

**NORTHVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

**March 21, 2012**

**Wednesday 7:00 P.M. – Northville City Hall - Council Chambers**

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

Chairman Johnson called the Historic District Commission meeting to order at 7 P.M.

**2. ROLL CALL:**

**Present:** Bayly, Field (left at 8:20 p.m.), Luikart, Hoffman, Vernacchia, Argenta and Johnson

**Absent:** None

**Also Present:** Sally Elmiger, Staff Liaison

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

Michael Rowan, 516 Randolph, expressed opposition to a chain link fence at 328 Randolph Street. He spoke to the definition of routine maintenance and referenced a Historic District Commission meeting held in September, 2011.

Chairman Johnson stated that permission had been granted for the subject fence.

Commissioner Bayly express concern regarding a telephone message left on her home answering machine following the Christmas break. She said the message did not indicate who the caller was, or any contact information. She played the message for the Historic District Commission and asked if any Commissioners received anything similar.

The Historic District Commissioners concurred that none of them had received any similar messages.

Commissioner Field said he did not receive any calls like that; however, Mr. Rowan had telephoned him in the past.

Commissioner Luikart pointed out that contact numbers for City board and commission members were listed on the City's website.

**4. MINUTES:** December 21, 2011 and February 23, 2012

Commissioner Hoffman made the following additions/changes to the December 21, 2011 minutes:

Page 2 – Case #2:

**Motion by Vernacchia, supported by Argenta, to accept the application for completeness ~~as complete.~~ as complete.**

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

**Motion by Hoffman, supported by Field,** to grant a Notice to Proceed referencing the ~~Secretary of Interior~~ **Northville Historic Design Standards** #3-23 for decks and #3-21 for materials.

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

Page 3 – Case #1:

**Motion by Hoffman, supported by Vernacchia** to grant a Notice to Proceed ~~regarding signage as presented-~~ **referencing the Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-24 regarding signs.**

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

Regarding the February 23, 2012, Commissioner Luikart thanked Ms. Elmiger for the minutes from the training seminar.

**Motion by Hoffman, supported by Field,** to approve the December 21, 2011 minutes as amended and the February 23, 2012 minutes as written.

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

**5. REPORTS**

- A. CITY ADMINISTRATION: None**
- B. CITY COUNCIL: None**
- C. PLANNING COMMISSIONER: None**
- D. OTHER COMMUNITY/GOVERNMENTAL LIAISONS: None**

**6. CASES**

<b>CASE #1</b>	
<b>ENGLE CONSTRUCTION</b>	<b>NEW GARAGE</b>
<b>589 RANDOLPH</b>	

Ed Engle, with Engle Construction, explained the application for new construction of a garage at 589 Randolph. He said the plan was to match the existing house which was built in 1874, and to maintain the integrity of the existing historic structure. Mr. Engle said the roofline of the garage would be attached to the house with a canopy, creating a walkway underneath the canopy into the rear yard. He said there would be no damage to the existing historic structure.

Commissioner Argenta complimented Mr. Engle on the design.

Commissioner Hoffman said he also liked the design; and he spoke to the idea of not being able to tell the difference between the new and the old. He said it makes sense to put in a garage that matches the renovation work.

Commissioner Bayly concurred that in this location, it would be more appropriate than in another location in the District.

Mr. Engle provided the following information:

- Regarding the door opening and the garage door, they have chosen the Oak Summit Collection;
- The garage door is a roll-up door, it will look like the drawing, it is in compliance, it matches in color and texture, and is an upgrade from the garage door across the street;
- The entry door will have an historic appearance, will match the doors on the house, and is made of is fiberglass;
- The second story in the garage will be used only for storage

Mr. Engle said they would anticipate completion of the project by July 4<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Luikart thanked Mr. Engle for not attempting to attach the garage to the existing historic home.

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

**Motion by Hoffman, supported by Vernacchia, to grant a Notice to Proceed** referencing Secretary of Interior Standards #10; and the Northville Historic District Design Standards 3.24 for garages, 5.9 for roofing, 5.14 for windows, 5.17 for siding, 5.18 for paint and color, 3.21 for materials, and 3.22 for details.

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

**CASE #2  
SPIDER9 INC.  
235 E. MAIN**

**SOLAR FIELD**

David Park was present regarding the Water Wheel building, along with Emily Potter, chief engineer and project manager for the solar project. Mr. Park described the proposal and their desire to find a location that was special. He spoke to the space, a brief history, and said the proposal was in the spirit of Henry Ford when Ford built the Water Wheel building.

Mr. Park used a power point presentation and provided information regarding Spider9; who they are, what they do; their leadership team; and the latest Michigan resources to accomplish their goals.

Ms. Potter said it would be a technological testing ground. She reviewed details regarding the proposal that included wattage and electricity usage. She said their goal was to provide the building with self-sustaining power using low profile solar fields located on the roof. The solar fields will not be mounted to the roof, but will utilize a ballasted mounting system, meant for extreme weather conditions.

Ms. Potter discussed the solar field layout, emphasizing that building modifications would not be needed; and the mounting system would not penetrate the roof. Ms. Potter spoke about the low profile system, and said they were determined that it would be unseen by pedestrians or cars from Main Street area or Griswold. She said it would return the building to its sustainable goal; and the building would meet all Historic District Commission needs and requirements.

Ms. Potter emphasized their desire to involve local schools and promote the green effort in the city.

Mr. Park discussed the vision of Henry Ford and industrial architect Albert Kahn in the timeframe of 1936. He spoke about the uniqueness of the factory, noting it was remarkable for its time. He said they have the original blueprints, and are working within a similar spirit. He described their goal to provide power to their company and other residents of the building, and that any excess power could light the parking lot, and or be directed somehow to the city.

Mr. Park discussed the development process and said they have many high profile clients. He said this project will attract positive attention to Northville because it is a northern climate solar field. He talked about their desire to get the water wheel working again and the potential it has for providing power. He spoke to the value of the project, pointing out that there would be a \$1.5 million dollar payback to the building, with a half million dollar investment.

Chairman Johnson said this was exactly the technology to spearhead some significant changes. He said he liked the low profile nature of the project that is in keeping with SHPO guidelines. He said if the product works as envisioned, it could be significantly different than other technologies. He noted the close proximity to the University of Michigan, and that this could help keep the area moving into the next century.

Mr. Park invited the Historic District Commission to visit the site and look at the project.

Commissioner Field concurred with Chairman Johnson. He said the Applicant has covered all the bases; it appears to be a great project, and one that Henry Ford would probably favor.

Commissioner Luikart said she liked the project, and she was glad it was in keeping with SHPO guidelines. She said it was great that there would be no damage to the existing building, and that it can be removed without creating any damage also.

Mr. Hoffman said he thought the design was impressive and incorporated multiple sources for a self-sustaining building. He recognized that SHPO standards talk about being minimally visible from the street; however, he noted that Ford placed his water wheel in a visible location, and he wondered if Ford would have wanted the panels visible or hidden from view.

Mr. Park said they did consider the idea of being intentionally visible. He spoke to the optimum angle for sun reflection in Michigan. He said the panels would be more visible if they installed more panels near the mezzanine.

Commissioner Hoffman said the SHPO guidelines were state guidelines, but they were not state law. He asked how the Historic District Commission felt about visibility.

Mr. Park spoke to the shaded area, and noted that they could be pulled forward toward the south wall, which would improve its purpose.

Commissioner Vernacchia inquired about increasing the angle of the solar panels, as opposed to moving them closer to the south wall.

Commissioner Hoffman said his point was the idea of making the panels deliberately visible; i.e. by altering the angle or moving them closer to the front of the building.

Commissioner Argenta pointed out that it wasn't an historic building when Ford built it. He stated that if the panels were visible, the Applicant would not have gotten a letter from SHPO.

Discussion took place regarding increasing the angle of the solar panels.

Mr. Park said they are fixed-angle panels, but they can be made to be non-fixed, and the angle can be altered. He discussed the desire for lightweight panels, and the need to see where they are placed on the roof. He said they would be eager to add more capacity to the system. He noted that ideally they would like to become self-sustaining for three days. He said the system was easily expandable. Mr. Park mentioned the grant that was approved by SHPO, and that they look to expand the system with their technology as it evolves.

Chairman Johnson suggested a good place to show it off from would be Hutton Street.

Discussion took place regarding inviting the community to the building, as well as field trips for school children.

Mr. Park invited the Historic District Commission to visit the site, and said that their first big launch would be on April 20<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Argenta confirmed that the angle of the solar panels shown on the presentation material was 15 degrees.

Mr. Park said the optimum angle is 37 degrees.

Chairman Johnson commented that the company was demonstrating a technological prototype.

**Motion by Vernacchia, supported by Argenta, to accept the application as complete.**

Commissioner Bayly commented that it has been about 20 years since the local standards were published. She said perhaps this would be a good opportunity for the Historic District Commission to work with this Applicant as they proceed with their project. She said she appreciated their working within the current standards as written.

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

**Motion by Hoffman, supported by Luikart,** to grant a Notice to Proceed referencing Secretary of Interior Standards #9 and #10; and the Northville Historic District Design Standards 5.7 for roofing, and 6.8 for energy conservation.

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

**CASE #3**

**KEITH PATERSON/GREG PRESLEY  
527 W. DUNLAP STREET**

**GARAGE**

Greg Presley was present, along with Applicant Keith Paterson. Mr. Presley explained the application for new construction of a garage at 527 W. Dunlap Street. He showed several photographs of the house and proposed colors, also the dilapidated small garage located in the back of the property. He said it was the homeowner's desire to erect a new garage.

Mr. Presley mentioned materials contained in the Board packet and spoke about the project. He indicated the following:

- Some accent fabric collected by Mr. Paterson (Birchboard)
- Single-pane wooden windows made locally (they match the windows shown in the photographs)
- Code requirements have been met regarding location, size, and building height
- The intention of not marrying to the existing historic house
- The proposed two-car garage is barn-like, with a workshop in back, and the loft level is for storage only
- The side is board-and-batten, paint color will match the house body color, the roof is metal
- The house was renovated in the late 1990s, with colors approved by Historic District Commission at that time

Commissioner Argenta observed that the garage was barn-like and was compatible. He said it was different from the house, it was not attached, and it fits in well with the area.

Discussion took place regarding the age of the existing garage.

Mr. Paterson said the existing garage was not original. He said it has a rock foundation, and he discovered paperwork in it that indicates it was built in the 1920s or 1930s.

Commissioner Hoffman inquired about the need to demolish the existing garage, and the 2 x 4's shown in the photograph.

Mr. Paterson described the garage, noting that it has a beam structure that was not to code; the foundation is stone, and would need to be raised up and replaced if it was re-done. He explained that it would have to be disassembled, and then re-assembled to reuse the existing materials. He emphasized that the rafters were pretty rough shape and were sagging. He added that the photograph does indicate 2 x 4s, and they will recycle as much of the materials as possible, and remove the wood flooring piece by piece to reuse as much of that as possible.

Mr. Presley said that it was a small structure, and to add on to it would overwhelm it. He noted that the foundation and floor was also sagging.

Regarding the existing garage they want to take down, Commissioner Hoffman spoke to the condition it was in, and clarified that it was the opinion of the homeowner and the architect that the floor and foundation was sagging, it was under-supported, and the rafters and framing were not in salvageable condition.

Mr. Presley said he has seen garages that were salvageable, and this was not one of them.

Mr. Peterson said he had no historical information regarding the carriage house; he noted that the house was likely the first house west of Linden, and was built in 1862.

Commissioner Hoffman reflected to the Historic District Commission that the subject building was not a contributing structure to the property and there is an adequate comfort level relative to demolishing the structure.

Discussion took place that the property owner would not have to return for permission to demolish the subject building.

Ms. Elmiger clarified that the Historic District Commission would need to decide that the structure was not historically significant, and therefore a Public Hearing would not be required. The demolition of the subject structure was included in the Applicant's application.

**Motion by Field, supported by Argenta**, that the existing accessory structure was not historically significant.

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

**Motion by Field, supported by Hoffman**, to accept the application as complete.

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

**Motion by Hoffman, supported by Vernacchia**, to grant a Notice to Proceed referencing Secretary of Interior Standards #10; and the Northville Historic District Design Standards 3.24 for garages, 3.21 for materials, 5.10 for metal roofing, and 5.18 for paint and color.

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

**CASE #4  
NANCY & DARYL RICE  
204 RANDOLPH**

**ENCLOSE PORCH**

Greg Presley was present, along with Applicant Nancy Rice. Mr. Presley explained the application for new construction at 204 Randolph. He said the homeowner would like to enclose a rear screened porch and make it part of conditioned space on the first floor. He said this home was a fine example of Greek Revival architecture, and he spoke to the history of the house, built in 1843; the conversion to a school house in the mid-nineteenth century, then converted back to a residence in 1869. He said there have been a number of additions, including a 1940s masonry block, two-level garage and a three level addition on the north side with a walk-out basement. The rear porch was part of that work, and is a screened covered porch over open patio space at the basement level.

Mr. Presley described an interior plumbing repair (toward the attached garage) that froze this past winter and caused water damage to kitchen and below. A portion of the home had to be redone, and now they would like to expand the living space into the rear screened porch, which is not part of the original historic structure. Mr. Presley said they would like to keep the same roof and structure, but replace the screens with windows and siding. The remainder of the work will be interior.

Mr. Presley said information regarding materials was provided, and white wood clad windows were chosen to match the existing windows of house. He noted that a flat, blank wall will be on the east side, which is needed for kitchen cabinets; the west side of the house will be replaced with some windows and siding. He said they would like to remove the additional balconette on one of the bedrooms upstairs; it is not historic and it leaks.

Commissioner Vernacchia confirmed that the lower floor will remain unchanged; and there would be no structural changes to the house.

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

**Motion by Bayly, supported by Argenta, to grant a Notice to Proceed referencing Secretary of Interior Standards #9; and the Northville Historic District Design Standards 3.10 for preserving porches secondary facades, 5.21 for materials with glass enclosures being appropriate for the windows, 5.18 for color selections, and 5.14 for windows.  
*Voice Vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion Unanimously Carried.***

**CASE #5  
TRENT & LAURA GUTHRIE  
417 DUBUAR**

**ALTERATION TO HOME**



Greg Presley was present, along with Applicant Laura Guthrie. Mr. Presley explained the application for new construction at 417 Dubuar, to upgrade the 1975 two-story home that was originally a ranch with a connected rental space. A 1988 second story was added over the main building and the rental space converted to an in-law suite. He said the house sits in the historic district and the homeowners would like to remake the look of the home and detailing in craftsman-style, and expand the floor area on the second floor.

Mr. Presley said everything on exterior of the house needs consideration. He provided the following information:

- A front porch was added;
- Every window in the house was changed to vertical windows appropriate to the district;
- A garage was added onto the house on the east side—and they are proposing an addition to the structure which marries with the garage, not the house;
- A second addition is on south side of the house, and extending the current ridge line to create living space in the back;
- There is no basement (it is on a crawl space) and storage is needed, so they propose 4,000 square feet on the two levels;
- The style is intended to be ‘craftmanesque’ to fit in with the neighborhood;
- They will keep the same roof lines;
- Materials intended are Jeld-wen Siteline EX;
- Wood clan windows;
- Lower siding would be lapped horizontal cement board;
- Upper siding would be shake style cement board;
- Reclaimed brick, asphalt shingles, colors yet to come

Commissioner Field complimented the design and said it was a huge improvement. He confirmed that the front porch roof would be removed.

Mr. Presley explained the clad stone pillars, with wood above. He spoke to the historic styling of the pillars. He said they were trying to create a good look, not trying to imitate a historic house.

The Historic District Commissioners agreed that the proposal was very attractive and fitting for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Luikart added that the proposal adds to the Historic District.

Commissioner Bayly asked if there was any concern regarding the addition over the garage relative to weight limitations.

(Commissioner Field left at 8:20 p.m.)

Mr. Presley said they would cut out the roof out and set the addition on the existing wall. He said there would not be any problems with the Hardiplank siding. He stated that the

project would begin this spring, and he would return with colors and materials information at the next Historic District Commission meeting

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

**Motion by Hoffman, supported by Vernacchia, to grant a Notice to Proceed, and that the Historic District Commission views the house built in the 1970s as a non-contributing structure that provides a great deal of latitude in the transformation of the house, referencing the Northville Historic District Design Standards 3.16 for mass, 3.17 for height, 3.18 for scale, 3.19 for proportion, 3.20 for hierarchy, 3.21 for rhythm, 3.21 for materials, 3.24 for garages, and 5.14 windows; notes that the architect will return to the Historic District Commission within two meetings for final approval for color. Voice Vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion Unanimously Carried.**

**CASE #6**

**ADAM DESMARAIS  
510 RANDOLPH**

**PORCH**

Applicant Adam Desmarais described his proposal to enclose an existing porch on the east side of his home. He said he purchased the house this past summer, and the porch was left by the previous owners in a state of disrepair. He said the porch was not original to the house which was built in 1892. He said he did not know the age of the porch, but it adds a lot to house, and could have been built in the 1950s.

Mr. Desmarais spoke to the unique nature of the spiral staircase and provided the following information:

- To keep the spiral staircase, and scrape and repaint it;
- Remove the rotting area of the upper floor structure, but not the foundation;
- Masons advise tearing down and rebuilding to the same dimension (12" split face block or with 8" split face block with limestone cap);
- The columns would go back in a similar style;
- The wood is in good shape and will be used;
- Desires to enclose the upper story of the porch—keep it open and light (Anderson windows and matching doors);
- The lower porch portion is the main entrance to house;

Mr. Desmarais said he is a woodworker and engineer, and he intends to do the work himself, and hire a mason. He showed some examples of materials and said he would use all painted trim work to match that sandstone trim on the windows. The staircase would be painted black, as it is today.

Discussion took place regarding the layout of the house. The staircase is in the front of the house. The Commission discussed the unique design of the house and agreed they

were glad Mr. Desmarais was keeping the spiral staircase, and its preservation speaks to the SHPO guidelines, as it is a side porch. They discussed the door on the second floor.

Mr. Desmarais commented that he did some patchwork of a gaping hole, as a temporary bracing to get through winter. He said they have multiple locks on the door of the second floor door, for security.

Mr. Desmarais commented about the choice of colors, and noted that the photos submitted show that he will match the new paint colors to the existing paint colors.

Commissioner Vernacchia clarified that Mr. Desmarais' intention is to use the same paint colors as currently exists on the structure.

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

**Motion by Luikart, supported by Vernacchia, to grant a Notice to Proceed, referencing Secretary of Interior Standards #9 and #10; and the Northville Historic District Design Standards 3.18 for scale, 4.21 for materials, 5.18 for color, 3.10 for preserving porches secondary facades, 5.21 for materials, and 5.14 for windows; and that the color used will match existing colors.**

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

**CASE #7**

**NORTHVILLE DDA/COOPER DESIGN**

**DOWNTOWN  
WALK THRU**

**(RETURNING WITH DETAILS)**

Downtown Development Authority director Lori Ward was present. She said the project construction began this past January with interior demolition of 125 E. Main Street. They moved on to remove exterior pink shed addition that was added much later than the original building. She spoke to the recent removal of metal panels on the front of the building, and offered brick samples for review, with the awning selection for the Comerica Bank building; with a color palette to address the trim work in the rear of the building.

Gary Cooper, representing Cooper Design, Ann Arbor, Michigan described the materials presented. He noted the problem with illustrating color, as the shades seem to look significantly different with each printing. He provided the actual colors, and said they would be using all of the colors presented.

Mr. Cooper discussed the treatment of color and materials for the storefronts, the rear facade, the vestibule, the application of colors, and he submitted several photographs (original and of a structure in San Francisco.) He said they were removing metal panels, bring back the original brick, demolish both storefronts and build new storefronts in keeping with the character of the building.

Mr. Cooper described changes to the rear of the structures, demolish the pink addition and the vestibule of the Comerica Bank building and remove the blue awning. He said a new opening will be created on the west side, and the original arch on the other side will be opened up and the door opening will be retained. He described the color choices as presented. The general concept is a gray-green palette.

Mr. Cooper discussed the exterior brick, the exposing of brick on the inside, and the west wall. He said the goal is to find another brick to match, and the mason has indicated there would be no problem. There is new brick on the interior of the building, with an odd orange brick color range. He showed a paint scheme of a Victorian home in San Francisco. He said the goal was to have little range between the colors, which is historically accurate.

Mr. Cooper spoke to the awnings for Comerica Bank, and the graphic in the packet. He noted that the colors were not accurate in the photographs, but represents placement. He showed a photo of the umbrella fabric.

Mr. Cooper said the submission did not include signage, and that signage on the drawings was conceptual. He said Comerica was going to add their logo to the signs. He said they would appreciate approval of the logo on the awnings.

Ms. Elmiger said the Historic District Commission may be able to comment on the design, but a permit is required, and can be conditioned upon their approval.

Chairman Johnson said the Historic District Commission has not looked at overall signage. He acknowledged the tall exiting sign, and that it must continue to meet Ordinance requirements.

Mr. Cooper spoke to the many challenges in coordinating with Comerica Bank.

Mr. Cooper discussed the upper facade, the compatibility in scale and height with the adjacent cornice. He described the decorative nature of the details and the paint colors as show in the materials. He said the existing limestone sills would be retained. He mentioned simulated Fypon wood on the lower storefront, and provided examples.

Discussion took place regarding simulated wood, how it effectively holds paint and does not hold water. Discussion was held regarding the front façade that was originally painted, and the possibility of removing the paint in accordance with historic guidelines.

Mr. Cooper discussion the interior of the building and reviewed the drawings with the Historic District Commission in detail. He spoke to the rear of the building, and the many modifications of that area over time. He said they propose to repaint the rear façade of the building, and not paint the vestibule that sticks out. That would be the only exposed brick on that side of the building. He mentioned the aluminum framed skylight, with panels for insulating value.

Mr. Cooper said Comerica Bank wants a bird screen on the bottom of their awning; their traditional surround was too large, so they are developing an application specifically for this project.

Mr. Cooper spoke to the distribution of color on the interior, and said they thought the Historic District Commission would have input on the colors and materials used in that area. He said the lower floor on the west side would have a new unpainted brick wall, made with the same brick as the rear vestibule.

Mr. Cooper discussed the area between the first and second floors.

Commissioner Argenta inquired about color, and asked if an elevation without the key notes, i.e. color 1, color 2, etc., to prevent any problems later.

Mr. Cooper said that would be fine, and noted that often you don't know what color to use until you start to paint.

Commissioner Argenta said the key notes could be pencil marked.

Commissioner Hoffman said once the structure is in place, they may want to experiment with colors. He suggested putting a check point in the procedure to have an Historic District Commission subcommittee review and approve the choices.

Discussion took place regarding places that sell salvaged brick.

Ms. Elmiger reviewed the request before the Historic District Commission.

Discussion took place regarding the Comerica Bank logo; simulated wood products; the quality of wood available today; evidence of color palette revealed in the deconstruction process; the open archway; door to the rear; wind effect through the walkway.

Discussion took place regarding what was approved at the February 2011 Historic District Commission meeting.

**Motion by Vernacchia, supported by Argenta, to accept the application as complete.**

Commissioner Luikart recalled the minutes from the February 2011 meeting, as related to the skyline which was replaced with four glass panels.

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

**Motion by Hoffman, supported by Vernacchia, to grant a Notice to Proceed, referencing Secretary of Interior Standards #9; and the Northville Historic District Design Standards 4.21 for materials, 4.23 for awnings, 4.24 for sign on the awning (with Applicant returning with other application for total signage), 5.4 for preserving brick masonry, and 5.18 for paint and color with the stipulation that at the time of application an Historic District Commission subcommittee will approve the final colors.**

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

Discussion took place re Comerica Bank internal sign group putting together a comprehensive sign package, and a logo on every awning. Discussion was held regarding the need for compliance with the sign Ordinance. Ms. Ward said that sign for the walkway itself will be brought to the Historic District Commission.

**DISCUSSION:**

None.

**ADJOURN**

Chairman Johnson adjourned the meeting at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cindy Gray  
Recording Secretary