



Rochester Hills Minutes

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

Historic Districts Commission

Chairperson Brian R. Dunphy, Vice Chairperson Maria-Teresa L. Cozzolino
Members: John Dziurman, Nicole Franey, Micheal Kilpatrick, Melissa Luginski,
Paul Miller, Dr. Richard Stamps, Jason Thompson

Thursday, August 20, 2009

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Dunphy called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

2. ROLL CALL

Present 6 - Maria-Teresa Cozzolino, Micheal Kilpatrick, Brian Dunphy, Jason Thompson, Nicole Franey and Melissa Luginski

Absent 3 - John Dziurman, Paul Miller and Richard Stamps

Also Present: Derek Delacourt, Deputy Director, Planning Department
Paul Davis, City Engineer, Engineering Department
Paul Shumejko, Transportation Engineer, Engineering Department
Jeff O'Brien, Road Commission for Oakland County
Judy A. Bialk, Recording Secretary

Chairperson Dunphy stated for the record that Dr. Stamps provided notice he was unable to attend this meeting and was excused.

3. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Chairperson Dunphy announced a quorum was present.

4. STATEMENT OF STANDARDS

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, MLHDA Section 399.205, and local Ordinance Section 118-164(a).

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS / COMMUNICATIONS

Chairperson Dunphy called for any announcements or communications. No

announcements or communications were presented.

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS (Non-Agenda Items)

Chairperson Dunphy asked if there were any public comments. He reminded the audience members in attendance that if they wished to speak on any non-Agenda items, they should complete a speaker's card and turn it in to the recording secretary. There were no public comments.

Chairperson Dunphy stated that if any member of the audience wished to speak on an Agenda item, they should also complete a speaker's card and provide it to the recording secretary.

(Arrive Commissioner Miller: 7:08 PM)

Present 7 - Maria-Teresa Cozzolino, Paul Miller, Micheal Kilpatrick, Brian Dunphy, Jason Thompson, Nicole Franey and Melissa Luginski

Absent 2 - John Dziurman and Richard Stamps

7. NEW BUSINESS

7A. 2009-0335 1046 E. Tienken Road (HDC File #94-001)

Applicant: Matthew Vincent
Sidwell: 15-01-352-023
District: Stoney Creek
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness

Chairperson Dunphy read the request for the record and invited the applicant to come forward to the presenter's table to discuss his application. He asked for a brief summary from Staff.

Mr. Delacourt stated this property had been on the Historic Districts Commission (HDC) Agenda many times over the years for different reasons related to applications and other actions taken by the Commission. Mr. Vincent recently purchased the property and meet with City Staff in both the Planning and Building Departments to see and understand what was possible to renovate and rehabilitate the structure both inside and outside. Mr. Vincent was before the Commission seeking approval to begin some of the initial work to the outside of the structure to secure it and put it back into good condition, such as refurbishing windows and replacing shutters. The Staff Report contains a complete list of the preliminary projects, all of which appear to be well within the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Mr. Delacourt stated the major piece of work the applicant would like to do, based on some research of the history of the house, was to refurbish and open up the front porch. There would still be columns and a half wall, and it would be screened in.

The renovated porch would be very unobtrusive, and appeared to be in conformance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Mr. Delacourt stated there were several projects proposed by the applicant and he would let Mr. Vincent explain them. He extended his thanks to Mr. Vincent for attending the meeting. He pointed out some supplementary information had been provided to the Commissioners prior to the meeting, which was not included in the packet. The supplementary information included paint colors and types of materials, which the applicant had not identified previously. The supplementary information also included a revised motion including those details in the draft conditions. Additional elevations were also provided.

Mr. Delacourt referred to the site plan that was included in the supplemental information, which depicts a revised driveway and deck that Staff had not reviewed. Those two improvements were not included in the draft motion; however, he asked that the Commissioners provide their comments regarding the materials, type and location to assist Mr. Vincent. He noted if the Commission was comfortable with those improvements, they could approve them or approve them with suggested changes. He was available to answer any questions.

Matthew Vincent, 5595 Orion Road, Oakland Township, stated he was the proud owner of 1046 E. Tienken Road. He thanked the Planning Department Staff for their assistance in this matter. He introduced his architect, Ryan McCaffrey of The Blain Group, 39209 Six Mile Road, Suite 111, Livonia, Michigan.

Mr. Vincent stated he planned to restore anything that could be restored, and if he had to replace anything he would use new materials that were closest to the existing materials on the home.

Mr. Vincent referred to the north elevation, specifically the front porch. He planned to remove all the windows and replace them with wood-framed screens. He explained the screen he would use was new on the market, and described it as invisible clear screen. He hoped the screens would not be visible from the road. He stated the door on the front porch would be a t-bar screen door with the same type of screen. He referred to the historic photographs of the house obtained from the Rochester Hills Museum and pointed out the t-bar screen door on the right which looked like the door he planned to use.

Mr. Vincent stated that the entry doors to the house would be 6-panel solid wood beveled glass doors. He provided a picture of the door for the Commissioners to review. He explained one of those entry doors would face Tienken Road and one would face the east. He was told that door was manufactured in the 1920s.

Mr. Vincent referred to the proposed brick pavers, which he understood had not been reviewed by City Staff. He explained that currently there was just a wood front porch on the north elevation, and he planned to install a brick paver porch with a cobblestone border. He provided a picture of a porch similar to his proposal to the Commissioners to review. He pointed out the brick pavers would lead to the driveway.

Mr. Vincent stated that he would restore all the existing windows on the home that could be restored and painted. If the windows had to be replaced, he will use exact replica sash windows that are from that time period. He stated he had purchased a 21x36 antique window from a neighbor in the District, which he planned to use on the south elevation of the home. He explained he did not intend to change any materials or window styles on the home.

Mr. Vincent referred to the foundation on the home which is damaged and needs to be repaired. He stated he planned to repair the foundation with the exact materials used for the face of the foundation, which was cobblestone supported to a cement form. He stated that the foundation was currently painted white, which he would replicate where needed. He noted that some of the foundation around the side had been cemented over, which he intended to clean up and would use replacement cobblestones where needed.

Mr. Vincent stated he planned to repair and replace the roof where needed with the same material. He provided an example of the shingle he was using, along with an example of the existing roof shingle, both of which are asphalt shingles.

Mr. Vincent stated he planned to add 15-inch vinyl shutters painted to match the trim, noting he only planned to put shutters on the bottom half of the front of the house, which is how it appeared in the historic photographs. He pointed that because of the way the roof was sloped, the shutters would interfere with the existing trim and architecture of the house. Shutters would also be put on the side of the house.

Mr. Vincent displayed paint swatches and discussed where he intended to use the various colors. He explained the siding on the main body of the house would be painted with Castleton Mist, which was selected from the Benjamin Moore Historic Paint category. He stated he had a print-out from the Benjamin Moore website, which depicted what his proposed colors would look like used together. He stated the trim on the house would be painted with Benjamin Moore Moonlight White. The windows and the trim around the windows and screens would be painted with Benjamin Moore Van Buren Brown. He explained the dark color would be used for the windows; the lighter off-white color would be used for the trim, and the light beige/yellowish color would be used on the siding.

