

~~MOTION by Sieffert, seconded by Dunphy, that the Minutes of the February 9, 2006 Regular Historic Districts Commission Meeting be approved as corrected.~~

~~Ayes: All  
Nays: None  
Absent: Cozzolino, Dziurman, Kilpatrick~~

~~**MOTION CARRIED**~~

**6. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS**

- A. *The Rochester Era* (March/April 2006 Edition)
- B. Memorandum regarding 2006 Earl Borden Awards
- C. Memorandum regarding 1470 W. Tienken (HDC File 98-010)

Chairperson Hill noted the above items had been received by the Commission, and asked if there were any other announcements or communications.

Ms. Sieffert stated the City of Rochester was celebrating Founder's Day over the March 17-19, 2006 weekend, including a presentation at the library regarding "Lost Rochester".

Chairperson Hill reminded the Commission that the Michigan Historic Preservation Network would be holding its annual conference April 20-22, 2006 in Saginaw, and additional was information available on the Network's website.

Chairperson Hill thanked the Commissioners for their complimentary comments made during the November 10, 2005 meeting. She stated she wanted to take the opportunity to thank Micheal Kilpatrick for doing such a nice job as Chairperson of the Commission over the past eight years.

Chairperson Hill asked if the Commissioners had any other announcements or communications. ~~None were provided.~~

**7. UNFINISHED BUISNESS**

**7A. 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

*Cl. 8  
M. Hill  
4/14/06*

Chairperson Hill asked the applicant to come forward to the presenter's table. She read the request for the record, and asked the applicant to provide his name and address for the record.

Mr. Fred T. Dunn, 1104 Maple Leaf Drive, Rochester Hills, the property owner was present, along with Architect Bill Wroblewski, of Candy Construction, LLC, 24154 Penn Street, Dearborn, Michigan 48124.

Chairperson Hill asked Mr. Delacourt if he had any comments regarding the work being proposed by Mr. Dunn.

Mr. Delacourt stated Mr. Dunn had appeared before the Commission at the February 9, 2006 meeting, and was requesting approval to renovate the structure located at 1841 Crooks Road, commonly referred to as the O'Neill Pottery house, noting the current condition of the existing structure. He indicated that Mr. Dunn had submitted some information and elevations for the building at the last meeting, and during the discussion at that meeting, a series of recommendations were made regarding potential changes and additional information had been requested. He stated Mr. Dunn had provided some additional information and revised elevations in an attempt to address the concerns posed by the Commission at the February 9, 2006 meeting.

Mr. Dunn stated he thought one of the main concerns of the Commission was the front elevation of the structure, including concern about the roof area being taken off the front. He explained on the prior plans, the front second story had been moved to the front of the house and had taken the roof off but kept the porch. He indicated in the current plans, the whole upper area was moved back about five feet to differentiate it from the existing old house, and left the roof where it was across the front.

Mr. Dunn stated he had previously included dormers in the prior plan, but had removed them in the current plan because they looked too massive. He noted the windows had been relocated because the Commission had portrayed a sense the windows were imbalanced, particularly the fifth window over from the left hand side. He stated that had been balanced with a window up and down, and he had moved the stairwell back on the inside to provide room for two windows.

Mr. Dunn stated the side elevations included the correct doors. He commented that French windows had been included above the doors. He thought the windows would provide additional light to the inside of the house, but was not sure the Commission would approve them.

Mr. Dunn stated they had changed the roofline because the Commission had indicated that there was not enough differentiation between the original house and the new additions. He explained the roofline that covered the porch line was all one from a central beam at the center. He stated that anyone looking at the house would be able to tell it was not an original roof.

Mr. Dunn referred to the rear elevations and stated at the last meeting the Commission had commented they did not like the siding up through the gable area of the roofline. He explained the major change in the current plan was that the siding had been removed, and that area would be matched with the trim paint color and then cedar would be used in those areas rather than siding.

Mr. Dunn stated there had been a question about whether the chimneys were stone or brick. He indicated the chimney that was originally on the side of the house was stone but had fallen down and been repaired with brick. He stated the brick chimney in the center of the house was never there until a heating system had been installed, and it was installed as a vent for the boiler system. He indicated he had moved that chimney from the center to the outside wall.

Mr. Dunn stated he thought the stone chimneys would balance the house with the stone in the foundation. He noted if the Commission required that the chimneys be brick, he would install them as brick.

Chairperson Hill called for discussion by the Commissioners, noting there would be several motions for the Commission to consider, i.e., removal of portions of the existing structure, and for approval to rehabilitate and add on to the home.

Mr. Miller stated he was impressed with the amount of work the applicant had done to meet the requests of the Commission. He noted he personally was not aware of whether the original chimneys were stone or brick, although he understood that the original chimneys had been lost. He suggested the applicant might find evidence when the roof was torn off, but that would be after the fact. He commented on the work done by the applicant with respect to the second floor and his efforts to differentiate the new construction. He referred to the Tudor-looking gable end on the new construction, which was different from the prior plans, and stated he did not recall the Commission requesting that, noting it was probably a matter of personal taste.

Mr. Dunn referred to the chimney that was on the fireplace that was currently shown on the lower view of the front elevation, and stated he had gone down in the crawl space to see its original foundation. He indicated it was stone below ground level, and was stone up to the floor level; however, he believed whoever bricked it up, bricked it around the floor joists. He explained when they had tried to level the house, they could not pick up that side without picking up the chimney and were afraid it would fall over. He noted that portion of the house was still not level, because the bricks had been wrapped around the frame.

Ms. Sieffert suggested the Commission could consider the demolition requests. Chairperson Hill stated she would like the Commission to discuss the entire project as a whole to avoid removal of something if the rest of the project was not approved.

Ms. Sieffert commented that she did not feel the Commission was as concerned about the look of the back or sides of the house, but was more concerned with what the passerby saw and related to as actual history. She noted the applicant's aesthetics were supremely nice, but stated she was hung up on the front of the house. She pointed out that the look of the upright and wing should be retained because it was the traditional farmhouse style in Michigan. She stated the applicant's plan gave the appearance that the front porch had been extended across the front of the home and asked whether it was integrated too much into the original house. She felt the aesthetics were very appealing, but was hung up by the fact that the roof went all the way across and obscured the original wing. She was not as concerned about the brick chimneys or the stonework.

Mr. Dunn stated it was not clear on his drawing, but pointed out an area in the front that was recessed back into the house, and noted the roof had always carried over. He indicated the room that was currently falling off the house made up part of the roofline. He stated the porch would still be the porch because it was recessed back into the home about six feet. Mr. Wroblewski stated it was actually the same front.

Ms. Sieffert asked if the roof had been extended. Mr. Dunn responded that the roof went across the front. Mr. Wroblewski stated it would actually appear to be connected.

Mr. Sinclair agreed the applicant had done a beautiful job with his plans, but was also concerned that after construction the end of the house would be lost. He suggested perhaps the roof could stop where the original house stopped, or could be set back a foot to create the corner of the original house.

Mr. Dunn stated that portion of the house was the piece that was falling off and currently had an angled, gabled roof. Mr. Sinclair stated it was set back from the front and was not completely straight across. He questioned whether it could be set back a bit to retain the roofline to depict the original and differentiate the addition.

Mr. Dunn discussed an option of coming straight down and cutting the corner, eliminating the roof from that section. He noted he would lose about four feet downstairs in that room, which was going to be the library.

Mr. Miller stated the concern was that the wing was only a story or a story and a half, and that visual was being lost because of the addition on the second floor. He was not sure how the applicant could retain the original wing with the proposed two-story addition. Mr. Dunn reviewed some proposed changes, including removing the roof from the existing wing area. Mr. Miller agreed that would mirror the existing addition more closely, although he was not sure the side addition was what the Commission wanted to see preserved.

Mr. Thompson thanked the applicant for coming back with such detailed plans. He stated he would be more comfortable with Mr. Dunn's suggestion of revising the plan to come straight down in that section.

Mr. Dunphy felt the applicant was more close to the mark with the current proposed plan, and applauded the applicant's efforts and willingness to accommodate the Commission. He asked for clarification on whether the applicant was attempting to separate the old structure from the new structure through the use of different paint colors. Mr. Wroblewski stated that was not their intent. He explained that the historic cream color noted in the plans applied to the trim, and the gray/green would be the body of the house.

