

---

Chairperson Kilpatrick asked if the applicants had anything further they wished to discuss regarding the proposed project. Mr. Mukesh Mangla inquired about the next step in the process. Mr. Delacourt stated the next step would be a preapplication workshop with the Planning Commission to discuss the use of the process from a land use standpoint.

Chairperson Kilpatrick thanked the applicants for coming before the Commission, noting their project was an exciting project.

---

C.     Address:     1631 W. Avon Road  
          Sidwell:     15-21-126-037  
          Applicant:  William Church

Chairperson Kilpatrick stated Mr. Delacourt would provide a brief summary regarding this matter, noting the applicant had not been requested to attend this meeting.

Mr. Dziurman stated he had worked with the applicant and would ask to be recused during this portion of the meeting. Mr. Dziurman then left the dais and took a seat in the auditorium.

Mr. Delacourt stated the Commissioners might remember this project, noting the parcel was located just west of City Hall on Avon Road. He explained Mr. Church had received permission from the HDC to demolish a detached garage on the site to make room for a land division of the property to create a separate lot. He stated at that time Mr. Church had received approval from the Commission for some proposed additions for the existing farmhouse. He noted the siding had been removed from the farmhouse.

Mr. Delacourt stated the resulting lot had been the source of some mistakes and misunderstandings between the City and Mr. Church regarding the review of the resulting lot. He stated that after the land division was accomplished, the resulting lot was still part of the historic district and under the review of the Historic Districts Commission (HDC). He noted Mr. Church was informed about that fact, but it was not made completely clear to him.

Mr. Delacourt stated Mr. Church had sold the lot with the historic home on it, and had also sold the newly created lot to a builder. He indicated the builder submitted plans to the Building Department for a new house on the vacant lot. He stated the Building Department subsequently issued the permits for the lot due to the fact the newly created lot had been given a new sidwell number and address, neither of which were reflected in the City's computer as being a historic district. He indicated that error had since been corrected.

Mr. Delacourt reviewed the proposed plans for the home to be constructed on the new lot. He stated it was not until the foundation was seen being poured on the site that Staff realized what had happened. He stated a stop work order had been issued for the building and a meeting held with Mr. Church, who was very apologetic and had been very accommodating.

Mr. Delacourt stated Mr. Church had been working with his builder and architect to revise the elevations on the home. He reviewed the elevations submitted to the Commissioners prior to the

meeting, in order to find out if they would be acceptable to the HDC. He noted Mr. Dziurman had indicated he did not believe the original elevations for the house would be compatible with the historic district. He stated Mr. Dziurman had reviewed the revised elevations and made some additional suggestions.

Mr. Delacourt stated the applicant had agreed to use a cement fiberboard for the siding material on the house, and agreed to submit elevations to the HDC next month for approval. He indicated Mr. Dziurman had provided some suggestions regarding the garage doors, and the foundation material, which had been identified as brick although the applicant had agreed to consider alternative materials.

Mr. Delacourt stated he wanted to determine if the Commissioners saw any apparent problems with the revised elevations. He explained due to the fact part of the problem had been caused by the City issuing the permits, he would like to work with Mr. Church in getting the stop work order released to permit the foundation work to be completed. He noted this would be done prior to Mr. Church appearing before the HDC next month for a Certificate of Appropriateness. He asked if the Commissioners saw any problems with the revised elevations.

Mr. Dunphy asked if a site plan was available to show the location of the structure on the lot and how it related to the historic structure next to it. Mr. Delacourt stated he did not have a site plan, and noted the problem included the fact the foundation was already in the ground. He indicated it was a very narrow lot, but it did meet the required setbacks for the district.

Mr. Dunphy expressed his concern that when the matter came before the HDC originally, as part of the issue of the lot split, he recalled being assured that the house on the newly created lot would be situated so it would not adversely affect the sight lines to the historic structure. Mr. Delacourt stated he did know that the front facade of the house sat back behind the existing house, based on the location of the foundation.

Chairperson Kilpatrick clarified that the Commission was being asked to agree that the foundation work could be completed. Mr. Delacourt indicated that was correct. He then referred to the revised elevations, noting that the peak located over the garage would be removed. He noted the original plans had called for vinyl siding, and Mr. Church had agreed to use cement fiberboard, and Mr. Church was looking into different garage doors and the use of stone material.

Mr. Delacourt stated that if Staff authorized the release of the stop work order, he wanted to be sure the Commissioners had not seen anything in the elevations such as mass, size, or orientation. He indicated a discussion regarding the materials could be held at the December meeting.

Chairperson Kilpatrick asked if the proposed structure would be consistent with the two homes built on the adjacent lots off Seville. Mr. Delacourt stated the original elevations contained a look that was much more consistent with the actual look of those two houses, and the foundation and orientation was consistent with those two homes.

Mr. Dunphy asked how the proposed home compared as far as scale in terms of the building height to the existing historic structure. Mr. Delacourt stated he did not have height measurements at this time. He explained he had requested Mr. Church to determine an elevation that would be more compatible based on what could be put on the existing foundation and the permits that had been issued. He noted the height of the district was fairly consistent, although he was not aware of the height of the existing structure.

Chairperson Kilpatrick verified that the new structure would not affect the sight line of the historic structure. Mr. Delacourt indicated that was correct.

Mr. Szantner stated he thought the new home would be fairly comparable to the other home due to the fact the existing home was a two-story with a 1-1/2 ell addition. He did not think there would be a scale problem, despite the fact the new home would have a three-car garage. He indicated he thought the improvements made to the elevations were much more in character with the area, and stated he liked the fact the peak had been removed from above the garage doors.

Chairperson Kilpatrick stated he did not have a problem with what was being proposed, noting he felt it was consistent with the adjacent new structures, and they had received assurance the new home would not interfere with the sight line of the existing historic resource. He noted as parcels are divided, these types of issues would come before the HDC on a more frequent basis. He indicated he thought the applicant could be allowed to continue with the project until he could come back before the Commission next month. He stated when the applicant's presentation is made at that meeting, the Commission could make comments at that time regarding any problems they saw.

Ms. Sieffert recalled that at the previous meeting regarding this matter, the Commission had given permission for two (2) houses to be built around the corner. She was surprised to hear that a home was being constructed next to the historic home. Mr. Delacourt pointed out the two houses on the adjacent parcel around the corner were not located in the historic district.

Ms. Sieffert asked if the parcel had been de-designated in order to allow Mr. Church to split the parcel. Mr. Delacourt noted that the HDC could not delist a parcel. He explained Mr. Church had come before the HDC to request permission to demolish the detached garage in order to create space to allow the division. He noted the HDC did not review or approve the land division. He explained the land division created two (2) parcels, both of which remain the historic district. He noted the parcel with the foundation was the new resultant parcel. He reiterated that the two (2) new homes on the adjacent parcels at the corner were never part of the historic district.

Ms. Sieffert asked if the adjacent parcels were part of the original acreage of the subject parcel. Mr. Delacourt stated he did not know if those parcels were part of the original acreage, but clarified they were never part of the designated district.

Ms. Sieffert commented that she understood a parcel that had a historic structure located on it was all deemed historic. Mr. Delacourt clarified that the adjacent parcels at the corner with the two new homes were not part of the subject parcel when that rule became effective in the 1990s.

He stated when 1631 W. Avon Road was designated, it was the structure and everything within 100 feet; however, the State Law had changed in the 1990s, making the entire parcel the designated district.

Ms. Sieffert asked if the new home proposed on the new parcel would visually overwhelm the historic house. Mr. Delacourt stated he did not have the square footage comparisons, but that based on the location of the foundation, the new home would sit as far back as the historic home. He did not feel it would block the historic house, and noted the new home would be wider along the frontage of Avon Road.

Ms. Sieffert noted that changes had been proposed to be made to the historic house, which would cause the historic house to visually appear larger. Mr. Delacourt stated Mr. Church had received approval from the HDC for some additions to the house; however, he had since sold the home to the individuals who had been renting the home from him.

Ms. Sieffert asked if the changes would still be made to the historic home. Mr. Delacourt suggested the Commissioners discuss that with Mr. Church at the meeting in December.

Chairperson Kilpatrick asked if Staff required a motion from the Commissioners regarding the new home on the vacant parcel. Mr. Delacourt indicated he did not because the stop work order was an administrative matter. He stated his purpose in bringing the matter before the Commission was to determine if there were any major issues with the proposed elevations that would prevent the stop work order from being lifted. He stated he would recommend to the Building Department Director that the foundation work be allowed to continue under the condition that Mr. Church would come before the HDC next month with elevations consistent to what was presented at this meeting for final approval.

Mr. Thompson asked if the stop work order were lifted, how much farther along the work could progress before the December 9, 2004 meeting. Mr. Delacourt stated he expected the framing work would be completed at that time.

Mr. Szantner asked if Mr. Church would bring elevations, materials and color samples to the December 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. Mr. Delacourt indicated that was correct.

Ms. Sieffert clarified that Mr. Church had sold 1631 W. Avon Road. Mr. Delacourt explained the property had been rented for about a year, and he understood that the renters wanted to purchase the home from Mr. Church. He indicated Mr. Church had acquiesced and sold the property to them.

Ms. Sieffert commented that the home would not now be renovated as had been discussed with Mr. Church. Mr. Delacourt stated the current property owners would have to come before the HDC to request approval for any renovation work.

Mr. Szantner asked if at the December 9<sup>th</sup> meeting, Mr. Church could provide the Commissioners with a presentation of the existing street, in street elevation, with the new structure next to it to provide the scale and color match-ups. Mr. Delacourt indicated he believed

the applicant could provide something that would depict the spacing between the houses and a plot plan that reflected the front yard setback comparisons.

Ms. Sieffert stated she wanted to go on record expressing her disappointment because she felt the farmhouse would look shabby by comparison next to the brand new houses because nothing was going to be done to it. She did not want the farmhouse to become an eyesore.

Chairperson Kilpatrick called for any additional discussion or comments regarding this matter. No additional comments or discussion was held. Mr. Dziurman returned to the council table for the remainder of the meeting.

---

## 9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

### Recommendation of HDC Member to the Historic Districts Study Committee.

Chairperson Kilpatrick stated the Commissioners had been requested to provide a recommendation to City Council indicating their approval of the appointment of John Dziurman to the Historic Districts Study Committee (HDSC). He asked Mr. Dziurman if he would accept the appointment if the Commissioners recommended him for the position on the HDSC. Mr. Dziurman stated he would accept the appointment. Chairperson Kilpatrick called for a motion to recommend.

**MOTION** by Dunphy, seconded by Sieffert, that the Rochester Hills Historic Districts Commission hereby recommends that Mr. John Dziurman be reappointed as the HDC Representative to the Historic Districts Study Committee.

Ayes: All  
Nays: None  
Absent: Cozzolino, Stamps

Chairperson Kilpatrick thanked Mr. Dziurman for accepting the recommendation for appointment to the HDSC. He then called for any other business.

### Earl Borden Award.

Ms. Sieffert indicated she wanted to discuss the 2005 Earl Borden Awards. She urged the Commissioners to think about an individual or structure to be nominated for the award. She felt the award was very important because it represented a sense of civic prestige. She hoped the property owners of those properties currently listed on the potential list might discover there was some prestige to residing in a historic property.

Ms. Sieffert stated she had a newspaper clipping regarding Dustin King, a thirteen year old Rochester Hills Boy Scout, who had organized the exterior painting of the Meadowbrook Greenhouse and two adjacent sheds for his Eagle Scout project. She suggested the Commissioners consider nominating Dustin King, noting she liked the idea of bringing in a younger person.