

REGULAR MEETING: City of Pontiac Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes on October 19, 2011; Pontiac City Hall, 47450 Woodward Avenue, Pontiac, Michigan 48342

CHAIRPERSON TURPIN CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 6:01 P.M.
MOMENT OF MEDITATION:

ROLL CALL: PRESENT: Hudson, Fegley, Cadd, Thomas, Turpin.

EXCUSED: None.

ABSENT: None.

Mr. Sabo reported a quorum is present.

COMMUNICATIONS: None.

MINUTES FOR REVIEW: None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS AND SITE PLAN REVIEWS:

5.1 PF-11-70 - Site Plan Review - Special Exception Permit - Residential use in the C-2 Zone District - 67 North Saginaw Street.

COMPLETE PRESENTATION BY MR. SABO.

Petitioner, Dave Cunningham, commented the proposed property will be a nice dwelling in the downtown area; they have met all the requirements, they have Historic District approval. Mr. Cunningham thanked everyone for facilitating this special meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING NOT REQUIRED.

Comm. Hudson commented concerning a memo from Mr. McDonald with misconstrued dates which caused him concern and wants more information for this landmark proposal in the Pontiac. If approved, when will they have approval for NSP II money, commencement and completion dates.

Mr. Cunningham indicated the architectural plans should be completed by the end of October, demolition and construction will start end of November and the eligible for funds from MHSTA and completion of project by May of 2012.

Sandy McDonald explained further the complete process of funds from NSP 1 and NSP II Stabilization Program and the process by which the City and other are involved in the whole process.

Comm. Hudson indicated he has experience with mixed use, and a special formula is needed to be successful with a project like this, such as Royal Oak. Hardwork is needed and wished the petitioners well on their project.

Comm. Fegley inquired of balcony restrictions. Petitioner indicated the balconies will have restrictions, furniture will match, canopies will have spotlights.

Comm. Thomas commented he understands the urgency and they want to make proper decisions and this is the most important intersection in the City. Comm. Thomas inquired if comparison were done and price. Petitioner indicated comparisons were done along with amenities. The price is between \$600 to 750.00, elevators are provided, loading and unloading area; meters on the street, parking in rear, washer and dryers in units; garbage disposal on each floor.

Petitioner also indicated window treatments will be provided with Pella Windows (blinds within the window), carpet and hardwood floors, one bedroom with breakfast bar, dining room area.

Comm. Cadd inquired of the heating and cooling, system system and fitness center. Petitioner indicated heating and cooling for each unit separately, card system entry and no fitness facilities provided onsite. Nearby fitness in the area.

Comm. Cadd inquired of the nearest grocery store, dry cleaners and the like. Petitioner indicated one block over for fitness center and grocery.

Comm. Cadd commented she is an advocate for the city and takes the direction of Pontiac very serious; 70 percent of the properties are owned by absentee landlords; 3-5,000 vacant properties, there are five abandoned houses in her immediate neighborhood.

Comm. Hudson concerned about the size of the property being too small for habitability.

Mr. Sabo indicated the Planning Commission is compelled to approve projects that meet the Zoning Ordinance Standards and meet Ordinance Requirements.

COMM. HUDSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN REVIEW PF-11-70 FOR MONARCH INVESTMENTS (SPECIAL EXCEPTION PERMIT PF-11-54) SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: AND COMM. FEGLEY SECONDED

1. Planning Commission waiver of Section 9.2.6 requirements for landscaping.

VOTE: AYES: Hudson, Thomas, Fegley, Cadd, Turpin.
 NAYS: None.
 ABSTAIN: None.

Vote 5-0-0 for Approval of the Site Plan Review.

NEW BUSINESS: None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None.

OTHER ITEMS: None.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Linda Hassan, commented she was uncertain about the leverage money for downtown Pontiac and feels the proposed project needs to be discussed further and feels Mr. Meisner should have explained the process clearer to the Planning Commissioners. She believe this process needs to be monitored and should have been given more consideration before approval.

Mr. Sabo commented the above comments are valid. Also, the Planning Commission has an obligation for Zoning and Planning and the Planning Commission is compelled to approve projects that meet the Zoning Ordinance standards and ordinance requirements, which this project does.

ADJOURNMENT: 6:58 p.m.