Mr. Vincent stated he planned to add aluminum gutters painted in the Benjamin Moore Moonlight White to match the trim and the shutters. He stated the front left of the house would have gutters, as would the right or west side of the house.

Mr. Vincent referred to the west elevation of the house. He pointed out the back side door, which he planned to replace with a solid wood door with beveled glass. He explained that all four wood entry doors would be stained with Minwax Gunstock 231, which was a new dark stain which looked very natural. He displayed a picture of the style of door he planned to use.

Mr. Vincent stated he planned to add an L-shaped deck to the back of the house, using all natural wood stained in the same Minwax Gunstock 231, with a handrail. The deck would be constructed right up to the foundation on the back of the house. He noted that part of the foundation did not match the foundation on the rest of the house.

Mr. Vincent referred to the south elevation, which is the back of the house. The windows would be done in the same manner as the rest of the windows on the house, with the same trim colors. He planned to add one bedroom window on the left-hand side, using the 21x36 window he purchased from a neighbor. He referred to the existing window on the back of the house, which was in the kitchen and off-centered, and stated he planned to add the 6-pane sash window and move it by centering it a bit more in the kitchen area. He explained it would not be centered on the back of the house, but centered with the kitchen area.

Mr. Vincent stated that neither the east nor the west side of the house were set up for gutters because the fascia came out very far out on the top and was curved with grooves so the gutters could not be attached. He would have to add a treated 2x4 painted in the same trim color to build the fascia out so he could mount the gutters on the side. He stated that because the house had not had gutters, the foundation on the east side of the house, besides being 140 years old, had a lot of water damage problems from the run-off water. He hoped the gutters would help preserve the house.

Mr. Vincent referred to the east elevation and explained he planned to remove the existing window next to the side door, and add a door that had windows. He stated both windows currently in the kitchen went down to about 26-inches off the ground, which meant there was not adequate space for counters or cabinets. By taking that window out, he could install a full counter and add a dishwasher. He planned to leave one of the kitchen windows, but would remove the one next to the door.

Mr. Vincent stated he would build a brick paver porch and steps with cobblestone borders on the side of the house similar to what he proposed for the front of the house.

Mr. Vincent referred to the site plan, and stated he hoped to install a wrap-around driveway to prevent anyone from trying to have to back out onto Tienken Road. He found there was more room on the west side of the house than where the existing driveway is located on the east side of the house. He commented it would not be a problem if it was out of the question, as he could create an area to turn vehicles around next to the two parking spaces indicated on the plan. He stated he would eventually like to access the alley, but the slope prevented putting a driveway back there. His choice would be to install a wrap-around driveway, and his second choice would be to leave the driveway where it was and add the two parking places and a little turn-out area.

Mr. Vincent stated the site plan also depicted the L-shaped brick paver porch front steps leading to the driveway, and the brick paver path leading from the deck to the driveway and parking area. He explained that he could not even pull in the driveway when he purchased the house, and noted that currently he could not pull two cars through there and get back out. He asked for suggestions from the Commissioners about how to accomplish making that more practical for him while keeping in conformance with the HDC guidelines.

Chairperson Dunphy stated he would take public comment at this time.

Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race Road, stated she was aware based on her former positions as a Councilperson and Historic District Commissioners that this property had been under a lot of different conditions for a long time. She had a real interest in seeing the house brought back to what it should be, and complimented the applicant on his proposals. She liked the proposed change to the front porch and liked the use of the clear screens, but noted that both the entry-way doors to the home and the columns had much more of an Arts and Crafts appearance. She suggested the applicant research what was typical of a farm property of that era. She referred to the front and east steps and the use of brick pavers, and suggested a cobblestone appearance was more in keeping with the foundation of the house and the time period. Although the choice of colors looked very nice, she asked if any research had been done regarding the original color combination of the home. She thought it might be interesting to look at the information available at the Museum, although there was nothing wrong with the applicant's color combination. She questioned whether the deck wrapped around to the west side of the house (the applicant indicated it did not and clarified it was just on the south side of the home). Ms. Hill suggested the driveway be stopped and include the back-up niche to allow access back out. She pointed out there was a nice yard and was much more of the appearance of the Village itself, versus having a lot of driveways. She stated she was really happy to see what the applicant had brought forward, and wished him good luck with his project.

Chairperson Dunphy also complimented Mr. Vincent on his willingness to take on the project. He explained the Commission had been through many proposals for the property with numerous owners. He stated that the Commission wished Mr. Vincent all the best in being able to put together a successful project. He called for discussion by the Commission.

Ms. Cozzolino stated that as the applicant went through his presentation, he invariably answered her questions. She noted the applicant had clearly put a lot of work, time and thought into the project, which was very much appreciated. She noted the proposal for the driveway was to use recycled crushed asphalt, and asked what was there currently.

Mr. Vincent stated there was an asphalt apron that was half grown over and could hardly be seen. He explained there were some buried cobblestones, and it was just a two-track to the end of the house.

Ms. Cozzolino asked if there was crushed asphalt at one time or in parts of the drive. Mr. Vincent responded no. He explained he thought that material made sense because it would hold up over the long term. It also made a good base for any other type of surface that could be put over it. He noticed his neighbor had a full asphalt driveway, and explained that asphalt could be put over the crushed asphalt in the future. He stated it also packed nicely and he thought it would be better than a gravel driveway or crushed limestone material. He chose it for its practical use, and because he noticed some of the neighbors had asphalt and this material would look like asphalt but was not as bound together as asphalt.

Ms. Cozzolino asked if that meant it was also not as stark as asphalt might be, noting she thought of asphalt as just being black. Mr. Vincent stated it was a mix and displayed a picture of the material. He noted it almost looked like a gravel driveway, but was more solid. He stated it was also called tar and chip, which was blacktop with stones in it. He stated he liked to use recycled materials.

Mr. Miller asked about the proposed siding replacement. He stated he had not seen the back of the house in a while, but had heard there were some problems with the siding in that area. He noted the applicant proposed to use a smart lap siding and asked about the composition of the siding or if it was like hardi-plank. Mr. Vincent believed it was similar. He discovered it by using the information from a prior Certificate of Appropriateness issued for the house. He had gone to the same lumberyard, but they no longer carried it in the same width. He stated it was a composite that did not warp or hold mold and mildew like natural wood did. He noted it did have the wood grain finish. He stated all the siding on the back of the house was replaced, but no structural sheathing was put underneath so it had to be removed. He stated some siding had been replaced by a previous owner and it blended nicely.

Mr. Miller stated he was going to ask if the applicant had checked to make sure it would blend and be unobtrusive and unnoticeable. Mr. Vincent stated he had some samples the Commission could look at. Mr. Delacourt stated it was the same type of siding approved by the Commission for a prior owner. Mr. Vincent stated the 7/16th size was no longer manufactured. Mr. Miller commented one of the down sides of the lumber business was that materials kept being downsized.

Mr. Miller stated he was inside the house in the late 1980s or early 1990s as a home inspector for a former owner, and had noticed some of the framing studs were not correct, and asked if that was still true. Mr. Vincent stated much of the new supports did not make sense, and it was something he was working on with his architect. Besides making the house safe and sound, he had to meet the building code requirements. He planned to open up the walls to see what was there, and would move or add walls as needed. He would address the structural issues, as well as some water damage in one area of the kitchen.

