

**NORTHVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**August 15, 2018**  
**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, Gudritz, Hoffman, Murdock, Tartaglia

**Absent:** Field (excused)  
one vacancy

**Also Present:** Planning Consultant Elmiger, Mayor Roth

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Mary Kay Gallagher, Superintendent, Northville Public Schools, gave an update regarding the Main Street School. Mike Zopf, Assistant Superintendent for Finance and Operations, Steve Banchemo, Director of Operations, and Cyndy Jankowski, School Board Trustee, were also present.

Superintendent Gallagher expressed gratitude for the support of the Northville community throughout the renovation of Old Village School.

Superintendent Gallagher said her purpose in speaking tonight was threefold:

1. To touch on the robust and transparent process the Board of Education engaged in as they weighed each of the options for the disposition of both Old Village School and Main Street School, with the input of stakeholders, including the community, neighbors, the HDC, the library, and the State of Michigan.
2. To share the outcome of that process, which was the Board of Education's decision last evening regarding the sale of Main Street School.
3. To provide an update to the HDC on what the District and Board of Education saw as their next steps, consistent with their ongoing commitment to be open and transparent throughout the process, while being respectful of the fact that while there may be different perspectives to balance, all shareholders shared a common goal of wanting what was best for their community.

The District looked forward to moving into Old Village School in September. The fact that the restoration of Old Village School could be celebrated was germane to the overall consideration of the disposition of Main Street School. From the time the City and the School District took part in a lengthy co-location study, eventually coming to the conclusion that the co-location at Old Village School was not financially feasible for either entity, the discussion had always centered on the need for only one building. This had been clearly conveyed following the issuance of the first RFP process at the District's informational meeting in February 2017, which was followed by a formal walkthrough of Old Village and Main Street Schools as part of a posted HDC meeting/workshop held at Main Street School on March 9, 2017. The purpose of that walkthrough was to illustrate current building conditions, layout, and the basis for the District's decision to renovate the Old Village School over the Main Street School. The messaging was consistent throughout the School's bond campaign, second issuance of an RFP for Main Street School, and in the thoughtful consideration of each of the proposals submitted.

Superintendent Gallagher described the Board's process as they worked through this issue to the final decision. She described the Board's goals, which were (1) to maximize the dollar value to the District, emphasizing that money taken out of the general fund was less money that could be spent on children's education, (2) to minimize the risk in the ability to finalize the project, and (3) to balance what the community, the City, and the HDC wanted regarding the first two goals.

Superintendent Gallagher spoke to the open and deliberative process that included considerable opportunities for public comment, transparent narrowing of options with rationale, and consideration of well over one hundred written communications. The Board read every communication, and the bidders had several opportunities to reflect on the public input, and to revise their submissions if desired.

The Board's unanimous decision was a resolution authorizing the District to proceed with negotiating a purchase agreement with Old Village, LLC, which was the proposal for four residential homes on the five lots, with an additional donation of green space buffer between Old Village School and the property line, along with an additional donation toward the creation of a pocket park on school district property.

Superintendent Gallagher said that from the view of the Board of Education, the final decision was seen as a win-win for the community. The Board remained grateful for the thoughtful, deliberate and caring comments received from community members. The overwhelming support was for Old Village LLC, which in their opinion constituted a win-win for Old Village, for the School District and ultimately for the community.

Regarding next steps, Superintendent Gallagher emphasized that each time they had communicated with the City, the District had consistently made it clear that their communications and submission had been done in the spirit of collaboration, and to voluntarily communicate with and seek feedback from the HDC and the City, and their communications were in no way intended to constitute an acquiescence to local jurisdiction relative to school construction including demolition and site plan review. The Board and the District saw their next step as submitting an application to the State for demolition. They would utilize a public process for seeking bids for demolition. They could not submit an application for demolition until they had a contract to demolish.

Superintendent Gallagher said they based their decision to apply to the State under the Michigan Revised School Code MCL 380.1263(3) that granted the State Superintendent of Public Instruction "sole and exclusive jurisdiction," and secondly the prevailing Attorney General opinion which didn't have all the same specifics but was in their view and their attorney's view the prevailing legal standard until such time as it was challenged in the courts.

Throughout the process their respect for the community had grown. While the City and the District might have to agree to disagree regarding jurisdiction, or perhaps disagree and work out their disagreement in court, the District felt that submitting to the HDC would take time and energy on the HDC's part and might be seen as manipulative on the District's part. Therefore tonight they were being transparent in acknowledging a difference of opinion regarding jurisdiction.

