

**CITY OF ROCHESTER HILLS
HISTORIC DISTRICTS COMMISSION MEETING
Thursday, January 10, 2008**

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

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

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Vice Chairperson Brian Dunphy; Members Maria-Teresa Cozzolino, John Dziurman, Paul Miller, Dr. Richard B. Stamps

Absent: Chairperson Melinda Hill (arrive 8:13 PM)
Members Micheal Kilpatrick, Michael Sinclair

Quorum Present

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

3. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Vice Chairperson Dunphy announced a quorum was present.

4. STATEMENT OF STANDARDS

Vice Chairperson Dunphy 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. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

5A. Minutes of November 8, 2007 Regular Meeting

Vice Chairperson Dunphy asked for any comments or corrections regarding the November 8, 2007 Regular Meeting Minutes. Upon hearing none, he called for a motion to approve.

MOTION by Thompson, seconded by Miller, that the Minutes of the November 8, 2007 Regular Historic Districts Commission Meeting be approved as presented.

Approved as amended/presented at the _____, 2008 Regular Historic Districts Commission Meeting

draft

Ayes: All
Nays: None
Absent: Hill, Kilpatrick, Sinclair

MOTION CARRIED

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

- A. Memorandum re Property Owner's Guide
- B. Memorandum re Invitation to Workshop

Vice Chairperson Dunphy stated that the Commissioners had received copies of the above documents, and called for any other announcements or communications. No other announcements or communications were presented.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT (Non-Agenda Items)

Vice Chairperson Dunphy asked if there were any public comments. There were no public comments.

8. NEW BUSINESS

- 8A. Establish 2008 Regular Meeting Schedule

Vice Chairperson Dunphy noted that the Commissioners had received a proposed schedule for 2008 in their packet materials. Mr. Dziurman made a motion to accept the schedule as presented. Mr. Thompson seconded the proposed motion. Vice Chairperson Dunphy called for discussion on the proposed motion on the floor. Upon hearing none, he called for a voice vote.

MOTION by Dziurman, seconded by Thompson, that the Rochester Hills Historic Districts Commission establishes the 2008 Regular Meeting Schedule as follows:

The regular meetings will be held on the second Thursday of each month at the Rochester Hills Municipal Offices, 1000 Rochester Hills Road, Rochester Hills, Michigan beginning at 7:30 PM Michigan Time

2008 MEETING DATES

January 10, 2008	July 10, 2008
February 14, 2008	August 14, 2008
March 13, 2008	September 11, 2008
April 10, 2008	October 9, 2008
May 8, 2008	November 13, 2008
June 12, 2008	December 11, 2008

Ayes: All
Nays: None
Absent: Hill, Kilpatrick, Sinclair

MOTION CARRIED

draft

8B. Election of Officers

Mr. Miller suggested the Commission move this item further down on the Agenda until Ms. Hill arrived for the meeting. He noted she had been delayed for about half an hour. Vice Chairperson Dunphy called for a second to the proposed motion. Ms. Cozzolino seconded the motion. Vice Chairperson called for any discussion on the motion on the floor. Upon hearing none, he called for a voice vote on the motion to postpone Agenda Item 8B.

MOTION by Miller, seconded by Cozzolino, that Agenda Item 8B (Election of Officers) be postponed until after 8:00 PM, in order to allow Commissioner Hill an opportunity to participate in the discussion and nominations.

Ayes: All
Nays: None
Absent: Hill, Kilpatrick, Sinclair

8C. Review

- Draft of "What every historic property owner needs to know" Guide

Vice Chairperson Dunphy stated that the Commission had received some suggested revisions to the draft Guide.

Mr. Delacourt explained a copy of the Guide had been sent to Ms. Kristine Kidorf for review and comment, and her recommended changes had been provided to the Commission. He noted Ms. Hill had also provided some suggested changes. He noted he had not reviewed the changes, and if the proposed changes appeared to be acceptable to the Commission, they would be made. He suggested a final draft be provided to the Commission at the next meeting.

Ms. Cozzolino stated she also had some suggested changes that she would pass along to the recording secretary.

Mr. Delacourt suggested that all the comments be incorporated into a revised draft document, and if any comments conflict or are a significant change, they would be brought back as specific discussion items at the next meeting.

Vice Chairperson Dunphy noted the Commissioners had received a Memorandum with some items that required discussion to ensure the Commission agreed with the statements. He asked if the Commissioners preferred to review those items and bring back their thoughts at the next meeting. The Commissioners agreed they would review the draft Guide and all suggested changes and bring any questions or comments to the next meeting.

Ms. Cozzolino stated she really liked the Guide and thought it was great tool, noting she would have liked to have this Guide when she became a Commissioner.

8D. 2008 Earl Borden Award

Vice Chairperson Dunphy stated the Commissioners had exchanged some email communications about the 2008 Earl Borden Award, and opened the floor for formal nominations.

Mr. Miller suggested the Commissioners have a general discussion, noting it had been past practice not to nominate anyone currently serving on a City Board or Commission. He understood the feeling that if the Commission nominated its own members, it appeared the Commission was just “patting itself on the back” and it also perhaps gave the appearance of a conflict of interest.

Mr. Miller stated the award was for outstanding leadership, and he felt that anyone who met the level of outstanding leadership in preservation should be considered. He noted if someone was nominated that was not currently serving on the Historic Districts Commission, it was not quite the appearance of conflict of interest.

Mr. Dziurman stated he was against nominating someone who was involved with the Commission or currently sitting on the Historic Districts Study Committee. He thought members currently serving on those Boards were doing their job, and should do their job well. He stated that preservation leadership should be reserved for something very significant. He agreed doing research was wonderful, but knew of others who had done more research and had not been recognized. He felt a leadership award should be given to someone who had done something significant over a long period of time.

Mr. Dziurman offered an example of the citizens group that was preserving green space. He thought that was preservation at its greatest, although perhaps not historic preservation. He noted there could be some historic properties involved. He pointed out that group as an example of citizens who really did something significant, which is what the Commission should be looking for. He also pointed out the Commission did not have to award anyone if there wasn't anyone outstanding. He commented the award was not just for preservation leadership, but also for a structure or building. He was not aware of any structure or building that should be recognized.

Vice Chairperson Dunphy asked if Mr. Thompson was interested in heading up the award this year. Dr. Stamps agreed Mr. Thompson would be an excellent choice to head up the 2008 award.

Mr. Thompson stated he was not sure and asked what would be involved. He said he was inclined not to present an award this year. He agreed with Mr. Dziurman that leadership should be over a period of time, and he did not want to give the appearance the Commission was only nominating currently serving members.

Mr. Miller stated he had not worked with the member of the Study Committee that had been suggested, but was aware of the work that person had done to preserve the Stiles School. He found Mr. Dziurman's suggestion very interesting because preserving open space in the City was about as historic preservation minded as the

Commission could get. He pointed out there was nothing more historic in Rochester Hills than the land itself. In preserving open space, they were preserving it in the way most people remembered it to be - notwithstanding the last 20 to 30 years of development. Most of the pictures or drawings from the 1830's pertained to trees and open space. He explained he was one of the original founding members of that group, and noted that several residents involved in that group had already received the Earl Borden Award, such as Lois Golden, Greg Doyle, and Rod Wilson.

Mr. Miller stated there was one particular couple who were instrumental from the beginning in trying to preserve and protect some of the historical areas of the City, such as the first platted subdivision which consisted of worker's housing for the Western Knitting Mill and which ran along the Clinton River Valley. He commented that couple had worked long and hard, and recently the City had approved the purchase of that land. He explained the site bordered the Clinton River Valley, which was the site where the Indians burned the white dog in the bonfire, and had historical implications.

Mr. Miller referred to that couple and noted one of them currently served on the City's Green Space Advisory Board, but he did not believe that presented a conflict of interest since that group had worked for nearly eight years building interest and developing momentum. He noted they had participated in the County's Greenway Vision Plan. He commented when people said there was nothing we can do, that couple kept asking "what can we do". He remembered that about six years ago they realized the problem was that there were no funds to finance the purchase of open space, and the group worked toward a millage. He thought that was a crowning achievement accomplished in the City. He stated it was important for the Commission to nominate someone.

Mr. Dziurman stated the presentation of the award did give the Commission some recognition in the Community, and asked whom the couple was Mr. Miller spoke about.

Mr. Miller agreed it was an important event for the Commission and stated he would like to nominate Pamela Bratton-Wallace and Andrew Krupp. He stated they resided on Cloverport and commented they had also been involved in working with a group to preserve the Stiles School, and had attended meetings regarding the Elevator Project in Downtown Rochester. He thought they met the level the Commission was looking for, and it would be the first time they had received any acknowledgement for all the work they had done.

Mr. Dziurman asked if anyone else knew them. Mr. Delacourt stated they had been involved in the City for quite some time. He commented that Mr. Krupp's father had designed the City's logo. He stated they were local teachers and represented some great things. He explained Pam Wallace sat on an active City Committee, and that Committee made recommendations to Council on the purchase of property. He commented that there were many residents involved in the green space millage who worked equally hard on that specific millage.

Mr. Miller stated he understood other people were involved with the millage proposal; however, the Krupp's were the only ones other than he, Gerry Carvey, Greg Doyle, Rod Wilson and Dan Kiefer who were instrumental from the beginning. He

explained that included the first failed millage, the second successful millage, and noted the Krupp's efforts extended four years prior to that. He thought that what the Krupp's did in keeping interest high and providing a forum for others to click into really made a difference. He said in his opinion the difference between the first failed millage and the second successful millage was the work the Krupp's did with respect to the millage language and in deciding what to ask for in tough economic times. He stated they were key in writing the ballot language, which had been clear and easy to understand.

Mr. Dziurman asked if anyone else involved in the millage would feel slighted if they were not named, noting many had worked hard on the millage proposal. Mr. Delacourt stated the Commission would have to establish why the Krupp's should be nominated above the rest of the individuals involved. Mr. Miller stated one distinction was the number of years of their effort.

Dr. Stamps suggested an award could go to the citizens group, with a special recognition to the Krupp's for their leadership efforts through the years. Mr. Miller pointed out that many other individuals involved in the group had already received an award, and he did not think they would feel slighted. He commented that there was a group who had worked on the second millage proposal that might feel slighted. He suggested the award could focus on the long work done prior to the millage, rather than on the successful completion.

Mr. Delacourt stated the award was almost being presented to the entire City since the residents voted for the approval of the millage, with special recognition to the "Save our Open Space" ("SOS") group. Mr. Miller agreed the award could be presented to the SOS group, with the Krupp's accepting the award on the group's behalf.

Mr. Delacourt asked if the Commission would be putting "open space" under the umbrella of preservation as being an important preservation piece of the Community. Mr. Dziurman stated they would be. Mr. Delacourt stated if "open space" fell under the umbrella of preservation, then the millage might be one of the most important things the City had ever done for preservation since it was the first time the residents across the City put up their dollars. He stated the Commission could recognize the entire City for its effort.

Mr. Delacourt stated there was a defined group in the SOS that made it happen, noting it was pretty amazing to watch especially after the first millage question went down.

Mr. Dziurman asked if the Commission would recognize those individuals directly. Dr. Stamps stated the award would go to the entire group, with special recognition of Ms. Wallace and Mr. Krupp for spearheading the effort.

Mr. Miller stated no one knew what the outcome of the millage would be and future land purchases could end up preserving buildings or trees on properties that are historically significant. Mr. Delacourt stated the open space contributed to viewsheds. Mr. Delacourt noted the evolution of the Green Space Advisory Board had been an impressive process beginning with a grass roots endeavor that evolved into a Council sanctioned board that was learning how to make recommendations to Council.

Mr. Delacourt stated the Commission should use care in singling out any two individuals because it was a large group that put the process together.

Mr. Dziurman asked who the award would be presented to. Vice Chairperson Dunphy stated he was going to ask the same question, and asked if there would just be one award. Mr. Miller suggested Pam Wallace and Andy Krupp be recognized as individuals; the SOS be recognized as a group, and the citizens of Rochester Hills, perhaps including City Council because they had agreed to put the millage question on the ballot. Mr. Dziurman stated "citizens" covered everyone.

Mr. Miller noted that the "City" could not come up to receive the award, and even the founding members of the SOS group numbered nine or ten that had grown into twenty to thirty. Mr. Dziurman stated those individuals could be given a letter.

Mr. Miller stated the SOS had been disbanded. Mr. Delacourt asked if there had been a formal structure to the SOS group membership, or whether it had just been an amalgamation of people.

Mr. Miller stated the members had appointed a steering committee to make decisions regarding ballot language, millage amount, what and where they would fundraise, and what the funds would be spent on. He noted the steering committee consisted of the founding members, and there were members who came and went, and some who worked on the first millage but not the second, and vice versa.

Dr. Stamps thought the Commission had the rough idea that the award went to the citizens for their vision in passing the millage, and to the SOS group for their facilitating it happening, with special recognition to the two individuals who were part of the inception and had a long history working on the proposal. Mr. Dziurman noted the two individuals had done more than work on the millage proposal.

Dr. Stamps stated the two individuals would receive the plaque. He noted the idea of presenting a plaque to the City was interesting because it would be hung in City Hall. He suggested a letter be given to all the individuals involved in the SOS group recognizing them for their efforts in bringing to pass this significant event in our City's history, and thanking them for their time, efforts, energy, expertise, and welcoming them to join the Commission at the City Council meeting where they could be publicly recognized. He suggested that during the program the Commission recognize those who worked on the SOS group and ask them to stand.

Mr. Miller stated those individuals should be invited to come to be recognized. Mr. Dziurman agreed. Dr. Stamps stated this could be a step down the line toward a historic preservation millage. Mr. Miller stated he regretted the open space millage proposal did not include historic, noting some on the group had argued long and hard to have that word included.

Dr. Stamps stated he felt comfortable with the idea. Mr. Miller asked if the Commission required that the award recipient be a Rochester Hills resident. Mr. Dziurman stated when the

award was created, Mayor Ireland was adamant the award only be given to residents. He indicated he did not know if that was written anywhere, but it had been the policy of the Commission.

Vice Chairperson Dunphy asked if the Krupp's were Rochester Hills residents. Mr. Miller stated not only were they Rochester Hills residents, they were active Rochester Hills residents.

Vice Chairperson Dunphy asked if any Commissioner had any other nominations to suggest. Ms. Cozzolino stated a potential for next year was Mr. LaVere Webster because he resided in a historic home; his restoration of the mural at the Rochester Community School Administration Building; he was a member of the City's Study Committee and a member of the Rochester-Avon Historical Society. Mr. Delacourt stated Mr. Webster was a true public servant as he is involved in preservation because he enjoys it and volunteers his time.

Dr. Stamps suggested Peggy Schodowski also be considered for a future award. Mr. Thompson stated he had a tremendous amount of respect for Mrs. Schodowski, noting she had done much work for the Study Committee, along with the work she did for the preservation of the Stiles School.

Mr. Dziurman stated Bruce Hawkins had previously served on the Commission, as had Brett Rasegan, when the work was being done on the golf course clubhouse. He stated Mr. Hawkins had traveled to Lansing and did a huge amount of research that had never been recognized.

(Enter Member Hill: 8:13 PM)

Mr. Miller stated there were many people who sat on a Board or Commission who went beyond the norm, and he thought someone sitting on a Commission could be recognized for the work they did on that Commission and work that was done "beyond the call of duty".

Mr. Thompson stated that Mr. Webster had recently been reappointed to the Study Committee and he did not have any objection to his nomination for either next year or this year. Mr. Dziurman stated the Commission had never nominated a sitting Study Committee member, but could certainly consider that option.

Dr. Stamps suggested Mr. Webster be nominated as a conclusion to the mural being completed. He commented on Mrs. Schodowski's behalf, noting she had done more than research on the Stiles School, but had also done some research on another potential property in the City. He explained when the Study Committee began working on the Preliminary Report for the Frank Farm, there was a question on the archeology end, and Mrs. Schodowski came to him, asked some questions, and then went to Lansing to gather additional data. He commented she was working on multiple projects, and at the appropriate time she should be considered.

Dr. Stamps suggested the Commission could wait until Bruce Hawkins' book on the Civil War was published before they nominated him. Mr. Dziurman stated that would tie in nicely with history. Mr. Miller stated he would be interested in reading the book. Dr. Stamps stated he had written a book about the Donner Party, who jettisoned

draft

half their belongings west of Salt Lake in the salt flats when he was working as a historic archeologist and was sent out there to do an archeological dig on wagon boxes, pony express stations, etc. Dr. Stamps said that Mr. Hawkins had a diary of a Civil War soldier, had visited all the places, done the research, and when the book came out it would be good, and he should be recognized at that time.

Chairperson Hill asked for a brief update on the meeting to this point. She was advised the Commission was discussing the Earl Borden Award nominations.

Mr. Miller explained the Commission had been discussing Mr. Dziurman's suggestion about the open space millage and the citizens responsible for its successful passage. Mr. Miller stated he had mentioned Pam and Andy Krupp's long efforts on land preservation and open space preservation, even prior to the formation of the SOS group. The second millage attempt was called "Green Space Yes!" which was the group's attempt at using positive language.

Dr. Stamps explained the award would be given to the citizens of Rochester Hills for their vision in preserving the open space and its historic context, with recognition of the SOS group and all those involved who helped bring about the successful passage of the millage, and especially identified two individuals for their long-term involvement in the process; their leadership; continuity, and bringing to a successful conclusion the preservation of open space.

Mr. Dziurman noted the Krupp's had some connection to the historical society as well, having worked on projects with them. Mr. Dunphy stated they had been involved in the Rochester Elevator project.

Mr. Miller stated the Krupp's lived on Cloverport, and Cloverport although not recognized as a historically designated district, had historic value to the City of Rochester Hills, Avon Township and the City of Rochester. He explained the bluffs the City had just purchased in that area were very historic property. He provided the example that the bluffs looked down at the area historically described as the area where the Indians held the bonfire and throwing the white dog, which was right by the bridge next to the cement factory. He indicated that was an important part of the development of Avon Township and Rochester Hills.

