

Ayes: All  
Nays: None  
Absent: Dziurman, Stamps, Szantner

**MOTION CARRIED**

**6. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS**

- A. Reliving the Rochester Era, Nov/Dec 2004 Edition
- B. Michigan Association of Community Arts Agencies  
(Brochure regarding MasterMinds Series Workshop)

Chairperson Kilpatrick asked if the Commissioners had any comments about the communications, or any additional announcements or communications. None were provided.

**7. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

~~No public comments were received.~~

**8. NEW BUSINESS**

**File No. HDC 04-008**

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness – New Construction  
Address: 1651 W. Avon Road  
Sidwell: 15-21-126-036  
Applicant: William Church

Chairperson Kilpatrick stated the Commission had briefly discussed this matter at the November 11, 2004 meeting, and noted that Mr. Kohl, the builder of the new home on the parcel, was present. He stated Mr. Kohl had brought material samples with him for review by the Commission, and explained Mr. Kohl could provide a brief presentation. He requested Mr. Delacourt provide some background information regarding this matter for the record.

Mr. Delacourt stated the Commission had discussed this matter at the November Historic Districts Commission (HDC) Meeting. He explained a property split of the historic parcel located at 1631 W. Avon Road had created the new lot, which is also designated as a historic district. He stated Mr. William Church was the owner of the property prior to its being split, and pointed out that Mr. Kohl was the builder of the lot, and had purchased the lot unaware it was an historic district. He noted the City had not informed Mr. Kohl the lot was a designated historic district, nor did Mr. Church believe at the time of sale that the parcel was a historic district.

Mr. Delacourt extended the City's thanks to Mr. Kohl for interrupting the building of the home, completely revising the elevations, and for submitting something for comment by the HDC at the November meeting, as well as submitting a full set of materials for this meeting.

Mr. Delacourt noted the elevations of the house incorporated the changes and suggestions made at the November HDC Meeting; the material for the siding was changed to be the cement backer board, and the peak over the garage was removed.

Mr. Delacourt stated the Commission had inquired at the last meeting about the location of the new house in relation to the existing historic house to the east. He noted a plot plan was included in the packet material which reflected that the new house was approximately fifteen (15) feet behind the existing home and should not interfere with the visibility of the existing historic home.

Mr. Delacourt stated Mr. Kohl had done everything requested at the November meeting, and had revised the garage doors to be more in keeping with the context of the house.

Mr. David Kohl, Kestrel Building Company, 70 S. Grey Road, Auburn Hills, stated that he had redesigned the elevations and reviewed the color scheme, explaining he was using a weatherwood dimensional shingle, cement Hardi siding in a grey color, with white trim boards around the windows. He noted the soffits and frieze would be white, with a brick beltline at three or four feet around the bottom of the house.

Mr. Kohl reviewed the changes made to the elevations, noting the roof pitch was lowered slightly, and the addition of a covered porch. He stated he would be happy to answer any questions the Commissioners might have.

Ms. Sieffert asked if the front door was a single panel door. Mr. Kohl suggested a fiberglass, six panel door could be installed that would look like a wood door, if that was in keeping with the Commission's standards. He asked if the Commission had a preference to the type of door.

Ms. Cozzolino asked what color the garage doors would be. Mr. Kohl stated the garage doors would most likely be painted the same color as the siding.

Ms. Sieffert asked if the garage doors would have the panels as reflected in the materials included with the packet information. Mr. Kohl stated he would use that identical garage door as depicted in the brochure.

Ms. Sieffert noted although the Commission did not legislate color schemes, it would be her personal preference that the front door echo the garage doors. Mr. Kohl noted he had been informed the Commission wanted to review the color choices. Ms. Sieffert explained the type of materials being used were important to the Commission.

Chairperson Kilpatrick verified the applicant would not have a problem being tied in to the materials and color scheme presented at this meeting. Mr. Kohl stated it was his intention to use the materials presented. He explained he would be using a prefinished product that would be painted prior to installation.

Mr. Dunphy stated he wanted to verify that the materials list and color scheme documentation had been submitted to the Planning Department. Mr. Delacourt stated it was included in the packet information and could be included in the motion.

Ms. Sieffert asked who owned the parcel under discussion. Mr. Kohl stated he had purchased the lot, and explained when the home was constructed, it would be sold by Kestrel Building Company.

Mr. Kohl asked if the Commission had a particular color preference for the front door and garage door.

Ms. Cozzolino stated she had asked about the garage door because she wanted to know if it would match the front door. She suggested that the front door coordinate with the garage door.

Chairperson Kilpatrick called for any additional discussion. There being none, he called for a motion.

**MOTION** by Dunphy, seconded by Thompson, in the matter of File No. HDC 04-008, regarding the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new single family home to be located at 1651 W. Avon Road, the Historic Districts Commission **APPROVES** a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following Findings and Conditions:

Findings:

1. The new construction does not have a negative impact on the integrity of the Non-Contiguous Historic District comprised of 1631 W. Avon Road and 1651 W. Avon Road.
2. Consistent with Section 118-162(c) of the Historic Districts Ordinance, the Historic Districts Commission has reviewed the information submission requirements such as the proposed styles and colors of the exterior siding, trim, shingles, brick and garage doors.

Conditions:

1. The new construction shall be completed in accordance with plans dated received by the City Planning Department on November 24, 2004.
2. All materials, colors and design shall be in accordance with plans dated received by the Planning Department on November 24, 2004.
3. If the plans for the materials and colors significantly change from those stated in Condition #2 above, the applicant shall return to the Historic Districts Commission and present those changes for approval.
4. The applicant shall receive all appropriate permits from the City's Building Department prior to Construction.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Sieffert, Castile, Cozzolino, Kilpatrick, Dunphy, Thompson  
Nays: None  
Absent: Dziurman, Stamps, Szantner

**MOTION CARRIED**

Chairperson Kilpatrick stated the applicant had received a Certificate of Appropriateness and thanked Mr. Kohl for coming before the Commission.

Mr. Kohl asked if gutters were in keeping with the Commission's standards. Ms. Sieffert explained the applicant's house was not an authentic historic house, but would blend in or be compatible with the adjacent historic home. She stated the HDC did not want to create a false sense of history or to imitate history.

Ms. Sieffert asked if when the new house was sold, whether prospective purchasers would be advised the house was located in a historic district. Mr. Delacourt stated any purchaser of the property should be informed that the home was in a historic district. He explained the property had been flagged in the Building Department as a historic district, which meant if a request for something such as an addition was submitted, the property owner would be notified they must first obtain approval from the HDC.

Ms. Sieffert added if the property owner wanted to build a deck, a fence or a swimming pool, approval of the HDC would be required first. Mr. Kohl indicated he had anticipated building a deck onto the home. Ms. Sieffert stated the plans should be submitted to the HDC for approval.

Mr. Kohl stated he was not sure prospective purchasers would understand what HDC approval meant. Chairperson Kilpatrick explained that anything the property owner wanted to do to the outside of the property, other than routine maintenance, would require approval from the HDC, due to the fact the home was located on a historically designated piece of property.

Ms. Sieffert stated the HDC's concern was that whatever happened on the property did not impact the adjacent historic residence.

Mr. Dunphy stated because the property was part of a historic district, any exterior renovations had to come before the HDC for review. He clarified that for a non-contributing resource, where the HDC recognized that the home was a new home and was not historic, and there was no intention to portray it as historic, the standards used by the HDC would not be as rigorous as they would be for a historic building. He noted the concern of the HDC was the compatibility with the adjacent property, which was historic and in the same District. He indicated that in the time he had been on the Commission, a number of proposals had come before the HDC for additions, decks, gazebos, garages and other items, and he did not recall any of those requests becoming tied up with any major issues because they were in the historic district as long as they were considered a non-contributing resource.

Mr. Kohl asked if there was something he could provide to potential purchasers that would explain the situation. Mr. Delacourt stated there was. Chairperson Kilpatrick suggested the historic designation should be disclosed, just as deed restrictions were disclosed.

Mr. Kohl asked if the historic designation would appear on the Deed to the property. Chairperson Kilpatrick stated some designations run with the Deed. Mr. Delacourt explained the original designation for the adjacent property was on the title work. He noted that pursuant to the lot split, the designation might not have been included with the title work on the subject parcel. He stated originally Affidavits were filed with the title work, and at some point the City could file Affidavits for the additional parcels that had been created by lot splits.

~~9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS~~

~~1046 E. Tienken (Prewitt House):~~

~~Ms. Sieffert stated the last time the Commission met they had discussed the status of the Prewitt House.~~

~~Mr. Delacourt stated he and the Director of the Building Department would be meeting with Mr. Bejusca to determine if he was going to follow through with his plans, or whether he would mothball the structure. He stated if the property owner did not intend to proceed, the City would have to decide if it wished to pursue the same type of action it planned on pursuing prior to Mr. Bejusca's purchase of the property. He noted that was a decision the City Administration would have to make.~~

~~Ms. Sieffert noted the house was fragile. Mr. Delacourt stated he had received some information indicating the house could be changing hands again with a new owner. He indicated if that were the case, he and the Building Department Director would want to meet with the new owner to determine what they planned to do with the house.~~

~~Ms. Sieffert stated the HDC could not just let the home keep changing hands while there was potential for the home to be destroyed by the elements. She stated there had been discussion several years ago about whether it was possible to save the home by mothballing it.~~

~~Chairperson Kilpatrick stated he hoped any new owner would be committed to preserving the structure. Mr. Delacourt stated that was what had been anticipated the last time the property changed hands, and the current owner had been given an appropriate amount of time to do something with the property. He indicated if the new owner did not intend to proceed, it would become a matter for the Building Department Director, the Mayor and the City Attorney to look into.~~

~~800 W. Avon Road (Rochester College):~~

~~Mr. Dunphy referred to the motion passed by the Commission at the November 11, 2004 meeting regarding demolition by neglect of the historic structures, and requested an update on the matter.~~

~~Mr. Delacourt stated the College had put a tarp over the corner. He indicated the College had been provided a copy of the mothballing standards and was considering adding them to the PUD~~