



# City of Ann Arbor

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

## Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

---

Thursday, June 14, 2012

7:00 PM

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

---

### A CALL TO ORDER

*Chair McCauley called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.*

### B ROLL CALL

*DiLeo called the roll.*

**Present:** 5 - Ellen Ramsburgh, Patrick McCauley, Benjamin L. Bushkuhl, John Beeson, and Jennifer Ross

**Absent:** 2 - Robert White, and Thomas Stulberg

### C APPROVAL OF AGENDA

**The agenda was unanimously approved.**

### D SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

#### D-1 12-0824 Cobblestone Farm Annual Report

*George Taylor, President of the Cobblestone Farm Association presented their annual report. He thanked the Commission and the City for their support.*

### E UNFINISHED BUSINESS

#### E-1 12-0828 HDC12-043; 220 South Main Street - Replace Eight Windows - MSHD

*Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This three-story brick commercial building was built in 1900. The first occupant was Arnold Jewelers. At one time the three-story Mack and Company flanked it to the south, but that building was reduced to one story in 1939, leaving the south wall of 220 exposed.*

*The applicant applied to the HDC in May 2012 to replace the windows with single hung units and cap exterior wood components with anodized bronze aluminum. The application was postponed to allow the applicant an opportunity to revise his proposal in response to HDC comments.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the west side of South Main Street, between West Washington Street and West Liberty Street.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace eight large, single-pane windows with new aluminum "tilt turn and hopper windows."*

**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 (other SOI Guidelines may also apply):*

**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.*

*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.*

*Changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which noticeably change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of the glazing; or the appearance of the frame.*

*Obscuring historic window trim with metal or other material.*

*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 windows that are proposed to be replaced are located on the front elevation and are character-defining features of the building. There are four large single pane windows each on the second and third floors. These windows are apparently constructed to open by pivoting on a central pin. The windows that are proposed to replace these large center-pivot windows are custom-made Marvin aluminum "tilt turn and hopper windows." These windows open towards the inside and can function as both a casement window and a hopper window. The applicant states that because of the large size of the windows, aluminum is necessary to provide the necessary structural support rather than wood. The proposed windows have no railings or muntins and are very similar in appearance to the existing windows.*
- 2. The exterior wood casing and trim will be restored and repainted, rather than capped in anodized bronze aluminum as originally proposed.*
- 3. Refer to the staff report prepared for the May 10, 2012 Historic District Commission meeting for the applicant's statements and staff's finding regarding the condition and concerns of the existing windows.*
- 4. Staff will make a recommendation at the HDC meeting regarding these windows, after a comprehensive review of their condition is completed at the Review Committee visit.*

#### REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

*Ross and Beeson visited the site as part of their review.*

*Ross explained that they had no access to the inside of the building and had to view the windows from the public right-of-way.*

*Ross and Beeson deferred to the May Review Committee whom had seen the inside window hardware.*

*McCauley, whom had visited the site in May said the staff report is quite complete. He said the interior and exterior window condition was repairable but had been painted shut, and the question remained if they could function for modern purposes.*

#### AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

*Jim Curtis, 345 S Main Street, Suite #218, was present to respond to the Commission's questions. He said the purpose for changing the windows is for the benefit of the tenants on the second and third floors. He said by replacing the windows they would be able to add another means of egress through having operable windows. Curtis explained the revised proposed window replacement.*

*Ramsburgh noted that the Commission had yet not received a full report, as requested, as to if the windows were repairable. She said she had done some research on the Chicago windows, and since they were operable at one time, asked*

*the applicant why not more follow-through efforts had been done.*

*Curtis said they had presented a bid from a company, but it didn't include the option of repairing the existing windows. He said the thickness of the glass pane was a factor and would become a dangerous structural issue that they didn't want to pursue. He said they don't want to avoid restoration, but avoid a hazard.*

*Ramsburgh asked if they intend to restore the leaded glass transom windows.*

*Curtis said, yes, that they intend not to alter the outside at all, just the inside, by adding a thermal pane insert from the inside that can be removed for cleaning. He said they will also be having the clear glass insert below the leaded glass as well.*

*Beeson asked if the upper windows were operable.*

*Curtis said they had been at one time, but currently were not.*

*Beeson asked about the sill photo that showed a sill height of 3 ¼ inches which is different than the profile of the existing windows which is 6 inches.*

*Curtis said there is a sill trim option that goes all the way around the window that will not be a part of this proposal. He said the exterior sill will remain the same as would the exterior wood trim, with the new window sitting at the same location as the current ones. He said the difference will be that the proposed windows are made structurally different.*

*Eleanor Pollack, 515 Detroit Street, said that for over thirty years Pollack Design Studios rented the third floor space of the building, and during that time the windows had not been functional. She said the front room was so cold in the winter that they needed to have two space heaters going in order to make the space habitable, and stifling hot in the summer, adding that the glass leaks. She said the proposed changes are very logical and a wonderful option.*

**Motion made by Beeson, seconded McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 220 S Main Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to allow the replacement of eight windows and restoration of exterior woodwork as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding resources 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.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

*Beeson said he felt the proposal brought a lot of discomfort with the Commission, adding that in the context of historic preservation, the guidelines for rehabilitation that are set by standard 6, say that the windows should be repaired rather than replaced. He said the Commission looks at addressing the applicant's issues of tenant comfort and safety and at the same time trying to balance the historic quality and modern functionality, knowing that the building really needs to have functional space. He said he was hesitant about supporting the replacement of the windows without looking at the options for repairing them.*

*Beeson said if they try to repair the windows they would still be looking at a single pane window that allows for infiltration, and the addition of an interior or exterior storm window would potentially eliminate the operable portion of the window during*

*the summer.*

*Ross agreed stressing that their charge is to objectively apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to the cases they review. She said she still wasn't convinced that replacement of the windows was the only available option, since Standard 6 says that windows must be damaged beyond repair.*

