



City of Ann Arbor

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

Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

Thursday, July 14, 2011

7:00 PM

City Hall - Council Chambers 2nd Floor

A CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Ramsburgh at 7:00 PM.

B ROLL CALL

Chair Ramsburgh called the roll.

Present: 5 - Kristina A. Glusac, Robert White, Ellen Ramsburgh, Patrick McCauley, and Benjamin L. Bushkuhl

Absent: 1 - Thomas Stulberg

C APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made that the Agenda be Approved as presented. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

D HEARINGS

D-1 11-0810

HDC11-084 414 Detroit Street - New Business Sign - Old Fourth Ward Historic District

PUBLIC HEARING:

Jill Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This house is a one and three-quarter story Italianate with gables facing the front and north, a pair of four-over-four double hung windows in the front gable, and single four-over-four windows on the rest of the house. The windows have elaborately carved hoods and there is a small gabled roof over the front door. It first appears in the 1883 City Directory as the home of John McComb, an engineer with the Luick Brothers lumber mill across the street. There was an earlier structure on the site, but it is not known whether this is the same building. McComb was followed in 1886 by laborer Henry Kauffmann, whose daughter Louise, a dressmaker, continued to live here until 1920, sharing the house with piano tuner Stephen Schaible. (From the Old Fourth Ward study committee report.)

LOCATION:

The site is located on the west side of Detroit Street between North Fifth Avenue and East Kingsley Street. Zingerman's Next Door is immediately to the north, and Community High is to the south.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to hang an oval-shaped business sign off the gabled wood roof over the front door of the building.

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):

Storefronts

Not Recommended: Using new illuminated signs; inappropriately scaled signs and logos; signs that project over the sidewalk unless they were a characteristic feature of the historic building; or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy remaining character-defining features of the historic building.

STAFF FINDINGS:

- 1. The proposed wood business sign is appropriately scaled and complimentary to the historic structure.*
- 2. Staff recommends approval of the proposed sign since it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Commissioners Bushkuhl and White visited the site as part of their review.

Bushkuhl stated that he felt the proposed sign was appropriate since it could be reversible and it was in proportionate scale with the rest of the building.

White agreed with Bushkuhl and stated that he supported the proposed project.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

None

Motion made by McCauley, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 414 Detroit Street, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to install a business sign as documented in the owner's submittal. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to 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 9 and 10 and the guidelines for storefronts. On the roll call vote the Chair declared the motion carried.

Yeas: 5 - Glusac, White, Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, and Secretary Bushkuhl

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - Rozmarek, and Vice Chair Stulberg

D-2 [11-0811](#)

HDC11-085 617 West Madison - Fence Installed Without Approvals - Old West Side Historic District

PUBLIC HEARING:

Jill Thacher gave the staff report. She added that her staff report noted blue glass in the second story windows, which she had since been informed was a blue film that had been applied to the windows.

Thacher referenced changes made to the Historic Preservation Ordinance that took place in 2007, and noted that a couple of the pictured fences in historic districts, provided by the applicant, were installed before the 2007 ordinance changes. She explained that the old ordinance did permit alterations that would only require permission from the Building Department and not the Historic District Commission. Those alterations included fences of any kind except chainlink or metal security type fences that were not allowed to be installed in front open space, within 15 ft behind the front of the house or within the side open space on side corner lots.

Thacher explained that in 2007 the Historic District Commission adopted their new ordinance and Design Guidelines that were also approved by the State Historic Preservation office.

She stated that she had gone through two hundred or more old photographs of Ann Arbor properties. She said that while the post and rail style of fence is old it was popular predominantly before the turn of the 19th Century and was used to enclose livestock. She said that post and rail fences weren't as predominant after the turn of the Century because land was getting subdivided and lots became smaller, noting that picket fences were mostly used in residential downtown areas. She said that she wasn't saying that there was never a split rail fence on a home built in the 1920s, but it was clearly predominant to have wood or metal picket fences on residential lots. She stated that since this house wasn't built until 1927, which is late in the period of significance for the district, it would be more stylistically accurate to have a picket style fence.

Thacher gave more background information on the post and rail fence style, stating that it made a comeback in the post World War II era, in the suburban housing boom in a more suburban style on large lots with a rustic look rather than the finer style that goes along with the Victorian and craftsman homes that are seen in the City's Old West Side Historic District.

She read standard 9 from the Secretary of the Interior's Standard's for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, and also, from the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, District of Neighborhood Setting, read that it is not recommended to introduce new construction into historic districts that is visually incompatible or that destroys historic relationships within the setting.

BACKGROUND:

This one-and-a-half story craftsman first appears in the 1927 City Directory as the home of Emil Hoppe, an employee of the telephone company and a student. It features a full width front porch with a large gable dormer above, siding on the first floor and shingles on the second, and blue glass in the top sash of several of the original three over one windows.

LOCATION:

The site is located at the southeast corner of West Madison and Fifth Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval for a split rail fence that was constructed without a Certificate of Appropriateness or zoning compliance permit.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

Ann Arbor City Code Chapter 103 § 8:421(3)

When work has been done upon a resource without a permit, and the commission finds that the work does not qualify for a certificate of appropriateness, the commission may require an owner to restore the resource to the condition the resource was in before the inappropriate work or to modify the work so that it qualifies for a certificate of appropriateness. If the owner does not comply with the restoration or modification requirement within a reasonable time, the commission may request for the city to seek an order from the circuit court to require the owner to restore the resource to its former condition or to modify the work so that it qualifies for a certificate of appropriateness. If the owner does not comply or cannot comply with the order of the court, the commission may request for the city to enter the property and conduct work necessary to restore the resource to its former condition or modify the work so that it qualifies for a certificate of appropriateness in accordance with the court's order. The costs of the work shall be charged to the owner, and may be levied by the city as a special assessment against the property. When acting pursuant to an order of the circuit court, the city may enter a property for purposes of this section.

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.

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

District or Neighborhood Setting

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

STAFF FINDINGS

1. On Friday, June 3, 2011 staff received a phone call from a neighbor about a fence being built without permits. A building inspector visited the site that day and

found that a split rail fence had been installed along the Fifth Street sidewalk on this corner lot. The inspector issued a stop work order, which was also signed by a gentleman on site who staff believes was the person doing the work (Gary S_____).

Over the weekend the fence was installed along West Madison, despite the stop work order. The property owner faces a civil infraction or misdemeanor for violating the stop work order. This has not yet been issued by the building department, at the request of HDC staff. It may still be issued by the Building Official.

2. Staff may sign off on the "Installation of new fences, provided they meet the requirements of the Historic District Design Guidelines" on the Commission's behalf. Those guidelines say it is appropriate to use wood (picket or alternating board), wrought iron or metal (wrought iron style), or chain link (rear yards only) for fencing. Split rail fence does not conform to these guidelines, and therefore must be reviewed by the Commission.

3. Staff's opinion is that split rail fences in front yards are incompatible with the historic character of the district. They were not traditionally installed in the Old West Side, which is why staff may not sign off on them on the Commission's behalf. A fence of square or flat pickets with at least 50% opacity would be an appropriate design. As an example, there is an old wood picket fence along the south property line of this lot. The design appears to be traditional and appropriate for the district. See application photos of "our old fence".

4. The placement (along the lot line) and height of the fence appear to be appropriate.

5. The applicant provided photos of other fences around the west side. Several of these sites are not in the historic district (814 Fifth, 815 Third, 407 Wilder, 705 Davis). The remaining photos show three split rail fences running on side-lot lines that were installed prior to the adoption of the current Historic Preservation ordinance in 2007. The other two photos illustrate the height of fences, which is not an issue with this application. The applicant mentions that city parks have split rail fencing, and the Wurster Park fencing was also installed prior to the adoption of this ordinance.

6. Staff recommends denial of the first motion below. The installed fence is not an appropriate design for the Old West Side Historic District and does not meet The Secretary of the Interior's standard 9 or guidelines for neighborhood setting. If the application is denied, a new application may be made to staff or the commission to install a fence in a design that is appropriate for the district.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Commissioners Bushkuhl and White visited the site as part of their review.

White stated that he supports the City on this application and would like to give the applicant 30 days to retro-fit the fence to be able to meet the Historic Standards, since as it currently stands the fence doesn't meet the standards.

Bushkuhl noted that the presented pictures illustrate what they saw on site and added that the applicant has a lot of street frontage since it is a corner lot which makes the fence very visible.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Joy Glovick, 350 S Main Street, Suite 400, Ann Arbor, attorney for the owners of the

property spoke on behalf of the applicants.

Louis Breskman and Meredith Newman, 617 W Madison Ave, Ann Arbor were also present.

Glovick stated that there are split rail fences in the area and if the standard is that the fence has to fit in with the surroundings then the fact that there are other split rail fences it would be inappropriate to say that this new fence doesn't fit in. Glovik also noted that there are some chainlink fences in the old historic district. She said her understanding of the ordinance is that what was approved for fences for 2007 was the same today.

Glovick said that by saying that this fence wasn't appropriate was singling out the applicant as one amongst many in the district that have the same kind of fence or that have fences that do not conform with the appropriate requirements. She said that the initial plan that was presented was to have plants grow on the fence so it would look like a shrub. She stated that the owners don't particularly like the look of picket fences and it would significantly impede the view of the house. She felt that it would be more obstructive to have a picket fence than a split rail that is more open.

Glovick said the purpose of the fence was to hinder people from cutting across their land. She said the owners had received a letter of support from a neighbor at 815 Third Street who thinks the fence is appropriate.

Glovick added that the owners do care about their property and have improved their property by painting it. She said that the owners wanted to do something that was consistent with their environment. She felt that a picket fence wouldn't look good on a lot that size. She also stated that there are split rail fences on nearby park properties that would make this fence look consistent with the surroundings.

Ramsburgh asked the owners if they knew their property was in the historic district before they installed the fence.

Breskman answered yes, and since two blocks away there is another split rail fence they thought it was appropriate.

Newman said that the guidelines didn't say that they couldn't specifically have a split rail fence, rather it only gave preferences.

Glovick said that the guidelines said wood fences and gave illustrations such as picket fences.

Ramsburgh asked if the applicant had called City staff to find out what would be appropriate.

Breskman said no, and since he knew that post and rail originated before chainlink he thought it was okay.

Glovick said it wasn't an intentional act of her client to install a fence without a permit. She said that the Building Inspector that came out with the Stop Work order made it very informal when he informed the owners that they needed a permit to install the fence.

White asked if they would be receptive to retro-fitting the fence. He suggested they speak to a fence installer to get ideas how they could use the existing fence and have it additionally fitted so it would meet the standards. He said the applicant would have

to come up with a design and the City would review it to see if it met the standards. He said that if they left the fence as it was and the Commission denied their application, then the fence would have to be removed, and he didn't like to see the economic waste.

Newman said they are open to retrofitting but the face of the rails aren't very even so it would be difficult, and it would be cheaper to rip it down and put up a new fence.

Glovick suggested maybe adding additional posts in between the existing posts.

Breskman asked about other post and rail fences in City's Parks.

White explained that the City's Park Districts are separate from the Historic Districts. He said that there are historic districts located across the street from non-historic districts, so it could be possible to see the same style fence allowed in a non-historic district that could be located across the street from their property, where it wasn't allowed. He said that the City created a cut-off line and decided which ones were within the significant historic era.

Glovick said she understands the boundary lines, and felt that the words "surrounding area" counter acts the ordinance. She felt that the ordinance was too restrictive and the new fence did hold historic value.

Breskman and Newman stated that they felt Thacher spoke in support of their fence when she said that picket fences were used for smaller lots and since their lot was larger it was more appropriate to have a different style fence.

A motion to approve was made by Commissioner Glusac, supported by Commissioner White (see text below) and this discussion followed:

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Glusac stated that it was the Commission's duty to review the application under the current standards and not under the pre 2007 ordinance. She said that if the application had come before the Commission in the normal process and they had reviewed it on paper before it had been installed, she felt the Commission would've felt strongly that this type of fence wasn't appropriate. She said that just because it's historic doesn't mean that it is compatible with any historic building. She said that as the application stands now, she wouldn't approve the motion on the floor.

McCauley stated that within the period of significance for this house, these types of fences, even if they existed within the Old West Side, would never ever have been in the front of the house. Since the front was the public side, it would've had a more refined picket fence and if they would've had a stockyard full of animals this type of fence would've been in the back of the house, out of the public view as much as possible. He said that this type of fence might be more appropriate in a farm type setting in a rural historic district. He said it didn't fit into an urban neighborhood historic district. McCauley added that if the fence would be installed in the rear yard he thought they would have a different view of the fence since it wouldn't be the first thing that you see when you approach the house.

Bushkuhl explained that the guidelines that he and the Commission must use are the current ones that were adopted in 2007, and they must examine each situation on a case by case basis using those guidelines. He said that an important distinction to him in light of the guidelines is to look at items such as other houses surrounding the property and when he drove through this neighborhood he didn't see split rail fences in the front yards of houses in the historic district.

Bushkuhl said he is sympathetic to the fact that the fence is well installed and that the owners have done a good job on the house since they moved in trying to preserve its historic character through painting and upkeep. He said that his research on historic split rail fences showed them to be with more stacked and staggered logs than this simple one that was used when subdivisions came and they were trying to hint back to historical times. Bushkuhl said that if this was a traditional split rail fence like at Colonial Williamsburg, which would be with logs stacked on top of each other with alternating sticks to hold them up, this design goes back to the Civil War. He said in reviewing each case before him, he looks at the Design Guidelines. He also read from a May 2006 memo from the State Historic Preservation Office noting that, 'In general fences should not be in front yards unless they were there originally.' He pointed out that it was important for the Commission to be careful in reviewing items that were being added to properties and that weren't original, which he felt was the case with the fence before them.

White reiterated that he would like to see the fence retrofitted if the owners were receptive to that and he agreed with the Commission's statements in that the fence was inappropriate.

McCauley added that he wasn't sure that given the fence design he didn't know if it was even possible to modify the fence to where it would be acceptable to meet the historic standards.

Ramsburgh thanked the Commission for their comments and hoped that those comments had helped explain their position and what the Commission's charge is in following the guidelines for the entire neighborhood. She noted that one of the great joys of the neighborhood is that it has retained its historic character and that is what their guidelines are intended to do. She stated that she didn't feel the fence is appropriate in this setting and she felt it was unfortunate that the Commission is acting on it after the fact. Ramsburgh added that she felt there are other alternatives to prevent people from crossing the lawn, and that the applicant has other options available to them.

Glusac pointed out the wording in the motion, which references the specific Standards the Historic District Commission must follow for each case that comes before them. She noted that these standards aren't just for the City of Ann Arbor, but a National standard that assists Commissions like theirs to review projects. She said that they must review each case against the mandated standards and that the Commission isn't making them up but they use them as the baseline for their reviews.

Bushkuhl added that if this feels arbitrary, that even if there were other fences that had existed for a long time before the district had these specific guidelines, that wouldn't be the basis to allow this style of fence. He said that in rehabilitating properties the Commission hopes to bring the historic features back towards the original rather than the other way.

A motion was made by Glusac, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 617 West Madison Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, for a split-rail fence that has already been installed along two front lot lines. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to 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 9 and the guidelines for district or neighborhood setting.

On a roll call vote, the record reflected that the motion failed.

Yeas: 1 - White

Nays: 4 - Glusac, Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, and Secretary Bushkuhl

Absent: 2 - Rozmarek, and Vice Chair Stulberg

A motion was made by Chair Ramsburgh, seconded by Vice Chair McCauley, that because this work was done without permission of the Commission and does not qualify for a certificate of appropriateness, the property owner is required to restore the property to its prior condition under section 8:421 of Ann Arbor City Code. The owner must remove the split rail fence within ninety days and restore the site to its previous condition. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Yeas: 5 - Glusac, White, Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, and Secretary Bushkuhl

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - Rozmarek, and Vice Chair Stulberg

D-3 [11-0812](#)

HDC11-086 703 West Madison Street - New Basement Egress Window - Old West Side Historic District

PUBLIC HEARING:

Jill Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This one and a half story gable-end home was built in 1948 and is a non-contributing structure in the Old West Side Historic District.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the south side of West Madison between Fifth Street and Sixth Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to install a new basement egress window on the rear elevation of the house.

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.

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

Windows - Alterations/Additions for the New Use

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.

STAFF FINDINGS

1. *The proposed egress window is on the rear of the house and is compatible with the design of the building. It would expand an existing window and shallow well to meet code requirements using a casement window. The application includes a window with between-the-glass muntins, which staff has advised is not appropriate. The suggested motion is conditioned on a window with no muntins. If that motion is passed and the applicant finds a window in the same size with appropriate applied muntins, it may be reviewed later for a staff approval.*

2. *Staff recommends approval of the application since the work is in an appropriate location on the rear of the house and does not detract from the character of the district or neighborhood.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Commissioners Bushkuhl and White visited the site as part of their review.

White stated that he supports the City on the project.

Bushkuhl added that he didn't see any concerns with the proposed project.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

None

Motion made by McCauley, seconded by Bushkuhl that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 703 West Madison, a non-contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to install a basement egress window and well on the rear elevation on the condition that the window is a single lite with no muntins. As conditioned, the work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to 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 9 and the guidelines for windows. On a roll call vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Yeas: 5 - Glusac, White, Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, and Secretary Bushkuhl

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - Rozmarek, and Vice Chair Stulberg

D-4 [11-0813](#)

HDC11-087 314 Second Street - New Deck Behind House - Old West Side Historic District

PUBLIC HEARING:

Jill Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This simple one and three-quarter story home features wide board trim in the front- and rear-facing gables, a cut stone foundation, and double-hung windows. The front porch is not original. It first appears in the Polk Directory in 1897 as the Buechler home.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the west side of Second Street, south of West Liberty and north of West William.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to remove a concrete side porch and construct a wood porch, construct a wood deck in the backyard, and install glass block in two basement windows.

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 or Neighborhood Setting

Not Recommended: Removing or radically changing those features of the setting which are important in defining the historic character.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The current side porch is part of a rear one-story wing and is built of concrete with a wood guardrail and steps. The proposed porch is wood, the same depth as the existing concrete porch (5'), and extends 13.5' to the rear corner of the house. It would have wood decking and guardrails, and cedar lattice skirting. The posts would complement those on the front porch.

2. Steps would lead off the porch to a low deck that is approximately 13' x 16' and 8" off the ground. One corner of the deck would be clipped to follow the lines of an existing picket fence that defines the backyard.

3. The two basement windows proposed to be infilled with glass block are on a rear addition that dates to at least 1908. The basement walls on this section of the house are modern concrete masonry units, however, and the two windows are not believed to be from the period of significance. The windows would be fully or partially obstructed by the new porch and deck.

4. Staff recommends approval of the application since the design of the porch is compatible with the historic structure, the deck is appropriately scaled and removable, and the basement windows are not character-defining or from the period of significance. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, material and relationship to the rest of the site and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 9 and 10, and the guidelines for district or neighborhood setting.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Commissioners Bushkuhl and White visited the site as part of their review.

Bushkuhl reported that he felt the project would be good since it will address issues the owners are having with their concrete porch, and the design has been well thought out and meets the standards for rehabilitation.

White stated that he supports Bushkuhl's comments and the City on this project.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

John Stafford, Stafford Carpentry, 438 Third Street, Ann Arbor, spoke on behalf of the owner, Bryan Peterson. He stated that he felt the owner has done a good job at maintaining the house in a historic manner and he felt the deck would add to the taste of the house without changing the character of the house. He added that the side porch was in need of repair.

Ramsburgh commented that the applicant has done a great job at rehabilitating several houses on that block of Second Street.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

McCauley stated that this section of Second Street has really transformed itself and he said it was exciting to see how the power of the Historic District neighborhood through the owners are able to improve it.

Motion made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 314 Second Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a wood side porch and wood deck, and infill two basement windows with glass block as detailed in the applicant's submittal. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, material, and relationship to the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 9 and 10 and the guidelines for district or neighborhood setting. On a roll call vote the Chair declared the motion passed.

Yeas: 5 - Glusac, White, Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, and Secretary Bushkuhl

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - Rozmarek, and Vice Chair Stulberg

D-5 [11-0814](#)

HDC11-088 514 Lawrence Street - One Story Rear Addition and New Garage - Old Fourth Ward Historic District

PUBLIC HEARING:

Jill Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

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

LOCATION:

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

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to 1) remove an attached 233 SF concrete block single-story garage from the rear of the house and replace it with a 308 SF sun room with a roofdeck and trellis; 2) add a second floor door in a new opening to access the roofdeck; 3) construct a new one and a half story, two-car garage in the rear yard, and 4) pave the driveway.

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 features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall 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.

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

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

New Additions

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

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

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

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

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

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

Building Site

Recommended: Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserve the historic relationship between a building or buildings, landscape features, and open space.

Retaining the historic relationship between buildings, landscape features, and open space.

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: Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color and texture or which destroys historic relationships on the site.

Removing or radically changing buildings and their features or site features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building site so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Commissioners Bushkuhl and White visited the site as part of their review.

White stated that he supports the staff report on this project.

Bushkuhl reported that the garage seems a bit large from viewing the plans but when you are on site you will note a three story building to the left of proposed garage location. He added that he felt a garage would be more acceptable than the large open space with crushed gravel covering it as is the current situation.

Bushkuhl noted that he was glad to hear that the owner would be converting the multi-family student rental to a single family home and moving in.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Robb Burroughs, reform studios, 1850 Robert Street, Ann Arbor, spoke on behalf of

the owners, Daniel and Marianne Clauw, who were also present.

He stated that they are currently seeking a Zoning Board of Appeal variance on the parcel and that it is currently occupied so it is difficult for them to gain access to the inside to verify original window placements etc.

Glusac asked if their intent is to match the new siding with the existing siding.

Burroughs responded that they haven't had the luxury of knowing what is behind the current siding and since it is asbestos they need to be careful once they begin the process. He said that their intent is to verify any existing siding material to see if it is historically restorable.

Glusac asked if they had thought about matching the garage type windows with those proposed on the house addition.

Burroughs said there are double-hung windows on the garage and operable casements on the porch addition. He said they had considered matching them but unfortunately they don't have the same broad swath available to them. He explained that they would like to use the porch more like a four-season room and have as much operable window space as possible.

McCauley asked if they would be granted the variance to move the garage further back, how would it affect the tree on the neighbor's side.

Burroughs responded that his understanding is that they need to stay out of the drip-line of that tree which is what they would do, adding that the tree is a remarkable specimen and they want to preserve it in every way possible.

Ramsburgh asked how tall the proposed garage would be.

Thacher responded that the height would be 25 feet at the ridge and 17 feet at the midpoint of the gable with a footprint of 24'x26'.

Ramsburgh asked if the new proposed garage would back up to the neighbor's garage.

Burroughs said that they want to be sensitive to the placement of the garage in relationship to the neighbor's garages.

Bushkuhl asked if the siding would be a Hardiplank siding with a smooth surface.

Burroughs said yes.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

McCauley said he wasn't sure that the proposed style of casement windows are fitting for an addition in the historic district. He said that maybe if they had muntins it might be more sympathetic and less modern looking.

Glusac said that she felt that given the height they were fitting and she supports the proposed design.

Ramsburgh agreed with Glusac in that it was appropriately distinguished and yet sympathetic enough.

McCauley asked the Commission what their thoughts were on the proposed

demolishing of the rear part of the building which is a part of the contributing structure.

Glusac and Ramsburgh responded no, not in this case.

Bushkuhl said that in visiting the site he noted that it isn't conditioned space and has been used for storage and is in very poor shape. He added that if they were to try to restore it, they wouldn't be able to use it as a garage.

White agreed with the comments.

A motion was made by Bushkuhl, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 514 Lawrence Street, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to demolish a single-car attached garage and construct a rear sunroom addition, construct a two-car garage, and pave the driveway, as documented in the owner's submittal. In addition, on the condition that a zoning variance is granted, the garage may be pushed toward the rear of the lot to within 3' of the rear lot line. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to 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, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for new additions and building site. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Yeas: 5 - Glusac, White, Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, and Secretary Bushkuhl

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - Rozmarek, and Vice Chair Stulberg

D-6 [11-0815](#)

HDC11-089 514 East Ann Street - Relocate One Wall of Garage for Code Compliance - Old Fourth Ward Historic District

PUBLIC HEARING:

Jill Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This elaborate Queen Anne features colored glass panels framing the upper half of every window on the original part of the house, and a large arched window on the porch. The front porch has elaborate spindles and cut-out designs on the skirting, as well as numerous gables. Frank A. Howlett was the original occupant in 1890. Howlett served as the County Clerk and also president of the Ann Arbor City Council. He lived at this address until 1915, after which it was occupied by Joseph Staebler (1918-1925), and Martha and John Miller (1928 – 1950s).

Certificates of Appropriateness were awarded for a roof modification on July 8, 2010 (HDC10-087); for the installation of five egress windows in December, 2010 (HDC10-160); and to relocate a previously approved garage egress window in May, 2011 (HDC11-051).

LOCATION:

The site is located on the south side of East Ann, east of North Division and west of North State.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to move the existing west wall of an attached rear addition two feet to the east in order to make the addition compliant with zoning regulations. The existing roof would not be affected. Two double-hung windows would be installed on the new west wall.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

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

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

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

Windows - Alterations/Additions for the New Use

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.

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. The rear addition on this building was previously used as a garage, and still has roll-up garage doors, though on the interior drywall has been installed and the owner's intent is to use the space for bedrooms.*
- 2. This application proposes moving the west wall of the addition two feet in order to comply with building setback regulations. The roof would remain the same, with a two foot eave overhang to the new wall, and full-height end walls mean that the appearance from the front or rear would also remain the same. The proposed double-hung windows are more appropriate than the previously approved casements.*
- 3. As background information only, if the building becomes zoning compliant, the owner will be allowed to proceed with work to finish the basement and convert the*

structure to a duplex. As it is, the rear addition of the building is too close to the side property line and therefore the house is a nonconforming structure. Additional floor area may not be added to a nonconforming structure without a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals, which is unlikely to be granted since there is no hardship involved.

4. Staff believes that the proposed work does not diminish the overall historic character of the property. Staff also suggests that since the owner is structurally altering the rear addition, it would also be appropriate to remove the garage door and install double-hung windows and matching siding in its place, since the addition will no longer be used as a garage. Removing the garage door would be appropriate work to make the addition more compatible with the historic house. Staff is hopeful that the owner will take this suggestion seriously.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Commissioners Bushkuhl and White visited the site as part of their review.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Michael Van Goor, 118A N Fourth Ave, Ann Arbor, Architect for the project was present along with the owner, Zaki Alawi, to answer the Commission's questions.

Van Goor stated that they had wanted to replace the garage door earlier but were cautious not to modify too much of the original structure. He reviewed the plans with the Commission explaining the proposed project. He noted that when the garage was built in 1987 it was constructed two feet too close to the lot line, which they are now proposing to correct by moving one of the west walls which would bring the structure into zoning conformance.

McCauley asked why the roofline would be left as it is.

Van Goor said that he is trying to keep the even gable roofline appearance the same both from the street as well as the back.

Ramburgh asked if a fire escape is required from the second floor window.

Van Goor responded, no.

Glusac asked if they had considered removing the entire siding for something other than vinyl siding.

Alawi said they are interested in doing what the Commission feels would ensure they maintain the historic look and feel of the house.

Glusac said that she would like to make sure it is compatible with the addition.

Alawi asked if Thacher had any recommendations for the siding.

Thacher responded that she felt that his incremental steps have been good, but if he was looking for a big impact in a perfect world, she felt the vinyl siding should be taken off and the old siding underneath restored. She added that if the existing garage would've come before them today, with vinyl siding, it wouldn't have been approved.

Van Goor said that for now they want to bring the building into zoning conformance

and make sure the work that they do that is affected by these changes meet the historical standards and maybe in the future if the owner decides to make restorative work he can look at options with the siding at that time.

Thacher added that since the owners asked for suggestions on items that would improve the property, she said that replacing the metal handrails with wood would greatly improve the historic character, as would replacing the concrete steps with wooden ones.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

McCauley added that he was glad to see the removal of the garage door which will greatly improve the look of the addition.

Glusac expressed that she felt the proposed windows were appropriate.

Ramsburgh said that the house was a beautiful house that is being slowly restored which she was grateful for.

A motion was made by Chair Ramsburgh, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 514 East Ann Street, a contributing property in the Ann Street Historic Block, to move the west wall of the rear addition back two feet and install two double-hung windows, and in addition, to remove the garage door and infill that space with vinyl siding and two double-hung windows, as shown in the amended drawings and the owner's submittal. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to 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, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for windows and building site. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Yeas: 5 - Glusac, White, Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, and Secretary Bushkuhl

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - Rozmarek, and Vice Chair Stulberg

D-7 [11-0816](#)

HDC11-090 214 South State Street - Remove and Replace 22 Windows - State Street Historic District

PUBLIC HEARING:

Jill Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

The Goldman Brothers Building is a story stone and brick commercial vernacular building featuring one over one doublehung windows with decorative turned wood columns, a cornice with dentils, and a "GBB" medallion on the front. It was first occupied in 1928.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the west side of South State Street, south of East Washington and north of East Liberty.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace 28 second floor windows. Most of the windows appeared to staff to be original or from the period of significance for the district, though a few appeared to be more modern.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

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

(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.

From the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings:

Windows

Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving windows – and their functional and decorative features – that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. Such features can include frames, sash, muntins, glazing, sills, heads, hoodmolds, paneled or decorated jambs and molding, and interior and exterior shutters and blinds.

Making windows weathertight by recaulking and replacing or installing weatherstripping. These actions also improve thermal efficiency.

Repairing window frames and sash by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing. Such repair may also include replacement in kind of those parts that are either extensively deteriorated or are missing when there are surviving prototypes such as architraves, hoodmolds, sash, sills, and interior or exterior shutters and blinds.

Replacing in kind an entire window that is too deteriorated to repair – if the overall form and detailing are still evident – using the physical evidence to guide the new work. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Not Recommended: Retrofitting or replacing windows rather than maintaining the sash, frame, and glazing.

Replacing an entire window when repair of materials and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.

Removing or radically changing windows which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Installing new windows, including frames, sash, and muntin configuration that are incompatible with the building's historic appearance or obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features.

STAFF FINDINGS

1. Staff visited the site and noted varying stages of window decay, ranging from intact to beyond repair. Staff is of the opinion that at least some of the windows merit replacement, but the site visit and documentation of each window's condition will

determine staff's final recommendations at the meeting.

2. The applicant has provided a thorough inventory of the location and condition of each window, which staff will compare to the inventory taken by the Review Committee.

3. Emails to staff clarified that the application is to replace the existing windows with custom built matching wood windows. The decorative wood turned posts would also be replaced with matching where deteriorated beyond repair.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Commissioners Bushkuhl and White visited the site as part of their review.

Bushkuhl agreed with the staff report and reported that the windows are totally inoperable and in very bad condition. He noted that the window sills are built in a double type construction.

White agreed with the staff report and with the comments of Bushkuhl.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Scott Bowers, Bowers and Associates, 2400 Huron Parkway, Ann Arbor, spoke on behalf of the project. He explained that the replacement windows will be custom made specifically for these window openings. He said the owner is concerned with public safety since if the windows fall they could injure the public below. He said because so much of the window sills are destroyed they will have to do a lot of work to stop water infiltration.

McCauley asked if they had considered replacing the wooden sills with any other type of material.

Bowers said that they are looking at various paint options, noting that the owner wants to see the project last for a long time. He said they are relying on expert advise on paint options for the wooden window sills since they didn't want to get into vinyls.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

McCauley said that after seeing the condition of the windows and window sills he thinks that this is one of the few cases where wholesale window replacements is appropriate.

Ramsburgh agreed and said that this was a case when the deterioration was beyond rehabilitation efforts.

Glusac agreed and added that she was glad to see the proposed upgrades to a jewel of a building. She supported the project.

Bushkuhl said that he felt comfortable with the proposed changes to the windows and trim.

A motion was made by Glusac, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for 212-214 South State, a contributing building in the State Street Historic District, to replace 28 second floor windows on the east, north, and west elevations of the building with identical custom built wood windows, per the submitted application and subsequent emails to staff. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and

relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standard 6 and the guidelines for windows. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Yeas: 5 - Glusac, White, Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, and Secretary Bushkuhl

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - Rozmarek, and Vice Chair Stulberg

D-8 [11-0817](#)

HDC11-091 418 South First Street - Demo Garage, Construct New Garage - Old West Side Historic District

PUBLIC HEARING:

Jill Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This simple single-story cottage first appears in the 1928 Polk City Directory as the home of Gottlieb Weltz, a mason. It features a partial-width front porch and one-over-one double hung windows. The house has had at least two rear additions since 1965. The garage does not appear on the 1965 Sanborn map, and was either constructed after that date or moved to its current site.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the west side of South First Street, south of West William and north of West Jefferson.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to demolish a one-story garage and construct a two story tandem garage with a studio above.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

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

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

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

Building Site

Recommended: Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserve the historic relationship between a building or buildings, landscape features, and open space.

Retaining the historic relationship between buildings, landscape features, and open space.

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: Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color and texture or which destroys historic relationships on the site.

Removing or radically changing buildings and their features or site features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building site so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

District or Neighborhood Setting

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

STAFF FINDINGS:

- 1. The footprint of the garage is 13'6" x 42'. The second level studio overhangs the south garage wall by an additional 4'8", the north studio elevation has a box bay window that projects 2', and the south studio elevation has a balcony that projects 2'. The building is approximately 25' tall at the ridge.*
- 2. This house is situated in a low spot on this block. The houses behind it on Second Street are on ground 8' higher at their front elevations (see topo at end of this report). Surrounding buildings of interest include a large modern apartment building to the south with an entirely paved backyard, a 1 ½ story building near the west (rear) property line that is similar in height to the one proposed in this application, and a large one-story cinderblock building in the backyard two lots to the north that is home to a plumbing and heating company (see area plan submitted with application and aerial photo). Another site consideration is that there are no houses across First Street, only a large lumberyard building that presents a blank wall parallel to the street.*
- 3. It would be difficult to add additional living space onto the existing house without compromising its historic form. The proposed garage/studio is, in staff's opinion, large for an outbuilding. The view from the street is minimized by the narrow, deep design of the structure. The bulk of the height and length of the building would be felt by the occupants of 414 South First, the lot immediately to the north. That house's backyard is mostly open, with only a garden shed in the rear corner and privacy fencing running along the interior side of the driveway. Staff is less concerned about the impacts to the non-contributing apartment building to the south, and to the Second Street lots to the rear because of their existing outbuildings and higher elevation. The proposed garage/studio will be taller than the single-story house at 418 S First. That is not historically unprecedented on the OWS since barns and outbuildings were often taller than a single story. The location of the garage/studio, farther back than the rear wall of the house's rear additions, adequately separates the historic main*

block of the house from the taller new structure.

4. *The garage/studio's design is modern and would not confuse the historic record, yet retains a traditional gable front and cementitious clapboard siding. The proposed materials are appropriate and compatible with surrounding buildings. The wood or metal trellis structure circling the building is simple and designed to support plant materials.*

5. *This lot and its First Street neighbors are zoned C2B, which means there are no setback requirements or height limitations on accessory buildings under Chapter 55 Zoning of city code. The applicant has elected to follow most of the zoning requirements for the R4C residential zoning district which abuts this property to the rear, out of deference to the residential character of the block.*

6. *Staff recommends approval of the application and finds it is generally compatible in design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the site and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 2, 9 and 10, and the guidelines for building site and district or neighborhood setting.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Commissioners Bushkuhl and White visited the site as part of their review.

Bushkuhl reported that during his site visit he noted that several of the neighboring parcels have made alterations to their lot elevations. He also added that there are several taller buildings in the neighborhood so the proposed garage wouldn't look out of place.

White agreed with Bushkuhl and Thatcher's staff report.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Margaret Wong, 418 South First Street, owner of the parcel was present and spoke in support of the project. She explained that for the past 10 years she has had the pleasure of living in the Old West Side and running her business out of the home and garage. She said recently her household has doubled in size which has brought her to consider how she can make better use of her property. She explained that the proposed design seeks to make the most out of the existing rear yard without negatively impacting the neighborhood. She handed out pictures of similar garages in her neighborhood.

Glusac asked for clarification on the elevation views.

Ramsburgh asked for an explanation on the reasoning behind the reverse shed roof on the south and north side.

She said they decided to take their cue from the neighbor's buildings while creating some light scoops, especially from the north side into the work area.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Glusac asked about the proposed height, noting that it was difficult to see how the outbuilding relates to the main structure.

White said that the neighbors backyard is 3-4 feet higher than the petitioner's backyard.

Public Hearing reopened:

Bushkuhl said that looking from the street and going back to the neighbor's front door, he estimated that there could be 12 feet difference in grade.

Glusac asked the petitioner about heights and elevation.

Wong said that she hadn't taken grade measurements from her neighbor's properties, but she estimated that it was approximately 2 feet. She said the design was created for the least possible impact on her principal structure and the relationship with the neighboring structures. She said that in surveying the neighborhood one can see many 1 1/2 story outbuildings that are set further back on the parcels. She added that the anomaly would be that her house is one of the few 1 story houses in her neighborhood.

She pointed out the elevation heights to the Commission.

Ramsburgh said that while the reverse gables are very modernistic and she likes them, she drove around the neighborhood looking for any roof or gables that were similar in design, but couldn't find any. She stated that she finds the design troubling and jarring and asked if the petitioner had considered other designs like shed or gable dormers.

Wong responded that she felt this was an opportunity to take a playful approach to forms that are well known and create a graceful floorplan on the inside of the building. She said the reverse gabling lets a lot more light into the space.

Ramsburgh said that she appreciated that the neighbor had written a letter in support of their proposed project.

Public Hearing closed.

McCauley said he can appreciate the desire of an architect to be playful in their approach but he can't see the Secretary of the Interior appreciating and stretching the architectural boundaries of the neighborhood in this way. He said that we don't see reverse shed dormers in the neighborhood, because on historical buildings they had to consider the wood products they had to work with. He added that he didn't have issues with the scale of the building and liked the front gable as well as the trellis idea that tied the buildings together, but he didn't like the look of the reverse shed roof from the outside. He said that while he was in favor of the overall project he couldn't support the reverse gabled roof.

Glusac agreed with McCauley and said she appreciated the architectural design but didn't think that the setting was appropriate for the reverse gabled roofline. She added that she felt the general arrangement of the outbuilding was appropriate but couldn't support the reverse gabled roof.

Bushkuhl said that he would like to see a more traditional 6x6 wooden column instead of a spindly 3" diameter metal column. He noted that while one of the reverse gables wouldn't be seen from the street the owner could leave that one and change the design of the one that would be seen to a more traditional style. He added that he does support the project.

White said that he also supports the project and noted that this parcel is in the valley with everyone else above them, which won't allow much of the project to be seen. He

said that he understands why they are trying to get as much light as possible into the architectural studio.

Ramsburgh said he agrees with Glusac and McCauley and said that the outbuilding will be seen from the street and she would like to see references to similar architectural styles in the neighborhood. She noted that she supports everything proposed on this project with the exception of the reverse gables.

A motion was made by Bushkuhl, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 418 South First Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to demolish a single-car garage and construct a two-car tandem garage with studio space above, as documented in the owner's submittal. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to 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, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for building site and district or neighborhood setting. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion defeated.

Yeas: 2 - White, and Secretary Bushkuhl

Nays: 3 - Glusac, Ramsburgh, and Chair McCauley

Absent: 2 - Rozmarek, and Vice Chair Stulberg

E OLD BUSINESS

F NEW BUSINESS

G PUBLIC COMMENTARY - (3 Minutes per Speaker)

H APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None

I REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

J ASSIGNMENTS

J-1 Review Committee: Monday, August 8 at 5 PM for the August 11, 2011 Meeting

Glusac and Ramsburgh volunteered for the Review Committee, with Bushkuhl and McCauley as the back-up volunteers.

K REPORTS FROM STAFF

K-1 11-0819 June 2011 Staff Activities

L CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS**M COMMUNICATIONS**

Thacher pointed out that she is noticing a home ownership trend in the Old Fourth Ward, which is encouraging.

N ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was unanimously adjourned at 10:00 PM.

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

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

- *Video on Demand: Replay public meetings at your convenience online at www.a2gov.org/government/city_administration/communicationsoffice/ctn/Pages/VideOnDemand.aspx*
- *Cable: Watch CTN Channel 16 public meeting programming via Comcast Cable channel 16.*