

**Highland Township Planning Commission
Record of the 1438th Meeting
Highland Township Auditorium
December 4, 2025**

Roll Call:

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

Also Present:

Elizabeth Corwin, Planning Director

Visitors: 80

Chairman Curtis called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Mr. York agreed to fulfill the Secretary role in Mr. Smith’s absence.

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/Work Session:

Agenda Item #2:

Parcel # 11-14-100-054
Zoning: R1.5, Single Family Residential, 1.5 Acre
Address: Vacant, Harvey Lake Road
File #: SPR 25-04
Request: Public Hearing-Residential Planned Unit Development
Applicant: Charles Burt, B&B Construction
Owner: B&B Construction

Mr. Charlick offered an overview of the project. The property was formerly owned by the Huron Valley School District, who sold it with the explicit intent that housing would be developed there. The property was rezoned to its current zoning district of R1.5, Single Family Residential Zoning in 2019. The rezoning was and is still consistent with the Master Plan.

The applicant has the right to develop a subdivision that fully complies with the zoning ordinance as to lot widths, setbacks and similar regulations without a public hearing. He has submitted a plan for 36 units,

which would cover every square foot of the property. The Township has developed an ordinance that rewards a developer for using open space cluster techniques like wide buffers along the public roadways and parks and for providing other public benefits by granting density bonuses. He noted that the open space indicated on the plan would be deed restricted for perpetuity and would never be eligible for additional housing. The purpose of the meeting today is to evaluate the proposal and determine whether to recommend approval of the planned unit development plan with 50 percent open space and 42 lots, or whether to accept the parallel plan, which the applicant is entitled to with no special approvals.

Mr. Curtis opened the public hearing at 7:40 p.m.

Aaron Williams, 1551 E. Wardlow is interested in learning more about plans for the open space. He lives next to the long strip of property parallel to Vero Drive on a twelve-acre parcel, where there is only a 20-foot open space between lot 16/17 and the far north end of his parcel. He wants assurance that residents of the subdivision will not trespass on his property, thinking it is part of their open space. He is also concerned about increase traffic on Harvey Lake Road. He wondered if he would have any future access to Cumberland if he chose to divide his own parcel.

Mr. Temple asked Mr. Williams if he preferred the parallel plan which would not present these same issues, but would put private back yards at his lot line. Mr. Williams preferred the cluster plan but wants to understand what the buffer looks like.

James Brennan expressed a concern about sight distance at the intersection which is on a “blind” curve. He suggested this is a hazardous location with a recent rollover accident. He also expressed concern about septic systems on these lot sizes and thought the green space is not worth the bargaining for more lots since homes would still be held back from neighboring properties and the road through setbacks.

Theresa Anderson, 1724 Apollo was concerned about the hours of operation during construction and how long the neighbors would have to endure construction noise. She is also concerned about the welfare of a coyote pack that lives on the vacant development property. She wanted to know if there would be stages of construction.

Gary Johnson, 2974 Waling Woods has observed accidents in front of his house. He thinks the curve in Harvey Lake Road creates a “blind” corner and that the speed limit should be reduced.

Tammy Ware, 1608 Juno is concerned about children cutting through her yard, since the break in the fence for Spring Mills Elementary School is in her back yard. She noted that cars line up for school pickup and drop off, and it is concerning that the plan does not show sidewalk. She also asked if these residents would be served by the water system in Axford Acres and if this would impact the existing customers.

Jim Lloyd, 2280 White Lake Road explained that he has served for many years on various parks and recreation committees. The committee had developed a Master Plan for an integrated trail network. He noted that in every resident survey, the top goals have always been more trails. He asked for strong consideration to require a trail connection as part of the plan.

John Smith, 1794 Apollo noted that his home is only 30 feet from the rear property line and wonders what will happen at the open space adjoining his property line. He is hoping that privacy concerns will be considered.

Patrick Territo, 1447 Anchor Lane noted his preference for the parallel plan and was pleased that only open space is proposed for the narrow “dog leg” strip of property running parallel to his subdivision.

“Steve from Highland” asked for an explanation of how this parcel was created and came to be zoned R1.5. He was also concerned about how the subdivision would be served by water and construction noise. He hopes that as many trees as possible will be saved. Mr. Temple explained that the decision to sell the property for development was made by the Huron Valley School District, and not by the Township.

Mr. Curtis closed the public hearing at 8:05 p.m.