*Ramsburgh stated that this is a hard case, since the windows are in good condition and probably did work at one time, and with the charge of preserving rather than replacing, it makes it very tough for the Commission. She said she has a degree of sympathy with the situation but she wasn't sure that the investigation of other ways to make the windows operable again and create the needed energy efficiency had been explored to the fullest, noting that the two times that the applicant had come before the Commission the results of a full investigation had not been presented to the Commission. She said several members of the Commission had experience in how to make windows more energy efficient without replacing them.*

*Bushkuhl said that if the windows are not badly deteriorated the Commission's first reaction is not to have them replaced; however, his experience with large windows in the downtown is the weight issue of the glass and the wood as well as general functionality issues. He said an old window will never close and seal as nicely as a new window will and older windows might not be able to be fitted with insect screens. Bushkuhl pointed out that cost didn't seem to be a factor for the applicant and a repair could be cheaper than a replacement.*

*McCauley said he couldn't see a way to repair the windows to make them function in a modern way, and that he felt it was unfair to ask the applicant to repair the windows to the way they originally functioned and were intended to open. He said it would be impossible to add screens to the windows, and the efficiency is limited on single hung windows. He said he would vote in support of the request because he felt it will look very similar to what is currently existing.*

*Ramsburgh commented that she would be more comfortable to issue a 'Notice to Proceed' than passing a motion that says that the request complies with the Secretary of the Interior Guidelines, since she felt it clearly did not. She expressed concerns about setting a precedence.*

*McCauley said while the windows are not deteriorated, they are in certain ways beyond repair in the traditional sense, and if repaired, wouldn't be functional, as we would expect them to be, according to modern standards.*

*Beeson added that the repairs could be made to make them function as they originally functioned, however the Standards didn't address the issue of repairing historical windows to meet modern functionality.*

*Bushkuhl said it was an interesting question between the request in light of functionality and the spirit of the guidelines. He referenced situations where they need to make a historical building handicapped accessible and a hole in a wall might need to be cut to allow that functionality in order to keep the building functioning. He said he was in favor of the replacement of the windows.*

*Ramsburgh noted that the new windows will not be screened, and two windows on each floor will be operable while two will remain fixed. She asked if the Commission could require the applicant to repair the windows that will remain fixed and add an interior or exterior storm window to those windows and replace the two windows on each floor that are intended to be operable.*

Ross said Ramsburgh had made some valid points.

Chair McCauley asked the applicant to respond to Commission discussion.

Curtis stated that there is a slight difference to the trim on the windows and he believed that it would be noticeable from the exterior if there were two original and two new windows, while all replacement windows would look the same as the existing. He said they like the idea of having the option available to use the windows as egress, if needed.

Beeson asked about screens.

Curtis said that a Commissioner had commented that screens were not originally a part of the windows and by adding them it would take away from the historical look. He said they were willing to accept the exclusion of screens as part of the Commission approval.

McCauley asked if their tenants would like to have screens if they were to open the windows for ventilation.

Curtis said yes, but he liked the clean look without screens.

McCauley thanked the Commission for their thoughtful discussion and reiterated that he believes the request meets the Standards of the Interior for rehabilitation because they were making the building functional, noting it was not a museum. He said the discussion shows that the Commission takes the issue seriously.

Bushkuhl said he felt it would be unfair to hold this building to a higher standard because it had a different type of window [Chicago Style] than others in the downtown.

Ross requested that if the Commission approve and grant the request, that the owner keep the windows in storage since they are such unique windows, so that future owners or tenants might be able to put them back.

Curtis said they would be happy to do that.

Beeson asked about the suggestion of granting a Notice to Proceed vs. a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Ramsburgh said that she will vote in favor of the request in order to make the windows functional, pointing out that the Commission has discussed their thoughts on the issue of meeting the Standards, and she withdrew her suggestion of granting a Notice to Proceed.

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

**APPROVED**

**Yeas:** 4 - Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Secretary Bushkuhl, and Beeson

**Nays:** 1 - Ross

**Absent:** 2 - White, and Vice Chair Stulberg

**F**      **HEARINGS****F-1**      **12-0829**      HDC12-097; 209 East Liberty Street - New Business Wall Sign - MSHD

*Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This two-story brick commercial vernacular building was built in 1906 for the Washtenaw Home Telephone company, which also occupied the space that is currently 211 East Liberty. The building features double-hung one-over-one windows, a stone stringcourse, and a cornice with corbelling and ornamental brickwork. For many years, the building had an operable retracting awning, which was replaced in 1992 by a fixed triangular shaped vinyl awning.*

*The HDC previously approved the installation of a new awning in 1992, and an internally illuminated sign in 1995.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the north side of East Liberty Street between Fourth Avenue and Fifth Avenue.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to install one new fabric waterfall shaped awning over the storefront to identify the business. The proposed awning is rectangular and measures nineteen feet six inches long, by four feet eight inches high, by two feet four inches deep. The awning is red with black lettering that is outlined with white.*

**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 (other SOI Guidelines may also apply):*

**Storefronts**

**Not Recommended:**

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

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. *The proposed awning measures nineteen feet six inches long, by four feet eight inches high, by two feet four inches deep. It will be constructed of a framework of steel tubes that will be covered in fabric. Based on submitted samples, the awning appears to have a high gloss finish. The awning will be red and contain the words "Wild Side Smoke Shop," which will be black letters outlined with white. The total length of the words will measure eleven feet three inches, and the largest letters measure one foot six inches high. The awning will also contain two small logos, one at each end, that measure one foot high and nine inches wide.*
2. *The building at 209 E Liberty previously had a triangular shaped awning installed over the entrance. The applicant proposes to install a new waterfall shaped awning. According to the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, using waterfall-shaped awnings are not appropriate.*
3. *The awning is placed at an appropriate height for the building and adjacent buildings. There are many awnings on adjacent buildings located at approximately the same height, but the awnings on the adjacent buildings are triangular shaped and one is rectangular. In order to protect the exterior brick the awning should be mounted through mortar joints, which is not indicated on the provided drawings.*
4. *The proposed waterfall shaped awning does not convey the same visual appearance as the adjacent awnings and is a shape that is considered to not be appropriate by the Design Guidelines. Therefore, it is generally incompatible in exterior design and a triangular shape is more appropriate. It may also be more appropriate to use a less glossy material such as canvas, rather than the high gloss finish provided in the sample. However, staff believes that the overall size and color are appropriate and meet The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 2 and 9, and the guidelines for storefronts.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:**

*Ross and Beeson visited the site as part of their review.*

*Beeson reported that they were not able to get a good view of the transom windows but they were able to see the window frame and where the old awning had been located.*

*Ross added that the Commission would need to see details of how the new awning would be attached to the building since such was not been provided.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Chris Saxton, Sales Representative for Signature Awning, 12283 Merriman, Dearborn, was present to respond to the Commission's question. He apologized for not providing a copy of the attachment details to the Commission and noted that he had provided that with his building application. He said it would not be a problem for them to attach the awning through the mortar joints. He said the purpose for the awning was to keep the sun and heat out of the building as well as for signage purposes.*

*McCauley asked the applicant what kind of material the awning would be made of.*

*Saxton said it will be a vinyl coated polyester type of fabric that will allow for easy*

*cleaning.*

*Ramsburgh asked why the 'waterfall' shape was chosen.*

*Saxton said the owner wished to stick with the same design for both of his buildings and businesses, adding that he has another business on Plymouth Road in Ann Arbor. He also noted that the waterfall shape allowed more signage.*

*Ramsburgh asked if the existing signage above the windows would be covered by the awning.*

*Saxton said, yes.*

**Motion made by Ramsburgh, seconded McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 209 East Liberty Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to add one new storefront awning as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2 and 9 and the guidelines for storefronts.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

*Ramsburgh asked if staff were aware of other waterfall shape awnings in the City.*

*DiLeo said there were a few but she wasn't sure if and when they had been approved by the Commission.*

*McCauley said he didn't have an issue with the shape of the proposed awning, but had some reservations with the shiny material.*

*Ross noted there was one just down the street from the proposed location.*

*Beeson said he believed that awning had been on the building since the ice cream business opened.*

*Beeson said the proposed awning is much larger than the previous one and will go from building edge to building edge, while awnings usually sit close to the windows.*

*McCauley asked staff about the suggestion conditional approval.*

*DiLeo said that staff recommends that the Commission make their approval with possible material and shape changes.*

*McCauley said he wasn't sure they could approve an awning, without having a specific design determined.*

*Beeson said he would like to get a better idea why the 'waterfall' shape awnings were included in their HDC design guidelines as not recommended.*

*DiLeo said she believes it has to do with the timeframe the 'waterfall' design was introduced, since it was not typically used during the period of significance.*

*Saxton offered to take the Commission's feedback to the owner and then provide revised plans of a different shaped awning with sample material to the Commission.*

**Moved by Ramsburgh, Seconded by McCauley that action be postponed, up to**

**60 days, in order to allow applicant time to submit revised proposed plans. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.**

**Yeas:** 5 - Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Secretary Bushkuhl, Beeson, and Ross

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - White, and Vice Chair Stulberg

**F-2 12-0830**

HDC12-066; 400 West Washington Street - New Projecting Business Sign - OWSHD

*Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.*

**BACKGROUND:**

*The YMCA building is a non-contributing building in the Old West Side Historic District that was constructed in 2005. The site has been in use since 1888, when The Ann Arbor Engine & Boiler Works constructed several buildings, including two forges, a foundry, a machine shop, and a pattern shop. In the following decades, several residential houses and companies were also constructed on the property, including the American Broach and Machine Company, Huron Valley Chevrolet, and Cushing Motor Sales. At the time the YMCA acquired the site, a 60,000 square foot building consisting of over one dozen additions, possibly dating back to the 1920s, was the only remaining building on the site. Due to its poor condition and structural instability, this structure was planned to be demolished. However, a fire occurred just prior to its scheduled demolition that destroyed most of the structure and the remaining debris was removed to make way for the new YMCA.*

*The HDC approved the demolition of the existing building and construction of a new building in 2003.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the north side of West Washington Street between First Street and Third Street.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to install a new illuminated commercial storefront sign above the awning covering the entrance of the building. The sign measures eight feet and eight inches wide, and eight feet eight inches high. The sign consists of stainless steel lettering on an aluminum background and is lit by small LED lights located around the letters.*

**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 (other SOI Guidelines may also apply):*

*Storefronts*

*Not Recommended:*

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

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. *The proposed YMCA business sign consists of a large "Y" surrounded by smaller letters spellings the words "the" and "YMCA," mounted on a square aluminum background. Sign is a square shape with rounded edges and measures eight feet and eight inches on each side. The font is a modern sans-serif style that is compatible with the modern building. It is located above the awing that marks the entrance to the building. It will be attached to steel beams that are bolted into the brick façade of the building.*

2. *The proposed business sign is appropriately scaled and its placement is appropriate. On the provided mock-up, the sign appears to be compatible in size, materials, and color to the building. However, the proposed sign will be illuminated from behind by small LED lights that line the large "Y" and the word "the" creating a halo effect around these letters. It would be more appropriate to illuminate the sign with small external spotlights.*

3. *The proposed sign 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 and 9. The sign meets the guidelines for storefronts, except that it is internally illuminated.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:**

*Ross and Beeson visited the site as part of their review.*

*Ross reported that they reviewed surrounding building and found that since the area is a mixed use area the sign appears to match the surrounding area in size and scale.*

*Beeson added that since the building is a new non-contributing structure the sign works well.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Mark Malchi, Architect with MAV Development and Board member of the YMCA, 1471 Ardmoor Ave, was present to respond to the Commission's question. He explained the reasoning of going with internal lighting of the sign.*

**Motion made by Bushkuhl, seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 400 West Washington Street, a non-contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to add one new exterior business sign as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship**

to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2 and 9 and the guidelines for storefronts.

*COMMISSION DISCUSSION:*

*Ramsburgh stated that creating halo lighting around the letters, as proposed, will be less disturbing to the residential houses than spot-lighting the sign. She added that the sign is appropriate to match with the contemporary building, in this instance.*

*Bushkuhl commented that the Commission had previously approved non-traditional internally lit signage.*

*Beeson noted that the sign is large but fits well with the surroundings.*

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

**APPROVED**

**Yeas:** 5 - Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Secretary Bushkuhl, Beeson, and Ross

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - White, and Vice Chair Stulberg

**F-3 12-0831**

HDC12-088; 535 East Liberty Street - New Business Wall Sign - STHD

*Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.*

*BACKGROUND:*

*This two-story brick commercial building is part of the west wing of the Michigan Theater Building. It was built in 1927 in the 20th Century Romanesque style, but underwent significant alteration in the 1950s that destroyed much of its original exterior character. All of the original windows and storefronts were changed and a large aluminum signboard was added running the length of the building. The storefronts are now mainly glass, framed in mill finish silver aluminum, with a low ashlar limestone sill and a few vertical panels of dark marble.*

*In 2002, the HDC approved the installation of a new business sign in the same location.*

*LOCATION:*

*The site is located on the north side of East Liberty Street between Maynard Street and Thompson Street.*

*APPLICATION:*

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to install a new non-illuminated commercial storefront sign in the signboard above the entrance of the building. The sign measures eleven feet and one inch long, and three feet nine inches high at its highest point. The sign consists of pink and purple letters on a white background, and a line drawing of a dish of frozen yogurt.*

**APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:**

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

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

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

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

**Storefronts**

*Not Recommended: Introducing a new design that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color; using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy remaining character-defining features of the historic building; using new illuminated signs.*

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. *The proposed "yoggie's frozen yogurt" business sign consists of pink and purple letters on a white background and is accompanied by a simple line drawing of a dish of frozen yogurt. The letters measure two feet four inches high and seven feet eleven inches long. The frozen yogurt drawing measures three feet nine inches high and three feet two inches wide. The font is a modern serif style that is compatible with other signs located along Liberty Street. It is located at the same height as other neighboring signs on the signboard. It will be attached by rods bolted into the signboard.*

2. *The proposed business sign is appropriately scaled and its placement on the metal cornice the front entrance is appropriate. The sign will be externally illuminated by gooseneck lights, which are not part of this application. On the provided mock-up, the sign appears to be compatible in size, materials, and color to the building. The sign also appears to be well balanced and does not detract from the character defining features of the building.*

3. *The proposed sign 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 9 and 10, and the guidelines for storefronts.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:**

*Ross and Beeson visited the site as part of their review.*

*Ross reported that the proposed sign seems to be compatible with signage in the area in size, material and texture.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Christine Podzikowski, from Sign Emporium, 5055 Pine Knob Lane, was present to respond to the Commission's question.*

*Beeson asked if they had decided on the goose-neck lighting.*

*Podzikowski said, no, not yet.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*None.*

**Motion made by Beeson, seconded by McCauley that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 535 E Liberty Street, a contributing property in the State Street Historic District, to add one new exterior business sign as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 9 and 10 and the guidelines for storefronts.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

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

**APPROVED**

**Yeas:** 5 - Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Secretary Bushkuhl, Beeson, and Ross

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - White, and Vice Chair Stulberg

**F-4 12-0832**

**HDC12-083; 212 South Ashley Street - Revision to Two Accessory Structures - MSHD**

*Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.*

**BACKGROUND:**

*The two brick commercial vernacular buildings at 210 and 212-216 South Ashley were built in 1899 and 1910, respectively. Number 210 was originally occupied by Mann & Zeeb Agricultural Imports, and 212-216 by Hertler Brothers Agricultural Implements. They are contributing structures in the Main Street Historic District. The proposed project is in the Downtown Home & Garden parking lot at the corner of South Ashley and West Liberty Streets and formerly had the address 218 South Ashley. On the current parking lot portion of the 218 South Ashley site, a house appears on 1888 through 1925 Sanborn maps, but this part of the site was vacant by 1931.*

*The applicant received HDC permission to construct a 422-square foot accessory building and two freestanding pavilions in the southwest corner of the parking lot off South Ashley Street in January 2012. In May 2012 the applicant received HDC permission to change the proposed roof from standing seam metal to asphalt.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is at the corner of South Ashley and West Liberty Streets.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to change a previously approved pyramidal roof design with a peak for two freestanding pavilions to a hipped roof that slopes away from the Downtown Home & Garden building.*

**APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:**

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

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

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

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

*Building Site - Alterations/Additions for the New Use*

*Recommended:*

*Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserves the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.*

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

**STAFF FINDINGS**

- 1. The pavilions are 14 feet square and 15 feet square, each with wood 6-inch by 6-inch posts. They are intended for shade and shelter, and are freestanding.*
- 2. The applicant stated that the redesigned roofs will create more symmetry between the pavilions and the existing greenhouse that is located adjacent to the proposed pavilions. The redesigned roof also slopes away from the existing building and will direct any water away from the building, rather than towards it as the previously proposed roofs did.*
- 3. Staff recommends approval of the application since the size, scale, design, materials, and color of the proposed roofs are compatible with the historic character of the site.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:**

*Ross and Beeson visited the site as part of their review.*

*Ross reported that the hipped roof would be more compatible than the existing roof and wouldn't be attached to the building. She added that the project was well thought out and a good project.*

*Beeson added that the hipped roof matched the beer garden roof much better.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Mark Hodesh, owner of Downtown Home and Garden, 2972 Oakridge, was present to respond to the Commission's question. He explained to the Commission that they are at a juncture point in the construction where they would like to connect the accessory structure to the main building, if the Commission will allow that, and if they won't then they will have to do some interior re-design of the pavilions in order to handle structural needs. He noted that the re-design would not change the exterior of the structures.*

*Ramsburgh asked if the proposed connection would be done in the same way as the greenhouse is bolted to the building.*

*Hodesh said, yes, the connection bolting all be done from under the roof, so nothing would be seen from the exterior.*

*Beeson said they would need to add some flashing along the seam.*

*Hodesh said, the flashing would be thin and of compatible color with the shingles.*

*The Commission asked about the incorporation of the window.*

*Hodesh said, they hadn't thought through the whole idea regarding the connection.*

*The Commission said they would take action on the presented plans before them, and when and if the applicant decided to move forward with a connection then they could return to the Commission.*

**Motion made by Ross, seconded by Beeson, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 212 South Ashley Street in the Main Street Historic District to revise a previously approved pyramidal roof for two freestanding pavilions and install a hipped roof that slopes away from the existing building. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the contributing structures on the site and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standard 9 and 10 and the guidelines for Building Site.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

*McCauley agreed with the Review Committee in that the revised roof looks better.*

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

**APPROVED**

**Yeas:** 5 - Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Secretary Bushkuhl, Beeson, and Ross

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - White, and Vice Chair Stulberg

**F-5 12-0833**

HDC12-098; 118-120 East Liberty Street - Modify Window Openings and Add Three New Windows - MSHD

*Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This three-story brick commercial vernacular building was built in 1906 and is commonly known as the Pretzel Bell Building. Its original occupant was Martin Haller Furniture. The building features fixed double-pane windows, stone label molding and window sills, and a decorative brick cornice with corbelling. Sometime between 1981 and 1992 it appears that the first floor of the north (front) elevation was modified, with the window openings at 120 and 122 E Liberty decreasing in size. It appears that the sills were raised and the openings below were infilled with brick. Three windows were added and a doorway was relocated in the first floor of the east (side) elevation during this time period (see attached photos).*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the southwest corner of East Liberty and South Fourth Avenue.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to lower the sill height of the windows in the first floor at 120 and 122 East Liberty. The applicant also seeks HDC approval to lower the sill height of the windows on the first floor of 122 East Liberty that face South Fourth Avenue, and create three new window openings in the first floor of this elevation.*

**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 (other SOI Guidelines may also apply):*

**Storefronts**

*Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving storefronts--and their functional and decorative features--that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as display windows, signs, doors, transoms, kick plates, corner posts, and entablatures.*

**Not Recommended:**

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

**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.*

*Not Recommended:*

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

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

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 1. The applicant proposes to lower the sill height of six windows in the north (front) elevation of the building so that they are the same height as the windows currently in place 118 E Liberty. Lowering the sills would create a more uniform appearance to the façade of the building while also allowing for more light in the interior of the building. Based on a photograph taken during a survey of E Liberty Street in 1981, the six windows at 120 and 122 E Liberty appear to have originally had sills at the same height as those at 118 E Liberty. In a photograph taken during a survey in 1992, the six windows had their sill raised, resulting in smaller windows. The area below the sills was infilled with brick.*
- 2. The six windows at 120 and 122 E Liberty are non-historically significant. Lowering the sills would involve removing the non-historic infill. Based on the provided drawings, none of the surrounding historic materials would be altered and the historical integrity of the building will not be harmed.*
- 3. The applicant also proposes to lower the window sills in three windows in the east (side) elevation of the building that faces S Fourth Avenue. These existing window openings were added sometime between 1981 and 1992, based on the survey photographs, and are non-historically significant. The creation of three new window openings in the east elevation of the building, to the rear of three currently existing windows is proposed as well.*
- 4. Although lowering the sills of the existing three windows on the east elevation and adding three new openings will harm original building materials, it appears that this elevation has been modified several times in the past. The three existing window openings were added between 1981 and 1992, and a doorway towards the rear of the building was relocated. In general, the first floor of this elevation is nondescript. Most of the building's character-defining features on this elevation are on the second and third floors, which will not be impacted by the new windows. It is staff's opinion that lowering the sills of the existing windows and installing three new windows openings will have a minimal impact on the building's historical integrity and character-defining features.*
- 5. Based on the provided mock up, the proposed window alterations are appropriately scaled and their placement in a previously altered area is appropriate. The proposed new window openings are also appropriately scaled.*

6. Staff recommends approval of the proposed window alterations and new window openings. They are 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 and 9. The sign meets the guidelines for storefronts.

**REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:**

Ross and Beeson visited the site as part of their review.

Beeson agreed with the staff report and said each of the three windows bays on the north east corner have been infilled with wood and brick. He said the proposed changes will make the windows line up.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

Alan Wang, 1899 Snowberry Ridge Rd. Was present to respond to the Commission's question. He added that the sills will be of similar stone as the second and third floor windows.

Ross asked about the specifications of the proposed windows.

Wang said the window width would remain the same and the windows on the 118 East Liberty Street bay are slightly larger, than the 120 and 122 East Liberty bays. He said all the spacing would remain the same, and the only change would be that they are dropping the height to 91 inches. He said the materials would be the same as in 122 East Liberty with an aluminum storefront window and the wood window trim would remain in tact.

Ross asked if the three existing windows on the south side are aluminum or wood framed.

Wang said they are aluminum frame with wood trim on the outside.

Ross asked if the proposed windows would be wood or aluminum clad.

Wang said they intend to keep the wood trim since it goes the entire length from the 118 E. Liberty bay.

Wang asked if he would need to submit a separate application for the proposed new awning.

The Commission said yes.

