Rochester Hills
Minutes
Planning Commission

1000 Rochester Hills Dr
Rochester Hills, MI
48309
(248) 656-4600
Home Page:
www.rochesterhills.org

Chairperson Greg Hooper, Vice Chairperson Deborah Brnabic
Members: Sheila Denstaedt, Gerard Dettloff, Anthony Gallina, Dale Hetrick, Marvie Neubauer, Scott Struzik and Ben Weaver
Youth Representatives: Oliver Blakeley and Siddh Sheth

Tuesday, June 16, 2026 | **7:00 PM** | **1000 Rochester Hills Drive**

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Hooper called the June 16, 2026 Regular Planning Commission Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., Michigan Time.

ROLL CALL

Present 7 - Deborah Brnabic, Sheila Denstaedt, Greg Hooper, Marvie Neubauer, Scott Struzik, Ben Weaver and Gerard Dettloff

Excused 2 - Dale Hetrick and Anthony Gallina

Others Present

Sara Roediger, Planning and Economic Development Director
Chris McLeod, Planning Manager
Jason Boughton, Engineering Utilities Specialist
Siddh Sheth, Rochester Hills Government Youth Council Representative
Jennifer MacDonald, Recording Secretary

Chairperson Hooper welcomed everyone to the June 16, 2026 Regular Planning Commission meeting. He noted that anyone wishing to speak during public comment must submit a comment card to the Recording secretary prior to the start of the public comment.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2026-0276 May 19, 2026 Draft Planning Commission Minutes

Chairperson Hooper introduced the approval of the revised May 19, 2026, minutes. Ms. Neubauer requested a correction on page 16, specifying that "Planning Commission" should be changed to "City Council" regarding the termination of a consulting contract.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Brnabic, that this matter be Approved as Revised. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik, Weaver and Dettloff

Excused 2 - Hetrick and Gallina

COMMUNICATIONS

Chairperson Hooper noted the receipt of communication from Michigan State Representative Donni Steele regarding ongoing zoning changes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

NEW BUSINESS

2026-0277 Public Hearing and Request for Conditional Use Recommendation - File No. PCU206-0003 - for alcoholic beverage sales for onsite consumption that is ancillary to an otherwise permissible use (pub/restaurant) for Perk's Pub, located at 3204 Walton Blvd. within the University Square shopping center, on the north side of Walton and west of Adams, Parcel 15-07-476-009, zoned CB Community Business with the FB Flex Business Overlay; Leonard Perkaj, Perk's Pub, LLC, Applicant

(Staff Report dated 6/8/26, Business Introductory Letter, Floor Plan, Site Plan, Development Application, Environmental Impact Statement, Menu, and Public Hearing Notice had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

Present for the applicant were Leo Perkaj, owner of Perk's Pub, LLC, and Loretta Adams, landlord of the shopping center.

Chairperson Hooper introduced a public hearing and request for conditional use approval for alcoholic beverage sales for onsite consumption ancillary to an otherwise permissible use for Perks Pub, located at 3204 Walton Boulevard within the University Square Shopping Center. Chairperson Hooper invited the applicant to the microphone. Mr. Perkaj introduced himself as the applicant, and Ms. Adams introduced herself as the landlord for the shopping center. Chairperson Hooper then turned the presentation over to Mr. McLeod.

Mr. McLeod stated that the conditional use request would serve as a recommendation to the City Council. He provided an overview of the application for 3204 Walton Boulevard, located on the north side of Walton Boulevard, just west of Adams Road. The proposed site is an approximately 1,900-square-foot tenant space, formerly occupied by a restaurant named "Burgerz," with planned seating for 56 people in various configurations. The space will include standard restaurant amenities, including kitchen, prep, and dishwashing areas.

Mr. McLeod noted that the former tenant utilized a small outdoor seating area and requested that the applicant clarify if they intend to include outdoor seating, as it was not part of their formal submittal. He briefly mentioned that the menu would feature typical bar fare and highlighted the applicants' extensive restaurant experience, noting their operation of Half Day Cafe and Bread and Yolk. Mr. McLeod concluded his presentation by providing zoning context, stating that the overall site and the area to its east are zoned Community

Business (CB), while the area to the west is zoned Special Purpose (SP) to accommodate senior living facilities.

