

**City of Northville
Historic District Commission Meeting
June 20, 2018**

**City of Northville Municipal Building - Council Chambers
215 W. Main Street
Northville, Michigan, 48167**

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

Chair Allen called the Historic District Commission meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

Present: Allen, Field (left at 9:12 p.m.), Gudritz, Hoffman, Murdock, Tartaglia
Absent: None
Also Present: Planning Consultant Elmiger, Mayor Roth, Downtown Development Authority Director Ward, Recording Secretary Cheryl McGuire, and approximately 60 citizens

2. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

A moment of silence was held in honor of long-time Commissioner John Argenta, who recently passed away.

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

4. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES: May 16, 2018

MOTION Hoffman, support by Gudritz, to approve the May 16, 2018 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

The HDC Chair explained the public hearing procedures. When the public hearing is opened, the applicant would have the opportunity to present the case. The public would then have the opportunity to speak, with comments limited to five minutes. Speakers were asked to not duplicate previously mentioned comments as those would already be a part of the record. All were asked to approach the podium and address their comments to the HDC and not the audience. Questions for the applicant should be asked through the HDC and the HDC will get the answer from the applicant. After the public hearing is closed, public participation would end and the HDC will vote on the demolition request.

The Chair opened the public hearing at 7:06 p.m.

Ed Funke was present to address the demolition application submitted by Guidobono Building Company for the building located at 341 E. Main Street. Funke noted the following:

- The initial demolition application for this building was made approximately one year ago. The applicant believed it has met the ordinance requirements, as well as all requests from the HDC, including a building tour.
- The applicant has remained patient and courteous throughout the process. This application was a learning curve through missteps of the HDC. While only one public hearing is required, three public hearings were scheduled and two were held with public comment.
- In listening to the comments during the public hearing from those that have not toured the building, the applicant requested the HDC look back to what was witnessed firsthand during their building tour.
- The building is located in the Central Business District (CBD), and is not zoned Professional and Business Office (PBO) as suggested by previous public comments. While uses on Main Street are more PBO than CBD, the property is zoned CBD and what is being proposed is allowed in the CBD.
- The applicant followed through with a request for a structural engineer's assessment of the building. The applicant's structural engineer cited deficiencies and the opinion that the building would not support renovation.
- The original intent was to remodel the building. As the project progressed, and sections of the interior were uncovered that were not able to be removed prior to purchasing the building, the initial HDC application was withdrawn and a demolition application was submitted.
- The preliminary concept proposed for this site meets the Downtown Development Authority's (DDA) vision for E. Main Street to expand the CBD and the downtown business district.
- Precedence was set in approving the demolition of the building two doors down from 341 E. Main, and a new building was built. Fifteen structures in the historic district have received HDC demolition approval. The applicants were not required to have a structural engineer report, nor were the applicants required to put the building up for sale. Guidobono Building was required to have two structural engineer assessments and place the building for sale.
- Previous minutes do not note that the applicant offered this building to the City and stated they would assist with moving the building.
- The applicant is not against preservation. The application and reasons for requesting the building be demolished meet the criteria. The decision should be based on the facts and the City's vision for expanding the downtown.

At this point, the HDC did not have questions for the applicant. As such, the Chair opened the meeting to public comment.

Several citizens read from a written statement and provided a copy of that statement to the Recording Secretary. The comments were summarized, and the written statements are part of the demolition application file in the Building Department.

Bill Stockhausen, 218 Dunlap, submitted written comments and spoke in opposition of the demolition request. Key points noted that Stockhausen and his wife Carole restored their 1884

Queen Anne home at 218 W. Dunlap. They also restored an 1854 grist mill in Bellevue, Michigan, which was slated for demolition and is now on the National Registry of Historic Places. The Stockhausen's have been members of the Northville Historical Society (NHS) since 1972. Stockhausen is a past president and current vice-president, and has participated in the original moving and restoration of every historic building at Mill Race Village.

Under the ordinance, the HDC has the legal responsibility to protect historic resources within the Historic District. Once a contributing building is gone, it is gone forever. This building is one of few in the City built pre-Civil War. The building is historically known as the Gold Cure Boarding House, and also served other uses. The boarding house is an excellent example of mid-1800s architecture and construction. It is a contributing structure at a historic entrance to the City.

Stockhausen spoke of the applicant's basis for demolition. The applicant originally cited #4 (retaining the resource is not in the interest of the majority of the community). In September 2017, the applicant also requested #1 as a second basis (resource constitutes a hazard to the safety of the community). The applicant must provide written evidence that alternatives to demolition or moving were evaluated. The applicant must also provide architectural and financial data to support a demolition as the only option, as well as feasible alternative uses to allow retention of the structure. The applicant has not provided concrete evidence to support the demolition request.

The owner is an experienced builder, has been involved in other historic restoration projects, and should not claim surprise that the building needs restoration that is more expensive than the cost to demo and construct a new building. Demolition makes all other HDC restoration projects a "sham."

The property was purchased in December 2016 for \$460,000 and offered for sale in February 2018 at \$699,000. Stockhausen believes the owner did not offer the property at a fair price and market it for a reasonable period of time. Granting the demolition request would set precedent for further demolition of historic buildings, leaving no basis for the Historic District to exist.

