



City of Ann Arbor

301 E. Huron Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
<http://a2gov.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

Thursday, April 12, 2012

7:00 PM

City Hall, 301 E. Huron Street, 2nd Flr.

A CALL TO ORDER

Chair McCauley called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm.

B ROLL CALL

DiLeo called the roll.

Present: 6 - Robert White, Ellen Ramsburgh, Patrick McCauley, Benjamin L. Bushkuhl, John Beeson, and Jennifer Ross

Absent: 1 - Thomas Stulberg

C APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Agenda was approved unanimously with the amendment of adding Cobblestone Farm Annual Report under F-2; New Business.

D HEARINGS

D-1 12-0518

HDC12-021: 903 East Huron Street - Replace Cedar Shingle Roof with Fiberglass Asphalt Shingles - OFWHD

DiLeo gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND: This two story, brick Greek Revival house features a front gabled roof with cedar shingles, cornice returns, double-hung windows, a half front porch with fluted Doric columns, a Greek revival-style doorway with side lights and transom. It was built in 1858 by Harvey Bannister, a mason, as a boarding house for University of Michigan students. In 1868, the house is listed in city directories as owned by Mrs. Mary Barber. It remained a boarding house until the mid-1920s, when it was purchased by Catherine Meier and became a single family residence. Catherine Meier and her daughter, Joy Meier, occupied the house until the 1970s.

LOCATION: The building is located on the northeast corner of the intersection of East Huron Street and North Ingalls street.

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace a cedar shingle roof with a new fiberglass-asphalt roof. The applicant states that there is a problem with squirrels causing damage to the shingles by chewing on them. The applicant believes that there is no way to stop the squirrels and that they will continue to destroy the roof, which will allow infiltration of water leading to structural damage and the potential growth of mold in the attic. The applicant states that the cedar shingle roof has been repaired many times over the last two years, resulting in an unsightly appearance that has been commented on by neighbors.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

From the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

(2) The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The replacement of intact or repairable historic materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

(5) Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

(6) Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.

From the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (other SOI Guidelines may also apply):

Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs - and their functional and decorative features - that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building.

Replacing in kind an entire feature of the roof that is too deteriorated to repair - if the overall form and detailing are still evident - using the physical evidence as a model to reproduce the feature.

Not recommended: Radically changing, damaging, or destroying roofs which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Removing a major portion of the roof or roofing material that is repairable, then reconstructing it with new material in order to create a uniform, or "improved" appearance.

Stripping the roof of sound historic material, such as slate, clay tile, wood, and architectural metal.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The current roof is made of cedar shingles that have been repaired numerous times with in-kind materials. The repairs have resulted in a patchy, uneven appearance as the wood has weathered unevenly. The applicant stated that repairs were done to stop leaks. The applicant believes that the roof is at risk of leaking more because of squirrels destroying the shingles, and that continued leaks will allow for the growth of mold in the attic, which may present health risks to the occupants. The applicant stated that continued leaks are likely to result in structural damage as well.

2. The current roof is not original because cedar shingles could not last that long. Cedar shingles are estimated to have a maximum lifespan of approximately 50 years. It seems likely that the roof was originally cedar shingles, and when it needed to be replaced cedar shingles were used again. This has not been substantiated by physical or documentary evidence.

3. The applicant is requesting a change in materials to install a new fiberglass-asphalt shingled roof. The proposed fiberglass-asphalt shingles are intended to mimic the cedar shingles. The applicant told staff that it is impossible to

prevent the squirrels from chewing and damaging cedar shingles. The applicant received a quote of \$35,100 for a new cedar shingle roof, and \$20,550 for the proposed fiberglass-asphalt reroof.

4. Staff feels that the existing roof is deteriorated beyond repair. However, the proposed fiberglass-asphalt shingles are not an appropriate material for replacement, based on the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines. The house has great historic value and is located on a corner lot. The roof will be visible from Huron Street and North Ingalls Street. Replacement of the cedar shingles with fiberglass-asphalt shingles will alter the overall historic character of the house.

5. Staff recommends denial of the motion below. The roof does not meet The Secretary of the Interior's standards 2, 5, and 6, nor does it meet the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for roofs. It would be appropriate to replace the roof with matching materials in matching dimensions.

REVIEW COMMITTEE:

Beeson and Bushkuhl visited the site as part of their review.

Bushkuhl reported that the roof was badly deteriorated and beyond repair and needed to be addressed. He added that they found several roof shingles laying in the yard and they noted that they were very thin, making them look like siding shingles. Bushkuhl said that there were some areas of the roof trim that was also damaged and needed to be repaired. He agreed with the staff report, that the site location is very visible from the streets.

Beeson agreed with Bushkuhl, and said he thought the existing cedar shingles were paper thin siding shingles and not roof shingles.

McCauley asked if they were able to determine the age of the existing shingles.

The Review Committee said it was impossible to estimate the age and the deterioration could've been increased due to the thin quality.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

David Rhoades, Contractor, representing the owner and applicant was present to answer questions from the Commission. He said he has been assisting the owner with his properties for 25 years, adding that the shingles have been on the roof as long as he has been working for him. He stated that the shingles are thinner than what one usually sees on a roof and repairs have been done with other thinner shingles because it would've caused a lot of problems to try to get a thicker shingle to fit in. He said they have to do repairs after almost every rain storm. He said that tenants sometimes call to complain that water stains are showing on the ceilings.

Commissioner Ross asked if the applicant had looked into other, non-asphalt roofing materials that look more similar to cedar shingles and have a similar texture, such as a composite shingle or even a metal roof.

Rhoades said they had looked at metal but it didn't seem to fit what they were doing. He showed the Commission a sample of the proposed roofing material.

Bushkuhl commented that during their site visit the owner had explained that the proposed asphalt shingle was a style that was meant to mimic the look of a rustic cedar shake.

Commissioner White asked what the neighboring houses have as roofing.

Rhoades answered that they have asphalt shingles and some of them aren't dimensional, but the old three-tab shingle.

A motion was made by White, seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 903 East Huron Street, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to replace the cedar shingle roof with a fiberglass-asphalt roof as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 5, and 6, and the guidelines for roofs.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Ramsburgh asked the petitioner what the life span of the proposed roof would be.

Rhoades responded that the roof was marketed to have a life span of 50-60 years.

Bushkuhl expressed that he felt it would be useful for the Commission to review the various outlined points in the staff report.

McCauley pointed out Item 2, of the staff findings, that the current roof is not the original. He said that it was possible that all of the houses on the street had wood roofs originally, but that was uncertain. He said it could even be possible that the roof had at one time been an asphalt shingle.

McCauley added that he wasn't so sure that the roof on this building was a character defining feature, since it wasn't very prominent on this front gabled house. He said he would have problems with replacing a cedar roof if the building was a museum. He said he was impressed seeing the proposed shingle and felt it was an appropriate replacement for a wood shingle roof. He also noted the cost of a cedar shingle roof, adding that the proposed shingle roof was an appropriate alternative. He invited the Commission to a discussion on the issue of determining if the roof was a character defining roof.

Beeson agreed with McCauley, noting that it isn't a museum, but a rental house. He said he believes what makes it unique is that it still has the wood shingles on the roof while the majority of the houses in the neighborhood don't have them anymore, thereby, drawing one's attention to it. He added that he would have had concerns if there would've been valleys on the roof, but there aren't any. He said he wasn't worried about the look and was in favor of the proposed asphalt shingle roof.

White stated that he favors the project and that in the long term it would protect the house and the interior from water leakage that could deteriorate the structure. He felt the proposed shingle would be the closest they could get to looking like the cedar shingle.

Ross stated that she felt a dimensional asphalt shingle was a better choice than the old three-tab shingle, yet she would still ideally like to see the comparison between the asphalt shingle to a metal or composite, noting that in her experience from the right-of-way these materials approximate more a cedar shingle than an asphalt shingle.

McCauley commented that on the proposed shingle there are additional tabs to give that three-dimensional look that is very close to the cedar look. He said it becomes a discussion as to the need to replace with an in kind material or not and which materials comes the closest.

Ross said that according to the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings they are trying to point folks to replacements that would be similar in texture and material, when it is possible. She said it is important to get close to color and texture, if the material aspect isn't possible.

Ramsburgh said that while the house isn't a museum, it is a highly noticeable property on Huron Street, because it looks older than any other properties along the street, and part of that appearance is the prominent roof that reminds you that the building is as old as it is. She said she is reluctant to removing a possible original material roof and lightly dismissing the replacement to a likeness in kind. She said she believes the squirrels are trying to get into the house because it has deteriorated to this current level, and not because they are eating the cedar shingles for food. She supported Thacher's staff report in her findings.

Bushkuhl added that the house is probably one of the more exciting houses on the street, because of its history, and the fact that it was built by a mason in 1858 and included very interesting features like framed in windows and trim details and the chimney also had different contrasting brick details. He said since it is situated on a corner it is highly visible and whatever decision the Commission makes should be done carefully.

Bushkuhl said he believes the roof definitely needs to be repaired or replaced, and since they don't know definitively what the original material was, and there might have been various replacements since the original, the owner is trying to replace it with a very costly asphalt shingle that looks appropriate. He said he felt he was on the fence with the issue, since they didn't have any photos showing what the original roofing material was.

McCauley said he felt there was a certain pragmatic purpose to the proposed asphalt roof and it was evident that the owner was trying to replicate the existing roofing material in appearance with a costly alternative. He agreed that any alternative would never look exactly like a cedar shingle but he did want to give the owner the benefit of the doubt that they are trying to match the existing as closely as possible.

Bushkuhl commented that this house, even though it is a rental house, it is kept up better than most houses on the block.

Beeson added that the asphalt shingle would bring a deeper [thicker] profile to the roof than with the existing thin cedar shingles.

On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

PASSED 4-2

Yeas: 4 - White, Chair McCauley, Secretary Bushkuhl, and Beeson

Nays: 2 - Ramsburgh, and Ross

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Stulberg

OFWHD

DiLeo gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND: This two story colonial revival home has had many alterations over its lifetime. It appears in the 1894 Polk Directory as #10 Bowery Street, the Blades home. On the 1916 Sanborn map, the main block of the house appears as only the north 2/3 of its current width, with a wider rear two-story addition. On the 1925 Sanborn, however, the main block of the house shows as its current width, which is several feet wider than the rear addition. On both maps the house had a full width front porch. The date of construction of the attached rear garage is unknown, but it does appear on the 1916 Sanborn showing two concrete block walls (the west and north walls). The south wall, which is shown as frame construction and was likely the car door, was later infilled.

A rear sunroom addition with roof deck and trellis was previously approved by the HDC in July, 2011 (HDC 11-088).

LOCATION: The site is located on the south side of Lawrence Street, east of North Division and west of North State.

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to 1) modify the roof profile of the sunroom addition on the rear elevation from a flat-top walkout to a gable with a single ridge line, and 2) infill two basement windows with glass blocks.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

From the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

(2) The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

(9) New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

(10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property will be unimpaired.

From the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (other SOI Guidelines may also apply):

New Additions

Recommended: Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

Designing new additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.

Locating the attached exterior addition at the rear or on an in-conspicuous side of a historic building; and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

Considering the attached exterior addition both in terms of the new use and the appearance of other buildings in the historic district or neighborhood. Design for the new work may be contemporary or may reference design motifs from the historic building. In either case, it should always be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color.

Not Recommended: Attaching a new addition so that the character-defining features of the historic building are obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

Designing a new addition so that its size and scale in relation to the historic building are out of proportion, thus diminishing the historic character.

Windows

Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving windows--and their functional and decorative features--that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building.

Not Recommended: Removing or radically changing windows which are important in defining the historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

STAFF FINDINGS

- 1. The previously proposed deck on the upper floor of the sunroof featured low parapet sidewalls with a handrail above and a railing on the rear. The previous proposal also included a wood trellis structure above the deck and a pair of French doors. The new proposal replaces the upper floor deck with a gabled roof that is perpendicular to the main body of the house.*
- 2. The new roof design is compatible in scale and massing to the existing house and does not detract from it. The addition is on a non-character defining elevation of the house. The ridgeline of the addition is well below the ridgeline of the house and will not be visible from Lawrence Street. The proposed asphalt roof is the same material as the roof on the house and the gable will be clad in the same cedar clapboards as the addition.*
- 3. Three basement windows on the east elevation are proposed to be infilled with glass blocks. The driveway is located adjacent to these windows and is higher than the windows, resulting in water being funneled into the windows. The windows show signs of rot in the exterior and interior. This is a secondary elevation and infilling these windows will not diminish the character. The glass blocks will be slightly inset from the foundation to distinguish the openings from the foundation. Staff believes that this will keep the original openings evident.*
- 4. Staff recommends approval of the application. The roof profile modification is appropriate in scale and massing. The window infill will not destroy character-defining features of the house. The proposed work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 2, 9 and 10, and the guidelines for new additions and windows.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE:

Beeson and Bushkuhl visited the site as part of their review.

Beeson reported that the site is under construction and that there was a slight alteration to the eaves from what was shown on the plans, noting that the eaves will have an overhang instead of stopping flush with the walls. He said there was some discussion on site about window height and how that might be modified. He said they got to see some of the proposed windows for the project that are in the process of being refurbished, and it all looked fantastic.

Bushkuhl added that some of the windows had been sent out to be professionally restored and those that had come back had been installed and were in great shape. He commented that after 120 years of usage the basement windows which are approximately one-third below grade are not very visible from grade. He said he felt the newly proposed change is probably more conservative than the previously HDC approved parapit.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Dan Clauw, 514 Lawrence Street, owner was present to answer the Commisison's questions.

Mike Mahon, Adaptive Building, 179 Little Lake Drive, was present to respond to questions.

Clauw agreed that the house is looking very nice and it now has a full porch again.

Motion made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 514 Lawrence, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to allow the modification of the rear sunroom addition roof profile and extension to roof eaves and infill of two basement windows as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding resources and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2,5,9, and 10, and the Guidlines for New Additions.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Ramsburgh said she didn't have any issues with the proposed changes and felt the roof line changes would be more appropriate. She added that the basement windows were not character defining and wouldn't cause any problems. She applauded the owners for restoring the house back to its original appearance, noting that the Commission likes to see that happen.

White stated that he was in favor of the application.

McCauley noted that the glassblock windows is something that they are not usually in the habit of approving; however, in this case there was a clear case of a grade issue.

Bushkuhl said that during their site visit they saw that there had been water infiltration through the windows and the very narrow nine foot driveway, would preclude the addition of a window well.

Bushkuhl explained to the Commission that the owners are restoring the previous rental house in great lengths, which include reusing historic wood flooring and structural beams.

On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

PASSED 6-0

Yeas: 6 - White, Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Secretary Bushkuhl, Beeson, and Ross

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Stulberg

D-3 [12-0520](#)

HDC12-038; 922 Catherine Street - New Five-Unit Residential Building - OFWHD

DiLeo gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND: This site consists of two lots, 922 and 926 Catherine. Houses are shown on both lots on the 1931 Sanborn map, and they are listed in the 1960 Polk directory, but both lots were vacant by 1971.

LOCATION: The site is located on the south side of Catherine Street, east of North Ingalls Street and west of Glen Avenue.

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct on two empty adjoining lots 1) a new 3-story, five-unit multi-family residential building with basement garages, 2) a new driveway, and 3) additional retaining walls.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

From the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

(9) New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

(10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

From the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (other SOI Guidelines may also apply):

Setting

Not Recommended: Introducing new construction into historic districts that is visually incompatible or that destroys historic relationships within the district or neighborhood.

Site

Not Recommended: Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color, and texture; which destroys historic relationships on the site; or which damages or destroys important landscape features.

STAFF FINDINGS

1. *The site is currently vacant with no structures or parking areas. There are a few large trees along the western property line.*
2. *The proposed building is compatible in size, scale, design and massing to the adjacent properties. The proposed building is appropriate for the district and setting. The size of the building is similar to the condominium townhome building located immediately to the east of the site. To the west and uphill from the site are three 1 ½-story single family homes. To the north, across Catherine Street, are a 4-story parking garage and a 10+ story University of Michigan medical building.*
3. *The modern materials proposed (Hardie siding, vinyl-clad wood windows, wood trim, wood porches, asphalt shingles, and reinforced concrete) are complementary to the historic materials used on the adjacent single-family residences and other neighborhood buildings. The design and modern materials will differentiate the building from historic buildings in the area.*
4. *The proposed driveway for garage access is located along the eastern side of the property. It extends from the street to approximately 20 feet north of the southern property line, and from the proposed building to within several feet of the eastern property line. It is separated from the property to the east by an evergreen hedge row.*
5. *One proposed segmental retaining wall, consisting of masonry units, is located to the rear of the property and serves to separate the driveway from landscaping. Two low, dry-laid stone retaining walls are located between the sidewalk and north (front) elevation. Terraced planting beds are located between the retaining walls. A "green screen" fence will be built along the west property line to separate the property from the single-family residence. This consists of a metal mesh that will be covered with living plants. Several existing trees along the north and west property lines will remain.*
6. *It is staff's opinion that the proposed building, driveway, and retaining walls are generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding neighborhood and meet The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, particularly numbers 9 and 10, and the Guidelines for Setting and Site.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE:

Beeson and Bushkuhl visited the site as part of their review.

Bushkuhl reported that the lot is currently a vacant lot. He expressed that he felt the applicant is taking a very similar structure to the east and making it with more historical details and higher quality materials. He added that provided plans were helpful to get an idea of the finished details.

Beeson agreed that the placement and scale of the proposed building is appropriate and helps greatly with the transition from one residential unit to single-family. He said the front porch and glazing did a great job of addressing the front street in a pedestrian way, while the building on the east side doesn't do that at all. He said there is a significant grade on site which makes construction very difficult and he added his accolades that the petitioner is looking to infill the site in an attempt to increase the density of the neighborhood.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Lincoln Poley, 234 Nickels Arcade, Architect for the project was present to review the project with the Commission.

Tom Fitzsimmons, Applicant and Builders of the project was present to respond to questions. He pointed out that they attempted to address the streetscape issue with a long narrow site and multiple units to work with. He said they put the two units in the rear and two units up front with conscious efforts given to the roof lines. He said they had had several meetings with the neighbors and are currently working on common landscaping options.

Ramsburgh asked if they were able to save more of the trees.

Fitzsimmons answered that they had moved several of their paths in order to save the trees and hoped to be able to keep as many as possible.

Poley said they are working with a local landscape architect in order to preserve as much of the existing landscaping as possible.

Ramsburgh asked about the height of the existing condominium to the east of the proposed building.

Poley said he believes both the existing building to the east and the proposed building would be about the same height from the sidewalk.

Fitzsimmons said that the building to the east was built in 1994 under the same height restriction that they are currently under.

Chris Crockett, President of the Old Fourth Ward Association, spoke in support of the proposed building. She said the neighborhood is very pleased with the design and the community is very pleased with the project. She said she hoped that the Commission would approve the application.

A motion was made by Bushkuhl, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 922 and 926 Catherine Street, vacant properties in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to allow the construction of a 3 story residence, driveway, and retaining walls as detailed on the submitted drawings. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding resources and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 9 and 10, and the Guidelines for Setting and Site.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Ramsburgh said that she hoped that the tree line wouldn't be moved. She added that the project had many merits so she would be in support of the application but she had reservations on the massing of the building. She felt that the infilled property resulted in outmassing and overpowering the neighborhood's historical structures. She pointed out that the roofing scale was too extensive.

White stated that he supported the application.

McCauley thanked Ramsburgh for her insight and observance on the infilled properties. He shared some of her reservations on the size, but added since the neighbors were in support of the project and didn't object to the massing he supported the project.

On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion

carried.

PASSED 6:0

Yeas: 6 - White, Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Secretary Bushkuhl, Beeson, and Ross

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Vice Chair Stulberg

E UNFINISHED BUSINESS

F NEW BUSINESS

[12-0517](#) 2012 HDC Award Recipients List Approval

Chairperson of the HDC Awards Committee, Susan Wineberg, was present to respond to any questions from the Commission. She explained that the Awards Committee consists of members who live throughout the City and are able to provide their input on projects and homes throughout the City. She said that the Committee begins with a much larger list of possible candidates for the awards that is then pared down to the current proposed 2012 Awards List. She said the awards ceremony would be held on June 4, 2012 at 7:00 pm in the City Council Chambers, which is followed by a reception.

Motion made by White, seconded by Ramsburgh to approve the 2012 HDC Award Recipients List as presented by Susan Wineberg. On a voice vote the Chair declared the motion carried.

Passed 6-0

Cobblestone Farm Annual Report

Postponed until next month's agenda or until they are ready to present their report.

G AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION - PUBLIC COMMENTARY (3 Minutes per Speaker)

H APPROVAL OF MINUTES

H-1 [12-0515](#) Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes of March 8, 2012

Bushkuhl stated that he is always surprised to see how detailed and accurate the minutes are.

McCauley agreed.

A motion was made that the Minutes be Approved by the Commission and forwarded to City Council. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

I REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

None

J ASSIGNMENTS

Review Committee: Monday, May 7, at 5:00 pm for the May 10, 2012 Regular Session

White and McCauley volunteered for the May Review Committee.

K REPORTS FROM STAFF

[12-0516](#)

March 2012 Staff Activities

White stated well done!

McCauley said the staff is doing a great job.

DiLeo reported that Thank-You notes had been sent out to Hobbs and Black for the use of their facility for the HDC Annual Retreat and to the Michigan Historic Preservation Network.

McCauley thanked staff for their efforts.

Received and Filed

L CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS

None

M COMMUNICATIONS

None

N ADJOURNMENT

Community Television Network Channel 16 live televised public meetings are also available to watch live online from CTN's website, www.a2gov.org/ctn, on "The Meeting Place" page (<http://www.a2gov.org/livemeetings>).

Live Web streaming is one more way, in addition to these listed below, to stay in touch with Ann Arbor City Council and board and commission actions and deliberations.

- *Video on Demand: Replay public meetings at your convenience online at www.a2gov.org/government/city_administration/communicationsoffice/ctn/Pages/Vid*

eoOnDemand.aspx

- *Cable: Watch CTN Channel 16 public meeting programming via Comcast Cable channel 16.*

The complete record of this meeting is available in video format at www.a2gov.org/ctn, on "The Meeting Place" page (<http://www.a2gov.org/livemeetings>), or is available for a nominal fee by contacting CTN at (734) 794-6150.