

NORTHVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
February 19, 2014
Wednesday 7:00 P.M. – Northville City Hall - Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER:

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

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Argenta, Field (left at 9:08 p.m.), Hoffman, Johnson, Luikart and Vernacchia

Absent: Gudritz (excused)

Also Present: Sally Elmiger

3. CITIZEN COMMENTS: Limited to brief comments for items not on the agenda.

None

4. MINUTES: December 18, 2013

The following change was made on page 7 of the minutes:

Commissioner Vernacchia explained the language he wrote regarding the different types of effort involved with replacement or updating; ~~the relief~~. He said the original draft was too restrictive; and more appropriate for historical structures; ~~and the homeowner does have to go back and do that type of restoration effort if they never had the fixtures initially.~~

Motion by Hoffman, support by Vernacchia, to approve the minutes of December 18, 2013, as amended.

Voice Vote: Motion Carried unanimously.

5. REPORTS

A. CITY ADMINISTRATION: None

B. CITY COUNCIL: Chair Johnson said a report would be provided later regarding an amendment change relative to the fee structure.

C. PLANNING COMMISSIONER: None

D. OTHER COMMUNITY/GOVERNMENTAL LIAISONS: None

6. CASES TO BE HEARD – BY CASE

A. Case is called.

B. Applicant presents case.

C. Commission questions & comments.

D. A motion pertaining to the completeness of the application is made, seconded, and voted upon. Results are announced by the Chair.

E. Public comments on the case are heard. (Please approach the podium to address the Historic District Commission)

F. If the HDC has voted to accept the application as complete, a motion pertaining to granting a Notice to Proceed is made, seconded, and voted upon. Results are announced by the Chair.

CASE #1
SCOTT MULLAN (Returning)
530 W. MAIN STREET
NORTHVILLE, MI. 48167

ADDITION

Mr. Mullan explained the request for a proposed second story addition to his home that was built in 1892; and the need for additional bedroom space for his three children. He said it was his intention to maintain the historical setting and character; there would be no color change; the architectural design would remain unchanged; and they would use materials as close as possible to the existing house. He recalled feedback previously shared by the HDC, and that the most critical point was to differentiate between the old and the new; he referred to page three in the packet and the view of the back of house. He pointed out the dormer; they would remove the roof, create more space, and add a hip roof, similar to what it was there today.

Mr. Mullan showed another view of the home. He noted the desire to differentiate between the addition, and said it would compromise their intention. He said they have a small roofline differentiation in mind; their desire was not to differentiate, but have a common line going down the home.

Commissioner Hoffman clarified that the proposed differentiation was only slight; and that the new roofline was down by 6 inches.

Mr. Mullan said the slight differentiation was in the roof height. He expressed concern with the width and the sides, and said they do not want to increase that factor.

The Commission discussed the plans that reflected “plus or minus” on the height measurements, on the rear elevation, on the left side; and that this was not normally shown on plans.

Mr. Mullan said the plans were not final plans and they sought approval that met with these specifications.

The Commission clarified that the plan was not conceptual; the Applicant requested final plan approval; and that if approved, what was built would have to be in accordance with the plan as submitted and in compliance with Historic District guidelines; and anything different would have to return to the Historic District Commission.

Commissioner Argenta clarified that “plus or minus” indicated uncertainty; that he viewed the subject plans as conceptual drawings that included more information than the first plan submitted. He spoke about requirements, emphasized the guidelines that require a separation to distinguish between the old and the new. He said this was so far to the rear; it addresses it more to the front; he had no problem with it, but thought six inches differently may or may not be clear until they do the final drawings.

Discussion ensued regarding procedure and the approval process; that the Commission required a plan without “plus or minus”; the potential to offer a conceptual approval; number 3-20 in the standards for hierarchy; and that while the Applicant may want the addition lined up, that was not acceptable. It was noted that the subject area in the addition can be used only for storage. Discussion continued re the Zoning Ordinance relative to space usage.

Discussion took place regarding decreasing the roof pitch so that the line-up would not be visible on the rear roof line.

Chair Johnson said an Application was not complete without final drawings. He suggested the Applicant return next month for consideration of approval of the entire plan that includes the final drawings.

Discussion took place regarding materials; and Commissioner Luikart read the proposed materials list from the Application; and clarified that they were using a painted brick foundation. She said that was appropriate.

Mr. Mullen concurred with what was listed on the application. He said the foundation was painted before they moved in; and there is a front portion of the house that is not painted, but the remainder is painted.

Discussion took place regarding the step-down, and that it would provide an obvious change.

Motion by Vernacchia, support by Luikart, regarding the proposed addition at 530 W. Main Street, that with the agreement of the Applicant, the matter would be referred back for the submission of final drawings, at the next Historic District Commission meeting.

Chair Johnson opened the floor for public comment; there were no comments.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion Carried Unanimously.

CASE #2

**VILLAGE WORKSHOP (Returning)
455 E. CADY STREET
NORTHVILLE, MI. 48167**

**CHANGES TO ORIGINAL
APPROVAL**

Mr. Presley was present with Dennis Engerer, Brian Donovan and Chris McDonald. He said some design changes were made on the outside of building; and they sought approval of the proposed paint colors. He referred to the site plan and noted the following:

- Dumpster size reduced by half, same style;
- Would like to remove a 1970s, poured-in-place, concrete stamped factory wall;
- Pavers proposed as a building entry point, herringbone pattern;
- Distributed a photograph as part of the packet;
- A change to front foyer, radius-out for a more aesthetic appearance;
- Wall sconces need approval, cut sheet provided as well as the cut sheet for the lighting standards;
- A wood fence (a portion adjacent to property not previously screened, *but was a Planning Commission requirement*)

Further, Mr. Presley explained that the architectural changes were mainly for the front foyer; same style, but enlarged for more room. He noted the following:

- A much bigger three story addition to the building for an elevator and bathrooms, moved to an area without adding to the building envelope;
- The extension shrunk above the first floor, in the north/south direction, using same materials;
- Regarding the elevations on the south side of the building, they propose steel awnings hung with cables, a more decorative element to provide sun protection on the south window, over windows on the two-story mason structure;

- Instead of opening up all of the in-filled windows, they propose a few in-fills where windows were filled up with brick decades ago (due to safety issues; door opening at grade; header was at a different height);
- Regarding the stairwell, they removed some windows that now will be left unchanged;
- A door egress required by code will be new;
- Some locations will have added windows because the center part was shrunk, so able to open them on the second floor, increasing light into office spaces (on west elevation);
- One door on each side of the exposed fire escape that overlooks the road, on the northeast elevation

Regarding the paint colors, Mr. Presley distributed a hand-out of same for the file: Two taupe colors on original structure; burnt orange (Montana Agate) as accent color for metal roof and entry doors; black as color for window sash and all other trims. (Benjamin Moore)

Motion by Vernacchia, support by Field, to accept the application as complete.

Chair Johnson opened the floor for public comment; there were no comments.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion Carried Unanimously.

Motion by Hoffman, supported by Vernacchia, to grant a Notice to Proceed referencing the Secretary of Interiors Design Standards 1, 9 and 10; and the Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-28, for adaptive reuse; 4-21 for materials; 4-23 for awnings; 5-14 for windows; 5-18 for paint and color; and the residential standard 3-4 for fences.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion Carried Unanimously.

CASE #3

**YOGURT PALOOZA/GRAPHIC VISIONS SIGNS
101 MAINCENTRE
NORTHVILLE, MI. 48167**

Sandy Mustonen was present for Graphic Visions and Yogurt Palooza. She provided color and material samples. She explained that they were using the Yogurt Palooza logo and corporate specifications for the carved sign-foam; same square footage as the previous sign.

Proposed sign colors for the foam panel exterior sign were from standard Sherwin Williams; two different types of paints, and 'one-shot' for brighter colors. Background color would be Luau Green, 6712; green for letter is Jolly Green, SW 6931; yellow is Primrose Yellow #130; purple blue color for blueberries is Reflex Blue, #155; and the strawberry color is Bright Red #104. She mentioned adding white to get different tones. These were the colors from the company's logo and product cup. (7 colors including the black and white.)

Commissioner Field said he thought there were an inappropriate amount of colors proposed for that type of sign in the Historic District. He referred to the Historic District guidelines and it notes three colors, including the natural brick; and the base color is of the façade wall. He said he favored the final page in the application more than the previous page.

Discussion took place regarding the colors and the number of colors; the need for sensitivity to the spirit of the Historic District standards; that the background black tones down the impact of the colors; and the visual impact of the many logos of signs in the downtown area; and the upcoming signs for the way-finding effort. Discussion took place regarding procedure.

Ms. Mustonen agreed with the Commission that the best solution would be to keep the two signs consistent and go with a black background on both signs.

Motion by Hoffman, support by Vernacchia, to accept the application as complete.
Voice Vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion Carried Unanimously.

There were no comments regarding the application.

Motion by Hoffman, supported by Vernacchia, to grant a Notice to Proceed referencing the Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-24 for signs; 5-18 for paint and color—with black as the background color for both signs, and five colors as shown on the application; and 4-21 for materials.
Voice Vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion Carried Unanimously.

CASE#4

**YESTERYEAR BUILDING (Returning)
629 NATALIE
NORTHVILLE, MI. 48167**

NEW HOME

The consultant's review letter indicated that the Applicant was proposing to construct a new house on the south side of Natalie Lane on vacant land. He appeared before the HDC to present this project in September, 2013. At this meeting, the HDC provided conceptual approval, with the applicant to return with the information listed in CWA's review letter (dated September 11, 2013). This home is being built on speculation, to be sold in the future.

The review letter indicated the following: The sketch plan does not include the size of the property; so lot coverage cannot be calculated. The proposed house footprint meets the side, front, and rear yard setbacks. Note that the ordinance allows architectural features, such as overhangs, to project into a required front or rear yard not more than three (3) feet. The proposed "cantilever" meets this requirement. The height of the structure has not been provided. A height dimension needs to be added to the plans. Therefore, we cannot confirm whether it meets ordinance requirements at this time. The property contains a number of existing trees. Removal of these trees will require a Tree Removal Permit from the Building Department before work on the project begins. In addition, a stream traverses the southern portion of the property that has been identified on the City's Flood Insurance Rate Map as a flood hazard zone. Provisions of Article 23, Flood Hazard Zones, of the Zoning Ordinance addressed when the applicant applies for a building permit.

The following information is required by the HDC application, and needs to be provided:

- 1) Recent photographs of the existing property.
- 2) Proposed floor plans showing the third floor.
- 3) Brochures showing design and materials for windows, pedestrian and garage doors, and proposed light fixtures.
- 4) Time frame for the project, including start date, exterior completion date, landscaping completion date, and occupancy date.
- 5) Streetscape view (to scale) with the new project inserted, showing proposed grade changes. This requirement shows how the new house will relate to nearby existing homes.

Applicant John Lacroix recalled the previous meeting and noted the following changes to the plan:

- A change of five feet that cantilevered on the right side;
- The house was shrunk by 4.5 feet, “and a few other changes”;
- Brick samples were provided (with red brown mixture);
- They were considering Gray for the fascia and soffit;
- Shingles were 30 year dimensional in Quarry Gray;
- The fascia shape would be rectangular and real stone;
- Everything else was black, i.e. sashes, muttons;
- Front door would be 8 feet tall, custom made, natural stained

Regarding property size, Mr. Lacroix said the topo and survey were done over a year ago; the square footage requirements were calculated for the house footprint. He said the height was provided on the first page of the revised drawings in the left margin.

The tree removal permit was in the purview of the Building Department.

Mr. Lacroix said the foundation and walls have been poured.

Commissioner Argenta said the drawings were considerably revised, but there was no site plan or legal description.

Mr. Lacroix said they can provide that, and that they were using only 19% of the property.

Commissioner Field mentioned that he was not present at the previous meeting for this matter.

Commissioner Argenta clarified that at the previous meeting, the Commission did not weigh in on anything on the exterior of the building. He said the Applicants were trying to get a permit for the basement and they wanted a conceptual review of sketches; and that there was not enough information provided.

Commissioner Luikart referred to the meeting minutes, and said it appeared that the Commission approved a foundation.

Commissioner Argenta said the Commission did not approve a foundation, as that was not within their purview. He said to application was appended to be a conceptual approval, and not a formal full package approval. He said it was to provide conceptual approval on the package as provided that outlined the building, the character, the elevations and the floor plans. He said the Applicant would have gotten a permit from the Building official regarding the foundation and return to the Commission with a complete set of drawings for review, but they are not yet complete.

- It was clarified that recent photo of the property were not provided;
- Proposed floor plans showing the third floor were provided;
- Brochures showing design and materials for windows, pedestrian and garage doors, and proposed light fixtures were not provided;
- Regarding the time frame for the project, it was begun two months ago, and will be built this spring and summer;
- Regarding the streetscape view to scale showing new project inserted on the street said he did not provide that, but could be submitted

Mr. Lacroix discussed the project, and said to enhance it they gained 5 feet. He said the third floor has a nine foot ceiling in the middle area under the big trusses.

Commissioner Field expressed concern with the proposed decorative gable. He said he had never seen this before. He said the vertical lines or battens did not seem to fit in the District. He said the windows are all lined up, but two sets don't line up. He said there appeared to be too much going on and there were a lot of different materials. He said it did not look like an historical house.

Mr. Lacroix discussed the elements of an English cottage and the vertical batten strips were in line with this style.

Discussion took place regarding the streetscape of other houses that needed to be provided.

Commissioner Argenta said the application was clear regarding what has to be submitted. He said the Commission did not get the plans the first time, nor this time. He said another one set was just received in the mail. He spoke about the elevations, the peak, cedar, etc., and referred to the standard 3.21 for materials. He said the standard was clear and prohibited split shake, stone façade, etc.

Commissioner Vernacchia concurred that the Commission was not in a position to review this material at this time; that it was too much, pieces were missing and he thought the application was not complete.

The Planning Commission concurred that they did not feel that the application was complete.

Chair Johnson suggested some direction be given regarding what is acceptable. He said choices needed to be made in light of all the different materials proposed, so the house has more uniformity. (6 different façade treatments) He said a third floor was not allowed, so the roof needed to be scaled back, and it could only be used for storage. He said a large English tudor was not in harmony.

Mr. Lacroix said the elevator goes all the way up.

Commissioner Argenta commended the Applicant on the other three buildings nearby, but said the proposed building was out of place.

Discussion ensued regarding the proposed plan and the need for the design to be more in harmony with the District; and that the Zoning Ordinance does not allow for a third floor..

Mr. Lacroix spoke about the proposed plan. He said he would speak with the Applicant regarding the elimination of the stone work.

Commissioner Hoffman clarified that the questions in the review letter needed to be answered. The façade treatments needed to be toned down to better represent the Historic District and the standards. Also the overall height, mass and scale were a concern.

Chair Johnson concurred and spoke about the proposed third story. He said it would be easily build-out-able and invited a violation of the Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Luikart said a big concern was the streetscape view, the third floor, the height and the massing in relation to others on block.

Commissioner Field said at meeting two the Commission does not have the whole package. He said he would like to see it all together; there was too much going on with the plan; he did not favor the gables; and it needed to be simplified.

Discussion continued regarding the need to see the streetscape relative to the houses next door, on the corner and the two across the street; and that the proposed house would stand out an entire floor above them.

Commissioner Argenta said there were a lot of verbal answers to questions; it needs to be on the drawings; regarding the actual design of the building, start with the curve; and it needed to be a much lower key home for Northville. He said specifically in section 321 under materials, that particle board and batten, stone façade and split shakes, real or imitation, were not acceptable.

Discussion took place regarding the Historic District standards and guidelines being available on the City's website.

Motion by Field, support by Vernacchia, to not accept the application as complete.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion Carried Unanimously.

CASE #5

**ANDRE JURKIEWICZ
405 RANDOLPH
NORTHVILLE, MI. 48167**

**REAR PORCH &
PAVERS**

Mr. Jurkiewicz was present and explained the proposal to construct a new porch and patio on the rear side of an existing home. The home was constructed in 2011, and received HDC approval at that time. He said the lot was pie shaped, and most of the rear proposal was obstructed in the sight line. He said he did not include streetscapes or side views in the package; but provided them to the Commission at the meeting.

Mr. Jurkiewicz referred to the package, and said the scale was included. He said it would be done in accordance with the front porch; the columns will be brick, tapered pillars, the roof in the same shingle, and a concrete porch. He said it was covered rear porch; an exposed aggregate with a brick patio and fire pit. He discussed the cure time of the aggregate, and said it was not cost effective. There will be a walkway and patio; with tumbled bluestone pavers. (Colors and material names to be provided as well as a photo of the pattern for the three different sized pavers. Shingles for covered porch would be Burnt Sienna, CertainTeed; the brick for patio base and columns is Essex Tudor brick by General Shale.)

It was confirmed that a photo of the proposed fan was provided; same as used in the front porch, no light on the fan; if the sight was objection, they we could vault it up; but it would be difficult to see. Applicant to provide manufacturer and number. Regarding time frame, Applicant said they would begin when the ground thaws, may perhaps with 60 day time frame for the porch and patio.

Ms. Elmiger explained the triangular property; the Ordinance calls for creating a rear property line for the purpose of measuring setbacks by finding the locations on each side that creates a rear property line ten feet wide; to determine which the structure is in the setback. The proposed porch is a little too close to the rear setback. The Building Official will have to confirm whether it meets the setback requirement.

Mr. Jurkiewicz said he spoke to Mr. Penn, who said it was good; and the design could be modified as required. He said he sought approval on the design as presented. He said the shrubs were on the property line; and 2 feet off the property line.

Commissioner Argenta noted that a Board of Zoning Appeals variance may be needed, if in fact it was 22 feet; or make the porch three feet smaller.

Mr. Jurkiewicz said he would like to keep it at 14 feet; and review it with Mr. Penn.

Discussion took place regarding options. It was noted that if the Applicant wanted approval as is, anything change would require him to return.

Motion by Vernacchia, support by Field, to accept the application as complete; with scales to be provided.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion Carried Unanimously.

There were no comments from the audience.

Motion by Hoffman, supported by Vernacchia, to grant a Notice to Proceed based on final detailed specifications to the City, and to approve the plans as shown with the substitution of pavers for the patio, rather than the poured aggregate, and also the changes of the rectangular fire pit and the squared off corner; based on not having pavers along the edge treatment; referencing the Northville Historic District Design Standards 3.21 for materials, 3-22 for details, 5-9, for asphalt shingles, and 5-18 for paint and color.

Discussion took place regarding the contingency on the setback; and that the Applicant would return to the Historic District Commission if the alternative was less.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion Carried Unanimously.

POTENTIAL ADD-ONS TO THE AGENDA

Presbyterian Church

Chuck Lapham was present on behalf of the proposed sign at the Presbyterian Church. Mr. Lapham referred to the previous presentation was regarding the sign, and noted that he was unable to get on the agenda for the following meeting. He said they tried to redesign the sign; they will have a custom cabinet to fit in the existing sign. He said he asked for 25 inches, but now they propose to do it in 12 inches in tiles. He spoke about the issue of scrolling and flashing; and said now the letters were black on white. He said he missed the 60 day appeal timeframe; he asked if they could return in April with more information to see if they can comply so this church can communicate their information.

Mr. Lapham discussed the needs of the church. He showed the present sign; discussed their desire to use LED lighting, and said it would be powder coated with matching frame.

Chair Johnson clarified that the Applicant can still proceed with their appeal on the State level.

Mr. Lapham said he has to exhaust the proposal at the local level.

Chair Johnson said one of the biggest problems with the application was not the idea; but the issue was a problem with the Ordinance itself with internally illuminated signs because that

language was not in the Historic District guidelines; where the City Council stated no internally illuminated signs in the Historic District. He said he did not see how they could get around that language in the code, as it is what the Downtown Development Authority has asked City Council to do. He said he would have to vote no in April unless the City Council would change the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Lapham said he would prefer to have the Commission deny him at this meeting.

Discussion took place regarding temporary signage; the Zoning Ordinance; no internally lit signs period, even if temporary. Discussion ensued regarding the red addition to the sign, so when the church has special events they can put those up, without it being permanent; and it would be cost effective.

Discussion took place regarding the previous denial being due to not being historically appropriate; and that being internally lit could set an unwanted precedent.

Discussion ensued regarding potential changes by the City Council. Ms. Elmiger spoke about the general process for updating the Zoning Ordinance; and that the Planning Commission has not been asked to consider the matter; and the length of time for making changes. She spoke about procedure; go to the State, if denied, return locally.

(Commissioner Field left at 9:08 p.m.)

Chair Johnson said a new, more detailed application could be filed in April, and it could be considered under whatever Ordinance existed at the time.

Mr. Lapham said he could return in April, even if he got denied. He distributed a note to the Historic District Commission from the church.

It was agreed that the Applicant would file a new application for the April meeting; and the Applicant was advised of the change to 16 days for submittal to the City.

REQUEST FROM BRIAN VINCENT FOR A SUBCOMMITTEE REGARDING AN APPLICATION FOR WINDOWS

Chair Johnson mentioned said another item not on the agenda was a request from Bryan Vincent, 212 West Street, who missed the HDC application submission deadline for the February 19th meeting.

Mr. Vincent was present and asked for a sub-committee to review his application for replacement of home windows.

Chair Johnson suggested three members volunteer for a subcommittee to consider the subject request.

The Historic District Commission concurred. Commissioner Field, Argenta and Chair Johnson would serve on the subcommittee. Ms. Elmiger would review and submit information prior to their meeting.

Mr. Vincent thanked the Historic District Commission.

Discussion took place regarding the formation of subcommittees.

Motion by Vernacchia, support by Hoffman, to establish a subcommittee to review the Applicant by Mr. Vincent regarding window replacement at 212 West Street, consisting of Commissioner Field, Argenta and Chair Johnson.

Motion carried unanimously: 5-0-2, with Field and Gudritz absent.

401 W. DUNLAP

Contractor Brian Bernard spoke on behalf of the McLain's at 401 W. Dunlap. He said the HDC approved their Applicant in November 2013 regarding an addition and exterior modifications. He said during renovations mold was discovered. He submitted some photographs of the house, and said in photos 4 and 5 show the 2 x 4's, not part of original house, and the solution is to remove two exterior walls, put in a row of 8 inch block, rebuild those walls, but have the outside look like original plan, so the inside will be 8" above grade to prevent water damage.

Motion by Vernacchia, support by Luikart, regarding 401 W. Dunlap, to allow the modifications to proceed as outlined, providing the exterior matches what was approved by the Historic District Commission at their November, 2013 meeting.

Motion carried unanimously: 5-0-2, with Field and Gudritz absent.

ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRPERSON

Commissioner Argenta said that Vice Chairperson Hoffman has done a splendid job as Vice Chairperson.

Motion by Argenta, support by Vernacchia, to nominate Commissioner Hoffman as Vice Chairperson of the Historic District Commission.

Motion carried unanimously: 5-0-2, with Field and Gudritz absent.

DISCUSSION

AMENDMENT TO HDC RULES AND REGULATIONS (ACTION ITEM)

Ms. Elmiger said the one modification was to allow more time to review the applications submitted; and it gives the Applicant more time to respond to her review. She said with 16 days, she could provide her review and the Applicant may be able to get with the Building Department for the information to be included in the Historic District Commission packet. She referred to page two of the rules and regulations, and the proposed change to the application deadline; and it is moved to the prior business day if it falls on a holiday and the City Hall is closed.

Commissioner Hoffman noted under section 4.0 for meetings, and the development of Cases to be Heard by Case, and the steps used; and it should be reflected in the rules and regulations. Also regarding page four, Public Hearings, and whether there should be a section in Section 4, for comments from the public that is not technically a Public Hearing.

Discussion took place. Commissioner Vernacchia said he would prefer seeing that in writing, and take number 6 and imbed in Section 4 under meetings would cover it. It was agreed to add to 4.6 on the agenda itself.

Discussion took place regarding the Chair having the ability to call a recess, and that it was at the Chair's discretion.

Commissioner Luikart inquired about page six, and the demolition permit, and that it must be completed within six months. She said many projects exceed that stipulation for six months completion.

Discussion took place and Ms. Elmiger would check on some of the demolitions for compliance with the process. Discussion ensued regarding changing that to one year, and staying internally consistent. A revised draft to be provided.

Discussion took place regarding comments always going through the Chair. Discussion ensued regarding the practice of creating subcommittee, and that they are in compliance with the Open Meetings Act as long as they comply with the posting requirements. It is noted in the Ordinance but not in the rules and regulations.

Chair Johnson suggested a change in the Public Hearing section regarding no time limit to be imposed on the Applicant for 45 minutes, unless the Historic District Commission extends the time.

Discussion took place regarding time limits on regular presentations.

Commissioner Hoffman clarified the Commission desire to keep it more procedural regarding the Applicant stating their case, as it is not a debate. Commissioner Argenta said he thought everything should go through the Chair.

Motion by Vernacchia, support by Luikart, to accept the change to the Historic District Commission rules and regulations to reflect the 16 day advance notice window, instead of the 10 days, as presented.

Motion carried unanimously: 5-0-2, with Field and Gudritz absent.

CHANGE TO HDC APPLICATION AND HDC NOTICE

Ms. Elmiger said there was not a lot of new information. The new information was reorganized, was more logical, and was highlighted. She said the original application had the signing on the front page, and people often did not read beyond that point. She said it would be more helpful to have more of the main part of the application in between the beginning and the signature. She said the yellow highlighted area shows the revisions, and points out if design changes take place following the Historic District Commission approval, they must return to the Commission.

Chair Johnson said that City Council recently approved a change in the fee schedule so another inspection can be added an earlier point in time—probably after the rough construction inspection. So this is now included in the Ordinance fee schedule.

Commissioner Argenta suggested a change on page two, third paragraph from the bottom; and to remove “blue prints” and refer to them as “drawings or prints and drawings.” Same thing on page five. Under new construction and additions including garage, (and several locations in the document) to insert “printed to scale.” Also for clarity, on page 5, under new construction, regarding site area, to insert “sight area (acres or square feet).” Also on the Historic District Commission notice, at the end, add INCOMPLETE.

Chair Johnson said he noted “referred back to Applicant.”

Demolition and the structural engineer was still on the discussion list for the Historic District Commission.

Discussion took place regarding having Applicants’ deficiencies not being brought to the Historic District Commission meetings at the last minute.

Ms. Elmiger said she was willing to tell Applicants that their application was not complete and that the Historic District Commission may not consider it. She said they may come anyway. She said with this additional time, she would be happy to indicate same to the Applicant if the application was indeed not complete.

Discussion continued regarding application deficiencies and the Commission needing time to review these matters and ways to remedy the situation.

Chair Johnson recalled the issue of the proposed mural by Lee Holland and the question of its location. He said the Downtown Development Authority was not excited about the location of the town square. He said there was still no objection or dislike of murals. He said the Downtown Development Authority has volunteered a couple people for an ad hoc committee for location possibilities, and Commissioners Luikart and Argenta volunteered to be on the committee.

Structural Engineer Requirement and Training Session

Discussion postponed.

ADJOURN Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Cindy Gray, Recording Secretary