

NORTHVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
June 20, 2012
Wednesday 7:00 P.M. – Northville City Hall - Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Mayor Pro Tem Allen called the Historic District Commission meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Allen, Argenta, Bayly, Hoffman, and Luikart

Absent: Field (excused), Johnson (excused), and Vernacchia (excused)

Also Present: Sally Elmiger, Staff Liaison

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

None

Mayor Pro Tem Allen requested items 6 (Downtown Walk-Thru) and 7 (Garage modifications) be switched; and Mr. Presley has requested a conceptual discussion for a new home, to be Agenda item 8.

4. MINUTES: May 16, 2012

Commissioner Hoffman corrected the spelling of a building material mentioned in the minutes, i.e. ~~Aztec~~ Azek board.

Motion by Hoffman, supported by Luikart, to approve the May 16, 2012 minutes as amended.

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

5. REPORTS

A. CITY ADMINISTRATION: None

B. CITY COUNCIL: None

C. COMMISSIONER: None

D. OTHER COMMUNITY/GOVERNMENTAL LIAISONS: None

6. CASES

CASE #1

HARMON SIGN-MONROE BANK

SIGN

201 E. MAIN STREET

Scott Smith, with Harmon Sign Company, represented Monroe Bank. He detailed application submitted to the Historic District Commission to modify some of the existing signs on the Monroe Bank & Trust building. Areas on the existing signs that are white will be changed to a green/beige color. The applicant is also proposing to add the words "Private Banking" in a metallic silver color onto the existing black awnings on the building. The branding colors are the PMS colors, to replace the colors on the logo over the ATM machine and on the rear wall

directory. He said originally, it was going to have the bank name on the two awnings, but they decided against that. Mr. Smith explained that the bank wanted to add private banking to their branding and their branches, to highlight their level of service. He said their changes have taken place at their Plymouth location. Mr. Smith said they want to add to their two canopies, on the left and right of the entry doors.

Discussion took place regarding the amount of wall signs allowed and the amount of wall signs indicated in the application packet. Commissioner Argenta said he counted six.

Ms. Elmiger said Mr. Penn does the review for signage compliance with the Ordinance, which is done separately. She spoke to the consideration of directional signage, and signage on ATMs. She explained that anything on a window, such as the sandblasted window, is separate, and is not considered a wall sign.

Mr. Smith said the signs are small on the directory panel; and are on the ATM.

Motion by Luikart, supported by Bayly, to accept the application as complete.

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 #10; and the Northville Historic District Design Standards 4.24 for signs, and 5.18 for color.

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

**CASE #2
DENNIS ENGERER
141 E. MAIN**

PERGOLA

Dennis Engerer explained the request to construct a new pergola at rear entry of the building for the Next Chapter Bookstore and Bistro. He supplied recent photographs of the existing structure; the proposed color of the pergola is white; and he provided a sample of the proposed white vinyl material to the HDC for consideration. Mr. Engerer expressed the business's desire to make an attractive, more inviting outdoor seating area for the enjoyment of their patrons.

Commissioner Bayly asked if Mr. Engerer was prepared to submit a site plan showing exactly where the pergola would sit on the property. She said there were dimensions and scale drawings of the pergola, but nothing that indicates where it would be placed, anchored, set up, etc.

Discussion took place regarding Commissioner Bayly's inquiry. Mr. Engerer said he was unaware of the need to provide a site plan.

Ms. Elmiger said her packet included an illustration, but no site plan. She noted that the second illustration indicated how the pergola would be attached to the building and where it would sit.

Discussion took place regarding the need for a more detailed site plan.

Mr. Engerer explained that the pergola would be nine feet high, above the windows, below the exhaust vents for the heating system, centered over the brick pavers, 15 feet wide at the columns, overhangs the sidewalks by approximately two feet, is approximately 20 feet wide, 10 feet tall at highest point, with a door on either side. He said the packet contained a photograph of a similar

pergola. Mr. Engerer drew on the photograph to indicate the exact location proposed. He said he had no immediate plans for the existing Next Chapter sign; so it will remain unchanged.

Discussion ensued regarding the dimensions of the proposed pergola.

Commissioner Bayly expressed that she could not envision the placement of the pergola.

Mr. Engerer's sign installer was present. He noted there was a clear path on the sidewalk that goes to either door. He apologized for not having a drawing to scale.

Mr. Engerer said the pergola was a kit; if it were to be removed in the future, it would not cause any damage to the building. He said the base is attached with sunk-in concrete pillars, there are tension brackets, there is a header attached to the brick building; it will hide some water damage and exhaust pipes; and it will be attractive. There are no similar applications as the proposed pergola in the area. The pergola was chosen because it requires no maintenance, the finish is the only choice with this company; and the pergola is expected to last a long time. He said the pergola would be power-washed periodically, but that would be expected of any material.

Discussion took place regarding the concept and the design.

Commissioner Bayly said she liked the design, concept and color; however, she expressed concern regarding the choice of materials, its potential to break down over time, and potential to be difficult to keep clean.

Discussion took place regarding how the materials could deteriorate over time.

Mr. Engerer's sign installer explained they were informed that this particular material has been engineered, tested and approved for high winds; it is a composite, the same basis of trek material, with a high longevity factor that sustains weather conditions and elements. He said the column also have heavy duty rods through them. He said he could provide information regarding the pergola and the material to the Historic District Commission within a day. The company that makes this particular vinyl pergola is called Backyard America.

Discussion took place regarding how the pergola would mount to the foundation and the building; as well as the potential to withstand snow load, and 140 mph winds.

Mr. Engerer explained his plans for the brick paver, and for further landscaping to enhance the bookstore, to attract people to the rear of the building, and go beyond simply a cut-through to the front. He said ivy would be planted to grow on the pergola; shade would be gained as a result.

The Historic District Commission discussed the proposal. Commissioner Luikart said she favored wood as a material, did not favor vinyl, but the pergola was on the rear façade of the property, so it was acceptable.

Commissioner Hoffman inquired about the idea of a pergola in an historic downtown.

Commissioner Argenta said pergolas are often seen in historic areas down South; and it would be a good start to improve the back area. He spoke to the on-going use of composite materials for this type of application.

Motion by Bayly, supported by Luikart, to accept the application as complete; subject to the

CASE # 4
MARTONE DESIGN
118 MAINCENTRE

SIGN

Carmine Martone explained the request to add a new projecting sign on the front of the studio. He spoke to his 12 years at the location, the history of flat signs on the building, the neighboring business's projecting signs, and his need for similar signage. He noted the subterranean nature of the storefront, and the challenge faced regarding signage in this area. He spoke to the eight foot height clearance for projecting signs, but due to the location of the planter, there would be no obstruction to the sidewalk.

Commissioner Luikart said the proposed sign was very appropriate for area; and that it was a tricky area to install advertisements.

Mr. Martone said he plans some window displays and graphics to make the business more approachable to the general public. The material will include a metal bracket, dimensional foam; and it may involve aluminum, painted with a matte finish, and the bracket to match the building.

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

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

Motion by Luikart, supported by Bayly, to grant a Notice to Proceed referencing Secretary of Interior Standards #10; and the Northville Historic District Design Standards 4.24 for signs, 5.18 for color, and 4.21 for materials.

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

CASE # 5
MICHAEL SHAW
450 E. MAIN STREET

PORCH

Michael Shaw explained the proposal to reconstruct the front porch. He said they were proposing to deconstruct an existing two-story front porch, and re-construct it to match the existing structure. He said structure was in good condition, except for one beam in the very front. He said they plan to strip it carefully apart (to reuse later); and insert a skeleton. He said the mason indicated that the brick was about 70% unusable; and preferred to install some new bricks. (example shown) He said the color was a near-perfect match. There are four units in the building; they propose the installation of a ceiling fan for each unit. Paint colors we be unchanged; except for the ceiling will be painted a pale blue; with a pale green on the first floor cement floor. The first floor ceiling is will require minimal patching; the top floor replace with be replaced with bead board.

Discussion took place regarding the elevation and tapers. Mr. Shaw said the intent was use the existing wood to wrap the columns that are going on.

Commissioner Bayly suggested Mr. Shaw may want to explore what may be on the interior of the columns. She said the plan was good.

Commissioner Luikart said she appreciated the products chosen by Mr. Shaw, and his intention to reuse whatever can be reused on the project.

Mr. Shaw discussed the structural problems causing the need to replace the porch, despite good measures to avoid replacement of the entire porch. He noted their need to protect the porch, and expounded on what he would do to support the structure; strip out the beams, posts, and flooring for the second floor; down to a bare cement porch and rebuild the stick frame. He said the same contractor will be used for the demolition as well as repair, and they were confident that things will stay intact; and the roof is in very good condition.

Motion by Bayly, supported by Luikart, to accept the application as complete.

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

Motion by Luikart, supported by Hoffman, to grant a Notice to Proceed referencing Secretary of Interior Standards #2, #5, #6, #9, and #10; and the Northville Historic District Design Standards 3.10 for porches, 3.22 for details, 5.3 for preserving wood, and 5.18 for paint and color selection.

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

CASE # 7

**RON & ROMAN-THE GARAGE
202 W. MAIN**

MODIFICATIONS

Roman Bonislowski was present to explain the request for review of several modifications to the plans, and for signage.

Ms. Elmiger's review letter indicated that this project was previously reviewed by the Historic District Commission at the March 23, 2011 meeting. At that meeting, the HDC granted a notice to proceed with everything except for the signage. The Planning Commission approved the final PUD on June 7, 2011, and the City Council approved the PUD agreement and site plan at a special meeting held on July 25, 2011. Since this time, the applicant received the necessary building permits and the building has been under construction.

Ms. Elmiger's review letter indicated that additional information needs to be provided; and changes have been made to the plans and are identified in the file, and are as follows:

1) New Construction / Additions: A modified approach is shown on these plans for the banquet facility entrance. A barrier free ramp has been added, and the porch area has been reconfigured. Additional information to be provided includes:

a) Material samples and color for canvas canopy. (Note that this is not necessary if the canopy is the same color as on the materials sample board provided at the March, 2011 HDC meeting.)

2) Door & Garage Door Replacement: A new wood and glass overhead sectional door is being proposed at the west end of the building (replacing an existing overhead door). The glass door will allow viewing of a "display garage."

a) Manufacturer brochure of new overhead door. (Note that in the previous submission, the applicant stated that the doors will be custom made. If this is the case for this new overhead door, then a brochure is not required.)

3) Sign Installation / Replacement: Includes a new pole sign on existing pole; two restaurant name wall signs and a “To Go” wall sign in metal letters; a “Jack’s Garage” wall sign in metal letters; two canopy signs; and six illustrated directional signs. Note that Jim Penn has conducted a zoning review for these signs, which is attached to this application.

a) Font, color and material samples.

4) Building Cleaning: The notes on the plans now indicate that the existing porcelain panels and joints are being repaired and painted in a high gloss white. The original plans stated that the porcelain panels would be restored.

a) A description of the needed repair work and methods should be provided.

5) Roof Replacement: The original plans showed a corrugated cement panel rooftop screen. These panels are being replaced with a Sunbrella canvas screen.

a) Color and material sample of canvas screen should be provided.

6) Window Replacement: The window treatment of the service entrance on the west side of the building (see “West Elevation”) has been reconfigured, adding differently-styled windows and eliminating the proposed canvas awning in this area.

a) Manufacturer brochure of new windows.

Ms. Elmiger’s review letter noted that the outdoor seating area in front of the large round window has been eliminated. Most of the information needed consists of material samples or colors.

Mr. Bonislowski summarized the work performed at 202 W. Main Street, and identified the items requested for approval. He said it was similar to the original submittal, but tweaking minor details. He described the following:

- Finding a hidden window
- Masonry of that wall had to be rebuilt
- They plan to have a 1931 Model A car to be a full time display in the restaurant
- The garage door will be stained and varnished, it will rolls up and the Model A will roll out
- Issues at the banquet end require simplification (preserved from PUD standpoint, made a simple rectangular entry; simply the roof; make a little entrance; the canvas at entry projection piece is charcoal and corner will be terra cotta; called The Annex; determined acrylic signage, covered in fabric with letter cutouts, down lit behind to light walk-way)

At west wall facing High Street:

- The hidden window
- Issues with crumbling, readdressed existing window for additional side light; bar area
- Not to include the proposed valance

Mr. Bonislowski spoke to acoustics; mechanical screen wall; discovered old hay loft; able to move 70% of equipment into building; 10 AC units still on roof, configured to design like a highway barrier mass wall in the rear to help block sound; propose facing Main and Wing Streets

like a painted metal frame and awning; a fabric wall on those 2 sides only; existing door originally proposed to be an auto sliding door on exterior—now to reuse existing door.

Mr. Bonislowski spoke to minor modifications in back, i.e. how the openings work; the primary service door was to be aluminum and glass, now to use a hollow metal door with porthole window. He spoke to what was originally proposed; reuse of some materials; provided brought cut sheets. He said they discovered multiple layers of roofing. He discussed the porcelain panels and the challenges and inability to restore them to their original state. They propose one panel out on the building to be permanently painted with paint with a gloss factor.

Discussion took place regarding restoration of porcelain panels.

Commissioner Argenta noted that the applicant was taking meticulous care, and it is a great solution.

Mr. Bonislowski spoke to the proposed secondary cafe, and the change in plans relative to safety, the parking area, and the drive-through. He said they will forego that little piece of café, and may consider that next year next to the sidewalk.

Mr. Bonislowski spoke to the signage on the front canopy; service with a smile tag; saved gooseneck fixtures; carryout area; reuse of the sign with one simple gooseneck on each side. The sign will state “Garage.” Proposed placement was shown on the site plan. All the work will be done on-site. He said they will not use the color charcoal, but will use slate instead. Gucci umbrella to be use in the café; above the canopy is a small running band—proposed color is terra cotta—requested painting a gloss black if needed; it is currently white.

Discussion took place regarding signage, the size of the signage, the PUD, and what was on the submitted plans. Signs have not been approved yet.

Mr. Bonislowski spoke to limited color palette as detailed in the application.

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

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 4.28 for adaptive reuse of historical commercial buildings, 4.21 for materials, 4.23 for awnings, 4.24 for signs, 5.18 for color, (notes architect to make field decision regarding the painin of the black above the awning), 5.16 for metal, 4.6 for window preservation, and 4.4 for storefront preservation. All signage was approved as submitted.

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

The Historic District Commission applauded the applicant on the meticulous attention to detail in this project.

**CASE # 6
NORTHVILLE DDA
125 E. MAIN STREET**

DOWNTOWN WALK THRU

Lori Ward was present representing the Northville DDA, along with Gary Cooper.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen provided an update regarding the downtown walk thru. He explained that a beam shifted and cracked at the façade of the storefront. He said structural engineers have been hired and it was determined that for health and safety reasons, the front façade of the building must come down.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen spoke to the Historic District Commission standards, for a demolition permit, a Public Hearing must be held; however, the City's code allows for demolition, if there is a health, safety, and welfare concern; which this is. He reiterated that the area involves the front façade of the structure; and all efforts want to be implemented to protect the structure and any surrounding structures or areas. He said there is authorization to proceed to emergency demolition. He spoke to the need for expeditious action relative to the holding of a Public Hearing, given the current state of the structure.

Ms. Elmiger spoke to the process; and emphasized that the Historic District Commission does not have authority, if there is a safety issue—that would be a City Council issue, who would interact with the Building Department relative to the situation. She said the City would like to make sure the Historic District Commission is notified and to go through their process and have a Public Hearing next month. However, between now and then, if demolition of the façade is needed, it must take place.

Ms. Elmiger said she spoke with Mr. Schneider at SHPPO, who indicated if the situation revolves around safety, “nothing trumps safety.” She said if the structural engineers say the structure needs to come down now, it must come down now, even prior to the opportunity for a Public Hearing.

Ms. Ward said she spoke with Mr. Penn and received a draft citing the International Property Maintenance code of 2009, dealing with dangerous structures on a premise. She said errors were found in the document, but she did not have a chance to address them with Mr. Penn. She said his intent was to note that he had inspected the site; it speaks to the Repair Notice and Order; which states there is 30 days to correct the situation, which could encompass removal and reassembly; but it reads like “fix in place.” She said Mr. Penn has indicated that he is prepared to issue a notice that the façade needs to come down.

Mr. Cooper provided a summary of what happened, and spoke to how something like this could be prevented in the future. He referred to historic photographs of the structure that were provided in the past. He discussed the low arches that were removed from the front of the storefront and the large steel beam that was installed. He spoke to how the beam shifted and created the subject situation. Mr. Cooper emphasized that there was no way for anyone to predict this, prior to construction, unless the building had been taken apart.

Discussion took place regarding the management of the construction site, and how to prevent this from happening in the future. Discussion ensued regarding the need to make sure the demolition is done properly.

Discussion was held regarding the unusable nature of the original masonry.

Commissioner Hoffman said he was convinced that the structure is not able to be repaired, based on the information provided.

Ms. Elmiger spoke to procedure. She said if the Historic District Commission determines that the structure to be demolished is structurally significant, then a Public Hearing would be required.

However, if in the meantime, if the structural engineers determine that the structure must come down, the City's Building Official would make that decision and implement the demolition.

Ms. Ward spoke to the DDA's efforts to make sure every possible alternative to salvage this storefront façade and repair it in place. She expressed dismay over the situation.

Commissioner Argenta noted that the Michigan Building Code takes precedent over the Historic District Commission.

Discussion continued regarding ownership of the building. Ms. Ward said she received from the bank authorization and copies of their deeds, and information that shows their ownership.

Discussion took place regarding holding a special meeting, and having time to provide notice regarding a Public Hearing.

Mr. Cooper spoke to the efforts regarding reuse of the brick; and their goal to match the adjacent buildings' bricks.

Discussion was held regarding the procedure to stain brick; and how new brick can develop a patina over time; the need to have site plans to scale relative to the reconstruction; dimensional drawings; revisiting the elevation; how far back into the historic structure they will go; the need for a subcommittee; and that safety is the utmost concern.

Commissioner Luikart said the proposal would basically become a new proposal, and new information would need to be provided in accordance with these changes.

Discussion took place regarding working continuing on other aspects of the construction.

Mr. Cooper said new architectural documents will be developed and submitted to the Building Department as an amendment to their building permit; and it will have to be submitted to their contractor, who will want documents and specifications related to the specification of the demolition and costs.

Discussion was held regarding procedure again, for the demolition, not the reconstruction. Ms. Ward reiterated that she has a letter of authorization from Comerica Bank regarding authorization for the demolition.

Motion by Hoffman, supported by Luikart, regarding 125 E. Main Street, that given the circumstances, the Historic District Commission recognizes the need for a partial demolition on the façade of the site, and that a Public Hearing be set at the next regular meeting of the Historic District Commission; wherein the Applicant will provide with a complete application and demolition documents, and address the issues presented at the Public Hearing.

The Historic District Commission discussed that this motion does not preclude the City from acting prior to the Public Hearing, regarding the demolition matter. It was discussed that if the demolition were to take place prior to the Public Hearing, the Public Hearing would proceed as scheduled.

Discussion took place regarding guidelines.

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

**CASE # 8
GREG PRESLEY
412 RANDOLPH**

CONCEPTUAL DISCUSSION

Mr. Presley requested the conceptual discussion regarding the property, prior a Public Hearing regarding the demolition of the building. He said the one-story house is 638 square feet; there are no records on the building; he believed it to date back to the 1920s. He said he has a letter from Building Official Penn who inspected the site and is prepared to provide a letter for demolition regarding the building.

Mr. Presley explained that the vacant site is a habitat for animals; the structure is dilapidated; the floor system is substandard; and the foundation is crumbling. He said the building has a split face front; it may have been temporary quarters; the lot is 44 feet wide; there is a newer one-car garage in the back of the lot. He said the structure does not contribute to the Historic District, and is of no historic importance to community; and he said he would request permission to demolish this structure without a Public Hearing, because it has no historical significance to the community. He added that the dilapidated structure also presented a safety issue for the public.

Discussion took place regarding the removal of rodents from the subject dwelling; and the health and safety issues presented.

Mr. Presley said he is the design architect for the replacement structure on this property. He said this situation was not an emergency demolition matter. He spoke to his design concept for the site; showed the configuration of the lot; the adjacent garage; the Ott's garage; the weed-like 36" Tree of Heaven; the series of Maple trees in the back, proposed to be saved; the existing garage to be kept; the proposed two-story, 2,000-2,100 square foot house; with ridge height similar to the adjacent garage; footprint is 24% of lot coverage; it fits the lot and neighborhood; style echoes a four-square theme; front sitting porch; a bay; cedar shakes, miter edge; setback a little more than what is there now; and 200 feet both ways. He said he would imagine the neighbors would not oppose the removal of this structure, given its condition.

Commissioner Hoffman concurred with the need to demolish this structure based on health and safety issues; and concurred that it was a non-contributing structure to the Historic District. He spoke about the matter of having a Public Hearing.

The Historic District Commission noted that a street scape sketch was needed; that the lack of a two-car garage would fit in, and the proposed design was simplistic and fitting for the area. Discussion was held regarding a Public Hearing being held.

DISCUSSION

Regarding the Downtown walk thru, Commissioner Hoffman emphasized the importance of the potential to put something into the Historic District Commission standards and process to help prevent this from happening; i.e. checks and balances, inspections, etc.'

Commissioner Luikart said she remembered Commissioner Bayly asking a lot of questions about structural integrity when the matter was being discussed.

Discussion was held regarding the difficulty in predicting things in terms of historic structures.

Ms. Elmiger said the Historic District Commission has the authority to require someone to reconstruct a structure as it was.

Discussion took place regarding the Secretary of Interior s standards for reconstruction; to be sent to the Commissioners for review.

Discussion took place regarding meeting schedules and the Thanksgiving holiday.

ADJOURN

Mayor Pro Tem Allen adjourned the meeting at 9:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cindy Gray
Recording Secretary