

- ~~2. The construction of the fence is located so as to not limit the view of the front of the home from Tienken Road.~~

Conditions:

1. The height of the fence shall be three (3') feet.
2. The style shall be a picket fence.
3. The material of the fence shall be a wood look-alike vinyl, and the fence will be white in color.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Miller

Nays: Dziurman, Kilpatrick, Thompson, Dunphy, Hill, Sieffert, Sinclair

Absent: Cozzolino

MOTION FAILED

Chairperson Kilpatrick stated for the record that the motion had been defeated. He encouraged the applicants to explore the landscaping option, or to explore the possibility of the horizontal type of fencing, noting the applicants had heard the concerns expressed by the Commission.

Mrs. Rice stated they understood the Commissions' concerns, noting they had considered some of the options themselves. Mr. Rice complimented the Commission on its earnestness and hard work.

~~Chairperson Kilpatrick stated the Commission would now hear Agenda Item 8A.~~

8A. File No. HDC 99-011

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness – Demolition of Additions
Certificate of Appropriateness – New Additions, Attached Garage
Sidwell: 15-20-428-003
Address: 1841 Crooks Road
Applicant: Fred T. Dunn

*Joe Thompson
3/17/06*

Chairperson Kilpatrick asked the applicant to come forward to the presenter's table. He read the request for the record, and noted the applicant had appeared before the Commission a few years prior, but now had some new plans. He stated the Commission might want to consider the proposed demolition first, and then continue with the proposed additions. He asked the applicant to provide his name and address for the record, and to provide a brief summary of the request.

Mr. Fred T. Dunn, 1104 Maple Leaf Drive, stated he had appeared before the Commission in 2002; however, the Commission expressed concern at that time that the proposed addition was overpowering the original construction of the property. He stated after the Commission had given its approval, he and his wife thought about the comments made at the meetings, and agreed that the approved addition was too large and overwhelmed the original historic property. He stated they decided to rethink their position and hired a different architect.

Mr. Dunn stated the plans before the Commission now were essentially the approval that was granted with respect to the existing home with the teardowns and remodeling. He explained they eliminated the former proposed large addition and replaced it with a two-car garage. He stated the current proposal was approximately 3,500 square feet less in additional home.

Mr. Dunn stated they still wanted to remove the additions put on the home by one of the previous owners. He stated their plan several years ago was to remove the additions and level the house because the back corner was down about thirty inches. He explained as they proceeded to level the house, the previous additions began to fall off the house because they were not connected and had no foundation under them. He explained the wood had rotted on all the additions, causing all the additions to start to fall off the home. He stated he was again requesting approval from the Commission to remove those additions and replace them with a full stone foundation.

Mr. Dunn stated the drawings that had been submitted for this meeting eliminated the formerly approved large addition, with a garage taking its place.

Chairperson Kilpatrick clarified that the applicant had previously received approval for the demolition of the additions, and no additional demolition work was being requested. Mr. Dunphy also asked for clarification that the demolition being proposed at this meeting was the same as what had been approved at the meeting in 2002.

Mr. Delacourt stated he believed the proposed demolition was very similar, noting the applicant was referring to the same additions on the home, which were part of the approval granted in 2002.

Mr. Dunphy clarified that the only reason that approval for the demolition work was being requested again was because the clock had run out on the previous approval. It was noted that a Certificate of Appropriateness is only good for one year, unless the work is begun.

Ms. Hill stated she was a member of the Commission when this project was previously approved by the Commission in 2002. She stated she had retained her file from that meeting, and noted the applicant's proposal was similar to the previous proposal. She commented the Commission had expressed concern about the massing and the fact the applicant proposed to add an addition over the L-shaped portion of the home.

Ms. Hill referred to the comments about the demolition being proposed at this meeting and noted it was very close to the prior demolition work proposed in 2002. She pointed out the wing on the south end facing Crooks Road was not included in 2002, but was included in the current proposal, along with a rebuild. She stated in 2002 the proposal included restoring that existing wing to the original condition, along with replacing the foundation underneath that wing.

