

CITY OF NORTHVILLE
Local Historic District Study Committee Meeting Minutes
October 26, 2020
Virtual Meeting
Monday 7:00 pm

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Allen called the final meeting of the City of Northville Local Historic District Study Committee Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. via Zoom video conference meeting in compliance with the Open Meetings Act, MCL 15.261, *ET SEQ.*, AS AMENDED. Members of the public body and members of the public participating electronically were considered present at the meeting and could participate as if physically present. Planning Commission members identified their location during roll call, as required.

Present: James Allen, City of Northville, Wayne County, MI
Leanie Bayly, City of Northville, Wayne County, MI
Mark Chester, City of Northville, Wayne County, MI
Suzanne Cozart, City of Northville, Wayne County, MI
David Field, City of Berkely, Oakland County, MI
Jeff Russell, City of Northville, Wayne County, MI

Absent: None

Also present: City Council Member Moroski-Browne
Planning Consultant Sally Elmiger

3 guests

CITIZEN COMMENTS

No comments

APPROVE AGENDA

Motion by Bayly, support by Field to approve the agenda as published.

Roll call vote. Ayes – Field, Bayly, Chester, Cozart, Russell, Allen. Nays – None. **Motion carried 6-0.**

APPROVE MINUTES – JUNE 6, 2019 MEETING

It was noted that Mark Chester and Suzanne Cozart, who were absent at the June 6, 2019 meeting, were shown as being both present and absent; this needed to be corrected.

Motion by Bayly, support by Field, to amend and approve the June 6, 2019 meeting minutes as follows:

- Page 1, under Call to Order/Roll Call, Present.: delete: ~~Mark Chester, Suzanne Cozart~~

Roll call vote. Ayes – Bayly, Chester, Cozart, Russell, Field, Allen. Nays – None. **Motion carried 6-0.**

TEXT REVISIONS TO STUDY REPORT – STUDY REPORT RECOMMENDATION

Referencing her October 22, 2020 memorandum, Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that on June 6, 2019, the Local Historic District Study Committee (LHDSC) held its final public hearing regarding the Northville Local Historic District Study Report, and recommended the final draft to City Council for adoption, with some text revisions. The motion specifically said the text revisions should state that *this report is presented as a living document with the information available at press time*. The motion also recommended that the document *include a narrative discussion of the definition of contributing and non-contributing structures*.

The Study Report was amended with those two items and also with some additional text, and presented to City Council for their review and recommendation. Council reviewed the Study Report, and revisions, and adopted the Report on August 17, 2020.

After the Study Report was adopted, procedural questions arose. In response, City Council rescinded its approval on September 8, 2020, and asked the LHDSC to review the text revisions to the Study Report and make a determination that the text revisions are correct, or alternatively, if the Committee wanted additional changes to be made. Once the determination is made the Committee can move to recommend the report with the revisions as provided.

Chair Allen added that after approving the proposed text revision to the Study Report, the Committee needed to also recommend the Amendment to the Historic Preservation Ordinance to City Council, who would have final authority to approve the amendment. The only change that was being made to the Historic Preservation Ordinance was the change to the legal description to illustrate the boundary.

Chair Allen recognized audience member Janice Johns.

Ms. Johns asked if the Committee had the opportunity to review the recording of the June 16, 2019 meeting, before approving the minutes. Chair Allen said that staff had listened to the recording and found the minutes to be very accurate, and the minutes had been approved as noted above.

Chair Allen asked if Committee members had any discussion regarding the text revisions being recommended as part of the Study Report.

Member Field asked for more information regarding the definition of the *period of significance*. He believed that the Historic District's period of significance ended in the early 20th century, but the Study Report indicated a moving period of significance, as structures in the District reached 50 years of age. He did not think the period of significance was voted on by the Committee.

Member Cozart said her understanding was that any structure 50 years or older fit within the period of significance per the National Historic Standard.

Member Field said the Statute said the District should not (although it did not say could not) consider anything less than 50 years of age as fitting within the period of significance. His understanding was the actual period of significance is generally set by the community, but he did not remember the Committee discussing or agreeing to change the period of significance to a moving target of anything 50 years or older.

Planning Consultant Elmiger read the section in Study Report, Volume 1, regarding the period of significance:

2.4 Period of Significance Justification

The period of significance for the Northville Historic District is circa 1830 to 1968. The earliest extant contributing buildings in the historic district were constructed between circa 1830 and 1840. Known examples of resources with early dates of construction include 502 West Main Street, 521 West Cady Street, and 239 High Street. The period of significance ends in 1968, following the National Park Service’s guideline that the historic period ending within fifty years of the listing date. The guideline provides an opportunity to assure that decisions of significance are based on history rather than a trend or popular movement. The selection of the fifty-year end to the period of significance in the Northville Historic District ensures that the contributing resources can demonstrate in one of the areas identified as important areas of contextual development. These areas include commerce, education, funerary, government, healthcare, industry, religion, social, recreation, entertainment, and architecture.

Chair Allen noted that this language had been previously approved.

As discussion had ended, Chair Allen asked for a motion.

MOTION by Bayly, support by Russell, to approve the proposed text revisions to the Study Report, as requested by City Council.

Roll call vote. Ayes – Chester, Cozart, Russell, Field, Bayly, Allen. Nays – None. **Motion carried 6-0.**

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – ORDINANCE RECOMMENDATION

Chair Allen said this ordinance amendment recommendation pertained to the legal description of the Historic District boundary, as reflected in the Study Report.

It was noted that the new description in Section 42-3, p. 7, line 7 should be corrected to read: . . . ~~203~~ 204 to 108 Randolph Street . . .

MOTION by Chester, support by Russell, to recommend approval of the amendment to the Historic Preservation Ordinance to City Council, showing the modified historic district boundary, as reflected in the Study Report, with the following correction:

- Section 42-3, p. 7, line 7, corrected to read: . . . ~~203~~ 204 to 108 Randolph Street . . .

Roll call vote. Ayes – Cozart, Russell, Field, Bayly, Chester, Allen. Nays – None. **Motion carried 6-0.**

DISCUSSION:

None.

ADJOURN:

MOTION by Bayly, support by Field, to adjourn the meeting at 7:26 pm.

Roll call vote. Ayes –Russell, Field, Bayly, Cozart, Chester, Allen. Nays – None. **Motion carried 6-0.**

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl McGuire, Recording Secretary

Approved as submitted 01/25/2021