



Rochester Hills Minutes

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

Historic Districts Commission

Chairperson Melinda Hill, Vice Chairperson Brian R. Dunphy
Members: Maria-Teresa L. Cozzolino, John Dziurman, Micheal Kilpatrick, Paul Miller,
Michael Sinclair, Dr. Richard Stamps, Jason Thompson

Thursday, June 12, 2008

7:30 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

Present 8 - Melinda Hill, Richard Stamps, Micheal Kilpatrick, John Dziurman, Maria-Teresa Cozzolino, Jason Thompson, Paul Miller and Michael Sinclair

Absent 1 - Brian Dunphy

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

3. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Chairperson Hill announced a quorum was present.

4. STATEMENT OF STANDARDS

Chairperson Hill read the following Statement of Standards for the record:

"All decisions made by the Historic Districts Commission follow the guidelines of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, MCL Section 399.204, and City Code Section 118-164."

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5A. 2008-0285 Minutes of the February 14, 2008 Regular Meeting

Chairperson Hill asked for any comments or corrections regarding the February 14, 2008 Regular Meeting Minutes. Upon hearing none, she called for a motion to

approve.

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

Aye 8 - Hill, Stamps, Kilpatrick, Dziurman, Cozzolino, Thompson, Miller and Sinclair

Absent 1 - Dunphy

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the February 14, 2008 Regular Historic Districts Commission Meeting be approved as presented.

5B. 2008-0286 Minutes of the April 10, 2008 Work Session

Chairperson Hill asked for any comments or corrections regarding the April 10, 2008 Regular Meeting Minutes. Upon hearing none, she called for a motion to approve.

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

Aye 8 - Hill, Stamps, Kilpatrick, Dziurman, Cozzolino, Thompson, Miller and Sinclair

Absent 1 - Dunphy

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the April 10, 2008 Historic Districts Commission Work Session be approved as presented.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

Chairperson Hill called for any announcements or communications. She noted the Commissioners had received some correspondence from the National Trust for Historic Preservation. No other announcements or communications were presented.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT (Non-Agenda Items)

Chairperson Hill asked if there were any public comments on any non-agenda items. There were no public comments.

8. NEW BUSINESS

8A. 2008-0287 971 Runyon Road (HDC File #04-003)

Applicant: Mark Kowal

Sidwell: 15-01-352-027

District: Stoney Creek

Request: Revision to Certificate of Appropriateness

Chairperson Hill read the request for the record, and invited the applicant to come forward to the presenter's table. She stated the Commission would hear the Staff Report first, followed by a presentation from the applicant of his request. She

suggested the Commissioner's ask questions as the presentations are made.

Mr. Delacourt explained that Mr. Kowal had appeared before the Historic Districts Commission (HDC) in September 2004 with a request to do some work associated with his property located in the Stoney Creek Historic District. That work was approved, and included the renovation of the front porch on the house back to some historically accurate photographs provided by the applicant.

Mr. Delacourt stated that Mr. Kowal had done some of the work on the resource, and recently came back with a request to ask if the HDC would reconsider some of the materials he was using to reconstruct the front porch. He indicated Mr. Kowal had submitted the appropriate materials, and was before the Commission to make that request. He explained the changes included the use of stone as opposed to wood on the porch posts. He referred to the detailed packet of information provided by the applicant.

Mr. Kowal stated they had been working on the house for four years and doing the items originally submitted, such as the new roof, and paint colors, and trying to get everything back to what that neighborhood deserved with a nice residence. He explained as they started to get the porch opened up, and to continue on with what they had originally presented to the Commission, the scale seemed a little different with the post height. He stated what they wanted to do was use culture stone bases, noting they had taken out some of the rotted wood from the original supports, and put some metal posts in on the original footings to get the posts boosted up. He indicated the culture stonework would match the exposed stone foundation of the house, and thus bring the posts up to the height to just above the rail height, with a tapered wood column top rather than a square column, from three feet up to the 7.6-foot header of the porch.

Mr. Kowal stated they would still do the rail the same way, and put in wooden stairs in place of the old concrete steps and handrails that had been put in back in the 1960s. He commented that everything, other than the column base and the tapered wooden tops, would be the same as originally submitted.

Chairperson Hill noticed that it appeared the applicant would be doing a side portico along the porch on the side of the home. Mr. Kowal explained that was just detail of the side elevation. Chairperson Hill asked if that work had been done. Mr. Kowal stated the drawing of the back depicted the addition to the house with an overhang that had some rather spindly-looking square posts and they thought they would match those to give the house a consistent look from the front to the back. He noted the addition was put on 14 years ago.

Mr. Dziurman told the applicant he appreciated the work they were doing, noting he had driven by the home and looked at what had been done. He understood the applicant ran into some problems with rotting wood in the porch posts. He

commented it was true that Craftsman-style homes did have various types of supports on their porches. He stated the applicant's home was part of a Nationally Registered Historic Site as the entire Stoney Creek Historic District was a Nationally Registered site. He noted at one time the applicant's house was the cook's residence for the Van Hoosen Farm. He stated the house was a contributing site and structure to that District, and he indicated he would prefer the applicant use the original posts for the restoration of the porch.

Mr. Dziurman stated he had done some research for the applicant, and as an architect, he understood what the applicant had encountered with the supports and the rotting. One of the things he thought the applicant might be interested in doing, depending on what the rest of the Commission thought, but suggested if the applicant stayed with his original idea, he could use a product that was a PVC. He had a catalog and had spoken to the people at Dillman & Upton, and they had the product available. He explained the applicant could put up the support, and encase it with the PVC product, which was seamless and which could be painted. He explained if it was properly done, with a proper base, he did not think the applicant would encounter any further rotting problems. He stated it was a substitute material, and it was an approved substitute material.

Mr. Dziurman stated the Study Committee had met earlier in the day with a representative from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and had reviewed various matters related to the Study Committee's work. However, it was very clear that the SHPO wanted both the Committee and the Commission to use the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the National Register criteria. He explained that criteria was much more stringent than what the Commission had approved in the past.

Mr. Dziurman stated those comments from the SHPO related to the applicant's request, particularly because the applicant's residence was part of a National Register Site and District, and which was probably the most important District in the Community. He pointed out that because the applicant's structure was a contributing resource, he felt the applicant's original scheme was much more appropriate. He stated he would be happy to discuss the substitute materials with the applicant.

Mr. Miller asked if the river rock was a veneer. The applicant indicated that was correct. Mr. Miller asked what the applicant proposed to use as a substrate to place the river rock on. Mr. Kowal stated it would be wolmanized plywood, 3/4-quarter base structure, a metal mesh, and a scratch coat of mortar. Mr. Miller referred to the picture provided by the applicant and asked if that depicted the house as it currently was. Mr. Kowal indicated the color picture included with the new submittal materials depicted the house after they removed the window and siding enclosure from the front of the house and exposed what they had to work with.

(Arrive Mr. Dunphy: 7:43 PM)

Present 9 - Melinda Hill, Richard Stamps, Micheal Kilpatrick, John Dziurman, Brian Dunphy, Maria-Teresa Cozzolino, Jason Thompson, Paul Miller and Michael Sinclair

2008-0287

Mr. Miller commented that it appeared that the porch posts sat on the floor and there were other posts underneath the porch. Mr. Kowal stated there were some old scraps of barn wood that were 4 x 6's. He explained the porch had dropped 6-inches from the rot. He stated in digging around the house for the footings, the concrete around the house was four feet. He indicated even the mass that was the front steps were solid-poured, 3-foot by 4-foot high. He stated from the ground up, the porch was still pretty stable. He described his proposed construction technique of putting the metal posts in, bracing them to the floor joists, carrying the weight to the top up to the overhang, to get the original portions to be more stable.

Mr. Miller asked if the metal posts would be offset from where the original barn timbers were. Mr. Kowal stated when they took apart the enclosure, they found the shadowing in the paint of the original posts. He noted the porch has a tongue and groove deck, and the four new posts will be evenly spaced across the front in the same positions as the originals posts were.

Mr. Miller asked if the applicant would then close that off so that the metal posts would not be seen, and essentially what the applicant was proposing was a decorative veneer from the ground line up. Mr. Kowal stated three feet off the deck of the porch, which would be just above the rail height. Mr. Miller noted that was two feet higher than the deck of the porch.

Mr. Miller asked about the sides. Mr. Kowal stated it would be similar. Mr. Miller clarified the addition to the home was built 14 years ago. Mr. Kowal stated it was. Mr. Miller asked if the applicant had experienced any rotting problems with those wood posts. Mr. Kowal stated the quality of the construction of the addition was a little lacking, and anticipated he would have an issue. He noted that his proposed plan was to make the whole house look consistent, and there was not an issue with it at this time. He commented that if the Commission did not agree with his proposal for the back of the home, he would just focus on the front porch.

Dr. Stamps thought the applicant had a lovely house, and he appreciated the fact the applicant was making the effort to maintain it. Initially, he looked at the renderings and thought the stonework would match with the foundation of the building, but when he looked at the older picture of the house, he questioned if there was a way

for the applicant to make it look the way it was rather than recreating something new and different. He thanked the applicant for taking care of the house, and noted he would like to come up with the best way to make the house look like it was or should be.

Chairperson Hill stated she shared Mr. Dziurman's concerns. She explained that the criteria had changed over the years by shifting and including more constraints. She stated the Stoney Creek Village itself, by being on the National Register, was a very important asset to the City. She noted the applicant's home, by being one of the contributing resources, helped to strengthen the Stoney Creek Village as a whole and the Historic District.

Chairperson Hill noted that part of the National Park Services' Standards for Rehabilitation criteria indicate that "distinctive features, finishes, construction techniques and examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved". She noted the Standards also indicated that "deteriorated home features shall be repaired rather than replaced" and "where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design".

Chairperson Hill agreed there were many styles of bungalows, but the stone and tapered pillars were much more in the Arts and Crafts portion of bungalows. She noted the construction that existed on the applicant's porch, as shown in the photograph the applicant got from the Museum and submitted with his original application, were really the distinctive and defining features for the front of the applicant's house. She noted that once that was changed, it would give the house a totally different appearance. She agreed the applicant's proposal was seen around the Community; it was a lovely feature, and she liked it, but she did not feel the applicant would be keeping the home in the historic manner that it should be as a contributing structure within the District.

Chairperson Hill thought the applicant's original proposal was perfect in comparing it to the historic photograph. She noted it fit the home and it was the home. She commented that what the applicant was requesting now was really changing the character of the house, and she would have a difficult time approving the request.

Chairperson Hill stated that there were several structures in the City that were being considered for delisting noting those homes were listed back in 1978 when the criteria for listing was less complex. She noted that approvals were given for additions and other changes that have now put those structures in the position that they should be delisted because they no longer fit the historic criteria. She stated the applicant's house was not in that category, but if the Commission approved the applicant's request, she felt the Commission would be remiss and would be putting the home toward a non-contributing resource because the main, distinctive features of the house would have been taken away.

Mr. Dziurman said he hoped the applicant would get Michigan tax credits for the work they were doing, noting the applicant could get a 25% credit. Mr. Kowal stated they were looking into the tax credits. Mr. Dziurman stated if the applicant did the work as proposed, they would not get the tax credits. He explained the State would use the same criteria he and the Chair had mentioned. He thought that should be an important consideration for the applicant.

Mr. Dziurman asked if the applicant was going to leave the steel posts as part of the foundation. Mr. Kowal responded, "yes, enclosed". He explained the biggest problem with the way the porch was built was that they ran the joist for the porch parallel to the face of the house instead of coming off the ledger board perpendicular, so he had to put in 2x8's underneath to hold them at the post points, and then have the metal post carrying that down to the foundation. He stated the porch was not just tipped forward, but was a little wavy.

Mr. Dziurman asked if he would use a masonry foundation, which could be screened. He noted he did not want to tell the applicant how to build the porch, but he thought he would be more comfortable with a masonry or concrete foundation down to a footing.

Chairperson Hill stated that if the applicant had not already applied for the tax credits, he should take photographs and document everything he was doing. She suggested the applicant complete the application and get it submitted because the State preferred to have the application before the work is done. She noted that many projects were being approved throughout the State very similar to the applicant's project, and pointed out the credits were available for both exterior and interior work.

Mr. Miller clarified that the posts at the outer corners of the porch were not the posts that were needed to be able to jack the joists up. Mr. Kowal stated there were the four points, and that the two in the middle were the bigger concern. He noted at the end, he had something coming off the house; but in the middle he did not have anything. Mr. Miller noted that was where the applicant added a post and beam underneath.

Mr. Miller referred to the color photograph submitted by the applicant in the packet materials and asked when that photograph was taken. He was advised it was taken after the applicant started deconstruction of the enclosed front porch. Mr. Kowal stated the posts had been moved in, which was another part of the problem with the front porch. He explained the two center posts had been moved in to create the doorway of the enclosed porch, which changed the structure somewhat because there was nothing carrying that load down to the original footings.

Mr. Miller clarified that the black and white photograph was an older photograph. Mr. Kowal stated he had obtained that photograph from the Museum when he was doing research for his original submittal. He noted that photograph was taken in the 1920s. He stated one other interesting thing they found when taking apart the enclosure, was that one of the former owners had written down "Terry and Dad 1964", which showed when the porch was enclosed.

Ms. Cozzolino asked if the applicant was open to what Mr. Dziurman had suggested, or if he had an affinity to the river rock. Mr. Kowal stated if he was not able to use the river rock, he would use wood. He stated he did not necessarily like the vinyl look, noting if he could use a different material and it was a manufactured material, he felt he had a strong argument for using the cultured stone, which was also a man-made material.

Mr. Dziurman stated he would like to clarify his statement. He explained the vinyl was only a suggestion as an outer cover, and a wood post would be used inside. He thought that would help with maintenance. He commented he thought using a wood post was wonderful, and just wanted to give a suggestion that might help over the long run, because he understood rotting was an issue. Mr. Kowal stated the structural part of the post was where the rotting issue occurred. Mr. Dziurman stated the vinyl did not have any structural capabilities at all, but was just a cover.

Mr. Kowal stated that was why he wanted to use the metal, because whatever he used, he did not want to have to go back in twenty years and do something again. He stated it would be protected and he would paint it with something rustproof before it is enclosed.

Chairperson Hill referred to the applicant's original submittal which depicted the posts as being similar to what the original structure had, and noted it appeared that the two center posts were moved back to their original location, with posts underneath. She asked if that supported the posts all the way down to the footings. Mr. Kowal stated they did not, and explained those posts were built on top of the deck and there was barn timber supporting the deck itself. He indicated there was nothing between that ten inches that was doing anything structurally.

Chairperson Hill clarified in that particular location, or all the way around. Mr. Kowal responded "all the way around". Chairperson Hill understood the need for the support, but noted the visual changes. Mr. Kowal stated what it will be and what it was in the original submittal from four years ago is what was there. He noted he could see the ghosting of the square posts and those posts had just been moved in. He explained he would be moving them back to where they were.

Chairperson Hill referred to the rotting issue and stated that whatever was there as the base for the posts were most likely original from 1915, which was a long period of time. She commented she owned a 60-year old home and just had to replace some redwood because of the rotting, but noted that rotting occurred over a 60-year period. She stated that if the applicant used wood materials, it would be a long time before it would require any repairs, as long as there were not any drainage issues.

Mr. Dziurman expressed his concern about using metal. He noted the applicant discussed using rustproof paint, but advised the applicant it had to be ventilated because it would rust. He stated his firm repaired a lot of buildings with angles that are hidden for brick ledges and they rust out and compromise the wall, which could cause the wall to fall down. He really thought the applicant should consider some other type of foundation unless he makes sure it will breathe and it won't rust. He commented it appeared to him that over a period of time it could be the wrong solution.

Dr. Stamps stated that the Study Committee had just met with the representative from the SHPO office, who was critical of what the Commission approved 15 years ago because it allowed work to deviate from what the structure used to look like, or they let somebody change something. He commented that even though he liked the stonework, he thought the applicant would lose what was appropriate and potentially could lose the tax credits, and the Commission would not be living up to its charge. He stated that although he personally liked the stone, he could not approve the stone because it would be taking away from the original look of the house. He was leaning toward making it look like the archive picture from the Museum.

Chairperson Hill commented that making it look like the archive picture was the applicant's original submittal.

Chairperson Hill called for any additional discussion or comments from the Commissioners. Upon hearing none, she suggested a motion was in order to either approve the request for a revised Certificate of Appropriateness, or a motion for denial of the request.

Dr. Stamps noted that a denial sounded harsh, and advised the applicant he had the ability to withdraw his request. Chairperson Hill agreed that was an option if the applicant wanted to withdraw his request for the revision; otherwise, the Commission's choices by Ordinance were to approve or deny.

Mr. Kowal stated he would withdraw his request at this time.

Chairperson Hill thought that in the long run the applicant would be happy with having his home consistent with the historic appearance and its contribution to the

Community. Mr. Kowal commented the repairs would be done a little sooner, which was a plus.

Mr. Kilpatrick stated that the Commission could also adjourn this matter if the applicant wanted to revise his proposal to consider some of Mr. Dziurman's suggestions. He did not know if that was an option the applicant wanted to explore, or to allow the applicant an opportunity to compare pricing.

Mr. Kowal stated he did want to make sure that the work was done as authentically as it could be. He noted if it was done with the idea of going back to the original, he wanted to use original materials. He understood what Mr. Dziurman meant about using the metal.

Mr. Miller concurred and agreed that based on the process for the State tax credit approval, the applicant probably would not have received the tax credits. He agreed the stone looked nice and dressier, and commented that based on the original picture, the home was more of a plain Jane type of house that most Americans were not currently living in or building in the Rochester Hills area. Rather they were dressing up their homes, changing them, and making them look more affluent. He also understood the applicant's desire to want to keep the home as authentic as possible.

Mr. Dziurman commented he thought the applicant's plain Jane house looked beautiful the way it was.

Chairperson Hill thanked the applicant for appearing before the Commission.

Mr. Delacourt asked the applicant to let him know if there was anything he could do to help with the tax credit application. He noted he had regular conversations with the SHPO and could help get answers to any questions the applicant might have.

Mrs. Mark Kowal stated they were not sure whether they wanted to use the stone; however, many of their neighbors liked the look and thought they should ask to change the plans.

Mr. Sinclair stated that when he first looked at the plans, he thought it really looked sharp. However, the longer he looked at them, and the tapered posts and the configuration of the original, he thought the applicant would have been surprised at how much that would have changed his home. He noted the straight posts gave it a tall look, but the use of the tapered columns with the stone cutting in would have made the house look short and squatty. He thought in the end, the applicant would be much more pleased with the original look.

Mr. and Mrs. Kowal thanked the Commission for their time and suggestions.

This matter was Discussed

- 8B. 2008-0288** 1058 E. Tienken Road (HDC File #99-005)
Applicant: Todd Szymczak
Sidwell: 15-01-352-032
District: Stoney Creek
Request: 1) Replacement of Siding
 2) Replacement of Windows

Chairperson Hill read the request for the record and invited the applicant to come forward to the presenter's table. She suggested the Commission hear the Staff Report, and then a presentation from the applicant regarding his request.

Mr. Delacourt stated the applicant's home was constructed in the Stoney Creek District on Tienken Road with a Certificate of Appropriateness issued in 1995. The house was constructed in conformance with the Certificate of Appropriateness that was issued at that time. The applicant came to Staff with a request to look at replacing the siding on the house due to some rot issues and some failing with the original siding, and wanted to replace the windows. He noted that an additional Memorandum was given to the Commissioners prior to the meeting providing some additional clarification to the Staff Report.

Mr. Szymczak stated this was primarily a maintenance issue. He bought the home last August, and due to the slow market, did not move in until November. He noticed when he purchased the home that there were some soft spots in the siding. He did some research and found that this siding was widely used in the early to mid-1990s and that it had established a reputation for failing around the country. He stated he had some pictures of the how the siding had failed. He explained the product was an oriented-strand board (OSB) that was compressed and coated, but the ends were never really treated well, which was a factor for the product in general, not just the siding on his home. He stated the siding absorbed water, never thoroughly dried out, and subsequently got moldy on the ends with the mold moving in behind the siding.

Mr. Szymczak stated the Commission could appreciate that when a person bought a house, they only usually spend an hour or two of quality time with the house prior to purchasing. Once they moved in, they noticed it had a strong odor of mildew in several rooms, and any room that borders the outside of the home that is left closed for any amount of time will also get a mildew/musty odor. He did not think that situation would be rectified unless they replaced the siding.

Mr. Szymczak stated the material he was requesting to use, HardiePlank cement siding, was a very compatible material with the neighborhood.

Mr. Szymczak stated that the reason they were looking at replacing the windows at this time was because they would already have the siding off the house, and also

because the windows were single-pane with storms on the outside which did not enhance the look of the house. Also, the windows do not insulate the road noise off Tienken Road very well, which he did not appreciate in looking at the house for an hour or two before purchasing; however, in trying to sleep at night, it was noticeable.

Mr. Szymczak stated that in the summertime, the windows let in an excessive amount of sun heat through the glass because they were not modern low-E glass. In the wintertime, they are okay, but they do sweat and drip and create mold on the sills of the glass. He stated there were many reasons to replace the windows, including long-term energy efficiency; getting the storms off the house, and having simulated divided lights would actually enhance the look of the house on the outside and fit into the neighborhood a bit nicer.

Mr. Szymczak hoped his proposed repairs would be a good long-term investment for both his home and the Community, while enhancing the look of the house.

Mr. Dziurman stated he was going to ask why the siding was rotting and retaining water, but thought the applicant had addressed that matter. Mr. Szymczak showed the Commissioners some documentation that demonstrated the stages of failure for the product.

Mr. Dziurman asked if there was another reason why it occurred. Mr. Szymczak stated he had explored the matter, and noted if his were the only house in America it was happening to he would think differently. However, there were class action lawsuits against the companies and he had talked to many people who had the same problem. He noted that many homes were at the stage of deterioration, which was when there was mildew going up behind the siding. The only way to get to the mildew would be to take the siding off, clean it and put it back on. He commented it was not a natural material on the home now, so he would not be changing much.

Mr. Dziurman stated that HardiePlank was an approved historic product; however, he wanted to be sure the applicant took care of the problem without realizing something else might be happening. Mr. Szymczak explained when it rained, with any clapboard siding, it could be seen how the water hugs around the bottom of the clapboard, and in looking at the way the product failed, it was obvious the water was just soaking in to the product.

Mr. Dziurman stated he understood how the applicant felt about the storm windows. He commented his profession was now going full circle because they were looking at storm windows again. He explained that the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has approved storm windows in many cases. He stated he brought it up because insulated glass will fail in ten to fifteen years. He noted storm windows provided a better insulating value if properly done. He clarified a storm window with single pane would give better U value than double-insulated glass. He thought that was something everyone should become aware of.

Mr. Szymczak asked if the storms would block more sun energy than low-E glass. Mr. Dziurman responded “no, you could still use low-E glass in them” and he would still promote that, but from an insulating point of view, storms have a deeper air pocket between the two. He indicated he had done some research and talked to window people, and had reviewed their studies.

Mr. Szymczak commented those must be nicer storms than what he had on his home because he could visually see gaps around the bottom so the water could get out. In addition there were weep holes in the bottom for the water to get out, which allowed insects to infiltrate. He commented his wife really wanted new windows to help prevent the elder bugs from getting in. He noted there were more reasons than just energy efficiency.

Mr. Dziurman stated he was not advising the applicant to keep the existing windows, but wanted to make him aware of issues he had encountered. He did not have a problem with the applicant changing the windows because the structure was not a contributing resource in the District, but was a non-contributing resource. He commented he did not like the snap-in grills used for divided lights.

Mr. Szymczak stated the windows he wanted to use would not have the snap-in grills. Mr. Dziurman asked if they would be between the panes of the glass. Mr. Szymczak stated that one of the reasons he went to the more expensive windows was because they looked authentic. He explained they were part of the window on the outside and the inside, and have the aluminum spacers in between to give the appearance of true divided.

Mr. Dziurman commented the applicant had answered his question, noting with the other type, they fell off and had other problems. Mr. Szymczak stated that many of the neighboring homes did not even had simulated divided, but had the grates on the inside of the home and looked like plain windows from the outside. He was proposing to use true simulated divided lights.

Mr. Dunphy stated he had relatively new vinyl windows in his home, and the box elder bugs still found a way into the house. He commented the new windows may not solve the applicant’s problem with insects.

Mr. Miller stated he did not have any problem with the siding or the windows. He knew what type of windows the applicant was proposing to use, and commented they were beautiful windows. He expressed concern about the underlying issues with the OSB, and suggested the applicant be very careful about the mold inside the house.

Mr. Szymczak appreciated that point, and explained he had also asked his contractor to tear off the fabric wind-block to he can verify there is no damage beyond that. He noted if there was damage, those sections would have to be replaced.

Chairperson Hill stated both she and Mr. Dziurman were on the Commission when the original plans were submitted for this home, and the HardiePlank was brought up at that time; however, another option of the cedar veneer was brought up. At one time, the Commission wanted to require the applicant to put on full cedar siding, not the veneer. She commented it was unfortunate this had happened, but she agreed the HardiePlank had a much better track record.

Chairperson Hill concurred with Mr. Dziurman's comments about the windows. She stated she had also done some research and noted her 60-year hold home had the original wood, true divided light with many panes of glass. She also had the old wood storms that were showing signs of wear and required a lot of maintenance. She stated that over the years some of the windows had aluminum and other types of storms, and the wood ones did a much better job. She agreed they did weep at the bottom and it was hard to get rid of bugs. She noted that from everyone she had talked to, and the research she had done, she concurred with Mr. Dziurman's comments about the wood storms.

Mr. Szymczak stated his windows did not have wood storms, but they had the typical aluminum sliding storms with the two-piece aluminum sliders. He noted they did not add any charm to the house.

Chairperson Hill asked whether the applicant would want to consider something like that for the front windows, noting she did not know if the appearance would detract from the home. Mr. Szymczak did not think he would put screens up on the front of the house because he enough other windows around the house to open for ventilation.

Chairperson Hill commented she did not have air conditioning, but did not take all the storms off, but only took those off for cross-ventilation. She left the rest of the storms on because it helped keep the house cooler throughout the summer. She commented the applicant was proposing a 6/6, and the original was a 6/1, and asked the Commissioners if they had any objection to that, keeping in mind the house was a non-contributing resource.

Mr. Szymczak explained the reason he proposed them was because it would look more consistent with the other homes in the neighborhood. He noted most of the contributing and non-contributing homes in the neighborhood had either the divided top and bottom, or a single over single. He thought that the 6/1's gave it a more 1950s or 1960s look, particularly with the storms over that, and they did not fit with the historic nature of the neighborhood. He pointed out with his home being next to the school, it would help the house fit in more.

Chairperson Hill agreed with the applicant because most of the homes that do mass in the same sizing, look and appearance as the applicant's home, do have the 6/6. She was not opposed to that, but wanted to get a sense of what the other Commissioners felt.

Mr. Dziurman added that the storms he was talking about could be used all year round because they open up and the windows can be opened. He noted it was a different kind of storm window.

Mr. Szymczak stated that the windows that were put in the house originally were built with all the trim. In taking apart the trim to get the paper out from behind, they would more than likely be tearing apart the trim around the windows, making it an ideal time to replace the windows.

Dr. Stamps stated he strongly supported the applicant's proposed renovations.

Mr. Thompson stated he would be willing to move the motion in the packet. Mr. Dunphy pointed out that the motion in the packet referred to 6/1 divided light, and based on the discussion, the motion would have to be amended to reflect the 6/6 divided light.

Mr. Szymczak clarified he would use 6 lights per sash on front, and 6/1 on the back.

Mr. Dunphy asked if the applicant was replacing the back windows as part of the project. Mr. Szymczak stated he would replace all the windows and all the siding.

Chairperson Hill asked if all the windows would be 6/6 or just the front windows. Mr. Szymczak stated he was planning on the just the front. He explained anything that could be seen from the road driving past the house he would want to be 6/6, or in some cases the window ratio makes it a 4/4 because it was narrow, noting those were currently 4/1. He thought a 1/1 in the back let in more light; 6/6 would match the front, and they were currently 6/1. He commented if the Commission was indifferent to the back, he was flexible on those because they were not seen. He would need to get a price if the 6/6 were required on the back.

Chairperson Hill thought the applicant should have the option of the 6/1 or 6/6 for the back side of the house, with the 6/6 on the front.

Dr. Stamps agreed to 6/6 on the front. He commented that the side and back were not seen, and he preferred more open to allow more light in. He suggested the applicant be allowed to choose by being given three options - 6/6, 6/1 or 1/1.

Chairperson Hill thought the side adjacent to the school was visible. Mr. Szymczak stated that everything on the sides that could be seen from the road would be divided. He noted that the back, which was where the most sunlight came in during the day, should be more open. Chairperson Hill agreed she would have less concern about those.

Mr. Dziurman stated the motion in the packet would have to be revised to include that, and suggested the proposed motion be removed from the table.

Chairperson Hill agreed, and noted the motion had not received a second. Mr. Thompson stated he would withdraw his motion.

Chairperson Hill asked if anyone would like to proposed a new motion.

Mr. Dziurman proposed the following motion, seconded by Mr. Dunphy. Chairperson Hill called for discussion on the proposed motion on the floor.

Ms. Cozzolino asked if the motion covered the back windows. Mr. Dziurman stated he had through Finding Number 5.

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

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

Aye 9 - Hill, Stamps, Kilpatrick, Dziurman, Dunphy, Cozzolino, Thompson, Miller and Sinclair

RESOLVED that the Rochester Hills Historic Districts Commission, in the matter of File No. HDC 99-005, ISSUES a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property located at 1058 E. Tienken Road, Sidwell 15-01-352-032, which is located in the Stoney Creek Historic District. The proposed work consists of replacement of the siding with HardiePlank lap siding, which will be a white finish; replacement as necessary of the trim around the windows with new wood or composite trim which will be a white finish; and replacement of all the windows on the home with Marvin Ultimate Clad Windows (white) such that the windows on the front elevation will be 6/6 divided light; and the side windows will be replaced with the appropriate 4/4 or 6/1 configuration proportional to the existing windows. The work, as proposed, meets "The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation" Standard Number 6.

Findings:

1. The resource is a non-contributing resource within the Stoney Creek Historic District.
2. The proposed work is compatible with the existing historic resources in the Stoney Creek Historic District.
3. The existing siding on the home will be replaced with HardiePlank lap siding, which

will be finished in white.

4. Trim work will be replaced as necessary with a white finish.
5. The existing windows on the front of the house will be replaced with Marvin Ultimate Clad Windows, white in color, in the 6/6 divided light style. The windows on the side will also be a divided light, white in color, and the windows in the back will be open, white in color.

Conditions:

1. The work will be consistent with the documentation reviewed by the Commission and submitted by the applicant on June 4, 2008, as modified as this meeting.
2. If necessary, the applicant shall obtain all permits required by the City's Building Department.

2008-0288

Chairperson Hill stated for the record that the motion had carried.

Mr. Szymczak thanked the Commission for their input. He asked what the Commission thought about copper gutters on the front of the house as an accent.

Chairperson Hill noted the applicant's home was a non-contributing resource, she did not think it would be detrimental to the home. She stated she would have to see something first.

Mr. Szymczak stated he still had to see if it fit in his budget, and if they could put an alarm system on them.

Mr. Dziurman asked if it would be copper, naturally weathered. Mr. Szymczak stated he liked the weathered look and did not want them to be shiny, although when installed, they would be shiny for a year or so.

Mr. Dziurman stated in many requests before the Commission, there was discussion about the gutter color. He commented if the applicant used copper, and it naturally weathered, he did not see a problem with that.

Mr. Szymczak stated if they had a product that looked like aged copper that would be fine too. He noted he liked the darker patina rather than the shiny look.

Mr. Dziurman stated there is a company in Kalamazoo, Michigan, that produces gutters that are half-shaped round, and have a variety of products, including copper and different finishes. Chairperson Hill agreed the company was located in Kalamazoo, and the gutters came in various finishes.

Mr. Szymczak asked Mr. Dziurman if the storm windows he referred to were more architecturally appealing than what he currently had on his house. Whether they were more flat. Mr. Dziurman stated they were pretty straightforward flat, and were manufactured in Minnesota. He noted the Paint Creek Cider Mill in Oakland Township would be using those windows. He indicated he had used them on a courthouse in Ithaca, Michigan, which was a 100-year old building. He noted the people inside the building were freezing during the winter months, and when the windows were replaced, those people said they no longer had to wear sweaters, and the County was anticipating a significant change in their energy bill, and they had been very happy with them at probably half the cost they expected to pay. He thought it was a good product that had been used all over the country.

Mr. Szymczak stated it was an appealing option, although he thought the 6/6 with fresh, bright white mutttons would look very nice and would enhance the look of the home. Mr. Dziurman agreed.

Mr. Dziurman commented that at this meeting, the Commission had heard from two applicants that had a strong sense of preservation and wanted to do the right thing. He stated he really appreciated that fact.

Mr. Szymczak stated he had looked around his neighborhood and had seen some contributing homes with vinyl siding and vinyl windows, and asked how that happened. He noted he and the other applicant were trying to be authentic, noting the energy it took to maintain an older house. He did not think his neighbors had used materials that fit into the program.

Chairperson Hill stated most of the homes that were original to the Stoney Creek Village had the true wood clapboard. She commented that the yellow saltbox home across the street from the applicant was a newer home. When it was approved, it was approved because the massing and the look of the structure had the compatibility to fit in with the rest of the homes in the Village. She noted that home was total wreck when the owners purchased it and brought it back up. The street appearance was not changed very much.

Mr. Dziurman stated that was one of the reasons they were being scolded earlier by the SHPO office. He indicated that was rightly so, because some of the homes were approved for vinyl many years ago, when it was a much different Commission makeup. He noted it was unfortunate some of that happened, and they were trying to make sure it did not happen again.

Mr. Szymczak asked if the new house at 1058 Runyon was in the Historic District. Chairperson Hill stated that home was located in the City of Rochester. She explained the south side of Runyon was the City of Rochester and is not in Rochester Hills Historic District.

Dr. Stamps asked if there were any other copper gutters in the neighborhood. Mr. Szymczak stated he had not noticed any others. Dr. Stamps asked if the copper gutters would fit in with the neighborhood. Chairperson Hill noted other home had gutters, and thought if the patina was correct, she did not know if it would be detrimental to the District.

Mr. Szymczak stated he had seen some homes with the half-round gutters, which were probably galvanized when built with the round downspouts, which would also be an option for him.

Mr. Dziurman stated that was probably more prominent when those homes were built, than the gutters used today. Dr. Stamps asked if they would have been copper. Mr. Dziurman stated they could have been because copper was the same cost. Chairperson Hill stated they also used wood.

Mr. Szymczak thanked the Commission for their time and the discussion.

Mr. Kowal returned to the presenter's table and asked about the clad windows that had just been discussed and whether he could use that type of window on his house, which is a contributing resource. He also wanted to know if they could not use the clad windows, if they could use the storm windows that were mentioned.

Mr. Dziurman stated the storms could be used because he knew that SHPO would approve them. He was not sure how far off the Marvin windows would be from the original windows in the applicant's home, as it related to dimensions. He suspected the Marvin windows may work for the applicant as well. He noted he could not make that determination without knowing the window measurements, but the storms could work.

Chairperson Hill thought that could be a tough consideration for the Commission because they had frequently discussed the window issue. She explained in some cases, SHPO has said if windows had been replaced on a structure, the Commission did not necessarily have to require that someone take them back to the original. However, if the original are still in place, and they are not deteriorated, the preferable method is not to replace, but to repair.

Mr. Kowal stated he liked the windows on his home, although they were a lot of work because they had the weights and things, and they were trying to restore them. However, the storm widows are the metal aluminum, and he would be interested in doing something that was more appropriate historically. He commented it would also help with the energy efficiency of the windows.

Mr. Dziurman pointed out he was starting to sound like a salesman for storm windows, but noted he was convinced they were good. He offered to send Mr. Kowal some information about the windows.

Mr. Kowal thanked the Commission for their time.

This matter was Discussed

9. DISCUSSION

- 9A. 2008-0289 Vacant Parcel - Winkler Mill Pond Historic District
Applicant: Nathaniel Brock
Sidwell: 15-01-201-009
Request: Discussion regarding proposed restoration of orchard
and proposal to fence orchard parcel

Chairperson Hill noted Mr. Brock was not present, and asked Mr. Delacourt if he had some information about Mr. Brock's request.

Mr. Delacourt apologized on Mr. Brock's behalf, noting Mr. Brock had to be out of town.

Mr. Delacourt stated some maps and aerials had been provided to the Commissioners. He explained Mr. Brock's home was on the northwest corner of Washington Road and Winkler Mill Road, and he had recently purchased the property on the southwest corner of the same intersection. It was Mr. Brock's intention to restore the old orchard on that property. Mr. Brock did not intend to develop it or build anything there, other than a few out structures.

Mr. Delacourt stated Mr. Brock had some questions about fencing because he was concerned about investing the time and money and the damage that could be done by the deer population. He was concerned about installing fencing that would be appropriate to the Commission, but also do a good job of preventing deer from entering the property. He stated Mr. Brock had some thoughts on different fencing he wanted to propose to the Commission. He thought Mr. Brock might like to attend the July meeting for either a discussion item, or with a request for approval for some fencing.

Chairperson Hill asked if Mr. Delacourt knew what type of fencing Mr. Brock was considering.

Mr. Delacourt stated Mr. Brock was considering deer fencing, eight-foot, steel posts, but set back on the property and screened so it would not be visible from the road, and making it as non-apparent as possible by using black mesh material.

Chairperson Hill stated there were other property owners in that area that have that around their property. One property, which was not in the District, was a little visible; and another, which she believed was in the Winkler Mill District, sat back behind so much growth along the road that it was not noticeable. She stated that would be a concern of hers. She noted the orchard trees were there, but there was also a lot of other growth on the parcel. She presumed Mr. Brock would want to work on the orchard and clean that other growth out. She noted that might leave two sides of the property very open to the streets as far as the streetscape on Winkler Mill and Washington Roads.

Mr. Delacourt stated that based on conversations he had with Mr. Brock, he felt Mr. Brock had a very good understanding of what the HDC would be looking for, and a very realistic understanding of what he had to demonstrate to the HDC to get his request approved. He stated Mr. Brock understood it might be a tough decision for the HDC.

Chairperson Hill commented that was particularly true based on the other fencing issues the Commission had dealt with along Washington Road. She asked if there was any other method of deterring the deer from an orchard. She had some concern as a neighbor about more deer on her property once they are deterred from that large parcel.

Mr. Delacourt stated Mr. Brock understood this could be a long process and was looking into several options. He noted if Mr. Brock did bring in a request it would be scheduled for the next regular HDC Meeting.

Chairperson Hill stated she would not be available for the July 10, 2008 HDC Meeting. Mr. Delacourt noted that since the July meeting was so close to the Fourth of July Holiday, the Commissioners would be polled to make sure a quorum would be available for the July meeting.

This matter was Discussed

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Chairperson Hill called for any other business. She noted she was very pleased to see that a full Commission was in attendance at this meeting. She was encouraged and hoped it would continue, as the Commission was one of the few Boards in the City that seemed to have an attendance problem. She noted if it got to the point where a Commissioner was unable to attend a number of meetings, the Commission had a self-imposed solution. She commented it was not only unfair to the Commission, it was also unfair to the Community if a full Commission is not present to discuss the business at hand.

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

11. ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion duly made and seconded, Chairperson Hill adjourned the meeting at 8:56 PM.

Melinda Hill, Chairperson
City of Rochester Hills
Historic Districts Commission

Judy A. Bialk, Recording Secretary

Approved as _____ at the _____ Regular Historic Districts Commission Meeting