Superintendent Gallagher said she hoped a way forward could be found providing a win-win for everyone to the extent possible. Perhaps the City could agree to disagree on the matter of jurisdiction and set that aside on behalf of a positive outcome that didn't waste resources or time, while protecting each side's future rights. The District would be willing to engage in any conversation along the way.

Chair Allen asked the timeline for submitting the demolition request to the State. Mr. Banchemo said that submission would probably occur in November, after a contract had been finalized and other steps, such as shutting off utilities, had been taken.

Superintendent Gallagher added that during Board deliberations last night, one factor included the consideration that Old Village and Main Street Schools were very close together. For any school, it was not optimum to have such a narrow buffer between a school and a complex of any kind.

Chair Allen thanked Superintendent Gallagher for the update.

Superintendent Gallagher emphasized that the District was willing to participate in study sessions, to meet with City Council, etc., to help arrive at a fruitful outcome while allowing each side to protect their future interests to the extent needed

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

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

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**4. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES: July 18, 2018**

**MOTION by Gudritz, support by Murdock,** to approve the July 18, 2018 minutes as presented.

**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. DEMOLITION BY NEGLECT REPORT – BUILDING OFFICIAL**

Planning Consultant Elmiger advised that the Building Official asked to have this item postponed to the September meeting.

**MOTION by Hoffman, support by Gudritz,** that Agenda Item 7 *Demolition by Neglect Report* be moved to the September meeting.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**7. CASES TO BE HEARD – BY CASE**

**CASE #1**

**GRAPHIC VISIONS/RUOFF HOME MORTGAGE                      SIGN**  
**118 W. MAIN**

Brad Petty, Graphic Visions, 1857 Northville Road, Northville, MI, was present on behalf of this application to install two new wall signs at 118 W. Main. Schematics of both signs had been included in the application documents, with dimensions, materials and colors listed. The paint colors for the front sign would be Pantone 281C blue and Pantone 357c green.

**MOTION by Gudritz, support by Tartaglia,** 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, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-21 materials, 4-24 signs, and 5-18 paint and color.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**CASE #2**

**WILLIAM RICHARDSON  
117 E. MAIN STREET**

**PAINT**

As the applicant was not present, this case was not heard.

**CASE #3**

**VANCE R. WITMER & GAIL R. WEIR  
501 W. DUNLAP.**

**WINDOWS & ROOF**

Gail R. Weir, 501 W. Dunlap, was present on behalf of this application to replace the covering on a section of roof at the rear of the house, and replace some windows on the rear of the house at 501 W. Dunlap.

Ms. Weir explained that as her husband was away, she had brought sample window materials. She understood that her husband had submitted further materials as requested in the August 7, 2018 Carlisle/Wortman review letter.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said she had not received any new submissions for this application.

Chair Allen noted there were several outstanding items listed in the review letter. Without the additional materials, the HDC could not act on this request.

**MOTION by Hoffman, support by Murdock**, to postpone Case #3, 501 W. Dunlap, to the September meeting.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**CASE #4**

**PAUL SKLUT & THERESE GROSSI  
512 W. DUNLAP.**

**FENCE & TOWER WINDOWS**

Paul Sklut, 512 W. Dunlap, was present on behalf of this application to install a new picket fence around the side and rear yard, to replace two windows in the tower of the home, and to add three new porch handrails at 512 W. Dunlap.

Mr. Sklut distributed photographs of the existing structure and property where the fence was to be located, as well as photographs of the building elevations that would receive the new windows, and a description of the existing window material.

The tower windows were the only windows that never had storm windows. The applicants wanted to replace the existing tower windows with stained glass windows. The proposal was to

provide custom made stained glass that would fit into the existing openings. The windows were on the south and east sides of the tower.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hoffman, Mr. Sklut said the existing tower windows were original. He had been successful in keeping the old double-hung windows on other locations on the home.

Commissioner Murdock pointed out that the Northville Historic District Design Standards said: *No tinted or mirrored glass is permitted.*

Commissioner Hoffman said there were other structures in the Historic District that had stained glass windows. It was unclear whether the term *tinted* referred to stain glass. He was concerned, however, about removing architectural details. The applicant had mentioned that the other original windows had been preserved. While he liked the stained glass windows that were proposed, it wasn't a matter of what he liked but what the Standards said. How did the other Commissioners feel about changing out a historic window that could be repaired and putting a stained glass window in?

Chair Allen said he preferred the existing glass. The stained glass would alter the look of the house from the street. Also, the glass design included very noticeable bright colors.

Mr. Sklut asked if the stain glass included a double hung muntin, would that make a difference?

