



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: Katherine Altherr-Rogers, Darlene Janulis, Kelly Lyons, Carol Morlan,
Dr. Richard Stamps, Tom Stephens, Charles Tischer

Thursday, May 13, 2021

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 7 - Julie Granthen, Darlene Janulis, Richard Stamps, Tom Stephens, Charles Tischer, Katherine Altherr-Rogers and Carol Morlan

Excused 2 - Kelly Lyons and Jason Thompson

Quorum present.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2021-0175](#) February 11, 2021 Regular Meeting

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

COMMUNICATIONS

There were no Communications presented to the members.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Vice Chairperson Granthen opened Public Comment at 7:01 p.m.
Seeing no one wishing to speak, she closed Public Comment.

NEW BUSINESS

[2021-0174](#) Request for Certification of Appropriateness - City File No. 21-011 - to replace 16 double hung, sash windows at 1481 Dutton Rd., west of Livernois Rd.,

Parcel No. 15-04-204-004, zoned R-1 One Family Residential, Brian Meier, Applicant

(Reference: Staff report, prepared by Kristine Kidorf, dated May 4, 2021 and associated application documents and photos had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record thereof).

Present for the applicant was Brian Meier, 1481 Dutton Rd., Rochester Hills, MI 48306.

Mr. Meier explained that he just wished to replace 16 sashes, and that all the exterior and interior trim would remain. Upon questioning, Ms. Kidorf felt that everything had been outlined in the staff report, and that she would be happy to entertain questions.

Mr. Tischer thanked Mr. Meier for maintaining this beautiful home. He did not see any issues with replacing the windows.

Vice Chairperson Granthen agreed that the project was pretty straight-forward. Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Tischer moved the following:

MOTION by Tischer, seconded by in the matter of File No. HDC 21-011, that the Historic Districts Commission **APPROVES** the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for replacement of the window sash in 16 windows with thermopane wood windows with composite exterior cladding as proposed at 1481 Dutton Road, the William Fox House, Parcel Identification Number 70-15-04-204-004, with the following Findings and Conditions:

- 1) *The existing windows **are** deteriorated beyond repair and **are** original to the house;*
- 2) *The proposed new window sash **do** match the window sash being replaced;*
- 3) *The proposed window sash replacement **is** in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines, in particular standard number 6 as follows:*

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

Ms. Janulis thanked Mr. Meier for his submittal. She was happy to see a lot of pictures and explanations for everything, and she indicated that it was easy to support. She felt that he had gone to a lot of trouble, which was appreciated.

Mr. Meijer asked about the grill pattern and if it made a difference if it was clear over clear or two over one. Ms. Kidorf advised that one over one was appropriate.

A motion was made by Tischer, seconded by Janulis, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Granthen, Janulis, Stamps, Stephens, Tischer, Altherr-Rogers and Morlan

Excused 2 - Lyons and Thompson

Vice Chairperson Granthen stated for the record that the motion had passed unanimously, and she also thanked Mr. Meijer. She asked if he might show them photos when the project was done.

Mr. Meier asked if there was an update regarding the State historic tax credits. Ms. Kidorf related that she had attended a session earlier, and she explained that they were currently in a rule-making process. They hoped to have public comment in June, however, applications would not be available until mid-2022. She suggested that it might be sooner, but they would not be granted for work already completed or for retroactive work. She commented that he should save up any big projects for next year, and said that she would send him the website so he could stay abreast.

2020-0579

Request for Certificate of Appropriateness - City File No. 20-039 - for roadwork on E. Avon Rd and a revised mill race culvert replacement associated with a 96" water transmission main relocation project for the Great Lakes Water Authority for the area affecting E. Avon Rd. adjacent to the Yates Cider Mill, Mill Race Culvert and Historic Clinton-Kalamazoo Canal, Jacobs Consulting, Applicant

(Reference: Staff report, prepared by Kristine Kidorf, dated May 4, 2021 and associated application documents and presentation had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record thereof).

Present for the applicant were Steven Roberts from Jacobs Engineering, 30800 Telegraph Rd., #4900, Bingham Farms, MI 48025 and Dave Eno and Kevin Hughes of Fishbeck, 39500 MacKenzie Dr., Suite 100, Novi, MI 48377.

Mr. Roberts stated that they were representing the Great Lakes Water Authority to present a project they were designing on GLWA's behalf. He explained that GLWA was undertaking the project to continue to provide essential, uninterrupted drinking water to its partners by relocating the 96" water transmission main. The main currently passed through a closed, industrial landfill. There were many other objectives; they would improve the reliability of the transmission system as well as the water main; relocate the water main outside of the Detroit Sportsmen's Congress Gun Club and out of many backyards; and improve operation and maintenance access for the water main. Along with that, GLWA was incorporating many roadway improvements that corresponded to the route of the new water main, which would improve traffic flow along east Avon Rd. and Dequindre and pedestrian safety by making improvements at intersections along the project. They were also coordinating very closely with the other area infrastructure projects - the project by the Road Commission for the bridge over the Clinton River as well as the roundabouts on Avon and Dequindre. He showed a map of the main route of the relocated section of the water main. It was approximately two-and-a-half miles in length, with tie-ins to the existing system at Hamlin as well as 24 Mile Rd. and the Macomb Orchard Trail. The project had previously received a Certificate of Appropriateness in January for the installation of the water main as well as the Mill Race culvert replacement. They were presenting a revision to the culvert and other roadway improvements on Dequindre and Avon. He turned it over to Mr. Eno.

Mr. Eno noted that Fishbeck was hired by Jacobs to do the road design related to the water main replacement. At the last meeting, Jacobs talked about the Mill Race culvert which fed the creek that ran underneath the Mill. Mr. Eno was present to talk about the quasi-related road improvements. The road was being torn up to put in the water main, and the City and County saw an opportunity to implement the long-range plan for the corridor in order to improve safety and reliability. It was a County road in Rochester Hills, and the proposed road improvements met the long-range goals of both organizations. The project included full replacement of the roadway. Primary improvements included a roundabout at the 23 Mile and Avon corner, which he claimed would pair up nicely with the roundabout at Avon and Dequindre to the west, and there would be significant pedestrian improvements and a center left turn lane added in front of the Cider Mill. He mentioned that the existing road was a two-lane, fairly rural road that had not changed since the 1980's. There was no continuous pathway along the road. He showed the current mid-block crossing in front of the Cider Mill, which was un-signalized. At the last meeting, they presented replacement of the Mill Race culvert. It

was proposed to only replace the portion under the roadway. The Road Commission expressed concern with that, due to the condition of the culvert. An Engineering report showed significant scaling and distress. It had been installed in the mid 1960's. They felt that it was not in bad shape, but since it was going to be a long-term improvement, it was decided to replace it to the extent possible. They were proposing to replace the culvert to within 15 feet of the Cider Mill. There was currently a trench that the water spilled into before it entered the Cider Mill. Due to concern about its age, they did not want to replace it through the structure. They would put in the exact same size, shape and slope of the existing culvert.

Mr. Tischer asked if they had considered lining the culvert instead. Mr. Eno said that it had been proposed, but since the culvert was at end of life, and although lining would be an adequate solution for a ten-year fix, the Road Commission wanted a 50-year fix.

Mr. Eno showed a cross section of the road with the Cider Mill and the Mill Race Pond. The proposed long-term fix for the segment that they were leaving in was to line it. They would also line the new culvert. From the interior, it would look like one continuous new culvert. He noted that there was a custom screen on the inlet. The owners probably had built a "trash rack," or a closely spaced bunch of one by fours that trapped sticks and debris. Their intent was to remove and replace that with the same hydraulic parameter so they did not invoke anything from EGLE regarding permitting. On the Mill Race inlet in the Pond, the existing headwall was built in the 1960's. It was adjacent to clearly historic concrete, probably related to the original canal. They would saw cut the existing headwall so they did not disturb the historic concrete. He showed a view of the proposed roundabouts. They would pave the driveways down to existing gravel, but not change their slope. They would be putting in a signalized, pedestrian-actuated crosswalk adjacent to Yates as well as on the north leg of the roundabout. The east leg would not have one, because it was a single-lane, and it was not required by the Road Commission. There would be a continuous three-lane section on Avon to match what would come off of the new bridge. The third lane would disappear at the roundabout. There would be curb and gutter for drainage. He said that a nice improvement would be no more runoff from the road. He had observed that it currently ran down into the park on the north side. They would capture that water and storm sewer and direct it to the River through a hydrodynamic separator that would filter the water before it was released. They would try to recreate what nature already did when it filtered water through grassy berms. He advised that there would

be ADA-compliant pathways on both sides of the road. A HAWK signal (high intensity, actuated crosswalk) would be installed. When a person pushed a button, two yellow lights flashed indicating that someone was trying to cross, and then it would go to solid red, indicating that traffic needed to stop. It would go to blinking red, indicating that traffic could proceed if there were no pedestrians present. They had been used on a lot of other roundabouts. There would be retaining walls. Mr. Eno showed a cross section of a wall at the Mill Race Pond and one just north of the Cider Mill in front of the house on the hill. He showed a mockup of the wall in front of the home, which was needed to accommodate the new sidewalk. Mr. Tischer asked if the sidewalk would be in front of or behind the wall, and Mr. Eno advised that it would be in front.

Dr. Stamps asked if the sidewalk currently existed, and Mr. Eno responded that it did not. There was a "goat" trail people used, and the sidewalk would go there between the wall and the road. Dr. Stamps asked if the wall would be a new, modern addition. Mr. Eno agreed. He pointed out that there were three trees near the wall, and they did not feel that they would survive construction of the wall, so they were proposed for removal. That would require easements from the property owner. They would plant new trees somewhere else, either on the owner's property or somewhere in the area. He showed a view standing down in the park looking up towards the home where the other wall would be adjacent to the Mill Race Pond. Since they would be widening the road and shifting it northward, they needed to raise the grade. The wall would get up to about eight feet. They were proposing modular blocks - a redi-rock wall - at about 2,500 to 3,500 pounds each. It would be a gravity wall, held up by its own mass as opposed to using tie-backs that would require further tree removals. He mentioned that the DTE power lines had been a significant challenge for them. There were some major lines running through the area. They worked with DTE to come up with a plan to relocate the lines. They could not go underground, because there were so many utilities in the area. They would be relocated in the same area on the north side of Avon. He pointed out one large tree integrated into the historic canal wall that would have a branch trimmed, but it would not have to be removed because of the culvert replacement.

Dr. Stamps asked if the Mill Race Pond was on one side of the wall and the green grass on the other, and if that was where the water would be flowing. Mr. Eno said that the water would be flowing on the camera side. The Pond would be between the camera and the wall. Behind that would be a slope up to the road.

Mr. Roberts showed some material samples for the redi-rock retaining wall. They had some communication about attempting to match the historical nature of E. Avon Rd. They looked at the ledgestone pattern. They had been collaborating with the RCOC and the City, and he felt that all parties agreed that they wanted to try to maintain the historic nature of the area. They would be open to other options. He noted that the adjacent RCOC and roundabout project to the west of the Clinton River Bridge was going to use a pewter color for the center of the roundabout. It was their intention to match the same color. He stated that they did not expect any impacts to the Mill Pond or the Clinton Kalamazoo Canal. There were also no impacts expected to the Yates Cider Mill building. He recalled mentioning at the last meeting that they were planning to use vibratory sensors during the installation of the water main and during the roadway work. He went over the timeframe. The team submitted the 30% design plans to GLWA at the end of January. They had been collaborating twice weekly with the RCOC and the City on the development of those plans. The RCOC project was planned to begin in November 2021 with a full road closure of E. Avon. The GLWA drinking water main installation was planned to start in January 2022. The E. Avon Rd. restoration was intended to be completed in August 2022 ahead of cider season. He thanked everyone for their time and opened it to questions.

Ms. Janulis thanked the gentlemen for their presentation, and said that she appreciated all the pictures and explanations. She was on a couple of other committees with the City, and they had talked about the changes by the Cider Mill, so she had heard the information a couple of times. She thought that the presentation was great, and she trusted Mr. Davis. She realized that it was a very extensive project, and she supported it. The only problem she had was with the samples shown for the wall. She felt that the textures were a little bit too contemporary. She had seen walls that looked more like stone. She believed that the retaining walls were needed, and they needed to not only look good, but be structurally sound, safe and something that would last. She did not want to vote no just because she did not like the brick work, but she thought that it was too modern. Mr. Roberts had mentioned that they could look for something with more of an historical flavor. Ms. Janulis indicated that she would trust Mr. Davis and the team, if the matter passed, to not use the samples shown, and that they would look for something that gave more of an historical flavor to the area.

Dr. Stamps agreed that he also liked the presentation. He believed that it was a project they needed to do, and he looked forward to smoother traffic

and better water. He noted the email the Commissioners had received from a resident about the wall. The person who wrote it said that he loved the stone walls on Adams Rd. by Meadowbrook, and he had suggested using something more along those lines. Dr. Stamps said that his concern was something in the Secretary of Interior Standards. He thought that there was some guidance which stated that they were not supposed to take a modern construction that previously was not there and create something artificial as to how they thought it would have looked way back when. He was concerned that they would try to create something that never was there, as if it were there, that was done so well someone driving down the road would think it had been there forever. It would not have been there for 100 years, and it would be a modern day creation they envisioned looked old. He remarked that it would be kind of like Disney Land, which they would not want to create. He suggested that they needed a little more clarification about the Secretary of Interior Standards and what they could and could not or should and should not do.

Ms. Kidorf said that Dr. Stamps was correct. She read from Standard 9: "The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion." As Dr. Stamps explained, they would not want to confuse the story or historic record. In her earlier conversations with the applicants, they were willing to do any texture or color for the concrete block product. She was not sure that there was one that would look as historic as outlined in the email received from an historic district resident. Her suggestion would be to give the applicants an idea of colors and textures they found acceptable, and then staff could look at a couple of selections and approve something. She was not sure how long it would take to order something, but she assumed that there would be time to come back at some point. Mr. Eno said that they showed a product from one manufacturer. There was a broad array of options, and they could start working with the suppliers. He said that the coloring was infinite - anything from a natural stone color to an artificial color. It sounded like they did not want to fake or try to make it look historical with modern materials. He considered that it would have to be made out of materials from the original time or something could clash, because faking it would be worse.

Dr. Stamps said that he liked the idea that the blocks would be gravity, held-in-place, solid blocks. He asked if there would be reinforcing rods on the inside with the pattern imprinted on the outside. Mr. Eno agreed. He added that they would be precast. By the Mill Race, they would excavate, add gravel and lay the first layer of block. They would be about seven feet deep and two feet tall. The next layer might be skinnier,

perhaps five feet deep. Behind the wall, there would be a layer of drainage stone, and the wall would be held up by its mass. They would fill behind the Mill Race wall with clean earth to build the road. In front of the house, it would be a different story. The wall would not be holding anything up; they would excavate and make the slope flat, and the wall would make up the difference between the proposed sidewalk grade and the existing ground. They would not fill behind that wall, as opposed to the wall by the Mill Race, which would need to hold up new material for the road. They would both be structurally very secure. They had been used on road projects with more modern-faced walls. They were very flexible. If something changed while it was being built, the wall could be disassembled and put back together, as opposed to a cast-in-place wall. If something was not right with that, it would need to be removed and destroyed. They could work with the suppliers and come back with more examples.

Dr. Stamps asked about the durability of colors and finish. He liked that they did not want to do a ten-year fix, but rather a 50-year. That sounded wise to him. He asked about the durability of the surfaces. He liked what they did with downtown Rochester Main St., where they dug it up from storefront to storefront and went down so many feet. They put in the pipes and then used printed concrete bricks. People walked back and forth and drove over them. He asked if the bricks would have a ten-year or 50-year durability, noting that the bricks downtown were wearing out, and it had been less than five years. He hoped that what they were proposing would have a little more longevity. He thought it should not be a problem, because people would not be walking on them.

Mr. Eno said that on the fancier patterns with relief, the color was not integral to the concrete. That would be brushed or sprayed on and sealed. If a single color was used, it would be integral to the concrete and it could never wear away. The stamped, colored concrete would have sprinkled on powder that had been sealed. It was beautiful when it was new, but it did wear off. That would be used in the islands of the roundabouts. That would not be driven on, and it should always look the same. A single, monotone color would be cast in with the materials and blended in with the concrete. Something with alternating light and dark colors would have to be sprayed on, and it could wear off over time. Dr. Stamps thought that a lot of it would be covered with vegetation, at least on the Mill Pond side. He thanked Mr. Eno for addressing his concerns.

Ms. Morlan asked if the walkway would be a regular sidewalk. Mr. Eno said that they were proposing an eight-foot wide asphalt pathway. Ms.

Morlan observed that when the water main went up Dequindre to Avon, it did not keep following Dequindre. She asked if that was because of the location of the roundabout. Mr. Eno said that it went behind the woods and under the River. It followed Dequindre. Ms. Morlan asked to see the slide that showed it, and she asked why it did not continue on Dequindre.

Mr. Davis noted that he had been involved in the projects quite a bit, and he felt that they were really exciting projects for the community. Originally, the main was going to continue along Dequindre and go on the north side of Avon and head east. GLWA changed that alignment. He believed that part of it was because of the bridge proximity. They were going to be east of the bridge, so they would not have to worry about trying to avoid some of the abutments for the new bridge. It would help the projects with timing, because both would be constructed at the same time. He thought that if the water main was going where it was originally intended, it would have been a problem for coordination. The downside of that was that there were taking an eight-foot diameter water main and going through private property. It presented a different set of difficulties. They would have been going through the City's Bloomer Park property on the north side of Avon or the private property owned by the Cider Mill. The decision had been made a while ago by GLWA. Ms. Morlan was recalling correctly; it did go differently when the project was first proposed. Ms. Morlan thought that it would make sense if Dequindre was ripped up anyway to follow that line.

Vice Chairperson Granthen asked if they had any idea how old the trees to be removed were. She explained that in the past, the HDC saw homeowners who wanted to preserve older trees on their property. Mr. Eno was not sure that they could place the wall in such a way that the trees would not be directly impacted. They would be within five feet of the trunks, and when they removed a lot of surface, it impacted the roots. He would rather remove them, with the understanding that if they did not, there was a risk that they could be damaged. He did not think that there would be a safe way to preserve them with the wall. Vice Chairperson Granthen reminded that they would have to get permission from the homeowner. Mr. Eno agreed, and said that most of the wall would be on private property. The Road Commission would need to acquire property to the back of the new wall. Temporarily, they would need an easement to excavate and build the wall. There were some negotiations that had to occur with the property owners. If the property owner did not want the wall, they would propose other options. He knew that the City strongly wanted a pathway down both sides of the road. If they could not get it, the water main would get built either way. Vice Chairperson Granthen recalled that

when the City wanted to install a sidewalk on Avon, no easement was granted so that some of the trees could be preserved, so the HDC had some issues with historic trees in the past. Mr. Eno asked if a gap had been left in the pathway, which she confirmed, and she added that there were two historic properties on Avon where the trees had been left, because the homeowners would not grant an easement.

Mr. Davis said that the owner of Yates, Mike Titus, had been extensively involved in the negotiations for the projects. It was a little frustrating from the Engineers' and the agencies' standpoints that the attorneys were the ones working things out. Ultimately, if there was a concern, and the trees could not be removed, which they had not heard yet, the projects might go a certain way, and the attorneys would decide the details.

Ms. Morlan asked if the Titus' had input on the wall. Mr. Eno said that the Engineers and Designers had not directly talked with them. They had been told not to contact them directly with options. They were presenting things to their attorneys. The lines of communication were a little cloudy currently. Ideally, they would show Mr. Titus several options and work with him so he could be 100% on board or at least understand what they were proposing. There were a few different influences on the projects, including the HDC and the property owners and in the end, they would be presenting everything to everyone. Hopefully, they could come to a consensus. He said that they did not know if the Titus' were aware of the proposed wall.

MOTION by Janulis, seconded by Stamps, in the matter of File No. HDC 20-039, that the Historic Districts Commission **APPROVES** the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for modification of the previous approval to replace additional length of the millrace and replace the concrete headwall and grate; and the new roadway, traffic circle, paths, retaining walls, fencing, and pedestrian crossing and signals as proposed at 1950 Avon Road in the Yates Cider Mill Historic District, Parcel Identification Number 70-15-13-427-002, with the following Findings and Conditions:

- 1. The mill building, mill race and headwall **do** contribute to the historic character of the district;*
- 2. The proposed removal of the additional length of corrugated metal pipe lining the mill race and replacement with matching corrugated metal pipe; replacement of the concrete headwall with a matching headwall and custom grate; construction of the new 3-lane roadway with paths, traffic circle, retaining walls, fencing, and pedestrian*

crossing and signals as proposed is in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines, where it is recommended to repair deteriorated historic features and have compatible new construction that does not destroy historic materials, in particular standard numbers 6 and 9 as follows:

3. *The applicant shall come back with options for the colors and materials for the retaining wall and attempt to communicate with the property owner at 1990 E. Avon Rd. regarding the design and appearance of the wall.*

6. *Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*

9. *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*

The original proposed motion in the staff report did not have condition three, which Mr. Tischer had suggested adding. Vice Chairperson Granthen asked the motion maker and seconder if they agreed. Dr. Stamps did, and Ms. Janulis said that she did in spirit. She reminded that the retaining wall would be on private property. If it was her property, she would have plenty to say about what it would look like, more so than the HDC members. She could agree with the condition, or she could leave it to Administration. Between the property owners and Administration, she believed that Mr. Davis knew what they were looking for. She did not feel that the applicants had to come back, but she would agree to it if everyone else thought that it was necessary. Vice Chairperson Granthen asked if other Commissioners had thoughts. Personally, she said that she would like to see some choices. Mr. Stephens and Ms. Altherr-Rogers agreed that they would as well.

A motion was made by Janulis, seconded by Stamps, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Granthen, Janulis, Stamps, Stephens, Tischer, Altherr-Rogers and Morlan

Excused 2 - Lyons and Thompson

Vice Chairperson Granthen stated for the record that the motion had carried. She thanked the applicants for the presentation.

Ms. Kidorf asked if the Commissioners could make some suggestions about the color palette or rock shapes they were interested in seeing so the applicants could come back with four or five choices. Mr. Tischer said that his opinion would be that they should keep the pewter color the RCOC was using. He said that was his thought personally, and he was not speaking for others on the Commission. Ms. Janulis suggested that the people whose property it would sit on should agree to the samples before they were brought back before the Commission. Otherwise, for her, there would be no point. Vice Chairperson Granthen asked if she would not want something to match the Cider Mill, and Ms. Janulis said that she agreed with pewter.

Mr. Roberts asked if more of a round rock in lieu of angular would be preferred, which the members verified. Vice Chairperson Granthen said that she had loved the historic stone wall on Adams since she was little, and she would love to see something similar. Mr. Tischer thought that if it could be less engineered-looking, if possible, that it would look better. Mr. Eno said that at least for the wall in front of the home, because they would be digging out the earth and making it stable, it could be, as opposed to the one by the Mill Race which needed to be engineered. The one by the house would really just be blocking the dirt, and he thought that there would be some flexibility with that one. He would ask the suppliers if they could show them some walls that had been done elsewhere, and get some options narrowed down. He agreed that it would be very important to have the homeowners understand and to get their buy-in.

Dr. Stamps said that he appreciated Ms. Janulis' concern in supporting the land owners. He would appreciate reaching out to them. The HDC needed to also look at what they might choose. If it was a Victorian mansion in San Francisco, they might choose purples and pinks. He thought that would be incompatible with what they were talking about. They needed to work together. He remarked that the landowners would only live there another 50 years, and he was concerned about another 100. He knew that Mr. Davis would take good care of them.

Ms. Kidorf reminded the Commissioners that the home to the east of the Cider Mill on Avon was outside of the historic district. It was not technically in the HDC's jurisdiction, however, the wall at the Pond was.

She understood the concerns, but she wanted to them to be aware. Mr. Tischer thanked her for the clarification, which he indicated was important.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Vice Chairperson Granthen mentioned that the State Historic Preservation Conference was going on this week. She and Ms. Janulis had signed up for the Saturday session. She suggested that if anyone else was interested, they might consider attending on Saturday.

Ms. Kapelanski said that they forgot to include the Earl Borden Awards on the agenda. She wondered if the members were interested in discussing that. Vice Chairperson Granthen explained, for the newer members, that in the past, the HDC had given awards to institutions and individuals for historic preservation. They did not give one last year due to the pandemic, but they might want to consider it for 2021. She thought that they could think about parties they might want to honor and discuss it at the next meeting.

Dr. Stamps felt that it was a nice opportunity to pat someone on the back and thank them. He mentioned past winner Oakland University for the reconstruction of the barn at Meadowbrook. He realized that they did not have to give an award every year, but if there had been a project that really stood out, he felt that it would be appropriate. Vice Chairperson Granthen suggested sending in ideas for winners, and they could be put on the next agenda.

Mr. Stephens asked if there were guidelines regarding it. Vice Chairperson Granthen said that they had looked at prior recipients and been inspired to recognize something or someone similar. She remembered that there was a list of past winners somewhere, and Ms. Kapelanski said that she would look it up and send it to the members. Vice Chairperson Granthen recalled that some people had received an award a couple of times. Dr. Stamps mentioned the Rochester University barn, and Vice Chairperson Granthen mentioned that the Van Hoosen Museum received one for the Calf Barn and another building. She thought that it was a lovely way to recognize historic efforts at preservation. She had not thought about it, but with more time to consider, she felt that she could come up with some ideas.

Vice Chairperson Granthen reminded everyone about the event on May 20 with the Museum. It would be virtual, starting at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Tischer asked Ms. Kapelanski if she could fill the Commissioners in

on the Crooks Rd. property. He noted that he had gotten a flyer in the mail regarding a proposed senior living facility for the property. He recalled that the Commission had approved the facility, and the barn had to stay. Ms. Kapelanski clarified that it was called Barns Senior Living, which came before the HDC in late 2020. It went to the Planning Commission on April 20, 2021, and a lot of residents turned out. They were almost exclusively opposed to the project, which was a facility for seven to 12 residents. She advised that senior living facilities were permitted outright for up to six beds. 7-12 beds required a conditional use recommendation from the Planning Commission and approval by City Council ultimately, which was mandated by State law. The matter was tabled at the Planning Commission meeting, and the applicant had decided to withdraw his application because of the pushback from the residents. The applicant did intend to move forward with six beds, and they intended to build the structure approved by the HDC. There would just be six residents instead of 12. Mr. Tischer asked if the home would be in the same footprint and have the same square-footage, which Ms. Kapelanski confirmed. Vice Chairperson Granthen had heard that the applicant did not have money to restore the barn. Ms. Kapelanski said that it came up at the meeting. Staff met with him and talked about his new plan and what happened at the Planning Commission meeting. He had been in contact with the people who restored the barn at Rochester University. He thought that he would make it structurally sound initially and do the work to maintain it. She did not think that the interior would be used right away, as it would require a lot more expensive work because of past renovations that were done without permits. She noted that he eventually wanted to use the interior for his residents. There was nothing in writing or any building permits stating that he was going to build the exact same thing, but that was what had been communicated to staff.

Mr. Tischer asked if he modified the home if it would have to come back before the HDC. Ms. Kapelanski agreed that it would. Mr. Tischer thanked her for the update.

Dr. Stamps said that for some reason, he was awake in the middle of the night, and he mentioned watching the Planning Commission "abuse" that poor owner who was trying to protect the barn. They were complaining because he did not have a dumpster or a surround for his dumpster, and he was just going to use regular trash cans. A couple of members also said some nasty things about the HDC, and that it was their fault because they allowed his project to go through, and then it was dumped on PC's lap. Vice Chairperson Granthen commented that the HDC had to follow the rules. Dr. Stamps acknowledged that they did, and he said that he felt

good about it. He just thought that they were dumping on the poor guy.

Ms. Kidorf encouraged people to sign up for the Saturday session of the MHPN conference. Even if someone could not watch it on Saturday, they would have access to the recording until the end of the year, and it was only \$10. Vice Chairperson Granthen added that the City would reimburse people. Ms. Kidorf said that it would not be available immediately, but if people registered, they would get an email when the recording was ready. Mr. Tischer asked Ms. Gentry to sign him up.

Vice Chairperson Granthen was not sure how many people watched the City Council meeting Monday, May 10th, but the Harding property was on the agenda. Ms. Kapelanski advised that the HDC forwarded the approved Final Report, which recommended that the Harding property not be delisted. The City Council accepted the report. Staff had also included a potential Ordinance to delist the property at the request of the homeowner. The Ordinance was pulled at the last minute, because a potential buyer came forward who was interested in restoring the historic home. It was their understanding that the owner, Mr. Miller, and the buyer had not yet negotiated pricing. It was hoped that they could come to an agreement on a reasonable price, and that the home would get restored. Alternately, if they did not, Mr. Miller had up to a year to come back to City Council and request a delisting. Vice Chairperson Granthen said it was very hopeful to see a potential buyer. She heard that the potential buyer had done previous restoration work on homes. Ms. Kidorf agreed that he told the Council members he had experience. Vice Chairperson Granthen remembered that a lot of the HDSC and HDC members visited the house back in December.

Mr. Tischer asked if Mr. Putnam ever came back (947 E. Tienken). Mr. Tischer thought that they gave him 60 days to come back with a proposal of some sort to move and/or renovate the house. Ms. Kidorf stated that it had not come back, and she thought that he had drifted away. Ms. Janulis knew that he had been out of town in Florida for a couple of months, so she considered that there still might be interest.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Vice Chairperson Granthen reminded the Commissioners that the next Regular Meeting was scheduled for June 10, 2021. She also reminded again about the presentation on May 20, 2021 by Pat McKay, Museum Director regarding work at the Museum during the pandemic.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Historic Districts Commission and upon motion by Mr. Tischer, seconded by Ms. Janulis, Vice Chairperson Granthen adjourned the Regular Meeting at 8:22 p.m.

Julie Granthen, Vice Chairperson
Rochester Hills
Historic Districts Commission

Charles Tischer, Secretary