Mr. Dziurman stated they had done a wonderful job and what they preserved was very important and the award could be given for preservation leadership. He thought there was enough historical value that the Commission could consider the nomination.

Mr. Miller stated the suggestion was the citizen group behind moving the millage proposal forward. He pointed out several of those citizens had already received an Earl Borden Award for preservation leadership, such as Lois Golden and Rod Wilson.

Mr. Dziurman asked if Chairperson Hill had any nomination suggestions. Chairperson Hill stated she did not, and commented the criteria stated the Commission did not have to give an award every year. She thought it was nice if the Commission did give an award, but had mixed feelings about the suggestion being made from the standpoint of considering preserving green space as a type of historic preservation. She agreed

preserving green space was a type of preservation for the Community, but was not sure it was historic preservation. She was a bit reluctant from the standpoint that it could appear the Commission was just searching for something to give an award to. She was a bit “on the fence” about the nomination at this time.

Mr. Dziurman stated they were deserving because they had done something very significant. Chairperson Hill agreed it was significant, but she did not know if it fell within the criteria for the award.

Mr. Miller stated he was interested in increasing the interest in open space as historic preservation as he did not think there was anything more historic than the land within the City itself. He noted it was the biggest thing the City had that had been there all the way through. He believed the bluffs were historic in so many ways, and it was important the City was able to preserve those.

Dr. Stamps referred to the open space and stated it was the concept. He explained the difference between Avon Township or Rochester Hills and the Village of Rochester was that Avon Township had a lot of open space with farms. The Commission should include a sentence in the award “that they have helped preserve what we were”.

Mr. Dunphy asked if the Commission needed to vote on the nomination at this meeting, or if the Commission could wait to the next meeting which would give the Commissioners time to decide if there were any other nominations. The Commission agreed to hold this nomination over to the next meeting.

Mr. Dziurman noted the Commission acknowledged at the beginning of the discussion that they did not have give an award this year, and no one had any structures that had been renovated or restored that could be nominated, and the grass roots group that moved the millage along grew and became very significant.

Mr. Miller thought the Commission should also look for a residence or structure that met the award criteria so as not to overlook anyone. He noted that during the discussion the Commission had developed a list of future preservation leadership nominees.

At this time, Vice Chairperson Dunphy turned over chair of the meeting to Chairperson Hill.

Vice Chairperson Dunphy advised Chairperson Hill that the Committee had postponed the election of officers until she could join in the discussion. He noted that all other Agenda Items under “New Business” had been concluded except for the election of officers, and suggested the Commission consider that Agenda Item next.

Chairperson Hill asked if the Commission had reviewed the “What every historic property owner needs to know” Guide. Vice Chairperson Dunphy stated the Commission had received several sets of comments and suggestions just prior to the start of the meeting, and felt they needed some additional time to review the context. The Commission had decided that a revised version would be reviewed at the next meeting.

Chairperson Hill suggested the Commission next consider Agenda Item 8B (Election of Officers).

8B. Election of Officers

Dr. Stamps stated the Commission had postponed the election of officers until Ms. Hill joined the meeting in the event the existing slate of officers was nominated, all would be present to either accept or decline the nomination. He commented he was comfortable with the well-oiled, enthusiastic machine currently running the Commission, and asked if those Commissioners were willing to continue to serve.

Mr. Miller asked if any of the current officers were unwilling to be nominated. Chairperson Hill stated she was not opposed to keeping the position of Chairperson, but asked if anyone else wanted to take a turn at chairing the Commission. She felt it was fair to pass the Chairperson position around among the members.

A. Chairperson:

Mr. Miller made a motion to open the floor for nominations, seconded by Dr. Stamps. Mr. Miller nominated Melinda Hill for the position of Chairperson. Chairperson Hill called for any other nominations. Dr. Stamps spoke in favor of Ms. Hill being re-elected as Chairperson because she is knowledgeable, understands both sides of issues, has a long history of the culture of the Community, and represents the Commission very well. There being no other nominations, Chairperson Hill closed the floor for nominations. Melinda Hill was unanimously elected to the office of Chairperson.

B. Vice Chairperson:

Chairperson Hill opened the floor for nominations for the office of Vice Chairperson. Mr. Miller nominated Brian Dunphy, seconded by Dr. Stamps. Dr. Stamps spoke in favor of Mr. Dunphy's re-election as Vice Chairperson noting he did a fine job, knew how to conduct the meetings, and was enthusiastic. Chairperson Hill called for any other nominations. There being no other nominations, Chairperson Hill closed the floor for nominations. Brian Dunphy was unanimously elected to the office of Vice Chairperson.

C. Secretary:

Chairperson Hill opened the floor for nominations for the office of Secretary. Mr. Miller nominated Jason Thompson. Chairperson Hill called for any other nominations. There being no other nominations, Chairperson Hill closed the floor for nominations. Jason Thompson was unanimously elected to the office of Secretary.

9. DISCUSSION

9A. 2008 Resident Workshops

Chairperson Hill stated the Commissioners had received information in their packets regarding two potential workshops. She indicated she had some concern about the proposed Saturday, February 16, 2008 date for the General Maintenance Workshop. She pointed out that the President's Day holiday was the following Monday, February 18, 2008, and many people took advantage of the three-day weekend to travel, particularly since the schools were closed for President's Day.

Chairperson Hill suggested the General Maintenance Workshop be moved to either Saturday, March 1, 2008 or Saturday, March 8, 2008. Mr. Delacourt stated he had put a telephone call in to the Michigan Historic Preservation Network (MPHN), but had not heard back from them.

Chairperson Hill noted the Tax Credits Workshop was being scheduled for April 10, 2008, which was the regular April meeting date for the Commission. She thought that meeting would work well for the residents and would be held in the City Hall Auditorium.

Ms. Cozzolino asked why the Tax Credits Workshop was being held as the second workshop. Mr. Delacourt stated it was based on the availability of the presenter. Ms. Cozzolino pointed out that was the topic that people appeared to be most interested in. Mr. Dziurman commented it was being held too late for residents to use the information from the workshop when filing their 2007 taxes. Dr. Stamps pointed out that based on the approvals necessary, the tax credits would not apply before the 2008 tax year. Mr. Delacourt stated it was already too late for 2007 projects, but might provide some incentive for 2008 renovation projects.

Mr. Miller asked if any other workshops would be scheduled this year, noting funds would have to be available for additional workshops. He knew that funds were somewhat limited, but hoped that windows and masonry workshops could also be scheduled. He thought the tax credits presentation had been given several times locally; however, there was not much information available for the window or masonry maintenance and repair. He suggested those workshops be given a priority for next year if they could not be scheduled this year. He commented that perhaps the Commission could partner with another local historical group to hold those workshops.

Chairperson Hill suggested that perhaps the Oakland Township Historic Districts Commission would be interested in working with the Commission to hold a workshop in the early Fall. Mr. Dziurman stated he had worked with a gentleman who owned a window company in Kalamazoo and did preservation work. He noted this gentleman gave seminars all over the country as part of the Main Street program, and was doing work on the Paint Creek Cider Mill. He thought this gentleman might be interested in giving a talk or presentation and would ask him.

Chairperson Hill asked if his presentation could be tied in with the Cider Mill restoration and his talk held at that facility. Mr. Dziurman stated that possibly as the work was scheduled to be completed by September 2008. Chairperson Hill suggested the presentation be organized in conjunction with Oakland Township and held at the Cider

draft

Mill facility. Mr. Dziurman said he would find out if the gentleman had any interest in conducting a presentation.

Mr. Miller suggested the Commission could also partner with the Rochester Historic Commission, and perhaps the Village of Lake Orion, to help host future workshops. The Troy Historic Commission was also suggested as a potential partner for an event. Mr. Dziurman noted that Troy had a Historic Commission and a Museum and might be interested.

Chairperson Hill stated that there were two good workshops scheduled, and noted Mr. Dziurman would find out if a window repair and restoration workshop could be arranged. She agreed that other Communities should be invited and encouraged to join with the Commission.

Mr. Delacourt stated that in discussions with the MHPN, other than the general maintenance workshop, which was not a "hands-on" workshop, there were size limitations for some of the other presentations, usually limited to 25 to 30 people. He questioned how the other groups could be involved with the size limitation, along with the question of City funds being spent. He reminded the Commission that the intent had always been to target Rochester Hills Historic District homeowners. He suggested perhaps the size might be limited by targeting those homeowners with a first mailing and by requiring an RSVP, and then utilizing a second mailing to fill available slots.

Chairperson Hill agreed that size limitations would be necessary with the hands-on demonstrations. Mr. Delacourt stated that both the window repair and masonry workshops were hands-on demonstrations, and the two that were not were the general maintenance and the tax credits. He noted the same mailing list used for the open house invitations would be used for these events, and the full Museum mailing list would be used.

Chairperson Hill asked if the invitation would be a postcard. Mr. Delacourt stated that the invitation would be a letter mailing on City letterhead.

Chairperson Hill suggested the first sentence of the draft invitation be changed to read "as the owner of a designated historic property". She suggested a time of 10:00 AM to Noon be included so the specific time slot is known.

Mr. Delacourt stated he would check on the March 1 or March 8 dates, and bring a final date and final invitation to the next meeting for review.

Chairperson Hill asked about the exhibit at the Museum. Mr. Delacourt stated that the Museum would have an exhibit on the photography of Balthazar Korab running through June 7, 2008, and Mr. McKay had suggested that information be included on the invitation to the General Maintenance workshop. He explained the General Maintenance workshop would be held in a classroom setting, and Mr. McKay indicated he could accommodate 30-40 in one room, or up to 100 in the main portion of the Dairy Barn.

Dr. Stamps noted that Mr. Korab had attended the County's Heritage program held in Holly, Michigan, a few years ago and was a very interesting speaker.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 10A. Update regarding Demolition by Neglect Districts
- 1585 S. Rochester Road
 - 1046 E. Tienken Road
 - 1841 Crooks Road

Chairperson Hill asked for an update on each of the properties noted above.

1046 E. Tienken Road:

Mr. Delacourt noted that no demolition by neglect order had been issued on this property as the Commission had decided to wait until after the court date scheduled by the Building Department had occurred. He stated that according to Oakland County's tax records, the property had been sold back in November 2007. He indicated the former owner did not appear at the scheduled court date, which was postponed because he had claimed he had sold the property.

The Commission discussed whether the new owner knew the property was a designated historic district. Mr. Delacourt stated that the Building Department would tag the house and ask the new owner to come to the City, as the County records did not indicate another address for the new owner.

1585 S. Rochester Road:

Mr. Delacourt stated that the property owner had come in to the City and at first was unwilling to do any work. The property had been looked at by the Building Department inspectors, and the property owner had completed all the items listed on the Code Compliance List, such as the soffits, fascias, cleaned up the scrub, secured the foundation, put the porch posts back up, and there did not appear to be any holes in the walls. He indicated the Building Department was of the opinion that the house was secure from the elements and secure from any other deterioration as far as damage from animals, etc. He commented that he did not believe the structure had been mothballed in compliance with the Preservation Brief guidelines.

Mr. Dziurman referred to the mold on the interior, and commented that in order to correct the problem the property owner needed to stop the moisture from getting in; the building had to be able to breathe by putting in some vents, but the building did not need to be heated.

Mr. Miller commented that many old houses "breathe" whether the owner wants it to or not. Mr. Dziurman noted that typically vents are put in a window. He stated he had a sheet he could provide to Mr. Delacourt that outlined what needed to be done.

Mr. Delacourt stated that the property owner seemed to be agreeable to anything that was simple, such as keeping the property secured from the elements. He did not know what the owner's

long-term intent was with the property. He did not think the owner would remediate the mold at this time, and noted the Commission's motion did state that was necessary to comply.

Chairperson Hill asked if the City had gone inside the home. Mr. Delacourt responded no. Chairperson Hill agreed the motion requested the property owner take a look at the mold problem and determine what it would take to remediate it.

Mr. Dziurman stated that the first thing that had to be done was to stop the water. Chairperson Hill agreed that was part of the solution. She stated if the structure was mothballed appropriately, there should not be further problems. She questioned if there was some way to determine it if was properly mothballed, and asked if the windows had to be covered. She noted she had seen other buildings with windows boarded up to prevent vandalism.

Mr. Dziurman commented he did not think the City wanted to see boarded up buildings along Rochester Road. Chairperson Hill agreed. Mr. Delacourt stated the City would keep an eye on the structure.

Chairperson Hill stated the City would also want to be vigilant about the fact there were not people living there that should not be, or vandalism occurring. Mr. Delacourt stated that Code Compliance would monitor that as that could be come a safety issue. He stated he did not know if the building had been appropriately vented and would ask the Building Department.

Mr. Delacourt stated his question was with respect to the mold remediation, which he did not believe the Commission would see an answer to any time soon. He pointed out the way the motion read, the owner had a deadline to come up with a remediation plan for the mold or the Commission would ask the City to get a court order to enter the property to do that. He wanted to know if the Commission thought the structure had been properly secured and ventilated, and if that was sufficient to come into compliance with the Commission's motion and the building was no longer in violation of demolition by neglect. He stated that in the alternative, since the deadline in the motion had passed, whether the Commission wanted to ask the City to move forward with the court order and do some additional verification or remediation of mold.

Mr. Miller stated he was very pleased the owner had completed the structural repair because that was really important. In terms of the mold, he would like to know it would not get better just by ignoring it, although he understood the reluctance. He commented it would be nice if the Commission could get an idea of what the cost or estimated cost for that remediation would be. He was not in favor of going to court to force the owner to do something at this time. He did not necessarily think the owner was in violation of demolition by neglect because there was mold in the building. He commented mold would break down wood very quickly; however, the mold in the building had to be properly remediated. He suggested if the building was unsafe, perhaps the Building Department could post that.

Chairperson Hill stated the Commission did not know that at this time. Mr. Miller thought it would be nice if the Commission could find that out, although he was not in favor of going to court to pursue further action at this point.

Mr. Delacourt stated that based on his initial discussions with the property owner, securing the property from the elements was about as far as the owner would go voluntarily. He noted if there was an easy way to vent the home and that could be presented to the property owner, that work might be done, especially if it could cure a problem with the house. Mr. Dziurman stated it certainly would stop it.

Mr. Delacourt stated that the Mayor had convinced the property owner that it was better to do what they did, particularly since no one knew what would happen with the property and the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Agreement. He was not sure how much more the property owner would be willing to do.

Dr. Stamps stated that this was the first show of good faith and the property owner had responded. He would rather not spend the money to take them to court. He suggested the owner be thanked for their efforts, and remind them the house was part of the PUD Agreement. He commented the Commission would hold their opinion on the mold until they knew more, and the Commission would decide if the mold could be minimized by proper ventilation when they received additional information.

Mr. Dziurman stated he would like to see the owner commit to appropriate mothballing. He noted that other than that, it could become another Prewitt house that would continue to deteriorate. He pointed out if the building was mothballed, the Commission would know the building would be stable. He agreed they were close to that with the work that was done. He commented the moisture had to be kept out of the structure, which was key. He did not presently know if the roof was leaking.

Ms. Cozzolino asked what more would be required to mothball the structure. Mr. Dziurman commented he was not sure as he did not know anything about the condition of the building; however, they would have to keep it weather-tight and introduce ventilation. He commented that could be done and still keep vandals from entering the building. He stated the outline he had would explain all that.

Mr. Delacourt stated there were two parts, i.e., what was acceptable, and whether the standing motion should be moved forward based on the deadline. Otherwise, the Commission would have to acknowledge they did not want that to happen.

Mr. Miller thought it was important to thank the property owner for the work done, and also to thank the Mayor as he was instrumental in the solution, and the Commission should let him know they appreciated his efforts. He asked if the Commission could request additional information from the Building Department. He agreed it was crucial that the roof be weather-tight to prevent further deterioration. He thought that there might be a way in thanking the property owner for the work done, to mention the fact there was a crucial step that had not been taken. He was in favor of working with the property owner, and would like to put the standing motion on hold and not pursue court action at this point.

Mr. Delacourt clarified that additional information would be provided regarding the venting to ensure no more moisture was entering the structure.

Chairperson Hill stated she appreciated the Mayor helping to move the process in the right direction. She noted that there had been a great deal of discussion at the last meeting about the motion, and she would be in favor of not going to a court action at this time. However, the process had been started and some repairs made, but appropriate mothballing of this building was still needed since it was not being used, and the Commission would still like to have further information about potential remediation of the mold problem. She commented that although the Commission had received the report, the report did not indicate whether the mold was a health hazard; the extent of the mold problem, and whether it was something that meant the building could never be adaptively reused. She noted the whole idea was that the Commission was asking that the building be preserved in an appropriate manner.

Mr. Dziurman stated that if the building were mothballed, it would stop any type of deterioration.

Chairperson Hill stated it would be back in the hands of the Commission if the property owner did not care to do anything further. She agreed the Commission was not ready to go to Circuit Court, but would like to have the mothballing completed and additional information provided. She stated that if there was additional information about how to complete the mothballing, that should be forwarded to the property owner.

Mr. Delacourt stated that the property owner had been provided with a complete copy of the National Park Service's Preservation Brief 31, which was the mothballing guide.

Mr. Dziurman stated the key was the roof. Mr. Delacourt stated that the Building Department Inspector had looked at the roof, but had not been on the roof, and there were no apparent leaks. Mr. Dziurman noted that no one had gone inside. Mr. Delacourt stated that no one from the Building Department would go inside at this time.

Mr. Miller agreed the employees should be very cautious, but noted a contractor should be prepared to deal with the problem.

Mr. Delacourt questioned whether a motion should be made to delay any court action at this time. He noted he had his directive as Staff on what to bring back to the Commission next month.

Mr. Miller noted the Commission had required certain things by a certain date in the motion. Chairperson Hill suggested a motion could be made indicating that due to the fact the property owner had made a number of repairs in good faith, at this point in time the Historic Districts Commission would withhold pursuing court action, but was still interested in having the building appropriately mothballed and further information on the mold situation.

Mr. Miller stated it would be helpful if the Commission could get a report of what had been done. Mr. Delacourt stated that was in the process of being done and noted he had just received an update this afternoon.

Chairperson Hill asked if the Commission wanted to include a time for completing the mothballing. Mr. Dziurman stated that should be done before the rains begin in the Spring. Chairperson Hill asked if that date should be April 1st or March 15th. Mr. Dziurman suggested it should be done by the 1st of March. Chairperson Hill stated that would give the property owner January and February without any further action being taken. Mr. Dziurman stated he would forward over the information he had on mothballing.

Chairperson Hill clarified the motion would state that the Commission would like to have the building appropriately mothballed by March 1st, and additional information regarding the mold issue.

Dr. Stamps stated he would make the motion as discussed, and Mr. Dunphy stated he would second the proposed motion as discussed. Mr. Delacourt clarified the Commission had not rescinded the original motion, which was still a valid motion, and all the Commission was doing was withholding court action, and the deadline was technically still December 31st for the appropriate mothballing. He noted the second motion was a good motion, but what the Commission was doing was giving the property owner a stay by withholding the court action.

Mr. Dziurman commented the work could be done in a couple of weeks. He stated he would like to have the March 1st date included in the motion on the floor because he felt it was important and did not want to see this delayed.

Chairperson Hill suggested the Commission could ask for the property owner to report back by March 1st.

Mr. Miller stated that if the roof was not watertight and water is able to enter the building, and the mold situation already existed, it would cause rapid deterioration of the structure.

Chairperson Hill called for any further discussion on the proposed motion on the floor. Upon hearing none, she called for a voice vote.

MOTION by Stamps, seconded by Dunphy, in the matter of the designated Historic District located at 1585 S. Rochester Road, Sidwell 15-23-300-035, the Historic Districts Commission has determined that due to the fact the property owner has made a number of repairs in good faith, at this point in time the Historic Districts Commission will withhold pursuing court action as set forth in the motion made by the Historic Districts Commission on November 8, 2007 regarding *Demolition by Neglect*. The Historic Districts Commission is still interested in having the building appropriately mothballed by March 1, 2008, and is still interested in receiving further information on the mold situation.

Ayes: All
Nays: None
Absent: Kilpatrick, Sinclair

MOTION CARRIED

draft

1841 Crooks Road:

Mr. Delacourt stated that Mr. Dunn had received the Demolition by Neglect notice from the Historic Districts Commission; a Code Compliance Letter from the Building Department with a list of code issues, and also received a more serious letter from the Building Department identifying issues that need to be addressed within 48 hours of receipt of the letter, which were safety issues such as securing the building from people being able to enter the structure.

Mr. Delacourt stated that Mr. Dunn went out and immediately took care of some of the items by boarding up and securing the building. He stated Mr. Dunn had not followed through with the rest of the items to secure the building from the elements and those issues. He commented he was not completely convinced Mr. Dunn understood all the things that needed to be done to comply. He believed Mr. Dunn felt he was still in the process of getting approvals to construct the additions, and does not know why the City was harassing him in the middle of that process. He is still working with his designer and architect to correct the last set of review requirements to avoid needing a variance, and now the City is requiring additional work that would be fixed when he receives his permits.

Mr. Delacourt stated he tried to contact Mr. Dunn and Mr. Dunn had tried to contact him before the Holidays. He noted he had not spoken to Mr. Dunn to ask him when he would bring in revised plans, or when the renovation work would be accomplished, or whether he would secure the building against the elements, including proper ventilation. Mr. Delacourt stated Mr. Dunn felt he was in the middle of the review process to fully renovate the entire structure.

Mr. Dziurman did not agree, noting it had been several years since the Certificate of Appropriateness had been approved. Mr. Delacourt stated Mr. Dunn's last review with the Building Department was last June or July 2007.

Mr. Dziurman stated he had heard this before and there was never a good resolution to the situation. He commented that if the renovation work had been done in a timely fashion, this would not have happened.

Mr. Miller understood Mr. Dziurman's point, but noted on the other hand, the property owner did have clear intentions and had spent a lot of money to back up his sincerity about redoing the house. He pointed out he had gone out and secured the house, and he did not believe there were gaping holes in the roof. He noted the Commission had approved the demolition of certain inappropriate additions, and those appeared to be closed up. He understood the property owner would not want to spend a lot of money closing up what would have to be taken down to start the renovation and remodeling. He did not want to make that harder and more expensive for the homeowner, unless the building was in danger of demolition by neglect due to the weather. He agreed the home did not look good with the peeling paint and the wood over the windows, but he thought the homeowner had made progress and the Commission did not want to make things so tough for homeowners that they ended up putting the house up for sale and abandoning their plans, which is what happened when the Commission tried to force a homeowner to do something they were unwilling or unable to do.

Mr. Dziurman pointed out that no one would want a house that looked like that sitting next to his or her home in a subdivision. He noted something had to be done as it had been over a year.

Mr. Miller thought the house was there before the subdivision, and everyone that purchased a home in that subdivision knew that historic farmhouse was there and that it was an old farmhouse.

Chairperson Hill asked if the Building Department had a set of standards as far as mothballing was concerned. Mr. Delacourt stated that a copy of National Park Service Preservation Brief 31 had been provided with the demolition by neglect notice.

Chairperson Hill stated that even though the property owner had received a copy of Preservation Brief 31 and had gone out and boarded up some of the windows, and even if he intended to do work on the house, he still had quite a ways to go and that work would not begin tomorrow. She would prefer to see the house mothballed.

Mr. Delacourt stated he had asked for a letter from Mr. Dunn indicating what things had been done, based on the notice he was given, and what his timeframe was for accomplishing those items. He asked the Commission, if Mr. Dunn indicated he did not intend to do any of those items, whether he should meet with the City Attorney and instruct him to get a court order, since the deadline had passed.

Chairperson Hill felt the answer was "yes" as the house needed to be mothballed and protected from the elements until it was going to be adaptively reused. Mr. Dziurman commented it would save the property owner money in the long run.

Chairperson Hill pointed out Mr. Dunn could not begin any renovation work because he did not have an approved plan. She did not see this as being unreasonable.

Mr. Delacourt asked if the Commission wanted to give Mr. Dunn more time as the demolition by neglect motion included a deadline of December 31, 2007.

Chairperson Hill did not understand why he would be given more time.

Mr. Thompson agreed the property owner had had several years, noting he remembered the various plans coming before the Commission. He asked if Mr. Dunn was still working from the same set of plans that were brought before the Commission.

Mr. Delacourt stated it depended on which set of plans the designer submitted. He noted the designer sometimes became confused over which plan had been approved by the Commission.

Chairperson Hill noted those plans had to be approved by the Building Department before Mr. Dunn could receive permits, but the plans did not meet all the City's standards, which is how the dilemma occurred.

Mr. Delacourt explained that the Building Department had met with Mr. Dunn and his designer and had done an amazing job going through the plans page by page showing them how to correct their drawings. He commented it was not the Building Inspector's job to design the house for a property owner, but the design that was submitted had become incredibly difficult to complete. He noted Mr. Dunn had been asked at the time the plans were originally submitted to take them to the Building Department for review. However, Mr. Dunn preferred to receive approval from the Commission prior to submitting them to the Building Department. During the Building Department's review, it was discovered that some of the dimensions were wrong and could require a variance.

Mr. Thompson asked if any alterations to the plans would require Mr. Dunn to appear before the Commission again. Mr. Delacourt responded not at this point.

Chairperson Hill explained the exterior of the building would have to be significantly changed before another review was required. If he can make the plans comply with what the Commission previously approved, he would not have to come back.

Mr. Thompson agreed he did not want to hold him up as he had been trying and he wanted him to move forward, but the property owner had had enough time to secure the house and properly mothball it.

Ms. Cozzolino asked for clarification on Mr. Delacourt's comment that he was not sure the property owner knew what he needed to do. Mr. Delacourt explained Mr. Dunn appeared to be having a hard time with the permit requirements, his professionals, what was required for the variance and what had to be submitted as far as surveys and plot plans demonstrating dimensions. He noted Mr. Dunn had submitted plans for a Zoning Board of Appeals variance request, but those plans had indicated different variance requests that were different from the plans submitted to the Building Department. He stated there appeared to be some confusion with the various submittals.

Mr. Thompson commented that did not negate the fact Mr. Dunn needed to secure the house. The submittal matters were between he and the Building Department and not a matter for the Commission.

Mr. Dunphy referred to the fact Mr. Dunn felt he was in the middle of the project and noted that caused him some concern. He noted it would take awhile to get all the issues sorted out, and it could be months before a permit is issued. He wondered what would happen to the structure in the meantime. He stated if Mr. Dunn was on the verge of receiving his permits and getting the contractors going, he would not want to push the button on this. However, no one knew how long it would take, and he truly believed the Commission had been very tolerant, understanding and supportive of the project. However, the structural integrity of the building had to be maintained, and he was not convinced that would happen soon.

Mr. Miller agreed the building needed to be protected and proper care should be taken. He referred to his comments from the November 7, 2007 meeting where he stated he thought at a minimum the Commission should ask the property owner to

seal the structure against the weather. He did not think at the time the property needed to be mothballed, and stated he was not sure what the difference would be. He was sympathetic to Mr. Dunn's situation, noting he had been present at the Commission meetings when his plans had been submitted, and noted he was uncomfortable taking him to court to make him do something he might otherwise be willing to do. He noted the fact it had not been done to date might be construed he was not willing to do anything. His comments at the November 7, 2007 meeting indicated a concern that some areas of the roof had been lightly covered with a tarp, and some areas where the roof sheathing was completely exposed had not been covered. He was still concerned that the house was not protected from the elements. He believed Mr. Dziurman was correct in that it might save the property owner money in the long run.

Mr. Thompson thought the Commission had been as generous as they could be, and stated he also did not want to go to court. He would prefer Mr. Delacourt talk to the property owner and work out an arrangement. He commented at some point the Commission had to say "enough was enough".

Mr. Delacourt asked if the Commission wanted to give Mr. Dunn another month to respond.

Chairperson Hill asked if there were any other comments. Mr. Delacourt stated the Demolition by Neglect motion was in good standing, and without a change from the Commission, the deadline was past due, and he could speak to the City Attorney. He explained without any other direction from the Commission, his recommendation to the City Attorney would be that it has not met the motion requirements, and if the Building Department agreed, to pursue action in accordance with the motion.

Chairperson Hill asked if the Commissioners had any objections to that. No objections were raised.

Any Other Business (Continued):

Chairperson Hill noted that the next Regular Meeting fell on February 14, 2008, which was Valentine's Day. She asked whether the Commissioners could meet on that day, or whether they would prefer moving the meeting date.

Chairperson Hill stated she would like to start seeing a full Board at the meetings, noting this Board seemed to be the one City Board that had a problem with full attendance. She indicated that if the Commissioners would have a problem attending the meeting on February 14th, the Commission could agree to change the date.

Dr. Stamps stated the meeting should be held as scheduled.

Chairperson Hill stated that the Commission would finalize the Earl Borden Award at the next meeting. She commented one of the Commissioners should volunteer to assist Staff with the arrangements for the Earl Borden Award.

Chairperson Hill suggested the Commissioners review the suggested changes to the “What every historic property owner needs to know” Guide, so that the Guide could be finalized at the next meeting. Mr. Delacourt stated the Guide would be revised to include the suggested changes, and a list of discussion issues would be prepared for the next meeting. He suggested the Commissioners forward any additional changes or corrections to Staff in the next week or two so those changes could be incorporated into the document before the next meeting.

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

10. ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion duly made and seconded, Chairperson Hill adjourned the meeting at 9:35 PM.

Melinda Hill, Chairperson
City of Rochester Hills
Historic Districts Commission

Judy A. Bialk, Recording Secretary

draft