

CITY OF PONTIAC  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2018  
6:30 P.M.

Meeting before the Planning Commission, at  
47450 Woodward Avenue, 2nd Floor, Council Chambers,  
Pontiac, Michigan 48342.

BOARD COMMISSIONERS:

Dayne Thomas, Chairman  
Ashley Fegley, Vice Chair  
Mayor Deirdre Waterman, Commissioner  
Mona Parlove, Commissioner  
Christopher Northcross, Commissioner  
Lucy Payne, Commissioner  
Hazel Cadd, Commissioner

CITY OFFICIALS PRESENT:

Arthur F. Mullen, Interim City Planner  
Rachel Loughrin, Director of Economic Development

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ADDRESSING THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

|                    |                    |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| Elizabeth Kelly    | William Hall       |
| Rasil Elia         | Patrick Castillo   |
| Hilda Reyes        | Dirk Kroll         |
| Tisha Wilson       | Michael Hubert     |
| Rickey Stitt       | Melissa Bochnig    |
| Peggy Wilson       | Debra Harris       |
| Latina Roberts     | Chuck Johnson      |
| Bob Felske         | Thomas Warren      |
| Renee Voit-Porath  | Melissa McGinnis   |
| Mark Magasian (ph) | Dustin McClellan   |
| Kone Holme         | Joanne Green       |
| Jeff Kingzett      | Peterson Cullimore |
| Marjorie Christmon | Eileen Kell        |
| Trent Morris       | Alex Resnik        |
| David Porath       | Gloria Miller      |
| Jessica Roberts    | Angie Declue       |
| Don Woodward       | Frederica Tucker   |
| Debra Norris       | David Goff         |
| John Scott         | Donnie French      |
| Mark Thomas        | Mikki Droste       |
| Brad Michaud       | Susan Harding      |

MINUTES RECORDED BY:  
Quentina R. Snowden, (CSR-5519)  
Certified Shorthand Reporter

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Thomas called the meeting to order  
at 6:37 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Dayne Thomas, Chairman  
Hazel Cadd, Commissioner  
Christopher Northcross, Commissioner  
Mayor Deirdre Waterman, Commissioner  
Lucy Payne, Commissioner

LATE: Mayor Deirdre Waterman, Commissioner

EXCUSED: Ashley Fegley, Vice Chair  
Mona Parlove, Commissioner

Mr. Mullen reported a quorum is present.

3. COMMUNICATIONS: (None.)

4. MINUTES FOR REVIEW: January 3, 2018.

Motion to approve by Commissioner Cadd; Seconded  
by Commissioner Northcross.

(All eyes to approve the minutes.)

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

5.1 PF 17-30 Zoning Map Amendment  
ADDRESS: 1416 Joslyn Avenue  
PARCEL NO: 64-14-16-201-024  
APPLICANT: Elizabeth Kelly  
PROPERTY USE: Medical Clinic  
CURRENT ZONING: C-4 Shopping Center  
Business District  
PROPOSED ZONING: C-3 Corridor Mixed Used  
District

(Presentation of facts provided by Mr. Mullen.)

(Chair Thomas invited the petitioner to address  
the Commission.)

Elizabeth Kelly, Executive Director of Hope  
Hospitality and Warming Center, 249 Baldwin, Pontiac,

Michigan, approached. She indicated the presentation by Mr. Mullen captured the proposal very well.

Commissioner Northcross asked for clarification of the C-3 versus C-4 zoning.

Mr. Mullen clarified that C-4 is suburban commercial and it does not allow a nursing home use in it, whereas C-3 does.

Commissioner Northcross inquired of the petitioner the length of stay of the patients.

Ms. Kelly indicated they will be there typically two to six weeks and they help to find them housing, because they don't have housing of their own. She stated once they rehabilitate, if they have not found housing, they will go to the shelter on Baldwin to continue to look for housing.

Commissioner Cadd inquired into the years of experience in doing this.

Ms. Kelly indicated 18 years.

Commissioner Cadd inquired as to the hours of operation.

Ms. Kelly indicated 24/7.

Commissioner Payne thanked the petitioner for caring for the sick and homeless. She stated the site appears to be fairly small with 25 parking spaces. She inquired as to how many patients they are really expecting.

Ms. Kelly indicated they expect to house 15.

Commissioner Payne inquired as to whether this is clinical care with clinical staff, and how many staff people will be present, and how physician care will take place.

Ms. Kelly indicated affirmatively with 4 to 5 people for first and second shift, which would include a shelter manager, a navigator/case manager, nurse, care coordinator/direct care staff. The consulting physician would be off-site.

Commissioner Payne asked about the transition from the hospital to the facility.

Ms. Kelly indicated the hospital discharge planner will identify someone as being homeless and they will contact the facility and will fax over medical records to make sure that they fit the discharge-to-home requirements; the patient cannot have some communicable issue like C.diff or MRSA or the like. These are post-surgery patients, or perhaps with a chronic condition such as unmanaged diabetes, heart disease, or an orthopedic issue. They patients will arrive via taxi to the facility and at that point an intake is done.

Chairperson Thomas inquired as to the facility bricks and mortar itself; that no exterior construction is going to occur, it is an existing building and they will restore/renovate/rehab and reshape the interior.

Ms. Kelly indicated they have to rehab the center. She stated there is not any construction, per se, it's going to be mostly painting and cosmetic interior work, so they would like to start ASAP.

(Public hearing was opened; no one approached.)

(Public hearing was closed.)

Commissioner Northcross inquired as to how the program is paid for.

Ms. Kelly indicated it does not cost the program recipients anything, it is free. She stated it is supported through hospital grants.

Commissioner Cadd inquired as to whether they lease or own the building; and whether the facility will grow over the years.

Ms. Kelly indicated they own the building. They will not grow at that site.

Commissioner Payne questioned the amount of space for EMS and vehicles to enter the site.

Ms. Kelly indicated that because the individuals who

are coming to the site typically do not have vehicles, there will only be vehicles for the staff, therefore, there would be plenty of space for vehicles to turn around.

Commissioner Payne inquired as to the landscaping.

Ms. Kelly indicated they do not have any formal plans at this time, but they do usually put in gardens for therapy, and of ensuring they are doing their part for the City to make it beautiful.

Mr. Mullen indicated it is only a zoning plan amendment, so this is not for site plan approval.

Motion made by Commissioner Northcross, the Planning Commission recommends to the City Council that the request for Hope Hospitality and Warming Center to rezone approximately 14,700 square feet of land (more generally described as Parcel Numbers 14-16-201-024 being that land area petitioned under Pontiac Planning File Case No. 17-30) from C-4 Suburban Business District to C-3 Corridor Commercial District be approved for the following reasons:

- A. The subject site will conform to the goals and objectives included in the City's Master Plan.
- B. The existing medical office building is compatible with the site's physical characteristics and its proposed use as a nursing facility would comply with the building's original use category.
- C. The existing site by itself is not conducive to a C-4 Suburban Business use, and it would have to be incorporated into adjoining properties to allow for such a use, which would limit the applicant's ability to gain a reasonable return.
- D. As the site is in close proximity to multiple C-3 Corridor Commercial Districts, its use would be compatible with the existing surrounding uses.
- E. No exterior construction is anticipated so the existing dimensional variances will be retained.
- F. The proposed nursing home use is not compatible with the proposed C-4 Suburban Business District so it is not appropriate to revise the use to be permitted in a C-4 District.
- G. Since C-3 zoning surrounds the site, this rezoning will not create an isolated or incompatible zone within this area.

Seconded by Commissioner Payne.

AYES: Thomas, Northcross, Cadd, Payne.  
NAYS: (None.)  
ABSTAIN: (None.)  
MOTION CARRIES 4-0-0

5.2 PF-17-63 Special Exception Permit  
ADDRESS: 510 W. Huron  
APPLICANT: Sunoco Mini Mart  
PROPOSED APPLICATION: SDM License  
CURRENT ZONING: C-3 Corridor Commercial

(Presentation of facts provided by Mr. Mullen.)

(Chair Thomas invited the petitioner to address the Commission.)

Mr. Rasil Elia, 510 W. Huron, Pontiac, Michigan approached. He indicated he is the owner of the Sunoco Mini-Mart. He stated they have been granted the beer, wine and liquor license for that location. He stated he has been there since 2005. He indicated he's trying to fill a void where Three Sister Market used to be.

Commissioner Northcross inquired of Mr. Mullen what other facilities provide liquor that are within the mile radius of the operation.

Mr. Mullen indicated there were two; one in the 300-block to the east and then to the west about five blocks to the west, both on the north side of the street.