Mr. Dunn stated that foundation was totally gone. Ms. Hill stated that meant the applicant was actually requesting the demolition of an additional structure compared to the demolition work approved in 2002.

Chairperson Kilpatrick stated he passed by 1841 Crooks Road every day and noted it appeared the wing was substantially detached from the house. Mr. Dunn explained the back sunroom was constructed in 1992; he believed the southwest corner was added in 1981 or 1982, and the addition by the kitchen was added in 1973.

Chairperson Kilpatrick suggested the Commission first consider the demolition request, and asked if the Commissioners had any comments or questions regarding the proposed demolition work. He noted the demolition work would be contingent upon the other plans for the new additions.

Mr. Dziurman stated he spoke to the applicant just prior to the start of the meeting, and had asked the applicant if he intended to reside in the home. He indicated Mr. Dunn had responded he did intend to occupy the home. Mr. Dziurman stated he was cautious about approving demolition work for an unoccupied home.

~~Mr.~~ Ms. Sinclair commented that he had gone by the property prior to the meeting, and noted the wing section discussed by Ms. Hill was pretty much detached. He stated the bottom was gone, and the section would demolish on its own within a year.

Mr. Dunphy stated for the sake of discussion, he would move the motion as contained in the packet information for the demolition work, noting the motion would read "approves" a Certificate of Appropriateness; condition #2 would read "will not have a negative impact", and condition #3 would read "are in such a state of repair".

Chairperson Kilpatrick called for a second to the proposed motion. Mr. Miller stated he would second the proposed motion on the floor. Chairperson Kilpatrick then called for discussion on the proposed motion.

Mr. Dziurman stated he had a question regarding the elevations shown on the plans. He noted the original house had a covered porch in the front on the Crooks Road elevation, which he did not see on the proposed plans.

Mr. Dunn explained the reason the porch did not show was because it was set back in about four feet, and the drawing did not show the angle.

Mr. Dunn introduced his architect, Bill Wroblewski, of Candy Construction, LLC, 24154 Penn Street, Dearborn, Michigan 48124. Mr. Wroblewski explained the dark line represented the porch ceiling, noting the two windows and the door were set back about four feet. He stated the second floor hung over the porch.

Mr. Dziurman stated that the porch would also be demolished and should be added to the proposed motion on the floor. Mr. Dunn stated the porch would remain; however, the roof itself would change. Mr. Wroblewski explained the new second floor that was going over that area would cover the porch. He stated only the roof portion of the existing porch would be demolished, but the porch itself would stay the same.

Ms. Hill stated she had some difficulty in moving forward with the proposed motion regarding the demolition without having some discussion about the proposed new construction. She felt the Commission should discuss the rest of the applicant's plan, and whether those plans would affect the project in any other way.

Mr. Dunphy stated if the discussion would help the Commission make a decision on the motion on the floor, then he felt that would be appropriate. Chairperson Kilpatrick agreed and asked the applicant to proceed with a presentation of his proposed plan for improvements to the home.

Mr. Dunn referred to the front elevation and explained the improvement would be that the roof would be extended and be the addition to the second story. He stated the only other addition would be the two-car garage on the proposed left-side (north) elevation.

Mr. Dziurman stated he had discussed some other changes with the applicant prior to the start of the meeting, which were not reflected in the proposed plan. Mr. Dunn stated all his proposed changes were included with his plans.

Mr. Dziurman reminded the applicant that they had discussed the windows on the rear side. Mr. Dunn stated they did not like the windows that were included with the submission documents, and the proposed rear elevation contained a sliding door. He explained where the sunroom was, he intended to put in a big bay window with a seat, and then the glass sliding doors would actually be French doors. He stated the entrance doors throughout the house would be original to the character of the house, not just steel, but rather wood doors with windows.

Mr. Dziurman asked if the sliding door reflected on the right side elevation would remain. Mr. Dunn stated that door would also be a French door, and there would not be any sliding doors on the house. Mr. Dziurman asked if they would be divided light. Mr. Dunn indicated that was correct.

Mr. Dunn stated he would putting in a stone foundation which would be block with a stone face, so that all that would be visible around the house would be the stone.

Chairperson Kilpatrick asked for clarification of which elevation was facing north on Crooks Road. Mr. Wroblewski stated the right side elevation faced south, and the new proposed garage area faced north.

Mr. Dziurman pointed out the Commission had not actually received accurate drawings. He asked the applicant what his timetable was for the proposed work. Mr. Dunn stated he hoped to demolish the bad additions, and begin the new construction in the spring.

Mr. Dziurman stated it was necessary for the Commission to have accurate drawings because the drawings would be submitted to the Building Department with any approval. He stated he would like to see something happen to the structure and did not want to discourage the applicant, but the Commission needed to see accurate drawings to include with any approval.

Mr. Wroblewski stated the proposed plans did reflect how the finished project would look, but did not contain the correct windows and doors. Mr. Miller stated the bottom of the proposed right side elevation depicted the front porch sticking out from the front of the house; however, the front elevation showed the front overhung the porch. Mr. Wroblewski explained that portion was a new front porch being added on. Mr. Dunn stated that was being added to differentiate the new second story away from the original first floor.

Mr. Dunphy asked if the submitted drawings were conclusive enough to move forward with the motion regarding the demolition, thereby allowing the demolition work to be approved at this meeting and having the balance of the project brought back to a later meeting with an up-to-date set of drawings.

Ms. Sieffert stated that would be acceptable to her, noting it would allow the applicant to begin some of the work.

Ms. Hill asked if the Building Department would permit a demolition without the construction plans. She also cautioned the Commission that if there were any significant changes to the proposed new construction, it could cause considerable problems for the applicant. She noted she would not like to see anything demolished prior to having an approved plan.

Mr. Wroblewski stated he was familiar with the building process and would not have begun demolition until the entire project was approved.

Mr. Delacourt stated it would take approximately a month for the applicant to get any permits from the Building Department. He suggested if the applicant had received sufficient input from the Commission about the proposed project; they could submit to the Building Department for their permits; the matter could be tabled and the applicant return for the actual approval in a month, while at the same time the building permits would be in the process.

Mr. Wroblewski clarified that their application for building permits would then run parallel with the Commission. Mr. Delacourt stated the applicant would have to submit plans reflecting what they intended to build, including any changes from what had been presented at this meeting. He noted that any other comments or questions the Commission had should be addressed at this time to prevent the applicant from submitting incomplete documents.

Mr. Wroblewski stated he would have to add some notes to the plans submitted at this meeting. Mr. Delacourt stated that whatever the applicant submitted to the Building Department had to be exactly what the Commission approved.

Chairperson Kilpatrick stated he would like to see the materials and color scheme set out. He noted conceptually the applicant's plan was very tasteful and easier to accept than the plan submitted in 2002. He expressed concern that if nothing were done to the home, it would fall into a major state of disrepair.

Ms. Sieffert clarified that the applicant would come back with more complete drawings. She stated she liked the proposed plan, but noted the definition of the original house was being lost.

She noted the changes had been integrated so beautifully that it was hard to tell the old from the new.

Mr. Dunphy agreed that was a valid concern, noting it was also an issue during the 2002 meeting, and which was one of the reasons there had been so many iterations of the plans. He stated there should be a clear distinction between the original structure and the additions. He indicated that when he looked at the proposed plans, he did not see anything that "popped out" as the original structure, particularly from the roadside elevation. He suggested the applicant ensure there was an adequate delineation between the existing structure and the new additions.

Mr. Sinclair stated he was also concerned that there were essentially only two walls of the original house remaining in the proposed plan. He stated the home was a textbook case of upright wing construction; however, there was no evidence of the wing at all, which was a significant part of the home.

Mr. Dunn referred to the proposed front roadside elevation, and stated the original house was only the two-story house, the rest was additions. He explained that six additions had been put on the home. Mr. Sinclair stated it had been very prevalent in the area to have the upright section with the wing, which would have been the original home.

Chairperson Kilpatrick asked the applicant if he had any problem with doing as Mr. Delacourt has suggested and coming back before the Commission in a month. Mr. Dunn stated he believed they could provide what the Commission wanted, noting the roofline in the front was their attempt to differentiate the original from the second-story building. He suggested the original could be sided differently from the new construction on the second story if that would be acceptable to the Commission.

Mr. Wroblewski commented that most people liked the fact that the additions did not look like additions, although he understood the difference with Mr. Dunn's house being a historical home. Ms. Sieffert stated that aesthetically, the applicant's plans looked beautiful; however, because the property was historic, the original home should be distinguished.

Mr. Dunphy suggested the original house could be differentiated by the use of color, or the size and direction of the siding.

Mr. Dziurman stated that the applicant had indicated that the "L" was not original and indicated he would like to know more about that. Mr. Dunn stated they had been in the basement, there was a basement under that portion of the house; however, the rest was all crawl space and the boarding was not the same. Mr. Dziurman asked if it was a stone basement. Mr. Dunn stated it was a stonewall basement. He stated the original basement was just crawlspace. He stated he believed the area where the heating, hot water tank and electric was located was done during another period of time. He stated it could be seen where the old front door had been located, which came in on the side.

Mr. Dziurman agreed that the "L" was added later, but thought it was probably done sometime around the turn of the century. Mr. Dunn agreed it was an addition.

Mr. Dziurman stated he agreed the applicant should try to differentiate between the old and the new. He felt the 2002 plans differentiated that more than the current plans. He stated the original house could be differentiated by changing the size of the siding just enough so that historians in the future could see the difference. He pointed out that adding the second floor in the front across the "L" changed the whole character. He wondered if that second floor could be moved to the back to keep the integrity of the original farmhouse.

Mr. Dziurman stated he would like the applicant to rethink some of the windows to keep them more in character with the rest of the house, noting it appeared that some of the shutters on the new addition on the south side abutted the corner right at the edge on the first floor. He felt the shutters should come off the corner.

Mr. Dziurman referred to the area where the sliding glass door was indicated, noting the applicant had stated he would be putting in French doors. He suggested the applicant do something different with the windows in that location. Mr. Dunn explained that was the portion of the house that had Plexiglas kitchen windows, which would be taken out.

Mr. Dziurman stated the Commission was not as concerned about the back of the structure, since it could not be seen from the road. He noted the applicant was attempting to get the fascias to line up, but suggested the applicant look at the windows.

Ms. Hill stated her major concern was the Crooks Road elevation, noting she saw fewer problems with the other three elevations. She stated the areas of significance for this property were architectural and agricultural. She noted when the architecture was lost, the house lost some of its significance. She indicated that under the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, number ten stated "new additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired".

Ms. Hill noted that the plans approved in 2002, although a massive addition to the rear of the structure, did not impair the historic structure. She stated if the applicant was going to add a second story onto the wing, it would lose the significance of the architectural point of the structure itself. She asked if there was some way to change that appearance. She stated she was somewhat concerned about the stone chimneys, noting there were brick chimneys on the existing structure. She noted the shake roof did not appear on farm properties of this type, but were more of a flat shingle. She also noted some concern about the dormers on the front, as dormers did not appear in this type of architecture. She indicated she would have less of a concern if they were not on the face of the structure.

Mr. Miller referred to the new masonry chimney and the fact the applicant had discussed having a masonry front on the exposed foundations for the new additions. He asked if the applicant intended to use natural, native rock. Mr. Dunn responded natural rock.

Mr. Miller referred to the brick chimney that was being extended and asked is that was going to be changed over to a fieldstone look. Mr. Dunn responded yes, just to match the foundation.

Mr. Miller stated he believed the original structure had wood shutters, and asked if applicant intended to replace them with vinyl shutters to match. Mr. Dunn stated the shutters would all be wood.

Mr. Miller commented that when the original farmhouse was constructed it did have a wood shake roof, which would have been the typical roofing at that time. Mr. Wroblewski stated he thought the shake shingles would help. Mr. Miller believed if the applicant looked in the attic, and if the existing roof boards were still there, they would be spaced a couple inches and he might see the original wood shake underneath. Mr. Miller suggested one way of distinguishing the original structure would be to use slight touches like that.

Mr. Dziurman suggested the applicant look at the corner board trim, which appeared to be missing, and which was typically found on these homes. Mr. Wroblewski stated they intended to put the corner board trim on the house.

Chairperson Kilpatrick reminded the Commissioners there was a motion on the floor. Mr. Dunphy stated he would like to withdraw his motion at this time. Mr. Miller concurred as seconder of the motion.

Chairperson Kilpatrick noted for the record that the motion regarding demolition had been withdrawn. He stated the applicant could bring the matter back to the Commission as soon as he had an opportunity to revise his plans and drawings based on the discussion held at this meeting. The applicant asked if it would be possible to submit plans to the Building Department to begin the permit process.

Mr. Delacourt explained that would depend on how comfortable the applicant was with his plans. He stated the applicant was allowed to submit an application to the Building Department, noting the Ordinance indicated the applicant could actually apply to the Building Department first. He explained the Historic Districts Commission and the Building Department have always agreed to allow the process to happen in either order or concurrently. He noted there were many changes and details that had to be added to the applicant's plans, but the applicant did have the option of submitting to the Building Department and being scheduled for the next HDC Meeting.

Mr. Sinclair suggested the applicant look over the moldings along the roofline, noting the applicant would be able to tell what had been added on because of the difference in the wood used. He stated the wood used in the additions was all straight planed, and on the original sections of the house, the wood was a little fancier and had a little more curve on them. He stated he also owned an old home, and indicated the original structure had both a basement and a crawl space.

Mr. Miller asked the applicant if he had any plans for the barn on his property, noting the applicant had mentioned at the 2002 meeting that there was some deterioration of the sill plate and the foundation in the rear. Mr. Dunn stated that had been coated with preservative both front and back on the sill plate.

Mr. Dziurman thanked the applicant for bringing his plans before the Commission. Mr. Wroblewski clarified the Commission would like to see plans depicting the changes to the windows, along with the changes regarding the second floor.

Chairperson Kilpatrick noted the applicant had an idea of the concerns expressed by the Commissioners. He explained until the Commission reviewed the revised plans, they could not be sure there would not be other concerns.

Ms. Hill suggested the Commissioners could identify any concerns they had with the proposed second story. Mr. Dunn stated he would try to move the second story towards the back of the building, leaving the front fascia the way it is. He thanked the Commissioners for their time.

Chairperson Kilpatrick suggested a short recess before the next Agenda item.

(Recess: 9:11 PM to 9:18 PM)

Chairperson Kilpatrick called the meeting back to order at 9:18 PM and indicated the Commission would proceed with Agenda Item 8C.

~~8C. File No. HDC 05-004 (City File #03-010)~~

~~Request: Certificate of Appropriateness
- Demolition of Additions to House
- Demolition of Garage
- Renovation of Existing House
- New Construction
Sidwell: 15-31-301-011
Address: 3861 S. Adams Road
Applicant: Mondrian Properties~~

Chairperson Kilpatrick asked the applicants to come forward to the presenter's table, and read the request for the record.

Mr. Delacourt stated that this proposed project was before the Historic Districts Commission (HDC) several years ago, and has also been before several of the City's Boards and Commissions. He explained it was a large project that was being developed under the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Ordinance, and had been through many iterations since it was presented to the HDC in 2003.

Mr. Delacourt stated the proposed project had received Final PUD approval from City Council, although they did not have Final Site Plan approval. He explained that the Final PUD approval was conditioned on the fact that any development on the historic district or renovation of the historic structure receive approval from the HDC.

Mr. Delacourt stated the applicant had submitted a sizable booklet of information regarding the historic house and the proposed development, as well as information regarding the various requests. ~~He stated Staff had discussed the best method of handling the many approvals required.~~