

NORTHVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
June 17, 2015
Wednesday 7:00 P.M. – Northville City Hall – Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

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

Present: Allen, Argenta, Field, Gudritz, Hoffman, Tartaglia,
Absent: Johnson (excused), Vernacchia
Also Present: Consultant Elmiger

2. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION Hoffman, support by Argenta, to approve the agenda as published. **Motion carried unanimously.**

4. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES: May 20, 2015

MOTION Hoffman, support by Gudritz, to approve the minutes of May 20, 2015 as submitted. **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 #1

DAN FERRARA

SIGN

123 E. MAIN STREET

Commissioner Argenta referred to a comment Planning Consultant Elmiger made in her review letter for Case #3: *If an application is submitted by someone other than the property owner, a letter from the owner must be submitted stating that they have permission to appear before the Board regarding the proposal. A letter needs to be submitted providing such permission.* Did this apply in every case? Cases 1, 4 and 5-A were all being represented by other than the property owner, although in Case 5-A the owner was present.

Dan Ferrara, 9570 Norborne, Redford, MI 48239, was present on behalf of this application, which was to install two new wall signs: one at 123 E. Main Street (Northville Gallery) and 121 East Main Street (Tiffany Art Glass) on the front façade.

Mr. Ferrara referred to the paint chip samples he provided. Colors included a small amount of yellow highlight, burgundy as the main color, a baguette (light brown), and a darker brown color to be used on the Tiffany Art Glass sign. The lettering would be white.

Regarding materials, Mr. Ferrara said they were going to use Exteria, a composite material.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hoffman, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the outstanding items (a scale and dimensioned drawing and color samples) in her review letter had been addressed this evening.

Commissioner Argenta noted that the application had been for 123 E. Main Street but now 121 E. Main (Tiffany Art Glass) was also being included. This should be noted in the motion.

Mr. Ferrara explained that the owner of Tiffany Art Glass had expressed interest in being included after the application had been submitted. Tiffany Art Glass was part of the same building but had a different entrance door. Planning Consultant Elmiger said that her review had not included a sign for Tiffany Art Glass, but in terms of sign size the revised application should still meet sign ordinance requirements, since Tiffany had its own door and therefore could be treated as a completely separate sign. Both were allowed 32 square feet. Window signs were not included in the 32 square feet.

In response to a question from Commissioner Argenta, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the Building Department would make sure the signs complied with the Zoning Ordinance.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Field, to accept the application as complete, noting that the application has been expanded to include Tiffany Art Glass, 121 E. Main Street. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Mayor Pro Tem Allen opened the meeting for public comment. Hearing none, he returned the item to the Commission.

MOTION Argenta, support by Hoffman, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness, 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 colors. **Motion carried unanimously.**

CASE #2

JOHN P. KELLY

SIDING

422 E. MAIN STREET

Michael Kelly, John Kelly's son, was present on behalf of this application, which was to replace the existing siding at 422 E. Main Street with new siding. Kelly & Kelly PC was located at this address, and Michael Kelly was one of the attorneys at the firm.

Mr. Kelly presented samples along with a brochure regarding the new HardiPlank siding, which was iron gray in color. All the windows and doors would remain the same.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hoffman, Mr. Kelly said they had responded to all the items in the June 3, 2015 Carlisle/Wortman review letter.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hoffman regarding the proposed 6-inch exposure, Commissioner Argenta said that he thought this was adequate. The house next door was also 6-inch exposure.

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

Mayor Pro Tem Allen opened the meeting for public comment. Hearing none, he returned the item to the Commission.

MOTION by Hoffman, support by Gudritz, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness, referencing the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular Standard 9, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-21 materials, 5-17 siding, and 5-18 color. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #3

**MIKE VETTER
537 W. DUNLAP**

WINDOWS

Jennifer Sickels, Renewal by Anderson, 37720 Amrhein Road, Livonia, MI 48150, was present on behalf of this application, which was to replace five of the existing windows at 537 W. Dunlap Street. She presented a letter from the homeowner authorizing her to appear before the Board on the homeowner’s behalf.

Ms. Sickels said that they were closely matching the appearance of the current windows, with the only change being that the windows would be more energy efficient. She presented samples of the Fibrex window material that would be used, and which would resemble painted wood. The exterior existing window trim would remain. The windows would be exact fits to those being replaced.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hoffman, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the questions cited in her June 3, 2015 review letter had been resolved.

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

Mayor Pro Tem Allen opened the meeting for public comment. Hearing none, he returned the item to the Commission.

