

NORTHVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
September 19, 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, Field, Gudritz, Hoffman, Murdock, Tartaglia
Absent: None
One vacancy
Also Present: Planning Consultant Elmiger
2 audience members

2. PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Commissioner Hoffman suggested moving Item #7, Demolition by Neglect, to be heard under Item #9, Discussion. Also, since the applicant would not be present for Case #2, 117 E. Main, that item should be removed from the agenda.

MOTION by Hoffman, support by Murdock, to amend the agenda as follows:

- Move *Item #7 Demolition by Neglect* to *Item #9 Discussion*
- Remove *Case #2 117 E. Main.*

Motion carried unanimously.

4. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES: August 15, 2018

MOTION by Hoffman, support by Gudritz, to approve the August 15, 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. CASES TO BE HEARD – BY CASE

CASE #1

ROBERT DEBOUTTE
117 S. ROGERS

GARAGE DOOR & FENCE
(Returning)

Robert DeBoutte Jr., 117 S. Rogers, was present on behalf of this application for a garage door and fence. Dwayne Miller, 240 S. Wing, Northville, MI was also present.

This application was first heard at the August 15, 2018 meeting. With this revised application, the applicant would remove the existing metal shed and retain the historic garage and use it as a shed instead. Regarding the new, 2-car garage proposed on the north side of the property, the applicant was asked at the August 15 meeting to return with a different style garage door that simulated two carriage doors vs. one large door. Regarding the new fence, the applicant was also asked to return with a different style fence for the western boundary (front) that was more in keeping with historic fences in the District.

Mr. DeBoutte distributed a packet of information to the Commission, and directed their attention to Page #22: Clopay Gallery Collection, Proposed Carriage Style Door. The door would be black. The small garage would have a similar door, as shown on Page #23.

Following up from the August 15 meeting, Commissioner Murdock said that at that meeting Commissioner Hoffman had wanted to see a door that looked like two separate doors. Commissioner Hoffman explained the Northville Design Standards discouraged using one large garage door. The door proposed this evening did give the appearance of two doors.

Commissioner Murdock said that while the picture of brown door gave that appearance, he was not sure if the same door, when black, would show enough differentiation to give the appearance of two doors. He asked if the only color for the hardware was black. Mr. Miller said he thought it was. Also, white hardware might not give an appropriate look for the style of hardware shown.

Commissioner Hoffman noted that the garage was set 75 feet back on the lot. The applicants had brought a design that had the appearance of two doors, although it did not have a dividing line in the middle. Still, he felt the proposed door met the spirit of the Standards. Chair Allen pointed out that with all black doors, a dividing line in the middle would not offer much visual differentiation.

Chair Allen asked the applicant to address the proposed fence. Mr. Allen said the north/south fence would mimic the picket size that they had in the back yard around the patio. As shown in the information provided, the pickets had a 1-1/2" face width, and there would also be a 1-1/2" spacing between the pickets. The fence would be a little tighter than the patio fence, which was more of a landscaping style fence.

Commissioner Hoffman asked if there were other cases where the Commission had approved vinyl fencing in the Historic District. Commissioner Gudritz said that while he did not remember approving vinyl, the Fence Guidelines did not prohibit vinyl fencing.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hoffman, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the issues listed in her September 10, 2018 memorandum had been resolved.

Mr. Miller said the location of the fence was shown on the mortgage survey provided this evening. The fence line outlined in yellow represented the picket fence. The rest of the fence would be chain link as it was presently.

MOTION by Murdock, 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 grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-4 fences, 3-24 garages, 3-21 materials, and 5-18 paint and color.

Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #2

**WILLIAM RICHARDSON
117 E. MAIN STREET**

PAINT

As noted above, as the applicant was not present this case was removed from tonight's agenda.

CASE #3

**AMERICAN LEGION
100 W. DUNLAP STREET**

AWNING/SIGN

Craig Williams, 100 W. Dunlap, Northville, was present on behalf of this application to install a new awning with a sign over the rear door at the American Legion building at 100 W. Dunlap. They wanted to remove their existing awning, and install a new awning with a gable so as to appropriately shed ice and snow in the winter.

Mr. Williams said Marygrove Awning would pull the permit. The awning would include a 5' x 3' sign: American Legion, Post 147. The upper lettering – *American Legion* – would be 5" x 3", with the lower lettering – *Post 147* – would be 4" x 3". The color would be as shown.

Commissioner Hoffman said that per Planning Consultant Elmiger's September 11, 2018 review memorandum, the Building Official would review the sign for conformance with the Zoning Ordinance.

Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that if the sign needed to be significantly changed after the Building Official's review, the applicant would have to return to the HDC for further consideration.

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 Murdock, support by Gudritz, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing the Secretary of Interior Standards, as well as Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-23 awnings, 4-24 signs, 4-21 materials, and 5-18 paint and color.

Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #4

**BAGLEY LANGAN/CELEBRITY PETS
124/128 N. CENTER**

SIGN

Seeing that the applicant was not yet present, Chair Allen called the next case. (The application was heard after Case #6, below.)

CASE #5

**WENDY RICHARDVILLE
543 W. DUNLAP**

PORCH RECONSTRUCTION

Wendy and Dennis Richardville were present on behalf of this application to replace the porch stairs on the front and rear porches at 543 W. Dunlap Street.

Ms. Richardville distributed photographs of the steps. With the Building Official's approval, they had installed new stringers, and reduced the number of steps from 5 to 4 by making the steps consistent in height. The treads would be wider in order to meet code. They would use TREX material. The riser would be white and the treads would be gray. They would also be replacing the handrail on each side; that material would be AZEK.

Ms. Richardville noted that they would remove the lattice next year.

There was discussion regarding the AZEK material, which was a composite material. The consensus of the Commission was that AZEK was acceptable material in this instance. Commissioner Gudritz noted that if the railing had been original to the structure, the Commission might decide differently, but in this case he did not have a problem with the AZEK material.

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 to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing the Secretary of Interior Standards 9 and 10, and the Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-10 preserving porches, 3-21 materials, and 5-18 paint and color, with the color of the TREX treads *Gravel Path Gray* and the risers *White*.

Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #6

**JOSEPH P. SNYDER
508 W. CADY**

PORCH OVERHANG

Joseph Snyder and Rene Conneally, 508 West Cady, Northville, MI were present on behalf of this application to re-build the front and side porches on their home. The roof on the front porch would remain, but the posts, deck and stairs would be replaced. For the side porch, the entire porch would be removed and replaced, including changing the existing flat roof to a pitched roof.

The applicants explained that while they were working with their contractors to install siding previously approved by the HDC, the contractors told them the porches were not structurally sound and needed to be rebuilt. They had therefore submitted plans to do that. They would duplicate the front porch, leaving the roof. The side porch roof, which now had a flat roof, would

have its roof changed to match the roofline of the house, which would provide an improved appearance as well as improving water management.

The front porch pillars would be wood and 4x4 squares.

Commissioner Hoffman noted that Planning Consultant's September 10, 2018 memorandum had asked for a number of things to be submitted. Had that been done?

The applicants acknowledged that they had not provided all the requested information or materials.

Significant discussion followed as the Commission sought to understand what was being requested and to find a way forward without the required submittals.

The applicants were concerned about their timeline and being able to finish the work this calendar year. The side porch was especially problematic, as it was in severe disrepair and was unsafe.

The Commission was concerned regarding the appearance and construction of the front posts, and the lack of detail regarding the construction generally. The applicants needed to submit the items called out in the Consultant's review memorandum, as noted. Also, it appeared that a demolition application should be included. While the Commission was sympathetic with the applicants' desire to move forward, they also were charged with following appropriate process and holding all applicants to the same standard.

Planning Consultant Elmiger added that without the appropriate submittals, the Building Official would not be able to move this project forward. For example, if the front porch was going to match the old, without the required drawings there was no way for the Building Official to know that it did match once the old porch was removed.

MOTION by Hoffman, support by Gudritz, that the application be referred back to the applicant because it is not complete.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Snyder remained concerned about the unsafe condition of the side porch; his insurance company had notified him this was a problem. Planning Consultant Elmiger suggested the applicants speak with the Building Official regarding what could be done to the side porch while the process was completed.

As the applicant was now present for Case #4, Chair Allen called that case.

CASE #4

**BAGLEY LANGAN/CELEBRITY PETS
124/128 N. CENTER**

SIGN

Dan Welch, W3 Management Company, 126 N. Center Street, was present on behalf of this application for two new projecting signs at 124 and 128 N. Center Street.

Mr. Welch explained that they had two tenants: Celebrity Pets and Bagley Langan, P.L.L.C. The tenants wanted to install hanging signs consistent with what was already at the Center/Main area. According to the September 11, 2018 consultant's review letter, everything had been provided

except for color samples, which he had brought this evening.

Chair Allen noted that the lettering for Celebrity Pets was Polar White, with background color black, and for Bagley Langan, the background color was Dark Blue with Medium Gray lettering.

Commissioner Hoffman pointed out that a new black wrought iron metal bracket would also be used; dimensions had been provided.

A sample had been provided of the sign materials, which would have raised letters.

In response to a question from Planning Consultant Elmiger, Mr. Welch said the signs would be hung between 8' and 14', as required by ordinance.

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

Motion carried unanimously.

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

MOTION by Murdock, support by Gudritz to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented, referencing the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, and the Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-24 signs, 4-21 material, and 5-18 paint and color.

Motion carried unanimously.

CASE #7

**REM DESIGN
322 E. MAIN STREET**

**NEW CONSTRUCTION/DOOR/PAINT
ROOF/SIDING/WINDOWS**

DeWayne White, owner, was present on behalf of this application, as was architect Robert Miller, REM Design, 114 Rayson Street, Suite 2C, Northville. The request was to replace the roof shingles, shake siding, all of the windows, existing louvers, and the front door to the house, and paint the house at 332 E. Main Street.

Commissioner Gudritz said there was a discrepancy between the Historic District Study and address given in the application. The study listed this property as 332 E. Main Street. Planning Consultant Elmiger said she would follow up regarding this discrepancy.

Mr. Miller explained that the existing building needed repair and they were seeking to refresh the building with new coats of paint, some new windows, and new entry doors. They were not really re-siding the building, but repairing existing trim and siding. As painting and work progressed, they would discover what needed to be replaced and what could just be sanded and painted. Therefore they were requesting to replace trim and siding as needed.

They had brought paint samples tonight. The siding would be SW 9162 African Gray, the base trim would be SW 7035 Aesthetic White, and SW 6629 Jalapeno would be for the trim pieces along the dental molding on the porch and also some of the column details. They were trying to maintain a little bit of the existing orange that was on the building so that they were not changing it too drastically, but at the same time they were using a color that was a more fresh and up-to-date.

The color for the windows noted in the application was not correct, as that color was no longer available. The window color would be Sandstone. It was a touch darker than the existing siding and some of the trim colors, which was intentional, in order to provide variation for the colors on the facade.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gudritz, Mr. Miller said the original shake siding was cedar. In some places that had been replaced with other types of siding. Their intention was to try to replace the non-Cedar pieces so the entire shake portion would be cedar. Mr. White added that the other existing siding was an LP material.

Commissioner Field asked the applicants to explain exactly what they were requesting. Mr. Miller said they were asking for approval for the paint colors, windows, roof shingles, and replacement as needed of any rotten trim and siding, and replacement of the wood louvres in the gable area.

Mr. White said they would replace the shake material with cedar shake. The shingles would be Landmark Shingle Moire Black. The siding would be Hardieplank. Regardless of what the material was now, whatever needed replacement would be replaced with Hardie material.

Mr. Miller said they would be removing the latticework in order to provide siding all the way to the ground. Right now they had a feral cat situation under the porch, and they wanted to eliminate that.

Mr. Miller described the new doors, which would be more in keeping with the Historic District. The front door would be Enliten Flush-Glaze clear glass, a Thermal-Tru door.

They were removing the carpet on the porch, which they would paint.

Regarding the windows, they were looking at the Anderson 100 series, which were aluminum clad on the outside. The new windows would be custom fit to insert into the existing window openings. The windows would be single hung, and they had provided a color chip.

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

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 Standards #9 and #10, and the Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-6 windows, 4-9 doors, 4-21 materials, 5-9 asphalt shingles, 5-17 siding, and 5-18 paint and color, based on the color details and the door and window manufacture details that have been provided.

MOTION carried unanimously.

CASE #8

**HESS PROPERTY SOLUTIONS
248 LINDEN**

**NEW CONSTRUCTION/PORCH DOOR/PAINT/
FENCE/ROOF/SIDING/WINDOWS**

Andreas Heseltine and Anatola Sesi, Hess Property Solutions, were present on behalf of this application, as were other members of the Hess Property Solutions team. The application was to remove the roof from the existing house at 248 Linden, demolish the garage, build a second story on the house, and build a new addition to the house in the location of the garage.

Ms. Heseltine said that Hess Property Solutions was a local independent residential redeveloper. Tonight would be a conceptual conversation as their application was still incomplete.

The property was listed as contributing in the Historic District Survey, and they were making every effort to retain what they could of what was left of the original house. They were also trying to update and modernize the home.

They had purchased the property this summer. It was an older home that needed updates. They wanted to breathe new life in the home and expand the footprint. The listing agent had received feedback that no one wanted to purchase the home because it was too small, the layout too choppy, and a new owner would need to expand it too much to make it livable.

The lot width was only 48 feet. Hess Property Solutions would be on the October agenda for the Board of Zoning Appeals for setbacks. They wanted to expand the 1-story, 3-bedroom 1-bath 940 square foot home to approximately 2400 square feet, with 4 bedrooms and 2-1/2 baths on 2 floors. They wanted to move the garage forward toward the street and build an addition behind that. They would take the roof off the house in order to build the 2nd floor.

Discussion included:

- Both the house and garage were considered contributing; the plans were to demolish the existing garage.
- The Historic District discouraged both front facing and attached garages.
- Drawings of the proposed structure should have the existing footprint juxtaposed on it.
- The demolition application would most likely require a public hearing.
- Significant discussion was held on the appearance of the proposed home, which was a nice suburban house, but which did not seem to fit within the Historic District, and which was much larger than its neighbors. It would be difficult to get approval to demolish a contributing structure, and very difficult to build a home in the Historic District with the elevations as shown.
- Typically additions to historic homes were limited to 50% of the original structure, and were encouraged to have a lower height than the original structure. Making the addition lower would be almost impossible in this case, as the original home was one-story. However, any final addition needed to fit within the Historic District, and any new garage would be best as a detached garage located in the rear.
- Historic District Standards called out the importance of rhythm, mass and scale of the existing street, and specifically the homes next door. Photos of the existing street needed to be provided, with the proposed building superimposed on that. The elevations of all needed to be shown to scale.

Commissioner Gudritz pointed out that the applicants were asking to increase the size of the home by almost 200%, with the attendant increase in mass. The reasoning behind holding an addition to approximately 50% of the existing home was that by doing so the original house was not lost, and the

original house was visible from the street. The idea was that if the addition were ever removed, the original house would remain. What was being proposed was contrary to the Guidelines for New Construction, and the result was the original house would be lost. The proposed addition was way too much than what would be allowed.

Further discussion with the applicants followed:

- The applicants were working with the Michigan Historic Preservation Network to help them move through this process. At the same time, they wanted to provide a home that was livable for people today.
- The Commission emphasized that while the existing house needed work, it was important not to lose it. They referred the applicants to a careful study of the Northville Historic District Standards, specifically Section 3-13 *Residential Additions and New Construction*.
- While the existing home was a small one-story building, in some ways that made the home more important, as there weren't many one-story homes in the Historic District, and those needed to be preserved.
- While there was a possibility the Commission might allow more than a 50% addition on this small home, things that would help retain the original home should be included, such as opening up the front porch, retaining the one-story part while adding on to the rear, constructing any new garage as a detached garage in the rear, etc.
- By taking the entire roof off the house as proposed, again, the original house was lost. Also the applicants should pay attention to detail. Double front doors did not fit in the Historic District. Also, in the Historic District windows would be tall, not horizontal. As stated previously, the house looked like a subdivision house, but this was located in the Historic District, and must fit in the District.

Planning Consultant Elmiger suggested the applicants find and work with an architect who specialized in modernizing historic structures and was well versed in historic preservation.

Commissioner Hoffman suggested that the applicants come back with another conceptual presentation, before investing in more detailed drawings. Chair Allen said the applicants needed to provide massing studies, and show how the proposed home would look like next to what existed on the street, both from the sides and the front. Perhaps the applicants could bring multiple concepts.

The applicants stated their desire to bring in more detailed plans in the hopes of getting the next submission right, so that the project could move forward.

Commissioner Hoffman cautioned against trying to get Commission approval of the current plan by offering only small changes. He encouraged the applicants to return for another conceptual presentation.

Seeing that comment had ended, Chair Allen closed the discussion.

8. & 9. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS AND DISCUSSION

Agenda items #8 and #9 were combined.

DEMOLITION BY NEGLIGENCE – 342 E. MAIN

Building Official Strong said there were significant property maintenance issues at 342 E. Main, as shown in photographs and other documentation provided to the Commission. The property owner had been notified and had been issued citations, but had been unresponsive to communications from the City and also had not responded to the tickets. Building Official Strong asked the Commission to find that the property met the standards in Section 42-29 for demolition by neglect, and that the Commission so notify the property owner.

In response to a question from Commissioner Field, Building Official Strong said there were multiple holes in the roof and soffit, and in the siding. The building needed to be sealed as protection against the elements.

Planning Consultant Elmiger read from Section 42-29:

Sec. 42-29 Demolition by neglect.

Upon a finding by the commission that a historic resource within a historic district or proposed historic district subject to its review and approval is threatened with demolition by neglect, the commission may do either of the following:

(1) Require the owner of the resource to repair all conditions contributing to demolition by neglect.

(2) If the owner does not make repairs within a reasonable time, the commission or its agents may enter the property, after obtaining an order from the circuit court, and make such repairs as are necessary to prevent demolition by neglect. The cost of the work shall be charged to the owner and may be levied by the city as a special assessment against the property if the costs remain unpaid 30 days after the owner has been notified of the cost.

After discussion regarding process, Commissioner Field offered the following motion:

MOTION by Field, support by Gudritz, that the Historic District Commission find that the structure at 342 E. Main Street meets the standards for demolition by neglect in Section 42-29, the Historic Preservation Ordinance, and that the property owner will have 30 days from the date of notification to present the Building Official with a schedule to repair the property maintenance violations, and within 60 days of that meeting must have the work completed. If the deadlines are not met the City will take the case to Circuit Court.

Motion carried unanimously.

129 N. WING – FIRST FLOOR ELEVATIONS

Planning Consultant Elmiger said a Planning Commissioner had asked her about the project at 129 N. Wing, the southwest corner of Wing and Dunlap. The house was moved and placed on a new foundation; per the HDC approvals the house would be elevated 1 foot but was elevated approximately 2 feet above that.

Building Official added that the building plan specified the structure was going to be one foot higher than originally; the elevations submitted to the HDC showed the structure about 2 feet above grade when in reality it was now closer to 4 feet above grade.

After discussion, Planning Consultant Elmiger suggested that the applicant be asked to return to the Commission in order to show a revised streetscape and explain the changes that were made. The consensus of the Commission was to follow this course of action.

100 W. DUNLAP – SHINGLE REPLACEMENT

Planning Consultant Elmiger said the shingles were replaced on the structure, like for like.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Chair Allen asked about the house at Dunlap and Linden that needed the HVAC units on the roof screened. Building Official Strong said that the owner was moving forward with compliance on this issue.

Commissioner Hoffman initiated a brief discussion on making sure applicants who appeared before the Commission had all their required materials in. Perhaps applicants could be denied a place on the agenda if they were not fully prepared, or at least warned that their chances were diminished by not having all required materials submitted.

Chair Allen introduced new Commission member Gisvi Pardo De Reyes, who had been in the audience tonight. Ms. De Reyes specialized in historic architecture and restoration, and currently was the technician restorator at the Fairlane Home of Clara and Henry Ford.

After welcoming Ms. De Reyes, Planning Consultant Elmiger noted that the Commission would still be seeking a consulting architect who could sit in the audience, but who would not be required to live in Northville.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Allen adjourned the meeting at 9:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl McGuire
Recording Secretary

Approved as published 10/17/2018