



Rochester Hills

Minutes - Draft

Historic Districts Commission

1000 Rochester Hills Dr
Rochester Hills, MI
48309
(248) 656-4600
Home Page:
www.rochesterhills.org

Chairperson Jason Thompson, Vice Chairperson Julie Granthen
Members: Darlene Janulis, Kelly Lyons, Susan McKinnon, Steve Reina,
Dr. Richard Stamps, Tom Stephens, Charles Tischer

Thursday, March 14, 2019

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairperson Julie Granthen called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Auditorium.

ROLL CALL

Present 5 - Julie Granthen, Steve Reina, Richard Stamps, Tom Stephens and Charles Tischer

Excused 4 - Darlene Janulis, Kelly Lyons, Susan McKinnon and Jason Thompson

Quorum present.

Also present: Kristen Kapelanski, Manager of Planning
Kristine Kidorf, Kidorf Preservation Consulting
Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2019-0112](#) October 11, 2018 Regular Meeting

A motion was made by Reina, seconded by Tischer, that this matter be Approved as Presented . The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

COMMUNICATIONS

A) Historic Preservation Month Celebration Flyer

Ms. Kapelanski recalled that last year, the Commission attended the above. She advised that Mr. McKay of the Museum had arranged another presentation and would send an invite to all of the all historic district homeowners. It was purposefully scheduled the day of the May meeting. The Commission could meet prior to the event if there were agenda items, and if not, everyone would be free to attend the presentation.

B) Toolkits and Wheelhouses Conference Brochure May 16-18, 2019

PUBLIC COMMENT

*Vice Chairperson Granthen opened Public Comment at 7:05 p.m.
Seeing no one come forward, she closed Public Comment.*

DISCUSSION

2019-0113

FILE HDC #19-009

Request: Informal discussion of possible changes including partial demolition and construction of new addition

Location: 947 E. Tienken Rd.

Parcel: 15-02-426-005

Applicant: Ralph Putman

(Reference: Staff report, prepared by Kristine Kidorf, dated March 5, 2019 and associated application documents had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record thereof).

Present for the applicant was Ralph Putman, 967 E. Tienken Rd., Rochester Hills, MI 48306.

Mr. Putman stated that he was trying to improve 947 E. Tienken, property next door to his.

Mr. Reina asked when the Roberson/Price family first moved into the house. He believed he saw that it was 1872 on the survey sheet. Ms. Kidorf confirmed that it was definitely a contributing property to the district. Mr. Reina said that it sounded as if it was one of the older ones.

Mr. Putman advised that the house had a couple of additions. The original part of the house was closest to Tienken. The addition he was concerned about was the last one constructed. He did not know if the builder did not know what he was doing or if he ran out of money, but it was improperly built. Mr. Putman said that he would like to remove that and try to construct something a little better. He said that he was present to see what the Commissioners thought before he started having plans drawn.

Mr. Reina thanked Mr. Putman for coming. He asked him to expound on how the addition was incorrectly built. Mr. Putman pointed out cracks in the foundation. He said that water had destroyed the house. Coming down the roof, the water had nowhere to go but into the original house. The inside was damaged where it had leaked. He would like to remove

the addition and construct something more appropriate.

Mr. Putman put up a drawing which was done by Mr. John Dzuirman (architect) about three years ago, which he said never panned out. He claimed that the best area for an addition was in the back of the house, commenting that the view was spectacular. He wanted to make the house big enough for two bedrooms and livable, without losing the historical value. Originally, the front door was on another part of the house. He wanted to move the door back to where it was originally. There had also been a small porch by the door.

Dr. Stamps asked Ms. Kidorf if she had any thoughts or suggestions. Ms. Kidorf stated that it was difficult, because while there was an addition, and she understood the damage it might potentially be causing, it was part of a period of significance. It had achieved its own significance in its own right, including the door location. Mr. Putman said that the problem with the door's location in the original part of the house was that the floors had a lot of damage. By moving it over to where it was originally, it would save the original part of the house and make it a lot more presentable. The floors in the original house were being destroyed quickly. Ms. Kidorf said that it might be possible to keep the door where it was but add a second door where there was originally a door and recreate a porch. Mr. Putman emphasized that he was not interested in doing that. Ms. Kidorf said that her suggestion would be to close off the door in the peaked part of the house. Mr. Putman said that he would like to put it back like it originally was. Ms. Kidorf asked Mr. Putman if he had original photos. Mr. Putman said that he did not bring them, and Ms. Kidorf advised that he should include them with his formal submission. Mr. Putman agreed. He said that he was mainly concerned about the addition. He did not want to put money into it the way it was. He would hate to see the house go down. He believed that some kind of commitment had to be made to make a house better and more presentable to live in, and that was what he was trying to do. If he did not do it, he was not sure it would ever get done. It might just sit and rot. He was concerned about the house, but he was not willing to put money into something that was not feasible, like a bad foundation. He dug down to see how far the foundation went, and it was 20" where the cracks were.

Mr. Reina asked what Mr. Putman felt about Ms. Kidorf's suggestion with respect to the door. He asked about leaving the door where it was but making it inoperable and then putting in the other door where it was originally. Mr. Putman said that he was very concerned about appearance. He did not think that would improve the appearance. It

would not help the historical value. Mr. Reina explained that the mandate the HDC operated under gave them some responsibility to ensure that the outside façade was as similar to the original façade as possible. That was why they asked the questions. Mr. Putman said that he did not believe that the door was there originally. He believed that it was in the front where the fireplace was. Mr. Reina thought that Mr. Putman said he had photographs. Mr. Putman said that he had an original photograph of the people that lived there showing where the door was. Mr. Reina recommended that the photos could go a long way toward satisfying the Commission. He pointed out that Mr. Putman was being guided in how to make an application to the City, and Mr. Reina asked him to keep in mind that to the extent they could support the project, it would help to have that information. Mr. Putman said that he could; his main concern was the addition. Mr. Reina understood that. He pointed out that learning about the door would help explain things. Mr. Putman said that he understood exactly what Mr. Reina was saying, and he would bring the information the next time.

Dr. Stamps mentioned that for some historic buildings, the Commission recognized that they would evolve through time and that one building might be built with one kind of brick and get an addition with some kind of wood later and so on. In many instances, the Commission liked to preserve the building, because it demonstrated the evolution of the structure. He asked Ms. Kidorf if there were cases where the HDC could want to preserve the original time period and remove the more recent additions that did not contribute to the structure. Ms. Kidorf explained that it was always recommended to remove things that were not part of the evolution of the property. The door was moved prior to 1978. The example of moving the door and recreating the porch might be perfectly acceptable if Mr. Putman could provide the photographic evidence he discussed. She did not know how old the addition was in the rear. Her assumption was that it was pre-1950 and possibly from the 1940's, while the initial family still owned the property. That was why she suggested a Notice to Proceed, if the Commission felt that it would be acceptable to remove the addition. They did not really know how the part of the addition was attached to the wing of the upright wing. She felt that there were a lot of questions about what would happen to the main house if that came off. Mr. Putman said that the corner of the house was water damaged and deteriorated. Ms. Kidorf asked Mr. Putman if he had looked at the corner post of the main house. Mr. Putman said that he had repaired the foundation a little bit, but the roof was worse and improper. Ms. Kidorf asked who built the addition, but Mr. Putman was not aware. Ms. Kidorf asked if he had a professional engineer or architect look at it. He said

that Mr. Dziurman looked at it three years ago, and he agreed that the addition should come off. Mr. Putman said that the house meant a lot to him, and he was trying to fix it so someone else would not move there and let it get run down.

