

NORTHVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
August 16, 2017
Wednesday 7:00 P.M. – Northville City Hall – Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

Chair Allen called the Historic District Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Allen, Argenta, Hoffman, Murdock
Absent: Field, Gudritz, Tartaglia (all excused)
Also Present: Mayor Ken Roth, Planning Consultant Elmiger

2. PUBLIC COMMENT:

None.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Commissioner Hoffman suggested moving Cases 7 and 8 to the top of the agenda, since this would be that applicant's 4th appearance before the Commission.

MOTION Murdock, support by Hoffman, to amend and approve the agenda with Cases 7 and 8 to be heard first. **Motion carried unanimously.**

4. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES: July 19, 2017

MOTION by Murdock, support by Hoffman, to approve the July 19, 2017 minutes as published. **Motion carried unanimously.**

5. REPORTS:

- A. CITY ADMINISTRATION:** None
- B. CITY COUNCIL:** None
- C. PLANNING COMMISSIONER:** None
- D. OTHER COMMUNITY/GOVERNMENTAL LIAISONS:** None

6. PUBLIC HEARING: None.

7. CASES TO BE HEARD – BY CASE:

CASE #7
TAMMY OLEXA
511 W. CADY STREET

PARTIAL ROOF DEMOLITION

CASE #8
TAMMY OLEXA
511 W. CADY STREET

PARTIAL ROOF REPLACEMENT

Cases 7 and 8 were heard concurrently.

William Carpenter, A3 studios Architects, 1441 E. Maple Road, Suite 312, Troy MI was present on behalf of this application, which was for a partial roof demolition at 511 W. Cady Street. He explained that – as discussed at the previous HDC meeting – after renovations were begun, a

neighbor mentioned that they thought the house had a leak. Indeed, they did notice evidence of water damage, and eventually found water damage in the upstairs walls. This required them to tear off and rebuild part of the roof.

Chair Allen commented on the roof's design, which was unusual but seemed to meet the design needs of the home.

In response to a question from Commissioner Argenta, Mr. Carpenter said the fascia would match the existing siding.

Commissioner Hoffman noted that the basis for the demolition of the roof was that the damaged roof structure was a deterrent to a major improvement project.

Regarding the demolition:

MOTION Hoffman, support by Murdock, to accept the application as complete. Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION Argenta, support by Hoffman, that the application is complete, that the resource is not historically or architecturally significant, that a public hearing is waived and that the requirement for a structural engineer's report be waived, based on the evidence provided relative to the condition of the resource. Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION Argenta, support by Hoffman, to grant a Notice to Proceed with the demolition of a portion of the existing roof as noted on the submitted drawings, based on the finding that the resource is a deterrent to major improvements. Motion carried unanimously.

Regarding the new roof:

Mr. Carpenter explained that the intent of the new roof was to minimize any changes in the elevations. He gave some details of the new roof design and the way they were able to establish a new roof line in the context of the original structure.

Commissioner Hoffman noted that this was the 4th time the applicant had been before the Commission. The Commission had spent significant time at previous meetings reviewing the structure, plans, and intent of the applicant.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Murdock, to accept the application as complete. Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Murdock, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular Standards 9 and 10, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-17 height, 3-21 materials, 5-7 roofing, 5-9 asphalt shingles, and 5-18 paint and color. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #1

**GANGA VADHAVKAR
122 S. ROGERS**

PAINT & ROOF

Ganga Vadhavkar, 122 South Rogers, was present on behalf of this application to paint the house at 122 S. Rogers and replace the roof shingles.

Ms. Vadhavkar explained that they needed to address leakage problems and to repair the exterior, which had peeling paint.

In response to a question from Chair Allen, Ms. Vadhavkar explained that they would have 5” white gutters; other information regarding the project was attached to the application. The proposed new roof would be black, and the new exterior color of the house and garage would be SW 2851 Sage Green Light. The exterior shutters, gutters, soffits, trim and front porch would remain white.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hoffman, Planning Consultant Elmiger confirmed that the issues outlined in the August 4, 2017 Carlisle/Wortman review letter had been resolved.