Chairperson Hill commented that while the applicant had designed a lovely looking house, she was concerned from the standpoint that the survey had indicated the property was significant for architecture and agricultural. She indicated it was one of the last upright and wing houses in the community. She stated that according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, additions should be undertaken in such a manner that if the additions were removed in the future, the integrity of the original resource would remain. She felt that would be difficult with the applicant's proposal.

Chairperson Hill noted the applicant was retaining the upright front facade and the facade of the wing, but not much else of the original structure was being retained. She agreed the Commission was less concerned about how additions to a resource may appear on the rear side of a structure;

however, the Commission was concerned about the integrity of whole resource. She pointed out on the northern side of the upright, none of the existing windows were being retained. She noted according the applicant's drawings, it appeared the new fireplace chimney fell exactly where the existing windows were. Mr. Wroblewski agreed that in order to get the fireplace in, the windows were moved a little bit. He explained he attempted to keep the look of the original windows, but due to the layout of the room, very few of the original windows could be retained. He stated in order to get the windows to correspond with the new second floor layout, the windows had been moved around.

Chairperson Hill stated on the south facade there used to be a window to the left of the existing fireplace, but the room was coming up to the fireplace area, so that wall and window were disappearing. She noted the existing window to the right was also replaced with something else. Mr. Dunn thought that was the area where the Plexiglas windows were. He explained the previous owner had torn out the back wall, framed in the room and installed Plexiglas.

Chairperson Hill stated she believed the existing window to the right of the chimney was a 4/4 double-hung window. Mr. Dunn stated that existing window would remain. Mr. Wroblewski agreed that window would remain, and the plans would have to be corrected.

Chairperson Hill was also concerned about putting a second story over the wing portion of the structure because it totally changed the structure. She did not feel that portion could be removed leaving a semblance of the original. She stated that was the same situation with the northern wall. She saw very little of the original structure being retained. She stated that although the proposal was for a very lovely home, the Commission was charged with maintaining the integrity of a historic resource.

Mr. Miller agreed with the idea that the front facade of the house should remain as distinguishable as possible. He stated that from a contractor's background, by leaving the original first floor and removing the roof, it could be changed back to the original. He explained that essentially on the front facade what was being done was adding above, which changed the original roofline completely. He stated that from the look of the front elevations, if the plans did not contain the bold black lines, it would be difficult to see the original house. He asked if the applicant was allowed to add any additions, and agreed the applicant was losing windows because he was extending walls outward, and/or removing the existing additions. He understood that on the rear, the sunroom was not appropriate and did not have any redeeming historical features.

Chairperson Hill agreed that the portions the applicant wanted to remove did not appear to be a problem. She pointed out that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards did not talk about "replaced" but talked about "not being impaired". She stated that did not mean that the front wall was retained, but the rest of the structure was reconstructed or reproduced, pointing out that once something was gone, it was gone for good. She was concerned that all the windows on the north facade on the upright were being relocated, causing the house to lose its integrity. She indicated the front facade was primarily there, but the second story structure was being placed over the wing.

Chairperson Hill referred to the plans the applicant brought before the Commission in 2003. She noted those plans contained a much larger addition; however, those plans retained Ninety (90%) Percent of the original resource by adding to the rear of the house. She stated in those plans, the applicant had not taken an existing foundation and structure and attempted to remake it into something else. She did not believe the Commission would be acting in good faith as far as retaining the historic integrity of the structure. She felt the proposed plan would bring the house close to being delisted due a loss of integrity, because the architecture was the reason it was an important resource.

Mr. Dunn noted that his 2003 plans did include a second story, which was also set back four feet. Mr. Wroblewski asked if that particular parameter had been addressed at the prior meeting, noting that requirement sounded new to him. He thought they just needed to differentiate the old from the new, noting he had not previously heard the comment about being able to remove the new addition.

Chairperson Hill stated she had attempted to clarify at the last meeting that it was not just a matter of recessing five feet, but that the applicant was adding a second story over the wing versus moving the addition back to the rear. She pointed out that the ell came out, but behind it was a lot of other house, which had the second story.

