



City of Ann Arbor

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

Meeting Minutes

Historic District Commission

Thursday, June 9, 2011

7:00 PM Ann Arbor Municipal Center, 301 E. Huron Street, 2nd Flr.

A CALL TO ORDER

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

B ROLL CALL

Present: 6 - Kristina A. Glusac, Robert White, Ellen Ramsburgh, Patrick McCauley, Thomas Stulberg, and Benjamin L. Bushkuhl

Absent: 1 - Lesa Rozmarek

C APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was unanimously approved with the amendment to move item F-1 Cobblestone Farm Annual Report/Update, to follow item C Approval of Agenda.

F-1 11-0722 Cobblestone Farm Annual Report/Update

George Taylor, President of the Cobblestone Farm Association, gave the report.

Received and Filed

D HEARINGS

D-1 11-0713 HDC11-071 1643 Broadway Street - Enclose Rear Porch - Broadway Historic District

Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This two story Georgian colonial first appears in the 1940 City Directory. See the attached survey sheet for additional information.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the north side of Broadway Street, east of Leaird Drive.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to remove a small rear open porch and build a 4'x9' enclosed rear porch with a shed roof and skylight.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

(5) *Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.*

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

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

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

New Additions

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

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

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

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.

Not Recommended: 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 existing rear entry porch consists of a simple shed roof and two square porch posts. The proposed addition would be slightly larger than the footprint of the current porch, with a single-lite clad wood door to match one on the side of the house, and a clad wood window next to the door. The muntins drawn on the door and*

window are not permanently applied, they are interior grids that can be snapped in and out. Generally speaking, snap-in grids are not an appropriate substitute for multiple-lite windows, but since the grids are removable and on a rear-facing new addition to the house, staff does not object.

2. The proposed materials – siding to match, asphalt shingle roof, clad wood window and door – are compatible with the existing house. The addition is simple and compatible without destroying character-defining features of the house. The new door and window will help distinguish the addition as modern rather than original to the house.

3. The proposed work is generally 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, in particular standards 2, 5, 9 and 10, and the guidelines for new additions and building site.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

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

Bushkuhl reported that he felt the project meets the standards for additions and is in the rear yard and not visible from the street in any way. He said that given the overhang that is there it would meet the standards for compatibility of size and shape and he felt it could be restored to its' original condition if they wanted to in the future.

McCauley reiterated what Thacher had addressed in her report, that the rear door with snap-in mullions wasn't historical.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Bob Leffler, Valley Builders, 124 W Summit, representing the project was present to answer the Commission's questions. He said the owners were made aware of the preference to keep the original door, but opted to have a more energy efficient door to match the existing door on the east side porch.

McCauley asked if the door is still intended to open outwards.

Leffler responded, yes, in keeping with many of the older homes in the area it would be an out-swing door. This would also help with the tight spaces on the inside. He said that you won't be able to see the difference between an in-swing door or an out-swing, but it would preclude them from having a conventional storm door on the outside.

Glusac asked about the proposed side windows by the door and the siding.

Leffler clarified that they aren't side-lites on the door, rather separate windows next to the door, that will have the same snap-in mullions as on the door. He said that the siding is all original wood and when they did the addition on the east side they were able to match the existing siding.

Ramsburgh asked if the window will also have removable mullions.

Leffler answered yes.

Ramsburgh asked if the porch on the east side was an enclosed porch.

Leffler said yes.

Stulberg asked about the condition of the exiting door and if they knew what the difference would be with the old door and an added stormdoor and the new door without a stormdoor.

Leffler responded the existing door is in fair condition, with single pane glass, lead paint, and historical hardware. He noted that with the addition of 2x6 walls they would have to build an extension for the door which would make it less aesthetically pleasing. He said they didn't have the comparison for energy efficiency.

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

Glusac stated that she felt it was unfortunate that they have to remove the original siding since it seems that it is in very good condition. She said ideally she would like to see it salvaged and if possible concealed under the new siding or saved for future in-fill if additional rehabilitation work would occur.

Stulberg voiced his concerns about putting in a new door with the snap-in mullions. He stated that the period of significance for this home is prior to the east side porch being enclosed.

White said that argument could be used if the east side addition didn't exist, but since it did, he could understand that the owners are trying to match the new with the existing.

McCauley said he was in favor of the addition with the exception of the snap-in mullions since he didn't feel they meet the standards of rehabilitation.

Ramsburgh said she was torn between calling the proposed work a new addition specifically because of striving to meet the standards of rehabilitation, stressing that she too didn't like approving snap-in mullions on a house that doesn't have them in their original configuration. She said she was also perplexed why they wouldn't be using the original door.

Leffler said that if they use the existing door it wouldn't have the out-swing door which the owners are looking for. He said that the bulk of the siding would remain. He added that they would be willing to look at other in-between glass muntin options.

Ramsburgh asked if the old interior door would be saved.

Leffler responded no.

Glusac asked if they would be able to save any siding and store it in the garage.

Leffler responded, yes.

Glusac said that she would be in favor of windows and doors without mullions/muntins.

McCauley and Stulberg agreed.

The Commission requested that the owners save the rear door and siding and evaluate the possibility of re-using the door.

Motion made by White, seconded by Bushkuhl that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 1643 Broadway Street, a

contributing property in the Broadway Historic District, to remove a small rear open porch and build a 4'x9' enclosed rear porch with a shed roof and skylight as documented in the owner's submittal. The work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 5, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for new additions and building site.

Friendly amendment made to the motion by McCauley, to include the condition that no muntins be included on the door and window. Amendment unanimously passed on a voice vote.

MAIN MOTION:

Motion made by White, seconded by Bushkuhl that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 1643 Broadway Street, a contributing property in the Broadway Historic District, to remove a small rear open porch and build a 4'x9' enclosed rear porch with a shed roof and skylight, on the condition that no muntins be included on the door and window. As conditioned, the work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 5, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for new additions and building site.

On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Yea: 6 - Glusac, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Stulberg, and Bushkuhl

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Rozmarek

D-2 11-0714 HDC11-072 515 West Washington Street - Second Floor Rear Addition - Old West Side Historic District

Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This one-and-a-half story gable-fronter has a triple window in the upper front and a large parlor window below. The house first appears in the 1910 Polk Directory as the home of Mary Rogers, a music teacher, and Andrew Rogers. Asphalt siding and a non-original brick front porch were removed by the previous owner, and the current porch was constructed after receiving a certificate of appropriateness from the HDC in 1993. Replacement basement walls received a staff approval in 1993. Several landmark maple trees are located along the west side of the house.

In May, 2011 an application to the HDC was partially approved, and a certificate of appropriateness was granted to remove the chimney and pave the driveway. Portions of the application to construct a second floor rear addition (including a screen porch) and move the garage 10 feet toward the rear of the lot were denied.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the south side of West Washington between Third and Fourth Streets.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct a second floor addition over an existing single-story rear addition. The addition would be set four feet back from the current second-floor rear wall of the house, with a second floor hyphen connection and side gabled roof. The second-floor addition would overhang the existing single-story rear wing by seven feet, and a metal or asphalt shingled porch roof would extend out an additional five feet to the rear over an existing patio. The area below the overhang and rear porch roof would be screened. See the application for an attached detailed description of the work proposed and justifications.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

(5) *Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.*

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

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

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

New Additions

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

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

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

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

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

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

Building Site

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

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

Identifying, retaining, and preserving buildings and their features as well as features of the site that are important in defining its overall historic character.

Not Recommended: Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color and texture or which destroys historic relationships on the site.

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

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *The existing house consists of a one-and-a-half story main block with a single story rear addition behind it, and a single story mudroom addition behind that. The first addition appears to date to the 1930s and extends seven feet into the west side yard. It has a nearly-flat roof, which can be accessed by a second floor door on the rear elevation. The mud room is newer than the period of significance for the Old West Side Historic District.*

2. *The proposed addition has been modified since the previous application, and now features a roof with side gables.*

3. *Materials on the addition include wood clapboards and trim to match the rest of the house. The rear screen porch roof would be metal or asphalt shingles, either of which are compatible on a modern addition that is out of site on the rear of the house. Windows would be wood double-hung on the street-facing (north-facing) portion of the addition, two wood double-hung and a pair of casement windows on the rear elevation, and smaller fixed single-lite windows on the east elevation along the driveway and on both sides of the hyphen corridor.*

4. *The addition's four foot setback from the second floor rear wall of the house is appropriate and preserves an original window on the second floor. Since the existing rear wing occupies a portion of the side yard, adding a second floor on top of it will not increase the footprint of the house into the side yard. The addition reads as such, and does not compromise the original form of the house. The proposed work could also be reversed with minimal impact to the house as it stands today. The addition would not compromise the relationship between this house and the non-contributing house next door to the west.*

5. *The proposed work is generally 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, in particular standards 2, 5, 9 and 10, and the guidelines for new additions and building site.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

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

McCauley reported that he felt the proposed revisions to the petition are a vast improvement and match the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. He commended the applicants for attempting to preserve as much of the original material as possible and said he was in favor of the application.

Bushkuhl stated that the applicants had positively addressed the concerns of the Commission while still being able to achieve their goals.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Robert Northrup, 515 W. Washington Street, owner of the property was present to respond to enquiries from the Commission. He said that they were disappointed that their request wasn't approved last month but added that they had also learned a lot from the Commission's feedback, of which has been incorporated into the revised plans.

Glusac asked about the windows sizing on the addition.

Northrup answered that the window on the north side is intentionally slightly smaller than the lower front window. He said that on the south elevation they intend to replace the larger window that was only approximately 18" from the floor with a window that is set higher.

Alex Dean, 1191 Shady Oaks Drive, was present and requested a signature verifying that he had attended a government meeting.

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

Glusac stated that she appreciates the new design and all the work that went into the revisions. She said that she feels it complements the house very well. She had a concern that the trim should not match the existing house, suggesting that it could be as subtle as the width of the trim be different.

McCauley said that while the trim did match the existing house he wasn't sure anyone would ever confuse the new addition with the original house, and therefore, didn't feel it would be an issue.

Stulberg thanked the homeowners for their efforts on the revisions. He said that while we want the addition to be clearly differentiated from the original structure, which in this proposal, he felt the windows and hyphen accomplishes. He said he didn't think that anyone will mistake the windows for replacements of originals based on trim size, and therefore didn't have an issue with the trim.

White said that he supports the project as presented.

Ramsburgh agreed with Stulberg's comments and thanked the applicant for presenting a well-planned project.

A motion was made by Vice Chair McCauley, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 515 West Washington Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a second floor addition over the existing one story rear addition and a rear screen porch as documented in the owner's submittal. The work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 5, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for new additions and building site. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Yea: 6 - Glusac, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Stulberg, and Bushkuhl

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Rozmarek

D-3 11-0715 HDC11-073 201 South Main Street - Install Three Cell Antennae on Roof - Main Street Historic District

Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

The First National Bank Building was constructed in 1929 to house the first bank chartered in Michigan under the National Bank Act of 1863. The building's exterior features broad vertical bands of terra cotta and banks of narrow windows separated by thin terra cotta mullions which give it strong vertical lines. Gargoyles are mounted below a decorative roof cornice. The building is listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

In July, 2007 the HDC issued a certificate of appropriateness for the placement of three antennas in locations similar to this new application. That certificate of appropriateness expired in July of 2010.

LOCATION:

The site is located at the southeast corner of South Main Street and East Washington Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to add three antennas and related equipment to the walls of the penthouse structure on the building's roof.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

(5) Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

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

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

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

Roofs

Recommended: Installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof, such as air conditioning, transformers, or solar collectors when required for the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

Not Recommended: Installing mechanical or service equipment so that it damages or obscures character-defining features; or is conspicuous from the public right-of-way.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *Three antennae that received a certificate of appropriateness in 2007 were similar in size and placement to the ones in this application, but appear to have never been installed. (They were associated with a different telecommunications company.)*
2. *The proposed antennae would not extend more than an inch or two higher than the penthouse wall, per the submitted mounting detail. All mounting brackets should be attached through masonry joints rather than masonry units.*
3. *If mounted through masonry joints, the proposed work is generally 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, in particular standards 2, 5, 9 and 10, and the guidelines for roofs.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

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

McCauley said that the building is one of his favorites in the downtown and very well maintained. He said that since he hadn't noticed or seen what was on top of the building previously he didn't think it would damage the historical integrity of the building if three more antennae are added.

Bushkuhl stated that the antennae will be installed correctly and felt it was unfortunate that one of the existing antennae had an unsightly metal support. He was in favor of the application.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Michael Snyder, 29488 Woodward Avenue, Suite 128, Royal Oak, spoke on behalf of AT&T Mobility, the applicant. He apologized for the last minute revisions and explained that the maintenance crew of First Martin, who maintain the building had

concerns for safety issues for their personnel since the original plans placed the bottom of the one antennae only six feet from the rooftop. He said they had therefore moved the antennae to the southwest corner.

Thacher added that the applicant had promised to provide revised plans within the next few weeks which she would need to review before she could approve any building permit applications.

Motion made by Bushkuhl, seconded by White that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 201 South Main Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to add three antennas and related equipment to the walls of the penthouse structure on the building's roof, as amended by the applicant at the meeting, on the condition that wall-mounted equipment is installed in masonry joints, not through masonry units, and a revised sketch will be submitted to staff. The work as conditioned is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the structure 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 roofs. On a roll call vote the Chair declared the motion carried.

Yea: 6 - Glusac, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Stulberg, and Bushkuhl

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Rozmarek

D-4 11-0716 HDC11-074 1327 Jones Street - Install Egress Door, Two New Windows - Northern Brewery Historic District

Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

*From the Northern Brewery Historic District Study Committee Report:
From its construction in 1886, the building was used as a brewery until about World War I...During the early years of the twentieth century the building was used as a creamery and an ice house. In 1922, the building was converted to use as the Ann Arbor Foundry and was operated as such until 1972.*

The building is late-Victorian commercial vernacular with arched window openings and decorative brick work. It is listed on the State Register of Historic Buildings and the National Register of Historic Places, and has been a single-resource local historic district since 1978.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the north side of Jones Drive. Traver Creek runs along the rear of the building.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to add an egress door and two windows, all in new openings, and an associated egress well, on the west basement elevation; and to add a below-grade 'grade beam' that will prevent further bowing of the west wall, and structural straps with earthquake washers at the floor level of the first floor.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

(5) *Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.*

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

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

Health & 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.

Not Recommended: Installing mechanical or service equipment so that it damages or obscures character-defining features; or is conspicuous from the public right-of-way.

Windows

Recommended: Designing and installing additional windows on rear or other-non character-defining elevations if required by the new use. New window openings may also be cut into exposed party walls. Such design should be compatible with the overall design of the building, but not duplicate the fenestration pattern and detailing of a character-defining elevation.

Not Recommended: Installing new windows, including frames, sash, and muntin configuration that are incompatible with the building's historic appearance or obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *The proposed new door and windows on the west elevation would be dark-bronze colored aluminum to match the building's existing windows and doors. In addition, a matching window would be installed in the existing basement window opening on the west elevation, which currently has a fitted metal panel instead of glazing (see page one of the exterior photos).*

2. *The exterior wall area where the windows and door would be installed has a parge coat over the brick. At a site visit, the architect explained that this would be removed as part of the project.*

3. *A new well would extend five feet from the wall for a length of approximately 37 feet to encompass an existing window and door, and the proposed windows and door.*

4. *The below-grade concrete beam would extend 4'6" from the existing basement*

wall and extend down 7'. The beam would prevent the existing field stone wall from moving any farther outward for a length of about 35'. Ten wall ties would be installed through the brick and into the floor joists for additional structural support. Round plates approximately 6" in diameter would secure the ties on the exterior of the building just above the proposed windows. (This reinforcement is similar to the historic metal stars often seen on the exterior of nineteenth century brick buildings.)

5. The proposed work would correct existing structural difficulties and deficiencies while allowing previously vacant space to be utilized. The two proposed windows are different in proportion from the existing basement window nearby, though they are stylistically quite similar. Staff suggests that new brick, rather than reclaimed, be utilized in the new opening to assure that it reads as an alteration rather than an original feature. The portion of the building where the work is proposed is generally not character-defining.

6. The proposed work is generally 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, in particular standards 2, 5, and 9, and the guidelines for health and safety and windows.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

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

McCauley reported that the original brickwork looks like it was in rough shape and he felt that if there was a need to place an egress window and door the proposed location seemed like a good place. He said it was encouraging to see the adaptive reuse of the building and the preservation of the fabric of the building.

Bushkuhl agreed with McCauley and felt that the character defining feature wouldn't be altered with the proposed changes.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Doug Smith, 1318 Ardmore, Ann Arbor, owner and caretaker of the building was present to respond to enquiries.

Gary Cooper, Cooper Design Inc. 2900 Brockman Blvd was also present.

Ramsburgh commented that she wished she was on the review committee, to see the historically preserved and maintained building. She asked where the underground supporting wall would be located.

Cooper explained the structural issues with the stone foundation they are encountering and how they propose to resolve them. He said that they plan to build a concrete wall, 4' 6" wide on the outside all the way to the base of the foundation to stop future pressure from the dirt. He noted that the wall would stay below grade and below the window well by approximately a foot. He added that the window well would alleviate the pressure from the dirt as well.

Cooper stated that the door to the north wasn't an egress door, but a door into a furnace/utility room. He noted that by code they are required to add another means of egress in order to utilize the lower level space as an office.

Bushkuhl asked what type of material they plan to use to reconstruct the basement wall and if they had a back-up plan if the brick crumbles during construction.

Cooper said that they don't know what they will find during the construction, but they plan to salvage and use reclaimed brick as much as possible.

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

Stulberg stated that he felt the project was a very desirable one and asked if the motion needed to include language regarding the usage of the reclaimed brick.

McCauley said that he would hope that if they had to use brick other than the reclaimed ones that it would match in texture.

The Commission agreed that they didn't feel it necessary to specify the brick issue in the approval motion.

Motion made by McCauley, Seconded by White that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 1327 Jones Drive, a contributing property in the Northern Brewery Historic District, to add an egress door and two windows, all in new openings, and an associated egress well, on the west basement elevation; and to add a below-grade 'grade beam' that will prevent further bowing of the west wall, and structural straps with earthquake washers at the floor level of the first floor, as documented in the applicant's submittal. The work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 5, and 9 and the guidelines for health and safety and windows. On a roll call vote the Chair declared the motion carried.

Yea: 6 - Glusac, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Stulberg, and Bushkuhl

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Rozmarek

COMMISSION BREAK

11-0717 HDC11-075 537 Detroit Street - Age Determination for Two Windows - Old Fourth Ward Historic District

CLOSED SESSION UNDER THE MICHIGAN OPEN MEETINGS ACT, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, LABOR NEGOTIATIONS STRATEGY, PENDING LITIGATION, AND ATTORNEY/CLIENT PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATIONS SET FORTH OR INCORPORATED IN MCLA 15.268 (C), (E), AND (H).

Motion made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White that the Commission enter into Closed Session under the Michigan Open Meetings Act to discuss attorney/client privileged communications as set forth in MCLA 15.268 (h). On a roll call, the vote was as follows, with the Chair declaring the motion carried and the meeting recessed at 8:45 PM.

MEETING RECONVENED

Motion made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White, that the meeting reconvene. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried and the meeting reconvened at 8:55 PM

Yea: 6 - Glusac, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Stulberg, and Bushkuhl

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Rozmarek

Thacher read the following memo and gave the staff report.

Memorandum presented to Commissioners

To: *Historic District Commissioners*

From: *Jill Thacher, City Planner/Historic Preservation Coordinator*

Date: *June 3, 2011*

Re: *June 9 HDC agenda item D-5 537 Detroit Street HDC11-075*

On November 20, 2008, and June 11, 2009 the replacement of several non-original or deteriorated windows on this house was approved by the Historic District Commission (HDC), but two windows in good condition were denied a certificate of appropriateness for sash replacement. The two windows are on the upper floor of the east (front) elevation of this house. The owner appealed the decision to the Michigan State Historic Preservation Review Board. The Review Board upheld the Commission's determination as to the non-deteriorated condition of the windows, however the Review Board found evidence lacking as to the age and historic significance of the two windows in question. The Review Board ordered the Commission to determine whether the windows are original to the house or alternatively are historic-era or non-historic era replacements.

The Study Committee Report for the Old Fourth Ward Historic District identifies the period of historic significance for construction of structures as 1931 or before. Per the Report, no new buildings were built in this neighborhood between 1931 and 1940. The Study Committee Report notes that construction styles changed to more modern techniques after the war, therefore to be considered historically significant the windows must have been constructed prior to the end of World War II. As noted in the attached 2009 staff report, 537 Detroit St. was constructed between 1897 and 1899. Therefore, to be considered original to the house, the windows must have been constructed in 1899 or prior.

The Review Board has ordered the Commission to make only a determination of the age and significance of the windows. The order instructs the Commission to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for repair if the windows are found to be original or historically significant or, in the alternative, to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for replacement if they are determined to be non-original and non-historically significant.

On April 22, Stephen Stier, a preservation consultant from East Lansing, Michigan visited the site with me, Commissioners Tom Stulberg and Lesa Rozmarek (acting as the Review Committee for this matter), and Assistant City Attorney Chris Frost. Mr. Stier, the Commissioners, and I inspected the windows, and Mr. Stier later provided a report of his findings and several photographs that he took on the site visit. Mr. Stier concluded that the window sash were produced and placed in use in this house between 1900 and 1930.

Commissioner Lesa Rozmarek (no longer on the Commission) provided the following

observations from the site visit:

I observed that the sashes exhibited pegs - a construction technique that is indicative of very old sash construction. The sashes are in very good condition, with the exception of the top sash slipping down, which can be resolved through restoration and rehabilitation of the window.

Based on my observations of the sash, I concur with Mr. Stier's report that the windows are pre-War construction. Because the windows were constructed before the end of World War 2 (and likely prior to 1930), they are within the period of historic significance of the district.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Stulberg gave the Review Committee report from the site visit on April 22, 2011. He said that the house is in very good condition and thanked the applicant for their preservation efforts of the historic property. He concurred with the staff report, historic expert Steve Stier's report as well as former Commissioner Rozmarek's comments.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Prudence Spink, 316 W Liberty Street, Medina, OH., owner of the property was present. She stated that she disagreed somewhat with the characterization of procedural events, adding that the City appealed the Administrative Law Judge's decision which then resulted in the State ruling. She said she has since appealed that to the Circuit Court which has resulted in his order for today's hearing. She said she received Mr Stier's report late Tuesday, and hadn't had enough time to prepare for a complete response to that report. Spink handed out copies of her response to the report to the Commission and for the record.

The Commission took a few minutes to read the Spink response.

Spink stated that when she purchased the house she believes the window sashes were unpainted and she believed she had a photo of them unpainted. She said that they had painted two layers of paint on the windows. She said she had taken some time to review the joinery of the windows and believed that they were not dovetailed. She added that Mr. Stier did not take apart the window sashes which she suggested they do in order to find out how they were constructed.

Spink said she had purchased a large set of bullseye corner blocks to make the whole house match. She said she wasn't sure if these were replacement ones or the original ones. She added that there had been lots of things left in the basement when they purchased the house. She said that she is proud of her work on this very delapidated house and her attempts to rehabilitate the house. She stated that she didn't believe Mr. Stier had enough information to make the judgment calls on the historic items as he did in his report.

Thacher explained the Study Committee Report for the Old Fourth Ward.

Ramsburgh stated that what they needed to keep in mind is the period of significance and even if the windows weren't original but if they were installed or built during the period of significance, according to the Study Report, that makes them contributing and makes them a part of the fabric.

Sprink asked for a chance to rebut the Stier report with a report from a carpenter as

well as photos she has.

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

McCauley stated that it was impossible to know 100% if these windows were salvaged or part of the original house, without photographs from that time. He explained that in his own experience as a painter there is a difference between windows built in the 1930's and the pre-depression era. He said the rope pulley system starts to disappear in the late 1930's, noting that they were replaced by chains and metal tracks after the war. McCauley said that this type of system is definitely within the period of significance. He added that the mortise and tenon construction was used back in the 1600's up until 1910, noting that they used pins in the older construction to hold the sashes together. He said that the joinery isn't as important as the pin as evidence of the age.

McCauley said that the trim could've been replaced over the years but it is unlikely that great care had been taken to preserve the historic fabric when given the presented facts that the original front funeral doors were taken out and replaced with unsympathetic ones. He believed the windows and sashes were the original ones.

Stulberg agreed that the windows and sashes were ones from the period of significance, and without any evidence of when they were replaced or installed they have to determine that they are from the period of significance.

Bushkuhl thanked Spink for her diligent work on restoring the house. He agreed with the Stier report and with McCauley and Stulberg's comments.

Glusac stated that she supports staff findings, Mr. Stier's report as well as the motion on the floor.

White stated that he also supports the motion on the floor.

Ramsburgh stated that she agrees with the motion on the floor and added that she was on the original Review Committee visit and believes the evidence is convincing that the windows are from the period of significance. She observed that the window at the top of the stairs was determined to be original, and that these windows match that one.

Buskuhl asked how the Commission would handle future documentation received from Spink on this matter.

Ramsburgh said that the Commission would be happy to review any documentation that would be brought before them on this matter.

Spink stated that she wasn't sure what the Commission means by the key point being the pin. She also disagreed that the sashes of the other windows being original.

McCauley explained the purpose of pins in older window construction.

Ramsburgh asked if the pins would be visible.

McCauley said that they could be but usually they are covered with paint. He pointed out on the powerpoint slide where the pins might be.

McCauley said that from his experience working with old windows he didn't believe there would be any significant construction difference between a window built in 1897

to 1900.

White agreed and added that they would be from the period of significance.

Motion made by Stulberg, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the repair of the four window sash on the second floor of the east (front) elevation at 537 Detroit Street, a contributing structure in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District. Based on a report provided to the Commission by Mr. Stephen Stier and the observations of Commissioners and staff, the Commission determined that the window sash were produced and placed in use on the house during the period of significance and are therefore historically significant to the Old Fourth Ward. Therefore, in accordance with the October 11, 2010 Final Decision and Order of the State Historic Preservation Review Board in this matter, the Commission issued a Certificate of Appropriateness for repair of these sash. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Yea: 6 - Glusac, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Stulberg, and Bushkuhl

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Rozmarek

D-6 11-0718 Old West Side Survey

Motion made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White to approve and adopt the Old West Side Survey. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Yea: 6 - Glusac, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Stulberg, and Bushkuhl

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Rozmarek

E OLD BUSINESS

F NEW BUSINESS

F-2 11-0719 Annual Historic District Commission Calendar Review

Motion made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White to approve the revised July 2011-June 2012 HDC Meeting Schedule. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Yea: 6 - Glusac, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Stulberg, and Bushkuhl

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Rozmarek

G PUBLIC COMMENTARY - (3 Minutes per Speaker)

H APPROVAL OF MINUTES

H-1 11-0720 Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes of the April 14, 2011

A motion was made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White, that the Minutes be Approved by the Commission and forwarded to City Council. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

I REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Bushkuhl reported on a conference he attended on lead paint.

McCauley added that there are new standards for lead paint abatement that all contractors must adhere to.

Ramsburgh reported on the HDC Awards Ceremony.

J ASSIGNMENTS

J-1 Review Committee: Monday, July 11 at 5 PM for the July 14, 2011 Regular Session

Commissioners White and Bushkuhl volunteered for the July Review Committee.

K REPORTS FROM STAFF

K-1 11-0721 May 2011 Staff Activities

Received and Filed

L CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS**M COMMUNICATIONS****N ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting was unanimously adjourned at 10:07 PM.