MOTION Argenta, support by Murdock, to accept the application as complete. Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Murdock, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular Standards 9 and 10, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-21 materials, 5-9 asphalt shingles, and 5-18 paint and color. The shingles will be CertainTeed Landmark Pro in black, and the gutters will be white. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #2

**LISA & JOSH MILITELLO
521 W. MAIN STREET**

PAINT

Lisa Militello, 521 W. Main Street, was present on behalf of this application to paint the house at 521 W. Main Street. Proposed colors were as shown on the schematic provided. Ms. Militello also distributed paint chips to the Commission.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Argenta, to accept the application as complete. Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION Murdock, support by Hoffman, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular Standards 9 and 10, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 5-18 paint and color. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #3

**GRAPHIC VISIONS/BRANDT REAL ESTATE
104 W. MAIN – 2ND FLOOR**

SIGN

Sue Dillon, Graphic Visions, 16857 Northville Road, Northville MI was present on behalf of this application to install a new projecting sign on the front façade of 104 W. Main Street next to the entrance door. Ms. Dillon distributed a replacement layout for the sign that reflected the client’s desire to add some marketing description. There were 5 total message units in the sign.

The 6.25 square foot sign was under the maximum square footage allowed. It would have a welded all-aluminum frame. The Sherwin Williams colors (orange and blue) were listed on the schematic. Ms. Dillon also distributed paint chips.

The sign would have 2 faces, thus creating some dimension. The top orange graphic would be dimensional also. There would be an 8-foot clearance under the sign.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hoffman, Planning Consultant Elmiger said she agreed that there were 5 message units on this sign.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Argenta, to accept the application as complete. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Allen opened the meeting for public comment. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Allen brought the matter back to the Commission.

MOTION Murdock, support by Hoffman, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular Standards 9 and 10, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-21 materials, 4-24 signs, and 5-18 paint and color. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #4

**PERFECT IMPRESSIONS/MY LITTLE PARIS
141 E. MAIN**

SIGNS

Rachit Pasricha, Perfect Impressions Graphic Solutions, 24580 North Industrial, Farmington Hills MI was present on behalf of this application, which was to install a new wall sign and projecting sign on the front façade of 141 E. Main Street. Mr. Pasricha distributed revised schematics of the proposed sign.

Mr. Pasricha said the new owner of 141 E. Main wanted to rebrand the location. They were going to retrofit the existing projecting sign and then erect a new façade sign. He reviewed the specifics of the sign materials and colors as shown on the schematics.

Commissioner Murdock asked about the placement of the façade sign over a door that was not the entrance to this business. Mr. Pasricha explained that the sign was over a door that opened to a stairway to the 2nd floor. The windows on either side of that door were nano-walls. There was identification on the stairway door stating what it was used for, thereby eliminating customer confusion.

Commissioner Argenta said he felt the graphics on the projecting sign were not a logo, making the sign compliant for message units. Planning Consultant Elmiger said the Building Department would make the final determination regarding message units.

In response to a question from Commissioner Argenta, Mr. Pasricha said the schematics distributed this evening superseded earlier submissions.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hoffman, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the projecting sign was less than the 7.5 square feet per side allowed.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Argenta, to accept the application as complete. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Allen opened the meeting for public comment. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Allen brought the matter back to the Commission.

MOTION Argenta, support by Hoffman, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular Standards 9 and 10, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-21 materials, 4-24 signs, and 5-18 paint and color. **Motion carried unanimously.**

CASE #5

GRAPHIC VISIONS/WATERWHEEL CENTER

SIGN

235 E. MAIN STREET

Sue Dillon, Graphic Visions, 16857 Northville Road, Northville MI was present on behalf of this application to install two new freestanding signs on the Water Wheel Centre site.

Ms. Dillon said the owners of the Water Wheel were proposing a sign that they felt was worthy of the Albert Kahn architectural style of the building. The sign would replace the existing ground sign. There would be no wall signs. The brick would match that on the building.

Ms. Dillon explained the structure and materials of the signs as shown in the submitted materials. The main sign would be aluminum painted to have a Corten-type weathered appearance, and would highlight the address because in that area of town there were some addresses out of order, resulting in confusion when people used mapping systems to find this location. The title *Water Wheel Centre* was therefore less dominant than the actual address. There would be no internal lighting.

The second one-sided sign would not be visible from the street. It was the primary wayfinding sign for those going to the destination location of HKS Architects. That sign was compliant with the size allowed for wayfinding signs, and was the same 5-foot height as the primary sign.