Chairperson Hill stated she would like everyone to understand the difference between the 2003 proposed plans and the current proposed plans. She reviewed the 2003 proposed plans with the applicant, discussing the location of the proposed addition and the portion of the original resource that was retained.

Ms. Sieffert noted that the wing had horizontal boards on the front, and although she was not sure how it would appear aesthetically, suggested in that portion and the upper portion, the applicant use vertical boards, which would visually differentiate the sections. She thought that might fulfill the Commission's requirements.

Chairperson Hill stated she understood Ms. Sieffert's suggestion, but noted she still had a problem with the whole second floor over the top of the wing.

Mr. Miller questioned whether the Commission was charged with preserving the original structure in its entirety, or whether the Commission was charged with ensuring the original was distinguishable from any additions. He noted the Commission was not just concerned with the front; however, the view from the road was generally the priority. He noted that was the reason additions were normally put on towards the back or to the side. He questioned if changing the front facade and making it a two-story was contrary to the spirit or letter of the standards.

Chairperson Hill stated she thought the Commission was charged with looking at the integrity of the resource and whether it retained its integrity with any alterations or work being requested. She pointed out in the present request that by keeping one wall, but changing the architecture to make it look totally different, she was not sure the Commission would be maintaining the integrity of the resource. She noted that Dr. Busch's survey included several structures that were recommended for delisting because they had lost their integrity. She recalled some of the

reasons a designated structure lost its integrity were because of the additions that were added that changed the whole appearance of the structure, or the type of the materials used. She noted that out of the 27,000 residences in the City, there were less than 100 resources that were designated as historic districts.

Mr. Miller asked if essentially the applicant retained the look of the wing and ell from the front, whether that would mitigate changing the side and the rears. He pointed out that the existing windows and doors on older houses were out of code, such as windows down to the floor or stairways that were two feet wide, and would not be allowed in new construction. He stated that trying to make an older house more livable and safe, often required changes. He understood the Commission was charged with preserving the architectural history, but pointed out history could not be so static as to keep a home according to 1800s standards.

Mr. Miller asked which of the applicant's proposed changes to the front and side of the home were acceptable to maintain the architectural integrity of the wing and ell. He noted the Commission had to prevent creating a false sense of history, while not losing the historical integrity of the dwelling.

Mr. Sinclair asked if it would alleviate the problem if the entire second story started back at the top of the roofline of the wing, leaving the whole front corner intact. He stated that would retain two of the exterior walls of the original structure and the roofline, which might alleviate the Commission's concerns.

Chairperson Hill clarified the addition would start at the backside of the lower ell and come up from there. She felt that based on the Standards, she would be more comfortable if that was how the addition had been proposed, because the addition would not be coming into the upright roof and there would not be a second story on the wing. She thought that would have retained the sense of the resource.

Mr. Dunphy thought that would address some of the Commission's concerns, noting the bulk of the discussion had concerned how much differentiation there was on the second level, and if there was enough for the Commission to feel comfortable that the historic integrity of the structure would be maintained. He felt the Commission's concern was whether there was enough of a clear separation between the new structure and the old structure, and if the old structure was visible. He was also concerned about the front elevation because the proposed second story significantly altered the lines of the building as opposed to how it currently looked from the street. He pointed out the current ell portion was one-story and the trees behind the house could be seen above the single story roof. He felt there was a consensus of the Commission about how that was addressed and to ensure that the existing structure was not lost in the new project.

Mr. Dunphy stated he had also participated in the discussion regarding the applicant's 2003 proposed plans, and agreed in those plans the proposed additions were almost entirely on the back of the existing structure.

Mr. Wroblewski referred to the discussion about the windows, and pointed out the current existing windows were in really bad shape. He asked if the windows had to be preserved exactly as they currently were, or whether the glass could be replaced. He noted that the windows in the front section of the house might not meet current codes, and he was not sure if they would encounter problems during final inspections.

Chairperson Hill stated that would not be a problem. She indicated that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation stated to rehabilitate or to repair and restore as much as possible of the exterior of the resource that creates the resource's integrity, and if something was absolutely impossible to restore because of deterioration, the Standards allowed replacement.

Mr. Wroblewski stated they had not intended to put in replacement windows, but rather order the same type of window with perhaps thicker glass to increase the R-value. He clarified the Commission would prefer the windows were repaired and kept as they existed on the existing historic structure.

Chairperson Hill stated that was why she was concerned about the north elevation, because all the windows on that side of the building were being moved.

Mr. Dunphy stated there was historic value even in the age of the glass in the existing windows. He indicated the Standard reflected the desire to maintain as much of what currently existed for the simple fact that it was old and historic. He stated unless something was so far gone it was impossible to do something with it, the Standard asked that those things be preserved rather than replaced.

Mr. Miller agreed the Standards preferred that the original windows be preserved and retained; but noted that many of the most historic buildings in America that were on the National Register had been changed. He noted that glass in old windows ran and was wavy and the R-value was essentially zero. He pointed out for energy reasons, there were historically appropriate wood replacement windows. He felt there was fine line between not being overly restrictive and compelling property owners to live without running water and outhouses, and living in the new millennium.

Chairperson Hill pointed out that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards were the Standards the Commission adopted to use for their criteria. She stated when repairs could be made in order to maintain the existing, that was what should be done.

Mr. Miller stated he understood that, but felt there was a double standard for homeowners wanting to renovate a house used for residential purposes, versus a business renovating a house for adaptive reuse. He did not feel that the adaptive reuse properties had retained their original windows and the Commission had accepted and allowed that. Chairperson Hill disagreed, stating she believed when a structure had windows or other items that could be restored and repaired, they were restored or repaired. She stated new replacements had not been allowed just to replace. She indicated there were many structures in the Community that were not designated, although they may be older homes, and the property owners had done work on those structures as they saw fit. She pointed out there were tax credits available to homeowners.

Chairperson Hill stated the Commission was obligated to uphold the Ordinance and the Standards and apply them during their review.

Mr. Dunn stated he understood the code required him to distinguish between the old and the new. He indicated if the Commission was suggesting that the upper level be done in vertical siding rather than horizontal siding, that could differentiate the existing house. He explained the reason he proposed the south view as he had was because that was the least visible side of the residence. He noted it was the side that was closest to the adjacent houses, and there were trees and shrubs on that side. He stated the east side was visible to the houses in the back across an open area. He indicated the north and east sides were the most visible from the road, due to the way the house sat on the lot. He pointed out that the north side was most visible driving up to the house because of the lilac bushes, noting in the summer the house was barely visible.

Mr. Dunn stated he understood the Commission's concern regarding the north side. He explained the windows had been moved because of the chimney. He asked if it would be acceptable to the Commission if he did not move the windows, but located the chimney between the existing windows. Chairperson Hill stated that would cause less concern.

Mr. Dunn commented that an addition had been put on the original structure in approximately 1986, and the sun porch was added in 1993, and a section was added to the back in the 1970s. He pointed out the original house was no longer a historic house because the various additions had ruined the original aesthetics of distinction. He was concerned he was being held to the additions being considered historic by the Commission.

Chairperson Hill stated the Commission was considering allowing the additions to be removed and they did not have to be replaced. She clarified her concern was the south elevation, noting the suggestion that the proposed addition be moved back behind the existing wing. She stated that would preserve the original wing, and there would still be a two-story structure behind it. She explained because the second story was being placed on top of the wing, the home was no longer an upright and wing home, but was a two-story colonial house.

Mr. Miller clarified if the applicant went from the ridgeline of the original wing back, that would retain the look of the original wing. Chairperson Hill cautioned she was not an architect, and she did not want to try to design the house, rather she was trying to find a solution that would retain the integrity of the structure.

Mr. Dunn did not feel that solution would work, noting a lack of access to a portion of the home and the creation of dead space.

Chairperson Hill stated the comments made by the Commission reflected the various concerns of the Commission with respect to the proposed project.

Mr. Miller asked the applicant if he started the addition at the ridgeline, which was the highest point on the existing wing, whether he would be comfortable he would have access to his

proposed second floor. He noted he did not know if the Commission would approve that change, but wanted to find out what the applicant was comfortable with.

Chairperson Hill agreed the Commission was not in a position to design, nor was it their charge, but they could make possible suggestions that would mitigate the situation, but the applicant would have to make a final determination.

Chairperson Hill stated if the applicant felt he wanted to redesign his plans, he would have to come back before the Commission with the appropriate drawings. She noted the Commission could proceed with a motion if the applicant preferred. She stated that when the applicant presented his proposal in 2003, the Commission did not necessarily feel those plans would maintain the integrity of the district.

Mr. Dunn stated his 2003 proposed plan was similar to the current plan, and noted the Commission had approved the 2003 plan. Chairperson Hill reviewed a copy of the drawings from the 2003 proposed project with the applicant, noting the original structure and the location of those proposed additions.

Mr. Thompson asked the applicant if he would prefer to discuss the Commission's suggestions with his architect. Mr. Dunn stated he would prefer that the Commission proceed with a vote on his current proposed plan.

Chairperson Hill called for a proposed motion, suggesting the Commission proceed with the rehabilitation and additions portion first. Mr. Miller moved the following motion:

**MOTION** by Miller, 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 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.

Mr. Miller asked if the Commissioners had any conditions they would like included with the proposed motion.

Chairperson Hill stated the applicant's plans referred to a historic cream and a historic gray/green color, but noted the applicant had not supplied any color chips or specific paint color numbers. Mr. Miller stated he had seen Benjamin Moore paints mentioned in some of the applicant's submission documentation. Mr. Wroblewski stated he did not have exact paint color numbers on the current proposed plan. Mr. Miller noted the 2003 plans included paint color numbers, although that was a different color scheme from the current proposed plans.

Chairperson Hill noted if the applicant had specific color names or paint colors, they could be included in the motion. She asked for clarification of the plan or drawing dates that should be included in the motion. Mr. Delacourt stated that the current proposed plans were dated received by the Planning Department on March 3, 2006, and those would be the plans that would be referenced in any motion.

Chairperson Hill asked for clarification regarding the foundation work proposed by the applicant, and whether that was correctly reflected on the current proposed plans. Mr. Delacourt stated the foundation work related to the proposed additions. He stated the elevations identified concrete trench footing and foundations.

Chairperson Hill stated there had been some discussion at the last meeting regarding the driveway and what the applicant intended to do with the driveway. Mr. Dunn stated he would pave just in front of the garage doors. Chairperson Hill asked if the applicant had any dimensions regarding the portion to be paved, and whether it would be paved out to the existing circular drive. Mr. Dunn stated yes, that the circular portion would remain stone. He explained the paving would be washed cement so that the stone showed through.

Chairperson Hill referred to the applicant's proposed plan and noted the front door appeared to have shutters on the sides of the two windows. She asked if the existing front door was being retained. Mr. Dunn responded yes. Chairperson Hill noted the drawings did not depict that, and stated anything that was going to be changed should be stated in the motion.

Mr. Dunn explained on the existing porch there were flower boxes under the windows, and he did not believe there were any shutters.

Chairperson Hill asked Mr. Miller if he had conditions to include with his proposed motion. Mr. Miller stated he did not believe his motion would be approved. He thought the majority of the Commission felt that the suggestions about the extension of the porch roof, moving the addition back, and distinguishing the new addition a bit more from the original wing and ell was what the Commission would like to see. He noted the current proposed plans did not reflect any of those

items. He questioned whether the Commission could add those items as conditions, or if it would be beneficial for the applicant to redo his proposed plans.

Mr. Delacourt suggested as a procedural matter, noting the proposed motion on the floor had not been seconded, that the Commission had two options. He explained the motion could be made in a positive manner with conditions, if the applicant agreed to the conditions, or proceed with a motion to deny with findings that indicated the proposed project did not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He noted if the denial was made, the Ordinance required the Commission to make suggestions or provide alternatives to the applicant so the applicant could make revisions and bring the proposed project back to the Commission.

Mr. Miller stated he would withdraw his proposed motion on the floor. He then proposed the following motion:

**MOTION** by Miller, in the matter of File No. HDC 99-011, a request for rehabilitation of, and the addition to, the home located at 1841 Crooks Road, that the Historic Districts Commission **DENIES** 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 do not appear to be compatible in mass, height, scale and design features with the existing structure.
3. The additions and rehabilitation will have a detrimental effect on the existing resource and surrounding area.
4. The proposed design, texture and materials of the additions and rehabilitation are not compatible with the existing structure.
5. The proposed additions and rehabilitation of the existing resource do appear to lessen the historic integrity of the resource.
6. The proposed additions and rehabilitation are not in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standard for Rehabilitation and Guidelines.

Chairperson Hill called for a second to the proposed motion on the floor. Mr. Sinclair stated he would second the proposed motion on the floor. Chairperson Hill stated for the record that the proposed motion on the floor was a motion to deny the proposed work, and called for discussion on the motion.

Mr. Dunphy asked whether the Commission's proposed suggestions or alternatives would be included within the motion. Chairperson Hill stated if the proposed work was denied, the

Commission could continue to discuss the matter with the applicant and make suggestions. She noted the applicant would also have the right to appeal the Commission's decision.

Mr. Delacourt pointed out that the Commission could include a finding that the Minutes of the meeting reflected a series of suggestions that provided alternatives. He noted the Minutes were also a record of the suggestions and alternatives proposed by the Commission.

Chairperson Hill asked whether the motion maker would like to add such a finding. Mr. Miller stated he would. Chairperson Hill asked if the motion seconder would concur. Mr. Sinclair concurred.

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

Complete Motion (as voted):

**MOTION** by Miller, seconded by Sinclair, in the matter of File No. HDC 99-011, a request for rehabilitation of, and the addition to, the home located at 1841 Crooks Road, that the Historic Districts Commission **DENIES** 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 do not appear to be compatible in mass, height, scale and design features with the existing structure.
3. The additions and rehabilitation will have a detrimental effect on the existing resource and surrounding area.
4. The proposed design, texture and materials of the additions and rehabilitation are not compatible with the existing structure.
5. The proposed additions and rehabilitation of the existing resource do appear to lessen the historic integrity of the resource.
6. The proposed additions and rehabilitation are not in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standard for Rehabilitation and Guidelines.
7. The Minutes of the March 9, 2006 Regular Historic Districts Commission Meeting contain an official record of the discussion held by the Commission with the applicant, and provide a record of the alternatives and suggestions made by the Commission during that discussion.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Sieffert, Dunphy, Hill, Miller, Sinclair  
Nays: Thompson  
Absent: Cozzolino, Dziurman, Kilpatrick

**MOTION CARRIED**

Chairperson Hill stated for the record that the motion had carried five yes votes to one no vote. She reminded the applicant he could request additional clarification from the Commission, or he could bring back revised plans for further consideration by the Commission. She also noted the applicant did have an appeal process available to him should he decide to pursue that route.

Mr. Dunn thanked the Commission for their time and consideration.

*(Recess: 8:57 PM to 9:05 PM)*

Chairperson Hill called the meeting back to order at 9:05 PM, and indicated the Commission would proceed with Agenda Item 7B.

**7B. File No. HDC 98-010**

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness  
- Installation of New Fence  
Sidwell: 15-04-377-035  
Address: 1470 W. Tienken Road  
Applicant: F. Edward Rice

Chairperson Hill explained that at the last meeting, the Commission had a motion on the floor to approve a Notice to Proceed, but that motion failed. She explained the appropriate thing to do when a motion failed was to proceed with a motion to deny. She stated because the Commission had not done that, and the matter was within sixty (60) days of being heard, the Commission needed to address that issue. She asked if there was any discussion or if the Commission was ready to move a motion.

Mr. Thompson moved the following motion:

**MOTION** by Thompson, in the matter of File No. HDC 98-010, that the Historic Districts Commission **DENIES** a request to allow the installation of a white, vinyl picket-style fence for the home located at 1470 W. Tienken Road, with the following Findings:

Findings:

1. The subject site is a locally designated, non-contiguous Historic District located within the City of Rochester Hills.
2. The proposed construction of a white, vinyl picket-style fence is neither appropriate nor compatible with the historic district.