



**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE  
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR  
Wednesday, April 8, 2009.**

**Commissioners Present:** Sarah Shotwell, Diane Giannola, Kristina Glusac, Robert White, Jim Henrichs and Ellen Ramsburgh (6)

**Commissioners Absent:** Patrick McCauley (1).

**Staff Present:** Jill Thacher and Brenda Acquaviva, Planning and Development Services (2)

**CALL TO ORDER:** Commissioner Shotwell called the Regular Session to order at 7:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:** Quorum satisfied.

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:** The Agenda was approved without objection.

**A - HEARINGS**

**A-1 HDC09-030 – 525 FIFTH STREET - OWSHD**

**BACKGROUND:** This two-story, front-gabled, Queen Anne clapboard house features a large front parlor window in a shallow bay as well as a wrap-around front porch on the northwest corner. The blonde brick porch base was probably added in the teens or twenties, though the gable detail above the front steps is consistent with the earlier period of the house. It appears on the 1890 Birdseye view and all subsequent Sanborn maps, complete with porch, north and rear wings. Cabinetmaker Louis Kurtz is first listed here in the 1890-91 city directory.

On February 12, 1998 the HDC issued a certificate of appropriateness to demolish a rear kitchen addition and construct a two-story addition in its place. Also approved was a second story addition on top of a single-story portion of the north side of the house which tied in to the new rear addition. This work was subsequently completed.

**LOCATION:** East side of Fifth Street, south of West Jefferson and north of West Madison.

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct a screened-in porch on an existing deck, extend and cover a portion of the deck, and move a set of rear porch stairs.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. The house is a contributing structure in the Old West Side Historic District. The proposed work affects only the 1998 rear addition to the house. No original portions of the structure would be impacted or altered.
2. The existing deck is 12' by 16'. The existing railings would be removed and three screen walls and a hip roof added, including a screen door on the north screen wall. Paired 6" by 6" wood columns would support the screen walls.
3. There are currently two sets of steps on the rear elevation, one set to the back door and another to the deck. Both sets of steps would be removed and consolidated into one new set that leads to a new covered porch that connects the back door to the screen porch. The new porch segments would feature rails, balusters, skirting, and other elements that match the existing.

- 52 4. The house is located on a relatively large lot and the proposed screen porch would not  
53 negatively impact neighboring properties or the surrounding area.  
54 5. The proposed addition is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture,  
55 material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets  
56 *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standard numbers  
57 2, 9 and 10.  
58

59 **Owner/ Address:** Wendy Lawson, 525 S Fifth St. A2, MI 48103

60  
61 **Applicant** Carl O. Hueter, 1321 Franklin Blvd., A2, MI 48103  
62

63 **Review Committee:**

64  
65 Commissioner Glusac – Agreed with staff report, and stated that she feels it is appropriate with  
66 the adjacent properties and the proposed plan.  
67

68 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Concurs with staff report and Commissioner Glusac.  
69

70 **Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Carl O. Hueter, Architect, was present to speak on behalf of the  
71 appeal. He offered to answer any questions that the Commission might have.  
72

73 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:** None.  
74

75 **Audience Participation:** None.  
76

77 **Discussion by the Commission:**

78  
79 Commissioner Henrichs – Stated that the application and design are straightforward and are  
80 compatible with the size and mass of the property and surrounding properties. Will support.  
81

82 **MOTION**

83  
84 Moved by Commissioner White, Seconded by Commissioner Giannola, **“that the**  
85 **Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 525 Fifth**  
86 **Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a**  
87 **rear screen porch on an existing deck, and a new segment of covered porch and**  
88 **new stairs, as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design,**  
89 **arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the**  
90 **surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for***  
91 ***Rehabilitation* in particular standard number 2, 9 and 10.**  
92

93 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE – PASSED (*Application Approved*)**  
94

95  
96 **A-2 HDC09-031 – 1502 HILL STREET - WHHD**  
97

98 **BACKGROUND:** This Georgian Colonial Revival house was built by the Delta Sigma Delta  
99 fraternity in 1929 and 30. It features dressed stone walls, a slate mansard roof, and a nearly full-  
100 width two story portico along the front façade.  
101

Staff recently approved the replacement of 17 vinyl windows with new vinyl windows on the second and third floors of the rear elevation. They had been approved under a prior ordinance in 1997.

**LOCATION:** South side of Hill Street, at the southeast corner of Lincoln Avenue.

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace approximately 50 wood windows (staff counts 18 on the front elevation, 8 on each side, and estimates 16 on the rear, from photographs) with vinyl windows.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 1 The wood windows (mostly 12/12, 8/8, and 6/6) are character-defining features of the house and are prominent on all elevations. The applicant has provided a letter from a former resident stating that the windows had been replaced prior to 1951. The applicant feels that vinyl replacement windows are an economical and compatible solution to the house's window deterioration problems. Delta Sigma Delta has owned this house since it was built in 1929-30.
- 2 The applicant has stated that the windows have metal guides, which would be consistent with windows replaced in the 1940s. Parts of the original blueprints for the house were provided, and the current windows match closely, though not exactly, with the blueprints. If these are not the original windows, they are very close replicas. A photograph of the newly-built house in the University of Michigan *Michiganensian* 1931 yearbook shows windows that are the same style as those visible today.
- 3 The applicant states that there used to be storms on the windows but that there are none currently.
- 4 The wood shutters are bolted to the wall and not operable. Many of the shutters are in poor condition. It would be appropriate to repair the existing wood shutters. If they are deteriorated beyond repair, new wood shutters that replicate the existing would be appropriate.
- 5 The proposed vinyl windows would have muntins between the two panes of glass (per Wallside Windows) and therefore the muntins have no exterior profile. It should be noted that the Theta Xi house in photos provided by the applicant is not in the historic district.
- 6 Staff asked the applicant to have a carpenter familiar with historic wood windows assess the condition of the windows and their repair or replacement. The applicant has done so and said he would provide this information at the HDC meeting.
- 7 Staff has opined to the applicant that the windows are character-defining elements of the house that should not be replaced unless they are beyond repair. If beyond repair, it would be appropriate to replace them with replicas of the current wood windows with matching profiles. This is a significant and stately building in the district and vinyl replacements would not be appropriate or retain the historic character of the building.
- 8 The proposed window replacement removes character-defining features from the house, the choice of materials is not appropriate, and the work is not compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture and relationship to the remainder of the house and surrounding area and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, in particular standard numbers 2, 6, 9, and 10.

**Owner/ Address:** Building Assn.- Alpha Chapter of Delta Sigma Delta, 1502 Hill Street, A2, MI 48104

**Applicant:** Richard Zillich, 2659 Danbury Lane, A2, MI 48103

**Review Committee:**

154 Commissioner Ramsburgh – We did as careful an inspection as we could. We did see the most  
155 deteriorated, and I feel that staff's report and our investigation are thorough. These are quality  
156 windows that should be maintained and repaired.

157

158 Commissioner Glusac – Concurs with Commissioner Ramsburgh and staff's report, especially the  
159 integrity of the windows. It appears that they are repairable. The basement windows are the  
160 most deteriorated. We looked closely from the interior and exterior on the first floor and we  
161 examined those in the living room, and in the 'bike' room. What isn't part of the application are  
162 the French doors that you see in the pictures. The second and third floors – we went into one  
163 room on the front that had one window (the others were occupied by students so we couldn't  
164 access those. It is obvious that those windows are protected by the porch, so those are in much  
165 better condition as they're protected from the elements.

166

167 **Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Richard Zillich, representative for the fraternity house was present  
168 to speak on behalf of the appeal. He stated that he had new information and that the front  
169 window had been replaced already. That one has springs on the side (on the front of the house).  
170 The muntins were similar in size, and we've been told that these windows weren't original to the  
171 house but replacements.

172

173 He also stated that three of the sills were rotted all the way through. The window replacement is  
174 estimated at \$37,000.00; repair estimated at \$73,000.00, and they do not have the finances to  
175 repair them. He offered to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

176

177 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

178

179 Commissioner Giannola – Some of these windows are already vinyl? What is the actual count of  
180 those? (Petitioner – 17 out of 70 total – so 53 are wood windows. He stated that they do have  
181 the original 1920 blueprints, and it shows that these windows are different from what is existing,  
182 as well as the front door and the French doors. We're not planning on replacing any of the  
183 doors.)

184

185 **Audience Participation:** None

186

187 **Discussion by the Commission:**

188

189 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Stated that she is aware that there are budget constraints, but she  
190 hoped that the fraternity would see it's way to repairing the windows – not all at once, but those  
191 that are in the worst condition first, and adding storms. She stated that she did some research  
192 and found that a storm window would be between \$100 and \$125 per window. Looking back at  
193 research done by the city consultant, Kristine Kidorf, and her estimates for repair, mainly re-  
194 glazing and repainting, the financial picture could be improved by doing this and doing it in  
195 phases..

196

197 Commissioner Glusac – Added that these windows are a character defining feature to the house,  
198 and the majority of them are in good condition. The person that provided the estimate to the  
199 applicant still thinks that these windows are also repairable, and with the exception of the  
200 basement windows, they are functional. Storm windows are also a great suggestion to prevent  
201 from further decay.

202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253

**MOTION #1**

Moved by Commissioner Ramsburgh, Seconded by Commissioner Glusac, “**that the Commission deny the application at 1502 Hill Street, a contributing property in the Washtenaw Hill Historic District, to replace all of the wood windows with vinyl windows. The proposed work is not compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standard numbers 2, 6, 9 and 10.**”

**On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO DENY - PASSED – UNANIMOUS (*Partial Application Denied*)**

Commissioner Glusac – Regarding the shutters. Were those included in this motion?

J. Thacher – That is a good question. The applicant did ask to repair and/or replace them with wood or composite shutters. We would require another motion to cover that.

**MOTION #2**

Moved by Commissioner Ramsburgh, Seconded by Commissioner White, “**that the Commission approve the application at 1502 Hill Street, a contributing property in the Washtenaw Hill Historic District, to replace the wood shutters that are beyond repair and to rehabilitate those that are repairable. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area and does meet *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standard numbers and meets rehab 2, 6, 9 and 10.**”

**On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVED - PASSED – UNANIMOUS (*Partial Application Approved*)**

**A-3      HDC08-032 – 105 EAST LIBERTY STREET – OWSHD**

**BACKGROUND:** The Fritz Building, a three-story commercial Italianate-style building, was constructed in 1869. It is three bays wide and two bays deep. The portion of the building facing South Main Street first served as a grocery for John Gerner. The rear bay facing Liberty Street (the location of this application) served as Sophia Allmendinger’s residence (from 1869) and laundry (from 1894 or earlier, until 1924). In 1929, Phelps A. Lee moved his Lee’s Barber Shop to 105 East Liberty from next door at 107 East Liberty, where it had been located since 1907. Lee’s later became Hanel’s for many decades and is now Varsity Barber Shop. A barber shop appears to have been located at 105 East Liberty continuously from 1929 to the present, and in the building since 1907.

**LOCATION:** North side of East Liberty Street, just east of South Main Street. The building contains two storefronts: this barber shop and the Occasionally Gift Shop around the corner fronting on South Main Street.

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to remove an existing retractable awning and replace it with a new fixed awning.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. The building is a contributing structure in the Main Street Historic District. The row of stores from 103 to 109 East Liberty were modified prior to 1950 (see photo at end of report) and visually joined with matching columns, bulkheads, and sign bands, though the storefront windows and entries differ.
2. The display windows on Liberty (on the Varsity Barber Shop, Kilwins two storefronts, and the Occasionally Gift Shop) and at 223 South Main (Occasionally) all retain their awning gutters, which protect the retracted awning and hardware. Only this awning at 105 East Liberty is still retractable rather than fixed. Awning gutters are a character defining feature of the building.
3. The Fritz building has featured retractable awnings since it was constructed in 1869. They are a character-defining feature of the building.
4. The application proposes a triangular fixed awning that would cover the rain gutter and extend ten inches above it into the sign band. The awning sides would extend five inches beyond the width of the storefront on either side. The Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines say that it is appropriate to attach the awning just below the storefront cornice and fit it within the storefront opening. The current awning style was designed for the storefront and fits within the storefront opening. The proposed awning does not fit within the opening and extends too far above and to the sides of the opening to be appropriate.
5. Per the applicant, it is not possible to fit a fixed awning within the storefront opening, thus ruling out a fixed awning in the location of the current awning.
6. The applicant has the option of installing a new retractable awning with sides for better sun blockage than the current open-ended awning provides. There are many examples of these in use in downtown. Window blinds are also an appropriate alternative to altering character-defining features of the building.
7. The proposed awning does not convey the same visual appearance as the surviving retractable awning and is therefore incompatible in exterior design, arrangement, and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standard numbers 9 and 10.

**Owner/Address:** Curtis Commercial 343 S Main St, Ste 218 Ann Arbor, MI 48103

**Applicant:** Andrew Biegas, 2572 Dardy Dr., Brooklyn, MI 49230

**Review Committee:** Commissioners Glusac and Ramsburgh visited the site.

Commissioner Glusac – Concurs with staff findings and hopes that the owner will be amenable to keeping the awning within the existing opening to maintain the awning gutter that is existing – otherwise, with their proposal it would be completely within the awning similar to Kilwins awning next door. It would be more appropriate to have it remain within the existing opening.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – Concurs with staff findings and Commissioner Glusac. She stated that when there is a current character defining detail to a building in the district, She added that an awning on that side of the street due to midday sun is a necessity; however, feels that it can be accomplished without losing the gutter.

**Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Andrew Biegas was present to speak on behalf of the appeal. He stated their goals in wanting to replace the awning, which are that deterioration is excessive, the sun is difficult to deal with, particularly with the barber shop as there is a work station in the window (which helps to show someone is available and is inviting to the public to come in). What

we find is that because that window faces south, we get a lot of sunlight coming in through the sides of the awning. Staff had first recommended that we stick with another retractable awning, we looked into that and others in the downtown area. The concern is that over time – the retractable awning is not durable enough to use on a 24/7 basis and will not stand the test of time. They also looked into putting a fixed awning as recommended by staff, but on the right hand side where the window meets the wall, it's almost flush there. There is really no surface to mount a fixed frame awning. The design guidelines show one mounted in that fashion, but there is only a small amount of brick wall to mount it to in order to stay within that window.

Our biggest concern is the durability of a retractable awning. The workstation in the window is unbearable without the sides on the awning to deflect some of the sun. (Petitioner mentioned that he did utilize the city's "Historic Guidelines" publication which was very helpful and that there is an example of this type of awning and its mounting location to be appropriate equal to their application.

### Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:

Commissioner Ramsburgh – Asked if a sign company had been consulted as to what options that they may have? (Applicant stated that yes, they had met with Signature Awning (who drew the mock-ups), and there is only about an inch or less of space at the edge of that brick. He stated that trying to mount anything on there would be precarious as there isn't much room to do that.)

I'm sure they know what they're talking about, but I went back this morning and looked at that and the mountings on Peaceable Kingdom and one other and the mounting device is very slender. I thought it might possibly mount onto the wood near the window rather than the masonry. (Petitioner stated that they took pictures of the awning on Peaceable Kingdom, and that that one is a different type of mechanism that has a suspended 'U' shaped bar that is mounted at the bottom and hinged there. Within the framing of the masonry, this awning is set inside of that; on theirs, the mounting goes all the way out past the window and the part where it pivots is directly below. Ours has a four or five inch gap as you go from the top of the awning gutter out to the side, so that one is different completely.) *(Additional lengthy discussion on options of mounting.)*

### Audience Participation:

1. Mr. John Curtis, owner of the Fritz Building – Mr. Curtis stated that he and his brother Jim have been owners of the Fritz building since 1992. They have always sought a balance between the needs of their tenants and the interest of maintaining the historic integrity of the building many times before. We are in support of Mr. Biegas's proposal. (He spoke about the other awnings on this building that have been approved previously). He supports the project and asked the Commission to approve the application.

### Discussion by the Commission:

Commissioner White – Stated that he is in support of the application.

Commissioner Shotwell – Asked about the picture and example within the "Design Guidelines" that the petitioner mentioned were 'acceptable.' The guidelines do state that it is acceptable to attach the awning just below the cornice and within the storefront opening. The photo included is also relevant. Are we just assuming that the rain gutter is the main issue and that there is no rain gutter present in this example in the "Design Guidelines?"

357 J. Thacher – The picture in the “Design Guidelines” is intentionally generic. Obviously this  
 358 storefront in the design guidelines doesn’t even have a sign band that would fall between the top  
 359 of the store and the cornice like the building that we’re talking about. It’s an issue of applying the  
 360 standards to a building that doesn’t look exactly like the design guidelines building.

361  
 362 Commissioner Giannola – The gutter will remain, the public can still see it. Is it really necessary  
 363 for it to be ‘above’ does it need to be visible and remain in tact?  
 364

365 Commissioner Henrichs – Believes that the intention of the “Design Guidelines” is to keep the  
 366 awning within the actual storefront itself; it seems to me that the petitioner should be able to  
 367 conceivably do that, based on other awnings in the area that exist as indicated by Commissioner  
 368 Ramsburgh. If it’s not necessary to cover those attributes, then why do that? It should be  
 369 feasible and possible to construct an awning that meets all of their needs and satisfy the  
 370 requirement of keeping the awning within the storefront. In support of the motion.  
 371

372 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Once consideration is that there are not many buildings in Ann  
 373 Arbor that show the detail of the gutter as it historically was, and it’s important to maintain those  
 374 when we can, especially because there are alternatives. She would like to see that explored  
 375 before they grant permission to go outside of the storefront opening.  
 376

377 *(Discussion between Commissioners Ramsburgh and White regarding the pros and cons of*  
 378 *installation of this within the masonry. Commissioner White believes the petitioner’s proposal is*  
 379 *acceptable and that the Commission should not be designing his awning.)*  
 380

381 Commissioner Shotwell – Stated that it is not actually fair to compare the neighboring property  
 382 awnings as equal to what this gentleman wants. Since there have been different historic  
 383 ordinances and guidelines over the years, making these comparisons are not fair as there are  
 384 other cases throughout the city where different schemes are or were approved depending on  
 385 what the rules were at the time.  
 386

### 387 MOTION

388  
 389 Moved by Commissioner Glusac, Seconded by Commissioner Henrichs, “**that the**  
 390 **Commission deny the application at 105 East Liberty Street, a contributing property**  
 391 **in the Main Street Historic District, to replace a retractable awning with a fixed**  
 392 **awning, as proposed. The proposed work is not compatible in exterior design,**  
 393 **arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the**  
 394 **surrounding area and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for***  
 395 ***Rehabilitation* in particular standard numbers 9 and 10.”**  
 396

397 **On a Roll Call Vote – MOTION TO DENY - PASSED – 4 yes, 2 no (Application Denied)**  
 398

399 **Yes (4) – Commissioners Shotwell, Ramsburgh, Henrichs and Glusac**

400 **No (2) - Commissioners White and Giannola**  
 401  
 402

### 403 **A-4      HDC09-033 – 919 WEST WASHINGTON STREET - OWSHD**

404  
 405 **BACKGROUND:** This 1½ story gambrel-roofed Dutch colonial revival house first appears in the  
 406 1907 Polk directory as the home of Edward Meyer, a tinner at Schumacher’s (probably the  
 407 hardware store). The house has had numerous additions after 1931, including the one being  
 408 considered in this application.



409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460

**LOCATION:** South side of West Washington Street, between South Seventh and Eighth Streets.

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to remove two 29 ½” x 42” wood windows on a rear addition, enlarge the opening, and install three 30 5/16” x 41 5/16” wood windows.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. The age of the existing wood windows is unknown. They may have been moved from another part of the house when the rear addition was built. Regardless, they are not character-defining due to their location on this relatively modern (post 1931) addition.
2. The windows would be trimmed with wood to match the existing (beneath the aluminum), and then re-wrapped in aluminum to match the rest of the house.
3. The new windows would be wood Weather Shield double-hung tilt. A window worksheet is included with the application.
4. The proposed window replacements and new window are compatible with the rear addition and the exterior design, arrangement, texture and relationship to the remainder of the house and surrounding area and meet *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*, in particular standard numbers 2 and 9.

**Owner/Address:** Hitomi Tonomura, 919 W Washington Street, A2, MI 48103

**Applicant:** Bill Levleit/Westside Builders 2200 Dexter Ave., A2, MI 48103

**Review Committee:** Commissioners Glusac and Ramsburgh visited the site.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – We looked at these on the inside and the outside, and they are not located on the character defining side of the house and are not historically distinctive either and she supports the staff findings.

Commissioner Glusac – Concurs with Commissioner Ramsburgh

**Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Bill Levleit of Westside Builders was present to speak on behalf of the appeal. He offered to answer any questions that the Commission might have.

**Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:** None.

**Audience Participation:** None.

**Discussion by the Commission:**

**MOTION**

Moved by Commissioner Giannola, Seconded by Commissioner Shotwell, “**that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for 919 West Washington Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to remove two wood windows and install three new wood windows, as proposed. 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* in particular standard numbers 2 and 9.**”

**On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS (Application Approved)**

**A-5      HDC09-034 – 240 CREST STREET - OWSHD**

**BACKGROUND:** This 1 ½ story shingle-sided craftsman home features end gables, a full-width front porch, and centered front and rear shed dormers. It first appears in the 1918 City Directory as the home of Emmanuel J. Sodt, a policeman.

**LOCATION:** West side of Crest Avenue, south of West Washington and north of West Liberty Streets.

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to demolish a garage and build a 1,767 square foot addition with a 200 square foot integrated garage onto the back of a 1,050 square foot house.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. The proposed addition would result in a house that is 2,817 square feet, or 268% of the current 1,050 SF (not counting garages -- if garages are included, the new house + garage is 3,017 square feet, or 228% of the 1,321 SF current house + garage).
2. The footprint of the current house + garage is approximately 954 SF and the proposed house + integral garage is approximately 1,761 SF.
3. The draft Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines that have been approved by the State Historic Preservation Office say that the addition's footprint should exceed neither half of the original building's footprint nor half of the original building's total floor area.
4. The rear shed dormer is a character defining feature and proposed to be expanded to the full width of the second floor. This would flatten out the rear pitch of the roof inappropriately and diminish the character of the current roof/dormer relationship. This is best illustrated by the 3-D drawings in the application packet.
5. The entire rear elevation of the house would be altered: the ground floor would be connected to the addition, the second floor dormer would be widened to full width, and the second floor would be connected to the addition in the northwest corner.
6. The width, depth, and large massing of the proposed addition overwhelms the historic house. The addition is in no way subordinate, and competes with and compromises the house's integrity. The size of the addition in relation to the house also makes it visually incompatible with surrounding sites and the neighborhood.
7. The use of rusticated block is not appropriate above the line of the foundation. Other materials compatible with the district should be used on the first floor walls, such as (but not limited to) brick, stucco, or cementitious siding. It is understood that these areas are intended to be covered by a trellis and green plants, but if future owners do not maintain the green screen the underlying walls will be exposed.
8. A contemporary design may be appropriate under the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. It may be appropriate to connect a small, architecturally modern addition with smaller massing on a 1918 craftsman house via a minimal (10 foot wide) single-story hyphen, in order to allow the house to retain its character and not have to compete unduly with the addition. If this were the case, the slat siding, green trellis walls, and flat roof of the addition may be appropriate.
9. It is understood that the applicant wishes to use green technology in the new addition, but it can only be approved if the materials and massing meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
10. The proposed addition is not compatible in exterior design, massing, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area, predominantly due to its large size, and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, particularly standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564

**Owner/Address:** Stephanie Keene 240 Crest Avenue, A2, MI 48103

**Applicant:** Steven Mankouche, 307 Westwood Street, A2, MI 48103

**Review Committee:** Commissioners Glusac and Ramsburgh visited the site.

Commissioner Glusac – I concur with the staff findings. We spoke with the architect and owner at the site and toured the home. They hadn't staked out the proposed footprint of the addition, so hopefully they can clarification on the site plan on how it would relate to the back wall of the addition and how that relates to the adjacent properties. As staff findings noted, there is concern regarding the scale and massing of this project with regard to the contributing existing home. The proposal overwhelms the original house and removes many character defining features at the rear of the home.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – Concurs with Commissioner Glusac and staff findings. The scale of the project is the biggest stumbling block as it overwhelms the original home.

**Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Steven Mankouche, architect on the project was present to speak about the appeal. He stated that they had built a model to help the Commission understand the massing and to answer some of the concerns that the Commission had.

He stated that it is the intention of the owner to not only to add on to the home, but to restore the home. As is noticeable, there are many features that have been covered up over the years with vinyl siding and other materials along the way. We understood that the square footage would be an issue. In our opinion, this will still not be the largest dwelling on the block. The neighboring home is 24045 square feet (not including the garage).

The owners purchased this home about 16 years ago. Having lived there, they can tell you that the three bedrooms are so small that you cannot put a queen sized bed into those and have any room for anything else. The shower is stand up only, it's only a four foot tub. They had converted the mud room into a functional bathroom when they originally moved in. The owner and her husband are ceramic artists and use their garage currently as studio space. The adjacency has been fine, but they have to experience inclement weather to go from the home to the garage carrying materials.

Mr. Mankouche stated that this home has the smallest footprint in the neighborhood. In a way they're unlucky to have the smallest home, and are being penalized for having waited to expand their home. The design impetus was to minimize the environmental impact of this addition on the environment. They are living in a home that is dysfunctional for them. They enjoy the home but need to improve it to fit their lifestyle. *(He continued to expound on the rest of the project).*

**Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

Commissioner Glusac – Will the garage gallery function as a car/garage? (Petitioner – It will probably function as it is now – as a workshop and it has a glass door to allow light in. Being ceramic artists, they'll require a kiln which we were thinking of locating on the back. There will also be a utility sink. Ideally, it would be nice to have that all on the same grade, as it currently steps down into the garden.)

**Audience Participation:** None.

565 **Discussion by the Commission:**

566

567 Commissioner Shotwell – While I’m a fan of old homes, I’m also a fan of this type of architecture  
568 and the green building elements. I am concerned with the scale and massing as well as the  
569 attachment to the existing house.

570

571 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Concurs with Commissioner Shotwell – this is an ‘ambitious’ design  
572 and appreciates the need for added space in the home. When we’re talking about massing,  
573 we’re also talking about the addition in context with the historic home, which is small to begin  
574 with. Unfortunately, I believe that the proposed addition will have to be smaller than the existing  
575 home – not larger.

576

577 Commissioner Henrichs – Agrees that the concept and design and sensitivities are great, but that  
578 the Commission is charged with using the guidelines to decide whether something like this is  
579 compatible, based on the size, scale, massing, features, character defining qualities of this home  
580 and the entire neighborhood. I am in support of the motion due to that reason.

581

582 **MOTION**

583

584 Moved by Commissioner Ramsburgh, Seconded by Commissioner Giannola, **“that the**  
585 **Commission deny the application at 240 Crest Avenue in the Old West Side Historic**  
586 **District to remove an existing garage and construct a 1,767 square foot addition with an**  
587 **integrated 200 square foot garage. The work is not generally compatible in exterior design,**  
588 **massing, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the**  
589 **surrounding area and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for***  
590 ***Rehabilitation*, in particular standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.”**

591

592 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO DENY - PASSED – UNANIMOUS (Application Denied)**

593

594

595 **B - OLD BUSINESS – None.**

596

597 **C - NEW BUSINESS –**

598

599 **C-1 Discussion On Brick Street Repair**

600

601 Mr. Cresson Sloten, of the Systems Planning division of the city of Ann Arbor was present to  
602 discuss this issue. He explained that his department is looking at possibilities of infrastructure  
603 items within the city that need repair. One of those items is looking at a solution for the brick  
604 streets within Ann Arbor, many of which are located in Historic Districts. Mr. Sloten presented a  
605 power point presentation with pictures and explanations of the affected areas, alternative ‘green’  
606 materials that they are now using, and asked the Commission to think about these issues and  
607 asked for their input.

608

609 **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION – GENERAL (Limited to 3 Minutes per Speaker)**

610

611 1. Mr. Richard Zillich, 2659 Danbury Lane, A2, MI 48103 – (Mr. Zillich was the applicant  
612 for item number A-2 (Alpha Chapter of Delta Sigma Delta, 1502 Hill Street). He asked  
613 the Commission for clarification about the windows that can or cannot be replaced.  
614 *(The chair stated that he would want to keep in contact with J. Thacher on approvals*  
615 *during the process of repair and replacement).*

616  
617  
618  
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

**D - APPROVAL OF MINUTES –**

**D-1** Draft Minutes of the Special Session of January 8, 2009 - *Approved as Amended*

**E - REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS**

Commissioner Shotwell – Stated she would not be attending the May meeting and as Vice-Chair, Commissioner Ramsburgh will be Chairing the meeting.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – Awards Committee has been meeting regularly. Those awards will be given out on June 1, 2009 at the Michigan Theatre prior to the City Council meeting that evening. That function will begin at 4:30 and run until 6:00.

**F - ASSIGNMENTS**

**F-2** Review Committee for Monday, May 11, 2009 at 5:00 p.m.

Commissioners White and McCauley.

**G - STAFF ACTIVITIES REPORT**

**G-1** Staff Activities Report for March 2009

J. Thacher – Reported that she handed out the report to the Commission and stated that she could answer any questions that they might have about any of the Staff Approvals.

**H - CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS – None.**

**I - COMMUNICATIONS – None.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

*The Meeting was adjourned by Chair Shotwell at 9:36 p.m. without objection.*

**SUBMITTED BY: B. Acquaviva, A.S.S. V, Planning and Development Services.**