In response to a question from Commissioner Argenta, Ms. Dillon said the landscaping would be modified to complement the new monument sign.

Commissioner Argenta commented that Corten steel was fabricated steel that rusted over time. While Corten was beautiful, the rust eventually became a detraction. He was happy that the owners had chosen the Corten-look, rather than the actual Corten product.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Argenta, to accept the application as complete. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Chair Allen opened the meeting for public comment. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Allen brought the matter back to the Commission.

Chair Allen suggested changing the *Water Wheel Centre* font to something more of the period of the building, such as something reflective of Art Deco, for instance. Ms. Dillon said the font was chosen by a team of people involved in the process, and the font was specifically chosen for identity branding and wayfinding.

MOTION Argenta, support by Hoffman, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular Standards 9 and 10, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-21 materials, 4-24 signs, 5-4 masonry, and 5-18 paint and color. **Motion carried unanimously.**

CASE #6

GRAPHIC VISIONS/LOVEWELL HOME CARE

SIGN

103 S. CENTER

Sue Dillon, Graphic Visions, 16857 Northville Road, Northville MI was present on behalf of this application to install a new projecting sign on the front façade at 103 S. Center next to the entrance door.

Ms. Dillon said they were replacing an existing projecting sign in order to rebrand the business to LoveWell. Colors would be Pantone 7664C and 241C. The existing bracket was welded and painted black. The sign would have a 12-foot clearance to grade as it did presently.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hoffman, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the sign was in compliance with Zoning Ordinance. She noted that color samples had been provided this evening.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Murdock, to accept the application as complete. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Allen opened the meeting for public comment. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Allen brought the matter back to the Commission.

MOTION Argenta, support by Murdock, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular Standards 9 and 10, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-21 materials, 4-24 signs, and 5-18 paint and color. Motion carried unanimously.

Note: CASES #7 and #8 were heard at the beginning of the meeting.

CASE #9

**BRIAN MAIORANA
160 E. MAIN**

PARTIAL DEMOLITION

CASE #10

**BRIAN MAIORANA
160 E. MAIN**

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Cases #9 and #10 were heard concurrently.

Brian Maiorana, 36157 Parklane Circle, Farmington Hills MI was present on behalf of this application, as was William Carpenter, A3 studios Architects, 1441 E. Maple Road, Suite 312, Troy MI. The request was to renovate the building at 158 E. Main Street to accommodate a new restaurant (called “160 Main”) and expand the restaurant use on the mezzanine level.

Mr. Maiorana said they were here this evening to clarify some things from the last meeting as well as to propose some aesthetic changes to the front façade, in response to the Commission’s previous comments that the front was a little plain. They had consulted with Carmine Martone regarding this design.

Mr. Maiorana showed a revised rendering of the front façade, which included a knee wall in the center section with a slight detail on top and described the colors as outlined in the materials page. The awnings on the west facade would be cadet gray and black, with the sides exposed with a black painted frame.

The design changes to the north-facing façade included eliminating the 2 existing windows on the upper floor, and replacing them with 3 much larger windows. The existing awning was also being removed. The storefront windows on the first level had been changed from 6 to 4 windows, which changed the configuration of the knee wall slightly.

The design changes to the west-facing façade included removing a small second-story window, and changing one of the new windows into a door; this would require removal of one of the City's planters. Also, the glass message case discussed at a previous meeting was being eliminated from the project. The paint colors had also changed.

The door to the west had been added with an eye to future outdoor dining.

Chair Allen asked about the upstairs door. Was that going to be a small nano-wall? Mr. Carpenter explained those would be French doors that opened just enough to open the area to air and music from the Town Square.

Mr. Maiorana described the proposed internal floor plan, with the bar area in the front providing easy access to the west door, making it easy for outdoor servers to access.

Commissioner Argenta commented that the entire existing storefront was being removed. Mr. Carpenter said they felt the result was materially similar but aesthetically better. They would have similar components to what was existing.

Commissioner Argenta thought the design was a marvelous solution for this site.

Chair Allen asked if they had given any thought to what to do with the 1956 limestone block at the cornice. Could that be incorporated in the remodel? Mr. Maiorana said he would like to do this.

Commissioner Hoffman noted that the demolition request was based on the fact that the portion to be demolished was a deterrent to a major improvement program.