Mr. York observed that the buffer zone created in the cluster plan provided a benefit to the neighbors. If the parallel plan were employed, homes could be placed within 50 feet of the property line. With the cluster plan, the homes would be placed at least 150 feet from property lines and a woodlands buffer would be preserved wherever possible.

Mr. Tierney asked Mr. Burt if the parks were for the exclusive use of the Homeowners Association (HOA) membership or if there would be any public access. Mr. Burt explained that the parks would be owned as common space, but his hope is that the preserved areas would remain open for the school children to visit as part of a nature study as they currently do.

Mr. Charlick explained the process of approval to the audience, noting that the Planning Commission will first provide a recommendation to the Board. But if the cluster plan is approved, there would be still be many months of fleshing out the engineering details and acquiring necessary approvals and permits from the Health Division, the State of Michigan for the watermain, and other agency approvals. This cluster plan is a concept, but the street and lot layout is assured to the applicant if he can obtain the other approvals.

Mr. Charlick and Ms. Corwin also explained the watermain. This project requires that the Township extend watermain from Wardlow Road to connect to Axford Acres. This is a piece of watermain that has been identified as the next most critical improvement in the existing water system. It will provide redundancy in the system and improve reliability for all the homes located north of Wardlow Road as it allows for a “backfeed” into the system if there is a watermain break. Ms. Corwin explained that there is no longer a wellhouse at Axford Acres, and that the water that serves those residents is a blended mix of water from Prestwick Village, Harvey Lake Estates, Huntwood Place and occasionally Bretton Oaks. This is no longer a subdivision “community well” system, but an integrated municipal water system.

Mr. York also explained that if the watermain is not extended, each of these homes in this project would be served by an individual well and onsite septic system. Mr. Charlick and Mr. Zeolla noted that bringing these users into the system provides more customers to offset operating costs and contain water rates.

Ms. Corwin explained that the Oakland County Health Division does govern the number of bedrooms permitted on any development property but is less concerned about the individual lot sizes than the overall density of the development. Their environmental protection provisions require that one acre is required for every three bedrooms, but it is up to a developer to decide how to allocate those bedrooms in their mix of housing (e.g. two, three or four bedroom homes).

Mr. York noted that in this case, the road system is a loop and traffic would primarily consist of residential trips. He thought foregoing sidewalks within the subdivision would have a calming effect, slowing down traffic to accommodate neighbors on bikes or with strollers. He thought there was merit to discussing sidewalk or a pathway parallel to Harvey Lake Road on the east side of the road. He would not want to encourage pedestrians to cross Harvey Lake except at the school crossing.

Mr. Charlick observed that at this time, there are only four or five lots that are in near proximity to Harvey Lake Road, and only a few homes south of the subdivision. He also would want to discourage pedestrian crossing and questioned whether it would be better to concentrate on internal trails.

Mr. Zeolla thought it would be wise to require a path along Harvey Lake Road, but only from the subdivision entrance north to the school property. Mr. O’Leary agreed.

Mr. Temple thought the path should be along the entire frontage, and noted that it is indicated on previous trail plans for the Township. Ms. Corwin noted that since the Township is moving forward with a watermain extension along Harvey Lake Road, it is possible that the excavation for the watermain would prepare the grade for the path.

Mr. Charlick concluded that the proposed cluster plan with the enhanced density bonus is concurrent with both current zoning and the Master Plan in that it meets the intent of maintaining the rural look and feel with its substantial offering of buffers and open space. He asked if the decision about the Harvey Lake Road pathway could be deferred to a future time when the Planning Commission could explore the decision further. Ms. Corwin thought that would be appropriate if identified in the motion of approval. The intent of this phase of review is to lock in the street and lot layout and “big picture” concepts for drainage, sewer and water supply so that the applicant would be able to efficiently pursue his engineering approvals.

Mr. Charlick offered a motion to recommend approval to the Township Board for the Residential Planned Unit Development known as Timberland Estates, parcel 11-14-100-054, vacant parcel on Harvey Lake Road. December 4, 2025 in accordance with the proposed PUD sketch plan prepared by Kieft Engineering, dated June 10, 2019 showing 42 single family units. The recommendation further stipulates that the plan should include a pathway across open space between units 4 and 5 to provide pedestrian access to Spring Mills Elementary School and leaves open for further clarification and discussion the need for a path parallel to Harvey Lake Road along the development parcel frontage. Mr. O’Leary supported the motion.

