PUBLIC COMMENT

No members of the public came forward to speak on non-agenda items.

NEW BUSINESS

2012-0126

Location: 1631 and 1651 W. Avon Road, located on the south side of Avon, between S. Livernois and Old Perch Roads, Parcel Identification Numbers 15-21-126-036 and 037, zoned RE, Residential Estates.

Purpose: To receive public comment regarding a proposal to decrease the historic boundary to exclude the new house at 1651 W. Avon, in accordance with Public Act 267 of 1976 (MCL 15.261 et seq., MSA 5.3407(3) et seq.) and the Rochester Hills Historical Preservation Ordinance, Section 118-131.

Chairperson Thompson opened the public hearing at 5:33 p.m.

Ms. Melinda Hill, 1481 Mill Race, Rochester Hills 48306 came forward and commented that staff claims they initiated the request to delist the property located at 1651 W. Avon Road as a designated historic district in order to maintain accurate boundaries for historic resources. Yet the report says very little about the property at 1651; only that there is nothing historic about the parcel or the recently built home. In the June 14, 2012 Study Committee minutes, Ms. Kidorf explains she did not spend an extensive amount of time on research because it is only a boundary change, just enough to justify the retention of the existing district with a smaller boundary. Ms. Hill suggests the Committee read the minutes from HDC's July 12, 2001 meeting where the proposed demolition of the garage at 1631 W. Avon and the proposed lot split were discussed. The Commission had concerns about the demolition if it meant that the lot split would create a lot in such close proximity to the historic resource in which the HDC would have no purview. An opinion from the City Attorney was to be obtained regarding this issue. Like any other new project. the HDC is looking for compatibility and protection for the adjacent historic resource. Neighboring properties play an important role in preservation, especially in historic districts. She referenced the March 14, 2002 HDC minutes where a Certificate of Appropriateness was given for the demolition of the garage at 1631, as well as a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new garage and other improvements to the home. Complete plans for both the renovations at 1631 and the new home at 1651 W. Avon were shown and discussed at that meeting. A legal opinion regarding the potential lot split and HDC's purview were promised by staff. The fact that the HDC would have some purview over the adjacent property helped move the demolition and ensuing lot split to take place. The consensus of the HDC was they had concerns as to what this lot split meant and their having any charge over what would be built next door. The only minutes provided to the Study Committee were from the November and December 2004 HDC meetings talking about the approval of the new home at 1651 W. Avon. Ms. Hill explained she was on the Commission in 2001 and 2002 and everyone was very clear about what was happening with this property. She understands some of the reasons for the boundary change request, but is sorry to see how this is played out. She does not think the Committee has been given complete background information. The charge of this Committee is to complete a factual report regarding the property's historical value and provide that information and any appropriate recommendation for changing a district to the City Council. Ms. Hill believes the report should contain an actual aerial map of the properties involved and the proposed new boundary, not the utility map that was included. She inquired whether the Committee received clarification regarding the split of the lots running up the driveway at 1631, as this question was asked at the last meeting. She opposes the Committee's recommendation regarding the proposed new boundary due to the fact that this Committee has had insufficient information to appropriately make such a recommendation. She believes it is detrimental to the existing historic resource. Ms. Hill added that Study Committee member Ms. Carlson does not live in the Winkler Mill Pond Historic District, but rather resides in the Stoney Creek Historic District.

Chairperson Thompson closed the public hearing at 5:39 p.m.

Board discussion relative to this request occurred after the Twist Drill public hearing, and resulted in a postponement of this request.

This item was postponed.

2008-0663

PUBLIC HEARING - FILE NO. HDSC 08-002

Location: 6841 and 6875 N. Rochester Road, located at the northeast corner of N. Rochester and Tienken Roads, Parcel Identification Numbers 15-02-300-004 and 015, zoned I, Industrial with an FB-1 Flexible Business Overlay.

Purpose: To receive public comment regarding a proposal to establish the subject property as an Historic District within the City of Rochester Hills, in accordance with Public Act 267 of 1976 (MCL 15.261 et seq., MSA 5.3407(3) et seq.) and the Rochester Hills Historical Preservation Ordinance, Section 118-131.

Chairperson Thempson opened the public hearing at 5:40 p.m.

Mr. Greg Obloy, 4111 Andover West 2nd Floor, Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302 came forward, explained he is present on behalf of Corporate Park of Rochester Hills, the owner, and gave the members a letter which he then summarized. He requests that the Study Committee make a negative recommendation with regard to the designation of this property as a historic district. His client has made this statement before at several neetings, and Mr. Obloy believes the property owner to the south has made a singilar statement. He noted that under the National Historic Preservation Act which creates the criteria to establish historic districts, provides that if the majority of the property owners object to the designation, that it can't be considered a historic district. Mr. Obloy finds the Study Committee Report to be absent of any evidence that creates significance for this area. It is a biographical factual statement of a 30-year run of a successful company and a successful family, but when this run ended in the early 70's, the company was sold. National Twist Drill is no longer a stand-alone company, it's merely a brand that made cutting tools. The cutting tools are not novel, there is no innovation. They were one of thousands of vendors to the U.S. Navy during the war, not exactly significant. The company was founded in Detroit, not in Rochester. The fact that it was a large employer doesn't make it