

NORTHVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
September 20, 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, Tartaglia
Absent: None.
Also Present: Mayor Ken Roth, Planning Consultant Elmiger

2. PUBLIC COMMENT:

None.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

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

4. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES: August 16, 2017

MOTION Hoffman, support by Gudritz, to approve the August 16, 2017 minutes as published. 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:

341 E. MAIN STREET – DEMOLITION

Ed Funke, Guidobono Building Company, was present on behalf of this application, which was to request a demolition permit for 341 E. Main Street, a burgundy-painted two-story building with a covered single-level front porch that had previously served as the McGuire Fine Arts building. Eric Guidobono, owner, and Joseph Mosely, architect, were also present

Mr. Funke explained that Guidobono Building Company had been Northville-based for 30 years. Their office had typically been housed in the subdivisions they were building. They had decided to find a permanent office home in Northville's Central Business District, so when the McGuire building came on the market in summer 2016, it caught their attention because the 2-story building with 1200 square feet on each floor was perfectly sized for their offices. They were also attracted to the location as well as the simplicity of the building's style: a streamlined Italianate with a Mansard roof that at one time had a widow's walk. They purchased the home and engaged the services of local architect Joseph Mosey to do the redesign work.

Historical research at the Mill Race Historical Village yielded some information about the home. Mill Race Village staff said that even though the home could be older, based on Polk Directory

records the home was probably built between the turn of the century up to the 1930s. The first owner identified by the Northville Historical Society was a dog trainer, Fred Moffit, who lived in the home in the 1940s. Prior to the 1920s the address didn't exist.

Guidobono purchased the home in December 2016, and worked with Mr. Mosey in order to develop plans for its renovation, which they submitted for HDC approval in the spring of 2017. Their intent was to maintain the integrity of the home, restore its exterior details as shown in the two available old photographs, and then redesign the interior for their office spaces.

Deconstruction work on the interior home was begun, including removing the plaster and lathe wall and ceilings. After they were about 25% into this deconstruction they decided they had found enough structural deficiencies that they needed to engage a structural engineer, Maverick Consulting Engineers, Inc., to complete a full assessment of the building. Maverick Consulting found virtually everything to be deficient.

The foundation wall was not classified as a basement wall, but rather a stone grade earthen retaining wall. They suspected it was not built on footings; it was just a stone wall on the ground.

The lumber was 2x6, 8- or 10-inch beams from old trees, with 2x8 or 2x10 floor and ceiling joists notched down by 2 inches, leaving 2x6 floor and ceiling joists that spanned about 24 feet.

The Mansard roof had been repaired a number of times by installing posts to transfer roof loads, bearing down on interior non-load bearing walls. The roof continued to sag.

Rebuilding the house would entail encapsulating the foundation on both the interior and exterior with cement, or digging underneath the walls to put in footings, or jacking up the house to move it and pour a new basement.

Additionally they had asbestos in the home and almost certainly there was lead-based paint.

The home was a 2x4 construction with balloon framing for the walls, which didn't support the floor load of the second floor. All the walls would need to be reframed, and the windows would need to be brought up to code, as would the mechanicals and plumbing.

The structural engineer's conclusion was:

The required improvements to this structure will amount to a complete and total structure rebuild. In essence, new framing will completely encompass the existing "skeletal" structure. New concrete foundations would encapsulate the existing stone foundation resulting in diminished usable basement square footage, or need to be completely rebuilt. Post renovation health risks may remain with mold and/or lead paint contamination being present. It is our opinion that the useful and technical service life of this building is expired. The minimum required levels of structural safety and serviceability no longer remain. It is our recommendation that the structure be razed and rebuilt.

Mr. Funke said it would cost somewhere in the neighborhood of \$750,000 to rebuild the home. If they demolished the home and rebuilt it to the exact same footprint, it would cost half that. However, if they were going to tear it down, it seemed to them more reasonable to investigate starting from scratch and building something more in keeping with today's trends and meet needs other than just Guidobono office space.

Mr. Funke said that at that point in their discussion they pulled their application from HDC consideration, and worked on developing plans for constructing a new project on this site. Working with Mr. Mosely, they came up with a beautiful 3-story building that would offer a mixed-use building environment, with their office on the first floor and perhaps other retail office space, with luxury condominiums on the 2nd and 3rd floors. He said they received frequent calls from old clients who wanted to sell their homes and move into town but there was nowhere to go. Guidobono thought this could be an opportunity to get some of those people into downtown Northville. They could meet all zoning requirements including parking on this lot, and had brought some renderings with them this evening.

Chair Allen opened the public hearing at 7:14 p.m.

John Kelly, Northville resident and owner at 422 E. Main Street, asked why the Guidobono's, being builders, had not anticipated the work this structure would need.

Mr. Funke said they had been aware of some of the structural weaknesses when they purchased. However, until they pulled down the plaster and lathe they were not able to actually see the skeleton of the building.

Mr. Kelly continued that he was excited about a project on this site. The building had been vacant for a long time, and the project could benefit the Central Business District generally and other business owners specifically. He hoped the new construction would be consistent with the idea of the Historic District.

Janice Johns, 410 E. Main Street, agreed that as builders the Guidobono's should have known they were buying a very old building in the Historic District. What was the real intention to begin with? While she didn't object to new construction, she felt allowing this construction in the Historic District constituted a slippery slope.

Ron Bodnar, 342 E. Main, said that while he respected the Guidobono's, he had questions about this project. He was surprised Guidobono didn't find out how bad the structure was until after they had purchased it. The building was older than represented this evening. He had been told the building had been used as a Red Cross Hospital probably for World War I and that Henry Ford used it after that as a dormitory when he opened his plant here. Mr. Bodnar felt the Commission should take its time making this decision, and asked for a delay of 30 days. He thought he knew of someone who would be willing to purchase the property and restore the home. He was concerned with tearing historic buildings down and replacing them with modern, 3 and 4-story structures. What was the point of the Historic District if buildings were allowed to be demolished?

Michelle Kelly, 422 E. Main, wondered why the City had allowed the building to deteriorate to such an extent that it now had to be demolished. She had not seen the building used in 30 years. She hoped that any building constructed would blend with the Historic District. She felt that people moving downtown benefited everyone. She supported the demolition request as long as the replacement was thoughtful and in character.

Chair Allen explained that some time ago the City had taken court action in order to get improvements made on the building's exterior; the HDC had never seen the interior. The full report from the structural engineer showed significant interior deficiencies.

James Ritchie, Spring Drive, Northville, MI, said he found the condition of the building shocking. If the applicants replaced everything that needed to be replaced, there wouldn't be much left of

the original building. He hoped that any new construction would reflect the historic character of the District, and perhaps replicate a building that had been lost, such as the Opera House that was demolished in 1947. People were drawn to Northville because of its historic character, and having a new, modern building at this location would defeat the purpose of having a historic district.

Gail Levan, 132 Randolph Street, gave some memories of the Historic District, including the demolition of the Opera House. She said that when they purchased the old Foreman farm 40 years ago, they couldn't find the year it was built either. It had been a tremendous challenge to make it livable, including jacking it up to make structural repairs. Now they lived in a house on Randolph Street, which had stones in the basement and crooked walls, but was still standing. People came to Northville because it was old and beautiful. It was a mistake to tear down old houses. Old wood and old beams came from old trees and were hand chiseled and were precious.

Dr. William Demray spoke to the need for historic preservation generally, the importance of the Historic District Commission, and noted that in terms of tonight's application, the applicants had gone from the preservation of a historic home to a more grandiose project. He agreed with Mr. Bodnar that this decision needed more time.

Greg Presley, 108 N. Center Street, Northville, MI said that as a preservation architect he needed to stand up for preservation. He acknowledged that he had been before the HDC himself asking for demolitions. Also, he had been through the structure under consideration about a year ago, when he was hired to take a look at it for someone else. While this building would cost a lot to fix up, you could fix anything. Preservation hurts. It was not fun sometimes but there were usually solutions. From a planning perspective, while this property was zoned CBD the uses in the area were actually closer to PBO – Professional Business Office, which were destination locations. Those uses were set back 20-30 feet from the road, and were all houses that had been repurposed. This house was definitely a contributing structure to the District, and if the HDC decided to preserve the building as contributing, he challenged the applicants to consider how to preserve the building in a creative project that met the financial needs of the building.

Richard Corriveau, owner of a law office across the street and a commercial building around the corner, said they spent significant money to keep both of their buildings in good shape. One was built in 1860 and he had invested in it rather than tear it down. He felt they jeopardized the value of their homes and neighborhoods if buildings in the District were allowed to be demolished, and he urged that the building be retained.

Leanie Bayly, President of the Northville Historical Society, spoke to the nature of the Society's archives, which existed as a result of donations only. Addresses had been changed a number of times over the years. The Guidobono's were talented, skilled builders. Still, when she moved in 25 years ago her 1923 home was one of the newer homes on her block; now it was one of the older ones. It was important to preserve the homes that were left. She spoke from experience, as she had served on the HDC herself for more than a decade. Once a building was gone it was gone forever. She agreed that the Commission should take its time to make this decision.

Seeing that no one else came forward to speak, Chair Allen closed the Public Hearing at 7:40 p.m.

Commissioner Argenta explained that the applicants had come to the last HDC meeting when only 4 commissioners were present. At that time they had set the application for a public hearing, in order to get input from the community and allow all members of the HDC to hear this case.

Commissioner Argenta said he had been the one who a couple of years ago had been concerned about demolition by neglect of this building and had started the action to get a court ordered repair of the property's exterior. At that time the house had been all but abandoned. You couldn't walk up the stairs, the porch was in bad shape, the roof leaked, the siding was terrible and the sill plates were deteriorating. The court ordered repairs and the owners fixed the porch, handrails, and steps, and then painted the whole building, hiding a multitude of sins.

Commissioner Argenta addressed the report from Maverick Consulting Engineers. In the report there were indications that the home could have been built as early as 1865. The pictures showed tree trunks in the basement holding up floor framing which was way over-spanned. When you looked at all that was wrong with this house, including the spans, the floor framing, the roof framing and rafters, and the deflection in the building, with part of the building just leaning – it was not in good shape. The structural report was extremely detailed. The scary part was there was literally no basement foundation – it was a stone wall with no known footing. The Commission's charge was to preserve historic structures in Northville, but this building had been changed so many times architecturally – it was just a simple building and many changes had been made to that. It was difficult to find architectural value to this house. It also seemed to lack historic value, in terms of important events happening there. The structural report showed stairways that didn't work, a roof that leaked, pieces of posts holding up over-spanned roof rafters. You would literally have to take the building apart and reconstruct it to bring it up to code.

Commissioner Field said that he was not at last month's meeting, but he had read the notes, looked at the pictures, and listened to the public hearing this evening. He would have a difficult time voting in favor of demolition at this point. His professional background compelled him to hear from a structural engineer not representing the applicant. Any house as old as this one would have many of the same difficulties, including his own house that was built in 1912. While this house was in bad shape, it was at the entrance to the City, and it was difficult to approve tearing it down in favor of a modern structure at this location. Additionally, he would have a difficult time if another homeowner came to the Commission and asked for a demolition permit because they didn't know how big a project it was going to be. He needed more information, and would like to hear from another structural engineer in this instance.

Commissioner Gudritz said he was also not present at the last meeting, but he had reviewed the materials and listened to the comments. He noted that he lived in a house that was built in 1877, and he didn't have a project yet that didn't cost double the original estimate. He had a stone basement, and he didn't know if it had footings or not. He had 3 jacks in the basement to control sagging. He agreed with Commissioner Field – he struggled with voting for demolition before they received more information. He also agreed with Mr. Presley – was there a way to use the building for Guidobono's purposes and still retain the building as part of the charm of the Historic District?

Mr. Funke said he had completed other historic preservation projects in the City and he understood what it took and cost to renovate an old building. The building they were discussing this evening had more than the usual problems – it had a timber rim beam that supported the whole structure and no footings. The structure was moving. In the 2 week time that they opened the back door to unload debris, the house had shifted so much they could not close the back door. Originally they had every intention of renovating the house; however when they came up against those deficiencies, it was not worth the cost, and cost was one of the four grounds upon which this application for demolition could be based, along with health and safety, and whether retaining the resource was in the interest of the majority of the community.

Mr. Funke continued that they needed about 2,000 square feet of office space; they had looked for this in downtown Northville and couldn't find it. They didn't want to delay further – they had delayed for 8 months now. They wanted to tear down a home that should be torn down.

Mr. Funke noted that he was 3rd generation Northville; his family had lived here for over 100 years. He understood the importance of the Historic District. But if this home had to be rebuilt it would be a new home, and would look like a box colonial. The home was falling apart at the seams. With the structural deficiencies present, it made no sense to put the necessary money into renovating this home. They had spent months and tens of thousands of dollars trying to figure out how to save the building and it just didn't make sense.

Mr. Funke spoke to the other newer buildings in the area, and said they wanted to be part of what was happening in the business district on East Main Street. They would do a great job, provide a superior project, and bring tax revenue and residents to the downtown area.

Commissioner Tartaglia said he he'd built and renovated a number of homes and he took the structural engineer's report seriously. He understood that you couldn't always see all the problems you were going to face when renovating an old home. The question the HDC had was whether the home was fixable, and was this demolition similar or different than demolitions approved in the past?

Commissioner Murdock said he could see the house was a wreck but he also agreed with the idea that once the house was gone it was gone. Comments tonight indicated that there might be a 3rd party that might offer an alternative of what to do with this building. The public asked the Commission to take a little more time to see if something else could be done. He supported that course of action.

Commissioner Hoffman thanked the public tonight for their respectful tone, which allowed the Commission to hear and consider their concerns. He summarized the comments as follows:

- There was agreement that the site had deteriorated and needed improvement.
- Everyone wanted to embrace the Historic District, which was a loved and desirable environment for residents and visitors.
- The question was whether this structure was a defining structure in the Historic District. Commissioner Hoffman felt it was a defining structure though also a simple one. Its simpleness did help define the transition from east to west.
- It was easy to spend others' money – substantial investment would be needed to restore this site.
- As Mr. Presley said, "preservation hurts."

Commissioner Hoffman said he was leaning toward finding a creative solution to preserving the building, but was also mindful of the costs related to that.

Chair Allen asked Mr. Funke if they had looked at different options other than tearing the building down. Could they build an addition to the rear, for instance?

Mr. Funke said they looked at that, but again, money mattered. Of course preservation also mattered. He acknowledged that the cost of the new building they were proposing would exceed what it would take to restore the home, and they were prepared to do that. However, at the price level of restoration, it made no sense. There was no adaptive reuse of the building that could justify that price level. So they felt they had to take it to the next level in order to justify the necessary investment.

Chair Allen asked what other options the applicants had considered.

Mr. Funke said if they expanded the existing building, the parking would be diminished and not meet code. The proposed building would have parking underneath the building, as well as outside. They had looked at putting on a 3rd story on the existing structure, but could not do that with the structural deficiencies already noted. They had been working with this since last November and looked at every avenue as to how to make it work. Everything that they looked at had a roadblock. Giving this one more month would not change the results.

Chair Allen noted that recently the HDC had seen two structures on Dunlap that were jacked up, moved while a new foundation was built, and then put back on the foundation. Was it possible to do that in this case?

Mr. Funke replied that nothing was impossible. However, the spans inside the house on Dunlap were all fine for the 1st and 2nd floor. In tonight's instance, they were in some cases 3 times the allowable span. For them to cobble that house even more made no sense – it would be easier to bulldoze and rebuild. This house was literally moving - they could not shut the back door because it was moving. The chimney was separating from the house. The whole structure was going to collapse because there was so much deferred maintenance. They knew some of that when they bought it but had not been able to pull down plaster and see what was there. It was theirs now; they loved the location and they wanted to move forward with providing Guidobono a downtown office. A precedent had been set with Dennis Engerer's buildings, which were beautiful and tied in well, and provided retail space and customers for downtown businesses. If they could save the building they would save it. That had been their intention at the beginning but now it made no sense. He invited people to actually go through the building.

Mr. Funke noted that they knew the building was older than the 1930s. They did feel the age range was from the turn of the century to the 1930's.

Commissioner Argenta said there was a difference between old houses that had been at least partially maintained, and a structure like this one, which was just shoehorned with fixes that didn't work. Additionally, nothing had been done to this building for at least 15 years. He did not feel the building met the Secretary of Interior standards for architectural or historical significance. It was just a simple farmhouse that might not serve as the best first thing to see when you're coming into Northville – especially if it was left as it was and the paint started peeling in a few years.

Planning Consultant Elmiger referred the Commission to page 7 of the *Guidelines for the Consideration of Application for the Demolition or Moving of Structures Within the Northville Historic District*, which listed questions to ask. Some of the questions had been answered, but some further information could be given regarding:

- b. What would the affect of any proposed replacement structure to the community be?
- m. What is the appropriateness of design of any proposed replacement structure to the Historic District?

Chair Allen invited the applicants to show the renderings of the proposed replacement structure.

In response to comments from Commissioner Argenta, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the answers to those questions were part of the consideration to be given to the demolition application.

Mr. Funke noted that at the August meeting they had requested demolition because the resource was not in the interest of the majority of the community, but then had amended the request to include the grounds that the resource constituted a hazard to the safety of the public or the occupants.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said both reasons had the same requirements for site plans, etc.

Mr. Mosely said it was their intention to work with the HDC and with the residents to make sure they designed a building that was in keeping with the character and the nature of the community. He displayed a conceptual drawing, explaining that it was intended to be a design direction, one that would continue the existing architecture of the CBD District. The new building would have the elements of an historic building, and give the appearance of an adaptive reuse project of an older building redone to today's standards. They would use similar materials, with an intended retail base, a center section, and a cap, with a decorative frieze and cornice.

Mr. Mosely explained further that the massing was broken up and set back so the proposed building didn't have an overwhelming presence on the street, and so that it was integrated with the park in the rear. There was a grade drop across the front of the building that didn't lend itself to a traditional storefront building, although they would try to maintain that as much as possible. Using double hung windows with divided lights helped it look authentic, like a warehouse building that was rehabbed.

They wanted to be sensitive to the proportions of other three-story buildings in town, so they stepped the façade back in the front and back in order not to end up with a giant box of a structure. The intent was to work with everyone to make a great building, and to honor the Historic District.

Mr. Mosely concluded that if the existing building were remodeled, it would be unrecognizable. It would look like a sad new building, with new siding, new windows, new porch, new roof, azek deck – there would be no recognizable features of an old home.

Speaking again, Mr. Bodnar asked about questions listed on page 10 of the Demolition Guidelines. Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that those questions were from the financial hardship section; the applicants were not formally requesting that be a consideration this evening.

Discussion was held regarding process, and whether or not one of the three structural engineers approved by the City should review the applicant's structural engineer report.

Commissioner Argenta was comfortable with the applicant's structural engineer report and was concerned that the City would require someone to renovate an old building regardless of cost.

Commissioner Field said he would like to have one of the City's approved structural engineers review the report, and if necessary, visit the structure. He had a difficult time simply accepting the opinion of an expert provided by the applicant.

Commissioner Hoffman suggested the Commissioners walk through the house. Perhaps interested members of the community could also walk through. Citing the recent walk through of the Northville Public Schools' Old School building, Commissioner Hoffman noted that there was past practice giving precedence for this action.

Rene Guidobono, owner, addressed the safety of the current structure, which at this point was a construction site, with walls torn apart and other work done. She did not feel safe entering the

building, and was concerned about liability especially if community members entered it. If the Commission wanted to go through, they should at a minimum wear hard hats.

After further discussion, Commissioner Hoffman summarized that the consensus of the Commission appeared to support having one of the City's approved structural engineers review the report, and that also it would benefit the Commissioners to walk through the house and see the situation for themselves. For safety reasons the Commissioners would go through in groups of 2 or 3, and therefore the walk-throughs would not constitute a public meeting.

Commissioner Argenta noted that the cost for the City's approved structural engineer review would be passed on to the applicant.

In response to a comment from Commissioner Field, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the City's approved structural engineer would decide whether he needed to physically inspect the building.

In response to a question from Mr. Funke, Planning Consultant Elmiger said this item could be placed on the next HDC meeting agenda.

Ms. Johns spoke again, asking what grounds for demolition were being requested, and also stating that the HDC would not allow a building to be renovated to look like a new colonial building.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said two grounds were being cited: 1) the resource constitutes a hazard to the safety of the public or the occupants and 2) retaining the resource is not the interest of the majority of the community.

Chair Allen asked for a motion.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Field, that the Commission delay the decision regarding the demolition request for 341 E. Main Street to the next scheduled meeting, so that:

- One of the City's consulting structural engineers will have time to review the report by the applicant's structural engineer and provide the Commission with a letter regarding that review, and
- The applicant provide access to the building to members of the HDC for a walkthrough.

Motion carried unanimously.

7. CASES TO BE HEARD – BY CASE:

CASE #1

**ANDRE & MICHELLE KAZEZYCH
495 W. CADY**

PAINT

Andre and Michelle Kazewych were present on behalf of this application. At the April 19, 2017 HDC meeting they had received approval for paint colors for the home at 495 W. Cady Street. After painting large samples on their home, they discovered problems with the colors they had chosen and would like to change them. Also their architect recommended they consider a pre-finished Hardie Plank for the siding on the addition. Therefore, they were seeking to switch the colors to:

- Siding: Factory finished Hardie Plank, Woodstock Brown, for the addition. Siding on the unaffected existing structure would be painted to match HC-104 Copley Gray.

- Window trim, door trim and half-round shingles under the gables: Sherwin Williams SW 7056 Reserved White.
- No accent colors.

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 brought the matter back 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 5-18 paint and color. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #2

**RAFFI & PATRICIA KUREDJIAN
422 DUBUAR**

PAINT

The applicant was not present for Case #2 and the trim colors had not been provided. Therefore by consensus the Commission moved this item to last on the agenda.

CASE #3

**JEFF FERRELL/CHERIE BABY
133 W. MAIN, SUITE 212**

AWNING & SIGN

Jeff Ferrell and Sherri Abbulone, 41890 Ridge Road E., Novi, MI., were present on behalf of this application, which was to install a new awning with signage at 133 W. Main, as a tenant in a multi-tenant building.

The awning was 12' 8", and was custom designed from Marygrove Awnings, with pink and oyster Sunbrella fabric, which would absorb light and would give a vintage feel. The font on the 11" valance was approximately 5" and there were two projecting side panels that said *ice cream* on the sides.

The applicants distributed samples of the material, and provided a new illustration with changed message units. Planning Consultant Elmiger said the awning – which was considered to be a wall sign – appeared to meet ordinance requirements for message units, but the Building Official would make the final determination.

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 brought the matter back 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, 4-21 materials, 4-23 awnings, 4-24 signs, and 5-18 paint and color. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #4

**POOLE’S TAVERN
157 E. MAIN**

**GLASS AWNING/BRICK
PAINT & ROOF UPDATE**

John Casey, 16804 Lochmoor Circle East, Northville, MI, was present on behalf of this application, which was to complete Phase 2 of the outdoor renovations for the building and adjacent land at 157 E. Main. Robert Clark, 6055 Jackson, Ann Arbor MI, owner of Four Seasons Sunrooms, was also present.

Mr. Casey referred the Commission to the architectural drawing of the proposed awning. He noted that footings were installed when they had completed the previously approved improvements to the cement and deck, and they were seeking to complete this project. They were replacing the roof with Hardie Board shingles, and would be putting split-faced brick concrete on the façade down to the sidewalk.

Commissioner Hoffman asked if the glass-top awning had solar filters.

Mr. Clark explained that the glass was patented, and during the day would block 95% of the UV and 98% of the heat, and at night you could stargaze through it.

Commissioner Allen asked what the height differential was between the outdoor propane warmers and the glass. Mr. Casey said the propane pedestals were 6.5’ tall; the awning would be 13’ high. Mr. Clark added that the heat would not affect the awning.

Mr. Gudritz asked if the awning extended out over entire patio including the new raised platform. Mr. Casey said it did not cover the raised platform.

Commissioner Field noted that the submitted drawings seemed to show a different number of panels. Mr. Clark pointed out the correct drawing.

Commissioner Field thought the awning lacked design interest.

Mr. Casey showed a sample of the material used to surround the poles, which mimicked the fluting columns of the lampposts. Mr. Clark affirmed the columns around the lampposts would add interest. He explained that they intentionally kept the design streamlined, so it wouldn’t stick out.

Commissioner Argenta asked if the columns would be light or dark bronze. Mr. Clark said they would be dark bronze.

Commissioner Argenta asked about process, since the Planning Commission had approved the awning last night.

Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that the applicant had to first obtain permission from City Council for this leasehold improvement, since it was over city-owned land. They had done that, and then gone to the Planning Commission. Last night the Planning Commission gave site plan approval for the awning. It was up to the HDC, however, to approve the design.

Mr. Clark said the Planning Commission had required that the applicants never put up any tarps or plastic on the awning to act as temporary walls.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hoffman, the applicants explained that they had never intended to put up walls. The lease they had with the City stated that the outdoor seating with awning only be used during warm weather. The outdoor furniture would be stored offsite during the winter.

In response to a question from Commissioner Field, Mr. Clark reiterated that there would be no heat buildup beneath the awning. They would have a couple of ceiling fans to move the air.

Commissioner Hoffman asked about the updating of the Mansard roofs.

Mr. Casey showed a sample of proposed Hardie Board shingles. The existing cornices would be removed.

Commissioner Murdock asked about any changes in lighting. Mr. Casey said there would be no lighting changes.

Commissioner Argenta asked about signage. Mr. Casey said they would use Graphic Visions to help design the signage.

Commissioner Argenta asked if they were going to make changes to their rear façade. Mr. Casey said they were going to change and update the rear façade, to match other façades in the area.

MOTION Field, 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 brought the matter back 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 4-4 storefront, 4-8 cornices, 4-13 pedestrian orientation, 4-16 mass, 4-21 materials, 4-23 awnings, 4-24 signs, 4-27 rear façade development, 5-17 siding, and 5-18 paint and color. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #5

THE CADY PROJECT

NEW CONSTRUCTION

LOT 170 – CADY STREET

Chair Allen explained that the Cady Project had received Preliminary Site Plan Approval at the August 1, 2017 Planning Commission meeting. The applicants were here this evening for a conceptual review. After tonight the next step would be for the applicants to return to the Planning Commission for Final Site Plan Approval and then come back to the HDC with those final plans for approval before this body.

Dave Mielock, Mielock Associates, Inc., 114 Rayson, Suite 2c, Northville MI was present on behalf of this application. Andrew Daily, 300 East Cady Street, owner of the development, and Architect Greg Presley, 108 N. Center Street, were also present.

Utilizing overhead slides, the applicants gave an overview of this project, which was to construct a new four-story mixed-use building on the south side of Cady Street. The new structure would

sit on the east side of the parking lot directly behind the hair salon on North Center. It would also occupy a small portion (24 feet) of the existing public surface lot to the west of Lot 170.

Mr. Mielock said they felt this was an important project in Northville that would establish the architectural vocabulary for Cady Street, and tonight they were seeking input from the HDC.

As already stated, the site was located directly east of the parking lot that was behind the hair salon on the corner of Cady and Center Streets. They were negotiating with the City regarding purchasing 24 feet of city-owned land from the City parking lot to the east. In exchange for City property, they were giving the City approximately 12 feet of right-of-way along the north side of the parcel, thus allowing East Cady Street to be better aligned with the portion on the west side of Center Street and enhancing the safety of that intersection. There would also be 12 feet along the west side of the building for 7 parking spaces.

The city-owned parking lot did not meet Wayne County drainage standards. As part of this project the entire parking lot would be improved and regraded to meet those standards, and the parking spaces on that side would be public parking spots.

The building footprint extended about 82.5' along Cady Street and was about 104 feet deep.

Mr. Presley noted that the Planning Commission suggested that the building be shifted forward 10 feet, resulting in a 10-foot rear yard setback, which helped overcome issues of having a wall directly on the south property line, where no windows would be allowed.

Mr. Mielock said they were valuing the rear elevation just like the front, as the rear would be an important presence from the south. They were paying close attention in terms of fenestration and massing with that façade.

Continuing to utilize overhead slides, the applicants pointed out the following:

- The Cady Street elevation showed recessed entries to office retail space, with a private entry into a condominium lobby with a stair or elevator to the 2nd, 3rd, or 4th floor. The residents would enjoy private secure parking underneath the building.
- There would be parallel parking on Cady Street. This was made possible by the 12 feet of right-of-way being given the City, as well as better aligning the street as mentioned.
- The 2nd, 3rd, and 4th floors would have two luxury condominiums each. The Zoning Ordinance and Master Plan allowed for a 5-story building, but they were not doing that because they felt 4 stories offered better massing, especially on the street frontage, and keeping to 4 stories allowed them to offer higher ceilings to match what was already downtown and allowed the placement of ductwork above the ceilings.
- The west facing balconies were over the parking area.
- There were no windows on the east side that was right up against the property line. If the City were to decide that would always be right-of-way, then windows could be installed.
- The green roof would allow tenants to be outdoors in the summer months. The plans showed 4 roof areas; they were planning to change that to 6, so that all tenants would have rooftop space.
- There would be no public corridors. The elevator would drop a resident off to their own private foyer.

Mr. Mielock noted that historically, when downtown was first developed, the first floor was for retail, and the upper floors were apartments. That configuration was mostly lost as upper floors were converted to offices. Their project returned to the earlier style, and had retail on the first

floor and living quarters on the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th floors. That configuration gave opportunities for windows with balconies, which some of the old Victorian structures had.

Commissioner Argenta asked if the green roof meant a private roof or an environmentally green roof. Mr. Mielock replied that there would be both. They would be installing a green roof to help mitigate water runoff, and also hard surface for residents to use as patio areas.

Mr. Mielock said they had studied the surrounding area for design and architectural context and presented slides of views in all 4 directions from the site. While currently the area was not walkable, the intent of the Cady Street Overlay District was to encourage a pedestrian-oriented tree-lined street with sidewalks, and with parking on both sides. The applicants were trying to establish that. They had looked at massing and height of existing buildings, along with scale and proportion, pilasters, windows and spacing of muntins, etc. All of this had impacted the design of windows, banding, cornice work, brickwork, etc. They had drawn from the existing downtown elements and put them into a more contemporary format while creating a pedestrian scale along the street level.

The applicants showed renderings of each elevation, explaining how they were using specific design elements in each façade and at each level. For instance, two projections on the north façade (Cady Street) gave a vertical feel to the building, along with large window openings broken up with muntins. Cornice overhangs were supported by brackets.

There were penthouses on the roof to house the elevator and stairwell. From the street those would be practically invisible.

The south elevation, facing the Downs, would have the same materials, repetition, and rhythm, and the same projections to break up the verticality of the structure. The west elevation would include balconies. The 4th floor balcony would have a roof over it, just as those did on the 2nd and 3rd floors.

Because the east elevation went right up to the property line and therefore was required to meet fire code, no windows were included. Interior service functions would be against this wall, and views would not be affected.

After reviewing height schematics, Mr. Mielock concluded his presentation and asked for feedback. Their intent was to go before the Planning Commission in October, and then return to the HDC for approval that same month.

Commissioner Argenta said he liked the direction of this project, and noted that with new construction, Secretary of Interior standards made a point of encouraging good design principles, rather than trying to deliberately copy period architecture. Specifically, he liked the way the developers had stayed with 4 stories, especially as on the west end they were opposite a 3-story building. The verticality of the design was reminiscent of Victorian row houses.

Commissioner Argenta noted the use of stone throughout the building's facades. There wasn't a lot of stone in downtown Northville, and he suggested reducing its use on this building. Also, stone got dirty and streaked in just a few years.

Regarding the east elevation, Commissioner Argenta suggested eliminating every other vertical element to give the design a little more openness.

Mr. Daily said that the grid on the east wall was designed to be reminiscent of windows. They were trying to design something that looked rich and appealing, and were considering a three dimensional element.

Discussion followed regarding the use of CMU or brown face brick construction for the east wall. The design guidelines discouraged CMU use, but also left the final decision up to the HDC.

Mr. Daily said they were also considering installing a mural on the east elevation, using the same company that had developed the downtown signage and who had previously presented on installing a type of clingon mural. Would the HDC support that?

Commissioner Argenta said he thought the DDA would support it.

Commissioner Field said he felt the design made a lot of sense. However, the east elevation reminded him of a moving and storage building.

Discussion followed. Mayor Roth and Chair Allen liked the east elevation as presented, as it had an older warehouse quasi-industrial look that drew on Northville's past.

Commissioner Hoffman said he agreed with Commissioner Argenta's comments regarding this project. He felt the project represented a good case study regarding how development along Cady Street should happen, with good attention to detail and architecture.

Commissioner Gudritz said that while this would be a new building, it also reminded him of row houses, such as those on the north side of Chicago. He really liked the project as presented.

In response to a question from Commissioner Tartaglia, Mr. Mielock said the balcony railings would be painted ornamental guardrails. They would bring details of those to the next meeting.

Advising that no motion was necessary this evening, Chair Allen closed this discussion item.

As the applicants for Case 2 were still not present, Commissioner Gudritz offered the following motion.

MOTION Gudritz, support by Field, to refer Case #2, 422 Dubuar, back to the applicant. Motion carried unanimously.

8. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS

Mayor Roth noted that the mural at the Farmers Market was undergoing changes and was still in process.

Chair Allen recognized Jason Moss, 20659 Lexington Court, Northville, who was in the process of purchasing 547 W. Main Street. The home there needed emergency repairs, including roof repair, brick mortar and tuck work, and possibly some brick replacement.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that Mr. Moss would be replacing the entire roof, and was replacing most of the fascia and soffits. Closing was on October 2, and Mr. Moss was concerned about leaks in the roof and other necessary repairs. He was hoping to have something approved as soon as possible.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said she had completed a review, dated September 20, 2017, that listed all the information that needed to be included for this project.

Mr. Moss commented that he would be replacing everything exactly as it was now, with the same colors and materials.

The consensus of the Commission was to form a subcommittee to review the proposed emergency work. Commissioners Argenta and Field indicated they were willing to serve on the subcommittee.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Murdock, that a subcommittee including Commissioners Argenta and Field review the emergency repairs to the structure at 547 W. Main, contingent upon the applicant showing legal ownership of the property. **Motion carried unanimously.**

9. DISCUSSION

Proposed Amendment to the HDC Rules and Regulations

Referring to draft changes in the revision dated September 12, 2017 for the City of Northville Historic District Commission Rules and Regulations, Planning Consultant Elmiger gave the background to this discussion item, explaining that currently the HDC Rules and Regulations and the Historic District section of the Ordinance stated that the Mayor may only designate another City Councilperson to be Chair of the HDC. It had been suggested to modify that rule to read: *the Mayor or ~~an~~ the alternate suggested by the Mayor and confirmed by City Council to serve as the HDC Chairperson.* This would give the Mayor a wider pool to choose from.

The Commission discussed whether or not the Chair should be term limited by ordinance. It was also brought in discussion that the chairperson did not necessarily have to live in the community.

Mayor Roth suggested adding a codicil that said the Chair could serve *until the Mayor and Council vote to withdraw such appointment.*

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that perhaps the term should be 3 years, the same as other Commission members. She also read from the Local Historic Districts Act 169 of 1970 the following: *The ordinance creating the commission may provide procedures for terminating an appointment due to the acts or omissions of the member.* Therefore any rules regarding termination would go in the Ordinance, not the HDC Rules and Regulations, and the City Council would need to address that if they so chose.

Commissioner Hoffman indicated he was ready to make a motion.

Motion Hoffman, support by Field, to adopt the changes to the Historic District Commission Rules and Regulations as proposed, with the change to Section 2.1 changing the word “the” to *an alternate selected* as shown in the September 12, 2017 revision. **Motion carried unanimously.**

10. ADJOURNMENT

Seeing that there was no further comment, Chair Allen adjourned the meeting at 10:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl McGuire
Recording Secretary

Approved as published 10/18/2017

