



**City of Ann Arbor**  
**Formal Minutes**  
**Historic District Commission**

100 N. Fifth Avenue  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104  
<http://a2gov.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

---

Wednesday, November 10, 2010

7:00 PM

City Hall - Council Chambers

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

**Approved**

**Present:** 4 - Kristina A. Glusac, Robert White, Patrick McCauley, and Thomas Stulberg

**Absent:** 2 - Ellen Ramsburgh, and Lesa Rozmarek

**ROLL CALL**

**On a roll call, the record reflected the following members present.**

**Present:** 5 - Kristina A. Glusac, Diane Giannola, Robert White, Patrick McCauley, and Thomas Stulberg

**Absent:** 2 - Ellen Ramsburgh, and Lesa Rozmarek

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

*Approved*

**A motion was made by McCauley, seconded by White, that the agenda be Approved. On a voice vote, the Vice Chair declared the motion carried.**

**A HEARINGS**

**A-1**     **10-1154**     HDC10-142; 207 W Jefferson St - Shed, Patio, Driveway, Basement Window - OWS

**BACKGROUND:**

*This simple 1 ¾ story house was probably built between 1904 and 1910, when Floyd A. and Klara A. Sweet occupied the house. Floyd was a driver for U.S. Express Co. The couple lived there until 1919, when John and Katherine Behr are listed in the Polk Directory as the occupants. John was a laborer and later a clerk, enameller, elevator operator, and engineer. Katherine is listed as the occupant through*

1955.

*In 2007, an egress window on the east elevation of the house was installed without obtaining a Certificate of Appropriateness or a building permit. An after-the-fact HDC application (07-94) was denied in September of 2007 because the window was an inappropriate size and style. The determination was appealed to the State Historic Preservation Review Board, which upheld the decision in May 2008. The installation of the same window elsewhere on the house is part of this new application.*

*At the January, 2009 HDC meeting, a new application (HDC08-068) was approved to replace the installed basement window with a more appropriate taller-than-wide egress window, and to replace another basement window on the east elevation with a matching egress window. That work has not yet been done.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the south side of West Jefferson Street between South Ashley Street and South First Street.*

*APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to move the basement egress window currently located near the front of the east elevation to a new opening on the rear elevation; install an eight foot wide concrete driveway; install a 14 foot by 16 foot decorative concrete patio in the backyard; and install an eight foot by ten foot wood storage shed in the backyard.*

**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.*

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

*(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.*

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

### *Windows*

*Recommended: Designing and installing additional windows on rear or other non-character-defining elevations if required by the new use. New window openings may also be cut into exposed party walls. Such design should be compatible with the overall design of the building, but not duplicate the fenestration pattern and detailing of a character-defining elevation.*

*Not Recommended: Changing the number, location, size or glazing pattern of windows, through cutting new openings, blocking-in windows, and installing replacement sash which does not fit the historic window opening.*

*Introducing a new design that is incompatible with the historic character of the building.*

### *Building Site*

*Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving buildings and their features as well as features of the site that are important in defining its overall historic character.*

*Not Recommended: Removing or radically changing buildings and their features or site features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the property so that, as a result, the character is diminished.*

### *STAFF FINDINGS:*

- 1. At their September, 2007 meeting, the HDC determined that the size of the existing egress window is out of proportion with the other windows and features of the house, and that the work negatively impacts the east character-defining elevation of the house. Staff feels that relocating this window to the rear elevation would be similarly inappropriate. Despite the rear elevation having a lesser visual impact on the structure as a whole, the window is still disproportionate to other windows on the house. In addition, the existing window cuts into the baseboard, which is incompatible with the building, and no indication has been given that the same would not be true if the window were relocated to the rear elevation. The window also does not match the two taller-than-wide egress windows approved for the east elevation, and the necessity of a third basement egress window has not been demonstrated.*
- 2. The eight foot wide concrete driveway fills the east side yard from the property line to the house, per the application drawing. In the January 2009 staff report it is noted that the two egress windows approved along the driveway appear to extend 3" to 5" below grade. If the driveway*

*paving is approved, staff will continue to work with the applicant and the Building Official to insure that any well or clear area required for the egress windows meets building, zoning and HDC standards. If any additional curbs, bollards, or similar are required by the Building Official to delineate the window well or driveway, a new application will need to be submitted to the HDC.*

*3. The storage shed would need to move three feet away from the west property line to meet zoning setback requirements. The size, materials, and design of the shed are simple and appropriate, as is its placement in the rear corner of the lot. The materials and size of the patio are appropriate.*

*4. A timeline for completion of the new work and previously approved work was submitted by the applicant per staff's request. Since the existing east elevation egress window was installed without permits, it needs to be replaced with an appropriate window before any other work approved by the HDC is undertaken. The applicant has stated via email that his contractor will pull permits for the replacement egress window prior to November 10, 2010, and that work will then commence. This timetable is satisfactory to staff. The suggested motion includes a condition that the window work be completed prior to any new work approved as part of this application.*

#### *REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:*

*Stulberg and McCauley were on the review committee and shared their findings with the Commission.*

*Stulberg noted there are some space challenges in that the driveway is only 8 ft from the property line, but that would be handled through the Building Dept. and any grading issues would be reviewed by the Building/Soil Erosion Dept as well. Stulberg stated that he was in favor of the project.*

#### *DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:*

*Thacher gave the staff report. She noted that the applicant had submitted changes to the application yesterday. The proposed rear egress window was changed to match the ones previously approved for the east side of the house, and the shed was made slightly smaller. Documentation of these changes were handed out to the Commission.*

*Thacher felt that the rear egress window was not appropriate as originally proposed, but the changes to the window submitted yesterday are appropriate. Timeline for replacement of the window that was*

*replaced without a permit needs to be taken care of before this additional work could proceed.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Tim Bell, 4922 Gullane Dr., owner and applicant of proposed project, was present to answer the Commission's enquiries.*

**A motion was made by Vice Chair McCauley, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the portion of the application at 207 West Jefferson, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to install a shed, patio rear egress window, and concrete driveway, on the condition that permits are not issued for the new work before the basement egress window on the east elevation is replaced per application HDC08-068. As conditioned, this proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house 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 9. On a voice vote, the Vice Chair declared the motion carried.**

**Yeas:** 5 - Glusac, Giannola, White, Vice Chair McCauley, and Stulberg

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - Chair Ramsburgh, and Rozmarek

**A-2**    [10-1155](#)    HDC10-141; 321 E Liberty St - ADA Accessible Ramp - ELHD

**BACKGROUND:**

*This building, the Enoch James House, was built around 1847-49 in the Federal style. This two story brick house features a small, classically detailed front porch; a paneled front door with sidelights and rectangular transom; 6/6 double hung windows with prominent lintels; and a second story sunroom porch on the west side. The house appears on the 1888 Sanborn map (then referred to as 29 E. Liberty), with a main footprint similar to present. Currently, the building is a residential duplex.*

*In January of 2009, an after-the-fact certificate of appropriateness was issued for the replacement of front porch columns that had been installed without permits or approvals.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the north side of East Liberty Street, west of Division and east of Fifth.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to: 1) construct two barrier free access ramps on the west side of the building – the existing porch decking will be removed, the frame will be extended approximately 36” to the west and the entire frame will be finished with treated wood tongue & groove decking; and 2) replace one existing 32” wide door on the west side with a 36” wide door. This change will not require any adjustment to the current masonry opening.*

**APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:**

*From the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation:*

*(1) A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.*

*(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):*

**Entrances/Porches**

*Recommended: Designing and installing additional entrances or porches when required for the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the buildings, i.e., limiting such alteration to non-character-defining elevations.*

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 1. The current side porch deck is approximately 10” above grade.*
- 2. Submitted details for the handrail indicate the use of a 1” thick top and bottom rail, 1x trim pieces, square spindles and an applied, graspable handrail.*
- 3. The replacement door will match the fenestration and materials of the existing non-original door.*
- 4. The ramp and the porch decking will be tongue and groove, and*

*should match the existing porch decking. The ramp and porch extension will remain uncovered.*

*5. Proposed work includes the installation of code-appropriate concrete footings under the existing porch columns in addition to the new ramp.*

*6. The proposed ramp is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation standards, particularly numbers 9 and 10.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:**

*Stulberg and McCauley were on the review committee and shared their findings with the Commission.*

*Commissioner Stulberg and McCauley were in favor of the proposed project.*

**DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:**

*Thacher gave the staff report.*

*Commissioner McCauley enquired if the new railing would be stained or painted.*

*Riggs responded that the ramp would eventually be stained to match the existing conditions.*

*Commissioner Glusac questioned the applicant regarding the front porch columns if they would be round or square.*

*Riggs answered that he would replace the existing with new square columns.*

*Glusac asked for clarification regarding the alignment of the ramp.*

*Riggs clarified the alignment question.*

*Glusac asked if there was a cut-sheet available on the proposed door that was proposed to be replaced.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Derek Riggs, 79 S. Harris, Ypsilanti, contractor for the project, was present to answer the Commission's questions.*

**A motion was made by Stulberg, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 321 East Liberty, a contributing property in the East**

Liberty Historic District, to permit the replacement of a non original exterior door within the existing brick opening, and installation of a matching twelve-light door, and the construction of new barrier free ramps as shown on the submitted drawings, on the condition that the new decking match the existing in dimension and material. As conditioned, the proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 1, 9 and 10. On a voice vote, the Vice Chair declared the motion carried.

**Yeas:** 5 - Glusac, Giannola, White, Vice Chair McCauley, and Stulberg

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - Chair Ramsburgh, and Rozmarek

**A-3**    [10-1156](#)    HDC10-143; 1121 W Liberty St - Replace Aluminum Siding - OWSHD

**BACKGROUND:**

*This story and a half home features a prominent front dormer and full-width front porch with stone half walls. The building is listed in the 1926 City Directory as the residence of Otille K. and George Heibein, an attendant at Hunter's Gas Station. The house was occupied in 1939 by Louis Kambas, who is listed as the occupant through 1970. The house and garage appear on the 1931 Sanborn map, with footprints similar to present. In 1991, the Historic District Commission granted approval for a small bathroom addition at the southwest corner.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the south side of West Liberty Street, west of Eberwhite and east of Crest.*

**APPLICATION:** *The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace existing 8" wide aluminum siding with 4-1/2" wide vinyl siding. Window casing trim, currently composed of painted wood, will be wrapped with aluminum to match the existing profile. Eave treatment/detail is not indicated, and therefore is assumed to be remaining as is. The existing front porch beadboard ceiling, tapered columns and beam will be painted and will remain in place.*

**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.*

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

*(6) Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*

*(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.*

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

#### *Wood*

*Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving wood features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as siding, cornices, brackets, window architraves, and doorway pediments; and their paints, finishes, and colors.*

#### *Windows*

*Not Recommended: Obscuring historic window trim with metal or other material.*

#### *STAFF FINDINGS:*

*1. The existing siding is in marginal condition. It is aged, dirty and would benefit from additional attention. The owner does not intend to modify the porch details, which are character-defining features of this building. However, the owner proposed to cover the existing window casing, which is not recommended. The eave detail is not addressed in the application and is therefore not proposed to be changed.*

*2. The staff approval list addresses non-original siding as follows:*

*Installation of... artificial siding that replicates clapboard where the existing siding is artificial and provided the exposed vertical dimension of the new "clapboard" is no more than five inches or within one inch of the missing or covered original; no new material may cover nor require the removal of any original trim or architectural detail such as ornamental shingles, carved brackets, window hoods, and the like.*

*Staff did not approve this at the staff level because 1) the wood window casing trim is proposed to be wrapped in aluminum, and 2) staff is not comfortable approving vinyl and feels the issue of the appropriateness of vinyl siding would benefit from commission discussion.*

*3. The proposed replacement siding might better replicate the appearance of the original siding, both in terms of exposure and small scale details. In order to determine this, select areas of the existing aluminum siding would need to be removed in order to determine the details and the condition of the underlying siding and trim. Approval to proceed with this investigatory removal will not constitute approval of the final work.*

*Once exposed, the similarities and differences between the existing (currently obscured) wood siding and the proposed vinyl siding would be determined, particularly the following:*

- a. Exposure to the weather. The proposed 4-1/2" exposure differs considerably from the existing aluminum siding, but may be a closer match to the original wood.*
- b. The detail condition at the corners. The aluminum siding has no corner boards, while other homes in this area with horizontal siding use boards nominally measuring 4"- 6".*
- c. The detail condition at the apron. Owner-provided photographs indicate an approximately 10" wide board with a significant drip edge.*
- d. The existence of special details, such as shingles or fish scales.*

*4. The Commission's approval could be offered with several conditions attached, including:*

- a. The receipt of details intended to repair or replace the missing features, as determined by a detailed site investigation.*
- b. The repair of trim details that were modified or removed when the aluminum siding was installed.*
- c. The repair and historically appropriate treatment of any special details.*
- d. The installation of synthetic siding in a profile or shape that closely replicates the siding to be covered, and with a smooth texture (see finding 5 below).*
- e. The appropriate treatment of window casing, including furring out the existing trim or incorporating integral vinyl trim pieces with the casing.*

5. *The submitted vinyl siding sample has an embossed wood grain. If the applicant's proposal is accepted, replacement siding would be expected to match the existing exposure as closely as possible and exhibit a smooth texture. Wood siding is sanded before being painted, which results in a flat surface with no visible grain.*

6. *The applicant's claim of hardship based on their installation of insulation is unwarranted. While the insulation will add value to the building by reducing its energy consumption, the intrusive method used to install the insulation was selected by the owner. Further, while replacement of the Styrofoam plugs with wooden plugs would not be easy to accomplish, neither would it be exceedingly difficult to undertake.*

7. *In all, the proposal is not ideal, since it continues to cover the existing historic material. However, given the condition of the existing aluminum siding, leaving it in place is not the best solution either. Staff feels that the work as proposed is inappropriate, but should the commission decide the work could meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, staff advises conditioning the work on staff findings three and four from this staff report, and the applicant's receipt of an additional staff approval documenting that those have been fulfilled.*

#### *REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:*

*Stulberg and McCauley were on the review committee and shared their findings with the Commission.*

*Commissioner McCauley noted that the proposal of removing aluminum siding and replacing it with vinyl siding wasn't in the best interest of maintain the historic character of the building.*

*Commissioner Stulberg added that he felt that the existing siding was in good condition.*

#### *DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:*

*Thacher gave the staff report.*

*Commissioner Glusac asked if the material under the aluminum siding had been verified.*

*Barlow responded, no.*

*Glusac asked what the owners would do if they discovered cedar shake siding on the second floor.*

*Barlow responded that the owners would probably cover it since they don't want to have to deal with the efforts and costs of maintaining wood siding.*

*Stulberg commented on the existing condition which is non-appropriate. He explained that the HDC is not in a position to say you have to take off what is currently existing, but they can also not recommend the use of non-appropriate material. He suggested that the applicant find out what is currently under the existing aluminum on the second floor and return to the commission at a later date.*

*McCauley stated that he felt the most inappropriate part of the proposed project was the wrapping of the trim around the windows.*

*Commissioner Giannola added that she didn't have an issue with the proposed vinyl siding since the presented historic brief seems to back up the use of vinyl siding in certain situations. She stated that she had issues with the wrapping of the trim around the windows.*

*Commissioner White noted that it wouldn't merit the applicant to verify the original material on the second floor if the Commission wasn't prepared to approve the vinyl siding on the first floor.*

*Giannola asked Thacher how many applications of aluminum siding replacing with vinyl had been approved by the City in the past.*

*Thacher responded that she hadn't approved any such applications.*

*McCauley stated that he felt this application was premature since they didn't know the condition of the existing material under the aluminum siding on the second floor.*

*Stulberg noted that it was up to the Commission to reinforce the ordinances that are in place. He suggested that it would be beneficial for the applicant to find out all of their options after they know what all the original material are on the building.*

*White brought out the issue of costs of maintenance to the applicant.*

*Thacher suggested that the Commission could postpone their decision until a later meeting.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Jeff Barlow, 1840 N. Dancer, contractor for the project, was present to respond to the Commission's questions. He displayed the various types*

*of vinyl and aluminum siding which was proposed to be used, and explained that they would like to restore as much as possible. He asked for clear guidelines regarding restoration.*

*Susan Perry, 1708 Fair, Ann Arbor, good friend and realtor who sold the house to the applicants, was present to respond to any questions. She provided a historic brief to the Commissioners that addressed siding replacement. She referenced the neighbors house that had the same type of vinyl siding that had been approved by the Commission a few years ago.*

**A motion was made by Glusac, seconded by Vice Chair McCauley, that the HDC10-143 Hearing be Postponed to the next Historic District Commission meeting scheduled for 12/9/2010. On a voice vote, the Vice Chair declared the motion carried.**

**Yeas:** 5 - Glusac, Giannola, White, Vice Chair McCauley, and Stulberg

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - Chair Ramsburgh, and Rozmarek

**A-4**    [10-1157](#)

HDC10-146; 520 Detroit St - New House on Vacant Lot - OFWHD

**BACKGROUND:**

*This vacant lot sits between a pair of two-story, framed buildings. The City Directory indicates that there was a house on the lot in 1912, occupied by Elizabeth Tice, widow of Clarence. The 1933 Sanborn map shows a two story dwelling on the lot; the building had been removed for the 1971 Sanborn update, though the exact date of the demolition is unknown.*

*The HDC issued a certificate of appropriateness in 2004 for the construction of a new single-family residence on the lot. The current application has similarities to that plan, but a new review is required since the City's historic preservation ordinance was rewritten in 2007.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the southeast side of Detroit, north of Kingsley and west of Division.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct a new, 2-1/2 story residence and single story garage on the vacant site.*

### 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):*

*District/Neighborhood*

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

### STAFF FINDINGS

- 1. The site is currently vacant and is used for extra parking for the house to the north, which is in the same ownership.*
- 2. The front setback employed is midway between those established by the adjacent properties. However, the front elevation of the subject property is fully enclosed, whereas the adjacent properties have open porches.*
- 3. The building reflects the scale and massing of the adjacent properties, and modern materials reflect the historic materials used on the adjacent buildings. An unusually large percentage of the site is impervious surfaces (buildings, driveway, walks, and a large deck off the back), but there is a small lawn area along the street. The rear wall of the main building is unusually angled to align with the rear property line. The front porch stoop and front walks are likewise skewed.*
- 4. It is staff's opinion that the proposed house is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding neighborhood and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation standards, particularly numbers 9 and 10.*

*REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:*

*Stulberg and McCauley were on the review committee and shared their findings with the Commission.*

*Commissioner McCauley was in support of the proposed project.*

*Commissioner Stulberg noted that the proposed house size was appropriate for the area. He noted that there might be some landmark trees in the rear of the lot that they might have to work around.*

*DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:*

*Thacher gave the staff report.*

*Fitzsimmons noted that the height did meet the zoning code for the area and the overall rhythm, massing and scale of the neighborhood.*

*Commissioner Giannola asked if the proposed house would have a driveway.*

*Thacher referenced the plan which indicated a shared driveway with the neighbor.*

*Commissioner Glusac asked if this building would be the tallest one on the block.*

*McCauley responded that the building would be close in height. He expressed that height in comparison to the neighbors is something that the Commission needs to be conscious of when reviewing proposed projects.*

*Stulberg added that the condos at the corner of the street were tall in height as well.*

*Glusac had concerns with the overall height of the building and didn't want the building to overwhelm the street since the lots are very small.*

*Fitzsimmons responded that they placed the house on the lot further back than what they could've given the setback averaging of the neighboring parcels.*

*Stulberg noted that the plans were somewhat deceptive when comparing the neighboring housing yet when reviewing the side views it brought the proportions into perspective.*

*Glusac expressed that she felt the proposed house wasn't as appropriate as it could be for the specific lot.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Tom Fitzsimmons, 608 N. Main Street, contractor and applicant, was present to respond to the Commissioner's questions.*

*Chris Crockett, 506 E. Kingsley, spoke as president of the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, in support of the proposed project.*

*Ray Detter, President of the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, spoke in favor of the proposed project.*

*Helen Spink, 537 Detroit Street, brought concerns with the proposed height of the new house as well as the lack of a front porch. She was otherwise, in favor of the project.*

**A motion was made by Giannola, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 520 Detroit, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to permit the construction of a 2-1/2 story residence and garage 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.**

**On a voice vote, the Vice Chair declared the motion carried.**

**Yeas:** 4 - Giannola, White, Vice Chair McCauley, and Stulberg

**Nays:** 1 - Glusac

**Absent:** 2 - Chair Ramsburgh, and Rozmarek

**B      OLD BUSINESS**

**C      NEW BUSINESS**

**PUBLIC COMMENTARY - (3 Minutes per Speaker)**

**D      APPROVAL OF MINUTES**



**10-1120** Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes of the July 8, 2010

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

**Yeas:** 5 - Glusac, Giannola, White, Vice Chair McCauley, and Stulberg

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - Chair Ramsburgh, and Rozmarek

**10-1161** Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes of the September 9, 2010

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

**Yeas:** 5 - Glusac, Giannola, White, Vice Chair McCauley, and Stulberg

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - Chair Ramsburgh, and Rozmarek

**10-1134** Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes of Oct 14, 2010

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

**Yeas:** 5 - Glusac, Giannola, White, Vice Chair McCauley, and Stulberg

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - Chair Ramsburgh, and Rozmarek

**E** **REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS / COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS****F** **ASSIGNMENTS**

**F-1** **Review Committee; Monday, Dec 6, 2010 at noon for the Dec 9, 2010 Regular Session**

*Commissioners McCauley and Stulberg volunteered for the December Review Committee.*

**G**      **REPORTS FROM STAFF**

**G-1**    [10-1158](#)      Staff Activity Report - September 2010

**G-2**    [10-1159](#)      Staff Activity Report - October 2010

**G-3**    **Old West Side Survey Presentation**

*Thacher presented a slideshow of the Old West Side Survey. Thacher would revisit the 4 properties in question and bring it before the Commission in the New Year.*

**H**      **CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS**

**I**      **COMMUNICATIONS**

**ADJOURNMENT**

*Meeting adjourned by the Vice Chair at 9:36 PM without objections.*