Mr. McLeod continued his presentation, noting that the tenant space is located on the easterly side of the shopping center. He explained that this location provides adequate separation from residential living areas, particularly since any potential outdoor seating would be highly limited.

Regarding parking, Mr. McLeod acknowledged that while securing a space directly in front of the shopping center can occasionally be challenging, there is ample, underutilized parking available to the east, west, and rear of the building. He emphasized that because the location previously operated as a restaurant, the primary change in the site's use is simply the addition of alcohol sales.

Mr. McLeod stated the proposed hours of operation are 11:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Sunday through Thursday, and 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday. He described the floor plan, noting that the front half of the space will be designated for public use, while the back half will be dedicated to food production. He reiterated staff's confidence that the site provides more than enough parking to properly accommodate the business.

Finally, Mr. McLeod reviewed the City's general standards for conditional uses: that the proposed use promotes the intent of the ordinance, is designed to be compatible and harmonious with the surrounding area, and is adequately served by public facilities. He stated that the staff report concluded the application meets or exceeds all requirements and would neither be detrimental to neighboring uses nor create additional public infrastructure costs. Mr. McLeod then offered to answer any questions from the Commission.

Chairperson Hooper opened the public hearing for the request. Noting that no public comment cards had been submitted, he closed the public hearing and asked if the applicants had anything to state for the record.

Ms. Adams spoke from the landlord's perspective, noting that her company already hosts three other restaurants operated by the Perkaj family, including Tangled Apron in Macomb Township. She clarified that this location would be their fourth restaurant partnered with the Perkaj family, alongside Bread and Yolk in Orion and Half Day Cafe. She stated that she manages six shopping centers with approximately 80 tenants and is on-site daily. She explained that they generally avoid allowing liquor licenses due to the additional management required, noting that the only other active liquor license across their properties is also held by the Perkaj family. Ms. Adams praised the Perkaj family as exceptional, hardworking tenants who are present behind the grill of their businesses every day. She expressed her understanding of the magnitude of the request and gave the application her full blessing.

Chairperson Hooper asked if the applicants were bringing a liquor license in with them. Mr. Perkaj confirmed that they are, stating they are currently working with a broker and are waiting on this approval to finalize the deposits.

Chairperson Hooper outlined the remaining steps in the process, advising that if *the conditional use is recommended tonight, the applicants will still need to go before the liquor license technical review committee, and finally the City Council. He asked if the applicants understood these remaining steps. Mr. Perkaj confirmed that they understood the remaining process.*

Chairperson Hooper then opened the floor for Planning Commission discussion.

Ms. Neubauer stated that she had no objections and would support the request, provided the applicants successfully clear the remaining procedural steps.

Mr. Struzik expressed his support, noting the benefit of having an established community business person open another location. He cautioned the applicants to ensure their staff are well-trained regarding underage drinking laws due to the anticipated college-aged clientele, highlighting the severe penalties for mistakes in that area.

Mr. Dettloff inquired about the status of the escrow license deposit. Mr. Perkaj clarified that they have retained an escrow license through a broker and are simply waiting to place the deposit.

Mr. Dettloff noted that there are currently no other facilities in the shopping plaza with a liquor license. Ms. Adams reiterated that they typically shy away from such tenancies. Mr. Perkaj and Ms. Adams then recalled that the restaurant "Oceana" previously held a liquor license in the center before relocating.

Mr. Dettloff expressed his full support for the application. He asked if the Liquor Control Commission (LCC) had placed any stipulations on the applicants, and it was confirmed that there were no LCC stipulations. Mr. Dettloff wished the applicants good luck with the project.

Mr. Weaver expressed his support for the application, stating that parking will not be an issue based on his familiarity with the area and frequent visits to Half Day Cafe. He inquired about the types of drinks that would be served. Mr. Perkaj replied that they will offer standard bar drinks, including draft beers and cocktails.

When asked by Mr. Weaver what would separate their establishment from the Red Ox, a nearby bar, Mr. Perkaj and Ms. Adams cited their high-quality service, food, and hospitality as the distinguishing factors. Mr. Perkaj mentioned they had initially worried about parking themselves, noting that customers sometimes park at Busch's and walk over when it is busy. Mr. Weaver replied that having a full lot is a good problem to have and reiterated his confidence in their success. Ms. Adams added that there would be less evening parking and traffic ingress and egress from other tenants.

Mr. Perkaj stated that the business intends to cater primarily to families. Mr. Weaver agreed that families would likely be their main demographic, though Ms. Adams and Mr. Perkaj noted that college students might still frequent the establishment, particularly on Friday and Saturday nights.

Mr. Weaver then asked if the restaurant would feature table service or operate *similarly to Half Day Cafe. Mr. Perkaj confirmed they will provide table service and highlighted that they will bake their own sourdough bread for all of their sandwiches. In response to a final question from Mr. Weaver, Mr. Perkaj confirmed that they will also offer gluten-free options.*

Ms. Denstaedt inquired about the anticipated opening date. Mr. Perkaj explained that they had experienced some complications with building permits, but expect to receive them by Wednesday and are targeting an opening date at the end of August.

Ms. Denstaedt then asked about their staffing plans and whether they would share employees with Half Day Cafe. Mr. Perkaj confirmed that they will share staff with both Half Day Cafe and Bread and Yolk, adding that he will also be working on-site daily.

Ms. Brnabic expressed her support for the request and asked to verify if there were any plans for outdoor dining. Mr. Perkaj confirmed that there will be no outdoor dining.

A motion was made by Mr. Struzik and second by Neubauer. After a roll call vote, Chairperson Hooper noted that the motion was passed unanimously.

Ms. Neubauer thanked the applicants for keeping their business in Rochester Hills.

Mr. McLeod informed the applicants that staff will target the July 13th City Council meeting for the next step of the approval process, noting that the timeline may be tight due to the upcoming holiday. He advised the applicants to work quickly through the Clerk's Office to schedule their required liquor license technical review committee meeting. Ms. Adams confirmed they would act immediately to meet the requirements.

A motion was made by Struzik, seconded by Neubauer, that this matter be Recommended for Approval to the City Council. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye	7 -	Brnabic, Denstaedt, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik, Weaver and Dettloff
Excused	2 -	Hetrick and Gallina

***Resolved**,* in the matter of File No. PCU2026-0003 (Perks Pub), located at 3204 Walton, the Planning Commission recommends to City Council Approval of the Conditional Use to allow sales for on premises alcoholic beverage consumption associated with a restaurant use, based on documents received by the Planning Department on September 18, 2025 with the following findings:

Findings

1. The proposed use will promote the intent and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance.

2. The existing building and proposed conditional use have been designed and is proposed to be operated, maintained, and managed so as to be compatible, harmonious, and appropriate in appearance with the existing and planned character of the general vicinity, adjacent uses of land, and the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the

use.

3. The proposed restaurant use should have a positive impact on the community as a whole and the surrounding area by providing additional eating and gathering opportunities within this area of the City and the proposed operators of the business have extensive experience operating restaurant businesses within the City and surrounding communities.

4. The existing development and proposed use are served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, water and sewer, drainage ways, and refuse disposal.

5. The existing development and proposed use should not be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to existing or future neighboring land uses, persons, property, or the public welfare. In addition, a use of this nature falls in line with the Community Business District.

6. The proposal will not create additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services that will be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.

Conditions

1. City Council approval of the Conditional Use.

2. If, in the determination of City staff, the intensity of the use changes or increases, in terms of traffic, noise, hours, lighting, odor, or other aspects that may cause adverse off-site impact, City staff may require and order the conditional use approval to be remanded to the Planning Commission and City Council as necessary for reexamination of the conditional use approval and conditions for possible revocation, modification or supplementation.

2026-0278 Request for Site Plan Approval - PSP2025-0016 - for the development of the existing vacant parcel, to construct a new industrial building and associated site improvements at 1150 E. Avon Rd., located on the south side of Avon and east of John R Rd., Parcel No. 15-24-100-004, zoned I Industrial District; Mike Lekocaj, Applicant

(Staff Report dated 6/9/26, Reviewed Plans parts 1 & 2, Development Application, K & M Investments LLC Consent Resolution, Environmental Impact Statement, McDowell & Assoc. Infiltration Study dated 10/7/25, Contech Chambermaxx Design, RCOC Letter & Reviewed Plans, WRC Letter dated 8/9/25, Updated Hydrant Flow Test Results 3/30/26, and Public Meeting Notice had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

Present for the applicant were Mr. Mike Lekocaj, property owner, and Mr. Thomas Alsobrooks, representing Mauro Engineering.

Chairperson Hooper introduced the request for site plan approval for the development of an existing vacant parcel to construct a new industrial building and associated site improvements at 1150 East Avon Road. He invited the applicants to the table to introduce themselves before welcoming Mr. McLeod to share his summary.

Mr. McLeod presented the site plan and an associated tree removal permit for the construction of a nearly 33,000-square-foot industrial building on the south side of East Avon Road, east of John R. Road. He described the surrounding *area context, noting multi-tenant industrial buildings at the hard corner, a self-storage facility and Rochester Broach to the south. He explained that the subject site, located at 1150 East Avon Road, is where a house was demolished the previous year and stands as the last industrially zoned property moving east from John R. Road. Mr. McLeod also pointed out that five new houses are being constructed on the north side of the road, with a cottage residential structure situated further to the east. He noted that the proposal is currently considered a simple site plan for a standard industrial building, as there are no specified tenants yet.*

Continuing his presentation, Mr. McLeod detailed the site's layout and neighboring properties. He stated that the site contains a number of mature trees. Immediately abutting the east side of the property is a 60-foot-wide panhandle lot that services a house to the southeast, followed by the cottage property further east. The properties to the north are single-family residential, while the abutting properties to the west and south are all zoned industrial. Utilizing a visual aid, he highlighted the surrounding landmarks, including Rochester Broach, the self-storage facility, the multi-tenant industrial buildings, the residential areas, and a utility substation located further to the east.

Mr. McLeod continued presenting the site plan, highlighting a singular access point that provides full circulation around the building. He noted that the plan has been well-vetted, having undergone approximately five administrative reviews. Dedicated parking will be located on both the west and east sides of the site. The multi-tenant building is designed with a total of eight tenant spaces, each equipped with an overhead door and a pedestrian door.

Mr. McLeod then discussed the landscaping plan, focusing primarily on the east side of the property which abuts single-family residential zoning and requires a Buffer E. He informed the Commission that the applicant is requesting modifications to this landscape buffer. Typically, a screening wall is required directly on the property line. However, Mr. McLeod explained that due to elevation changes, a six-foot retaining wall must be constructed to support the developed portion of the site before the grade drops down to the existing vegetation. The Planning Department determined that requiring both a property line wall and the retaining wall would create a canyon effect and fail to provide functional screening for the properties to the east. To resolve this, staff worked with the applicant to place the screening directly on top of the retaining wall, which shifts it off the property line and necessitates the first modification request.

Mr. McLeod stated that the second modification request is to utilize a fence for this screening rather than a traditional wall. He explained the rationale for this request, noting that because the screening will sit atop a retaining wall, it will create an effective height of almost 12 feet when viewed from the residential property. Staff felt that utilizing a fence instead of a solid wall would help break up the vast expanse of vertical concrete and masonry. To address safety concerns and prevent vehicles from potentially crashing through the fence, the applicant has agreed to install protective bollards along the parking side of the barrier.

Transitioning to the tree removal permit, Mr. McLeod stated that the applicant is requesting to remove 104 regulated trees, which includes 41 specimen trees. The current plan is to replant 47 trees on-site and pay the remaining balance into the City's tree fund. He pointed out that trees along the front portion of the site are being preserved, along with several larger trees on the east side abutting the residential property. These preserved trees will count toward the required east-side landscape buffer and provide additional screening along the frontage.

Mr. McLeod transitioned to the proposed tenant layouts, explaining that while the current plans show individual spaces, they can be customized later if a future tenant requires multiple units.

He then reviewed the building's architectural elevations. Starting with the east and west side elevations, he pointed out the overhead doors and noted that masonry elements - including burnished block and brick - will be utilized across the entire building, complemented by extensive glazing and canopies. Displaying the front elevation facing Avon Road, Mr. McLeod highlighted its storefront appearance and the intentional absence of overhead doors. He detailed the color and material scheme, explaining that the dark gray sections on the plans represent brick, while the light gray areas represent a burnished block material. He confirmed that the rear, south-facing elevation utilizes this same material palette.

Mr. McLeod then shared architectural renderings to provide a clearer visual of the completed project. The front rendering illustrated the brick, canopies, and glazing exactly as they would be seen from the street. The side rendering depicted the east elevation facing the residential properties, specifically pointing out the protective bollards, noting that the screening fence was visually cut away in the drawing to clearly show the building's facade.

Concluding his presentation, Mr. McLeod briefly referenced the standard criteria for site plan approval and offered to answer any questions from the Commission.

Chairperson Hooper opened the floor for public comment. Noting that no public comment cards had been submitted, he closed the public comment.

Chairperson Hooper acknowledged the receipt of an email from David and Renee Meehan, neighbors residing two doors down from the subject site, who were also present in the audience. He explained that the email requested a modification to the proposed retaining wall, specifically asking for a field stone appearance with brown and gray tones in lieu of the planned decorative natural stone textured precast block. Chairperson Hooper asked the applicants if they would be able to accommodate this design request.

Mr. Lekocaj stated that he had just spoken with the neighbors and respects their desire to maintain the beauty of their home and the surrounding area. To accommodate their request, he confirmed that he will consult with the retaining wall manufacturer to obtain a variety of color options and will allow the neighbors to select the color they prefer. He explained that utilizing actual fieldstone would *be excessively expensive, particularly since the existing trees and proposed landscaping will naturally obscure much of the wall. Instead, he proposed finding a nice brown color option or a material that resembles the brick on the neighbors' house to ensure they are satisfied. Mr. Alsobrooks confirmed the applicant team's desire to collaborate with the neighbors to find a mutually agreeable middle ground.*

Chairperson Hooper suggested that a condition could be added to the potential approval, allowing the applicant and the neighbors to work together on a final solution for the wall's appearance. He acknowledged that the retaining wall would be installed behind significant trees on the east property line that are being preserved. Mr. Lekocaj added that additional landscaping would also be planted on the inside of the wall.

Chairperson Hooper expressed his support for the buffer modification. He noted that placing a fence directly on the property line would serve no practical purpose due to the building's higher elevation. He agreed that installing the screening at the top of the retaining wall is the most appropriate and aesthetically pleasing solution, especially when combined with the preserved trees.

Mr. Lekocaj stated that he would also allow the neighbors to approve the color of the proposed screen fencing, acknowledging that they will be the ones viewing it daily. Chairperson Hooper noted that the current plans already specify a brown-colored fence. Mr. Lekocaj agreed that brown would look good, but he reiterated his commitment to having the neighbors approve the final color choice.

Chairperson Hooper clarified that the final color and material choice for the wall would be subject to approval by both the neighbors and City staff. Mr. Alsobrooks agreed, noting that the proposed brown screening fence on top of the wall had already been thoroughly vetted by staff and would likely remain unchanged, meaning only the facade of the retaining wall would require color coordination.

Ms. Neubauer raised a question for Mr. McLeod regarding the second condition of approval, which specified a landscape bond amount of $137,767. Noting that staff comments mentioned revised calculations for tree removal and replacement, she asked if the bond amount should be listed as an approximate figure to account for potential changes.

Mr. McLeod agreed that adding the term "approximate" would be appropriate, explaining that final landscaping costs often fluctuate during the engineering phase due to necessary site adjustments, such as utility line placement, or when updated quotes are received. Ms. Neubauer asked if a specific variance, such as plus or minus 2%, should be included. Mr. McLeod advised that simply stating "approximate" would provide sufficient flexibility, as the final bond will ultimately be set to match the actual landscape quote. Mr. Alsobrooks confirmed that the applicant team accepted the modification to add the word "approximate" to the condition.

Ms. Neubauer then proposed an additional condition regarding the retaining wall. She suggested language requiring the applicant to present stone color options to David and Renee Meehan, with the final selection subject to administrative approval by City staff. Mr. Alsobrooks confirmed that the applicant team was fully acceptable to this new condition. Ms. Neubauer then concluded her remarks.

Mr. Dettloff thanked the applicant for their investment in the City and asked if they had any prospective tenants lined up for the new building.

Mr. Lekocaj replied that he does not have any prospective tenants yet. He explained that he has not started looking because the approval process has been lengthy, and he was uncertain when construction could officially begin. Mr. Dettloff expressed his confidence in the project's future success and reiterated his appreciation for the applicant's investment.

Ms. Brnabic asked to verify the materials for the building's facade facing Avon Road, seeking confirmation that it would primarily consist of brick, with the exception of the openings. Mr. Lekocaj confirmed that the facade is mostly brick, featuring a limestone appearance along the bottom and a decorative stucco crown around the top.

Mr. McLeod provided further clarification, confirming that everything depicted in the reddish color on the architectural plans is brick. He noted that the area below the windowsill line utilizes the burnished block or limestone material, while the decorative crown at the top is likely an Exterior Insulation and Finish System (EIFS) or stucco, which is standard practice to manage weight restrictions on a building of that size.

Ms. Brnabic thanked them for the clarification, noting that smaller digital renderings can sometimes be difficult to interpret on a computer screen. She requested that staff encourage future developers to provide larger, full-color renderings to help the Commission better visualize proposed designs.

Mr. Struzik requested clarification from the Meehans regarding their property's location, noting it was previously stated that there was a house between them and the development. Mr. Meehan initially replied that they were directly adjacent.

Mr. McLeod provided visual clarification using the displayed site plan. He explained that a 60-foot-wide panhandle lot - functioning as a driveway for a house located further back - actually separates the two properties. Mr. Lekocaj confirmed the separation is approximately 60 feet. Mr. Struzik acknowledged the clarification, noting that while the properties are not directly adjacent, they are extremely close, and he expressed his support for allowing the neighbors to have input on the wall and fence colors.

Mr. Struzik then inquired about parking capacity, pointing out that the application anticipated up to 40 jobs, but the site plan only provided 30 parking spaces. Mr. McLeod clarified that the 30 spaces fully meet the City's ordinance requirements. He added that there are other areas on the site that could easily *be converted into additional parking if it ever became necessary.*

Mr. Struzik stated that bringing 20 to 40 new jobs to an area located across the street from one of the City's densest residential neighborhoods is a positive development. He then made a motion to approve the site plan, with the additions that the applicant work with Mr. and Mrs. Meehan o the color of the wall and the fence prior to administrative approval, and the revise condition two to add the word "approximately", and Ms. Neubauer seconded the motion.

Chairperson Hooper summarized the active motion to approve the site plan, noting that it included the six pre-printed findings, the two pre-printed conditions (with the modification to condition two), and the newly added third condition regarding the wall and fence color coordination. He then opened the floor for discussion on the motion.

Ms. Brnabic asked if there were any potential tenants currently secured for the eight proposed spaces. Mr. Lekocaj responded that he does not have any tenants yet, as the lengthy approval process has prevented him from signing anyone. However, he noted that his real estate agents will actively market the property as soon as construction begins.

After these comments, al roll call vote was taken and the motion was passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Struzik, seconded by Neubauer, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik, Weaver and Dettloff

Excused 2 - Hetrick and Gallina

Resolved, in the matter of City File No. PSP2025-0016 (Avon Industrial), the Planning Commission approves the proposed Site Plan, to allow for the construction of an industrial building of approximately 32,740 square feet along with the associated parking, landscaping, and stormwater infrastructure in the I Industrial District, based on plans received by the Planning Department on April 29, 2026, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions:

Findings

1. The site plan and supporting documents demonstrate that all applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as other City Ordinances, standards, and requirements, can be met subject to the conditions noted below.

2. The proposed project is being constructed in a manner that provides for dedicated parking areas that provide adequate parking and the site will be accessed via a singular entrance/exit directly to E. Avon Road, which is a major roadway, thereby promoting current and future safety and convenience of vehicular traffic both within the site and the general area.

3. Off-street parking areas are being provided for the park site based on the square footages of the building dedicated to office and warehouse use.

4. The proposed development and associated improvements should have a satisfactory and harmonious relationship with the existing development in the adjacent vicinity.

5. The proposed development will not have an unreasonably detrimental or injurious effect upon the surrounding area. The proposed improvements will bring additional leasable square footage of industrial building to the city and should generate additional jobs.

6. Finally, the Planning Commission finds that a modification to allow the screening wall to not be located along the property line and to be located as shown on the site plan acceptable since the proposed location will more efficiently screen the use at the proposed location due to the elevation changes being proposed onsite. Further that due to the location of the screening mechanism, that a fully opaque fence in lieu of a masonry wall is also acceptable due to the fence being the same height as the required wall, the fence is an opaque screening fence, the fence will be located at least 20 feet from the abutting property line, and the fence is being protected by bollards for long term maintenance and protection.

Conditions

1. The applicant shall address all remaining comments and notations as depicted on the reviewed site plans.

2. The applicant provides a landscape bond, in a form acceptable to the City, in the amount of approximately $137,767 to the Planning and Economic Development Department prior to the granting of a Land Improvement Permit.

3. The applicant shall present stone color options for the retaining wall to property owners David and Renee Meehan for review, with the final color selection subject to administrative approval by City staff.

2026-0279 Request for Tree Removal Permit Approval - File No. PTP2026-0003 - to remove up to 63 regulated trees and 41 specimen trees with up to 297 replacement trees required, to construct a new industrial building and associated site improvements on the vacant parcel at 1150 E. Avon Rd., located on the south side of Avon and east of John R Rd., Parcel No. 15-24-100-004, zoned I Industrial District; Mike Lekocaj, Applicant

(Staff Report dated 5/13/26, Reviewed Plans Parts 1 & 2, Development Application, Environmental Impact Statement, Umlor Group Letter dated 4/13/26, GAV Associates Letter dated 4/13/26, Allen Design Letter dated 4/13/26, WRC Letter dated 5/9/25, Public Hearing Notice, PC Minutes 6/17/26, PC Minutes 12/18/26, Adams Vito Settlement, and Public Comment had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record hereof.)

Chairperson Hooper then transitioned to the associated tree removal permit.

Ms. Neubauer made a motion to grant the tree removal permit for city file PTP 20260003, Avon Industrial, based on the plans received by the Planning Department on April 29, 2026. The motion included the two pre-printed findings and two pre-printed conditions. The motion was supported by Ms. Denstaedt.

Chairperson Hooper opened the floor for discussion on the motion. Seeing none, he called for a roll-call vote. After the vote, he announced that the motion was passed unanimously.

Chairperson Hooper thanked the applicants for their investment in Rochester Hills. Mr. Lekocaj thanked the Commission and expressed special appreciation for the hard work of staff members Jennifer and Chris.

Mr. McLeod informed the applicants that he would put them in touch with the City's Economic Development manager. He noted that the size of the proposed building hits a "sweet spot" in the market and that there may be opportunities to bring in new businesses or re-house existing businesses currently operating within the City. Mr. Lekocaj appreciated the connection, recalling a previous meeting with a staff member who indicated she knew of several parties interested in locating in Rochester Hills.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Denstaedt, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Brnabic, Denstaedt, Hooper, Neubauer, Struzik, Weaver and Dettloff

Excused 2 - Hetrick and Gallina

Resolved, in the matter of File No. PTP2026-0003 (Avon Industrial) the Planning Commission grants a Tree Removal Permit based on plans received by the Planning Department on April 29, 2026, with the following findings and subject to the following conditions:

Findings

1. The proposed removal of regulated trees is in conformance with the City’s Tree Conservation Ordinance.

2. The applicant is proposing to remove a total of one hundred and four (104) regulated trees including a total of forty-one (41) specimen trees as a part of site development, and replant a total of at least forty-seven (47) trees onsite.

Conditions

1. Tree protective fencing, as reviewed and approved by the City staff, shall be installed prior to temporary grade being issued by Engineering.

2. The applicant pays into the City Tree Fund the equivalent of 226 trees prior to the granting of a Land Improvement Permit.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None.

NEXT MEETING DATE

July 21, 2026 - 7:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Planning Commission and upon motion by Neubauer, seconded by Denstaedt, Chairperson Hooper adjourned the Regular Meeting at 7:24 p.m.

____

Greg Hooper, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

____

Jennifer MacDonald, Recording Secretary