Mr. Curtis called for further discussion. Mr. Anthony Raimondo, a member of the Zoning Board of Appeals was present in the audience and asked the chairman if setbacks could be addressed. Ms. Corwin pointed to her report, noting that she had provided a table summarizing typical lot sizes and setbacks in many of the modern subdivisions in the Township. The consensus was that the front and rear yard setbacks of 50 feet were appropriate, although a 40-foot setback would also be acceptable. The side yard setbacks should be increased to 15 feet at least where side yards abut, so that the home spacing is never less than 30 feet. Mr. O’Leary noted the 30 feet provides the greatest flexibility in the materials of construction, since separations of less than 30 feet might require special treatment in design to meet building safety codes.

Mr. Charlick and Mr. O’Leary accepted an amendment offered by Mr. Zeolla that the Planning Commission reserves the right to reconsider side yard setbacks of 10 to 15 feet and front/rear yard setbacks from 40 to 50 feet during site plan review. Ms. Corwin read back the motion as follows:

Recommend approval to the Township Board for the Residential Planned Unit Development known as Timberland Estates, parcel 11-14-100-054, vacant parcel on Harvey Lake Road. December 4, 2025 in accordance with the proposed PUD sketch plan prepared by Kieft Engineering, dated June 10, 2019 showing 42 single family units. The recommendation further stipulates that the plan should include a pathway across open space between units 4 and 5 to provide pedestrian access to Spring Mills Elementary School and leaves open for further clarification and discussion the need for a path parallel to Harvey Lake Road along the development parcel frontage. Further, the Planning Commission reserves right to reconsider side yard setbacks of 10 to 15 feet and front/rear yard setbacks from 40 to 50 feet during site plan review.

Roll Call vote: Charlick, yes; Curtis, yes; O’Leary-yes; Temple-yes; Heyn-yes; Tierney-yes; York-yes. Motion carries (8 yes votes, 0 no votes).

Agenda Item #3:

Parcel # 11-01-351-002
Zoning: ARR, Agricultural and Rural Residential Zoning District
Address: 2075 Oakland
File #: URSA 25-04.
Request: Public Hearing/Special Land Use Approval for Golf Course improvements
File #: RZ 25-02
Request: Public Hearing/Rezoning with offer of conditions to RM, Multiple-Family Residential ZD
Applicant: David Dowling, Yukon Building Company
Owner: SIGA Corp

Mr. Curtis introduced the agenda item for a public hearing for two projects with distinct approval processes on the same parcel, 11-01-351-002, commonly known as the Highland Hills Golf Course.

Mr. David Dowling, applicant and owner of Yukon Building and Land Development was invited to provide an overview of the projects. Mr. Dowling explained that the Highland Hills Golf Course has operated since the 1920's. Parts of the golf course have fallen into disrepair, and he had been invited to consider options to build a few homes on the site to generate some revenue to invest back into the golf course. He and some partners decided to not only take on the housing component but also purchase the golf course and restore it.

The golf course parcel is approximately 117 acres and is currently zoned agricultural and rural residential. Given the current zoning, the site could yield 22 subdivision lots. He and his partners propose to build only eight units total on 4.6 acres--three duplex units and two single units. These would be situated south of the current hole three, just north of Oakland Drive, in an area previously platted for single family homes. The units would have attached side entry garages, off a one-way driveway with two entrances from Oakland. There will be slab on grade patios at the rear yard of each unit. Existing trees will be preserved where possible, and additional landscaping is proposed to protect the homes from stray golf balls. All but three existing trees will be saved.

The proposed homes will have full basements with ingress/egress windows. The homes will be two-bedroom/two-bathroom and three bedroom/two bathroom homes ranging from 1400 to 1700 square feet, marketing between \$350,000 to \$425,000.

The proposal calls for the addition of a golf driving range/simulator on 2.1 acres in the southwest corner of the parcel, south of the existing cart barn and clubhouse. This portion of the project would consist of a three-sided shelter for twenty-two driving lanes with only ten lanes equipped with Top Golf computer simulators. All lanes would be available for practice/warmup. The golfers would drive south towards a net enclosure, 60 yards deep, that ranges from 45-foot poles to 80-foot poles on the south. The existing trees in that area are 45 feet tall. All lighting would be in berms, installed at grade level—there would be no pole mounted lighting. The 18-hole golf course will remain in play throughout the development except that hole 3 will be modified. The golf simulator would operate year-round with the same hours of operation as the golf course--7 a.m. to 9 p.m. in the summer.

Mr. Dowling also proposes to expand and improve the parking lot and paint the golf cart barn with a minor structural addition. Improvements at the clubhouse would include partially wrapping the columns along the front with stone, paint the exterior and add some low stacked stone walls to separate the patio from the golf cart path. The clubhouse will continue to provide a place to pay greens fees, interact with staff, and affordable short-order food services.

Mr. Dowling noted that they have already started making improvements to the golf course, and that the core business will remain a neighborhood golf course with affordable green fees and casual dress code. The intent of the housing is to provide revenue for the golf course improvements.

Mr. Curtis opened the public hearing at 9:10 p.m. He noted there was correspondence from Kinney, Duffey, Syke, Blankenship and Ford which will be included in the record of the meeting. Copies have been provided to each Commissioner.

David Thompson, 4525 Highland Hills Drive explained that the neighborhood, and area known as the "Horseshoe" has a very stable population, with many residents living there for over 25 years. He believes the golf course is thriving as is and has been a peaceful neighbor that has provided employment for neighborhood teachers. His experience is that Top Golf simulators are not peaceful neighbors; but rather draw a different type of customer who are "party-ers." He and his neighbors are afraid that this change will fundamentally change the character of their neighborhood.

Mr. Thompson was further concerned that duplexes are not in character with the neighborhood and will load the streets with added traffic. The streets were improved with resident dollars through an Special Assessment District and the residents do their own snow removal.

James Brennan does not support the proposal because of the drinking atmosphere prevalent at other Top Golf facilities. He also thinks the noise from the simulator is significantly different than the noise from the third hole of the golf course. He is concerned that the layout of the housing is short-sighted and does not allow for the future expansion that might happen. He is pessimistic that the golf course will not survive and that future housing will be created.

Mr. Brennan does not appreciate the multiple family designation and thinks there are other areas in the Township where apartments currently exist where the duplexes would be more appropriate. He noted there is no local commercial services nearby. He is also concerned that this represents an increase in traffic on a dirt road.

Carl Anderson, 2073 Jackson Boulevard asked if there has been any environmental studies as to the drainage. He has observed that runoff from the golf course in the spring melt flows across the road and sits in their yards. He noted the homes on Jackson and Oakland sit too low, and the culverts get cut off. He has dug a pond to mitigate the flooding.

Greg Martin, 1582 Clubview Drive noted that the slides are quite lovely, but he does not think they are realistic. He said there are curves in the roads that are not reflected in the slides, and that he can currently see the cart barn from his yard. He is annoyed by the one light on the barn in his own yard. He does not see this proposal as an improvement, but an industrialization of a local recreational site. He is concerned about the scale, noise, traffic and lighting that will accompany this project. He thinks the net represents a permanent industrial blight that is three times higher than any home would be allowed.

Mr. Martin compared the noise of a titanium driver to a nail gun, and asked the Commissioners to imagine the continual sound of 20 nail guns being fired at the same time. It would sound like thousands of explosions per hour. He also noted that the size of the proposed parking lot is an acknowledgement that the site cannot handle the current traffic load. Golfers using the course park for four hours, range users only 45 minutes. He believes this indicates a significant increase in traffic volumes for the site, with a big influx of traffic into residential streets at closing time.

Mr. Martin is also concerned that there will be stadium style lighting that will not be compatible with the neighborhood. The golf course is currently totally dim after hours.

Tim Samel, 2015 Oakland lives just south of the proposed driving range/simulator. The view out of his yard would be a prison, with the 80 foot high net with lights and constant noise. He has seen other Top Golf facilities and they are lit up like prisons all night long.

Scott Syke, 1982 Clubview stated his intent is not to deny anyone the right to improve property, but believes this project does not comply with the Master Plan intent and undermines the character of a historic neighborhood. He submitted a written copy of his remarks which are included in the public record. His concerns also included lighting, traffic, noise, and drainage.

Brandon Miller, 2013 Jackson Boulevard is concerned about safety and the integrity of the nets protecting the homes. He does not think Oakland Boulevard is wide enough to accommodate more traffic.

Jim Lloyd, 2280 White Lake Road is the neighbor on the north and has more shared boundary than other parcels. He noted the golf course has been a good neighbor and shares many values about environmental preservation, wildlife habitat and similar. He is not commenting on the driving range/simulator but is concerned about the duplexes. He thinks mixing multiple family and residential/agricultural so closely is an issue. He asks that the Planning Commission carefully consider any precedence that may be established with this very dense residential zoning and takes care in crafting motions to preclude the spread of such housing into the remainder of the golf course in the future.

Richie Wallace, 4278 Flynn Drive is a regular customer at the golf course and does not support the driving range/simulator. He is concerned about the suitability of the septic systems for the increased commercial activity on the site. He is concerned that undertreated sewage would wash down into the lake and impact water quality.

Steve Brook, 2259 Jackson was also concerned about the party atmosphere that accompanies other Top Golf installations. He thought single family residential might fit the area and asked if an association would be established with bylaws, and if short term rentals would be precluded. He thought duplexes sometimes carried a stigma.

Terri Allport, 2285 Oakland Drive explained that they get considerable traffic on the east side of Oakland Drive, which is not paved. She thinks there will be a safety issue on Highland Hills Drive, north of the paved section because of the narrowness of the road. She travels slowly through this area due to the conditions. She is also concerned about loss of property values.

Larry Cichon, 2097 Jackson Blvd explained that his driveway floods half of its distance with 1/4 inch of rainfall. He finds six golf balls per month in his yard. He does not believe expanding the pond on hole 3 will do anything to reduce the runoff.

Kenny Vore is concerned about the wetlands impact.

Dave Dennis, 1938 Clubview Drive is not concerned about the housing proposal but thinks it should be single family homes. He is concerned more about the driving range/simulator and the noise and activity at night.

Dale Green, 2235 Oakland is not in favor of the project and is very concerned about the massive drainage problems in the neighborhood. She also echoed other neighbors concerns about safety, and noted that Highland Hills is the only north/south road in the area since Duck Lake Road does not extend all the way to White Lake Road. She asked if the northeast corner of the site would be more appropriate. She is also concerned about environmental impacts.

Mona Prime, 2281 White Lake Road is concerned about the aesthetics and its compatibility of the rural atmosphere. She fears that allowing projects like this would discourage large property holders and prompt them to divide up their own parcels to move on. She is concerned about traffic safety on White Lake Road.

Mr. Curtis closed the public hearing at 10:00 p.m.

Mr. Charlick explained that there are two separate processes and actions to be considered. For the golf course, the use is subject to Special Land Use Approval. This process requires the Planning Commission to consider specific standards of approval outlined in the zoning ordinance, which he read for the benefit of the public.

Mr. Charlick commented that he had heard many residents discussing the fear of the drinking and party atmosphere surrounding the driving range/simulator. That concern might go against the interests of the public health, safety and welfare, and should be explored further. The compatibility with surrounding land uses seems to be a little more to overcome, given its near proximity to residential properties. There may be some mitigating measures, but he has not convinced that the current proposed range location can work, especially given its height and the sound concerns.

Mr. Charlick went on to note that an important goal of the Master Plan is to preserve open space, and helping the golf course remain in business is a worthy aim. But commercializing the golf course may be too much of a change to satisfy the intent to preserve the open space. He also thought there may be some increase in traffic, but if the driving range is mainly serving the existing customers, it may not be that substantial. The traffic discussion bears more consideration and may be negative. The fifth standard talks about the design and operation of the project minimizing detrimental impacts to surrounding properties, and this is probably the most compelling argument against the project. He did note that issues surrounding increased drainage would be addressed through the review and approval process and that the drainage standards for the Oakland County Water Resources Commissioner are much stricter than previously. Mr. Charlick did not think the project would impose any unreasonable burdens on public services and the project does comply with the specific standards for a golf course. There are a lot of questions surrounding the commercialization of the golf course and not enough answers to proceed.

Mr. Temple appreciated the review of the special land use standards and Mr. Charlick's take on how the project complied. He personally thinks none of the project complies with the standards and does not believe the Planning Commission is prepared to proceed further with the project based on what has been presented.

Mr. Curtis agreed, particularly the standard regarding compatibility with the neighboring properties. He has not had time to really digest all he has heard tonight.

Ms. Corwin noted it would not be unusual to table such a request at the public hearing to take time to reflect on what was learned and come back to it at a future meeting.

Mr. Zeolla is not in favor of the proposal for the golf course improvements at this location either but might support the housing proposal. The driving range/simulator is too loud, too high, too much to abut residential land uses.

Mr. Tierney does not think the driving range/simulator fits the Master Plan, as this represents a movement from recreational to a more commercial nature. He is in favor of improvements to the golf course that are more in line with the rural nature of the area.

Mr. Heyn asked for clarification of the hours of operation for the driving range/simulator. The applicant reaffirmed that the hours would match the golf course operations, with 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. in the summer months. He thought it was more appropriate to shut down all operations at dusk. He noted that Highland

Township strives to be a dark sky community. He does appreciate the improvements to the clubhouse but thinks adding the housing is a slippery slope that might lead to more dense housing proposals.

