

**NORTHVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**March 20, 2013**  
**Wednesday 7:00 P.M. – Northville City Hall - Council Chambers**

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair Johnson called the Historic District Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL:**

**Present:** Argenta, Field, Gudritz, Hoffman, and Johnson

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

**Also Present:** Sally Elmiger

**3. CITIZEN COMMENTS:** Limited to brief comments for items not on the agenda.  
None

**4. MINUTES: February 20, 2013**

**Motion by Argenta, supported by Field,** to approve the minutes of February 20, 2013, as published.

*Voice Vote: Motion Carried unanimously.*

**5. REPORTS**

**A. CITY ADMINISTRATION: None**

**B. CITY COUNCIL: None**

**C. PLANNING COMMISSIONER: None**

**D. OTHER COMMUNITY/GOVERNMENTAL LIAISONS: None**

**6. CASES**

**CASE #1**

**FRANK & JEANETTE MYERS/GREG PRESLEY**  
**542 W. MAIN STREET**

**PORCH &**  
**PORTE COCHERE**

Greg Presley discussed construction of a new porch at 542 West Main Street. Owners Frank and Jeannette Myers were present. Mr. Presley said the house was a 1911 Sears kit house and he spoke about the classical elements. He said the front of the house may or may not be original and the door was not symmetrical. He said the owners were asking for the same thing, and they plan to create a wrap-around porch for sitting.

Mr. Presley discussed the porte cochere (carport). He said the trim will be all wood, and it will be painted the same color white to match the house. He said the materials for new columns and stairs, including treads would be all wood; there would not be any proposed light fixtures; and there will be a new concrete driveway, as shown on the site plan. Mr. Presley provided materials and color samples, noting the roofing material was brown and would match the existing roof. (Certainteed Colonial)

Commissioner Hoffman said he thought the proposed plan changed the look of the front of the house, when compared to the existing front façade.

Mr. Presley said all the older homes had protective coverings; and over time, they have all have been replaced. He said this was probably replaced in the 1950s. He said they were not keeping the asphalt shingle eyebrow over the door as it was not in keeping with the character of the original house. He said sitting porches were enjoyed in the Historic District, and it does not change the essential character of the building. He added that it covers the 1999 aluminum sided bay window, which was not centered.

Commissioner Argenta said the new add ties into the sun room and looks nice. He said the big thing was the gamble roof.

Commissioner Field concurred and said the proposal provided more breadth to the look.

Commissioner Hoffman spoke about the use of carports, and said historically, they were used for dropping off goods, and only used for occasional parking.

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

**Motion by Hoffman, supported by Field**, to grant a Notice to Proceed, referencing the Northville Historic District Design Standards 3.18 for scale; 3.20 for hierarchy; 3.21 for materials; 3.24 for garages and carports; 5.9 for asphalt shingles; and 5.18 for paint and color, as presented by the Applicant.  
*Voice Vote: All. Nays: None. Motion Unanimously Carried.*

**CASE #2  
PAT & JANINE MCLAUGHLIN/GREG PRESLEY  
373 LINDEN**

**DEMOLITION**

Greg Presley was present with new owner Pat McLaughlin. Mr. Presley explained the proposal to demolish the existing house at 373 Linden. He said it was a legally non-confirming ranch dating back to the 1950s. He said the property became a sort of dumping grounds, and demolition was based on the grounds that retaining the resource was not in the interest of the majority of the community. He stated that there was no historic relevance as residential artifact, it was not a contributing structure, it does not echo the themes within the Historic District, there were no records to indicate that anyone important ever lived or died at this residence; and the building has served its purpose. He said he would not recommend using the uncertain foundation base, and it would require Board of Zoning Appeals approval. He said they would prefer to remove it and add a more fitting project to the parcel.

Mr. Presley explained the proposal, showed the scale for the two-story farmhouse-style building, with a detached structure and connecting breezeway for privacy. He said there is a great barn at the corner of the house that is accessed to the lower portion of this property. He said the proposed structure would be better in proportion; they were trying to echo the history; they were not asking for approval of the preliminary design, but showing a conceptual plan so the Historic District Commission was aware of their plans, and they were requesting approval of the demolition.

Commissioner Field expressed concern with possible historical significance.

Commissioner Gudritz said while the existing structure may be non-conforming, it still was representative of an era of home building in the 1950s. He mentioned two similar homes on Linden Court. He said it was relevant for the Commission to ask if they want all the homes fundamentally the same or if they welcome change. He asked does it have historic relevance; was it worthwhile to consider the precedent, or to go to Public Hearing.

Mr. Presley said he appreciated the concerns expressed, but said there were issues and market forces relative to a single-story house. He spoke about how difficult it would be to try to add onto the existing house.

Commissioner Argenta said the house was older than 50 years, but it was not a significant piece of architecture.

Commissioner Hoffman and Chair Johnson concurred that it was not a contributing structure to the Historic District Commission, and that they were not advocating that every 1950s house be eradicated.

Ms. Elmiger clarified the procedure. It was noted that no audience members chose to speak about the subject issue.

**Motion by Hoffman, supported by Field**, to waive the Historic District Commission Public Hearing, given discussion held, and the Commission agreed they do not see the existing building as a contributing structure.

***Voice Vote: All. Nays: Gudritz. Motion Carried 6-1, 4-1 with Gudritz opposed.***

**Motion by Field, supported by Argenta**, to allow the demolition of the structure at 373 Linden.

Regarding the selected grounds for demolition, and providing the required written discussion of how the demolition of the resource might benefit the community, Ms. Elmiger said Mr. Presley indicated that he gave his reasons for demolition and felt that spoke to the requirement.

Regarding the written narrative description of proposed process to accomplish the demolition, Mr. Presley said the demolition would take place in one day, using the proper machinery for the project. His timeline was within the next two months.

Chair Johnson clarified that this approval was only for the requested demolition, not an approval of the proposed home. He called the question.

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

**CASE #3  
DANIEL SCHNEIDER ARCHITECTS  
522 W. DUNLAP STREET**

**ADDITION &  
REMODEL**

Architect Dan Schneider was present without the homeowners; and was unsure of the former ownership. He explained that he was working on the master plan for the interior and exterior and has completed the design phase. He referred to the site plan and exterior work, and said the main focus was to clean up the backyard. He said there was an existing carriage house, and the driveway is unsightly. Because of the large carriage doors, the residents do not park there, but park in the backyard instead. He said they have talked about putting a two-car garage addition on

the rear, but the property was very thin, so they propose to remove the addition on the back of the carriage house.

Ms. Schneider distributed information from 1942 when the Allison family moved in through a lease purchase agreement. They submitted for a building permit, and he showed a hand-drawn sketch showing where the former shed was removed to build the addition. He said the current owner wants to maintain the 19<sup>th</sup> century character.

Commissioner Field said Mr. Schneider can show the plans, but would have to return to the Historic District Commission.

Mr. Schneider spoke about the porch addition on the back of the house; and the owners would like to have a more usable porch. He spoke about the design, and explained other proposed changes to the main house, such as replacing two windows. He said the demolition would be first.

Ms. Elmiger said as far as the demolition was concerned, this was not in the interest of the majority of the community. She said his outline spoke to why it was not in the interest of the community and that the structure dated to 1950.

Commissioner Argenta said the application was for an entire demolition; and the HDC has not had a chance to read it. He pointed out concerns in Ms. Elmiger's letter. He said there were several major issues to be resolved. He spoke about the addition, and pulling it back seven feet.

Mr. Schneider said the setback shown on Rogers Street was not correct.

Ms. Elmiger said it was an accessory structure; the setback was five feet; and from the front setback line, he could go out an average of about 25 feet.

Discussion took place regarding several issues related to the existing building, Rogers Street, the addition, the porch, and numerous non-conforming issues.

Chair Johnson said the Historic District Commission requires a completed plan, and while it appears that most of the issues were addressed in the plan, they have not had time to review it. He said conceptually, he did not see any issues, given the small size of the addition, and that it takes a little bit away from the carriage house. He said the porch design was the dominant part.

Discussion continued regarding the project, approving the demolition without the replacement plan, and reviewing materials at the next meeting.

Commissioner Argenta said he did not have problems with the plan conceptually. He said it would be nice for the porch addition to come down. He said the proposed 16 foot garage door looks like two doors, and there was enough room for a pillar and two doors. He said the Commission needed the calculations for the Rogers Street setbacks.

Discussion ensued regarding the carriage doors; the fence needed repair, and relocating the gate to the north drive if possible.

Chair Johnson suggested the Commission defer on the request for demolition, and address it at the next meeting.

Mr. Schneider said he would submit to the Board of Zoning Appeals and wait a month to revisit the Historic District Commission.

**Motion by Hoffman, supported by Gudritz**, to refer the matter back to the Applicant, with his permission, to address the following:

- Calculations for the Roger Street setback
- Returning with a design for two garage doors, with post in the middle
- Statement regarding refurbishment of the fence
- The final porch location
- Final construction plans
- Board of Zoning Appeals approval left to the Applicant
- Regarding the demolition, given the material provided, the Historic District Commission felt more time was needed to review it for completeness

Applicant Schneider agreed to the referral. Regarding the trellis, he said the design would match, and would be painted wood.

Discussion took place regarding the windows, marble and double-hung, the back door, and the potential for adding another window.

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

**CASE #4  
ROBERT SCHWARTZ  
317 RANDOLPH**

**DEMO & RE-BUILD  
OF PORCH**

Homeowner Robert Schwartz was present. He said he purchased the home from the Schoenherr, who may be the original owners, but he had no other historical information. He said he sought permission to demolish the enclosed front porch and reconstruct the covered porch and the porte cochere; or at least a conceptual conversation with the Commission. The initial package was incomplete, but since has been submitted as complete. He referred to the site plan and said it was a non-conforming lot, so he will go before the Board of Zoning Appeals. Floor plans were included; and he said he wanted to repaint the house.

As far as setbacks, Ms. Elmiger said it was considered a structure, because it is attached to the building.

Mr. Schwartz acknowledged that size and dimensions were not included in the packet, but it was the same size as the existing carport. The porch would be the same size also, with exception of carrying the fascia line where the existing enclosed porch is now.

Discussion took place regarding the dimensions on the site plan, and that the proposal would line up with the house next door.

Mr. Schwartz said the house is 16 feet off the side lot; and the existing and proposed carport is 12.5 feet. He said he assumed he would have to visit the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Ms. Elmiger said she did not see the proposed view previously, and pointed out that it looks like the carport goes back quite a distance along the house. She spoke about lot coverage in the

Zoning Ordinance, and that a regular sized lot was 30%; but 35% for a smaller lot. She said she would have to check the calculations. She said the issue of height may be adequate.

Discussion ensued regarding the aluminum railing; it was agreed that a wooden railing would be preferred.

Commissioner Argenta said he had no problem with conceptual approval, but that many issues needed to be addressed by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Commissioner Gudritz said the proposal enhanced the house. He suggested the Applicant approach the Board of Zoning Appeals first, then the Historic District Commission could review the final plan.

Chair Johnson asked to refer the matter back to the Applicant, rather than deny the proposal as incomplete. Mr. Schwartz concurred.

Commissioner Hoffman mentioned standard 3.24, and the style of the house, the flat roof front porch, and the carport along the side.

Mr. Schwartz said it was more of an aesthetic decision, but he was open to other direction relative to design.

Commissioner Argenta said the existing porch was flat, and visually, he saw no problem with it.

Discussion took place regarding maintenance of a flat roof.

Commissioner Field said the posts on the drawing looked round, and the detail called for square posts.

Mr. Schwartz said the intent was for round posts and he would change the drawing.

Chair Johnson said a motion would be needed to defer the application back to the Applicant—with his permission—and address the following issues regarding a new site plan and floor plan:

- Board of Zoning Appeals requirements for the front yard and side yard
- Coordinate the floor plans with the rendering and indicate the carport
- Pergola on back that should be indicated on the plan (does not apply to lot coverage as it does not have a solid roof)
- Porch railing in wood
- Light fixture detail
- Dimension drawings for exterior views

Commissioner Hoffman mentioned documentation for the 5% demolition for the porch.

Ms. Elmiger said there is a process for that, and she did not think a demolition permit was necessary, but the Applicant did provide the documentation; so 95% would remain intact. She said if the permit was kept, some more information was needed and could be reviewed with the Applicant.

It was noted that the Applicant provided an actual color palette and listed the colors on the proposal.

Motion by Hoffman, supported by Field, to defer the application back to the Applicant—with his permission—and address the following issues regarding a new site plan and floor plan:

1. Calculations for the front yard and side yard setback
2. Indicate carport on the floor plan
3. Pergola details
4. Porch railing details, from aluminum to wood
5. Light fixture details
6. New site plan showing new construction
7. And additional details related to demolition request

Discussion took place and it was agreed it was up to the Applicant which order he would pursue relative to approaching the Historic District Commission and Board of Zoning Appeals for considerations.

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

**Regarding 350 N. Rogers Street, this item was not on the agenda.**

Todd Hallett thanked the Historic District Commission for allowing the opportunity for a conceptual discussion regarding proposed demolition on the property at 350 N. Rogers Street. He said there was no historical reference, the archivist indicated the house was built in 1970; and the house was not in keeping with the rhythm or cadence of the Historic District. He referred to the rear deck as unsafe, not laterally braced, not up to code, and that it was less than 50 years old. He referred to the rear of the 'snout house,' and said they want to sink it back in.

Discussion took place regarding the informal submission.

Chair Johnson said the Applicant was on the right track conceptually. He said he did not see a lot of historical significance, and suggested that perhaps Heidi could reference on stationary that she did not find any historical reference.

Discussion took place regarding setbacks and the Applicant needed to clarify and verify them. It was pointed out to the Applicant that habitable space was not permitted on the third floor under the Zoning Ordinance.

Discussion ensued regarding the garage slab that was sloping and failing.

Mr. Hallett thanked the Historic District Commission for their time.

**DISCUSSION**

The Historic District Commission discussed potential changes at Poole's Tavern on Main Street.

Commissioner Field emphasized the need for including outdoor maintenance in any agreement between the City and Poole's Tavern.

**ADJOURN**

Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 8:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Cindy Gray, Recording Secretary