

**City of Rochester Hills
Department of Planning**

STAFF REPORT TO THE HISTORIC DISTRICTS COMMISSION
September 30, 2008

Vacant Parcel (Corner of Washington and Winkler Mill)	
APPLICANT	Nathaniel Brock 6425 Winkler Mill Road Rochester Hills, Michigan 48306
LOCATION	Vacant Parcel – Corner of Washington and Winkler Mill Roads
SIDWELL	15-01-201-009
FILE NO.	HDC 08-001
ZONING	R-4 (Single Family Residential)
STAFF	Derek L. Delacourt, Deputy Director
REQUEST	Certificate of Appropriateness - Installation of Protective Fence
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Winkler Mill Pond

PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION

The subject site is a vacant parcel located at the corner of Washington and Winkler Mill Roads within the contiguous boundary of the Winkler Mill Pond Historic District. The parcel is the site of a former orchard (see aerial photographs attached progressing from 1994 through 2007) and is just slightly over 3 acres in size.

HISTORICAL INFORMATION

The subject parcel is located within the boundaries of the Winkler Mill Pond Historic District and is the site of a former orchard. The Intensive Level Survey conducted by Dr. Jane Busch does not specifically address this vacant parcel with an individual survey sheet; however, she does include this parcel in her proposed redistricting of the Winkler Mill Pond District. The Survey Report itself focuses on the gristmill and pond as the primary reason for the District's designation, and only briefly mentions (on Page 33 of the Report) that the area around the mill was primarily agricultural and sparsely populated during the nineteenth century.

PERTINENT FACTS

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of protective fencing around the subject parcel. The applicant intends to restore the former orchard on the parcel and would like to protect his restoration project from the pervasive deer population prevalent in the area.

The applicant has submitted photographs of his proposed fencing, which would consist of wooden posts spaced every ten feet, with the fencing itself described as a “fixed knot exclusion fence”. The fence would be 75-inches in height, set inside the perimeter of the parcel. The applicant has submitted documentation depicting the overall look of the fence.

Although the applicant believes the existing vegetation will be sufficient to disguise the fence from any view along Washington Road, additional trees will be planted around any visible areas. Access to the parcel would be through a gate installed near the northeast corner of the parcel, basically just across Winkler Mill Road from the applicant’s existing driveway. The applicant is highly cognizant of the view shed from the road and intends to make every effort not to disturb that view.

The southern side of the subject parcel is adjacent to the driveway for 1701 Washington Road (a non-contributing site); the western edge abuts 6400 Winkler Mill (a contributing resource); the eastern edge abuts Washington Road (which does not contain any contributing resources along Washington Road from Mill Race to Carter), and abuts Winkler Mill Road on the northern edge (the applicant’s home [a contributing resource] is directly across the street from the subject parcel).

The applicant appeared before the Historic Districts Commission in 1999 for the construction of a fence on the vacant parcel adjacent to his home, identified as Parcel Number 15-01-227-017. That request was approved by the Commission, although the fence in that particular instance consisted of a three-rail style, split wood fence designed to match the existing fence along the applicant’s property at 6425 Winkler Mill Road. A copy of the Minutes from the December 9, 1999 Commission Meeting are attached.

ANALYSIS

1. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow the installation of protective fencing around a former orchard.
2. The City’s Survey identifies the vacant parcel as a contributing resource within the Winkler Mill Pond Historic District.

3. The applicant is cognizant of the view shed of historically designated parcels, and will make every effort to disguise the visibility of the fence from Washington Road.

Attachments: Applicant Submittal Documentation
Location Map
Aerial Photographs (1994 through 2007)
12/9/99 HDC Minutes
Winkler Mill Historic District Map (from Survey)
Winkler Mill Survey Report Comments (Pages 7, 8 and 33)
Thematic Narrative – Agriculture (Pages 24-27 from Dr. Busch's Report)

EXAMPLE WORDING FOR MOTION *(to be modified by Commission at the meeting – if approving request)*

MOTION by _____, seconded by _____, that the Rochester Hills Historic Districts Commission, in the matter of File No. HDC 08-001, **ISSUES** a Certificate of Appropriateness for the vacant parcel identified as Parcel Identification Number 15-01-201-009, which is located in the Winkler Mill Pond Historic District. The work consists of the installation of protective fencing around the perimeter of the parcel to protect the existing orchard. This Certificate of Approval is issued with the following Findings and Conditions:

Findings:

1. The subject parcel is a non-contributing resource within the Winkler Mill Pond Historic District.
2. The proposed renovation work is compatible with the existing historic resources located in the Winkler Mill Pond Historic District, and the District itself.
3. The proposed work consists of the installation of a perimeter fence around a vacant parcel with an existing abandoned former orchard. The applicant intends to restore the former orchard, and the installation of the fence is to prevent the native deer population from destroying his efforts.
4. The proposed work also consists of the use of wood columns spaced every ten feet, with a 75-inch “fixed knot exclusion fence”.
5. The proposed fence installation will not detract from the rural appearance/streetscape of Washington Road, nor affect any contributing resources in the Historic District.
6. The work, as proposed, meets “The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation” Standard Numbers _____ (**4 and 10**).

Conditions:

1. The work shall be consistent with the plans dated received by the Planning Department September 19, 2008.
2. The applicant shall obtain any permit required by the City’s Building Department.

EXAMPLE WORDING FOR MOTION *(to be modified by Commission at the meeting – if denying request)*

MOTION by _____, seconded by _____, that the Rochester Hills Historic Districts Commission, in the matter of File No. HDC 08-001, **DENIES** a Certificate of Appropriateness for the vacant parcel identified as Parcel Identification Number 15-01-201-009, which is located in the Winkler Mill Pond Historic District. The work is denied because the work as proposed does not meet “The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation” Standard Number _____.

**THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S
STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION**

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation are ten basic principles created to help preserve the distinctive character of a historic building and its site, while allowing for reasonable change to meet new needs.

The Standards (**36 CFR Part 67**) apply to historic buildings of all periods, styles, types, materials, and sizes. They apply to both the exterior and the interior of historic buildings. The Standards also encompass related landscape features and the building's site and environment as well as attached, adjacent, or related new construction.

Rehabilitation projects must meet the following Standards, as interpreted by the National Park Service, to qualify as “certified rehabilitations” eligible for the 20% rehabilitation tax credit.

The Standards are applied to projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.