



City of Ann Arbor

Formal Minutes

Historic District Commission

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

Thursday, August 12, 2010

7:00 PM

City Hall - Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM in the Guy C. Larcom Jr., Municipal Building, 2nd Floor Council Chambers, 100 N. Fifth Avenue.

ROLL CALL

Present: 7 - Kristina A. Glusac, Diane Giannola, Robert White, Ellen Ramsburgh, Patrick McCauley, Lesa Rozmarek, and Thomas Stulberg

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Added: C-8 Election of Vice Chair

Approved by consent

PUBLIC COMMENTARY - (3 Minutes per Speaker)

Jim Mogensen - 3780 Greenbrier Blvd, Ann Arbor, MI 48105

Had general historic preservation comments.

A APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None

B UNFINISHED BUSINESS

B-1 10-0805 HDC10-082 109 Glen

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to install three basement egress windows: two on the west (rear) and one on the north (side) elevation. See also previous Staff Report dated July 8, 2010.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 1, 2, 5, and 9, and the guidelines for windows and health and safety.

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

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *New drawings have been submitted and are included in this packet. The new drawings replace and clarify the ones from the July 8 packet.*
2. *The existing wood windows would be replaced by taller windows with a matching profile that are built on site. The window width would remain the same. The window wells would measure 3'8" wide by 3'2" deep and have 6" poured concrete walls.*
3. *Staff feels that converting the basement of this house is more appropriate than putting an addition on the building to gain more usable space and will result in better protection of character-defining features of the house. The conversion of three basement windows to egress windows (instead of one or two) is not unprecedented in the city's historic districts, though staff encourages limiting the conversion to egress windows whenever possible for the new use. In this particular application, the owner desires to place three bedrooms in the basement, and egress windows are required in each bedroom.*
4. *Staff has raised with the owner the issues of locating an egress window under a fire escape stair (on the rear of the house) and along a walkway (on the side of the house). The owner is aware that if this application is approved, any changes required by the building department would require a new application to the HDC.*

5. Because of the locations of the proposed egress windows and their minimal visibility and impact on character defining features, staff recommends approval of the application.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

No new report.

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

Thacher gave the staff report.

The Commission reviewed the proposed plans.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

A motion was made by Vice Chair Ramsburgh, seconded by White to APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS the application at 109 Glen Avenue, a contributing structure in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, and issue a certificate of appropriateness to replace three basement windows with egress windows that match the width of the current openings, on the condition that the south retaining wall of the window well on the south elevation is not located beyond the face of the bumpout on that elevation. As conditioned, 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 standards 1, 2, 5, and 9, and the guidelines for windows and health and safety. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Yeas: 7 - Glusac, Giannola, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Rozmarek, and Stulberg

Nays: 0

C NEW BUSINESS/HEARINGS

C-1 10-0800 HDC10-095 553 S Seventh Street Roof Solar Panel

BACKGROUND: The two-story, gable-front house at 553 South Seventh appears in the 1890-91 City Directory as the home of John Eiting, a carpenter, at the northeast corner of Jewett Avenue (now Seventh Street) and West Madison, and the home may be older. Other

Eitings boarded in the home, including George, a tinsmith at Eberbach Hardware, Christiana, and Philip, a cabinetmaker at T. Rauschenberger & Co. The address was briefly 71 Seventh Street in the 1890s. The two-story cross-gable on the north side and the stone front porch were later additions. The 1931 Sanborn map shows the footprints of both as they are today.

The owner submitted a separate application for staff approvals for other work items (new roof, removal of the non-original siding, etc) simultaneous with this application, and it is currently under review by staff.

LOCATION: *This site is located on the east side of South Seventh Street, two houses north of West Madison.*

APPLICATION: *The applicant seeks HDC approval to install solar panels on the south-facing slope of the roof. The panels are each 3 feet by 5 feet, and the applicant has provided three different installation configurations. Options A and B form a rectangle near the back of the house, and Option C runs along the ridge.*

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

Roofs

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

Not Recommended: Changing the configuration of a roof by adding new features such as dormer windows, vents, or skylights so that the historic character is diminished.

Energy Efficiency

Recommended: Placing a new addition that may be necessary to increase energy efficiency on non-character-defining elevations.

Not Recommended: Designing a new addition which obscures, damages, or destroys character-defining features.

Mechanical Equipment

Recommended: Providing adequate structural support for new mechanical equipment.

Not Recommended: Failing to consider the weight and design of new mechanical equipment so that, as a result, historic structural members or finished surfaces are weakened or cracked.

Installing a new mechanical system so that character-defining structural or interior features are radically changed, damaged, or destroyed.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *Staff's initial thoughts on solar panels are that they are an acceptable, reversible addition to residential structures in historic districts if the panels a) match the color of the roof, b) match the angle of the roof and do not project more than eight inches above it, and c) do not cover more than 30% of the roof surface on which they are installed if any part of the panel is visible from a street or sidewalk, and most importantly, d) do not detract from the historic character of the house or destroy, obscure, or damage character-defining features.*

2. *Of the three configurations proposed in this application, staff feels that any would be acceptable, but slightly prefers Option C, the single row of panels running the width of the roof near the ridge. Option C would draw less attention since it parallels the ridge and runs nearly the width of the roof. Options A and B have the advantage of being located near the rear of the house, but the large size of the resulting panels may still draw the eye toward them.*

3. *Staff considers the chimney to be a character-defining feature of the roof, but sees no impact on the chimney from the proposed solar panels. Staff supports the proposal if the panels match the color of the roof and*

are not taller than eight inches from the roof surface.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Commissioners White and McCauley visited the site with staff and reported their findings to the Commission.

McCauley felt that the solar panels would have a minimal impact on the historical aspect of the house since they could be removed at anytime.

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

Thacher gave the staff report.

Applicant and owner Chris Hewett and his wife were present to answer questions. He mentioned that they would like to start with the 5-8 solar panels and maybe add more at a later date.

Commissioner Rozmarek asked for clarification of the proposed solar panel placement on the roof.

Commissioner Stulberg asked the applicant if they had a preference to the presented options.

Hewitt responded that they would prefer option B or C at this point in time.

Commissioner Glucac asked if option B had been verified by Contractor or manufacturer for any possible obstruction on the roof.

Hewitt answered that there currently was no obstruction on the roof.

Commissioner Stulberg noted that given the possibility that during installation they noted that the approved option would restrict the applicant and therefore hinder them, it would be better to approve option A and add two panels to the front, it would allow more flexibility during installation of the solar panels.

Commissioner McCauley stated that he didn't find any of the presented options more or less distracting from the historic character of this particular roof.

Commissioner Giannola stated that she felt it was best to allow the installer decide where the best location would be for the panels in order to have the most efficiency.

Commissioner White stated that he supported the project.

Chairperson Ramsburgh expressed her concern with specific solar panel placement, noting that she had attended a recent historical seminar that specifically addressed solar panels and explained that historical commission approval should review and approve specific placement so not to distract historical character of the building in question.

McCauley and Giannola explained that they felt placement could be addressed on an individual basis of each property in the future in order to assure placement doesn't become a distraction.

Thacher weighed in that she felt it was important to maximize the energy efficiency of the solar roof panels, and didn't feel that option C was more distracting than the other provided options. She stated that she didn't think it made sense to allow applicants to put up solar panels but not get the maximum usage and efficiency from them. She noted that solar panels are not an historic feature of the house but rather an addition to an existing building, and additions are intended to serve their purpose as best they can.

Commissioner Rozmarek requested that future applications contain more information which would spell out which proposed options maximize the efficiency of the solar panels, and the structural membranes of the existing roof in order to protect the existing building.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Matthew Grocoff, 217 S. Seventh Street, Ann Arbor, spoke in support of historic preservation in his neighborhood, and his own plan to become the oldest net-zero house in the USA.

Christina Snyder, 44 E. Cross, Architect in Ann Arbor who has been working with solar panel installations in Ann Arbor for over twenty years, addressed some of the Commissions questions regarding solar panel mountings. She explained that solar panels are mounted on racks that can be moved any way on a roof surface allowing great flexibility.

