

~~She thought by not designating the portion of the building that had the fire, and reducing the parking lot, that would provide some expansion room at the back of the building, while still preserving the façade.~~

~~Ms. Kidorf suggested the Boundary Justification be reworded to eliminate the word "view shed", because it was commonly accepted that property was not preserved just to create a view. She suggested the wording be changed to state "will protect the historic front yard" or "will include the historic front yard".~~

~~Mr. Webster commented that was where the original school building stood. He explained there had been two schools in that location, with the first one being right on the corner about 1852. Another school was built behind that building, that ended up being moved down the road and became part of a house. Ms. Schodowski agreed, noting it was where the subdivision was built. Mr. Webster stated there were a couple potential houses that might include that former school building.~~

~~Mr. Delacourt clarified that proposed district Option B was acceptable to the Committee. He pointed out that a Public Hearing had been held on this proposed district, and the matter had gone before City Council. He suggested the revised report and map be transmitted to SHPO for review and comment, and a second Public Hearing held to follow the process because this was a significant change to the recommendation. That would provide an opportunity for the school and others to comment on the proposed district, and the Committee would know if the State agreed with the proposed reduced district.~~

~~Chairperson Thompson stated he would be more comfortable if the report was transmitted to SHPO and another Public Hearing held. He preferred the Committee follow the procedure for this proposed change.~~

~~This matter was Discussed~~

- 7B. 2008-0663 National Twist Drill (HDSC File #08-002)
- Review Revised Preliminary Report/Revised District Map

Chairperson Thompson stated that a revised proposed district map had been prepared for the National Twist Drill site, based on the discussion held at the last meeting about perhaps saving what was most appropriate and representative of the proposed district, rather than the entire parcel.

Mr. Delacourt stated the initial recommendation in the draft Preliminary Report included the entire parcel and all the outbuildings. The Preliminary Report has not been transmitted to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) nor has the Public Hearing been held. The Study Committee began to re-evaluate how much the manufacturing space contributed to the integrity or met the criteria for designation.

A revised map was prepared that only included the visible office portions of the buildings.

Mr. Delacourt stated the Committee could review the revised map to determine if the reduced proposed district still met the criteria for designation, or the Committee might want to have the matter re-evaluated by the Preservation Consultant. It was thought a reduced proposed district might gain the cooperation of the property owner and City Council, if the reduced district still met the criteria for designation.

Mr. Delacourt stated the Committee could continue with the recommendation included in the Preliminary Report; could revise the report to include the reduced proposed district, or ask the Preservation Consultant to review and re-evaluate the matter.

Chairperson Thompson asked if Ms. Kidorf had seen this Preliminary Report. Ms. Kidorf stated she had not written that report and had not had an opportunity to review it. She asked why the proposed boundary did not end at the edge of the building. Mr. Delacourt stated the façade of the middle building was an office building and had the same architectural components as the other office buildings. He reminded the Committee the revised proposed district map was only prepared to begin discussion among the Committee members. The proposed district included the buildings or portions of buildings the Committee felt contributed, plus enough area so the Historic Districts Commission (HDC) would be able to evaluate any additions or anything that might have an impact on those buildings, should some type of development come forward in the future.

Ms. Kidorf referred to Mr. Delacourt's conversation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) about the Stiles School proposed district. She assumed the conversation was essentially about the proposed district cutting the building in half. In that situation, the Stiles School proposed district cutting off an addition made some sense. In the National Twist Drill situation, she did not think the portions of the buildings included in the proposed district were necessarily additions. She wondered how SHPO viewed cutting off buildings.

Mr. Delacourt stated he had not sent specific maps to SHPO, but had asked whether or not the boundaries could be changed, or whether or not the lines could run through buildings, and it was SHPO's opinion that as long as the proposed district still met the criteria and the Committee could justify the boundary, they would be fine with that.

Mr. Delacourt agreed the National Twist proposed district was different because it proposed cutting off a portion of the original building. Ms. Kidorf asked what portion represented the original building. Mr. Delacourt believed that was most of it. He pointed out the portion in the southern parcel to the eastern half of the site to the breezeway addition that had a different roof, but noted he believed most of the

entire building was built close to the same time. The Committee would have to decide how they wanted to propose the district. He reminded the Committee the draft proposed district had not been evaluated by either the State or the City Council.

Chairperson Thompson thought Ms. Kidorf should review the report and the proposed boundary change. He pointed out there could be some problems in cutting off portions of the buildings because the balance of the remaining building could not be torn down with that section left standing. Essentially, the proposed district would force the property owner to leave the entire building in tact. He noted that the Stiles School report was being sent back to SHPO and the Committee would receive a definitive written response and would know if SHPO had a problem with portions of buildings as historic districts. The Committee could discuss this again once they received some input from Ms. Kidorf and the SHPO.

Mr. Delacourt thought it was proactive of the Committee to evaluate various proposed districts. They could then advise City Council what size districts had been examined and that the Committee had evaluated all options.

Ms. Kidorf stated she would review the matter prior to the Committee's next meeting. Mr. Delacourt stated he would appreciate Ms. Kidorf's input and evaluation. He noted he had not discussed this proposed district with SHPO because the Committee had not really discussed the options or selected their preferred proposed district.

Chairperson Thompson thought that would give the Committee sufficient information to discuss the matter at the next meeting.

This matter was Discussed

(Depart Ms. Kidorf 6:35 PM)

~~VC 2007 0313 2040 S. Livernois (HDSC File #08-012)
 -1Set Public Hearing Date
 Chairperson Thompson stated this property is located on Livernois, south of Hamlin Road.
 Mr. Delacourt stated the Preliminary Report had been completed, and the Committee did not appear to want to make any changes to the report. He asked if this report should be transmitted to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and a Public Hearing scheduled.
 Chairperson Thompson stated he was comfortable with the report, and thought it should be transmitted to the State and a Public Hearing scheduled.~~