



Rochester Hills

Minutes

Historic Districts Commission

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

Chairperson Jason Thompson, Vice Chairperson Julie Granthen
Members: Katherine Altherr-Rogers, Yousif Elias, Bryan Lemanski, Kelly Lyons, Michael McGunn, Dr. Richard Stamps, Charles Tischer
Youth Representative: Henry Hall

Thursday, March 14, 2024

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairperson Granthen called the Historic Districts Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Michigan time.

ROLL CALL

Present 6 - Katherine Altherr-Rogers, Yousif Elias, Julie Granthen, Richard Stamps, Charles Tischer and Michael McGunn
Excused 3 - Kelly Lyons, Jason Thompson and Bryan Lemanski

Others Present:

Chris McLeod, Planning Manager
Kristine Kidorf, Kidorf Preservation Consulting
Jennifer MacDonald, Recording Secretary

Chairperson Thompson and Members Lyons and Lemanski provided prior notice that they would not be in attendance and were excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[2024-0156](#) January 11, 2024 HDC Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by McGunn, seconded by Tischer, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 5 - Altherr-Rogers, Elias, Granthen, Tischer and McGunn
Abstain 1 - Stamps
Excused 3 - Lyons, Thompson and Lemanski

COMMUNICATIONS

Vice Chairperson Granthen noted that she did receive a hand-delivered letter to the Commission to be entered into the record.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

NEW BUSINESS

2024-0148

Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness - File No. PHDC2021-0001 - for a two-story addition to the side of the house at 1046 E. Tienken Rd., zoned R-4 One Family Residential, Parcel No. 15-01-352-036, Vincent Sinacola, Applicant
(Staff Report prepared by Kristine Kidorf dated 3-4-24, Location map, Site Plan, Floor Plans and Elevations, Materials, and Application had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record.)

Vice Chairperson Granthen introduced this item as a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a two-story addition to the side of the house at 1046 E. Tienken Road. She noted that the applicants were Vincent and Lauren Sinacola and invited them to the front table.

Mr. Sinacola stated that they appreciate everything that the Commission does and acknowledged that the Commissioners have a very hard job. He explained that when they bought their house in 2019, they bought it from Ms. Sinacola's father, and in 2016 they were in front of the Commission asking for a second-story addition on the home. He noted that at that time, they had one child and the stairs were tough to get up and down, and it allowed them to put an extra bedroom in upstairs. He stated that since that time they have had three more children and now have a family of six. He commented that their three bedroom home has become too small for them; and he stated that more space is not just a want at this point, it is a necessity.

He noted that his wife grew up in this neighborhood and her parents lived there for 32 years. He stated that they wanted to raise their kids there and absolutely love the neighborhood; however, they are outgrowing their home. They are asking for an addition on the west side to allow them to have extra bedrooms, a basement that they currently do not have, and extra closets. He explained that about a year-and-a-half ago they engaged Gary Kwapis of Heins & Kwapis Architects who had done their first plans presented in 2016 and instructed him to keep the historic nature of the home, the community and the neighborhood. He added that they took careful consideration about setting the addition back and making sure that the siding differentiates itself from the existing structure. He stated that the goal is to keep it to the period, and make sure that when people see it they know that it is different, but it would still be the same. In addition, if it was to be removed at anytime in the future, it would still have the same front facade and would not change the original house or footprint. He commented that it was keeping with what the Department of Interior is looking for when it comes to rehabilitation and additions.

Vice Chairperson Granthen asked if any of the Commissioners had any questions.

Dr. Stamps asked for staff input, noting that there were written comments about the massive nature of the addition.

Ms. Kidorf noted that the size and massing of the addition more than doubles the size of the house and would not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards. She commented that the question that comes into play is relative to the review of the addition back in 2016. She noted that she suggested at that time that perhaps the house would be considered non-contributing because the addition was placed on the house, which the Commission approved. She stated that the big questions for the Commission at this point are whether or not the house still contributes to the Historic District the way that it is right now; and if it does, whether or not the proposed addition meets the standards. If it does not contribute to the District, the question is whether the addition is compatible with the District.

Dr. Stamps stated that he was delighted to see audience members in attendance and stated that he would like to hear comments.

Mr. Sinacola asked if he could speak to the question of whether the house is contributing. He pointed out that if looking back to the meeting minutes from 2016, there was a lot of conversation about whether or not approving the first addition was going to make the house non-contributing. He noted that at that meeting, Chairperson Dunphy asked the Commission if they were prepared to go ahead with the motion that was presented as notice of receipt with the understanding that the resulting structure will no longer be a contributing resource to the District. He noted that it did go forward and was approved as such. He mentioned that Ms. Kidorf noted a couple of times in the current staff report that it was the Commission's decision whether to say it is contributing. He explained that they have done these plans under the understanding that it was going to be a non-contributing asset and they have scaled it to what they see in their immediate neighborhood where there are multiple homes that have front elevations off the street that exceed what they are asking for. He mentioned that there is one home with 129 feet facing the street, and one with 80, another with 82 and another with 83 all within the Stoney Creek District. He added that there are homes outside of the neighborhood and into the greater district that are over 6,000 square feet. He commented that they did their best to keep it within their neighborhood because that is what people see.

Dr. Stamps noted that he remembers the meeting where it was approved, and he stated that he would echo tonight what he said then. He thanked the Sinacolas for saving the resource; however, he was a bit nervous at that time because of the second story addition. He commented that he understood all of the rationale and didn't remember that it shifted to non-contributing. He stated that he is leaning toward approval, as the Sinacolas have done their due diligence and are trying to be good citizens. He noted that he would remind himself that at the time when the first addition was approved, it set the Commission on a slippery slope. He asked what would happen if this is approved tonight, and the next house wants to expand. He noted that it would set a precedent by approving it tonight, and it would reaffirm the precedent that will take what used to be a 19th century historic village and turn it into yet another suburb off the edge of the City of Rochester. He commented that he understands what it is like to fit five children into a two-bedroom house.

Mr. Elias stated that he agrees with Dr. Stamps. He noted that while he was a

single child, he has six kids now, and he appreciates families of the largest size living in Rochester Hills. He commented that he is in favor of going forward with approval.

Mr. Tischer asked Dr. Stamps if he would say that it is non-contributing now, because that would make a big distinction in his mind. He commented that if it is contributing, there is no way he would approve something like this; however, if it is not, that can put it into a different light.

Vice Chairperson Granthen opened the floor for public comment.

Sheri Daugherty, 1058 E. Tienken Rd., stated that she had additional comment from a couple of residents that could not be here tonight. She stated that Emily Ferry of 1081 E. Tienken stated that they watched the Sinacola residence go from a dilapidated eyesore to the beautiful home it is today, and they supported the addition. Dan and Sandra Browning, 940 Van Hoosen Rd., conveyed that the Sinacolas have been valuable members of the community and renovated a property that would likely still be vacant today and expressed their support. Mena Sinacola is the oldest child of the Sinacola family and wrote a letter expressing that she needed more space, and stating that her younger brother is currently sharing a small room with her younger sister. Ms. Daugherty added that she lives two doors down from the Sinacolas and also approved of the addition.

Dan Schmitt, 1058 E. Tienken, noted that Ms. Daugherty was his sister, and he also had a couple of letters of support from neighbors, including Foster Engleman at 986 E. Tienken, and Kathryn Sprengel, 1055 Runyon Rd., supporting the addition.

Vice Chairperson Granthen asked that the letters be given to Ms. MacDonald for the record.

Stephanie Renner, 1002 E. Tienken, stated that she and Jeff Williams are directly west of the Sinacolas and noted that she purchased the home 22 years ago and her love of historic architecture and the past propelled her to live in the district. She pointed out that in the north and west ends of the District, larger homes and entire condominium complexes have been built that are not period or size correct for the area. She added that most of the homes have been added on to or altered in some state, including her home back in 1922, and a precedence has been set and is nothing new to the District. She pointed out that if the vacant lot was sold to another family, they would not build an 800 to 1,500 square foot home, and a brand new standalone home would dwarf these homes and look totally out of place. She expressed support for the addition.

Lou Fischetti, 1005 Runyon Rd., stated that he lives in the home where Bertha Van Hoosen was born, and since 1992 he has put on two additions. He noted that a couple of years ago they put in a swimming pool and it is now the focal point of the neighborhood for the kids. He stated that he has been active with the Museum and not once has he been questioned about his additions. He expressed support.

James Martone, 999 E. Tienken, stated that he believes his house has been referenced as being one of the oldest homes, and expressed support for the Sinacolas. He stated that if it were not for people like the Sinacolas, these homes would fall by the wayside. He stressed that they want to preserve the integrity of the historic district and the integrity of their families and live as a community.

