr. York found it interesting that the applicant had filed a Freedom of Information Act request to uncover complaints but noted that lack of formal complaints should never lead the Planning Commission to assume that no one is negatively impacted. Some might not know how or where to lodge a complaint or just assume that nothing positive will come from a complaint or just decide to live with the annoyance.

Mr. Lee agreed but noted that he has visited all the neighbors and addresses issues as they are identified, such as the lighting issue that was explained previously and addressed to the satisfaction of the neighbor.

Mr. Tierney asked if the track still existed, and in use. Mr. Lee explained that it is now used as a prayer trail. Ms. Ray asked if the neighbor allows use of the track this way, since it extends beyond Mr. Lee's property line. Mr. Lee explained that the track is blocked at the property line.

Mr. York asked at what point would the parking lot need to be paved. Ms. Corwin referred to the zoning ordinance, that grants the Planning Commission the authority to approve alternative surfaces such as grass pavers on parking lots they determine to be low use or seasonal. For some churches, gravel or grass fields are approved for some or all of their parking needs. The Planning Commission could, for instance, identify a portion of the parking they would want paved based on the daily demands of the site, and defer or waive paving on overflow and event parking areas.

Mr. Lee explained that there are paved areas on the south side of the barn, which can be dedicated for barrier free parking. There are responsible members overseeing and directing parking during events.

Mr. York suggested that the parking area on the south side of the barn could be expanded to provide some paved parking to accommodate the weekly bible study attendance. Mr. Lee noted that much of the activity around the barn is online. Most of the time there are only four to twelve persons there.

Mr. Charlick asked if engineering review would be required. Ms. Corwin thought this decision would be based on whether a lot of impervious surfaces would be added. She was confident that what was there today was acceptable without engineering, given that many of the Planning Commissioners are experienced in reading plans and the site did not seem to pose a risk of offsite runoff nuisance.

Mr. Temple noted that the Planning Commission has allowed many other churches to operate with gravel parking lots until they themselves were ready to pave for the convenience of their patrons.

Mr. Charlick noted that most of the proposed activity is not concerning, but the periodic crowds of 300 persons did give him pause. Mr. Temple noted that paving massive parking lots would only serve to amplify the noise. Mr. Charlick was concerned that all applicants should be treated similarly and recalled that recently they had limited attendance at the historic barn down the road to only 50 persons per event.

Mr. Curtis asked if the 300-person limit was seasonal or year-round. Mr. Lee said the only events that would rise to this limit would be the Sunday night events and the annual praise and worship event and they are seasonal. The hope is that the future barn expansion would accommodate more attendees inside and allow them to extend the young adult ministry into winter months.

Ms. Ray raised the concern that the building does not currently meet the needs of the current occupancy of the building of 136 persons. The restrooms are not adequate. They rely on portable toilets to protect the septic system. Mr. York asked the code requirements for the largest "routine" onsite event, which is the men's bible study with 100-person attendance. Ms. Corwin noted that the building official had explained that 1 toilet per 150 men or 1 toilet for 75 women is the code requirement. In other words, twice as many toilets for women. There are two toilets, although the bathrooms do not currently meet the standards for barrier free design.

Mr. Charlick asked the Planning Commission about their opinions on the maximum number of attendees of 300 persons, even if infrequently. Mr. Zeolla was emphatic that 300 persons was an extreme number for a site in this zoning district and the rural atmosphere. He did not believe this was compatible with the expectations of the neighbors and the character of the district. He thought such volume of traffic belonged in commercial zoning districts.

Mr. York thought this was an improper analysis. Churches and institutional uses are permitted in Agricultural and Rural Residential parcels, provided the site is designed to mitigate negative impacts. Historically churches were constructed right within residential neighborhoods and were an important part of the community fabric. People wanted their church to be convenient.

The Planning Commissioners debated whether 200 parking spaces could be absorbed on this site without impacting their neighbors. Mr. York noted that the 300-person attendance was only a few Sundays a year. They talked about other adjacent sites. The Lloyd site was limited to 50 persons, because of the barn occupancy and the cleared area that was available to park cars. The Bonadeo site has a limit of 100 persons in the barn; they provided about 40 spaces at the barn and 75 spaces for the corn maze. The Bonadeo permit does not limit the number of attendees but comes with a strict prohibition about allowing parking on White Lake Road.

Mr. Charlick asked if there was a green space requirement in the ordinance for institutional uses. Ms. Corwin answered there was not, but there is overall maximum coverage for structures and setbacks. This site would comply with those standards as currently stands. Mr. Zeolla asked about parking lot setbacks. Ms. Corwin said there is not specifically a parking lot setback, but there are standards regarding screening of incompatible land uses. Mr. Lee explained that they have proposed a berm with dense shrubs to screen the parking lot.

Mr. York noted that it is important to understand future plans to approve the use and set expectations for limits, but that the site improvements need only accommodate today's use and the near future. The Special Land Use Permit will dictate the day-to-day operations of the site, and the events will require special annual permits. There will be opportunities to propose other physical improvements in the future to reach the ultimate vision for the site.

Mr. Temple referred to the Required Standards for Approval of Special Land Uses. He is most concerned about standards 2 and 5. He noted for standard 2, all special land uses must be compatible and harmonious with surrounding land uses considering size, location and character of the proposed special land use and the special land use cannot cause substantial injury to the neighboring properties. He reminded the Planning Commissioners that they will need to develop a recommendation based on that standard. For standard 5, the special land use shall be designed, constructed and operated to preclude negative impacts from noise, dust, odor and light or detract from the area.

Mr. Lee noted that this is why there is so much paved driveway, to allow the dust and mud to be knocked off the tires before accessing the public road.

Mr. York questioned the commissioners and applicant as to what measures could bring the proposal in line with standards 2 and 5 for the Sunday night young adult activities with attendance of up to 300 persons. Mr. Zeolla felt it could not happen. Mr. York asked him if the activities were all inside if he would feel differently. Mr. Tierney suggested it is not only the noise, but also the traffic that presents a problem. Mr. York asked if 250 vehicles is too much, what number is acceptable? Mr. Zeolla thought 50 or less vehicles for an ARR zoned site. Mr. Zeolla thought the scale presents a huge stretch to make it seem to fit.

Mr. Curtis asked if more services, with smaller numbers would be more acceptable. Ms. Corwin suggested that given the nature of the young adult gathering, you would probably end up with multiple events each week with 300 persons every time, not three separate events with 100 persons each.

Mr. Charlick said his concern was that the neighbors would not have a rest from the activity all summer long. He voiced an idea that perhaps the neighbors would appreciate having one weekend a month where this activity could cease.

Mr. Curtis noted that there was no serious objection raised by any of the public. Even those who commented did not object to the land use but wanted concessions about lighting or noise. He thought in light of the public support, the use should be allowed in some form.

Mr. Charlick was concerned about putting a hard number on the permit. He knew that the township was not equipped to monitor the number of attendees. He thought there must be other performance measures that would be more appropriate.

Mr. York noted that clearly there would be an increase in traffic, but that might not cause a serious problem just because there was more traffic. Mr. Lee noted that he had approached the Road Commission for Oakland County, and they were not requiring him to pull a commercial driveway permit, although they offered some suggestions. Ms. Corwin confirmed that she had reached out to the Road Commission to verify their findings. The Road Commission is dealing with some trees in the right-of-way that notably had been causing safety concern regardless of Barn 45 due to their age and overhanging White Lake Road. They also recommended some minor widening of the driveway and keeping the sight triangles clear of vegetation.

Mr. Temple compared this site to other churches such as Cornerstone and Holy Spirit Church. Those churches are easily doing similar or greater numbers on a regular basis. Mr. York noted that churches provide a public service. Ms. Corwin noted that Cornerstone also started small and grew from their exposure to media. Ms. Ray noted that not everyone seeks the more formal institutions of church and are seeking a more casual atmosphere like Barn 45. She noted that Barn 45 presents themselves as a “boutique church” and has no stated goal to become a “mega church.” Mr. Lee said the goal of Barn 45 is to bring the youth back to some faith and encourage them to find their place in community.

Mr. Temple said he understood the argument about protecting the neighbors. Ms. Corwin reminded the Planning Commissioners that in the past, they had taken the position that there is a difference between “coming to the nuisance” than the “nuisance coming to you.” It may not be as important to protect future neighbors from an established use. There is merit to considering the interests of the current neighbors as taking precedence over concerns about future neighbors.

Mr. York said his struggle is the inconsistency of the stated goal of intimacy, and the truth of having a 300-person gathering as hardly intimate. He wondered if the larger events could be held offsite, such as at a high school auditorium.

Mr. Matt Carr, also with Barn 45, explained that the 300-person limit has never yet been reached at this site. He noted that the volumes ramp up and down through the summer season, and that the youth gather over a period of time, and do not all hit the driveway at once. He reiterated that Barn 45 has always accommodated all the parking on the site, and there is no record of complaints. He said more vehicles could be accommodated on site; and that the drawings were very conservative.

Mr. and Mrs. Lee explained what happens at Sunday Night Live. There are speakers in the Barn, and a small musical group plays three songs. Then there is some teaching before the youth break into small groups to discuss what they have heard. The Lees also feed the youth. The attendance varies from 100 to the high 200 persons per month. She admits some youth comes hungry and are sent home with leftovers. There are protections in place with the Health Department to be sure the food safety rules are observed.

Mr. Curtis asked if the Planning Commissions could pick a cap of say 200 persons, and anything above that requires special permission. Mr. Charlick noted that there are other uses in ARR zoning district such as our parks and boat launches that could attract large crowds on an occasional basis. Mr. Lee asked if the Special Use Permit could be very specific for the daily activities with separate asks for the 15 Sunday nights per year and the annual Praise and Worship concert.

Ms. Corwin cautioned the Planning Commission that federal laws protecting religious institutions require that you treat them like other similar uses. We have not imposed numbers on the farm markets or any other church other than what the building codes dictate for occupancy and parking and other physical improvements cause constraints. She noted that Mr. Charlick is correct in stating the Township cannot enforce based on a number of attendees. It would have to be based on something like improper parking or creating a nuisance.

Ms. Corwin thought it was appropriate to follow the model of the Bonadeo farm permit, that gave him a year to test some ideas for outdoor activities and the option to come back and tweak the permit the next year. If all went well and he wanted to stick to the the same parameters year and year there was no need to come back in. But either the township or the applicant could seek a refinement of the permit. There could be assurance that the indoor activities with attendance that does not exceed the building capacity could proceed indefinitely, but the outdoor activities would be negotiable.

There was more discussion about the observation that neighbors had not come out to complain. Mr. York asked if no neighbor is concerned, then who exactly would be protected by rejecting the proposal. He asked if there was a structure in the ordinance for large events.

Mr. Smith reflected on the difficulty of evaluating the proposal. He noted that while he respects the applicants' mission, he is equally concerned about the rights of neighboring property owners and the overall compatibility of the use in its setting. He questioned whether the Township would have approved the use had it been proposed before it was established without permits. His primary focus is determining how to bring the site into alignment with Township ordinances and to avoid setting a precedent where applicants seek approval only after developing their sites without proper authorization.

Mr. Charlick asked whether the special land use could be tied to the site plan. Ms. Corwin stated that special land uses should be linked to at least a conceptual site plan, with clear requirements for the final plan. She noted that the Planning Commission should provide sufficient guidance, so applicants are not required to invest in engineering for proposals unlikely to be approved.

Mr. Charlick then asked whether the proposed hours of operation, 11:00 a.m. to 9:45 p.m., were acceptable. Mr. Zeolla suggested an 8:00 p.m. weekday closing time. Mr. Lee noted that weeknight Bible studies typically conclude at 9:00 p.m. Ms. Corwin added that in a commuting community, an 8:00 p.m. closing time may be too restrictive, as many activities begin at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Zeolla proposed tying attendance limits to the building's occupancy rating. Mr. Charlick questioned the Township's ability to enforce strict attendance limits.

Ms. Corwin noted that Chapter 14 of the General Code of Operations regulates large gatherings, addressing hours of operation, portable toilets, parking, and related requirements. Although the ordinance is broad, it has been applied to events exceeding 500 attendees and could serve as a framework for annual permits for the large worship and praise event.

Ms. Corwin observed that the discussion was becoming repetitive and offered to prepare draft permit language for the Planning Commission's consideration based upon the framework of the Bonadeo permit. A subcommittee could work with her and the applicants to refine it prior to the next meeting. A subcommittee consisting of Mr. York, Mr. Zeolla and Mr. Smith was determined.

The schedule was discussed. The first young adult gathering would be scheduled May 15, 2026. If the Planning Commission took up the permit application at their April meeting and was able to reach a recommendation, the Board could consider the permit in early May. Mr. Charlick asked if the township would hold Barn 45 from that May 15 event if the Planning Commission was still working on the permit. Ms. Corwin noted that as long as everyone continued to work together, any enforcement activity would be stayed.

The applicants asked for clarification of the process. The Planning Commission will discuss and determine a recommendation next, and perhaps reach a recommendation to the Board at the April meeting. The Board of Trustees approves the Special Land Use Permit, perhaps as early as their May meeting. In the meantime, the applicant can work out the final site plan details with the Planning Commission, which could be approved at a future meeting, perhaps June if the applicant is ready. The Board of Trustees does not review the final site plan.

Mr. Curtis offered a motion to table the application until such time as the applicant provides additional information to support the request. Mr. Tierney supported the motion. Roll call vote: Charlick-yes; Curtis-yes; Heyn – yes; Ray – yes; Smith-yes; Temple – yes; Tierney -yes; York – yes; Zeolla -yes. Motion carries (9 yes votes, 0 no votes)

**Agenda Item #7:** Committee Updates

- Zoning Board of Appeals:
- Township Board:
- Highland Downtown Development Authority:
- Planning Director's Update

Committee liaisons reported on the activities of their respective organizations.

**Agenda Item #6:** Minutes February 19, 2026

Mr. Curtis offered a motion to approve the minutes of the February 19, 2026, Planning Commission meeting as presented. Mr. Tierney supported the motion which was approved by voice vote (all ayes, no nays)

***Adjournment:***

Mr. Curtis moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:15 p.m. Mr. Charlick supported the motion, which was unanimously approved by voice vote. (all ayes, no nays)

Respectfully submitted,  
Roscoe A. Smith, Secretary  
ARS/ejc