



Rochester Hills Minutes

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

Historic Districts Commission

Chairperson Melinda Hill, Vice Chairperson Brian R. Dunphy
Members: Maria-Teresa L. Cozzolino, John Dziurman, Micheal Kilpatrick, Paul Miller,
Michael Sinclair, Dr. Richard Stamps, Jason Thompson

Thursday, November 13, 2008

7:30 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

MINUTES of the **REGULAR ROCHESTER HILLS HISTORIC DISTRICTS COMMISSION MEETING** held at the Rochester Hills Municipal Building, 1000 Rochester Hills Drive, Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Hill called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM.

2. ROLL CALL

Present 6 - Melinda Hill, Richard Stamps, Micheal Kilpatrick, Maria-Teresa Cozzolino, Jason Thompson and Paul Miller

Absent 3 - John Dziurman, Brian Dunphy and Michael Sinclair

Also Present: Derek Delacourt, Deputy Director, Planning & Development Department
Judy A. Biak, Recording Secretary

3. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Chairperson Hill announced a quorum was present.

4. STATEMENT OF STANDARDS

Chairperson Hill read the following Statement of Standards for the record.

"All decisions made by the Historic Districts Commission follow the guidelines of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, MCL Section 399.205, and City Code Section 118-164."

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5A. 2008-0569 Minutes of the October 9, 2008 Regular Meeting

Chairperson Hill asked for any comments or corrections regarding the October 9, 2008 Regular Meeting Minutes.

Chairperson Hill suggested the following changes:

Page 13 Finding #2 Change: , and the District itself.
To: , and adjacent resources.

Page 13 Finding #3 Change: abandoned former orchard
To: abandoned orchard

Page 13 Finding#4 Change: 84-inch round natural wood posts
To: 84-inch tall round natural wood poles

Page 13 Finding #4 Change: fence" as shown on the submitted application on the Washington Road
To: fence," as shown on the submitted application, for the Washington Road

Page 13 Finding #4 Change: 84-inch fence on the other two sides
To: 84-inch fence for the other two sides

Page 13 Finding #5 Change: of Washington Road, nor affect any
To: of Washington and Winkler Mill Roads, nor affect any

[**Note:** It should be noted that the above changes were suggested for a motion passed by the Commission at its October 9, 2008 Meeting. However, changes cannot be made to an approved motion in this manner. To effectively change the wording in an approved motion, the motion must be brought back to the floor by a member who voted in the affirmative; the original motion must be rescinded; a revised motion appropriately made; and a vote taken on the new, revised motion. Therefore, the above suggested revisions could not be made to the October 9, 2008 Historic Districts Commission Minutes.]

Chairperson Hill called for any other comments or corrections to the October 9, 2008 Regular Meeting Minutes. Upon hearing none, she called for a motion to approve.

A motion was made by Thompson, seconded by Miller, that the Minutes be Approved as Amended.

The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 6 - Hill, Stamps, Kilpatrick, Cozzolino, Thompson and Miller

Absent 3 - Dziurman, Dunphy and Sinclair

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the October 9, 2008 Regular Historic Districts Commission Meeting be approved as amended.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

Chairperson Hill called for any announcements or communications. She noted the Commissioners had received some literature from Copper County Preservation, Inc., attempting to raise funds for the restoration of the Quincy Smelting Works.

2008-0289 Vacant Parcel - Winkler Mill Pond Historic District

Applicant: Nathaniel Brock

Sidwell: 15-01-201-009

Request: Discussion regarding proposed restoration of orchard and proposal to fence orchard parcel

Dr. Stamps referred to HDC File #08-001, and noted that Condition #4 required the applicant to investigate possible archeological resources of the property prior to completing the proposed project. Dr. Stamps advised the Commissioners that Mr. Brock had contacted him. Dr. Stamps indicated he had reviewed the known records, and wanted to inform the Commissioners that Mr. Brock had completed the requirements of Condition #4.

Chairperson Hill stated that information would be included in the Minutes of this meeting, so it would be known that Dr. Stamps had that conversation with Mr. Brock.

This matter was Discussed

Announcements/Communications (continued):

Mr. Miller reminded the Commissioners that the Open Space Millage that had been passed a few years ago had been accumulating funds, and the City had purchased a number of parcels. The latest parcel approved for purchase was 24 acres on Harding Avenue. He explained it was the 24 acres directly surrounding the existing non-contiguous Eureka Farm Historic site and in fact, was the old farmland for the old Eureka Farm.

Chairperson Hill called for any other announcements or communications. No other announcements or communications were discussed.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairperson Hill asked if there were any public comments on any non-agenda items. There were no public comments.

Chairperson Hill stated that Melissa Luginski from the Stoney Creek Village hoped to attend this meeting. She explained the Village had their own Village meeting tonight as well, which began at 7:00 PM. Ms. Luginski hoped to attend the Village meeting and then come to the Commission meeting around 8:15 PM. She wanted to let the Commission know what the residents had been doing in the Village and some of their plans. If she cannot make this meeting, she will try to attend the January Commission meeting.

8. DISCUSSION

- 8A. 2008-0570 Historic Districts Commission Discussion
- Year End Recap
 - Overall District Look Back
 - Outstanding Certificates of Appropriateness
 - Present/Future Preservation Issues/Concerns

Year End Recap:

Chairperson Hill stated this was an opportunity to recap what the Commission had done over the past year; to take a look at the districts, either as a whole or individually, to see if there are some areas of concern; to look at the Certificates of Appropriateness and where they stand, and where the Commission needed to put in some extra effort for next year.

Chairperson Hill noted a Memorandum was included in the packet material titled "Year End Recap" which indicated that with tonight's meeting, the Commission had held six meetings during 2008. She thought the December meeting would most likely be cancelled unless an approval item was submitted. She stated that one of the six meetings held was the Tax Credits Workshop. She thought the recap reflected that the Commission had put out the effort to communicate with the residents in the Districts and to provide some educational information, which was all part of the Certified Local Government (CLG) process should the City receive CLG Certification. She noted that was also part of the Commission's charge under the Ordinance. She felt from that perspective, the Commission had done a good job.

Chairperson Hill asked for the Commissioners' thoughts and feedback regarding the past year and how to continue their efforts in the coming year.

Mr. Thompson suggested the Commission hold another workshop or seminar. He noted the tax credits workshop was very informative and had been well attended.

Chairperson Hill agreed and noted the General Maintenance Workshop held at the Dairy Barn was also a good workshop. She thought the Commission might reach out to the other communities that had historic districts commissions, which could increase attendance at the workshops or seminars. She commented she received information about events in other areas some of which were similar to the events the Commission had held.

Mr. Thompson stated he did not have any specific workshops or seminars in mind, but thought the outreach should be continued as he thought it had been well received and was a good approach.

Ms. Cozzolino commented that the Commission had previously put together a list of workshops and had prioritized the ones they felt should be held first.

Chairperson Hill agreed that was why the General Maintenance workshop had been held, as well as the Tax Credits workshop. She remembered the Commission had discussed a window repair workshop that had not materialized.

Ms. Cozzolino suggested the Commissioners review the feedback from the Open House survey to see what the residents were interested in.

Chairperson Hill stated she did not recall what other seminar suggestions were on the list from the survey, and suggested that information be included on the January Meeting Agenda. She thought another seminar should be held at the end of April or at the latest in May because if residents were going to be working on the exterior of their homes, they would start that work in late Spring or during the Summer. She suggested the Commission could select a workshop at the January meeting in order to give both the Commission and Staff sufficient time to schedule the event.

Mr. Miller stated that the workshop held at the Dairy Barn was very nice, but did require a lot of extensive planning. Chairperson Hill asked if Mr. Miller was referring to the Open House held in 2007. Mr. Miller stated he was. He suggested if another workshop was held, the Commissioners first determine if there is enough interest to hold one, and suggested the possibility of using the City Hall Building for the next seminar. He commented the Commission would want to keep the outside Staff time and any rental costs down. Chairperson Hill noted the Museum was open on Saturdays and was free for the Commission's use. Mr. Miller commented the Museum was a better destination draw, but noted it did require extra time and effort.

Mr. Delacourt recalled that the General Maintenance and Tax Credits workshops had received the most votes based on the survey results, with the rest of the available workshops receiving mixed results. He suggested a presentation be held for both the Commission and the residents in the Districts about preservation easements. He noted there were tax incentives to creating a preservation easement,

although specific criteria had to be met. He commented he was not that familiar with preservation easements, and thought a representative from the Michigan Historic Preservation Network might give a presentation on the easement program and how it worked.

Chairperson Hill agreed that was a good suggestion, and noted that type of a presentation could be held at City Hall on a regular Commission meeting night. She thought invitations could be extended to the residents in the Districts, and the adjacent communities since they were dealing with the same issues. She suggested a list of workshops be reviewed by the Commission at the January meeting with the idea of scheduling something in early Spring before people became too busy with other activities.

Chairperson Hill thanked Staff for the information that had been included on the City's website for property owners. She thought it was very helpful, and commented it would also be nice to include some historic preservation items on the City's cable channel.

Overall District Lookback:

Chairperson Hill referred to the Quarterly Report, and noted the Commissioners had received a copy of the Historic Districts Map, which depicted all the Districts in the City. She suggested the Commissioners review the individual Districts for input about them. She thought it could be very easy to lose the context of the Districts over the years, and depending how in tune the Commission was with the property owners, things could slip through the cracks. She noted when Dr. Busch conducted her survey in 2002, she had made recommendations for some Districts to be delisted because of the changes that had been made. She was most concerned about the two contiguous Districts, but there was also potential for that to happen with the existing non-contiguous Districts.

3681 S. Adams (District Map Item #3):

Chairperson Hill stated this is the stone house that is part of the Lorna Stone Development. She commented the developer had intended to return to the Commission for review regarding windows when the project began, but nothing had been started to date. She asked about the condition of the house, or whether it had been mothballed or would experience deterioration, given the fact it did not appear the project would begin any time soon.

Mr. Delacourt stated that what the developer was experiencing with the property was constant vandalism. The house was vacant; was not being rented, and like any other vacant building in any city, there were constant attempts to strip it of metal, copper or anything else that could be taken. He stated Mondrian Properties was constantly re-securing the site. They had boarded the windows, although he did not

know if the structure had been completely mothballed. They had turned off the water to prevent that type of damage from taking place, but the biggest issue was constant vandalism. The house is an attractive nuisance, especially being surrounded by so many trees and its location, not being well lit or having any nearby street lighting. He indicated that each time the City speaks with the representatives from Mondrian Properties, they were immediately on site resolving any issues. He did not think the project would be going forward any time soon.

Dr. Stamps asked if the City could alert the Sheriff's Department and request the property be routinely checked during their patrols of the area. He thought an increased presence might be helpful.

Mr. Delacourt stated that was already being done, and noted the members of the adjacent Church were very good neighbors and kept an eye on the property. Oftentimes, members of the congregation contacted Mondrian Properties or the City if they noticed a problem.

Chairperson Hill understood the problem, and noted more of those situations could occur around the City because of the foreclosures going on. She asked what role and what extent the Commission should play with respect to the mothball question. She noted some historic property owners had been required to do that, such as the property on Rochester Road where another large development had not moved forward.

Mr. Miller confirmed that the developer responded quickly to any telephone calls, and stated he assumed the City was also keeping an eye on the property. Mr. Delacourt stated the Ordinance Enforcement Officers were aware of the problem properties in the City, and paid attention to those sites during their normal rounds.

Mr. Miller stated if the water was turned off and the windows were boarded up, there was not much more the Commission could ask them to do, lacking great deterioration; holes in the roof, or structural problems. He did not think there was much more the Commission could ask the developer to do at this time.

Chairperson Hill agreed as long water was not entering the resource. She was concerned that the vandalism could result in a fire being set inside, such as sometimes happened when squatters took over a building. She noted the Commission was concerned about the exterior, but if wood or other items were removed from the inside, that could destroy the resource from the inside out.

1385 S. Adams Road: (District Map Item #60)

Chairperson Hill noted this was the location of the University Presbyterian Church. No problems have been noticed with the property.

1381 Brewster (District Map Item #10):

Chairperson Hill stated this was the Brewster Road Cemetery property.

2498 W. Tienken (District Map Item #26):

Chairperson Hill stated this was the house located at the corner of Brewster and Tienken.

Dr. Stamps stated that the property owner had recently passed away. He noted there had been a problem on the east side of the house, which had been repaired. He was unaware of the status of the ownership of the property.

Chairperson Hill stated she had not seen a "for sale" sign on the property, and did not know if the home was occupied. She was not sure how the ownership of the property could be tracked, if it did change hands or was being held in the estate.

Dr. Stamps thought descendants of the former owner currently owned the house, but he did not know what would happen to it in the future.

2332 W. Avon (District Map Item #45):

Chairperson Hill stated this property was the Bishop House and the house appeared to be in good shape.

1841 Crooks Road (District Map Item #53):

Chairperson Hill stated this was the property owned by Mr. Dunn, and asked if anything was happening with this property.

Mr. Delacourt stated there had been involvement by the City almost daily on that property. He noted Mr. Dunn's builder had pulled a building permit over a month ago, and commented a building permit was in good standing for six months. He stated there was another hole in the roof, although Mr. Dunn had already patched up one hole in the roof.

Mr. Delacourt stated the demolition by neglect motion passed by the Commission was still enforceable should Council choose to enforce it. In fact, a meeting was being held with the City Attorney on Monday to discuss this property. Mr. Dunn had pulled his permit; had approved plans, and sent out bids to select a contractor. However, nothing had begun with the property, the resource was deteriorating, and winter was approaching. He noted Council had taken some interest in the structure as well.

Mr. Miller asked if the City had sent a letter to the property owner about the hole in the roof. Mr. Delacourt stated the City has been calling him every day and was in constant telephone contact with Mr. Dunn.

Chairperson Hill pointed out that this was one of three properties the Commission had sent out letters regarding Demolition by Neglect.

Mr. Delacourt stated a stay had been given to Mr. Dunn based on the fact he had secured the property and had plans under review. One of the things that would be discussed with the City Attorney was whether the Commission's motion was still in good standing, or whether the Commission needed to pass another motion. He noted Mr. Dunn had been granted a stay from the motion based on the progress he showed, and the matter had not been pursued with Council or a court order requested to enter the property for that same reason. Part of the discussion with the City Attorney will be whether action should be taken, if Mr. Dunn shows no additional progress in the near future.

Mr. Thompson stated he hoped something was done as he had driven past the property a number of times and was very disappointed with the property owner's progress. He noted Mr. Dunn had been given every opportunity and the house was falling apart, was an eyesore, and looked terrible.

Chairperson Hill stated the mothballing did not look nice. She questioned the Commission waiting another month if another resolution would be required. She stated the Commission would be happy to provide another resolution in order to allow the City to move forward, if that was necessary.

Mr. Delacourt stated the Commission could pass another resolution as a precaution, but he did not think it was necessary.

Mr. Thompson stated a second motion might provide some added emphasis.

Mr. Miller asked how long the City had been in contact with Mr. Dunn. He noted Mr. Dunn had pulled a building permit over a month ago, and asked if Mr. Dunn was refusing to acknowledge that there was work to be done, or had expressed a desire to wait until his wholesale renovation and remodeling work began.

Mr. Delacourt stated Mr. Dunn expresses his desire to start immediately every time the City speaks with him.

Mr. Thompson pointed out that had been Mr. Dunn's response for several years now. He had been before the Commission several times; both the Commission Chairperson and Member Dziurman had sat down with him, and the Building Department had worked with him several times. He was unsure what else the Commission could do as the house was now falling apart and something needed to be done.

