

Comment Review and Response Form		Date	Reviewer (initials)	Instructions:
Project:	Northville Local Historic District Survey Report	Submitted for review:	5/17/2019	Please fill in any columns as needed to identify the location of your edit/comment. Type your requested edit in the "Reviewer's Edit/Comment" column. HNTB will respond to your comments and edits in the shaded columns.
Document being reviewed:	September 2018 version	Changes made:	5/22/2019	
Reviewer Name/Initials:		All changes verified:		

Comment	Page #	Line #	Chapter/Section/Subsection	Reviewer's Edit/Comment	Commonwealth Response	Agree (Y/N)	Edit Made (initials)	Verified (initials)	Notes
Comment Source: Rich Kern, 124 High Street, Northville, 248-417-7972, richkern@icloud.com; email received 11.14.2018									
1	vol II: 1-183, 1-184		1.10.1	The home has all its original windows (many are original glass within the frames). The home has modern storm windows over the original windows. The reports indicate in numerous places (pages 1-183 and 1-184) that the windows in the home are "modern replacement" windows	Revised as suggested	Y	ehr		
2	II: 1-183, 1-184		1.10.1	The home has the original stone foundation. At some point, an owner put a skim coat of concrete over the exterior stone to make it appear it is a block foundation - but it is not a concrete foundation. If necessary I can send a picture of the basement to confirm this.	Revised as suggested	Y	ehr		
Comment Source: Tom Gudritz, 548 West Main Street, Northville; email received 11.27.2018									
2	vol II: 1-345, 1-346		1.15.1	corretctions for South Rogers to North Rogers	Revised	Y	ehr		
4	vol II: 1-345, 1-346		1.15.1	clarification on location of the door on the façade	Terminology (use of façade) clarified in email exchange; text in report is correct - no revision required	Y	ehr		
Comment Source: Patricia Thull, 572 Randolph Street, Northville, telephone call January 2019									
5	vol II: 1-401		1.17.1	Ms. Thull continued to express concern that her property at 572 Randolph was not listed as contributing to the historic district; and informed Ms. Robinson that the house was probably older than its neighbor at 588 Randolph, which does contribute.	Ms. Robinson asked Ms. Thull to provide information, and gave several places to seek that information on the age of the house. She also indicated photographs of the house showing it hadn't been altered would also help. There was no additional contact or information provided by Ms. Thull	Y	ehr		
Comment Source: Kimberly Campbell-Voytal, 113 West Street, Northville; email received 02.27.2019									
6				How do I correct an error in the description of my historic home? I live at 113 West Street. Thank you, Kimberly Cambell-Voytal.	No response.	Y	ehr		
7				Response from Dianne Massa, City Clerk: Email me what you believe is the error and the proposed correction. If you have supporting documents to support this, please include that too. Supporting documents not required but helpful. I will forward to the Consultant for review. If you could send me this by next Monday March 4 that would be great.	No response.	Y	ehr		
Comment Source: Kimberly Campbell-Voytal, 113 West Street, Northville; email received 03.04.2019									
7	vol II: 1-484		1.20.2	The assessment of the historical background of our house at 113 West Street states that the picture windows in the east and south-facing windows of the living room are updated windows. This is not true. Those two windows are original to the house and have float glass in wooden framed windows. I have been advised that it is important to correct the record, and I am doing so. There is a third original window on the ground floor, it faces west. Otherwise the windows on the second floor and selected windows on the ground floor have been updated.	There is no reference to replacement windows in this portion of the text. If, in fact, the glass in the windows is float glass, a process that was invented in 1959, then they may be replacements, but it would have been done within the period of signifiacnce and therefore would not impact the integrity of the house.	Y	ehr		
Comment Source: Cynthia Steinberg, 404 West Main Street, Northville; email received May 2, 2019									
8	vol II: 1-323		1.15.1	Ms. Massa - My family resides at 404 W Main Street. I have a couple of minor changes/additions for our home. I have attached the sections from the Historic Study Draft II with comments and have summarized below.	No response.	Y	ehr		

