

~~Upon hearing no comments or corrections, Chairperson Hill called for a motion to approve.~~

MOTION by Sieffert, seconded by Thompson, that the Minutes of the April 3, 2006 Rescheduled Regular Historic Districts Commission Meeting be approved as presented.

Ayes: All
Nays: None
Absent: Dziurman, Miller

MOTION CARRIED

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

A. The Rochester Era, May/June 2006 Edition.

Chairperson Hill asked if there were any other announcements or communications.

Mr. Dunphy referred to the June 17, 2006 move date for the Rochester Elevator and noted that the date had been changed due to some issues with the closing date and some occupancy issues with the current owner. He stated it did not appear that Mr. Smith would be out of the building until June 10, 2006, and there were several weeks worth of work that needed to be completed before the movers could begin. He indicated at this time it appeared the move would occur sometime in mid-August to mid-September before the elevator could be moved.

Mr. Thompson asked if The History Channel was still interested in filming the move. Mr. Dunphy stated the change in date might affect the production schedule, although discussions were ongoing, and he did not know how it would affect their need to have the segment completed and delivered to air on a certain date. He stated that the production company was currently in negotiations regarding the renewal of their contract for another season; however, the elevator move was a project they had proposed as an event they would cover.

Chairperson Hill called for any other announcements. No additional announcements were provided.

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS

~~No public comments were provided.~~

8. OLD BUSINESS

8A. Location: 1841 Crooks Road
HDC File: HDC 99-011
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness – Removal of Additions
Certificate of Appropriateness – New Additions; Attached Garage
Owner: Fred T. Dunn

Chairperson Hill informed the Commission that the applicant, Mr. Dunn, had agreed to meet with Mr. Dziurman, Ms. Hill and Mr. Delacourt on

draft

Wednesday, May 10, 2006, to discuss his proposed plans that had been submitted for this meeting. She stated they had reviewed the Commission's desire for Mr. Dunn to retain the upright and wing structure and form, which had not been accomplished with the submittal documents. She indicated that Mr. Dziurman had explained the form concept to Mr. Dunn and had mentioned some alternatives. Mr. Dunn had discussed several alternatives to his proposed plans, but noted he wanted to proceed with the current plan if possible.

Chairperson Hill stated that as a result of the May 10, 2006 meeting, Mr. Dunn had submitted some concept drawings to Mr. Delacourt, which were provided to the Commission at this meeting. She suggested that if Mr. Dunn was not able to provide full-scale drawings, the Commission could still hold an informal discussion about the concept drawings, and provide Mr. Dunn with some feedback.

Mr. Dunphy noted the concept drawings were small in size, but thought the concept drawings were closer to the mark than the submittal documents included with the packet. He stated he did not think the submittal documents included in the packet had addressed the concerns noted by the Commission at the last meeting. He indicated the concept drawings appeared to address the issue of the back addition which had been set back and separated more, and the addition on the side had also been set back and had more of a visual separation. He stated those were two concerns he had noted when reviewing the submittal documents included in the packet.

Chairperson Hill noted for the record that the applicant arrived at 7:46 PM, and informed him that the Commission had been discussing the meeting held on May 10, 2006 regarding his proposed plans, and the submission of his conceptual drawings. Mr. Delacourt suggested Mr. Dunn review his changes and what he was trying to accomplish.

Mr. Fred T. Dunn, 1104 Maple Leaf Drive, Rochester Hills, the property owner, stated that after the meeting yesterday, he better understood the changes the Commission had discussed at the previous meetings. He stated his architect had revised the plans, which had been submitted for this meeting.

Mr. Dunn stated he had removed the additional roof on the front area, and went back to the existing, with the exception that they had matched the roofline. He explained that the roofline had varied due to the additions put on by the previous owner. He indicated there was an existing hole in the old section of the house that had not been filled in and had been taken over by raccoons.

Mr. Dunn stated that addition started at the corner and was only in one area, with the exception of the garage, which was in front. He indicated it would be the current footprint, with a small exception of a foot or so, but nothing substantial.

Mr. Dunn stated that all the windows would remain provided they were not rotted to the point of not being salvageable. He stated he talked to Marvin Windows and was informed that Marvin Windows could match the windows exactly. He indicated they would match the windows that were currently in the existing historic home across the side, and the noted the new windows would go in the back.

Mr. Dunn stated that the door in the back would come out because the roofline where a previous owner had built an apartment would come off and be replaced with standard windows. He stated he would try to keep the same theme with the doors and in any additional windows, noting the area where a previous owner had installed Plexiglas solid open 4 x 4 windows.

Mr. Dunn stated he would be putting shutters on all the windows of the house, noting shutters were there originally on some of the windows. He stated that none of the upstairs windows had shutters; however, he would put shutters on those windows.

Mr. Dunn stated he still wanted to tear off the additions put on by a previous owner because those additions only had wood foundations, which had rotted. He noted most of the additions were leaning off of the house because they were so rotted, and there was no stone or block foundations. He indicated he would use a stone foundation for his additions.

Ms. Sieffert referred to the front elevation and noted it appeared as if the chimney was behind the window and asked for some clarification on the drawing. Mr. Dunn described the location of the porch, noting the larger drawings would depict that area better. He explained the location of a door out of the library, the door out of the kitchen, and the location of the porch. He stated it was recessed back because that was the current location of the basement door. He noted the basement was accessed from outside the house. Chairperson Hill asked if it was a Michigan basement. Mr. Dunn responded it was. Chairperson Hill commented that the upper story created the porch roof area, and noted the fireplace was on the back wall of the porch area.

Mr. Dunphy stated he originally had some concerns about the drawings submitted with the packet, but was happy to see the changes that had been made. He explained that the new drawings addressed two concerns with the previous design, which were the separation of the original farmhouse from the addition behind it, which was the roofline issue discussed by the applicant, and the separation of the addition on the right-hand side from the front elevation visually from the original structure, which had been done by setting it back. He thought the concept drawings were much closer to what the Commission wanted to see, and thanked the applicant for bringing in the revised plans. Mr. Dunn stated he had misunderstood the previous comments of the Commissions, noting he thought the differentiation would be shown by the use of the building products.

Chairperson Hill referred to the wing portion of the structure, and asked if the roof on the backside of the wing ran from end to end. She pointed out the wing roof on the existing house, and asked if the roof spread across the whole back of the wing, or was a smaller portion that hooked into the wing. Mr. Dunn explained it was wider at the back and became proportionally smaller as it came forward, which was to drain the snow and water. He noted it would not be seen from the front of the home. Chairperson Hill asked if it went edge to edge of the original gable. Mr. Dunn explained it followed a line shown on the plans and was only there for water runoff.

Chairperson Hill referred to the upright, and asked if the addition went into the upright roof. Mr. Dunn stated it partially hit it, but did not hit the whole

thing. Chairperson Hill asked if it was forming another gable roof. Mr. Dunn responded no and described the location of the existing home and the location where the gable would meet the portion of the gable over the old home.

Chairperson Hill asked if that was attic space and if it was necessary to tie the new addition second story roofline into the ell. Mr. Dunn responded yes from the standpoint that it would be a dead drop zone and there would not be any way to get rid of the water and snow. Chairperson Hill stated she had a similar situation with her house and garage, and there was a gutter trough that area. She noted it gave appearance that the facade hooked into the upright, although she was not sure if that had to be done in that manner.

Chairperson Hill referred to the north facade of the upright, where the new chimney was being put in, and asked if any of those windows were being moved. Mr. Dunn stated they were not, rather he had moved the chimney. Chairperson Hill verified that the windows would be maintained in that location. Mr. Dunn indicated they would.

Chairperson Hill referred to the plans depicting the front facade, and asked Mr. Dunn if he was interested in putting in a couple small windows under the eaves. Mr. Dunn stated he had considered that, but thought the Commission did not want windows in that location. Chairperson Hill stated the Commission did not want dormers in that location, but she thought that was a huge expense and she did not think it would be detrimental to the overall look to have small windows. Mr. Dunn stated he could put in some windows, noting the entire window would not be seen, and windows would provide more light to the upstairs of the home. Chairperson Hill stated the applicant did not need to put in the same number of windows as were on the lower level, but two or three spaced across might work and would break up the long wall.

Chairperson Hill stated that the concept drawings appeared to retain the original resource, although she wondered whether there was anything that could be changed where the upper roof hooked in to the upright. Mr. Dunphy added if there were anything that could be done to separate the roof of the original two-story from the rest of the house visually, and still maintain the applicant's need for water runoff, he would like to see that happen. He pointed out that the house also had to work from an engineering standpoint. Mr. Dunn indicated he would look at that area again to see if anything could be done.

Chairperson Hill stated she did not believe the Commission had any problem with the removal of the additions. She thought the concept drawings left the original resource about Ninety (90%) Percent intact.

Mr. Sinclair stated he thought the concept drawings did a great job of retaining the original house. He thought the additions of windows along the second story would add additional depth to the feature.

Chairperson Hill stated the Commission would prefer to see the actual drawings before giving approval. Mr. Delacourt stated the applicant could revise his plans and submit the drawings to the Commission for the next meeting. He understood that Mr. Dunn would like to get his building permits and get the project started.

Chairperson Hill noted the project still had to be approved by the Building Department, and suggested the revised plans could be submitted to the Building Department for review and if the Building Department review was completed at the time the applicant came back to the HDC, he would be ready to proceed. Mr. Delacourt noted the building permit review would take about a month; therefore, if the applicant updated his plans and submitted his architectural plans to the Building Department to start the permit review, and finalized the drawings for the Commission, the review would run concurrently.

Ms. Sieffert asked if the demolition process could be handled by the Commission at this time. Mr. Delacourt stated it would not be necessary at this time. Chairperson Hill pointed out that nothing would happen until the final approval was received. She stated if the Building Department could begin their review, the applicant would not have a long delay after he received the Commission's approval. Mr. Delacourt noted the applicant could submit his request for demolition to the Building Department, which also required a review. He pointed out the demolition could not be executed until the applicant received the approval from the Commission. He stated he would work with the applicant to coordinate those matters.

Mr. Dunn asked what was required on the final drawings in terms of paint, replacement windows, etc. He asked if a brand name would be sufficient. Mr. Delacourt stated that exact information would be better. Chairperson Hill stated the Commission would appreciate it if the applicant could bring in color swatches or brochures, because it gave them a clear idea of what he intended to use. Mr. Delacourt suggested the applicant meet with him and he would provide Mr. Dunn with an example of what could be labeled on the drawings. He stated the more exact the detail, the easier and less problematic it would be when the work was done. Chairperson Hill agreed that some items could be called out on the drawings, rather than the applicant bringing in samples.

Chairperson Hill asked the applicant if he had any further questions. Mr. Dunn stated he would revise his plans and could probably submit them in two weeks. The Commission thanked Mr. Dunn for discussing his proposed renovations with them.

~~9. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS~~

- ~~9A. Draft Ordinance Amendment
- Revisions requested by SHPO re CLG Certification~~

~~Chairperson Hill stated the Commission had previously discussed the Certified Local Government (CLG) process, and wanted to finish up some of the items that were necessary to complete the application. She noted the Commissioners had received a draft Ordinance Amendment prepared by the City Attorney.~~

~~Mr. Delacourt stated there had been much discussion about the CLG Certification. He stated the proposed Ordinance Amendment had also been sent to the State Historic Preservation Office~~