Commissioner Northcross stated that there is also a church about 500 feet from the site

Mr. Mullen clarified it is 448 feet.

Commissioner Northcross stated he takes exception with Section 3, the interpretation that this does conform with Section 3; one, given the local ordinance; and two, given that often if you have package liquor sales occurring, that it can adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Elia indicated it would be beer and wine, not liquor.

Commissioner Northcross stated the petitioner has been operating in that location for a number of years. He stated he doesn't think it would be in the best interest of the community and the people within the community, particularly the church and other things to have it.

Mr. Elia stated that Three Sisters closed their doors and they used to have beer and wine. He stated since he is open and open until 1:00 it will be a good chance to provide good service for the community, they need the products.

Commissioner Northcross stated he thinks that product has done a lot of damage.

Mr. Elia stated it all depends on who uses it and how they use it.

Commissioner Cadd inquired as to the hours of operation.

Mr. Elia stated 6:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m.

Commissioner Cadd indicated she is kind of leery about the number of liquor stores, and with it being so close to the church.

Chairperson Thomas stated that from his perspective since he's been on the Planning Commission since 2011, a special exception means a compelling argument. And he stated combining gas with alcohol is not a compelling argument. He stated the petitioner runs a good business and done a good job. He stated in his heart he can't see allowing this. He stated if a liquor store wants to set up and properly sell liquor away from the churches, away from schools, set up in proper protocol, but for a special exception just to say you want to add wine and beer to this gas station, it's beyond what he considers a special exception qualifier.

He stated, once again he is respectful of the business, he believes they all are respectful of the business, but that this is asking for a special exception compelling argument, and he just can't put

a compelling argument into that combination.  
(Public hearing was opened.)

Tisha Wilson, 34 Thorp, Pontiac, Michigan. She stated the street she lives on is a one-way street. She stated she has two special need kids on that street and four other special need kids. She stated it's bad enough people fly down the street going 70 miles an hour, and now going to incorporate beer, wine, alcohol is alcohol. She stated everybody doesn't follow the laws and wait until they get home and drink. They drink and drive. She stated not only that but there is an issue with prostitution in the area. She stated she knows that the petitioner does run them off, but they're there, and that's going to incorporate more business for them. She stated she can't even let her kids out to play because there is prostitution on 59 or people are flying down the street. She stated she's been asking for a handicapped sign for years.

Hilda Reyes, 125 Ottawa, Pontiac, Michigan stated two years ago someone tried to take her granddaughter. She stated they found out that they met up at the gas station. She stated she knows the petitioner has nothing has to do with it, but when they went up to ask for cameras, they have no cameras outside. She stated if there is a crime being committed on the premises and there's drinking, there is no record of it, and nothing to show to the police. She stated for the benefit of everyone in that neighborhood, that's not a safe location to have liquor.

Ricky Stitt, 29 Thorp Street indicated that no one mentioned the petition they had signed by a lot of the neighbors. He stated from his porch he can see people urinating behind the gas station. He stated they have had a lot of issues on Thorp Street, some shootings. He stated they just now got the 500 building taken care of, which they are trying to get rid of for years. So he doesn't believe this would be a benefit for the neighborhood.

Peggy Wilson, 34 Thorp Street, Pontiac, Michigan.

She stated she believes the petitioner is a very nice person. She stated she was at the gas station once and there was a drug deal that went bad and there was a shooting. She stated no one got shot, but all the kids were there and tried to get into her car. She stated she just doesn't think that alcohol is a good thing for the gas station because they have enough issues already going on.

(Mayor Waterman entered the Chambers.)

Kone Holme (ph), (inaudible) Pontiac, Michigan. He stated in regards to that the other liquor licenses, there are others within a couple of blocks away to the west of the gas station, and then another one further away about five blocks to the south of it. He stated there is also Rite-Aid down on the corner of Telegraph that actually sells packaged beer and wine as well. He believes they are only licensed for so many liquor licenses within the City of Pontiac and they are overrun already with those. He stated the City has actually gone over what the allotment is, and he realizes they have the ability to go to the State and usurp whatever the Planning Commission decides to do. He stated that at least a recommendation of no would send a note to them that you guys are on the same page as the residents and don't really want to have another liquor license within the area.

Don Woodward, 109 Ruth Avenue, Pontiac, Michigan. He stated he agrees with the Board, that this gentleman does a wonderful job with his business, but we need to leave it as it is. across the street is a hospital. He believes the City should maybe revisit some of the other stores, that they need to figure out a way to stop it.

John Scott, approached, stating owns multiple properties on Huron. He stated he had a rental property right next to the Spotlight Party Store. He stated he's had experience of having properties that sold liquor, and those that just sold beer and wine. He stated he's like to have people consider the difference between liquor

being sold and just beer and wine. He stated the properties that are near liquor stores there is a lot of drug activity and prostitution and criminal activity and stuff going on at the liquor stores. He stated houses near stores that just sell beer and wine, have been nowhere near the trouble that he had with ones that sell liquor.

Debra Norris, 71 Wenonah, Pontiac, Michigan. She stated in response to the previous gentleman who spoke, whether it's beer, wine or liquor, it all has the same effect. She does not think they need another liquor store in the City of Pontiac especially there. She stated there's a little nail place and a bar there too. She stated there is liquor everywhere, that the City doesn't need another.

Renee Voit-Porath, 145 Illinois Avenue, stated she's not far from the gas station. She stated with all due respect to the petitioner, she was part of a group fighting a special exception for liquor license over at Rainbow Plaza several years ago, and it was a hard fight. She stated the City is saturated and it's time for Pontiac to do better.

(Public comment was closed.)

Mayor Waterman stated the boards, commissions and city government for that matter lives to execute the role of the people who live here in the City, and so they always like the opportunity for people to come and to speak about the kind of community that they want constructed.

Commissioner Northcross made a motion that the City Planning Commission approve the Special Exemption Permit at 510 W. Huron Street, PF 17-64 to allow for the sale of alcoholic beverages to be consumed off premises, (SDM license) based on the following reasons.

1. The Special Exemption Permit application meets all standards of approval;
2. Site plan meets zoning standards, with the exception of the rear setback, which

is a type C dimensional nonconformity;  
and

3. The Planning Commission does not have authority to review, approve or deny liquor licenses, only the authority to approve Special Exemption Permit applications.

(Seconded by Commissioner Cadd.)

AYES: (None.)

NAYS: Thomas, Northcross, Payne, Waterman,  
Cadd.

ABSTAIN: (None.)

MOTION FAILED 0-5-0

(Chair Thomas read a statement into the record regarding the upcoming topic of PF-18-01.)

5.3 PF-18-01 Zoning Map Amendment

ADDRESS: 64-14-31-127-001

APPLICANT: Venture, Inc.

PROPERTY USE: Assisted Living Facility

CURRENT ZONING: R-1 One Family Dwelling

PROPOSED ZONING: R-4 Multi-Family Elevator  
District

(Presentation of facts provided by Mr. Mullen.)

Mr. Mullen clarified his recommendation is to rezone to R-3, not R-4.

(Chair Thomas invited the petitioner to address the Commission.)

Brad Michaud, president of Venture, Inc., 196 Cesar E. Chavez, Pontiac, Michigan approached.

Susan Harding, CEO for OLHSA.

Mikki Droste, non-profit housing consultant retained by Venture, Inc.

Mr. Michaud gave some background information in regards to Venture, Inc. He stated that they have been providing affordable housing in Oakland County for 27 years. He stated they're a Pontiac-based

business.

He further stated that there will be a Town Hall meeting on February 13, at Venture Inc. He indicated they will be providing additional information and handouts regarding the project.

Mikki Droste provided a presentation. She stated they are providing more information than what they normally do at a Planning Commission meeting, but she recognizes there are a lot of concerns regarding this project.

Rachel Loughrin discussed the benefits of a project like this. She stated it is true it is very difficult to redevelop something like the former school that has been closed and abandoned; it's obsolete and dilapidated. She stated there is an enormous cost to remove asbestos, lead paint and other contaminants that you find in a structure like this. She stated that's why the City would support a project like this.

She stated that the population of Oakland County residents age 65 and older is forecast to grow at an average rate of 1.8 percent per year from 2015 to 2045. She stated as a consequence, the percentage of seniors living in the county will have grown from 15.5 percent in 2015 to 24.4 percent in 2045, meaning that almost one out of every four people will be 65 years of age or older in 2045. She indicated this is a necessary use in the community.

Mark Thomas, the owner of the property approached. He stated if this project is approved, Venture will become the fourth owner. He stated he's a believer in historic preservation and the future of Pontiac, which is why he bought the property and have invested in Pontiac for over 32 years. He stated he hopes to do well and also to do good.