Paul Snyder, Northville Historical Society (NHS) Archivist/Curator, submitted written comments and spoke in opposition of the demolition request. Key points noted the Secretary of Interior does not make allowances for a building to be replaced, and have it retain its historic designation. Contrary to an article in the Northville Record, the property owner did not make an offer to the Northville Historical Society to move the building to Mill Race Village.

Maverick Consulting identified warped floors, a sagging roof, and an unstable foundation, which are conditions a competent developer should notice without removing paneling.

The NHS assertions on the history of the building are based on proven history and educational text vetted by historian scholars, along with an abstract of ownership obtained from the Wayne County Register of Deeds. Snyder summarized the history of this building in his written submission. It predates Northville's incorporation as a village and is one the City's oldest buildings.

He spoke of the struggle with conflicting values of economic opportunity for a few and the historic preservation that defines a community.

Ann Mannisto, 1027 Springfield, spoke on behalf of Wendy Mutch, 24741 Taft Road, and submitted Mutch's written comments opposing the demolition request. Key points noted Mutch is the Local History Librarian at the Northville District Library. The history of Northville is detailed and well-documented from accounts of the people that helped form the community.

In the 1890s, the boarding house served hundreds of patients as they sought a cure for afflictions. A 1903 Detroit Free Press article was written about the Yarnall Gold Cure Institute and its work. The building has stood and served Northville for over 125 years. Many historic structures have

been lost to fire or demolition by neglect and cannot be replaced. It is the responsibility of the HDC to ensure remaining historic structures are not demolished for progress. The HDC should preserve the building to honor those long ago who contributed to Northville, and pass it along to those who will follow.

Suzie Bone, 16159 Old Bedford Road, Northville Township, submitted written comments and spoke in opposition of the demolition request. Key points noted that she previously owned two historic houses in Northville. 341 E. Main was the house for patients receiving the “gold cure,” and was the home for many prominent Northville families. It is an example of a pre-Civil War house and was used as a boarding house before and after the Civil War.

Many residents chose to live in Northville because of its historical designation. Northville will lose its charm, quaintness, and “draw” to this historical town, if it continues to allow people to tear down old houses and buildings, and replace them with new and modern structures. The building has other possible new uses, including a museum, which could bring in revenue and make new people aware of what Northville was and still is.

New businesses and subdivisions constructed in and around Northville, including Northville Township, increased not only the tax base but sales prices. Bone voiced concern that those elected to sit on the city board have chosen a larger tax base over preservation of historic Northville.

Kathleen Switalski, 218 Lake Street, spoke in opposition of the demolition request. Key points included concern that the decisions made tonight will open Pandora’s Box for further demolition of historic structures, especially with the upcoming sale and redevelopment of Northville Downs. The community must remain vigilant and retain its history and charm. Switalski also questioned why the applicant would offer to move a house that they claim is structurally unsound.

Charles Lapham, 18412 Blue Heron, spoke in support of the demolition request. Key points included his belief that people that made Northville what it is today did so by making decisions to demolish buildings. Sometimes a building has served his purpose. Denying the demolition request will deter people from wanting to develop in Northville. Developers and retail businesses need to know Northville is not closed to new businesses and development. Lapham cited prominent areas of the City that resulted from demolition, which included Ford Field and Town Square. As a former city council member, he understood his position is not popular with the community.

Kathy Bilger, Northville Historical Society, Chair of Education, Programs, and Archives, submitted written comments and spoke in opposition of the demolition request. Key points noted that Bilger lives in Livonia. Livonia does not have the history of Northville, Livonia residents shop and visit Northville for its history and charm.

Henry Ford saved the building and made certain it was protected. The sale of the building by Ford Motor Company occurred after Henry Ford’s death. Keeping this building is the justification for Northville being part of the Motor City Heritage. Bilger reviewed the chain of ownership for this building as researched through records at the Wayne County Register of Deeds and census records. She also provided a document that showed Yerkes’ notes as he researched previous ownership of the building. Many of Northville’s streets are named after previous owners of this house. These owners were prominent, old Northville families.

Bilger also reviewed the many uses of this house and their historical significance. The house’s history is unique as it contributed to the story of Northville through its owners and their positions within the town. Annually, the NHS brings Northville third grade students to Mill Race Village

to teach them of Northville's history and its significance. This house has served the community for over 150 years, in many capacities, it is significant and deserves the respect of the community. It will find a use in downtown Northville.

Jennifer Moss, 547 W. Main Street, spoke in opposition of the demolition request. Key points noted that Moss has lived in Northville her entire life and now owns a home in the Historic District. When purchased, the house was almost beyond repair; however, she understood what she was getting into when buying a house in the Historic District. Extensive restoration work has been done on this house.

While she has heard good things about Guidobono Building, Moss believed that efforts to sell the building at \$200,000 above the purchase price, was not of the right mindset. Historic property owners and business owners are stewards of a community. If Northville loses its individual historic buildings that can be repurposed, it loses its character and charm. Moss understood the HDC does not have any easy job and everyone has their own agenda. She will support whatever decision is made.

John Roby, 511 W. Dunlap, submitted written comments and spoke in opposition of the demolition request. Key points noted that the residents are not trying to shut down development or prevent business from coming to Northville. He has lived in the Historic District for 39 years, and has aspired to evolve his home as rooted in history, harmonious in setting, and pleasing to view, and he owes this to the Historic District. By ordinance, the HDC owes it to the historic district to protect this building. Demolition is an irreversible act that must always be the last resort.

The building has longevity, style, and location, and its ownership has been outlined by the Northville Historical Society. Professional engineering analysis finds no imminent hazard. The building remains amenable to sensitive rehabilitation and reuse. The building does not deter a major community improvement as no such project has been identified. Purchasing a historic property in a historic district that was based on demolition, which is then blocked, resulting in a loss, is a business mistake, not an undue hardship.

Northville residents and property owners, backed by the founding and regimen of the Historic District, make an investment to live and work in the community. This establishes that the interest of the majority of the community favors historic fabric and harmony. The community prefers the charm and scale of 341 E. Main over a commercial structure. The HDC was urged to protect this old building.

Bob Sochacki, 223 Linden, submitted written comments and spoke in opposition of the demolition request. Key points noted that Sochacki is a property owner in the Historic District. He is also a Northville Historical Society Board member.

The U.S. Department of Interior and the Michigan State Historic Preservation Office developed a program that helps local governments protect and preserve their heritage by establishing historic districts. This process is administered locally by the Historic District Commission. Unlike museums and museum villages, buildings within the historic district are useful, vibrant, and living history. Federal and state guidelines do not recognize structures that have been moved as "contributing" to the historic district. Moving 341 E. Main to Mill Race Village diminishes the integrity of the Historic District. The District is shrinking in part due to demolition of contributing structures as well as additions to structures that disguise the original character of the building.

While the applicant claims the resource constitutes a hazard to the safety of the public or the occupants, the City's structural engineer found that demolition is not recommended on structural basis alone. Instead, investment is necessary to preserve and rehabilitate the building. The

applicant argued that the repairs are too costly, yet Cambridge Homes recently submitted a bid of \$1,550,000 to Northville Public Schools to acquire the Main Street Elementary School building. The applicant notes there is a demand for residential units near the downtown. Many residential units near the downtown are being built or are in the planning stages.

Sochacki read the 12/19/17 letter to the Historic District Commission from Ellen Thackery, Deputy Executive Director at the Michigan Historic Preservation Network. Thackery's letter reviewed the statute and the historic demolition guidelines used by the HDC to review demolition requests, the role of the HDC in protecting historic structures, and the results from the City's contracted structural engineer's report. The report states the building's structural condition does not warrant full demolition. It acknowledges that investment is needed to rehabilitate the building and that the foundation should be the first priority.

Sochacki also read the 8/23/72 letter from the Michigan Department of Natural Resources to John Burkman, President of the Northville Historical Society and Chair of the Northville District Study Committee. The letter acknowledges the Northville Historic District being placed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Mallory Bower, Southeast Michigan Field Representative, Michigan Historic Preservation Network (MHPN) submitted written comments and spoke in opposition of the demolition request. Key points noted that MHPN's mission is to advocate for Michigan's historic places. Communities that retain their historic sense of place attract visitors and residents. Encouraging preservation and reuse of historic buildings is recognized as an important public policy and supported by laws at the federal, state, and local levels.

The City's historic preservation ordinance charges the HDC to uphold the ordinance and work with property owners to maintain and retain the historic fabric. The City made it clear that demolition must be a last resort. Demolition or moving of historic resources constitutes an irreplaceable loss to the Historic District and the City. Bower reviewed the factors for demolition as outlined in the City's ordinance. One of the factors must have sufficient evidence to support approving a demolition request. The Demolition Guidelines require careful evaluation of the facts and circumstances before a historic resource may be demolished.

The MHPN supports the findings of Cheryl Early which found that, with minimal repair and improvement, the structure at 341 E. Main is able to be reutilized. The stone foundation requires considerable work and should be addressed to prevent further deterioration or movement of the wood structure. Full demolition of the structure was not recommended. Investment is necessary to preserve and rehabilitate the building.

The ordinance and evidence before the HDC establishes that the building clearly contributes to E. Main architecture, is a valuable contributor to the Historic District, and with investment to the foundation and regular maintenance, it should continue that status for another hundred years.

Jennifer Luikart, 521 W. Cady Street, submitted written comments and spoke in opposition of the demolition request. Key points voiced appreciation to the HDC members for serving. HDC members took an oath to uphold the laws and standards and guidelines adopted by the City.

The 2007 final report on the historic district boundaries found that the HDC exists to encourage the preservation of the Historic District's character and to educate current residents of the need to preserve their properties. The HDC must understand that their opinion on whether or not something is liked does not matter. The standards and guidelines that govern the Commission are what matter.

Luikart previously served on the HDC and spoke of her tenure and experience. She was often the lone dissenting vote and her votes had nothing to do with the applicant, but everything to do with the Historic District and her obligation as a Commissioner to preserve and protect the District. She noted that HDC members should attend regular mandatory training. Luikart also believed that property owners were responsible for educating themselves on their property before purchasing it.

The City and the Historic District are at a critical juncture. Based on preliminary results of the 2018 Historic District Survey study, many contributing properties in the 1972 study are no longer contributing or have been demolished. A decision to adhere to the standards and guidelines gives the community a chance to maintain the history that makes it unique, which is the reason many people were attracted to the area. Granting the demolition request will continue to weaken the historic fabric of this community.

Jackie Dobson, 235 Rayson, spoke in opposition to the demolition request. Key points included urging the HDC to follow the rules and guidelines. Dobson was confused as to why the developer purchased the property. The current plan is for a condominium building with underground parking. Dobson questioned what the original plan was when Guidobono purchased the building.

Dan Seybo, Taylor, Michigan, spoke in opposition to the demolition request. Key points noted that he is not a Northville resident. He grew up in Old Village Plymouth and has been interested in Plymouth and Northville history since childhood. He grew up in the home built by his great-grandfather in the 1800s. His grandfather was the local historian, and his great-grandmother and grandmother were founding charter members of the historical museum.

Per the State of Michigan, of nearly 2000 communities, only 78 cities have historic districts and only 30 of these districts are state-certified. Northville is state-certified and unique. These homes can be preserved, foundations can be shored up, and the structures can be saved. He urged the HDC to take this into consideration when voting on the demolition request. Demolition permits set precedence and have weakened historic districts in other communities. He questioned the purpose of the HDC if it does not uphold the ordinances and guidelines of the Historic District.

Jim Bone, 16159 Old Bedford, Northville Township, spoke in opposition to the demolition. Key points noted that he is a member of the Northville Historical Society, as well as a member of the Stone Gang, which are volunteers that meet weekly to maintain Mill Race Village. Bone has led tours of Mill Race Village, and spoke of visitors from other communities that are envious of the historic buildings in Northville. Demolition of historic structures and putting up parking lots and high rises are not Northville. Those that visit Northville do not see that as Northville. Demolished buildings cannot be replaced.

Sheree Lowery, 370 S. Rogers Street, spoke in opposition to the demolition request. Key points noted that she owns a historic home. Lowery and her husband also own a business in the downtown. Older homes cost more than planned, but are worth it. She voiced her belief that the criterion to list the property for a reasonable price and reasonable timeline has not been met. The \$200,000 increase over the purchase price is not fair or accurate. The property was on the market for too short of a period for a commercial property. She also noted that previous speakers mentioned the other criterion had not been met.

Scott Lowery, 370 S. Rogers Street, spoke in opposition to the demolition request. Key points noted his experience with restoring a historic home at the corner of Baseline and Grace. When the restoration was complete, he found that the restoration cost was higher than the cost to

purchase the home. They were pleased to renovate the home and bring their beautiful Victorian home to life.

Lowery's office building on N. Center Street was also rehabilitated. The properties were used as residences in an area zoned CBD and they needed approval from the Planning Commission and the Board of Zoning Appeals to change that use to restore the homes. The homes were not in the Historic District and they were not required to save it. The first house was beyond repair, could not support renovation, and had to be removed. The second building was restored. They are committed to the historic charm of the town. They understand what Guidobono is experiencing with the cost to rehabilitate as they have been there. However, demolitions continue to shrink the Historic District and it is the right decision to save this house.

Mary Elwart-Keys 502 W. Main Street, spoke in opposition to the demolition request. Key points included that Elwart-Keys has lived in the Historic District for 39 years and owns an Italianate contributing house. She has appeared before the HDC for approval of paint colors, and other work. Historic District property owners have invested in their properties and understand the cost to rehabilitate historic buildings. She asked the HDC to look at the audience. They know most of the people there as they have been before the HDC for their own properties. These are their people. The HDC is the steward of historic preservation. She wanted the HDC to think about the message they will send to the other Historic District property owners if the demolition request is approved.

Gail Levan, 132 Randolph Street, spoke in opposition of the demolition request. Key points noted that Levan lives in a house built in 1888. Recently the house was appraised, and the report stated the house had a stable foundation, and received a very favorable appraisal. Her parents lived in the Hunter House for 47 years. Levan spoke of the chain of ownership of that house. She also spoke of her family's history in the community, as her father was the first Fire Chief in Northville. Levan commented that the previous generation regrets the demolition of the Opera House. Northville is a wonderful place with history, and she cannot stand to see this historic building torn down. Levan also submitted written comments stating her reasons for opposing the demolition of the building at 341 E. Main.

Leanie Bayly, 223 Linden, submitted written comments and spoke in opposition of the demolition request. Key points noted that Bayly urged the HDC to uphold the City's Historic District Ordinance, and abide by the Secretary of Interior Standards, the Northville Historic District Design Standards and Guidelines, the Demolition Rules and Guidelines, and the HDC Rules and Regulations.

The HDC has heard testimony from others tonight that urged the denial of this demolition request. It also has reports from three structural engineers. Two of them, approved by the City of Northville, do not recommend a complete demolition of this structure. The report does not support the applicant's grounds for demolition that the structure presents a safety hazard for the occupants or the community. In response to many inquiries for historical data on this property, the NHS Archivist and Board of Directors Education Chair have done their due diligence in thoroughly researching historical documents to share the history of 341 E. Main Street.

Bayly also spoke about her previous service as an HDC member, which included first-hand experience reviewing applications for work as well as demolition requests within the district, along with the resources available to HDC members to complete their research and reviews. There is no such rule for "precedence" as expressed by the applicant. It is unfortunate this application has been before the HDC numerous times and has not been thoroughly presented to the Commissioners. The application lacked the data needed to review this application.

Bayly spoke of HDC training available to commissioners, which is a valuable and effective tool. She urged the Commissioners to seek and attend training opportunities. During its research and application reviews, the HDC must clearly quote the laws, rules, ordinances, and standards when making its decisions. These are in place for a specific reason and are not suggestions or mere opinions. The work on the Historic District Survey inventory project indicates that Northville cannot afford to lose another historic structure. The Historic District is in jeopardy.

Suzanne Heathcote, 49744 Parkside, spoke in opposition to the demolition request. Key points noted that Heathcote owned four historic homes in the City. As a business owner, she understands the additional cost of owning a historic property. With proper planning and investment, owners can renovate and rehabilitate their properties and preserve them for future generations.

Richard Corriveau, 324 E. Main Street, spoke in opposition to the demolition request. Key points noted that his building is across the street from this property. He also owns several pieces of property in the City. Corriveau has rejected offers to sell his properties because he does not want to see the historic buildings demolished for new development. He spoke about the history of his building, which is between 85-100 years old and was owned by doctors that used the building for their home and office.

Residents in the Historic District are spending significant amounts of money rehabilitating their homes. He receives many compliments about his building, and recognizes it is costly. The uniqueness to this block of E. Main Street will be further diminished if 341 E. Main is demolished. This demolition could also entice him to apply to the HDC to change his building to a less desired use or sell it to Starbuck's if they were interested in expanding. He wasn't committing to doing so, but said the prospect could be tempting.

The following written comments were submitted to the HDC. All were opposed to the demolition of 341 E. Main.

- Letter from David Carver, 235 High Street (undated)
- Letter from John Suchomel, 220 N. Wing Street (undated)
- Petition to save the Old Yarnell Boarding House 341 E. Main signed by 35 residents
- Letter from Maureen Hayes, 418 Randolph (undated)
- Letter from Annette Berard, 418 Randolph (undated)
- Letter from Arden McClure, 41765 Onaway (undated)
- Letter from Marianne Barry, 239 High Street dated 6/20/18
- Letter from Andrea Blomberg, 519 Horton dated 6/20/18
- Letter from Norbert Radzialowski, 311 First Street, dated 6/20/18
- Letter from Janet Evans, 21232 E. Glen Haven, Novi, dated 6/20/18
- Letter from Suemarie Klimek, 333 Yerkes, dated 6/20/18
- Letter from Kathy Galarneau, 46111 Fonner Road, dated 6/20/18
- Letter from Mary Palmer dated 6/20/18
- Letter from David and Lynn Kirkpatrick, 1062 Elmsmere, dated 6/1/18
- "Buy to Demolish – It's a Myth" received 6/16/18 (no name provided)

Being no further comment, the public hearing was closed at 8:53 p.m.

Hoffman commented that the public hearing lasted about two hours. In addition to the applicant, about 22 people spoke. His comments voiced appreciation to the rational and heartfelt comments and polite demeanor of those that spoke. This allowed Commissioners to consider the points made. Public meetings do not always go this well. The comments and attendance were appreciated.

Comments from the Historic District Commission were as follows:

Murdock noted that he has thought about this demolition application for about six months. His conclusions are based almost exclusively on the application and materials presented to the HDC. Murdock read the Structural Engineer's report many times. Safety concerns are the basis of the demolition application, and the report does not find a safety concern. Instead, it identifies problems in the building and offers solutions to correct the issues. The report does not cite a safety concern or risk to a crew fixing the problems with this building. The building can be refurbished and put to a good use. The report did not include evidence that doing so is not in the best interest of the community. Murdock is on the side of denying the demolition request.

Gudritz noted that the process has been extraordinarily long and he appreciated the applicant's patience. This was a useful process and a lot of good information has surfaced. There is a better understanding of the age and history of this building. The HDC is responsible for speaking for the resource as it cannot speak for itself. The building's history includes not only its age as it has been around for a long time, it has also served many interesting purposes in the community. All of these factors conclude the resource is old and meaningful.

The building is in rough shape, but per one of the engineering studies, it can be rehabilitated. Gudritz acknowledged it will cost money to rehabilitate this property. Those living in historic homes know that projects usually cost twice what you expect and this is part of owning a historic home. Historic preservation and business progress are not mutually exclusive. Northville can still be preserved and it can still progress and attract business. It does make the market smaller for people that want to come here, and that's something the community accepts. Gudritz could not support the demolition request.

Field noted that he moved to Northville over 30 years ago and originally did not know he had purchased a historic home. He has been through many projects in his own home and understands the cost. A lot of time has been spent on this demolition application. Comments supporting the structure at 341 E. Main included historical charm and uniqueness, and its historical significance. The case has been made for the building's historical purpose and uniqueness. While Field wouldn't purchase the building to live in, he acknowledged that it is unique and interesting to look at.

Years ago, the HDC decided that if it needed a secondary opinion as to if a building could be saved or should be demolished, it would have an architect do an independent review. The applicant's structural engineer recommended tearing down the building. The structural engineer retained by the City acknowledged the foundation was in rough shape but the building is savable. Field has heard the comments that say "let it live, once it's gone, it's gone." He is not opposed to some changes and would consider a partial demolition to allow for an acceptable addition to the building. He would not support a total demolition.

Tartaglia noted that the previous commissioner comments covered his thoughts. He agreed the demolition application should be denied.

Hoffman noted that he owns a historic home in Cabbagetown and rehabilitated his home inside and out. During his tour of the applicant's building, he recalled how he felt when he first began rehabilitating his home. Hoffman recognized the building was in rough shape, partially because it sat for so long. He understands the tremendous time, energy, and money needed to restore the house. Those that live in historic homes understand there are ongoing characteristics that you live with that you try to mitigate.

The HDC has heard loud and clear from the residents and community. Looking at the HDC

guidelines, it is a contributing structure and an important piece of history for the City. Hoffman feels for the applicant in the time, energy, and money that will be needed to restore this property. He cannot support the demolition request.

Allen noted that his family moved here in the mid-1970s. He had forgotten about some of the more interesting history of this building, including its time as a bedspread outlet. The building has sat for decades virtually unnoticed and now it has generated a lot of conversation.

For the basis that it is a safety hazard, Allen noted that the structural reports do not agree with this assessment. Going through the structure, he saw that the foundation does need some help. However, it is not in such a condition that the building is going to fall down. It may be a hazard to the pocketbook, but it is not a structural hazard.

For the basis of not being in the best interest of the community, tonight's comments and all of the written correspondence received have been clear that keeping the building is in the best interest of the community. A lot of people care about this building. With the intensive historic district survey going on right now to evaluate which buildings are contributing and which are not, Allen could not support removing a building that is on the contributing list.

In response to a question on whether the motion should be phrased in the affirmative or the non-positive, it was explained that either method is acceptable. A motion "not to allow" for the demolition should also include findings to support the decision. The findings would include that the building does have historic significance based on the information provided to the Commission. The findings should also note that the demolition application does not meet the following conditions: 1) it is not a hazard to the public based on the structural engineers report; 2) the resource is not a deterrent to a major improvement that would be of substantial benefit to the community, and 3) the retention of the resource is in the interest of the majority of the community.

MOTION Hoffman, support by Field, to not allow the demolition of 341 E. Main Street, based on the following findings:

1. The resource does have historic significance based on the information provided to the Commission.
2. The resource is not a hazard to the safety of the public based on the city approved structural engineer's report.
3. The resource is not a deterrent to a major improvement program that will be of substantial benefit to the community.
4. The retention of the resource is in the interest of the majority of the community.

Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Field left the meeting.

As there were additional cases to hear and to allow people the opportunity to leave, the Chair called for a five minute recess. Meeting recessed at 9:10pm. Meeting reconvened at 9:15pm.

7. CASES TO BE HEARD – BY CASE

CASE #1

**GRAPHIC VISIONS FOR SWEET & SPICE/COFFEE HOUSE
133 W. MAIN SUITE 222**

WALL SIGN

The applicant is requesting to install a new wall sign at the above address for Sweet Brew 'n Spice Café, a new tenant in a multi-tenant building. A representative from Graphic Visions was present to present the application. Color samples were provided to the HDC for review, along with a digital print that depicted a small section of the actual sign design and colors. The sign

will include foam dimensional letters in white, attached to an aluminum panel. This business was previously at this location, with the same owner, but now with a different name.

HDC comments noted that the applicant provided color samples and the digital print colors are fairly accurate. As outlined in the Carlisle/Wortman memo dated 6-12-18, the proposed sign meets the zoning ordinance sign regulations for wall signs including permitted signage square feet allocated to this tenant as part of a multi-tenant building, message units, and sign height dimensions.

MOTION Gudritz, 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 Murdock, support by Gudritz, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular Standards 9 and 10, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-21 materials, 4-24 signs, and 5-18 paint and color. MOTION carried unanimously.

CASE #2

**CHRISTOPHER AND PATRICIA JOHNSON
312 W. MAIN STREET**

NEW ATTIC WINDOWS

The applicant is requesting to replace two existing attic windows, and add back a third attic window in an existing opening that is currently filled in by a vent in this building.

The applicant addressed the application deficiencies as outlined in the Carlisle/Wortman memo dated 6-12-18. It was explained that the house was purchased in 1982 and it is aluminum sided, including on the face of the dormer surrounding the windows to be replaced. The windows will be the same size as the existing openings for the two current windows and the third window would be installed in the existing vent opening, so no changes to the elevation are proposed. The HDC was provided with a brochure that showed the windows will be custom-made by Anderson, with a vinyl frame and single-glass pane (not double glass). The windows will not open. The attic is not used. The windows will add light.

The aluminum trim on the dormer will be removed and replaced with vinyl siding that is the same dimension. The wood frame would be mostly aluminum and vinyl. The color will be white, and they plan to use vinyl siding as the applicant cannot find the same aluminum siding, and the vinyl siding looks more like wood. There will not be any other changes to the façade.

HDC comments and discussion noted that the use of vinyl siding is typically discouraged in the Historic District. While this is a small area of a house that is currently aluminum sided, it was questioned if the HDC should require that aluminum siding be used instead of vinyl. It was pointed out that the house is currently aluminum sided with aluminum clad windows. The proposed vinyl siding will be on a very small area around the dormer. If the applicant was proposing to reside the entire house, the use of vinyl siding would be a different discussion. This use of vinyl will close the gaps. The HDC would like the material to look the same as what is currently there. The applicant stated they were having difficulty finding matching aluminum siding, and the vinyl siding would resemble wood. Other comments found this to be an acceptable solution in the short-term.

HDC comments noted the applicant had addressed the questions in the Carlisle/Wortman memo. The applicant stated the new windows will be the same dimensions as the existing openings, so building

elevations are not needed. The applicant sufficiently described the proposed work, including trim work, and noted the color will be white.

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 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 Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-21 materials, 5-14 windows, 5-17 siding, and 5-18 paint and color. Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #3

**ROBERT AND KRISTIN EVANS
109 N. ROGERS**

NEW WINDOWS, ROOF, PAINT

The applicant is requesting to replace the roof on the house and garage, replace the windows on the house, and paint the house and garage at the above address.

The applicant addressed the application deficiencies as outlined in the Carlisle/Wortman memo dated 6-12-18. The applicant provided recent photographs of the existing structure, and paint samples. The applicant would like to change the look of house by replacing the shingles from the current brown/brown/gray color, to charcoal grey/black, paint the brick portion a dark grey color, and paint the trim white. Paint color samples provided were Sherwin Williams 6250 Granite Peak, and 6203 Spare White.

The applicant is replacing the windows in both the historic part of the house as well as the 1995 addition. It is believed that most of the windows on the historic portion of the house are the original windows. The applicant researched previous records, and believes that around 1995, the previous owner installed storm windows, along with beveled grey metal flashing, over the historic windows.

The applicant proposes to install energy efficient windows that look as close to the original as possible. These will be single pane, double-hung windows. The storm windows and beveled flashing will be removed, but the decorative window hoods above the window openings will remain. The windows will fit the exact openings, so building elevations were not needed. The window color will be white.

HDC comments questioned the proposed power wash process, and if the goal was to remove the existing paint. The applicant explained that the house has dirt and mildew, and needs cleaning. The power wash is not intended to remove any paint. This is a “gentle” power wash that will not damage the siding or brickwork.

MOTION by Gudritz, 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 by Murdock, 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 7, 9 and 10, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-21 materials, 5-9 asphalt shingles, 5-14 windows, and 5-18 paint and color. **Motion carried unanimously.**

CASE #4

S4 CENTER

NEW CONSTRUCTION/ADDITION

107 N. CENTER STREET

On March 25, 2017, the applicant received Historic District Commission approval for a third floor penthouse addition on the roof of the building at the above address. This approval was conditioned upon a sub-committee evaluation confirming that the deck railing and penthouse was not visible from N. Center St. or Main St. At the April 19, 2017 meeting, the sub-committee affirmed that the proposed site lines identified during the field investigation were acceptable. In November 2017, the project returned with an elevator accessing the second floor. This elevator was located on the southwest corner of the building.

The project is returning with a different location and configuration for the elevator. The elevator shaft has been relocated in the rear at the northwest corner of the building, and the elevator also accesses the new penthouse addition.

The application proposes the following changes:

- Increase in penthouse size to 1,216 square feet, which includes a kitchen and toilet room. The previous design also had a “break room” and bathroom.
- The space is now identified as “open loft area” vs “open office.”
- The rear deck (on west side of building) has been eliminated.
- The front deck (on the east side of the building) is slightly larger (417 square feet vs 364 square feet), and is located further away from the east edge of the building than the previous design. The railing was not visible from the adjacent streets in the previous design. The new design will make the railing even harder to see from the street.

This project is located within the Central Business District (CBD), and also requires review and approval by the Planning Commission. The project was considered by the Planning Commission at their June 19, 2018 meeting.

Architect Dave Mielock gave a brief presentation to explain the project changes. It was explained that the owner decided to go in a different direction from the previously approved design. Those changes included:

- The previously approved addition of an elevator and access vestibule into the building would be changed by removing the stairs since an elevator is provided for vertical circulation. Stairs are incorporated within this newly designed addition, which are located on the northwest corner of the building, and they will keep the existing door and windows on the southeast corner of the building.
- Previously, the elevator only went to the second level. It is proposed the stairs and elevator be carried to the third floor for ADA compliance.
- The previous approved deck setback was a minimum of 12 feet. The new setback is more than 13 feet, which is greater than what was previously approved.
- Space on upper level has grown. The line of the east most façade is the same line, and brings usable floor area to the west face of the existing building. The previous design did not have the elevator going up to the third level. It had a deck and patio overlooking the area.

- The west elevation had a peak of 42 feet and this is the same. The proposed addition has clear glass with painted aluminum. The mullions will have clear glass. The other parts of the new addition will be made of a CMU block with a burnished finish. The existing brick that is painted and the new brick would be painted the same color. The color palette is in the same family as the previously approved original palette. The fascia panel would be darker to give it substance. Samples were provided to the HDC.
- The materials for the back of the building are masonry products and glass. New windows would match the existing window openings. The new canopy would have a metal wrap and a new door would be installed.
- The previously approved front elevation would not be changed, and will be painted the same colors as previously approved. The difference is the previously approved elevation had a single sloped shed roof, with deck and hand rails. The new elements respect the architecture, and the proportion of windows mimic a more modern look to the penthouse addition, instead of a having residential look.
- The cement board is in 8” wide sections that are smooth and not wood grain (tuck jointed to create a smooth look). The boards have a small notch to “fish tail” and prevent water intrusion. The fascia on the top is the same fascia as on the back of the building.
- Previously approved sight lines were moved, with the deck moved back two feet from the previous submission. The roof elevation height is increased 2-feet due to the type of design for this addition. The Zoning Ordinance allows for three stories and a height of 42 feet to the tallest point of a flat roof. The design keeps the same foot print and family.
- The plaza and rear access to these buildings is messy, with standing water issues. This area will be redone and will include a rain garden to manage storm water.

HDC discussion ensued pertaining to the views from E. Main Street and N. Center Street. The picture provided makes the building appear substantially higher than what was previously approved.

The architect explained that the rendering might not be exact, which is likely due to how the drawing was imported into the actual photo. The plane on the east face is the same plane as in the previously approved plan. The rendering perspective makes the height difference appear higher than the actual 2-foot increase. The glass and darker tone on the façade will also make it appear more like a secondary view.

HDC discussion ensued regarding the rendering of the rear of the building. The previous plan had a room built on top of the roof and a deck. The applicant is essentially proposing to add a third story to the rear of the building. The architect explained that the applicant would likely have had to come back to the HDC as the Building Inspector would have required the elevator to access the third floor.

HDC comments also noted that the proposed changes, from north to south, change the second story window rhythm. The new design breaks the rhythm with the large vertical windows. It was responded that this was intentional as they didn’t want to distract from the original elements. The brick will be seen through the windows so that there is more modern look and a transparent depth.

Comments from the HDC voiced concern that the back of the building will look more modern and will not be harmonious with the rear façades of other buildings. The windows and roof give it a more modern look. The roof has a large overhang, which also makes it look higher.

The architect explained that it was their intent to not have the rear façade match the other facades. The goal is to have the rear façade stand alone and express its own architecture. Trying to “fit in” would be a mismatch. The rears of these buildings were originally designed as service entrances and were not intended to be main entrances. That is why there is an absence of ornaments on the rear façade. The HDC and architects need to be sensitive to the fact that buildings are being used differently than their original intended function. As people improve these buildings, ADA requirements are going to require vertical circulation paths for access to the upper floors. This cannot always be accomplished internally within the building.

Comments from the HDC also noted that previously, the HDC didn’t have comments on the corrugated steel on the third floor and corrugated chase on elevator shaft because a majority of the building was still intact. Now this is flipped and all glass is on right hand side and not the left. The mass that was on the right is now on the left. Through the glass you see the stairway and masonry that surrounds the elevator. It will be clear glass, with the exception of a frosted panel window on the back that would be necessary for the privacy of people walking up the stairs.

Brief discussion ensued pertaining to the commercial standards (4-17) in the Historic District Design guidelines. The guideline note that the proposed height of this building should be within 5% of the average heights of existing structures within a 300 ft radius. The HDC questioned if the proposed changes meet this guideline as the architect did not have these figures. HDC comments noted the 5% rule was the premise for the D&D Bicycle decision. From the back, the building will change, however the front will not change. While knowing these numbers would be both interesting and useful, HDC comments noted that 4-17 suggests that taller buildings should be designed so that they relate to the existing adjacent structures. This design is sensitive to that.

Final HDC comments noted the applicant’s representative reviewed all items referenced in the Carlisle/Wortman memo.

It was noted that HDC member Field wanted an approval to be contingent upon verification of the sight lines. Discussion ensued on what the “verification” would be. The previous design required the deck railing be lowered so that it could not be seen from E. Main Street (by Genitti’s). The proposed changes include a design with a height that is two feet higher than the original approval. However, the deck setback is now proposed to be more than 13 feet. As Member Fields was not present and the HDC could not determine what the sightline verification would be, the contingency was not included in the motion.

**MOTION by 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 by 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 4-17 height, 4-20 hierarchy, 4-21 materials, 4-27 rear façade development, 5-4 masonry, 5-7 roofing, 5-14 windows, 5-16 metal, 5-17 siding, 5-18 paint and color. Motion carried unanimously.

8. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS: None

9. DISCUSSION: None

10. ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Allen adjourned the meeting at 10:07 p.m.

Dianne Massa
City Clerk

*[Transcribed from the audio recording and meeting notes of Recording Secretary Cheryl McGuire]

Approved 07/18/18