9	vol II: 1-324		1.15.1	1) Page 1-324 last paragraph the exterior walls of the garage. When we purchased the home in 2013 the garage had block exterior walls. We received approval from the HDC to cover the walls with Hardie Plank cement board. The exterior does not have clapboard as stated.	revisions made as requested.	Y	ehr		
10	vol II:1-325		1.15.1	2) On page 1-325. Because the interior lights were probably not on at the time of the study on our home It may not have been possible to see but the Etched transom is still intact. If helpful, I have attached a photo.	revisions made as requested.	Y	ehr		
Comment Source: Kimberly Campbell-Voytal, 113 West Street, Northville; email 5.14.2019									
14				The assessment of the historical background of our house at 113 West Street states that the picture windows in the east and south-facing windows of the living room are updated windows. This is not true. Those two windows are original to the house and have float glass in wooden framed windows. I have been advised it is important to correct the record, and am doing so. there is a third original window on the ground floor, it faces west. Otherwise, the windows on the second and selected windows on the ground floor have been updated.	Emailed Ms. Voytel for clarification on 5.21.2019	Y	ehr		
Comment Source: Kimberly Campbell-Voytal, 113 West Street, Northville; email 5.22.2019									
14				Yes, I reviewed the text too and came to the same conclusion. My concern was based on an earlier draft of the report, from last year.	No revision required	Y	ehr		
Comment Source Marianne Barry, 239 High Street, Northville; email 5.7.2019									
15				As I look over the map of the contributing and non-contributing structures and property within the current historical district I was shocked and saddened to see just how much of historic Northville has been lost. Nothing can be done at this point to undo what destruction has occurred in the past but a well thought out plan for the future is the only way to stop future mistakes. I see this moment in time as a tipping point for Northville! As I'm sure you well know a proactive approach is vital and the only recourse at this point for Northville.	No response.				
				Being a resident within the historic district is not always easy or cheap but the benefits are many. I have had to forgo plans I have considered for my home based on the historic nature of my home. I have had to seek out knowledgeable contractors and studied up on historically accurate changes. I have crawled through barns, warehouses and yards to find items I needed for my "restoration". It was not easy, but living in an historic structure requires this challenge.	No response.				
				I see the historic status of my home as a protection of my investment. From my readings and investigation I note that property values never or rarely decrease in designated districts. I have lived in my historic home for 33 years and I can attest to that.	No response.				
				As I look at the configuration of the current Northville historic district and the ordinances associated with it - I feel that Northville needs to stand as a unified group-not as individual owners. Our power as a unified historic district will safeguard our communities heritage and improve our cities beauty. I am against individual property owners asking to be removed from the Northville historic district designation. on the SHPO website I read that once a community decides to establish a local historic district it must follow the standards and guidelines of the US Secretary of the Interior for the National Register of Historic Places. Based on the secretary's guidelines for determining historic district boundaries it states that "boundaries are based on geography, integrity, and the significance of the resource, not on political boundaries or ownership". They also state that "donut holes cannot be cut in the district to intentionally excluded properties".	No response.				

				<p>I am concerned about the inclusion of homes that are now 50 years old but considered historic. I am referencing the three brick one story homes in the current historic district. I feel that Northville has always acknowledged and recognized the Victorian era as the identifying factor of being historic as it should be but including the 50's homes is a big stretch in my mind and muddies the waters. Homeowners of a 50's ranch are restricted by the footprint size of their home, small lot size but yet pay high taxes. I am proposing that the Historic Commission and District Historic Preservation Committee pick an era that we are focusing on and move on with that in mind. This would provide Northville residents and the community a primary focus rather than a continually moving and expanding preservation target - a target that continually changes. How can a goal be reached if the target keeps on changing?</p>	No response.				
				<p>Our local Historic District designation status is something that nots to our past and enables our community to preserve our unique character. It will help us to hang on to expectations we have for our community as we mov forward with the massive amount of building that is happening and will be happening in the near future in our town. This is particularly important when we fact the extreme pressure of builders and their ideas of what would be good for Northville.</p>	No response.				
				<p>I consider our historic district designation as an asset to me, to my family, my neighborhood, my community, my city and my state! My hope is that many other see this as well!</p>	No response.				
				<p>I am against individual property owners asking to be removed from the Northville historic district designation.</p>	No response.				
				<p>I do want the Historic District Status to remain but would like to identify the Victorian era as the focus.</p>	No response.				
				<p>I am concerned about the building restrictions that would be placed on homes that are now 50 years old (the 3 small brick homes built in the 1950's).</p>	No response.				
				<p>I would like to suggest the possibility of expanding the historic designation to other areas of the city of Northville eg. West of Rogers St (OLV areas-west of Cady St.)</p>	No response.				
				<p>I would like to see the Historic District Commission acting as a resource for home owners in the historic district so that home owners know that there are ways for them to restore or renovate their homes in a appropriate ways rather than removing or replacing features in non-historic ways. Suggestions might include: city led conferences re: historic preservation/renovation break out sessions, volunteer neighbors sharing their restoration/renovation stories and resources, restoration/renovation home tours and contractor resources.</p>	No response.				
				<p>Additional Info on 239 High Street: the garage located on the west side of property and off of West Street was first seen in the Sanborn map of 1942. In reality the garage was originally attached to the original home (it was the 1/2 story of the original home and was located on the north side of the home). See attached photo.</p>	clarified with telephone conversation, 5.22.2019	Y		ehr	
				<p>The 1/2 story was moved to become the "new garage" in the early 1900's when the automobile came into existence. At the same time the Laphams built a 2 story addition on the north side of the house as it appears today.</p>	clarified with telephone conversation, 5.22.2019	Y		ehr	
				<p>the original 1900 sliding barn/garage doors are preserved inside the existing building as wall accents. The side door of the garage on the east side is original to the home and has hand tooled handles on it.</p>	clarified with telephone conversation, 5.22.2019	Y		ehr	
				<p>This building was placed onto the sight where a barn originally stood and one part of the footing still exists on the south side of the cutting garden next to the current "garage". The oxen bow above the garage doors is original from the homes working farm.</p>	clarified with telephone conversation, 5.22.2019	Y		ehr	

				The basement of the main home has hand hewn beams in the ceiling with bark still on many. It has stone walls and a coal shoot built when the 1900 addition was added. We believe that since this was a working farm that some animals were sometimes housed in parts of the basement in the depths of winter.	clarified with telephone conversation, 5.22.2019	Y	ehr		
				the porch that is seen on the home today and that has been a part of this home since the late 1800's or early 1900's is different than the original porch. The original porch on the home was quite small an was more farm style in nature. See photo attached. In fact the area was a working farm and the Chapman's who we bought the home from had a plaque for it being a centennial farm. Farmed by the same family for over 100 years!	revised	Y	ehr		
				Just one change for your original write up. You mentioned that we had synthetic siding on the back of the home which we do not. All siding is wood.	revisions made as requested.	Y	ehr		
Comment Source: Sarah Russell, 113 High Street, Northville; email received 5.14.2019									
				I may be reading the report incorrectly as some of the descriptions included about my property aren't familiar to me. One item I wanted to inquire about was that it seems to indicate all the windows on the property except the front 2 windows are replacement vinyl windows. In fact the only vinyl windows in the house are on the rear addition. We do have storm windows we use in the winter to provide additional insulation, however, most of the windows in this home are lead glass windows, including the second story windows.	revisions made as requested.	Y	ehr		
				I would also like to understand the classification of our garage as contributing. My concern is the garage is actually in very bad shape and needs to be rebuilt. We currently only use this as a large garden shed due to its condition. The structure has a dirt floor and the walls do not appear to be of sound structure. Will it's classification as a contributing structure prevent us from rebuilding the garage so it is actually a useable garage?	No report comments to respond to. Sally Elmiger and Elaine Robinson have both reached out via telephone to respond. EHR had no response from a call placed 5.21.2019		ehr		
Comment Source: Jim Nield, 120 West Street, Northville; email received 5.14.2019 jnield@comcast.net, 586.918.8600									
				We formally object, due May 17, 2019, regarding the Northville Historical District Survey With MANY inaccuracies through the more than 800 pages. We also specifically object to the inaccurate description of 120 West Street. Criterion A has no significant role in the development of the community. The comment, It maintains the original footprint is also totally inaccurate. There was an addition added in 1977 with a building permit approved by the City of Northville. The intent of the Historic District in the 1972 to 1974 documentation never intended to add homes at a later date that became 50 years old. The original plan was to identify home in the 1800's. Being identified in the National Register is of no value to Northville at all. There is no tax advantage to any home owners in the City of Northville. Elaine Robinson, from the Commonwealth Heritage Group, stated Northville needed 60% categorize as contributing structures in the first 2 meetings and said in third meeting no percentage is required. Somehow the date of 1968 was added during the survey to extend the historic homes vs the original intent of the district outlined in 1974. The contributing and noncontributing is very arbitrary and only one person's opinion which includes many errors. There are many examples of inaccuracy. The recent survey should ONLY be used as an inventory of homes in the Historic District and NOT adopted officially in any form.	No response.		ehr		
Comment Source: Barbara Moroski-Browne 116 High St, Northville, 734-604-3709; email received May 20, 2019 (replaces message sent on May 17, 2019)									
				I inserted the wrong street map images in the document I sent you (Attachment 1, page 4 of the 7 page doc). In this email, I attached two PDF documents: 1) a PDF of the complete 7 pages (with the revised Attachment 1) and 2) a PDF of Attachment 1, page 4 only. This replaces the original page 4.	No comments to respond to		ehr		

				Suggested addition of information on Mrs. Maude Bennett (nee Richardson) who resided in the house from ca. 1931 to her death in 1968. Ms. Bennet was the daughter of Thomas Glenn and Jennie (Whittaker) Richardson, who arrived in Northville from Holly, Michigan in 1883. Mr. Richardson built the Fredyl building on Main Street and owned several businesses in downtown Northville. (supporting documentation provided in two attachments).	revised	Y	ehr		
				Suggested revision for text on the garage: The modern garage was likely constructed circa 1980 in 2007...and incorporates two windows salvaged from the original home and the door of the old garage on the east side of the structure (see attachment 3).	revised	Y	ehr		
Comment Source: Gregory Presley, Presley Architecture LLC, 198 N. Center, Suite 205, Northville, Michigan 48167; email dated May 17, 2019									
				I have reviewed the Northville Local Historic District Study Report (DSR) and have these comments related to my work in the Historic District (HD): -of the 173 or so home sites west of Center Street in the HD, PA (Pressley Architecture) has done or is doing over 67 projects in the past 30 plus years. Reviewing the DSR analysis of property historic status (DSR, Figure 1-1): 035 PA alterations that are considered Contributing (C) -16 PA alterations that are considered Non-Contributing (NC) -13 new PA homes (9 plus 4 in process) -3 PA alteration projects in process	No comments to respond to				
				I disagree with the NC designations for my projects in most cases. Of the 16 NC alteration sites all PA projects have met the HDC Design Guideline requirement for building setback, spacing, massing, height, scale, proportion, hierarchy, rhythm, materials and (in most cases) details. They all contribute aesthetically and functionally to the streets in which they reside. If allowed, I will provide a resource-analysis-by property at the next public hearing.	No comments to respond to				
				Further I doubt that 2 alterations that PA has designed since this report was completed *currently under constructing and approved by HDC) would now be considered Contributing (window and siding replacement/relocation, large addition, house move, other). Yet these homes will contribute greatly to the streetscape for all the reasons listed above. NC status is not a property read of their value in the Historic District.	No comments to respond to				
				There used to be in the Historic District Design Standards Introduction page 2.3 a category for "Complimentary Buildings" (see attachments). Someone should explain when and why this language was changed to eliminate "Complimentary Buildings" as a category. This a category that included both new buildings that fit in to the neighborhood and allowed the historic structures to stand out, but it also considered altered historic structures (in which the current consultant finds too much loss to allow "C" status) to have a visual status higher than "NC". It seems quite severe to list a home that has been altered in a manner approved by the HDC as "Non-Contributing" building, even although it absolutely contributes to the aesthetic visual fabric of the streetscape in all the categories that the HDC considers.	No comments to respond to				
				I understand the need to inventory our historic resources and consider their contributing but offer a few observations: 1) <i>All of history is not equal</i> . An historic building style one cannot find just outside the historic District should have more hierarchy, carry more weight in the decision-making process than a building style that can be found just outside the boundary in abundance. 2) <i>Not all historic buildings are equal</i> . A historic home should have more importance in HDC decision-making than old garage. 3) <i>We do not live in a museum</i> . Adaptive reuse of turn-of the 19th-century homes to bring them into the 21st century and beyond requires more aggressive structural and exterior cladding fixes to ensure that client re-investment is worth the risk. If we want to save history, sometimes it requires more adaption than at other times.	No comments to respond to				

				<p>A few questions: 1) what happens if the Study is adapted? Concerns are: treating the DSR as a rule to be obeyed, not as a guideline tool to assist in HDC judgements; all so-called Contributing structures cannot be demolished going forward (eg. Old small garage that is obsolete); loss of property value in the HD through more strict interpretation of allowable change where more folks are discouraged from alteration projects or property purchased (already happening, purchasers are steering away from the HD, guided by realtors)</p>						
				<p>My most basic question is this: Why cannot the DSR be accepted as a useful tool but not codified? Let it assist in the HDC approval process, as do the HD Design Guidelines, without inappropriately driving HDC evaluations and decisions. Adaption seems tantamount to making the DSR the "Bible", the highest arbiter in harder decisions, rather than HDC good sense on a case-by-case basis. HDC has done a good job until now. For that I for one am grateful.</p>						

No comments to respond to

No comments to respond to