Mr. Charlick noted that the housing piece is an interesting component that might help preserve the golf course as long as possible. If we had a more robust tool for a planned unit development, we would not have to consider multiple family zoning options. He would be interested in options that would limit the development potential in the future. Mr. Charlick would like to see the total potential of the site, which is currently 22 homesites reduced by the eight housing units that could be approved in this proposal.

Ms. Corwin noted that the housing proposal is a rezoning with an offer of conditions. The applicant could, in theory, volunteer to transfer some of the development right of the parent parcel to the newly created rezoning parcel.

Mr. York understands that the project might be feasible, but needs more detail. He would like a better understanding of the traffic volumes and patterns, what roadway improvements could be required to manage the impacts of the commercial activity, and whether the applicant has explored other locations on the site to buffer the existing homes from the commercial activity. He has issues with lighting, noise and traffic in particular. He is inclined to table the applications to allow the applicant time to reflect on what he heard and revise his application.

Mr. Heyn asked for clarification about the process. Mr. Curtis explained there are two different actions, so there can be two independent motions.

The Planning Commissioners discussed whether it was more appropriate to reject the application out right, or allow the applicant an opportunity to address the concerns with a revised proposal.

Mr. Dowling suggested that he could break up the duplexes into single family detached housing if that were more acceptable. He was not prepared to make a comment about the driving range and possible relocation. He would like an opportunity to study the site again and come up with an alternative.

Mr. Charlick noted that he is not necessarily opposed to duplexes, but is more concerned about limiting the overall density of the site as a whole, to protect the golf course as long as possible and to assure the community that we are not setting the stage for more density than we are prepared to accept.

Mr. Curtis asked a clarifying question about the comment that the housing would enter a private road. Ms. Corwin noted that Oakland Boulevard is a public road under the jurisdiction of the Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC), but that for subdivision streets, the RCOC only makes improvements using special assessment districts where the adjoining property owners pay for the improvements.

Mr. York would like more information about the implication of allowing new access to a road improved under a special assessment district.

Mr. Zeolla noted that his personal interest in serving on the Planning Commission is to encourage development of quality middle income housing in a manner that supports the Master Plan. He is not concerned about the duplexes since he has a lot of personal experience visiting duplexes that are tastefully done and well maintained. He thinks we should encourage flexibility in housing to provide housing options for new families, which could also lead to more students for the school district, better schools, keep our housing values up and help keep our community rural. He is not in favor of the golf improvements but is in favor of the housing portion.

An audience member rose to remind the Planning Commissioners that the drainage issue is critical. Mr. Charlick noted that the applicant would address the drainage in the site plan review. If there is no project, the applicant will not be required to study the drainage issue and the situation is not likely to be addressed.

The applicant noted that the plan calls for all the stormwater runoff from the housing development to be directed back into the golf course and a pond.

Another audience member asked if rezoning affects access to Duck Lake. Mr. Charlick explained that zoning has nothing to do with lake access.

Mr. Charlick offered a motion to table the special land use petition for the golf course improvements to allow the applicant an opportunity to address the issues identified in the public hearing and offer mitigation for the concerns. Mr. Tierney supported the motion. Roll call vote: Charlick-yes; Curtis -yes; Heyn – no; O’Leary – yes; Temple – no; Tierney – yes; York – yes; Zeolla -yes. Motion carries (6 yes votes, 2 no votes)

Mr. Charlick offered a motion to table the rezoning with offer of conditions for RM, Multiple Family zoning to allow the applicant to provide his written offer of conditions and identify the limits of the rezoning action. Mr. Curtis supported the motion. Roll call vote: Charlick-yes; Curtis -yes; Heyn – yes; O’Leary – yes; Temple – yes; Tierney – yes; York – yes; Zeolla -yes. Motion carries (6 yes votes, 2 no votes)

Agenda Item #4: 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 #5: Minutes: November 20, 2025

Mr. Charlick offered a motion to approve the minutes of the November 20, 2025 Planning Commission meeting as presented. Mr. Curtis supported the motion which was approved by voice vote (all ayes, no nays)

Adjournment:

Mr. Charlick moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:38 p.m. Mr. Curtis supported the motion, which was unanimously approved by voice vote. (all ayes, no nays)

Respectfully submitted,

Guy York
Acting Secretary
gy/ejc