

NORTHVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
March 19, 2014
Wednesday 7:00 P.M. – Northville City Hall - Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Johnson called the Historic District Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Argenta, Field, Gudritz, Hoffman, Johnson, Luikart and Vernacchia

Absent: None

Also Present: Sally Elmiger

3. CITIZEN COMMENTS: Limited to brief comments for items not on the agenda.

None

**4. MINUTES: February 19, 2014; February 26, 2014 (Sub-Committee);
February 26, 2014 –Joint Training Session**

Chair Johnson said minutes were not required for training sessions, as no action was taken. Ms. Elmiger said she was directed to take the minutes by City Manager Sullivan.

Commissioner Hoffman added one dash to page two of the February 19, 2014 regular minutes.

**Motion by Argenta, support by Field, to approve the minutes of February 19, 2014 and
February 26, 2014 (Sub-Committee) as published.**

Voice Vote: Motion Carried unanimously.

5. REPORTS

A. CITY ADMINISTRATION: None

B. CITY COUNCIL: None

C. PLANNING COMMISSIONER: None

D. OTHER COMMUNITY/GOVERNMENTAL LIAISONS: None

6. CASES TO BE HEARD – BY CASE

A. Case is called.

B. Applicant presents case.

C. Commission questions & comments.

D. A motion pertaining to the completeness of the application is made, seconded, and voted upon. Results are announced by the Chair.

E. Public comments on the case are heard. (Please approach the podium to address the Historic District Commission)

F. If the HDC has voted to accept the application as complete, a motion pertaining to granting a Notice to Proceed is made, seconded, and voted upon. Results are announced by the Chair.

Case #2 and Case #3 were heard before Case #1; while awaiting arrival of the Applicant.

CASE # 2
GRAPHIC VISIONS/YOGURT PALOOZA (Returning) SIGN
101 MAINCENTRE

Sandy Mustonen was present for Graphic Visions and Yogurt Palooza. She provided the modified design for the subject sign. She said her client not pleased with the decision, as they thought it did not reflect their corporate branding effort. She explained that the black background was eliminated from the sign and presented that to the Commission.

Discussion took place regarding whether the sign was in keeping with other signs in the downtown area. One Commissioner was opposed; the remaining Commissioners felt the sign was in keeping with the area.

Motion by Vernacchia, support by Luikart, to accept the application as complete.
Voice Vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion Carried Unanimously.

Motion by Hoffman, supported by Gudritz, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness, referencing the Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-24 for signs and 5-18 for color; noting the exception for the number of colors on the sign, based on the needs of the Applicant.
Voice Vote: Motion carried, 6-1 with Field opposed.

CASE#3
YESTERYEAR BUILDING (Returning) NEW HOME
629 NATALIE

The consultant's review letter indicated that the Applicant is proposing to construct a new house on the south side of Natalie Lane on vacant land. He appeared before the HDC to present this project in September, 2013, where the Historic District Commission provided conceptual approval. At the February, 2014 meeting, the HDC provided the applicant with comments regarding the proposed home regarding the following:

- 1) Proposed design has too many façade treatments. This needs to be scaled back per Northville's Standards.
- 2) Proposed third floor/height needs to be confirmed via zoning. The third floor can't be used for living, only storage.
- 3) Address the informational items in CWA's review letter.
- 4) Reconsider overall massing and scale relative to other homes in along the street. Streetscape view needs to be provided to allow HDC to review.
- 5) Gables don't seem to be historically accurate.
- 6) Curve on building out of place.
- 7) Character of structure should not stand out. It should be in harmony with the district.

The consultant's review letter spoke about zoning compliance, and emphasized that if the design of the building changes in order to comply with the Zoning Ordinance, the Applicant must return to the HDC for review of the modified building design. The Building Official will make a determination before a building permit is issued if the plans comply with the Zoning Ordinance.

Further, the review letter stated: The home is located in the R-1B First Density Residential District. Zoning requirements for new buildings include meeting lot coverage, setbacks, and height requirements. The proposed building meets these requirements. Note that there is an egress well at the rear of the building that is within the rear yard setback. The Building

Official will need to determine if this complies with the Zoning Ordinance. The property contains a number of existing trees. Removal of these trees will require a Tree Removal Permit from the Building Department before work on the project begins. In addition, a stream traverses the southern portion of the property that has been identified on the City's Flood Insurance Rate Map as a flood hazard zone. Provisions of Article 23, Flood Hazard Zones, of the Zoning Ordinance addressed when the applicant applies for a building permit.

Regarding construction of a new house, the consultant's review letter indicated that the following information is required by the HDC application, and needs to be provided:

- 1) Recent photographs of the existing property.
- 2) Material samples and colors for roofing, siding (lap, shake, and stone), and trim.
- 3) Brochures showing materials and design for windows, pedestrian and garage doors, and proposed light fixtures.
- 4) Time frame for the project, including start date, exterior completion date, landscaping completion date, and occupancy date.

Applicant John Lacroix recalled the previous meeting and noted the following changes to the plan:

- The new design addresses the egress and walk-out in the back of house;
- There is no roof over the egress area and walk -out area;
- They have permits and the basement is in the ground;
- One dead tree was removed, that is the extent of it;
- The property goes beyond the creek, they may put in a bridge and no more trees will be removed;
- The new design is elegant and uses simple materials;
- Regarding windows, they will be double hung, aluminum clad, coordinated vertical patterns, include grey hues, and raised muttons; (brochures can be provided);
- Stone and shingle sample provided, using a geometric cut stone along the bottom and the piers

Commissioner Vernacchia said the submittal was a nice improvement.

Discussion took place regarding the front elevation and the three windows in the bay to the right. It was noted that the field drawing does not include the windows. The house has two floors, and the size is 4,625. It was noted that these were not the final prints.

Mr. Lacroix responded that he was not a licensed architect; and the final prints were sitting on his board. He said what the submitted drawings look like is what the project would end up looking like, and the foundation has been poured.

The Commission noted the following:

- That the Applicant would have to transfer the dimensions onto the final drawings;
- That anything approved at this meeting would have to have the same dimensions;
- That sheet three has materials noted, but the other elevations have to be finished;
- That a final set of drawings was required;

- That the front elevation was not called out on the plans, and the Commission needs a final set with the information shown for the record

Mr. Lacroix said he could have the drawings done on Thursday or Friday; and provide the colors in a month. He said the rear does not show the decorative truss in the gable area, but he showed it in brackets.

The Commission noted the following:

That sheet three includes details of the trim, the roof and the siding and would be reflective of the other elevations also;

The submittal was close to being complete, but not quite complete, and a complete set was needed, and a subcommittee could be formed to help finalize;

Specific information was needed regarding materials, colors, window choices, lighting

Mr. Lacroix said the garage doors would be custom made 'to mimic pretty close' to what he has drawn; and they won't have pictures or samples until the house is being built

Discussion ensued regarding the front elevation; the formation of a subcommittee; the need for a very specific list, and that the Applicant cannot put anything else in until the subcommittee meets and approves the details.

It was emphasized that the Applicant needed to provide the following:

- 1) Recent photographs of the existing property.
- 2) Material samples and colors for roofing, siding (lap, shake, and stone), and trim.
- 3) Brochures showing materials and design for windows, pedestrian and garage doors, and proposed light fixtures.
- 4) Time frame for the project, including start date, exterior completion date, landscaping completion date, and occupancy date.

Discussion took place regarding what was deficient and how to assist the Applicant in providing the missing details. Ms. Elmiger pointed out that approving projects that were incomplete was not appropriate and can lead to problems. Discussion continued regarding approving a portion of the plan at this time.

Discussion took place regarding the need for the Commission to see how the project would fit in with the surrounding neighborhood. Commissioner Field expressed concern with having the muttons for the windows at the top of the window, instead of at the bottom.

Mr. Lacroix described the surrounding homes.

Commissioner Vernacchia noted that the provided picture was helpful in a relative nature; the second picture contained the information for a relative comparison, and there were only two houses in the neighborhood. He said the information needed was at least represented in this content.

Commissioner Luikart noted that the full list was included in the application. She explained that without this, houses can be built up with daylight basements, and that is what the Commission was trying to avoid, so the houses are on the same level.

Discussion continued regarding the finished floor elevation. Mr. Lacroix said it was two feet from the grade that drops a foot from the corner of the Greek Revival going south. He said the elevation was 623.4; progressing west or south and it drops a foot.

Commissioner Argenta noted the plan indicated the elevation was 862; the original was 860.8 so finished floor will be as the elevation of the nearby Greek Revival.

Discussion ensued regarding the floor elevation. Mr. Lacroix said they “came up two feet from 862.”

Commissioner Argenta said the Applicant needs to state clearly what the finished floor elevation would be. He said sheets 1, 2, and 4 need to include the elevation accurately. He said there were notes on the rear elevation.

Discussion was held, and the Applicant confirmed that he was not putting in a curved driveway.

Ms. Elmiger clarified that Mr. Lacroix needed to provide items 1-4 on the review letter, to the subcommittee for consideration.

Discussion took place regarding the formation of a subcommittee. Chair Johnson volunteered, along with Commissioners Argenta and Field; and would meet on April 2, 2014 at 9:00 a.m. It was clarified that the Applicant needed to bring at least four sets of this required information.

Motion by Gudritz, support by Hoffman, to table the matter of 629 Natalie, and refer the matter to the subcommittee on April 2, 2014, at 9:00 a.m.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion Carried Unanimously.

CASE #1

**SCOTT MULLAN (Returning)
530 W. MAIN STREET**

ADDITION

Jennifer Mullan was present representing her husband Scott Mullan, regarding 530 W. Main Street, and their request for an addition.

It was clarified that the consultant considered the application complete. It was noted that the reference to fire safety was needed to be signed by the Applicant and included in the City’s file.

Commissioner Luikart clarified that the subject roofline was down by 2.5 feet; and the reference to “plus and minus” was removed from the notes.

Motion by Field, support by Vernacchia, to accept the application as complete.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion Carried Unanimously.

Motion by Hoffman, supported by Vernacchia, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness, referencing the Secretary of Interiors Design Standards numbers 9 and 10; and the Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-16 for Mass; 3-18 for Scale; 3-19 for Hierarchy; 3-21 for Materials; 5-9 for Asphalt Shingles; and 5-18 for Paint and Color.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion Carried Unanimously.

DISCUSSION

Amendment to HDC Rules and Regulations (action item)

Ms. Elmiger reviewed the new changes that included the change from a 10 day period to a 16 day period to allow Applicants more time to submit information. She reviewed some additional changes suggested by the Historic District Commission, referring to page 3, item 4.6 which now illustrates exactly what is on the agenda. The agenda was modified to include the approval of the agenda. Regarding page 3, 4, and 5, some modifications were included so what is in the Rules and Regulations is on the agenda and vice versa.

Regarding page 6, item 4.11 approvals, Ms. Elmiger said the Rules and Regulations did not describe some possible situations regarding demolitions. She said this was modified so that what is allowed by Ordinance is also illustrated in the Rules and Regulations.

Discussion took place regarding page 5, item g., number 6; and the wording relative to the use of the wording Certificate of Appropriateness or Notice to Proceed. Chair Johnson clarified that the term was Certificate of Appropriateness. The Commission concurred that they agreed with the submission. Discussion took place regarding people addressing the Commission from the podium; and to include that in the Rules and Regulations.

Motion by Vernacchia, support by Argenta, to accept the modifications to the Rules and Regulations as presented.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion Carried Unanimously.

Change to HDC Application and HDC Notice

Ms. Elmiger said she made no additional changes because she did not receive any changes from the Commissioners. Commissioner Argenta provided a marked-up copy that referenced the prints of drawings, printed to scale.

Chair Johnson said the Historic District Commission would act on that change later, along with the change to the 16 day timeframe.

Chair Johnson made a suggestion regarding the reply sheet sent to the Applicant. He said regarding the Notice to Proceed or the Certificate of Appropriateness should have the same footnote, and be placed after the boxes on the form. It was decided that the Cert of Appropriateness should be shown first; then Notice to Proceed; referred back; referred to Subcommittee; and then Denied at the end. It was clarified that if an Applicant deviated, they would be required to return to the Historic District Commission.

Structural Engineer Requirement

Ms. Elmiger explained that the Historic Preservation network has a membership book with some Structural Engineers, but it is not vetted. Upon discussion, the City Manager suggested that the City name the Structural Engineer as the third-party Structural Engineer, so the Historic District Commission is assured that the person is experienced and not being paid directly by the Applicant, but through the City's fee schedule. It was clarified that this would have to be approved by the City Council.

Discussion took place regarding the matter and the language regarding an independent structural engineer licensed in Michigan. Discussion took place regarding doing due diligence in terms of potential demolition of historic structures, the criteria involved, and that the Historic District Commission could waive the requirement. The Commission emphasized the importance of the

procedure, so any Applicants were not surprised by the possible need for a Structural Engineer and the associates costs and timeframe.

Commissioners Luikart and Hoffman concurred with the suggestion by City Manager Sullivan.

Commissioner Vernacchia emphasized his desire for the Commission to reserve their right to make the final decision, regardless of an opinion by a Structural Engineer.

Discussion ensued regarding the matter. Ms. Elmiger said she would follow-up on the matter and return to the Historic District Commission once more.

Study to Categorize Contributing/Non-contributing Structures

Ms. Elmiger said she did not have more information regarding this at this time. It was suggested that possibly a student could assist with the effort to categorize the structures. She said she would contact EMU regarding same.

Discussion took place regarding the value of categorizing the Contributing/Non-contributing Structures. (Examples from nearby communities to be provided.)

Commissioner Luikart recalled her previously expressed concern regarding 333 N. Rogers Street. She said the home continues to remain vacant; while the owners requested approval for an addition in April 2009 and renewed in 2010.

Ms. Elmiger said the Building Official reviewed the exterior and found no rotting wood; there was some peeling paint; the lawn is mowed; but no structural problems with the house.

Discussion took place regarding procedure in contacting the property owner regarding the Historic District Commission concern. It was determined that Ms. Elmiger would as the Building Official to include a memo in the address file.

Discussion took place regarding the matter of licensed architects; and that there is no requirement for same, however, the Building Code requires that plans have to be signed and sealed by a licensed architect if the dwelling exceeds 3,500 square feet.

Ms. Elmiger said she would be providing reviews of historic structures whenever the exterior is complete. She said she would use a check off list, before the Applicant goes any further. She said details need to be worked out regarding this new process, and hopefully it will make the process smoother.

Chair Johnson noted that the City Council recently approved the fee schedule and it included the inspection fee.

Discussion took place regarding the Northville standards and projects that have gone forward in the community. Discussion took place regarding the need to consider revising some of the standards.

ADJOURN Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Cindy Gray, Recording Secretary