



Rochester Hills

Minutes

Historic Districts Commission

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

Chairperson Jason Thompson, Vice Chairperson Julie Granthen
Members: Darlene Janulis, Kelly Lyons, Susan McKinnon, Steve Reina,
Dr. Richard Stamps, Tom Stephens, Charles Tischer

Thursday, May 11, 2017

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Thompson called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Auditorium.

ROLL CALL

Present 9 - Julie Granthen, Darlene Janulis, Kelly Lyons, Susan McKinnon, Steve Reina, Richard Stamps, Tom Stephens, Jason Thompson and Charles Tischer

Also Present: Kristine Kidorf, Kidorf Preservation Consulting
Sara Roediger, Director, Planning & Economic Development
Kelly Winters, Deputy Director, Building
Sandi DiSipio, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2017-0214](#) April 13, 2017 Regular Meeting Minutes

Correction to Minutes: *Under Any Other Business, when discussing how to inform homebuyers of historic designation, add the following sentence - "When a homeowner wishes to sell their property, they are asked to fill out a disclosure form. Realtors who list properties in Rochester and Rochester Hills could add a line to this form saying "this property is in a historic district", and check yes or no. That way any buyers would be informed before a sale."*

A motion was made by Stamps, seconded by Stephens, that this matter be Approved as Amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Granthen, Lyons, McKinnon, Reina, Stamps, Stephens, Thompson and Tischer

Abstain 1 - Janulis

COMMUNICATIONS

No communications were brought forward.

PUBLIC COMMENT for Items not on the Agenda

No public comment was heard.

NEW BUSINESS

2017-0228

FILE NO. HDC#17-014

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness - New Construction

Location: 1385 Washington

Parcel: 15-01-327-003

Owner: Jason Witt/Emily Fogler

(Reference: Staff Report dated May 4, 2017 by Kristine Kidorf, Kidorf Preservation Consulting, and associated documents were placed on file in the Planning and Economic Development Department and by reference becomes part of the record thereof.)

Chairperson Thompson read the request for the record and asked Ms. Kidorf to summarize the staff report.

Ms. Kidorf explained this application is for the construction of a new house on a presently vacant 3 acre site located on the northwest corner of Washington Road and Mallon Court. It is in the northern section of the Stoney Creek Historic District, within the part of the district that was suggested for removal in the 2002 survey. The parcel is surrounded by new houses and newer subdivisions. The proposed house is a 2 story with an attached one story garage wing. It is proposed to be clad in a dark red brick with black aluminum clad windows and beige trim. The surrounding houses appear to have footprint sizes about the same as the proposed house. The angled siting on the parcel does not appear to be unusual. The front setback is compatible with the neighboring houses and appropriate for this part of the district. A new 18-foot wide concrete driveway is proposed to curve from Mallon Court to the garage, with a concrete walkway from the driveway to the front of the house. Concrete driveways and walkways are compatible with this part of the district. The proposed aluminum clad arch top and other types of windows that are shown on the elevation appear to be compatible with this part of the district. The applicants are retaining the split rail fence that runs along Washington Road.

Mr. Reina asked if the application is complete enough to make a decision tonight.

Ms. Kidorf responded yes, but there are a couple of places where the elevation and floor plan don't match up, and the elevation shows some stone cladding, but it wasn't specified in the application. This should be clarified by the applicant. The Board could either approve the plan as proposed or have staff check, once the applicants get their final details worked out, to make sure it materially conforms to what is approved. Any deviations would need to be approved by the Commission.

Chairperson Thompson invited the applicants to come forward and summarize their request.

Mr. Jason Witt and Ms. Emily Fogler came forward. Mr. Witt circulated pictures

of the stone cladding to the members.

Dr. Stamps asked the homeowner if they knew the house was in an historic district when they purchased the property.

Mr. Witt said he was not aware, and made a few inquiries beforehand, but was told the property was not in a historic district.

Dr. Stamps indicated Mr. Witt reaffirmed an ongoing problem with realtors. Perhaps a sign needs to be installed at the start of the historic district.

Ms. Janulis commented it appears the way the house is laid out, it will really work well with the neighbors and other houses in the area. The applicant did a good job of sizing up the neighborhood and putting a house in this area that would benefit the neighborhood.