He stated there's a lot of misinformation going around about this. He stated he believes they want the same thing, to preserve a beautiful landmark building, and in the process, improve the

neighborhood, raising property values. He stated in this case it will take a lot of money to do that and it gets worse with every passing year. He stated that vandals have started fires in the school three times. He stated the flat roofs are leaking.

(Public hearing was opened.)

MS. ROBERTS: Good evening. My name is Latina Roberts. I am a resident in Washington School District. I was also the Pontiac School Board President at the time that we voted to sell this property with Mr. Northcross present on the Board with me at that time. One of the stipulations that we as a Board put into place as a policy was that any sales of our facilities had to meet the goals, missions and values for the embitterment (sic) of our youth and the embetterment (sic) of our community.

I'm not going to go into all of the details of the language because I don't remember that, but I was a part of crafting that. I would just like to ask one, the committee as well as Venture Capital, Venture Inc., to please go back and look at those documents and make sure that it is aligned with the information and the way in which we decided as a team, as a board, as a governing body, how we felt our property should be sold and utilized in the future.

Secondly, my comment, and let me know when my three minutes are up, you say there's a lot of misleading information on this document here. Many did not get that in my community, for whatever reason. I did receive an official letter from the City. So I do appreciate that. However, the meeting that took place in November, was not aware of that and I would like to find out how in the future our district can get more engaged, because I think one of the biggest challenges that you're going to face from the community is that we just simply didn't know. No one likes to be brought into the mix of things once the decision has been made. This document appeared to say that that decision has been made and you're just doing your due diligence. Please, in the future, respect the residents better than that. I don't care what organization you are. We need to know, we need to be a part of that planning and that discussion, because I think you'd receive a more opening welcome. Thirdly, I would like to know if the planning document that has been put together is available for

public use or do I need to FOIA that document? Okay. Well, I guess I'll have to get back with someone at OLHSA with the Venture Capital or Venture Inc. to get that information because I would like to see that a little bit more in detail.

The other concern I have, and I'll wrap this up, is this document talks about multi-family apartments. Can you with all good faith, tell me that this will maintain its initial use to be for seniors 55 and older?

CHAIRPERSON THOMAS: Let me -- by the way, let me answer this or comment here. One of the things that we do, we can't have a to and fro in here. You're welcome to put forth your questions, we'll gather all of those questions, Mr. Mullen will answer those questions and we'll ask the Petitioner.

MS. ROBERTS: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON THOMAS: But we can't -- in the interest of time, if you will.

MS. ROBERTS: Not a problem. So that's another question. And my final concern is that we've got several other housing facilities for seniors. I moved here when I was 12 years old from Nashville, Tennessee, and I came with some really good roots, and was brought up very well. My mother was very good friends of Mayor Deirdre Waterman. So I know her well and I know what she stands for.

But my concern is over the years I have seen the deterioration of Carriage Circle. I have seen the deterioration of Woodland heights. And I can go on and on and on. Those facilities were designed for the very reason that this group is bringing this project before the City. I would like to see a commitment made once this deal comes together, or if it goes anywhere, that the residents in this community hold them responsible for making sure that that facility is meeting the kinds of needs and equality that this community deserves. And I look forward to you answering my questions in the future. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON THOMAS: Thank you very much.

Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you very much. My name is Chuck Johnson, I'm at 21 North Paddock. You know, I come to this mic quite frequently to these proceedings, council meetings, et cetera, et cetera. When I come to this mic I come with the feeling that I'm speaking on behalf of not only myself as a citizen, but the citizens and the folk that live in this community. We all deserve and want a better and nicer city to live in and have our friends and relatives to come and visit.

I do go along with this particular development. I think it's good for the area. I think that it's going to be a -- a catalyst for other developments to continue coming to our city. I was just at the Patterson meeting over there, the address, you know, he was pointing out some very important issues and concerns as to what is happening in Oakland County. Well, Pontiac is in Oakland County and we all deserve and we all want what is right for us as citizens and our kids as they grow older and so on and so forth. I think I'm the senior in this room besides Mr. Parker over there. I see him and maybe one or two more. But I've been in this community for close to 60 years and I've watched it go from sugar to shit, and excuse the expression, but it's time for us to try and bring this community back citywide and these developers that are bringing these plans and ideas, we have to really take them into consideration.

There's only one thing that happened here that I'm going to be concerned about and I noticed there was a lot of people who thought -- kind of raised their eyebrows, the owner of the property is selling or deeding over to the developer a portion of the property, which is the building. He is going to retain the other part of the property. Now, how do we know going forward what he plans to do with the remaining parts of the property? Is he going to come back here at some point in time and ask us, the citizens, to redevelop it or rezone it or do whatever? We'd like to think in this meeting, without having to wait and see, we'd like to know if he can give us a solid and firm commitment to this -- to this commission. And I know that this commission can either vote this up or down. But usually if it's a good project for the City, they really give us the benefit of the doubt.

And they can do this with stipulations. Whatever stipulations that we feel we want incorporated in this plan, we can get it. If we -- if we can't get it then it ain't going to go. Thank you very much.

MR. FELSKE: Hello. My name is Bob Felske, I live at 755 Menominee. I just recently moved into this area. Definitely like the property -- you know, I'm right across the street from the open lot half of this. So one of the things I would like to see is, instead of zoning the entire portion R-3, if they're going to split it anyway, why don't allow the split to occur, zone the building R-3, leave the rest as R-1 or for future development, depending on what comes along. The problem is if you don't R-3 you can't take it back and somebody can build something that we don't necessarily want on that property. Right now I have a beautiful green land, green space there and there's a possibility of that going away. Now the owner of the property has indicated that he doesn't want to do that. Well let's make sure of that and split the property first and then zone the properties properly.

The other thing I'd like to address is the flyer. Maybe a little misleading, but it basically said that R-4 could allow a 12-story elevator building. Doesn't mean they're going to build it, but it means you can allow it. Which means if you zone that entire area R-4, which I understand you've changed that now, which is good, that's a step in the right direction, but if you zoned it to R-4 nothing stops anybody from building a 12-story apartment build right there. So you want to protect the neighborhood, you want to make it better, don't bring in low housing that could be bad. Detroit is bringing in condos and houses and developments to build up the city. We need to take example from that and build our city as well. Thank you.

MR. WARREN: My name is Thomas Warren. I live at 89

Winona. And I would just like to reinforce the statements that he made. We need to separate those properties before we zone it. Because once the zoning happens, we are coming back to the situation and may be even losing our neighborhood. We need to properly separate it before you make that zoning decision. That will save us all.

I like the idea of the senior building, but I do not like the idea of all of the rest of the property being able to be changed right before eyes when they sell it. They will sell it. He would like to increase his value in his life and take care of his grandkids and his family, and we also would like to maintain our neighborhood. Thank you for your time.

MS. VOIT PORATH: I'm going to request -- is it possible for me to speak?

CHAIRPERSON THOMAS: Name and address, please.

MS. VOIT-PORATH: Renee Voit-Porath. I'm at 145 Illinois Avenue in District Two. I'm going to request that I can respond wearing two different hats, because I'm -- I can answer some of the -- a couple of the questions or address a couple of the comments, and I also just wanted to make a statement about the District Two community group where the meeting happened. And then I'd like to make a comment for my own personal --

CHAIRPERSON THOMAS: Okay. And all of that is fine, statements, comments, whatever, but we're not going to -- we can't engage back and forth. So --

MS. VOIT PORATH: No, that's okay.

CHAIRPERSON THOMAS: So however it works for you to answer whatever question.

MS. VOIT-PORATH: That's okay. All right. Renee Voit-Porath, I'm one of the co-chairs of the District Two community group. We did -- we were approached by Venture and also to present at a meeting and we did so in November. We did put that out. We have a Facebook page that some people have signed up to, we encourage other people to

spread that too and to share that with your neighbors. We also have an e-mail list of I think over about 200 people right now. We know that we need to still do other -- you know, find other ways to reach out to the community, possibly some signage or something for people that don't get on social media. So we are aware that some people did not come, however it was a very well attended meeting back in November. It also went very well, lots of questions and concerns brought up. Since then obviously more information has come out.

I do want to let people know that it was not the District Two community group that put out that green flyer. We have been trying very hard to keep just kind of the facts that we know, and there's a lot that we didn't know, but we have been trying to just disseminate everybody please come to this meeting, get the information. So I just wanted to clarify that, that green flyer was, I believe, put together by a resident and delivered, hand-delivered to houses. So we -- it was a surprise to me too. And I had neighbors calling me with questions about it. And with confusion. So I just wanted to clarify that for District Two.

And anyway, we are going to be -- as Venture said, there is going to be another opportunity for people to weigh in and we have been asking people -- and by the way, we have a new administrative assistant who is going to be helping us to get more of the word out to people and they're probably going to do a better job than I will. So, we are going to be getting information about that and we are also -- we have asked people to kind of refrain from their opinion of this, and from their decision until they get more of this information. So, people can do that now after this meeting. The e-mail address is D2AGinfo@gmail.com. And if you could put your name and comment, how you feel and sign it, or just, you know, put your name and submit that for us, we will be tallying

those for the next appropriate time. So that's my comment from my hat of the District Two community group. Thank you.

So, now, I am Renee Voit-Porath, private citizen and neighbor.

CHAIRPERSON THOMAS: I want to remind you --

MS. VOIT PORATH: Sorry.

CHAIRPERSON THOMAS: And please, we've got a lot of folks here so, time-wise.

MS. VOIT-PORATH: Okay. Renee Voit-Porath. I live in District Two. I pass by this school very often. So as a 24-year resident of Ottawa Hills I recall driving by or walking past this building during school days and going to vote on election day. The streets of Menominee, the north end of Navajo, as well as Chippewa were busy five days a week with school buses and the cars and presence of parents, along with voters, volunteers and candidates. At this time I never dreamed that this building, along with so many others would be vacant and boarded up for over -- for over ten years. It's been very quiet there. Too quiet. Many people have gotten used to that quiet and have concerns about traffic or who might live there pending a development at the location. I'd like them to consider what comes with that kind of quiet.

Unfortunately, we continue to look at this once vibrant and stately old building now decorated with graffiti, plywood windows and padlocks. It sits desolate and vulnerable to break-ins and vandalism. Over the years, my husband and I participated in cleanups at the site where we worked with many residents to rake, sweep, pick up most unsavory trash and debris. We even placed missing boards over first floor doors and windows that have attracted vandals to the building. Much of that was behind or at the east end of the building, close to backyards of people that

live on Chippewa and Menominee. So that's what we still have today. It's not affected us in a positive way at all, even though it's been quiet there.

So after many years here we are at this point. So I'd like to offer a little bit bigger idea after, you know, considering the proposal that's shown, imagine at this particular with this proposal, imagine a Washington Square bake shop utilizing renovated school kitchen. Or a Washington Square daycare, child or senior. All these ideas would employ and enrich the lives of potential senior residents and service the community. Since this was a school, imagine music or art classes and concerts. Local exercise or physical therapy classes. Training workshops where seniors or younger can learn how to fix leaded glass windows or master some plaster work. Maybe our community can actually get some of the help we need to repair our old houses through low cost Washington Square historic home rehab shop. Possibly Pontiac SUN TimeBank might offer a new location there.

So like the high rise rumor, these ideas are not in the current proposal by Venture, but unlike the high rise scenario these are all realistic and positive ideas that could be integrated into the current proposal by Venture and OLHSA and I have shared that with them. Or could potentially be added down the road. These ideas may likely entice many positive people and organizations in our city. The most important thing is to take advantage of an opportunity to stop the decay and restore this building.

I've heard and read the hundreds of comments and concerns and I truly believe ideas like this would help turn this proposal into a positive effect for this community, our economy and the City of Pontiac. Thank you.

MS. MCGINNIS: My name is Melissa McGinnis, I live at 155 Chippewa Road. And one of --

CHAIRPERSON THOMAS: Thank you again. And just a friendly reminder, please try to stay within that three-minute time.

MS. MCGINNIS: Yes, sir. A big concern that our family has in particular is the infrastructure of our neighborhood. We already have so many problems with sewage backing up. I've had the city engineer come out to my street because we have sinkholes that are forming in our street. There's a sinkhole at Navajo and Menominee. Is all this going to be addressed or are we just going to continue to patch it?

CHAIRPERSON THOMAS: As I mentioned in my opening statements, please stay on point with this is a rezoning question. If there are issues with regard to DPW, code enforcement, any other issue, that's another meeting at a different time. So with respect, please keep your comments as it relates to -- I hate to do that, but it's -- we've got so many people here.

MS. MCGINNIS: Sorry. With the zoning thing, like what they said earlier, how much of a guarantee do we have that this is going to stay for senior living?

CHAIRPERSON THOMAS: We'll answer that at the end. We'll gather all of the questions and we'll answer them one at a time.

MS. MCGINNIS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. MAGASIAN (ph): I'm Mark Magasian, one of the hundred and now nine people who signed the petition about the opposing the R-4. I would just like to say that if there's any confusion or any misunderstandings about what's on that petition or what was on the announcements, it's because of the city planner. He himself said that it is for the whole parcel. They wanted the whole parcel to be R-4. I heard Mr. Thomas. Mr. Thomas said, leave it R-1. Everybody here would be more than happy if they left the green space R-1. I asked the city planner, did Mark Thomas want the whole parcel R-4? No answer. I asked if Venture wanted it.

Venture hasn't got skin in this game. They have an option to buy. You can do that with a dollar. They have no funding.

Now you heard our city planner use this term once, and I want to know how many of you heard it, low-income senior housing. And that can be turned into a euphemism, affordable housing. Watch out. We're not here tonight to take about whether or not we want senior housing in one of the most historic neighborhoods and affluent neighborhoods in Pontiac. We're here to make sure that the zoning that our city planner set out for the whole parcel doesn't get zoned R-4. And he himself told you that if it was R-4, that it could have a 12-story building.

Now, if it's split with an R-3 or with an R-4, anybody can put anything they want there. OLHSA, also known as Venture in this particular case, doesn't even want that land. So why are we talking about it? Why didn't the city planner tell Mark Thomas, the owner who right now regrets that he owns this property because it's so subject to much vandalism. I'm an investor too. I take care of my properties. I don't come before this commission and say, "We got to sell it because I don't want to handle it anymore." That's really what he's thinking.

Why doesn't -- why didn't the city planner tell Mark Thomas to split the land and then maybe we can get this shoved down our throats. Because that's what they're doing. These people don't want an R-4.

CHAIRPERSON THOMAS: I'll just politely remind you, please, we're a little bit over the three minutes.

MR. MAGASIAN: I am? Thank you for your attention.

MR. McCLELLAN: Good evening. Dustin McClellan, 257 Ottawa Drive. I would like to speak in support of this property being rezoned to R-3. And I would like to speak in support to what OLHSA Venture is trying

to do in our community.

I can't name, and I'm sure that this Planning Commission cannot name very many entities that have come to us with an opportunity like this over the last 11 years. The only schools of the many that have been boarded up that have been redeveloped are the ones that have been stated tonight, Pontiac Central, Wisner, and hopefully soon Webster Elementary. And so having this property redeveloped would be an investment for our future for our seniors, for our children.

And I would also speak to the low-income or affordable housing concern and just say this: The two downtown loft developments that have been developed in an exquisite fashion are considered affordable housing units. I lived in one of those units for three years. I know the owners of both of those units. And they have been managed effectively, efficiently and appropriately. And so, I think with this community sticking together, coming alongside OLHSA and Venture and making sure that they do what we are asking them to do and what we need them to do in keeping this a safe, a quiet, an appropriate landscape, I think that we can see this property maintained in the same way as the two downtown developments.

So I speak in support of this. I'm thankful. I thank you for coming to our community and for being here so long and bringing this development. And I want to say that because I don't want to discourage others that want to come to our city. And when they hear and see this on the news or on Facebook or on Nextdoor, they say "I don't want to do business, it's in Pontiac." We need people to come and do business in Pontiac. So thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I first wanted to address the issue of misfacts (sic) or miscommunications. And a lot of that is coming --

FROM THE AUDIENCE: Speak into the mic.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: A lot of that is coming from different directions, including the City. Tonight I looked at some of the paperwork you have and it specifically

states assisted living. That was never brought up in this meeting tonight. There's a huge difference between assisted living and affordable housing. It seems the terms "Affordable" and "Low-income" were avoided tonight. Specifically on the second slide it said LIHTC. Was it ever mentioned that is Low-income Housing Tax Credit. I bring this up because people have said that this is inaccurate, that it is not low-income. Let's call it what it is.

First of all, I'd like to say thank you for allowing me to opportunity to speak this evening. I have been a resident of Pontiac since 1996, and I have 25 years of experience in the design build industry. And I have a Bachelor's of science in architecture.

Seminole Hills and Ottawa Hills are jewels in the City of Pontiac, but we're a neighborhood divided. Normally friendly and supportive neighbors are now embroiled in a heated debate. I've stood before local government, whether it be Pontiac or other municipalities, and what I've found are people very passionate in their beliefs and usually not nearly as divided as it may seem. The common thread in this debate is the love of this neighborhood and its history and the desire to preserve that and their quality of life.

Going back a few years, December 5th, 1999, the Detroit Free Press headline reads, "Street Fight Embroils Pontiac." I'm talking about Ottawa Drive. Ottawa Drive was a through street from Huron to Orchard Lake Road before being partially closed to traffic. Residents --

CHAIRPERSON THOMAS: Excuse me, I'd really like you to stay on point. Ottawa Drive is not part of this conversation tonight.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Correct. It will come back to the end when I'm done. You'll understand what I'm going after.

Residents were quoted as saying people were using this as a major cut-through, stop signs didn't mean anything. Chippewa is not immune to the same problems that existed on Ottawa. When Ottawa closed people started use Cherokee and Chippewa to cross M-59 to Orchard Lake Road. Residents of Cherokee complained after the closure that they inherited their problems and they still do after almost 20 years. Chippewa is slightly different with regard those problems as it is the only street with a cut-through from M-59 to Voorheis without a light.

Chippewa's housing density is more than double than streets such as Winona and Illinois. The intersection of Miami and Chippewa complete with stop sign signage is merely a dip in the road. Not only does it not have a light, it also has a two-way street on the north side --

CHAIRPERSON THOMAS: I'm going to respectfully ask you to keep your comments to this petition tonight. Please.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right. Most of the development is not an assisted living facility, these people will need the same necessities as we do. They are 55-plus, they're not going to be running around with walkers and wheelchairs. You want to allow all parking to exit onto Miami Street, already hampered by an existing apartment complex to residential driveways that dead end and parking on both sides. One of the questions I have is how many parking spaces are allocated to this development? What is the width of the driveway in the back? And if this is actually buildable.

I called the Planning Department, finally reaching someone after two days of calling and unreturned messages to confirm with Donovan Smith and Arthur Mullen that R-3 was an acceptable zone classification for this intended development, and that in fact that would accommodate an elevator. As a citizen of Pontiac we deserve better. As

of last night at 12 a.m. this was not even on your online agenda to be spoken about tonight. We as residents deserve to know what's going on in this community.

I attended the November meeting, and at that meeting the owner of this parcel was present. When asked what he was doing with the green space we were met with silence not once, but twice. We wouldn't be here if facts had been presented.

CHAIRPERSON THOMAS: I'm going to respectfully ask you to kind of wind up your comments, please.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You have the opportunity this evening to vote R-4 or not. I'm hoping that based on -- well, you won't let me speak about what I want to speak about, so it really is a moot point at this point. But respectfully, I thank you for your time.

MS. GREEN: Hello, my name is Joanne Green. I live at 81 Illinois and I'm definitely behind this project a hundred percent. I will tell you a short little story about senior affordable living. My grandmother lived in Detroit, lived in a house and she got elderly and was unable to take care of her home. She also was on Social Security. She moved in to the seniors' affordable housing apartments. It was a safe place for her to live and a very nice place to be around other seniors. This building would be -- is fabulous for seniors. And also, the building in our neighborhood, I don't know -- thank goodness I don't have to look at it, because it is decaying.

Nobody has another option for this building. We have a good option sitting there in front of us. And I think we need to all be behind this. This will be good for our neighborhood, otherwise that building is going to rot and fall down. Nobody has come up with another plan or another buyer or other options. This is -- they need schools for senior housing, one of the reasons is the hallways are wide, the doorways are wide for the wheelchairs or whatever. But please keep an open mind. This is good for our neighborhood. I love our neighborhood and it's becoming an eyesore and we need -- this can be a beautiful building and addition to our community.

Thank you.

MR. KINGZETT: Mr. Chairman, my name is Jeff Kingzett, 197 Chippewa. What my family has resided at that address since 1968. I arrived at the meeting late. With apologies, I didn't see the presentation. I arrived late because an Orchard Lake pothole at my tire, and four other cars too.

So, but I didn't get to see the presentation. Is the presentation going to be online someplace? It seems to me if there's a problem with misinformation it's because there's not enough information that is going on out there and people are filling in the blanks. So that's my first question.

Second question is, procedurally I understand from conversation that the Planning Commission is considering an R-3 instead of an R-4 at this point. Is that a substitution, is that action something you can take tonight without providing a separate public notice of a hearing for R-3?

CHAIRPERSON THOMAS: As I mentioned earlier, we'll gather all these questions, and collect them, aggregate them and answer all at the end of the meeting.

MR. KINGZETT: I understand. I got that part. Thank you.

Thirdly, when I sat on housing commission of the city more than 20 years ago the definition of elderly included disabled people of any age. And the definition of disabled included people with mental illnesses and developmental disabilities. Are those groups also included in the definition of elderly that would be used with this particular development? I'm very concerned about that. And I'd like some information about that.

Lastly, on the question of splitting the

lot. If in fact the property owner does not want the green space to be rezoned to R-3, I would ask that the lot split be done first and then take up the issue of rezoning the school as R-3. And I believe that would require you to table your action this evening until the lot split is completed. Would that not be necessary?

CHAIRPERSON THOMAS: Our action is with regard to this petition this evening. So, we will take that into due consideration when we go to a motion.

MR. KINGZETT: I think you did not directly answer my question. Can you take up the R-3 this evening without any further public notice?

CHAIRPERSON THOMAS: To the same protocol, at the end of this we will answer your question to the best of our ability.

MR. KINGZETT: You just tried to respond and I didn't understand your response. So I just wanted to clarify your response. I'll follow your protocol.

CHAIRPERSON THOMAS: Thank you.

MR. HOMAN: Again, Kone Homan, 225 (inaudible), Pontiac, Michigan. Life-long resident of District Two.

Couple of questions and comments that I wanted to make as I sat here. I heard that they're going to come before the City for a PILOT, which is a payment in lieu of taxes, which means that the City is not going to get a full tax capture on that because of the -- what there's going to be possibly granted to them. So it's kind of misconstrued, I guess one could say, when they're saying that it's going to get the full taxable value to the City, or the City is going to get taxes on it.

Secondly, Ealy Elementary Schools were located on 15 Mile and Orchard Lake Road in West Bloomfield was closed a few years ago, so it is something that's going on all

across the State of Michigan. However, they tore the school down and they began to redevelop the area and there are two very affluent housing subdivisions on each side of that particular area. Low-income housing in a middle income and upper income area is not going to equate to raising the property value. Stonegate Point was supposed to have the same type of effect and we're still right now waiting for somebody to come in and hold their feet to the fire to what they promised they were going to do.

Accountability is supposed to be something that the City stands for. We have ordinances on the books that actually stipulate that if a building is vacant for 180 days or more, an attractive nuisance or open to trespass the City can take that property per the Land Trust Act. However, with code enforcement there are citations that can be written when the graffiti is on the building because it's open to trespass and it's vacant. There are tickets that can be issued if the building is not kept up to par and is not like it's supposed to be done. So those are things that the City can do. I'm a former council person, chairperson of the DPW, DPU, Department of Public Works and community subcommittees as well. So there are things that can be done in the City to make sure that this property is -- the property owner is held to the highest of extent that he's supposed to be.

Secondly, I would humbly ask that you guys table this issue until -- this room wouldn't be this packed, I believe, if everything was put out there in the forefront to begin with. But to number one, as Mr. Kingzett said, we can come back and have this parcel split up if it's really truly the intent of the owner and have the green spaces still remain R-1, number one.

Number two, after that is done then the change from R-4 to R-3 is done at the same time. I'm in agreement, I went to

Washington Junior High School and it's a beautiful building. Didn't know that it was not on the historical rolls considering that the homeowner right next to the front of the building, she couldn't get new windows in her house because she had to put historical windows in her home. But she literally is right next to the front door of the school district, so it's interesting that it's not zoned that.

But, for -- and I'm not going to take up your time. I appreciate you guys and I appreciate everyone who came to this meeting tonight. I'll just end with this, we just have to follow the money, because somebody is making money on the deal. And if you follow the money (inaudible) and table this until we can get all of that stuff. Because I know a lot of people here feel that this is already a foregone issue and it's going to happen. But I have faith and belief that you guys are going to do the right thing, that's why you're here. Thank you.

MS. CHRISTMON: Good evening. My name is Marjorie Christmon and our family has owned a home in the area, 285 Cherokee, for 43 years. So Washington is really just right down the street from us. I come to you a little bit different, because I'm a realtor and I've been watching what's been going on in the area for over ten years. I watched our properties go from \$25,000 up to now they're going for 200- to 250,000. I'm really concerned about the property values. So I ask the Committee to please table this decision until we can ask more questions and get more things in writing.

MS. KELL: My name is Eileen Kell. I live at 60 Chippewa Road. That's right at the corner of Miami, so this is indeed in my backyard. I had two pages of notes, I've managed to chop them down to one.

I thank you for the opportunity to address this meeting of the Planning Commission and voice my concerns. We have heard the plans of the modification of Washington Junior High School, and the neighborhoods

surrounding the school welcome the end of the vacancy of this building, we're just very concerned with how it's done. It sounds like the green space is the biggest concern of everybody, the zoning of the whole space. I have lived on that corner for 37 years, and I see the traffic come and go from when Washington was open and now that it's closed, and they say well, Miami is a dead end street. Well, it's not a dead end street, it empties into a parking lot for 25 apartments, and those people don't have enough parking so they park in the street, which makes Miami Street basically a one-lane road.

The City has never plowed that street, it falls to the landlord of the apartments to plow the street so most of the time, the street is plowed, but it's still barely two cars wide.

There's already a serious parking issue over there. They used to park at the school before the school was chained off. People come flying out of the school when the school was there and flying out of the parking lot. There are no stop signs so they think that it's an extension of their parking lots and they fly out, they don't stop, and there are many near accidents. When cars are parked along the one edge there's no way to get a fire truck in there, they won't fit. So, unless the front road up to Miami is wide enough to handle a lot more traffic, or if they were to put a boulevard through the green space to Miami, this would be a much better thing to do with it. But my concern is the traffic since it goes right past my house all day long.

My second issue is rental properties are notorious for not being maintained in the City. And our senior buildings are no exception. North Hill Farms being a prime example. They take their money, their rent money and they don't put a dime back into it. They don't care if it has landscaping, they don't care if there's no grass, they

don't care if there's garbage all over the ground. They don't care. This is what we are afraid of with low cost housing, is that the building will not be maintained and our housing values will fall. If the building were -- if we could have a guarantee that the building would be maintained, and would be a beautiful building, and beautiful green space, I don't think we would have so many concerns.

And that's basically all I have. Private management companies just have not done well by the City. And I thank you for your time.

MR. MORRIS: Hello, I'm Trent Morris, 211 Navajo.

First of all, I want to say I really appreciate the change in the R-4 to R-3. I very much appreciate that, that was one of my main concerns.

Second of all, I would say my other main concern is the fact that this is one large parcel and there has only been, you know, the plan presented for the part that is the existing Washington Middle School. That I do not feel has been completely addressed yet and I just want to second, third, fourth everyone else who has said I would feel a lot better if the parcel were split and the R-3 designation was considered for the school and the other substantial area of the plan, that was, you know, kept R-1 and addressed at a later date if necessary. That's it. Thank you.

MR. RESNIK: Hello, Alex Resnick, 237 Ottawa Drive. When I came here tonight I didn't know if I was for or against this, and after taking in all of the information that I have I am for it, especially with the R-3 designation. Some of the biggest reasons why I'm for it is because applying for historical tax credit makes it a historical site. The exterior of the building has to be kept up to those designations, which means that the building will be kept nice.

Another reason is that West Construction is going to be the GC on this. I worked for the Lafayette Place Lofts, I was the

property manager, so I worked for West Construction. Being in that building and the attention to detail they had for that historic building was second to none. So I know that they would do the exact same thing with this. And West Construction as everybody else knows is on the (inaudible) too.

Another reason is that there's 39 apartments. I was a property manager of 46. I know who came and went in my building. I know for a fact the family members that came and went in that building. So I'm not too concerned with 39 apartments of the people who are underneath 55 living there, especially when it's the tax credits that are going to be at stake there. I know that 39 does sound like a lot. I was the manager of 46. It's very, very doable, especially with the proper security cameras.

And this development shows that Pontiac is still on the rise. So far this year everyone knows of all of the shootings that have happened. So we've had a black eye to our community this year. But it doesn't -- this last month isn't going to affect that. There is strong developments that are happening in this community that are going to make it better and this is just one of many that are going to be coming. So thank you.

MR. PORATH: Good evening. My name is David Porath. I live at 145 Illinois. I've just been sitting up here listening to what's going on. One thing that's definitely going to have to be done here is we are going to need the City to be bringing out this information to us in a timely manner so that we avoid this kind of situation where we've got a lot of people not happy right now. Because there's a lot that needs to be really finalized and all that. Okay. Fine. Good.

That said, excuse me, what's going to happen to this if this doesn't go through? It's just going to sit there, it's going to rot, it's going to fall apart, it's going to be yet another eyesore that some people

already talked about for the City of Pontiac. We got people that want to spend some money here, got a situation that will have taxes. It doesn't sound to me like it's a horrible thing to do, so let's just do it. Thank you.

MS. MILLER: Good evening everyone my name is Councilwoman Gloria Miller, District 5. I just have a couple of things I would like to say first.

First of all, the notices only go within 300 feet of that community when they have these meetings. 300 feet. So if you're not within 300 feet you're not going to get notification. The Board can correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe that I'm correct.

And second of all, I want to just give my opinion to some things because this is important, like being on a council. When it gets to us, please have your mind made up, because we get blamed for a lot of things. This is the most important meeting. If you want that property split, you should ask for it today. Because if it gets to us, whatever you want, the council, we on to the next move. And so that's why I have to speak tonight, because that's why I came down tonight, I wanted to hear the concerns of District Two, even though I'm in Five. I think the whole city is ours, I want the whole city to look good.

I think that Seminole Hills is a very, very nice neighborhood. I have family live over there and I understand your concerns. But it's imperative that you get things straightened out at this board before you move it on up, because it's a process and we want that process settled before it gets to us. And I will leave you with this, and that's not saying which way I vote because I vote for what you want. Whatever majority you want, that's the way I vote. I don't vote for popularity, I vote for what you want. And that's only the majority of the people. And I'll leave you with this, all development is not necessarily good development.

MS. ROBERTS: Hello. My name is Jessica Roberts. I live at 745 Menominee Road and I have since 2005. We have put a lot of money into our home to maintain it, to fix it. Before we bought the house it was a foreclosure. It was in disarray, to say the least. Our neighbors thanked us for fixing things and making the house nicer. With that said, do I want a low-income housing project directly in my front yard? No. Honestly, no. Do I want to see the school repaired? Yes. Is that the only way to do it? I don't know. I'm happy to hear that you're not going with an R-4, that you're looking at an R-3, but I do think the property needs to be split.

I brought a letter, I hand delivered it before the meeting two days ago. In that I noted that the community uses that green space. It is not just empty, vacant land. We walk our dogs there, we have picnics there. The church has meetings there. Oakland County has K9 training there for their K9 units. It's an important space in our neighborhood. People have walked there. There is a path from one of my neighbors, she walks it every single day. You can see her foot trail from the sidewalk out to the trees and back. And she has probably walked that for 20 years or more, who knows. But that green space isn't just vacant land for someone to make money on, it's part of our community.

And when you look at zoning something in R-3, when it was a school, the last statistics were that there were 419 students enrolled. How many toilets are in there? How many flushes per day? We do have an infrastructure problem in our neighborhood. Our basements have flood with sewer water on multiple occasions. How do you know that if you rezone this for R-3, that it can withstand, the neighborhood can withstand all of those units with all of those sinks and disposals and flushes and bathtubs. I mean, you're talking about a lot, 39 more units. That's a lot of flushes every day.

So, I don't see how you can possibly vote on something when you're not looking at it in totality to see that it's even a viable situation. Thank you.

MS. DECLUE: Good evening. My name is Angie Declue, 176 Oneida. I'm one of the people that passed out that green flyer. And at the time we passed it out, that

property was zoned -- or you guys was looking to zone it R-4. So the information on it, to our knowledge, was not wrong. Want to put that out to you.

That neighborhood is not really -- let me get this together here, what I want to say. We don't want low-income. We're not -- we're not -- we're a middle class, upper class neighborhood. I don't know why every time something comes up in the City of Pontiac you guys want to put low-income in. We got to step it up. We don't always need low-income. Start thinking bigger and better for us.

So I hope you guys think about tabling this, split that -- we don't -- if he doesn't -- if he said he doesn't need the green space to be R-3, don't give it to him. That's all.

MR. HALL: Good evening. William Hall at 73 Chippewa Road. Somebody's pockets are going to get fat and it's not going to be ours. She's right about the sewer. We have had three houses on Chippewa all back up right together. It's in the road. That's out of our pockets. It's not the City. That cannot -- they need to look at things like that. I've seen three people get hit on our street. I've seen three cars get side-swiped on our street. Our street cannot handle that. You need to think of -- our property is going down, I don't care what you say. When they go in, it's going to be just like North Hill Farms and the -- they're trying to close North Hill Farms. And you know that. Somebody's pockets getting fat, it's not going to be ours. Think about that.

MS. TUCKER: My name is Fredricka Tucker. I'm not good at this speaking, but I live at 70 -- I've lived there since 1972 on East Iroquois, 25. I worked hard for General Motors for my property. I work hard now cripple to keep up with my property. I don't want to see a low-income coming there that end up looking like the Phoenix Building downtown Pontiac. Please. I am the low-income, I'm struggling to hold on. Thank you.

MR. CASTILLO: Pat Castillo, 39 East Iroquois. I am Mrs. Tucker's neighbor and I do help her with the house. I believe low-income is the wrong thing for us, we all know it. And as a former union president you do have to table this. Thank you.

MS. KLASSEN: My name is Kris Klassen, I live at 151 Ontario Road. I've been in the community for over 20 years. Love being here. I also am a deputy clerk in the City of Auburn Hills and my understanding is that the motion before you has to be voted on. And then if it's turned down it has to be re-presented with different classifications and so, I hope that tonight you have heard your community and you've heard your residents and you will respect us as much as we have shown respect to you.

MR. GOFF: Hello, my name is Dave Goff and I've lived across that piece of green for 52 years. And I want it to stay that way. I don't want low-income housing coming to our neighborhood. I think if everyone was honest about it they'd say the same thing. Thank you for your time.

MR. KROLL: My name is Dirk Kroll, I live at 136 Chippewa and we're newbies, my Marci and I, we've been here three years. Anybody that knows our house, we put a roof on it, redone it, we really love the neighborhood. Love Pontiac. Pontiac Boosters.

I don't think we should get too singular about this, everyone would like a nice older folks home. The devil is always in the detail and it's government accountable. Thank you.

MR. CULLIMORE: Good evening, I'm Peterson Cullimore, 578 West Iroquois Road. District Two. I just want to say, I just want to echo the sentiments of a bunch of people. It needs to be split before it's changed. And as far as the green space, if you look at an aerial map it's blatant it's the only green space around. Green space is really important, especially for an up and coming city.

MR. HUBERT: I'm Michael Hubert. I think I

live at 206 Chippewa. And I'm here -- I have already sent you a note, a letter, I hope read it. Basically I feel that this whole process has been a cart before the horse operation, in that you're looking at the secondary level decision, i.e. whatever the zoning is, while you're ignoring the real question should be is senior housing good for Pontiac or is it not? Now I keep hearing terms bandied about, I'm not really sure what some of them mean, but diversity has been mentioned as an asset. Can you tell me what diversity you're talking about? You can write that down. Okay.

I have a question, too. The problem, as the City Planner pointed out, about lack of ability to get bank or typical funding for projects is due to fact that they can't get market rate for the projects they want to do. And my question would be -- excuse me -- do you really think putting in senior housing is going to improve our approximation of market rate? That's not there either.

Let's see, what else did I have? Oh, it appears, now I know I'm off base in even mentioning the word -- the plan, your city plan for the future, but it does appear that you're looking forward to creating all low-income housing in the area. Because as someone mentioned, every time you want to throw some money at something or change something, it doesn't improve the future prospects of the City, it's just a stopgap measure to put a band-aid on an issue and the band-aid never gets changed. Because you don't have money now to provide the services that the City needs, yet you want to add another burden to the back of the taxpayer. Thank you.

And again, I agree with most of the comments about, you know, somebody is going to make money here, it's a -- a quick fix, and the one thing I resent most is the strong arm tactic that has been used in this process in trying to force the citizens here to make a second decision

before the first decision is made. Okay? The first decision -- this is why you got the problem with people don't know what's going on, because it makes no sense to do it the way you're doing it. You're trying to ramrod something down people's throats and forcing them into a position where the real important thing is automatically cart blanch to the developer, or the owner. Okay?

Let me see what else I have. I could be here all night, I'll tell you. That's okay. I like that. Pull yourself out.

Got you, Dear. Yeah, I just -- I'm sorry, hold on one moment, please. There's so many notes, I took them so fast I can't keep them straight. I'm going to pass the floor at this point. I think I've said as much as I need to say.

MS. FRENCH: My name is Donnie French, I live at 749 Menominee Road, directly across from Washington School. Mostly in the green, I'm in the middle of that block. And it's my understanding from the false information or not that I did see a plan drawn up about the exit, the street. I'm concerned about another road being built out to Menominee. I worked for the school district for 30 years and buses were lined up with their engines running every morning. That didn't bother me, our children have to be bused and educated. But it does concern me tremendously if you're going to put another road coming out to Menominee Street where Navajo is only a few hundred feet away. It's going to cause mass confusion. The traffic is going to be unbelievable. And I can also reintegrate (sic) the backups over in that area, what's it going to do with 39 more units being built into that area? Please table the R-3 to 4, the zoning, so that we can have more time to discuss this. Thank you.

MS. BOCHNIG: My name is Melissa Bochnig, I live at 63 South Genesee. I am the house right next to the school on Genesee Street. My husband grew up going to Washington Junior High. We loved it when the kids were there. We were sad when it closed. I worked for West Bloomfield, I know the

school you speak of that closed and that got torn down. My husband and I, years ago started talking about we wish somebody would do something with this lovely old building and I actually said "What about an old folks home" or something like that, "Wouldn't that be great." And I think part of what we're all upset about is that we weren't -- didn't have clear information. So thank you for the R-3 now. I think that should calm everybody down.

Your choice is here, you act like you're surprised that somebody is going to make money off a deal. Of course they are. How do you think the world works. You know, somebody is always making money, that's why things move forward.

Our choices, what are our choices? Do we leave it like that let it fall down? I hope not. I'm kind of excited that somebody has a vision for that building and next to my home, you know. Let's look forward, let's move forward. It's scary, that's for sure, and as we get older change is always scary. Nobody likes it. But our choices are looking at that, which my home, I look at the back of the building from my yard and my sun room. I've called the police a couple times because we have seen vandals over there destroying the building, you know. I would love it if somebody moved in there and had enjoyed it and lived there and took care of it. May it cause some issues? I'm sure it might. But let's -- let's move forward and see what does happen.

I do like the idea of my neighbor of splitting the parcel. Do the school as one thing. Do the green as something else, you know, so that doesn't change so in the future we're not here arguing about something else being built on that green. But that's my feeling. I mean, I am tired of looking at an empty building that's decaying. I'm excited that somebody's got an interest in it and wants to do something with it. Will it be a little nerve

wracking and scary and extra traffic and, you know, I heard about plumbing? The infrastructure in the whole state is questionable, it's not just our neighborhood.

So, you know, you had 400 kids there before, now you're probably not even going to come close to 400 people, I assume, with -- you know, maybe one or two people in each apartment. That's less than the school had. So, thank you for all of your time and your hard work, appreciate it.

Chairperson Thomas invited the public for further comments. No one approached.

(Public comment closed.)

Mr. Mullen stated he'll answer a bunch of questions, which may then beget a whole new set of questions.

He indicated the funding requirements from the understanding of the Applicant would be that it would be senior for 45 years. He stated that's due to the tax recapture requirement of the low-income housing tax credit program.

He addressed the issue about maintenance.

He answered questions regarding the application and the lot split.

He addressed the questions about the funding and low-income. He stated that it is a low-income housing tax credit program. He stated the rents are going to be paid by the people living in that structure, that their income is 30 to 60 percent of the average median income in the County.

He addressed the number of parking spaces. They are providing a significant large number of extra parking spaces that are not required for the apartment use. He stated the reason for that is because the community had asked to have some public assembly spaces in the back of the building.

He addressed the question about R-3 versus R-4. He stated this is the opportunity for the Planning Commission to make their decision based upon what

they would like to see. There's a petition before them for the R-4.

He addressed the issue regarding the lot split. He stated the petitioner is going after low-income housing tax credit dollars in which the applications are due April 1st. He stated there is no way for them to be able to do the lot split, have the lot split come through the Planning Commission, be approved and then go to Oakland County and be done in that time frame.

(FROM THE AUDIENCE stated the property owner can rezone the property.)

Chairperson Thomas requested the public to not speak at this time.

Mr. Mullen addressed the traffic concern. He stated the Applicant is looking to provide access along the western side of the property, so that there is two means of egress into that parking lot, because that width, the senior housing and the community space in the back, it makes a lot more sense to be able to have two entrances and two exits onto the site.

