



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, November 12, 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 5:30 PM.

2. ROLL CALL

Present 4 - Richard Stamps, John Dziurman, Jason Thompson and James Hannick

Absent 3 - LaVere Webster, Peggy Schodowski and Murray Woolf

Others Present: Derek Delacourt, Deputy Director, Planning Department
Judy Bialk, Recording Secretary

Chairperson Thompson stated that Ms. Schodowski had left prior notice she 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. The Members requested that the approval of minutes be postponed to the December meeting indicating they had not had an opportunity to review the Minutes. Chairperson Thompson stated the approval of the September 10, 2009 Regular Meeting Minutes would be scheduled on the December meeting Agenda.

This matter was Postponed

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

- 7A. 2005-0537 Stiles School (HDSC File #05-002)
- 3976 S. Livernois
- Resolution of Final Report

Chairperson Thompson stated that the Committee had received copies of a new proposed District, along with a copy of the formerly proposed Historic District. He noted some of the Committee members had toured the Stiles School property on October 8, 2009, and called for thoughts regarding the revised proposed District.

Dr. Stamps stated the site visit was very insightful and noted the school personnel were very gracious and gave them an extensive tour of the facility. He thought the proposed size of the revised District seemed to be in accordance with their general discussion during the site visit. He commented in an ideal world the entire building would be designated because that told the history of the evolution of the school, but suggested the Committee lean toward a compromise.

Mr. Dziurman stated he also participated in the site visit, and noted the Committee did not intend to include everything included in the revised proposed District. He stated they talked about the "L-shaped" portion of the building, and possibly the boiler room. He noted the transition building should not be included.

Dr. Stamps clarified the transition room was the library room. Mr. Dziurman indicated that was correct. He noted the comments from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) indicating they could designate just a portion of the school building were interesting. He commented that was different from what had happened in the past.

Dr. Stamps agreed the Committee had talked about the library room during their site visit and agreed it was an addition and not part of the original school building.

The Committee reviewed the revised proposed District and confirmed they had discussed including the L-shaped school building and boiler building. Dr. Stamps clarified the boiler building came out to the left of the bottom of the "L". He thought the portion of the building in the middle was to be included. He described the location of the alcove and the discussion held in that area.

Dr. Stamps stated that the building included in the upper left-hand corner of the revised proposed District should be eliminated, which was basically the library room.

Mr. Dziurman asked how the Committee would define the proposed District.

Mr. Hannick referred to the transition room, which included stairs to the second story, and noted that should be included. He commented it had a different roof line than the rest of the original building.

Mr. Dziurman stated that the tour of the facility was extremely helpful and really defined what should be saved and what should not be saved. It was interesting in touring around the back of the building how the materials that were used became cheaper. He commented that was still common today, explaining the backs of buildings are often done with cheaper construction materials. He agreed the proposed District would not include the library room (shown with the white roof on the revised District).

Mr. Delacourt stated the Ordinance Amendment would have to include the drawing of the District, rather than just including a parcel number and address. He suggested a map would have to be included so everyone would be comfortable about what would be designated.

Mr. Dziurman referred to the revised proposed District and asked how far west the District would be defined. He thought the present School Administration had some concern about the size of the proposed District. The Committee discussed the parcel boundaries.

Mr. Delacourt suggested the new proposed District would move the north property line of the corner parcel south. Rather than a straight line to define the District, it would follow the L-shape of the original building, with a perpendicular line to the existing property line.

Mr. Delacourt suggested the Final Report be modified to describe the District. He also suggested the modified Final Report be sent to the SHPO for comments on the new proposed District, and hold another Public Hearing on the redefined District. He thought that would follow the process outlined in the Ordinance. Chairperson Thompson agreed the Committee would like to follow the process, noting a Public Hearing would put the comments and feedback of the present property owner on the record.

Dr. Stamps suggested the Final Report include a notation that the Committee was requested by City Council to re-examine the building and look at a smaller District.

The Committee did that and the revised proposed District is the result.

Mr. Delacourt noted although it would take more time, he thought following the process and holding another Public Hearing would be the best way to proceed. Chairperson Thompson agreed it would be the appropriate thing to do because the Committee was making a change.

