

CITY OF NORTHVILLE
Local Historic District Study Committee Meeting Minutes
November 8, 2018
Northville City Hall - Council Chambers
215 W. Main Street
Northville, Michigan 48167

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Allen called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the City of Northville Municipal Building, City Council Chambers, 215 W. Main Street, Northville, Michigan, 48167.

Present: James Allen
Leanie Bayly
Mark Chester
Suzanne Cozart
David Field
Jeff Russell

Absent: Robert Miller (excused)

Also present: Elaine Robinson of Commonwealth Heritage Group, Planning Consultant Sally Elmiger, Mayor Roth, and approximately 25 guests.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

**Motion Field, support by Cozart, to approve the agenda as published.
Motion carried unanimously.**

APPROVAL OF 9/25/18 MEETING MINUTES

Member Bayly commented that the conversation recorded on page 7, 2nd paragraph regarding the home at Wing and Dunlap, the 2nd sentence should include the statement that Chair Allen had said the property owner had been invited to return to the HDC and was going to lower the home. Chair Allen clarified that the property owner had been invited back to the HDC to explain the height of the home.

Tim Luikart, 521 W. Cady Street, asked that his comment as recorded on page 6, 7th paragraph, be corrected as noted in the motion below.

Motion Bayly, support by Russell, to amend the September 25, 2018 meeting minutes as follows:

- Page 6, 7th paragraph, 4th line: . . . put a burden on the owners of ~~non~~contributing structures and . . .
- Page 7, 2nd paragraph: Ms. Luikart asked about the home at Wing and Dunlap that appeared to have been inappropriately raised when a new foundation was constructed so that the building was too high. Chair Allen explained that property owner had been invited to return to the HDC in order to explain why the building was too high.
- Page 8, last paragraph: ~~Ruth~~ Luci Klinkhamer . . .

Motion carried unanimously.

UPDATE FROM ELAINE ROBINSON, COMMONWEALTH HERITAGE GROUP

Utilizing a revised map of the Historic District shown on the overhead projector, Elaine Robinson, Senior Architectural Historian, Project Team Leader, Commonwealth Heritage Group, showed on the overhead projector a map that reflected changes that were discussed at the September 25, 2018 meeting:

- The Historic District boundary was returned to the south side of East Cady Street including all the lots between Griswold and South Center Streets.
- The Historic District boundary now incorporated the parking garage on the south side of East Cady.
- The Historic District added the house at 588 Randolph Street as contributing and revised the Historic District boundary to capture the entire associated parcel.
- The Study revised the status of 534 W. Dunlap to contributing. This was done at the owner's request; the owner had provided substantial additional information and after consulting with the State Historic Preservation Office that change was made.

There had been discussion at the last meeting regarding changes that the State Historic Preservation Office had made regarding the recommended status of some of the buildings in the Historic District. SHPO's reasons for each property were:

- 536 W. Main – this house was not altered more than the others around it (521-531 W. Main) and should be listed as contributing.
- 446 Dubuar – The addition of a third story on this house substantially altered its original appearance, proportions, and massing; this should be noncontributing.
- 115 E. Dunlap – The absence of the block screen wall and other details removed all decorative elements to this structure and it should be noncontributing.
- 534 W. Dunlap – This house's form and massing has been substantially altered with the addition of a second story over the wing and the addition at the rear; this should be noncontributing. Note: This house was again changed to contributing as explained above.
- 320 High – The addition of the porch and the unknown origins of this house, plus the lack of information regarding its move indicated that it should be noncontributing.
- 520 W. Main – there was not sufficient historic fabric remaining to allow this building to be contributing.
- 113 Randolph – The addition completely altered the footprint, massing and size of this house and was particularly visible from the street; this should be noncontributing.
- 124 Randolph – Large side and rear additions dwarfed the original structure and were not easily distinguishable; this should be noncontributing.
- 572 Randolph – Without more information regarding the original architecture, this structure should be listed as noncontributing based on the additions/alterations.
- 227 N. Rogers – Based on the movement of this house and the large addition it should be noncontributing.
- 228 West – the report currently said contributing but should be noncontributing.

Ms. Robinson said that the general public was not asked to discern when a structure was contributing or noncontributing; however people who worked with historic structures should be able to discern this, as should the Study Committee.

Member Bayly thanked Ms. Robinson for her work on the Local Historic District Intensive Level Survey and the Local Historic District Study.

Ms. Robinson explained that the State Historic Preservation Office wanted to help protect the Northville Historic District, and SHPO had taken a lot of time reviewing this project to make sure it was done correctly.

Member Fields summarized that there were 411 parcels in the Historic District, and a little over 60% of the structures were found to be contributing. What Ms. Robinson had just reviewed was that after the report was submitted to the State, SHPO changed 10 of the parcels, one from noncontributing to contributing, and nine from contributing to noncontributing.

**PUBLIC HEARING – NORTHVILLE 2018 LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT STUDY REPORT
AS REVISED SEPTEMBER 28, 2018**

Chair Allen opened the public hearing.

Tim Luikart, 521 W. Cady, referred to an email included in the Members' packets that he and his wife Jennifer Luikart had sent to the Northville Historic District Study Committee, with copies to the Michigan State Historic Preservation Office and the Michigan Historic Preservation Network, along with a separate letter to the Michigan State Historic Preservation Office with copies to the Study Committee and to the Keeper, National Register of Historic Places. This correspondence formally petitioned to have their home removed from the Northville Historic District's Proposed 2018 Boundaries.

Mr. Luikart said that they were requesting removal from the District not because they didn't like what the District was doing, but rather because of their location. Their property was a small historic home on the southwest border of the District, surrounded by noncontributing homes. They now felt that being part of the Historic District was inappropriate as it put them at a disadvantage as homeowners, especially when they were surrounded by noncontributing structures. The letters had gone out this morning and they wanted to let the Study Committee know they were pursuing this course of action.

The materials that Mr. Luikart had sent the Committee included pictures of the structures that surrounded them. To the south of them was the border of the Historic District. Properties immediately to the southwest were not in the Historic District. Across the street to the west was a large newly constructed home that was outside the District. Directly across the street to the north were noncontributing homes, as was the home to the east of them. Again, as an island in the middle of noncontributing homes the Luikart's felt it was inappropriate to remain in the District.

Patricia Thull, owner of 572 and 588 Randolph, thanked the Committee for reconsidering 588 Randolph and making the recommendation to restore it to the Historic District. She asked when the State Historic Preservation Office became involved with the Study. Ms. Robinson said SHPO's involvement was as a result of the last public hearing. Ms. Thull asked what the advantage was to be noncontributing vs. contributing. Chair Allen explained that the rules were the same whether a property was contributing or noncontributing.

Ms. Thull said 572 Randolph had a glowing report in the July Survey, when it was considered contributing. Why did SHPO move it to noncontributing? The July report said the house maintained its integrity of location, setting, feeling and association, and was recommended as a contributing resource to the Northville Historic District. Yet in September the comment was: overall the house cannot be associated with any style or period of architecture and also lacks integrity of feeling and association. When Ms. Thull purchased the home in 1993, there wasn't a nail on the property – it was a complete peg design and the Michigan basement still had rough-hewn trunks and boulders. She thought the only changes made by the previous homeowner was the porch and the T-111 siding.

Ms. Robinson said 572 Randolph was one of the properties that SHPO had commented on, and specifically SHPO had said they needed more information.

Ms. Thull asked what additional information might be required. Chair Allen said any documentation would be helpful, including old pictures, what was underneath the T-111, and any history of the home. Planning Consultant Elmiger said any new documentation should be provided to the Building Department.

Mary Kay Gallagher, Superintendent of Northville Public Schools, spoke on behalf of Northville Public Schools and the Northville Board of Education. She was concerned regarding the representation of Main Street School in the Local Historic District Study Report.

In August 2012, Old Village School was officially closed and mothballed, with a pending financial crisis resulting from significant cuts in state funding. The condition of both Old Village School and Main Street buildings continued to deteriorate given the mothballing of Old Village and the deferment of all but critical repairs to Main Street, given the ongoing facility study process. The high renovation costs at Main Street were driven by the need to replace major building systems (heating, ventilation and air conditioning, roofing, windows), needed site work, and inefficient work space.

From day 1, the District had been consistent in messaging the fact that maintaining both of those facilities was cost prohibitive, not feasible or fiscally responsible, and the feedback from the community, from the Historic District Commission, and from the City was overwhelmingly in favor of restoring Old Village School. In fact, the City's Master Plan referenced the desire to save at least the exterior of Old Village School; no such reference was made to Main Street School. The Master Plan stated that another important caveat was that the Old Village School building façade should be retained in its current condition and the building be repurposed rather than replaced. Again, no such comment was made regarding Main Street School.

Given those conditions, it seemed that the timing of the Historic District inventory report, with the degree of focus on 501 West Main, and a sudden drive to designate the building as a contributing structure, coming after an exhaustive, transparent and multi-year study process that included a joint District-City Colocation Study process, two rounds of RFPs, literally dozens of meetings, hundreds of hours, and considerable community input, seemed disingenuous and inappropriate.

As detailed in the June 30th report provided by Kathy Spillane, there were a number of inaccuracies and/or omissions in the report that were significant. There were additions in 1950 and 1969, along with remodels in 1970, 1977, and another addition in 1990 along with window replacement. Oddly, the report included views of Old Village School and the Community Center from both Main Street and Cady Street, while only including a view of 501 West Main Street from Main Street, excluding the unsightly view from Cady Street that showed the considerable addition made to the building.

There had been focus on the architect and the building being the first modern school building of its type. The District had another example of Eberly Smith's design work, Amerman School, located at 847 N. Center Street. While not in the Historic District, Amerman was just a few hundred yards away.

The focus on 501 W. Main was outside of the purview of the HDC, as the Michigan State Historic Preservation Office referenced on its website (Attorney General's Opinions Regarding Local Preservation), A.G. Opinion No. 6957, September 30, 1997, which read: *A local school district is not required to obtain a permit under the local historic districts act before commencing work affecting the exterior appearance of a school building located within a local historic district. The state, through enactment of the School Building Construction Act and the Revised School Code, has exempted from*

local regulation the construction and remodeling of school buildings by local school districts. Other related acts referenced demolition as well.

As Ms. Gallagher understood it, the SHPO office was not even considering the challenges to the Main Street facility because the School District already had their demolition permit and SHPO knew the building was up for demolition.

Ms. Gallagher urged the Committee to give thought to the references to Main Street School in the Local District Study Report. There were a host of inaccuracies in the report that the SHPO office had reviewed and given feedback on, so that the Committee was making changes in the report. She asked that the Committee not recommend approval or acceptance of the report to City Council given the number of inaccuracies and the fact that the report should be given a due diligence study process before moving forward. If any portion of the report in reference to Main Street School would be used against the demolition process, she hoped that the Committee would get SHPO's review as to whether it was contributing or noncontributing. As she understood it, SHPO was not even considering the way Main Street School was referenced in the report because this was a school district and not under their review.

The School District needed a portion of the property to be demolished simply to complete its existing parking plans for Old Village School. The redevelopment of the property was overwhelmingly supported by the school community and by the neighbors of Main Street School. Delaying or taking action against demolition of Main Street School was a deterrent to a major improvement program that would be of substantial benefit to the community.

Forcing the School District to retain the property would cause undue financial hardship to the District. All feasible alternatives to eliminate the financial hardship, including offering the resource for sale at its fair market value had been attempted and exhausted by the District.

The District in the spirit of collaboration and hard work that had been supported by the HDC, the City and the School community, had invested considerable funds into the restoration of Old Village School - \$10 million. Superintendent Gallagher invited everyone to attend the ribbon cutting ceremony and open house this coming Sunday. She hoped that would be given consideration on the overall consideration of the School District and what was best for the community. The Study Committee could hardly expect the District to have the wherewithal to restore two properties. The District had been clear about that from the beginning of the process. Superintendent Gallagher hoped that the Study Report was not being used to force a different outcome that was not in the best interest of the majority of the community.

Chair Allen said the report looked at every structure within the District, irrelevant of any ongoing outside activities or forces. There had been some inaccuracies regarding some of the properties which were being addressed at this public hearing. Ms. Robinson had received Ms. Spillane's report, and had responded to it. Main Street School was considered a contributing structure.

Ms. Robinson commented that the Main Street School was a mid-century modern design. Mid-century modern was born in Michigan, and the people at SHPO found Main Street School to be a phenomenal building and they agreed that it was historically significant.

Chair Allen said that this evening the Committee was looking at the contributing and noncontributing designations of structures within the Historic District, as well as the District's boundaries. The points being made by Superintendent Gallagher were more appropriately given to the Historic District Commission.

Superintendent Gallagher asked the Committee to give thought as to whether Main Street School truly was a contributing structure at this point. Her understanding was that SHPO set Ms. Spillane's report and Ms. Robinson's responses aside because this was a school building.

Ms. Robinson said that she was unaware that SHPO had set the building aside; this would need to be verified.

Member Bayly asked if the demolition of Main Street School had begun. Superintendent Gallagher said they had not yet started the demolition; they were in the process of interior asbestos abatement. Their demolition permit was for the entire building.

Superintendent Gallagher concluded by saying that the City had authorized legal action against the School District, and the attorneys were in communication with each other. The District would maintain transparent communication throughout this process.

Mary Elwart-Keys, 502 W. Main Street, said she would like to understand the specific process and timeline for the Historic District Survey review and acceptance. She was disappointed at the last survey public hearing that there was an attempt to vote on acceptance of the survey results in what she felt was a premature manner. SHPO's recommendation was that a local HDC and community sit with the survey results and have dialog, research, ask questions, and ponder possible changes to the district's map, etc., for up to a year before acceptance.

Many of the residents of the Historic District and outlying neighborhoods were confused as to why the City of Northville and the HDC would move to take legal action against the School District over the impending demolition of 501 W. Main Street when SHPO had no quarrel with it. In fact, SHPO saw no point in discussing the matter, as it was the Superintendent's state-conferred right to dispose of the property in a manner she deemed best for the School District; this was entirely acceptable and within her purview. At the 9/14/18 SHPO Quarterly Board Meeting that Ms. Elwart-Keys attended, neither the Board nor its staff were willing to discuss the matter as it was a "moot point" and a waste of time as it was a done deal; they knew better than to challenge the demolition plan. There was no discussion at the Board meeting among SHPO staff about the high regard that they had for the building. There was no discussion of the fact that they considered it historically contributing. They said there was no point in discussing it as the Superintendent had communicated her wish to demolish the building. So Ms. Robinson's statement that SHPO found the building to be phenomenal was inaccurate. Also at the SHPO meeting Ms. Robinson said she had been denied the ability to tour 501 Main Street when she had never asked to do this.

Ms. Elwart-Keys suggested that instead of legal action, the HDC should contact SHPO directly and have dialogue directly with them regarding similar scenarios, and why SHPO did not get involved when other contributing school buildings were demolished. A vote on accepting these results this evening would look like an intent to thwart the demolition process that may be in play at the State level and circumvent the Superintendent's right and responsibility. Anything short of allowing the current process to play out would look like political grandstanding.

Andrew Daily, 300 E. Cady Street, said that if the School Board felt they had a right to demo 501 W. Main it would be demolished. The School Board and the Superintendent had a right to construct and remodel buildings in accordance with State Building Codes. What they didn't have the right to do in a Historic District is to demolish a historically significant building unless they were reconstructing a building on the site. However, tonight's meeting was not about the demolition. What they were here to meet about was historically significant structures: what was historically significant and what was not, what was contributing and what was not. At the end of the day the facts were the facts. The Historic

District Study Report did not litigate the problem. The Study was not a litigation tool and should not be used as one this evening.

Jennifer Luikart, 521 W. Cady, confirmed that the Committee members had all read the information presented to the Committee regarding their request to be removed from the Historic District. She asked about the process going forward. Chair Allen explained that the Committee was taking comment, and would discuss specific situations when the Public Hearing portion was closed.

Ms. Luikart referred to their November 8 letter to the Committee. She emphasized that when they bought their home, they knew that owning a historic home had expenses and conditions in order to maintain its historic character, including compliance with the Northville Historic District Design Guidelines and the Secretary of Interior Guidelines.

When the Historic District boundaries were drawn, it made sense for them to live in the Historic District. In 1972 all the homes on Cady and Rogers were contributing. Now their home was a little island by itself. At the last meeting someone had brought up the benefit of being in the Historic District. When they bought their home, they knew their home would have more value by being in the District. Unfortunately she had now been told by 3 local realtors that her home was going to be worth less by being in the Historic District, because they were totally surrounded by big foot homes. The other 1400 square foot houses were gone now. Who would want to buy a 1400 square foot house that was surrounded by 3,000 square foot homes? Being in the District would hurt them for resale because of what had been allowed in the Historic District. Historic District homes were worth more when other homes in the District were also historic homes. Ms. Robinson had said in the June meeting that new construction in a historic district often damaged the value of the historic district because the historic setting had been altered. That was the point the Luikarts were making. In the last 2 years two of the neighboring homes had been made noncontributing; in the last 4 years, three. For those reasons, Ms. Luikart asked the Committee to consider their request for withdrawal from the Historic District.

Noel Walker, 531 Linden Court, said that he lived in a 2-bedroom, 1-bathroom ranch house. When he purchased the house it wasn't contributing; all the other small ranch homes had been torn down. The rest of the homes on his street were new 2 story structures. He did not want his structure to be contributing. Ranch homes were among the most common homes in the metropolitan area; if someone wanted a ranch home they would probably not look at one on Linden Court. The house was built in 1959. As a tear down and empty lot his property was worth a lot of money; as a 2-bedroom ranch it was not worth as much. Yet if the home was considered historic, anyone who purchased the home would have to maintain it as a 2-bedroom ranch.

In response to comments by Chair Allen regarding the goal to have a higher percentage of contributing homes, Mr. Walker said that was not his problem. Chair Allen pointed out that whether the home was contributing or noncontributing, the property still had to follow the rules of the Historic District.

Ms. Elwart-Keys said when she attended the SHPO meeting referenced earlier, in off the record comments SHPO members said this ranch would most likely be allowed to be demolished because it had lost context. Chair Allen commented that in any event the home would have to go through the demolition process before the HDC.

Mr. Walker asked what he needed to do to get his house classified as noncontributing. Ms. Robinson explained that Mr. Walker's home was built within the period of significance, which was prior to 1968. The home retained historic integrity, and still looked like a ranch. It was representative of the period for which it was built.

In response to a question from Ms. Elwart-Keys, Chair Allen said HDC decisions could be appealed to SHPO. The Local Historic District Study Committee was different than the HDC.

Planning Consultant Elmiger further explained that the Historic District Commission was set up via the Local Historic Districts Act PA 169. The Local Historic District Study Committee was set up solely to shepherd the District through the Local Historic District Survey and Historic District Study. No appeal was possible for that process. City Council would approve or not approve the results of the Survey and Study, after the Committee made a recommendation to City Council.

Decisions of the HDC regarding modifications to homes in the District could be appealed to SHPO.

Member Field said that the Study was not in effect until it was approved by City Council. If someone wanted to challenge the results of the Study they should go to City Council with their comments.

In response to a further question from Member Field, Ms. Robinson said that at the present time there was no required percentage of contributing historic structures in a Historic District; in the past the required percentage had been 80%.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said the importance of the study was that it was done by professionals, and it provided the HDC with a tool to use when making its decisions. The HDC had not had this kind of document in the past.

In response to a question from Superintendent Gallagher, Chair Allen said that after the Committee felt satisfied with the report, they would recommend it to City Council for approval. Superintendent Gallagher emphasized the importance of the Committee doing due diligence before recommending approval of the report.

Chair Allen addressed the different terms used by the Historic District Commission. For example, demolitions were based on significant/non-significant determinations. The Study being discussed this evening talked in terms of contributing and noncontributing structures. It was possible for a noncontributing structure to become contributing, especially if an addition were removed to reveal the original structure.

Ms. Elwart-Keys asked if the Committee would brainstorm removing areas from the District where most homes were now noncontributing. Chair Allen addressed the process thus far, and pointed out areas that had been recommended to be removed from the District. Member Cozart added that Ms. Robinson had made recommendations regarding changing the District boundaries. Member Bayly said that all meetings were public meetings.

Ms. Elwart-Keys spoke about the need to feel empowered as a resident of the District to help make decisions regarding the District. Member Bayly said the main purpose of the Survey was to update the original 1972 survey. She made further comments regarding the importance of hearing people's comments, and the importance of preserving the historic homes in Northville. The Survey and Study provided an update of the inventory of the Historic District.

Ms. Elwart-Keys asked why the boundaries were where they were. Chair Allen explained that the Committee's charge was limited to looking at the original 1972 boundary. Member Chester added that the Committee did not have the authority to expand the scope of the Committee. Expanding the District, for instance, was not under the purview of the Committee. Member Field said the survey completed in 1972 was a very small survey, and it did not list contributing and noncontributing structures. As others had said, the Committee's scope was limited. Member Bayly said the last boundary change was ~~2002~~ 2003. In

the current instance, the City had tried very hard to make it easy for people to comment on the process and the results of the survey.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said the HDC had requested the survey. The HDC had wanted an understanding of what was currently in the Historic District, and applied for a grant to accomplish the survey. If people wanted to expand the District, they could make their wishes known and there would be a way to accomplish that.

Greg Presley, 735 Randolph, asked about the lack of a required percentage of contributing homes in the District, and asked what the ramifications would be if the percentage was at 60%. Ms. Robinson said 3 reports were currently in process: 1) the Local Historic District Study Report, 2) the Local Historic District Survey, and 3) the National Register Nomination Update. SHPO made the application for a National Register Nomination Update. The National Register would only comment on the National Federal Register of Historic Places. It was at the State Level where comments could be made on the Local Historic District. The Secretary of Interior had made it clear that there was no longer a standard percentage of contributing homes that had to be met.

Mr. Presley asked if the Report were approved by City Council, would the HDC be bound by that? Chair Allen said it would be.

Mr. Presley asked if the standard for demolition of noncontributing structures was less than the standard for contributing structures. Planning Consultant Elmiger said the standards for modification for a contributing or noncontributing structure were the same. If the HDC found that the modifications to a building were historically significant, they could require a public hearing. Noncontributing structures still played a part in the District as a whole, and modifications to a noncontributing structure could impact the District as a whole.

Member Field said that if a structure was noncontributing, a public hearing was not required for demolition. If it was a contributing structure, a demolition request would require a public hearing.

Planning Consultant Elmiger pointed out that a noncontributing structure could have an original porch, for instance. Removing the original porch could be a significant change, and the HDC's decision would be based not only on whether the structure was noncontributing, but also whether the requested change was significant.

Member Field pointed out that 95% of the resources in the Historic District had been modified.

Ms. Keyes asked why it was important to label structures contributing and noncontributing, if the rules were the same for both. Member Chester said the study provided a baseline; this baseline had not been available in the past. The Study provided a process for people to make changes to their homes, as opposed to a shotgun approach that had been used in the past.

Mr. Presley asked if the HDC could use the Study without it being formally approved. He wondered why 528 W. Dunlap was considered noncontributing, for instance. Chair Allen said if anyone questioned a structure's designation, they should contact Ms. Robinson regarding their concerns.

Mr. Presley wondered if the designation of a contributing structure could be an issue of taking, since contributing buildings were limited in how much they could be changed or whether they could be demolished.

In response to a further question from Mr. Presley, Ms. Robinson said the original structure of a home would remain the original structure. Modifications within the period of significance could be historically significant in the lifetime of the house.

Mr. Presley felt the HDC was becoming more restrictive, making it difficult for people in the real world to sell their homes. Member Bayly thought the information in the Survey could be a valuable tool for people and architects who wanted to modify their historic homes.

Member Field said that at this time the Historic District Survey was an asset. He agreed that new restrictions were going to make modifications more expensive and more difficult. As a member of the HDC, Member Field felt the HDC had done a good job over past years in terms of regulating modifications in the Historic District. Mr. Presley agreed, saying that even the noncontributing structures contributed to the beauty of the District.

Mr. Presley asked why moving a structure made it noncontributing. Ms. Robinson said that if a structure was moved so that its orientation was changed, that could affect the status of the building. The question was why was the building moved.

Cynthia Steinberg, 404 W. Main, asked if there was a goal for a certain percentage of contributing homes in the District. Chair Allen said the goal was to get the percentage as high as possible. Ms. Robinson said the higher the percentage of contributing structures in a Historic District, the more evident the boundaries of the District were for people who come to the City to see it. Also, the Historic District was more defensible in court when a community had the strongest possible Historic District.

In response to a question from Ms. Elwart-Keys regarding moving historic structures, Ms. Robinson said that a moved structure could be considered contributing for architectural reasons only. Moving a structure represented a loss of integrity.

Seeing that discussion had ended, and no one else came forward to speak, Chair Allen closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION

Regarding 501 W. Main, Chair Allen asked Ms. Robinson to make sure the comments in the report were updated to reflect the most recent corrections and comments regarding that property.

Chair Allen asked the Committee for their thoughts regarding 521 W. Cady.

Member Bayly thought the Luikarts had made a strong case for removal of 521 W. Cady from the Historic District, as their property had become an isolated island. 521 W. Cady was bordered by noncontributing homes on the sides in the Historic District, and the property itself was right on the border of the District.

Member Cozart said that 128 S. Rogers Street could then also be asked to be removed from the District. Their situation was similar. If the south side of Cady Street were removed, what about the homes to the north of Cady Street?

Member Russell agreed, saying that starting a precedent of removing homes from the District could result in the entire District becoming unraveled.

Member Bayly said that she felt there was validity in removing 521 W. Cady, as justified in the materials presented by the Luikarts, especially since 2 properties had already been removed on S. Rogers.

Member Russell asked if a decision had to be made this evening.

Member Bayly said that while a decision didn't have to be made this evening, the Committee was a study committee, and they owed it to the community to have these types of discussions.

Member Field said the boundaries had been defined since 1972. Removing 521 W. Cady could be the beginning of a slippery slope, and could have a domino effect. He felt the Luikarts had made a very good argument, but he could not support removing the property from the District.

Member Chester said that when a property was in the Historic District, whether or not it was contributing or noncontributing, it was still under the same rules. The property had been in the Historic District from the beginning. What had changed? Why should the Committee agree to remove something that was contributing? If as in this situation a contributing structure was now surrounded by noncontributing homes, the property owner could petition the HDC to allow the same thing on their property. He was opposed to actually changing the boundary.

Ms. Luikart said that what had changed was the entire street where they lived. Mr. Luikart added that the fabric of their street had changed since 1972. The corruption of the District now put them at an economic disadvantage.

Member Chester said he saw that as an issue of what the HDC had done over a period of time, not the scope of this Committee, which was charged with looking at the original boundary of the District.

Ms. Luikart said the 2 homes across the street on Rogers Street had been rewarded for making inappropriate changes to their homes by being taken out of the Historic District. Now the Luikart home was on the furthest corner of the District, and they were surrounded by noncontributing structures. They were asking to be removed from the District.

Ms. Elwart-Keys asked if SHPO would respond to the Luikart's request. Ms. Robinson said she didn't know how this request would be handled at the State or National level.

The consensus of the Commission was to close the meeting without action being taken, and to continue the discussion in the future.

ADJOURN

Seeing that discussion had ended, Chair Allen adjourned the meeting at 8:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl McGuire, Recording Secretary

Approved as amended 5-2-2019