

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Sieffert, Szantner, Dressel, Dziurman, Stamps, Thompson, Dunphy, Kilpatrick  
Nays: None  
Absent: Cozzolino

**MOTION CARRIED**

Ms. Butty stated she had some maintenance work to be done on the chimney and requested some direction regarding those repairs. Ms. Sieffert asked the type of material the chimney was constructed of. Ms. Butty indicated it was colored brick.

Mr. Dziurman stated he had discussed this matter with the applicant previously, and suggested the chimney remain brick. He noted the applicant's contractor had suggested boxing the chimney in wood, and he indicated he told the applicant the chimney should remain the same brick as it currently is. He noted the chimney had pulled away from the wall necessitating the repairs.

Ms. Sieffert stated it was preferable for the repairs to a historic building to be made as close as possible to the original. She indicated if the chimney was brick, it was preferable not to change the material in any way, otherwise it would change the look of the structure. She noted the HDC was not required to monitor routine maintenance.

Ms. Butty indicated she was questioning whether a change to the chimney, with material of that era, would be acceptable. Ms. Sieffert noted the HDC would not want to see the chimney changed to a different material. Mr. Dziurman stated a change in materials could result in a "false sense of history". He explained the HDC had certain standards they were required to follow, which would not allow for substitution of materials in a historic structure.

**9. OLD BUSINESS**

**File No. HDC 03-003 (City File #02-027)**

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness - New Construction  
Certificate of Appropriateness - Relocation of Historic House  
Sidwell: 15-23-300-035  
Address: 1585 S. Rochester Road (City Place)  
Applicant: G&V Properties LLC

Chairperson Kilpatrick explained the request was for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction, and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the relocation of a historic house. He noted this project had been presented to the HDC approximately one (1) year ago for discussion.

Mr. Delacourt noted this project had been before the HDC as a discussion item, and had been through multiple meetings with the Planning Commission and City Council regarding the use of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) process. He explained the use of the PUD process had been approved, and the applicant and staff felt the next

appropriate step would be to appear before the HDC to discuss the elevations of the proposed new construction, and the relocation of the historic house.

Mr. Delacourt explained approval by the HDC of the new construction and the relocation of the historic house would be two (2) of three (3) approvals that would be required by the project. He stated the third approval would be the renovation of the historic house once a use had been identified and the house relocated. He indicated the applicant preferred to identify a use for the house before requesting any approval for the rehabilitation. He stated the approval of the new construction and the relocation of the house would be conditioned upon the rehabilitation plan being approved prior to the actual moving of the structure. He explained the house could not be moved until the HDC granted approval of the rehabilitation plan.

Mr. Delacourt stated the reason for the request for the approval of the new construction and the relocation of the historic house at this time, was to give the Planning Commission and the City Council some level of confidence that the HDC was in agreement with the new construction and relocation of the historic house.

Mr. Dziurman stated the proper request before the HDC at this meeting was moving the house, and the location would come with the move.

Ms. Sieffert noted the Agenda listed approval of the new construction first, with the relocation of the historic house second. She suggested the relocation of the house be discussed first. Chairperson Kilpatrick agreed with that suggestion. Mr. Dziurman noted if the HDC did not approve relocation of the house, the balance of the project might not work. Chairperson Kilpatrick verified that the applicants would agree to a discussion of the relocation of the house first. The applicants indicated they would.

Chairperson Kilpatrick noted the applicants had been before the HDC previously, and requested a brief summary of the proposal with respect to the relocation of the house. He noted the Minutes from the previous discussion reflected the proposed relocation of the home to the end of a boulevard.

The applicant, Mr. William Gilbert, G&V Investments, LLC, and Mr. Mark Abanatha, Alexander Bogaerts Associates, the project architect, were present.

Mr. Gilbert stated at one time it was proposed for the historic house to be relocated to the east corner of the property. He noted it was a consensus of the HDC that the house be more visible and located on the main street, as well as oriented to front on the main street. He referred to a display on the easel, and noted the current proposed location of the house on the southeast corner of the parcel off Rochester Road. He noted that location fit in well with the rehabilitated historic house on the west side of Rochester Road, which was currently the Mercy Medical Building.

Mr. Gilbert stated the historic house at 1585 S. Rochester Road was currently sided with eight (8") inch aluminum siding and was in pretty bad shape. He noted additions had

been made to the home over the years, such as the two-car garage and at least one of the porches. He indicated he was not sure at this time what portion of the house was original, although additional research would be conducted to determine that. He explained they had not peeled away any of the siding to check the condition of the clapboard on the home. He stated the inside of the house was a mess, noting maintenance had been deferred for many years. He stated the house had not been maintained for many years prior to his purchase of it in 1986. He felt the last time the house had been redecorated was most likely done by the previous owners in the 1960's. He explained there was evidence inside the house of leaks, and the kitchen was not in good shape.

Mr. Gilbert stated because the house was a regulated historic house, they wanted to relocate the house and work with the HDC on restoring the house to its original integrity.

Chairperson Kilpatrick questioned whether the project could proceed with the house in its present location. Mr. Gilbert explained if the house was left in its present location, it would be in the middle of the project and out of place with the balance and the consistent look they were trying to achieve with the development. He felt that architecturally, the house would fit in better on the perimeter of the project, rather than in the middle.

Ms. Sieffert stated she was familiar with the property and the house was part of the Rochester Hills cultural landscape. She noted it resembled the building across the street, and in a sense the two homes are like bookends leading to Downtown Rochester. She indicated the additions on the home were typical of the evolution of any structure, and the HDC regarded the additions as the timeline of a structure showing what has taken place through the years. She explained the HDC did not look at a structure in its purest form of having to go back to the beginning, but rather the HDC valued all of the structure. She noted that would be with the exception of the garage. She indicated the interior of the structure was not a concern of the HDC, but rather what it represents to the City.

Ms. Sieffert stated she felt the house was a precious part of the City's cultural landscape; however, she did not believe it appeared to be compatible, architecturally, with the proposed project. She requested the applicant to address potential reuse of the house, noting it had been suggested the house could be used as a clubhouse. She indicated she did not feel the proposed project would have a need for clubhouse. She suggested the house might be reused as a gourmet restaurant, or possibly as a bed and breakfast.

Mr. Gilbert stated the house would not be used for a clubhouse. He suggested the house might be used as an antique shop, or an office building, and noted the suggestion of a bed and breakfast was good. He indicated the house could also be used as a private residence.

Mr. Dziurman noted as the City becomes built-up, the pressure on historic properties would increase. He noted many current projects within the City included historic properties. He felt the Commission had to be careful about the direction they take, because it could make a significant difference to what happens to the Community historically. He explained the decisions made by the Commission were for the protection of the citizens and the City's historic resources.

Mr. Dziurman stated some of the suggestions for the ultimate use of the historic house were good ones. He indicated the applicant had been before the HDC several years previously with respect to the Eddington Farms Subdivision, and at the time the HDC was promised no barns would be torn down; however, the barns were torn down.

Mr. Gilbert stated he did not believe he had ever made such an agreement and requested a copy of the Minutes from that meeting. He questioned the reason for appearing before the HDC at that time. Mr. Dziurman stated it was in connection with the development of the Eddington Farms Subdivision. Mr. Gilbert noted the property connected with the Eddington Farms Subdivision was not a regulated historic site. Mr. Dziurman stated the house was regulated, and at that time the HDC regulated within one hundred (100') feet of the house. He agreed the barns were not part of the regulated site; however, he felt the applicant had promised to retain the barns. Mr. Gilbert indicated that was not his recollection of those events. Mr. Dziurman stated he felt there was a history between the HDC and this applicant, and he was not happy with that history.

Mr. Dziurman stated the HDC was required to follow the Secretary of Interior Standards, and noted Dr. Jane Busch's survey of the site indicated the house had architectural significance. He noted the house had been modified, and removing the inappropriate additions, such as the two-car attached garage and the aluminum siding during the applicant's restoration of the house would be very positive.

Mr. Dziurman stated the Secretary of Interior Standards criteria indicated the HDC was to consider relocation of an historic structure as a last resort. He referred to the National Register criteria, which indicated the integrity of the property was an issue. He stated there were seven (7) aspects of integrity, which are:

Location: The place where a historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.

Mr. Dziurman noted moving the structure would take away from its proper location.

Design: The combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure and style of the property.

Mr. Dziurman stated the argument could be made that some of the design of the farm had been destroyed; however, the area in front was still relatively open.

Setting: The physical environment of a historic property.

Materials: Mr. Dziurman noted the house would be restored as part of this project.

Mr. Dziurman indicated the remaining criteria for integrity were workmanship, feeling and association between the person and the historic site.

Mr. Dziurman referred to relocation of the house, and noted the National Register contained criteria that spoke in favor of relocation by stating under Section VII (How to Apply the Criteria Considerations): "A building or structure removed from its original location, but which is significant primarily for architectural value, or which is a surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic person or event". He felt that statement indicated relocation was allowable if the significance was primarily architectural, and noted Dr. Busch's report had indicated the house was architecturally significant.

Ms. Sieffert questioned what circumstances would allow the relocation. Mr. Dziurman stated when Dr. Busch had conducted her survey, she had discovered other houses that had been moved from their original location, and they had lost their significance because they were not architecturally significant. He felt it was possible to relocate the subject house and if the house retained its architecture, the relocation would be approvable under the HDC standards. He indicated if the relocation were approved by the HDC, the results of the restoration would have to be specified very clearly.

Chairperson Kilpatrick stated if a relocation was approved, the appropriateness of moving could be conditioned upon the applicant presenting a proper plan about how it will be rehabilitated. He clarified if the house were not to be rehabilitated pursuant to the HDC's jurisdiction, the removal would not happen.

Mr. Delacourt explained the intent of any proposed motion would be to indicate that the proposed location of the house within the project was acceptable; however, prior to relocating the house, the plans for the renovation of the house would have to be approved by the HDC. He noted those approvals would be necessary prior to the City issuing the applicant a permit to relocate the structure.

Mr. Delacourt explained the applicant would be required to present the HDC with a revised plot plan showing the dimensions from the road, dimensions from the new driveway, landscaping, or any other items the HDC wanted to review.

Mr. Delacourt stated approval by the HDC of the proposed relocation of the house would give the City Council confidence that if they approved the PUD, and the development in general, that the relocation of the house had been decided, with the details to be worked out later.

Mr. Szantner questioned the purpose for rotating the house ninety (90°) degrees. Mr. Abanatha explained the purpose was the placement of the primary front of the house which would relate to the historic house across the street, as well as the street presence of the streetscape and urban fabric being established along Rochester Road.

Mr. Szantner clarified the rotation of the house was to provide a more accurate representation of how the building was presented to the street. Mr. Gilbert stated it was their opinion that most homes face the street.

Mr. Szantner questioned which side of the home the applicant considered the front. Mr. Gilbert indicated it was the south side.

Chairperson Kilpatrick questioned whether the applicant had determined whether the house could, in fact, be moved and maintain its integrity, or whether the move would destroy the home. Mr. Gilbert stated he did not believe the additions could be moved, and noted the garage was an add-on. He indicated he was not sure if the house would have to be moved in sections. He noted the house would require major exterior work, which was currently hidden by the aluminum siding, noting the siding was at least thirty (30) years old.

Chairperson Kilpatrick questioned what would happen to the applicant's proposed plan if it was determined the house could not be moved, or it would be destroyed through a move, and had to be retained on its present site. Mr. Gilbert stated it was his general feeling the house could be moved. Mr. Dziurman stated he believed the house could be moved, although it might have to be moved in two pieces. Mr. Gilbert noted the home was not being moved a great distance, and he felt a contractor using today's technology could move the house.

Mr. Dziurman referred to the proposed orientation of the house, which would change the original orientation. He noted the case could be made to present the front, but it would change the relationship the house had to the street.

Dr. Stamps referred to the current orientation of the house, noting the prime view was most likely looking north at that time. He agreed rotating the house, if relocated, would make more sense noting the elevation and the fact it would provide a better view to the public.

Dr. Stamps referred to his comments made during the July 11, 2002 HDC meeting regarding the historic house across the street. He felt it would be appropriate for the current house, if relocated, to be set back a distance from the street, providing a front yard. He indicated he preferred relocating the house to the front of the site, rather than in the back as had been proposed a year ago. He noted that would showcase the house as an architectural piece, and not as an open space as it was previously. He indicated the previous context had been lost because the barns and other buildings were gone.

Dr. Stamps noted the applicant had indicated the house had not been properly maintained prior to his purchase of it, and questioned whether the applicant had performed any maintenance during his ownership of the structure. Mr. Gilbert stated the roof had been repaired after he purchased it. He noted the house had been leased because he did not want to leave it vacant.

Mr. Dunphy questioned whether the applicant could provide a potential distance of the house from the street if relocated, as opposed to its current distance from the street. Mr. Gilbert referred to the display on the easel, noting that City Staff had requested an additional access point to the site, which he did not believe would be approved by the

Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT). He felt the boulevard entrance would be sufficient to handle the traffic, and the added entranceway so close to the adjacent property would not be approved. He indicated he did not believe the road next to the proposed relocation of the house would be kept in the final plan. He noted if that road were eliminated, the space for the house would be better. Mr. Abanatha stated the area where the house was currently proposed to be located was approximately sixty-eight (68') feet off the right-of-way. He noted the house's current location was approximately fifty (50') feet off the right-of-way. Mr. Abanatha referred to the display on the easel, and noted the relocated position of the house would be aligned with the street presence and not set as far back in terms of a visual line.

Mr. Dziurman questioned whether the proposed plan had been approved. Mr. Gilbert explained the process began because the site was master planned mixed use, but was zoned residential. He indicated the only way to develop a mixed use development was through the PUD Ordinance.

Mr. Gilbert stated the project had been presented to the HDC for information and discussion purposes; then presented to a Planning Commission study session; and then presented to a joint meeting of the Planning Commission and City Council. He noted City Staff had also been reviewing the plan during this process. He indicated the plan then went back to the Planning Commission for recommendation of the use of the PUD process, which was the only vehicle available to develop this project. He stated the plan was then presented again to City Council for approval of the use of the PUD process as an appropriate vehicle for the project.

Mr. Gilbert stated the next step for the project was this meeting with the HDC, and it would then go back to the Planning Commission with an actual PUD Agreement, which would include any HDC conditions, and HDC approval for adaptive reuse of the structure and related rehabilitation. He explained the use of the PUD would give the City and the City Council more control over the project than straight rezoning.

Mr. Gilbert stated the project had been in process for approximately fifteen (15) months, although it had received positive reassurance along with expressed concerns and issues. He explained based on the recommendation and approval of the use of the PUD process, the next step would be approval by the HDC for relocation of the historic house and approval of the new construction. He stated prior to negotiation of the PUD Agreement, the relocation of the house should be approved by the HDC.

Mr. Dziurman stated the adjacent property was owned by Bordines, and noted future development of that property by Bordines could affect the project.

Mr. Dziurman questioned how access would be provided to the house if it is relocated to the proposed position on the site and adaptively reused. He noted there did not appear to be a provision for parking by the house for any adaptive reuse.

Chairperson Kilpatrick expressed concern about being tied to a particular location without having the details about any proposed rehabilitation. He noted the potential use of the adjacent property by Bordines could present some problems. He suggested there might be a better place on the site to relocate the house, such as the northern end of the property.

Mr. Gilbert stated he understood the concerns that had been expressed by the Commissioners. He indicated parking would be considered based on the use of the structure. He noted a similar situation had occurred with the historic house at 71 N. Livernois, because the structure had previously been a private residence and then was adapted to an office use. He stated at the time the office use of that premises was considered, the parking had to be adapted to fit that use.

Mr. Gilbert stated the readaptive use of the house would have to meet all ordinance requirements. He indicated they were not sure at this time how the structure would be adaptively reused, although he did not believe it could be reused as a restaurant due to the low ceiling heights, and the fact there was very little room for the mechanical and ventilation requirements of a restaurant. He noted a reuse of the house as a restaurant would require major renovation. He believed the house could best be reused as a small office or small retail shop, such as an antique shop.

Mr. Szantner questioned the setback requirements along Rochester Road and whether the proposed project met the minimum setback requirements at this time. Mr. Delacourt explained, through the use of the PUD process, the City would enter into an agreement for the redevelopment of the site. He stated that written document would set the zoning requirements for the site. He indicated the reason for the applicant coming before the HDC at this meeting was to determine if the proposed relocation site was appropriate, which would allow the negotiation of the PUD Agreement to begin. He explained as part of the PUD process, the setbacks became flexible and negotiable. He stated if the HDC approved the proposed relocation, and the plan were approved as part of the PUD Agreement, the plan would become an exhibit to that agreement indicating the property would have to be developed accordingly. He noted the technical site plans would then be generated that would determine exactly what the setbacks were. He indicated once that part of the process was completed, the plan would be brought back to the HDC for approval of the use, the renovation, the setbacks, and the orientation, if the orientation could not be decided at this meeting.

Mr. Szantner questioned if the plan were developed under the Ordinance, or if the property to the south was developed under the traditional Ordinance, whether the proposed plan would be in violation of the front yard setbacks. Mr. Delacourt indicated it would.

Mr. Szantner noted if Bordine developed their property according to the Ordinance, the setbacks would be greater than under the proposed PUD plan, which would provide visibility for the house. Mr. Delacourt stated part of the reason the proposed project was being developed under the PUD Ordinance was because the property was master planned



as mixed use. He explained the City did not have a specific mixed use zoning district, which left very few options other than the use of the PUD. He noted the Bordine property was also master planned for mixed use, which most likely meant it would be developed under the same scenario and the City could negotiate those matters. Mr. Dziurman noted the HDC would not have any authority over the Bordine property.

Mr. Szantner noted if the Bordine property were also developed under a PUD process, the City would have the opportunity to ensure the house was showcased. Mr. Dunphy noted the Planning Commission and the City Council would have to agree they wanted the house to be showcased as a condition of any proposed development by Bordine's.

Mr. Dziurman suggested the HDC could include a condition in their approval which would indicate the HDC's desire for the home to be showcased, and which would remain on the record and in writing. Mr. Delacourt stated whatever was approved or recommended at the HDC, would be included in the record that goes forward to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Szantner suggested the HDC could include a condition that would specify that the greenspace remain in front of the relocated house, and parking or related items for any proposed adaptive reuse would have to be located elsewhere on the site. He clarified any proposed reuse of the structure would have to be approved by the HDC. Mr. Delacourt indicated that was correct. Mr. Szantner noted that meant the HDC did not have to be as concerned about any proposed reuse at this time because any proposed reuse would be brought back to the HDC for approval.

Dr. Stamps asked whether Bordines had given any indication of a proposed development on their property. Mr. Delacourt stated the Planning Department had not been contacted regarding any redevelopment of that site.

Dr. Stamps suggested it would be nice if Bordine could purchase the corner of the applicant's property where the house was proposed to be relocated and create a similar setting such as the Kmart Corporation had done on Big Beaver Road. He indicated Bordines could then use that site as their headquarters.

Mr. Gilbert stated he had spoken to members of the Bordine family, suggesting they join with G&V Investments in the development of this project. He noted although there were considerable advantages to developing together, at that time the Bordine family indicated they intended to continue their current use of the site. He indicated he had heard the property had since been sold, and he was also concerned about what could be developed on the site.

Dr. Stamps questioned whether the applicant would be willing to sell off the corner of his property if Bordines expressed an interest. Mr. Gilbert indicated he would be willing to negotiate a sale, although he did not believe there was any interest on the part of the Bordines at this time.

Chairperson Kilpatrick suggested the Commissioners determine if they agree conceptually with the proposed relocation of the house.

Mr. Thompson stated he felt this was a good opportunity to keep the house intact. He noted the house would be moved, but it would remain and stated he appreciated the fact the applicant was willing to work with the HDC to rehabilitate the structure. Ms. Dressel agreed with Mr. Thompson's comments.

Mr. Dziurman questioned whether the setback would be in line with those proposed for the office buildings. Mr. Delacourt stated if Bordines were to redevelop under the current zoning codes, the setbacks would be farther back than those of the proposed project. He noted the setback from Rochester Road would be one of the big issues with this project as it moves forward.

Mr. Dziurman questioned whether any other projects in the City had been developed with the proposed setbacks. Mr. Delacourt stated the setbacks from Rochester Road were a complicated planning issue in the City because Rochester Road had a meandering one hundred eighty (180') foot right-of-way from section line and it was not consistent up and down Rochester Road. He noted that was the proposed right-of-way and not the existing, which is what was planned from. He explained the right-of-way meandered different widths on different sides of the road, depending on where it went because of the way Rochester Road was built. He noted the setbacks would be a big part of all discussions regarding this project.

Mr. Dziurman clarified the setback requirements would be part of the PUD Agreement. Mr. Delacourt stated with the proposed project, the setback from the proposed right-of-way would become a part of the PUD Agreement.

Mr. Dziurman stated he was not comfortable approving something that was just a proposed location, noting he felt the HDC was required to be more specific in its decisions. Chairperson Kilpatrick agreed there were many issues still to be considered with the proposed project.

Mr. Dziurman questioned how the HDC approval of the proposed location would help the applicant move on with the process. Mr. Gilbert stated it was his understanding from the City Council and the Planning Commission meetings, that City Council felt it would be better for him to discuss the project with the HDC again in view of the fact the previously proposed relocation site had not been acceptable to the HDC. He stated City Council would like to address the relocation of the house during the negotiations of the PUD Agreement, and the issue could not be negotiated until the relocation received HDC approval.

Mr. Delacourt stated City Council wanted to be sure the HDC was in agreement with the proposed relocation of the house, and the moving of the house in general. Mr. Dziurman noted that the proposal was still in concept. Mr. Delacourt noted the determination and approval of the final location would be made later in the process.

Mr. Delacourt indicated City Council also wanted to be sure the HDC was in agreement with the type, amount and elevations for the proposed new construction on the historic district.

Mr. Dziurman questioned whether the property comprising the entire project was in a historic district. Mr. Gilbert noted it was the section south of Eddington.

Mr. Dziurman stated there were many homes and subdivisions located on property in the Stoney Creek Historic District that had required HDC approval; however, he did not believe those homes and subdivisions should have been under the authority of the HDC. He noted the proposed project would fall into a similar situation, with any changes proposed in the future requiring HDC approval. He suggested if the project is approved and relocation of the historic resource is approved, a portion of the property be delisted.

Mr. Delacourt stated currently the property is a historic district, and noted the HDC could recommend that the Historic Districts Study Committee reevaluate the district and make a recommendation of a smaller district to City Council. Mr. Dziurman noted that process could be recommended after the subject project is approved, although he felt the matter should be pursued at a later date. Chairperson Kilpatrick agreed, noting this situation was also occurring with similar projects in historic districts.

Mr. Delacourt stated Staff had discussed that situation, noting the proposed buildings on Rochester Road would have commercial on the first floor. Staff had questioned whether each individual sign on the front of the building would require HDC approval. He stated the suggestion had been made that as long as each sign was in keeping with what was approved originally, it would not be required to come back to the HDC. Mr. Dziurman stated he did not believe that would work very well, and noted if something was in a historic district, it would be required to come before the HDC for approval. He indicated that was the reason he had suggested delisting a portion of that property.

Dr. Stamps stated he was not ready to vote on an approval for either of the requests before the HDC at this meeting. He felt he needed more time to review the matter before voting, because there were so many unanswered questions at this time.

Mr. Dunphy questioned whether any of the Commissioners were comfortable presenting a proposed motion at this time. He noted he shared many of the concerns that had been expressed by the Commissioners.

Mr. Dziurman suggested a proposed motion should isolate the dimensions of the property, noting it would be better to understand how large or small the parcel would be where it was proposed to relocate the house. He noted the side yard setback appeared to be extremely tight at this time.

Mr. Gilbert stated the proposed plan currently reflected the house relocated with the attached garage. He indicated since the garage was not a concern of the HDC, it would not be moved, which would allow for additional greenbelt and setback area around the

home. He stated he had conceptual landscape architect site plans that had been prepared by isolating the property around the house, and which had been prepared with and without the additional access road. He noted he believed it was highly unlikely MDOT would approve a curb cut in that location, due to safety issues and sight distances.

Mr. Delacourt stated another option, rather than approving a Certificate of Appropriateness, would be for the HDC to pass a resolution indicating the HDC's agreement to moving the historic house to a location consistent with the materials presented to the HDC at this meeting, and requiring the applicant to appear before the HDC for a Certificate of Appropriateness when more information became available. He indicated that such a resolution would indicate to the Planning Commission and City Council that the HDC was comfortable with moving the historic resource to a general location. He explained the HDC would then approve the official location at the time the renovations are approved.

Chairperson Kilpatrick questioned whether the applicant was prepared to commit to a description of a proposed site. Mr. Gilbert stated there were still many variables, although he was now aware that the HDC was not concerned about the attached two-car garage. He indicated that would open up the side yard considerably, and provide an opportunity to do more or less landscaping, whatever is negotiated. He explained the HDC might not want certain features of the house screened, which would mean less landscaping. He indicated he was comfortable working with the HDC at a later date on materials, landscaping and an exact orientation to the road. He felt there would also be an opportunity to move the building more to the north and provide more space or a greenbelt around it if MDOT did not approve the curb cut.

Chairperson Kilpatrick questioned whether the Commissioners would be more comfortable if the applicant appeared before the HDC again next month. He noted the applicant would most likely not have more information to provide in a month, but it would give the Commissioners time to think about the project.

Dr. Stamps indicated he would prefer to have another month to consider the project. He clarified the portion of the building the applicant referred to as the garage was the addition on the north side of the building, and that the garage had been accessed from the back. Mr. Gilbert indicated that was correct.

Dr. Stamps clarified that if MDOT did not approve the proposed curb cut, the applicant would be willing to relocate the historic house more to the north and leave a greenspace surrounding the building. He questioned whether the applicant knew how much further north the house could be located.

Mr. Gilbert discussed a tentative proposed landscape plan with some of the Commissioners, noting the elimination of the addition that was the two-car garage would provide an additional forty (40') feet of space. (The proposed tentative landscape plan discussed by Mr. Gilbert was not placed on file at this time). A discussion ensued among the Commissioners regarding possible location and landscaping options.

Dr. Stamps noted there were three (3) buildings to the east of the proposed relocation site, and questioned whether those buildings could be moved further to the east to provide parking for the relocated historic home. Mr. Abanatha explained the buildings could not be moved very much because of the location of the wetlands in the area. Mr. Delacourt noted the boundary of the wetland, and the fact a twenty-five (25') foot buffer was required.

Dr. Stamps questioned whether those three (3) buildings could be moved closer together in an effort to provide parking for the relocated house at the back of the house. Mr. Abanatha explained those items would be reviewed when the plan is brought back at the time the reuse of the structure is determined.

Dr. Stamps noted it would not be practical to relocate the house if no parking could be provided for any adaptive reuse. He suggested the bank included in the project might be relocated.

Chairperson Kilpatrick suggested the Commissioners determine whether a motion for a Certificate of Appropriateness could be voted on, or whether the Commissioners would prefer to postpone this matter to a future HDC Meeting.

Mr. Dziurman stated he would like to see a proposed size of a parcel that could be isolated for the historic house, noting he felt delisting the balance of the parcel might be appropriate. He agreed a proposed reuse could not be determined at this time.

Mr. Thompson stated he felt the Commission should keep the project moving forward, noting they currently had an opportunity to save and preserve the house. He indicated he would agree to postpone the matter for a month, but would not want to see the project held up any longer than that.

Mr. Szantner questioned when the applicant expected to receive notice from MDOT regarding the proposed curb cut near the possible location for the historic house. Mr. Delacourt stated the proposed project was still at a conceptual level to identify issues and to approve the use of the PUD process. He indicated the design of the site had not been reviewed by either the Planning Commission or City Council at this point, because both Boards wanted clarification from the HDC that the historic house could be relocated.

Mr. Szantner noted the proposed project would not be any further along in a month than what was presented at this meeting. He suggested the HDC provide an opinion regarding the relocation of the historic house to allow the Planning Commission to begin review of the proposed project. Chairperson Kilpatrick suggested the Commission could pass a resolution agreeing to the proposed conceptual relocation of the house. Mr. Gilbert explained a resolution would be helpful, noting that would allow the process of working out the details to begin.

Mr. Dziurman stated this was an important decision because the HDC had an obligation to protect historic properties. He stated he felt the matter should be postponed for a month to allow the Commissioners time to think about the matter.

Dr. Stamps agreed the Commissioners needed additional time to review the matter.

Mr. Delacourt explained the applicant was required to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness prior to relocating the house. He stated a resolution passed by the HDC would provide a communication to the Planning Commission and the City Council indicating the HDC's opinion about the matter. He noted a resolution would not provide the applicant with a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Thompson stated he understood the Commission's need for additional detail; however, those details could not be provided at this meeting. He indicated he did not believe the applicant could be held to a specific lot size at this time. He felt the Commission should consider moving forward with a resolution to allow the applicant the opportunity to go forward with the process.

Ms. Sieffert questioned whether any of the Commissioners were prepared to make a motion to indicate the HDC was in agreement with the relocation of the historic house in concept. Chairperson Kilpatrick agreed a motion to either approve the relocation of the house, or to postpone the matter to the next meeting should be made.

Mr. Dziurman stated he would make a motion to postpone the matter to the next regularly scheduled HDC meeting. Dr. Stamps stated he would second a motion to postpone.

Mr. Dziurman stated a postponement of the matter would allow the Commissioners to draft an appropriate resolution containing the proper wording, which he felt was extremely important from a legal standpoint.

Mr. Dunphy requested assistance from the City Staff in drafting a proposed resolution for discussion at the November HDC Meeting. Mr. Delacourt indicated he would provide draft resolutions as requested.

Chairperson Kilpatrick clarified the motion on the floor was to postpone the matter until the November 13, 2003 HDC Meeting. Mr. Dziurman stated that was correct.

Ms. Dressel questioned whether a resolution could be considered non-binding. Mr. Delacourt explained a resolution would not grant a Certificate of Appropriateness, which was required to actually move the house. He stated he had suggested the HDC pass a resolution approving the potential relocation of the house, in order to provide a communication to the Planning Commission and the City Council. He stated a resolution would put the opinion of the HDC on the record through a vote.

Ms. Dressel clarified the resolution could be worded to include the words "in theory" or "conceptually" to approve the resource within the district. Chairperson Kilpatrick stated

a resolution would provide the opinion of the HDC on October 9, 2003, which would indicate agreement or opposition to the proposed project. He clarified the motion on the floor was to postpone the matter to the next HDC meeting.

**MOTION** by Dziurman, seconded by Stamps, in the matter of HDC File No. 03-003 (City File #02-027), that the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Relocation of an Historic House located at 1585 S. Rochester Road, Parcel Identification Number 15-23-300-035, be **POSTPONED** to the November 13, 2003 Historic Districts Commission Meeting.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Dunphy, Sieffert, Thompson, Dressel, Kilpatrick, Szantner,  
Stamps, Dziurman  
Nays: None  
Absent: Cozzolino

**MOTION CARRIED**

Chairperson Kilpatrick questioned whether it was the intent of the Commission to also postpone the second request regarding the proposed new construction.

Mr. Gilbert requested the Commission clarify what it required for the next meeting with respect to the project. Chairperson Kilpatrick stated there were many issues currently facing the Commission and the Community regarding the relocation of a historic house and historic resources in general. He indicated the Commission wanted to present a motion containing the appropriate wording, and the Commissioners wanted to study the project and the relocation of the resource for some time prior to making a final decision. He noted the applicant would most likely not be able to provide additional detail at the next meeting regarding curb cuts, lot size or possible reuse of the resource.

Mr. Gilbert questioned how the Commissioners felt about the proposed plan on a conceptual basis, noting everything south of Eddington was the designated historic district, not just the house.

Mr. Delacourt requested clarification on whether the Commission had postponed both of the applicant's requests. Mr. Dziurman stated his motion only postponed the first request regarding relocation of the historic house.

Mr. Dziurman referred to the proposed plan, and noted the proposed relocation site situated the house somewhat behind the adjacent building. Mr. Gilbert stated he did not believe it would be a problem to move the house forward.

Mr. Dziurman stated he wanted the opportunity to review the style of architecture proposed for the project, noting it was important because it would be very visible and would set a precedent. He indicated he was concerned about protecting the City's historic properties.

Mr. Dunphy stated the issue was less about expecting more information from the applicant, but more about requiring additional time to process the information already provided and to be comfortable with and think through any proposed motion or resolution.

Mr. Dziurman requested the applicant provide something he could scale the size of the buildings from. Mr. Gilbert stated he could provide a copy of the blue prints for review.

Mr. Dziurman stated it appeared the elevations in front were proposed to be brick, although some appeared to use siding. Mr. Abanatha stated some siding was shown on the buildings; however, the majority of the buildings would be stone to match the buildings along Rochester Road.

Chairperson Kilpatrick questioned whether the Commissioners required any additional information from the applicant regarding the proposed plan. Mr. Dziurman noted he would appreciate a scaled plan to review.

Dr. Stamps referred to the proposed plan, noting the location of a wetland from the east to the west, the open space, the relocated house, two buildings and some greenspace, and questioned whether that wetland was required to remain open. Mr. Gilbert explained that was actually the location of the Honeywell Drain.

Dr. Stamps clarified the two buildings could not be moved further north. Mr. Gilbert indicated they could not be moved north.

Chairperson Kilpatrick questioned whether there was any additional information the Commissioners would like to receive.

Mr. Szantner stated he felt the conceptual plan; the proposed location of the historic house, and the demolition of the garage portion of the house was acceptable. He indicated his questions concerned how parking would be handled to support the reuse of the historic resource, and noted the front yard portion was very important and indicated he would prefer that remain as a greenspace or open space. He noted it would be helpful to receive an opinion of what structures could be built on the adjacent property to the south.

Chairperson Kilpatrick questioned whether the Commissioners felt the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new construction should be postponed, or whether the Commissioners felt they could vote on a motion to either approve or disapprove the new construction.

Ms. Sieffert proposed a motion to postpone the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new construction to the November HDC meeting. Mr. Dziurman stated he would second that proposed motion.



Mr. Szantner questioned whether the Commissioners had received sufficient information to provide a quick opinion to the applicant regarding the proposed new construction.

Chairperson Kilpatrick stated he agreed that the relocation of the historic house and the balance of the project were tied together. He noted there was a motion on the floor to postpone the new construction matter.

Ms. Sieffert questioned whether any of the other Boards and Commissions in the City had been requested to provide an opinion regarding the proposed project. Mr. Delacourt stated both the Planning Commission and the City Council had rendered an opinion on the use of the PUD process, which included attaching key issues to the approval of the process. He indicated the Planning Commission and the City Council had reviewed the site plan in concept and had identified issues to be resolved.

Ms. Sieffert questioned whether both Boards had identified the same issues. Mr. Delacourt stated the issues identified were fairly consistent.

Mr. Dziurman stated he felt the relocation of the historic house was allowable under the standards because the house was significant because of its architecture.

Chairperson Kilpatrick called for additional discussion on the motion on the floor.

Dr. Stamps referred to the renderings provided the Commissioners, and questioned whether the applicant expected the Commissioners to select certain proposed elevations, or whether the applicant intended to utilize those mixed architectural styles. Mr. Delacourt explained that each of the elevations contained in the packet had a number assigned to it, and those numbers were then associated with a building on the site plan. He stated if the Commission approved the new construction, they would be approving the particular elevations in the particular locations.

Mr. Gilbert suggested the displays utilized at the meeting held on July 12, 2002 could be brought back to the next meeting. Mr. Szantner stated he would prefer to receive a rendering of the historic house to include with the renderings included in the packet that would provide the location of the house in scale next to the new construction.

Mr. Dunphy questioned if this request was postponed to the November 13, 2003 meeting, whether the Commission would be considering a resolution or a Certificate of Appropriateness. Chairperson Kilpatrick indicated that would be the decision of the Commission at that meeting.

Ms. Dressel noted the mixture of architectural styles in the proposed plan, and questioned whether there was some unifying concept about the development as a whole; why there were so many different styles, and how they related to that location or Rochester/Rochester Hills. Mr. Abanatha indicated they hoped to create an urban streetscape that fit the master plan for Rochester Hills, which was a mixed use project. He stated they also hoped to create "small town America" by tying into scale the shops,

retail and office on the first floor; living quarters above, with the building located close to the road, as is seen in many small towns in the Southern part of Michigan. He explained the detailing on the building was pulled from those various styles, including the varying heights, the cornices, and the flat roofs. He stated those details were then pulled into the residential to the east. He indicated the “style” was a collection of the architectural styles seen in Downtown Rochester, or Plymouth, Northville, Howell and Chelsea, pulled together to create a fresh look that would be City Place.

Chairperson Kilpatrick called for a vote on the motion on the floor.

**MOTION** by Sieffert, seconded by Dziurman, in the matter of HDC File No. 03-003 (City File #02-027), that the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction located at 1585 S. Rochester Road, Parcel Identification Number 15-23-300-035, be **POSTPONED** to the November 13, 2003 Historic Districts Commission Meeting.

Ayes: All  
Nays: None  
Absent: Cozzolino

**MOTION CARRIED**

Mr. Gilbert requested the Commissioners contact Mr. Delacourt with any requests for additional information. He noted he would happy to provide whatever was requested.

Chairperson Kilpatrick thanked the applicant for attending the meeting, and noted the matter would be scheduled on the November 13, 2003 HDC Agenda.

## **10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### Special Joint Meeting with the HDSC regarding 1705 Walton:

Ms. Sieffert noted the Commission had previously agreed to hold a special joint meeting with the members of the Historic Districts Study Committee, and questioned whether a joint meeting would be scheduled in the future.

Chairperson Kilpatrick stated the purpose of that special joint meeting was to discuss the house located at 1705 Walton on the Church of the Nazarene property. He requested an update on that matter.

Mr. Delacourt stated the Church was in the process of complying with the Planning Commission motion, which required the Church to clean up the property and to clean up the garage structure prior to requesting a Revised Conditional Land Use from City Council. He noted the HDC had previously requested review rights on the property, which City Council had denied. He indicated the Commission had discussed the possibility of requesting a moratorium from City Council regarding that property. He stated the Revised Conditional Land Use had not been scheduled for a City Council meeting at this time. He noted if the Commissioners wanted to schedule a special meeting with the HDSC, they still had an opportunity to do so.