

~~be addressed later in the meeting under Any Other Business.~~

(Arrive Derek Delacourt, 6:15 PM)

Ms. Thomasson clarified that a Public Hearing was not being held on any other properties at this time. Chairperson Thompson explained that Hearings were not scheduled until 60 days after transmittal of the Preliminary Report to the State.

Mr. Delacourt explained that one year after the Public Hearing is held, the Committee would submit its Final Report and recommendation.

Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race, reminded the Committee that with respect to 1585 S. Rochester Road, City Council had requested input back within 180 days after forwarding the matter to the Study Committee. She noted it was scheduled for the February Public Hearing but that one needed to move forward and faster, it did not have a whole year.

Mr. Delacourt noted that both 1585 S. Rochester Road and 2371 S. Livernois Road had been forwarded to the Study Committee by City Council with a response requested within 180 days.

Chairperson Thompson explained those matters would proceed in accordance with the resolution passed by City Council.

~~This matter was Discussed~~

8. NEW BUSINESS

- 8A. 2009-0437 2371 S. Livernois Road (HDSC File #04-006)
- Preliminary Report

Chairperson Thompson stated the Committee had received copies of a Preliminary Report, noting this study was begun based upon a request for delisting that was forwarded from City Council.

Mr. Delacourt stated the property owner had submitted a request to City Council indicating their concern with the original designation and whether or not the property and the house met the criteria. The basic argument was that it was a defective procedure when it was listed, and even if there was not a defective procedure, it did not meet the criteria for designation. Council had referred the matter to the Committee for study. The Committee followed the normal procedure in sending it to the consultant, who drafted the Preliminary Report which had been provided for the Committee's review. A recommendation was included for the Committee's review and discussion.

Mr. Delacourt asked for comments from the Committee on the draft Preliminary Report, the recommendation from the consultant, and how they would like to proceed.

Chairperson Thompson thought the Preliminary Report looked solid, noting the Committee had briefly discussed the property at the December meeting. He asked if the Committee was ready to accept the Report and transmit it to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).

Mr. Delacourt reminded the Committee that even if the Report was submitted to SHPO, they still had the opportunity to revise the conclusion or the recommendation as part of the Final Report process. That can be done at any time.

Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race, stated she had read the report and had similar comments to the comments she made about 1585 S. Rochester Road. In fact, she was bothered that the report read almost identical to that one in some respects. She had a problem with the conclusion from the standpoint of it saying things were different from what the committee originally thought. She did not think we knew what the committee originally thought. It is not the same as "previously defined". The house has always looked the same. She had trouble with the style of architecture because it truly has the appearance of a Greek Revival Plantation style piece and has always looked that way. If one looked that up, as she was not an expert in the field, she was curious if there was perhaps a mistake because it talks about it being a Colonial Revival style. It has the appearances, but not the same as the plantation by any means. Again, there were not that many examples talked about in Rochester Hills for one thing of that style. When it talked about Criteria B about moving a house and not meeting National Register Standards that again is addressing it in today's context, not in the context of when it was moved where it had no obligation or requirement to meet National Register criteria to be designated. To state that is one of the reasons that it failed is not really appropriate. That may be what happens today, but it certainly was not at the time it was designated. Again, she has a problem when the conclusion says it was not what it was thought to be by the original Study Committee, because it is exactly what it was defined as by the original Study Committee. We do not know what they were thinking or they did not have as much to research, but we have not shown either in this report very much research. She also was not sure she could agree with the conclusion just because there was not a lot known about Jack Burns as an architect or that we had not found a lot of evidence or he was insignificant for the time. She stated he did the "Black and White Cow" house, but was he really a well thought of architect at that time or very prominent she did not know as that would take some more research. Maybe there is more that can be found to add to this Report, but it disturbed her a little that the Committee would say they agreed it did not have any significance or it was insignificant. That same thing about Rochester Road and that was what bothered her about the report in both cases.

Mr. Hannick stated the Committee looked at older homes that the owners had made changes to because they liked a particular style which changed the look of the house. He questioned how that was reviewed or if it followed the review standards versus reviewing a house that always looked the same. He commented if the house was moved or a porch or addition was added, that had an effect on the house. He stated if the Committee was operating under those guidelines, then this house did not fit the guidelines because it was moved, and had been changed drastically in its style. The style added by a former owner changed the original house. It was not the same as a house like the Brooks farm house in Troy, Michigan, south of the Kresge building, that house had not changed. He asked if the Van Hoosen farm house had changed or if additions had been added. He wanted to know where the Committee drew the line. He noted Mr. Webster's house was a historical house and asked if that house had had any changes.

(Enter John Dziurman, 6:23 PM)

Chairperson Thompson stated that in some instances additions were inappropriately added and they did change the structure. It also depended on when they were added, where the additions were located and if they had been approved by the Historic Districts Commission.

Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race, stated that both this property and the other were designated after they had been moved and after they had been changed. Since the time of designation back in 1978, nothing had changed. That is what one is judging it on, not what it looked like when it sat at the corner of Auburn and Rochester Road. That is not what was being talked about. What was being talked about is the structure as it existed in 1978 on the property known at 2371 S. Livernois. That is what one should be judging its significance against. Yes, properties have changed, but they were not designated, or even the Rochester Road one, it was changed but changed in 1971 and then designated in 1978. So the people in 1978 who looked at these properties looked at the histories of them and designated them at that point for certain reasons. But if it was for an architectural style, they were designated for the style at that particular point in time.

Dr. Stamps stated he heard Ms. Hill clearly about imposing modern day criteria on a former decision. He wondered if there were times when it could be said that maybe they had made the decision but they did not have all the information.

Mr. Delacourt stated that unfortunately no documentation was included from the original designation in this instance. The survey sheet available for the structure did not list the year of construction for the house. The original Study Committee report does not identify why, and the current Study Committee did not have the benefit of that information to know what criteria or standard was used to qualify. The only thing the Committee can look at is what stands today.

Dr. Stamps stated even though he understood Ms. Hill's comments, and the Committee had to be careful about judging on a different set of standards, maybe sometimes that had to be done. He asked if the house was really that significant. He referred to the comment about the architect, and noted if the architect was a significant architect, the Committee would have known that. He commented that to say "we should save it because he was a great architect", and pointed out that most great architects get their name listed in the Architects of Michigan or Architects of America or some other publication. He thought the architect probably did not reach the level of significance that would justify. This is in part why the Committee turned to a knowledgeable consultant, and took the consultant's word for it. If someone could provide new information that indicated that "this was designed by the architect who built the twin towers in New York" then the Committee would have to consider that information.

Chairperson Thompson stated the original 1978 Study Committee did a good job considering how many of the properties they designated remained designated. However, they had looser standards at that time and he asked what criteria this Study Committee should set and whether the Committee was obligated by the standards that were almost non-existent then or apply the current standards. He did not think he had a definite answer, but would not want to see all properties designated in 1978 coming back requesting delisting.

Mr. Delacourt stated that research done validated over 95% of what was designated in 1978 although those properties did not have individual reports from 1978. He commented that this property and the 1585 S. Rochester Road property were both probably marginal by today's standards, although he did not have the benefit of understanding what the standards were in 1978.

Chairperson Thompson did not want to criticize what had been done in 1978 because they did a wonderful job considering there were not a lot of guidelines at that time. He agreed that 95% of what had been designated was still standing and solid.

Dr. Stamps recalled that the Historic Districts Commission stated at every meeting that they made decisions in accordance with the National Register Department of Interior guidelines. If the Committee follows those standards, they could be holding the buildings to a higher standard than what they were originally designated under.

Mr. Dziurman noted he had arrived late and had not heard the earlier conversation, but stated he could assure the Committee that the original Study Committee did not

have that information in 1978. With respect to moving buildings, he commented there had been a number of buildings moved in the Community, although he was not a proponent of that. He gave a lot of credence to the original Study Committee and the good job they did. He commented he had not had an opportunity to read the entire Preliminary Report, and asked if the report indicated the property did not meet the National Register criteria. He reminded the Committee that the State allowed a Community to retain its own local district, and it did not have to be the National District.

Mr. Delacourt stated that the Preliminary Report concluded the house was not significant in architecture.

Dr. Stamps noted Mr. Dziurman was an architect and asked if Mr. Dziurman thought the house was significant. Mr. Dziurman stated he knew the building and he always thought it was a nice looking building. Dr. Stamps agreed it was a lovely house.

Mr. Dziurman referred to the National Twist Drill property and the consultant's opinion that the entire site should be recommended for designation, but that was not what happened with the Stiles School because the State said the Committee could do that.

Dr. Stamps asked if the State had responded on the Stiles School.

Mr. Delacourt clarified the State had indicated the Committee could suggest that type of a district, but had not said they would agree with it.

Mr. Dziurman stated he was trying to relate that to the report where the consultant made a comment that he normally would support.

Mr. Delacourt clarified the difference between the Stiles School property and the National Twist property was that the recommendation for the Stiles School included all the portions of the building that contributed to its integrity. With respect to the National Twist Drill property, the portions that were being excluded were also considered contributing portions. That was what the consultant based her recommendations on.

Mr. Dziurman stated that the National Register standards are very clear the entire property should be included in the designation. He was confused by the State because they have been sending mixed signals over the last few years and did not appear to be following the guidelines.

Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race, stated she did not say this was not being suggested for significance because of the architect. What she disputed, debated and questioned was the fact about what criteria one needs to follow in this designation.

Frankly, it was open to what it used to be prior to 1992 when the State Act made a change that said "shall be guided by" and then in 2002 SHPO set forth some criteria rules. We are prior to either one of those and that is what allows us to look back at the report that was there and decide were those people correct in the fact that they felt this particular structure was worth saving and preserving. They felt it was and the City at that time felt it was. Does that make it any lesser of an entity today than it was then and in trying to apply the moving criteria when she said right in the report that it has no bearing so to speak, and all of a sudden she contradicts herself in this report. Really, the question is "does this body feel that it still has the significance that it had then" because there was no other. She's saying "we don't think it does compared to what they thought" and that was still her argument about what was it identified as and what was identified as a certain structure, which is still the exact same structure today. She did not think that argument held water. She would like to see anything else that we could obtain to make the report a better report about the structure. To come to the conclusion that it was not significant and we should not have it listed anymore, she had a difficult time with.

Chairperson Thompson stated it appeared the Committee would like more time to review this more thoroughly. He suggested the matter could be rescheduled for the next meeting.

Dr. Stamps stated he could agree to delist it and pointed out it was still a beautiful house.

Mr. Delacourt suggested that the consultant could be invited to attend the next meeting to discuss the research and report.

Chairperson Thompson reminded the Committee the Public Hearings were scheduled for the February meeting, and he did not know if there would be sufficient time to address additional Agenda items prior to the Historic Districts Commission meeting beginning at 7:00 PM. He suggested the Committee could consider a special meeting with the consultant or schedule this matter for the Regular March Meeting. He asked that Staff contact the consultant to see when she was available to meet with the Committee.

This matter was Discussed

~~2P 2010-0047 Election of Officers - 2010
 Chairperson
 - Vice Chairperson
 - Secretary
 Dr. Stamps asked if the current officers were willing to continue serving, or if~~