



City of Boyne City
Founded 1856

319 N. Lake Street

Boyne City, Michigan 49712
www.boyneCity.com

Phone 231-582-6597
Fax 231-582-6506

BOYNE CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Thursday February 18, 2016, 5:00 p.m.
Boyne City Hall
319 North Lake Street

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Minutes of the November 13, 2015 meeting.
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**
4. **OLD BUSINESS**
None
5. **NEW BUSINESS**
 - A. Elect Officers
 - B. Review Board Application
 - C. 423 Pearl Street Permit Review
 - D. Consideration of a letter of opposition to proposed bill to amend 1970 Public Act 169
6. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**
7. **ADJOURNMENT**
8. **NEXT MEETING: May 19, 2016**



Scan QR code or go to
www.cityofboyneCity.com
click on Boards & Commissions for complete
agenda packets & minutes for each board

*INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES REQUIRING AUXILIARY AIDS OR SERVICES IN ORDER TO PARTICIPATE IN
MUNICIPAL MEETINGS MAY CONTACT THE BOYNE CITY HALL FOR ASSISTANCE:
CINDY GRICE, DEPUTY CLERK, 319 NORTH LAKE STREET, BOYNE CITY, MI 49712. (231) 582-0334.*

An Equal Opportunity Provider and Employer
Hometown Feel, Small Town Appeal

BOYNE CITY HISTORICAL
DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES of the November 13, 2015 meeting

Present: Wellman, Bandy, Martin, Sheets, and Glassford.

Absent: None

Staff: McPherson, Hewitt

1. Call to Order: 10:00 am

2. Approval of Minutes of February 17, 2015 meeting Martin motioned, Sheets second, all ayes.

3. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items:

None

4. Old Business:

None

5. New Business:

- A. Sheets will not be renewing her board appointment. Hewitt to ask if Jane MacKenzie might be interested. Wellman to ask Jerry Kragenbrink if he would be interested.
- B. 2016 Calendar dates, February 18, 2016, May 19, 2016 and October 20, 2016. Meeting time 5:00 pm. Motioned by Bandy, second by Martin. All ayes. Martin informed the board that she would not be at the February meeting.
- C. Motion by Martin to make a recommendation to the City Manager asking for permission to host Historic District training in the spring. Second by Glassford. All Ayes.
- D. 417 Boyne Avenue updates, project moving along very well. Exterior of building is looking very nice.

6. Announcements:

None


7. Adjournment 10:26 am, motion by Martin, Second by Sheets. All ayes.

8. Next Meeting: February 18, 2016

CITY OF BOYNE CITY

319 North Lake Street Boyne City, MI 49712 (231) 582-6397

RECEIVED
DEC 16 2015
BY:



BOARD MEMBER APPLICATION

The City understands you are interested in becoming a member on one of the City Advisory Boards/Commissions. We appreciate your interest and future dedication to Boyne City. In order for the City to have information on file as reference when the next board has an opening, we ask you please complete the following and return to City Hall.

Name: Gerry Kirgenhant

Address: 127 West Division St

Telephone: 231-675-4321 (daytime) _____ (evening)

Email: 44gerry@sbglobal.net

Occupation: Carpenter/Supervisor

Please check any Advisory Board or Commission you may be interested in.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Airport Advisory Board | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Development Corporation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Historical Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> Main Street / DDA Program |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Planning Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> Parks and Recreation Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Board of Review | <input type="checkbox"/> Housing Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Zoning Board of Appeals |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Finance Authority | <input type="checkbox"/> District Library Board |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Historic District Commission | |

Reason(s) you wish to serve:
Am a life long carpenter and
this interest me

Other community or civic service activities:

Signature Gerry Kirgenhant Date 12/15/15

February 9, 2016

Dear Scott,

Enclosed you will find the documents you asked me to drop off for the February 18, 2016 Historic District Committee. I look forward to meeting with all of you and sharing the tentative plans.

I will also try to bring some of the building material samples that are being considered.

Thanks again for meeting with me and having copies of the materials in this packet available for the meeting. If there are any charges for the copies, please let me know.

Sincerely,


Jo Bowman

Renovation/Building Project




Jo Bowman
423 Pearl Street
Boyne City, Michigan 49712
February 9, 2016

Objectives:

1. Repair and replace roof over existing cellar on the North side of house.
2. Construct a new sunroom over existing cellar/foundation on the North Side of house.
3. Tear off old porch on the South side of house.
4. Replace porch with a shed roof porch similar to the original porch. (South Side)
5. Build porch on the West side of the house similar to the original porch.
6. Replace lower level window on the south side of house.
7. Replace small upper level window on the south side of house.
8. Add architectural details to the house and garage peaks on the south side of house.


As the pictures show, the house at the above address lacks architectural details to give it appeal on any street, let alone in a historic district. The former owners, Olympic Champion ice skaters, Pierre and Andre Brunet remodeled the home in the 1930's stripping off details, porches, and an addition on the back of the house. Judging from the inside, I believe they were going for the 1930's cottage or farmhouse look.

It is not my intent (nor within my budget) to dramatically change the appearance of this house. I would love to restore a few of the original features and work with the current bones to give this unique home some sense of dignity.



Option #1

26x17




423 Pearl St. Boyne City, MI

2/16

W

Option
2A

22x17'




423 Pearl St. Boyne City, ME


2/16

Option
#2 B

22' x 17'




2/16



1/4" WEST ELEVATION

DO BONMAN RESIDENCE -



1/4" SOUTH ELEVATION

HOME PLANNING & DESIGN, LTD.

_____, 2016

RE: Proposed Bill to Amend 1970 Public Act 169 Local Historic Districts Act, House Bill 5232 & Senate Bill 720

Dear _____,

These comments are regarding House Bill 5232 and Senate Bill 720 and the proposed changes to 1970 Public Act 169 Local Historic Districts Act.

Significant resources in Michigan rely on protection from inappropriate alterations, incompatible new construction, and development pressures that often result in demolition. Such protection comes in the form of Michigan's current state law, PA 169 of 1970, enabling local governments to choose to safeguard their historic resources within local historic districts across the state. This local legislation declares historic preservation to be a public purpose and as so, it has value to the entire community. The system we have is not broken—there is no need for the amendments proposed in HB 5232 and SB 720 and they go too far. Their sponsors are calling these bills “modernization” bills, but they are not that. These proposed amendments completely change the way the local historic designation process and district administration works in response to several mistaken assumptions.

The bills' sponsors state that a local historic district's boundaries are established by the state and not the local community. This is not true. This process is in the hands of the local legislative body from start to finish. The local legislative body appoints the study committee and decides whether to establish a district or not, and sets final district boundaries in the local ordinance. Currently, the State Historic Preservation Review Board receives local study committee reports for comment, but those comments are NOT binding on the local communities—they are advisory. If a local historic district's boundaries change in the future, again, that process is started and finished at the local level. Local legislative bodies establish local historic districts through the local democratic process—public hearings, discussion, and local voting by the elected officials.

The proposed changes in HB 5232 and SB 720 undermine the ability of a community to pursue protection of important local landmarks by requiring that 2/3 of property owners within a proposed district boundary first consent to establishing a local historic district. Furthermore, requiring that exact boundaries for a potential local historic district be proposed before appointing a study committee is contradictory to the work the committee is charged with doing—completing research about the significance of historic resources and the area including the boundaries, which are often determined by contiguous architectural styles, plat maps, and other relevant information uncovered during the research process. Whether a house is historic or contributes to its district or not is *not* based on property ownership—it's based on the research outcomes. The bills' sponsors state that property owners' rights and consent are not currently included in the process of local historic district designation. Because it is a local, political process, their input is very much part of the complete process through meetings, workshops, and public hearings. The preservation of historic places is a public purpose, upheld by the Supreme Court, and the preservation of historic assets is a long-term goal—it takes a longer view than the property ownership that will probably change every seven years or so.

In order to establish a local historic district, as proposed by HB 5232 and SB 720, petitioning of property owners and then mandating that the general electorate vote in favor of the district would be required. Unjustly, the reverse process—dissolving a local historic district—would not require such petitioning or voting, allowing local legislative bodies to eliminate a district without nationally accepted guidelines or justification, and without community input. Additionally, these bills severely jeopardize local historic districts in Michigan through their requirement that local historic districts be voted on every 10 years. Not only is such a process exceptionally inefficient, it would be costly to a local government in its dedication of staff time and community education efforts. This modification to PA 169, should it be amended through these bills, would clearly threaten all local historic districts statewide.

The bills' sponsors also believe that there is not enough flexibility in the current Standards local historic district commissions use. These Standards—the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation—are the *gold*, national standard in historic preservation; they preserve historic materials and character-defining features while allowing for building adaptations, and they allow for replacement materials and they require that technical and economic feasibility be considered. They also establish Standards for reviewing new construction, including additions, in historic districts. The Standards do require that the homeowner repair before replace but if replacement is necessary, replacement materials may sometimes be appropriate. Each case is different and the local historic district commission is made up of local residents who apply the Standards, and local historic district design guidelines can be created now. It is important to note that the Standards are the same Standards the federal rehabilitation tax credit program uses, so when a developer is doing a rehab project in a local historic district where the federal tax credit is also being used, consistency in review is crucial. These Standards are used all over the country and have been for many years; they keep commissions' decisions consistent and defensible.

The current system is not broken and the changes these bills propose would not be fixes in any case. The amendments are so sweeping it appears that, if these bills pass in current form, federal funding for Michigan preservation projects through the Certified Local Government program—one of the VERY few grant programs for historic buildings—would be jeopardized. In Michigan, over 90% of applications for work in local historic districts are approved by commissions. There are less than 8 appeals per year in Michigan, on average, and this average is declining. The idea that voters need to vote again on an issue that their elected local legislative unit passed is inefficient, expensive, and unnecessary. And mandating a unit-wide election every 10 years to keep the districts the community has already passed is an expensive administrative wreck. It is unnecessary and cumbersome that the State should have to issue a sunset clause on local decisions.

House Bill 5232 and Senate Bill 720 should be resoundingly rejected. These bills would weaken protections for historic resources and threaten the viability of local historic districts in Michigan into the future. Our historic places and neighborhoods are too important.

Thank you,