

NORTHVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
February 17, 2016
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, Field (left 8:07 p.m.), Gudritz, Hoffman, Murdock, Tartaglia (arrived 7:05 p.m.)
Absent: Gudritz (excused)
Also Present: Mayor Roth, Planning Consultant Elmiger

2. PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Commissioner Argenta asked to have a discussion item added to the agenda: *456 E Cady Street*.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Argenta, to approve the agenda as amended to add item 8.B: 456 E Cady Street. **Motion carried unanimously.**

4. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES: January 20, 2016

MOTION Field, support by Hoffman, to approve the minutes of January 20, 2016 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

DEWAYNE WHITE
137 N. CENTER STREET

DOOR & WINDOWS

DeWayne White, 143 Cady Center #234, Northville MI, was present on behalf of this application, which was to replace an existing door and windows at 137 N. Center Street. He explained that he had previously been before the HDC for this restaurant. He was now requesting:

- The replacement of windows in unit #3. The parts for these windows were no longer made and the sills were in very bad shape. The size of the opening would remain unchanged. The window color would be Sandstone.
- The replacement of the front entry door. The size of the door opening would remain unchanged. The door color would be Mahogany.

Chair Allen clarified for the record that the door was the northern one that led to the units upstairs.

Commission Field initiated a discussion of process, emphasizing the importance of following City procedures and requirements. This application was a little bit piecemeal in that regard.

In response to a question from Chair Allen, Mr. White said they were replacing 3 windows. Two would be casement windows. The third window was a picture window with a casement on each end. This window would be replaced with a gliding window.

Commissioner Argenta said he had tried to see the windows but without climbing up on the roof the windows were basically invisible. He did not think they affected the neighborhood or the appearance of the building.

Commissioner Argenta said he had also looked at the door. The color of the proposed replacement was almost exact to what was there now. The existing door was in bad shape and needed to be replaced.

Commissioner Argenta noted that the outside of the building was close to complete. Mr. White agreed, saying he still wanted to replace the back stairs. The roof also needed to be replaced.

Commissioner Argenta mentioned that 2 awnings on the front of the building had been part of the previous approval. However, they were not installed.

Mr. White said that he had not been a part of the decision making process that included those awnings and he did not want to include them.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said this change would not be a problem as the awnings were not a significant architectural feature. However, since the awnings were part of a previous approval, the Commission could include its acceptance of the omission of the awnings in tonight's motion.

Commissioner Argenta said that he remembered a line being drawn across the building during the earlier submission, with the restaurant being responsible for the lower portion and the building owner being responsible for the upper portion. The awnings on the upper portion were part of the approved drawings.

Mr. White said he had never been asked if he was willing to pay for those awnings and he had never agreed to them. There were 2 awnings in the front and 2 in the back. One awning on the back would remain.

Chair Allen and the Commission took a moment to look at the previous file. The Commission acknowledged that they had approved awnings that were not going to be put up. After brief further discussion, Commissioner Field indicated he was ready to make a motion.

MOTION Field, support by Tartaglia, 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 returned the item 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 4-6 windows, 4-9 doors, 4-21 materials, and 5-18 paint and colors. The Commission also approves the deletion of the second floor awnings on the Center Street elevation that were previously approved. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #2

**GRAPHIC VISIONS/J.S. CIVIL LAW
105 E. MAIN**

NEW WALL SIGN

Sarah Prescott, Salvatore Prescott, 105 E Main Street, was present on behalf of this application, which was to install a new wall sign at 105 E. Main Street on the front façade.

Ms. Prescott said they were working with Graphic Vision, who was experienced in dealing with signs in the Historic District. She had brought paint samples this evening, as well as samples of the raised letter material. The “P” was raised rather than engraved.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Field, 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 returned the item to the Commission.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Field, 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 4-24 signs and 5-18 paint and colors, which colors are Sherwin Williams Marigold SW 6664 and Royal Blue SW 6510. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #3

**J.S. CIVIL LAW
105 E. MAIN**

PAINT

Sarah Prescott, Salvatore Prescott, 105 E Main Street, was present on behalf of this application, which was to re-paint the area around the storefront façade at 105 E. Main Street. She presented color samples, and explained that they had generally tried to match existing colors.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Field, 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 returned the item to the Commission.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Field, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing Northville Historic District Design Standards 5-18 paint and colors, which colors are Sherwin Williams SW 6505-113-06 Blue Gray and SW 6505-09-870 Tan. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #4

**MARYGROVE AWNING
112 W. MAIN**

AWNING

Roger Ryskamp, Marygrove Awning, 12700 Merriman Road, Livonia MI was present on behalf of this application, which was to re-cover an existing awning that would include a new sign at 112 W. Main Street. Referring to a rendering in the packet, Mr. Ryskamp said they were proposing to recover the left half of the awning that constituted 112 W. Main Street. The existing frame would remain. They would be replacing a vinyl fabric with a solution died acrylic fabric (Sunbrella).

In response to a question from Commissioner Murdock, Mr. Ryskamp said the new material would be stretched in place. The underlying ribs would not be as visible as currently, as the older vinyl had a tendency to shrink.

Commissioner Argenta said that while he had no problem with the sign itself, he did have an aesthetic suggestion. Guidelines 4-26 spoke to *Combined or Divided Facades*, encouraging a sense of continuity across the entire front of the subject building. The proposed black awning gave a stark division between the two sides of the awning. He wondered if perhaps a white or cream divider strip line could divide the two signs that were connected on the entire façade.

Discussion followed on ways to blend the two awning signs on the single façade. Ideas included carrying the cream of the C. Harold Bloom Agency into the new sign, including a vertical strip as Commissioner Argenta mentioned, or carrying over the wide strip of the Bloom Agency sign.

Chair Allen appointed Commissioner Argenta as a subcommittee of one in order to work with the applicant to see if a better sense of continuity could be provided. Commissioner Argenta clarified that he had made the aesthetic suggestion as a suggestion only, not as a reason to deny approval.

MOTION Field, support by Tartaglia, 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 returned the item to the Commission.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Argenta, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-21 materials, 4-23 awnings, 4-24 signs, and 5-18 paint and color, subject to review and final approval by the Committee of One, Commissioner Argenta. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #5

**PAUL SKLUT
512 W. DUNLAP**

PAINT & ROOF

Paul Sklut, 17211 Willow Ridge Court, Northville, MI was present on behalf of this application, which was to replace the roof and paint the house at 512 W. Dunlap.

Mr. Sklut said they would like to use a dimensional shingle with a little bit of red in it, which was a slight change of color from the existing roof. The proposed shingle was Landmark Pro Max Definition Colonial Slate.

Mr. Sklut said that as they painted the home, they would need to make some repairs as outlined in the memo in the Commissioners' packets. Paint colors would be:

- SW 2820 Downing Earth (brick)
- SW 2805 Renwick Beige (window)
- SW 2802 Rockwood Red (trim)
- SW 2846 Roycroft Bronze Green (ornaments)

In response to a comment from Commissioner Field, Mr. Sklut explained that Detroit Edison had been out to do tree trimming in the past few days.

Commissioner Hoffman confirmed with Planning Consultant Elmiger that the list of included repairs was appropriate and that any architectural elements that had to be replaced would be replaced identically.

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

Chair Allen opened the meeting for public comment. Mayor Roth initiated a brief discussion regarding whether or not a DTE representative had spoken to Mr. Sklut before the DTE crews came out to trim trees. Mr. Sklut said this had not occurred. A short discussion followed regarding DTE processes.

Seeing that no one else came forward to speak, Chair Allen returned the item to the Commission.

MOTION Argenta, support by Field, 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 3-9 preserving ornament and details, 3-21 materials, 3-22 details, 5-3 preserving wood, 5-4 preserving masonry, 5-9 asphalt shingles, 5-18 paint and color. Motion carried unanimously.

8. DISCUSSION

8b: 456 E Cady Street

Commissioner Argenta said that he had attended last night's Planning Commission meeting. A PUD (Planned Unit Development) application had come before the Commission for the Foundry Flask area, in order to request a determination of PUD eligibility.

Chair Allen explained that a PUD required an applicant to demonstrate community benefit in order to request deviations from the zoning ordinance.

Commissioner Argenta said that the PUD application showed the entire demolition of the Foundry Flask building. However, interestingly at one point the presenter talked about saving some of the building and using it for the farmers market and/or other commercial use. The Planning Commission ultimately deemed the plan to be PUD eligible 5-2. However, instead of scheduling a public hearing right away they asked to have a preliminary site plan review. The PUD proposal was for an assisted living/memory care, private pay facility.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that at some point the proposal had to come before the HDC for review. This would most likely happen after preliminary site plan review but before – or perhaps just after – a public hearing. The public hearing would allow the public to weigh in on the proposed use and the PUD generally.

Commissioner Field said the HDC needed an expert opinion as to whether or not the building could be preserved. Commissioner Field also wondered why the PUD applicants needed this location, as at least the memory care residents would rarely – if ever – leave the facility.

Commissioner Argenta said the applicants had said they did have another location in mind, if this one did not work out. He was concerned that when this proposal came before the HDC, the Commissioners should be ready. For instance, when the proposal was next on the Planning Commission's agenda, as many HDC members as possible should attend.

Commissioner Field left the meeting (8:07 p.m.).

Chair Allen said that the applicants needed a PUD because they were seeking deviations in order to ~~allow~~ allow first floor residential, plus they were seeking the use of assisted living/memory care in this district. In return they would provide a place for the farmers market, provide an upgraded river walk, and provide site cleanup. Chair Allen reviewed how a similar process in terms of HDC review of a Planning Commission item had gone forward for the Corner House.

Commissioner Argenta spoke to the lengthy master plan process, and his dismay that all that planning seemed to be in danger of being discarded by this proposal. Commissioner Hoffman agreed, noting that this was one of 3 big entrances to the City.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that as the applicants had done their due diligence, it became apparent that a lot of the Foundry Flask property was not buildable due to a flood plain in one area and a main sanitary sewer line a considerable distance from Main Street. Additionally the remediation for the pollution was also limiting. Any other developer that came in, for instance someone who wanted to build apartments, would have the same restrictions. The reason the applicants had not walked away was because the potential revenue for their proposed use allowed them to move forward.

Commissioner Argenta spoke to the ability of parking to go over sewer lines; perhaps the proposed site plan was not the best layout for this project.

9. ADJOURNMENT:

Seeing that there was no further comment, Chair Allen adjourned the meeting at 8:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl McGuire
Recording Secretary

Approved as amended 3/16/2016