Chairperson Hill stated there was a consensus that the Commission was very interested in seeing some action taken regarding Demolition by Neglect because it had been over a year and the property owner had been given every opportunity to have the situation rectified. Now it is a year later and the Commission was in the same position as they were one year ago. The Commission would like to see the City take action and expedite this before it was absolutely too late. The Commissioners all agreed there was consensus among the Board with respect to this matter.

3030 Crooks Road (District Map Item #55):

Chairperson Hill stated this property was located on Crooks Road near Auburn Road. She thought the current owner had done some nice restoration work.

1580 South Boulevard W. (District Map Item #22):

Chairperson Hill commented the property had not been before the Commission for many years. She believed the current owner was an architect, and stated she had not seen any work done on the property lately.

1160 South Boulevard W. (District Map Item #21):

Chairperson Hill stated this property was owned by a current member of the City's Historic Districts Study Committee and was in good condition.

3610 S. Livernois (District Map Item #50):

Chairperson Hill stated this property was the white stone house with the barn. She was not sure about the condition of this property, noting the barn appeared to be deteriorating. Mr. Delacourt agreed it needed a coat of paint, although he was not sure about deterioration.

Chairperson Hill was not sure about the roof, and noted she was not sure who lived there, but it might be more recent owners. She had heard they were interested in keeping this preserved, but had not had any conversations with the current owners.

Chairperson Hill stated it might be helpful to try to have a conversation with the homeowner, or to send a letter, asking if there was a way the Commission could help them with anything. Rather than waiting until a resource reaches such a terrible state that the Commission or the City had to issue a violation, she would prefer the Commission hold a conversation before a resource reaches a violation stage.

Ms. Cozzolino stated the Commission should be careful because the Commission was trying to promote the idea of historic preservation and was not "big brother" looking for problems and trying to chase people down. She agreed it would be good to be proactive, but the Commission had to be really careful in how they approached it.

Chairperson Hill agreed, noting it was more difficult with the non-contiguous districts, than enforcing something in a contiguous district. She noted that recently letters had been sent to the historic district property owners trying to encourage communication.

Mr. Delacourt suggested that prior to the next meeting, Staff would work on a draft of gentle introduction-type letter, including a reminder to be aware of certain things before they got to the next step. He stated the letter would be sent to property owners who had not hit the duty to maintain level or the demolition by neglect status, but before it got to that stage to let them know what the options were.

Chairperson Hill suggested the letter might also encourage property owners to attend a Commission meeting to talk about some of their concerns, or perhaps there was something the Commission could help them with. She stated that simply being able to put a face to a resource helped build some rapport. She noted a property owner did not have to come to a Commission meeting only for a review, but could come to hold a discussion.

Mr. Delacourt stated perhaps a letter could be drafted for all the non-contiguous property owners so it would not appear a certain property was being targeted. He indicated the letter could include information about the process.

1081 W. Auburn (District Map Item #5):

Chairperson Hill stated this property was located near Crooks Road, and that the property owner, Mr. LeBreque, had come before the Commission to discuss his potential use of the resource, but it had been some time since that occurred.

Mr. Delacourt stated there had been a "for sale" sign on the property for a long time.

Chairperson Hill asked if Mr. LeBreque was still the property owner. Mr. Delacourt stated he did not know. He believed Mr. LeBreque had an option on the property when he came before the Commission. He stated he had received some interesting requests about use for the property, but no one had ever come in and followed through.

Chairperson Hill stated the house was relatively close to the road and pretty visible, and asked if there had been any problems with vandalism on this property.

Mr. Delacourt stated he had not heard of any problems or received any complaints about the property. He commented the building appeared to be pretty secure, although the columns in the front could use a coat of paint.

Mr. Kilpatrick stated that house was pretty visible. Mr. Delacourt agreed it was right up on the road and had neighbors. He thought one of the neighbors was a family member of the former owner and kept a close eye on the property. He noted the lawn appeared to be maintained.

2371 S. Livernois (District Map Item #49):

Chairperson Hill stated the house sat back on the property and appeared to be occupied. Mr. Delacourt stated it was renter-occupied, and the property had been purchased by a developer several years ago who wanted to incorporate the resource into a Planned Unit Development. He stated the resource appeared to be in very good shape.

Mr. Miller asked how large the parcel was. Mr. Delacourt stated it was about ten acres in size.

1631 W. Avon and 1651 W. Avon (District Map Items #46 and #81):

Mr. Delacourt stated a parcel was split and a new home built on the vacant parcel, although it was still considered part of the historic district. He noted the Commission had approved the new home, and the historic home was structurally solid. He stated the aluminum siding had been removed from the historic home, but the home had never been repainted.

Chairperson Hill stated both homes were occupied, but unfortunately nothing had been done to the historic house other than the siding being removed. She commented that the Certificate of Appropriateness had expired and the property owners would have to come before the Commission for approval of any work.

1568 W. Avon (District Map Item #44):

Chairperson Hill noted the structures on the site were in good shape.

Mr. Delacourt stated the property owners had recently replaced the cedar shake roof on their barn with new cedar shake, using the exact same materials. He commented they redid the entire roof and it was a nice improvement.

71 N. Livernois (District Map Item #80):

Chairperson Hill stated this property was known as the Avon Prairie House.

1365 W. Tienken (District Map Item #23):

Chairperson Hill stated she was not sure if the property was currently occupied, noting it was owned by the Heyniger's and was up for sale. She indicated the property was close to the road, with many adjacent neighbors; it was highly visible; there did not seem to be the appearance of vandalism, but it was an empty home.

1750 W. Tienken and 1470 W. Tienken (District Map Item #24 and #47):

Chairperson Hill stated that these properties were both in good shape. She noted 1470 W. Tienken was owned by Mr. and Mrs. Rice.

1481 Dutton (District Map Item #9):

Chairperson Hill stated that this property was owned by the Nicholson's, and was formerly owned by Glenda Byers. She believed the house was renter-occupied, but appeared to be in good shape.

1005 Dutton (District Map Item #8):

Chairperson Hill stated this property was the Tay residence and was in good shape.

1207 N. Livernois (District Map Item #12):

Chairperson Hill asked if this property was studied with a view toward being delisted. Mr. Delacourt stated the Study Committee had studied that property and would be making a decision about the property shortly.

1021 Harding (District Map Item #57):

Chairperson Hill stated this property was owned and occupied by a Commission Member.

370 W. Avon (District Map Item #56):

Chairperson Hill stated this resource was part of the Rochester College complex. She commented the buildings looked fairly decent, and although the barn still needed some work, the roof looked secure. The other outbuildings had been repaired.

1812 S. Rochester (District Map Item #41):

Chairperson Hill stated this resource housed medical offices and was in good shape.

1585 S. Rochester (District Map #40):

Chairperson Hill stated the resource had been mothballed and asked if there had been any change since the last time the Commission discussed the property. She inquired if the City was addressing anything with respect to the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Agreement on the property.

Mr. Delacourt stated there was nothing for the City to address. He explained the Agreement had been recorded and was in good standing, but the developer had not acted on the second phase of the project. The 5th/3rd Bank was constructed as the first phase of the project, and some of the utility connections had been put in. However, there was not a time frame for the expiration of the PUD once it had been recorded and acted on. It was a matter of whether the developer intended to move forward with the project or come back to the City to request changes.

Mr. Miller asked if it was usual for there to be no expiration for a PUD Agreement. Mr. Delacourt stated the Agreements ran with the land and were recorded as part of the deed and on the title. He explained it ran with the land unless it was vacated.

Chairperson Hill asked if this particular Agreement contained a clause for a time period. She noted some of the PUD Agreements contained a statement indicating that after a certain number of years if there was no activity, it would be looked at.

Mr. Delacourt stated he believed the language in the subject PUD Agreement stated "significant construction" and noted he was not sure if the bank was considered significant construction.

Chairperson Hill stated the bank would be for Phase One of the project, but not for Phase Two. Mr. Delacourt stated City Council would have to determine they no longer wanted to support the Agreement, or that it had not been lived up to significantly. He was not aware of that discussion having taken place between the parties.

(Depart: Member Kilpatrick 8:28 PM)

1425 E. Auburn (District Map Item #17):

Chairperson Hill stated the property owner had been before the Commission for approval for the construction of a detached garage. She noted the garage had been completed and the property owner had done a nice job.

861 E. Avon (District Map Item #52):

Chairperson Hill stated the property was located on Avon Road, just west of John R. She stated it was a white house; the property owners had done a really nice job with the property, and the house was in good shape.

Mr. Miller asked why the numbers assigned to the non-contiguous districts were not in numerical order. He was advised that when the original districts were looked at back in 1978 a long list of possible properties was created; however, not every property on the list was designated. The numbers were not reassigned after the decision was made on which properties should be designated.

(Return Member Kilpatrick: 8:30 PM)

2008-05701950 E. Avon; 23 Mile & Dequindre (District Map Items #6 and #72):

Chairperson Hill stated these properties comprised the Yates Cider Mill property. She stated Item #72 crossed over the creek and was on the west side of Dequindre. She understood part of this property was being discussed by the Greenspace Advisory Board as a potential site for acquisition. She was not sure if this property was divided into a number of parcels, and one of the parcels might be sold. She stated the parcel on the east side of Dequindre was the actual Cider Mill location.

1100 Mead (District Map Item #4):

Chairperson Hill stated this property was owned by the adjacent property owner, and as far as she was aware it was occupied and in good shape.

Mr. Miller stated that property was a large parcel, perhaps the largest of all the non-contiguous properties.

Chairperson Hill thought it was about 65 acres. She was not aware of any proposed development for the property. She believed the owner wanted to keep the property as open land.

2008-0678 Stoney Creek Village

- Discussion Regarding Resident Issues

Chairperson Hill stated that Melissa Luginski had arrived and wanted to talk about the Stoney Creek Village with the Commissioners.

Melissa Luginski, 985 E. Tienken Road, stated she used to be a resident in the area in 1977, having lived in the old farmhouse with the huge barn at the corner of 25 Mile Road and Dequindre. She stated it was a rental at the time with a 99-acre farming parcel in the back, and was a great place to grow up.

Mrs. Luginski stated she returned to the area about six years ago, and was familiar with the Stoney Creek Village and found a home there for sale. She stated she had looked at many houses in the Bloomfield Township area, and had not planned to live this far north. She stated she bought one of the homes built by Jim Mallon, which was right next door to the Nathaniel Millard house. She said they had been watching over that house for the two years it had been for sale.

Mrs. Luginski stated she had fallen in love with the Historic District. She noted she was from a family that appreciated older homes, and since she was about 12 years old, she had been renovating older homes with her parents. She stated she had a very deep commitment to historic properties, and it was a pleasure to be in the Historic District.

Mrs. Luginski stated there were about eighteen historic contributing buildings directly in the Village. She commented the residents had spent thirty years protecting, restoring and maintaining their properties, and they all enjoyed living in the Village as it is a nice environment.

Mrs. Luginski stated that about a year and a half ago she started to notice some problems, with Tienken Road in particular. She commented it had changed a lot since 1977, and took some getting used to the traffic and to the development, but everyone in the Village had accepted that to some degree. About a year and a half ago they started experiencing tractor/trailer traffic coming through. The noise was the first sign, and has increased every month for the last sixteen to eighteen months. In the last year, the residents started comparing notes, and they had noticed rattling windows, and physical vibration of the structures, which goes on all day and night. She has mullioned windows in her dining room, which rattle all through dinner. She recently had preservation architects out to her house, and she served them soup right next to the windows so they would hear what is happening to the structure. She noted her house is a reproduction, built in 1980, and sits almost an acre off the road, and her windows are rattling. She was very concerned about the historic structures that line Tienken, and she could not imagine they were not experiencing foundational damage.

Mrs. Luginski stated that is what started the Village's project, as the residents are united. She noted the residents were holding a meeting this evening that she had to leave to come to the Commission meeting. They were primarily concerned about the physical structures in the Village, but were also concerned about the effect it is having on the neighborhood. They cannot cross the road; getting the mail is very dangerous; going to the Museum, and trying to play where they live is very difficult. Dogs and children are not a good thing to have in the neighborhood.

Mrs. Luginski stated it had really changed their way of life. It has also inhibited people coming to enjoy the Village and to enjoy the asset that Rochester Hills has. She knew that Pat McKay stopped all of the Historic District walking tours through the Village because it was not safe any longer, and that asset had been lost unless the truck traffic can be dealt with.

Mrs. Luginski stated there were hidden views on the road, such as the intersection at Van Hoosen. She explained in looking east there was hidden view, and with traffic travelling 40 miles per hour, oncoming traffic cannot be seen to make a left off Van Hoosen. She stated they had school bus stops in the Village and with the hill and the traffic circles, there are tractor/trailers that cannot stop in time for the school buses because they do not see that the buses are stopped.

Mrs. Luginski stated they had safety issues; the structural issues, as well as the entire landscape of the Village changing to the negative. Those are the things the residents started talking about. Also, there was an overall degradation of the value of historic properties in the Village. They understood there was a natural lowering of values because of the economy. She pointed out the former Prewitt House (1046 E. Tienken) has been empty for at least eight years, and stated it was a real concern that one of the oldest and most significant structures in the Village was not being bought. She stated that affected another property across the road that was for sale, because potential purchasers did not want to look at an abandoned house across the road.

Mrs. Luginski stated that housing sales were slowing down. She noted that historic homes will find a buyer, even in a difficult economy. She believed there was less value in the Historic District that there used to be five years ago because of the road, and because of the Prewitt House. They were concerned because as the houses do not sell and continue to be rented, the properties will not be properly maintained, creating more Prewitt Houses. She pointed out it was a gradual decline they were starting to see.

Mrs. Luginski stated there were several rental properties in the Village. The old stagecoach tavern has been a duplex for a number of years, and there have been problems with the renters of those homes. She pointed out that was not consistent with their neighborhood. She indicated there have been renters with criminal issues, and there have been security issues. She stated the neighborhood has a nice network, and they spend time talking to each other and sharing information about the issues, but that was still a negative impact on the neighborhood.

Mrs. Luginski stated the second rental was the Putnam property (947 E. Tienken), which she believed is an 1840s structure, and is one of the old homes right on the road with the barn where Van Hoosen intersects Tienken Road. She indicated there had been issues and concerns with the renters in that home. She explained one of the renters came to her door asking to do work for her, which was uncomfortable.

Mrs. Luginski stated she had been told that one of the houses that sold recently would be used as a rental. Her issue with that was maintenance of the property. She stated that the Millard House was one of the most significant houses in the County, not just in Rochester Hills.

Mrs. Luginski stated that three houses out of eighteen historic houses were now rentals. She stated the residents of the Village were concerned about that and it was one of the issues that brought them together.

Mrs. Luginski stated the residents of the Village wanted to get support from the City to understand what the issues were in the Village that they needed help with. She advised the Commission that the residents had gone directly to Oakland County because Tienken was a County Road to deal with the traffic issues. She stated they had gone to the County twice and had been told there was nothing they could do.

Mrs. Luginski stated they were trying to take a historic approach, and hoped the City saw the Village as an asset. She indicated there was potential for cultural tourism, and it was one of the only Villages like that in the Midwest. She stated that Dr. Jane Busch was working on a Statement of Significance for the Village residents, which they would be following up with some research because they could not afford to pay Dr. Busch for her research. They were trying to find out, in terms of their significance, how far geographically that expanded, which they would document.

Mrs. Luginski stated the residents had spoken to Mayor Barnett about their concerns, and Pat McKay at the Museum had been very helpful. She stated she had spoken to Melinda Hill for some advice about who to talk to and how to proceed. She noted that Mayor Barnett was happy to hear that the residents were trying to do their part before coming to the City for help.

Mrs. Luginski stated that because traffic was such an issue, and getting the character of the Village restored was so important, the residents had tried to think of things they could do on their own before they went to the City for support. She noted they understood traffic calming concepts, and narrowing of the road visually could help with that, while they were trying to work on getting the speed limit lowered.

Mrs. Luginski stated the residents were trying to do short-term things because they were looking at developing a master plan. The master plan would be a long-term plan and they were anxious for the Commission to be a part of that. She noted the plan had not been started yet, but that was part of the reason she was before the Commission. She wanted to be sure they had that representation on their advisory board.

Mrs. Luginski stated they had installed historic signage book-ending the neighborhood, and asked if the Commissioners had seen them. Chairperson Hill stated she had seen the signs. Mrs. Luginski provided a black and white rendering of the signs, which was placed on file and becomes a part of the record herein.

Mrs. Luginski stated the purpose of the signs was to educate the commuters who came through. She stated it was a goal of the residents to have historic signs built right in to the new bridge, which was a separate subject. They would also like to install a stonewall with a historic marker at the traffic circle at the east end of the Village. She noted these were a temporary, inexpensive way to educate the commuters coming through that this was a historic site and deserved some respect.

Mrs. Luginski stated that another thing that would help affect a narrowing of the road and unify the space, and something that could be done quickly and easily, would be to put in mailboxes that are taken in concept from the Van Hoosen Farm. The mailboxes would all be painted white and would line that section of the District. They thought that would bring the road in; bring some recognition to the drivers, and unify the space.

Mrs. Luginski stated they had just gotten a vote from the neighbors for the prototype of the mailbox, and the residents voted last week that they were interested in participating. She stated they wanted to show the Commission what they had been working on. She stated it could be a temporary measure, but if it worked out well, they could keep them. At this point, they were trying to put in an emergency stopgap until such time they can get the speed limit lowered and start implementing some of the other traffic calming projects.

Mrs. Luginski stated those were the two things she wanted to make the Commission aware of. The attempts the residents were making to help themselves. Dealing with the Road Commission required more than twenty-five residents as that would not be successful if the residents tried to do that themselves.

Dr. Stamps asked what companies were driving the trucks through the Village and where they were going. Mrs. Luginski responded they were seeing more every month, but the majority of the truck traffic was Allied Waste, who is currently working on a contract with the City. She stated another company was Faurecia, which had set up a new distribution center on 26 Mile Road near Mound Road. Faurecia's trucks were coming through all night, every half hour, and pretty much through the day.

Mrs. Luginski stated they had contacted Faurecia directly last summer and let them know that the Historic District existed, and asked them to re-route their trucks. Faurecia said they did not have to, so they would not.

Dr. Stamps verified that the current speed limit on Tienken Road was 40 miles per hour. Mrs. Luginski confirmed that, and noted it was very difficult to patrol that area because the traffic was so heavy. She explained it was difficult for a police officer parked on Van Hoosen to even pull out to pull someone over. She stated the road was not regularly patrolled at all. She thought most people would say the average speed through that stretch was 48 miles per hour. She stated they had traffic count data that just came back which indicated the average speed was 48 miles per hour with eight cars per hour exceeding 50 miles per hour. That meant the average speed was ten miles per hour over the speed limit. She explained their concern was that the road was very narrow and there was nowhere to stop if there is a problem. Obviously, in a neighborhood there were dogs and balls and people getting their mail, and left-hand turns, making it very dangerous.

Mr. Kilpatrick asked if because it was a County road, the County was keeping the speed limit at 40 miles per hour. Mrs. Luginski stated the County told them that the traffic and the existing speed dictated 40 miles per hour. She stated she was lucky enough to obtain a resource from another municipality that helped her out with the process in reviewing the speed limit assignments, and explained there was something called a traffic control order that was issued. That could be reviewed if it was issued within the last eight years. She was able, through a Freedom of Information Act inquiry, to obtain a copy of the original traffic control order, which was dated 1979. She felt it was definitely ready for review. She stated that as far as speed, Oakland County and the Rochester Hills Engineers discussed with the residents the 85th percentile rule. That rule basically states that 85 percent of the people are going the correct speed, and only 15 percent are exceeding it. Whatever 85 percent are going should be the correct speed limit. She indicated that if the residents wanted to do a study, the speed limit could go up if 85 percent of the people drove that speed. The only problem with that argument, in looking at the 85th percentile ruling, is that it assumes a flat, straight road with no obstructions. The Village did not have that as there is a very steep hill in the Village, and there were obstructions, such as the intersection with the limited site visibility, the hidden driveways, cars pulling in and out, and she did not think the 85th percentile rule applied.

Mrs. Luginski stated that in addition to that, when the new road is put in, they would put in a new curve in the road, which would be another obstruction. Those were the things the residents were trying to discuss with Oakland County, with help from Rochester Hills.

Dr. Stamps stated the Commission was a very understanding and sympathetic audience. He guessed the residents would have strong support from the Commission to lower the speed limit, and he thought they would be willing to send a letter to that effect to the residents' group. He thought they would like to know when the review would be, and perhaps some of the Commissioners could also go with them to the County indicating they agreed with the residents about the concern about the vibrations and the foundations. He commented that places like Mesa Verde National Park limited the number of tourists who can walk there because of the vibrations. That was just walking vibrations. He thought with 18-wheel large trucks travelling the area, they would have grounds to say vibrations were damaging. He noted the Commission needed to find a way to help.

Mrs. Luginski stated she was looking for formal support. Specifically, she was looking for some engineering support, perhaps to look at the foundations. She would like to document the current status. She pointed out that twelve of the eighteen contributing buildings were on Tienken, which was very significant. She would like to look at the foundations, observe the rattling windows, and go back in six months and take another look to see what the degradation was. She was confident there would be measurable evidence.

Mrs. Luginski asked if the Commission had a recommendation of someone the residents could speak to, or whether the City could do that. She stated she had tried to contact John Dziurman because of his historical background and his architectural business but had not been successful in reaching him.

Mr. Kilpatrick asked if the residents had talked to the school system since there were schools in the District. Mrs. Luginski stated the schools were the reason the residents previously talked to the County each time, but were absolutely shut down. She stated they not only had the Stoney Creek High School, but also the one-room schoolhouse, which was operating. One positive thing that came up in the past nine months was that the new Hart Middle School Assistant Principal, Rachel Guinn, lives in the Village. Ms. Guinn had been asked by the residents to solicit comments and concerns from the parents of the children attending the school. Their buses were also part of the problem, and the residents were going to complain through the school administration to the bus garage to slow down the buses. They had documented perilous situations where children were walking down the road, trying to cross over the bridge, and traffic would not slow down for them, and noted she had seen the fear in the children's eyes when they are walking there.

Dr. Stamps asked if Bret Rasegan had attended the meetings. Mrs. Luginski stated he had attended the meeting held this evening.

Dr. Stamps thought if there was something the County could do, Mr. Rasegan might be aware of what could happen, and could be a good resource. Mrs. Luginski stated Mr. Rasegan was concerned about a conflict of interest as being a resident. She thought there might be the appearance of some financial benefit to Mr. Rasegan in improving the Village, and he wanted to be careful to avoid that conflict. She stated Ron Campell, a preservation architect who works for Mr. Rasegan, made it clear they saw the issues, completely agreed with it, and was supposed to be responsible for developing the master plan. She stated the residents had been told they had to get a letter from the Mayor stating he wanted to solicit Oakland County's resources. She explained the residents could not ask for the help, the City had to do that. She stated Mayor Barnett was happy to do that when she met with him, and agreed to send out the letter.

Dr. Stamps stated it was too bad the Commission had not requested the Mayor to write the letter. He thought it would be appropriate for the Commission to make that request. Chairperson Hill stated the Commission was not aware of the situation, and that was one of the reasons she had asked Mrs. Luginski to attend this meeting. The Commission had not had a dialog with the Village residents about what was going on, their concerns and what they were proposing to try to do about it. She wanted to create that loop so the Commission would not be unaware of the issues and unable to assist.