Chair Allen said it would still be a complete change in window appearance in a prominent tower location.

Commissioner Gudritz agreed. The applicants had been true to the house in everything done so far, and he felt that the two large stained glass windows and their placement in the tower would detract from everything else the applicant had done to preserve this historic home. The stained glass windows were not true to the house; neither did they add to the character of the home.

Mr. Sklut asked if a more subdued stained glass design would receive a more favorable response.

Chair Allen said the original double hung windows were very prominent. The stained glass window would flatten it out. All the rooflines and ridgelines were mimicked by the existing sash, which would be removed and therefore completely change the look of the house.

Commissioner Gudritz suggested installing a stained glass piece interior to the window so it would not change the exterior appearance of the house.

Regarding the fence, Mr. Sklut noted that the Carlisle/Wortman review letter had asked why the fence was not proposed along the entire rear property line. He explained that his neighbors already had a privacy fence at that location. He had brought a sample of the fence, which was traditional black metal picket. They were planning a 36" gate.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hoffman, Planning Consultant Elmiger confirmed that all the issues called out in the August 7, 2018 review letter related to the fence had been resolved.

**MOTION by 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 by Hoffman, support by Murdock,** to refer the part of the application for new windows back to the applicant.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**MOTION Hoffman, support by Gudritz** to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented for the fence element of the application as well as the handrail, referencing the Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-4 fences, 3-21 materials, and 5-18 paint and color.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**CASE #5**

**ROBERT DEBOUTTE  
117 S. ROGERS**

**DEMOLITION**

Robert DeBoutte Jr., 117 S. Rogers, was present on behalf of this application to demolish the existing one-car garage and construct a larger garage on the north side of the property at 117 S. Rogers. The application also called for demolishing a metal garden shed.

Dwayne Miller, 240 S. Wing, Northville, MI was also present.

Chair Allen asked the age of the home. Mr. DeBoutte said they did not have an exact age, but Wayne County records showed the existing home was built in 1900 or before.

Chair Allen pointed out that the garage was shown on a 1966 survey. He asked why Mr. DeBoutte wanted to demolish it. Mr. DeBoutte said that the existing garage served no true garage function, and was leaning.

Commissioner Hoffman said it was important to know when the garage was built. Commissioner Gudritz said both the garage and home were listed as contributing structures in the recently completed Historic District Survey. The garage was significant in terms of date. While the Commission understood why the homeowner would want a larger, more modern garage, the Commission's charge was to protect contributing historic structures in the Historic District. It appeared that the garage could be repaired.

Mr. Miller said the existing garage was 12'x30', was basically the size of an oversize shed, and was not a viable structure in terms of use.

Chair Allen gave background regarding the Historic District and the process for approving a demolition. Commissioner Gudritz said the garage appeared on a 1948 Sanborn map. Commissioner Hoffman pointed out that at some point the garage had been lifted with a newer cement block as a foundation.

Planning Consultant Elmiger suggested that if the applicants demolished the tin shed and maintained the existing garage as a shed, they could construct a new garage on the property without demolishing the existing garage and still meet lot coverage requirements. The applicants would need to make sure all zoning requirements were met, but she thought that option would work.

In response to a question from Mr. DeBoutte, Chair Allen said the existing driveway would have to be removed; the property could not have 2 driveways.

After further discussion regarding the option presented by Planning Consultant Elmiger, Mr. DeBoutte asked to withdraw the application for demolition (Case #5).

**Therefore, Case #5 for Demolition at 117 S. Rogers was withdrawn.**

**CASE #6**

**ROBERT DEBOUTTE  
117 S. ROGERS**

**NEW GARAGE**

Robert DeBoutte Jr., 117 S. Rogers, was present on behalf of this application to construct a new garage at 117 S. Rogers. Since the existing garage would remain as a shed, as discussed above, the application would only be for a new garage, and not an additional shed as originally requested.

Dwayne Miller, 240 S. Wing, Northville, MI was also present.

Mr. DeBoutte distributed a packet of information in response to items listed in the August 7, 2018 Carlisle/Wortman review letter. He showed a sample of the roof in the proposed pewter color, and a chip of Sherwin Williams 6252 Ice Cube White for the trim, which was close to the same color as the house.

Mr. Miller said the existing aluminum siding had a wood-grain texture. Therefore they had tried to find a siding product that had some grain structure in it, and they had decided on a PPG Product, and they showed a sample of this. There would be a 5” reveal to match the existing house. They had provided a streetscape showing the relocation of the garage to the north side of the property. They had also provided a cut sheet for the stamp steel garage door, which would be black and match the existing garage door.

