

~~MOTION by Sieffert, seconded by Dunphy, that the Minutes of the July 8, 2004 Regular Historic Districts Commission Meeting be approved as corrected.~~

~~Ayes: All  
Nays: None  
Absent: Dziurman, Stamps, Szantner~~

**MOTION CARRIED**

**6. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS**

- A. July 29, 2004 E-mail from The Historical Society of Michigan
- B. *Reliving the Rochester Era*, July/August 2004 Edition
- C. The Historical Society of Michigan Brochure regarding the 130<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting and State History Conference
- D. Historic District Design Guidelines Workshop Brochure
- E. Oakland County Historical Society – How to Save a Barn Postcard
- F. Michigan Association of Community Arts Agencies October 5, 2004 Seminar Brochure

Chairperson Kilpatrick called for any additional announcements or communications. No other announcements or communications were received.

**7. PUBLIC COMMENT**

~~No public comments were received.~~

**8. NEW BUSINESS (HDC File #04-003)**

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness - Renovation  
Sidwell: 15-01-352-027  
Address: 971 Runyon Road  
Applicant: Mark W. Kowal

Chairperson Kilpatrick read the request for the record and asked the applicant to come forward and identify himself. He noted the Commissioners had received copies of an informational brochure in their packets regarding the proposed request. He asked the applicant to provide a brief summary of his proposed renovations.

Mark Kowal, 971 Runyon Road, stated the photograph on the front cover of his informational brochure represented the current condition of his house. He explained he wanted to restore the house back to its original condition. He noted he had gone to the Rochester Hills Museum and had received assistance in obtaining photographs of the house from close to its original construction date. He stated he would like to bring the house back to more in keeping with the other houses in the area.

Mr. Dunphy commended the applicant for his proposed plan, noting he was very impressed with what he saw and indicated he appreciated the applicant's desire to be as historically authentic as he could by bringing the house back to a condition that fit the Historic District and the surrounding properties.

Ms. Sieffert stated she would like to echo Mr. Dunphy's comments. She asked the applicant how long the applicant had resided in the house. Mr. Kowal stated he had purchased the house three (3) months ago.

Ms. Sieffert noted the applicant was a recent owner, and asked whom the applicant had purchased the house from. Mr. Kowal indicated he had purchased the house from the Schaffer's. Ms. Sieffert asked the applicant if he knew how long the Shaffer's had owned the house. Mr. Kowal stated he believed they had owned the house for eighteen (18) years.

Ms. Sieffert noted the applicant had indicated on his applicant documentation that the house was originally the cook's house for the Van Hoosen Dairy, and asked what reference the applicant had used to obtain that information. Mr. Kowal stated he had received that information from the Rochester Hills Museum.

Ms. Sieffert asked the applicant if he had received any information regarding the year that the picket fence was installed or how old the picket fence was. Mr. Kowal stated he had not received any information regarding the fence.

Ms. Sieffert asked the applicant if he had received any information regarding the age of the garage or carriage house. Mr. Kowal stated he had not, but intended to bring a proposal before the Historic Districts Commission (HDC) in the future, noting the garage was in very poor shape.

Ms. Sieffert ask the applicant if the house was a carpenter built house or whether it had been built by blueprints. Mr. Kowal stated the Rochester Hills Museum had three (3) photographs of the house, two of which were similar to what he had used in his application materials, and one photograph from the 1960's which showed a chain link fence that had since been removed. He stated he believed that was the time frame when the storm windows were added to the porch, and other changes were made with respect to the colors on the house.

Ms. Sieffert asked if the applicant's house was the house with a built-in buffet unit in it. Mr. Kowal indicated that was correct.

Chairperson Kilpatrick called for any additional discussion regarding the applicant's proposed plan. Upon hearing none, he called for a proposed motion.

Mr. Dunphy provided the following proposed motion:

**MOTION** by Dunphy, for File No. HDC 04-003, regarding the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for renovations to the home located at 971 Runyon Road, that the Historic Districts Commission **APPROVES** a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following findings and conditions:

Findings:

1. The plans for the renovation are compatible with the existing historic resource.

2. The subject site is a contributing resource located within the Stoney Creek Historic District.
3. The architectural features, design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed are consistent with those of the Stoney Creek Historic District.
4. The proposed renovation is consistent with the requirements of the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.

Conditions:

1. All improvements shall be consistent with plans presented to the City and dated August 23, 2004.
2. Prior to construction, the applicant shall submit for and receive and a Building Permit from the City.

Chairperson Kilpatrick called for the second to the proposed motion. Mr. Castile indicated he would second the motion. Chairperson Kilpatrick then called for discussion on the proposed motion.

Ms. Sieffert suggested the renovations be defined more clearly, based on the materials provided by the applicant. She noted the storm windows were being removed, and asked the applicant if the enclosed area was being completely eliminated. Mr. Kowal stated the door to the enclosed porch would also be removed.

Ms. Sieffert suggested the motion should indicate that the enclosed porch would be eliminated, and replaced by an open porch.

Mr. Delacourt stated that Condition #1 tied the plan to the materials dated received August 23, 2004, noting every specific detail included in the packet information would become part of the record or motion for approval. He noted the Commissioners could list the items specifically; however, by attaching them through the reference in Condition #1, it became part of the approval. He explained the items were listed individually through that packet material.

Chairperson Kilpatrick noted the information provided by the applicant spelled out in very good detail the specifics regarding the front porch renovation and the other repairs. He stated anyone looking at those specific details would understand what renovations had been completed or not completed.

Mr. Delacourt stated if the motion were approved, the Certificate of Appropriateness would be attached to the documentation provided by the applicant and submitted to the Building Department. He explained they would become one and the same document.

Chairperson Kilpatrick verified that the applicant wanted to be tied into the Sherwin Williams Exterior Color Preservation Palette (Color "Weathered Shingle #SW2841), and the Timberline

30 Architectural Shingles (Style Weathered Wood). Mr. Kowal stated he had done some paint research and that was the choice he wanted to stay with.

Chairperson Kilpatrick noted that occasionally applicant's ran into trouble obtaining the specified colors or products and usually requested some leeway in order to be allowed use an alternate similar choice. He verified the applicant was prepared to use the colors specified in the application documentation, or was prepared to come back before the HDC to request a change. Mr. Kowal indicated he understood that point.

Ms. Sieffert verified that Finding #3 named the correct Historic District. Mr. Dunphy indicated he had included the Stoney Creek Historic District in that Finding.

Chairperson Kilpatrick called for any other discussion regarding the proposed motion. Upon hearing none, he called for a roll call vote.

Complete Motion as Voted:

**MOTION** by Dunphy, seconded by Castile, for File No. HDC 04-003, regarding the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for renovations to the home located at 971 Runyon Road, that the Historic Districts Commission **APPROVES** a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following findings and conditions:

Findings:

1. The plans for the renovation are compatible with the existing historic resource.
2. The subject site is a contributing resources located within the Stoney Creek Historic District.
3. The architectural features, design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed are consistent with those of the Stoney Creek Historic District.
4. The proposed renovation is consistent with the requirements of the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.

Conditions:

1. All improvements shall be consistent with plans presented to the City and dated August 23, 2004.
2. Prior to construction, the applicant shall submit for and receive and a Building Permit from the City.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Sieffert, Thompson, Cozzolino, Castile, Dunphy, Kilpatrick

Nays: None

Absent: Dziurman, Stamps, Szantner

**MOTION CARRIED**

Chairperson Kilpatrick noted the applicant had received approval for his renovation plans. He stated he would like to echo the previous comments regarding the applicant's presentation, noting it was an impressive presentation, and wished the applicant the best of luck with his renovation project. Mr. Kowal thanked the Board for granting his request.

~~9. DISCUSSION ITEMS~~

~~9A. Sidwell: 15-33-200-013  
Address: 1081 W. Auburn Road  
Applicant: Leon LaBrecque~~

~~Chairperson Kilpatrick stated this item was a discussion item with respect to the premises located at 1081 W. Auburn Road. He explained the applicant was coming before the Board to request some guidance or suggestions regarding what the Board may or may not approve.~~

~~Leon LaBrecque, 1660 N. Livernois, stated he was former Commission Member, and was very excited about a project he hoped to complete regarding the Albert and Delia Terry House, 1081 W. Auburn Road. He indicated the house was one of the oldest houses in Oakland County, built in 1839 in the Greek Revival style, on one and one-half acres.~~

~~Mr. LaBrecque stated he was a tax attorney and financial advisor, with about twelve employees, with offices currently located in Troy, Michigan. He indicated he had been looking for a historic structure for quite some time, and felt 1081 W. Auburn would make an ideal professional office building. He indicated he would like some input from the Commission regarding what he needed to do in order to turn the house into an office building while preserving its historic character, and basically keeping it in its intact state. He felt it would be a benefit for the public to have access to such a building, and he felt it would make a superb office building for his type of business.~~

~~Mr. LaBrecque stated he would like to obtain a special use permit from the City for such a use, noting he did not think it should be rezoned. He indicated he felt a special use, such as the one granted to the Avon Prairie House, due to the home's historical significance, was the best option. He stated he had researched Albert Terry, noting the Terry family went back to one of the original Mayflower families. He requested input from the Board on whether they felt he could proceed with such a project.~~

~~Mr. Delacourt stated Mr. LaBrecque understood the rezoning process and was very familiar with that process. He indicated it was his understanding that Mr. LaBrecque intended to submit for a rezoning of the property, and pointed out some of the Commissioners had been through the process with 71 N. Livernois (Avon Prairie House). He explained the owners of 71 N. Livernois had requested a rezoning for that property, and were ultimately granted a use variance. He noted the process outlined in the City's Ordinance, which requires denial of a rezoning prior to requesting a use variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA).~~

~~Mr. Delacourt stated the subject property mirrored the 71 N. Livernois property in some respects, although in other respects it did not. He stated the Planning Commission would be very interested in the HDC's opinion regarding the applicant's proposed use, noting the property was~~