Dr. Stamps asked if the Mayor had already sent the letter, or whether it could be revamped such that after the Commission met and become aware of the problem, the Commission felt it was appropriate for the City to take some action. Chairperson Hill added to include a request for assistance from the County if possible.

Dr. Stamps wondered if the Commission could ask the City to do the engineering examination of the City properties, i.e., the little Red House, and the Van Hoosen farm building. He noted that was a stone building and if there were vibrations, it could cause damage. Ms. Luginski pointed out there were also stonewalls along the farm property. Dr. Stamps stated the Commission would make the request to the Mayor as they had just become aware of the problem, and ask as part of their stewardship as being responsible for the Historic District, if there were City recourses that could help the Commission examine and see what is going on, and then also request the County resources.

Chairperson Hill agreed the City should create a baseline for the City's resources to provide a benchmark. Mrs. Luginski agreed they would not know unless that was done.

Mrs. Luginski stated the reason she brought up the matter with Mr. Rasegan was because she was concerned. She stated the residents felt it was a victory that the Mayor would send the letter and his support of their issue. But, Mr. Rasegan let her know that Ron Campbell was busy and he had 61 other municipalities to cover, they were losing staff and there were budget issues, and he could not tell her if Ron Campbell would be available after Mr. Campbell had committed to do the work on the master plan. She was confused and concerned about the response. She wanted to make the Commission aware of that situation, and requested any help the Commission could provide in securing that support. She stated it was critical to develop the master plan because then they could do grant writing, budget work, and all the other work that needed to be done. She pointed out a master plan cost money, and they had hoped to have five or ten years to gather the money, which was not the case. If they did not have a master plan, she did not know what they would use to do that work.

Mr. Miller stated that brick masonry chimneys would show problems pretty quickly because they were up above the ground, were long, and were not supported as well as the house foundations. He stated a lot of cracks could be an obvious sign, especially if homeowners knew the cracks were new. He explained cracks did occur on their own given time, gravity and weather.

Mr. Miller stated that the Museum and the Historic Village were important to the County because their Economic and Planning Department recently put out a vacation destination brochure that also included Oakland County and northern Macomb County, and those places were identified on the map. They were also looking at the watershed areas and their importance to the whole County and the adjoining areas. He suggested that was another area to explore.

Mr. Miller noted Mrs. Luginski had made a statement about looking for the money to do what everyone knows should be done, and asked if the residents had a proposed solution to the problem. Mrs. Luginski stated she was new to this, and that was why they wanted a preservation architect involved, and the Commission involved. She said there was a long list of people that they would like to be on the Mayor's Advisory Board for this project. She did not have all the answers; however, the residents believed the power poles should be buried in the Village; they believed there should be some sort of aggregate on the road to provide a physical change when they drive in that can be felt and that was a calming device; they believed they should consider things like period lighting if that was considered appropriate, and they would like to replace the fencing that was originally there. Those were the things the neighbors had talked about, but had not been in a formal environment to discuss with anyone else.

Mr. Miller clarified that when the residents were talking about a master plan, it was more than just traffic control, but included the overall preservation and improvement of the Village. Mrs. Luginski pointed out that no improvements would matter if no one could come to the Village to enjoy it.

Mr. Miller thought that the traffic situation, especially the large trucks, would be a priority. Mrs. Luginski agreed. He stated his daughter was in third grade last year and went to the schoolhouse, and he was concerned because the traffic on Tienken did move quickly. He was not sure what could be done about the waste hauler but thought it could be looked into.

Mrs. Luginski stated that when she met with the Mayor, he knew that Allied was one of the trucking companies that was causing some of the problem in the area. She stated Allied had more trucks than Faurecia and were through the area more often and caused more vibrations. The Mayor indicated he intended to talk to Allied about their routes. She pointed out that with the proximity to Macomb County, they could not assume that that was Rochester Hills hauling going on. She thought the safest but most difficult solution was to request "local deliveries only" which was their goal, and to offer the route made for trucking, which was Parkdale and the Letica bypass. She had sympathy for Rochester and that intersection, but trucks could also take Dequindre to M-59, and did not have to go through Rochester. She noted there were alternate routes, and stated the Rochester Hills Engineers had discussed that.

Mr. Kilpatrick asked if there had been any discussion with respect to enforcement of the trucks because the fines for violations on the trucks were enormous, such as weight enforcement. Mrs. Luginski stated she had never seen the Sheriff's Department pulling over cars in that area, let alone trucks. She indicated the proposed new bridge was intended to increase the tonnage.

Mrs. Luginski stated that when the residents found out that Oakland County wanted to pave Washington Road, it was easy to see that a natural pathway from Van Dyke, down 26 Mile Road, down Washington Road and then dumping into the Village would occur, with Livernois being five lanes. She stated the residents had heard from other elected officials that the feeling about Tienken Road was that it should be the next M-59, and "the historic district be damned". That was the sentiment the residents had been told existed when the planning for Tienken was done.

Mrs. Luginski stated the residents were concerned the bridge that was going in would be extra wide, with the ability of 72 tons, not the current 42 tons, and that Washington Road would be the new funnel for traffic going through the Village. She questioned what would happen to the historic structures. She believed that the truck traffic would increase substantially.

Chairperson Hill believed the bridge was slated for around 2010 or 2011. Because there were Federal dollars associated with it, a Section 106 review would be required, which included an environmental impact study. She hoped the Commission would be kept in the loop regarding the plans since it was in the heart of the District. She noted she had not personally heard anything about the bridge other than what Mrs. Luginski had told them. She was not aware of whether the City had seen plans for the bridge. She commented the surface of the bridge was in horrible shape, and needed to be resurfaced until they move forward with the plans

for Tienken. She noted that the resurfacing on Tienken north of Rochester Road had helped tremendously. She stated there were actually holes in the deck of the bridge. She thought the Commission should ask the City if they could do something about it or communicate that to the Road Commission.

Dr. Stamps asked if the bridge was in the District. Chairperson Hill responded it was, noting the District went to the portion of the condominiums across from the high school.

Dr. Stamps suggested the Commission send a communication to the Mayor or even the Engineering Department indicating the Commission had become aware of the fact there is a proposal to widen the bridge, which is in the Historic District. The Commission should ask to be kept informed or ask the Engineering Department to attend the next Commission meeting to tell the Commission about the plans. Then the City would know the Commission was aware, was interested, and wanted to be kept in the loop on the review process. He thought an environmental impact study would be required. He pointed out the County would have to talk to the City, and then the County would know that the Commission was also in the loop.

Mrs. Luginski thought there might be something the Commission could help the residents with. She believed 95% of the funds for the bridge are Federal, which would invoke a Section 106 review. She stated that Pat McKay attended a meeting held by the Oakland County Project Manager, and that was not discussed. Rather it was a narrow discussion about the historic focus. She felt responsible to make sure that someone who puts the project together knows about that. She stated that Ron Campbell gave the residents some contact information for the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) who would be responsible for reviewing this project. She thought that person might work with the National Register of Historic Places, and stated she believed the person's name was Margaret Bessimer. Mr. Campbell told them that Ms. Bessimer had an interest in bridges from a design perspective. She asked if the Commission would be the appropriate party to contact Ms. Bessimer, rather than the residents.

Chairperson Hill stated the residents could make the contact and copy the Commission to help create the loop. She did not know what the status of the bridge project was at this time. She commented that 18 months out was not very much time, which suggested the project must be moving along at some level. She thought perhaps the City's Engineering Department could provide some information about the project to the Commission, such as the status and the time frame.

Mr. Delacourt stated he could ask the Engineering Department if a Section 106 review was planned for the project. Chairperson Hill agreed that was something the Commission would like to know. Mr. Delacourt stated he could ask the City Engineer if that was part of the scope of the project and where the project stood.

Chairperson Hill asked if the intent of the contact information at MDOT was provided for some other reason. Mrs. Luginski stated it was just to make sure that the bridge plans include a Section 106 review.

Mr. Delacourt stated he had not seen any plans for the bridge and did not know if they had let the contract for the initial design or if the bids had even gone out for it. He found it hard to believe that something that ran through the middle of a National Register District would somehow slip out of a Section 106 review because that was part of the normal process. He stated he would check on the status and provide an update to the Commission.

Mr. Miller said he was proud of what the residents were doing as a neighborhood and a community. He offered whatever support he could as a member of the Commission. He stated that just because the plans were there, it did not mean they could not be changed. He pointed out there were many instances where residents stood up and changed what was going to happen.

Mrs. Luginski agreed, stating she thought the main role of the residents was to educate the Community. She did not want Oakland County to dictate what happened to their asset. She said that Rochester Hills did have some pull with Oakland County as the County was there to support Rochester Hills. If both Rochester Hills and Oakland County, or one or the other, decided that they did not value the Historic asset that would have to be said in public. The residents wanted to raise awareness.

Mrs. Luginski stated they were working with other neighborhoods and had representatives from other neighborhoods attending their meetings. She explained they were training lead resident neighborhood organizers, and had a Washington Road contingency; a Stony Creek Ridge contingency, and were working with the historical society, and this was an important meeting with the Commission to make everyone aware. She stated that the residents in the communities around them were also as upset as the Village residents were because they saw what was happening to the District.

Mrs. Luginski stated the historic homes tour held a couple months ago was attended by over 200 people, who came in the driving rain. She thought that was pretty impressive, and noted there was not one person who came through that did not have very strong feelings about what they had just experienced. She stated the Village residents knew how they themselves felt, but they had not realized that others felt the same way.

2008-0678

Chairperson Hill stated the Commission had been reviewing the Historic Districts at this meeting. She agreed there was an increase in the traffic through the Village. She commented she usually intentionally slowed down driving through, much to the consternation of the vehicles behind her. She pointed out that walking through the District had also changed considerably. She participated in the homes tour and there was an entirely different feeling walking along the side of Tienken Road, compared to what it was even two years ago. She shared the residents' concerns, as did the entire Commission. The Commission wanted to be sure the District retained its integrity, because it could disappear.

Mrs. Luginski envisioned the Village becoming a destination in ten years. She commented that the southeast corner contained homes built in the 1970s that she thought people would want to tear down to build historic reproductions because they wanted to live in the Village. She felt it was a destination place with charm, character and homes that were maintained and filled with antiques. She thought that if a little care was taken now, an even better asset would be created for Rochester Hills.

Dr. Stamps stated that earlier in the evening the Commission had talked about potential workshops and suggested the ideas presented by the Village residents could be such a session. Perhaps reviewing the master plan or discussing the master plan the residents were preparing. He thought the Commission could hold a work session on the status of the Village that would be well attended. The City Engineer and the Mayor could be invited, which would provide some education and also lend some support.

Chairperson Hill thought the two contiguous Districts could be done together because they had some bearing on each other, particularly with the road plan which would run the length of both. She agreed that might be another potential idea.

Chairperson Hill asked if the Commissioners had any other questions for Mrs. Luginski. Upon hearing none, she thanked Mrs. Luginski for attending the meeting. She noted the Commission would welcome any property owner who wanted to attend a meeting to discuss their thoughts and concerns, of if there was a need for help.

Mrs. Luginski stated that the Village residents were not happy and needed the Commission's help. She thanked the Commission for listening to and discussing their concerns.

This matter was Discussed**2008-0570**Stoney Creek Historic District and the
Winkler Mill Pond Historic District:

Chairperson Hill stated that the concerns just discussed with Mrs. Luginski were also a concern to the Commission, although it was not easy to address. She thought the condition of most of the homes in the Districts were good, although Mrs. Luginski had brought up the condition of the former Prewitt House. She asked if the purchaser who bought the house with the intention of fixing it and flipping it, still owned the property.

Mr. Delacourt believed the same people still owned the property, but they had not come back in to talk to the City.

Chairperson Hill stated that the exterior of the house was deteriorating again. She noted there were two different for sale signs up, one for the adjacent vacant parcel and one for the house. She presumed that the Building Department had not been able to conduct the inspections behind the drywall. Mr. Delacourt stated he did not think the drywall was ever removed to allow the inspections.

Chairperson Hill stated that sometimes she had seen the windows open and other times they were closed. Mr. Delacourt stated he could check with the Building Department to see if there had been any activity on the permits. He had not heard anything new about the property.

Chairperson Hill stated the condition of that house did not help the other houses in the area that were up for sale.

Chairperson Hill stated there was a white barn that sat on the alleyway with the house on Van Hoosen across from the Museum that had been painted. She noticed when she was on the homes tour that it appeared some interior work had been done on the barn but they had also cut in and installed a door on the barn. Mr. Delacourt asked if Chairperson Hill could provide an address so a letter could be sent. He stated he tried to keep the Ordinance Enforcement Officers aware of what required approval, but it was also hard for them to keep track of. He suggested if any of the Commissioners saw something like that, to let him know. He would like to send a letter advising the homeowner that although the paint looked great and appeared to be the same color, it should have come to the Commission for approval. The homeowner could be directed to the property owners guide on the City's website.

He agreed a door that altered the exterior should have come before the Commission. Chairperson Hill stated that the door could eventually be removed and the boards put back up, but it should have come for review.

Chairperson Hill referred to the home on Runyon that had come before the Commission and commented the porch was done and looked fabulous. She believed that house also had an outhouse at one point, and stated she did not see the outhouse while on the homes tour. Mr. Miller asked if the outhouse listed in the survey on the property. Chairperson Hill stated it was one of only two in the District, although she did not know if the other one was still there.

Mr. Delacourt stated the outhouse was surveyed. Chairperson Hill stated it was gone. Mr. Delacourt stated it was listed as non-contributing, but that did not mean it did not need permission to be removed. Chairperson Hill stated that the Certificate of Appropriateness issued in 2004 was for renovation of the front porch, exterior painting and installation of a new roof.

Chairperson Hill stated she did not know if the garage had been redone, because the garage had also been fixed up and looked very nice, but the outhouse was gone. She noted the property owners had come back to the Commission earlier this year to discuss changing the front porch, and the porch had been finished and look very nice.

Chairperson Hill stated that the new siding and the window replacement had been completed at 1058 E. Tienken Road. That particular house was built right next to the school as infill construction, and the hardy plank siding had been installed.

Dr. Stamps asked if the Commission could recap what they were going to do with respect to the Village issues discussed with Mrs. Luginski. He asked if the Commission was going to write a letter to the Mayor with the various ideas suggested.

Chairperson Hill stated the letter would express the Commission's concern about the traffic issues that seemed to have increased in the District and the potential damage of the resources.

Dr. Stamps added that the City's properties should be looked at to see what is happening to the other structures in the District that the Commission has stewardship over.

Chairperson Hill suggested that the letter could include whether any assistance could be provided by having the County address the situation or having the County address a temporary cleanup or paving of the bridge surface until a new bridge is installed. She thought there were a number of issues the Commission was concerned about, including the traffic increase; the present state of the bridge that was not helping the situation; whether a baseline inspection could be done of the City's resources within the District, and any other assistance the City might be able to provide in looking at the overall District.

Chairperson Hill thought if the Village residents had talked to the Mayor regarding the issues, the Commission could express their agreement that the City needed to look into the issues and would appreciate any assistance the City could provide.

Dr. Stamps thought a short letter to the Village residents from the Chairperson of the Commission stating the Commission appreciated their appearance at the meeting; that they had provided excellent information; the Commission appreciated all the residents were doing; the Commission supported their activities, and requesting to be kept in the loop. He thought those residents should be encouraged to keep on doing what they had been doing. Chairperson Hill agreed the Commission should try to help where they could, and to keep the relationship and communication going.

Mr. Miller suggested the Village residents be encouraged to have a representative attend the Commission meetings to provide regular updates since the issues were so important.

Chairperson Hill stated she did not know if the residents were forming some type of board or whether one of the Commissioners would be allowed to be a part of that or not. She did not know if there would be any conflict, but noted it would be nice to be included in the loop in some respect.

Dr. Stamps suggested the letter could say that the Commission welcomed updates and information, and if someone from the residents organizing group would like to attend the Commission meetings and provide an update, the Commission would be happy to put them on the Agenda. Chairperson Hill agreed that even a five-minute update would be helpful.

Chairperson Hill stated she also shared the concern with the Winkler Mill Pond District of the Washington Road paving project. She hoped an update could be provided on that project.

Mr. Delacourt stated he would ask about all infrastructure projects affecting or that may have an impact on any of the Districts, both non-contiguous and contiguous. He stated he would talk to the City Engineer about what was on the books; what was upcoming, and what information was available.

Chairperson Hill stated that the Winkler Mill Pond District was next, and noted there were more newer homes than designated structures in that District. She commented that at some time the District might be reduced in size eliminating the newer homes.

Dr. Stamps asked if it was appropriate to request the same information from the County. He noted the assumption was that the City was "hand in glove" with the County, but if the same request went to the County, the County would know that the Commission was aware and was working with the City, but would also like to work with the County. He asked if all MDOT programs went through the County, or whether the Commission should make a request of all three agencies.

Mr. Delacourt stated if it was an infrastructure project in the City, whether it was a County, City, State or Federal project, the City was aware of it. He did not know what type of response the Commission would get if the request went directly to each agency. He stated the Commission would have to send the County information about the Historic Districts so the County could look at that in relation to infrastructure projects. He commented it would be easier for Staff to work with the City's Engineering Department, but that did not preclude the Commission from making the request.

Chairperson Hill stated her first inclination would be to see what the Commission heard from the City. She noted that Pat McKay had been included in some type of meeting with the County. It would have been nice if Mr. Delacourt or someone from the Commission had also been included in that meeting to hear what they were planning to do in the District. She stated she had not had any conversations with Mr. McKay about the meeting, and was only aware because Mrs. Luginski had mentioned the meeting and indicated it was with the County.

Mr. Delacourt stated he did not know these issues were going on until just recently. He noted that while Dr. Busch was in town doing some fieldwork on the potential districts, she had mentioned it to him. He indicated he had meet Mrs. Luginski earlier in the day because she was at City Hall with Pat McKay meeting with the Mayor. He was not aware there had been any meetings about the road projects or that the residents group had been formed. He would find out everything he could and would pass along any formal request the Commission had. He indicated he would find out what meetings had taken place; where the projects were in the pipeline; whether Section 106 reviews were going to be conducted; and if not, why, and anything the City or the Commission could do to assist in these matters. He stated he would provide a brief update prior to the next meeting, and work with the Chair regarding any formal agenda items for the next meeting.

Dr. Stamps asked if in the context of the fact the Historic District was maturing and it was becoming appropriate to develop a master plan, whether the City, County and MDOT could be asked if they had any plans that the Commission should be aware of as the master plan is developed. The context could be to indicate that a master plan is being developed and ask if those agencies had anything to contribute.

Mr. Miller knew the City had been working on the Master Thoroughfare Plan, and asked if that had been finalized. He noted there had been a lot of talk about Tienken and the bridge between Rochester Road and Livernois Road. He felt Mrs. Luginski was right that if Washington Road was paved, it would be used a major traffic corridor.

Chairperson Hill stated when the road opened up between Dutton and M-24, there was a big difference, as well as Tienken to Squirrel when the barricade was removed. She stated the connection to M-24 definitely allowed cross-traffic through the Village. She thought the Planning Commission had just approved or accepted the Master Thoroughfare Plan at their last meeting. She commented it was stressed to go back to the original concept of ring road on Dequindre, but it could take some time for that to be done.

Chairperson Hill asked if there were any other comments or questions regarding either the Stoney Creek or Winkler Mill Districts.

Chairperson Hill recapped that a couple letters would be prepared regarding the situation in the Stoney Creek District; with one letter to the residents to help establish that connection, and perhaps a work session would be scheduled regarding some of those issues in the District. Also, an eye would be kept on some of the properties that had the potential for vandalism and on some other properties that might require further mothballing.

This matter was Discussed

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Chairperson Hill called for any other business.

Chairperson Hill commented that Dr. Jane Busch was in the area recently working on studies on the National Twist Drill and 2040 S. Livernois. She asked if the National Twist Drill property would be looked at as a potential brownfield.

Mr. Delacourt stated the property qualified as a brownfield. Chairperson Hill asked if that would be included as part of the scenario, noting she had heard that possibly someone wanted to demolish the building.

Mr. Delacourt explained that as part of a brownfield redevelopment project, a request is made by an owner of the property or someone who wanted to redevelop the property. He was sure it qualified as a brownfield, which would make tax increment financing (TIF) available if the Brownfield Redevelopment Authority and City Council wanted to approve TIF reimbursement. He clarified whether or

not the property would be looked at as a brownfield would depend on whether the current owner or any future owner made that request.

Chairperson Hill asked if the study was being conducted because there was the potential for demolition. Mr. Delacourt stated the property had been half for sale and half not for sale for as long as he had worked for the City, as had the rumors about demolition. He commented he used to receive numerous telephone inquiries about the site, but had not received as many recently. He stated that portions of the site, from a use standpoint, were functionally obsolete. The property had been looked at for many different types of development over the years, but no plans had been officially submitted. Many times the plans were dropped because they did not conform with either the zoning or the master plan; some were fearful of the potential historic designation, and some were fearful of the potential for environmental contamination. He noted some developers had picked up the site on options; started due diligence, but never completed their plans.

(Depart Member Cozzolino: 9:52 PM)

Chairperson Hill asked if there were multiple owners of the National Twist Drill site. Mr. Delacourt responded there were two owners and explained there was a seven-acre, long, narrow parcel on the corner and thirty-three acres to the north, which included a portion of the building with the rest of the parcel being vacant.

Chairperson Hill commented it was a gorgeous art deco building, and stated she had heard that the interior had a lot of art deco remaining from its time period. She thought it had potential for some alternative living, such as was occurring in the City of Detroit, despite the bad economy.

Mr. Delacourt stated he expected Preliminary Reports on both properties to be received shortly, which would be reviewed by the Historic Districts Study Committee, followed by Public Hearings.

Chairperson Hill asked when the Historic Preservation Ordinance Amendments would go before City Council. Mr. Delacourt stated the Amendments were being scheduled for the December 8, 2008 City Council meeting. He explained a presenter from the Michigan Historic Preservation Network (MHPN) would be at the meeting to discuss the Certified Local Government Program. He stated that representatives from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) were unable to attend the meeting, but recommended someone from the MHPN.

Mr. Delacourt stated there were two Ordinance Amendments going forward, one that related to the CLG and one that formally delisted the 56187 Dequindre property. Chairperson Hill suggested the Commissioners be notified of the meeting date, and encouraged the Commissioners to attend the Council meeting.

Particularly since it was the Commission's Ordinance, and was something they wanted. If the Commission did not attend, it would give the appearance the Commission did not care very much about the Amendments.

Chairperson Hill stated she did not anticipate the Commission would hold a meeting in December unless a request for approval came forward. She noted the next Commission meeting would most likely be the January 2009 meeting.

Mr. Delacourt stated he would provide some interim email information if any updates are received on any of the properties discussed at this meeting.

Chairperson Hill called for any other business. She thought this meeting had been beneficial to the Commissioners to keep everyone apprised of what was happening with the Districts.

(Enter Member Cozzolino: 9:56 PM)

Chairperson Hill commented that the Districts were a great asset for the Community and she thought residents liked to have that diversity. From a cultural tourism aspect, she felt this region had much to offer.

Chairperson Hill called for any other business. No other business was presented.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion duly made and seconded, Chairperson Hill adjourned the meeting at 10:05 PM.

Melinda Hill, Chairperson
City of Rochester Hills
Historic Districts Commission

Judy A. Bialk, Recording Secretary

(Approved as _____ at the _____, 2009 Regular Historic Districts Commission Meeting.)

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

