



# Rochester Hills Minutes

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

## Historic Districts Commission

Chairperson Brian R. Dunphy, Vice Chairperson Maria-Teresa L. Cozzolino  
Members: John Dziurman, Nicole Franey, Micheal Kilpatrick, Melissa Luginski,  
Paul Miller, Dr. Richard Stamps, Jason Thompson

---

Thursday, March 12, 2009

7:30 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

---

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

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

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

### 2. ROLL CALL

**Present** 8 - Richard Stamps, Micheal Kilpatrick, John Dziurman, Brian Dunphy,  
Maria-Teresa Cozzolino, Paul Miller, Nicole Franey and Melissa Luginski

**Absent** 1 - Jason Thompson

Also Present: Derek Delacourt, Deputy Director, Planning & Development  
Department

Judy A. Bialk, Recording Secretary

Chairperson Dunphy stated for the record that Mr. Thompson had left prior notice he was unable to attend the meeting and was excused.

### 3. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Chairperson Dunphy announced a quorum was present.

### 4. STATEMENT OF STANDARDS

Chairperson Dunphy read the following Statement of Standards for the record.

All decisions made by the Historic Districts Commission follow the guidelines of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, MLHDA Section 399.205, and local Ordinance Section 118-164(a).

## 5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### 5A. 2009-0116 Minutes of the January 8, 2009 Regular Meeting

Chairperson Dunphy asked for any comments or corrections to the January 8, 2009 Regular Meeting Minutes. Upon hearing none, he called for a motion to approve.

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

**Aye 8 - Stamps, Kilpatrick, Dziurman, Dunphy, Cozzolino, Miller, Franey and Luginski**

**Absent 1 - Thompson**

**RESOLVED that the Minutes of the January 8, 2009 Regular Historic Districts Commission Meeting be approved as presented.**

## 6. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

- A. Ordinance Amendment 528 (CLG Related Amendments)
- B. Update from P. Davis re 2040 S. Livernois MOA
- C. MHPN Network News, January 2009 Edition
- D. 51st Annual Michigan in Perspective Conference Brochure
- E. Oakland Co. Movement and Migration Presentation Information
- F. The Rochester Era, March/April 2009 Edition

Chairperson Dunphy noted a number of items had been provided to the Commissioners. He referred to Ordinance Amendment No. 528, which related to amendments required because of the Certified Local Government (CLG) application, and which had recently been adopted by City Council. He called for any announcements or communications. No other announcements or communications were presented.

## 7. PUBLIC COMMENT (Non-Agenda Items)

Chairperson Dunphy asked if there were any public comments. There were no public comments.

## 8. NEW BUSINESS

Chairperson Dunphy stated that a couple residents had attended the meeting to discuss an issue related to a property, and suggested the Commissioners add that matter to the Agenda and hear that matter first. The Commissioners were in concurrence with the Chair's suggestion.

8A. 2007-0576 **1585 S. Rochester Road**  
**- Discussion Regarding Potential Move of House**

Chairperson Dunphy invited the residents to come forward to the presenters table, and asked for a brief introduction and update from Staff.

Mr. Delacourt stated he had been contacted about a week ago with an interesting question related to the historically designated house located at 1585 S. Rochester Road. He distributed copies of the survey sheet prepared by Dr. Jane Busch on the property during the 2002 Intensive Level Survey to the Commissioners.

Dr. Delacourt reminded the Commissioners that property was included in a proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) Agreement. The residents before the Commission had been in contact with the owners of the property about the potential to move the structure off the site to a different location and to renovate it. He had suggested the residents attend a Historic Districts Commission (HDC) meeting to discuss the matter with the Commission to get an initial idea of the process involved, and to get some feedback from the Commissioners about their proposal.

**Tom and DeeDee Briski, 40137 Vincenzia, Clinton Township, Michigan,** introduced themselves and thanked the Commission for taking the time to hear about their idea. Mr. Briski explained the property owner was in favor of their moving the house from the property, and they would like to move it to a suitable location within the Community, and to restore it. They felt it was an incredible piece of architecture and they would like to restore it before it fell apart. The property owner seemed to be very willing and felt it would be a benefit to move it. They would like to know what it would take for the Commission to approve this, and also where the house could be relocated. He asked if the Commission had historic areas they preferred that these types of structures be located. Mrs. Briski asked if the historic integrity could be preserved if they moved the house to another location. She stated they would like a general idea from the Commission on whether this was a feasible option, and would be in everyone's best interests.

Chairperson Dunphy clarified that when the developer came before the Commission with his PUD proposal with respect to the historic property, one of the things they looked at in terms of their development plan was to move the house. The Commission approved that plan on that basis. He stated for the benefit of the Commissioners who were not on that Commission at the time that plan was approved, the Commission had already approved one option that had the house moved on the property.

Mr. Briski clarified the house was going to be moved but would remain on the same property. Chairperson Dunphy responded "yes", and stated if the house was moved to another property that was a different issue. His explained the Commission had

approved moving the house from its current location to another location on the property, along with the proposed development plan presented by the developer as part of the PUD Agreement.

Mr. Briski inquired about the process.

Dr. Stamps stated it was a delight to have citizens come before the Commission that shared the same feelings the Commission had about the nice resources in the City that should be preserved rather than left to fall to pieces. He commented it was too bad Mr. and Mrs. Briski had not seen the property when the barns and other outbuildings were there because it was more delightful at that time than it was now.

Mr. Briski commented he had been driving past the property for about twenty years, and thought it's current condition was a shame. Mrs. Briski asked if the Commissioners knew where she could obtain photographs of the property depicting it in its day because she would like to have copies of them.

Dr. Stamps suggested the Rochester Hills Museum might have some information. He thought some of the original survey work might have included pictures of the various outbuildings. He recalled that a barn, a pump house and some other structures were on the property. He noted that a historic survey had been done back in the 1930's that might have information about the property.

Mrs. Briski stated they thought if they could see photographs of the house as it looked originally, they would try to renovate it as closely to that as possible.

Dr. Stamps stated that the general guidelines were that it was best to preserve things in place, and he thought the City had done a good job of following those guidelines. He pointed out that given the option, it might be better to move it and preserve it than to leave it and destroy it. He was not sure where the Briski's would find a suitable location. He hoped this house would be better preserved than the house across the street, which was currently being used as medical offices. He commented that house did not look right with the front porch chopped off and the large additions on the back.

Mrs. Briski stated they wanted to keep the house as a residence. Mr. Briski stated the property owner did not really want the house on the property, and would rather see it moved off the property. He did not think there was much hope of keeping the home in its current location and restoring it where it stands.

Dr. Stamps suggested Mr. and Mrs. Briski ask if the home could be moved to the location it was going to be moved as part of the PUD Agreement, which was on the south side of the property near Bordine's.

Chairperson Dunphy stated that the Commission had approved a development plan that included preserving the structure. The developer did not get to opt out of that plan just by saying they did not like that deal any longer. The Commission approved the plan, and that was what governed the transaction. If they are willing to offer an alternative that the Commission finds acceptable, the Commission will look at that alternative. He wanted to be clear that the developer could not unilaterally back out of the Agreement.

Mr. Briski stated that was why they had come before the Commission, to see what could be done and what would work out the best for everyone. Mrs. Briski stated she had been in contact with the property owner, and he was very willing to help them because he preferred the house be moved. She stated they had some pictures from the inside of the house they would like to show the Commission.

Mr. Miller stated he was all in favor of an adaptation and if necessary, removal to preserve the structure. He thought the house would lose almost all of its historic significance when it was moved away from the property. He noted it still had some display value, but in terms of the historical significance, particularly if it were moved to another part of the City, that could be lost.

Mr. Miller wanted to be sure the Briski's were aware the Commission had discussed this building, including the fact City Staff would not enter the house in its present condition. Mr. Delacourt stated that City Staff would not enter the premises until they had more information. He explained the property owner had provided a mold report to the City, which the Briski's were aware of; however, City Staff would not enter without additional information about what exactly the report said. City Staff was not qualified to determine what was there.

Mr. Miller understood Staff's reluctance until more was known, and clarified the Briski's had been through the building. Mrs. Briski stated they had pictures of the inside and it was hazardous. She stated that Mr. Vennettilli had mentioned the mold and asked them to sign a waiver before they entered the premises.

Mr. Miller noted for the record the property owner's reluctance to do much with the structure without pressure. He commented the Commission did not want to set a precedent such that if someone did not want a historic structure, they would just give it to someone else. He understood there was a plan in place; however, the property owner was liable to preserve, maintain and update the structure.

Mr. Dziurman asked if the existing PUD Agreement was a legal application at this point. Mr. Delacourt responded "yes". Mr. Dziurman clarified the PUD Agreement was based on the historic home. Mr. Delacourt indicated "partially". Mr. Dziurman clarified the developer received approval based on the understanding the historic

home would be preserved. Mr. Delacourt indicated that was correct. Mr. Dziurman asked if the developer got rid of the historic home, if that would change his PUD Agreement. Mr. Delacourt agreed that was something that would have to be resolved.

Mr. Dziurman asked if the Fifth/Third Bank that had been built was part of the development. Mr. Delacourt indicated that was correct.

Mr. Dziurman stated it was true that once a historic building was moved off its site, it lessened its historic value and probably eliminated it. Depending on the history of the building, it might still retain some historic value, particularly if it was associated with a historic person or event. He wanted the Briski's to be aware of that.

Mr. Delacourt questioned if a property was designated under the criteria of architecture, whether the house could maintain some of its integrity. He noted it was connected to the property, but thought it might still meet the criteria.

Mr. Dziurman did not believe that was correct. He thought it was designated as part of a farmstead. He recalled the property owner had promised the Commission he would not take down the barns, and they were demolished anyway. He agreed that moving it might help save the building, but wanted the Briski's to be aware it might not necessarily be historic.

Mr. Dziurman referred to finding a location for the home. He commented that the City of Troy did move things around, and had established their museum by moving a number of buildings to their site at Wattles and Livernois. He stated the Troy Museum tried to reconstruct the buildings on the site, creating a setting similar to Greenfield Village.

Mr. Dziurman stated that the Commission followed the Secretary of the Interior's Standards which are very specific and do include a guideline about moving buildings. He explained it was not impossible, but it made it more difficult to retain the designation.

Mr. Dziurman asked if the Briski's had a site for the home. Mr. Briski indicated they did not. Mr. Dziurman referred to the Briski's question about whether there was a historic area they should look at. He explained the City had two contiguous historic districts - the Stoney Creek Historic District and the Winkler Mill Pond Historic District. He indicated he would not approve moving the house to either of those districts, because it did not belong there. He pointed out the Stoney Creek Historic District was a Nationally Registered District. It was Nationally Registered because what is there is historic to what was there and still is to some degree.

Mr. Dziurman stated if the Briski's wanted to move the house to another site and restore the building, he thought that was wonderful. In his opinion, it would not retain its historic characteristic.

Mr. Delacourt asked if "historic characteristic" meant it would not be eligible for local designation, which would have an impact on the availability of tax credits. Mr. Dziurman stated it had been done and it had been approved, but it was not an easy process. He indicated the Commission would work with the Briski's, and he did not want to sound like he was against the idea, but he wanted the Briski's to be aware of what he understood to be the case.

Mr. Delacourt stated even if the home did lose its historic designation, he assumed that designated or not, the Commission would be willing to work with the Briski's. He noted the Briski's had expressed a great interest in doing an accurate restoration, and he assumed if the home stayed within the City, the Commission would be interested in working with them, whether or not it required approval.

Mr. Dziurman stated that designation was fantastic because it would allow the Briski's to receive some significant tax credits. He agreed the Commission would try to accommodate them as long as the restoration was in compliance with the Standards.

Mrs. Briski asked if there was a process to be followed.

Mr. Dziurman asked if the move was proposed, whether the matter would have to go to the Historic Districts Study Committee.

Mr. Delacourt stated his initial reaction was yes, and noted he had checked with the City's consultant. Once a site was located, then the house in combination with that site would be reviewed to determine if based on its location and the architecture of the structure, whether it still met the criteria for architecture in its new location. Once it was not tied to the original farmstead, which had already lost the other outbuildings, it would have to be evaluated with the new site to see if it still met the criteria. The Study Committee would provide a recommendation, and then the Commission would have to make a decision about whether to approve the move. He explained that even if the house did not meet the criteria, it could still be approved under a Notice to Proceed, rather than a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Delacourt stated that another option the Study Committee could consider was to review the house for delisting, and then the house could be moved anywhere.

Mr. Dziurman explained to the Briski's that he was one of the members of the Study Committee, noting three Commissioners served on that Committee. He explained the Commission was geared to protect the historic structures in the City, and the

Committee was created to be more objective about potential sites. He noted there were citizen representatives on the Committee as well. He stated the Study Committee would make the determination of whether the house still met the criteria. If it was determined the house was still historic, then the Commission would review that property as another registered site in the City.

Mr. Delacourt stated that the Commission would still have to approve the move, which was the first and biggest question. The Briski's were curious to know if they started down that road, if the move was something the Commission was willing to consider. He asked if the Commission would entertain the idea of a move, before all the other procedures were started, or before the Briski's spent the time and energy pursuing the matter.

Mr. Kilpatrick asked if the Briski's were tied into moving the house, noting they had asked if they had to move or whether they could rehabilitate it there. Mr. Briski stated that he thought the best place for it was right where it was. However, the property owner wanted it to be moved. Mrs. Briski stated the property owner had discussed his plans with them, and those plans did not involve having the house in that location.

Mr. Kilpatrick stated he personally did not have a problem with moving it. The problem he had was that given the history of the barns being destroyed, it appeared the Commission was letting the property owner off the hook. Mrs. Briski asked if that was by moving the house. Mr. Kilpatrick stated that the property owner would get rid of the structure, which had been an issue for him. He wondered if there had been any negotiation about rehabbing the house but allowing the house to remain on some portion of the property. He commented the PUD plans had been on the drawing board for quite some time. The economy had changed drastically since the plans were approved, and it did not appear anything would be developed very soon on that property.

Mrs. Briski thought everything had stopped for the property owner as far as developing because of the economy. She thought it would be worth asking again, because the house was toward the end of the property bordering a subdivision.

Mr. Kilpatrick recalled the conversation when the PUD plan was brought before the Commission, and whether it would work to move the house on the property, and the potential uses for the house, such as a restaurant. He thought the developer had some good ideas, but he was concerned that moving the house cleared everything for him. He questioned whether the house in its current condition could survive a move of any distance.

Mrs. Briski stated she was also surprised it could be done. She stated they loved the house, but noted by the time they paid for the move and some land to put it on, and



after going through the house, the work was going to be more expensive than they originally thought. She explained they were in the process of adding up those costs, and the land was an important part of that expense. She stated they had established with the property owner that they were doing him a favor by moving the house.

Mr. Kilpatrick stated he was hesitant because although he still believed the house should be rehabbed, he was concerned about the message the Commission would be sending to the developer.

Mrs. Briski stated they wanted to be flexible so they could make this happen, and they would love for it to be a positive outcome for everyone. She referred to the historical integrity if the house was removed from the property. She commented in Downtown Mt. Clemens they held Christmas walks through their historic homes, and asked if there was some type of community involvement like that in the City.

Mr. Miller stated that was something that was up to the individual homeowners, in terms of whether the homeowners were willing to open up their homes and have people come through and tell the story of the history of the home. He stated that because of the nature of the City's contiguous historic districts, as nice as the house at 1585 S. Rochester was, it was not part of that history. He was not aware of a historic neighborhood in the City where the house could be moved. He stated that the Commission did not have organized Holiday Tours, but the Library and other organizations around the area did have holiday walks and tours.

Mr. Miller stated none of the Commissioners were in favor of losing the structure, and all of them mourned the loss of the significance it had as a farmstead. Yet, they were not happy about losing the last vestige in this location. He questioned whether the property owner would be willing to allow the house to remain on the property because if it remained on the original farmstead property, it would retain much more value than it would if it was moved.

Mr. Briski asked if it was moved on the same property, whether it would retain its historic integrity.

Mr. Miller did not know that, but stated he knew there was more of a history of moving historic structures to accommodate issues on the site, where those structures remained on the site. He stated he was interested in seeing the pictures the Briski's took of the inside of the house.

Ms. Franey stated she drove past that house every day, and she often thought about what she could do with that house because it was such a beautiful house. She thought it was great the Briski's were there and wanted to do something with it. She asked if the Briski's goal was that they wanted the home to be a historic site or whether they really wanted to preserve it and utilize it.

Mrs. Briski stated they wanted to restore it and use it as their residence. Mr. Briski stated they thought it was the same thing. Mrs. Briski stated they were just learning there was a difference.

Ms. Franey stated they were two different things. Based on the conversation that had been held, if the house was moved, it could lose its historic title; if it was kept where it was, there were some issues although they may retain the historic title. She asked if what the Briski's wanted was to retain the historic home, or really wanted a house with those attributes that they could preserve.

Mr. Briski stated preserving it was the first thing, and hopefully they could retain the historic part of that as well. He commented to preserve it and keep it standing was the first thing. He noted the historic value did mean something, not necessarily just for the tax credits. He stated he did not know about the tax credits until yesterday and was not sure what it exactly entailed.

Mr. Delacourt stated there had been a lot of discussion about preservation and preserving the historic character versus whether it met the criteria for designation. The house could be moved and restored to its most pristine original condition, but because it was not in its original location, it may fall short of the criteria for designation. That meant there would be no local requirement to have the restoration work reviewed by the Commission, nor would they be eligible for the tax credits.

Mr. Briski commented that preserving it would have to be first, otherwise the rest might not even be able to happen.

Ms. Cozzolino stated the Commission had had many conversations about the home over the last several years, and there had always been concern about the condition of the home. In her opinion, she thought the Commission had a tremendous interest in seeing the house exist, whether in its current location or somewhere else. She thought both the Commission and the Study Committee would do what they could to try to help the Briski's.

Mrs. Briski summarized, if the situation worked out with the property owner, and they found a place and they moved the home, there was no objection to that. What they would not know is whether the home would retain its historic integrity.

Chairperson Dunphy stated there were a number of issues the Commission would have to consider. He clarified that without something formal to review, as everything depended on the details, the Commission could not give the Briski's a definitive statement. He pointed out the developer did have a plan approved by both the Commission and the Planning Commission, that involved the developer

keeping the structure and rehabilitating it. Anything that changed that agreement would have to be approved by both those Commissions.

Chairperson Dunphy stated he thought the Commissioners were open to consider the idea, which was about as far as the Commission could go with it at this time.

Mr. Dziurman stated that based on the current economy, the Briski's should consider talking to the property owner about purchasing the home in its existing location. He thought there might be an opportunity, although it was prime property on Rochester Road. He stated that would be the best situation because they would be assured of tax credits. He explained tax credits could help pay for a new furnace, a new roof, and other things besides historic items.

Mrs. Briski asked about the consequences for the property owner if he did not restore the house.

Mr. Dziurman noted the property owner had owned the property for a long time, back when it was a farmstead. He did not know what the home or the property were worth, but he thought it was worth asking because moving and restoring the house was not going to be easy or inexpensive.

Dr. Stamps asked if the property owner would lose his PUD Agreement if the house were moved. He suggested if the Briski's preserved the house in place, then he could continue with his proposed development. If the house disappeared, he did not think the developer could proceed with the development he was given permission to do if he preserved the house. If the property owner wanted to continue with his development plan, he needed to find a way to preserve the house. It might be an advantage if the Briski's preserved the house, and the property owner continued to develop the property as planned.

Mrs. Briski wondered if the property owner knew if the house was removed, the terms of the PUD Agreement would have been changed.

Mr. Delacourt cautioned about making assumptions about what could and could not be done, or what the property owner would or would not do as it related to the house. He noted the discussion was not about what could be developed on the property, which would ultimately be approved by the Planning Commission and City Council, and if something changed, the Historic Districts Commission as long as the property remained designated. The relationship of the Agreement to the structure and the designation of the property had an important impact on that. The only thing the Briski's were requesting was input on the potential to move the structure, and not how it impacted the PUD Agreement.

Mr. Delacourt stated if the move was a possibility, all those items brought up by the Commission would have to be discussed by several Boards and Commissions in the City. He stated he had not talked to the City Attorney about what could or could not be done at this point.

Dr. Stamps noted the survey sheet indicated the area of significance was architecture. He thought that even if the structure was moved, if the architecture was retained and restored, it was more likely it would still be eligible because of the architecture.

Mr. Dziurman disagreed. He commented one of the reasons the developer had to come before the Commission for approval of the PUD plan was because the entire property was designated. Mr. Delacourt clarified the portion south of Eddington Boulevard to Bordine's. The parcel where the Fifth/Third Bank sat was not designated.

Mr. Dziurman thought perhaps the Briski's could purchase the house, limit the designated portion to an acceptable sized site, which would allow the balance of the property to be delisted. He commented the Briski's would probably want to know what type of development would be proposed before they decided they wanted to reside there. That might give the property owner some incentive to sell that portion of the property.

Mr. Delacourt stated whether the home stayed on the site or was moved, he expected there would be negotiation and a rework of the entire development agreement. He guessed the property owner was well aware the designated house was an inducement to the PUD Agreement, and the topic would come up and those discussions would have to take place with the City. He noted limiting the size of the historic district and delisting the balance of the property would follow a process through the Study Committee. The Study Committee would look at the resulting piece to be designated, and the delisting of the rest of the parcel, and make a recommendation to City Council.

Mr. Miller commented it was clear that the Briski's needed to do their homework on this matter as it was quite involved. He stated at one time he had considered purchasing an older home and moving it, and he understood it can be done, but a large part of the cost involved what had to be done to move the house down the roads. He thought it might be cost prohibitive to move it a long distance, which might help in the decision.

Mr. Kilpatrick asked if the Briski's could show the Commission the pictures from the inside of the house.

Mr. Briski displayed some additional pictures of the outside of the house, noting there were holes right through the roof, and there was water damage. He stated most of the rooms had peeling paint, and the walls and plaster were damaged. He displayed a picture of a paneled room that was still intact, but there were many areas where there were holes which were also ruining the floors. He commented there were some good parts to the house as it contained some nice wood, but it needed to be covered.

Mr. Briski pointed out the second floor, where the floor had swollen up and buckled. He displayed a picture of a room where the wood had just rotted out. It was not only just wet, the ceiling had fallen down. He noted even on the first floor, some of the ceilings had caved in as well. Many of the shingles were gone.

Chairperson Dunphy asked that the Briski's leave a set of the pictures for the file. The Briski's provided a set of the pictures, which have been placed on file.

Mrs. Briski stated they intended to ask for estimates from contractors, and asked if the Commission had any recommendations. Mr. Miller stated a historic contractors guide was available from the Michigan Historic Preservation Network. Mr. Delacourt suggested the Briski's stop by City Hall for some additional information.

Mrs. Briski stated that Mr. Vennettilli had indicated he would be out of town for a couple of weeks, but had given them permission to have contractors access the site to provide estimates. That would give them an idea of the financial aspect of their proposal and if it is feasible.

Mr. Briski clarified it was the Commission's first choice for the structure to remain intact on the existing site. It was noted that was the Commission's consensus.

Ms. Cozzolino stated from a moving perspective, a couple of years ago the Rochester-Avon Historical Society did some research in connection with a proposed move of the grain elevator in Downtown Rochester. The Society has the name of a contractor who gave them some estimates. She suggested the Briski's could contact the Society for that information.

Mrs. Briski stated she had spoken to Rod Wilson, and Mr. Wilson had told them about that proposed project. Mr. Briski clarified the grain elevator was no longer going to be moved. Chairperson Dunphy indicated that was correct.

Ms. Luginski thanked the Briski's for their interest in older homes in Rochester, and commented she wished there were more people interested in these types of projects. She asked if the Briski's currently resided in Rochester Hills.

Mrs. Briski stated they resided in Clinton Township. She commented that two of their children attended Rochester College; their church was in the area; and they

spent much time in area, making it an ideal location for them. She noted they had been looking for a historic house for quite some time.

Ms. Luginski complimented the Briski's for considering this project, noting there was a lot of work to be done. She appreciated their interest in historic properties.

Mr. Briski commented he used to work at Sanyo Machine and had driven past the home for many years. He thought it was a shame to see the house slowly deteriorate.

Dr. Stamps noted that the Troy Historical Museum had moved buildings, including a parsonage that was moved just a couple of years ago, and suggested the Briski's contact Ms. Campbell at the Troy Historical Museum for contractor information.

Mr. and Mrs. Briski thanked the Commission for their time and input.

**This matter was Discussed**

**8B. 2009-0117 Joint Meeting - City Council, HDC, HDSC  
- Discussion**

Chairperson Dunphy noted a joint meeting was scheduled for March 23, 2009 with City Council, the Commission and the Study Committee.

Mr. Delacourt stated that based on a conversation with the City Council President, he would put together a small packet of information, including the Ordinance, a District Map, the State Act, and the Secretary of Interior's Standards. He would provide a short introduction regarding the individual responsibilities and charges of each Board, as they relate to City Council, followed by a discussion about those charges and responsibilities. There would also be discussion about "demolition by neglect"; the Certified Local Government status, and some of the studies currently underway by the Study Committee and that process. He reminded the Commission this was a City Council meeting and would be televised.

Mr. Delacourt suggested if there were other topics of conversation the Commission wanted to include at the joint meeting, they should provide that information to him for inclusion in the packet materials.

Ms. Luginski asked if the Commission would receive a copy of the Agenda prior to the meeting. Mr. Delacourt indicated they would, and noted Council packets were transmitted electronically and were typically available on the City's website the Wednesday prior to the meeting.

**This matter was Discussed**

- 8C. 2008-0684 **2009 Earl Borden Award**  
- **Review Selection Criteria**  
- **Selection of 2009 Recipient(s)**

Chairperson Dunphy stated the Commissioners had received material regarding the Earl Borden Award. He referred to the Selection Criteria document, which had been reviewed by the Commission at their January meeting, with the goal of updating and cleaning up the criteria and procedures. He anticipated the Commission would use the Selection Criteria to guide the process going forward, noting the original version dated back to 1994. He noted the revised document more clearly indicated there were two separate awards that could be given; one for the structures themselves, and one to individuals for their leadership in historic preservation. The revised document included a time frame for the process.

Chairperson Dunphy asked if the Commissioners had any thoughts or comments about the Selection Criteria.

Mr. Miller referred to the award selection criteria that indicated, "such renovation shall have been made by the award recipient". He asked if that meant "as opposed to hiring a firm" or if that meant the actual recipient did all the work personally with their own hands.

Chairperson Dunphy thought that was intended to award people for work done while they owned the property. In other words, they did not purchase a property that had been renovated and got the award for that prior work.

Ms. Cozzolino suggested the criteria be reworded to indicate the recipient was responsible for the renovation work. Chairperson Dunphy indicated that criteria would be clarified.

Chairperson Dunphy opened the floor for award nominations for the 2009 Earl Borden Award. He noted the Commission had briefly discussed some proposed individual recipients, as well as a structure they had received information about at the January meeting.

Mr. Dziurman stated he thought 971 Runyon deserved an award because the owners had done a fantastic job restoring the house. He commented he had forgotten it had received an award back in 1994, but pointed out the current owners restored the house again. It was important to acknowledge people were taking care of their homes. He noted he was not against the two other candidates the Commission had discussed in January, but pointed out he thought the award should be given to individuals who were involved in preservation over a long period of time. He thought the leadership award was an important award and should have a legacy that whoever received the award had been active in preservation for a number of years.

Ms. Luginski said she recommended the Runyon Road structure, and noted the owners had redone every room on the interior, and had put in a significant effort to maintain all the internal woodwork. The exterior was changed quite a bit when they removed the enclosed porch and restored the porch to its original look. She thought the work done by the current owners over the last three years was significant.

Ms. Cozzolino understood that Deborah Larsen did not receive any compensation for writing her book, and would not receive any compensation for the copies that were sold. Chairperson Dunphy also believed that to be the case. He stated in discussions he had with the Rochester-Avon Historical Society Board, he did not recall any mention of compensation for Ms. Larsen's work on the book. All the proceeds are going to the Historical Society.

Chairperson Dunphy called for nominations for the 2009 Earl Borden Award.

Ms. Luginski nominated 971 Runyon Road, owned by Mark and Micki Kowal, which was seconded by Mr. Dziurman.

Dr. Stamps asked if the Kowal's were the same applicant that had come before the Commission with a different proposal for the front porch. Upon discussion, the Commission gave the Kowal's some suggestions and the Kowal's followed those suggestions. Ms. Luginski stated that was correct. Dr. Stamps stated he was impressed by the Kowal's and would support the nomination of their restored residence.

Chairperson Dunphy called for a vote on all those in favor of the selection of the house located at **971 Runyon Road, owned by Mark and Micki Kowal**, as a recipient of the 2009 Earl Borden Preservation Award. The Commission accepted the nomination unanimously.

Chairperson Dunphy asked if there were any other nominations for the 2009 Earl Borden Award.

Mr. Kilpatrick nominated Deborah Larsen for the preservation leadership award. He noted he agreed with Mr. Dziurman's sentiments, but also was compelled by the fact she was donating the proceeds to the Rochester-Avon Historical Society. He pointed out the Society took an active role in preservation in the Community, and he thought she was a deserving candidate.

Ms. Cozzolino seconded the nomination, and stated she understood Ms. Larsen spent an enormous amount of time writing that book, and put a great deal of effort into the book.



Chairperson Dunphy called for a vote on the nomination of **Ms. Deborah Larsen** as a recipient of the **2009 Earl Borden Preservation Leadership Award**. The Commission voted in favor of the nomination, with one opposed vote.

Chairperson Dunphy summarized that the house at 971 Runyon Road (Mr. and Mrs. Mark Kowal), and Ms. Deborah Larsen had been selected as recipients of the 2009 Earl Borden Award.

Chairperson Dunphy stated the presentation would be scheduled for a City Council meeting in May; the recipients would be notified, and the invitation and plaques prepared and ordered. He noted the Commissioners would be notified when the City Council meeting date was selected.

**This matter was Discussed**

## **9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### **9A. 2006-0428 Certified Local Government (CLG) Application - Update**

Chairperson Dunphy requested an update on the status of the Certified Local Government (CLG) Application.

Mr. Delacourt stated he had received an update from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Although the City had not formally received designation as a CLG, SHPO was in the process of preparing the necessary documents for signature by the Mayor. Once SHPO has the executed agreements, they forward those agreements to the National Park Service for approval of the certification.

Ms. Luginski asked if Staff expected any problems with the application at this point. Mr. Delacourt responded "no", it had moved on to the next step. He noted the Mayor had to sign an agreement indicating the City would perform under the requirements of the CLG Program. He had never seen those requirements, but did not expect there would be any problems.

Mr. Miller asked if the agreement was with the State or the Federal Government. Mr. Delacourt stated it was with the State. Mr. Miller asked why the Federal Government was reviewing it. Mr. Delacourt explained that the Department of History, Arts and Libraries operated under the National Park Service, and the CLG Funds came from the Federal Government through the State.

Mr. Dziurman explained the SHPO, although a State Agency, acted on behalf of the Federal Government. Mr. Delacourt noted the State was reorganizing its various

departments, including the Department of History, Arts and Libraries, and SHPO would most likely be housed under another State Department.

Chairperson Dunphy asked if there was a timeline for completion of the CLG process. Mr. Delacourt stated it could take a couple more months before any formal news is received.

Chairperson Dunphy asked if the City or the Mayor's Office would provide the information to the news media once the CLG was confirmed. Mr. Delacourt agreed it was an important certification that the City could be proud of.

**This matter was Discussed**

Chairperson Dunphy called for any other business.

2008-0678

**Stoney Creek Village**  
**- Discussion of Resident Concerns**

Ms. Luginski stated she resided in the Stoney Creek Historic District, and there was a road project planned for Summer, 2010 regarding the bridge on Tienken Road in that District. She stated there had been some deck issues with the bridge during the past week, which closed the bridge for some time. The bridge was planned for 2010 and it appeared it would go forward in 2010.

Ms. Luginski stated that a Section 106 Study would be done in connection with the project, as Federal dollars were involved. She had been told there would be time for public input, and she thought the Commission might want to watch for that as the bridge would have an impact and affect on the District. She wanted the Commission to stay on top of those plans. Because of the proximity of the houses to the road in that District, she thought the Section 106 review could elevate into an environmental impact study and a 4F Study through the Federal Highway Department.

Ms. Luginski stated the size of the bridge was a big issue, noting the current bridge was narrower than the proposed new bridge. The new bridge could impact some City-owned property and some privately owned property. There was also talk of a pedestrian path, which was seen as a benefit by the area residents, because it would bring people down to the Historic District and allow them to ride or walk through that area safely. She thought the Commission wanted to be sure it was done well. For example, with respect to the bridge itself, she mentioned that Pat McKay from the Van Hoosen Museum had suggested the possibility of creating a cobblestone bridge rather than a concrete bridge. She thought it was important the Commission was aware of any proposals.

Mr. Dziurman stated the design aspect of the bridge should come before the Commission for review and approval. Mr. Delacourt stated he did not believe the

Road Commission had reached that point yet. Mr. Dziurman stated Ms. Luginski indicated Pat McKay was making some suggestions, and he thought the Commission should be part of that discussion.

Ms. Luginski stated Mr. McKay attended a meeting with the Road Commission. Mr. Dziurman stated that the Commission should not be overlooked in any design process. He commented that widening the bridge was one thing, but expressed concern over what they wanted to do to the road. He pointed out that was a Nationally Registered Historic District, and the installation of sidewalks should be carefully considered. He did not want the Commission to be the last to be involved in the process.

Mr. Miller asked if the public input meeting had already been held. Ms. Luginski stated it had not. She commented a meeting had been held for the stretch of Tienken Road between Livernois to Sheldon Road. Mr. Delacourt noted that stretch of Tienken Road was outside the Historic District.

Ms. Luginski stated there was concern because that stretch of Tienken Road was being discussed as a five-lane road, and there were some who did not want to see that portion become a five-lane road. She thought the width of the new bridge was critical, noting there were two-lane bridges that could become a four-lane bridge. She thought it was important that the integrity of the District was protected and she thought it was important the Commission was aware that process would be happening soon.

Mr. Dziurman stated it was his point that the new bridge should not be something that was made up, but should accurately reflect what was there when it became a District. He emphasized it should not necessarily be what someone thought it should look like.

Mr. Delacourt felt it was important to point out that this would be a long process, with everyone having time for input.

Ms. Luginski was concerned that if the bridge was scheduled for installation in Summer of 2010, there was not much time left for that input. Mr. Delacourt thought all agencies that were involved were aware of the input that had to be provided before it moved forward.

Dr. Stamps commented this was the first he had heard about the proposed bridge. Mr. Delacourt reiterated that all the agencies involved in the installation of the bridge were aware of who had to provide public input before it was built, including the Commission. Mr. Dziurman questioned whether the Commission should contact someone first. He did not want the Commission to be contacted after the fact. Dr. Stamps asked if the Commission should contact the project manager and request a meeting.

Chairperson Dunphy asked if it would be appropriate for Planning Department Staff to ask the Road Commission for an update for the Commission. He noted the Road Commission might not be ready for any type of presentation, but perhaps there was a brief update to inform the Commission about where the process was headed. Mr. Delacourt stated he would make that request.

Dr. Stamps suggested the Road Commission be advised that the Commission was concerned because it appeared to be happening, but the Commission was out of the loop.

Mr. Dziurman commented he would like to request that the project manager come before the Commission to explain the project. He thought the Road Commission should understand how important the District was and the bridge's affect on that District. He requested that someone from the Road Commission come and talk to the Commission about this project. Dr. Stamps supported the idea that a representative from the Road Commission talk to the Commission.

Mr. Dziurman thought that the Road Commission needed to be aware the Commission was serious about that Historic District. Mr. Delacourt guessed that until the Section 106 Study was completed, which was done through the SHPO and operated under certain standards, the impact and how the bridge was reviewed was not even determined.

Mr. Dziurman stated it was an automatic that the bridge was in a historic district, and that fact could not be changed. Mr. Delacourt commented there was a process and the Road Commission would follow that process.

Ms. Cozzolino asked if Staff could find out when the Road Commission intended to approach the various City Boards and Commissions, or whether there was a timeframe in place. Mr. Delacourt stated he could ask that question.

Ms. Luginski stated in her discussions with the SHPO regarding Section 106 reviews, they did say that the Section 106 review included public input as part of the process.

Mr. Dziurman commented that public input did not include the Commission, which was more for the residents.

**This matter was Discussed**

**2005-0914 Rochester Grain Elevator  
- Update**

Chairperson Dunphy provided a quick update on the Rochester Elevator. He stated the property had not changed hands and was still owned by the original owner and

operating as his business. The City of Rochester asked the owner to make some cosmetic improvements to the property under their blight ordinance. The Rochester-Avon Historical Society had talked to the owner about some type of cooperative project that would help the owner to put a coat of paint on the building; stabilize it and preserve it, while the final disposition of the building is worked out. There was still on-going discussion about how that would take place, and who would pay for what. It has been the position of the Historical Society that they wanted to see the building preserved, and ideally, adaptively re-used. He commented if it could remain on its current site, that would be the best. He noted the Rochester City Council had discussed the idea of purchasing the property and using it as a town square park. In the meantime, they wanted to be sure the building was preserved. They will make arrangements to get the building painted, and will repaint the checkerboard sign on the end, which would be done by a professional sign painter who will recreate the historic sign on the side of the building.

**This matter was Discussed**

Dr. Stamps stated that the Historic Districts Study Committee was studying the National Twist Drill property located at the northeast corner of Rochester and Tienken Roads. He commented it appeared to be a very important, architectural and historical feature in the City. He asked for suggestions for an adaptive re-use of the building, although the Study Committee was still in the early stages of the study process.

Chairperson Dunphy called for any other business. No other business was presented. He noted the next regular meeting date is April 9, 2009.

## 10. ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion duly made and seconded, Chairperson Dunphy adjourned the meeting at 9:10 PM.

---

Brian Dunphy, Chairperson  
City of Rochester Hills  
Historic Districts Commission

---

Judy A. Bialk, Recording Secretary

{ Approved as \_\_\_\_\_ at the \_\_\_\_\_, 2009 Regular Historic Districts Commission Meeting. }

DRAFT      DRAFT      DRAFT      DRAFT      DRAFT