



**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR
Thursday, August 9, 2007**

Commissioners Present: Susan Wineberg, Sarah Shotwell, Michael Bruner, Jim Henrichs
Kristina Glusac and Robert White **(6)**

Commissioners Absent: Vacancy **(1)**

Staff Present: Jill Thacher, HDC Coordinator/Planner II, Kevin McDonald, Asst. City Attorney
and Brenda Acquaviva, Administrative Support Specialist V, Planning and Development
Services **(3)**

CALL TO ORDER:

Commissioner White called the meeting to order at 7:42 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Quorum satisfied.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

Moved by Commissioner Wineberg, Seconded by Commissioner Shotwell **“to approve the
agenda as presented.”**

On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE - *PASSED – UNANIMOUS.*

A - HEARINGS

A-1 402 Koch Street - OWSHD

BACKGROUND: This cottage first appears in Polk Directories in 1923 as 402 John K
Avenue, the residence of Daniel and Edith Posey who both worked nearby at the Westgate
Manufacturing Company, makers of lamps and shades. It was constructed as a single-story
(see photo), and a second story was added in 2002 (for which HDC approval was granted in
December, 2001).

LOCATION: The property is located on the north side of Koch Street, between Third Street
and First Street.

APPLICATION: The applicant requests HDC approval to install two 6' 7" sections of black
iron fence along the front walk to the house. The fence was purchased as salvage from a
cemetery out-of-town.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The fence would be purely decorative in nature. The style is obviously not in keeping
with the home on the lot, and would probably not confuse the historic record.

- 51
52 2. This is a non-contributing structure in the Old West Side Historic District, though this
53 application affects the yard and fence placement rather than the structure.
54

55 **Owner/Address:** Ken Staples, 5 Ridgemor Drive, Ann Arbor, MI 48103
56

57 **Applicant:** Same as Above
58

59 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Wineberg and White
60

61 Commissioner Wineberg – We visited the site and I think we both feel that this fence, while
62 not compatible with the style of the house, is not destroying historic material and is not
63 ‘incompatible’ – so, it’s not a problem.
64

65 Commissioner White – Concurs with Commissioner Wineberg
66

67 **Applicant Presentation:** No applicant was present to speak on behalf of the appeal.
68

69 **Questions by the Commission:** None.
70

71 **Audience Participation:** None.
72

73 **Discussion by the Commission:**
74

75 Commissioner Bruner – I feel that this fence is not appropriate and does create a false sense
76 of historic development, and I quote “Each project will be recognized as a physical record of
77 its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historic development, such as
78 adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties will not be undertaken.”
79 It is stated in the application that this fence was purchased from a cemetery somewhere else
80 and brought here.
81

82 Commissioner Wineberg – I would also suggest deleting standard two so that we would only
83 reference standard nine in the motion, as we’re not touching the historic property at all. It’s
84 an exterior alteration. (Friendly amendment – seconded by Commissioner Henrichs.) Will
85 that solve the problem?
86

87 Commissioner Bruner – No. I won’t be voting in favor of this.
88

89 **MOTION**
90

91 Moved by Commissioner Wineberg, Seconded by Commissioner Henrichs “ **that the**
92 **Commission approve the application at 402 Koch Street to install two 6’ 7”**
93 **sections of black iron fence along the front walk to the house. The work is**
94 **generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and**
95 **relationship to the rest of the building and to the surrounding area and meets**
96 ***The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation standards 2 and 9.***”
97

98 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE -PASSED – 5 Yes – 1 No**
99

100 *Commissioners Wineberg, White, Henrichs, Glusac and Shotwell – Yes (5)*

101 *Commissioner Bruner – No (1)*
102

103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154

A-2 1530 Hill Street - WHHD

BACKGROUND: The J.D. Baldwin House was built in 1848 on 154 acres outside of the city. The Greek Revival house has a nearly-flat roof and the stucco was originally salmon-colored. The slope-roofed porches were added in 1885. See the attached excerpt from Marjorie Reade and Susan Wineberg's *Historic Buildings, Ann Arbor, Michigan* for more information.

LOCATION: The property is located on the southwest corner of Hill Street and Washtenaw Avenue, directly across Hill Street from "the Rock".

APPLICATION: The applicant requests HDC approval to install four post-mounted lamps to illuminate garden areas around the perimeter of the home. The lamps are black cast aluminum that are similar in size to the elaborate cast iron wall-mounted lamps found next to the homes' doors. The lamps would be mounted on fluted aluminum posts and bases.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The lamp posts would be located approximately 15 feet from the four corners of the house (see the attached mortgage survey). The Review Committee will confirm that the posts are sited appropriately in relation to the buildings and landscaping.
2. The applicant explained that the four lamps are desired to enhance not only the garden areas but also security on the site. Students spilling onto this property from "the rock" across the street and nearby fraternity houses are a problem. Littering, drinking, and urinating on this property are common occurrences.

The lamps and posts are made of cast aluminum and probably will not confuse the historic record.

Owner/Address: Dr. Tim Wang, 1530 Hill Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Applicant: Drake Ambrosino, Arbor Building Company, 3855 Leroy, Ann Arbor MI 48103

Review Committee: Commissioners Wineberg and White

Commissioner Wineberg – Commissioner White and I visited the site and I would like to mention that there is also a lot of other work going on at this time – re-stuccoing the home and other improvements, but they were administratively approved by staff. They showed us how they 'scored' the stucco to look like stone by using string, and I encourage you to go and look at it. We have no objections to the placement of the lampposts. We understand the issues of living in a heavily populated student neighborhood, and the lamps will enhance the property. The property is beautifully landscaped, and the owner is spending a lot of money to improve the looks of this house and bring it up to date. We approve.

Commissioner White – Concurs with Commissioner Wineberg.

Applicant Presentation: Drake Ambrosino was present to speak on behalf of the appeal, but had nothing to add to the presentation.

Public Commentary: None.

155 **Discussion by the Commission:**

156

157 **MOTION:**

158

159 Moved by Commissioner Henrichs, Seconded by Commissioner Wineberg, “that the
160 Commission approve the application at 1530 Hill Street to add four post-
161 mounted lamps near the four corners of the house. The work is generally
162 compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to
163 the rest of the building and to the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of*
164 *the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* standards 2 and 9.”

165

166 On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – **UNANIMOUS**

167

168

169 **A-3 220 Third Street - OWSHD**

170

171 **BACKGROUND:** This simple two-story Queen Ann first appears in the 1912 Polk Directory
172 as the home of William L. and Edith Dawson. William was employed by Dawson Brothers
173 Druggists at 102 East Huron Street. The Dawson’s lived there until 1922.

174

175 **LOCATION:** The property is located on the northwest corner of Third and Krause Streets.

176

177 **APPLICATION:** The applicant requests HDC approval to install a fence on the two street-
178 facing sides of his corner lot. The fence would be cedar and pine, with 2” by 2” spindles, 4” by
179 4” middle posts, and 6” by 6” corner and end posts. Along Third Street, the fence would be
180 30” high. Along Krause Street, the fence would be 30” for the first 25’ from the corner, then
181 48” high for the remaining 38’.

182

183 **STAFF FINDINGS:**

184

- 185 1. The applicants have applied to build this fence in order to stop people from cutting
186 through the yard on their way to and from the YMCA (1/2 block to the north).
- 187 2. The style of the fence is visually compatible with the character of the Old West Side
188 and would protect the site from inappropriate and unwanted foot traffic.
- 189 3. The fence appears to meet city code, including height and opacity requirements.

190

191 **Owner/Address:** Rebecca & Peter Esselman, 220 Third Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48103

192

193 **Applicant:** Same as above.

194

195 **Review Committee:** Commissioner’s Wineberg and White

196

197 Commissioner Wineberg – We visited the site and spoke with one of the owners. This is a
198 nice fence and will allow the owner to continue to develop her perennial garden without
199 people tromping all over it, and I urge you to support it.

200

201 Commissioner White – Concurs with Commissioner Wineberg

202

203 **Applicant Presentation:** Applicant had nothing to add.

204

205

206

Questions by the Commission:

Commissioner Bruner – How did you arrive at the design for the fence? (We took walks in the neighborhood to find fences that were appealing and also fit into the zoning regulations.)

Public Commentary: None.

Discussion by the Commission:

Commissioner Bruner – I am not opposed to a fence in this location – they make a good case for it. The period for this fence is probably earlier than the period for the house. I think a simple picket would be appropriate for this house.

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner Shotwell, Seconded by Commissioner Wineberg, “**that the Commission approve the application at 220 Third Street to add a fence along the street-facing sides of the lot. The work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and to the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* standards 2 and 9.**”

On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS

A-4 448 Fifth Street - OWSHD

BACKGROUND: This two-story brick Colonial Revival front-gabled house first appears in the 1905 City Directory. The occupant is listed as carpenter Albert Nordsman. The following year bottler George Voelker and his wife Catherine were the residents, and in 1910 widow Marie Dupper and her two daughters were sharing the house with the Voelkers. The house appears to have remained a two-family through the 1940s. The Voelkers lived in the house through 1915, and Mrs. Dupper until 1931. A one-story addition on the front of the house was approved by the HDC in April of 1994. A rear addition on the south side appears to have been added in the mid 1980s.

LOCATION: The property is located on the west side of Fifth Street, south of Liberty and north of Jefferson (across Fifth Street from Bach Elementary School).

APPLICATION: The applicant requests HDC approval to 1) add a six-foot wide dormer on the rear section of the building on the north elevation, and 2) relocate a non-original window on the rear elevation approximately three feet to the north (left).

Owner/Address: Barb & Dave Hall, 448 Fifth Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48103

Applicant: Marc Reuter, 515 Fifth Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48103

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The front of the dormer is proposed to be clad in brick veneer that matches the house. It is not in keeping with the character of the house and district to use brick on the dormer, unless a wall

258 dormer were being proposed (instead of a gable dormer). Staff recommends that wood or
259 fiber-cement board (such as Hardiplank) be used on the front and sides of the dormer.
260

261 2. The round-top window proposed for the dormer imitates one found on the same elevation near
262 the front of the house. It probably does not confuse the historic record.
263

264 3. Per the applicant, the bathroom window proposed to be moved on the rear elevation was
265 probably installed in the late 1920s. As long as the opening is carefully filled in using matching
266 bricks and mortar, moving the window will not diminish the character of the rear elevation. The
267 added distance from the larger original window may actually enhance the character of the
268 original window by being less of a visual detraction from it.
269

270 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Wineberg and White
271

272 Commissioner Wineberg – We met at the site with one of the owners, and we saw the pile of
273 bricks that they wish to use. This is not traditional material used for a dormer, so I was torn
274 about whether I could support use of the brick, but since it's not appropriate for this house,
275 you can tell that it is not part of the original (as required). I would recommend approving it.
276

277 Commissioner White – Concurs with Commissioner Wineberg.
278

279 **Applicant Presentation:** Barbara Hall was present to speak on behalf of the appeal, and
280 stated that she appreciated the history given regarding their home.
281

282 Marc Reuter, architect, was also present. He stated that the terms used to describe the
283 dormer in the staff report called it not a well dormer but a gable dormer. A well dormer is
284 described as one that is flush with the wall; a roof dormer is recessed from the wall. The roof
285 dormer is not appropriate to have masonry materials on it, since the structure is not capable
286 of supporting masonry. (He expounded on the aesthetic features of the proposal.)
287

288 **Questions by the Commission:** None.
289

290 **Public Commentary:** None.
291

292 **Discussion by the Commission:**
293

294 Commissioner Bruner – The points the architect makes are very good ones, and he cites
295 precedents going back to Renaissance architecture. Unfortunately, they make not be
296 applicable to an Application for Appropriateness in this neighborhood. It is, in fact, as staff
297 has found, to clad a dormer like this perched on the roof, regardless of its alignment on the
298 wall below, historically, the further back you get on this house with other additions from the
299 past, I feel this is inappropriate. The dormer inside is necessary, but I cannot support a roof
300 perched dormer clad with brick (vener), which also looks out of character.
301

302 **MOTION #1**

303

304 Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Henrichs, **“that the**
305 **Commission approve the application at 448 Fifth Street to add a six-foot wide dormer**
306 **on the rear of the north elevation and move a non-original window on the rear**
307 **elevation on the condition that the dormer front and sides are clad in wood or fiber-**
308 **cement board. The work as conditioned is generally compatible in exterior design,**
309 **arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and to the**

310 **surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for***
311 ***Rehabilitation standards 2 and 9.***”

312
313 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE - *FAILED* – 1 Yes – 5 No**

314
315 *Commissioners Bruner – Yes (1)*

316 *Commissioners Wineberg, White, Henrichs, Glusac and Shotwell – No (5)*

317
318 **MOTION #2**

319
320 Moved by Commissioner Shotwell, Seconded by Commissioner Wineberg, “**that the**
321 **Commission approve the application at 448 Fifth Street to add a six-foot wide dormer**
322 **on the rear of the north elevation and move a non-original window on the rear**
323 **elevation per submitted drawings. The work as conditioned is generally compatible in**
324 **exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the**
325 **building and to the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s***
326 ***Standards for Rehabilitation standards 2 and 9.***”

327
328 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE - *PASSED* – 5 Yes – 1 No**

329
330 *Commissioners Wineberg, White, Henrichs, Glusac and Shotwell – Yes (5)*

331 *Commissioners Bruner – No (1)*

332
333
334 **A-5 100 SOUTH MAIN STREET – MSHD**

335
336 (**Note:** Commissioner Bruner recuses himself, as he was previously employed by the
337 Applicant and working on this specific project.)

338
339 **BACKGROUND:** This seven-story commercial building, constructed in 1906 in the Beaux
340 Arts style of red brick with fluted limestone columns, rosettes and garlands over the windows,
341 is known as the Glazier Building. The building has housed a number of banking and trust
342 companies since its construction, and is currently Key Bank. An elaborate cornice was
343 removed in the 1960s, and on August 11, 2005 the Historic District Commission approved an
344 application from the same owner and applicant to replace the cornice based on historic
345 documentation. This work has not yet been completed. On March 8, 2007 the HDC approved
346 the replacement of a non-original door and steps, the addition of a third-floor balustrade on
347 the south side annex, removal of two non-original windows on Huron Street, and the addition
348 of a corner-mounted clock and exterior building lighting.

349
350 **LOCATION:** The site is located on the southwest corner of South Main Street and West
351 Huron Street.

352
353 **APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to 1) add a canopy that is clad in bronze
354 metal over the Huron Street entryway on the north elevation of the building, 2) install a cast
355 bronze tenant sign that is 17” by 11.33” on the north elevation between the Huron Street door
356 and the fluted column to the east, and 3) install a cast bronze tenant sign that is 15” by 10” on
357 the east (Huron Street) elevation.

358
359 **Owner:** Dahlmann Properties, 300 S. Thayer St, Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Applicant/Address: John Beeson Quinn Evans Architects, 219 ½ N Main Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The canopy appears to have been designed so as not to harm the existing architectural features and materials, including the fluted column and the existing metal cornice that would remain intact behind the proposed canopy. There would be four downlights in the ceiling of the canopy. There are two existing downlights over the door.
2. On the site plan, three “future planters” are noted. This application does not address those planters. They fall under the purview of the DDA, and will need to be submitted by the DDA for future HDC review.
3. The material and style of the proposed canopy are appropriate to the building and the district.
4. The two proposed wall-mounted signs are an appropriate design and size for the building. The signs must be mounted in the masonry joints, not through the masonry units.

Review Committee: Commissioners Wineberg and White

Commissioner Wineberg – We visited the site, and we don’t have a problem with the proposed canopy, even if it is the same style as the others – it is very appropriate. We were concerned with how they were going to mount the proposed signs. In the proposal, these are not going to be mounted in the joints, and we discussed ways they could accommodate that (either making the signs bigger or smaller), but that is an issue. Otherwise, we recommend approval.

Commissioner White – Concurs with Commissioner Wineberg.

Petitioner Presentation: Michael Quinn of Quinn Evans Architects was present to speak on behalf of the application. In general, we concur with the staff report and the review committee. This canopy is being added to the exterior rehabilitation project that we’ve brought to you previously. Like many Huron Street buildings, it doesn’t have an appropriate entrance to it. The proposed canopy and signage will enhance that identification. This address has now been separated (from Keybank) with a new address so that it’s now 115 West Huron Street.

Questions by the Commission:

Commissioner Wineberg – When we met at the site, the sign said “Glazier Bldg.,” and now it says “Dahlmann Bldg.?” I’m a bit concerned that that is not appropriate. You could say “Dahlmann Company,” so that people are not confused that the building has two names. It is really the Glazier Bldg. (Petitioner – We reviewed this with the owner before tonight and informed him that this would be the final approval and did he have comments. He said he would like to call the building under his name, under its current ownership.

We talked about it, that this building is identified as the Glazier Bldg. on a historic plaque – that is it’s historic plaque. I would suggest that the canopy, which is removable and will not destroy historic materials – that putting his name on the canopy would not be inappropriate. As we look at historic properties anywhere, we should consider that history does not stand still and that there are episodes of ownership.

414 I feel that this building has a historic reference as the Glazier Bldg., but in thirty years, Mr.
415 Dahlmann is the owner of this building on a long term basis and that he's brought pride back
416 to this building with rehabilitation efforts, should we say that we can't show changes in
417 ownership with names that change over time. We understand your concern.
418

419 Commissioner Wineberg – So, he's not willing to put Dahlmann Co. and eliminate "Bldg?" It's
420 standard practice in historic preservation to call the building by the builder (Glazier). It's had
421 ten owners in the past, and has always been referred to as the Glazier Building and it's
422 carved in stone over the front entrance. (Petitioner – I will take that information back to Mr.
423 Dahlmann.)
424

425 **Public Commentary:** None.
426

427 **Discussion by the Commission:**
428

429 Commissioner Henrichs – Stated that he feels this project is appropriate and in keeping with
430 the rest of the work that is being done to this property. (Commissioner Wineberg agreed with
431 that statement.)
432

433 **MOTION** 434

435 Moved by Commissioner Glusac, Seconded by Commissioner, **"that the Commission**
436 **issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 100 South Main Street to**
437 **install a canopy that is clad in bronze metal over the Huron Street entryway on the**
438 **north elevation of the building with appropriate signage for the address 115 West**
439 **Huron Street, with the name of the owner (Dahlmann) but not the word "Building" in**
440 **the sign, and to install two cast bronze signs per the supplied drawings on the**
441 **condition that the signs are mounted in masonry joints and not in masonry units. The**
442 **work as conditioned is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture,**
443 **material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and**
444 **meets *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* standards 5, 9, and**
445 **10."**
446

447 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE - PASSED – 4 Yes – 1 No – 1 Recusal**
448

449 *Commissioners Wineberg, White, Henrichs, Glusac and Shotwell – Yes (4)*

450 **Commissioner Shotwell – No – (1)**

451 *Commissioners Bruner – Recused (1)*
452
453

454 **A-6 1131 West Washington Street – OWSHD** 455

456 **BACKGROUND:** This two-story clipped-gable craftsman-influenced house first appears in
457 the 1923 Polk Directory as the home of Oswald R. and Alice M. Mayer. Oswald was the
458 president of Mayer-Schairer Co. on Main Street. Oswald lived in the house until 1966 (when
459 he presumably passed away) and Alice continued to live in the house until at least 1979.
460

461 The 1926 Sanborn Map shows a full-width front porch. The porch was enclosed prior to 1979.
462

463 **LOCATION:** The property is located on the south side of West Washington Street, west of
464 Buena Vista and east of Crest.
465

466 **APPLICATION:** The applicant requests HDC approval to add a one-story addition on the
467 southeast corner of the house by enclosing an existing 6.7' by 6.5' entry deck. An existing
468 rear door on the east elevation and two windows on the south elevation would be removed.
469 An aluminum-clad wood Jeld-Wen sliding doorwall and two light fixtures would be added on
470 the new south elevation. The addition would be sided in vinyl to match the existing house.
471

472 **Owner:** Leslie Pincus, 1131 W Washington Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48103
473

474 **Address/Applicant:** Charles Shiver, 407 N Main Street, Chelsea, MI
475

476 **STAFF FINDINGS:**
477

- 478 1. Comparing the current footprint to the 1926 Sanborn map, the two-story rear section
479 with a second-floor sleeping porch is probably original to the house. The first floor of
480 the rear section has been expanded a few feet to the east, and a casement window
481 added; it probably originally aligned with the second floor sleeping porch (see "Existing
482 South Elevation drawing).
483
- 484 2. One window on the south elevation would be removed for this project, as well as the
485 non-original casement window. A new doorwall and two light fixtures would be added
486 to the new south elevation. The doorwall would open onto an existing deck off the rear
487 of the house that would be retained.
488
- 489 3. The proposed addition is 44 square feet. Its size and scale are limited, it is located on
490 the rear of the house, and damage to character-defining features is minimal.
491

492 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Wineberg and White
493

494 Commissioner Wineberg – This house has all its original windows and screens and storms.
495 This home is a gem, which is my problem, as this addition requires removal of an original
496 window (9/1) and the casement window and door. We asked if some of these could be used
497 in the new addition.
498

499 Commissioner White – Concurs with Commissioner Wineberg.
500

501 **Petitioner Presentation:** Leslie Pincus, owner of the property was present to speak on
502 behalf of the appeal. She stated that she is trying her best to stay within the style of the
503 home and matching materials. She stated that there was an earlier remodel to the house and
504 this would correct that.
505

506 Charles Schiver of Chelsea Woodworking Co. was also present. He stated that he designed
507 this addition. He said that although they're losing the 9/1 window, the purpose of the addition
508 is to expand the space of the house. In order for her to feel comfortable in this new addition,
509 they don't need the window in any location. He clarified with the Commission the revisions
510 from what were originally submitted.
511

512 **Questions of the Applicant:**
513

514 Commissioner Henrichs – I'm looking at the drawing 1-b, "proposed addition floor-plan," and
515 can you explain what we're looking at here? Is this connecting to the room on the lower left
516 side on the left of the kitchen or is that a wall there? (Petitioner – That is a demolition plan.
517 The hatched lines indicate walls that will be removed from the first story of the house.)

518 (Conversation between the Commission and the Petitioner regarding windows both new and
519 old or no windows at all for the addition. Commissioner Henrichs stated that window
520 treatments and other options can still provide the privacy that the petitioner seeks while still
521 utilizing the historic window.)
522

523 Commissioner Bruner – The alignment of the four windows are at odds with the composition
524 of the building above. I'd ask if you'd consider moving the 9/1 window to the location of the
525 doorwall element furthest of the left, and then limiting the size of the doorwall to two elements
526 which center on the bay to the right? This may be more appropriate for the period. (Owner –
527 Yes, I understand, but as someone who lives there and wants to be more connected to my
528 garden, which is the high point of my house and you'd be getting very close to the bathroom
529 window.)
530

531 **Public Commentary:** None.
532

533 **Discussion by the Commission:**
534

535 Commissioner Wineberg – Having the 9/1 window on the east elevation would match all the
536 other windows, and on the back of the home, it doesn't match due to the sleeping porch.
537

538 Commissioner Henrichs – We have discovered two possible ways to solve this problem. It
539 seems there is an opportunity to do so, so I can't see why they wouldn't want to look at that.
540

541 Commissioner Bruner – I think this view – the east elevation and the organization of the
542 upper floor relate to the windows at the lower floor, even though they're different in character.
543

544 Commissioner Wineberg – Suggested the motion to be amended to include the contingency
545 of reusing the window in question.
546

547 Commissioner Glusac – I would personally like to see the overall elevation and revised plan
548 drawn out to see how it aligns with the second floor windows.
549

550 **MOTION #1**

551

552 Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Wineberg, **“that the**
553 **Commission approve the application at 1131 West Washington Street to add a**
554 **one story addition on the southeast corner of the house. The work is generally**
555 **compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to**
556 **the rest of the building and to the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of***
557 ***the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* standards 2 and 9.”**
558

559 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION FAILED - UNANIMOUS**
560

561 **MOTION #2**

562

563 Moved by Commissioner Wineberg, Seconded by Commissioner Shotwell, **“that the**
564 **Application for Certificate of Appropriateness for 1131 West Washington Street**
565 **be postponed until new drawings can be submitted for the next regular session**
566 **of the HDC.”**
567

568 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO POSTPONE – PASSED - UNANIMOUS**
569

570 **B - OLD BUSINESS –**

571

572

B-1 512 East Huron Street – OFWHD

573

574

This item was postponed from the July 2007 Historic District Commission meeting after the application could not be approved or denied due to tied votes.

575

576

577

The applicant has submitted new materials. These are presented to the HDC as an alternative to the existing application. The existing application is referred to by staff as the **Original Application** and the new materials as the **Alternate Application**.

578

579

580

581

ALTERNATE APPLICATION: The applicant presents HDC with an alternative stairway design. It adds a false gable with decorative brickwork to the end wall of the stair. The gable mimics one found on the 1970s church entry about twenty feet to the west. The door style has been changed to a “storefront door & frame” which appears to be metal with a full-length window pane. There is also an additional glass panel above the door where the stair’s ceiling has been squared off. Much of the technical drawing detail appears to be the same for the elements of the stair that are not proposed to change under this alternate application.

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

Review Committee: Commissioner’s Wineberg and White

590

591

Commissioner Wineberg – We did not visit the site, as this is the fourth time we’ve discussed this. Both of us had been approving of the original application, so I think we could approve either one.

592

593

594

595

Commissioner White – Concurs with Commissioner Wineberg.

596

597

Applicant Presentation: Tish Campbell, Co-Chair of the Co-Op Nursery at this address was present to speak on behalf of the appeal. She stated that she wanted to give a bring overview of their school and the difficulty they have had in finding a place for their school (they’ve recently relocated to the church building at this address.) The school was founded in 1938, and we have one teacher, but everything else is done by the forty families involved.

598

599

600

601

602

603

Due to licensing regulation changes this year, we need to provide two means of egress, 100 feet from our classroom door. We currently have one means of egress, but the other is not enclosed and is too far for us. Consequently, we have to provide another means of egress. The First Baptist church has provided everything for us except for this egress.

604

605

606

607

608

Questions by the Commission: None.

609

610

Public Commentary:

611

612

1. **Ina Hand-Gerdenich - 618 Spring Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48103** – (Spoke in Favor of the Application) - She stated that she has a master’s degree in historic preservation and that she’s worked for the Washtenaw Historic District Commission. She wants to address some of the concerns the Commission had with this proposal. She explained the different additions that have been done on the building in the past.

613

614

615

616

617

618

2. **Lynn Archer – 2324 Yorkshire Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48104** – (Spoke in Favor of the Application) – She stated that she is the teacher for this organization and has been there for 12 years. They are the oldest co-op in the State of Michigan and they do draw a major portion of their membership from the surrounding neighborhoods.

619

620

621

622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673

The Baptist Church location allows us to continue to provide the convenience of that service to the families so they can still, bike/walk to school and parents that are in the downtown area (working) can drop in and visit with their children and their education.

3. **Chris Taylor – 1505 Brooklyn Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48104** – (Spoke in Favor of the Application) – He stated that he wished to echo the statements made by the previous speakers and that he is an attorney working downtown and his family has been with the co-op for years. The co-op is also good for downtown, and it is nice to be able to visit with your children if there is a reason to – or just for no reason at all!
4. **Helen Chamberlain – 1218 Wines Drive, Ann Arbor, MI 48103** – (Spoke in Favor of the Application) – She stated that her six older siblings and herself attended co-op nursery school in Flint, MI. This will begin her sixth year with this co-op and her family. Co-op nursery schools play a vital role for parents as well as children.
5. **Tomoko Ogawa La’Al and Daughter – 1450 Jones Drive, Ann Arbor, MI 48105** – (Spoke in Support of the Application) - They stated that the children are able to participate in field trips and other programs that they are able to walk to in the downtown area. Someday, one of the students may become a Historical Commissioner!
6. **Paul Simpson Duke – 1201 Birk Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48103** – (Spoke in Support of the Application) – He stated that he and his wife at pastors at the First Baptist Church (and speak on their behalf as pastors only), and they and the congregation are committed to doing ministry downtown, and with diverse groups of people. Our focus has largely been with Ann Arbor’s poor and homeless and University connected students. We recently decided to do some outreach type of work in downtown; this became possible with the addition of the nursery school, and this endeavor is entirely consistent with the mission of our congregation and its existence in that place.
7. **Carrie Hatcher-308 Arbana Drive, Ann Arbor, MI 48103** – (Spoke in Support of the Application). She passed out a copy of a letter of all past presidents and teachers from the school that endorsed this project. She stated that she is fundraising chair for the school and believes that becoming involved makes a difference in the community as does the Ann Arbor Nursery.

Discussion by the Commission:

Commissioner Bruner – With a need to defend our position, we’re not opposed to your mission, we’re not against children or low-cost child care; we’re in fact very much in support of that. What you need to understand is the evolution by which this case has come before us – with the idea that it was a necessary egress stair. With that in mind, the vestigial stairway with the polycarbonate plastic were all appropriate for an emergency stair, which, forbid – should only be used in case of an emergency.

After talking with the applicant after a few hearings on his application, it came to light that this stair would indeed be used on a daily basis, several times a day – it may even be your front door. That was never quite established by the petitioner, and it could get a great deal of use. In THAT case, the polycarbonate will get a lot of stress and flex in this lightweight structure that was supposedly only to be used in an emergency. With this in mind, making this a more

674 substantial structure – the plan moved to a ½ inch tempered glass, which has probably
675 quadrupled the cost of what once was a very inexpensive structure. The idea that this
676 structure needed to be more substantial could have been addressed in a different way and
677 still been cost effective, but I want you to keep in mind that our decision has been based on
678 the idea that this will be functioning now on a daily basis and it needed substantial structure.
679

680 My concern at the last meeting was, not only was this structure lightweight, but it'll probably
681 need diagonal bracing of some type. Since it has an open 'glass' tube, what will that look
682 like? At this point I'm willing to say, ok. I was fine with the original application, and this
683 change in the gabled end is not responding to my concern or anyone else's concern whether
684 it looks more historic or different. In fact, many of us were happy that it was "new and of its
685 time," and represented an evolution of progression from the 1860's building down through
686 what we're building now. With that in mind, is that, will you forgive us for bringing you to this
687 point with the concern that this project, through discovery by this Commission as to how it will
688 be used and our concerns for what it will look like brought us to this point today .
689

690 Sahba LA'al – It wasn't the cost of the material – the glass was actually less costly. We're
691 making the structure frame compatible vertically. The structural steel is more durable than
692 wood, and the joints are fixed (like nail joints) once they are welded. There is a number of
693 ways they can be braced.
694

695 Commissioner Glusac – Stated that she preferred the original design dated 6/20. The roof is
696 more appropriate on that design and the front façade on the design dated 7/22 is not
697 appropriate as an ending point to that roof or the façade of that building.
698

699 Commissioner Henrichs – Stated that they have never been opposed to this project or the
700 concept behind what the applicant was trying to accomplish. Our concern was always the
701 way it was being done/designed – technically. I don't think the Commission has ever been at
702 odds about granting the project, per se', it's our concern because several of us are
703 professional architects with many years of experience, historic preservationists, etc. and we
704 do have a lot of technical concerns with this – and I still also do. I have concerns with how
705 this is being designed. I think there should still be a lot more thought and follow-up thought
706 given to this.
707

708 Commissioner Bruner – Following up on the architects' statement, any changes that were
709 made pursuant to this plan should be submitted, and I encourage him to look into gusset
710 plates and/or any other intersection strengthening devices that would provide the stability for
711 the structure.
712

713 Commissioner Wineberg – I understand that the architects are concerned with these things,
714 but I also recognize that we have, in the past, tried to avoid 'designing' things for applicants in
715 the past, and we pretty much stick to what the standards for rehabilitation allow us to use to
716 approve a project, and that is whether the historic character of a property is preserved,
717 whether historic materials are being damaged, and whether a new addition is compatible with
718 a historic building. Beyond that – welding plates and gussets – that's beyond our purview –
719 that should be left to the building department.
720

721 Commissioner Bruner – I think Commissioner Wineberg makes a good point, but our concern
722 due to the fact that it was so lightweight and 'gossamer,' and all of its elements open to view,
723 that is in fact a part of whether it will be 'appropriate.'
724

725 Commissioner Shotwell – I understand the concerns of the architects, however, if there were
726 structural changes that needed to be made that would affect the appearance, it would then
727 have to come back to us for approval. (J. Thacher – Yes).

728

729 **MOTION #1**

730

731 Moved by Commissioner Shotwell, Seconded by Commissioner Henrichs, “**to**
732 **approve the alternate Application at 512 East Huron Street to build an exterior**
733 **stairway on the south elevation of the building. The work is generally**
734 **compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture and material to the rest of**
735 **the building and to the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the***
736 ***Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* standards 2, 9 and 10.”**

737

738 Previous Motion (#1) withdrawn by Commissioner Shotwell and Commissioner Henrichs

739

740 **MOTION #2**

741

742 Moved by Commissioner Shotwell, Seconded by Commissioner Wineberg, “**to**
743 **approve the original Application at 512 East Huron Street to build an exterior**
744 **stairway on the south elevation of the building. The work is generally**
745 **compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture and material to the rest of**
746 **the building and to the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the***
747 ***Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* standards 2, 9 and 10.”**

748

749 ****The petitioner requested that he would like the framing that applies to the alternative***
750 ***drawings to be used rather than the original drawings – but that the exterior design of***
751 ***the end cap and the roof would be the original.*** (J. Thacher stated that she would be
752 *checking with Commissioner Bruner on the accuracy of the structural drawings submitted*
753 *once the building permit is applied for.)*

754

755 The actual Motion will read as follows:

756

757 ***Moved by Commissioner Shotwell, Seconded by Commissioner Wineberg, “to Approve the***
758 ***application at 512 East Huron Street in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, and issue***
759 ***a certificate of appropriateness to add an exterior stairway to the south elevation of the***
760 ***red brick education wing, which would extend from the ground to the second floor, per***
761 ***the submitted drawings.***

762

763 ***The proposed work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture,***
764 ***material and relationship to the rest of the building and to the surrounding area and***
765 ***meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* standards 2, 9, and***
766 ***10.”***

767

768 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED - UNANIMOUS**

769

770 **C - NEW BUSINESS –**

771

772 **C-1 Glen Ann Place**

773

774 Report by J. Thacher on what transpired at the Special Session of the HDC prior to the
775 Regular Meeting tonight. The Commission voted on choosing between two building designs
776 for the Glen Ann project as a part of the settlement agreement between the City and the
projects developers.

777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825

A public hearing was held at that Special Session and a vote was publicly taken and the Commission approved the nine story option of the two buildings. (This was presented as a recap of the earlier session that same evening.)

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION/PUBLIC COMMENT

1. **Chris Crockett – Ann Arbor, MI** - (Spoke in Opposition of the Glen Ann Project) - I've lived in the Old Fourth Ward Historic for 27 years now. For at least five years, I've spoken with the developers of this site, where it went from a half-block, five story structure that seemed to be, for all intents and purposes with the neighborhood – to this 'monstrosity.' At the same time, our City government has somehow maneuvered this way through various commissions and parts of our government so as to 'subvert' the Historic District and Department of Interior Standards and Laws. They've taken your vote away from you, and shame on each and every one of you who voted for this. This is an outrage and a complete slam to Historic Preservation - that some of the citizens in this community have worked so hard at and put our money where our mouths are – and yet, the City of Ann Arbor has sold out to the deep pockets of Chicago. This is a dark day for Historic Preservation.

Commissioner Wineberg – Since I wasn't at the meeting where these two proposals were given – that we were going to decide on one of these two options – I'm wondering why the settlement agreement didn't just pick one option then – why we were given this two option opportunity. Is that privileged information. (Commissioner White – We'll have to check with the City Attorney.)

Commissioner Bruner – I believe it was negotiated in with the other party as to how to settle this – that they would go 'as far as' offering an option.

J. Thacher – The HDC had no influence over the two options that were presented.

Commissioner Shotwell – I believe that some of the concern that was voiced in the previous session was that if we didn't vote on one of these two options, that the choice would be moved outside of the HDC, and could spiral even further out of control and/or be sold to the University – which would also be unfortunate. None of those were seen as 'good options.' It was more like a lesser of two evils because the control was taken away.

D - APPROVAL OF MINUTES –

- D-1 **Draft Minutes of the July 12, 2007 Regular Session – Not available at the time of the August Regular Session.**

Moved by Commissioner Wineberg, Seconded by Commissioner Shotwell, **“that the Minutes of the July 12, 2007 Regular Session be postponed until the September 13, 2007 Regular Session.”**

On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO POSTPONE - PASSED - UNANIMOUS

E - REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS – None.

HDC – August 9, 2007

826 **F - ASSIGNMENTS –**

- 827
- 828 402 Koch Street – Commissioner Bruner
- 829 1530 Hill Street – Commissioner Wineberg
- 830 220 Third Street – Commissioner Henrichs
- 831 448 Fifth Street – Commissioner Shotwell
- 832 100 S. Main Street – Commissioner Wineberg
- 833 1131 W. Washington – **POSTPONED**
- 834 512 East Huron – Commissioner Wineberg
- 835 Glen Ann – Commissioner White

836
837 **G – REVIEW COMMITTEE –**

838
839 For the September 13, 2007 Regular Session – Commissioner’s Bruner and Glusac will meet
840 J. Thacher on Monday, September 10, 2007, at 5:00 p.m.

841
842 **H – CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS –**

843
844 Commissioner Bruner – Stated that he thought it important that the Review Committee
845 reports show a thorough stated opinion from each Commissioner as opposed to concurring
846 each time.

847
848 **I - STAFF ACTIVITIES REPORT**

849
850 **I-1 Staff Activities Report for June** – There were twenty applications: ten were
851 approved by staff, nine by the HDC. Ninety five percent of those were
852 approved. We’ve added the HDC Monitor lists to this to help us keep track.

853
854 **I-2 Staff Activities Report for July** – There were thirteen applications; nine were
855 approved by staff, four by the HDC and One Hundred percent were approved.

856
857 J. Thacher – Violations are beginning to pile up. I now have the process and procedures
858 down and the letters have been written and some sent out. There will probably be violations
859 coming to this body for the next several meetings. I’ll try not to schedule everyone at once,
860 but there are at least two violations that I know I will bring before you as the work was done
861 without HDC approval. There are a few others that have not been investigated yet.

862
863 Commissioner Bruner – Asked if these are from concerns raised by Commissioners.
864 (J. Thacher – Stated that some have been from Commissioners and some from residents that
865 have emailed and /or come in.)

866
867 Commissioner Henrichs – What is our procedure for handling those situations? (J. Thacher –
868 In a nutshell, when a complaint comes in, staff will investigate. This may involve me going
869 out, or inspectors going out if there seems to be a building permit violation – in fact, one just
870 yesterday had a ‘stop work’ order put on the work that was being performed. Once we
871 determine that there is a violation, or that we suspect strongly that there is a violation in which
872 all of you will be copied – the letter notifies them that they will have to come before the HDC
873 to either have the work approved after the fact or there is the chance that it will not be
874 approved, and you will have to return it to the original state – which is why these become
875 complicated.)

876

877 Commissioner Glusac – Will that be a part of the regular hearings? (J. Thacher – Yes, as the
878 applicant/possible violator will have to come in and make an application and pay the \$50.00
879 and have a normal staff report and public hearing. You will then decide if the work can be
880 approved or if the work is in violation and if it should be returned to it's former state and if a
881 fine can be issued. The building official has the power to fine and issue tickets.)

882

883 **J - CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS –**

884

885 Commissioner Wineberg – Can you tell me why the windows at Cobblestone Farm had to be
886 replaced? Were they deteriorated? (J. Thacher – They had. They had basically 'failed.')

887 This is why I tell people 'repair your old windows.' I was on the Commission when that barn
888 was built, and that was the late 80's, and they're already failing.

889

890 Commissioner Wineberg – 1010 Glen – Is there a 1010 Glen Avenue? (J. Thacher – That
891 doesn't sound correct. I'll check on that.)

892

893 Commissioner Wineberg – When we were discussion 100 South Main Street, J. Thacher
894 pointed out that there were bollards being proposed that we weren't discussion but would
895 need our approval? (J. Thacher – Yes, that's true.) So, would street lights have to be
896 approved by us? (J. Thacher – I don't know). When the DDA was putting them in, we
897 weren't asked about that. (J. Thacher – We have been in contact with the DDA and they are
898 now aware that those need to go through the HDC.)

899

900 Commissioner Bruner – Stated that when he was working on the Glazier Building through
901 Quinn Evans, that I communicated with the DDA to ask about street improvements along
902 Huron. The plan was being developed at that time by an outside firm. Through the DDA, our
903 office was provided with those drawings so we knew what to expect along the building front.
904 What we saw on the drawings was the incorporations of street improvements proposed by
905 the DDA – the planters or bollards and other street lighting proposed or mentioned.

906

907 **K - COMMUNICATIONS – None.**

908

909 Commissioner Bruner – At the request of Commissioner Wineberg who asked staff to
910 produce a list of monitoring assignments for past projects, I went through and made that list
911 going back to December 2003. I can provide that to anyone who wants it.

912

913 Commissioner Bruner – I appreciate that work, but I'd like the entire list in case I'd like to see
914 who is monitoring a particular project.

915

916 The Commission and Staff thanked Commissioner Bruner for his efforts.

917

918 Moved by Commission Wineberg, Seconded by Commissioner Bruner, **“to adjourn the
919 meeting.”** *The Meeting was adjourned at 11:40 p.m.*

920

921 ***SUBMITTED BY: Brenda Acquaviva, Administrative Service Specialist V, Planning and
922 Development Services.***