Mr. Miller commented it sounded like the applicant had quite an adventure in front of him and wished him well.

Chairperson Dunphy asked if the applicant was requesting approval of the driveway plan at this time, noting it was not included in the draft motion.

Mr. Delacourt stated he had not provided a motion for the driveway, and noted it was lucky that both the City Engineer and the Road Commission were present for another matter. He had been informed that a second curb cut might be difficult for the Road Commission to approve along Tienken, plus Staff had not reviewed that plan. He noted Staff did not have any issues with the proposed material; the extension of the driveway on the east side of the property; the additional parking area, or any additional T-turn around or anything Mr. Vincent wanted to do in the rear. He suggested the Commission could craft a set of guidelines based on those parameters for a motion to approve the driveway. He pointed out it was the same with the proposed deck, as Staff did not have a problem with that. The only reason it was not included was because Staff had not had an opportunity to review it prior to submittal to the Commission for the meeting. If the Commission chose to move on those items, a revised site plan could be required with an administrative approval based on those parameters. He reiterated a second curb might be a problem for Tienken Road.

Chairperson Dunphy stated in terms of keeping the property consistent with the historical design, he would personally have trouble approving the full wrap-around driveway. He understood the need and certainly did not want anyone to have to back out onto Tienken Road, but if the applicant could work with a turn-around in the back, he thought that was a much better approach. He noted there could be some concerns on the part of the Road Commission, which might be the deal breaker. Mr. Vincent acknowledged that.

Ms. Luginski also wanted to thank the applicant for taking on the project as the house needed him. She mentioned that the Greek Revival style was one of her personal favorites in terms of housing styles. She was glad the applicant's focus was to maintain the architecture of the house, which she thought was critical. She stated the City did not have a lot of examples of Greek Revival in the Stoney Creek Village, so the applicant's house and the house next door were key examples located on the main road getting a lot of exposure.

Ms. Luginski referred to the historical photograph of the house, and discussed the difference in the porch as it was shown in the photograph and how it currently existed. She stated she had seen porches like that on Greek Revival houses, although the applicant's drawing did not exactly reflect how that porch looked originally. Her goal was to restore houses back to their original look. If that was not possible, she thought the applicant's drawing was something she had seen on other houses. She asked if the door the applicant chose had been reclaimed. Mr. Vincent indicated it had. Ms. Luginski stated it was nice example, but noted she was not used to seeing that style in a Greek Revival house. She commented since it was a front door, it would get a lot of exposure. She encouraged the applicant to research that again because it was a front door and it was important to the style of the house.

Ms. Luginski stated the applicant had mentioned he was replacing a window on the south side, and was eliminating a window on the east side. She asked if the applicant had thought about moving the window. Mr. Vincent stated he had thought about it depending on where the counters would lay out, noting he had not totally set up the kitchen layout on the inside. He stated he had also thought about putting in a smaller window to allow light to come in. His second thought was to put in a window door. He thought about a shorter window so a counter could be installed in front of it.

Ms. Luginski asked if the applicant was taking out that window and putting in elsewhere in the house. Mr. Vincent explained the window that was being added would be a bedroom window on the south elevation, and would not add anything to the kitchen area.

Ms. Luginski asked if that was the reclaimed window he had gotten from a neighbor. Mr. Vincent indicated it was. Ms. Luginski asked how old that window was or if it was historical. Mr. Vincent stated his neighbor told him it was an original window from the neighbor's house. Ms. Luginski pointed out that house was a reproduction built in 1980. Mr. Vincent stated it was not a 1980 window. Ms. Luginski asked if it was possible to use the window he was eliminating because it was original to the house. Mr. Vincent stated the window he was taking out was part of the addition and did not match the original windows. Ms. Luginski stated she appreciated the applicant repairing rather than replacing the windows, and noted it would help retain the value of the house itself.

Ms. Luginski referred to the pavers the applicant indicated he wanted to use, and noted there were a lot of stone walls and brick in the Village. She pointed out his neighbor was doing a paver project and had obtained reclaimed brick from Detroit. She encouraged the applicant to use more natural materials. She thought the pavers the applicant proposed really looked modern, and if there was a way to go back to an aggregate material, which was a lower cost alternative that looked like a gravel road; or antique brick or cobblestone, she would appreciate seeing real materials because of the age of the home.

Ms. Luginski suggested the applicant invest in wood shutters because that would have been original to the house. She noted materials were really important in restoration.

Ms. Luginski stated one mistake often made when putting shutters on a house, was that they were not sized accurately. She suggested the shutters be sized to make sure they actually close fully across the window, so the size looks proportionate to what would have been there 150 years ago. Oftentimes people install very narrow shutters and the look does not make sense.

Ms. Luginski referred to the color choices and asked how they were chosen. Mr. Vincent stated he selected those colors based on his painting experience and because he knew that yellow, white trim and dark windows worked in general and in the historical atmosphere. He stated he would not be painting for some time, and wanted to give the Commission an idea of what he wanted to do, if the colors were acceptable.

Ms. Luginski asked where the dark brown paint would be used. Mr. Vincent explained just the window mullions, and the framing around them would be the Moonlight White. He stated the framing for the screens on the front porch would also be dark brown.

Ms. Luginski stated that Greek Revival was a specific period and architecture, and she had not ever seen the colors presented by the applicant, although she personally liked them. She stated there were many books depicting Greek Revival homes, and encouraged the applicant to research that because of the age of the home and because it was located in a Historic District. She thought the house deserved that respect. She stated she had seen Greek Revival homes painted yellow with white trim quite often on the East Coast, although not so much in Michigan. There was documentation that would support that, and part of the fun of restoration was looking back at what was done 150 years ago.

Ms. Luginski stated she would be supportive of a single driveway with a pad in the back. She hoped in the future the alley would be straightened out so the applicant had access because it would be easier to get in and out.

Ms. Franey stated she owned a Greek Revival home, but it was already renovated when she bought it. She stated there was a yellow Greek Revival home on Dutton and Adams with an off-white trim. She thought it might help taking a picture of that home to compare it to the applicant's color choices. She stated one thing she disliked about her house was that someone put plastic shutters on it. She was currently searching for the right shutters, and commented they could be found fairly inexpensively, even in comparison to plastic; however, it was a matter of finding the right size. She thought there were some examples in the area that might help the applicant.

Ms. Franey stated her front door was a double panel wood door, not a 6-panel, which was replaced, but did have the beveled wood. The door the applicant selected was a Frank Lloyd Wright 1920s style, but it was a beautiful door. She thought the applicant might want to look at the other Greek Revival examples in the area because he would see they all have similar styles for the entryway door. She acknowledged that might not be the applicant's taste, but it might be something he could incorporate.

Mr. Thompson stated the applicant's house had been a problem for many years and noted he was glad the applicant had taken it on as it needed a tremendous amount of work. He indicated he did not have any problems with the Commission establishing parameters for the administrative approval of either the deck or the driveway with the pad in the back. He suggested the applicant look into wood shutters. He stated he was glad to meet the applicant and looked forward to seeing the project done.

Ms. Franey stated the home a couple doors down from the applicant did have a horseshoe driveway. She noted it was not a wrap around going around the back, but was a horseshoe drive, and asked if that was original or fell within the time frame as she did not believe it was done recently. Ms. Luginski stated that house was not contributing, but was a 1980s Colonial reproduction.