Dr. Stamps knew that Mr. Dziurman was a very respected historic architect. He served on the City's HDC for 20 years. Dr. Stamps suggested that Mr. Putman should get a statement from him regarding removing the addition. That would influence the Commission. Mr. Putman said that he could try to do that, but he claimed that Mr. Dziurman was hard to communicate with at times. He had hired a new architect, and he was trying to get some insight to formulate a plan without wasting the architect's time.

Mr. Tischer asked Mr. Putman if he planned to do anything with the siding on the rest of the house, which looked fairly worn. Mr. Putman said that whatever the Commission wanted him to do, he would do. He did not want to do more than he had to, but he needed to put in two bedrooms and a bath-and-a-half.

Mr. Tischer asked about the roof. Mr. Putman said that it was okay. It was about 25 years old and wood. Mr. Tischer said that he was trying to visualize the house without the addition. Mr. Putman said that he would welcome the Commissioners looking at the house. No one was living there currently. He said that he would replace the siding with whatever the Commission approved. He claimed that cedar roofs were not good to have when leaves got on them and rotted the wood. He noted that there was also a major ice dam off the one side. Mr. Tischer said that they could easily see the water damage from the pictures. He said that he appreciated Mr. Putman coming before them for an informal discussion so they could work together moving forward.

Dr. Stamps said that it seemed like they had an applicant who wanted to do the best to save the resource. Mr. Putman felt that it was the cornerstone of the historical community. Dr. Stamps felt that the addition, on a split and cracking foundation, should be removed. Ms. Kidorf pointed out page two of the staff report under Review Considerations. There was a bullet point list of everything she thought the applicant should be prepared to provide the Commissioners so they could make a formal decision on the application, including more information about the deterioration. If it was deteriorated beyond repair, and there was enough evidence provided to validate that, Dr. Stamps was correct that the Commission might very well approve the request to remove the addition.

Mr. Putman reiterated that it was a nice, historical property that the Commissioners should inspect and get answers. Mr. Reina asked if the applicant could be provided the bullet points.

Mr. Stephens asked if there were any pictures for the eastern side of the building. Mr. Putman put one on the overhead. It was a view of the original part of the house going down Tienken. He believed that the door was there originally, because Tienken was right in front of it. Mr. Stephens said that it was a little confusing, because he was looking at a view of the west and south sides of the house. Mr. Putman pointed out the chimney, which was on the east. He showed the southern and northern views, but said that he did not have the west. He again suggested that the Commissioners view the house.

Ms. Kidorf said that the Commission could do a site visit, but it was not their responsibility or job to do one. Mr. Putman needed to provide the materials. The simplest thing would be to do everything that was on the bullet point list and turn it in.

Mr. Reina wanted to make sure Mr. Putman had the bullet points and the material the Commissioners were talking about. He wanted Mr. Putman to walk away with something that was helpful and beneficial. He reminded that it would be helpful to get a letter as to why the addition should be removed. If they got a letter from a former Commissioner, it would be helpful. Also, photos of the original door would be helpful. Mr. Putman said that he understood, and that his architect would help make sure they had everything. He had just wanted his intention known, and Mr. Reina said that the Commission wanted to help make it happen.

Vice Chairperson Granthen thanked Mr. Putman, and said that the Commission looked forward to receiving the additional information at a future meeting. Mr. Reina wished him the best of luck.

Discussed

2019-0114

Oakland County's 200th Anniversary (2020)

Vice Chairperson Granthen announced the next agenda item, indicating that it was very exciting. Oakland County would be celebrating its bicentennial, and it was suggested by Dr. Stamps that perhaps the HDC could do something with respect to that. Vice Chairperson Granthen worked at Oakland University, and she knew that Professor Dave Dulio was the representative from OU on the Bicentennial Executive

Committee, and that Judge Warren was the head of the Committee.

Dr. Stamps advised that about a year-and-a-half ago, the Oakland County Board of Commissioners realized that when the boundaries were drawn, the County seat for Pontiac was declared in 1820. They thought they should celebrate that because, as someone said, "Some things only happen once in a lifetime." They formed a study group of about 15 people who got together to determine what they could or should do for the bicentennial. They met for about a year, came up with some proposals and submitted those to the Oakland County Board of Commissioners. He listed some of the Executive Committee members. There were also about 15 subcommittees, and each was supposed to do something special. Dave Dulio was going to put together some history items. There was a subcommittee to plant 200 Oak trees. There was a subcommittee that wanted to have an Olympic-like torch run around city halls by high school and college cross country teams. There would be concerts, time capsules, a black tie event, a monument created, proclamations and other things. The idea was "Learn from the past, live in the present and plan for the future." He was on a subcommittee that was looking at higher education in Oakland County. There would be a day-long seminar with Presidents, Provosts and movers and shakers of higher education units in the County to look at what higher education would be in the future. There would be bicentennial articles written for publication, speakers and presentations. For example, the OU History Dept. each year had a history series, so they could focus on the history of Oakland County. There would be essay, photo and picture contests. The Committee was working with the Oakland County Parks folks who ran a float in various parades. They had agreed to let the Committee co-brand it and put OC 200 Bicentennial on it. There had been an official logo created. There would be a web page, exhibits and events. The idea was not just that the County would do a lot of things, but to encourage local communities and organizations to hold some events. Other suggestions were to have County Commissioners speak at various functions, to have special bicentennial proclamations, plant a garden and create a calendar. The Oakland County Pioneer and Historical Society was on board. They always had an annual ice cream social, and the theme for the coming year would be the bicentennial. His thought was that Rochester Hills, as one of the higher-quality communities in the County, should be leading and thinking about what they could do. He felt that they should plan to do some proclamations and exhibits. He asked the members to put it on their radars and to brainstorm what they could and should do to help celebrate the bicentennial. Rochester was the first community in Oakland County with European citizens, and he thought that could be highlighted.

He just wanted to make people aware, and he asked the members to start brainstorming as to what they could do.

Vice Chairperson Granthen mentioned that she had talked with Judge Warren about a week ago. He talked about things such as the Brookside Way, which could have a bicentennial hint to it. She thought about Arts and Apples and the Heritage Festival and those types of events. Dr. Stamps added Fire and Ice, which was co-sponsored by the County. His hope was that they could get a three-sentence statement on a program for a concert, for example, that stated, "Tonight's event is brought to you in part by Oak 200." There were quilt clubs who might add the logo and name in their advertising. He thought that it would be good for those organizations, because by advertising, they would get on the year-long calendar of events.

Vice Chairperson Granthen noted that when Rochester celebrated its bicentennial recently, there was a proclamation presented at one of their City Council meetings. She asked if a proclamation from the HDC was something in which they might be interested. Dr. Stamps agreed. The proclamation could be presented, and it would give some credibility to the HDC. He mentioned burying another time capsule. He thought that it would be cool to have a snapshot of Oakland County in 2020. They could photograph what life was like in 2020 - the roads, the houses, the businesses and even cell towers. He did not think there would be any around in 100 years. It would be called "A snapshot of Oakland County in 2020." He recommended that the HDC could put together an exhibit for the library or City Hall and could work with the Museum.

Vice Chairperson Granthen suggested that they could set up a subcommittee if someone wanted to work on the proclamation or a traveling exhibit for various places. She claimed that Dr. Stamps would be excellent as the Chair (he declined, but said that he would help). Vice Chairperson Granthen suggested taking it to the local schools. She felt that they should consult with the whole Commission, since several were absent, to see who was interested in being on the subcommittee. Mr. Stephens agreed that a proclamation sounded great.

2019-0115

Nominations for the Earl Borden Award

Vice Chairperson Granthen noted that Ms. Janulis was unable to be present, but she had sent an email to Chairperson Thompson and Vice Chairperson Granthen to put forth the nomination of Rochester College for its efforts in the barn restoration. Vice Chairperson Granthen said that

it sounded like a great idea, because it had been an excellent project for the area.

Further to that, Dr. Stamps said that he ran across an article from September 23, 2003 written by Gail Kemler, who recently celebrated her 101st birthday. She had lived in the apartment above the Home Bakery in downtown Rochester. He read, "Dear Editor, the request to remove the farmstead located on Avon Rd. at Rochester College from the Historic District prompts me to write. As a long-time resident and preservationist, I am deeply disturbed that the farmstead is at risk. When I ask the newcomers in this area the reason they came here, usually the reply is that they love the history and the old buildings. I look at our area as a tapestry with historic sites in Rochester, Rochester Hills and Oakland Township, creating the blend of new and old. Each time a site is removed from the Historic registry, the hole created cannot be replaced. It is gone forever. If removing sites like this farmstead sets the precedent, soon we will have a tapestry full of holes. The uniqueness of the Rochester area will be gone, and we will look like any other suburban community in Michigan. I don't think this is what the vast majority of our community wants for our future generations. The barn is part of the (College) site on Avon Rd. There surely are alternative uses for the barn, corn crib, tool shed and house. The corn crib, for example, is the only one left in the area. Surely, this site could be used in connection with the curriculum of the College, particularly the education department. I trust the City Council of Rochester Hills will give serious thought to the impact of losing this historic site forever. Unfortunately, the Parke Davis barns have been lost forever. Let us prevent this from happening again," signed Gail Kemler, Rochester resident.

Dr. Stamps said that the good news was that people listened. The HDC fought, and they saved all but the tool shed. The HDC allowed that to go down, which he felt was a shame. He supported the idea that Rochester College was a recipient of the Earl Borden Award. He asked when the award would be given, and if they should wait until the project was completed. He wondered about giving an award for something that was half done.

Mr. Tischer asked if anyone knew the completion date. Ms. Kapelanski said that the last she heard, they hoped to be completed in the summer, but she would have to check. Vice Chairperson Granthen thought that the Earl Borden award was normally given in May. She felt that it would be quite appropriate, since they would be at the Calf Barn for the Historic Preservation Month celebration for the May meeting. There would be a

group of people to see the award presented. Ms. Kapelanski said that was correct, but she did not think the barn improvements would be done by then.

Mr. Reina agreed with Vice Chairperson Granthen that the timing would be fine. Vice Chairperson Granthen said that it would be good to have a nice crowd. They would be recognizing the historic preservation efforts the College was making, and there would be a lot of historical owners there. She suggested that the award could possibly state, "On their continuing efforts to improve the site," or to somehow acknowledge that it was not finished, but they had made great strides thus far. She asked if there were any other nominations. She reminded that they could do an individual award, and they could give more than one.

Dr. Stamps agreed with Rochester College. He recalled that they had given an Historic Preservation Leadership award previously. He asked if anyone knew of someone who had been a mover and shaker in getting things done, educating people or helping to save something.

Mr. Reina noted that there would be another meeting before May, so they could think about it further. Vice Chairperson Granthen thought that they might have recognized Gail Kemler before. Dr. Stamps said that she was from Rochester, but Vice Chairperson Granthen said that she had advocated for Rochester Hills, and she was 101. She believed that they had awarded someone twice in the past, so she did not think it would be unprecedented to award Ms. Kemler with a second one. Her efforts regarding Rochester College did help in the decision to save the barn. She suggested that they could mull it over and make a decision at the next meeting. Dr. Stamps suggested that in the proclamation, they could quote from her visionary statements.

Vice Chairperson Granthen asked Ms. Kapelanski and Ms. Kidorf if they concurred with the selection of Rochester College and/or Gail Kemler for the award. Ms. Kidorf could not give an opinion of Ms. Kemler, as she did not know her, but she felt that the barn was a great idea. She thought that they might want to wait until the work had been completed, but if it was mostly done, she thought it would be a great choice.

Ms. Kapelanski asked if the HDC members would want to meet if there were no other items on the April agenda, or if they were comfortable proceeding with the two they had discussed. Mr. Reina felt that in the event that they might not meet in April, he would be on board with green lighting both of the awardees. He did not know if they should have a

meeting just for that purpose. In lieu of meeting, he was certain enough with the two entities discussed. He was not sure whether or not a motion was needed.

Dr. Stamps advised that in the past, nominations were approved via a motion. He thought that they should research Ms. Kemler a little further. Mr. Tischer recalled seeing historical data about past winners. Mr. Reina felt that for someone that was 101, they could bend the rules a little. Vice Chairperson Granthen remembered when Meadowbrook Hall was recognized, the person who came to receive the award was not a Rochester Hills resident.

MOTION by Stamps, seconded by Reina, that the Rochester Hills Historic Districts Commission hereby **approves Rochester College/University** on Avon Rd. as the recipient of the 2019 Earl Borden Award for historic preservation work on the farmstead.

MOTION by Stamps, seconded by Reina, that the Rochester Hills Historic Districts Commission hereby **approves Gail Kemler** as the recipient of the 2019 Earl Borden Award for Executive Leadership of historic preservation in Rochester Hills.

A motion was made by Stamps, seconded by Reina, that this matter be Approved. The motion PASSED by an unanimous vote.

Vice Chairperson Granthen stated for the record that the motions had passed unanimously. She said that it was exciting to be giving the award again, noting that it had been several years. Ms. Kapelanski advised that staff would work with Chairperson Thompson to get everything together for the May meeting.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Vice Chairperson Granthen asked for an updated status for 1841 Crooks. Ms. Kapelanski advised that she had talked with the Building Dept. earlier in the day. The owners were still planning to demo the house. They requested the utility shutoffs. She expected the demolition to proceed whenever DTE Energy, etc. were done in the next few months. Vice Chairperson Granthen said that she was sad, because she lived near there.

Election of Officers was scheduled next. Vice Chairperson Granthen recommended that the matter should be postponed until they had more

members present.

MOTION by Stamps, seconded by Stephens, the Rochester Hills Historic Districts Commission hereby **tables Election of Officers** until the next available meeting.

Voice Vote:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Absent: Janulis, Lyons, McKinnon, Thompson **MOTION CARRIED**

Mr. Tischer clarified that the By-laws did not state that Election of Officers had to be voted upon by a certain date. Ms. Kidorf believed that a month was specified, but it assumed that there was a meeting every month. She felt that it would be fine.

Dr. Stamps asked, with regard to the former O'Neill Pottery property at 1841 Crooks, if the City had condemned the structure, allowing for demolition. Ms. Kapelanski agreed, and said that the owners were working with the Building Dept. and had secured a demo permit. They had a contractor selected to do the demolition. It was her understanding that there were some challenges with the contractor. She reiterated that the Building Dept. had requested the utility shutoffs for the property. The owners should be able to follow through with their current contractor, but might have to find a new one.

Mr. Tischer asked if the City would be there for the demo. One of his fears was that the barn would go, too. Ms. Kapelanski responded that Mr. Sage of the Building Dept. was dealing with the owners (Dunns). He was in contact with them at least once a week, so he was on top of it. Dr. Stamps questioned whether, knowing the utilities would be turned off in the house, there were utilities in the barn. Ms. Kapelanski said that they would only be turned off to the house. Vice Chairperson Granthen asked if there had been any inklings about dividing the property after the demolition. Ms. Kapelanski stated that she had not heard anything about that.

Dr. Stamps asked for an update about the stone house on Adams. Ms. Kapelanski said that she had not heard from the owners in some time. The last time they spoke was in July or August, and they were looking at development alternatives for the larger property. They had planned to come in with a plan for that, but she had not heard since the summer.

The stone house was a church they wanted to use for a meeting space. They were looking at multiple-family for the larger property east of the road. They were also looking at retail and office but some kind of mixed-use development. Dr. Stamps said that the sad part was that part of the delay in getting things done was because the Building Dept. said that the building had to be wrapped in Tyvek for moisture control. They were imposing 21st century building codes on a 19th century building. He stated that they should not wrap a stone building with Tyvek. He felt sorry for the owners, because they had been working hard to get things going. Ms. Kapelanski believed that they were mostly done with the exterior, so it was weather tight and good to go. Dr. Stamps asked about the windows. Ms. Kapelanski thought that the windows had been installed. They might be boarded up, but they were in. Dr. Stamps felt that it would be safer to be boarded.

Dr. Stamps said that there was currently, and he hoped that the City had received the copy he sent, a resolution before the State Senate and House in support of reinstatement of the State Historic Tax Credits. He felt that it was important that the HDC supported the reinstatement. He thought that they should write a resolution and get the City Council to write one that would also go to Lansing.

Ms. Kidorf advised that the Michigan Historic Preservation Network had a sample resolution they could use. Senate Bill 54 and House Bill 42 had been introduced for the current legislative session. That was to reintroduce the historic tax credit. The Michigan Historic Preservation Network was collecting resolutions from City Councils and Historic Districts Commissions. Benton Harbor, East Lansing, Huntington Woods, New Baltimore, Sault Ste. Marie, Southfield, Pittsfield Charter Township, the Village of Leonard, and the Village of Oxford had all sent Council resolutions. The Highland Park Historic Districts Commission had also submitted a resolution. Dr. Stamps believed that Clarkston had as well. Ms. Kidorf encouraged the Commission to send a resolution and pass it along to City Council if they would be willing to pass a resolution.

Dr. Stamps asked who should write it, although it appeared to be a template that they could just fill in the blanks to personalize. Vice Chairperson Granthen thought that Chairperson Thompson would sign it. Dr. Stamps said that it was fine with him, as long as they got it there. The bill had already been initiated, but it would be up for discussion. The more support, the better. It had been up last year and had a lot of support, but someone drug his feet, and it did not get a full vote before the session was over. Ms. Kidorf advised that it was online at the MHPN's

site.

Mr. Reina said that he would feel comfortable tabling the matter until they had more people, so they could get consensus from the entire Commission. Vice Chairperson Granthen asked if it was time sensitive. Ms. Kidorf said that to her knowledge, there was no deadline, and no hearings had been scheduled. Mr. Tischer suggested that someone could type it up and have it ready for the next meeting, so they could expedite things.

Dr. Stamps proposed for the next agenda that they reviewed what the HDC's charge was. He thought that their charge was to do more than just respond to people coming in saying they wanted to tear off an addition on their historic house. He thought that they should be pro-active and be the stewards protecting and preserving their cultural resources. If there was a paragraph of what their charge was, he thought that it would be a good thing to bring it to the next meeting to remind them. Vice Chairperson Granthen said that it would be part of the May event. They would be informing residents of the HDC and the special challenges of living in an historic home.

Ms. Kapelanski asked if the Commission would want to have a meeting prior to the Preservation Month Celebration to talk about that and perhaps get the resolution passed. Mr. Reina thought they should poll the members regarding the earlier time. Ms. Kapelanski believed that it would be at the Calf Barn prior to the event already planned.

Vice Chairperson Granthen recalled that at the last meeting, there had been some discussion about three areas they could focus on, including the old Avon Township areas. She wondered if there had been any more follow-up. Ms. Kidorf explained that as part of the Certified Local Government status, they needed to update the Rochester Hills historic survey. They had talked about the three areas that were recommended in the 2002 survey, and she agreed that it could be brought to the May meeting.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Vice Chairperson Granthen reminded the HDC members that the next Regular Meeting was scheduled for April 11, 2019 (subsequently cancelled).

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Historic Districts Commission and upon motion by Mr. Reina, seconded by Mr. Tischer, Vice Chairperson Granthen adjourned the Regular Meeting at 8:12 p.m.

Julie Granthen, Vice Chairperson
Rochester Hills Historic Districts Commission

Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary