



**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE  
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR  
Thursday, July 9, 2009.**

**Commissioners Present:** Sarah Shotwell, Diane Giannola, Patrick McCauley, Robert White, Jim Henrichs, Kristina Glusac and Ellen Ramsburgh (7)

**Commissioners Absent: (0)**

**Staff Present:** Jill Thacher, Planner and Historic District Coordinator and Brenda Acquaviva, Administrative Support Specialist V, Planning and Development Services (2)

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Wallace 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 HDC09-090 – 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 birds-eye view and all subsequent Sanborn maps, complete with porch and north and rear wings. Cabinetmaker Louis Kurtz is the first occupant listed at this address, in the 1890-91 Polk city directories.

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. The HDC also approved 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.

April 9, 2009 the HDC issued a certificate of appropriateness to construct a screened-in porch over an existing deck, extend and cover a portion of the deck and move a set of rear porch stairs.

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

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to build a 12 foot by 10 foot wood pergola with a 12 foot by 10 foot brick paver patio beneath it in the rear yard of the house.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. The pergola is a simple structure with 6" x 6" posts and 2" x 10" beams and 2" x 8" crosspieces. The patio pavers resemble brick and would be arranged in a herringbone pattern edged with a soldier course. The pergola would be located three feet behind an existing 12 foot by 14 foot greenhouse.

- 50 2. This lot is fairly large for the Old West Side, 66 feet wide by 132 feet deep. The location of  
51 the pergola towards the rear of the lot and behind the greenhouse is an appropriate  
52 location for a landscape feature. It does not compete unduly with existing structures on this  
53 or neighboring lots.  
54
- 55 3. The proposed pergola and patio are compatible in exterior design, massing, arrangement,  
56 texture, material and relationship to the site and the surrounding area, and meet *The*  
57 *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, particularly standards 2 and 9.  
58

59 **Owner/Address:** Wendy Lawson , 525 Fifth Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48103  
60

61 **Applicant:** The Great Outdoors/William Murphy, PO Box 1940, Ann Arbor, MI 48106  
62

63 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Wallace and White visited the site.  
64

65 Commissioner Wallace – Agrees with Staff's evaluation. Based on the site itself, it is a large lot  
66 and I don't believe the patio and pergola would overwhelm the site.  
67

68 Commissioner White – Concurs with Staff and Commissioner Wallace.  
69

70 **Applicant Presentation:** William Murphy of the Great Outdoors was present to speak on behalf  
71 of the appeal. The goal is to enhance the backyard and allow her to have a larger outdoor living  
72 area.  
73

74 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:** None.  
75

76 **Audience Participation:** None.  
77

78 **Discussion by the Commission:**  
79

80 **MOTION**  
81

82 Moved by Commissioner Giannola, Seconded by Commissioner White, “**that the Commission**  
83 **issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 525 Fifth Street, a contributing**  
84 **property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a pergola and patio in the rear**  
85 **yard as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement,**  
86 **texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area, and**  
87 **meets *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for***  
88 ***Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, in particular standards 2 and 9, and the *Guidelines for***  
89 ***Building Sites.*”**  
90

91 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS (Application Approved)**  
92  
93

94 **A-2 HDC09-091 - 542 FOURTH STREET - OFWHD**  
95

96 **BACKGROUND:** This two story gable-front home features a full-width front porch. It was first  
97 occupied in 1895 by Fidel Schmidt, a carpenter. The address prior to 1898 was 40 Fourth Street.  
98 The single-story room on the south side was formerly a side porch with a smaller footprint, and  
99 there are two modern rear additions.  
100

101 On October 17, 2002 the HDC approved the replacement of three windows.

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

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace the sash only in three windows on the first floor: two on the front and one on the south side elevation.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. The property owner reported that these three windows were previously denied for replacement by the HDC, so she contracted to have the three windows stripped and refinished. When the paint was removed, each sash showed fire damage and rot that had been previously obscured. The contractor determined that the wood was unacceptable for finishing. Fire damage was also identified on the jambs, but the owner believes they are still serviceable and is not requesting to replace them.
2. New replacement sash with dimensions to exactly match the existing would be custom built.
3. Staff inspected these windows, and feels that the damage is extensive and that the sash are worthy of replacement and meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards for replacement.

**Owner/Applicant/Address:** Martha Kinney Sedgwick and Dave Sedgwick, 542 Fourth Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48103

**Review Committee:** Commissioners Wallace and White visited the site.

Commissioner Wallace – We did find these windows as staff mentioned. There is fairly extensive fire damage on all three of them. Lot's of darkened patches. On one window in particular that I felt myself, I could push my fingernail all the way down into the wood, so it was fairly well rotted. I find it very admirable that she is going to great lengths to replicate the sash's and retain the jams, so I feel this is appropriate.

Commissioner White – Concurs with staff and Commissioner Wallace.

**Applicant Presentation:** Martha Sedgwick and Bruce Curtis (Contractor) were present to speak on behalf of the appeal. She added a small correction that the upstairs windows were approved by the Commission previously; it was when the lower windows were denied that the addition was added to the house. We did make a good faith effort to refinish these, and the sub-contractor stopped his work as he stated they were too damaged to work with.

Mr. Bruce Curtis mentioned that there was an original addition put on sometime in the 1960's and then they built the larger addition a few years ago.

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

Commissioner Henrichs – Will the replacement sashes be the same size as the current sashes? (B. Curtis - Yes. We're having a sash company make those to the same dimensions, but we're going to put in insulated glass instead of single glazed. It means we don't have glazing compound on the outside, but we get a comparable profile that is similar.)

**Audience Participation:** None.

**Discussion by the Commission:****MOTION**

Moved by Commissioner Ramsburgh, Seconded by Commissioner Wallace, “that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 542 Fourth Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to replace the sash in three first floor windows on the front elevation and south elevation, 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 and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, in particular standard number 6 and the *Guidelines for Windows*.”

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

**A-3      HDC09-092 - 310 SECOND STREET - OWSHD**

**BACKGROUND:** 310 Second Street, a simple 1 ½ story gable front with cornice returns, was built before 1853. It was moved to this site in 1898 from the southwest corner of Liberty and Second next door. The applicant believes the rear addition was added around the time of the move.

The barn behind 310 Second was originally part of 413 West Liberty (a Greek Revival house built prior to 1894), and appears on the 1908 Sanborn map. It is possibly much older than 1908, given that 413 West Liberty was probably built before the Civil War. The Sanborn reference marks it as a stable at first, and later an automobile garage. Until at least 1971, it had the address 413 ½ West Liberty. In 1908 there was a one-story addition with the same size footprint next to the existing barn, accessed through the east side door that can be seen in the photographs. The addition was removed between 1925 and 1931. At some point, property lines were redrawn and the barn became part of 310 Second Street.

In February, 1994 a certificate of appropriateness was issued by the commission to repair and reconstruct the front porch.

In May, 2008 an application was submitted to demolish the barn and a garage on an adjoining property. That application was withdrawn during the meeting before action was taken by the Commission.

**LOCATION:** West side of Second Street, south of West Liberty Street and north of West William Street.

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to: 1) remove existing aluminum siding and restore the underlying wood siding; 2) add a porch off the kitchen on the south elevation near the rear of the house and shift the existing kitchen door to the east; 3) place a window at the location of the former (sided over) north kitchen door; 4) replace “nonconforming” windows with new historically correct windows; 5) replace poorly maintained windows with new historically correct; 6) Provide an egress window to an existing second floor bedroom off the rear (west elevation) ; 7) investigate the east (street) elevation for possible return to the original window placement and configuration; 8) place a skylight over the second floor bathroom to give headroom at the tub; 9) restore the barn and raise it 16 inches on top of the existing concrete block foundation.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. Some of the work proposed could be approved at the staff level, including removing the aluminum siding, replacing non-original windows with wood windows, and replacing existing windows with windows of a different size based on historic documentation (i.e. replacing the large front windows with more historically accurate windows if physical or photo evidence of the former windows is found). Since there is now a fee for staff approvals, these requests have been included in the HDC application. Additional information on these items is being requested from the applicant and will be presented to Commissioners at or before the July 9, 2009 HDC meeting.
2. Removing the aluminum siding and restoring the underlying wood siding is appropriate.
3. The kitchen door on the rear wing currently has steps but no landing outside of the door, which does not meet building code. This door opening is probably not original, since there was another door opening on the other side of the rear wing that has been covered over. The proposed covered porch would not extend beyond the plane of the south elevation of the main house. Since this is a rear entrance, and no character defining features of the house, such as windows, would be negatively impacted, this work is appropriate. The application also requests to move the kitchen door a short distance to the right or east to accommodate kitchen cabinets inside. Since the door opening is not original, this work is appropriate. The motion proposed by staff will limit the move to no more than twelve inches.
4. Placing a window at the location of the former north kitchen door is not appropriate since the door still exists underneath the siding. Staff has not seen the door, but the applicant's description indicates that it may well be original to the rear wing. Leaving the door in place after the aluminum siding is removed would be appropriate. The property owner may still opt to cover over the door from the interior.
5. Staff is in the process of getting more information from the petitioner on the skylight and whether the windows proposed to be replaced are replacements or original or some of each, and what they would be replaced with.
6. The front (east) elevation has two large windows that are out of proportion with the rest of the building. They were most likely replacements for smaller windows. Evidence of the earlier windows may be uncovered beneath the siding, or the applicant may have to find a photograph or other documentary evidence showing the original fenestration pattern on the front of the house. If this portion of the application is approved, it should be conditioned on staff's review of the evidence and the proposed new windows' size, location, materials, etc.
7. Proposed restoration of the barn includes replacing the roof and east elevation window; restoring the gable-end windows; replacing the T-111 plywood siding on the east elevation with board and batten siding to match that found on the other three elevations; replacing the rotted skirt roof on the east elevation; replacement of the rotted bond beam; replacement of the non-original sliding doors with historically appropriate sliding barn doors; and increasing the height of the non-original block foundation wall by two block courses (16 inches).
8. The restoration of the barn is badly needed and appropriate. Raising the structure 16" by increasing the height of the foundation will allow increased headroom inside, either on the first floor or by dropping the floor lower on the second floor, or both.

258  
259 The interior of the barn could then be more comfortably used for storage, an office, or  
260 other similar uses. Zoning prevents the barn from being converted to a housing unit, and  
261 therefore no plumbing or kitchen may be installed in the barn. Though the barn will  
262 definitely look taller, staff does not believe that increasing the foundation by this height  
263 would look disproportionate to the rest of the building or negatively impact the surrounding  
264 properties.

- 265  
266 9. The proposed work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture,  
267 material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets  
268 *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, in particular standards 2,5,6,9  
269 and 10.

270  
271 **Owner/Address:** Jan Muhleman, 403 West Liberty LLC, 213 West Liberty, #100, A2, MI 48103

272  
273 **Applicant:** Carl O. Hueter, 1321 Franklin Blvd., A2, MI 48103

274  
275 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Wallace and White visited the site.

276  
277 Commissioner Wallace - Concurs with staff's report. The door opening was found to be non-  
278 original and is appropriate to move that over. The work on the porch won't be affecting any of the  
279 character defining elements of the house, being in the back, so that seemed appropriate for the  
280 work they're doing. The barn is an incredible old structure. It's fantastic, and the work that  
281 they're doing to restore it is not only appropriate but I'll be excited to see how it turns out. I would  
282 like to see some additional information on the proposed windows, so postponing that is a good  
283 idea. If we look at any motions relating to window repair, those should be omitted.

284  
285 Commissioner White – Concurs with staff and Commissioner Wallace and feels that the window  
286 elements should also be postponed to next month's meeting.

287  
288 **Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Carl Hueter, Architect on the project was present to speak on  
289 behalf of the appeal. He stated that they are also in agreement that the proposed windows  
290 should also be postponed until a later meeting. We're looking at the front and actually  
291 reconsidering replacement of some of the front windows, so that would be appropriate for a later  
292 time. The door would be better functionally as a window, but we would like to hear what the  
293 Commission has to say about that, and if it is original, would certainly keep it there.

294  
295 The barns foundation was built sometime in the past. The block is of a 'plant-mix' design. If you  
296 look at the foundation at the home as opposed to that, you can tell that this foundation was done  
297 sometime after the 1940's and repositioned this. Allowing this to be boosted up will allow the  
298 structure to be much more useable, and the give on that would be that we would restore the barn  
299 to its original condition. It has a beautiful molded batten on it and would like to replicate it on all  
300 four sides.

301  
302 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

303  
304 Commissioner Ramsburgh – How are you going to tackle the problem of the little structure that is  
305 adjacent to the barn? (C. Hueter – When the parcel went up for sale and it was the two homes,  
306 the property line actually splits the two homes, so that six inch gap is the property line running  
307 down the middle. The upper battens will be replicated and replaced.

308

309 Commissioner Glusac – Is there an elevation on the proposed window for egress? (C. Hueter –  
310 I'll provide details for that for your August meeting. There were some head room issues and  
311 trying to fit that in up there will be an interesting exercise.)  
312

313 Commissioner McCauley – The back window that is proposed to be changed with the porch  
314 addition – is there any evidence that this is not the original opening? (C. Hueter – Yes - If you go  
315 inside where the framing has been changed to fit that window and the front two windows in. That  
316 window could be from the move period, or even later, we don't know.)  
317

318 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Will the new porch roof cover that window on the second floor?  
319 (C. Hueter – No. We'll have an area well there, so there will be an indent to allow that window to  
320 stay where it is.) The roof will slant out? (Yes, but the new roof is flat.)  
321

322 **Audience Participation:** None.

323  
324 **Discussion by the Commission:**

325  
326 **MOTION #1**

327  
328 Moved by Commissioner Wallace, Seconded by Commissioner McCauley, "that the Commission  
329 postpone the portions of application HDC09-092, 310 Second Street, that address window  
330 repairs, window replacement and skylight until the August 13, 2009 Historic District Commission  
331 Meeting."  
332

333 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO POSTPONE – *Approved – (Postponed to the August 2009***  
334 ***Regular Session.***

335  
336 **MOTION #2**

337  
338 Moved by Commissioner McCauley, Seconded by Commissioner White, "**that the**  
339 **Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 310**  
340 **Second Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to add**  
341 **a porch off the kitchen on the south elevation near the rear of the house and shift**  
342 **the existing kitchen door to the east no more than twelve inches; restore the**  
343 **exterior of a kitchen door on the north side of the rear wing; and restore the barn**  
344 **and raise it 16 inches on top of the existing concrete block foundation, as proposed**  
345 **and conditioned. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement,**  
346 **texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area**  
347 **and meets *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and***  
348 ***Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, in particular standards 2,5,6,9, and**  
349 **10 and the *Guidelines for New Additions, Building Site, Entrances and Porches.*"**  
350

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

352  
353 **B – OLD BUSINESS – None.**

354  
355 **C - NEW BUSINESS – None.**

356  
357 **Audience Participation – General – None.**

358  
359 **D - MINUTES – None available.**

360

361 **E - REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS – None.**

362  
363 **F - ASSIGNMENTS**

364  
365 **F-1** Review Committee for Monday, August 10, 2009 at 5:00 p.m. Commissioners  
366 Wallace and Ramsburgh.

367  
368 **G - STAFF ACTIVITIES REPORT**

369  
370 **G-1** May report was handed out to the Commission.

371  
372 **H - CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS**

373  
374 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Spoke about the fee increases for the HDC and that they are all  
375 glad that those have been rescinded. She stated that some residents met last evening to discuss  
376 alternate ways to fund or arrange fees as necessary, but that more information is needed. They  
377 plan to present some information to this body.

378  
379 Coordinator Thatcher – The fees are set by the Planning and Development Services Unit and  
380 presented to City Council for approval. If the HDC wants to have input on that process, that's  
381 great – but I would shy away from saying you're going to approve those as you're not the  
382 approving body. I did get a summary of the meeting that you attended last night, and I will be  
383 meeting with other city staff on a new potential fee schedule that will go to City Council in  
384 September.

385  
386 Commissioner Wallace – I was also in attendance at that meeting, and it was very productive. I  
387 know that more than one individual there seemed to have done a lot of research regarding other  
388 cities and their fee schedules so that we could do a comparison and fall into line with what other  
389 municipalities are doing and that was very helpful.

390  
391 Commissioner White – Reminded the Commission to take care when meeting off-site discussing  
392 business – that an inadvertent quorum could result, so we should be mindful of that.

393  
394 Commissioner Giannola – Do the Commissioners want to have a formal 'opinion' on these fees,  
395 or do we want to leave it to the Committee and Council to handle?

396  
397 Commissioner Wallace – Once that fee schedule comes forth, I wouldn't be opposed to formally  
398 stating that this is what is recommended or we're in favor of it.

399  
400 Coordinator Thatcher – Due to the timeline, it won't be ready to present to you.

401  
402 B. Acquaviva - Mentioned that the proper venue for that would be to go before City Council and  
403 speak at the public hearing regarding these fees. *(More general discussion among the*  
404 *Commission regarding this subject.)*

405  
406 **I - COMMUNICATIONS**

407  
408 **ADJOURNMENT**

409  
410 *The Meeting was adjourned at 7:52 p.m. without objection.*

411 **SUBMITTED BY: Brenda Administrative Service Specialist V, Planning and Development**  
412 **Services.**