Chairperson Granthen closed public comment.

Mr. Tischer asked if any of the older trees would be removed as he did not see a landscaping plan.

Mr. Sinacola responded that there are a few trees that will have to be removed where the garage is going; however, they are overgrown with three of them growing sideways because they had fallen down. He noted that there are brush and rock piles there and it would be cleaned up. He explained that their goal is to keep the mature trees in place and not remove them.

Mr. Tischer stated that if this passes, he would caution the Sinacolas to take care when digging to look for any historically significant treasures.

Mr. Sinacola mentioned that when they dug out the crawlspace during the first addition to reinforce the foundation as there were no footers in the basement, they found a safe that was full of water and nothing else.

Mr. McGunn stated that he would concur with Dr. Stamps' comments.

Vice Chairperson Granthen asked if Ms. Kidorf had any additional comments.

Ms. Kidorf stated that she would remind the Commission that this is not a precedent-setting body, and everything is taken on a case-by-case basis. She noted that just because this might be approved, it does not mean that everything similar must be approved.

Vice Chairperson Granthen suggested that a potential motion could make this clearer that this would not be precedent-setting.

Dr. Stamps thanked everyone in attendance this evening, noting that these meetings do not typically have that many attendees. He commented that their presence justifies the Commission's existence and reaffirms that there is community out there that shares the history and wants to preserve it. He stated that he would ask the question of staff as to how many structures are in the City of Rochester Hills and how many are listed as historic features. He noted that if he had asked that question ten years ago, it was probably twice as many as now, as many have been lost to fire and neglect. He stated that the value of those remaining is probably going up and he thanked those who preserve them.

He asked what the expectancy is of a new building, and commented that new homes are not built to last forever. He stated that he is less concerned about additions, especially those in the back, and believes they are okay as long as the historic feature is preserved.

Mr. Tischer made a motion to approve the certificate of appropriateness, stating that the existing house is not a contributing building, the proposed addition is compatible in massing, size and scale, and the proposed addition is in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines. He noted that by saying it is not a contributing building, that will help prevent the idea that this is a slippery slope. The motion was seconded by Dr. Stamps.

After calling for a roll call vote, Vice Chairperson Granthen announced that the motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Tischer, seconded by Stamps, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 6 - Altherr-Rogers, Elias, Granthen, Stamps, Tischer and McGunn

Excused 3 - Lyons, Thompson and Lemanski

Resolved, in the matter of File No. PHDC 2024-001, that the Historic Districts Commission **APPROVES** the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of an addition at 1046 E. Tienken in the Stoney Creek Historic District, Parcel Identification Number 70-15-01-352-036, with the following Findings and Conditions:

1) The existing house **is not** a contributing building in the Stoney Creek Historic District and the proposed addition **is** compatible in massing, size, scale and materials with the existing house and district;

2) The proposed addition **is** in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines, in particular standard numbers 9 and 10 as follows:

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

2024-0015

Discussion regarding 947 E. Tienken Rd., Ralph Putman, Owner

(McLeod memoranda dated 3-7-24 and 1-2-24, Designhaus letters dated 2-29-24 and 12-11-23, plans received 2-13-24 and 12-15-23, Draft HDC minutes from 1-11-24, Location map, and Photos had been placed on file and by reference became a part of the record.)

Vice Chairperson Granthen introduced this item and noted that it was a continuation of the previous discussion regarding 947 E. Tienken Road. She invited the applicants to the table.

Present for Ralph Putman, owner of the property were Andrew Miller and Mike

Pizzola, representing Designhaus.

Mr. Miller noted that they came before the Commission two months ago and received comments regarding the first iteration designed for the property. After the comments, noting that the addition was above the historical house, they dropped it down and also made an indent where the old and the new separate from each other. He pointed out that the siding is changed as well, and the roof slope is lower. He stated that from the road you still see the historical building and the addition gets lost behind the landscaping and is buried into the ground with the walkout basement on the back. He noted that the original house will not be touched and it will see replacements of windows and siding.

Vice Chairperson Granthen asked the applicant to review the landscaping.

Mr. Pizzola noted that the overall goal is to not see the addition in relation to the existing house. He pointed out that there are several mature trees and no existing trees would be cut down. He stated that there are a number of walnut trees in the area that are relatively large on the property and also on the property Mr. Putman owns behind it and next to it. He mentioned that Mr. Putman is adamant about preserving the natural landscape and has been cutting out Oriental Bittersweet vines all the way to the back of the property to make it better and prevent the spread of that invasive plant. He noted that they propose some modest landscaping to screen it with a tiered effect with evergreens and some understory plants to give an effect throughout the seasons and provide several aspects to buffer the proposed addition. The intent would be to keep the existing house open to the road with native plantings, grasses and perennials and buffer the back with more native plants to blend into the fabric of the neighborhood.

Vice Chairperson Granthen asked for Commissioner questions and comments.

Mr. Tischer noted that he was not in attendance in January, but read the minutes and looked at the initial plans, and he thought there was no way that the initial proposal would go forward. He commented that this is better in comparison and at least the historic part will be front and center. He thanked the applicants for proposing to move the house back and make it more of a conforming structure zoning-wise, and stated that it would be an improvement.

Mr. Miller stated that as the house sits right now there is no foundation under it, and trying to keep the house in the existing location increases the efforts.

Mr. Tischer commented that he would assume that they would put metal through it and move the house back.

Mr. Miller responded that they even spoke with Mr. Putman and with the retaining wall on the back he wants to source it all as naturally as they can.

Mr. Tischer stated that some of the members were on the Commission when Mr. Putman came before them a year or two ago and he had a concept in his head and no drawings; and he commented that he is glad the Commission gets to see something before he puts in an application to make an actual

determination.

Dr. Stamps asked Ms. Kidorf for her comments relative to the mass and size of the addition and how it will align with the Department of Interior Guidelines. He noted that while it looks great, they are tripling the square footage of the little historic house.

Ms. Kidorf responded that she shares the concerns with the size of the addition, although reducing the height has helped tremendously. She pointed out that it also seems like the addition might be in a slope so that the bulk of the addition would be below the existing house. She commented that she also wanted to make it clear that the site plan alludes to both sections of the home being moved but it is really just the two-story gable portion which is one-and-a-half stories and there are not really two stories being preserved. She added that the wing part is not being preserved but it is being somewhat recreated with the proposed addition the way it is designed. She noted that the way it has been revised to retain or reinstall the cobblestone on the existing historic portion of the house and use a more compatible stone on the addition is good.

She noted that it really comes down to the details of what will be done to the existing one-and-a-half story and what will be the materials, trim and renderings. She stated that she would probably want to see closer to construction drawings with a bit more detail as to what will happen with the trim and the window. She acknowledged that the building has not been painted in many, many years, but historically the siding would have always been painted.

Mr. Pizzola stated that they can do that.

Mr. Tischer asked if the wing was original or was added on later.

Ms. Kidorf responded that while it has been some time since she looked at the survey card, she believes that the gable one-and-a-half story is actually newer than the one-story portion.

Mr. Pizzola noted that the rear portion was added on, and commented that with that intent in mind, they are doing nothing but following that spirit by removing that portion and modernizing it while keeping the front original house. He pointed out that the original photograph shows some of the additional buildings identified as contributing factors, along with the outhouse, the privy, and the chicken coop; and he stated that Mr. Putman still has those on site and it is his intent to relocate those as they were back in a photograph on display. He added that they would look into painting the structure something that would be more conducive of the area so it would blend in.

Dr. Stamps commented that the outbuildings are a crucial piece as this is not just a farmhouse but is a farmstead, with all of the components from the outhouse to the chicken coop and corn crib. He mentioned that the barn is in the County right-of-way, and he stated that he does not want to see the barn abandoned. He noted that the road view is actually the side of the house. He commented that he is fine with leaving the orientation the way it is as long as the resource is preserved.

Mr. Pizzola noted that the chimney is new. He explained that there used to be a central fireplace in the building with a chimney that was replaced, and the current chimney is the second chimney.

Mr. McGunn asked if the intent is to move the entire existing structure back.

Mr. Pizzola confirmed that is correct. He added that this would free up the right-of-way for municipal purposes.

Vice Chairperson Granthen asked for Mr. McLeod's input.

Mr. McLeod stated that they have had a number of conversations regarding the barn within the right-of-way; and he noted that unfortunately it is one of those situations where no one really wants to take ownership of it. He explained that the Road Commission has basically acknowledged that it is in their right-of-way, but they are not touching it; and in conversations with the owner, he feels the Road Commission should do something with it. He stated that ideally, the barn would be moved backwards or moved to the north along with the house structure as well as an opportunity to shore it up. He commented that the concern is that something could happen such as a car accident, and you would want to try to move the barn if given the opportunity to do so. He noted that it has been an ongoing conversation, but unfortunately it is just one of those things where no one is stepping up to say that they will move it.

Mr. Miller confirmed that it is in limbo. He stated that they would like to incorporate it somehow, but they do not know who has ownership; and he commented that the owner does not want to take ownership if it is someone else's responsibility.

Mr. Pizzola stated that the owner did go in and try to shore it up by jacking it up and putting some temporary footings underneath because it is getting to the point where something needs to be done with it. He commented that they will revisit that in the near future.

Dr. Stamps suggested that the owner be encouraged to maintain his connection with Pat McKay at the Museum as they have a team of amateur archaeologists trained on the Van Hoosen property that may recognize things an average backhoe digger or construction person might not recognize. He commented that it might be a win-win opportunity to preserve some items for the Museum.

Vice Chairperson Granthen noted that there was no motion for consideration this evening on this item, and thanked the applicant team for sharing the plans. She stated that the Commission looks forward to seeing them the next time.

Mr. Pizzola noted that the Putmans should be back soon as they spend the two coldest months of the year in Alabama.

Discussed

Vice Chairperson Granthen noted that it is time for the Earl Borden Awards discussion. She asked if there had been someone considered in the past that they are not thinking of.

Mr. McLeod mentioned that the Questers were considered two years ago, and were given the award last year.

Vice Chairperson Granthen commented that at the last Historic Districts Study Committee meeting, there were so many members of the community that wanted to keep the entire historic area as a district, and asked if there might be a way to honor the housing itself or the owners of homes in that area. She stated that perhaps the Commission could recognize the residents of the Winkler Mill District and their efforts and could be shown an appreciation for their input and passion for the district.

Dr. Stamps stated that in the past they have given the award to a group of people who supported some activity, and he would say that this could be on a list of potential honorees. He stated that he feels really good about the award given a couple of years ago for the Gate Lodge on Adams Road entering to Meadow Brook Hall. He commented that the Commission received good publicity for giving out that award and that gave them some support for their ongoing projects.

He mentioned the property on Crooks where the house was torn down, an assisted living constructed, and the barn is still remaining. He suggested that perhaps the award might be an incentive to justify the expenditure of funds to preserve the barn.

Vice Chairperson Granthen noted that they have shored up the barn, but have not done much else to it. She asked if any of the staff members had any ideas.

Mr. McLeod noted that it was coincidental that they mentioned the Winkler Mill group, and he commented that while it is one year removed from the Stoney Creek 200th Anniversary, it might be a nice way of honoring their celebration. He pointed out that they are obviously a close knit group.

Vice Chairperson Granthen noted that the library is 100 years old.

Mr. McLeod added that the City itself is 40 years old.

Vice Chairperson Granthen commented that these are all excellent ideas.

Dr. Stamps suggested that he would like to propose sending a letter to whomever was responsible for the City Hall display regarding the Stoney Creek Bicentennial.

Mr. McLeod noted that Mr. McKay and the Museum put that together.

Dr. Stamps stated that it would fit in with the discussion that this is a celebration and perhaps they deserve recognition.

Vice Chairperson Granthen noted that these are excellent ideas. She commented that Mr. McKay has received the award so many times; however, the Stoney Creek anniversary is very special.

Mr. McLeod noted that in his mind it would be for the entire district rather than simply the Van Hoosen Museum.

Vice Chairperson Granthen asked if the resident association has a chair or president.

Mr. McLeod responded that he was not sure if they did. He commented that they could ask Mr. McKay if there is a designated person other than himself that might represent the residents. He suggested that there should be an official motion and vote to recognize Stoney Creek for its bicentennial with the Historic Preservation Board award.

Mr. McGunn made that motion, and it was seconded by Mr. Tischer. After calling for a voice vote, Vice Chairperson Granthen noted that the motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by McGunn, seconded by Tischer, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 6 - Altherr-Rogers, Elias, Granthen, Stamps, Tischer and McGunn

Excused 3 - Lyons, Thompson and Lemanski

Resolved, that the Historic Districts Commission recognizes the Stoney Creek Historic District for its Bicentennial with the Historic Preservation Award.

2024-0155

May - Historic Preservation Month

Vice Chairperson Granthen noted that May is Historic Preservation Month and perhaps the time to award the Historic Preservation Award.

Ms. Kidorf mentioned that the Statewide Preservation Conference is scheduled for May 9 through May 11 in Kalamazoo.

Discussed

Dr. Stamps asked if there was any new information regarding the Adams Road widening. He suggested that the Commission should be constantly reminding those involved that the Commission is constantly vigilant.

Mr. McLeod responded that they met three weeks ago and introduced what they consider to be five proposals, which is what they were tasked with doing as a part of the funding mechanism that they received for the project. He commented that two are most likely non-starters, including doing nothing, and a four-lane boulevard that has a 60-foot median to it. He stated that three of the proposals are being worked through, but no decisions have been made as yet. He mentioned that there should be another open house sometime in May to present the five options and gain public input, and he will let the Commission know when that date is set.

Dr. Stamps asked who would represent the City at the open house.

Mr. McLeod responded that there will be an entire team from the City, most likely including representatives from Planning, Engineering, and Forestry.

Dr. Stamps asked for any updates on the Stone House on Adams Road.

Mr. McLeod responded that the Priya project becomes null and void as of next week. He commented that their complete silence as to the progression of the project leads staff to think this project will not go forward.

Dr. Stamps suggested sending a brief memo to the current owners indicating that they are sorry that the project did not work, but including a reminder that they are the caretakers of one of the limited historic features and the Commission is anxious to work with them on whatever proposal comes forward.

Dr. Stamps noted that the Michigan Historical Society's Local History Conference will be held March 22 and March 23 at Oakland University.

Vice Chairperson Granthen mentioned that she and Mr. McGunn will be attending, along with Janice Ferry on the Study Committee.

Dr. Stamps stated that it is on his calendar as well. He mentioned that this is the 150th anniversary of the Oakland County Pioneering Historical Society, and they are having a series of events this year, approximately one each month on various topics.

Vice Chairperson Granthen asked if the Society might be a good group to consider for the Leadership Award.

Dr. Stamps responded that they would possibly be, but added that they are more county-wide rather than just Rochester/Rochester Hills. He mentioned that there will be a presentation at Oakland University on March 25 on Indian boarding schools in the area.

He mentioned his request from earlier in the meeting and asked if there could be a list compiled of the contributing structures in Rochester Hills, and which have been lost.

Mr. McLeod asked if he wanted all buildings taken into account, whether residential, commercial, industrial or office.

Dr. Stamps confirmed he did.

Vice Chairperson Granthen mentioned an email forwarded regarding a SHPO webinar available for the Commissioners to attend if they wish.

Mr. McLeod announced that the City is currently undertaking its Master Land Use Plan update. He explained that typically the process is undertaken through the Planning Commission, but as a part of the process of making sure that the plan is a holistic plan and addresses all aspects of the City in regards to the built environment and how it has been developed or not developed, there will be a

series of small focus group workshops through April, and then over the course of the next 12 to 13 months beyond that. He stated that they are looking for potentially two people from the Commission to participate for about three days over the course of the next 14 months. He noted that the first date is April 22, the second is September 23, and the third being February 24 or 25, 2025. He explained that these are tentative dates but would be the approximate timing of the commitment.

Vice Chairperson Granthen mentioned Mr. Tischer stated he would be willing.

Dr. Stamps asked Mr. McLeod to send out a reminder for those dates. He commented that it is crucial and important that someone from this group should be sitting in the focus group as it would be easy to forget about history. He stated that this would be a good time to have the numbers of how many structures are historic. He mentioned that 500 people walk through the Garden Tour and that is very important.

Mr. McLeod mentioned that he sent the Commissioners a notice about a survey, and encouraged anyone who has not taken the survey to do so as the time is winding down and will be closing by the weekend so it can be discussed at the Planning Commission next Tuesday. He added that more surveys will be forthcoming in the future that will be more holistic in terms of the general population of the city.

Vice Chairperson Granthen encouraged the Commissioners to look at their schedules to see if anyone else might want to participate in the focus groups.

She mentioned that the Study Committee will be having the Public Hearing for the removal of 1021 Harding on April 11 based on recommendations and the fact that the house has been demolished and the property divided into three lots.

NEXT MEETING DATE

- April 11, 2024

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, it was moved by Tischer, seconded by Stamps, to adjourn the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

Minutes were prepared by Jennifer MacDonald.

*Minutes were approved as presented/amended at the _____
Regular Historic Districts Commission Meeting.*

Julie Granthen, Vice Chairperson