



Rochester Hills Minutes

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

Historic Districts Study Committee

*Chairperson Jason Thompson, Vice Chairperson Dr. Richard Stamps
Members: John Dziurman, James Hannick, Peggy Schodowski,
Sue Thomasson, LaVere Webster*

Thursday, January 14, 2010

5:30 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

MINUTES of a **ROCHESTER HILLS REGULAR HISTORIC DISTRICTS STUDY COMMITTEE** meeting held at the City Municipal Offices, 1000 Rochester Hills Drive, Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Thompson called the meeting to order at 5:30 PM.

2. ROLL CALL

Present 4 - Richard Stamps, Jason Thompson, James Hannick and Sue Thomasson

Absent 3 - John Dziurman, LaVere Webster and Peggy Schodowski

Others Present: Derek Delacourt, Deputy Director, Planning (*arrive 6:15 PM*)
Judy Bialk, Recording Secretary

Chairperson Thompson stated that Mr. Dziurman had indicated he would arrive late due to a scheduling conflict, and Ms. Schodowski and Mr. Webster had left prior notice they could not attend this meeting and were excused.

Chairperson Thompson stated that Mr. Delacourt had a conflict with tonight's meeting and would arrive late.

On behalf of the Study Committee, Chairperson Thompson welcomed Ms. Thomasson to the Committee. He noted Ms. Thomasson had recently been appointed by City Council for a term ending December 31, 2011.

3. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Chairperson Thompson stated for the record that a quorum was present.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4A. 2010-0015 December 10, 2009 Regular Meeting Minutes

Chairperson Thompson asked for any comments or corrections regarding the December 10, 2009 Regular Meeting Minutes. Upon hearing no comments or

corrections, he called for a motion to approve.

A motion was made by Hannick, seconded by Stamps, that the Minutes be Approved as Presented. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 4 - Stamps, Thompson, Hannick and Thomasson

Absent 3 - Dziurman, Webster and Schodowski

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the December 10, 2009 Regular Historic Districts Study Committee Meeting be approved as presented.

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS / COMMUNICATIONS

1. 01-06-10 Memorandum regarding Stiles School

Chairperson Thompson stated the Committee had received a copy of a Memorandum including Ms. Kidorf's opinion regarding the proposed Historic District boundary of the Stiles School property. He noted this matter was not on the Agenda for this meeting, however, the Committee could discuss it further under "Any Other Business".

Chairperson Thompson asked if there were any other announcements or communications. No announcements or communications were provided.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT (Non-Agenda Items)

Chairperson Thompson called for any public comments.

2009-0411 1585 S. Rochester Road (HDC File #03-003) - Preliminary Report

Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race, stated after reading the December 20, 2009 Study Committee Meeting Minutes, she was somewhat surprised and a little disappointed to see what came up in the Preliminary Report on 1585 S. Rochester Road for several reasons. She understood what was said in the report regarding the condition of the house, but after reading what Ms. Kidorf wrote regarding the guidelines for designation - that home was designated in 1978 and at that point the State Act did not have the "shall be guided by" National Register criteria when making an evaluation whether to look at listing or designating a particular property. She stated the consultant explained some of that, but what she explained in the report, Ms. Hill did not feel the conclusion truly followed what was said because there was lack of a defective process, which the report indicated, there was not necessarily lost physical presence. To say it was insignificant basically due to the fact that it was not "as the original study committee thought it was". She stated it was hard to read their thoughts and she found that different from being the same as "not as significant as previously defined". She stated "previously defined" and "what one thinks" are two different things. After the years we've spent looking at that property, just because there was some aluminum siding, there clearly physically was no change. She thought there was a great deal of significance from the standpoint of it being the Fairview Farm, and there was information about that as

being a very progressive farm for its time in this State, and as it moved on to the Eddy's, they really did not change it. It was one of four neo-classical styles in the Community, one across the street which has been restored. This was the second-most significant, it has not been restored. The other two houses we are saying don't hold as much significance. But to say we have one and so that's it, and that's why in today's context not as important. But, she had already said, and the report had indicated we were not basing that and that actually Community's at the time had their autonomy to decide what they felt was worth saving and what was significant. To come back and say according to 2002, it isn't, she had a great deal of problem with. She wanted to have that on the record. She stated she would come to the Public Hearing. When she finished reading the Report, she did not come to a conclusion that said it was not worth keeping. She was somewhat disturbed when she read the Minutes that the Committee agreed with everything she said, because she did not think that much was said about it. She hoped that as this moves forward, we can hopefully find some more information regarding this property and the home itself. Even though we understand why the outbuildings are gone because they were not part of the original designated area and were demolished prior to the total parcel becoming the designated district.

