



City of Ann Arbor

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

Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

Thursday, November 15, 2012

7:00 PM

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

A CALL TO ORDER

Chair McCauley called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

B ROLL CALL

Alexis DiLeo called the roll.

Present: 4 - Ellen Ramsburgh, Patrick McCauley, Thomas Stulberg, and Benjamin L. Bushkuhl

Absent: 3 - Robert White, John Beeson, and Jennifer Ross

C APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Agenda was unanimously approved as presented. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

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

None

E UNFINISHED BUSINESS - HEARINGS

[12-1458](#)

Revisions to Design Guidelines

A motion was made by Ramsburgh, seconded by Chair McCauley, that the Commission postpone taking action on the Revisions to Design Guidelines until the December 2012 HDC meeting. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

F HEARINGS

F1 [12-1452](#)

HDC12-180; 114 Ninth Street - Pantry, Window, and Porch Additions - OWSHD

PUBLIC HEARING:

Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This two story vernacular Queen Anne house features a stone foundation, side porch along the south elevation, a small oriel window with a shed roof in the front elevation,

and windows with colored glass in the upper sashes. It was built in 1897 and the original address was 4 Ninth Street. The first occupant was Henry Allmand, a laborer and photographer, and his wife, Carrie. Jacob Keck and his wife, Johanna, resided at the house from 1901 into the 1940s. A wood sided detached two car garage is also located on the north side of the property.

The HDC previously approved the construction of a large two story addition at the rear of the house in 2000.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the west side of Ninth Street between West Huron Street and West Washington Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to (1) construct a small new addition on the south (side) elevation; (2) construct a new porch and doorway in the north (side) elevation; (3) install a new window in a new opening in the second story of the south elevation; and (4) install a new door in a new opening on the garage. All of the proposed work on the house is on the large rear addition, not the original portion of the house.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

(2) *The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall 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 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):

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.

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

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

Not Recommended:

Attaching a new addition so that the character defining features of the historic building are obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

Duplicating the exact form, material, style, and detailing of the historic building in the new addition so that the new work appears to be part of the historic building.

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

Windows

Not Recommended:

Changing the number, location, size or glazing pattern of windows, through cutting new openings, blocking in windows, and installing replacement sash that do not fit the historic window opening.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The small new addition on the south elevation would use an existing gable roof covering an exterior door and build a box below it to form a pantry, accessed from inside the house. The pantry would be sided and trimmed to match the existing addition, and would have the appearance of a small bump out. It is located on the south side of the addition that was approved in 2000 by the HDC. No historic materials or character defining features would be lost, altered, or obscured by the work.

2. The exterior door removed by the pantry enclosure is proposed to be moved to the rear facing side of an existing bump out on the north elevation. In addition, the north bump out's shed roof would be extended 10'8" toward the rear of the house to form a porch roof over a 4'3" deep deck. The porch would have a single 8" square post and wood steps. The design of the porch is simple, inconspicuous, and complimentary to the house as a whole.

3. The proposed single hung bathroom window is located on the second floor near the rear of the addition to the back of the house. Per the homeowner, the window would be wood, 30" tall and 20" wide, and match the other windows on the rear addition. Its size and placement are appropriate and inconspicuous.

4. The addition of a wood person door to the rear of the modern two car garage would not negatively affect any nearby historic resources.

5. Staff finds the work compatible in exterior design, arrangement, material, and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area, and finds that it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Stulberg and McCauley visited the site as part of their review.

McCauley reported that he agrees with the staff report and that the changes are simple and will not affect the building or the historic nature of the site, adding that the new garage door will be facing the back and not be seen from the front of the house. He said the owners had mentioned that they were moving the door since they didn't end up using that entry way and they would also be moving the air conditioners to the other side of the house.

Stulberg agreed with McCauley and the staff report, noting that the size of the addition is relatively insignificant in terms of the pantry and the changes will be made

to the addition that was built in 2000. He said the added bump-out will match the bump-out of the other side and he felt it was good that they will be re-using the existing door. He said the changes will be unobtrusive to the existing structure.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Geoffrey Cook, 114 Ninth Street, owner of the property, was present to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

Ramsburgh asked if the applicant had considered making the roof over the proposed pantry a shed roof, to match the existing roofs on the house.

Cook said they had intended to use the existing structure built in 2000 and keep it as close to the existing as possible, but they were willing to make changes if the Commission felt it would be more appropriate.

Stulberg added that he would support a shed roof if the applicant decided they would like to make that change. He said the Commission could approve either style roof and leave it up to the applicant to work with staff if they decided to make the change.

Motion made by Ramsburgh, Seconded by Stulberg, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 114 Ninth Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a new addition on the south elevation, which if applicant wishes, could use a shed roof design instead of peaked roof design with staff approval, install a new window in a new opening in the second story of the south elevation, and construct a new porch and doorway in the north elevation. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for additions and windows.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Bushkuhl said that it was a good analysis and he agrees with the staff comments and the other Commissioners, agreeing that the Commission could approve either style roof as stated in the motion.

Stulberg clarified that the reason the Commission is saying the applicant could change the roof on the existing is because it is part of the addition built in 2000 and not a part of the original structure, because if it was a part of the original structure they would be encouraging the applicant to use the existing roofline.

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

Yeas: 4 - Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Vice Chair Stulberg, and Secretary Bushkuhl

Nays: 0

Absent: 3 - White, Beeson, and Ross

F-2 [12-1453](#)

HDC12-187; 217 West Madison Street - New Shed - OWSHD

PUBLIC HEARING:

DiLeo gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This two story vernacular house features a full width front porch with a hipped roof that wraps partially around the west elevation, a stone foundation, and large double hung windows in the front elevation. This contributing house was built in 1900 and was first occupied by Michael Kuebler, a fireman, and his wife, Matilda. In later City Directories, the last name is spelled Keebler and Michael is listed as a teamster. From 1915 to 1933, the house was occupied by Jacob F Graf and his wife Anna.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the southeast corner of the West Madison Street and South First Street intersection.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to remove a small existing shed located along the side of the house and construct a new 9' by 20' shed in the southeast corner of the property.

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.

(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):

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 preserves the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.

Not Recommended:

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

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The design of the shed would feature a shed roof sloping away from the house toward the east side property line, with wood barn sash windows and a fiberglass person door on the south elevation (facing the rear of the lot). Materials would include an asphalt shingle roof, 1"x4" wood trim, wood T111 siding, concrete block footers, 2x4 wall/roof framing, and 2x6 floor construction.

2. T111 siding is generally not an appropriate material to use on primary structures

like houses or commercial buildings in pre WWII historic districts, but may be appropriate for use on small accessory structures like a shed. Solid wood T111 can look compatible and hold up well if properly maintained. Composite T111 (usually plywood with a hardboard face, or compacted fiberboard) is problematic because of water infiltration and deterioration issues.

3. The shed is less than 200 square feet and would therefore not require a building permit. The property owner plans to construct the shed himself. In 2009, the owner received a staff approval for front porch repairs, which he also completed himself.

4. The simple features and shed roof style are appropriate and compatible with the OWS Historic District. The shed, at 9'x20', is slightly smaller than a single car garage. (For reference, a standard sized parking space is 9'x18'.) The work is reversible: the shed could be removed in the future with no adverse effects on historic structures.

The review committee visit will clarify placement on the lot and its relationship to neighboring buildings.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Stulberg and McCauley visited the site as part of their review.

Stulberg reported that the existing shed would be removed and replaced by the proposed shed. He said the addition of the shed would not detract from the home in any way and would be removable at any time. He said since the shed would not require a building permit he asked the owner to make sure that the setback requirements would be met.

McCauley added that he felt the removal of the existing shed would be a benefit to the existing historical building. He said the placement of the new shed is a bit closer to the house than what he would like to see but given the small lot size, he noted there is just no other place to build it. He said he was in favor of the application.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

John Van Alsburg, owner of the property, was present to respond to the Commission's questions. He said he had contacted the Planning Department regarding the required setback and they had verified that the setback is three feet from the property line, so the proposed plans are within the requirements.

Ramsburgh asked about the location of the entry door to the shed.

Van Alsburg said it would be on the north side.

Bushkuhl asked if any trees would have to be removed for placement of the shed.

Van Alsburg said, no, that the trees are on the property line.

Motion made by Stulberg, Seconded by Bushkuhl, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 217 W Madison Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to remove an existing shed and build a new 9' by 20' shed as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2 and 10 and the guidelines for building site.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

None

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

Yeas: 4 - Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Vice Chair Stulberg, and Secretary Bushkuhl

Nays: 0

Absent: 3 - White, Beeson, and Ross

F-3 [12-1454](#)

HDC12-188; 511 West Jefferson Street - Small Rear Addition - OWSHD

PUBLIC HEARING:

DiLeo gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This two story vernacular house features brick on the first floor and wood shingles on the second floor, and a full width stone front porch with Ionic columns. A one story, single bay garage is located in the southwest corner of the property. The garage features wood siding and double leaf hinged wood doors with 6 pane windows. The house first appears in the 1916 City Directory. The first occupants of the house were Theodore Schmidt, the principal of Zion Evangelical Lutheran School, and his wife, Freda. A single car garage of similar size to the current one appears on the 1925 Sanborn map.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the south side of West Jefferson Street between Third Street and Fourth Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to (1) construct a new 4' by 6' one story addition in the rear, southwest corner of the house, (2) replace the existing wood garage door with a new steel garage door, and (3) reshingle the upper story with wood shingles to match the current shingles, which have already been removed.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

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

features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

(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):

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.

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

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

Not Recommended:

Attaching a new addition so that the character defining features of the historic building are obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

Duplicating the exact form, material, style, and detailing of the historic building in the new addition so that the new work appears to be part of the historic building.

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:

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 house has a single story brick bumpout on the rear elevation that is 4' deep with a flat roof. At some point, a small wood framed and sided 4'x6' extension was added to it. The new owner of this house would like to extend the wood framed section by another 4' so the bumpout would span the width of the rear of the house. The new and old wood sections would be clad in wood shingles to match those on the second floor of the house. A new single lite door and concrete stoop and stairs leading up to it would face the rear yard. The size and location of the small addition are appropriate, do not compromise any architectural features of the house, and the shingle siding would improve the appearance of the rear of the house.

2. The garage doors appear to be original. If so, they should be repaired and retained unless they are deteriorated beyond repair, in which case they should be replicated. The owner desired to submit a new garage door design that rolls up but looks, when closed, like a double leaf door (i.e. a pair of doors with hinged sides). One of her goals is a way to open the door remotely. Staff feels that if the doors were allowed to be replaced such a new door could be considered, but that the design submitted does not replicate the existing doors closely enough. A better alternative, whether the doors are the repaired originals or replica double leaves, might be to install a swing door opener (made for swing garage doors or gates) or attach a swing door fitting to a direct drive garage door opener.

3. On November 6, staff received an inquiry about whether permits had been pulled to replace the shingle siding on the second story. Since they had not, staff called the contractor, who she had previously talked to about selective replacement of rotted shingles (mostly along the lower edge of the second story). The contractor explained that it turned out that the old shingles looked bad next to the new ones, so he went ahead and removed all of the shingles on the upper story, intending to replace them all with new ones for consistency. He knew that a building permit was required for this work, but had not tried to pull it in advance of removing the shingles. Staff informed the contractor that the HDC must approve the wholesale replacement of siding, so it was added to this application. The contractor will bring old and new shingle samples to the meeting.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Stulberg and McCauley visited the site as part of their review.

McCauley reported that he was a bit perturbed by the application, since he believed the application was for a shingle repair but when they visited the site they noticed that the contractor had removed all of the trim on the windows, and the window sills had been hacked off, and freeze boards had been removed, which he stated showed a total disregard for the process. He said Thacher verified that she had told them to stop the work, and there had been a stop work order placed, but they kept working. He said he believes the contractor had some explaining to do why they continued to do all the work after they had been told to stop work and without any approval from staff or the HDC or a building permit, which he noted was totally against the rules.

McCauley said the addition is a different issue and he didn't feel it would be an issue, but all the other on-going work seemed to be a mess. He said the existing garage doors didn't seem to be in bad shape. He noted that the plywood shingle panels that the contractor is proposing isn't even a real shingles and were not appropriate and he felt they should be replaced with real individual wood shingles in cedar.

Stulberg agreed that the garage doors are still in very good shape and should be retained and repaired. He agreed that the window trim that was removed should definitely not have been removed and any trim that will go back on needs to match the original. He said the roof shingles also should not have been removed and the replacement should match with the original.

Stulberg said the addition is very minor in relationship to the house and covering it up with shingles to match the existing house would be a significant approval over what is currently there. He agreed with McCauley that the soffits and freeze boards do not seem to be in bad shape and the spots that do need attention could be removed and replaced instead of covering it all up or replacing it.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Greg Hainen, Contractor for Katie Westgate, apologized for not following the process and requirements, stating that this was his first job on a house in a historic district. He said he must have misinterpreted Thacher's instructions regarding the repairs, since he believed as long as he put everything back to the way it was before, he would be okay. Hainen said there were issues with water coming into the house and they needed to add a water barrier since there was none. He said he wanted to do everything correctly and wants to put everything back to the way it was before the repairs, but with new materials. He showed shingles to the Commission explaining that they are real cedar shingles that come in a strip, with a sturdy bonded wood backing to last longer. He said they come from Chelsea Lumber.

Ramsburgh asked if the owner knew she was in an historic district.

Hainen said, yes, but not when she bought the house.

Ramsburgh said that information regarding historic district designation on each parcel is now available and noted on the City's assessing records.

McCauley asked the Contractor if he had spoken with Thacher before any of the work was commenced.

Hainen said, yes.

McCauley said, the work was a bit over zealous, on the removal of materials.

Ramsburgh said it looks like the material above the first three rows of siding, that had been removed, were in relatively good shape.

Hainen said, no, they were in bad shape. He showed pictures of the shingles to the Commission, stating that there was a lot of dry rot.

Ramsburgh said that those that were rotted could've been replaced or filled in with shingles. She said the old cedar shingles had a curve to them where they met the brick and it wasn't certain that the new shingles could achieve that same look or curve.

Hainen said he would be able to achieve the same look.

McCauley said the new shingle panels are shorter than the original ones.

Hainen said the new shingles have an interlocking system to them so they don't have to be so long.

McCauley asked about the external parts of the window sills, noting that it looked like they had been removed.

Hainen said they intend to sand down the window sills and keep them in place.

Bushkuhl asked if Hainen had used the cedar shingles before and if it looks the same as cedar shingles.

Hainen said, yes, that they are a cedar shake shingles with a composite backing.

Ramsburgh commented that they don't look the same just from examining them at the meeting.

Bushkuhl asked if they had looked at various options for the garage door, pointing out historic guidelines for protecting special features on historic properties.

Hainen said, no, because the garage was about 6-7 inches out of plumb so they built a mini foundation to help straighten it first.

Motion made by Stulberg, Seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 511 West Jefferson Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a new 4' by 6' one story rear addition as proposed and replace the second story wood shingle cladding with individual new wood shingle cladding in a matching size and material, repair soffit as needed with wood but not by covering it up or replacing it entirely; retain existing freeze and trim; retain any remaining window trim and replace the rest with wood sized to match original. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 6, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for additions and building site.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

McCauley said that he shares Commissioner's Ramsburgh concerns with the appearance of the proposed shingled material. He said he was somewhat uncomfortable approving the proposed shingles, yet he said he supports the motion since the guidelines specify that original materials needs to be replaced or repaired with same kind which he felt would be the individual wood shingles. He stressed trying that it was important to try to retain as much of the original house as possible, given that so much of it had been obliterated.

Stulberg agreed that the shingles don't look like individual shingles, given the plywood backing, but rather one solid piece of wood that had been cut to look like individual shingles, with plywood backing. He said as these shingles weather, they will not get that individual look of weathering, as with individual shingles that bend and move.

Bushkuhl clarified that the Commission was voting on a motion that did not include the proposed cedar shake shingle that the Contractor had wanted to use for the siding.

Bushkuhl also asked the Commission for discussion on the wood trim and what would be considered wood; jointed wood or pine.

Stulberg said he felt that a composite material would be considered a wood trim.

McCauley said it comes down to how the Standards are interpreted, and with new materials always coming out, the Commission has to do their best to interpret the Standards based on what they think they are referring to. He said he felt that jointed pine wood would hold up longer and act and look the same as wood.

Ramsburgh said she agrees with the motion on the floor and felt that the Commission had addressed their concerns on the issue.

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

Yeas: 4 - Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Vice Chair Stulberg, and Secretary Bushkuhl

Nays: 0

Absent: 3 - White, Beeson, and Ross

For the garage door replacement:

Motion made by Ramsburgh, Seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 511 West Jefferson Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to replace a wood garage door with a steel garage door. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 6, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for additions and building site.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

McCauley said that the Contractor had done a good job on repairing the garage, and since there was a lot of rotted wood on the garage it would need to be replaced; however, the garage doors were in very good shape for a carriage house, and he was therefore against replacing them.

Ramsburgh added that the doors are very much a character defining feature and characteristic of the garage and should be retained.

On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion denied.

Yeas: 0

Nays: 4 - Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Vice Chair Stulberg, and Secretary Bushkuhl

Absent: 3 - White, Beeson, and Ross

Hainen apologized for getting ahead of himself on the project.

McCauley said that they try to work with the applicant and owners to do the reviews first before time and money is spent and if the process had been followed it could have saved them time and efforts on the project.

F-4 [12-1455](#)

HDC12-193; 616 West Madison Street - Small Rear Addition - OWSHD

PUBLIC HEARING:

DiLeo gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This one and a half story Craftsman house features a wide front porch, wide battered columns, full width shed dormers on the front and rear elevations, knee brackets, and wood shingle and stucco walls. The house first appears in the 1923 City Directory as the residence of Ernest Dieterle, a laborer, and his wife, Ruth.

In July 2004, the HDC approved the construction of a two story rear addition. The addition was never built.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the northeast corner of the West Madison Street and Fifth Street intersection.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to (1) replace the east, north and west sections of the basement foundation walls, (2) replace four basement windows with new wood windows, (3) replace one basement window with a larger egress window and construct a new window well, (4) extend the rear basement foundation wall to the perimeter of the existing rear porch, (5) expand the rear porch two feet six inches to the east, (6) enclose the porch on the east, north and west to allow for expansion of the existing kitchen, (7) relocate two original windows approximately one foot to the north in the east elevation, (8) construct a new wooden stoop and stairs to the rear yard from the existing rear porch, (9) remove a concrete retaining wall along the east lot line and replace it with new precast concrete retaining blocks, and (10) remove and replace the existing asphalt driveway with a new driveway of asphalt, compacted gravel or concrete.

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.

(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):

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.

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

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

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. Duplicating the exact form, material, style, and detailing of the historic building in the new addition so that the new work appears to be part of the historic building.

Windows

Recommended:

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

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

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.

Health and Safety

Recommended:

Identifying the historic building's character defining spaces, features, and finishes so that code required work will not result in their damage or loss.

Complying with health and safety codes, including seismic code requirements, in such a manner that character defining spaces, features, and finishes are preserved.

Not Recommended:

Altering, damaging, or destroying character defining spaces, features, and finishes while making modifications to a building or site to comply with safety codes.

Entrances and Porches

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

Enclosing porches in a manner that results in a diminution or loss of historic character by using solid materials such as wood, stucco, or masonry.

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.

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 submitted plans show the replacement of the existing east, north and west CMU basement foundation walls with new 8" CMU blocks, which will then be painted to match the existing foundation. Staff already approved the replacement of these walls at the time the HDC application was submitted because a portion of the east wall had already collapsed, and the owner needed to retain a contractor as quickly as possible. A photo submitted with the application shows the collapsed portion of the foundation wall from the basement interior.

The applicant also proposes replacing two windows in the east elevation of the foundation wall and two windows in the west elevation of the foundation wall when the foundation is replaced. The proposed windows are wood awning windows, and would match the existing windows, with one exception the basement window on the east elevation (along the driveway) closest to the rear of the house is a larger egress window. That window opening would be reduced in size to match the other existing window opening in this elevation.

3. The north elevation (rear wall) basement window is proposed to be converted to an egress window. The new window will measure two feet six inches wide by three feet tall. A new window well will also be constructed that measures one foot six inches deep, and three feet by three feet across. It will be constructed of six inch by six inch pressure treated wood. Relocating the egress window to the rear of the house from the east side will result in about the same level of visibility from the sidewalk since this is a corner lot. It is generally desirable to get an egress window out of the driveway, however, because of potential conflicts with cars (blocking or driving into it).

4. The new foundation wall is also proposed to be expanded beneath the existing rear porch. This will allow the rear porch to be converted into living space, and accommodate an expansion of the kitchen. The foundation wall will extend beneath the west and north walls of the rear porch, and continue the east foundation wall of the house to allow for an expansion of the porch.

5. To expand the kitchen, the applicant also proposes expanding the porch two feet and six inches to the east, so that it is aligned with the east wall of the house. The existing porch does not appear to be original to the house. The east, north, and west walls of the porch will then be enclosed by removing the existing partial walls and constructing new walls. The porch currently has four one over one windows and a door. Based on the provided photographs, the windows and door appear to be aluminum. The proposed walls will have no windows, and one door will be located in the north elevation of the porch. The siding will be painted sawn wood shingles to match the existing rear wall, and the original rear kitchen door will be relocated to the new north wall of the porch.

6. A new wooden stoop and set of wooden stairs is proposed to be built at the rear of the new kitchen expansion to provide access to the rear yard. It will have simple square balusters and a simple square railing, and is an appropriate design.

7. Because of the expansion and remodeling of the kitchen, the applicant proposes relocating two windows in the east elevation to accommodate the interior kitchen. The two windows, which are located towards the rear of the house, are proposed to be moved approximately one foot towards the north (rear). The two windows feature four

over one sashes that are a character defining feature that is typical of the Craftsman style and are likely original to the house. Staff feels that since the windows would be retained, relocating them twelve inches would not diminish the character of the existing historic resource.

8. The applicant proposes removing a non original concrete retaining wall that is located along the east lot line. It is proposed to be replaced with a new precast concrete retaining block wall. The existing driveway along the east lot line will also be removed, and replaced with a new driveway of asphalt, compacted gravel, or concrete.

9. Staff finds the work compatible in exterior design, arrangement, material, and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area, and finds that it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Stulberg and McCauley visited the site as part of their review.

McCauley said that from the exterior it didn't look like there were any problems with the foundation walls, but the interior pictures of the foundation were very striking, showing that they had collapsed in. He said the back porch will be the main focus of the discussion and the moving of the windows was a concern for him. He said he had hoped that the opening would all be stucco in. He said the back porch did look original, but wasn't sure. He said he didn't feel the proposed changes would negatively affect the house, in comparison to adding a large addition to the rear of the house. He said he was in favor of the whole project and hoped that it would make the house more useable to the owners.

Stulberg said the house looks like it is in pretty good shape and replacing the basement foundation walls was important. He felt that it was a good replacement use of an egress window and the work would be minimally intrusive. He said he didn't feel that the rear porch was original since inside the porch there appears to be an exterior wall. He said if the rear porch was built during the period of significance then the Commission might not have a say over the removal of the original windows.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

Motion made by Stulberg, Seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 616 West Madison Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to (1) replace the east, north and west sections of the basement foundation walls, (2) replace four basement windows with new wood windows, (3) replace one basement window with an larger egress window and construct a new window well, (4) extend the rear basement foundation wall to the perimeter of the existing rear porch, (5) expand the rear porch two feet six inches to the east, (6) enclose the porch on the east, north and west to allow for expansion of the existing kitchen, (7) relocate two original windows approximately one foot to the north in the east elevation, (8) construct a new wooden stoop and stairs to the rear yard from the existing rear porch, (9) remove a concrete retaining wall along the east lot line and replace it with new precast concrete retaining blocks, and (10) remove and replace the existing asphalt driveway with a new driveway of asphalt, compacted gravel or concrete as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of

the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 6, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for additions, windows, health and safety, entrances and porches, building site, and district or neighborhood setting.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Ramsburgh said she had concerns with reconciling moving the windows on the east elevation, since the Commission really discourages moving windows when it is not for preserving historic features, but for the configuration of kitchen cabinets, in this situation. She said she liked everything else that was proposed on the application.

McCauley said his thought on moving the window for the kitchen layout, allows for more flexibility with using the same footprint instead of adding a huge addition to the house, which would have a larger impact on the house. He said the record will reflect all the changes that were made to the house which is an important requirement of the Standards.

Stulberg said he agrees with Ramsburgh, that the windows should definitely stay, but in terms of the rear porch addition, he felt that the balance of moving the windows would not be obscuring the original appearance of any character defining feature of the house.

Ramsburgh said that it is difficult to repair stucco and unless it is painted after in-filling, she had concerns that the stucco would reflect repairs.

Bushkuhl stated that given the minor modifications it would be giving the owners more usability and moving the windows wasn't a major problem.

Stulberg asked the Commission if they felt they had jurisdiction over the interior porch window.

Ramsburgh said she would like to ask the applicant to save the window, but she isn't sure she would deny the application to remove the window, given its location. She said she did think the window was under their purview since it was an original window that they are proposing to remove.

McCauley said it was an interesting question regarding the jurisdiction of the window, adding that with any additions there is always some fabric lost with interior or exterior changes.

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

Yeas: 4 - Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Vice Chair Stulberg, and Secretary Bushkuhl

Nays: 0

Absent: 3 - White, Beeson, and Ross

F-5 [12-1456](#)

HDC12-191; 425 West Liberty Street - Move Existing Windows - OWSHD

PUBLIC HEARING:

DiLeo gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This two story wood frame house features a curving front porch supported by paired Doric columns along portions of the north and west elevations. This house first appears as a duplex in 1907 city directories. Edward W and Magdalena Staebler are listed as the occupants of 423 West Liberty, and Michael and Rosina Staebler are listed as the occupants of 425 West Liberty. In the 1910 City Directory, Edward is listed as the son of Michael, who together owned the M. Staebler and Son store on Washington Street.

In August 2012, the HDC approved the construction of a new rear addition, a new rear deck, and a new garage at the rear of the property.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the southeast corner of the intersection of West Liberty Street and Third Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to raise two original windows in the south elevation twelve inches.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall 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.

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

Windows

Recommended:

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

Not Recommended:

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

Changing the number, location, size or glazing pattern of windows, through cutting new openings, blocking-in windows, and installing replacement sash that do not fit the historic window opening.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The proposed work involves raising two wood one-over-one double hung windows that are likely original to the house and are character defining features. The windows are located in the south (rear) elevation and are currently twenty-four inches off the floor. The applicant proposes raising them to a height of thirty-six inches off the floor. The components of the windows will be retained.

2. *Although the windows will be relocated, the majority of the original openings will be retained. The opening will be extended twelve inches above the current opening, and the lower part of the openings that will be left beneath the raised windows will be infilled.*

3. *The applicant proposed relocating the windows to accommodate a new interior kitchen. The existing windows are too low for kitchen cabinets to be installed beneath them. Raising the windows will allow cabinets to be installed. The applicant states that by installing the new kitchen in this location instead of the dining room as originally proposed, many of the original interior dining room features, including the original butler's pantry with cabinets, can be preserved.*

4. *While the windows themselves are character defining features of the house, staff feels that raising them twelve inches would not diminish the character of the existing historic resource. Staff finds the work compatible in exterior design, arrangement, material, and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area, and finds that it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Stulberg and McCauley visited the site as part of their review.

Stulberg said that the modifications requested were very minor in comparison to what they had approved for this project, and he felt it would not have a negative impact at all.

McCauley added that while moving windows is not something they encourage they have to review each application on a case by case basis, to see how it affects the character defining features of the building. He said this request is minor and knowing that the owner has gone to great lengths to preserve the interior spaces while making it livable, which also has preserved the character of the building, even though the interior is not under the Commission's purview. He said he is in favor of the minor changes to the back of the house.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Tom Fitzsimmons, owner and applicant of 423-425 W Liberty, said it was an oversight on their side that they didn't address the window locations in the earlier application.

Motion made by Stulberg, Seconded by Ellen Ramsburgh, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 423 425 West Liberty Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to raise two original windows located in the south elevation twelve inches as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2 and 9 and the guidelines for windows.

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

Yeas: 4 - Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Vice Chair Stulberg, and Secretary Bushkuhl

Nays: 0

Absent: 3 - White, Beeson, and Ross

F-6 [12-1457](#) HDC12-195; 317 South State Street - New Business Sign - SSHD

PUBLIC HEARING:

DiLeo gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This two-story, Art Moderne brick commercial building features tapestry brick and fixed-pane ribbon windows that give the building a horizontal flow, an entrance in the southwest corner with a large curved glass display window, a sign band above the entrance with non-original brown-red tiles, a rounded southwest corner with a curved window in the second story, and an aluminum covered fluted column in the entrance. It was built in 1937 and was occupied by Kresge's department store from then until the 1980s. Michigan Book & Supply was located here from 1989 to 2012.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the northeast corner of the South State Street and North University Street intersection.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to install three fabric blade signs, re-cover four existing awnings, and install six gooseneck lamps above the entrance.

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:

Introducing a new design that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color; using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy remaining character-defining features of the historic building; using new illuminated signs.

STAFF FINDINGS:

- 1. The two "Walgreens" signs in the sign band replace the former Michigan Book & Supply signs are have been approved by staff. The gooseneck lighting on these signs has not been approved by staff; see below.*
- 2. The applicant seeks approval to re-cover four awnings. They would retain the*

triangle-shaped form of the existing awnings, and have a black background with white text. Two of the awnings have the word "Walgreens" in script letters, and the other two have the word "pharmacy" in a simple sans-serif modern font next to a green and white medical cross logo.

3. Staff recommends approval of the proposed awnings. They are appropriately scaled to the storefront windows and use the existing awning frames. (If the awning frames can't be reused for any reason, staff will work with the applicant on a staff approval for their replacement.) On the provided mock-up, the awnings appear to be compatible in size, materials, and color to the building. The new signage also appears to be well balanced and does not detract from the character defining features of the building.

4. The three proposed blade signs consist of fabric and will be non-illuminated. Two are located on the south elevation along North University Street, and one is located on the west elevation along South State Street. The signs will be gray in color with white text and a white, blue and green logo. The proposed signs measure seven feet high and two feet wide. The fabric signs will be attached to the building by aluminum arms that are anchored in a ten inch by ten inch aluminum mounting plate.

5. Staff believes that the blade signs are inappropriate for this building. At seven feet, the signs are too tall and extend several feet below the second floor window band, which is a consistent height around both fronts of the building. The signs also interrupt the horizontal flow of the building and detract from the fenestration pattern, which are main character-defining features of the building. In order to protect the exterior masonry the signs should be mounted through the mortar joints, which is not indicated on the provided drawings.

6. The applicant seeks approval to install six large gooseneck lamps above the entrance in the southwest corner of the building. Three lamps would be located on the south elevation, and three on the west elevation. The proposed lamps will illuminate the two "Walgreens" wall signs located in the sign band of the building above the entrance (which have already been approved at the staff level).

7. Staff does not recommend approval of the proposed gooseneck lamps. Based on the submitted information, the lamps appear too large and the gooseneck style is incompatible with the Art Moderne style of the building. More appropriate lighting could include smaller, less conspicuous lamps or a light bar located above or below the signage. Any new lighting would also need to be mounted through the mortar joints, which is not indicated in the application. A more suitable style of light could be approved at the staff level.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Stulberg and McCauley visited the site as part of their review.

McCauley reported that their site visit verified the information provided in the staff report. He said that there might be a little too much signage going on with the blade signs and the proposed gooseneck lamps. He said the awnings were appropriate and he agreed with the staff report.

Stulberg agreed with McCauley and the staff report.

Kurt Beleck, Agree Realty, applicant for the project, was present to answer the Commission's questions. He said they have been working closely with Thacher on the lighting and they aren't married to the idea of gooseneck lamps at this point, but

they are trying to follow the historic guidelines, and they see a lot of gooseneck lamps along the corridor. He said he had just provided another more Art Deco style lamp to Thacher, adding that the lamp was more in keeping with the architecture of the building and he thought it would more fitting.

Larry Brozac, Architect for Walgreens Pharmacy, said that the vertical banners are more like book-ends that enforced the transitional columns as the building turns from State Street onto University Avenue, and therefore he did not believe they are out of character with the building.

McCauley pointed out the duplicated signage and asked if all the signage was necessary.

Brozac said, yes, and without the banners it would be a distraction.

Stulberg asked how many blade signs were proposed.

Brozac said, three. He asked if there were any other issues or ideas on the signage, pointing out that they are within their allowable signage units for the building. He added there their proposed signage is compatible to other signage on State Street.

McCauley explained that the Commission's charge is to interpreting the historical standards for buildings in the historic districts and not review the sign code.

DiLeo pointed out issues of concern as outlined in the staff report.

Stulberg asked if the applicant had pictures of the lighting that they presented to Thacher.

Brozac showed a sketch of the lighting to the Commission.

Beleck said that Thacher felt the lights were more appropriate because they were more linear.

Brozac said he didn't understand the comments that the sign banners were not compatible with the building.

Stulberg explained that the horizontal lines/bands on the building are what break the building up, and since the building is very visible from a distance, the horizontal lines matter, and would be affected by such a large blade sign.

Bushkuhl stated that whether you are looking at signage or a business identification, this building has been there since before any one of us was born and will continue, and the discussion is about adding a permanent feature to the building, which is the issue of concern. He said he feels that the standard says not to add these features unless there is no other exception to do so.

Ramsburgh agreed with the comments of the Commission, stating that she feels the blade signs are too large and they do disrupt the horizontal flow which is the distinguishing characteristic of the building and that style. She added that the Commission judges each application based on its own merits, along with the site, and the other buildings along State Street. She said each application for signage is reviewed individually as to the sign, and placement on the building, so just because there is a lot of signage along State Street doesn't mean that the large signs are appropriate for this building. She felt that the proposed signs are too large, and too vertical and there is already quite a bit of signage of the building.

Brozac asked if she suggested they eliminate one blade sign.

Ramsburgh said she felt all three should be eliminated.

Discussion pursued regarding the signage, with the Commission expressing the need to see new plans with any possible changes or alterations on the signage to the application.

McCauley said that the issue was that the building was looking like a big sign instead of signage on a big building.

Motion made by Ramsburgh, Seconded by Bushkuhl, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 317 South State Street, a contributing property in the State Street Historic District, to re cover four existing awnings that include new signage, as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 9 and 10 and the guidelines for storefronts.

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

Yeas: 4 - Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Vice Chair Stulberg, and Secretary Bushkuhl

Nays: 0

Absent: 3 - White, Beeson, and Ross

Beleck asked if the Commission to could make a discretion on the signage, and partially approve some of the signage.

Ramsburgh said that she didn't feel that signage along the window band was appropriate, because when reviewing historic images of the building there has never been signage at that level.

The Commission felt that they needed to review plans of changes to the signage and the lighting.

To address blade signs and gooseneck lamps:

Motion made by McCauley, Seconded by Bushkuhl that the Commission postpone the application at 317 South State Street, a contributing property in the State Street Historic District, to add three new fabric blade signs and install six gooseneck lamps as proposed until the December 2012 HDC meeting.

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

Yeas: 4 - Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Vice Chair Stulberg, and Secretary Bushkuhl

Nays: 0

Absent: 3 - White, Beeson, and Ross

G NEW BUSINESS

H APPROVAL OF MINUTES

I REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

J ASSIGNMENTS

Review Committee: Monday, December 10 at Noon for the December 13, 2012 Regular Session

Stulberg and Bushkuhl volunteered for the December 10, 2012 Review Committee.

K REPORTS FROM STAFF

[12-1459](#) October 2012 HDC Staff Activities

The Commission asked if the solar panels that have been approved at the staff level were the first ones.

Received and Filed

L CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS

Ramsburgh said she had noticed that at the historical property on the corner of Washtenaw and Hill Street, one of the columns had been knocked down and she would like to know if the column would be put back up and if they would be required to put it back. She asked Thacher to look into it and follow up on it.

M COMMUNICATIONS

N ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned unanimously.

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

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

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

Cable channel 16.

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