

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL CITY OF BURTON COUNCIL MEETING
HELD OCTOBER 10, 1979 AT 4303 S. CENTER ROAD,
BURTON, GENESEE COUNTY, MICHIGAN

Mr. Rabine gave a slide presentation prior to the opening of the meeting for the eleven residents that were present.

Meeting opened at 8:15 PM. by R. Dallas, Council Vice-President.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Dallas, Mikulich, Card, Brown.

OTHERS PRESENT: J. Rabine, Director of DPW; J. Major, Assistant Director of DPW; R. Maike, Civil Engineering Technician; A. Hesse, Deputy City Clerk.

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING:

FIRST PUBLIC HEARING FOR PAVING OF WELLS STREET FROM CAMDEN AVENUE TO
GRAND TRAVERSE, COMMONLY KNOWN AS P-78-9B.

Councilman Dallas explained why the presentation was presented before Council arrived.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Mary Reider, 1245 Wells Street said she is on a fixed income and cannot afford the assessment.

Wilma Wilson, 3366 S. Grand Traverse said she worries that if anything should happen to her husband and she became ill, her children would only have one year to pay off the assessment. She was speaking of the one year clause in the hardship procedure. She is opposed to the paving.

Mrs. McMurray, 1248 Wells Street said she was on a fixed income also, and could not afford the assessment.

Robert Green, 1257 Wells Street asked if the letter received by the residents reflected the City's 25% share? Councilman Dallas said yes, it has been figured in before you see your assessment. Mr. Green said many of the residents on the street think this figure quoted to them is before the City contributes, and that would decrease their assessment. Mr. Green said he does not feel he should be assessed for two (2) units, as his house goes over the lot line. He would reserve his opinion until that is corrected and he knows what his assessment is.

Mr. Major explained that if his house is truly on both lots his assessment will go down, it will probably be around \$3,000.00. The Assessor will re-evaluate it.

Mrs. Reider asked why she is assessed for two (2) lots, her house is on one lot but the extra lot is only 40 feet frontage, and that is not a buildable lot, she was told.

Mr. Dallas explained that it is a buildable lot if it is plotted lot of record. ?

Discussion proceeded on what constitutes a buildable lot, standing surface water, and the benefits of paving. They also discussed the Zoning Ordinance that was passed in 1974, which was advertised in the Flint Journal. Apparently the lady that was denied a building permit because of the 40 foot frontage, was told that this must have been denied by the County Health department because there were no sanitary sewers in at that time. Mr. Major read from the Zoning Ordinance the section concerning buildable lots. He said with a 40 foot frontage on a plotted lot of record, you might have to have a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals, but that would not be difficult to receive.

Mr. Wilson said when the sewers were put in, they didn't go to this lot. Mr. Major replied that when a building permit is issued for the lot the sewer lead will be given free.

Councilman Dallas explained to Mrs. Wilson, that when you receive a hardship determination, this is in effect until both spouses are dead, then your children have one year to pay off the assessment, but normally they sell the property so it is not a hardship on them either. This is actually an interest free loan from the State to the original applicants.

Councilman Mikulich asked Mr. Green and Mr. Wilson, as circulators if they were now opposed to the paving. Mr. Green said he wanted his assessment adjusted before he answered that question.

Councilman Dallas then took an informal poll of the landowners present at the meeting. The results showed three (3) in favor, two (2) against and one undecided. Councilman Dallas said that not many of the landowners were represented tonight. He felt that Council would not want to proceed to second Public Hearing, where the City must commit several thousand dollars that can not be recouped if the project fails. He said he would rather recess this meeting, send letters to all the residents on the street and reconvene at a later date, so that this project doesn't lose the City's 25% share.

Council discussed the idea of recessing and informed the people that if this project fails for any reason the next street in line would get the 25 % share the City is contributing.

Mr. Wilson asked if this street is not paved now, and the City's 25% share is given to another street, could we be forced to pave at a later date and pay the full 100% ourselves? Councilman Dallas said the Council, by a 7-0 vote could determine to pave this street and you would have to pay the total cost.

MEETING RECESSED AT 8:55 PM. TO BE RECONVENED ON OCTOBER 16, 1979 AT 8:45 PM.

Submitted by,

Ardis L. Hesse
Deputy City Clerk