Ms. Kidorf commented there is a small discrepancy between the plan and the elevation of the bay just to the left of the garages. On the plan, it's a flat sided bay, and on the elevation it's a rounded tower.

Mr. Witt clarified it will be a rounded tower. He displayed an elevation/site plan that depicts the tower.

Ms. Kidorf suggested if the Board is considering issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness, it be tied to the proposed floor plan that has been presented tonight.

MOTION by Janulis, seconded by Reina, in the matter of File No. HDC17-014, that the Historic Districts Commission **APPROVES** the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new house at 1385 Washington Road in the Stoney Creek Historic District, Parcel Identification Number 15-01-327-003, with the following Findings and Conditions:

Findings:

1. *The proposed house is in the Stoney Creek Historic District and is compatible in massing, size, scale and materials with this part of the district;*
2. *Prior to obtaining a building permit the applicant must provide staff the following for review and approval:*
 - a) *Final site plan that shows the exact front, side and rear setbacks, existing trees that will be retained and removed, proposed trees, proposed gardens, proposed driveways and walkways, patios or other lot treatments proposed;*
 - b) *Final elevations and floor plans of the proposed house; and*
3. *The proposed house construction is in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Standards, in particular standards numbers 9 and 10 as follows:*
 - 9) *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall*

be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Condition:

The Board incorporates by reference, the specific plan that was displayed at tonight's meeting.

A motion was made by Janulis, seconded by Reina, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Granthen, Janulis, McKinnon, Reina, Stamps, Stephens, Thompson and Tischer

Abstain 1 - Lyons

2006-0105

FILE NO. HDC#99-011

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness or Notice to Proceed for demolition of existing house

Location: 1841 Crooks Rd.

Parcel: 15-20-428-003

Owner: Frederick & Kathryn Dunn

(Reference: Staff Report dated May 4, 2017 by Kristine Kidorf, Kidorf Preservation Consulting, and associated documents were placed on file in the Planning and Economic Development Department and by reference becomes part of the record thereof.)

Chairperson Thompson invited the applicants to come forward and summarize their request. Ms. Kay Dunn, 1841 Crooks Rd., property owner and applicant, distributed to the members a few quotes for work she received after the demolition application was filed. She has not yet received quotes for the fireplace stonework or the siding. Ms. Jill Rubin, the applicant's daughter, explained the top page is an estimate for foundation repair, next is a list of police reports for the subject property, and the third part is a 2009 letter from an attorney and a letter from a structural engineer/builder that supports what the structural engineer/builder stated at last month's meeting.

Chairperson Thompson opened the floor for Board discussion.

Ms. Janulis indicated she read all the paperwork contained in the file and didn't get a good feeling that the homeowners did everything they could to protect the property or that they worked in concert with the City. She has more trust in the City's reports that say the integrity of the house has been lost and there is nothing there. She explained it was very discouraging for her, knowing the homeowners are very frustrated, when someone says the Commission imposes their desires on the property owners. She feels that attacks her character as well - that she makes decisions based on a feeling rather than fact. This bothered her after going through 12 years of meetings and discussions and where the discussions were even taken to another court. She is at the point of

trying to salvage what is left of the property as the house is ruined. Having the house torn down and allowing the owner to rebuild after they have done everything they can to allow the house to proceed to the condition it's in - what can she do as a Commissioner to at least salvage the barn? She was told by the administration that the barn is in good condition and is used for storage. She feels she should vote to allow the owners to take the house down, but is wondering what the Commission can do to ensure that the barn, in its historical preservation, would remain as is. Clearly, what the Commission has been doing, didn't work or the house would not be in the condition it's in. She's not sure if a condition could be added to maintain the barn and that inspections be done periodically to assure it be maintained. She has lost confidence in the homeowners - if the Commission helps them so that they can build a house they want, will they at least maintain the barn? She does not mean to be disrespectful, but she has lost confidence that there will be some movement made to at least maintain the barn in good condition.

Ms. McKinnon said she read all the paperwork that had to do with this property. It has been an extensive issue. She was surprised to read that the property was purchased in 2000 for \$245,000, and then three years later the property was listed for sale for \$550,000, which makes no sense. She's been confused about why the owners did not continue on with some other quotes from other realtors about what the correct value for the home was and try to proceed with the sale. The owners have said they wanted to tear the house down and rebuild, and did not know it was historic, which is a shame. They had five children; that house was not adequate for this many people. She is confused as to why the owners went ahead to work on this house, which was not going to be appropriate for the family. Pictures and comments by people who were in the house when Ms. O'Neill lived there say it was in good condition at that time. The Root's only had the house for a year. This deterioration clearly has occurred in the past 17 years. The current owner has not acted in good faith over time. Neighbors are not happy because the house has been so neglected; only the grass has been cut. The owners have been doing "demolition by neglect". Options have been given as to how to proceed on this situation. The owners could rehabilitate the house, which seems unlikely; they could apply for the Notice to Proceed for Demolition, which they are doing. Ms. McKinnon feels that the owner has created their own economic hardship by not completing exterior work to the property that has been requested by the Commission, nor have they met deadlines. Another option would be to redesignate the property as non-historic, and the fourth option was to sell the property to a new owner who will rehabilitate and maintain the property. If the property were to be demolished, a home that looks the same and is in the same footprint as the existing home, would have to be built.

Mr. Thompson clarified that the HDC can't change the designation of the property - that is a different process.

Mr. Reina asked what the typical length of a real estate agreement is.

Ms. Rubin replied 90 days. When she had the house listed for \$550,000, she had it listed through Prudential, and had non-stop calls. The minute they heard the house was historic, they were no longer interested. Potential buyers wanted

to split the parcel and build homes. Most people wanted to tear the house and barn down.

Mr. Reina then inquired if the house was ever listed again.

Ms. Rubin commented she put it on Zillow after the last meeting to see if she would receive any calls. She had two builders call, one said he would get the City to take it off the historic list and one was looking to split the property. Her parents love the barn and don't want it to go.

Ms. Dunn explained one of the reasons she put it up for sale is that she was just frustrated with everything, but then realized she loves the property and doesn't want to sell.

Mr. Tischer asked if only the house is proposed for demolition, and the barn will be left as is.

Ms. Dunn confirmed this statement.

After seeing photos of the exterior of the house from 2003, he is wrestling with this decision as the house looked in much better shape then, and it's terrible now. He believes things could have been done in the past to help alleviate some of the existing problems, and then we wouldn't be here tonight making a decision.

Ms. Dunn stated when they bought the property, they didn't know it was historic. When they found out it was historic, they came before the HDC with an architect. He kept the house exactly as it was and added stone pillars on both sides. She believes the Commission said it met the Secretary of Interior Standards, but they didn't like the proposal. She did what the Board told her to do, but the Commission still said no. This killed her hope for a house of her dreams.

Dr. Stamps stated he was on the Commission at that time, and he did vote no. It wasn't because the Board didn't like it - it was a question of the design and size of the bookend pillars. They just overwhelmed the historic structure. It wasn't that the Board didn't like the design, the Guidelines require additions/renovations have to be compatible in size and shape, etc. The Commission's interpretation of the Guidelines did not find the renovations to be compatible.

Ms. Lyons asked if these plans were from 2006.

Ms. Dunn replied the plans were reviewed by the Commission in 2002, not long after she bought the property and started to renovate it. The previous owners had gutted the inside of the house. Ms. Dunn believes they had a plan approved, but never renovated. They sold the house to the Dunn's because it was too much work.

Dr. Stamps has struggled with this issue, recognizes a bit of the dilemma the owner is in, and hopes the owner appreciates the dilemma the Commission is

in. He is leaning toward denying the permit to demolish.

Ms. Rubin pointed out the Eby historic home was demolished because it was unsafe and unfit. The cost to repair this house was enormous. The property owner of 820 Auburn Road didn't know the house was historic when they bought it and they were allowed to demolish it. The previous case regarding 1385 Washington - the owners didn't know it was historic and were allowed to demolish it. Ms. Rubin indicated her parents didn't know their house was historic when they purchased it, and had every intention of maintaining the barn and building a safe and proper structure for their family. The City did allow the homeowner to remove the additions that weren't built with any permits. Precedent has already been set, especially with the 820 Auburn home.

Ms. Dunn doesn't think there is anything original left to the house, except three windows.

Ms. Kidorf clarified that 820 E. Auburn was on the potential historic list, so it wasn't a designated local historic district, and City Council opted not to have the Historic Districts Study Committee study the building. So, that isn't the same situation as this at all. The house on Washington was in a local historic district, but it was built in 1967 and considered a non-contributing or a non-historic structure. Each case is different and each case is considered carefully.

Chairperson Thompson opened the public hearing at 7:36 p.m. and asked if anyone wishes to speak.

Mr. Glenn Moore, 2195 S. Bretton Dr., Rochester Hills, MI, came forward and said he is adjacent to the subject property. He has lived there since 1989 and has seen the house when it was originally purchased. It was a perfectly functioning house. As far as no one knowing it was an historical house - everyone in town knows the story of Tootsie the horse, and everyone knew Ms. O'Neill had a problem with the City with the historical designation. If in the future, it's thought it would be better to replace the house with a functional structure, he suggests keeping it in the same spirit as what it originally was in 1905 - taking the original materials from the outside of the house and putting it on the new elevation; this would be good. What makes this house important is the front elevation with the four windows and porch, and around the side. He mentioned a house on Avon that was moved back from the street and another on Hamlin & Livernois that was rehabilitated using the same materials.

Mr. Reina asked Mr. Moore if the house was permitted to remain as is, what his reaction would be and what's the impact on his property value.

Mr. Moore feels the way the house sits right now, it's historical to the area. Everyone knows this house and it's used as a landmark. He has no problem if the house remains on site.

Ms. Dunn reiterated she did not know the house was historic, nor did her husband, until they started fixing up and one of the neighbors brought it to Mr. Dunn's attention.

Mr. Thompson commented he has been on the Board for more than 15 years, and this has been a consistent issue with purchasers and property owners finding out after the fact that the house/property is historic.

Mr. Tischer asked the applicant if the demolition request is denied, what will she do next.

Ms. Rubin replied knock the house down and pay the fine. She has had two structural engineers and two builders out to the house, and the only thing original to the house is three windows and some of the interior. The outside wood is not the original wood. The front porch is not original.

Mr. Tischer is surprised the applicant came back to the HDC instead of City Council to try to get the property delisted.

Ms. Rubin responded that the delisting process takes over a year, and they wanted to get this done. Her parents want to live on this property, and if they wait another year, it will only get worse.

Mr. Kelly Winters, Deputy Director of the Building Department, came forward stating he highly recommends that the applicants do not demolish the house. Permits are required for demolition in order to protect a lot of things. If the applicant decides to go that route, the City has no recourse but to take the owner to court for it; the City does not want to go down that road. Mr. Winters commented whatever is decided tonight, that the applicant not demolish the house on their own as it will create a lot of work for the City and unpleasant circumstances for the owner.

Ms. Rubin mentioned a lot of houses in the historic district have been approved for LP siding, Marvin windows, asphalt roofs - that is not in the Interior Standards. So, if the subject home is not approved for demolition, would the Commission approve LP siding or Marvin windows making renovation more affordable? Ms. Dunn explained to replace the roof to original materials will be thousands of dollars. Is there some leeway in order to build the house so it's up to code without having to be cedar roof and historic windows?

Chairperson Thompson clarified decisions are made on a case by case basis, but the Commission would have to see a plan before any decisions on proposed materials are made.

Ms. Kidorf pointed out that the Secretary of Interior Standards does not say you can't have an asphalt shingle roof, and was surprised the applicant had a quote for a cedar shingle roof because the house currently has an asphalt shingle roof. Ms. Rubin indicated the asphalt was original and is underneath. According to the website, materials are supposed to go back to what was original. Ms. Kidorf clarified that the Secretary of Interior Standards do not make owners put back anything that is no longer existing. If the cedar shakes for the roof are already covered over with asphalt, the Commission could approve a new asphalt shingle roof. Ms. Kidorf does not know what LP siding is, so she can't address it. If the wood siding is deteriorated beyond repair, the Commission can look at alternate materials. Also, the Commission will need to look at the

existing windows and what the applicant wants to replace them with. Until an applicant brings in an application showing proposed materials, the Commission can't make a decision about what they will or will not approve. The Commission is willing to work with owners who are rehabilitating properties.

Ms. Dunn asked if she came back with a reasonable quote for a modern foundation, would the Commission approve it?

Ms. Kidorf explained the Commission can't make a decision until a specific plan from a contractor describing all materials and foundation work has been reviewed. She encouraged the applicant to work with an architect/builder who has experience with the Secretary of Interior Standards and return with a rehabilitation plan.

Ms. Rubin stated all the quotes she got for work were from people who do historic homes, including wood windows that were built to the historic standards. They were trying to keep the home the way it was originally because she thought that was what the Commission wanted.

Mr. Tom Rubin, related to both applicants, stated the biggest concern, as an outsider looking in, would be the salvation of the barn, as everyone notices the barn. No one even notices the house because it's behind overgrown bushes. He feels it would be in everyone's best interest if the house was knocked down, and another farm-style home of the same footprint was built in the same place. He indicated the City could perform periodic checks on the barn to make sure the integrity is there and nothing has changed. In order to make it all work, instead of going another 10 or 15 years of the home deteriorating, the house could be torn down and another home just like it could be built in the same location, so everything is the same. The barn is the biggest asset to the property.

Mr. Reina pointed out the applicants previously said they were interested in putting together a renovation plan using less expensive materials. He asked how long it would take to draw up the plan.

Ms. Rubin indicated the plans would not take long to complete. She added part of the problem is that part of the existing foundation is only 36 inches deep. Code now requires 42 inches. The whole foundation has to be replaced, the house has to be lifted up. We're talking from the bottom up, the whole house has to be taken apart.

Mr. Reina then asked if the applicant is saying they don't want to do renovations.

Ms. Rubin said they could do renovations and maybe use cinderblock instead of the stone and mortar. Ideally, the house would be torn down and another house built to get it to code. All the siding and walls have to be removed in order to restore the house. It seems more cost effective to use newer materials and maybe keep the original front windows. They could try and maintain as much as they can, but the wood is not original, two windows upstairs and one in the kitchen are original, the front porch is a cedar concrete block which is not

originally. All this has to be removed, but to get it to code, the house will have to be completely dismantled and put back together. That's the problem. If the Commission is not willing to let her parents demo the house, give them some leeway to make it work.

Mr. Winters indicated there is nothing in the code that requires this house be completely dismantled and built back up. The 36 inch footing that has been there since 1860 and hasn't caused the building to fall over or into the ground probably means that the foundation did what it was supposed to do. The current building code would not require the owners to remove the foundation and replace it. He stated there's also a code called an existing building code. There's nothing that drives anyone to take an existing structure and make it different. If the internal studs are fine, there are ways to make things comply on the inside. Nothing says the owner can't add additional studs on the inside of the existing studs to make the wall thicker or to make the insulation requirements. He suggested the owner get in touch with a historical architect to determine what needs to be done.

Ms. Lyons thanked the applicant for coming back and appreciates the effort that went into the due diligence. She said one thing that came out of the discussion tonight is that there are more options. She hopes the owners will continue to work with City staff and everyone can get to a place that's good for the property. Options have been set forth tonight that give the owner more flexibility in what can be done. Ms. Lyons suggested the owner take time to prepare detailed revised plans with the proposed renovations and materials, and bring them back for Commission review.

Mr. Reina referred to last month's meeting and discussion about the feasibility of salvaging the property, and he remembers it was the City's position that essentially the property wasn't renovateable. Is this a correct understanding?

Mr. Winters feels the question is how much money do you want to spend on it. You can bring any structure back, it depends on time and money. In the house's current state, Mr. Winters would not want to take on the project. It's to the point where it is overwhelming on where to start, including foundation work, structural and flooring work that affects the outside of the house, roofing, etc. Can it be done?? -- Sure it could be done.

Mr. Reina stated if the homeowner had a desire to have the Commission consider a renovation plan, but one that was more to the spirit of the Guidelines than the strict letter of them, would that make it more feasible?

Mr. Winters replied that the Building Department would not deny an approach like this. They would not have the ability to deny this type of approach. He was involved in the 2008/2009 addition/remodeling plans for the home before the plans was scrapped. So yes, rehabilitation can be done. With the HDC's blessing, the Building Department would have to issue the appropriate permits and inspections until the final certificate of occupancy was issued.

MOTION by Reina, seconded by McKinnon, Whereas the property at 1841 Crooks Road is a vital historic property, Whereas the homeowner has indicated

*a desire to have the Commission consider a renovation plan, Whereas this discussion is taking place against the backdrop of the request and submission of a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of this property, Whereas City staff has indicated that the renovation plan articulated in principle by the homeowner at this hearing is actually practicable, Whereas there's a desirability in preserving this property for current and future residents of the City of Rochester Hills, and that it's consistent with the will of the homeowner as they've expressed at this meeting to do, it's this Motion's conclusion as it relates to File No. HDC 99-011, that the Historic Districts Commission **DENIES** the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the property at 1841 Crooks Road , Parcel Identification Number 15-20-428-003, with the following findings:*

1) The proposed house demolition is not in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines, in particular standard number 2 as follows:

2) The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

The property owner asked for permission to speak prior to the vote: Ms. Dunn thinks the amount of money it's going to take to fix the house up -- it's not going to work. She just can't see fixing it up.

Mr. Reina said he must have misunderstood -- he thought the applicant was saying if the house was demolished, another home was going to be built there.

Ms. Dunn said she'd like that but she doesn't know what's going to happen. She believes that would be an easier fix than trying to renovate the old house. She invited everyone to come and see the house. She thinks it's going to cost way too much to fix it. She loves old, loves history, but thinks it's crazy.

Dr. Stamps is excited about the possibility of trying to renovate the house. He would feel much better leaving tonight saying let's look at a plan to renovate as opposed to demolish. If the homeowner feels it's beyond the realm, maybe they sell it and someone else comes up with a renovation program.

Ms. Janulis asked the applicant to come back with plans for the house she wanted and the price tag of that house as opposed to the renovation - at least the Commission would have real information they can make a decision on.

A motion was made by Reina, seconded by McKinnon, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 9 - Granthen, Janulis, Lyons, McKinnon, Reina, Stamps, Stephens, Thompson and Tischer

It is noted for the record the applicant/homeowner has left the meeting.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Granthen wrote a draft proclamation to honor Rochester's bicentennial, and asked if there were any changes. In the 5th Whereas, add "the Cobblestone Home Bakery", and in the last paragraph add the word "Commission". The Commissioners thanked Ms. Granthen for drafting the very well written document. It was suggested the proclamation be printed on letterhead, and Ms. Granthen will try and secure a date on a future Rochester City Council meeting for presentation. She invited all Commissioners to attend if possible.

MOTION by Janulis, seconded by Lyons, to approve the proclamation with the two additions to be printed on letterhead.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED

Dr. Stamps indicated he is tired of hearing homeowners say they didn't know their property was historic, and asked what the Commission/City can do to ensure when there is a transfer of property from one owner to the next that the historic designation is recognized. He mentioned the number of historic structures isn't that high. Ms. Kidorf pointed out that every Commission struggles with this problem, and every applicant who gets caught, that is always their excuse. She mentioned in New York City, the street signs in historic districts are a different color. Staff could have discussions with the Assessing/Treasury Departments to see what could be done to flag these properties. This information needs to be recorded on the property's title work. Realtors could also include a line on the disclosure form about whether or not the property is historic. Dr. Stamps suggested that Rochester Hills be the community that comes up with a solution to this issue. He suggested this issue be placed on a future agenda as a discussion item, that staff come up with suggestions on how to resolve this problem, and that staff develop a list of the number of structures contained in the districts and how many of them are historic. Dr. Stamps offered to talk to the realtors. He also suggested to talk to the City Attorney about a possible solution. Mr. Tischer offered to be on a subcommittee to study this issue.

Ms. Dunn returned to the meeting and asked to speak. She apologized for leaving the meeting earlier, and indicated she plans to return to the Commission in about two months with house plans. The Board encouraged her to work with Ms. Kidorf when developing these plans. Ms. Kidorf suggested Ms. Dunn work with an architect who will be able to develop a scope of work and take some of the burden off the applicant.

NEXT MEETING DATE

The next Regular Meeting is scheduled for June 8, 2017.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business, and upon Motion by Reina, seconded by Lyons, the Chairperson adjourned the Regular Meeting at 8:30 p.m.

*Jason Thompson, Chairperson
Historic Districts Commission
City of Rochester Hills*

Sandi DiSipio, Recording Secretary