

NORTHVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
January 17, 2018
Wednesday 7:00 P.M. – Northville City Hall – Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

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

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

2. PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Commissioner Murdock asked to have the wording of *Guidelines and Application for Demolition* added to the agenda as a discussion item.

MOTION Murdock, support by Gudritz, to amend the agenda to include as a discussion item: *The Wording of Guidelines and Application for Demolition*. **Motion carried unanimously.**

4. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES: December 20, 2017 Regular meeting and
November 21, 2017 Special meeting

MOTION Murdock, support by Gudritz, to approve the December 20, 2017 minutes as published.
Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION Field, support by Gudritz, to approve the November 21, 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: None.

7. CASES TO BE HEARD – BY CASE

CASE #1

THOMAS & JUSTINE GUDRITZ
548 W. MAIN STREET

WINDOWS

Commissioner Gudritz asked to be recused, as he was the applicant in this case.

MOTION Argenta, support by Field, to recuse Commissioner Gudritz from this agenda item.
Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Gudritz left the dais.

Thomas Gudritz, 548 W. Main Street, was present on behalf of this application, which was a request to replace 7 windows of various sizes with 7 new windows of the same size on the second story of the home. Charlie St. Louis, Design Consultant for Renewal by Andersen, was also present.

The new windows would occupy the same area of the facades as the existing windows, which were installed approximately 1940. No other work was proposed. The replacement windows would be the same Andersen windows that were used to replace the windows at the front of the home in 2008.

Mr. Gudritz directed the Commission's attention to his application packet, where he had circled pictures of the windows to be replaced, and provided a photograph of a window interior. The current windows had an aluminum insert with a 2-piece storm window and 2-piece screen. The existing windows were drafty, had to be completely disassembled in order to clean them, and because many of the clips on the storm windows were broken, the storm window had to be completely removed in the summer rather than simply raised.

The proposed windows were double hung with 2x3 grills on the top and bottom, with wood on the inside and Fibrex on the outside. The Fibrex would be painted white by the manufacturer. The grills would give the appearance of separate panes of glass. None of the windows frames, sashes, sills, etc., would be changed.

Mr. St Louis showed samples of the proposed windows, which were full divided light grilles. They were the colonial style, with the same number of sashes as the current windows.

In response to a question from Vice Chair Hoffman, Mr. Gudritz reiterated that there would be no change in the trim.

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

In response to a question from Commissioner Murdock, Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that the photos showing the existing elevations of the home would suffice in documenting the proposed windows; this was consistent with past practice, since the location and size of the windows would not change.

Motion carried unanimously.

Vice Chair Hoffman opened the meeting for public comment. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Vice Chair Hoffman 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 3-21 materials, 5-14 windows, and 5-18 colors. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Gudritz rejoined the Commission.

**CASE #2
S4CADY LLC
162 E. CADY STREET**

WINDOWS

It was noted that the correct address should have been:

102/201 E. CADY STREET

David Murphy, Fractal-Designs, 706 Florence Avenue, Royal Oak, MI was present on behalf of this application, which was a request to replace all of the windows on the second and third floors of the building. Currently the windows were double hung vinyl; they were proposing to replace them with a storefront system, non-operable, with insulated glazing.

Mr. Murphy showed renderings of the existing and the proposed windows. He distributed sample materials, noting the colors and specifications as listed in the submission.

The dimensions of the new windows would be exactly the same as the existing windows and would occupy the same area of the façade. The aluminum storefront window design would eliminate the wood trim surrounding the existing windows.

In response to questions from Commissioner Field, Mr. Murphy explained that the appearance would be similar in appearance to the existing windows but the aluminum extrusions would give a slightly different appearance. The look would be completely rectangular.

Commissioner Argenta asked some clarifying questions regarding the drawings labeled detail 4 and detail 2. Commissioner Field was concerned that the horizontals and verticals on the new windows were all the same dimension. The existing windows had smaller center horizontals than verticals; the new windows lost that dimensional appearance. Commissioner Murdock added that the applicants were trying to give the appearance of a double hung window, but the new windows looked like 1 window with 6 panes.

Commissioner Field continued to express reservation about the appearance of the new windows. Would it be possible to make the verticals a little bit wider than the center horizontals in order to give the illusion of separate windows?

Mr. Murphy said the vertical needed to stay 2” mullions as shown. He was not sure that the horizontals could be replaced with 1” mullions, but he would try.

Commissioner Field suggested 3” verticals and 2” center horizontals. Commissioner Argenta was unsure that those sizes would be available.

Mr. Murphy again said he would try to get a thinner center horizontal for the windows.

Commissioner Field reiterated that when the verticals and horizontals were the same size, the result was a flat appearance.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gudritz, Mr. Murphy said all the 2nd and 3rd floor spaces were commercial.

In response to a question from Commissioner Argenta, Mr. Murphy said the windows would be thermally broken.

Vice Chair Hoffman asked if the Commission was ready to proceed. Commissioner Field remained concerned about the new design of the windows, with the 2” verticals and 2”

horizontals. He was ready to move ahead but would like to reference that concern in the motions.

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

Vice Chair Hoffman opened the meeting for public comment. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Vice Chair Hoffman 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 4-6 windows, 4-21 materials, and 5-18 color. The motion requires the applicant to see if the center horizontal member of the storefront system can be a 1" face instead of the 2" face. If not possible, the HDC approves the the 2" vertical and horizontal members. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #3

LEGACY CUSTOM BUILDERS 254 LINDEN

PARTIAL DEMOLITION

Matt Pyzocha, 254 Linden, was present on behalf of this application, which was a request to demolish a porch on the front of the house so that a single-story addition could be built in its place. Dano Prezioso, Legacy Custom Builders, was also present.

Mr. Prezioso said they would be incorporating 2 new Anderson windows, and spec sheets had been provided for those. The color scheme of the home would remain the same. A new mahogany front door would be installed, and the exterior would consist of smooth Hardie siding.

Mr. Pyzocha noted that the porch to be demolished was approved as new construction by the HDC in 2008; there would not be anything historically relevant involved in this small demolition.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hoffman, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the grounds for demolition was based upon the resource being a deterrent to a major improvement program. The applicant needed to provide a description of the process that would be used to demolish the porch, so as not to damage the historic part of the structure.

Mr. Prezioso said the porch would be removed by hand.

Commissioner Argenta summarized that there was no record of what the original home looked like, and tonight's application was to remove a 2008 addition. The only new activity was the opening of a hole through the wall to the dining room in order to add a door.

Commissioner Gudritz asked if there was any sense of what was the original 1900 home looked like. Mr. Pyzocha said they did not know what the original home looked like.

Vice Chair Hoffman noted that the HDC had to make a decision regarding the historical or architectural significance of the home, and was ready to entertain a motion.

MOTION Field, support by Murdock, that the Commission determines that the porch proposed to be demolished at 254 Linden Street has no historical or architectural significance, and is not a contributing structure to the Historic District and does not require a public hearing. Motion carried unaimously. (Final motion below.)

MOTION Field, support by Gudritz, to accept the application for a porch demolition as complete. Motion carried unanimously. (Final motion below.)

Note: during the Discussion portion of the agenda, Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that those two motions should be reversed. This was done by the following motion:

MOTION Gudritz, support by Murdock, to reverse the motions under Case #3 regarding completeness and historical significance for 254 Linden Street. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Therefore, the final motions read:

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

MOTION Field, support by Murdock, that the Commission determine that the porch proposed to be demolished at 254 Linden Street has no historical or architectural significance, and is not a contributing structure to the Historic District and does not require a public hearing. **Motion carried unanimously.**

MOTION Argenta, support Gudritz, to grant a Notice to Proceed for the demolition of the following items, based on the finding that the resource is a deterrent to major improvements: the west front porch and cutting a new opening through the porch to the new dining room.

Vice Chair Hoffman opened the meeting for public comment. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Vice Chair Hoffman brought the matter back to the Commission.

Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #4

**LEGACY CUSTOM BUILDERS
254 LINDEN**

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Vice Chair Hoffman asked the applicants if there were any more comments regarding the new addition.

Mr. Prescioso said that the new porch would be a small addition to the home; it would be smaller than the current porch and more attractive, and would better blend with the two homes to the north.

In response to a request from Vice Chair Hoffman, Planning Consultant Elmiger summarized variances that had been received by the applicant from the BZA on November 1, 2017, as outlined in her memorandum of January 11, 2018: a 1.8 foot side yard variance and a 2.45 foot average front yard setback variance were granted in order for this project to proceed.

Commissioner Gudritz asked if the other windows on the home were vinyl. Mr. Pyzocha said they were.

Commissioner Murdock noted that the HDC was tasked to make sure that additions were different and distinctive than the original home; in this case that did not seem to apply. Commissioner Argenta pointed out that 80% of the the front façade was going to stay as it was, and there was no logical way to differentiate this small porch from that. It would be an attractive addition.

Commissioners Murdock and Gudritz agreed. Commissioner Field said he felt the new porch would add value to the home.

Vice Chair Hoffman confirmed that a sample of the Hardie siding had been brought to tonight's meeting. No color sample was needed as the addition would be the same color as the house. The reveal would be consistent with the current siding reveal.

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

Vice Chair Hoffman opened the meeting for public comment. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Vice Chair Hoffman brought the matter back to the Commission.

MOTION Argenta, support by Murdock, 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 doors, 3-10 porches, 3-14 setback, 3-21 materials, 5-3 wood, 5-9 asphalt shingles, 5-12 stone, 5-14 windows, 5-17 siding and 5-18 paint and color. **Motion carried unanimously.**

At this point in the meeting, Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that the motions regarding demolition in Case #3 should be reversed. After brief discussion regarding process, and as noted under Case #3 above, the following motion was offered:

MOTION Gudritz, support by Murdock, to reverse the motions under Case #3 regarding completeness and historical significance for 254 Linden Street. **Motion carried unanimously.**

8. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR

MOTION Argenta, support by Gudritz, that Commissioner Hoffman remain as Vice Chair, and the nominations be closed. **Motion carried unanimously.**

9. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS: None.

10. DISCUSSION:

Wording of Guidelines and Application for Demolition

Commissioner Murdock explained that he had asked this item to be added to the agenda because he felt a current interpretation of the Guidelines was not consistent with the HDC's intent; and the language needed to be modified.

Commissioner Field ~~made the following points~~ said that in his opinion:

- If a building or portion of a building was found not to be historically or architecturally significant, no grounds for demolition needed to be cited.
- Regarding making changes in grounds and preconditions for demolition, including offering a property for sale, the language – though confusing – was included for a reason, and other governing bodies should be brought into the conversation, including City Council, as well as the City Attorney. The intent of the original writers needed to be discovered, if possible.

Commissioner Murdock said he felt the last interpretation of requiring a property to be put up for sale was not consistent with what he felt the HDC's intent was. He asked if Planning Consultant

Elmiger should be tasked with coming up with new language.

Discussion followed regarding the importance of following correct process and being transparent. The issue was a significant one, and should be handled with care.

Commissioner Gudritz wondered where the requirements for making an application for demolition originated. Planning Consultant Elmiger said the language was identical to that used by the City of Mackinaw Island.

Commissioners Gudritz and Hoffman felt that grounds for demolition should perhaps be different for commercial and residential properties.

Commissioner Argenta thought two things should be clarified: 1) process – in what order did things happen, and 2) content – what was being said.

Planning Consultant Elmiger suggested that she research and summarize how other cities handled demolitions in historic districts, and bring that back to the Commission before attempting to draft new language. However, if Northville was an outlier in how demolitions were addressed, she might go ahead and draft some new language and send individually via email to the Commissioners to get individual comments back, and then summarize those comments at a public meeting.

Commissioner Tartaglia suggested the matter be taken up at a study session, after Planning Consultant Elmiger's research had been received.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Seeing that discussion had ended, Vice Chair Hoffman thanked the Commissioners for their donation of time and expertise, and adjourned the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl McGuire
Recording Secretary

Approved as amended February 21, 2018