Commissioner Hoffman explained that the Historic District Standards discouraged large, full panel-doors. There were design options that would give a single door the appearance of 2 separate doors. Commissioner Gudritz further explained that the idea was to reduce the appearance of mass.

Mr. Miller pointed out they had also provided cut sheets for their proposed lighting. The packet presented this evening also showed garage had been reduced in size and had been moved forward.

Commissioner Hoffman said his only remaining issue was the large, full panel garage door. The Commission could act on the garage generally, but he would like the applicant to come back with a new design for the garage door.

**MOTION by 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.

Discussion was held regarding the proposed chain link replacement. The applicants were replacing like with like, and wanted to continue the chain link fence across the new driveway and the west boundary on the south side of the house. However, the Historic District Design Standards did not encourage chain link fences. While the fence could be replaced like for like on the southern property line to meet up with the existing chain link fence, the front fence should be of another material and design more in keeping with the Historic District.

Commissioner Hoffman suggested that when the applicants came back for garage door approval, they also return with a revised fence plan.

**MOTION by Hoffman, support by Gudritz** to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing the Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-24 garages, 3-21 materials, 5-9 asphalt shingles, 5-14 windows, and 5-18 paint and color. The motion makes clear that the existing metal shed will be removed, and the fence portion of the application as well as the garage door were being referred back to the applicant.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**CASE #7  
JOE MALLOURE  
552 W. DUNLAP**

### **DEMOLITION**

Joe Malloure, 552 W. Dunlap, was present on behalf of this application to demolish the shed portion of the existing one-car garage and construct a larger garage on the north side of the property. The application also called for demolishing the second story of an addition on the northeast side of the house to accommodate a larger second story addition. Two doors would also be removed.

Greg Presley, Presley Architecture LLC, 108 N. Center, Suite 205, Northville MI was also present.

Responding to the August 8, 2018 Carlisle/Wortman review letter, Mr. Presley said the community benefit of demolishing the shed portion of the one-car garage and constructing the 2-car garage was that the neighbors would not have to see the parked cars outside the garage. Also, in 2012 the same portion of the garage was approved for demolition, but for a different project.

They were also asking to demolish the rear portion of the 1970's 2<sup>nd</sup> floor addition. The ridgeline didn't match the original ridgeline of the house and came down at an odd angle. They would like to remove that portion to create a larger space for the master bathroom and closet area. The area in question was not easily seen from the front of the home. The benefit to the community was that they would be improving the appearance of the house with a very modest alteration. The footprint of the original structure would not be altered.

Last, they were proposing to remove 2 doors that served no function. About a year ago the HDC approved removing a porch door on the house about 4 doors to the east at 528 W. Dunlap.

Commissioner Hoffman asked if the wood cladding on the garage was going to be saved. Also, between the shed addition on the garage and the garage wall itself, there was a demising wall. Would that be preserved? Mr. Presley said they wanted to keep the demising wall in order to keep a stairway going up to a kind of duck-walk loft over the original structure.

Commission Murdock asked if the door on the west side of the home was part of the original

structure. Mr. Presley said he thought it was original as there was evidence of a concrete step there.

Commissioner Hoffman summarized that there were 3 elements proposed to be demolished: (1) the shed off the garage, (2) the more recent addition to the master bedroom, and (3) the 2 service doors. The Commission needed to decide whether each element was historically significant. In his opinion the shed on the garage and the 1970s addition on the house were not historically significant. The 2 doors, if original to the structure, might be historically significant. If the doors were found to be historically significant, the HDC would need to schedule a public hearing regarding their demolition.

Commissioner Gudritz pointed out that the recent Historic District Survey found both the home and garage to be contributing structures within the District.

In response to a question from Chair Allen, Mr. Malloure said the front porch door was solid, without windows. The side door did have windows, and they were thinking of putting a window there that would match existing windows, i.e., change out a door for a window.

Commissioner Hoffman said that even though they were only discussing 2 doors, since they were original to the house and could be considered significant features of the home, a public hearing would need to be held regarding their removal. Planning Consultant Elmiger agreed.

Mr. Presley suggested keeping the door that faced the street even though it was never used, and removing only the side door.

After a brief discussion regarding process, Commissioner Hoffman offered the following motions:

**MOTION by 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 by Hoffman, support by Gudritz,** that the Historic District Commission find that the existing garage addition (shed) is not historically significant.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**MOTION by Hoffman, support by Murdock,** that based on the fact that the existing garage addition (shed) is not historically significant, the Historic District Commission approve its demolition.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

Chair Allen asked for a motion regarding the east door. The west door, facing Rogers, was now being retained.

**MOTION by Hoffman, support by Tartaglia,** that the Historic District Commission find that the door off the covered porch that faces east is not historically significant.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**MOTION by Hoffman, support by Murdock**, based on the fact that the door off the covered porch that faces east is not historically significant, the Historic District Commission approve its demolition. The door on the west side of the house will remain.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**MOTION by Hoffman, support by Gudritz**, that the Historic District Commission find that the portion of the second story addition requested to be demolished is not historically significant.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**MOTION by Hoffman, support by Murdock**, based on the fact that the portion of the second story addition requested to be demolished is not historically significant, the Historic District Commission approve its demolition.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**CASE #8  
JOE MALLOURE  
552 W. DUNLAP**

**ADDITION & NEW GARAGE**

Joe Malloure, 552 W. Dunlap, was present on behalf of this application to construct a new second-story addition on the northeast corner of the house at 552 W. Dunlap. He would also like to construct a new two-car garage that was attached to the existing carriage house on the property.

Greg Presley, Presley Architecture LLC, 108 N. Center, Suite 205, Northville MI was also present.

Mr. Presley said they were proposing a new 2-car garage that met all zoning requirements. It would have 2 single-occupancy doors as shown.

In response to a question from Chair Allen, Mr. Malloure said they would replace the gravel driveway with concrete. They were keeping the trellis that was on the west side of the existing original garage.

Chair Allen asked about the restoration of the cladding on the garage. Mr. Presley said the original cladding might have lead paint. Mr. Malloure explained that he worked with removing lead paint professionally, and spoke regarding the technical expertise needed and the inherent dangers that accompanied removing lead paint. Removal was very expensive. Instead of restoring the cladding, they proposed to remove all of the existing wood cladding and replace it with new wood cladding.

Chair Allen asked why the applicants could not just paint over the existing paint. Mr. Malloure said that had been done for years, and the paint would no longer hold.

Chair Allen asked about using a stripper or heat instead of sanding the wood. Mr. Malloure said they were looking at their options, but they couldn't use any option that would result in airborne lead particles.

Mr. Presley said that most likely there was no sheathing; the siding was probably attached directly to the studs, so when it was removed they would have to apply sheathing. There would have to be adjustments made to the trim board, etc.

Chair Allen advised that if all the boards were being removed from the house and being replaced, that process would be considered a demolition request. He thought there might be newer methods to get lead paint off homes that would not require removal of the wood.

Mr. Presley suggested removing the cladding replacement from the request. They would return to a future meeting with more information regarding what they proposed regarding the lead paint.

Regarding the addition on the main house, they were proposing to match the existing ridgeline. It was a simple change.

Regarding the existing windows, Mr. Presley said they were looking at the cost differential between restoration and adding storm windows or using replacement double hung windows. Since they had to return with further information about the lead paint, they would also like to postpone action on the windows, to give them time to finalize their window design.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gudritz, Mr. Presley said half the existing windows were original, the other half were windows that were part of additions.

Commissioner Gudritz initiated a discussion about differentiating the original home from its additions. Mr. Presley pointed out the parameters of the original house, which was basically a T-shaped kit house. They would use trim board to provide differentiation, and pull the addition back a couple of inches so it read more like an addition.

Chair Allen indicated he was ready for a motion.

**MOTION by Murdock, support by Gudritz, to accept the application as complete.**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

Chair Allen opened the meeting for public comment.

From the audience, Leanie Bayly spoke in support of this request and gave some background to the recent history of the home, including the addition proposed to be removed. That addition had gone up quickly in order to meet the medical needs of one of the residents, and the previous owner had always wanted to remove it.

Seeing that no one else 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 Standards 2, 9, and 10, and Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-16 mass, 3-17, height, 3-18 scale, 3-21 materials, 3-22 details, 3-24 garages, 5-9 shingles, 5-14 windows, and 5-18 paint and color. The motion requires the applicant to differentiate the east and north elevation of the addition by setting it back slightly from the existing structure. The applicant also agrees to return to the Commission at a later date to discuss either the restoration or replacement of the siding and windows.**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**8. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS:** None.

**9. DISCUSSION:**

There was a short discussion regarding process regarding the Main Street School, as related to the comments made earlier in the evening by Superintendent Gallagher. The matter now rested with the City Attorney.

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Allen adjourned the meeting at 9:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Cheryl McGuire  
Recording Secretary

Approved as submitted 09/19/2018