

No members of the public came forward to speak on non-agenda items.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2010-0109 Stiles School, 3976 S. Livernois Road (HDSC File #05-002)

Final Report Recommendation

Mr. Delacourt commented that the suggested changes have been made to the Final Report. If the report is acceptable to the HDSC, it is recommended that the Committee forward the report to Council for final consideration.

Acting Chair Dziurman asked if there were any comments/additions/deletions regarding the Final Report. He then asked if the additions to the building are non-contributing resources. Ms. Kidorf confirmed the structure's additions were excluded from the district, the map, and the Final Report.

MOTION by Kochenderfer, supported by Webster, to accept the Final Report recommendation as presented and to forward the report to Council for their final determination on or about February 7th.

A motion was made by Kochenderfer, seconded by Webster, that this matter be Accepted. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 5 - Dziurman, Webster, Hannick, Thomasson and Kochenderfer

Absent 2 - Stamps and Thompson

2008-0663 National Twist Drill (HDSC File #08-002)

Preliminary Report Discussion

Mr. Delacourt indicated this is a preliminary report the HDSC has had previous discussions on. It was mentioned at the last meeting to bring this report back for discussion on how to proceed.

Acting Chairperson Dziurman commented he was not aware that the proposed district had been reduced. Mr. Delacourt explained that at one time there was an aerial photo similar to the Stiles School photo, that showed a revised proposed district encompassing the office buildings, but eliminating all of the manufacturing space. SHPO then pointed out that those parts of the building are considered contributing, whereas the additions that were eliminated from the Stiles School building were seen as not contributing. So, it seems SHPO was more resistant to the revised Twist Drill boundary determination than it was to the Stiles School boundary. The revised boundary was drawn by staff only as a starting point for discussion if the Committee wanted to consider something less than the entire parcel, and is not a recommendation. This boundary can be changed to whatever the Committee wishes to recommend, and staff would do its best to generate an acceptable boundary description. Mr. Delacourt stated he is not sure this approach to this property is ever going to be 100% acceptable to SHPO. Whether or not it's acceptable to SHPO, the Committee needs to assure that the boundary serves the purpose of protecting the most important portions of the resource. SHPO has said that designation is a local decision and can be undertaken without their support of a district. So if this reduced boundary is acceptable to the Study Committee and acceptable to Council, Mr.

Delacourt is not sure there would be any negative implications.

Acting Chairperson Dziurman then indicated he would like to schedule a tour of the building with the owner to look at exactly what is being recommended to assure it is correct. Mr. Delacourt explained there are two property owners; the owner of the southern portion has been cooperative and a tour could possibly be arranged with them. Mr. Delacourt is not sure what the other property owner's response would be about a tour of the northern portion of the structure, but indicated he would make that contact.

Mr. Kochenderfer suggested staff research any possible negative consequences to recommending a boundary that SHPO does not approve of. Ms. Kidorf offered that one possible negative consequence would be that the property owner would not be able to take advantage of the historic tax credit because the entire property wouldn't be designated. Most likely it would not affect the City's CLG status.

Acting Chair Dziurman suggested recommending designation of the whole site and letting Council direct the Committee to do something different if they so desire. Mr. Delacourt agreed this is a reasonable way to approach the issue because it would demonstrate that the Study Committee did first attempt to compromise by recommending a lesser district, but the idea was rebuffed by the SHPO. (Because this is a preliminary report and a public hearing has not been held, a formal submittal to SHPO for their review has not yet been sent.)

Mr. Webster reported that the other night Mr. Pat McKay included Twist Drill in his program on the Rochester Area - his indication was that the important part of the resource was the southwestern corner of the building. Mr. Webster also indicated that if the current property owner of the northern section did not want designation, a new owner could always come back to the Study Committee and request designation. Mr. Delacourt said he would contact Mr. McKay and get a written opinion regarding this resource. This information could then be forwarded to the Study Committee members.

Mr. Delacourt explained that if the Committee wants to move toward getting this report to Council, they could talk about the potential to forward the report to the State for their review of the whole district and ask staff to begin to schedule the public hearing. Potential public hearing dates could be available at the next meeting. This is only suggested if the Committee wants to keep the process moving.

Acting Chairperson Dziurman suggested that members read through the preliminary report again as a refresher and that discussion of the report be placed on the next agenda. It would also be helpful to schedule a tour of the buildings prior to the next meeting, preferably on a Saturday morning.

This matter was Discussed

2006-0425

Frank Farm (HDSC File #04-005)
1290 E. Auburn; 1304 E. Auburn; 1344 and 1356 E. Auburn