

**NORTHVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**November 15, 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:** Planning Consultant Elmiger

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Mary Kay Gallagher, Superintendent, Northville Public Schools, acknowledged the support of the Northville community, and thanked them for voting to approve the bond proposal last Tuesday. Tonight, in the spirit of cooperation and transparency, she wanted to provide an update regarding the renovation of Old Village School. She was joined this evening by Cyndy Jankowski, Board of Education President, and Jeff Hamilton, Vice President and Project Director for Auch Construction.

Superintendent Gallagher said they had done their bid awards for the Old Village School Project last Wednesday, and they were prepared to bring a formal application with full site plan to the December 20 HDC meeting. However, in the meantime they needed to demolish two parts of the building's exterior: the walkway and the elevator shaft, which had been added to the building in 1979. Their intent was to restore the building to the original envelope.

Mr. Hamilton said they needed to accomplish the partial demolition before the onset of winter weather, and to maintain their tight schedule in order to provide August 2018 occupancy. The timeline called for the demolition to begin the week after Thanksgiving.

Chair Allen explained that the HDC would need to approve the partial demolition before they could proceed. Planning Consultant Elmiger suggested the HDC schedule a special meeting to hear this issue.

The consensus of the Commission was to add the scheduling of a special meeting for the *Partial Demolition of Old Village School* after Case #6 on tonight's agenda.

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

**MOTION Field, support by Gudritz**, to amend the agenda to add a discussion of scheduling a special meeting for the *Partial Demolition of Old Village School* after Case #6. **Motion carried unanimously.**

**4. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES:** October 18, 2017

**MOTION Hoffman, support by Murdock**, to approve the October 18, 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

**5. PUBLIC HEARING:** None

**CASE #1**

**GUIDOBONO BUILDING  
341 E. MAIN**

**DEMO – RETURNING**

Chair Allen noted that copies of the report prepared by the City-approved structural engineer regarding this demolition request were available next to the agendas.

At the request of Chair Allen, Planning Consultant Elmiger reviewed the history of this application, which was submitted to the City on July 31, 2017:

Demolition applications had four bases, or reasons from which to choose, for demolishing a building, and each basis had its own list of requirements. The four bases were:

1. The resource constitutes a hazard to the safety of the public or the occupants.
2. The resource is a deterrent to a major improvement program.
3. Retaining the resource will cause undue financial hardship to the owner.
4. Retaining the resource is not in the interest of the majority of the community.

In their original application, Guidobono used Basis #4: *Retaining the resource is not in the interest of the majority of the community* as their reason for demolishing the building. However, at the August 16, 2017 HDC meeting, the applicant and the HDC discussed the possibility of modifying the application to state that another reason for demolition was Basis #1: *The resource constitutes a hazard to the safety of the public or the occupants*. At the August 16 meeting, the HDC also moved to schedule a public hearing at the earliest available date in order to gather public input on the proposed demolition. The public hearing was scheduled for September 20, 2017, the next regularly-scheduled HDC meeting date.

The public hearing was held on September 20. At that meeting, the applicant stated that their basis for demolition had been amended to include #1: *The resource constitutes a hazard to the safety of the public or the occupants*. Also at that meeting, the HDC requested that one of the City's pre-approved structural engineers provide an analysis of the structural engineer's report that was submitted with the application. They also requested that HDC members tour the building.

Between October 2 and 6, HDC members individually toured the building with the applicant's representative.

The applicant returned to the next HDC meeting on October 18, 2017. At that time, the second structural engineer's report had not yet been concluded. The HDC moved that this second report include an assessment of the structural soundness of the building, its adaptability for rehabilitation, and identify any dangerous conditions.

As of tonight, the City-approved structural engineer had completed a site visit and evaluated the building as to its adaptability for rehabilitation. The City-approved structural engineer had also provided an opinion about the conclusions of the original structural engineer's report.

Last, correspondence from a resident had been received questioning the timing of the public hearing. After researching the issue, Planning Consultant Elmiger agreed that the public hearing should have been scheduled after the HDC considered the application to be complete. This

finding had not yet been made, as the HDC had needed more information before making that determination. Therefore a second public hearing would be scheduled after the HDC moved that the application was complete.

Chair Allen opened the floor for comments.

Commissioner Argenta expressed displeasure that the process to engage a city-approved structural engineer had taken as long as it did – 2 months. Was the structural engineer one of the original 3 structural engineers who had been on the City's approved list?

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that structural engineer Cheryl Early was one of the original City-approved structural engineers, although she worked for a different company than she had 4 years ago.

Commissioner Argenta was concerned that the report was cursory, and was opinion-based. He felt the report was supposed to be a structural report, not opinion-based.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said Ms. Early was asked to review the applicant's structural engineer's report. Ms. Early was not asked to come up with a second independent structural report.

Chair Allen said the question before the Commission this evening was whether to determine that the application was complete, and if it was, to then schedule a public hearing.

Commissioner Field said that the way he read the *Guidelines for the Consideration of Applications for the Demolition or Moving of Structures Within the Northville Historic District*, especially C. *Requirements of Applicant*, subparagraph 6, the application was not complete. That subparagraph read:

*Written evidence that alternatives to demolition or moving have been evaluated (including but not limited to rehabilitation, sale, adaptive reuse) and provide both architectural and financial data to support a conclusion the demolition or moving is the only feasible option. This evidence shall show that the property was offered for sale, the price asked, the period of time during which the property was offered for sale, and how the property was advertised for sale.*

Commissioner Field said that he thought this requirement had to be met before the Commission could even consider the basis upon which an application was submitted. At the least, he felt the Commission should get a legal opinion from the City Attorney as to whether the guidelines required the building be offered for sale.

Also, Commissioner Field said that under Basis #1, The resource constitutes a hazard to the safety of the public or the occupants, subparagraph c required the applicant provide a *detailed description of proposed changes* and subparagraph e required a *site plan, to scale, and any other information which accurately describes the proposed use and appearance of the site after demolition or moving of the resource*. He did not feel either of those requirements had been met.

Commissioner Field continued that the applicant needed to be more precise as to what changes were being made, and also show the new use in detail. Until those requirements were met, he did not feel the application was complete, especially as subparagraph 8 under C explicitly read:

*It is the applicant's burden to show that the application complies with the ordinance. If the applicant does not meet the burden, the application shall be denied.*

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that regarding subparagraph C.6., the wording was that

*Written evidence that alternatives to demolition or moving have been evaluated . . .* From her reading, the application was asking for written evidence that alternatives to demolition had been evaluated. She was concerned that the HDC did not have the jurisdiction to require that the applicant put a building up for sale, but they could require written evidence that all courses of action had been evaluated. If an applicant did try and sell a building, the rest of the paragraph listed what needed to be included in the written evidence.

Commissioner Argenta said that he felt requiring an applicant to put a building up for sale after structural engineers had reported significant problems with the structure was unreasonable.

Commissioner Hoffman asked which of the 4 grounds for demolition were being used. Planning Consultant Elmiger said the 2 bases being used were:

#1: the resource constitutes a hazard to the safety of the public or the occupants.

#4: retaining the resource is not in the interest of the majority of the community.

Basis #1 was the only basis that required a report from a structural engineer.

Commissioner Hoffman asked Mr. Ed Funke, Guidobono Building Company, if he agreed that Bases #1 and #4 were being used for this application. Mr. Funke said he did agree, and that also at a past meeting Guidobono asked that the cost factor come into play because as they had stated it would cost much less to remove the building and rebuild it exactly as it was than to renovate it. Cost was part of the information submitted to the Commission.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said the minutes of earlier meetings were clear that only Bases #1 and #4 were being used as bases for demolition. Mr. Funke agreed, but he also pointed out that they had included information regarding the expense of maintaining and restoring the building vs. rebuilding it.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said no formal request had been received to include Basis #3.

Commissioner Hoffman commented that if the applicants changed their mind as to what the basis was, they were back to ground zero.

Mr. Funke said they were basically back to ground zero anyway, with another public hearing scheduled. He had received the City-approved structural engineer's report at noon today, and had not had a chance to give it a thorough review. He felt every structural engineer that might be hired might come up with a different opinion.

Mr. Funke continued that precedence had been set with Dennis Engerer's prior demolition of a Victorian farmhouse in order to complete new construction on that site.

Mr. Funke addressed comments the City-approved structural engineer had made to him regarding suspending ceilings on an independent framework. Anything could be saved, but at what cost? They had reached a point where they wanted to stay, but did not want to maintain the existing building. They felt the best option was to demolish the structure, and they had brought two different renderings of proposed structures to the Commission at previous meetings, along with a proposed streetscape. He felt they had met the requirement to show what the new use would be on this site.

Renee Guidobono, Guidobono Building Company, said it was not their intent to argue with the City – they had been part of the community for many years. They just wanted to find a home in

downtown Northville. She spoke to the futility of trying to save the existing building. They wanted to put their money into something that would last a long time. She asked for direction from the Commission. Did the Commission want the applicants to build another structure that basically looked like the old one? The applicants didn't want to continue to come to meeting after meeting. Perhaps this should be tabled to allow them to respond to the City-approved structural engineer's report. What was the point of the Commissioners walking through the building if the City-approved structural engineer's report would trump everything?

Chair Allen said that discussion could be held at the next meeting. However, speaking for himself, walking through the building was not the same as having a professional review the original report. However, tonight the Commission needed to decide whether or not to find the application complete, and if they did find it complete, to schedule a public hearing.

A discussion of process followed. The public hearing could not be held this evening, as it would have to be noticed first.

Commissioner Field said he felt that addressing this application was like hitting a moving target. The basis for demolition changed from meeting to meeting. Now he was hearing that the applicants wanted to include Basis #3 – financial hardship. He remained concerned that the application was not complete, based on reasons he'd stated earlier.

Chair Allen said Basis #3 was not being included. Mr. Funke acknowledged Basis #3 was not part of the formal application this evening.

Commissioner Field said that the guidelines also stated: *An application which does not include the required information and material is incomplete.* The HDC's charge was to do what they could to retain the historical perspective in the City. While the subject property needed a lot of work, it was not the Commission's charge to prove the demolition could go forward. That was the applicant's responsibility.

Ms. Guidobono said that she felt they had done everything they had been asked to do.

Chair Allen said there was a difference of opinion regarding whether the property had to be offered for sale.

Commissioner Argenta emphasized that if the building were demolished, per Secretary of Interior standards a new structure could not replicate the old.

Commissioner Argenta reviewed the requirements for Bases #1 and #4 as stated in the application for demolition, which had slightly different wording than the Guidelines. He felt the applicants had met all those requirements. He did not think the requirements for Bases #1 and #4 called for detailed new construction documents.

Commissioner Hoffman asked if Commissioner Argenta felt the application was therefore complete. Commissioner Argenta said he would like to review the application item by item but he felt the application was very close to being complete.

Commissioner Hoffman asked Planning Consultant Elmiger if she felt the application was complete, specifically regarding Bases #1 and #4. Planning Consultant Elmiger said she thought the application was complete.

Commissioner Allen said he also thought the application was complete.

Commissioner Field remained concerned that the applicant had not met the requirements in Paragraph C. *Requirements of Applicant*. He strongly advised that the City's Attorney be asked for an opinion regarding this. He felt the Guidelines purposefully made it difficult to demolish a building. There were other houses across the street whose owners could make the same argument for demolition, in order to build more profitable structures. The way he read paragraph C, the application was not complete.

Commissioner Argenta said the only sticking point for him in paragraph C was the language about offering the property for sale. He felt that all other requirements were met. However, the Guidelines were just that – guidelines.

Commissioner Tartaglia spoke to the difficulty of offering this property for sale now that demolition on the interior had begun. Things had happened to the property which devalued it. Even if the HDC required that the property be put on the market, who would buy it?

Mr. Funke said the property was on the market for 5 months with multiple showings before they purchased it. Additionally, the HDC had endorsed and approved the demolition of Dennis Engerer's building. Mr. Funke had reviewed that application thoroughly before they submitted for this property, just to understand what the HDC was looking for. Mr. Engerer had replied in his application content that the property was not for sale, and the HDC had seemed to accept that in his case. Mr. Engerer had said he had bought the property because he wanted to put a new building there. That had not been the Guidobono's original intent, but Mr. Engerer's approval did provide that example.

Commissioner Gudritz said it would be useful to get a legal interpretation as suggested, but to require someone to put a building on the market did not pass the common sense test. Considering selling a property was different than actually putting it on the market, and requiring that an applicant offer a building for sale did not make logical sense. The applicants simply needed an answer as to whether they could demolish. If the decision were made to refuse approval, the applicants would know they needed to seek a different route. From that perspective, it seemed to him the application was complete and should be moved forward.

Based on tonight's conversation, Commissioner Argenta indicated he was ready to make a motion.

**Motion Argenta, support by Gudritz**, that the application is complete.

Commissioner Hoffman noted that the Commission relied on Planning Consultant Elmiger's professional advice.

Planning Consultant Elmiger pointed out that in her original review she considered the application complete for the original Basis #4, *that retaining the resource is not in the interest of the majority of the community*. Now that Basis #1 had been added, the *resource constitutes a hazard to the safety of the public or the occupants*, and now that the City-approved structural engineer and issued her report, Planning Consultant Elmiger felt that the application was complete for Basis #1 also.

Commissioner Hoffman said he agreed with moving the application forward.

Chair Allen said he would ask for the City Attorney’s comment prior to the next meeting.

Chair Allen called the motion.

**Motion carried 6-1** (Field opposed).

**MOTION Hoffman, support by Murdock**, to set this application for public hearing at the next regularly scheduled HDC meeting based on grounds of Basis #1, Resource constitutes a hazard to the safety of the public or the occupants, and Basis #2, Retaining the resource is not of interest to the majority of the community.

Chair Allen confirmed there would be a quorum at the December 20 meeting.

**Motion carried 6-1** (Fields opposed).

**CASE #2**

**NORTHVILLE SPORTS DEN  
133 W. MAIN – SUITE 102**

**WALL SIGN**

Rachit Pasricha, Perfect Impressions Graphic Solutions, Farmington Hills MI, was present on behalf of this application to install a new wall sign for a tenant in the multi-tenant building at 133 W. Main. Mr. Pasricha said the 21 square foot sign would be constructed of stained cedar planks, and would be installed per the schematic provided. He distributed color samples.

Commissioner Hoffman noted that Planning Consultant Elmiger’s review indicated the application met the requirements for message units, square footage, and size. The background colors would be standard black and white.

Commissioner Argenta pointed out that the urethane finish would get weathered and could look worn quickly. Mr. Pasricha said the weathered look was deliberate; they were seeking an old-school barn look with a homey feel.

**MOTION Gudritz, 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 brought the matter back 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 4-21 materials, 4-24 signs, and 5-18 paint and color, with colors to match the samples provided. **Motion carried unanimously.**

**CASE #3**

**JOSEPH SNYDER  
508 W. CADY STREET**

**NEW SIDING**

Joseph Snyder, 508 W. Cady Street, was present on behalf of this application to remove the existing aluminum siding on his home and replace it with Hardiplank lap siding. Other repairs included replacing the window trim with new wood trim. The applicant received HDC approval to replace the siding on his garage with the same Hardiplank product in 2009.

Mr. Snyder said the Hardiplank would be Timber Bark, and the siding would be identical to that on the garage. Standard white would be used for trim.

Commissioner Hoffman confirmed that there would be no changes to the façade other than pulling off the siding and replacing it. He noted that the Commission had samples of the materials and the trim color.

**MOTION Hoffman, 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 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, 5-17 siding, and 5-18 paint and color. Motion carried unanimously.**

#### **CASE #4**

**JOSEPH MACLEAN  
401 W. DUNLAP**

**NEW PORCH**

Greg Presley, Presley Architecture, 108 N. Center Street, Northville MI was present on behalf of this application to build a new porch on the north side of the existing home at 401 W. Dunlap.

Mr. Presley said the owners would like to add a small sitting porch on the street side of their property; the proposed porch met ordinance requirements.

Chair Allen asked if minor demolition was involved with this project.

Mr. Presley said the old porch – a little roof over the entry – was built in 1988, so it was not historic. In fact, he had been the architect that presented before the HDC in 1988 in order to construct that porch.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that since the history of the small porch was known, and the architect of that porch was present this evening, the demolition of that porch did not require further investigation.

**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 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 3-8 floors, 3-10 porches, 3-17 height, 3-18 scale, 3-19 proportion, 3-21 materials, 3-22 details, 5-9 asphalt shingles and 5-18 paint and color. Motion carried unanimously.**

**CASE #5  
S4 CENTER LLC  
107 N. CENTER STREET**

**REVISION TO THIRD FLOOR  
PENTHOUSE ADDITION**

Joseph Philips, Architect, 921 Wing Street, Plymouth MI was present on behalf of this application, which was to amend the approval received on March 15, 2017 for a third floor penthouse addition. The applicant was proposing the following changes:

1. Increase the penthouse size from 405 to 728 square feet, with a dedicated “break room” and bathroom.
2. The space was now identified as “open office” instead of “rooftop lounge.”
3. The observation deck on the west side of the building would now overhang the rear of the building. The size of the deck had not changed.
4. The gathering deck on the east side of the building was larger (364 square feet vs. 240 square feet), and was now located on the east edge of the building. The previous design had this deck set back so that the railing was not visible from the adjacent streets.
5. The walkway to the gathering deck (east side) was 5 feet wide (vs. 3.5 feet wide), and 20 feet long (vs. 11 feet long).

Designer Mike Devine was also present.

The applicants distributed additional drawings of the proposed addition.

Mr. Philips said that during the building department submittal process it was determined that they needed to provide barrier-free access to the building by means of an elevator. The elevator would provide access to the lower level, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floors. Barrier-free access to the rooftop would not be required. However, providing the required access to the other levels allowed a larger rooftop addition. Therefore they had made some alterations to the original plan. The mass of the rooftop came about a foot closer to the rear of the property, and a foot further back from Center Street. Also with this application, they proposed going closer to the parapet in the hopes that they would be able to take advantage of some of the events happening on Center Street.

The applicants had provided additional materials illustrating some of the extra elements in this revised proposal. The color palette had remained unchanged. A portion of the elevator shaft would be clad with 12 x 24 tile. On the exterior there was an area for a stainless steel trellis in order to have some green growing in that area.

The addition would be constructed into the rear yard set back. There was a provision in the Ordinance that allowed the Planning Commission to approve this without the applicants having to go to the BZA.

Mr. Philips reviewed the new drawings submitted this evening, including Sheets 3.1 and 4.1, which added dimensions to the information on Sheets 3 and 4. Page 7 listed the proposed colors and their locations. Spec sheets were included for other elements, including the tile, gutter downspouts, rear fascia, railing system, LED lighting, etc.

The railing system was transparent, with aluminum uprights and horizontals and stainless steel cables. The LED lighting was proposed to be incorporated into the post, thus eliminating the need for an exterior light fixture.

A cutsheet had been provided for the nanawall system, and information was given regarding 3 ornamental lights.

Mr. Devine said the overall concept hadn't changed – the addition had just been expanded. The large show window at the rear elevation would be made slightly smaller to accommodate the vestibule there.

Commissioner Hoffman said it appeared that the west façade was more broken up than what was shown in the original design.

Mr. Philips said the new plan functioned better, and was also pushing the line with making the addition more contemporary in appearance – it was more fun than the last submittal.

Commissioner Hoffman emphasized that the proposed structure was at the rear of the building.

Commissioner Field referred to a comment in Consultant Elmiger's November 7, 2017 review letter: *At the April 19, 2017 meeting, the sub-committee affirmed that the proposed site lines identified during the field investigation were acceptable.*

Commissioner Field addressed this issue. The subcommittee had met to confirm that the railing would be only marginally visible from the street – the only place it could be seen was from Genetti's for a span of 70-80 feet. Tonight the proposal was to move the front deck almost to the front of the building.

Chair Allen noted that the railing was originally 12'6" from the parapet. Tonight's proposal showed the railing at 6" from the parapet.

Mr. Devine said part of the reason they had changed the design of the deck and railing was that now that they had accessible levels, the amount of square footage that could be built on the roof had increased.

Commissioner Argenta said the subcommittee had met to ensure that the railing was not visible from the street. Why was it now moved right up to the parapet?

Mr. Philips said they desired – with the elevator and the new footprint – to be able to see what was happening on Center Street. Such a configuration would make the space much more desirable.

Commissioner Argenta said he had no problem with the new design except for the railing. Originally the Commission did not want the railing to be seen. That was one of the nicest buildings in the area and to have a new railing going across the top would be a detriment to the building. Also, the HDC didn't want people hanging over the edge. Commissioner Argenta thought the deck and railing should be pulled back to its originally approved location.

Mr. Philips said there was some concern that people would leave the deck and step down to the area close to Center Street without benefit of a railing.

Commissioner Argenta reiterated that there was no reason not to conform to the original approved location.

Commissioner Field agreed, saying that the reason the subcommittee had visited the site was to assure the Commission that very little of the railing would be visible.

Chair Allen added that at the first meetings the Commission made a point of highlighting the Secretary of Interior standards that the back facades of historic buildings were not nearly as important as the front. He also had no objection to the new proposal, except for the location of the deck. The HDC did not want the deck and railing visible.

Commissioner Hoffman agreed.

The consensus of the Commission was that the new proposal could be approved, especially as the height of the structure had not changed, as long as the deck and railing conformed to the original approval.

Aaron Cozart spoke on behalf of the owners of the building. He asked if the Commission's decision to require the deck and railing be pulled back 12 feet was based on the guidelines or just on opinion.

Commissioner Argenta said it was based on the Commission's charge to maintain the integrity of historic buildings. There was no specific guideline that addressed rooftop buildings; but a railing across the top would change the nature of the historic space.

Mr. Cozart said they were hoping to bring the deck and railing forward in order to utilize the space for certain events.

Commissioner Argenta commented that if they wanted to increase the size of the deck, they should pull it back the 12' 6" and make it wider.

Planning Consultant Elmiger clarified that the Commission used the Secretary of Interior standards as a basis for decisions regarding elements such as they were discussing this evening.

Commissioner Field emphasized that under the Secretary of Interior standards, they were concerned about seeing the railing at the front of the building. It needed to be moved back.

Mr. Cozart said they were looking at the overall cost for this project. They would like an approval this evening. This project had been going through processes since April, and they would like an approval to take back to their team. That would enable them to make a decision to go forward or not.

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

Chair Allen opened the meeting for public comment.

Mr. Presley asked if the applicants had considered a glass railing. Mr. Philips said maintenance was a concern with a glass railing, and the top rail would still be visible. Commissioner Argenta added that part of the concern was having people hanging over the edge on Center Street.

From the audience a resident asked several questions regarding the proposed structure, including the comment about having a more contemporary, fun looking structure, and was it the Commission's intent to keep the building original-looking. She was concerned about the appearance of the new rooftop structure.

Chair Allen explained that the plan called for a more contemporary rooftop structure at the rear. From the front, the historical character should be maintained. Commissioner Argenta said the guidelines for the Historic District did give property owners the ability to change the rear of their homes and other historic structures.

Seeing that no one else came forward to speak, Chair Allen brought the matter back to the Commission.

**MOTION Argenta, support by Field,** to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular Standards 9 and 10, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-4 setback and spacing, 4-21 materials, 4-27 rear façade development, and 5-18 paint and colors, with the following condition:

- The rooftop deck and railing be moved back to the west 12’6” from the front parapet, to conform to the original approved use. With that change, the size of the deck can be whatever the owner deems feasible and meets ordinance standards.

In response to a question from Chair Allen, Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that the applicants would have to receive approval of this new plan from the Planning Commission. Parking would not be affected.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**CASE #6**

**THE CADY PROJECT  
LOT 170 – E. CADY STREET**

**NEW CONSTRUCTION**

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 a power point presentation, Mr. Mielock explained changes and modifications that had been made to their proposal since they had appeared before the HDC in September. The proposal was for the construction of a new four-story, mixed-use building, located on the south side of Cady Street, directly east of the parking lot behind the hair salon on N. Center Street. The building would also occupy a small portion (24 feet) of the existing public surface lot to the west of Lot 170.

They had received final site plan approval from Planning Commission on November 7, and they were seeking final approval from the Historic District Commission this evening, so that they could move ahead with construction documents.

The applicants had pushed the building north toward Cady Street 10 feet, and created a greenbelt on the south side, so that hopefully any future building that would be constructed on the south side of the subject lot would also have a 10-foot setback, so that neither building would be required to have fire-rated walls, and windows could be included on the south elevation.

In response to a comment from Commission Field, Mr. Mielock said that the new configuration allowed Cady Street to be widened with parallel parking on the north and south sides, something the Department of Public Works Director had wanted to achieve for years. That part of Cady Street did not align with Cady Street on the west side of Center Street. Widening it at their location would be the first step to aligning that portion of Cady with the portion to the west.

Mr. Mielock explained that the development would have commercial on the first floor, and then 3 floors of condominiums with 2 condominiums per floor. Each tenant would have useable green space on the roof, with no railings around the perimeter – the parapet would be raised high enough to form the guard-rail barrier.

In response to a question from Commissioner Argenta, Mr. Daily said the green roofs would be both a combination of sitting area and a true green roof.

Mr. Mielock briefly reviewed the overall design which had been seen at the September HDC meeting. They had taken certain components from downtown and made them their own, keeping proportion and massing in line with existing downtown historic structures.

Mr. Presley pointed out that the penthouses were related to the stair and elevator shaft. The penthouses were set back so that they were not read from the street.

Regarding the east elevation, Commissioner Argenta had suggested at the September meeting removing every other vertical. The applicants did that, and had liked the results. They were trying to create a warehouse/industrial appearance on the east elevation, knowing that in the future a building could be constructed right up against theirs; therefore no windows were proposed on the east side. Removing every other vertical pulled the height down, and gave a more horizontal look to the east elevation.

In response to a question from Commissioner Argenta, Mr. Mielock said the east elevation was burnished block, with natural mortar on the verticals and horizontals. In the panels they would use colored mortar close to the color of the block, resulting in some value difference in the block and a little more shape and shadow along that elevation.

Mr. Daily said he was researching installing an aluminum foil type screen print similar to what was on the Village Workshop, using the same company that had installed the way finding signs in the downtown area.

Mr. Mielock said that Planning Consultant Elmiger had asked about landscaping in her November 8, 2017 review letter. He noted that the DDA did not yet have streetscape standards for this part of Cady Street, so they had developed landscaping that could change as they continued to work with the City and the DDA. They were proposing to plant trees along the south elevation to buffer and soften that vertical elevation, and would also be planting evergreens along the east side of the building.

Two new parallel parking spaces were shown at the front of the building on Cady Street.

Mr. Presley addressed a new schematic showing a partial elevation of the front (north) of the building. There was a brick panel between two vertical stone elements, with the stone elements being the same stone as the base of the building. They proposed a storefront type mold frame for the storefronts and a residential sash – probably aluminum clad wood sash – for the upper units. They would also like to introduce mullions on the residential windows but those had not yet been added. They were hoping for approval this evening with the condition that they return to the HDC with further design elements as the project developed.

Commissioner Field asked if any of the stone in the middle of the elevation had been changed since the September meeting. Mr. Presley said it had not been changed.

Mr. Presley further described details of the north elevation, as shown on the partial north schematic. Those details included:

- Parapet and brick veneer
- Parapet and stone panel
- Storefront canopy
- Residential entry canopy
- Guard rail with balcony

Mr. Mielock said they would like to utilize a storefront system on the first floor, with a dark bronze anodized color, and then have a more residential type window on the upper floors, with a narrow profile line creating the look of an old steel sash warehouse-type building. The residential windows would be anodized or have some sort of painted aluminum exterior, with wood on the interior which could be painted or stained as the resident wished.

Mr. Presley addressed a schematic that had originally been drawn for the Planning Commission, which showed how parking could be provided on both sides of the street. If they had 7-foot parking on both sides of the street, they would have 11-foot drive lanes – a foot wider than on North Center Street. They would also have 12 feet from the curb to the face of the building, meeting Cady Street Overlay requirements.

Mr. Mielock pointed out that they were working with the City and the last revision of the CSO district to produce a design that would be open, with a tree-lined street that also offered parallel parking.

Mr. Mielock said the review letter had also mentioned light standards. They were trying to keep lighting to a minimum. They were proposing all LED outdoor lighting that met ordinance requirements.

Mr. Mielock said the review letter had also asked for material and color samples, and they were providing some samples this evening to give an idea of the color family being proposed. However, final materials had not yet been determined.

Regarding the west elevation, they were proposing frosted windows in the garage door leading to the private parking there. They were trying to enhance the look of the parking structure and allow natural light, while also providing privacy.

Commissioner Field asked for clarification as to what the applicants were seeking this evening.

Mr. Mielock said they were seeking final approval with the condition that they would come back for further HDC approval as details changed and/or evolved moving forward. This project was not a renovation of a single storefront or single façade, but rather was a new building with four facades, and would require future meetings with the HDC as things developed.

Mr. Presley listed those things that would need future approval, including windows, cornices, and building finish materials.

Mr. Mielock added that their desire was to show the HDC everything in context. They also needed assurance that as they started the next phase of the project, including construction drawings and bidding, that they were headed in the right direction.

Mr. Daily further explained that final approval this evening would give the applicants the ability to move forward with construction drawings and bids, which in turn gave them the ability to finalize the brick, finishes, and windows, which they would show to the HDC at a later date in order to get approval for those design elements.

Commissioner Field noted that this was the applicants' second meeting before the HDC, and in both instances the applicants had heard that they were on the right track.

Commissioner Tartaglia expressed approval of the accents included in the design that followed the historic tradition of the downtown, and said he would like to see those things in the final designs presented to the Commission. What he didn't want to see was a contemporary Northville and a historic Northville.

Mr. Daily said their goal was to complement the Historic District.

**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 brought the matter back to the Commission.

**MOTION Hoffman, support by Murdock, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing the Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-12 commercial additions or new building, 4-13 pedestrian orientation parking, 4-17 height, 4-20 ryhythm, 4-22 ornament, with the following condition:**

- The applicant return to the HDC for approval of details on windows, colors, and façade materials at a later date.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

#### **NEW AGENDA ITEM: PARTIAL DEMOLITION OF OLD VILLAGE SCHOOL**

Based on the earlier discussion during Public Comments at tonight's meeting, Chair Allen suggested that the Commission schedule a special meeting to hear the application for partial demolition of Old Village School.

Mary Kay Gallagher, Superintendent, Northville Public Schools, was present for this discussion, as was Jeff Hamilton, Vice President and Project Director for Auch Construction.

Mr. Hamilton explained that the School District did not want to be presumptuous in bringing this request forward before the vote on the millage. Now they were in a time crunch because they planned to have the Old School open in time for the 2018 fall season.

Superintendent Gallagher said that their hope for tonight was to go forward with the demolition of the breezeway and elevator, which were added in 1979 without HDC approval. They hoped the HDC would see this partial demolition as a step in the right direction, especially as the District was removing an unsightly non-historic portion of the building. However, the District did respect rules and process.

Commissioner Hoffman said he felt the HDC would be working with the School District on this project, and correct process should be followed. They had the ability to call a special meeting.

Superintendent Gallagher said they could have the documentation in tomorrow for a partial demolition request.

After a discussion of process, the consensus of the Commission was to set the special meeting for 7:00 p.m., November 21, 2017.

**8. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS: 522 W. Dunlap – New Roof**

Planning Consultant Elmiger advised that 522 W. Dunlap had received administrative approval to replace a roof with the same roofing materials as were there now.

**9. DISCUSSION: None.**

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

Seeing that there was no further comment, Chair Allen adjourned the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Cheryl McGuire  
Recording Secretary

Approved as published 12/20/2017