He stated he did want to let everyone know that they really appreciate the engaged public. All of the letters that were submitted were shared, were compiled and shared with the Planning Commission members.

He addressed the intensity of use. He stated a 40-unit apartment building is significantly less of an intense use on that parcel than a 400, 500, 600-unit school.

He addressed the ability for market rate. He stated the Applicants showed that the development is going to take approximately \$11 million to be constructed. The appraisal is going to come in at 7.6 million. He indicated there is a huge funding gap. He stated the only way this investment can happen is through a lot of subsidies. He stated this is non-traditional sources of financing that doesn't come through the traditional banker.

He stated market studies show that senior housing is a dire need for Michigan, for Southeast Michigan, and Oakland County and the City of Pontiac. He stated

it's going to get a lot worse. He stated these people are going to be on a fixed income and are only going to be able to be using Social Security.

He also gave an explanation of the PILOT, the payment in lieu of taxes. He stated this is a requirement of all low-income housing tax credit projects. He stated the State will not grant a low-income housing tax credit to any community that doesn't enter into one of these PILOT agreements with the developer or the development team. He stated without it there is no deal, they will not get their funding from the State, and it is a requirement from the State to say that the local municipality also supports the development of low-income housing within their community.

Commissioner Northcross stated there was one more question to be addressed. He asked whether the presentation that was made by Venture and OLHSA will be available, if it's something that can be put online?

Ms. Droste stated they have shared that with Mr. Mullen and are fine with them sharing that.

Mayor Waterman stated the Planning Commission meetings are being video recorded and it will be on the City's cable broadcast.

Mr. Kingzett asked to speak.

Chairperson Thomas indicated he was not reopening public hearing, but would allow a question.

Mr. Kingzett stated one of his questions was not answered. He stated when he served on the City's Housing Commission 20 years ago the definition of elderly included disabled persons. The definition of disabled persons included those with developmental disabilities and mental illnesses under the age of 55. He questioned whether that is still the case.

Ms. Droste stated the definition as defined by the State for tax credits is 55 or older, anybody under the age of 55 has to live with somebody who is 55 or

older, and they can be a minimum age of 50. There is no exception for disabled or seniors raising grandchildren.

She stated R-3 is acceptable to them. She addressed the questions between the R-3 and the R-4 and the elevator being one of them. She stated they have resolved the fact that R-3 can have an elevator. She stated the other reason was for the ability to utilize the community space as community space.

Mr. Mullen affirmed the statement.

Chairperson Thomas recapped the events, stating they heard public comment and have answered the questions to the best of their ability. He turned it over to his colleagues for final questions and comments and motion.

Commissioner Northcross stated it is very difficult to find entities, groups of folks that will even express any type of vision for repurposing a school.

He questioned Mr. Mullen, if there is any possibility of being able to rezone only a portion of that property and do it in a manner, a timely fashion that will meet the requirements of the Applicants? He inquired if an application can be rewritten and could a special meeting be called to entertain that to walk through to rezone only a portion of it.

Mr. Mullen stated it is based upon the developer's timeline. He stated they're going to need to apply for tax credits by the 1st deadline, there is no time to do the lot split that would be required to rezone it across.

Commissioner Northcross stated inquired whether a meeting be called to one, split, to approve the lot split; and two, to do the zoning all in one?

Mr. Mullen stated his concern is Oakland County then has to approve the lot split and accept it.

Mr. Kingzett interrupted, stating he has some more information to add to Mr. Mullen's response. He stated he served on

the Oakland County Board of Commissioners through the 1990s, and did in fact sit on the Zoning Review Commission, a subset of the Planning/Building Commission at the County. He stated it is extremely rare that the County will not approve a requested lot split from municipality. And he stated he thinks that a lot split could be identified, correctly legally described, sent to the County for approval, and have that approval come in after April 1st, but before construction begins on the project.

Chairperson Thomas stated they are not going to play conjecture with what Oakland County will or will not do.

Commissioner Northcross stated when he was in school he had an engineering professor, who commented often that you don't get something for nothing. That we're sitting here on one hand looking at a possible \$10.9 million investment to be made into the community, and then on the other hand we have this risk, the unknown.

He stated there have been a series of statements that have been made, placed on the Board about the vetting of the Applicants, the people, the residents, some of the other constraints that there are in terms of the construction of the building, and the requirements for the construction of the building. He stated there is a \$10.9 million investment that the City can get into the community that also serves a portion of the community that he thinks needs to be served. Nothing ventured, nothing gained.

He stated they do have this other issue, too, of the zoning of a large portion of land going to R-3. He stated he's not sure how to address that.

Commissioner Cadd questioned the timeline for the lot split. She stated they needed to get something positive going for the City of Pontiac.

She stated the low affordable housing of 455 to \$890

rent, that if you're on a fixed income of Social Security, that is not low-income housing, that it's pretty much the market. She stated they should make a move on it.

Mayor Waterman stated she appreciates everyone's participation. She stated even projects of this like that get through this point, the rezoning still has to go before Council. And then if they get through rezoning then they have to talk about the lot split. She stated that's a whole process. She stated the question is can they get all of this done in time to make the April 1st deadline that they got to go to MSHDA.

She asked the petitioner Mark if he'd be willing to do a lot split.

Mr. Mark Thomas stated he is in favor of the lot split.

Mayor Waterman questioned whether the zoning is only on the part that would be purchased by the Venture, right?

Mr. Mark Thomas stated he has no problem with whatever zoning because he has no plans.

Mayor Waterman questioned Mr. Mullen whether they can do a conditional rezoning conditional upon there being a lot split done?

Mr. Mullen indicated a conditional rezoning is a contract type of zoning, and so the applicant would have to offer a contract to the City that says they are only going to use this for senior housing, and then we will give up everything else.

He stated the problem is that has to be offered by the property owner and then negotiated with the City. The City can't tell them what they want in that conditional zoning. He stated in looking through the timing, again, it's a tight time frame. He stated what he's thinking is, can we rezone the lot to R-3 conditioned upon a lot split.

Commissioner Northcross stated once it gets

approval by the Planning Commission, it still has to go before City Council.

Chairperson Thomas interjected to the audience that this is their city, everyone pays taxes here, and not everyone is agreeable and that's why he opened this up with we can disagree without being disagreeable. He stated this school has been vacant, derelict for ten years and they've had virtually no one come forward and propose a plan in a decade. And this building basically has, at the maximum, five years left without being properly restored or basically the whole thing is going to be taken down. He stated when you end up with finally a proposal, a coherent proposal, you need to act on it. He stated they have outlawed all the reckless propositions of adult clubs, strip clubs, convenience stores selling beer, wine, liquor. He stated there are no guarantees. There are no guarantees anywhere, but you don't end up with this kind of coherent proposal. He stated the clock is ticking for these applicants.

Commissioner Payne stated that unfortunately, when it comes to decision-making, there is always someone that is not happy with the decision. She stated she believes at this time they need to make a decision to grant an R-3, and based on what we have heard from Mr. Thomas, and Venture, that we will do the split and have another meeting at whatever time it permits to do that.

Chairperson Thomas proposed that they seek two motions. One, a motion to put on the docket R-4 and decline, and then once that's declined, denied, then put on the docket for R-3 and attempt to see if they can get the go-ahead.

Commissioner Northcross made a motion to approve the recommendation to rezone the parcel number 14-13-127-000 from R-1 to R-4 as contained in the Planner's report of January 31st.

Seconded by Commissioner Payne.

AYES: (None.)  
NAYS: Thomas, Northcross, Cadd, Payne,  
Waterman.  
ABSTAIN: (None.)

MOTION FAILED 0-5-0

Mayor Waterman made a motion that this Commission approve the change in zoning from R-1 to R-3, and the recommendations that follow in the Planner's report and recommendations from January 31st, 2018, as cited in the Planning Commission documents of February 6th, 2018.

Seconded by Commissioner Payne.

AYES: Thomas, Northcross, Cadd, Payne,  
Waterman.

NAYS: (None.)

ABSTAIN: (None.)

MOTION CARRIES: 5-0-0

6. SITE PLAN REVIEWS: (None.)

7. LOT SPLITS: (None.)

8. NEW BUSINESS: (None.)

9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS: (None.)

10. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

11. ADJOURNMENT:

Commissioner Northcross made a motion to adjourn;  
seconded by Commissioner Payne.

(All ayes.)

Adjourned at 10:33 p.m.

Minutes certified by:



/s/ Quentina Rochelle Snowden, CSR-5519  
QRS Court Reporting, LLC  
800.308.0068