

**NORTHVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**November 16, 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, Gudritz, Hoffman, Murdock, Tartaglia  
**Absent:** None  
**Also Present:** Planning Consultant Elmiger

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Robert Buckhave, 145 North Center, Northville MI, distributed to the Commission documents including 2 schematics and 2 photographs of 145 North Center. He explained that he had been working with professional architects for about 6 months in order to develop plans to redevelop the rear of the building. About 6 weeks ago, they realized they had a leak in the flat roof that was over the top of the entranceway. They decided it was more cost-effective to replace the roof rather than make expensive repairs, but in order to do this they needed HDC approval, and therefore he was asking to be placed on tonight's agenda for emergency consideration. They would return to the HDC in the spring with a full rear façade redevelopment plan.

Mr. Buckhave gave some details for the overall redevelopment proposal, especially noting that the new roof would have a slight slope and that the support posts would be temporary, and would be replaced by columns when the full proposal was made.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hoffman, Chair Allen said this item could be added to the agenda as an emergency request. Commissioner Hoffman said with winter coming, and with a safety concern with the sagging joist and rotten rafters, the requested work warranted special consideration this evening.

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

**MOTION Field, support by Argenta,** to amend and approve the agenda with the addition of Case #4: 145 North Center. **Motion carried unanimously.**

**4. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES:** October 19, 2016.

**MOTION Gudritz, support by Murdock,** to approve the minutes of October 19, 2016 as amended to reflect the following change on page 8, in the last paragraph before the adjournment: Joe ~~Lewis~~ Louis had been a groom . . .

**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**

**KRISTIN & ROBERT EVANS  
109 N. ROGERS STREET**

**DECK MODIFICATIONS**

Kristin and Robert Evans, 109 N. Rogers Street, were present on behalf of this application, which was to replace the floorboards and railings on the deck at the rear of the house at 109 N. Rogers. The plans also showed a portion of a “new” deck.

Mr. Evans distributed photographs to the Commission. He gave brief background information regarding their history in the community and their history renovating other older homes. He explained that the house at 109 N. Rogers Street was actually in great shape, but they wanted to do some improvements to the rear of the home.

Ms. Evans called the Commission’s attention to a mortgage survey in their packets, which showed the location of the proposed 10 x 24 deck. They currently had a deck that was about half that size, as shown in the photograph, which basically was a landing area for the rear door. They would maintain the deck cover/portico, and extend the deck itself out to the edge of the 2002 addition, along with replacing the deck material that was there.

Mr. Evans said they had contracted with Imagine Landscapes, 422 E Main, Northville, in order to create a little more outdoor living space. The roof structure would stay in place. The posts and railing would be similar to what was there now. The current railing was a vinyl-type product; the new railing would be wood. The deck color would be Gravel Path and the rail color would be Charcoal Black. They would also be replacing with pavers a driveway and pathway made of stamped asphalt that had been painted brick red.

**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 returned the item to the Commission.

**MOTION Argenta, support by Gudritz, 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, 3-22 details, 3-23 decks, and 5-18 paint and colors. Motion carried unanimously.**

**CASE #2**

**ALPESH TRIVEDI  
133 W. MAIN, SUITE 210**

**WINDOWS**

Alpesh Trivedi, President, Satpurush, Inc., 18114 Cascade Drive, Northville, MI 48168, was present on behalf of this application, which was to add three windows on the Main Street elevation, and two windows on the Wing Street elevation at 133 W Main Street (Suite 206). The project would create new window openings in both facades of this building.

Mr. Trivedi gave some of his personal and professional background, including the fact that he was an engineer working for Nissan in Farmington Hills. This was his first business of this type (My Salon Suite), and he hoped to complete the work in order to open in the spring. The business needed more

daylight, thus this application to add windows to the building. The windows would be the same proportion as shown on the elevations. The proportions and color would match the existing windows, and the landlord had also indicated his support by co-signing the letter to the HDC dated November 10, 2016.

Commissioner Argenta noted that this was a prominent building on Main Street. There was patterned brickwork going across the façade and around the windows. While he did not mind adding more windows, he was concerned about the execution of the design. Would there be brick to match the existing brick, so it didn't look like a patch job? He was also concerned about structure, as some of the windows were quite large. He would like to see was more detail of the beams, how they would hold up, etc. Were there existing columns?

Mr. Trivedi showed columns with a molded frame design. The changes would be supported by the columns and the beams; the walls were not load bearing so it was possible to install the windows without structurally damaging the building. They would have complete architectural drawings and would be getting City approvals. The brick would match exactly the existing bricks and the patterns would also be an exact match.

Commissioner Argenta remained concerned about the execution of the brickwork. He recommended that the applicant keep as much original brick as he could for use in patching around the new windows. It was very hard to find a brick that matched something that was done 40 years ago.

Mr. Trivedi said his goal was to have exactly the same bricks.

In response to a question from Commissioner Argenta, Planning Consultant Elmiger said she would list Commissioner Argenta's concerns in the tracking report she prepared after each meeting; Building Inspector Strong would receive a copy of the tracking report.

Chair Allen suggested that Mr. Trivedi work with the building owner to store any excess bricks, so that they might be available for future use.

Commissioner Field suggested that the applicant bring a detailed elevation of the brick design to an HDC subcommittee for approval. Any approval tonight should be conditioned on approval of the subcommittee. Commissioner Gudritz noted that the HDC also needed confirmation that the matching brick was available.

**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 returned the item to the Commission.

**MOTION Hoffman, support by Gudritz, 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, 5-4 masonry, 5-14 windows, and 5-18 paint and colors, subject to the following condition:**

- A detailed front elevation showing the brick patterns be submitted to and approved by a subcommittee made up of Commissioners Argenta and Field.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**CASE #3**

**MARY BETH WIDAK LIAS  
217 W. DUNLAP**

**ADDITION/ALTERATIONS**

Greg Presley, Presley Architecture, LLC, 108 N. Center, Suite 205, Northville MI 48167, was present on behalf of this application, which was to construct a building addition on the rear (south elevation) of the home at 217 W. Dunlap to add a master bedroom on the second floor. The project would be built on top of an existing one-story room, replacing a gable roof at the rear of the home. The footprint of the home would not change. Additional changes included:

1. The roof over the front porch would be replaced.
2. An existing window would be relocated to an existing bedroom on the first floor.
3. The garage roof and doors would be replaced.

The owner, Mary Beth Widak Lias, 217 W. Dunlap, Northville, was also present.

Mr. Presley distributed revised documents for this project.

Mr. Presley explained that the subject property was a corner lot, and the home had been added onto a few times. As a result, while the old house was nice, part of the back had an inappropriate pitch for the kitchen addition, and there was an addition with a flat roof over a bedroom on the first floor. What they were trying to do was an alteration to heal the house, both inside and out. They were doing four things:

1. Adding a master bedroom on the second floor as an expansion of the second floor.
2. Make interior changes to the first floor.
3. Redo the exterior cladding of the home.
4. Remove and replace the roof of the garage with added height, thus improving the design and providing some extra storage space.

In addition to the materials provided in the original packet, Mr. Presley said they would like to add two more requests:

1. New fireplace and chimney on the west elevation (remove existing chimney).
2. Replace all windows, with an accompanying design change.

Regarding the windows, they would replace the plain double-hung windows with windows that had an Arts and Crafts reference, which was more appropriate to the time period of the original home.

Mr. Presley said the body color (both lap siding and cedar shake) would be BM (Benjamin Moore) HC 97 “Hancock Gray.” The trim color and all doors, including the garage door but not the front door, would be BM HC 172 “Revere Pewter.” The windows would be white framed, with black sash and muntins, per the manufacturer. The front door would be BM HC 51 “Audubon Russet.”

In response to questions from Commissioner Field, Mr. Presley said the footprint of the home would not change. They were hoping to work with the siding uncovered during this alteration; this would probably be beveled cedar siding. The lot and house were nonconforming, with the garage having a nonconforming setback. The addition would be a conforming addition.

In response to a question from Chair Allen, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the zero setback for the garage was an existing non-conforming condition. Chair Allen asked if extending the height would increase the nonconformity. Mr. Presley said this would be decided by Building Inspector Strong.

Planning Consultant Elmiger asked the height of the existing garage. Mr. Presley said it was approximately 1 to 1.5 feet shorter than the proposed ridgeline of the new roof.

Chair Allen asked about the eaves that would be projecting over the neighboring property. Mr. Presley said this was an existing condition: the eaves currently extended over the neighboring property.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said she thought raising the height of the garage would be increasing the nonconformity in the setback. Mr. Presley said that if necessary, they would seek relief from the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Commissioner Field said the HDC's responsibility was to decide whether the addition met the requirements of the Historic District and whether the resulting structure would fit with the area.

Mr. Presley again reviewed the colors to be used. They wanted to add new cedar shakes at the upper wall area of the house and miter the corners; this would give a more historic reference. They were changing the front porch to give it a flare, so the wall actually flared out to meet the roof. They were changing out the supporting brackets. The color patterns were more of a tone on tone: sage with a trim board that was lighter but not white. They were adding color to the front door.

In response to a question from Commissioner Argenta, Mr. Presley said the body color would be the same, up and down, with textual differences adding interest to the home.

Commissioner Argenta wondered how old the home was. This alteration changed the whole outside of the home, resulting in a whole new appearance. Would the lap siding be stained?

Mr. Presley explained the history of covered over lap siding in old homes, and said he thought that while there might be holes in the lap siding, he also expected to find siding that was useable. They would be lightening the house by removing the existing thick aluminum siding.

Commissioner Argenta pointed out that the narrative said the existing siding would be reused, but the drawing said "new siding." Would Mr. Presley clarify this? Mr. Presley said they were refurbishing the existing siding on the bottom part of the home. There would be new cedar shake siding above.

Commissioner Hoffman asked what the time frame was for this project. Mr. Presley said the work would begin in spring 2017, and would take about 6 months to complete.

Commissioner Hoffman asked Planning Consultant Elmiger if all her concerns had been addressed. Planning Consultant Elmiger said the proposed overhang on the neighbor's property remained an issue. The applicant would need to either seek written permission from the neighbor for this overhang, or come back to the HDC with a new design, or do without it completely.

Mr. Presley asked if they could match the overhang that was there now, since they would not be expanding the nonconformity. Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that the nonconformity might not be expanded, but the City could not issue a permit for something on someone else's property.

Commissioner Gudritz asked which windows on the cut sheet would be used. Mr. Presley said they were using the window labeled "Hybrid." In response to a further question from Commissioner Gudritz, Mr. Presley said the windows were wood, and were clad on the outside with metal. The muntins would be attached on both sides, so that for all intents and purposes they would look like real divided light. The sashes would be black, the frames white.

In response to a question from Commissioner Argenta, Mr. Presley said there would not be any shutters.

In response to a question from Commissioner Field regarding windows on the east elevation, Mr. Presley said the drawings should be corrected to show all windows as having divided lights, with picture windows showing 4 over 1.

Planning Consultant Elmiger asked if the chimney would be brick. Mr. Presley showed samples of the materials. The roof shingles matched the existing. The chimney brick was Old Detroit. He also showed a sample of the cedar shake siding.

Commissioner Gudritz asked about the current chimney on the west elevation. Mr. Presley said they were removing that chimney in order to add the new one.

Commissioner Argenta noted that the chimney extended beyond the setback. Mr. Presley said the ordinance allowed 2” into the setback per foot of setback. The chimney would not exceed that allowance. There was a 10-foot setback, so 20” was allowed.

Commissioner Argenta asked if that requirement applied to nonconforming situations also. Mr. Presley said this was a question for the Building Inspector. The existing chimney already projected 17”.

Planning Consultant Elmiger noted that the 2” for every foot formula was for side yards, and not for front yards. The formula allowed a front projection to extend into the front yard not more than 3 feet, but this assumed the building was meeting the front setback requirement. It did not allow an additional 3 feet if the building was already in the setback.

Again, the plans would need to be reviewed and approved by the Building Inspector.

**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 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 3-21 materials, 3-22 details, 3-24 garages and carports, 5-4 masonry, 5-9 shingles, 5-14 windows, 5-17 siding, and 5-18 paint and colors. Motion carried unanimously.**

**CASE #4**

**ROBERT BUKHAVE  
145 N. CENTER**

**FLAT ROOF REPLACEMENT**

As noted above, the agenda was amended to add this item.

Robert Buckhave, 145 N. Center, Northville, MI was present on behalf of this application. He had brought color samples to show the Commission. They were proposing a metal roof, with the color as close to the original Harvest Green as possible.

Commissioner Field asked the location of the flat roof that was leaking. Mr. Buckhave pointed this out on the illustration provided. The flat roof came out 6 feet. Instead of repairing this they were proposing to build the roof out to 12 feet to cover the walkway.

Commissioner Field summarized that the applicant wanted to build a new roof, and at a later time they wanted to come to the HDC to show what it would be like underneath. The HDC would see the pillars and other improvements at a later date.

In response to further questions, Mr. Buckhave said that the wall had a transformer behind it, where the downspout was. In the future they were going to be bringing the wall out and providing a semi-transparent cover for the transformer.

Mr. Buckhave explained the design of the new roof, which would have a slight pitch.

Mr. Buckhave provided a slate sample, which had been salvaged from the building, to put on the small gables. The rest of the roof probably would last another 10 years. For tonight, they didn't want to change or alter anything else except to get the roof on. The temporary posts would only be there through the winter. The entire rear remodel would be brought back for approvals in the spring.

In response to a question from Commissioner Argenta, Mr. Buckhave said one of the pictures showed the leak in the roof, including where the ceiling was sagging.

**MOTION Gudritz, support by Field**, to accept the ~~application~~ verbal proposal 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 Gudritz**, to acknowledge that tonight's action is a solution to an emergency situation to stop a roof leak with its attendant structural problems, noting also that the application represents a special circumstance based on the needs of the owner and health and safety concerns, especially in light of the impending winter weather, and therefore the Commission grants 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, 4-27 rear façade development, 5-4 masonry, 5-8 slate, 5-10 metal roofing in the emerald green as presented, and 5-18 paint and colors. The Commission recognizes that this work shows temporary measures put in place for supporting the roof, with the applicant committed to returning to the HDC by April 2017 for approval of the entire rear façade development. **Motion carried unanimously.**

## 8. DISCUSSION

### Lighting Design Standards

Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that at a previous meeting she had provided requested samples of lighting design standards for the Commission. Based on that discussion, tonight she was presenting draft language for residential and commercial lighting standards.

Chair Allen asked about process. Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that these were standards/guidelines, and as such could be approved by the Commission without a public hearing. After approval, the standards would be in effect, and did not need to go to City Council. She read from the Local Historic District's Act, Act 169 of 1970:

*(9) The Commission shall adopt its own rules of procedure and shall adopt design review standards and guidelines for resource treatment to carry out its duties under this act.*

There was nothing in the bylaws or Northville ordinance that required City Council to review guidelines.

Round table discussion followed. Suggested changes included:

- Residential guidelines, amend second bullet point, 3<sup>rd</sup> line, new sentence to read: If a reproduction is not available, install a new contemporary fixture that is . . .
- Residential guidelines, 6<sup>th</sup> bullet point: *Use understated techniques and light sources to highlight a building's architecture.* Should this be included at all? Should lighting be used in a contemporary way to highlight a historic structure? Porch lights sometimes also highlighted a building's architecture, but that did not seem to be the point of this language. Did the Commission want to allow highlighting a structure? What was an understated technique? Couldn't this cause future conflicts? However, this language would prohibit spotlights, for instance, while allowing appropriate lighting to highlight a property. At any time the HDC could say that lighting was not appropriate in the Historic District. Alternate language could state: *The use of lighting to highlight a building's architecture is discouraged.* This would allow a little flexibility to allow lighting when appropriate.
- Was there a way to communicate these new guidelines to people in the Historic District? Would simply adding them to the guidelines be sufficient? The guidelines and standards were posted on the City's website.
- Residential guidelines, amend the 9<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read: A low height is recommended for light poles in most locations lampposts.
- Commercial guidelines, amend second bullet point, 3<sup>rd</sup> line, new sentence to read: If a reproduction is not available, install a new contemporary fixture that is . . .
- Commercial guidelines, amend 7<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read: Don't use harsh flood lighting on the front or side of residential building faces . . .

The consensus of the Commission was to have Planning Consultant Elmiger bring back revised language for approval at the next meeting.

## 9. ADJOURNMENT:

Seeing that there was no further comment, Chair Allen adjourned the meeting at 8:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Cheryl McGuire  
Recording Secretary

Approved as amended 12/21/2016