Chairperson Thompson summarized the proposed District Map would be re-drawn and the Final Report amended to reflect the new proposed District.

This matter was Discussed

7B. 2006-0425

Frank Farm (HDSC File #04-005)

- 1290 E. Auburn; 1304 E. Auburn; 1344 and 1356 E. Auburn
- Resolution of Final Report

Chairperson Thompson reminded the Committee that the Frank Farm Designation was referred back to the Committee from City Council. He summarized there was the issue of the consent of the homeowner, and asked if the Committee recalled any further instructions from Council.

Dr. Stamps recalled that the homeowner was not present at the City Council meeting, although relatives of the homeowner were present. In fact, one of the relatives stated at the meeting that the homeowner would like to have the property designated, but she, as a granddaughter, did not want the property to be designated as she would be taking care of the property in the future.

Mr. Dziurman thought City Council was leaning more toward the archeological issues rather than the building issues. He agreed the fact that the property owner was not present was an issue, but he recalled Council thought there was reason to go forward with the archeological aspect.

Chairperson Thompson recalled one Council member discussing artifacts found at that site. He was not sure if the Final Report included the archeological criteria as part of the recommendation for designation.

Dr. Stamps stated the Report indicated archeological remains had been documented from the site, but that it would require further investigation. He noted the Committee had not had an archeologist look at the property.

Chairperson Thompson asked if an archeologist would be interested in reviewing the property. The Committee questioned whether any funds could be allocated for that work.

Mr. Dziurman thought if the budget allowed, the Committee should hire an archeologist to conduct an exploratory survey. He did not think that had ever been done, although it appeared good information was available that those things existed on the site. He thought a professional survey should be done, which he did not think was extremely expensive.

Chairperson Thompson inquired how the Committee could receive funds for this project. Mr. Delacourt stated he would have to request the funding from City Council. He explained a new budget item would have to be established and an RFP prepared and sent out for a consultant, similar to the process followed for the preservation consultant. He stated the City could enter into a contract with a consultant for either a specific project or for continuing services.

Mr. Delacourt stated the criteria would have to be defined so the RFP could be prepared for the project. Chairperson Thompson asked if a motion requesting the funds would be appropriate. Mr. Delacourt indicated that was correct.

Mr. Dziurman suggested estimates would be helpful so the Committee could determine what the cost of this project would be. He thought the Committee could identify other areas where a survey would be helpful, such as the Stoney Creek Village.

Mr. Delacourt stated that the RFP could be for a continuing services contract if the Committee could identify other potential uses, rather than being established for just one project. He explained the process followed by City Council for establishing a contract, noting the yearly renewal would have to be reapproved as part of the budget.

Mr. Delacourt asked if there was any potential of students conducting the survey work as part of a class project. Dr. Stamps stated a class would be offered and the students would be digging at the Wisner Mansion in Pontiac. He noted a class was currently working in Waterford on a grant.

Mr. Dziurman asked if that work was overseen by someone who was certified. Dr. Stamps stated it was overseen. Mr. Delacourt thought checking on the availability of students from the local universities would be an important part of the request for funding. Dr. Stamps stated there were local universities available that had the resources.

Chairperson Thompson asked if the Committee was prepared to make a motion requesting the funding. Mr. Dziurman asked if Five Thousand Dollars would be sufficient. Dr. Stamps thought the project could be done for less than that, although the number of projects would determine the cost. He mentioned Kent Taylor, from Troy, Michigan, who did the archeological project for the parking lot

underneath the South Bridge in Rochester. He noted that particular project required the use of a backhoe and digging a 12-foot deep trench, which was an involved project and added to the cost. He mentioned Bruce Hawkins was also available for these types of projects.

Mr. Delacourt commented it was hard to put a dollar figure to a project as it appeared there was a wide range of associated costs, and noted the Committee did not know how many projects they might have per year. He stated he would need some reliable estimates for an average size project.

Dr. Stamps stated these projects ran in phases, and explained Phase I was to check published literature, conduct an on-the-ground survey and interview locals. If nothing was found, the survey was finished and a recommendation made. If something was found, such as the items that were found on the Frank Farm, the survey would continue to a Phase II. Phase II delimited the size of the site. He stated if artifacts were discovered, their origin would have to be determined, and additional test pits would be done to define the map and identify the location.

Mr. Dziurman stated he had an RFP for a Phase I survey.

Chairperson Thompson summarized the Committee would assemble additional information and contact information and discuss budget numbers at the next meeting.

Mr. Delacourt clarified the Frank Farm Report would be held pending the Committee's decision on the archeological survey project. Chairperson Thompson agreed, noting the matter would be scheduled for the next meeting.

This matter was Discussed

7C. 2008-0663 National Twist Drill

- Discussion regarding Preliminary Report Process

Chairperson Thompson stated that the National Twist Drill Report had been held pending the results of the Committee's meetings with the Planning Commission and the City's Economic Development Manager, both of which had been held.

Mr. Delacourt summarized the Committee had the Preliminary Report, which had not been forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and the Public Hearing had not been held.

Mr. Dziurman explained the Committee had been trying to develop a strategy for the potential designation of this site. He commented that based on the recent feedback from SHPO, he thought the Committee could consider recommending

only a portion of the property for designation, rather than the entire parcel. He wanted to be sure this matter moved forward properly.

Dr. Stamps asked if the Report should be sent to SHPO indicating that given the local economy, although the Committee's first preference was to save the entire site that might be unrealistic, and the Committee wanted to explore the possibility of saving just the architecturally significant building. The Committee would then have SHPO's comments about that proposal.

Mr. Dziurman stated that step would move the process forward, and expressed concern the proposed designation could fail given all the economic issues associated with the site. He noted once the Public Hearing was held, the time frame defined in the Ordinance would have to be followed. He thought the Committee needed some time to finalize the Preliminary Report.

Mr. Delacourt asked if the Committee was ready to forward the Preliminary Report to SHPO with a recommendation for the full District, or propose a smaller District.

Chairperson Thompson thought the smaller District might be what the Committee should recommend. Dr. Stamps noted the Report could be revised to indicate that although the Committee would like to recommend the full District, they recognized the current conditions and in an effort to be receptive to the property owner, proposed a smaller District.

Mr. Dziurman suggested recommending the full District, but including a recommendation to reduce the District to the front buildings, similar to what was being proposed for the Stiles School.

Mr. Delacourt suggested the Report could state that the Study Committee believes a smaller District, i.e. the office building portion, would meet the criteria without the balance of the property. The Report would indicate that the site was evaluated as a smaller District and met the criteria.

Mr. Dziurman suggested the Committee review some proposed language. Mr. Delacourt stated revised language could be prepared for the next meeting, along with a revised proposed District map.

Dr. Stamps agreed, noting the Committee might consider two recommendations, one being the full District and one smaller District consisting of just the office building.

Chairperson Thompson summarized that language for the proposed recommendation would be reviewed at the next meeting, along with a revised proposed District map.

Dr. Stamps noted the Committee recognized this was a large parcel located in an area that developers had a lot of interest. Because of that, the Committee met with the Planning Commission and the City's Economic Development Manager. He asked if there was anyone else the Committee should meet with.

Mr. Dziurman thought it was important that future developers, or the owners of the property, understood historic properties and the tax credits available for them. He commented this was a problem State-wide, noting additional education was necessary to promote the advantages of developing historic properties. He stated that many properties being developed in the City of Detroit would not have happened without the historic tax credits. He discussed a successful development in Ann Arbor utilizing a historic building. He felt there was a misunderstanding about the historic tax credits.

Dr. Stamps asked how effective the Eastern Michigan University Historic Preservation Program was, noting the University had a Master's Degree program. He asked if those students gave presentations on tax credits and how they worked and their benefits. Mr. Delacourt stated that tax credits presentations were usually conducted by SHPO. He commented one of the professors at Eastern gave preservation talks through the Michigan Historic Preservation Network.

The Committee discussed the fact that developers would only be convinced by the dollars and cents involved, and whether they would save money. Mr. Delacourt noted that some of the projects in Detroit combined resources, such as environmental tax credits with historic tax credits. He noted those developers were not preservationists, but used the incentives available for their projects.

Mr. Dziurman suggested the Committee might hold an educational presentation. Dr. Stamps asked who the target audience would be.

Mr. Dziurman stated there was an organization called the International Council of Shopping Centers ("ICSC") that held quarterly meetings. He stated that was a group of developers that might be interested in such a presentation. Mr. Delacourt stated he could contact them to see if they would be interested. Mr. Dziurman stated he could also make some contact.

Dr. Stamps suggested Rewold might be a good resource because they were a local business with a history in the area and had preserved some buildings.

Chairperson Thompson summarized that Mr. Delacourt and Mr. Dziurman would pursue a presentation regarding preservation benefits.

Dr. Stamps asked if there was a developer waiting to demolish the Twist Drill to build something else. Mr. Delacourt stated there was no developer at this time.

The current property owners wanted to sell the site and did not want to limit a potential purchaser. Although they understood the potential benefit of designation, they preferred to leave that decision to a future purchaser. Because the current owners were not planning to redevelop the site, they were not interested in potential incentives.

Dr. Stamps asked if the Rochester-Avon Historical Society could provide any assistance, such as presenting a program regarding the history of the National Twist Drill, which would raise public awareness about the site.

Mr. Dziurman stated he had previously talked to Rod Wilson about the site, and could make that request.

Mr. Hannick stated that the Rochester-Avon Historical Society scheduled events at the Rochester Hills Public Library related to historical matters, which were all very good. He noted that Paula Tutman from Channel 4 resided in the area, had written a book, and reported on those types of local events.

Mr. Dziurman stated that Lynn Sieffert wrote articles related to historic preservation that had been published locally.

Chairperson Thompson summarized the Committee had several good avenues to follow up on. Mr. Delacourt summarized a revised recommendation and revised potential District map would be prepared and reviewed by the Committee at the next meeting. Both he and Mr. Dziurman would contact Mr. Detloff about the potential of a presentation at the ICSC. If Mr. Detloff agrees to a presentation, the Committee will need to discuss potential presenters.

This matter was Discussed

**7D. 2007-0313 2040 S. Livernois (HDSC File #98-012)
- Discussion re Preliminary Report Process**

Chairperson Thompson stated that this report had not been forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and no Public Hearing had been held.

Mr. Delacourt stated the house was located on Livernois just south of Hamlin Road and had been owned by a former Study Committee and Historic District Commission member. He noted the house had been listed for sale for quite some time, although it did not appear to be for sale at the present time. He stated a thin coat of paint appeared to have been sprayed on the exterior.

Mr. Delacourt stated that the property owner had come to the City and indicated they were not interested in designation. The property owner preferred to leave that

decision to a potential purchaser to determine if they are supportive of a designation. The property owner thought designation would limit the market for sale of the property, and asked it not be moved forward.

Chairperson Thompson suggested the Committee move forward with this report. Mr. Dziurman asked what the next step would be. Mr. Delacourt stated the Report would be transmitted to SHPO and a Public Hearing date scheduled.

Mr. Dziurman noted the State was already familiar with this property. Mr. Delacourt agreed as it was the subject of a Memorandum of Understanding in connection with the road improvements on Hamlin and the Livernois intersection.

This matter was Approved

Aye 4 - Stamps, Dziurman, Thompson and Hannick

Absent 3 - Webster, Schodowski and Woolf

RESOLVED that the Preliminary Report regarding the property known as 2040 S. Livernois, Parcel Identification Number 15-28-226-026, be forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Office.

2007-0313

Chairperson Thompson stated the Report would be sent to the State Historic Preservation Office. He noted that it might be advisable to schedule the Public Hearing for this property at the same time the Public Hearing is scheduled for the Stiles School property.

Mr. Delacourt asked if there were any suggested changes to the Preliminary Report prior to the report being sent to SHPO. No changes were suggested by the Committee. He pointed out the property was not currently designated, which meant there was no duty to maintain or other protections offered by Ordinance.

8. NEW BUSINESS

- 8A. 2009-0411 1585 S. Rochester Road (HDC File #03-003)
 - Referral from City Council
 - Request for Study re Delisting Request

Chairperson Thompson asked for a brief summary from Staff regarding this property.

Mr. Delacourt stated that the property owner made a request of City Council to delist the property. The property owner submitted a packet of information as to why they felt the property should be delisted. City Council made a motion to forward the information to the Study Committee; engaged the City's preservation consultant to conduct a review, and requested that a response be brought back to

Council within 180 days of September 28, 2009. The City's preservation consultant received a copy of the information and has begun her review. He expected a Preliminary Report to be completed shortly.

Mr. Delacourt stated the Study Committee had been provided a copy of the information submitted to City Council. He asked if the Committee had any input or information to pass along to the preservation consultant. He introduced Mr. Cornell Vennettilli, G&V Properties, the property owner, who was present.

Mr. Delacourt stated that the property was part of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Agreement that was approved by the Historic Districts Commission (HDC) that included the relocation and adaptive reuse of the house on the site. He stated that City Council was aware that if the site was delisted, the PUD Agreement would have to be amended, noting the property owner was also aware the PUD Agreement would be open for renegotiation. The property owner had held some preliminary discussions with the Planning Commission regarding their ideas as to what direction they would like go with the PUD Agreement, especially if the property is delisted. Staff has not made any recommendation to either the Planning Commission or City Council regarding the PUD Agreement, pending receipt of the Preliminary Report. He explained once the Preliminary Report was received, the Study Committee made a recommendation and that information would be taken back to City Council.

Mr. Dziurman asked when the Preliminary Report would be available. Mr. Delacourt expected it to be completed soon, and indicated it would be forwarded to the Study Committee when it was received.

Mr. Dziurman asked about the deadline. Mr. Delacourt explained the Study Committee had a deadline to get to City Council with some type of information or a request for additional time.

Chairperson Thompson noted that this matter was forwarded to the Committee at the September 28, 2009 City Council meeting, and the Committee had 180 days from that date to respond.

Dr. Stamps clarified the matter had been referred to the Study Committee for delisting. He inquired about the applicant's rationale and reasons for delisting.

Mr. Delacourt stated it was the opinion of professionals hired by the applicant that it did not meet any of the criteria for designation. City Council has asked that to be reexamined by the Study Committee.

Chairperson Thompson summarized that informational material had been provided to the Study Committee and the Preliminary Report was being prepared by the preservation consultant.

Mr. Delacourt stated the applicant had provided professional opinions regarding the house. The Study Committee would evaluate that information and make a recommendation about whether that information was correct or not. In accordance with the Ordinance, a delisting request is made to City Council.

Chairperson Thompson stated the applicant had provided quite a bit of information for the Committee's review.

Mr. Hannick noted the submitted information indicated the porch was not original to the house, and there were other additions made to the house. He commented some of those items could be considered improvements, and he did not know how the Committee would respond.

Mr. Dziurman stated the Ordinance prevented a house from being left to rot. A claim could be made that it would cost a lot of money to repair, and questioned whose fault it was that it was in that state, which would have to be addressed.

Mr. Hannick stated part of the information indicated a demolition by neglect violation could be issued when it was determined the City was in danger of losing the Historic District resource. He noted the barns had been demolished. He thought the pictures depicted the unbelievable shape the house was currently in, which appeared to be a violation.

Mr. Delacourt stated that demolition by neglect violations had been issued on the house. Mr. Dziurman stated that was part of the duties of the Historic Districts Commission, and the Study Committee did not get involved in those matters.

Chairperson Thompson stated the Committee would have a more complete picture when they received the Preliminary Report. He stated no one was questioning any work that had been done. Rather the Committee had to review all the information before making a recommendation.

Mr. Delacourt stated there were two different items being discussed. The item before the Study Committee was whether it did not meet the criteria for designation, regardless of its current condition. That was the question City Council had asked the Study Committee to evaluate. He explained it was the applicant's position that even if the house was in immaculate condition, it still would not meet the criteria for designation. The second part of the argument was that even if it met the criteria, the condition was such that it should not be kept. He stated that was more of an argument for the Historic Districts Commission or City Council. Technically, the charge of the Study Committee was whether it met the criteria or not. The Study Committee has always based its recommendations on the integrity not the condition.

Mr. Delacourt asked if the Study Committee had any information they wanted to give to the preservation consultant before she completed her report.

Chairperson Thompson stated the Committee would follow the process and would await receipt of the Preliminary Report. Once all the information was received, the Committee would discuss their recommendation.

Dr. Stamps stated the property was examined; it was designated; and the property owner agreed when the PUD Agreement was approved. He questioned the use of the PUD, and why the argument against designation was not made at that time.

Mr. Delacourt stated there are advantages to designation; however, agreeing to the designation and agreeing it is historic are two different things. He stated if there was an advantage for the development of the property, the property owner did not have to agree with the designation. He was aware of a similar situation where a developer questioned the historic designation, but recognized the designation as a benefit to the proposed development.

Cornell Vennettilli, the property owner, added that there was never an in-depth investigation in the past as was done now. He explained that special experts had been called in to review the property.

Mr. Dziurman stated that the property owner may not have conducted an investigation, but the Study Committee at that time did. He explained there was a Committee at the time of designation.

Mr. Vennettilli stated the experts he recently brought in to investigate determined the house was not the historic structure it was previously thought to be.

Chairperson Thompson stated that the Committee would review all the information it received in making its recommendation. He called for any other comments or questions about the property. Upon hearing none, he stated the matter would be scheduled for the next meeting agenda.

This matter was Discussed

- 8B. 2009-0437** 2371 S. Livernois Road
- Referral from City Council
- Request to Delist

Chairperson Thompson stated this matter was referred to the Study Committee by City Council at its October 26, 2009 meeting, and was a request to delist.

Mr. Delacourt stated this was an interesting matter because there was a paperwork error involved that confused the issue for quite some time. He stated this was a ten-acre parcel on the east side of Livernois, north of M-59 with a single family home on the property.

Mr. Delacourt stated this property was designated as part of the original designations in 1978. When the property was designated, there were two single family homes on the property. Pictures of the second home were included in the packet information. One parcel with two single family homes with two separate addresses (2409 S. Livernois and 2371 S. Livernois). When the original designation was done, the picture included on the survey sheet was of the 2371 structure with the correct sidwell number for the entire parcel; however, the address of the 2409 structure was identified on the survey sheet.

Mr. Delacourt further explained that the Affidavit filed with the Oakland County Register of Deeds and attached to the title work reflected the 2409 S. Livernois address. That house was a block house that was demolished in 2001.

Mr. Dziurman inquired about the Affidavit. Mr. Delacourt explained that when the properties were designated in 1978, Affidavits were prepared and filed with the Oakland County Register of Deeds. If anyone purchased a home, the Affidavits appeared on the record.

Mr. Delacourt explained that originally the property owner believed the 2409 house was the house that was designated, which had been demolished, and requested that the 2371 house be delisted. The property owner believed there had been a defective procedure in the original designation.

Mr. Delacourt stated Staff researched the original paperwork and determined that the original survey depicted the 2371 house and it was clearly the intent of that Study Committee to designate the 2371 house. Even though the Affidavit has the wrong address on it, because the houses were on the same parcel, it had stayed attached to the 2371 house title work.

Mr. Delacourt stated the property owner then did some additional research on the 2371 house and found the house was designated in 1978 and had been constructed in 1945. The property owner's argument then became that the house was not even 50 years old when designated. Mr. Dziurman commented that a structure can be less than 50 years old.

Mr. Delacourt stated the property owner referred to the City's old Property Owner's Guide, which said a property must be 50 years old.

Mr. Delacourt stated the property owner's argument was two-fold; one it did not meet the criteria even if the house is now 50 years old; and two it was designated through a defective procedure because the City did not identify how old the house was when it was designated. Mr. Delacourt stated the original survey sheet did not identify a "year built" date and the architectural type was wrongly identified. Mr. Dziurman agreed the procedure could be considered defective.

Mr. Delacourt stated it was a valid argument but that argument would cease to matter because the Study Committee would evaluate the structure based on what it was currently to determine if it meets the criteria.

Mr. Dziurman asked who had prepared the submitted information. Mr. Delacourt stated the property owner had used research information from the City to prepare his material.

Mr. Dziurman asked about the reason for the request. Mr. Delacourt stated the property was currently up for sale, and the property owner felt the designation limited the number of prospective purchasers and scares purchasers away. The property owner is no longer going to develop the property and would like it delisted for sale. If the new owner wanted to embrace the designation, that new owner could request a reconsideration of the designation.

Mr. Delacourt stated it was explained to City Council that the Study Committee would make a recommendation about whether the property met the criteria for designation. City Council asked the Study Committee to evaluate the property and make a recommendation.

Mr. Dziurman asked if the City's preservation consultant was preparing a Preliminary Report. Mr. Delacourt indicated that was correct.

Chairperson Thompson asked if the Study Committee would have the Preliminary Report by the next meeting. Mr. Delacourt stated he had requested it be done by then.

The Committee discussed when the home was actually built. Mr. Delacourt stated based on the information provided, it appeared the house was built in 1945. He noted the house was moved to its present location in 1971. It was moved from the site of the former Pat Moran Oldsmobile Dealership on Rochester Road, which is now the Lowe's site. He pointed out that when the house was moved, several additions were added. He stated that information was being verified by the consultant.

Chairperson Thompson stated it was clear the Committee needed to review the

Preliminary Report since there were so many issues involved with this site. He asked if there were any questions or comments from the Committee.

Mr. Delacourt asked if the Committee had any thoughts on what the consultant should research or any concerns the Committee would like the consultant to look into.

Dr. Stamps inquired about a resource losing its value once it is had been moved. Mr. Delacourt stated that does have an impact. He explained it could be offset by the level of integrity.

Mr. Dziurman asked when the resource was designated. Mr. Delacourt stated it was designated in 1978 by the original Study Committee. Mr. Dziurman commented the original Study Committee did a pretty good job noting they did not have all the tools available today.

Mr. Delacourt agreed, noting the requirements were not at the same level they are currently. The investigation necessary to determine a designation was not near what it is today. He pointed out the Intensive Level Survey conducted in 2002 verified the 1978 work. He stated the amount of information from the 1978 designation is not enough to counter the type of information being presented now, particularly with the guidelines and the National Register. He explained what was done in 1978 was a series of survey sheets and addresses.

Mr. Dziurman stated property owners were now saying nothing was done at that time, which was not correct. Mr. Delacourt stated for that time, work was done. He stated he had asked the consultant to review the property as she would any new property being considered for designation, specifically, does it meet the criteria. That is the same question being asked of the Study Committee.

Dr. Stamps stated he had asked the question because a couple of weeks ago he was taken on a tour of Corktown in Detroit. Every block had a house that had been moved in to a space. He had become aware there was much more moving of houses years ago, even in the 1890s. He commented that moving structures was a more common phenomenon. He referred to the Rochester College historic district, noting the setting or the context was important as well. He thought a case could be made that structures were moved around and still have value after they were moved. He did not know how SHPO currently viewed moved structures.

Mr. Dziurman stated he was involved in a project in Ann Arbor where three or four houses may be moved a few feet forward. He stated while SHPO could not commit to anything, it might be allowed. He thought it was pretty clear according to the National Register guidelines that if a resource was moved off a site, it was almost automatically forgotten about.

Dr. Stamps stated that was part of the case made by the applicant before City Council. The applicant stated that the National Register guidelines do not allow structures to be moved; therefore, the property should be delisted.

Mr. Dziurman pointed out that structures can be moved on the same property because it still retains its context. He stated that some of the homes in the Stoney Creek Village had been moved back to get them off the road.

Mr. Delacourt suggested the preservation consultant attend the next meeting to discuss the Preliminary Reports with the Committee. The Committee agreed that was a good idea.

This matter was Discussed

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Chairperson Thompson stated that the next regular meeting was scheduled for Thursday, December 10, 2009 at 5:30 PM. Chairperson Thompson asked if there was any other business.

Dr. Stamps advised the Committee he would be out of town on December 10, 2009 and unable to attend that meeting. Chairperson Thompson asked if any other members would be unable to attend, noting a quorum was required to hold an official meeting.

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 6:55 PM.

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

Judy A. Bialk, Recording Secretary

Approved as _____ at the _____, 2009 Regular Historic Districts Study Committee Meeting.

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT