

**Highland Township Planning Commission  
Record of the 1393<sup>rd</sup> Meeting  
November 3, 2022**

**Roll Call:**

Scott Green, Chairperson -absent  
Eugene H. Beach, Jr  
Grant Charlick (acting chairperson)  
Kevin Curtis  
Chris Heyn - absent  
Beth Lewis - absent  
Roscoe Smith  
Scott Temple  
Russ Tierney

Also Present:

Elizabeth J Corwin, Planning Director  
Doug Lewan, Carlisle-Wortman Associates

Visitors:

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

*Work Session*

**Agenda Item #1:**

Parcel #	11-21-426-014
Zoning:	IM, Industrial Manufacturing
Address:	Vacant Enterprise Drive
File#:	SPR 22-11
Request:	Site Plan Review
Applicant:	Scott Hoensheid, S.A. Sheid Properties, LLC
Owner:	S.A. Sheid Properties, LLC

Mr. Charlick disclosed his financial interest in the property under consideration, as he is the contractor developing the project. Mr. Beach moved to allow Mr. Charlick to recuse himself from the discussion. Mr. Tierney supported the motion which carried by voice vote. Mr. Smith assumed the role of chairperson.

Mr. Smith introduced the site plan for review of a multi-tenant industrial building on the vacant parcel just south of the existing Oakland Business Center Unit 3. The parcel is zoned IM, Industrial Manufacturing.

Mr. Charlick noted that the applicant, Scott Hoensheid was unable to attend the meeting. Mr. Charlick represented the applicant in his absence. He noted that Mr. Hoensheid does not intend to start building the structure immediately, but that there was a significant amount of earth balance activity required and that he wanted to prepare the site now. Although he could do the earthwork without Planning Commission approval, he wanted assurance that the building location, parking and similar features would be acceptable.

He explained that the project was similar to the two previous projects on Units 1 and 2 of the industrial park, except that the building footprint for the new building was about the same as the other two buildings

combined. Mr. Hoensheid seeks to offer a wider range of leasable spaces to meet current market demand. He expects some of the existing tenants will move into the new space, backfilling the existing spaces with other prospects.

The parking meets ordinance requirements, and additional reserved parking is indicated on the site plan. Mr. Charlick noted that some of the sports uses allowable in this district generate significantly more peak parking than typical industrial uses. If it proves necessary in the future, the boundary between unit 3 and this new project would be revised to allow for even more parking.

Mr. Charlick noted that Mr. Hoensheid has reviewed the consultant's review letters and is prepared to address the issues identified such as landscaping in the construction plans.

Ms. Corwin asked if the unit would be incorporated into the industrial condominium and subject to the same bylaws and restrictions as the rest of the park. Mr. Charlick noted that the surveyor and attorney are already at work on those ownership issues and that the condominium will be expanded to incorporate this property.

Ms. Corwin noted that the Fire Marshal has reviewed the site plan and has no issues with the layout. The building is serviced by municipal water supply and will include fire suppression. The Fire Marshal will review each unit as a tenant is identified through the land use permit process. Mr. Charlick acknowledged that some units may require alterations such as additional doors or different access routes and fire separation depending upon the use and configuration of the space.

Mr. Beach made a motion to approve the site plan for a new multi-tenant building for the vacant property on the east side of Enterprise Drive, south of Oakland Business Center subject to final review by staff, consultants and the Fire Marshal, with the understanding that staff would refer any issues to the Planning Commission as deemed necessary. Mr. Tierney supported the motion. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Curtis - yes, Mr. Temple - yes, Mr. Beach - yes, Mr. Tierney - yes, Mr. Smith - yes. The motion was approved with five yes votes.

Mr. Charlick returned to the chairperson position for the remainder of the meeting.

**Agenda Item #2:**

Parcel #	11-08-400-004
Zoning:	R-3, Single-Family Residential; 3 acre min.
Address:	Vacant Middle Road
File#:	PLU 22-0029
Request:	Sketch Plan Review for Class B Farm Market
Applicant:	Michael and Jillian Mantua
Owner:	Michael and Jillian Mantua

Mr. Charlick introduced the agenda item.

The applicant, Mike Mantua explained that the proposal is to build a greenhouse now in order to start flowers and vegetables. There is no plan to provide electric, water or septic service to the structure at this time.

Ms. Corwin explained that the greenhouse would be the principal use until such time as the house is built, at which time the use would become accessory to the principal residence. It is an allowable use with site plan approval as a Class B Farm Market since the Mantua's plan to offer flower sales to the public.

Mr. Charlick asked Mr. Mantua to explain how the greenhouse location relates to the remainder of the proposed residential development. Mr. Mantua explained that the 40 acres site will remain his homesite, but that seventeen lots would be developed off a single private drive on the east end of the 121 acre parent parcel, parallel to the lake. The proposed structure is approximately 350 feet from the nearest property line.

Mr. Beach noted that the proposed structure is clearly uninhabitable as a residence, since it is not served by utilities; and since it is a “glass house.” The nature of the structure restricts its use, which is clearly agricultural.

Mr. Charlick asked if the public would be admitted to the structure. Mr. Mantua explained that customers would have to make an appointment, and would be safely escorted back to the site. It is not intended to be a traditional market. The Mantuas prepared flowers for a wedding last year, and envisioned using the structure to support that type of project.

Mr. Charlick moved to approve the proposed site plan for a greenhouse used to support the propagation of plants for direct sales to consumers although not for a traditional storefront market, with the understanding that the greenhouse would become an accessory use to the principal use of the parcel as a single family residence. Mr. Temple supported the motion. Mr. Curtis - yes, Mr. Temple - yes, Mr. Beach - yes, Mr. Tierney - yes, Mr. Smith – yes, Mr. Charlick – yes. The motion was approved with six yes votes.

**Agenda Item #3: Master Plan Discussion—Resident Opinion Survey Results/Transitional Lands**

Doug Lewan, Carlisle-Wortman Associates explained the results of the residential survey. 1800 surveys were mailed, and 418 responses were received. Approximately 25 percent were used entered into the SOGO survey website, the remainder were received by paper and Township staff entered the responses.

There were no surprises in the responses. There were many positive responses to the open ended questions. The raw data is available for any Planning Commissioners who would like to read these responses in depth.

The commissioners discussed that public attitudes have not really changed, and since twenty years have elapsed since the first survey this indicates that a new generation is attracted to the same values and characteristics of the community. Mr. Beach noted that when you turn attention to what residents want from the community, the recreational amenities like bike paths score higher than utility services like sewer and water. Mr. Tierney noted that the exception is broadband internet services, even though that was not offered as a choice in that part of the survey. Road improvement is still a high priority for residents.

Mr. Charlick noted that there were not many responses from younger residents. Mr. Lewan noted that the aging population is reflected in the census data and that meeting the housing needs of seniors is an important issue. Mr. Charlick noted that we must also concern ourselves with keeping Highland Township relevant, which means offering other housing choices. Mr. Smith noted that there are examples where three generations of a single family have resided in the same subdivision, since they desired to keep a home in the neighborhood they grew up in.

Mr. Smith noted that the Planning Commission needs an analysis that would allow comparison of the other past surveys so that trends could be identified. Ms. Corwin explained that she had completed a summary after the 2005 survey, but had neglected to do so after the 2016 survey but would complete a comparison now for the four total surveys. She has pulled all the past data and will have it ready for December.

Mr. Lewan indicated that since the survey reveals that the community attitudes have not changed, there is no call for any widescale policy changes. The Master Plan should be refreshed with new maps and supporting data.

Mr. Charlick noted that the population is the same over the last 20 years, but there are so many more homes. Ms. Corwin noted that there is a trend towards smaller households. So more households does not necessarily yield a greater population.

Mr. Beach noted that the survey results are the best documentation that our zoning structure reflects community values, that the population is stable and their attitudes are stable. Short of a major road improvement, there is no apparent need to address development pressures.

Mr. Tierney asked if it was possible or practical to reverse our trend to increase zoning density. For instance, we once had ten acre minimum lot sizes in much of the community. Mr. Beach noted that the courts have determined that such lot sizes were inherently unreasonable and discriminatory. Mr. Lewan suggested that there are other ways to address reduced density, such as a sliding scale whereas the number of lots is predicated on the original parcel size, while retaining a minimum 2.5 acre parcel size. Mr. Beach noted that the lack of public sewer is the greatest restraint to limit density.

Mr. Charlick noted that the changes in the stormwater standards for the Oakland County Water Resources Commissioner's Office will create new development challenges and a greater percentage of a development parcel will be consumed to encourage infiltration.

It was agreed that to proceed, staff will provide the summary of the survey. Mr. Lewan will create some bullet points summarizing key findings for the revised Master Plan and prepare for a possible January Public Meeting at the new Township Hall. The meeting should focus on the traditional lands and identify what, if any, mapping changes would be warranted. The general message should be that we will "stay the course" since the census data and survey results show that there is a consistency to support continuation of current land use goals and policies.

Mr. Beach noted that the one thing that we have to reflect in the new Master Plan is that the various area plans should be rolled up into one document. Ms. Corwin noted that there is one map that is considered the "Consolidated Master Plan" and reflects all mapping changes from all the area plans up to 2018. The area plans will always remain to support specific issues/geographic areas.

Mr. Charlick asked about the public notice requirements. Mr. Beach noted that there is no requirement for individual notices. Ms. Corwin noted that the public notice will include a newspaper of general circulation, which in this case will be the Spinal Column's legal notices circular, and our website and social media. Staff will also reach out to specific individuals who have expressed interest in map changes for their properties.

**Agenda Item #4:** Committee Updates  
Zoning Board of Appeals:  
Township Board:  
Highland Downtown Development Authority:  
Planning Director's Update

Committee updates were discussed.

**Agenda Item #5:** Minutes: October 6, 2022

Mr. Beach moved to approve the minutes of October 6, 2022, as presented. Mr. Curtis supported the motion. The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

At 8:20 p.m., Mr. Tierney made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Green supported the motion. The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

A. Roscoe Smith, Secretary  
ARS/ejc