MOTION by Argenta, support by Gudritz, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness, referencing the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular Standards 9 and 10, and Northville Historic Design Standards 3-21 materials, 5-14 windows and 5-18 paint and colors. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #4

**GREG PRESLEY/LAING
525 LINDEN COURT**

DEMOLITION

Gregory Presley, 5332 Indian Garden Road, Petoskey MI 49770, and architect for this project, was present on behalf of this application, which was to demolish the existing home at 525 Linden Court, based on the grounds that retaining the resource was not in the interest of the majority of the community.

Mr. Presley said that they were requesting the demolition of this building because they believed it was not contributing to the Historic District. He quoted from the original 1972 charge regarding the Historic District: “*The buildings we are trying to protect in the proposed historic district are largely of the*

Victorian period, not great architecturally but “carpenter Gothic” typical of that time. Others are much later but represent changes in taste common throughout the United States.” Mr. Presley referred to the discussion from the October 22, 2014 meeting regarding what buildings were worthy to be preserved within the Historic District.

Regarding the building being discussed this evening, Mr. Presley discussed the structure as it related to:

- Massing. The building was basically a box.
- Height. Ranches were outliers in the Historic District, as they were one-story buildings.
- Scale. The structure was smaller than normal in the Historic District, with a forward facing garage, representing the automobile age.
- Proportion. Windows were horizontal, different than the cadence and rhythm than that found in most homes in the Historic District.

While the buildings in the Historic District had not been fully inventoried, Mr. Presley felt that out of 200 residential structures west of Center Street, 53 homes were original to the Historic District. 118 structures were contributing and 21 structures were complementary. Nine structures were non-contributing, including the one being discussed this evening. Approving this demolition would not encourage future demolitions because it was non-contributing; a new structure would better contribute to the Historic District.

Mr. Presley said that there were four ranches in the community now, and with this demolition, three would remain. This was on the edge of the Historic District and was an outlier and was not worthy of preservation.

In the neighborhood context, there were six ranches previously. Four of those had been demolished with the approval of the HDC and two-story structures had replaced them.

Mr. Presley said they believed the demolition of this structure was in the interest of the majority of the community, in that it would help balance preservation with change.

Mr. Presley said there were two litmus tests regarding demolition approvals:

- Was the structure a significant architectural resource?
- Is there any associative history related to the structure?

In both cases, the answer was no.

Mr. Presley said the home could not be effectively enlarged due to limiting regulations regarding homes in the Historic District. Its current configuration was nonconforming.

Mr. Presley said the house itself was structurally sound. However, the garage floor did not meet current code, having no fume sill to keep carbon monoxide from leaking into the house. Additionally, it needed “everything,” as many old structures did.

Mr. Presley concluded his presentation by asking for approval to demolish.

In response to a question from Mayor Pro Tem Allen, Mr. Presley said the home to the north was a similar era but had a little more interest. The home being discussed this evening was built in 1954, and was probably an infill project. The substrate would need to be checked.

Commissioner Field quoted from the Local Historic Districts Act 169 of 1970, the State law under which the HDC operated: *“Historic district” means an area, or group of areas not necessarily having contiguous boundaries, that contain 1 resource or a group of resources that are related by history,*

architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. Was there any evidence that this particular building was historical in any of these ways?

Mr. Presley said that in his opinion the structure was not historical in any of these ways.

In response to a question from Commissioner Argenta, Mr. Presley said the reason for the demolition was to build a new home for the owner, who was also a builder. It would not be a spec home.

Commissioner Argenta said he had walked the property. While the home was over 50 years old it had no architectural value. It was basically four walls with holes punched in it, and represented the low end of architectural design. No one famous had ever lived there and nothing historical had transpired there. It was nonconforming on its lot. The home was placed far back on its lot. The demolition would not affect the fabric of the Historic District, and he supported the demolition request.

Commissioner Gudritz agreed that this was not a contributing structure.

MOTION by Field, support by Hoffman, that the Commission find that the structure is not historically or architecturally significant, and is not a historic resource. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Mayor Pro Tem Allen opened the meeting for public comment.

Jeff Hamilton, 430 Dubuar, said his property backed up to this one, and he supported this demolition request.

Michael Kelly, Novi Road, Northville MI, said that he thought this demolition and eventual new construction would improve this neighborhood, and he supported the demolition request.

Andrew Krenz, 541 Linden Court, said that he supported the demolition request.

Alan Laing, owner, said that he currently lived in the home, and he was looking forward to building a new home on this property.

