

**Highland Township Planning Commission  
Record of the 1432nd Meeting  
Highland Township Auditorium  
July 17, 2025**

***Roll Call:***

Kevin Curtis, Chairman (absent)  
Grant Charlick  
Chris Heyn, Acting Chairman  
Mike O'Leary  
Roscoe Smith  
Scott Temple (absent)  
Russ Tierney  
Guy York  
Michael Zeolla

***Also Present:***

Elizabeth Corwin, Planning Director

Visitors: 12

Acting Chairman Heyn 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.**

There was no public comment.

***Public Hearing:***

**Agenda Item #2:**

Parcel #	11-01-151-006
Zoning:	ARR, Agricultural and Rural Residential Zoning District
Address:	2381 White Lake Rd
File#:	URSA 25-03 PH
Request:	Use Requiring Special Approval Class C Farm Market with events
Applicant:	Jake Lloyd
Owner:	James and Mary Lloyd

Mr. Heyn introduced the request for special approval of land use for the 20-acre parcel at 2381 White Lake Road, parcel 11-01-151-006. The parcel is zoned ARR, Agriculture-Rural Residential and the requested use is to allow for small events at a Class C Farm Market for a historic barn that has been restored and moved to the property. Mr. Jacob Lloyd was present to answer questions and identified himself as the applicant. Mr. Lloyd has resided at the property with his wife for over ten years and is purchasing the property on land contract from his parents, James and Mary Lloyd. Mrs. Tina Lloyd was also present to assist.

Mr. Lloyd presented slides highlighting his property and the progress on the historic barn, which he moved with the help of friends and contractors from its original location in Springfield Township and methodically reassembled it on his own land. He is an architectural historian by trade; and is excited to share the space created in this barn with others to encourage an appreciation for and continued efforts in historic preservation.

Mr. Lloyd explained that his property is roughly 20-acres; and was once an active farm. He and his wife have worked to restore native landscapes and much of the north portion of the site has returned to woodlands. The remainder of the site is being transformed over time to match pre-settlement habitats. The barn was erected near the middle of the site, approximately 350 feet north of White Lake Road and at least 250 feet away from the nearest neighbor's home.

Mr. Lloyd reviewed the process of disassembling and inventorying the members of the barn. The footprint of the barn is approximately 1400 square feet. The basement is a poured concrete floor and walls, with a walkout face on the south. The north side of the upper level of the barn will have ground level access once the grading is complete.

The Lloyds envision using the barn for small events such as gatherings of the conservancy, nature hikes, farm to table dinners and similar functions. They have been approached by friends to consider hosting small weddings. They also plan to continue their small market stand, which offers eggs, cut flowers, native plant materials and some vegetables within season. He explained that the barn is a nice space to spend time in, and that they did not move the barn merely to create an event venue. He is proposing about two events per month during the summer seasons when the native tree cover is full and helps to mitigate noise and privacy concerns.

Mr. Lloyd recognizes that there is a significant traffic volume passing the site on White Lake Road, but does not believe the events will add significantly to the traffic load. He will clearly mark his driveway during events with temporary signage to be set only the day of the event. He is not proposing an amplified sound system, but there will be some music and speakers that would be contained within the barn and not travel beyond the property boundaries. Events will end early in the evening in consideration of their neighbors. He sees the limit of about 50 to 60 guests per event. The size of the barn and area for parking will limit the size.

He and his wife will be present on site during all events to monitor activities and keep guests within their property boundaries and allay concerns of neighbors regarding possible trespass.

Mr. Heyn opened the public hearing at 7:50 p.m. Ms. Corwin noted that the Planning Commission received a letter from Douglas and Ramona Prime (owning two parcels to the west of the subject site) stating opposition to the proposal. A second letter was presented by Joe and Renee Youngs of 2300 Horseshoe Drive, also expressing concerns regarding the proposal. Ms. Corwin explained that references to Barn 45 concerns a property to the west of this site that is operating without any approvals and is under a current enforcement action.

Mrs. Young summarized her letter, noting that some of the concerns had been addressed in the presentation, but that she remains concerned about how an event would be managed, particularly if the participants were "out of control" and about the noise. She reiterated that Barn 45 was becoming a growing concern to her and her neighbors and that the traffic on White Lake Road was growing and also very loud. She is concerned that the character of the neighborhood is changing, and that if the Lloyds were to move, what the next property owner might do with the barn.

Mr. Young pointed out inconsistencies between the written proposal and the verbal presentation. He had read May through October, but now it seems the proposal is for April through November. He finds the proposal to be ambiguous. He did not want to equate their proposal with Barn 45, but noted that their last concert lasted past 10 p.m. He noted that the trees were ineffective at deadening noise. Mrs. Young noted that the activity at Barn 45 begins early in the day through late at night. She also noted that the Barn 45 operators have stopped traffic on White Lake Road. She is not opposed to small gatherings, but is very concerned about how to keep the activity within reasonable limits. She does not want to have to call the police every weekend.

Mr. Douglas Prime, 2821 White Lake Road was concerned about a zoning change, and the future of the property. He asked what the limits are on the size of a Class C Farm Market. He does not want to see trespass into his pasture where he keeps the horses. He is concerned about the liability. An umbrella liability policy would cost him about \$1000 per year.

Mr. Prime also noted that one can hear Barn 45 all the way to Rose Center Road. He reiterated concerns about traffic, and how close the parking would come to his property.

Mr. Charlick explained that a Class C Farm Market is not a new zoning classification, but is rather a use category within the zoning classification. The permit will contain the parameters that limit the allowable frequency and size of events. Ms. Corwin explained that subsequent property owners could only continue if they agree to the permit conditions or if they bring a new proposal forward under whatever rules are in effect at that time, if any such use is even allowed then.

Ms. Mona Prime, also of 2821 White Lake Road expressed her desire to maintain green space. She did not appreciate trespass onto her property and would like to see fences to keep strangers off her property. She did not agree with the policy of allowing home businesses on agricultural property.

Mr. Heyn closed the public comment period at 8:14 p.m.

Mr. Tierney asked if the recent decision about short term rentals in residential districts applies to this use. Ms. Corwin explained that farm markets in an agricultural zoning district are not strictly the same principal. Farm markets are recognized by the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development as an acceptable practice. Mr. Tierney noted that we had not approved the use at Barn 45.

Ms. Corwin again explained that Barn 45 should not be used as a standard to judge this proposal. The activities at that nearby site were never approved because no one ever applied for any permit beyond homeowner's construction permits for the home, a barn and pavilion. There was no notice to neighbors because there was no application. The Township has recently learned of the activity and has notified the property owner of a violation. She noted that when a nuisance is occurring after hours, the best approach is for neighbors to report the activity to the Sheriff. Neither the Sheriff's office nor the Township office has record of complaints on the Barn 45 property until recently.

Ms. Corwin noted that the difference between this proposal and Barn 45 is that the Lloyds are presenting an application for an activity that is supported by the ordinance. If the Planning Commission believes that the activity can be contained within certain parameters to allow some use of the property without undue nuisance to the neighbor, the application may proceed, and a permit issued. If the Planning Commission believes that the activity is simply incompatible due to the nature of the activity and the neighborhood, then the permit will be disallowed. The Planning Commission's job is to tease out the application and determine what the appropriate guard rails might be.

Mr. Tierney asked about the suitability of the parking. He noted that he had attended events at similar venues and it is very dark at night and difficult to see. Ms. Corwin noted that the application is not for

events that end late at night. Ms. Corwin explained further that she had visited the site that afternoon. While the Fire Marshal has not completed his evaluation of the permissible occupancy yet, she affirmed Mr. Lloyd's statement that the barn is not as big as it seems from the outside. She thought it would be difficult to exceed about 50 participants in the barn and the necessary parking.

Ms. Corwin explained that the Fire Marshal is researching how the code will affect public use of the timber frame building. There will be some necessary modifications such as additional doors and emergency lighting. There are already fire extinguishers in the barn.

Mr. Zeolla noted that his primary concern is the driveway. It seems that the existing driveway is located near a dip in White Lake Road. He is concerned about sight distance. He thought a traffic study might be appropriate. Ms. Corwin thought a traffic study was not appropriate, but that a traffic engineer could evaluate the sight distance.

Mr. Heyn asked about the farm products. Mrs. Lloyd explained that the market has been operational for about seven years; but not opened this year because the barn project was occupying their time. She noted that her mother has a significant cut flower garden and sells bouquets. She raises chickens and offers eggs, and veggies from her garden. Her husband cultivates and sells pine trees and other native plant starts. She noted that they keep the farm market small, because they live on the property and do not want to encourage too much traffic to their site. But she noted that all customers at the stand near their house express curiosity about the barn and want to see it and hear of its history.

Mr. Charlick asked about the driveway to the barn. Mr. Lloyd explained that the driveway is shown in the aerial photo; and is a branch off their existing driveway. They have not proposed a second entrance/exit off White Lake Road.

Mr. O'Leary asked for clarification about the two levels of the barn. He asked if both levels of the barn would be used for events. Mr. Lloyd said that he plans to use both levels.

Mrs. Lloyd clarified the concern about past use of the property for events. She explained that there she had allowed women's yoga classes in the yard in the past. She thought these quiet events were perfect examples of the intensity of events proposed.

Mr. O'Leary asked about conversations with the building department. Ms. Corwin explained that Mr. Tino had witnessed the barn as it was built. She asked him to revisit the site with the Fire Marshal when the Lloyds decided to pursue the Special Use Permit. Neither the Building Official nor Fire Marshal believe there are many challenges to opening the barn to the public, but the property owners will work with them on compliance. Mr. O'Leary was concerned about the lack of running water and toilet facilities. The proposal is for use of portable toilets for events, which might also limit its appeal for large gatherings.

Mr. Charlick thought this was a good example of a proposal that meets the intent of preserving open space in the Township. This is an example of allowing some return on the property, so it is spared being split into multiple building sites. Each property will be allowed different intensity based on its characteristics. He thought that perhaps 70 participants might be too much for this property, especially if an unexpected weather event turns the site to mud. He believed the Planning Commission could come to an agreement about some activity on the site, but that he is not necessarily satisfied they are ready to say yes based on the proposal without more work.

Mr. York voiced agreement with the approach described by Mr. Charlick. He affirmed the applicants in their desire to craft a proposal that respects their neighbors and seeks to make all feel safe with the activity proposed. He believed there is potential to design some limits, such as the number of visitors and the frequency and duration of events. He believed that there were ways to treat the trails, including

landscaping, fencing and even signs to discourage unintentional trespass. He thought one or two events per month is a small business and does not rise to the impacts of a full blown commercial activity with loudspeakers blaring and people tailgating.

Mr. Tierney thought it would be important to hear from the Fire Department about access and limits to the occupancy of the barn.

Mr. Charlick thought that the Planning Commission's job was to steer the proposal toward a reasonable solution to the issues identified. He would like to see a parking layout and understand better how traffic would move. He would like answers to questions such as how the trash will be handled and how is the accessibility addressed in building code.

Mr. Zeolla thought it was important to arrive at a more complete site plan with parking layout.

Mr. York thought there could be different frequencies for events based on the number of anticipated guests. He thought a small yoga class with 6 or 10 ladies would draw no attention but two larger events per month would bring more scrutiny.

Mr. Smith explained that throughout his career on the Planning Commission, he has always been a proponent of open space. He is wrestling with whether the tradeoff of allowing some business activity in the rural neighborhood is worth avoiding a subdivision, with its more continual increased traffic. He thinks small meetings that end before dark, that have no outdoor loudspeakers, no fires, etc. could be beneficial to preserving the rural feel of the community.

Mr. York suggested the permit could be crafted with no limits on small events with a threshold of 5 participants, but limits the frequency of bigger events. He suggested even a special permit for the largest events.

Mr. Charlick moved to table the application until August 21, 2025 to allow the applicant to refine his proposal and for the Fire Marshal and staff to review the proposal in more detail. Mr. O'Leary supported the motion. Roll Call vote: Charlick-yes; O'Leary-yes; Tierney-yes; Zeolla-yes; York-yes; Heyn-yes; Smith-yes. Motion carries (7 yes votes, 0 no votes.)

***Work Session:***

**Agenda Item #3:**

Parcel:	11-27-351-005
Zoning:	OS, Office Services with Site Specific Relief
Address:	100 Lone Tree Road
File#:	SPR 25-02
Request:	Site Plan Review for Pitch Hopper
Applicant:	Phil Rashid, Pitch Hopper
Owner:	100 Lone Tree LLC

Mr. Heyn introduced the site plan review for Pitch Hopper, at 100 Lone Tree Road. The site specific relief application for reuse of the site was approved by the Board of Trustees on June

Mr. Rashid has evaluated the requests from the prior meeting; and wanted to discuss some of the ideas for finalizing the site plan in light of what he has found. He does not think it is cost effective to create a public entrance from the front of the building, because of the presence of the large 480 volt service on the cinder

block wall in the center of the building. He would like to dress up the south face of the building by planting lilac bushes and similar shrubs. He will add windows as shown on the sketches and paint the building.

Mr. Charlick asked about the west property line. Mr. Rashid would like to defer clearing out the existing planting and refreshing the landscape there until Phase II, so it could be completed in conjunction with the proposed building.

