

~~being a very progressive farm for its time in this State, and as it moved on to the Eddy's, they really did not change it. It was one of four neo-classical styles in the Community, one across the street which has been restored. This was the second-most significant, it has not been restored. The other two houses we are saying don't hold as much significance. But to say we have one and so that's it, and that's why in today's context not as important. But, she had already said, and the report had indicated we were not basing that and that actually Community's at the time had their autonomy to decide what they felt was worth saving and what was significant. To come back and say according to 2002, it isn't, she had a great deal of problem with. She wanted to have that on the record. She stated she would come to the Public Hearing. When she finished reading the Report, she did not come to a conclusion that said it was not worth keeping. She was somewhat disturbed when she read the Minutes that the Committee agreed with everything she said, because she did not think that much was said about it. She hoped that as this moves forward, we can hopefully find some more information regarding this property and the home itself. Even though we understand why the outbuildings are gone because they were not part of the original designated area and were demolished prior to the total parcel becoming the designated district.~~

Public Comment Received

Chairperson Thompson stated that Public Hearing would be held on Thursday, February 11, 2010 at 5:30 PM. He called for any other public comments. No other public comments were received.

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

7A. 2008-0663 National Twist Drill (HDSC File #08-002) - Discussion

Chairperson Thompson stated the Study Committee had reviewed some options on a proposed historic district for this property, including one option that tried to balance the most significant portions because it might be more acceptable to the property owner and City Council. Ms. Kidorf had offered to review the proposed options against the contents of the Preliminary Report and had provided her opinion. She disagreed with changing the scope of the proposed district. He suggested the Committee discuss how they wanted to proceed noting the Committee still had the ability to make whatever recommendation they felt appropriate.

Dr. Stamps asked why the consultant felt that the Committee should not propose just a portion of the property. Chairperson Thompson stated Ms. Kidorf believed the entire parcel, with the exception of one building, contributed to the significance of the district. He noted there was discussion at the last meeting about the various proposed boundary lines, and it was decided that Ms. Kidorf should review the matter. The Committee reviewed the various boundary options.

Chairperson Thompson stated that part of the discussion at the December meeting included whether just portions of the various buildings fronting Rochester Road could be designated particularly because they were not separate structures with additions added to them. Such a boundary designation would essentially "chop" the buildings in half.

Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race, commented she had read the opinion and the Preliminary Report and was very impressed by the report because there is a great deal of content in the report. She agreed with Ms. Kidorf's opinion that we're asking for problems trying to cut off some portion of the property, because the great part of what is there is so much of the original existing there. Whether it is all that important to people today or not is something that will have to be determined or if at some point it goes all the way to City Council, they will make the determination on what to do. She would not want to see it divided up because she thought it stood on its own and has a great deal of merit on its own. There was no reason to try to split it up into something else. She understood that Building B had been changed some, but that was something that could be addressed somewhere down the road.

Ms. Thomasson asked if the thought behind trying to split off portions of the buildings was to allow the property owner to use the balance of the property in another manner. Dr. Stamps thought that summarized the reason, noting that the current property owner did not want any of the property designated. The Study Committee was aware the property owner felt he had a large, developable piece of property that no one wanted to purchase with the old factory buildings. He noted City Council gave a lot of weight to the property owner's opinion.

Dr. Stamps recalled that portions of buildings were architecturally significant with the art-deco fronts on the west side, and the Committee was exploring options and realistic possibilities. The Committee could recommend the entire parcel as historic as it is a significant piece in the arsenal of democracy where they made drills and tools to make parts to make tanks during the war. In the political sense, having participated in the last few recommendations brought to City Council that were not designated, the Committee spent some time exploring other options. Ms. Kidorf's opinion was right from a preservation point of view. The Committee had to decide if it was worth trying to save a portion of the site, or the whole site. He asked if the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) had provided a clear response about saving a portion of a building. He commented if SHPO agreed with the Stiles School proposed district boundary that might be considered a precedent. He had not made up his mind and would like to continue exploring the options.

Ms. Thomasson commented that corner was a valuable piece of property.

Chairperson Thompson reminded the Committee their focus was rather narrow and limited to a review and recommendation. The Committee did not make the decision to designate. He asked if the Committee felt it would be beneficial to discuss this property with the Consultant.

Mr. Hannick asked if the Committee would have received some feedback from SHPO by the time of the Public Hearing. It was noted that SHPO would not respond until after the Report was brought before the Review Board, which meets on a quarterly basis.

Dr. Stamps agreed the focus of the Committee was to determine if the property met the criteria, with the decision on designation left to City Council.

Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race, agreed with the comments made and we should not be second guessing. It was unfortunate the political climate swings one way or another and ends up rejecting something that could be significant. She thought this not only had architectural significance, and that would be one thing that would be happening, it would be limiting the number of areas of significance if one starts to break this apart. It truly does benefit to a number of areas. In fact, all three, which really makes it one of the top pieces. Whether or not the property owner likes it, that is just too bad. It was unfortunate we don't have or have not had in the past a Council that looks at the value of historic property and the potential for those. This is not something that we're putting under glass in a museum and saying "don't touch." That's not the point, because there so much in so many other places across this country and around the world that have taken architecturally significant pieces and retained this history and done some great things. The other part of it was that even the two that nothing happened with, that they did not chose to designate, did not preclude the opportunity of going back to Council at any point in time and making that same recommendation. There is still potential for that. Fortunately, in maybe both cases, they have not been destroyed. They still exist in the Community and there is always that potential and there is nothing stopping that from happening. She looked at this one and at some point it would be nice to make the recommendation, whether they don't care to do that, then I guess you get to the point where is it totally flattened. There is always the option of having the HDC request a moratorium from Council. She thought there were so many areas of significance with this piece of property.

Chairperson Thompson stated this was a unique piece of property within the City and in the area. If designated, it would have to be adaptively re-used, although this region of the country did not seem to accept that concept. He stated it was his thought to retain the original recommendation in the Preliminary Report, but noted this was still an on-going discussion.

Dr. Stamps asked if any descendants of the McGregor family still resided in the area. He thought perhaps the portion of the report about that family could be added to if they could find some relations and some additional information. He commented he had a former student he thought was related to the family, but did not know if they remained in the area. If that student could be contacted, they might be able to provide more history on the family.

Mr. Hannick inquired whether the Alumni Association would have contact information. Dr. Stamps stated he would see if he could obtain contact information.

Chairperson Thompson stated this matter would be scheduled for the next meeting.

This matter was Discussed

~~7B. 2009-0547 2009 Annual Report~~

~~Chairperson Thompson stated the 2009 Annual Report had been provided to the Study Committee at the December meeting for review and comment. He reminded the Committee the report was prepared as part of the Certified Local Government (CLG) designation received by the City in 2009.~~

~~Ms. Thomasson inquired about the CLG designation. Dr. Stamps stated receiving the designation allowed the City to become eligible for Federal grant funds and resources.~~

~~**Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race**, agreed the report was a well put together piece especially because it was new. She stated she made some comments to the recording secretary. The part about the Preliminary Reports that Council was requesting when they really were requesting a full report within 180 days, both on 1585 S. Rochester Road and 2371 S. Livernois Road. She made mention about putting dates after Wayside Park and the South Boulevard property so one knew at what time frame those were not designated so that was clear in the report. The only other piece she had was at the very end where it said something about this body making or going before Council to ask what study to do next. A lot of times she thought the Committee probably has ones they felt were a good priority to be studied, and she wondered if that wording might be better said somehow in the gist of the Committee was making recommendations to Council and requesting permission to perform studies on those recommended properties versus asking them what the next study should be. That was only just a little thinking about the rewording and was her own suggestion. She did not think Council ranked them and decided what it is, and the Committee had done that type of work.~~

~~Chairperson Thompson noted under the current Ordinance, City Council had to provide permission before the Study Committee began a study. He agreed with the~~