MOTION by Argenta, support by Gudritz, to grant a Notice to Proceed with the demolition of the structure at 525 Linden Court, based on tonight's discussion and the finding that the structure is not historically or architecturally significant and is not a historic resource. **Motion carried unanimously.**

In response to a question from Commissioner Hoffman, Mr. Presley said the demolition would be accomplished before the end of the year.

CASE 5-A
PAUL SKLUT
512 W. DUNLAP

DEMOLITION

Kevin D. Hart, AIA, 700 East Maple, Suite 101, Birmingham, MI, and architect for this project, presented on behalf of this application, which, in combination with Case 5-B, was to modify the exterior of the home at 512 W. Dunlap. This application was to demolish two existing additions: a porch on the east side of the home, and a mudroom addition on the north side. They were also proposing to demolish part of an exterior wall to create a larger opening to the new enclosed porch (east elevation). The demolition was based on the grounds that retaining the resource was not in the interest of the majority of the community.

Mr. Hart provided a handout with additional photographs, and said the overall project was to renovate the home. This home represented a wonderful example of an historic structure that warranted preserving in its historic form.

Therese Grossi, property owner, introduced herself and gave her and her husband's history with the City of Northville. She further explained that they had purchased this home when it became available, although the home had some serious maintenance issues, and now they were trying to make improvements and restore the home consistent with its historic nature.

Mr. Hart said that he and his crew had been hired in the spring to go through the home, take measurements and see what needed to be done in terms of repair, maintenance and restoration. The structure itself was solid, and with care and concern the renovation would be very successful.

The home was built in 1883, with original owner Andrew Jackson Welsh, who had built the house as a city house for his family.

There were two additions that were not in keeping with the historic nature of the home and demonstrated architectural details that were definitely much later than the original construction. To the east, a sun porch had been constructed – probably in the late 70's or early 80's – with a general style and a roof that was not consistent with the original home. On the north side was a small mudroom extension, probably constructed in the late 50's or early 60's.

Mr. Hart said that their intention was to save as much of the original structure as possible, and the proposed replacement/additions would be similar in theme, geometry and rhythm with the rest of the home.

In response to a question from Commissioner Field, Mr. Hart said the addition on the south side would be the same in size to that which was being removed.

Commissioner Argenta said that this all-masonry building was one of Northville's classic buildings. In spite of the fact that it needed care, it was one of the few buildings that still had all its details. There was no question that the two additions being discussed this evening were later add-ons, and were insignificant in terms of historic and architectural purpose.

In response to a request from Commissioner Argenta, Mr. Hart marked on the plans exactly what was being demolished.

MOTION by Field, support by Hoffman, that the Commission find that the sun porch on the east side and the mudroom on the north side of the structure are not historic. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Mayor Pro Tem Allen opened the meeting for public comment. Hearing none, he returned the item to the Commission.

MOTION by Field, support by Hoffman, to grant a Notice to Proceed with the demolition of the non-masonry areas including the sun porch on the east side and the mudroom on the north side of the structure at 512 Dunlap, based on tonight's discussion and the finding that these parts of the structure are not historic.

Planning Consultant Elmiger noted that the new construction that went from the new kitchen into the new sun porch area would require demolishing a portion of the exterior wall of the existing house. Commissioner Field said that arguably that wall would then be an interior wall.

Motion carried unanimously.

**CASE 5-B
PAUL SKLUT
512 W. DUNLAP**

**ADDITION, PORCH
ROOF, WINDOWS**

Kevin D. Hart, AIA, 700 East Maple, Suite 101, Birmingham MI 48009 was again present on behalf of this application, which was to construct an addition to include a new rear porch, a basement access staircase, new kitchen and morning room, and second floor master suite and a new enclosed Eastern porch with the exact footprint size as the 1970s addition being demolished. All of the work would match the existing structural and finish materials as closely as possible. Window and door proportions, masonry materials, columns and balustrades would all match the existing details and all of the trims, casing, frieze boards, rake boards and framing would match the original architectural theme of the home.

Mr. Hart referred the Commissioners to sheet A-8 that he had provided this evening, and which showed the front of the home. He reviewed this drawing in detail. Again, they were adding directly on top of the sunporch area that was being removed. They were proposing a structure that would match as closely as possible the existing structure, and which would resemble a conservatory of the historic period. The base would be concrete block. Directly above that would be raised panel siding, and 66-inch tall clear casement windows with a wood type sash that would crank open. Moldings and fascia board under the soffit would match the existing home. A balustrade with newel posts would be around the perimeter; these would match the front of the house. A metal roof would be used. Mr. Hart reviewed other elements and details shown on sheet A-8, which would be part of the permanent file for this case.