Regarding the demolition:

MOTION Hoffman, support by Murdock, to accept the application as complete. Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION Argenta, support by Hoffman, that the application is complete, that the resource is not historically or architecturally significant, that a public hearing is waived and that the requirement for a structural engineer's report be waived, based on the evidence provided relative to the condition of the resource. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Allen opened the meeting for public comment. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Allen brought the matter back to the Commission.

MOTION Argenta, support by Hoffman, to grant a Notice to Proceed with the demolition of all items listed under the heading *Extent of Demolition* in the letter from the applicants dated 7/31/17 and submitted as part of the application, based on the finding that the resource is a deterrent to major improvements. Motion carried unanimously.

Regarding the new construction:

MOTION Hoffman, support by Murdock, to accept the application for Case #10 as complete. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Chair Allen opened the meeting for public comment.

Ms. Dillon said she thought the design of the building was beautiful.

Seeing that no one else came forward to speak, Chair Allen brought the matter back to the Commission.

MOTION Argenta, support by Hoffman, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular Standards 9 and 10, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-4 storefronts, 4-6 windows, 4-9 doors, 4-21 materials, 4-23 awnings, 4-24 signs, 4-27 rear façade development, and 5-18 paint and color.

This motion is based on the revised design shown this evening and supercedes the previous conceptual approval granted at the July 19, 2017 meeting.

In the event that the proposed signage on the front of the building does not meet ordinance size requirements, this motion allows a change in the size only of the proposed sign to meet ordinance requirements without additional HDC approval, as long as the general design does not change.

Motion carried unanimously.

**CASE #11
FRANK MYERS
531 W. MAIN**

DEMO PORCHES

Greg Presley, Presley Architecture, 108 N. Center St., Suite 205, Northville MI was present on behalf of this application, which was to alter the historic Sears Kit residence at 531 W. Main. The applicant would like to add two additions, one on each side of the home, and demolish 2 porches that were a deterrent to a major improvement of the home. Also the flat roof on the addition on the second floor would be demolished in order to build a new pitched roof.

Mr. Presley said the home had been through a series of alterations, many of them not well done. They wanted to alter the home to be more in line with the original house, while also bringing it into the 21st century. The application to demolish the porches and the roof were based on the fact that those items were a deterrent to a major improvement.

Two additions were proposed, one on each side of the home. In order to construct those, they would need to demolish 2 porches. In the application Mr. Presley had said the east-facing porch was probably not original. This needed to be revised –it probably was original, but all of the detail had been stripped off. The other porch that faced west was neither attractive nor original.

As part of the restoration effort of the original structure they were:

- Removing the aluminum siding and repairing the original wood cladding.

Mr. Presley noted that the aluminum siding had already been removed. After discussion, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the removal of the aluminum siding needed to be included in the demolition application.

- Add window hoods at original windows that replicated what might have been there originally.

Commissioner Hoffman addressed the issue as to whether or not the porches to be demolished were historically significant. Even though the porch on the east side was a period porch, all the details had been stripped off, rendering it not significant.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Murdock, to accept the application as complete. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Allen opened the meeting for public comment. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Allen brought the matter back to the Commission.

Chair Allen asked if there were any better photos of the east porch. Mr. Presley said he did not have any, but the porch was drawn on the bottom of Sheet 2, showing the existing east elevation.

Commissioner Argenta also thought the porch was not significant.

MOTION Argenta, support by Hoffman, that the application is complete, that the resource is not historically or architecturally significant, that a public hearing is waived and that the requirement for a structural engineer's report be waived, based on the evidence provided relative to the condition of the resource. Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION Argenta, support by Hoffman, to grant a Notice to Proceed with the demolition of the following items, based on the finding that the resource is a deterrent to major improvements:

1. Remove the rear porch of southwest corner of resource.
2. Remove side porch on the east side of the resource.
3. Remove the aluminum siding on the existing resources.
4. Remove the existing flat roof on the existing 2nd floor addition on the south side of the resource.

Motion carried unanimously.

**CASE #12
FRANK MYERS
531 W. MAIN**

ADDITION

Mr. Presley introduced the owners Frank and Jeannette Myers, and their daughter Jean who was going to live in the house.

Mr. Presley outlined proposed changes to the home's interior, which would bring the home into the current century. They were creating a first floor family room, recreating the kitchen and creating a space for a mud hall and a powder room. They would remodel the existing steep staircase, and repurpose a 2nd floor bedroom into a master suite. The 2000 square foot home would be enlarged to 2600 square feet, with a porte-cochere proposed for the east side of the building, giving the owners a place to park their car while unloading groceries, etc., before they moved it back to the garage.

They were also proposing to create window hoods where those had been originally. Mr. Myers could see shadows of the original hoods – large ones above the double hung windows and smaller ones on single windows on the front and sides of the house.

Mr. Presley explained that the hoods would be on the original windows only. The new windows would thus be differentiated from the old.

Mr. Presley showed material samples as requested by Planning Consultant Elmiger, including paint chips, a sample of the stained tongue and groove material for the porch floor, and a shingle. The materials including colors were listed in the July 27, 2017 response letter from Mr. Presley.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hoffman, Mr. Presley said the new columns would be tapered wood.

Commissioner Argenta expressed pleasure at the work being done on this home – it was a restoration rather than just a change.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Murdock, to accept the application as complete. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Allen opened the meeting for public comment. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Allen brought the matter back to the Commission.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Murdock, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular Standards 2, 9, and 10, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-16 preserving windows, 3-9 ornament and details, 3-10 porches, 3-11 preserving siding, 3-16 mass, 3-17 scale, 3-18 proportion, 3-21 rhythm, 3-21 materials, 3-24 garages and carports, 5-7 roofing, 5-9 asphalt shingles, 5-14 windows, 5-17 siding, and 5-18 paint and color. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #13

**GUIDOBONO BUILDING CO
341 E. MAIN STREET**

DEMOLITION

Ed Funke, Guidobono Building Company, was present on behalf of this application, as was Eric Guidobono, owner. Mr. Funke explained that they were a design build firm and had been Northville based for 30 years. Their office had typically been housed in the subdivisions they were building. They had decided to find a permanent office home and had chosen 351 E. Main for that purpose. They purchased the building from the McGuire family in December 2016 with the intention of renovating the property, which had about 1200 square feet on each floor. As they removed those elements that had modernized the space, including wall paneling, suspended ceilings, etc., they saw some things that worried them and called in a structural engineer, Scott Lidgard of Maverick Consulting Engineers Inc. The engineer’s findings were included in the application packet.

Mr. Funke continued that the engineer had found the building extremely deficient from a structural standpoint, with floor joists insufficient for their purpose, and floors that dipped significantly. The foundation was constructed of a stone earthen retaining wall, placed on virgin ground with no footings. The rim joists showed rotting portions. There were overspans on the first and 2nd floor. The rafter built roof system had been repaired for leaking, with vertical posts installed haphazardly, bearing down on interior non-loadbearing walls.

The house sagged and was probably still moving. When Guidobono had brought a dumpster into the back for debris removal, over a period of a couple of weeks the back door was opened to

allow access. When they were finished with that process they were unable to close the door because it had shifted so significantly.

While they felt they could have met any of the grounds upon which an application for demolition could be based, they chose the grounds that retaining the resource is not in the interest of the majority of the community.

Mr. Funke said they would like to propose constructing a 12,000 square foot 3 story mixed use building on the site. They had submitted conceptual drawings to the Commission. They would like to get approval for the demolition before moving ahead with detailed finalized drawings. They would use the first floor space as their permanent office space, and the upper 2 levels would house residential condominiums. They were seeking to extend the style of development that already existed on the street.

Guidobono had built approximately 400 homes in Northville over the years, and they received calls from people who now needed to downsize and wanted to move into downtown Northville. Although this project would only offer 4 condominiums, Mr. Funke felt they would be offering a benefit to the City as well as the applicants. Tonight they were seeking the HDC's endorsement of the demolition of the building.

The Guidobonos had looked at rehabilitating this project. In order to replicate what was there – to improve it and not tear it down – just to encapsulate what was there, reframe the walls, encase the basement stone walls with concrete and somehow support those walls since there were no footings – just to do that basic rehabilitation, the cost would be \$650,000 – \$720,000.

Demolition and rebuilding the same building would cost \$420,000 - \$480,000. However, the applicants felt the proposed building was a much better use for everyone concerned.

Mr. Funke said they had researched the home for historical significance, including talking with the State of Michigan Historic Preservation Department (SHPO), and personnel at Mill Race Village. SHPO had nothing on the building. The first owner identified by the Northville Historical Society was a dog trainer from 1940, and prior to the 1920s the address didn't exist per Polk records. The previous owners believed the home dated to the mid to late 1800's.

Commissioner Hoffman said that with the construction of the foundation the home would have to be pre-1900. Chair Allen added that with the size of the oak timbers construction had to be 1800s.

Commissioner Argenta said he spent quite a bit of time looking at this application. The applicants were proposing a major project for Northville on Main Street. He noted that some time ago he and Chair Allen had looked at this property and found it to be in rough shape. The City had sought and gained court authority to paint the building and repair the steps, as it was being demolished by neglect. The 1930s photo submitted by the applicant showed a home that even then was in rough shape.

Commissioner Argenta discussed the various grounds on which this demolition request could be based. He felt that at least 3 of the grounds could be used: the resource being a hazard to safety, the resource being a deterrent to a major improvement program, and retaining the resource was not in the interest of the majority of the community. The building was at the entrance to Northville, and was not going to get any better. Additionally, the sill plate made him very nervous.

Commissioner Argenta said based on what he saw, and after doing some research, he felt there was no architectural or historical significance to this building. The structural engineer's report had been thorough and had pointed out deficiencies in the foundations, the nonconforming roof framing, nonconforming floor framing for the 1st and 2nd floors, the exterior wall, the deteriorated siding, the sill plates, water damaged basement, roof damage, and the inside was a disaster. To repair this building would be extremely expensive – they would literally be taking the building apart and demolishing it in order to save/reconstruct it.

Based on these thoughts, Commissioner Argenta said he could support the demolition of the building and find that it was not historically significant. However, the demolition guidelines required that the proposed construction be approved by the Planning Commission and have zoning approvals, and that detailed plans be provided, before a demolition permit could be issued. The HDC did not have those approvals tonight. Additionally, even the conceptual plans needed a lot of work and seemed almost haphazard. For instance, they showed a Mansard roof, but the Design Guidelines specifically prohibited Mansard roofs. Also design qualities such as setback, mass, height, scale, proportion, materials, etc., all had to be taken into account.

Mr. Funke said the conceptual submission had been to show their intention with massing and with the streetscape. They were also aware of what Dennis Engerer had done with his building. They wanted to blend in and look like an extension of the downtown area.

Commissioner Argenta commented that this would be the first building a lot of people saw when coming into Northville.

Commissioner Hoffman said that while he agreed with Commissioner Argenta regarding the building's structure, he came down on a different side relative to the building's historic significance, as the house was an example of late 1800s architecture. Many of the City's historic homes might have a thick report on how they didn't meet current structural standards. He felt at a minimum he would like to hear what the community had to say in terms of historic significance; that would require a public hearing. A public hearing needed to be part of the process because this property was so front and center in downtown Northville; the Commission owed it to the community to have a public hearing.

Chair Allen agreed that a public hearing was necessary.

Discussion followed. If the grounds for the application were changed to "Resource constitutes a hazard to the safety of the public or the occupants," the applicant would not need to have detailed plans or Planning Commission approval prior to demolition, because those grounds did not require replacement.

Mr. Funke quoted from the structural engineer's report:

The required improvements to this structure will amount to a complete and total structure rebuild. In essence, new framing will completely encompass the existing "skeletal" structure. New concrete foundations would encapsulate the existing stone foundation resulting in diminished usable basement square footage, or need to be completely rebuilt. Post renovation health risks may remain with mold and/or lead paint contamination being present. It is our opinion that the useful and technical service life of this building is expired. The minimum required levels of structural safety and serviceability no longer remain. It is our recommendation that the structure be razed and rebuilt.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that the Commission would need to determine if the structural

engineer's report was sufficient; the structural engineer needed to be someone with historic experience.

Commissioner Argenta said from what he saw of the report it was pretty thorough.

Mr. Funke provided a span table chart to the Commission. He had starred what the allowable spans were on 2x8's and 2x6's. The spans were 50% greater than that. He said when you walk the floors you can feel the major deflection caused by the deficient spans.

Commissioner Argenta said he did not object to a public hearing. Also, it would give Commission members who were not here tonight a chance to comment on the request.

Chair Allen asked if the public hearing could be scheduled for the next HDC meeting. Planning Consultant Elmiger said that the City Clerk would know if submission and posting deadlines could be met for that meeting.

Chair Allen said that he had heard the home was a DAR – a Civil War hospital after the war.

Mr. Funke said there were a lot of purported uses but there was no record of any of them actually occurring.

Chair Allen agreed it was important for more Commissioners to be part of this decision, and it was good to let people in the community know what was going on.

MOTION by Hoffman, support by Murdock, to call for a public hearing at the earliest available date on 341 East Main for the sole purpose of gathering community input relative to the demolition of that building and also to provide an opportunity to have the full Commission review the request and give feedback.

Mr. Funke asked if they were able to modify the application to choose the grounds for demolition being that the resource constitutes a hazard to the safety of the public or the occupants. Planning Consultant Elmiger said they could do this.

Chair Allen said the structural engineer should comment further on the safety of the structure.

Commissioner Argenta said this would give the applicants time to follow up with Planning Commission and Zoning and put more work into the design of their proposed replacement. Commissioner Hoffman agreed, saying that based on what they had heard from the community in the past, people were interested in not just commenting on the retention of the historical resource, but also in what was going to be in its place.

Chair Allen called the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

Planning Consultant Elmiger asked the Commission if they were satisfied with the structural engineer that provided this report.

Commissioner Argenta said he had asked around a couple of offices, and they felt comfortable with this engineer. Chair Allen spoke to the level of detail provided. The consensus of the Commission was that they were satisfied.

Rene Guidobono, owner, said that when they purchased this building, it was their intention to remodel it. They submitted plans, colors, roofing, etc. for the remodel. It was only after they got in the building and started working on it that they discovered how unsafe it was and how costly it would be to repair. They were open to finding a design that would complement the area and honor the site's placement at the edge of the historic community.

Discussion followed regarding the Design Guidelines, and the importance of following those guidelines for new construction.

8. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS

There were no administrative reviews.

In response to a question from Chair Allen, Mayor Roth said the mural at the Farmers Market was undergoing changes but was still in process.

9. DISCUSSION

The Commission acknowledged a letter received by Mayor Roth from the State Historic Preservation Office regarding the City's participation in the Certified Local Government Program, which had been granted in 2016.

In response to a question from Chair Allen, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the RFP for the Historic District Intensive Level Survey had been recently released. This would also be online for 30 days. RPs were due September 5.

In response to a question from Chair Allen, Consultant Elmiger said the photo survey resulting from the Intensive Level Survey should be quite detailed and would be digitally available.

Commissioner Hoffman asked if the HDC could be involved in the internal City process once RPs were received. Mayor Roth said that although this would be a change from past practice, he would value the additional input from the HDC.

Discussion followed regarding how the HDC could best be involved. Commissioner Hoffman said this survey was an achievement to be celebrated in the Historic Community. Perhaps presentations could be given at public HDC meetings, for instance. Also, perhaps a couple of HDC members could be part of the committee that chose finalists for this work.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that SHPO required a very specific process for the survey, including approvals throughout the process from SHPO, the creation of a study committee by the City, scheduling a public kick off meeting, etc. It was a detailed process that had to be completed by September 2018. She noted that there was a web page regarding this on the City's website.

Mayor Roth asked that City Manager Sullivan

- Be notified that HDC would like to have 2 HDC members involved in the screening of the initial bids.
- The survey web page should have a link on the City's home page.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said there would be an upcoming article in the local newspaper about the Intensive Level Survey.

HDC Organization Change

Mayor Roth said the City ordinance that addressed the organization of the Historic District Commission had one sentence that had created a bit of organizational bottleneck, in that the ordinance called for the Mayor or a Council Member to chair the HDC. With the imminent change of Chair Allen's status on Council he would like to expand the purview of the Mayor within the embodying legislation, so that an HDC chair could be the Mayor or the *Mayor's designee*, instead of Council Member. There was a great deal of expertise and work that went into this position and Council may or may not have the resource to act as Chair, and he wanted to be able to appoint Chair Allen or someone equally qualified, even if that person was not on Council.

The consensus of the Commission was to support this change.

Discussion followed regarding process. City Manager Sullivan was researching whether this change would be initiated by the HDC or by Council. Also, SHPO would have to sign off on the change.

Further discussion regarding this matter would be on an upcoming agenda.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Seeing that there was no further comment, Chair Allen adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl McGuire
Recording Secretary

Approved as published 09/20/2017