Mr. Rashid has identified the area for outdoor storage on the plan in the northeast corner of the site.

Mr. O’Leary thought the plan does not go far enough to improve its appearance. He asked what other improvements could be considered with the windows, such as canopies or awnings. He reminded the Commission that this is a special approval to allow continuance of use of non-conforming building and additional effort would be reasonable and merited. Mr. Rashid was willing to add more windows, but thought the idea of canopies or awnings was not within his comfort because of the steel construction of the building. He was concerned about the neighbors and not eager to provide a view into warehouse area.

Mr. Charlick thought there was only so much one could do to improve the appearance of an industrial building. The landscape will only go so far to change the appearance and could easily be displaced or overgrown. He was satisfied with the proposal.

Mr. Heyn noted that if this building were on Milford Road, he might feel differently about the façade. He noted the neighborhood is accustomed to this building.

Mr. Smith encouraged Mr. Rashid to consider a diversity of landscape species.

Mr. Charlick offered the following motion: To approve the site plan for 100 Lone Tree Road, parcel 11-27-351-005 for Pitch Hopper, with the understanding that the Phase I improvements shall include all the plantings except the west property line; installation of 4 windows on the south façade; and removal of the pavement on the south side of the property. The Phase II improvements shall include additional plantings on the west property line and the second building. Mr. Tierney supported the motion. Roll call vote: Tierney-yes; Zeolla-yes; York-yes; Heyn-yes; Charlick-yes; O’Leary-no; Smith-yes. Motion carries (6 yes votes, 1 no votes.)

**Agenda Item #4:** Open discussion regarding ordinances: Farm Markets, Pet Care Facilities, Commercial/Recreational Parking in Residential Areas.

Ms. Corwin explained that she had invited a few people to come in and talk about ordinances. The first was Isabela Davis of Terrace Flower Farms at 440 Rowe Road. She explained that she had started a few years ago with a greenhouse, and had planted beautiful gardens on her property, to beautify her yard and as a U-pick flower business. Her gardens had attracted attention of photographers, and she obtained a land use permit that allows her to have photographers come to the site with a client as a home occupation. Now she has been approached to allow small wedding ceremonies within the gardens—basically the couple, their witnesses and the officiant. She will not be having receptions at her property.

Her property is about 4 acres with access to a private road that serves only her own property, but crosses a neighboring property on an easement.

Ms. Corwin explained that the photographer and client meets a definition of allowable home occupation, but the “elopement” wedding involves a few more people than allowed. Originally staff thought the weddings would fall under the Class “C” Farm Market with events, but the scale of the wedding is so small that it seems like overkill to conduct a public hearing.

Mr. Charlick observed that the property is so small that it would be impossible to have too large a party because there would be no room for parking. There is also a gas line crossing the property. Ms. Davis received permission to plant over the pipeline.

The consensus was to allow the activity to continue under Ms. Davis's Class "A" Farm Market permit, and revisit it if there are complaints in the future. Ms. Corwin noted that the Farm Market definitions could be revisited next time we amend the ordinances.

Ms. Corwin explained that there had also been interest in the concept of allowing "doggie day care" on agriculturally zoned properties. Currently pet care facilities are allowed only as Special Use in commercial districts. The question for discussion would be whether the traffic patterns resulting from pet drop off and pick up would be tolerable on agricultural properties. Kennels are allowed in the agricultural zoning on a ten-acre parcel. She noted that the citizen with interest in the subject was not present and thought the discussion could be raised at a future meeting, but encouraged Commissioners to think through the issue in the meantime, as this is a popular business model with a lot demand.

Ms. Corwin informed the Planning Commission that Mr. Bonadeo was still interested in expanding his calendar to allow him to host the events now allowed under the ordinance. Ms. Corwin needs to review the existing Special Use Permit and determine if the Board has the authority to expand the permit or whether a new public hearing should be conducted. Even if the Board has the authority, they might refer the issue to the Planning Commission for a recommendation.

**Agenda Item #5:** 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: June 19, 2025

Mr. Zeolla offered a motion to approve the minutes of the June 19, 2025, Planning Commission meeting as presented. Mr. O'Leary supported the motion which was approved by voice vote (all ayes, no nays)

***Adjournment:***

Mr. Zeolla moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:58 p.m. Mr. O'Leary supported the motion, which was unanimously approved by voice vote. (all ayes, no nays)

Respectfully submitted,

A. Roscoe Smith, Secretary  
ARS/ejc