Mr. Miller stated that the houses in the Village did not have wrap around driveways, but if the driveway was removed, it would go back to its original state. He continued that although a driveway seemed permanent, if the gravel were removed and grass laid, it could be restored to its original condition. He pointed out if this were a request for an adaption for a commercial use, there would be required parking lots, driveways and sidewalks that would be added. He understood there could be a problem with the additional curb cut, but the location on Tienken Road required the applicant be able to get safe access to the Road.

Chairperson Dunphy clarified it was his understanding that half of the wrap-around proposed for the west side of the property did not currently exist. Mr. Vincent explained the current driveway was on the east side of the house and was basically just grass to the back of the house and a couple tracks. When he purchased the house, the shrubs were all overgrown and he could not get to the back of the property. He referred to the site plan and pointed out the proposed additional driveway expansion, noting that area was currently grass.

Chairperson Dunphy recapped there were a couple issues discussed by the Commission. He suggested the Commission review the proposed draft motion, and noted Condition #5 referred to the interior door which seemed to be a concern to the Commission. He asked the applicant if he was willing to reconsider that item, noting he shared the concern that the proposed beveled door was not in keeping with a Greek Revival Farmhouse and suggested the applicant look at what else might be available. He noted the Commission had some concerns with Condition #12, specifically the paint color choice for the exterior siding. The concern was that the color chosen by the applicant was truly in keeping with the historical character of the structure and the area. He asked if there were any other comments from the Commissioners or he would entertain a motion.

Mr. Miller stated he was willing to make the motion and clarified that some changes should be made to the proposed draft motion in the packet.

Chairperson Dunphy stated that concerns of the Commission focused on those two points, plus the driveway, noting the proposed driveway was not included in the draft motion. He pointed out that draft Condition #5 referenced the 6-panel beveled glass door, and Condition #12 referenced the paint color. He suggested those conditions be amended with language that proposed some alternatives and whether those items could be approved administratively rather than asking the applicant to re-appear before the Commission. He asked Staff to provide some input on the most manageable way to handle those items.

Mr. Miller asked if Condition #9 should also be amended because it referred to vinyl shutters. He explained vinyl was a useful material but was not truly a historic material.

Chairperson Dunphy asked if Mr. Miller was prepared to make a motion. Mr. Miller moved the motion in the packet, but asked if the conditions in question should be removed or handled administratively.

Mr. Delacourt suggested the motion in the packet could be moved with the elimination of Conditions #5 and #9, if the vinyl shutters were not acceptable. He noted Condition #9 could be left in place if the dimension and type of shutters were acceptable and replace the word "vinyl" with the word "wood". That would allow

the applicant to move forward with the shutters if he were able to find some that were of the same size and type. He referred to Condition #12 and noted that was up to the Commission. If the Commission was not happy with the paint color choices, they could eliminate that condition, or state the colors they felt would be acceptable to be approved by Staff at a later date. He commented paint colors had always been a touchy issue with the Commission. He stated if the paint colors did not meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards, he thought the applicant was willing to come back at a later date with revised colors. In that instance, Condition #12 would be eliminated.

Mr. Miller asked if Condition #5 could simply be amended to eliminate the 6-panel beveled glass door and reword the condition to read "a new interior solid wood door". Mr. Delacourt stated whatever the Commission was comfortable with was acceptable to Staff.

Mr. Thompson suggested that Condition #12 be eliminated, noting he would prefer to see the paint colors before they were approved. Mr. Miller suggested that just the reference to the paint colors be removed, leaving the removal and replacement of the lap siding portion.

Chairperson Dunphy clarified that Mr. Miller had proposed a motion and called for a second. Mr. Thompson seconded the proposed motion. Chairperson Dunphy called for discussion on the proposed motion on the floor.

Ms. Luginski stated it would be great if the applicant reviewed books and local buildings. She wanted to qualify that when she saw the Castleton Mist color sample it looked a little green to her. She suggested using a stronger yellow, such as the local example pointed out by Ms. Franey at Dutton and Adams. She thought it would be great if the applicant re-looked at the interior door and the colors and came back to the Commission next month.

Mr. Kilpatrick asked if Condition #9 was changed to wood shutters. Mr. Delacourt indicated that was correct.

Ms. Cozzolino asked if Condition #4 should be revised, as it referred to the screen door to Condition #5. Mr. Delacourt noted those were two separate doors, one being the interior and one being the door onto the porch itself. Chairperson Dunphy stated that the T-Bar door shown in the historic photograph provided documentary evidence it was in keeping with the historical background of the home.

Mr. Delacourt suggested that if the Commission did not have any issues with the proposed rear deck, they could add a condition that the deck was approved to be built consistent with the materials identified on the plan.

2009-0335

Chairperson Dunphy asked if the motion maker and seconder would approve that additional condition. Mr. Miller and Mr. Thompson both agreed to the addition of a new Condition regarding the deck.

Mr. Thompson inquired about whether the proposed driveway should also be included in the motion. Mr. Delacourt suggested a separate motion be prepared for the driveway if the Commission wanted to handle that item at this meeting. Mr. Thompson asked if the driveway could be addressed at another meeting with updated parameters provided to the Commission. Mr. Kilpatrick stated that would be his preference as it appeared an additional curb cut might not be acceptable to the Road Commission for Oakland County. He pointed out that even if the additional curb cut was acceptable to the Road Commission, some of the Commissioners might feel that a wrap-around driveway was more appropriate, and that would give the Commission another opportunity to discuss the matter.

Chairperson Dunphy agreed the Commission did not appear to have sufficient detail to make an informed decision on the driveway. He suggested it would be better to hold off on that decision at this time. He called for any other discussion on the motion. Upon hearing none, he called for a roll call vote.

A motion was made by Miller, seconded by Thompson, that this matter be Approved. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Cozzolino, Miller, Kilpatrick, Dunphy, Thompson, Franey and Luginski

Absent 2 - Dziurman and Stamps

RESOLVED in the matter of File No. HDC 94-001, regarding the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for renovation to the existing house located at 1046 E. Tienken Road, the Historic Districts Commission **APPROVES** a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following Findings and Conditions:

Findings:

1. The plans for the renovation of the existing house are compatible with the existing resource.
2. The subject site is a contributing resource within the Stoney Creek Historic District located in the City of Rochester Hills.
3. The architectural features, design, arrangement, texture and materials proposed are consistent with those of the Stoney Creek Historic District, and do not have a negative impact on the resource.
4. The proposed renovation is consistent with the following requirements of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

- A. Number 1, which states: "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". The Applicant is maintaining the historic purpose of the resource.
- B. Number 2, which states: "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". The Applicant is retaining the historic character of the property and is restoring the front porch back to its original look.
- C. Number 3, which states: "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 no be undertaken". The Application is not adding any features or architectural elements that would create a false sense of historical development.
- D. Number 5, which states: "Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved". The Applicant has not proposed any renovation or repair work that detracts or changes the craftsmanship of this resource.
- E. Number 6, which states: "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". The Applicant is repairing as much as possible, and where that cannot be accomplished, is replacing with like materials.

Conditions:

1. All improvements shall be consistent with plans and materials presented to the City dated August 20, 2009.
2. Prior to construction, the applicant shall submit for and receive all required Building Permits from the City's Building Department.
3. The existing windows on the front porch will be removed and replaced with wood framed screens with Clear Advantage fiberglass charcoal screen manufactured by New York Wire. Paint color choices for the windows will be submitted for review at a future Commission meeting.
4. The inappropriate metal door on the front porch will be removed and replaced with a T-Bar wood screen door manufactured by Columbia and stained with Minwax Gunstock 231.
5. The fascia on the front and rear of the home will be built out using pine wood as indicated on the plans dated received August 20, 2009, and aluminum gutters will be installed. Paint color choices for the fascia and gutters will be submitted for review at a future Commission meeting.
6. The damaged stone foundation on the front and rear of the house will be repaired with CMU's and cobblestone exterior to match existing as indicated on the plans dated received August 20, 2009.

7. The existing asphalt shingles will be replaced with matching GAF Elk Royal Sovereign Autumn Brown 3-tab asphalt shingles as necessary.
8. Wood louvered shutters will be installed on the north and west elevations of the house as indicated on the plans dated received August 20, 2009. Paint color choices for the shutters will be submitted for review at a future Commission meeting.
9. The existing windows on rear porch will be removed and replaced and centered with 21" x 36" Antique Sash Windows. Paint color choices for the shutters will be submitted for review at a future Commission meeting.
10. Replace existing rear metal and side door with solid wood doors with beveled glass and stained with Minwax Gunstock 231.
11. Damaged and deteriorated wood lap siding will be removed and replaced with 3/8" x 16' LP Smart Lap Siding as noted on the plans dated received August 20, 2009. Paint color choices for the siding will be submitted for review at a future Commission meeting.
12. Repair all existing windows as needed using wavy glass. Paint color choices for the windows will be submitted for review at a future Commission meeting.
13. Install 21" x 36" antique sash window in back bedroom as noted on the plans dated received August 20, 2009. Paint color choices for the window will be submitted for review at a future Commission meeting.
14. Install a deck on the south elevation constructed of 2'x6' stained, treated lumber and 2'x2' spindles, stained with Minwax Gunstock 231, as noted on the plans dated received August 20, 2009.

2009-0335

Chairperson Dunphy stated for the record that the motion had carried. He advised the applicant it was hard to express just how much the Commission wanted the applicant to succeed. He stated they appreciated Mr. Vincent's willingness to work with the Commission, and they wanted nothing better than to see him make the house the jewel it could be in the Historic District.

Mr. Vincent thanked the Commissioners for the opportunity and their consideration.

Chairperson Dunphy stated the Commission would take a brief recess.

(Recess 8:11 PM to 8:31 PM)

Chairperson Dunphy called the meeting back to order at 8:31 PM.

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 8A. 2008-0678** Stoney Creek Village (Tienken Road Bridge)
- Discussion with Road Commission

Chairperson Dunphy stated that representatives from the Road Commission for Oakland County and the City's Engineering Department were present to provide some additional information to the Commission and discuss the renderings submitted in their packets. He invited them to come forward to the presenter's table.

Chairperson Dunphy thanked Mr. O'Brien for returning and providing the Commission with more material to review. He stated the Commission appreciated Mr. O'Brien's willingness to accommodate this process and the thoroughness of the documentation provided. He asked Mr. O'Brien to provide a summary and overview of how the project was fitting together.

Jeff O'Brien, Design Engineer, Road Commission for Oakland County, referred to his August 12, 2009 cover letter and the questions asked at the July meeting regarding funding. More specifically whether or not if a separated pedestrian facility was constructed adjacent to or beyond the traffic bridge, could local bridge funds be used for such facility? Essentially, the answer he received was that a separated pedestrian facility would not be funded if completely separated as local bridge funds could not be used for that purpose. It would have to be funded entirely by the local Community.

Mr. O'Brien indicated the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) did state that if the pedestrian facility was immediately adjacent to the traffic bridge itself, MDOT had in the past on one occasion extended a sub-structure unit to facilitate the construction of a superstructure at a later date. The superstructure is actually the bridge itself. The proposed bridge facility they are building is essentially a three-sided culvert, and it would be a matter of extending the sub-structure units, which would ultimately result in the look being proposed with a pedestrian facility immediately adjacent.

Mr. O'Brien stated the question was asked whether MDOT would approve the funding of a bridge without a pedestrian facility. The answer to that is "as there is no existing pedestrian facility on the current bridge, they would fund a bridge without a pedestrian facility".

Mr. O'Brien noted the question was also asked if there were any surplus local bridge funds that were allocated to the project, that were not used for the traffic bridge, could they be used for a separated pedestrian facility. The answer he received was a "unanimous no". The funds would go back to the local bridge fund and would be allocated to a traffic bridge somewhere else.

Mr. O'Brien stated one other question asked was whether MDOT would fund a traffic bridge that did not meet current legal loadings. The answer was a resounding no, it must meet current AASHTO (American Association of State and Highway Transportation Officials) live load design criteria.

Mr. O'Brien stated the Road Commission had done some additional work; essentially completed their TS&L (Type, size and location plans) discussions with MDOT, and asked a series of questions that were asked by the Historic Districts Commission with regards to offsets to bridge barriers, width of pedestrian facilities, etc. He stated he would provide the information first and then go through the plan set.

Mr. O'Brien stated MDOT would approve a 2-foot offset to the barriers, instead of the previous proposed 4-foot offset. That is what is now being proposed as part of the Road Commission's proposal. The Road Commission has chosen the traffic barrier, which is an open two-tube steel barrier. The barrier is a crash-worthy barrier, and still has two 8-foot reinforced concrete ends on the barrier, where the traffic barrier ties to the guardrail, where the guardrail extends off the bridge. That is necessary from a crash-worthiness perspective. He displayed the plans as he discussed these items.

Mr. O'Brien stated the end wall elevation dictated an 8-foot long reinforced concrete area where the two tubes bolt to the concrete, noting the location of the guardrail on the plans on display. He indicated the guardrails would continue out to the grassy areas with a crash appropriate ending.

Mr. O'Brien displayed a drawing depicting the existing bridge deck, noting the jersey-style reinforced concrete traffic barriers, and stated the current proposal on the bridge deck itself was the two-tube traffic barrier. He stated the pedestrian facility was separated by a traffic barrier, noting the pedestrian facility was roughly 7-1/2 feet in width. There was a strong likelihood that there may be bikes using the pedestrian facility, making the barrier separation a very good safety feature to ensure there is no conflict between pedestrians or bikers and the motoring public.

Mr. O'Brien stated another change was the width of the pedestrian facility. The previous proposal was 10-foot wide; however, upon further discussion with MDOT, AASHTO guides from a sidewalk definition require a maximum of 8-feet in width or less, or if a multi-use path, it is 14-feet in width on the structure (10-foot multi-foot path, two 5-foot lanes with 2-foot offsets to fixed objects). Those are the requirements given the Road Commission. In discussions with the local Community, and based upon the size, scale and scope of the bridge itself, it was decided to go with the 7-1/2-foot pedestrian facility.

Mr. O'Brien stated one other change to the proposal was that the Road Commission had been in contact with MDOT and MDOT salvaged some R-4 barriers (bridge railings) from a previous project which are located at MDOT's Mason garage. He viewed the site and reviewed what MDOT had available, and the railings were in surprisingly good shape. MDOT did have steel posts available for the connections to reinstall the railings, although some refurbishment is necessary.

He stated they may need to manufacture some posts, and the railings are good candidates for refurbishment. He stated MDOT verbally and graciously agreed to do a material transfer to the Road Commission, and the Road Commission would incur refurbishment and reinstallation costs as part of the contract. The proposal is to include that on the south fascia.

Mr. O'Brien stated the plan had been submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for comment. SHPO agreed to take a look at the plans and potentially offer some comments, although no meeting had been scheduled between the Road Commission and SHPO. He hoped to provide either written documentation or feedback from a meeting with SHPO the next time the Road Commission came before the Historic Districts Commission.

Mr. O'Brien stated one other issue brought up at the last meeting was about the traffic counters on Tienken Road. He indicated they were Road Commission traffic counters performing their annual counting. He commented since the Road Commission had been out several times counting traffic, he was not sure any other counts would be performed, as they should have the data they need.

Mr. O'Brien displayed an aerial view depicting the existing structure and existing road on the top, as well as the proposed plan on the bottom. He explained the yellow depicted the paving or repaving of the existing road cross-section, and extension of the path system. The dark brown area was the size of the bridge deck, which extends approximately 6-feet beyond the existing wing wall to the south. On the north side, they pretty much line up. The Road Commission proposed a retaining wall along the southeast quadrant of the project to minimize impacts for the construction of the pathway. He noted there was some grade differential, which is why they were proposing the wall in order to minimize any grading or vegetation loss. They proposed to extend the existing mill race culvert approximately 20-feet to extend beyond the retaining wall, which is necessary. No decisions have been made regarding the type or color of retaining wall, but the Road Commission was leaning toward a keystone-type, modular block retaining wall. The current plans depict a vegetated wall for the entire height, but that is being re-evaluated. The Road Commission may use a more vertical-type wall with a couple rows of the planting-type in the middle to facilitate vegetation growth. The Road Commission anticipated that even if no plantings were installed, the vines would cover the bulk of the wall over time, essentially making the wall disappear. The full-height planting wall would extend the slope stake line or earth disruption because it is much wider than a vertical wall, and the Road Commission was trying to minimize the impact or footprint of the construction project. In order to do that, a vertical-type wall is necessary.

Mr. O'Brien explained another benefit would be to pull the toe of the wall farther from the existing 36-inch water main in the vicinity. He noted the City was very

concerned about how close the bridge project would get to the water main because it is a large facility and if it ever requires repair or maintenance, the City would prefer the bridge project be as far as possible away from it.

Mr. O'Brien stated they had elected to shorten up the location of where the pathway ended. The Road Commission felt they would end the path in a more appropriate location, giving the City more options as to where to extend the path in the future. He discussed the various extension options toward Van Hoosen Road, or through the Van Hoosen Farm, or along Tienken. That was a potential future project to be discussed between the City and Historic Districts Commission.

Mr. O'Brien stated it did not appear that the proposed retaining wall would impact any large trees, although some brush and undergrowth would be impacted. They expected that to grow back and reestablish itself within a few years of project completion. The Road Commission took great care in locating the significant trees in order to avoid them and avoid impacts to those features.

Mr. O'Brien referred to plans circa 1951 of the MDOT bridge railings, which were a similar style to those observed at MDOT's Mason Yard. He noted the details for the posts were a little different than what he observed in Mason, but were a steel type post with a flange at the bottom bolted to a concrete block end wall or head wall.

Mr. O'Brien stated he had provided some detail regarding the keystone block planter walls, but noted no decision had been made as to color or number of rows, as the Road Commission wanted to minimize impact. They would probably select a more vertical wall to pull the slope stake lines in as far as possible.

Chairperson Dunphy thanked Mr. O'Brien and the Road Commission for accommodating the Commissioners questions and concerns. He lauded the Road Commission for their efforts in trying to accommodate the process and meet the standards the Commission is concerned with. He noted he had one request for public comment, which he would take at this time.

Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race, stated she had reviewed the plans and appreciated the reduction in the actual bridge structure, which was approximately 10-feet greater than the existing bridge. She asked how far east the repaving of the road would go. Mr. O'Brien responded it was proposed to be repaved to Van Hoosen Road. Ms. Hill asked if the width of the road would increase. Mr. O'Brien responded no. Ms. Hill clarified it would be exactly the same width as the road currently existed. Mr. O'Brien stated that was correct. Ms. Hill asked if that was in both directions. Mr. O'Brien stated it would be a little different west of the structure because of adjustments required to add curb and gutter, and some shoulder areas would be eliminated to address some drainage concerns.

Ms. Hill clarified that no large trees would be eliminated. Mr. O'Brien stated some brush would come out, and explained their surveys typically picked up any trees six inches in diameter or greater, and none were indicated on the plan for removal.

Ms. Hill asked if the tubular guard rail on the inside went into a concrete block segment at either end. She hoped photographs of this type of rail could be provided because it would be helpful to see how existing railing like this looked. Mr. O'Brien stated the Road Commission could try to provide photographs. He explained there would be an 8-foot reinforced concrete connection between where the guard rail extended away from the structure. Ms. Hill asked if that would look like the Paint Creek Bridge. Mr. O'Brien stated it was an 8-foot long concrete piece that was the connection detail between the guard rail and the actual bridge rail. He noted it was more vertical and was not jersey shaped.

Ms. Hill asked how tall the guard rail segment was. Mr. O'Brien stated it was roughly two-feet, and 8-1/2 was the top of the top rail.

Ms. Hill was concerned about the retaining wall and was glad to hear the Road Commission was exploring the more vertical option. She asked if keystone would be used or a poured concrete. Mr. O'Brien stated the Road Commission was looking at a mechanically stabilized earth retaining wall. He explained it was a keystone-type wall with geo-fabric or geo-grids that go back into the slope to hold the wall up. Ms. Hill asked if the slope would be reduced. Mr. O'Brien explained there was more of a slope with the living retaining wall because for every course of block there was approximately 5-inches for growth. A vertical wall would have much less than that, which would pull the toe of the wall closer to the road.

Ms. Hill was concerned because there was a similar wall on Livernois, and she was not certain the look was compatible. She commented it would take a long time to hide that wall with plantings or re-growth. She hoped there could be something that looked more like a cobblestone that would be more appropriate for the area, or some type of vertical structure.

Ms. Hill noted the City was limited to where the pedestrian path could go, and asked what the City was proposing, especially to the east of the bridge. She thought the Commissioners needed to know exactly what the intention and where it would go so they got a clear picture of what it would look like.

Mr. Delacourt stated the City was absolutely looking at every option for the pedestrian path, and noted they wanted to avoid just extending it due east along the edge of the road because of the impact it would have on the landscaping and the stone wall at Van Hoosen Road. The City would like to swing it south, noting the

City's Engineering Department was trying to accommodate it and avoid the impacts of extending it due east along the edge of the road to save those trees. The option might be through the red house parking lot, and all concerns were being considered.

Paul Davis, City Engineer, stated he had been asked to provide information regarding the construction costs for a separate pedestrian bridge at a prior meeting, and the direction of the path related to what the ultimate alignment would be.

Mr. Davis stated he looked at how a separated pedestrian bridge could be constructed; and where it made the most sense to try to construct it given the existing constraints in the area. He came up with two locations and provided a cost estimate to the Commissioners for both locations. He displayed a drawing depicting the Two Hundred Thirty Thousand (\$230,000.00) Dollar proposal. They looked at how the bridge would be without the pedestrian component, considering the wing walls that were also be a part of bridge; considering the 36-inch water main running east/west parallel to Tienken Road offset from the bridge, and also considering the retaining wall included in the Road Commission's proposal because that was an important piece of the design for the bridge because it allowed a quicker elevation difference to be achieved to avoid grading out into the floodplain a significant amount.

Mr. Davis pointed out where the wing wall ended very close to where a separated pedestrian bridge would be located, and considering the water main, he was still in the retaining wall causing a conflict. That would give about an 11-foot separation between the pedestrian bridge and Tienken Road. Basically, that was still unacceptable, although it was probably the best location given the existing constraints. The toe of the proposed retaining wall was projected to be about 1-foot off of the existing 36-inch water main, which was a very undesirable situation. If repair work was required on the water main, a significant portion of the retaining wall would have to be removed. Being a large main on a mile road, it was probably deeper than the typical 6-foot minimum barrier. Normally a water main easement is 20-feet, and the City did not want to have anything in the easement, whether it was trees, and certainly not a retaining wall. In this case, there was no way to achieve that. He noted that between the center of the water main and the pedestrian bridge was 6-1/2 feet. Although it was probably the best location given the existing constraints, it was not desirable from an engineering perspective.

Mr. Davis stated the other location he looked at was south of the water main. There was an opportunity to use a bridge to go across the floodway, south of the water main, but that presented other problems. Instead of the pathway east of the steel pedestrian bridge being mostly out of the floodplain limits, it would be in the floodplain limits and required construction of a wooden pedestrian bridge. He estimated it would be 110-feet and noted those bridges were not only initially expensive to construct, but were also a maintenance problem, and there was also a

replacement cost. He had checked with two different engineering consulting companies that had proposed bridges like this; one company estimated Three Hundred Thirty (\$330.00) Dollars a foot, and the other estimated Three Hundred Fifty (\$350.00) Dollars a foot. Just that small 100-foot section would cost over Thirty Thousand Dollars. Being made of wood, it would deteriorate and be a maintenance problem.

Mr. Davis stated the other difficulty in going south of the water main was that they would have to obtain an easement from the Mill Stream Village development because that put the bridge in their property. He pointed out the right-of-way line and explained although they could try to squeeze the bridge in, it was really too close to the water main. He also pointed out the location of the storm sewer that ran from the detention basin that discharged to the Stoney Creek. He explained that would cause the pedestrian bridge to be moved further down into a wider area of the floodplain, including areas where trees would have to be removed, and an easement would be required for construction. He noted that also was not a very desirable location.

Mr. Davis stated the original question was "what would happen if the Road Commission bridge was incorporated, how the alignment would run". He noted there were some unique problems in figuring out the alignment. He explained there were Detroit Edison utility poles that might be able to be relocated, but there were also established trees along Tienken. One of the biggest constraints was the existing stone wall running along the Museum property, which ran into the right-of-way of Tienken Road. There was really no room to fit a pathway along Tienken considering the utility poles, the existing tree stands and where the stone wall terminated.

Mr. Davis stated that forced the City to consider bringing the pathway down into the Museum property. He commented there had been some question about whether the City had the right to do that because the property might have some deed restrictions from Michigan State when it was originally donated to the City. He stated the City Attorney had reviewed that matter and felt that based on the limited information he had reviewed, as long as ownership of the property was not transferred for a pathway easement, and it did not materially impact the function of the remainder of the property, the pathway could be put through there. He pointed out how they would try to put the pathway between two existing trees and swing it to the southeast.

Mr. Davis explained there were two locations they could try to bring the pathway out, figuring they would have to come out to a driveway location. The stone wall goes up to each driveway, one driveway by the red house and one by the Museum. He pointed out the horseshoe driveway for the Museum, and commented he did not know if both driveways were needed. They would have to explore whether a portion of that driveway could be abandoned to bring the pathway through to run back up to Tienken, to avoid disturbing the stone wall.

Mr. Davis referred to the west side of the pathway and stated they were trying to stay north of the detention basin, and would like to match up to existing pathway for the Millstream Village development.

Mr. Davis stated he had identified the constraints associated with a separate pedestrian facility, and the estimated costs. He explained MDOT would not pay for a separate pedestrian bridge, it would be 100% City cost if it was determined a separate bridge was needed for this portion of the pathway.

Chairperson Dunphy called for questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Ms. Franey clarified if the pedestrian pathway was not incorporated in the bridge project, four-foot sides would be required rather than two-foot. Mr. O'Brien stated it would be the Road Commission's recommendation they go back to the four-foot shoulders because there would be a higher probability of bicyclists and other uses along the road shoulder edge. They felt it was important to have a wider separation along that bridge facility.

Ms. Franey clarified that with the pedestrian bridge added, there was 7-1/2 feet added for the pathway with two-foot shoulders. If there was no pedestrian bridge, there would be four-foot shoulders, resulting in a 3-1/2 foot difference. Mr. O'Brien clarified it was a matter of four to six feet because the barrier would be lost off the outside. The outside of the south fascia to the traffic barrier was 7-1/2 feet for the path, and roughly a foot and a half for the south railing, resulting in nine feet. He stated it was about a five-foot difference because of adding another four foot of bridge.

Mr. Kilpatrick noted there were items MDOT would and would not approve with respect to the weight and safety restrictions. He stated there was some discussion about speed limits, such as the City trying to reduce the speed limit, and asked if that would be an impediment to MDOT funding the project.

Mr. O'Brien stated the speed limit was independent of the funding for the bridge replacement. Speed limits were set by the Michigan State Police through a speed study. The Road Commission designs the road based upon an appropriate design speed, which for this project was 40 mph. There way very little in the way of profile change, because all they were talking about was the replacement of the bridge. The vertical curves meet the design speed, but they almost meet that design speed today. The Road Commission was essentially matching the existing. If they got into a situation where they significantly changed the vertical alignment of the road, they would have to review driveway impacts, but they were essentially matching the existing.

Mr. Kilpatrick asked if the City were to encourage or there was the possibility of decreasing the speed, whether that would not impact the project. Mr. O'Brien stated that was an independent discussion.

Mr. Kilpatrick asked if the City were to have weight restrictions, although the bridge had the proper weight restriction, but because of protection of resources, whether that would have any impact on the bridge. Mr. O'Brien stated that the City could request the Board of County Road Commissioners to consider a traffic control order, but he could not speak for the Board and did not know how that would be received. Studies would have to be conducted for alternate routes for the trucks that would not be allowed, and noted it was a public road.

Mr. Kilpatrick stated that would not impact the bridge one way or the other. Mr. O'Brien stated as long as the bridge was designed in accordance with current AASHTO live load designs, which meant allowing legal loadings, and the bridge was not posted, it was fundable.

Mr. Thompson stated he appreciated the Road Commission's patience in working with the City and the Commission. He noted the proposed bridge pretty much mirrored the existing, with the difference being the width of the pedestrian pathway which was absolutely needed. He did not think it was practical or cost effective to have a separate pathway, although he understood the argument for it. He did not know how the City would fund a separate bridge, and encouraged the Commissioners to look at the budget projections for the City.

Mr. Thompson stated that although the speed limit was a separate issue, he encouraged the City to take a look at it or to try to slow down the traffic. He was encouraged by what he had seen and the improvements made by the Road Commission and stated he looked forward to final approval of the project.

Ms. Luginski appreciated what the Road Commission presented. She noted they had started at 54 and went to 48 and she was encouraged by that. She wanted to try to understand exactly what speed the bridge was engineered for. Mr. O'Brien stated it was posted at 40 mph currently, and he believed the design speed was 45 mph. Ms. Luginski stated that was her impression from previous discussions. She referred to the Road Commission's cover sheet which indicated the posted speed was 40 mph and the design speed was 35 mph, which she believed was an error. Mr. O'Brien concurred.

Ms. Luginski stated she was encouraged in looking at the cross-section diagram of the east proposed approach, from the center of the road there was a 50-foot expansion to the south. She noted much of that was due to the modular retaining wall, which she understood the Road Commission was now reviewing as more of a vertical wall.

Mr. O'Brien explained there was close to a 9-foot batter, which is the horizontal distance from the toe of the wall to the top. Each course of block had a 5-inch batter for the vegetated wall. He stated they could go to a more vertical wall which would pull the toe further away. He commented some of the wall was buried, noting the existing ground elevations were not noted. Mr. Davis added he found the foot off to be unacceptable, and stated he felt it needed to be more vertical. He explained it could not be hanging over the water main even in a buried condition, as it was not desirable to the Engineering Department.

Ms. Luginski asked if the Commissioners could have access to pictures of the railings. Mr. O'Brien stated the Road Commission took photographs of the vintage railings when they were at MDOT's Mason Garage, and could provide them. Mr. Delacourt asked if those could be provided prior to the next packet being prepared. Mr. O'Brien indicated he would send them.

Ms. Luginski stated she took the opportunity to look at the wall on Livernois and indicated she had heard from the residents that it was unsightly. She knew the keystone wall that was part of the proposed project would be buried and would have foliage, but pointed out that the foliage might not survive the Michigan winters and the wall would not look like the walls in the catalogs because those examples were mostly in warmer climates. For the record, if she had her way, she would have something that was a little less modern looking, although she was not sure what other options there were.

Mr. O'Brien stated there were various keystone options, noting the Livernois one was the sculpted type look. He stated the Road Commission constructed one recently at 14 Mile and Farmington, which was a split-face type look, which was very flush and did not have the oblong shape. From his perspective, the flush-faced type wall looked fairly attractive. He suggested the Road Commission could provide photographs of that wall as well.

Chairperson Dunphy pointed out that from the standpoint of visual impact, there was a big difference between having something on Livernois that was at street level and above, as opposed as something like this project that would be below grade.

Ms. Luginski stated she agreed but the mitigating factor was that it was in the Historic District. She said there were people in that area participating in the "Fun Fridays" at the Museum, and there was some visibility from people who frequent the Museum.

Ms. Luginski stated the dimension was definitely an improvement, but she was still interested in the concept of traffic calming devices. She hoped the City would work on that because this was a widening and she wanted to go on record that she hoped there was an attempt to try to narrow it down. In terms of the weight limit, she stated she was familiar with the Traffic Control Order (TCO) opportunity and

would like to look at that. She felt the Road Commission had worked with the Commission very well, and now there some things the Community had to do to mitigate the issues that would be created. Obviously speed was one of those.

Ms. Luginski was encouraged to see the walkway staying away from the stone wall. She noted the stone wall was one of the key components to the entire Historic District, and it really signified the Stoney Creek Village. Anything they could do to stay away from it, which meant leaving the Road Commission sidewalk where it was and making smart choices about where it goes in the Village, she was behind.

Chairperson Dunphy referred to the comments about taking a request to have the weight limits and speed limits reviewed, and asked if that was best done by the Commission. He asked if the Commission should be making some parallel motions or it should come from City Council.

Mr. Delacourt stated it would be appropriate for the Commission could make a motion supporting the request and asking City Council to move forward. He indicated that the Advisory Committee that had met with the residents in the two Historic Districts focusing on the Tienken Road and Washington Road Corridors, would be meeting with the residents again on May 26, 2009. At the meeting, the initial recommendations were very much in support of reducing speed and requesting TCOs. He commented a lot went into the TCO requests, but he thought everyone was on the same page with respect to the traffic calming devices, although not all of them would be approved, and some alternatives might have to be considered. He thought it was appropriate for the Commission to request City Council request those items from the Road Commission. He did not think the TCOs could be acted upon without the approval of Council. He thought the Advisory Committee was very supportive of the same issues discussed by the Commission such as speed, traffic calming measures, and the location of the pathway, and had some good thoughts about how to accomplish that.

2008-0678

Mr. Miller stated he was intrigued to see that the pedestrian bridge that was originally along Tienken over the Paint Creek was still in the City's possession. Mr. Davis pointed out his cost estimates assumed they were using that bridge. He stated the City had the bridge since it had been removed as part of the Tienken/Kings Cove Bridge Project, noting it was sitting in Spencer Park. He commented there were a couple locations it could be put to use, but this particular project was not a good location for it.

Mr. Miller stated it was also intriguing that using that bridge would only save the City about \$20,000.00. Mr. Davis stated that using the bridge would actually save

the City about \$90,000.00 over the cost of a new bridge. He explained the estimates pointed out there was a significant cost to do a separated bridge, even if it was a donated bridge. There were other items that came into play in trying to set a donated bridge in place. The main difference in the costs was separation, with one proposal being north of the water main location and one proposal south. One was more difficult to get to with a crane and required an easement and required a wooden boardwalk, which were some of the differences in the costs.

Chairperson Dunphy asked if there were any other discussion by the Commissioners. He thanked Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Davis for their input. He looked forward to seeing the formal application at the next meeting.

This matter was Discussed

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Chairperson Dunphy called for any other business.

Ms. Luginski stated Mr. Tripp had told her, in terms of the circular driveway for the non-contributing structure on Tienken Road discussed with the 1046 E. Tienken Road matter, that home went before the Historic Districts Commission years ago. She wanted to clarify it was not a circular driveway in terms of the home having two access points off Tienken Road, they were sharing a driveway with their neighbor.

Mr. Delacourt stated he had spoken to the applicant and the applicant could wrap the driveway around the front of his house if he wanted to make that request. He did not know if the Commission would consider that request approvable because it got rather tight across the front yard. The applicant might pursue the possibility of the curb cut through the Road Commission to find out what their opinion would be.

Chairperson Dunphy reminded the Commissioners that the next regular meeting of the Commission was September 10, 2009 at 7:00 PM, noting he had a potential conflict with that meeting date. The Commissioners would be contacted if it became necessary to change that date. He then asked if there was any other business. No other business was presented.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion duly made and seconded, Chairperson Dunphy adjourned the meeting at 9:20 PM.

Brian Dunphy, 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