Dave Strenski, 323 Oak Street, Ypsilanti, spoke in support of solar panels in historic districts. He noted that he had been working with solar panels over the last five years and he stated that he didn't believe the applicant would have an issue with ice damming. Strenski noted that the higher up on the roof the install is done, the more efficient the panels become.

A motion was made by McCauley, seconded by White, to APPROVE the application at 553 South Seventh Street in the Old West Side Historic District, and issue a certificate of appropriateness to install

solar panels on the roof per any of the three configurations proposed, on the conditions that all exterior parts of the panels closely match the color of the roof, and no part of the panels extend more than eight inches above the roof surface. As conditioned, the work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, and material 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 1, 2, 5, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for roofs, mechanical equipment, and energy efficiency. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Yea: 7 - Glusac, Giannola, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Rozmarek, and Stulberg

Nays: 0

C-2 10-0802 HDC10-096 603 East Liberty

BACKGROUND: The Michigan Theater Building was constructed in 1927 to house shops, offices, and a lavish theater. The auditorium featured a Barton organ and 1800 seats. See the attached Historic Buildings of Ann Arbor article for more information. The theater underwent the first phase of a major renovation in 1986 which restored the 1927 appearance of the Auditorium and Grand Foyer. A 1998 initiative renovated the lobby, vestibule and faced, including a new marquee, screening room, restrooms, and HVAC system.

LOCATION: This site is located on the north side of East Liberty, between Maynard and North State.

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to install solar panels on the south-facing wall of the main theater, which is set back 58 feet from the front of the shops on East Liberty Street.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

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.

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 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:

Energy Efficiency

Recommended: Placing a new addition that may be necessary to increase energy efficiency on non-character-defining elevations.

Not Recommended: Designing a new addition which obscures, damages, or destroys character-defining features.

Mechanical Equipment

Recommended: Providing adequate structural support for new mechanical equipment.

Not Recommended: Failing to consider the weight and design of new mechanical equipment so that, as a result, historic structural members or finished surfaces are weakened or cracked.

Installing a new mechanical system so that character-defining structural or interior features are radically changed, damaged, or destroyed.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *The proposed location of the solar panels is visible from Maynard Street and East Liberty, but the panels would be mounted on a blank brick masonry wall set back and above existing street front shops. The panels do not detract from the historic character of the Theater or neighboring structures, or obscure or damage character-defining features.*

2. *The applicants have provided clear photographs with the solar panels superimposed, and also photos of a similar built example (on the Ypsilanti City Hall building). Additional information is provided with the application.*

3. *Staff supports the proposal if the panels and their supporting*

armature are a neutral, and preferably matte, brown, gray, or black color when feasible. Very conspicuous panels, such as bright blue ones, and bare metal frame finishes should be avoided if they detract from character-defining features of the structure and neighboring ones.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Commissioners White and McCauley visited the site with staff and reported their findings to the Commission.

McCauley stated that during all his years of living in and visiting the site he had not noticed the proposed wall for solar panel installation as being there.

Commissioner White stated that he agreed with Commissioner McCauley as well as Jill Thacher and was in full support of the proposed project.

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

Thacher gave the staff report.

Applicant Russell Collins, Executive Director for the Michigan Theater was present to answer Commissioner's questions.

Commissioner Glusac questioned Strenski about installation qualifications.

Strenski responded that he was a volunteer and not a contractor but he had installed many panels himself. He noted that there are specific solar contractor who hold a solar panel installer's certificate. He noted that the installation is closer to house wiring.

Chairperson Ramsburgh asked if anchors could be installed through mortar.

Strenski answered that the Ypsilanti Historic District wanted them to go through the mortar and preferably not the brick during installation.

Commissioner Stulberg and White shared that they were members of the Michigan Theater.

Commissioner Rozmarek noted that the installation on this project would be a deliberate visual feature that would be added to the building.

McCauley expressed that in the future each project will have to be

reviewed individually with their different architectural characteristics before the Commission can make a decision.

Chairperson Ramsburgh added that if the installation would be moved to the very top of the wall, they wouldn't be hardly visible.

Thacher explained that there is a parapet wall up higher with nothing behind it, so installation higher up wouldn't be possible.

Giannola noted that the proposed solar panels will be mounted on a wall and not on the front of the building that will alter the character defining facade of the building.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Bonnie Bona, 1100 Mixtwood, Ann Arbor, spoke in support of Clean Energy and the proposed project that is being sponsored by XSEED ENERGY, Ann Arbor's Community Power Project.

Mark Ritz, 3954 Barton Farm Court, spoke as a volunteer with the Clean Energy Coalition. He explained the importance of the color of solar panels, noting that the general color is usually dark blue.

Andrew Brix, 812 Hillcrest Dr., Manager of the Energy Program at the City of Ann Arbor as well as a member of the Advisory Committee of XSEED ENERGY, spoke of the efforts of the City of Ann Arbor involving sustainable energy.

Christine Snyder, 44 E Cross, with XSEED ENERGY spoke about the technical details of solar panels. She also explained that the State of Michigan Office of Energy maintains a list of qualified solar and wind contractors.

Dave Strenski, 323 Oak Street, Ypsilanti, spoke about the three year project of the solar panels installed on the Ypsilanti City Hall building.

A motion was made by McCauley, seconded by White to APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS the application at 603 E Liberty Street in the State Street Historic District, and issue a certificate of appropriateness to install solar panels on the south wall of the theater, on the condition that the panels be mounted through masonry joints and not masonry units. As conditioned, the work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, and material 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 1, 2, 5, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for roofs, mechanical equipment, and

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

Yea: 7 - Glusac, Giannola, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Rozmarek, and Stulberg

Nay: 0

C-3 10-0803 **HDC10-097** 306 N Division

BACKGROUND: *St Andrews Episcopal Church was built in phases: the nave in 1868-69, a chapel and rectory were added in 1879, and the tower in 1903. It is constructed of split boulders laid in courses and is English Gothic in style. In 1989 the HDC issued a certificate of appropriateness (CofA) to re-roof the cloister in slate or composition slate. (The cloister roof is slate today.) In 1998 a CofA was issued to rebuild the front steps. In 2008, a CofA was issued to rebuild the stairs to the west entry and reroof several small roof areas.*

LOCATION: *The site is on the east side of North Division Street between Catherine and Lawrence.*

APPLICATION: *The applicant seeks HDC approval to install a canopy structure to shelter the barrier-free entrance at the north side of the sanctuary. The canopy would be a neutral taupe color with a painted black metal frame.*

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:

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.

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.

Entrances and Porches

Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving entrances – and their functional and decorative features – that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as doors, fanlights, sidelights, pilasters, entablatures, columns, balustrades, and stairs.

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.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *The proposed canopy is simple and complimentary to the wood entry door and gothic stained-glass transom. No historic or character-defining features would be compromised, and the canopy is easily removable.*

2. *Staff feels that the canopy is an appropriate weather-guard that will not permanently alter any features of the historic church.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Commissioners White and McCauley visited the site with staff and reported their findings to the Commission.

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

Thacher gave the staff report.

Chairperson Ramsburgh expressed how helpful it was to have complete plans and drawings of the proposed project.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Jennifer Henriksen, 219.5 N. Main street, Ann Arbor, spoke as the representing architect of the project from Quinn Evans.

A motion was made by Giannola, seconded by White to APPROVE the application at 306 N Division, a contributing structure in the Division Street Historic District, and issue a certificate of appropriateness to install a canopy structure to shelter the barrier-free entrance at the north side of the sanctuary. As proposed, 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 standards 2, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for building site and entrances and porches. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Yea: 7 - Glusac, Giannola, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Rozmarek, and Stulberg

Nays: 0

C-4 10-0804 **HDC10-098 615 Turner Park Court**

BACKGROUND: This single-story shingle-sided cottage features a full-width front porch and six over one windows. On 1916 Sanborn Maps, this area is still a single large lot called "A.A. Turner's Park" with no road shown. In 1917, 615 and its twin at 613 first appear in the City Directory. Ellet O. Mitchell, a "mach [machinist] hnd" and his wife Estella M. were the occupants of 615. On the 1931 Sanborn Map, the footprint of the house appears as it does today.

In 2001 a staff approval was granted to shore up the front porch and reroof the house.

LOCATION: The site is on the east side of Turner Park Court, south of West Madison.

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct a single-story addition on the rear of the house, and a single car garage with an attached carport.

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.*
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 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:

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.

Identifying, retaining, and preserving buildings and their features as well as features of the site that are important in defining its overall historic character. Site features can include driveways, walkways, lighting, fencing, signs, benches, fountains, wells, terraces, canal systems, plants and trees, berms, and drainage or irrigation ditches; and archeological features that are important in defining the history of the site.

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

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.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *The proposed addition is simple and appropriate. The sides and ridge are stepped in from the original, the cementitious siding with 7" exposure is similar to the size of the shingles on the historic house, and the window and door size, style, and placement are compatible with the original house without matching exactly. The addition is large in comparison to the house, but the house itself is a very small 611 square feet.*
2. *On the back of the house, the new entry is recessed, leaving the original southeast corner of the house and an existing bathroom window intact. A small basement stair enclosure on the back of the house would be removed to accommodate the addition. Staff does not consider the stair enclosure to be a character-defining feature of the house.*
3. *The back of the lot, especially the southeast corner behind the proposed garage, is a steep slope up to Wurster Park (see drawings X1, A1). Locating the carport/garage farther toward the rear of the lot, which staff would prefer, would require grading and earth removal. Considerations which make the proposed carport/garage acceptable are a) that the neighboring property to the south is several feet higher than this lot, and it has a carport that forms a wall about ten feet from this proposed carport, so the impact of the long structure on the neighboring property is minimal, and b) pavement would be removed abutting the house and result in a landscaped strip separating the driveway from the house, and providing a visual break between the house and carport/garage.*

4. Staff feels that the proposed work is appropriate for this site and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and guidelines.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Commissioners White and McCauley visited the site with staff and reported their findings to the Commission.

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

Thacher gave the staff report.

Commissioner Stulberg stated that the proposed project was very appropriate to the relative size of the existing structure and lot size, and in keeping with existing historic nature of the district.

Chairperson Ramsburgh agreed with the comments of Stulberg, White and Thacher, expressing the appropriateness of the proposed project.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Helga Haller, 615 Turner Park Court, Ann Arbor, was present to answer question. She spoke as the applicant and owner of the proposed project.

LeAnn Fields, 619 Turner Park Court, Ann Arbor, spoke as a neighbor in support of the project, and stated that she would like to know the distance of the proposed garage would be from the property line.

A motion was made by Vice Chair Ramsburgh, seconded by White to APPROVE the application at 615 Turner Park Court in the Old West Side Historic District, and issue a certificate of appropriateness to construct a single-story addition on the rear of the house, and a single car garage with an attached carport. As proposed, 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 standards 2, 5, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for new additions and building site. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Yea: 7 - Glusac, Giannola, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Rozmarek, and Stulberg

Nays: 0

C-5 10-0806 HDC10-099 519 Third Street

BACKGROUND: This two-story gable-fronter with a slightly off-center three-quarter width front porch first appears in City Directories in 1911 as the home of Roy Standbridge, a piano setter at the Ann Arbor Organ Company.

LOCATION: The site is located on the east side of Third Street, south of West Jefferson and north of West Madison.

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to remove non-original aluminum siding and restore the original siding, remove a one-story rear addition and construct a two-story addition, construct an enclosed rear porch, replace elements of the front porch with more appropriate designs, and install a person-door on the south side of the garage.

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.*
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 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:

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.

Identifying, retaining, and preserving buildings and their features as well as features of the site that are important in defining its overall historic character. Site features can include driveways, walkways, lighting, fencing, signs, benches, fountains, wells, terraces, canal systems, plants and trees, berms, and drainage or irrigation ditches; and archeological features that are important in defining the history of the site.

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

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.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *Removal of the aluminum siding is appropriate and encouraged. The*

condition of the underlying wood siding will determine whether any selective replacement of clapboards will be necessary. The owner will be expected to notify and work with staff if any underlying siding or trim needs replacement.

2. *The one-story addition proposed to be removed dates to the 1950s. The two-story addition that would replace it would have cementitious siding that matches the exposure of the existing siding. The new foundation would be of split-faced block. Windows on the addition would be aluminum-clad awning, casement, and double-hung. Behind the addition is an enclosed entry porch at ground level. On the south side of the addition is a single-story hipped-roof 7' x 20' addition similar in proportion to many side entry porches of this era. The simplicity of this portion of the addition, and its location behind the house, allows it to tie in with the larger addition and not detract from the original house.*
3. *The front porch work (replacement wood stairs, railings, and porch post wraps) will result in a more appropriate design than the current concrete steps, steel steel guardrail, and thin porch posts.*
4. *Relocating the 1950s rear door of the house to the garage is a good re-use of the door and appropriate for the garage.*
5. *Staff feels that the proposed work is appropriate for this site and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and guidelines.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Commissioners White and McCauley visited the site with staff and reported their findings to the Commission.

McCauley expressed some concern with the size of the proposed window on the west side bump-out addition.

White stated that he was in favor of the project.

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

Thacher gave the staff report.

Commissioner Glusac expressed some concern with the plans presented in that they weren't clear differentiating the existing house from the new addition. She asked what the difference in the roof ridge would be on the proposed addition from the existing. She stated that she was in support of an addition but not the proposed addition. She requested alterations to the front elevation.

Commissioner Rozmarek commented on the placement of the window and how it could affect the outside view from the inside. She stated that she also had concerns with the proposed plans of the addition.

Stulberg asked for clarification on standards when adding new additions to existing buildings.

Thacher explained that there are standards that the Commission need to follow. She noted that additions to the rear of the building are less significant than those that are seen from the front.

Chairperson Ramsburgh stated that she felt the proposed addition fit into the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Swatti Dutta, 519 Third Street, owner and applicant was present to answer questions. She explained there was flexibility as to the window sizing on the addition bump-out.

A motion was made by McCauley, seconded by White to APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS the application at 519 Third Street in the Old West Side Historic District, and issue a certificate of appropriateness to remove non-original aluminum siding and restore the original siding, remove a one-story rear addition and construct a two-story addition, construct an enclosed rear porch, replace elements of the front porch with more appropriate designs, and install a person-door on the south side of the garage on the following conditions: the head and sill heights of the window on the west elevation of the new bump-out matches the head and sill heights of the window on the front elevation under the porch roof; and the fascia of the new bump-out matches (or is even with) the fascia of the front porch. As conditioned, 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 standards 2, 5, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for new additions and building site. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried with one no vote by Glusac.

Yeas: 6 - Giannola, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Rozmarek, and Stulberg

Nays: 1 - Glusac

C-6 10-0807 HDC10-100 241 E Liberty Storefront signage and awnings

BACKGROUND: This storefront occupies the western end of the Zwerdling Block, built in 1915 by tailor Osias Zwerdling. Zwerdling was a leader in the local Jewish community. In the late 1970s, it and its neighbor to the east, the 1917 Darling Block, were renovated into the East Liberty Plaza. The six original storefronts were removed and new contemporary ones inset several feet to allow light into new commercial spaces in the basement level. All of the original wood double-hung windows were replaced with metal double-hung windows in the same size but with unequal sash.

LOCATION: The building is located on the north side of East Liberty Street, between Fourth and Fifth Avenues.

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to install, in the two western bays, new decorative awnings and storefront signage, including a large blade sign, three small blade signs, an entry-area sign, two small menu signs, a sign in the traditional sign band, and, in the east-of-center bay, future signage for all other tenants in the building.

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.*

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

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.*

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *The four storefront bays on this building are a modern design and therefore non-significant. The awning design proposed is non-traditional. Per the detail, the awnings would be appropriately mounted below the stone coping that runs along the top of the storefronts, below the sign band. Staff feels that the awning design may be appropriate if the individual awnings are kept within the storefront bays and do not cover the brick piers dividing the bays. This would probably result in ten awning squares (five in each of the two bays) instead of the eleven shown on the drawings. The drawings indicate that all signage and awnings will be mounted in masonry joints, and not through masonry units.*
2. *Staff feels that the blade and pin-mounted sign-band signs, both of which are externally illuminated, are appropriate. The menu plaques are small and inconspicuous. The entry sign (or "decorative sculptural plaque at entry") competes with and detracts from the historic Zwerdling Fur Shop sign which was restored several years ago and which is a character-defining feature of the building. The three "decorative dimensional squares mounted to building pilasters", which are small blade signs mounted below the awnings, are excessive and incompatible.*
3. *The tenants and landlords have been working with the city to come up with appropriate signage for the multitude of tenants in this building (ground floor, second floor, and basement). The existing signage is haphazard and out of compliance. The drawings include proposed signage areas for all other tenants on the bay that is to the right of center (see especially View 5). Staff and the applicants would like the Commission to consider these locations and dimensions for signage that would later be approved for materials and content at the staff level. These two signs, in combination with the Squares signage being considered in this application, would replace all of the other signage on the building.*
4. *Staff feels that the proposed large blade sign, sign band sign, menu plaques, and signage for other tenants is appropriate for this site and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and guidelines. Staff feels that the awnings are appropriate if they are contained within the storefront areas between the brick piers, and that the entry sign and three small blade signs do not meet the standards and guidelines.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Commissioners White and McCauley visited the site with staff and reported their findings to the Commission.

McCauley statated that he was in agreement with the staff report and supported the project.

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

Thacher gave the staff report.

McCauley asked if the applicant planned on having a square included in their signage.

Kwasnik responded that the signage and logo would be similar to what they intend to use at other Squares Restaurant locations.

Thacher asked Kwasnik if they intended to use any neon colors in their proposed signage.

Kwasnik responded No.

Rozmarek asked if the brick repair work included a plan to match the existing brick. She aslo asked if a mortar/brick analysis had been done which would help them in the future if further restoration work would be performed so that new mortar would match old mortar as well as the brick color, texture and composition.

Kwasnik responded that they did plan on matching the brick but it would be painted to match the existing.

Haupman responded that they would match color, texture and composition of the existing brick and mortar.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Stephen Kwasnik, 1021 Livernois Street, Ferndale, spoke as the architect of the project on behalf of the Squares Restaurant.

Jeff Clark, 2617 Woodstock Dr, Detroit, designer of the signage, spoke on behalf of the applicant.

Andrew Haupman, from OX Studios spoke on behalf of the landlord of the building of proposed signage, in support of the project.

A motion was made by Chair Ramsburgh, seconded by White that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for 241 East Liberty Street, a contributing structure in the Main Street Historic District, for the portion of the application to allow future signage for

all other tenants in the building in the east-of-center storefront bay, on the condition that the materials and content of the signs be approved by staff. As conditioned, the work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, 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 storefronts. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried. [Request Approved]

Yea: 7 - Glusac, Giannola, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Rozmarek, and Stulberg

Nays: 0

A motion was made by McCauley, seconded by White that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for 241 East Liberty Street, a contributing structure in the Main Street Historic District, for the portion of the application to install a large blade sign, two small menu signs, a decorative sculptural plaque without text on the west elevation, and a sign in the traditional sign band as proposed, and storefront awnings on the condition that the awnings are contained within the storefront openings between the brick piers. As conditioned, 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 standards 2 and 9 and the guidelines for storefronts. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried. [Request Approved]

Yea: 7 - Glusac, Giannola, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Rozmarek, and Stulberg

Nays: 0

A motion was made by Rozmarek, seconded by White that the Commission deny the portion of the application at 241 East Liberty Street, a contributing structure in the Main Street Historic District, to install three blade signs on the piers between storefronts. The blade signs are excessive and incompatible with the historic character of the building, and the work is not compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and does not meet 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 storefronts. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried. [Application and Request Denied]

Yea: 7 - Glusac, Giannola, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Rozmarek, and Stulberg

Nays: 0

C-7 10-0808 HDC10-101 308 S State Replace 19 windows and infill opening

BACKGROUND: The three-story brick commercial vernacular building at 308-310 South State was constructed in 1890. It features large second-floor arches enclosing bay windows, and flat, fluted pilasters extend the arches down to high black granite bases on either side of each storefront. The east half of the building, 308, was originally occupied by Butts & Hazelwood, billiards. 310 was originally the home of Wahr's Books. The double-hung windows in both bays were replaced in the 1990s.

In July, 2010 application HDC10-083 was given a certificate of appropriateness to replace six double-hung and one transom window on the rear (west) elevation.

LOCATION: This site is located on the west side of South State Street, south of East Liberty and north of North University.

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace nineteen double-hung windows, including six vinyl and thirteen wood circa 1910 windows (per the applicant). The applicant also seeks to infill a door opening on the rear elevation of the building using brick.

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.

Entrances & Porches

Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving entrances--and their functional and decorative features--that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as doors, fanlights, sidelights, pilaster, entablatures, columns, balustrades, and stairs.

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.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. All of the windows are proposed to be replaced with full-frame aluminum clad units. Nine of the windows are located on the north side and ten on the south side of the building, and none can be seen from the street or alley. This three-story building is dumbbell-shaped, and sixteen of the windows are located on light/ventilation shafts on either side of the center of the building. The two-story buildings on either side were constructed later and are straight-walled without the indent, leaving the ventilation shaft at half of the intended depth for the second-floor windows (see photos of windows 2.5-2.12).
2. A door opening on the second floor of the rear elevation is proposed to be infilled with brick. The opening currently has a wood door and frame and security bars on the exterior. A new, smaller fire escape was installed last year which does not reach this door, so the door is unusable. Removing the door and frame and infilling the opening with standard brick that is set back 2" from the wall face will preserve the original opening with a compatible material that will not deteriorate the way a wood or cement-board infill would. Brick infill is reversible if done correctly and commonly used on historic brick commercial buildings. This is a secondary elevation, and infilling this opening in the manner proposed will not diminish the character while keeping the original opening evident.
3. The photographs provided show paint loss, deterioration, and some inappropriate past repairs. Before making a recommendation to the commission, staff will need to attend the review committee site visit and assess each wood window individually to determine its condition. It is appropriate to replace the vinyl windows with clad windows.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Commissioners White and McCauley visited the site with staff and reported their findings to the Commission.

Commissioner McCauley expressed that the windows seemed inaccessible and not seen from the exterior. He stated that the inaccessibility probably is what has caused the delapidation of the windows.

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

Thacher gave the staff report.

The Commission reviewed the Individual Window Element [Windows Worksheet] Worksheet for each of the proposed window replacement before making their decision.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

A motion was made by State Street Area Association Giannola, seconded by White to APPROVE the application at 308 South State Street in the State Street Historic District, and issue a certificate of appropriateness to replace nineteen windows on the north and south elevations of the building with clad windows, and infill a rear door opening with brick. As proposed, 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 voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Yeas: 7 - Glusac, Giannola, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Rozmarek, and Stulberg

Nays: 0

C-8 Election of Vice Chair

A motion was made by White, seconded by Giannola, to nominate Patrick McCauley as Vice Chair of the Historic District Commission. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Yeas: 6 - Glusac, Giannola, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Rozmarek, and Stulberg

Nays: 0

Recused: 1 - Vice Chair McCauley

D REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS / COMMISSIONER CONCERNS**E ASSIGNMENTS****E-1 Review Committee: Tuesday, Sept 7 at 5 pm for the Sept 9, 2010 Regular Session**

Commissioners Rozmarek and Ramsburgh volunteered for the September 2010 Review Committee.

F REPORTS FROM STAFF

F-1 **10-0809** July 2010 Reports from Staff

G COMMUNICATIONS

10-0810 Communication from CC

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Glusac, seconded by Giannola to Adjourn at 11:07 PM. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.