



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, David Kibby, K'Yhel King, Peggy Schodowski, LaVere Webster

Thursday, September 11, 2008

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 5 - Richard Stamps, John Dziurman, Jason Thompson, LaVere Webster and K'Yhel King

Absent 2 - Peggy Schodowski and David Kibby

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

Chairperson Thompson welcomed Mr. K'Yhel King to the Committee. He stated Mr. King had recently been appointed by City Council to complete Mr. Dennis Mueller's term, which expires December 31, 2009.

3. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

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

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4A. 2008-0351 June 12, 2008 Regular Meeting Minutes

Chairperson Thompson asked for any comments or corrections regarding the June 12, 2008 Regular Meeting Minutes. Upon hearing no comments or corrections, Chairperson Thompson called for a motion to approve.

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

Aye 5 - King, Stamps, Dziurman, Thompson and Webster

Absent 2 - Schodowski and Kibby

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the June 12, 2008 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)

No public comments were received on any non-Agenda items.

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 7A. 2005-0537 3976 S. Livernois (Stiles School)
- Discussion regarding Preliminary Report

Chairperson Thompson noted for the record that a representative from the Oakland-Steiner School was present, and thanked Ms. Katherine Thivierge for attending the meeting.

Mr. Delacourt explained that the Preliminary Report for 3976 S. Livernois had been completed, and there have been on-going discussions with representatives of the Oakland-Steiner School regarding the proposed designation and what impact it would have on the School. The Study Committee had invited representatives of the Oakland-Steiner School to attend the meeting to participate in the discussion. He noted the School had discussed the proposed designation with their insurance company. He stated the Preliminary Report had been submitted to both the City's Planning Commission and the State's Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for review, and SHPO had agreed the school met the criteria for local designation.

Mr. Delacourt stated the Committee needed to decide whether or not they were going to make the recommendation to designate to City Council, or whether there were any changes that should be made or any additional information that should be added to the Preliminary Report.

Chairperson Thompson explained the Committee was limited in the scope of what they could do. It is the Committee's charge to determine if the property meets the requirements for designation, and to pass that information on to City Council. City Council makes the decision on whether or not to designate a property. He asked Ms. Thivierge to provide her comments.

Ms. Thivierge introduced herself and stated she was the Administrator for the Oakland-Steiner School. She pointed out that with respect to the insurance costs, in

the event something happened to the building, the replacement cost would be borne in the rates charged the school. She explained they were a small, private school and did not have State funding; they did not have endowments, and enrollment was down.

Ms. Thivierge stated that was their primary concern, and noted they valued the historical nature of the building. This summer they had restored an office back to the former classroom it had been originally. The former owner of the building (Avondale School District) had converted the classroom to an office.

Ms. Thivierge stated that the school's primary concern, if the property met the designation criteria, other than the area proposed to be designated, is that the historical building and the repairs would adversely affect the programs and future plans for the school. The historical building is a small area of what is proposed to be designated. The school does value the historical nature of the building, but it could impact their programs.

Ms. Thivierge suggested that just the historical building and the area towards the street, or the view from the street, be designated and maintained historical. If anything happened, the school would have to close down because they did not have any funds for restoration. The other part of the building from the 1950's and the 1960's did not add to the historical nature of the property.

Chairperson Thompson explained that City Council had the final say on designation. The Study Committee was charged with making a determination on the criteria, and making a recommendation to City Council. He asked if the Committee could consider changing the size of the proposed district.

Mr. Delacourt stated the Committee could make a recommendation based on whatever met the criteria, such as if the Committee felt a smaller district would meet the criteria for designation. He pointed out he did not know of just a single structure being designated, because the Ordinance designated the entire parcel, not just a structure. Buildings or structures on a parcel within a district are considered either contributing or non-contributing to the district.

Ms. Thivierge stated the school felt that they would be restricted from doing something as simple as putting up a swing set.

Mr. Dziurman advised Ms. Thivierge that the school had originally asked the Study Committee to designate the property because it was under threat from a developer. Ms. Thivierge stated that perhaps parents might have asked, but not the official representatives of the school. Mr. Webster explained that the school had made the request because the prior owner, the school district, felt it might just be better to bulldoze the building and sell the property as vacant land. At that time, the

Oakland-Steiner School was renting the building from the school district, and wanted to save the school. The Oakland-Steiner School had requested the support of the neighbors and the Community to help them save the school.

The Committee noted that once the potential developer dropped out and the Oakland-Steiner School purchased the property, it appeared that Oakland-Steiner no longer needed the Study Committee or the designation. The Oakland-Steiner School had brought the request to the Study Committee and the Study Committee took action. At that time, everyone felt the school was worth saving.

Ms. Thivierge stated she knew that parents had come to the City, but not officials from the school. The school felt the designation should be limited to the historical building. She again expressed concern about being able to install a playground for the children, or making repairs such as window replacement, and the restrictions that could be imposed and the associated costs. Dr. Stamps pointed out that if the windows were broken or had to be repaired, the school would still have to replace them, whether the building was designated or not.

Mr. Delacourt noted that window replacement was not an issue for the Study Committee, but was something that would be brought up for discussion with the Historic Districts Commission (HDC). He noted that insurance might not cover the difference in replacement costs.

Ms. Thivierge commented that the added replacement value after the fire last May could be high; however, their agent could not give them figures at this time.

Chairperson Thompson asked if the Committee felt they were ready to move forward with the report.

Mr. Delacourt stated the charge of the Study Committee is narrow and straightforward. Does the property meet the criteria, and what size parcel area meets the criteria for designation and to provide protection for the resource in the future. He asked if there was any additional information that should be included in the report.

Ms. Thivierge noted that the photographs included in the Preliminary Report focused on the historical building, which the bulk of the school was not. She suggested the Committee limit its recommendation to the historical building and the area around it that affected the street view and the view for the Community.

The Committee questioned if that would be too narrow, considering how the building had been added on to. Mr. Dziurman stated he had not seen anything else in the City narrowed down to that extreme. Ms. Thivierge stated the school felt the historical building was like a separate building. Chairperson Thompson asked if there was anything similar in the City.

Mr. Webster stated the Committee had drawn a line several reviews back. Dr. Stamps asked if the line should be redrawn between the new additions and the main building. Mr. Delacourt asked if that would be considered an identifiable area. Mr. Dziurman commented that could be a legal question for the City Attorney. He explained the Ordinance used to require 100-feet around the building; however, that had been changed to include the entire parcel.

Mr. Delacourt noted that during the Rochester College redistricting, the College had been required to split the parcel such that the context of the District and the associated farm buildings remained and were protected. The designated parcel was not just the structures themselves, or just the barn.

Mr. Delacourt explained if just the building was designated, and the current owners moved and sold the property, anything could be developed close to the building. If the property were developed, no review would be required by the HDC for the area around the building, which could impact the historic building, as well as the view shed of the building. He was not sure about designating just the footprint of a building.

Ms. Thivierge suggested including the building and the area in the view. Dr. Stamps noted that in limiting the size of the district to the building and a few feet around the building, if the property were sold in fifteen or twenty years, a new developer could wrap a new building entirely around the historic building. He pointed out that not only was the main building historic, but that the evolution of the building was also important. The school grew and the building and additions told the history of the structure; the history of the school, and the history of the neighborhood. He noted that even the 1960s addition was now at least 40 years old.

Ms. Thivierge stated the school was not talking about changing anything, but rather they had put a lot of care and love into the building and the property. They tried to be site consistent with items such as gardens or the areas where the children played.

Mr. Delacourt noted that a playscape would not lessen or impact the integrity of the structure. Mr. Dziurman stated the HDC protected the integrity of the site.

Ms. Thivierge stated the school had just purchased the property in August 2006, and did not anticipate moving and hoped to have a home there forever.

Mr. Delacourt discussed the impact on the resource if a district line were drawn that did not include the additions. He noted if those additions were removed, it could negatively impact the resource. If the district line was moved, something could be built that did not require review and could be something that would not be considered prudent by the HDC.

Chairperson Thompson stated that the discussion and comments had been very beneficial. He asked the Study Committee for their thoughts regarding the size of the proposed district.

Mr. Webster reminded the Committee that in earlier meetings, the Committee had talked about moving the line south, to exclude the gym and the 1960s addition.

Mr. Delacourt stated that when the property was under contract to the developer, the developer had requested the study because he wanted to move forward with plans for the site. That developer had actually paid for the study to be done. When the original report was completed, the recommendation was to include all the parcels in the proposed district. Any development that took place would have been reviewed by the HDC to make sure the integrity of the district was maintained. Subsequently, the Study Committee reviewed the proposed district and reduced the proposed district to include the parcel that contained the majority of the school buildings (Parcel 15-33-476-027), and the southern 90 feet of Parcel 15-33-476-014.

Dr. Stamps noted that the proposed reduction in the size of the district was a substantial compromise. He commented that if the proposed district was further reduced to only include the original school building, the wing addition and gym could be removed. He wondered what the school's plans were for that area.

Ms. Thivierge commented the school did not have any plans to change anything at the present time. She noted if the school had the economics to do so, they would like a gym that was an appropriate size. At this time, no one had mentioned any other future plans for the school.

The Committee and Ms. Thivierge discussed the compatibility of any future additions with the original school building and the context of the proposed district. The Committee commented that designation provided some protection for the school building against future development. The Oakland-Steiner School recognizes the value of the original building; its value to the neighborhood, and wanted to be in the Community. However, it was noted that a future developer could come along with enough economic incentive that the school would sell, and a future developer might not put a premium on the school building.

The Committee discussed the fact the previous developer wanted to construct a strip mall on the property; however, at that time the Oakland-Steiner School wanted to save the soccer fields, and asked the Study Committee to help preserve the soccer fields.

Mr. Dziurman stated he would not vote to reduce the size of the proposed district. Although the current owners valued the school, twenty or thirty years from now, that may not be the case. He understood the Oakland-Steiner School agreed with the historical value, and the Study Committee was providing an opportunity to protect that historical value. If a developer came along with the right check, the Oakland-Steiner School would have to seriously think about it, and the City could lose a historical building. Designation would provide protection for the building, the City, and future generations as well.

Chairperson Thompson asked if the Committee was ready to move the report to City Council. Mr. Delacourt asked if there was anything else the Committee would like to add to the Preliminary Report, or whether the Committee had any new information that should be included.

Mr. Dziurman clarified there was nothing that the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) felt should be included in the report. Mr. Delacourt responded that the State Review Board did agree the property met the criteria, and the SHPO office appeared to be satisfied.

Mr. Dziurman questioned whether there was anything the Committee wanted to add to the report to make it stronger, based on the Committee's recent meeting with a SHPO representative. Mr. Delacourt did not recall anything that should be added, noting it met the criteria, and the report reflected that.

Dr. Stamps thought the Committee should forward the report to City Council. He noted the Oakland-Steiner School would have a representative present at the City Council meeting. He pointed out the charge of the Study Committee was to study the site and see if it met the criteria for designation. The Committee had done that, and it would be up to City Council to decide if it should be designated or not.

Dr. Stamps stated the Preliminary Report had been prepared; it has been sent to SHPO; it had been reviewed by SHPO and the State Review Board which supported the Study Committee's recommendation, and he thought it was time to move the report forward to City Council.

Mr. Webster commented that when the study began, the Oakland-Steiner School rented the building. The Avondale School District had surveyed the neighborhood with the intention of purchasing additional property to build a middle school. However, because his house was designated, they could not purchase his property with the intention of bulldozing his house down. If his house had not been designated, and if the Stiles School had not been on the potential list, the School District could have bulldozed all the structures, sold the property as vacant land, and the Oakland-Steiner School might not have had a building to purchase, and the school building would have been lost to the entire neighborhood.

The neighborhood wanted to maintain the building as a school and was happy the Oakland-Steiner School was there.

Mr. Dziurman stated that the Oakland-Steiner School was a private school, and was privately owned, and would qualify for tax credits. He explained some of the parents might have to establish a Limited Liability Company (LLC) beforehand, but there were ways for the school to qualify for tax credits. He pointed out the tax credits were a significant amount of money, and although the school might have to do some research to qualify, the school could get 20% back for remodeling work. He commented there were ways to qualify for the tax credits, and noted that designation was not all negative.

Ms. Thivierge noted the school had a very humble budget.

Mr. Delacourt stated that the comments about the insurance company were surprising. Ms. Thivierge explained private school insurance was not provided or offered by very many carriers. Mr. Delacourt offered to explain to the school's carrier what designation meant.

Mr. Webster commented the insurance premiums on his house had doubled, but it did not have anything to do with the designation or the State of Michigan, but rather the insurance company's losses in Florida. He had researched insurance companies and found that Michigan Mutual offered policies for less.

Ms. Thivierge noted the school had very limited choices in carriers for private school insurance.

Chairperson Thompson asked if the Committee wanted to prepare a presentation for Council. The Committee agreed once a Council meeting date was selected, they would decide who was available to present the Preliminary Report to Council.

Chairperson Thompson summarized that the Preliminary Report would be presented to City Council, and the Committee would be advised when it is scheduled. He noted that the Oakland-Steiner School would also be notified when the matter was scheduled, and would be given an opportunity to present Council with their point of view as well. He reminded everyone that Council had the final say on designation, and the Committee was simply fulfilling its charge with respect to the property.

This matter was Discussed

7B. 2006-0425

Frank Farm

- Discussion regarding Preliminary Report

Chairperson Thompson stated the Committee would now discuss the Frank Farm Preliminary Report, and requested an update.

Mr. Delacourt stated the Preliminary Report had been prepared and sent to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and to the City's Planning Commission for review. SHPO agreed it met the criteria and did not ask for any additional information.

Mr. Delacourt noted the proposed district contained multiple properties comprised of three parcels of land, family homes, and outbuildings associated with a farm. He explained that originally it was thought the proposed district consisted of just two parcels; however, when Dr. Busch did the fieldwork, it became clear all three parcels were part of the original farmstead.

Mr. Delacourt stated that 1290 E. Auburn and 1356 E. Auburn were currently owner-occupied, and 1304 E. Auburn was owned by an absentee landlord. He commented that the City's Building Department had issued several citations to that property owner.

Ms. Anita Holtz, 1290 E. Auburn Road, was present on behalf of her mother, who still resided at 1290 E. Auburn. She commented that 1304 E. Auburn was a good example of demolition by neglect. Mr. Delacourt agreed that if that property was designated, it could go to the City's Historic Districts Commission (HDC) as a demolition by neglect.

Dr. Stamps asked if the property owner of that parcel had been notified. Mr. Delacourt stated that notification letters had been sent.

Ms. Holtz stated that presently there were twenty-one people living on the property, which she felt should be checked into by the City. Mr. Delacourt stated that the City's Ordinance Enforcement officers were aware of the site and were currently waiting to see what the Study Committee and City Council were going to do about the potential designation.

Dr. Stamps stated that the Study Committee's review indicated that the property was a unique site in the City, because the City was originally all farmsteads. The Frank Farm site was now one of only a few left in the City. Ms. Holtz commented that Ray Frank still did some farming on the property.

Dr. Stamps felt that made the property even more special. He noted the property depicted the evolution of farming life in the City, and he felt it was a unique, valuable property. He suggested the Preliminary Report be forwarded to City Council with the Committee's recommendation for designation.

Ms. Holtz explained she was part of the Frank Family, and that her mother lived at 1290 E. Auburn, and her cousin, Ray Frank, resided at 1356 E. Auburn. She grew up on the property, and stated Ray Frank had recently celebrated his 90th birthday.

Mr. Dziurman commented that Ray Frank was a former member of the City's Historic Districts Commission. He asked what the family thought about designating the property.

Ms. Holtz stated she was the youngest member of the family; Ray Frank had just turned 90, and the children were all out of state or had passed away. She noted her mother resided in 1290 E. Auburn, and was in her 80's, and suffered from some memory loss. Ms. Holtz, herself, was not interested in living on the property. She explained 1304 E. Auburn was where her father was born and raised. That property has been sold several times, and it appeared to be Section 8 housing at the present time. She did not believe the home had any value left to it. She indicated that in comparing pictures of the past and the present condition of the house, she did not think it could be restored. She commented the "bones" of the house might be good, but it would require extensive work to bring it back to a livable condition. She noted it was not up to code, which was the same with all the houses on the properties. She stated it was possible there could be a situation where the house was sold "as is", but it would be hard to do. She also did not know how limiting it would be to sell if it was designated historical.

Ms. Holtz commented she would hate to see the property sold and developed as a subdivision. She stated at one point she had considered moving the house back on the parcel and putting trees around it, and at one time she wanted to live in the house next door. She pointed out the property was located on Auburn Road and might not be as valuable as other property in the City. She also noted the property was zoned as single family, and was located next to the Reuther Middle School.

Ms. Holtz stated it would nice if someone took over the property and wanted to live there, but she thought the chances of that happening were slim.

Mr. Webster stated that about eight to ten years ago designation had been discussed with the idea of the property becoming an educational farm. Ms. Holtz recalled that "Pat" had visited her mother and talked about that. Dr. Stamps stated that ten to fifteen years ago that there had been discussion about creating a living farm with live animals, similar to what the City of Troy had done. It had been suggested the site could be used for school tours, which would help pay for the operation, and would be used as a learning center.

Ms. Holtz noted that the barn had burned in the mid-1970s, caused by someone smoking in the barn.

Mr. Delacourt asked Ms. Holtz about her feelings about designation, noting if the family were to sell the property and hoped a potential purchaser was interested in buying and restoring the structures appropriately, designation and the required review by the HDC would ensure that and could be an advantage. He stated that if a potential purchaser were desirous of utilizing the 25% tax credits, designation would be necessary.

Ms. Holtz stated she was not sure how restrictive it would be if the property is designated or whether that would stall any potential sales. She commented the property was paid for and the current taxes were not burdensome to the current owners. She indicated she would not like to leave the structures empty when the time comes. She felt there were advantages and disadvantages if the property were designated, and she did not know how it would affect them in the long-term.

Mr. Dziurman asked for clarification on how the parcels were split up. Mr. Delacourt noted there were two homes on one parcel. Dr. Stamps noted the middle house was in a state of disrepair.

Ms. Holtz stated that was the original farmhouse. She commented if the property was deemed historical, she did not think developers would be beating their doors down to make an offer. She also noted the property was zoned single family. She commented she would not like to see zero lot line homes developed on the property.

Mr. Delacourt stated the City's Ordinances did not allow zero lot line houses. He commented a potential purchaser could always request a zoning change, which would have to follow the normal process.

Mr. Dziurman asked if the subject parcels were included in the Olde Towne area. Mr. Delacourt stated the property could be impacted by it, but was not included in that area.

Mr. King asked Ms. Holtz if she was in favor of the designation. Ms. Holtz asked what the advantages or disadvantages of designation would be to her family. She commented it would be good if the property could remain somewhat as it is presently, but questioned whether it would become an albatross if designated. She was trying to get a feel for the pro's and con's of designation.

Mr. Webster pointed out that the tax credits were a benefit. He explained that additions would be permitted to the sides or the back of the original structures. The property owner could get a 10% to 25% as a tax credit, depending on whether or not a property is residential or commercial, which is significant. Ms. Holtz agreed that could be a selling point.

Dr. Stamps explained the tax credits were available for such things as new plumbing, heating, re-wiring, roofs, and painting.

Mr. Webster stated that designated properties had a higher resale value. He commented he had checked on his house, which had 17% more in value than an equal house that is not designated.

Ms. Holtz commented her mother's house was just a farmhouse built in the 1940s. Mr. Dziurman stated that the criteria was over 50 years in age; although there was interest developing in the "recent past" which included structures built in the 1960s.

Ms. Holtz asked what the "down side" of designation was. Mr. Webster stated he would rather provide the "up side" and stated that in comparison to other historic districts commissions, the Rochester Hills HDC was very friendly, particularly based on his experience with commissions on the East Coast. He stated he had specifically looked for a historic home, and had searched from Lake Orion all the way through the Woodward Avenue Corridor in Royal Oak, before he found his home.

Mr. Delacourt stated that designation had an appeal to certain purchasers that depending on their particular interest would be motivated to look for this type of property. Certainly the tax credits would be to their advantage. He explained another advantage was that the City was given more ability to step in and take care of a situation such as was occurring with the 1304 E. Auburn property.

Ms. Holtz asked if 1304 E. Auburn was designated, whether it would have to be brought up to Code. Mr. Delacourt explained that if designated, the HDC had a process to establish demolition by neglect. If a resource becomes structurally unsound or loses its historical reference due to neglect, the Historical Preservation Ordinance contains a provision regarding a property owner's duty to maintain and a time frame to accomplish some protection for the resource. Upon demonstrating the structure's instability, City Council can take action, obtain a court order, and take over the resource, along with placing a lien on the property for administrative costs. The City has followed this procedure previously, which involves very extreme circumstances. The process is followed to bring a property up to a non-blighted stage, and can be used to save a property.

Ms. Holtz commented in the case of the 1304 E. Auburn property, it might prevent the structure from falling down. She stated the house had siding on the front, but not on the back. She asked if the landlord had been notified of the proposed designation.

Mr. Delacourt stated the property owner had been sent several letters throughout the entire study process, but had never responded.

Dr. Stamps referred to the proposed district, and stated that not only did the property have a sense of the City's rural roots, it was the Frank Farm. The generations of the Frank family go back through the local history, and were founders of the Community, which gave the property even more meaning.

Ms. Holtz stated the Frank family had received the property in a land grant and that Andrew Jackson had signed the property over to them.

Dr. Stamps stated that the property depicted the transition of the residents on the property from rural to more modern, which also showed the history of the farm.

Ms. Holtz commented that if the property were sold, it would not mean anything to a new owner.

Dr. Stamps stated that if the property were designated, it would live on and would be known as the Frank Farm, and its history would be preserved.

Ms. Holtz stated that with one of the houses in danger of tumbling down, the farm was a long way from what it used to be.

Chairperson Thompson asked if the Committee wanted to move forward with the Preliminary Report. The Committee agreed the Report should be moved forward to City Council.

Chairperson Thompson asked if there were any proposed changes to the Report before it was moved forward. No suggested changes were discussed.

Chairperson Thompson summarized that the Report would be moved forward to City Council.

Ms. Holtz asked how City Council made its decision about designation. Mr. Delacourt explained the Study Committee made a recommendation based on whether the property met the criteria. City Council reviewed the Committee's recommendation, but also took other factors into consideration. He stated the property owners were strongly encouraged to attend the Council meeting and give Council their input.

Ms. Holtz pointed out that the photographs included in the Preliminary Report did not depict the terrible condition of the 1304 E. Auburn property. Mr. Delacourt stated that the Council Members would have an opportunity to go and look at the property before the meeting, and would see the condition of the structures themselves. He commented that Council would have to weigh the integrity of the proposed district against the condition of the resources.

The Committee discussed the charge of the Study Committee, which was very narrow, versus the decision that Council had to make. The discussion continued regarding property owner rights, and other protective Ordinances, such as Wetland, Tree Conservation and other environmental protections.

Ms. Holtz asked for clarification regarding what was under review by the HDC if the property were designated. It was explained that the HDC reviewed the context of the entire property, including site features, structures, and driveways. Mr. Dziurman explained that the City's HDC did not just give a yes or no answer, but tried to provide as much assistance and helpful information as possible. Mr. Delacourt commented that sometimes the HDC required different materials than the property owner proposed to use.

Mr. Delacourt stated that the City's Master Plan tried to provide flexibility for the historic properties. As in the case of the Stiles School, that developer had hoped to use the designation to provide flexibility in the development of the property, rather than developing under the single-family zoning. There could be advantages to a potential developer of the subject property that would include restoring the structures, that would allow for other flexibility in the development of the property.

Mr. Dziurman commented on the on-going redevelopment of several properties located in the City of Detroit, most of which would not have been accomplished without the use of the available tax credits.

The Committee discussed the fact that properties can also be delisted. Mr. Delacourt explained if a property lost its integrity or no longer met the criteria under which it was designated, a request to delist could be made. City Council would make the decision regarding delisting.

Dr. Stamps referred to the proposed Frank Farm Historic District, and commented that future generations of the Frank Family could either come back and see the property redeveloped or they could see the farmstead and be reminded of what it originally was.

Chairperson Thompson asked if there were any other comments or discussion regarding the proposed District. No other comments were offered. He recapped that the Preliminary Report would be forwarded to City Council, and the Committee and property owners would be advised of the Council meeting date.

This matter was Discussed

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

8A. 2007-0313 2040 S. Livernois
- Discussion

Chairperson Thompson asked for an update on the subject property.

Mr. Delacourt reminded the Committee that this property had been identified as being impacted by the road improvements to Hamlin and Livernois, and a National Register Nomination for the property is to be prepared, which will require extensive study and research.

(Depart Mr. Webster: 7:00 PM)

Approval had been given to pay for the National Register Nomination work through the road project. However, in order to complete the nomination, access to the house must be obtained. The request for access has been made of the property owner, but no response has been received. It had been hoped that the Preliminary Report fieldwork could also be done in conjunction with the National Register nomination.

If access is not given by the property owner, the City's Engineering Department may write the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and ask to be released from the National Register nomination.

The Committee discussed whether they should proceed with the study and Preliminary Report on the property. It was noted that the home is almost in danger of demolition by neglect at the present time.

This matter was Discussed

8B. 2008-0496 National Twist Drill

Mr. Delacourt stated that the National Twist Drill property is coming under development pressure.

The Committee discussed whether any potential development of this property would include demolition of the existing structures. Mr. Delacourt stated he had advised the individuals who called that the property was on the City's Potential List. He suggested the Committee might want to consider this property for their next study, rather than having to begin a study in reaction to a proposed development.

Mr. Dziurman commented the National Twist building was a premier building.

Mr. Delacourt suggested the Committee might want to get both the 2040 S. Livernois and National Twist Drill studies started this year. He stated that Five Thousand Dollars was allocated in the 2009 Budget for studies.

Mr. Delacourt reminded the Committee they had previously discussed studies regarding the redistricting of both the Stoney Creek and Winkler Mill Pond Districts.

Chairperson Thompson asked if the consultant had been contacted about the studies.

Mr. Delacourt stated he would talk to Ms. Kidorf about doing the National Twist Drill study first. If authorization to access the interior of 2040 S. Livernois can be obtained, it may still be possible to include the Preliminary Report fieldwork with the National Register nomination work through the Memorandum of Understanding.

This matter was Discussed

8C. 2007-0393 1470 W. Tienken Road
- Discussion

Chairperson Thompson stated that the Committee had received a copy of a letter from the property owners of 1470 W. Tienken.

Mr. Delacourt reminded the Committee that that property had been studied and recommended for delisting. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) had disagreed with the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Dziurman noted he also disagreed with the delisting recommendation.

Mr. Delacourt asked if the Committee wanted to table the report for the time being; leave the property designated, or conduct some additional research.

(Return Mr. Webster: 7:06 PM)

Dr. Stamps suggested the report be tabled. Mr. Dziurman concurred.

Mr. Delacourt stated that a letter would be sent to the property owners informing them that the Committee decided to table the report pending the receipt of additional information or further research being done regarding the resource's possible loss of integrity.

This matter was Discussed

8D. Any Other Business

Dr. Stamps stated that the Oakland County Historical Commission was holding a workshop on September 20, 2008 called "Endangered School Buildings: Plan Ahead or Face the Wrecking Ball". He discussed a recent situation in Royal Oak

where the population had decreased, schools had been closed, and subsequently the buildings were demolished. The question had been asked about what that did to a neighborhood when a school building was torn down and just a vacant lot was left.

Mr. Dziurman commented that the Older Persons' Commission (OPC) had begun in the old Woodward School, which was now gone.

Chairperson Thompson called for any other business. No other business was presented. Chairperson Thompson noted that the next regular meeting was scheduled for October 9, 2008.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion duly made and seconded, Chairperson Thompson adjourned the meeting at 7:05 PM.

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

Judy A. Bialk, Recording Secretary

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT