



Rochester Hills Minutes

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

Historic Districts Study Committee

*Chairperson Jason Thompson, Vice Chairperson Dr. Richard Stamps
Members: John Dziurman, James Hannick, Peggy Schodowski,
LaVere Webster, Murray Woolf*

Thursday, December 10, 2009

5:30 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

MINUTES of a **ROCHESTER HILLS REGULAR HISTORIC DISTRICTS STUDY COMMITTEE** meeting held at the City Municipal Offices, 1000 Rochester Hills Drive, Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Thompson called the meeting to order at 5:40 PM.

2. ROLL CALL

Present 4 - Jason Thompson, LaVere Webster, Peggy Schodowski and James Hannick

Absent 3 - Richard Stamps, John Dziurman and Murray Woolf

Others Present: Derek Delacourt, Deputy Director, Planning Department
Kristine Kidorf, Kidorf Preservation Consulting
Judy Bialk, Recording Secretary

Chairperson Thompson stated that Dr. Stamps had left prior notice he could not attend this meeting and was excused.

3. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Chairperson Thompson stated for the record that a quorum was present.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4A. 2009-0498 September 10, 2009 Rescheduled Regular Meeting Minutes

Chairperson Thompson asked for any comments or corrections regarding the September 10, 2009 Regular Meeting Minutes. Upon hearing no comments or corrections, he called for a motion to approve.

A motion was made by Hannick, seconded by Webster, that the Minutes be Approved as Presented. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 4 - Thompson, Webster, Schodowski and Hannick

Absent 3 - Stamps, Dziurman and Woolf

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the September 10, 2009 Regular Historic

Districts Study Committee be approved as presented.

4B. 2009-0545 November 12, 2009 Regular Meeting Minutes

Chairperson Thompson asked for any comments or corrections regarding the November 12, 2009 Regular Meeting Minutes. Upon hearing no comments or corrections, he called for a motion to approve.

A motion was made by Hannick, seconded by Webster, that the Minutes be Approved as Presented. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye 4 - Thompson, Webster, Schodowski and Hannick

Absent 3 - Stamps, Dziurman and Woolf

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the November 12, 2009 Regular Historic Districts Study Committee Meeting be approved as presented.

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS / COMMUNICATIONS

Chairperson Thompson asked if there were any announcements or communications. No announcements or communications were provided.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT (Non-Agenda Items)

Chairperson Thompson called for any public comments. No public comments were received.

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chairperson Thompson suggested the Committee move Agenda Item 7D (1585 S. Rochester Road) ahead on the Agenda, due to the fact the City's Preservation Consultant was in attendance and had to leave at 6:30 PM. The Committee agreed to consider Agenda Item 7D.

7D. 2009-0411 1585 S. Rochester Road (HDC File #03-003)
- Review Preliminary Report

Chairperson Thompson stated the Committee had received a copy of the draft Preliminary Report prepared by the Consultant, along with copies of the applicant information that was provided to the Committee last month.

Mr. Delacourt provided a brief summary, noting that the applicant made a request to City Council to delist the property. City Council forwarded the matter to the Study Committee per the process outlined in the Historical Preservation Ordinance. Ms. Kidorf had prepared the draft Preliminary Report. He reminded the Committee they would decide what the recommendation to City Council would be. Ms. Kidorf had conducted her review and provided her objective opinion.

Ms. Kidorf stated this was not an easy task, noting there was not a lot of historic

information available. She visited the site with an architect and Mr. Delacourt and looked carefully at the exterior of the building and the details of the property. She did as much research as possible at the Burton Historical Collection in Detroit, Michigan; at the Rochester Hills Library; at the Van Hoosen Farm, and at the Oakland County Register of Deeds, which did reveal some names that helped with additional research at the Burton collection.

Ms. Kidorf stated if the entire Fairview Farm was still intact and the house still in its original "Queen Anne" form, she thought there were be no question about the site. The biggest or most troubling matter was that she could not determine when the house was altered to its current Colonial Revival state and the entrance changed. Based on the architectural details and the way the building is assembled, which may have been over fifty (50) years ago, she did not think it was an outstanding example of Neoclassical architecture in Rochester Hills, especially with the aluminum and the changes to the details.

Chairperson Thompson thanked Ms. Kidorf for the well-written, detailed draft report. He stated he did not realize until how "mish-matched" the property was. In his opinion, it did not meet the criteria to remain designated. He called for comments from the Committee.

Ms. Schodowski clarified this property had been failing and needed to be updated. Mr. Delacourt stated the City's Historic District Commission (HDC) had issued demolition by neglect notices and although some preliminary restoration was done on the exterior, the interior was in very bad condition, although that was not something the Study Committee evaluated. Ms. Schodowski stated she had driven by the home many times, and thought it would be great if the home was in its original form.

Ms. Kidorf agreed that in driving past the home on Rochester Road, it did look like a historic home and it looked like the details were just covered in aluminum siding. It was not until she got closer and looked at the house and some of the oddities of it, that she realized it was not what it appeared to be.

Ms. Schodowski commented it would be extremely difficult to restore the home to the form it was originally. Ms. Kidorf did not think it could be taken back to original look. She commented that if the farm buildings were still intact it would have more integrity, even with the house in its current form. The loss of the farm buildings reduced the significance.

Chairperson Thompson pointed out that when the property was originally designated in 1978, the standards were not as comprehensive as they were now. He asked if that was going to cause problems in the future, noting the applicant had listed "defective procedure" as a reason for the delisting request. Although the standards were different in 1978, they were followed. He asked if every designated property could cite the same reason for delisting.

Ms. Kidorf stated that currently it only appeared to apply to a couple properties in the City. She stated it was not a matter of defective procedure. Rather it was a case that this building was not as historically significant as originally thought. She believed the original Study Committee relied on a "windshield survey" and did not have the benefit of the National Register Criteria. She stated she had talked to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) about the National Register Criteria, and was advised that just because a property was not eligible for the National Register, that was not a sufficient reason to de-designate a property.

Mr. Delacourt stated it would have to be demonstrated that there were factual mistakes in the information relied on for designation in 1978. For instance, if a house was designated as having been built in the early 1900s, and it turned out to be built in 1975, perhaps the argument could be made that the process itself was defective or the designation was based on non-factual information. He thought the City was pretty thorough at the time of the original designations, and had always been over-cautious. He did not know if the designations had been reviewed by the SHPO back then. Ms. Kidorf did not think that would have been done.

Chairperson Thompson stated he had not realized until he read the draft report that the initial 1978 survey included many more potential properties, and that the Township Board withdrew some of them. He clarified this was not a matter of defective procedure.

Mr. Delacourt advised the Committee that another similar request had been made, identifying defective procedure. He explained that request had a different set of merits and considerations and would be discussed by the Study Committee at the next meeting.

Chairperson Thompson stated in reading the draft report, it appeared this may have simply been a mistake. Ms. Kidorf stated when it was designated, the outbuildings were there. Although the original designation did not cover the outbuildings, they contributed to the original thought that the property was historic.

Mr. Delacourt asked if the Study Committee members had any issue with the proposed recommendation contained in the draft preliminary report. He reminded the Committee this was not a final report and additional information could be generated before the final report is prepared.

Chairperson Thompson noted a Public Hearing would have to be held. Mr. Delacourt agreed, and noted the report also had to be submitted to SHPO and the State Historic Review Board for review and comment. He stated if the Committee accepted the draft preliminary report, it would be transmitted to the State and a Public Hearing date set.

Chairperson Thompson called for any questions or comments on the draft preliminary report.

Mr. Hannick agreed that from a distance, the home looked historic. In reading the report and reviewing the photographs that had been submitted, it appeared to be the typical older home that homeowners added on to, or changed other details about the structure.

Mr. Webster commented it was a very nice looking house from the street, but he had not seen it up close. He agreed with the draft preliminary report.

Ms. Kidorf thought the house had been remodeled in the 1950s or perhaps the 1940s. She stated the Eddy family must have done the remodeling because they owed the property from 1936 through the 1990s. She did not find any records about the Eddy family.

Chairperson Thompson asked if the Committee was comfortable accepting the report.

Mr. Delacourt reminded the Committee that City Council had imposed a time frame for a response, and if there were no questions about the report, Staff would transmit the report and set a tentative Public Hearing date for February 11, 2010. He hoped to have the State's review comments back at that time.

Ms. Schodowski asked if the property was de-designated, if the home would be demolished. Mr. Delacourt thought that could be the intent. The property owner had put together a huge packet of information, and this request appeared to be in response to the demolition by neglect notice. He advised the Committee the house was part of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Agreement, which would have to be dealt with before City Council could take any action. If the property is delisted, that Agreement would have to be amended, which the property owner was looking into.

Ms. Schodowski asked if the subject property was separate from the Bordine property to the south. Mr. Delacourt stated it was. He noted that City Council could weigh factors from both the development side and the preservation side in making their determination, which was something the Study Committee could not do.

Chairperson Thompson summarized the report would be transmitted and the public hearing scheduled.

This matter was Discussed

Chairperson Thompson stated the Committee would return to Agenda Item 7A (Stiles School).

- 7A. 2005-0537 Stiles School (3976 S. Livernois) (HDSC File #05-002)
- Review Revised Preliminary Report/Revised District Map
 - Set Public Hearing Date

Chairperson Thompson stated the Committee had been provided with some maps depicting a couple proposed boundaries for the district, along with a copy of the original proposed boundary. He noted a draft Boundary Justification and Conclusion had also been provided for changing the district to a smaller district.

Mr. Delacourt stated the district was originally proposed to include the entire building, the entire corner parcel, and a portion of the northern parcel. When that was presented as a recommendation to City Council for designation, both City Council and the property owner identified some concern with the size of the district and the need to designate non-contributing portions. City Council asked the Study Committee to re-evaluate whether there was a possibility of lessening the size of the district while still meeting the criteria for an acceptable designated district.

Mr. Delacourt stated that members of the Study Committee met with school officials at the site, toured the building and did a little additional research. He stated he spoke with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) about manipulating the size of the district. SHPO indicated that if the Committee felt the smaller district met the merits on its own, SHPO was willing to consider a modified district. At the last meeting, the Study Committee requested some smaller district options for additional discussion, and revised language for the report representing the smaller district. He asked for discussion from the Committee on which proposed district they preferred.

Chairperson Thompson stated he liked Option B. He referred to Option A and stated he was not sure why the boundary would include the asphalt parking lot. He thought Option B satisfied the prior discussion of including the original structure and extending the district to the corner. He asked if the asphalt parking lot as included because it was part of the original parcel boundary line.

Mr. Delacourt stated the original thought was to include some additional space in the event additions to the building are made in the future, whether the additions were connected to the original building or not. That option was also presented for discussion.

Ms. Schodowski liked the reduced district as shown on Option B. She was concerned that the additions that were still included represented different years of construction. She was surprised the proposed district did not just include the 1929 building.

Mr. Delacourt stated the proposed district was drawn as discussed by the Committee at the last meeting.

Ms. Schodowski stated she knew there was a little addition when they built the library and there was another addition at another time when they connected the cafeteria, representing multiple years of construction in that one portion of the building.

Mr. Delacourt thought the logic was that all that architecture contributed to the district and the reason why the building met the criteria locally and perhaps the National Register criteria. Without that, the integrity of the district was lessened.

Ms. Schodowski clarified the proposed district would not include the portion that was the “youngest” classroom that was tacked on in the back. Mr. Delacourt stated the proposed options were drawn based on the input provided by the Committee at the last meeting.

Chairperson Thompson agreed the proposed options followed the discussion from the last meeting.

Ms. Schodowski stated the Committee had walked through the building. She was aware of the electrical problems encountered in some of the classrooms where the fire had occurred, and other construction problems. She thought those issues would cause problems for the property owner if those portions were designated.

Mr. Delacourt pointed out that the designation would not affect the interior, or any work to the electrical or plumbing systems. The designation would only impact the outside façade. He did not think the portion where the fire occurred was included in the proposed smaller district.

Ms. Kidorf recalled that the two small back portions were more integral to the historic piece than the new additions to the north.

Mr. Delacourt stated there was a clear delineation of the appropriate additions over time, and the non-contributing additions that were outside the proposed district. That seemed to be the unanimous opinion at the last Study Committee meeting. Whether the school would agree or City Council would agree, that seemed to be the clear delineation point between the contributing and non-contributing.

Chairperson Thompson agreed there was a lengthy discussion at the last meeting, and that was the conclusion arrived at. He was concerned about chopping buildings in half, which could present problems in the future.

Ms. Schodowski stated she was looking at the proposed district and the ease with which the school could expand, noting they had always been short of space.

She thought by not designating the portion of the building that had the fire, and reducing the parking lot, that would provide some expansion room at the back of the building, while still preserving the façade.

Ms. Kidorf suggested the Boundary Justification be reworded to eliminate the word "view shed", because it was commonly accepted that property was not preserved just to create a view. She suggested the wording be changed to state "will protect the historic front yard" or "will include the historic front yard".

Mr. Webster commented that was where the original school building stood. He explained there had been two schools in that location, with the first one being right on the corner about 1852. Another school was built behind that building, that ended up being moved down the road and became part of a house. Ms. Schodowski agreed, noting it was where the subdivision was built. Mr. Webster stated there were a couple potential houses that might include that former school building.

Mr. Delacourt clarified that proposed district Option B was acceptable to the Committee. He pointed out that a Public Hearing had been held on this proposed district, and the matter had gone before City Council. He suggested the revised report and map be transmitted to SHPO for review and comment, and a second Public Hearing held to follow the process because this was a significant change to the recommendation. That would provide an opportunity for the school and others to comment on the proposed district, and the Committee would know if the State agreed with the proposed reduced district.

Chairperson Thompson stated he would be more comfortable if the report was transmitted to SHPO and another Public Hearing held. He preferred the Committee follow the procedure for this proposed change.

This matter was Discussed

- 7B. 2008-0663** National Twist Drill (HDSC File #08-002)
- Review Revised Preliminary Report/Revised District Map

Chairperson Thompson stated that a revised proposed district map had been prepared for the National Twist Drill site, based on the discussion held at the last meeting about perhaps saving what was most appropriate and representative of the proposed district, rather than the entire parcel.

Mr. Delacourt stated the initial recommendation in the draft Preliminary Report included the entire parcel and all the outbuildings. The Preliminary Report has not been transmitted to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) nor has the Public Hearing been held. The Study Committee began to re-evaluate how much the manufacturing space contributed to the integrity or met the criteria for designation.

A revised map was prepared that only included the visible office portions of the buildings.

Mr. Delacourt stated the Committee could review the revised map to determine if the reduced proposed district still met the criteria for designation, or the Committee might want to have the matter re-evaluated by the Preservation Consultant. It was thought a reduced proposed district might gain the cooperation of the property owner and City Council, if the reduced district still met the criteria for designation.

Mr. Delacourt stated the Committee could continue with the recommendation included in the Preliminary Report; could revise the report to include the reduced proposed district, or ask the Preservation Consultant to review and re-evaluate the matter.

Chairperson Thompson asked if Ms. Kidorf had seen this Preliminary Report. Ms. Kidorf stated she had not written that report and had not had an opportunity to review it. She asked why the proposed boundary did not end at the edge of the building. Mr. Delacourt stated the façade of the middle building was an office building and had the same architectural components as the other office buildings. He reminded the Committee the revised proposed district map was only prepared to begin discussion among the Committee members. The proposed district included the buildings or portions of buildings the Committee felt contributed, plus enough area so the Historic Districts Commission (HDC) would be able to evaluate any additions or anything that might have an impact on those buildings, should some type of development come forward in the future.

Ms. Kidorf referred to Mr. Delacourt's conversation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) about the Stiles School proposed district. She assumed the conversation was essentially about the proposed district cutting the building in half. In that situation, the Stiles School proposed district cutting off an addition made some sense. In the National Twist Drill situation, she did not think the portions of the buildings included in the proposed district were necessarily additions. She wondered how SHPO viewed cutting off buildings.

Mr. Delacourt stated he had not sent specific maps to SHPO, but had asked whether or not the boundaries could be changed, or whether or not the lines could run through buildings, and it was SHPO's opinion that as long as the proposed district still met the criteria and the Committee could justify the boundary, they would be fine with that.

Mr. Delacourt agreed the National Twist proposed district was different because it proposed cutting off a portion of the original building. Ms. Kidorf asked what portion represented the original building. Mr. Delacourt believed that was most of it. He pointed out the portion in the southern parcel to the eastern half of the site to the breezeway addition that had a different roof, but noted he believed most of the

entire building was built close to the same time. The Committee would have to decide how they wanted to propose the district. He reminded the Committee the draft proposed district had not been evaluated by either the State or the City Council.

Chairperson Thompson thought Ms. Kidorf should review the report and the proposed boundary change. He pointed out there could be some problems in cutting off portions of the buildings because the balance of the remaining building could not be torn down with that section left standing. Essentially, the proposed district would force the property owner to leave the entire building in tact. He noted that the Stiles School report was being sent back to SHPO and the Committee would receive a definitive written response and would know if SHPO had a problem with portions of buildings as historic districts. The Committee could discuss this again once they received some input from Ms. Kidorf and the SHPO.

Mr. Delacourt thought it was proactive of the Committee to evaluate various proposed districts. They could then advise City Council what size districts had been examined and that the Committee had evaluated all options.

Ms. Kidorf stated she would review the matter prior to the Committee's next meeting. Mr. Delacourt stated he would appreciate Ms. Kidorf's input and evaluation. He noted he had not discussed this proposed district with SHPO because the Committee had not really discussed the options or selected their preferred proposed district.

Chairperson Thompson thought that would give the Committee sufficient information to discuss the matter at the next meeting.

This matter was Discussed

(Depart Ms. Kidorf 6:35 PM)

**7C. 2007-0313 2040 S. Livernois (HDSC File #98-012)
-1Set Public Hearing Date**

Chairperson Thompson stated this property is located on Livernois, south of Hamlin Road.

Mr. Delacourt stated the Preliminary Report had been completed, and the Committee did not appear to want to make any changes to the report. He asked if this report should be transmitted to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and a Public Hearing scheduled.

Chairperson Thompson stated he was comfortable with the report, and thought it should be transmitted to the State and a Public Hearing scheduled.

Mr. Delacourt reminded the Committee that transmitting the report to the State or scheduling the Public Hearing did not prevent the Committee from doing additional research. If significant changes were made, the Committee would most likely want to schedule another Public Hearing. Minor changes can be made after the Public Hearing is held and a recommendation made to City Council.

Chairperson Thompson stated the Committee had had an opportunity to review the report prior to this meeting.

Mr. Delacourt stated that at one time, it was contemplated through SHPO that this house would be moved back on the site because of the boulevard construction on Hamlin and the related intersection improvements along Livernois. However, the intersection improvements were later changed to a round-about configuration, which lessened the impacts and the house did not have to be moved.

Chairperson Thompson summarized the Preliminary Report would be transmitted to SHPO and the Public Hearing would be scheduled.

This matter was Discussed

8. NEW BUSINESS

8A. 2009-0546 Establish 2010 Meeting Schedule

Chairperson Thompson stated the Committee had received a copy of the proposed 2010 Meeting Schedule, noting the meetings were scheduled for the second Thursday of the month at 5:30 PM. He asked if the Committee had any concerns with the proposed schedule. Upon hearing none, he called for a motion to approve and establish the 2010 meeting schedule.

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

Aye 4 - Thompson, Webster, Schodowski and Hannick

Absent 3 - Stamps, Dziurman and Woolf

RESOLVED that the Rochester Hills Historic Districts Study Committee establishes the 2010 Regular Meeting Schedule as follows:

The meetings will be held on the second Thursday of each month at the Rochester Hills Municipal Offices, 1000 Rochester Hills Road, Rochester Hills, Michigan, and will begin at 5:30 PM Michigan Time.

2010 MEETING DATES

January 14, 2010	July 8, 2010
February 11, 2010	August 12, 2010
March 11, 2010	September 9, 2010
April 8, 2010	October 14, 2010
May 13, 2010	November 11, 2010
June 10, 2010	December 9, 2010

2009-0546

Chairperson Thompson stated that the 2010 Meeting Schedule had been adopted. In an effort to ensure a quorum is present for the meetings, he requested that the Committee Members advise Staff if they have a conflict with any of the meeting dates. Mr. Delacourt stated that would be especially important for the February meeting because the Public Hearings were being scheduled that evening. Chairperson Thompson advised the Committee that a special meeting could be scheduled if a quorum could not be established; however, once the Public Hearing date was published, the meeting date could not be changed.

8B. 2009-0547 2009 Annual Report

Chairperson Thompson stated that the Annual Report was something new for this Committee. It was a summary of what the Committee had accomplished over the past year and would be submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) as part of the requirements since the City had received its Certified Local Government (CLG) status. He suggested the Committee review the report and bring any suggested changes or additions to the next meeting.

This matter was Discussed

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Chairperson Thompson stated that the next regular meeting was scheduled for Thursday, January 14, 2010 at 5:30 PM. Chairperson Thompson asked if there was any other business. No other business was presented.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion duly made and seconded, Chairperson Thompson adjourned the meeting at 6:45 PM.

Jason Thompson, Chairperson
City of Rochester Hills
Historic Districts Study Committee

Judy A. Bialk, Recording Secretary

(Approved as _____ at the _____, 2010 Regular Historic Districts Study
Committee Meeting)

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT