

**NORTHVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**August 22, 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 7:00 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL:**

**Present:** Allen, Argenta, Bayly, Field, Hoffman and Vernacchia

**Absent:** Johnson (excused) and Luikart (excused)

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

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

None

**4. MINUTES:** July 18, 2012

Commissioner Argenta provided a correction to the name of Ron Cieslack. He noted that the last motion on the last page should say “new wall” not “new all.”

Mayor Pro Tem Allen said Commissioner Luikart had forwarded changes to the minutes, and for the record, the changes could be inserted into the minutes.

Commissioner Field expressed opposition to inserting Commissioner Luikart’s changes into the meeting minutes.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen said he emailed Commissioner Luikart that meeting minutes were a meeting summary, not a verbatim account of a meeting. He said Commissioner Luikart replied that her changes were integral to her discussions on the items discussed at that meeting.

Commissioner Field said he thought Commissioner Luikart’s proposed changes went too far.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen concurred with Commissioner Field, but noted that Commissioner Luikart was not present at this time for this discussion.

Commissioner Field said he would not support including Commissioner Luikart’s changes into the record. He said if the Historic District Commission wanted a verbatim account of a meeting, they could pay for it, and the meetings could go on for a long time. He said this goes way beyond what is needed.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen concurred with Commissioner Field and reiterated that meeting minutes are a summary of events.

Commissioner Field said that by accepting or amending the minutes with Commissioner Luikart’s comments, it adds to fuel to the fire and should be stopped. He said if a special meeting was needed to discuss this, then that would be fine. He said agreeing to these amendments as presented allows members to insert their personal preferences into the minutes, and causes additional time, effort and cost; and needs to be stopped.

**Motion by Vernacchia**, that without Commissioner Luikart present, that the minutes of July 18, 2012 be approved, excluding Case #4, and the remainder of the minutes be deferred until the next meeting when Commissioner Luikart is present.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen said the minutes either need to be approved or tabled.

Ms. Elmiger suggested the minutes should not be approved ‘in part.’ She suggested the entire set of minutes be tabled.

**MOTION** failed due to lack of support.

**Motion by Hoffman, supported by Bayly, that the minutes of July 18, 2012, be tabled and considered at the next meeting when Commissioner Luikart is present.**

*Motion carried, 4-2, with Field and Allen opposed.*

**5. REPORTS**

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

**6. CASES**

Mr. Presley said that the Applicant for Case #5 requested to go first, and he deferred to that Applicant.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen approved the request to hear Case #5 first.

**CASE # 5**

**MR. DON BINGHAM**

**141/145 E. CADY STREET**

**BUILDING REMODEL**

Ms. Elmiger spoke to her review of Case #5, noting the applicant is proposing to renovate the rear façade of the building. She recalled that conceptual plans were presented to the HDC at the July meeting, and comments were gathered. The HDC moved that it was in general agreement with the conceptual plans; and commented that they would prefer another color than white; that they did not prefer “blank” windows; and they requested the applicant provide more information on the EFIS material proposed for the façade renovation.

Ms. Elmiger said she reviewed the application for completeness. She said there were no specific application requirements for façade renovations, so the “New Construction” requirements were used as a guide. She included the following comments:

1) A full site plan and floor plans have not been provided with this application. However, it would be considered acceptable since only the façade of the building was being modified, and a very small planting area directly next to the building was being added. The plantings are to be completed by the owner of the property.

2) As requested, the applicant has submitted additional information describing the EFIS material proposed for the façade.

3) The plans indicate that two new surface mounted light fixtures will be installed near the top of the building. The applicant has provided a manufacturer cut sheet.

4) The time frame for the project is provided on the architect's transmittal letter. The project is scheduled to start this summer, and be completed by the fall of this year.

Commissioner Bayly pointed out that Northville historic standards 4-27 addresses rear façade development, and should be treated as new construction; compatible, commercial construction.

Ms. Elmiger said in reviewing the application for completeness, she looked at the categories on the application to see what information the applicant was required to bring; and that was her reference.

Mr. Bingham was present, with Mr. Cieslack. Mr. Cieslack said their application contained all of the information that was requested, as well as an additional drawing showing revised colors. He spoke to the challenge in providing true color samples, and presented the actual colors and finish to the Historic District Commission. (Color one, inset of windows; color two, the darker for the cornice, bump out, and band across the bottom; and color 3, is the field color.) He said the colors were chosen as they seemed to go well with the brick.

Discussion took place regarding the colors. The black band along the bottom of the elevation drawing is a ground line or base line on the elevation.

Commissioner Bayly noted previous EFIS applications in the historic district that have been denied; examples given. She said she would not feel comfortable approving the use of EFIS in the proposed application; and that this was spelled out in the material guidelines.

Commissioner Hoffman explained that at the meeting, Commissioner Argenta provided some comments regarding EFIS, and asked him to share those comments again.

Commissioner Argenta spoke to the stability of the EFIS material, and noted that in the past, problems did occur. He said EFIS is now considered a readily acceptable material, and he was not aware of any problems with it. He said he has used it many times, and it is a compatible item that would fit in this situation. Commissioner Argenta spoke to the application of EFIS in various locations in the community.

Commissioner Bayly said she checked with a professor at the University of Texas who has researched EFIS; and he said he would not recommend using it for application in the northern states.

Commissioner Bayly commented about the following:

- Awnings and color change: appropriate;
- The addition of false window facades: not appropriate, does not follow standards;
- The front façade: the owner is very sensitive to changes from cedar shake to shingle shingles, however, for the proposed application, it is not appropriate for that venue in that region, and design standards spell out the change should not be a grand difference;
- If the colors were changed on the painted block, it would provide a change of appearance, without the use of EFIS

Commissioner Bayly asked if the applicant had looked into using any other materials.

Mr. Cieslack said they had considered different materials, and any other veneer would require more maintenance. He spoke to the materials just east of the church, with arched treatments. He emphasized that the standards call to compliment the downtown, and the subject building was built in the 1960s; and that was their intent in using the EFIS. He said he felt the product was a good product, and he has used it in many places in Michigan; notwithstanding the comments from the professor in Texas.

Commissioner Bayly reiterated that the use of EFIS was not in accordance with the standards and guidelines; and she was not comfortable with it. She cited 4-21, where it calls it an imitation stucco product. She expounded on it being a synthetic material, with many issues resulting from its use; and that the Historic District Commission is trying to protect the applicant and his building.

Commissioner Vernacchia said he did not read the standards in that way.

Mr. Bingham said he was sorry he just didn't paint it. He said he was trying to eliminate the peeling and the sad look back there.

Commissioner Vernacchia said that none of the Commissioners at the last meeting had any problems with the use of this building material. He said he was satisfied with Commissioner Argenta's explanation regarding the material, and the explanation received at the last meeting. He said the objections were noted and old territory was being rehashed.

Commissioner Field concurred with Commissioner Vernacchia. He said this use was in the back of the building and is a great improvement. He said the applicant was here with the final materials, and that is what was presented.

Mr. Cieslack said everything else was in the packet; the material change is the use of EFIS and the shaping of the façade; the canopies are existing.

Commissioner Hoffman inquired about the improper installation of EFIS.

Commissioner Argenta said in the past there problems, mainly down South. He said he cannot go along with someone in Texas saying not to use it up North. He said people use it everywhere, and he has not heard of any failures. He emphasized that the location is the rear of the building; it looks like an alley back there, with painted, peeling block. He said the owner is making a good effort to improve the area, and there is nothing historically significant about the building, nor the backs of all the buildings; and is a reflection of a lot of the arched windows on Main Street. He said it was a good solution that could inspire others to improve their locations.

Mr. Cieslack said very dark colors can fade, but they have selected light colors.

Discussion continued about the EFIF product and application.

Commissioner Hoffman said that being sensitive to Standard 4-21, that use of EFIS materials be reviewed on an individual basis, based on the comments shared, that this is a rear façade of a building that is not historically significant, and when properly applied, it is a suitable material.

**Motion by Hoffman, supported by Vernacchia, 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 #9 and #10; and the Northville Historic District Design Standards 4-27 and 5-18 for paint and color; for Standards 4-21, that the use of EFIS materials be reviewed on an individual basis, based on the comments shared, that this is a rear façade of a building that is not historically significant, and when properly applied, it is a suitable material.

*Voice Vote: 5-1, with Bayly opposed.*

**CASE #1  
GREG PRESLEY/HICKMAN  
206 W. DUNLAP**

**WINDOWS**

Ms. Elmiger spoke to her review of Case #1, noting the applicant was proposing to add a new window to one elevation of their garage, and replace an existing, second-story barn door and cupola vented openings with windows.

Ms. Elmiger said she reviewed the application for completeness. She included the following comments:

- 1) Confirm that the new windows will be made from wood.
- 2) Confirm that the second-story barn door opening is currently the same size as the new window.
- 3) Will any related work be required to install the new windows?

(It was noted that the applicant should confirm that the second floor of this garage will not be used as habitable space.)

Mr. Presley said the new windows will be made from wood; the current second-story barn door opening is a bit larger than the current windows; some wall patching will be necessary to install the new windows; and the second story of the home will not be used as habitable space. He said they would like to make the window about a foot narrower, and the same height, to make it look a little smaller than the barn door.

Dean Flitsos said the barn was built in 1850; it was dismantled and moved from Lyme, New Hampshire; and reconstructed in Northville. The cupola was not original; the barn has been on the site since the late 1990s.

Commissioner Bayly said that since the barn was moved to Northville by the previous owner from New Hampshire, historically the placement of the additional windows would not be appropriate to the structure, if it were still in its original location. However, since it's been moved to the present location in recent years, it opens the door to certain liberties of alteration. She said the request was reasonable, and in time, reversible. She stated that they were under the guidelines, and still fall under Secretary of Interior Standards #10; and garages for Northville.

**Motion by Vernacchia, supported by Field**, 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 #9 and #10; and the Northville Historic District Design Standards 3-24, for garages, and 3-6 for windows.

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

**CASE #2**  
**GREG PRESLEY/ZACK**  
**120 108 N. CENTER**

**PAINT**

Ms. Elmiger spoke to her review of Case #2, the applicant is proposing to repaint the façade of the existing storefront.

Ms. Elmiger said after reviewing the application, it is considered complete for paint. However, a sign is also shown on the storefront illustration. Is the applicant also asking for approval for the sign as well?

Mr. Presley said they were not asking for approval for the sign. He said they were coming for paint colors for the storefront, and he provided color copies for the file. The paint was only for the front façade—but not the sides of building or the back.

**Motion by Vernacchia, supported by Field, 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 5-18 for paint and color.

Ms. Ward said she met with the owner, who expressed interest in painting the sides and back of the building. She wondered if that could be included at this time.

Discussion took place, and it was decided to continue with the motion as stated.

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

**CASE #3**  
**GREG PRESLEY/MILLER**  
**412 RANDOLPH**

**DEMOLITION**

Ms. Elmiger spoke to her review of Case #3. The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing home at the above address.

Ms. Elmiger said she has reviewed the application for completeness, and has the following comments:

- 1) Was the applicant able to discern the date of construction of the home?
- 2) Description of the architectural style of the resource.
- 3) Written narrative description of proposed process to accomplish the demolition.

Conceptual drawings for a new building were also included in the submission.

Mr. Presley provided a written narrative of the demolition process. He said the house dates from the 1920s; it is folk style, one story, generic, and designed as a service facility for workers. He spoke to critter control, and said several raccoons were trapped and relocated. Regarding the demolition, it will be standard, with a bobcat, push down, remove foundation; fill in.

Mr. Presley said he was seeking demolition approval at this time. He said he wanted to show the Historic District Commission the intent at this point.

Commissioner Hoffman noted that it was important to establish that this house was not historically significant, and no Public Hearing was required.

Ms. Elmiger concurred, noting as long as the Commission have a majority vote.

**Motion by Vernacchia, supported by Field**, that this building is not historic, based on the evidence provided.

*Motion carried 5-1, with Bayly opposed.*

**Motion by Vernacchia, supported by Field**, to accept the application for demolition as complete.

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

**Motion by Vernacchia, supported by Field**, to grant a Notice to Proceed, as far as adherence to the demolition process called out by the Historic District process, which has been satisfied.

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

Commissioner Bayly requested that Mr. Presley include a small perspective street scape sketch for the file.

**CASE # 4  
JIM SPAGNUOLO  
115 E. MAIN**

**WINDOWS**

Ms. Elmiger spoke to her review of Case #4. The applicant is proposing to replace the lower left and lower right second story windows with windows that open. The other four remaining panes of glass will stay as is. Ms. Elmiger said she reviewed the application for completeness, and has no comments.

Mr. Spagnuolo said he was redoing the front of the building; the paint has faded over time, and the new windows will be double hung windows that open, one on each side. He said he discussed the paint with Ms. Elmiger, and will use the same color that it was; however, he had a conflict with the paint, and showed the original photographs. He said the painters arrived and they painted the building.

Discussion took place regarding the color of the paint used to paint the buildings; and the windows. Paint colors were submitted for the file.

Mr. Spagnuolo said the color in violation would be the trim; and he would repaint if so desired; he would change the trim color. Top section is SW6837, baroness; the trim is SW6838, vigorous violet, Sherwin Williams.

**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, noting that typically applicants come to the Historic District Commission ahead of time, get approval, then proceed with the work—and this is an exception due to circumstances in the field; referencing

Secretary of Interior Standards #6; and the Northville Historic District Design Standards 5-15 for windows and 5-18 for paint color.

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

**CASE # 6  
LAURA GENITTI  
112 E. MAIN STREET**

**TRANSOM GLASS  
WINDOW  
RESTORATION**

Ms. Ward was present on behalf of Laura Genitti.

Ms. Elmiger said she had no comments.

Ms. Ward spoke to the three applications that were approved for Genitti's that were requested in May. She said in order to help with funding the improvements, the Genitti's applied for and received grant funding through the Business Assistance Program, and the DDA considered the funding at their July meeting; including discussion regarding the loss of the leaded transom glass windows at 112 E. Main. The item was tabled; a subcommittee was appointed and met with the Genitti's on August 2, 2012 regarding the windows. Ms. Ward said concern was expressed by the Genitti's regarding heat loss and maintenance; they met with the owner of Tiffany Art Glass and got a proposal for an additional \$2,100 for restoration and insulation; and agreed to split that cost as part of the grant program, and agreed to retain that existing leaded glass and not remove or cover it—a was the initial proposal.

Ms. Ward said the DDA approved that concept for funding, and because this differs from the application approved by the Historic District Commission, they have returned to the Commission.

Discussion took place regarding the possible procedure.

Ms. Elmiger suggested a new motion be made that reflects the situation, from further information and action, the Applicant would prefer to repair the glass window, rather than remove it.

**Motion by Vernacchia, supported by Field**, to accept the proposed change as presented by Ms. Ward, regarding the leaded glass transom window, as opposed to removing it, which was previously approved on May 16, 2012.

Commissioner Argenta spoke to the situation, and said the owner had initially indicated the window had been retrofitted at some point. He said since the DDA feels the change is period appropriate, he said he thought it would be appropriate as well. He added that no one knew exactly when the original window was put in.

Discussion took place regarding the window, and other windows in nearby buildings.

Discussion ensued regarding this funding/grant situation.

**Commissioner Hoffman asked if DDA input was setting a precedent to override Historic District Commission decisions.**

Commissioner Vernacchia said if he thought the situation was unreasonable from the perspective of the Historic District Commission, he would not support it. He said he did not think it set any form of precedent.



Ms. Ward spoke to the situation, noting it was greatly discussed because of the process, and at the last City Council meeting, it was noted that if another BAP cycle can be funded, they can look at a program that weighted if restoration rather than just maintenance was pursued. She said they would be willing to fund at a higher level if a restoration can be considered, rather than simply maintenance.

It was noted that this emphasized that all the entities were working as partners toward the goal of historic preservation; it was not a redesign; there was an energy conservation issue; and the DDA should be thanked for being proactive.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen called the question

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

### **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Ward gave an overview of the restoration of the Walk-Through. She noted that the general contractor's response was received to a bulletin to reinstall salvaged brick wall. She said discussions are on-going with the general contractor regarding the division of responsibility and the breakdown of the fee. She said once the City Council approves the change order, it'll take about two and a half weeks to restore the front façade. They hope by end of September or October it will look like it should, with just finished work to be done.

### **ADJOURN**

Mayor Pro Tem Allen adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cindy Gray  
Recording Secretary