Public Comment Received

Chairperson Thompson stated that Public Hearing would be held on Thursday, February 11, 2010 at 5:30 PM. He called for any other public comments. No other public comments were received.

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

7A. 2008-0663 National Twist Drill (HDSC File #08-002) - Discussion

Chairperson Thompson stated the Study Committee had reviewed some options on a proposed historic district for this property, including one option that tried to balance the most significant portions because it might be more acceptable to the property owner and City Council. Ms. Kidorf had offered to review the proposed options against the contents of the Preliminary Report and had provided her opinion. She disagreed with changing the scope of the proposed district. He suggested the Committee discuss how they wanted to proceed noting the Committee still had the ability to make whatever recommendation they felt appropriate.

Dr. Stamps asked why the consultant felt that the Committee should not propose just a portion of the property. Chairperson Thompson stated Ms. Kidorf believed the entire parcel, with the exception of one building, contributed to the significance of the district. He noted there was discussion at the last meeting about the various proposed boundary lines, and it was decided that Ms. Kidorf should review the matter. The Committee reviewed the various boundary options.

Chairperson Thompson stated that part of the discussion at the December meeting included whether just portions of the various buildings fronting Rochester Road could be designated particularly because they were not separate structures with additions added to them. Such a boundary designation would essentially "chop" the buildings in half.

Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race, commented she had read the opinion and the Preliminary Report and was very impressed by the report because there is a great deal of content in the report. She agreed with Ms. Kidorf's opinion that we're asking for problems trying to cut off some portion of the property, because the great part of what is there is so much of the original existing there. Whether it is all that important to people today or not is something that will have to be determined or if at some point it goes all the way to City Council, they will make the determination on what to do. She would not want to see it divided up because she thought it stood on its own and has a great deal of merit on its own. There was no reason to try to split it up into something else. She understood that Building B had been changed some, but that was something that could be addressed somewhere down the road.

Ms. Thomasson asked if the thought behind trying to split off portions of the buildings was to allow the property owner to use the balance of the property in another manner. Dr. Stamps thought that summarized the reason, noting that the current property owner did not want any of the property designated. The Study Committee was aware the property owner felt he had a large, developable piece of property that no one wanted to purchase with the old factory buildings. He noted City Council gave a lot of weight to the property owner's opinion.

Dr. Stamps recalled that portions of buildings were architecturally significant with the art-deco fronts on the west side, and the Committee was exploring options and realistic possibilities. The Committee could recommend the entire parcel as historic as it is a significant piece in the arsenal of democracy where they made drills and tools to make parts to make tanks during the war. In the political sense, having participated in the last few recommendations brought to City Council that were not designated, the Committee spent some time exploring other options. Ms. Kidorf's opinion was right from a preservation point of view. The Committee had to decide if it was worth trying to save a portion of the site, or the whole site. He asked if the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) had provided a clear response about saving a portion of a building. He commented if SHPO agreed with the Stiles School proposed district boundary that might be considered a precedent. He had not made up his mind and would like to continue exploring the options.

Ms. Thomasson commented that corner was a valuable piece of property.

Chairperson Thompson reminded the Committee their focus was rather narrow and limited to a review and recommendation. The Committee did not make the decision to designate. He asked if the Committee felt it would be beneficial to discuss this property with the Consultant.

Mr. Hannick asked if the Committee would have received some feedback from SHPO by the time of the Public Hearing. It was noted that SHPO would not respond until after the Report was brought before the Review Board, which meets on a quarterly basis.

Dr. Stamps agreed the focus of the Committee was to determine if the property met the criteria, with the decision on designation left to City Council.

Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race, agreed with the comments made and we should not be second guessing. It was unfortunate the political climate swings one way or another and ends up rejecting something that could be significant. She thought this not only had architectural significance, and that would be one thing that would be happening, it would be limiting the number of areas of significance if one starts to break this apart. It truly does benefit to a number of areas. In fact, all three, which really makes it one of the top pieces. Whether or not the property owner likes it, that is just too bad. It was unfortunate we don't have or have not had in the past a Council that looks at the value of historic property and the potential for those. This is not something that we're putting under glass in a museum and saying "don't touch." That's not the point, because there so much in so many other places across this country and around the world that have taken architecturally significant pieces and retained this history and done some great things. The other part of it was that even the two that nothing happened with, that they did not chose to designate, did not preclude the opportunity of going back to Council at any point in time and making that same recommendation. There is still potential for that. Fortunately, in maybe both cases, they have not been destroyed. They still exist in the Community and there is always that potential and there is nothing stopping that from happening. She looked at this one and at some point it would be nice to make the recommendation, whether they don't care to do that, then "I guess you get to the point where is it totally flattened". There is always the option of having the HDC request a moratorium from Council. She thought there were so many areas of significance with this piece of property.

Chairperson Thompson stated this was a unique piece of property within the City and in the area. If designated, it would have to be adaptively re-used, although this region of the country did not seem to accept that concept. He stated it was his thought to retain the original recommendation in the Preliminary Report, but noted this was still an on-going discussion.

Dr. Stamps asked if any descendants of the McGregor family still resided in the area. He thought perhaps the portion of the report about that family could be added to if they could find some relations and some additional information. He commented he had a former student he thought was related to the family, but did not know if they remained in the area. If that student could be contacted, they might be able to provide more history on the family.

Mr. Hannick inquired whether the Alumni Association would have contact information. Dr. Stamps stated he would see if he could obtain contact information.

Chairperson Thompson stated this matter would be scheduled for the next meeting.

This matter was Discussed

7B. 2009-0547 2009 Annual Report

Chairperson Thompson stated the 2009 Annual Report had been provided to the Study Committee at the December meeting for review and comment. He reminded the Committee the report was prepared as part of the Certified Local Government (CLG) designation received by the City in 2009.

Ms. Thomasson inquired about the CLG designation. Dr. Stamps stated receiving the designation allowed the City to become eligible for Federal grant funds and resources.

Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race, agreed the report was a well put together piece especially because it was new. She stated she made some comments to the recording secretary. The part about the Preliminary Reports that Council was requesting when they really were requesting a full report within 180 days, both on 1585 S. Rochester Road and 2371 S. Livernois Road. She made mention about putting dates after Wayside Park and the South Boulevard property so one knew at what time frame those were not designated so that was clear in the report. The only other piece she had was at the very end where it said something about this body making or going before Council to ask what study to do next. A lot of times she thought the Committee probably has ones they felt were a good priority to be studied, and she wondered if that wording might be better said somehow in the gist of the Committee was making recommendations to Council and requesting permission to perform studies on those recommended properties versus asking them what the next study should be. That was only just a little thinking about the rewording and was her own suggestion. She did not think Council ranked them and decided what it is, and the Committee had done that type of work.

Chairperson Thompson noted under the current Ordinance, City Council had to provide permission before the Study Committee began a study. He agreed with the

point about the motions made by City Council and asked whether the Committee wanted to change any of the other portions of the Report. He commented the Study Committee could schedule a review of the potential list to prioritize and rank them for future studies. He stated oftentimes the studies depended on other circumstances and the order was changed based on development pressures or other matters.

Dr. Stamps agreed it was a good idea to review the Potential List and to provide City Council with a proposed list of properties for study.

Chairperson Thompson stated Council would be provided with a copy of the 2009 Annual Report, and a list of the potential properties remaining to be studied could be included. He suggested the Committee could review the Potential List and rank the studies.

Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race, thought that would be helpful for the Committee, even if they had the next five. She commented the Committee may go to Council six months from now and tell them they would like to study certain properties, and Council would see that those were the next ones. She thought Council had expressed in the past that they certainly would like to see these studies be completed. At least the Committee was showing they have some ranking or some priority so they could go in front of them to ask for permission.

Chairperson Thompson suggested the wording regarding the City Council motions be corrected, noting the discussion about the report was on the record in the meeting Minutes.

This matter was Discussed

7C. 2010-0016 Review Public Hearing Schedule

- February 11, 2010 / 5:30 PM

Chairperson Thompson stated a Public Hearing would be scheduled for Thursday, February 11, 2010 at 5:30 PM for each of 3976 S. Livernois (Stiles School); 1585 S. Rochester Road and 2040 S. Livernois Road. He asked if any Committee member had a conflict with the date and time, noting the importance of establishing a quorum.

Ms. Thomasson asked for a quick synopsis of the procedure for the Public Hearing.

Chairperson Thompson explained that Notice of the Public Hearing was published in the local paper, and copies mailed to the property owners along with a copy of the Preliminary Report. The Committee would hear public comment on each of the properties noticed. There was no debate among the Committee members during the hearing, rather the Committee just listened to the comments. If the Committee wanted to respond to something said during the Public Hearing, it could

be addressed later in the meeting under Any Other Business.

(Arrive Derek Delacourt, 6:15 PM)

Ms. Thomasson clarified that a Public Hearing was not being held on any other properties at this time. Chairperson Thompson explained that Hearings were not scheduled until 60 days after transmittal of the Preliminary Report to the State.

Mr. Delacourt explained that one year after the Public Hearing is held, the Committee would submit its Final Report and recommendation.

Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race, reminded the Committee that with respect to 1585 S. Rochester Road, City Council had requested input back within 180 days after forwarding the matter to the Study Committee. She noted it was scheduled for the February Public Hearing but that one needed to move forward and faster, it did not have a whole year.

Mr. Delacourt noted that both 1585 S. Rochester Road and 2371 S. Livernois Road had been forwarded to the Study Committee by City Council with a response requested within 180 days.

Chairperson Thompson explained those matters would proceed in accordance with the resolution passed by City Council.

This matter was Discussed

8. NEW BUSINESS

8A. 2009-0437 2371 S. Livernois Road (HDSC File #04-006) - Preliminary Report

Chairperson Thompson stated the Committee had received copies of a Preliminary Report, noting this study was begun based upon a request for delisting that was forwarded from City Council.

Mr. Delacourt stated the property owner had submitted a request to City Council indicating their concern with the original designation and whether or not the property and the house met the criteria. The basic argument was that it was a defective procedure when it was listed, and even if there was not a defective procedure, it did not meet the criteria for designation. Council had referred the matter to the Committee for study. The Committee followed the normal procedure in sending it to the consultant, who drafted the Preliminary Report which had been provided for the Committee's review. A recommendation was included for the Committee's review and discussion.

Mr. Delacourt asked for comments from the Committee on the draft Preliminary Report, the recommendation from the consultant, and how they would like to proceed.

Chairperson Thompson thought the Preliminary Report looked solid, noting the Committee had briefly discussed the property at the December meeting. He asked if the Committee was ready to accept the Report and transmit it to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).

Mr. Delacourt reminded the Committee that even if the Report was submitted to SHPO, they still had the opportunity to revise the conclusion or the recommendation as part of the Final Report process. That can be done at any time.

Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race, stated she had read the report and had similar comments to the comments she made about 1585 S. Rochester Road. In fact, she was bothered that the report read almost identical to that one in some respects. She had a problem with the conclusion from the standpoint of it saying things were different from what the committee originally thought. She did not think we knew what the committee originally thought. It is not the same as "previously defined". The house has always looked the same. She had trouble with the style of architecture because it truly has the appearance of a Greek Revival Plantation style piece and has always looked that way. If one looked that up, as she was not an expert in the field, she was curious if there was perhaps a mistake because it talks about it being a Colonial Revival style. It has the appearances, but not the same as the plantation by any means. Again, there were not that many examples talked about in Rochester Hills for one thing of that style. When it talked about Criteria B about moving a house and not meeting National Register Standards that again is addressing it in today's context, not in the context of when it was moved where it had no obligation or requirement to meet National Register criteria to be designated. To state that is one of the reasons that it failed is not really appropriate. That may be what happens today, but it certainly was not at the time it was designated. Again, she has a problem when the conclusion says it was not what it was thought to be by the original Study Committee, because it is exactly what it was defined as by the original Study Committee. We do not know what they were thinking or they did not have as much to research, but we have not shown either in this report very much research. She also was not sure she could agree with the conclusion just because there was not a lot known about Jack Burns as an architect or that we had not found a lot of evidence or he was insignificant for the time. She stated he did the "Black and White Cow" house, but was he really a well thought of architect at that time or very prominent she did not know as that would take some more research. Maybe there is more that can be found to add to this Report, but it disturbed her a little that the Committee would say they agreed it did not have any significance or it was insignificant. That same thing about Rochester Road and that was what bothered her about the report in both cases.

Mr. Hannick stated the Committee looked at older homes that the owners had made changes to because they liked a particular style which changed the look of the house. He questioned how that was reviewed or if it followed the review standards versus reviewing a house that always looked the same. He commented if the house was moved or a porch or addition was added, that had an effect on the house. He stated if the Committee was operating under those guidelines, then this house did not fit the guidelines because it was moved, and had been changed drastically in its style. The style added by a former owner changed the original house. It was not the same as a house like the Brooks farm house in Troy, Michigan, south of the Kresge building, that house had not changed. He asked if the Van Hoosen farm house had changed or if additions had been added. He wanted to know where the Committee drew the line. He noted Mr. Webster's house was a historical house and asked if that house had had any changes.

(Enter John Dziurman, 6:23 PM)

Chairperson Thompson stated that in some instances additions were inappropriately added and they did change the structure. It also depended on when they were added, where the additions were located and if they had been approved by the Historic Districts Commission.

Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race, stated that both this property and the other were designated after they had been moved and after they had been changed. Since the time of designation back in 1978, nothing had changed. That is what one is judging it on, not what it looked like when it sat at the corner of Auburn and Rochester Road. That is not what was being talked about. What was being talked about is the structure as it existed in 1978 on the property known at 2371 S. Livernois. That is what one should be judging its significance against. Yes, properties have changed, but they were not designated, or even the Rochester Road one, it was changed but changed in 1971 and then designated in 1978. So the people in 1978 who looked at these properties looked at the histories of them and designated them at that point for certain reasons. But if it was for an architectural style, they were designated for the style at that particular point in time.

Dr. Stamps stated he heard Ms. Hill clearly about imposing modern day criteria on a former decision. He wondered if there were times when it could be said that maybe they had made the decision but they did not have all the information.

Mr. Delacourt stated that unfortunately no documentation was included from the original designation in this instance. The survey sheet available for the structure did not list the year of construction for the house. The original Study Committee report does not identify why, and the current Study Committee did not have the benefit of that information to know what criteria or standard was used to qualify. The only thing the Committee can look at is what stands today.

Dr. Stamps stated even though he understood Ms. Hill's comments, and the Committee had to be careful about judging on a different set of standards, maybe sometimes that had to be done. He asked if the house was really that significant. He referred to the comment about the architect, and noted if the architect was a significant architect, the Committee would have known that. He commented that to say "we should save it because he was a great architect", and pointed out that most great architects get their name listed in the Architects of Michigan or Architects of America or some other publication. He thought the architect probably did not reach the level of significance that would justify. This is in part why the Committee turned to a knowledgeable consultant, and took the consultant's word for it. If someone could provide new information that indicated that "this was designed by the architect who built the twin towers in New York" then the Committee would have to consider that information.

Chairperson Thompson stated the original 1978 Study Committee did a good job considering how many of the properties they designated remained designated. However, they had looser standards at that time and he asked what criteria this Study Committee should set and whether the Committee was obligated by the standards that were almost non-existent then or apply the current standards. He did not think he had a definite answer, but would not want to see all properties designated in 1978 coming back requesting delisting.

Mr. Delacourt stated that research done validated over 95% of what was designated in 1978 although those properties did not have individual reports from 1978. He commented that this property and the 1585 S. Rochester Road property were both probably marginal by today's standards, although he did not have the benefit of understanding what the standards were in 1978.

Chairperson Thompson did not want to criticize what had been done in 1978 because they did a wonderful job considering there were not a lot of guidelines at that time. He agreed that 95% of what had been designated was still standing and solid.

Dr. Stamps recalled that the Historic Districts Commission stated at every meeting that they made decisions in accordance with the National Register Department of Interior guidelines. If the Committee follows those standards, they could be holding the buildings to a higher standard than what they were originally designated under.

Mr. Dziurman noted he had arrived late and had not heard the earlier conversation, but stated he could assure the Committee that the original Study Committee did not

have that information in 1978. With respect to moving buildings, he commented there had been a number of buildings moved in the Community, although he was not a proponent of that. He gave a lot of credence to the original Study Committee and the good job they did. He commented he had not had an opportunity to read the entire Preliminary Report, and asked if the report indicated the property did not meet the National Register criteria. He reminded the Committee that the State allowed a Community to retain its own local district, and it did not have to be the National District.

Mr. Delacourt stated that the Preliminary Report concluded the house was not significant in architecture.

Dr. Stamps noted Mr. Dziurman was an architect and asked if Mr. Dziurman thought the house was significant. Mr. Dziurman stated he knew the building and he always thought it was a nice looking building. Dr. Stamps agreed it was a lovely house.

Mr. Dziurman referred to the National Twist Drill property and the consultant's opinion that the entire site should be recommended for designation, but that was not what happened with the Stiles School because the State said the Committee could do that.

Dr. Stamps asked if the State had responded on the Stiles School.

Mr. Delacourt clarified the State had indicated the Committee could suggest that type of a district, but had not said they would agree with it.

Mr. Dziurman stated he was trying to relate that to the report where the consultant made a comment that he normally would support.

Mr. Delacourt clarified the difference between the Stiles School property and the National Twist property was that the recommendation for the Stiles School included all the portions of the building that contributed to its integrity. With respect to the National Twist Drill property, the portions that were being excluded were also considered contributing portions. That was what the consultant based her recommendations on.

Mr. Dziurman stated that the National Register standards are very clear the entire property should be included in the designation. He was confused by the State because they have been sending mixed signals over the last few years and did not appear to be following the guidelines.

Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race, stated she did not say this was not being suggested for significance because of the architect. What she disputed, debated and questioned was the fact about what criteria one needs to follow in this designation.

Frankly, it was open to what it used to be prior to 1992 when the State Act made a change that said "shall be guided by" and then in 2002 SHPO set forth some criteria rules. We are prior to either one of those and that is what allows us to look back at the report that was there and decide were those people correct in the fact that they felt this particular structure was worth saving and preserving. They felt it was and the City at that time felt it was. Does that make it any lesser of an entity today than it was then and in trying to apply the moving criteria when she said right in the report that it has no bearing so to speak, and all of a sudden she contradicts herself in this report. Really, the question is "does this body feel that it still has the significance that it had then" because there was no other. She's saying "we don't think it does compared to what they thought" and that was still her argument about what was it identified as and what was identified as a certain structure, which is still the exact same structure today. She did not think that argument held water. She would like to see anything else that we could obtain to make the report a better report about the structure. To come to the conclusion that it was not significant and we should not have it listed anymore, she had a difficult time with.

Chairperson Thompson stated it appeared the Committee would like more time to review this more thoroughly. He suggested the matter could be rescheduled for the next meeting.

Dr. Stamps stated he could agree to delist it and pointed out it was still a beautiful house.

Mr. Delacourt suggested that the consultant could be invited to attend the next meeting to discuss the research and report.

Chairperson Thompson reminded the Committee the Public Hearings were scheduled for the February meeting, and he did not know if there would be sufficient time to address additional Agenda items prior to the Historic Districts Commission meeting beginning at 7:00 PM. He suggested the Committee could consider a special meeting with the consultant or schedule this matter for the Regular March Meeting. He asked that Staff contact the consultant to see when she was available to meet with the Committee.

This matter was Discussed

- 8B. 2010-0017** Election of Officers - 2010
- Chairperson
 - Vice Chairperson
 - Secretary

Dr. Stamps asked if the current officers were willing to continue serving, or if

someone else would like to be nominated for one of the officer positions. The current officers indicated they would be willing to continue serving.

Dr. Stamps nominated Jason Thompson as Chairperson; Mr. Thompson nominated Dr. Richard Stamps as Vice Chairperson, and the Planning and Development Department staff was nominated as Secretary. The nominations were duly seconded.

Chairperson Thompson called for any other nominations. No other nominations were made and the floor was closed. The following nominations were unanimously approved:

Jason Thompson was unanimously elected to the office of Chairperson of the Historic Districts Study Committee for a term ending December 31, 2010.

Dr. Richard Stamps was unanimously elected to the office of Vice Chairperson of the Historic Districts Study Committee, for a term ending December 31, 2010.

Staff from the Planning & Development Department was unanimously elected to the office of Secretary of the Historic Districts Study Committee for the term ending December 31, 2010.

Officers duly nominated and unanimously elected.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Chairperson Thompson stated that the next regular meeting was scheduled for Thursday, February 11, 2010 at 5:30 PM and reminded the Committee the Public Hearings would be held on that date. Chairperson Thompson asked if there was any other business. No other business was presented.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion duly made and seconded, Chairperson Thompson adjourned the meeting at 6:43 PM.

Jason Thompson, Chairperson
City of Rochester Hills
Historic Districts Study Committee

Judy A. Bialk, Recording Secretary

(Approved as _____ at the _____, 2010 Regular Historic Districts Study Committee Meeting).

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT