

~~MOTION by Dunphy, seconded by Kilpatrick, that the Minutes of the May 11, 2006 Regular Historic Districts Commission Meeting be approved as presented.~~

~~Ayes: All
Nays: None
Absent: Dziurman, Sieffert~~

MOTION CARRIED

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

- A. Heritage IX: Preservation Through Dedication and Designation (Oakland County 9th Annual Conference).
- B. Notice of a Public Hearing being held by the Historic Districts Study Committee scheduled for Thursday, June 22, 2006 regarding Wayside Park

Chairperson Hill asked if there were any other announcements or communications. No other announcements were provided.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

~~No public comments were provided.~~

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 8A. Location: 1841 Crooks Road
Sidwell: 15-20-428-003
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 explained that the applicant had submitted drawings that had been revised per the discussion held at the May 8, 2006 Historic Districts Commission meeting. She asked the applicant to come forward to the presenter's table and provide his name and address for the record.

Mr. Fred T. Dunn, stated he resides at 1104 Maple Leaf Drive, Rochester Hills, Michigan, and was also the owner of 1841 Crooks Road.

Chairperson Hill asked for a brief summary of the applicant's request and his proposed project from Mr. Delacourt.

Mr. Delacourt provided a brief history of the applicant's request, noting the Commission was aware this was Mr. Dunn's third appearance before the Commission regarding this particular request, including proposed renovations to the house and demolition of some additions that were in a current state of disrepair. He noted Mr. Dunn had had several discussions with the Commission and had made several adjustments to his plans. He stated there was discussion at

the May 11, 2006 Historic Districts Commission (HDC) meeting about whether or not the applicant should submit plans to the Building Department for review or come back to the HDC for review, and the applicant had requested he be allowed to appear before the HDC prior to submitting the applications and fees to the Building Department for review and approval. He explained Staff had not had an opportunity to review the plans submitted for this meeting as they were submitted on the day the meeting packets went to the Commissioners. He noted the applicant had worked very hard to bring his plans to a state he felt was reviewable and would meet the requirements of the Commission. He stated Staff had made an exception to the Ordinance submission requirements as the Commission had requested that Staff be as flexible as possible, and the revised plans had been included in the meeting packet along with a Memorandum explaining the situation. He noted that all prior documentation had been included with the meeting packet, along with the previous discussion regarding the proposed renovations.

Chairperson Hill referred to the sample motions included in the packet, and reminded the Commissioners that some of the plan submission dates would have to be adjusted. She explained the removal portion of the applicant's proposed project appeared on the March 3, 2006 plans; however, any motion regarding the rehabilitation should also include a reference to the June 2, 2006 concept elevations.

Chairperson Hill then asked the applicant to provide a review of the changes he had made to his plans for his proposed project.

Mr. Dunn stated that if his project was approved, and if the Commission so requested, he would submit full-sized plans of the approved project. Chairperson Hill stated she not believe that would be necessary, unless the Building Department's review required some changes that would require the Commission's approval. She noted that any approval by the Commission would be contingent upon Building Department approval.

Mr. Dunn pointed out the windows on the front and side elevations that were all original, some of which had some rotten framing. He stated he would repair, when possible, all the street side and driveway side windows. He indicated that if the windows could not be repaired, he would use a thermo-pane window made by Marvin Windows. He showed the Commissioners an example of the proposed replacement window, and stated the company would thermo-pane the windows and glue the mullions to the side wood on both sides, which would be appropriately painted or stained to match the outside and inside of the home. He explained if it were possible, he would take some of the windows from the back area, and replace the windows in the back. He referred to some windows in an addition added by a previous owner that were not new, but were older, and stated he would reuse them so they matched and looked nicer.

Mr. Dunn stated he and his wife might want to change the paint color from what he had previously proposed. He indicated that as they began demolition, they would take a piece of the siding to Sherwin Williams because Sherwin Williams had told him they might be able to determine the original color of the house. If they can do that, he would like to match that color and would come back to the HDC for approval of the new color. He stated if Sherwin Williams could not provide the original paint color, they would use the historic grey/green color.

Mr. Miller asked if when Mr. Dunn referred to the original color, he meant the first color or stain put on the siding. Mr. Dunn indicated that was correct, whatever color had first been put on the home.

Mr. Dunn stated he would be using dimensional black asphalt shingles, and noted no original shingles were left on the home. He thought the original might have been a slate roof, but could not prove that, so he would use the black asphalt shingles.

Chairperson Hill called for any comments or questions from the Commissioners.

Mr. Dunphy asked what was different on the June 2, 2006 plans as compared to the plans reviewed by the Commission at the prior meetings. He noted the Commissioners had discussed issues regarding the lines of the building, rooflines and other items.

Mr. Dunn described the changes in the rooflines, including the area of the porch covered by a roof, which had been changed from a double-arched roof joined to the front roof, and was now totally broken off and sat behind the first story and restored the covered porch back with its setback. He thought the setback and the differentiation between the new second story and the old first story were the biggest issues discussed by the Commission.

Mr. Dunphy asked if there had been a change in the roofline directly behind the two-story portion of the original structure. Mr. Dunn stated they had put the original room back on, and rather than joining the roofline continuously due to concerns about the drainage, he had put the crick in and a straight line roof, and started a new roofline for the new area.

Mr. Miller referred to the back slope of the wing portion of the original structure, and asked for clarification of where the new two-story addition would be constructed. Chairperson Hill stated that the new structure actually started totally behind the gable. She noted the plans depicted a fine line running down through the wing roof, and the piece of the roofline that would allow for drainage. Mr. Dunn noted that particular roofline would not be visible.

Mr. Dunphy stated he felt the applicant had addressed the concerns the Commission had at the last meeting, and he thought Mr. Dunn would have a good project. He informed the applicant the Commission appreciated Mr. Dunn's willingness to go through this process.

Chairperson Hill reminded the Commissioners that two motions would be required: one for the removal of existing portions of the structure, and one for rehabilitation and addition to the home.

Mr. Miller stated he would like to propose a motion approving the rehabilitation and addition to the home. He noted the applicant had discussed the fact he may want to change the color of the paint, and had not provided a paint name or number, and suggested the motion include the color "historic grey/green" with the understanding the applicant would provide the exact name and color number, or if the color changed, the applicant would return to the HDC with a different color name and number should he discover the original color of the home.

Chairperson Hill suggested that Condition #2 could be worded to state: All exterior trim and shutters will be painted a historical color of cream, name and paint shade to be provided.

Mr. Dunphy noted that Conditions #1 and #3 required some additional information, as well as some of the conditions that referred to the addition.

Chairperson Hill suggested the Commission complete the conditions regarding the rehabilitation first. She referred to Condition #6, and noted that some additional language should be included to clarify which windows were being repaired and restored. She stated that Condition #6 could be worded as follows:

6. The windows on the north facade of the upright and the west facade of the upright and wing of the original historic home will be repaired and restored, if possible. All other windows will be replaced with Marvin thermo-pane simulated divided light windows (per the sample shown to the Commission on June 8, 2006).

Mr. Dunn referred to the statement about the widows on the north and west side, noting that a previous owner had installed Plexiglas in the kitchen area, and had also installed Plexiglas on the south side. He stated he did not want to keep the Plexiglas windows.

Mr. Sinclair asked if either the north facade or the west facade were included in the area proposed for demolition. Mr. Dunn pointed out the area with a roof that was being used as a doorway, which would be taken off. He noted a portion of the original first floor set back, which was where the big piece of Plexiglas had been installed.

Chairperson Hill suggested that the relevant conditions be revised to include "all work performed on the existing resource will be consistent with plans dated March 3, 2006, and elevations dated June 2, 2006".

Chairperson Hill suggested the Commission review the proposed conditions regarding the additions portion of the project. She noted Conditions #1 and #2 regarding the paint color should include language stating that the paint color would be finalized by the applicant regarding the actual paint scheme and number.

Mr. Miller asked how much of the driveway would remain asphalt. Chairperson Hill asked the applicant if he intended to pave just the portion in front of the new proposed garage. Mr. Dunn responded yes. Chairperson Hill clarified the paved portion would be considered the apron, and suggested that Condition #12 would read:

12. The driveway will remain a gravel surface except for the concrete apron portion in front of the new garage.

Chairperson Hill noted that Condition #13 should include the language "plans dated March 3, 2006, and elevations dated June 2, 2006".

Mr. Miller noted that Condition #16 relating to the "General Conditions" should also reflect "plans dated March 3, 2006 and elevations dated June 2, 2006". Chairperson Hill agreed both dates would apply to that condition.

Mr. Dunphy asked for clarification on the wording for the conditions regarding the paint to be used on the resource. Chairperson Hill stated the conditions would read"

"...which will be painted a historical color of grey/green (paint name and number to be provided by the applicant); or the applicant will demonstrate to Planning Department Staff, after professional paint sample testing, the original paint color of the structure, and request Staff's approval to paint the structure in a similar color (paint name and number to be provided by the applicant). If the color is changed due to the test results, and Staff believes it is not in keeping with the historic structure, the applicant will return to the Historic Districts Commission for approval of a revised color".

Mr. Miller stated he would be comfortable with Staff making the determination, and requested the Commission be advised of the test results. Mr. Delacourt stated he would provide that information to the Commission.

Chairperson Hill referred to proposed Condition #14, and suggested that language be added stating that the approval was contingent upon the administrative review of the Building Department. Mr. Delacourt suggested the condition be modified as follows: "If the Building Department requests any alterations or changes, the modified work will be submitted for additional approval of the Historic Districts Commission". He explained due to the amount of work, he would not want to see the plans altered substantially from what the Commission had approved. Chairperson Hill agreed if the Building Department did not approve the plans, any recommended changes should come back before the Commission. Mr. Miller pointed out that would only pertain to changes made to the exterior of the resource.

Chairperson Hill stated Mr. Miller had proposed a motion, and called for a second to the proposed motion. Mr. Dunphy stated he would second the proposed motion as discussed and amended.

Chairperson Hill then called for any additional discussion regarding the proposed motion on the floor. Upon hearing none, she called for a vote of the Commissioners.

Complete Motion Regarding Rehabilitation and Addition (as voted):

MOTION by Miller, seconded by Dunphy, in the matter of File No. HDC 99-011, the request for rehabilitation of, and the addition to, the home located at 1841 Crooks Road, that the Historic Districts Commission **APPROVES** the work for Fred Dunn, 1841 Crooks Road (Parcel Identification Number 15-20-428-003), with the following Findings and Conditions:

Findings:

1. The subject site is a locally designated noncontiguous Historic District located within the City of Rochester Hills.
2. The plans for the additions appear to be compatible in mass, height, scale and design features with the existing structure.
3. The additions and rehabilitation will not have a detrimental effect on the existing resource or the surrounding area.
4. The proposed design, texture and materials of the additions and rehabilitation are compatible with the existing structure.
5. The proposed additions and rehabilitation of the existing resource do not appear to lessen the historic integrity of the resource.
6. The proposed additions and rehabilitation are in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standard for Rehabilitation and Guidelines.

Conditions (Related to Rehabilitation of Existing Resource):

1. The applicant will repair and replace, where necessary, the existing wood clapboard siding using 1/2" cedar wood horizontal siding, which will be painted a historical color of grey/green (paint name and number to be provided by the applicant); or the applicant will demonstrate to Planning Department Staff, after professional paint sample testing, the original paint color of the structure, and request Staff's approval to paint the structure in a similar color (paint name and number to be provided by the applicant). If the color is changed due to the test results, and Staff believes it is not in keeping with the historic structure, the applicant will return to the Historic Districts Commission for approval of a revised color.
2. All exterior trim and shutters will be painted a historical color of cream (the name and number of the paint shade to be provided by the applicant). The applicant may request a color change via the same process stipulated in Condition Number 1 above, and may be required by Staff to return to the Historic Districts Commission for approval of a revised color.
3. All shingles will be dimensional, black asphalt shingles.
4. The existing chimney located on the south side of the home will be extended and renovated as a stone masonry chimney.
5. A new masonry chimney will be constructed on the north side of the existing structure, and on the south side of the southeastern addition.

6. The windows on the north facade of the upright and the west facade of the upright and wing of the existing historic home will be repaired and restored, if possible. All other windows will be replaced with Marvin thermo-pane simulated divided light windows (per the sample shown the Commission on June 8, 2006).
7. Work related to the foundation of the resource will be limited to the area indicated on the plans dated received by the Planning Department March 3, 2006.
8. All work performed on the existing resource will be consistent with plans and elevations dated received by the Planning Department June 2, 2006. .

Conditions (Related to Additions):

9. The siding material will be 1/2" cedar wood horizontal siding, which will be painted a historical color of grey/green (paint name and number to be provided by the applicant); or the applicant will demonstrate to Planning Department Staff, after professional paint sample testing, the original paint color of the structure, and request Staff's approval to paint the structure in a similar color (paint name and number to be provided by the applicant). If the color is changed due to the test results, and Staff believes it is not in keeping with the historic structure, the applicant will return to the Historic Districts Commission for approval of a revised color.
10. The exterior trim and shutters will be painted a historical color of cream (the name and number of the paint shade to be provided by the applicant). The applicant may request a color change via the same process stipulated in Condition Number 9 above, and may be required by Staff to return to the Historic Districts Commission for approval of a revised color.
11. The shingles will be dimensional, black asphalt shingles.
12. The driveway will remain a gravel surface except for the concrete apron portion in front of the new garage.
13. All work related to the additions to the historic resource be consistent with the plans and elevations dated received by the Planning Department dated June 2, 2006.

Conditions (General):

14. All work proposed for the subject site shall receive all appropriate Building Department permits prior to any work (removal or construction) being performed. If the Building Department requests any alterations or changes, the modified work will be submitted for additional approval of the Historic Districts Commission.

15. No work is being requested or approved regarding the barn or any other outbuildings or site features on the property at this time.
16. Any work, other than what is indicated on the plans dated received by the Planning Department March 3, 2006 and elevations dated received June 2, 2006 by the Planning Department will require additional review and approval by the City's Historic Districts Commission.

Ayes: All
Nays: None
Absent: Dziurman, Sieffert

MOTION CARRIED

Chairperson Hill stated for the record that the motion had carried unanimously. She noted the Commission should then consider a motion regarding the removal of portions of the existing resource.

Mr. Kilpatrick stated he would move a motion approving the removal of portions of the historic resource. Mr. Dunphy stated he would second the motion.

Chairperson Hill stated that a motion to approve the removal of certain portions of the existing resource had been made by Mr. Kilpatrick, seconded by Mr. Dunphy. She then called for any comments or changes to the proposed motion on the floor.

Mr. Kilpatrick clarified that Finding #2 would read that the "portions of the resource will not have a negative impact"; that Finding #3 would reflect that the "portions to be removed are recent and inappropriate" and "have no historic significance"; and that Finding #4 would reflect that "portions of the home to be removed are in a state of disrepair/deterioration". Mr. Dunphy agreed that Findings #2, #3 and #4 should read as Mr. Kilpatrick indicated.

Chairperson Hill stated that the reference to the "plans dated received by the Planning Department March 3, 2006" in Condition #2 correctly reflected the plans to be reviewed for the removal. She then called for further discussion regarding the proposed motion on the floor. Upon hearing none, she called for a vote of the Commissioners.

Complete Motion Regarding Removal of Additions (as voted):

MOTION by Kilpatrick, seconded by Dunphy, in the matter of File No. HDC 99-011, the request for removal of portions of the home located at 1841 Crooks Road, that the Historic Districts Commission **APPROVES** the work for Fred Dunn, 1841 Crooks Road (Parcel Identification Number 15-20-428-003), with the following Findings and Conditions:

Findings:

1. The subject site is a locally designated noncontiguous Historic District located within the City of Rochester Hills.

2. The removal of the indicated portions of the resource will not have a negative impact to the historic integrity of the home.
3. The majority of the portions to be removed are recent and inappropriate additions, were done without permits or approvals, and have no historic significance.
4. The portions of the home to be removed are in a state of disrepair/deterioration and maintaining them would not be advantageous to the complete rehabilitation of the resource.

Conditions:

1. The portions of the historic resource to be removed are limited only to:
 - the west facade (southern-most wing)
 - the south facade (window west of the chimney)
 - the east facade (enclosed porch)
 - the north facade (gas meter)
 - the northeastern single-story portion of structure (located at the rear of the 2-story upright portion)
 - the exterior wooden stairs to the second story
 - the brick patio (northeast side of structure)
 - the wood deck (northeast side of structure)

all as indicated by the plans dated received by the Planning Department March 3, 2006.

2. Prior to removal of any portions of the resource, the applicant will obtain all appropriate permits and approval of the proposed work plans from the City's Building Department.

Ayes: All
Nays: None
Absent: Dziurman, Sieffert

MOTION CARRIED

Chairperson Hill stated for the record that motion had carried unanimously. Mr. Dunn thanked the Commission for their consideration of his project.

~~NEW BUSINESS~~

~~9A. Historic Districts Commission By-Laws:~~

~~Chairperson Hill stated that the Commissioners had previously reviewed some suggested changes to the Commission's By-Laws; however, after some further review by the City Attorney Staran, additional revisions had been provided to the Commission.~~