Mr. Hart directed the Commission's attention to sheet A-7, which showed the rear of the house including the new roofline of the proposed addition there, the frieze rake trim, the columns, etc. Other modifications that were part of the restoration were shown, and Mr. Hart reviewed these in detail; this drawing and the rest of the plans in the Commissioners' packets would be part of the permanent file for this case.

Commissioner Field asked about the casement windows and trim on the addition on the east. Mr. Hart said that in a historical sense he wanted the room to be slightly different than the rest of the house. They didn't want a dead-on match there, but rather wanted the addition to reflect an organic addition to the home. They were trying to differentiate the addition from what was truly historical. Commissioner Argenta confirmed that this was in line with the historical guidelines for additions.

Mr. Hart said the house would be the same color as it was now.

Commissioner Argenta asked about work being done on the main part of the building.

Mr. Hart said the brick would need to be repaired; they would use a product called Sikken's, which was a concrete block sealer and would hold paint for 25-30 years. He noted that color was part of the story of this house, which was known as the "yellow Victorian on Dunlap."

Commissioner Hart showed a sample of the windows for the new additions, from the Weathershield Architectural Series. Color of the house would match existing color, as already noted.

Commissioner Hoffman asked that the record reflect his appreciation for the applicant's attention to detail and documentation of the home's deficiencies, as well as the elements and details of the restoration.

In response to a question from Planning Consultant Elmiger, Mr. Hart said the new fireplace would be a Franklin stove type that would use a B-Vent system with a concealed flu stack.

In response to a question from Commissioner Field, Mr. Hart said that the new door would be a French door, solid core mahogany with 15 lights. Hardware would be inside historic placement with crystal knobs.

In response to a further question from Planning Consultant Elmiger, Mr. Hart said that the lighting would be the Kirchner Designer Series, solid bronze. Coach lights would be provided in back. There would be no recessed or halogen lights.

Commissioner Gudritz asked for specific paint colors. Mr. Hart said the yellow would be Benjamin Moore Canary Yellow, with Benjamin Moore Antique White trim. The finish would be spread satin, and the brick would use flat paint.

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

Mayor Pro Tem Allen opened the meeting for public comment. Hearing none, he returned the item to the Commission.

MOTION by Hoffman, support by Argenta, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness, referencing the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular Standards 2, 9 and 10, and Northville Historic Design Standards 3-8 doors (solid core mahogany door, 15 light), 3-9 ornament and details, 3-10 porches, 3-16 mass, 3-17 height, 3-18 scale, 3-19 proportion, 3-20 hierarchy, 3-21 materials, 3-22 details, 5-9 asphalt and shingles, 5-12 stone, 5-14 windows (Weathershield Architectural), 5-17 siding, 5-18 paint and color (Benjamin Moore Canary Yellow and Antique white). The applicant has provided details regarding lighting, using the Kirchner Designer Solid Bronze series. Motion carried unanimously.

7. DISCUSSION:

Application – Minor Change

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that a minor change needed to be made in the HDC Application forms, requesting that all demolition applications include *printed to scale*.

Demolition Application – Minor Change

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that the Demolition Application should include a clarification that an applicant had to submit a demolition application when there was a portion of a building being demolished.

The consensus of the Commission was for Planning Consultant Elmiger to bring the wording for these changes back to the Commission.

Commissioner Field suggested that the Commissioners' packets needed only to include the relevant pages of the application (first two pages), and perhaps the materials could be double-sided.

Certified Local Government Status

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that the City was now a Certified Local Government and could apply for grants offered through the State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO).

HD Boundary

Planning Consultant Elmiger noted that Commissioner Argenta had questioned the Historic District boundary in the Foundry Flask area, as shown on the Zoning Map. The map was correct – there were a number of separate parcels, only some of which were in the Historic District. Planning Consultant Elmiger had a question in to SHPO regarding this situation.

Administrative Decisions

Administrative decisions made April through mid-June, 2015:

- 1) 528 W. Dunlap: New roof using shingle of same material and color as existing shingle.
- 2) 118 E. Main Street, Brown Dog Creamery: Painting plywood over transom window with colors previously approved by the HDC.
- 3) 113 S. Center Street, Eagles Club: Repaint the wood on the building the same color.
- 4) 247 West Street: New roof using shingle of same material and color as existing shingle.

Other Discussion

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that permits had been pulled for 333 N. Rogers and construction would be starting there.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said the Corner House would be before the Planning Commission on July 21.

8. ADJOURNMENT:

Mayor Pro Tem Allen adjourned the meeting at 8:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl McGuire
Recording Secretary

Approved as published 7/15/2015