

NORTHVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
April 19, 2017
Wednesday 7:00 P.M. – Northville City Hall – Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

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

Present: Allen, Argenta, Field, Gudritz, Hoffman, Murdock
Absent: Tartaglia (excused)
Also Present: Mayor Roth, Planning Consultant Elmiger, Downtown Development Director Ward

2. PUBLIC COMMENT:

None.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

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

4. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES:

March 9, 2017 – Workshop
March 15, 2017 – Regular
April 3, 2017 – Subcommittee

The following correction and amendment was made to the March 15, 2017 minutes:

- P. 3, Case 3, 3rd paragraph, 3rd line: This evening ~~that~~ they
- P. 4, Case 3, 1st paragraph, 3rd line forward: . . . A schematic illustrating the width of the pass-through to the rear of the building was shown on page 7 in the packet, showing a 6-foot person adjacent to the building. A walkway would be provided from Main Street adjacent to the building and then to the back as illustrated.

MOTION Argenta, support by Hoffman, to approve the minutes of March 15, 2017 as amended. **Motion carried unanimously.**

MOTION Hoffman, support by Field, to approve the minutes of the March 9 workshop meeting as published. **Motion carried unanimously.**

MOTION Argenta, support by Field, to approve the minutes of the April 3 subcommittee meeting as published. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that it had just been brought to her attention that an application for a sign from Brown Dog Creamery had been submitted on time for tonight's meeting, but the application did not get on tonight's agenda or its accompanying information in the packets.

After brief discussion, Commissioner Hoffman offered the following motion:

MOTION Hoffman, support by Gudritz, to add as agenda item 3.1 a sign for Brown Dog Creamery. **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

S4CENTER LLC

ROOFTOP ENCLOSURE

107 N. CENTER

Commissioner Field said that he and Commissioner Argenta had met as a subcommittee on April 3, 2017, with Mike Devine and Joseph Phillips, of Joseph Philips Architects, as charged in the motion made at the March 15, 2017 HDC meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to meet the following condition of the motion:

Visual verification by a subcommittee of the line of sight from the street by a six-foot tall person to the top of the most forward part of the railing and the top of the most forward part of the building, from the following locations:

- *Directly across the street (North Center)*
- *Genetti's at Main and Center.*

In the case of a discrepancy, the applicants must return to the HDC for further discussion and revision.

Commissioner Field said at the subcommittee meeting the applicants had a 13'4" pole with a flag on it to show the heights of the railing and the building. Commissioners Argenta and Field were there to affirm that the information presented at the March meeting that only a little ridge would be visible from across Center Street and from Genetti's was in fact accurate.

What they affirmed was that the building would be visible. The rooftop structure would be visible from street level between Genetti's and Chocolates by Rene, a lineal distance of about 90 feet. Therefore the application was referred back to the applicant, and they were again present before the HDC.

Commissioner Field said that it was now up to the HDC to decide whether or not the structure's visibility was enough to change their opinion regarding approval. He himself was fine with the change, as long as the color was appropriate.

Joseph Philips, 921 Wing Street, Plymouth MI, showed the pole that had been used and where the visibility occurred – about 5 feet of the pole's height was visible. New drawings had been submitted for this evening's meeting to show the degree of visibility.

Commissioner Argenta explained that the concern was that the drawings showed the rooftop structure would not be visible. However, for the 90 feet already described, about 6-7 feet of the structure would be visible. This was more than was originally shown on the plans, but with the proper colors, the visibility would probably not be detrimental.

Commissioner Hoffman said that a pedestrian on Main Street was typically not focused on what was across the street and up. Commissioner Field added that the structure would not distract from the building; it would almost appear as a large HVAC shield might appear.

Commissioner Murdock asked if there were any other decks in town. Commissioner Field said that he didn't think there were.

Mr. Philips showed the color palette for the structure, as listed on the sheet entitled *Color Selections*, dated 03/15/17. The railings would be steel cable, with wood-stained caps as finials.

Mr. Philips further explained that the original drawing had been accurate, except that the computer designer had thought Genetti's was on the corner.

MOTION Field, support by Hoffman, 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.

As there had been a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness at the March 15, 2017 meeting, Commissioner Hoffman made the following motion:

MOTION Hoffman, support by Gudritz, to grant a notice to proceed based on the visual verification of the Subcommittee, and the Commission accepts the line of site verification as described this evening. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #2

**MARGENE & BOB BUCKHAVE GATE
145 N. CENTER**

Margene and Bob Buckhave, 145 N. Center, were present on behalf of this application, which was to modify the rear façade at 145 N. Center as follows:

- Add metal gates to screen existing electrical transformers.
- Extend deck and install Trex railing (black and white) and Trex decking on the deck above the transformers.
- Add columns and black railings along the barrier-free ramp to the rear door.
- Stain existing stone in gray tones, and restore the existing deck.

Ms. Buckhave distributed supporting materials as requested in the Carlisle/Wortman review letter, including photographs.

Mr. Buckhave reminded the Commission that he had been before the HDC last year. The photographs showed 3 areas:

- The area of the green roof.
- The center section that included the deck and the gate.
- The south portion of the west side of the building.

Regarding the deck and gate, they would be removing a portion of the block wall, fence, and existing deck, in order to install a new deck with an overhang that would project out approximately 5 feet, with 3 columns. They would also install a new fence/gate with a sliding door at the south end of the existing gate. The materials would be black metal similar to that shown on the cut sheets, though the finials might have round tops.

There was a transformer behind the block wall. Mr. Buckhave had met with DTE and they came to a decision that the deck installation would be designed so that if DTE brought in a boom truck they could raise a section of the deck, set it off to the side, and access the transformer. The gate would also be removable in order to be able to use a HI-LOW there.

Commissioner Field asked how the Buckhaves would access the deck. Ms. Buckhave said their access would be from inside the house, and since the deck was behind the gate, it would not be visible from the parking lot. It could also be accessed when the gate was opened, via a staircase there.

In response to a question from Commissioner Field, Ms. Buckhave said that the rolling gate would not be entirely visible, but needed to be clear enough for DTE to access it.

Ms. Buckhave further described the project. In the area of the handicapped railing, there would be four fiberglass columns matching the one shown on the bottom photograph, with black railing in between the columns. Regarding the brick, she showed examples of two colors of Belden brick: Rosewood, which would be used on the original 1885 building, and Bellcrest 30, which would be used on the 1927 addition.

The faux-stone façade was what was left of the Castleridge Restaurant. This was a very hard material and was difficult to remove. They were working with Nawkaw to help stain that wall – they would not know the exact color until the on-site colorization was complete.

Referring to the April 11, 2017 Carlisle/Wortman review letter, Commissioner Hoffman asked about the brick restoration process.

Ms. Buckhave said this specifically referred to an area shown on the photograph of the south portion of the west side. The left side of the door was the only portion that had paint on the brick. They were seeking bids to remove the paint and restore the brick. If they could remove the paint without harming the brick, they would like to have Nawkaw stain that wall also.

Ms. Buckhave pointed out the 6 windows filled with cinderblock, with concrete atop that with lines added to look like brick. To cut through that, remove it, and then fill it again with brick was very expensive.

Commissioner Argenta said that if the painted brick wall could be cleaned and neutralized, a dark red stain such as that shown on the photograph could cover a multitude of sins. He cautioned against hard-pressure washing.

Commissioner Hoffman pointed out that sand blasting was prohibited.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gudritz, Ms. Buckhave said the brick to the right of the door was part of the 1920s addition; it was not part of the original church.

Ms. Buckhave said she would like approval this evening for the Nawkaw stain process. Commissioner Argenta said that he would be fine with approving a dark red to match the existing dark red south end brick that was there now. If the color changed, the applicants should return to the HDC for further approval.

Mr. Buckhave said the other option was to paint all the brick.

Commissioner Field agreed that an approving motion could reference the color of the dark red brick on the south end. If anything else should occur, the Buckhaves would have to return.

MOTION Argenta, support by Hoffman, 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 2, 6, 7, 9 and 10, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-21 materials, 4-27 rear façade development, 3-4 fences, 3-23 decks, 5-4 masonry, and 5-18 paint and color. Regarding color of the brick specifically, if the applicants decide to do anything other than stain the brick to match the dark red color at the south end, they must return to the HDC for approval. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #3

**GEORGE & RITA FARAH
124 E. MAIN STREET**

NEW DINING PLATFORM

George Farah, 4875 School Bell Lane, Bloomfield MI, was present on behalf of this application, which was to change the decking of the outdoor dining platform at 124 E. Main Street, which was installed in front of their business during summer months. No other changes were proposed.

Mr. Farah explained that the old decking was too heavy to manage and they would like to change materials. He distributed material samples from Aeratis Porch Flooring in 2 colors: Weathered Wood and Redwood. He would install the new deck the summer of 2018.

Commissioner Hoffman cautioned that there was a one-year time limit to accomplish the requested change and no extensions were permitted.

Commissioner Field asked if there would be a skirt around the deck. Mr. Farah said the construction was such the base would disappear.

Commissioner Hoffman asked if the color had been decided or if the dark color was still an option. Mr. Farah said the dark color was still an option.

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

Chair Allen opened the meeting for public comment.

Downtown Development Director Ward suggested adding the Aeratis product as part of the accepted design guidelines for platforms for sidewalk cafes, so that in the future such a change would only require administrative approval. The guidelines already contained types of materials for railing, trim on top, decking, etc., and if a business owner stayed within those parameters, the City Manager could approve an application administratively. Only if an option was desired that wasn’t on the list would something come to the HDC.

Commissioner Field said that he was against giving up process for something right in the middle of town. Although the approval process could be very simple, he would like to have the platforms come before the HDC.

Director Ward said such things were approved administratively now. Perhaps this should be reviewed.

Seeing that no one else 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 Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-23 decks, 4-21 materials, for Aeratis porch flooring as shown, and 5-18 paint and color, with approved color being Weathered Wood or Redwood. **Motion carried unanimously.**

CASE 3.1

BROWNDOG CREAMERY
PAUL GABRIEL
120 E. MAIN STREET

SIGN

As noted above, the agenda had been amended to hear this case.

Paul Scherle and Paul Gabriel were present on behalf of this application. They distributed the packet information regarding this request.

The requested sign would be a flat sign mounted to the front of the building. Dimensions were given on a superimposed photograph of the sign, with the colors being Pantone 719 Cream at 75%, and Pantone 483 Brown. The materials would be die bond and PVC. These were the same colors as the sign approved at their previous building. The sign would not be lit.

In response to a question from Chair Allen, Planning Consultant Elmiger said she had not been able to review this application, as she had just received the materials this evening.

Chair Allen asked if the sign size met regulations. Planning Consultant Elmiger said that it appeared that the sign's size – about 26 square feet – was compliant, but again she had not been able to review this application.

Commissioner Hoffman asked how the sign would be attached to the building. Mr. Gabriel said that there were existing sign screws from the previous sign. They hoped to use those. In any event, they would not interfere with the glass behind the façade.

Commissioner Allen said that if the transom were exposed the sign could probably be raised. From the audience, Greg Presley said the transom was about 18" high.

Commissioner Argenta said that part of a previous approval was to remove the awning and restore the glass behind. Mr. Scherle said that approval was actually for their previous building. They never did that work because they did not own that building.

The applicants said there were many amazing features of this property, and they would be very careful not to damage the glass and were keeping other elements as well, including some milled black walnut.

MOTION Field, support by Gudritz, 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, 4-24 signs, and, and 5-18 paint and color. **Motion carried unanimously.**

CASE #4

**SHELTER DESIGN STUDIO, LLC
495 W. CADY STREET**

DEMOLITION

Andre Kazewych, owner of 495 W. Cady Street, and architect Steve Pariseau, Shelter Design Studio, LLC were present on behalf of this application.

Mr. Kazewych spoke of their pleasure at being able to purchase 495 W. Cady Street. He mentioned several historic projects that Mr. Pariseau had completed and was completing throughout southeast Michigan.

Mr. Pariseau said they would like to expand the front porch. There was an existing slab-on-grade shed attached to the easterly side of the house that would be removed and a 70 square foot first floor addition constructed. The deck on the south side would also be removed, and the front porch would be expanded to the east. A second floor addition over the existing footprint on the south side was also planned; this would entail the removal of the existing roof.

Chair Allen asked how old the shed was. Mr. Pariseau said he thought the shed was most likely constructed in the 1970s when a carport was removed. The existing deck on the rear was constructed in the 1980s. He gave further history of the home, including a fire in the 1940s. Over the years there had been interior renovation, and a kitchen had been moved to a bedroom space. The present owners were planning on moving the kitchen back to its prior location.

Commissioner Hoffman summarized that the majority of the house was original with the exception of the one-story addition and the deck in the rear, and potentially the one story portion on the south side of the home.

Mr. Pariseau said he thought there had been an addition on the south side because there was an exterior chimney hidden in the wall.

Regarding the proposed west elevation on First Street, Commissioner Field said that the old portion of the home should be differentiated from the new. The proposed construction made the home look like it was built this way originally, with no differentiation of new siding, windows, trim, etc.

Mr. Pariseau said there were different schools of thought regarding adding on to historic homes. They tended to make their renovation designs seamless, so the addition did not look like an add on.

Commissioner Hoffman explained that Secretary of Interior standards required differentiation between new and old.

Commissioner Argenta said there were discussions regarding this all over the country right now. Large additions needed to be differentiated. If the addition was small and adjacent to the existing building, then sometimes these could be blended in.

Commissioner Hoffman said that tying in the porch with the existing structure was within guideline specifications. However, perhaps the foundations for the new additions might be constructed of a differentiating material.

Commissioner Hoffman further explained that the differentiation did not need to be dramatic, but did need to be there.

Mr. Pariseau said that a stucco finish for the new foundation would provide a nice differentiation and would be true to the era. Also, a vertical trim line could be added to the west elevation.

Relative to the demolition, Commissioner Hoffman said the only comment in the Carlisle/Wortman review letter asked about the history of the portion to be demolished.

Commissioner Argenta said that he was intrigued by the historic picture that showed the curves on the porch woodwork. Mr. Pariseau said that when work was done in the 70-80's, the then owner had removed some porch coverings and discovered that those curved elements were no longer there.

Commissioner Hoffman asked if the existing railing was period-authentic. Mr. Pariseau said it was. Commissioner Hoffman pointed out that the lower railing helped maintain authenticity.

Commissioner Hoffman noted that the case for demolition was that the resource was a deterrent to a major improvement program.

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 approve the demolition of the shed, along with the affected roof and the portion of the south wall that would be removed to construct the new second floor, at 495 W. Cady Street, because:

- The resource was a deterrent to a major improvement program
- The features were not historically significant.

Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #5

**SHELTER DESIGN STUDIO, LLC
495 W. CADY STREET**

ADDITION & RENOVATION

Andre Kazewych, owner of 495 W. Cady Street, and architect Steve Pariseau, Shelter Design Studio, LLC were present on behalf of this application, which carried forward the discussion from Case #4. The plan was to:

- Replace existing wood siding with Hardie plank siding.
- Add new windows in building additions.
- Add new French doors at rear addition.
- New roof over original and new structures.
- Paint entire building.

Mr. Pariseau referred the Commission to the materials sheet for the new addition and renovation for 495 W. Cady Street. He noted that the *stone foundation to match existing* would now be a stucco foundation, as already discussed. The remainder of the materials would include "Certainteed"

Independence Dimension Shingle in black for the roof, and James Hardie products for the siding. The siding color would be 18 Adams Gold, with accent in Benjamin Moore 258 Acorn Squash, and trim Benjamin Moore 204 Woodmont Cream. The aluminum cladding on the windows would match the trim color.

Regarding window replacement, they would like to salvage the existing glass by removing it, insulating it, and then sending it to the window manufacturer to install within the new frame.

Commissioner Argenta asked why all the siding was being removed, as some appeared to be in decent shape.

Mr. Pariseau explained that the original intent was to remove all the existing siding, but upon review they were planning to leave the existing siding in place, and at a later time replace with the Hardie siding. Therefore the existing home would keep the original siding, but the addition would utilize Hardie siding. Chair Allen said this would help with the differentiation.

Responding to further questions in the April 11, 2017 Carlisle/Wortman review letter, Mr. Pariseau explained:

- Currently there was lattice under the porch. They were proposing board and batten there, with color matching the trim color.
- No exterior lighting such as coach lighting was proposed. There would be lighting recessed in the deck areas.
- They hoped to start construction within 6-8 weeks.

Mr. Pariseau asked for clarification regarding the comment in the review letter pointing out that a calculation showing the average front setback needed to be provided for both Cady Street and First Avenue. They were matching the existing setbacks on Cady and First Streets.

Planning Consultant Elmiger advised that whether or not this was a nonconforming situation depended on what the average setback was as defined by ordinance – this would determine the setback for that property. If the existing porch was in that setback, enlarging the porch would be enlarging a nonconformity and would need BZA approval. This would be determined by the Building Official.

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

Chair Allen opened the meeting for public comment. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Allen 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 2, 9, and 10, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-8 preserving doors, 3-9 ornamental details, 3-10 porches, 3-14 setbacks and spacing, 3-17 height, 3-19 proportion, 3-21 materials, 3-22 details, 3-23 decks and dormers, 5-9 asphalt shingles, 5-12 preserving stonework, 5-14 windows, 5-17 siding, and 5-18 paint and color, with the stipulation that the new siding be on the addition only. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #6

**GREG PRESLEY/THERESE GROSSI
512 W. DUNLAP**

DEMOLITION

Architect Greg Presley, 108 N. Center, Suite 205, Northville, was present on behalf of this application, as were the property owners Therese Grossi and Paul Sklut.

Mr. Presley explained that the existing 1930's garage had dilapidated to the point that it was ready to collapse under its own weight. Structural issues were:

- No foundation
- Decayed wood bottom plates sit on dirt
- Bowed walls and roof
- No ridge rafter

Mr. Sklut and Ms. Grossi said that when they had acquired the property they had thought about saving the garage. After living with the garage for some time, it now appeared that saving it was hopeless.

Mr. Presley said they couldn't find any history that supported the structure. It was very small and narrow, and could not really function as a garage. They were asking for a simple permission to demolish without a formal structural engineer's report.

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 Gudritz to approve the demolition of the garage at 512 W. Dunlap, because:

- The resource constituted a hazard to the safety of the public or the occupants.
- Based on the documentation provided and the review by Commission members a structural engineer study is not required.
- The structure is not historically significant.

Motion carried unanimously.

CASE # 7

**GREG PRESLEY/THERESE GROSSI
512 W. DUNLAP**

RE-BUILD GARAGE

Architect Greg Presley, 108 N. Center, Suite 205, Northville, was present on behalf of this application, as were the property owners Therese Grossi and Paul Sklut. This application was related to and carried forward the discussion from Case #6. The application was for the construction of a residential accessory building – a new garage.

Mr. Presley said the new structure would be larger than the one to be demolished, but it did meet all dimensional requirements and was smaller than the size permitted. There would be an area for loft storage, with stairs constructed to code.

Commissioner Argenta asked about the garage door. Mr. Presley said it would be one garage door, 18 feet wide, that would look like 2 doors. The garage would be forward facing, but would be set back 130 feet from the edge of the street. The one wide garage door would facilitate making a 3 point turn in order to pull out of the drive face-forward much easier.

Commissioner Field said that other single doors of this same style appeared out of place where they had been used in the City.

Commissioner Hoffman said that he understood the difficulty of getting in and out of the garage if two smaller doors were installed. He also understood that the design of the door did give the appearance of 2 doors.

Mr. Presley gave an example of another garage where they had used the same design with a good result.

Commissioner Hoffman also noted how far back the garage would be and the house would block most of the garage visually. The record would show why this single door would be appropriate for this specific lot, and should not be considered a precedent.

Commissioner Hoffman referenced the outstanding questions in the April 12, 2017 Carlisle/Wortman letter. Mr. Presley explained that:

- The lap siding, trim and column would match the home's addition, and would be James Hardie material.
- Coach lights were proposed on both sides of the door.
- Information regarding the garage door design had been provided.

MOTION Argenta, 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 Gudritz to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing the Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-14 setbacks and spacing, 3-17 height, 3-19 proportion, 3-21 materials, 3-23 dormers, 3-24 garages, 5-9 asphalt shingles, 5-14 windows, 5-17 siding, and 5-18 paint and color. Motion carried unanimously.

As noted above, the approval of this single garage door was given as appropriate for this specific property, and should not be considered precedent.

**CASE #8
TAMMY OLEXA
511 W. CADY**

DEMOLITION

Architectural Designer Marilyn Sullivan, 532 Fairbrook, Northville, MI and Architect Kenneth Polenz, 163 Amelia Street, Plymouth MI were present on behalf of this application, as was the property owner Tammy Olexa. The proposal was to demolish and replace the roof, and demolish an existing deck on the rear of the house, and construct an addition on the rear and east side of the home.

Ms. Sullivan explained that the rear deck was not original to the home. They were also requesting that:

- The front porch flooring and rails be changed out as they were not original to the home and currently constituted a safety hazard.
- The roof be raised. The roof was a strong architectural feature of the home; they wanted to continue that feature through the new addition.
- A change of roof color.

Ms. Sullivan further explained that the existing second floor had a ceiling height from 7' to 7'7". The new construction would provide for an 8' ceiling height. There was also a safety issue concerning the roof because where the dormer came down at an angle there was a maximum 5'10" height in the stair landing.

Commissioner Argenta asked for a description of the proposed additions.

Ms. Sullivan said the additions included:

- The rear would be enlarged to create a mudroom and sunroom.
- The side would be enlarged to create a guestroom.
- A dormer would be added to the front of the house.
- The hip gable roof would be continued to the rear of the home.

They were requesting a change to the exterior color and siding of the house. Specifically, were requesting vinyl siding, and Trex for the porches with square finials. This would be repeated on the rear porch.

Ms. Sullivan showed a sample of vinyl siding that was currently being manufactured for use in historic districts. It had the appearance of 4” flatboard and cornerboards. She distributed color samples of the siding and trim.

Discussion regarding vinyl siding followed.

Commissioner Hoffman said that essentially the vinyl siding looked like a tougher material than normal vinyl siding. However, there would be J-channel installation for the siding. Was there a reason that Hardie siding was not being considered?

Chair Allen said there was only one home that he knew of in the Historic District that had vinyl siding.

Commissioner Argenta noted that the Northville Design Standards specifically prohibited vinyl siding.

Ms. Olexa said the vinyl siding being discussed had been builder-recommended. Its quality was high, it was designed to mimic wood, and as a single mom she did not want to have to repaint the house years from now. She also had heard that Hardie Plank had moisture issues.

Ms. Sullivan asked if painting the aluminum that was currently on the home would be an option.

Chair Allen said that new Hardie board against painted aluminum would be less than optimum. The aluminum would still oxidize under the paint – painted aluminum just didn’t work.

Commissioner Argenta said that the proposed addition was rather large. How would that addition be differentiated from the original home?

Ms. Sullivan said that she felt the addition should blend in. However, like the earlier applicant, they would be using a different foundation. There would also be a cornerboard where the new and old were connected. They would make whatever changes were necessary to differentiate as required.

Commissioner Gudritz asked about the historical background of the home. Ms. Sullivan said it was built in 1922. The interior was simple bungalow. She believed the entire home was original because the original basement was under the entire footprint.

Commissioner Hoffman said the vinyl siding would not be approved. Ms. Olexa asked if the paint colors could be approved this evening. They would be Benjamin Moore HC 143 Wythe Blue for the body and Benjamin Moore 960 Dove Wing for the trim.

Commissioner Hoffman said that the home was a beautiful bungalow. He also felt the addition was a major one. Would the addition now be the primary structure? He acknowledged that the addition was set more to the back of the home, thus preserving the front. The east elevation seemed a long façade that was not broken up. He asked for Commissioner Argenta’s opinions about these issues.

Commissioner Argenta said that lifting the roof would not maintain its existing lines. He noted the absence of construction drawings.

Commissioner Argenta felt that the submitted drawings seemed preliminary in nature, with no notes, heights, cross sections, etc. If there were cross sections drawn, they might change some of the configuration of the roof lines. The addition changed the entire building except for the front elevation.

Commissioner Field agreed that this was a substantial addition. He felt the HDC needed more information. He would like to see:

- How the addition would be differentiated from the original home.
- What siding would be used.
- Elevations after the roof was raised.

Commissioner Allen suggested superimposing the existing structure on the new elevation.

Mr. Polenz spoke to the need to raise the roof while saving the roof lines. He thought this would be possible. He would bring construction documents in May.

Commissioner Argenta asked how much of the second floor actually had 7’6” ceilings, which was the minimum required by code.

Design options were discussed, especially regarding the roof, stair well and second floor design.

Ms. Sullivan said they would like to have exterior lighting, including motion detectors. One would be on the garage and another on the porch.

A discussion of process followed. The demolition could not be approved because the Commission was not ready to approve the new addition. Referring the application back to the applicant would avoid the need to complete the review within a certain amount of time.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Field, to refer the demolition application for Case #8, 511 W. Cady, back to the applicant. **Motion carried unanimously.**

**CASE #9
TAMMY OLEXA
511 W. CADY**

RENOVATION & ADDITION

Following the discussion and motion regarding Case #8, the following motion was made regarding Case #9.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Gudritz, to refer the application for Case #9, renovation and addition at 511 W. Cady, back to the applicant, with the following items needed for a return to the Commission:

- Siding cannot be vinyl
- More details on differentiating the new from the old
- Methods for breaking up the east elevation
- Detailed elevation drawings with dimensions

- On all elevations, superimpose the old construction on the new
- Street view to scale, in order to show the relationship of the renovation to next-door neighbors.

Motion carried unanimously.

8. DISCUSSION

None.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Seeing that there was no further comment, Chair Allen adjourned the meeting at 9:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl McGuire
Recording Secretary

Approved as published 06/21/2017