**Motion made by Ellen Ramsburgh, seconded by McCauley, that the Commission APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS the application at 118-122 East Liberty Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District and issue a certificate of appropriateness, to lower the sill height of nine windows and create three new window openings, providing that the three (3) new windows have wood trim and aluminum frames. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2 and 9 and the guidelines for storefronts and windows.**

*COMMISSION DISCUSSION:*

*Ramsburgh stated that the proposed changes will enhance the building.*

*Bushkuhl said that the changes meet the Secretary of the Interior Guidelines and will engage the pedestrians more, which is a positive change.*

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

**APPROVED**

**Yeas:** 5 - Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Secretary Bushkuhl, Beeson, and Ross

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - White, and Vice Chair Stulberg

**F-6 12-0834**

HDC12-089; 256 Crest Street - Add Two New Dormers to Existing Rear Addition - OWSHD

*Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.*

*BACKGROUND:*

*This vernacular one-and-a-half story bungalow features a full-width front porch, a front-facing gabled dormer, and knee brackets. The house first appears in the 1923 Polk City Directory and lists Frank Ulrich and his wife Mary C Ulrich as the owners. Frank Ulrich is listed as a boiler fireman with the Washtenaw Gas Company.*

*LOCATION:*

*The site is located on the west side of Crest Avenue, between Bemidji Drive and West Washington Street.*

*APPLICATION:*

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct two rectangular shed dormers on the north and south (side) elevations to increase the interior headroom in a bedroom and provide room to add a new bathroom. The proposed dormers would be added to an addition built in the 1980s, and each measure approximately 16 feet long and approximately twelve feet deep. The proposed dormer on the north elevation has two windows and the proposed dormer on the south elevation has three windows. The applicant also seeks approval to install a new skylight in the proposed dormer on the north (side) elevation.*

*APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:*

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

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

*(10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction 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:*

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

*Placing a new addition on a non-character-defining elevation and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic building.*

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

*Not Recommended; 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.*

*Radically changing a character-defining roof shape or damaging or destroying character-defining roofing material as a result of incompatible design or improper installation techniques.*

#### *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.*

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

#### *STAFF FINDINGS:*

1. *The 16' wide dormer is proposed on the north (side) elevation approximately 30' feet behind the east (front) façade. The dormer roof is located at the same height as the ridge height of the current roof of the 1980's addition, but below the roof of the original building, and its size and proportions are consistent and compatible with the rest of the house. It appears that the new dormer will not be highly conspicuous from Crest Avenue due to its location and size. The dormer that is proposed on the south (side) elevation is of the same dimensions, and also appears to not be highly conspicuous from the street.*

2. *The proposed dormer on the north elevation features two three-over-one windows that match the existing windows in style. The dormer will be sided with*

cedar shakes to match the existing siding, and will have an asphalt roof to match the existing roof. The applicant also seeks approval to install a skylight measures two feet by four feet on the proposed dormer. It appears that the skylight will not be highly conspicuous from the street.

3. The proposed dormer on the south elevation features three three-over-one windows that match the existing windows in style. This dormer will also be sided in cedar shakes and have an asphalt shingle roof.

4. The proposed dormers are located on a rear, non-character defining-addition that was built in the 1980s.

5. The proposed dormers and windows are compatible in design with the existing house and the locations on side elevations with low visibility from the street are appropriate. The proposed dormer does not detract from the overall building proportions and design.

6. Staff recommends approval of the proposed dormers, windows, and skylight. 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 9 and 10, and the guidelines for new additions and windows.

#### REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Ross and Beeson visited the site as part of their review.

Ross reported that the building itself sits on a hill and when standing in the right-of-way it will be very difficult to see the new rear dormer addition, stressing it will be quite inconspicuous and the scale will be compatible with the original building.

Beeson agreed with Ross and said this bungalow is a nice bungalow on a street with similar designs. He said a key factor for him is that the addition is a non-contributing structure since it was built in the 1980's, and the proposed dormers will not be seen from the front.

#### AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Derek White, 256 Crest Avenue, owner, and Ed Wier, 1503 Shadford, architect for the project, were present to respond to the Commission's question.

Ramsburgh referenced the guideline that new additions should be designed in a manner that makes it clear what is historic and what is new. She asked if the applicant was set on using windows that were three over one or if they would be content with using one over one windows.

White responded that they would like to prefer to stay with the three over one, since it is more in character with the general house, pointing out that the addition is clearly defined with the foundation and divider board.

Beeson referencing plan A6, asked if the soffits on the new dormer would line up and be the same plane as the existing soffit.

Wier responded that they could work towards that if the Commission would like that, but as the overhang comes out, it drives the window down, noting that there are some geometry issues involved.

Motion made by McCauley, seconded by Beeson, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 265 Crest Avenue, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to add a shed dormer on the north (side) elevation, add a dormer on the south (side) elevation, and install a skylight as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 9 and 10 and the guidelines for new additions and windows.

*COMMISSION DISCUSSION:*

*McCauley commented that he thinks the addition is straight forward and will look nice.*

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

**APPROVED**

**Yeas:** 5 - Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Secretary Bushkuhl, Beeson, and Ross

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - White, and Vice Chair Stulberg

**F-7 12-0838**

HDC12-090; 717-719 West Jefferson Street - Enlarging Rear Three-Season Porch - OWSHD

*Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.*

*BACKGROUND:*

*This two-story brick vernacular tri-gabled ell house features two front porches, arched bricks above the windows and stone window sills, and a stone foundation. The house first appears in the 1888-1889 Polk City Directory as the residence of Mathias Fischer. Mathias Fischer was the proprietor of Western Brewery, along with Christian Martin. Prior to 1898 the address of the house was 55 W Jefferson Street. In 1927, the house was divided into a duplex. Roland M Steele is listed in the City Directory as the resident of 717, and William H Gregory is listed as the resident of 719.*

*LOCATION:*

*The site is located on the south side of West Jefferson Street at the corner of Sixth Street.*

*APPLICATION:*

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to expand the back porch located on the east end of the south (rear) elevation.*

*APPLICABLE REGULATIONS*

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

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

*characterize a property will be avoided.*

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

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

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

#### *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.*

#### *Windows*

##### *Recommended:*

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

##### *Not Recommended:*

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

*Introducing a new design that is incompatible with the historic character of the*

*building.*

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 1. The existing one-story rear addition measures eight feet wide by five feet deep. Although an exact date of construction could not be determined, the addition was built after 1931, as it does not appear in the 1931 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. The addition currently serves as a mudroom. It is unremarkable and has aluminum siding, fixed windows, and rests on piers. In 2005, the Historic District Commission approved the expansion of a rear porch along the west side of the south (rear) elevation.*
- 2. The applicant seeks approval to expand the existing porch located on the eastern side of the south (rear) elevation. The proposed porch measures twelve feet wide, seven feet six inches deep, and nine feet high. The roof will be hipped and the addition will have a rear door. The addition will be built on concrete piers and will not be heated.*
- 3. The proposed addition will have horizontal Hardi-plank cement board siding that will match the existing addition on 719 W Jefferson, an asphalt shingle roof, double hung windows that will match the existing addition, and a fiberglass exterior door with a transom window above. The design of the addition is compatible with the house and uses distinct materials to differentiate it from the historic structure.*
- 4. The proposed addition will require that one window on the south (rear) elevation be covered. This window is an original opening. The window will not be removed and all materials will be kept in place.*
- 5. Staff recommends approval of the proposed addition since it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for New Additions, Site, Windows, and District of Neighborhood Setting.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:**

*Ross and Beeson visited the site as part of their review.*

*Ross agreed with the staff report and the addition will be a good replacement of the existing.*

*Beeson reported that this house is a great West Side house that characterizes the neighborhood and in order to keep the structure going, this is a good move.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Sarah Briggs, 717 W Jefferson Street, owner of the property was present to respond to the Commission's question. She said she loves her house.*

*Beeson asked if the porch would be air conditioned space.*

*Briggs said, no.*

*Bushkuhl asked if they would be installing a screen door on the porch.*

*Briggs said they would probably be installing a regular storm door.*

**Motion made by Beeson, seconded by McCauley, that the Commission approve the application at 717 W Jefferson Street, a contributing property in**

the Old West Side Historic District, to expand a rear porch as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 5, and 9 and the guidelines for new additions and windows.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

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

**APPROVED**

**Yeas:** 5 - Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Secretary Bushkuhl, Beeson, and Ross

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - White, and Vice Chair Stulberg

**F-8 12-0836**

HDC12-084; 509 Detroit Street - New Rear Addition and Attached Garage - OFWHD

*Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.*

BACKGROUND:

*This two-story Queen Anne house first appears in the 1894 City Directory as the residence of Katherine Hartmann and her daughter Sophie, who was a dressmaker. The house changed ownership many times in the following years, with postman Albert Mayer and his wife Nellie residing there the longest, from 1910 until the late 1920s. The house exhibits many typical Queen Anne characteristics, including a square tower on the south elevation, a front gabled roof with a sunburst motif, and fish-scale siding. The house also features a full-width front porch with a fieldstone foundation and large double-hung windows.*

LOCATION:

*The site is located on the northeast side of Detroit Street between E Kingsley Street and High Street.*

APPLICATION:

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to 1) construct a new two-story addition on the west (rear) elevation, 2) construct a new second-story addition above an existing one-story rear addition, 3) construct a new below-grade two-car garage with patio above, and 4) remove the existing curb-cut and driveway along the north elevation and remove the rear gravel parking area.*

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

*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.*

*Site*

*Recommended:*

*Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserves the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.*

*Not Recommended:*

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

*District or Neighborhood Setting**Not Recommended:*

*Introducing new construction into historic districts that is visually incompatible or that destroys historic relationships within the setting.*

*STAFF FINDINGS:*

- 1. The existing house consists of a two-story main block with a one-story rear addition and porch, and a small one-story addition on the north (side) elevation. Based on Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, it appears that the rear addition was built between 1892 and 1908. The smaller addition on the north elevation was constructed after 1931. A rear porch appears in the 1931 Sanborn Map, but the shape and size is slightly different than the existing porch. Because of this, an accurate date for the rear porch could not be determined.*
- 2. The applicant seeks approval to construct a new two-story addition at the rear of the house. The addition would require demolition of the rear porch, which is not original to the house. The proposed addition is seventeen feet seven inches long and twenty-nine feet eight inches wide. The addition will be two stories and have an asphalt shingle gable roof with parallel orientation, with decorative trim work in the gables. The roof will have a shed dormer in the west (rear) elevation with three vinyl-clad wood awning windows. The ridge line of the addition is several feet higher than the existing ridge line, but is approximately the same height as neighboring properties.*
- 3. Materials on the addition include horizontal Hardi-plank siding with an eight-inch exposure on the first floor, and a four inch exposure on the second floor. The foundation will be stucco cement. There are multiple types of vinyl-clad wood windows, including double-hung windows, casement windows, and awning windows.*
- 4. The applicant seeks approval to construct a new second-story addition above the existing one-story rear addition. This will provide additional living space and access to the new addition from the second floor of the house. The proposed addition is inset from the main block of the house on the north and south (side) elevations, and has a ridge line below that of the existing house. Staff believes that this addition is relatively inconspicuous when viewed from the sidewalk.*
- 5. The applicant also seeks approval to construct a new below-grade two-car garage to the rear of the proposed addition. The garage is forty-two feet nine inches long and twenty-two feet wide. The west end of the proposed garage is narrower, at fourteen feet one inch wide and will be used for storage. The garage will be accessed from the south, where an existing driveway will remain in place. The driveway will need to be expanded slightly to allow access to the garage. The exterior entrance to the basement near the garage and a pathway to access the storage space at the rear appear to be constructed of pavers, as depicted in provided drawings.*
- 6. A deck is proposed above the garage and level with the first floor of the addition. The deck will be accessed by a set of doors on the west elevation of the proposed addition and a staircase leading from the side yard on the north elevation. The deck will be surrounded by a stucco cement wall continuous with the garage foundation and a one-and-a-half inch painted metal railing.*
- 7. The applicant seeks approval to remove a driveway from the north (side) elevation and a parking area at the west (rear) elevation to create additional green*

space. The driveway and parking area are not believed to have any historical significance and were likely built when the house was used as student housing.

8. Staff believes that the design of the rear addition and garage are compatible with the house, do not detract from it, and use distinct materials (such as cementitious lap siding) to further differentiate them from the historic structure. However, the roofline of the proposed addition projects several feet above the existing house. The overall scale of the proposed addition may also detract from the historical integrity of the house.

9. Staff recommends approval of the proposed new rear additions and garage, and the removal of an existing driveway and parking area since they meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, in particular standards 2, 9, and 10, and the guidelines for New Additions, Site, and District or Neighborhood Setting.

#### REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Ross and Beeson visited the site as part of their review.

Beeson said the existing structure is a cute little Queen Anne house, next to the transition neighborhood. The porch addition on the rear of the house looks like it is slipping a bit, and there is need for some paint touch-up of the wood, but otherwise quite intact. He said they looked at how the addition would work with the driveway and the view from the street.

Ross echoed Beeson's comments, adding that the view from the right-of-way, with the high gabled roof seems out of scale in comparison with the original small house.

#### AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Holly Parker and David Santacroce, 601 N Fifth Avenue, owners of the property, along with Marc Rueter, architect for the project, were present to respond to the Commission's enquires. Parker said they live in the area and are looking forward to enlarging the building and making this house their permanent residence. She explained that they have met with several of their neighbors asking for their input on the house and design.

Santacroce added that the lot is a large L-shaped lot that is gravel and has been used as parking. He explained that since the house has been used as a rental property, there have been temporary issues done to the house making them unsalvageable, yet they will attempt to commit to the project and make it work within the historic character of the neighborhood.

Rueter explained the project, saying the new addition in the rear is connected with a small hyphen. He said the height was driven by several factors, including mechanical system, insulations, and required headroom. He commented that the existing house is minimized by the larger Brownstone apartment building nearby.

McCauley asked why they didn't choose to build the addition further back, instead of so tall, stressing that the addition is too tall.

Rueter said their other option was building out into the side yard, and they wanted to make use of the existing rooms as much as possible.

McCauley asked if the height was necessary if the additional height space would not be adding more living space, but intended for storage and mechanical equipment.

*Santacroce said the house currently doesn't have any attic space and 2/3 of the basement doesn't have adequate headroom. He said they are trying to limit the footprint of the house since the rear part of the lot could be subdivided if they chose to move in that direction. He said they are willing to work with the Commission in lowering the height to that of the tower.*

*Bushkuhl clarified that no matter how far back the building was, it would still appear the same on the elevation plans because it doesn't take into account the view from the street.*

*Eleanor Pollack, 515 Detroit Street, stated that she is the neighbor directly to the north of the parcel. She said that she fully supports the project, adding that the owners have worked with her over several months. She read a prepared statement, provided for the record.*

*Christine Crockett, 506 E. Kingsley Street, President of the Old Fourth Ward Neighborhood Association, spoke in support of the proposed project, the architect, and the owners.*

*Ray Detter, 120 N. Division Street, Vice-President of the Old Fourth Ward Neighborhood Association, spoke in support of the project, with added greenspace, adding that he felt the project was in keeping with the historic character of the neighborhood.*

**Motion made by Bushkuhl, seconded by McCauley, that the Commission approve the application at 509 Detroit Street, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to construct a new rear two-story addition, new rear second-floor addition, and new garage, and remove a driveway and parking area as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for new additions, site, and setting.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

*Beeson agreed with the benefit of bringing a single-family owner-occupied house back into this neighborhood, and commended the work that is being reviewed. He said while they understand the needs of a growing contemporary family, meeting those needs shouldn't be done at the expense of future generations. He thinks there should be openness within the aspect of tweaking the project, specifically looking at the scale and size of the third floor, and looking if the mechanical system could fit into a different space. He said the lap siding adds a visual height effect, and thought narrowing the lap on the lower portion, it would help decrease the overall height. He said on the north addition there is a large grade change, which will make the addition seem even higher.*

*The applicant commented that they intend to bring in dirt.*

*Beeson said that they need to look at how the house fits within the standards and how proposed additions can fit more comparably into the surroundings.*

*Bushkuhl commented that he didn't believe the Commission had a clear street view of what the proposed changes would look like, adding that it would be helpful to have that.*

*Ramsburgh echoed the Commission's concerns. She praised the applicants for their previous undertakings and what they propose to do with this property. She said she feels the phrase 'diminishing the historic character' is what will happen with the addition overwhelming the special original property. She said it was important for the applicant to take the special character of the property into consideration, and not allow the addition to over power the historic structure, pointing out that that is what the HDC is trying to protect and preserve. She said she couldn't support the motion on the floor.*

*McCauley said the main issue is the height of the addition, otherwise he liked the design, the below grade garage and the details. He said he really notices cross gabling and how they line up on streets, noting that on this proposed addition, the fascia and gabling peaks didn't line up with the original house.*

*Santacroce offered to bring the height of the rear addition peak down to the height of the peak of the tower.*

*The Commission agreed on the need to see renderings of any proposed plans, before taking action.*

*Discussion pursued regarding pitches and possible height reductions.*

*Beeson suggested that a point to keep in mind, is the use of the existing house as much as possible, and building use through the idea of the 'Not So Big House' concepts.*

**Ramsburgh moved, seconded by McCauley, to postpone Historic District Commission action, up to 60 days, to allow applicant to submit a revised application. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.**

**POSTPONED**

**Yeas:** 5 - Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Secretary Bushkuhl, Beeson, and Ross

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - White, and Vice Chair Stulberg

**F-9 12-0837 HDC12-091; 538 Fifth Street - New Additions - OWSHD**

*Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This one-and-a-half story vernacular house features a front porch that spans approximately one-half of the front elevation, a cut stone foundation, wood window and door surrounds, and small rear and side additions. The house first appears in the 1886-1887 Ann Arbor City Directory and lists John Krauss, a carpenter at Luick Brothers, as the resident. Until 1898 the address of the house was 38 Fifth Street.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the west side of Fifth Street between West Jefferson Street and West Madison Street.*

*APPLICATION:*

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to 1) demolish an existing front porch and build a new, larger front porch, 2) construct a new addition along the west (rear) and south (side) addition, 3) construct a second floor addition on an existing rear addition, 4) construct a new screen porch on the west (rear) elevation, 5) rebuild the foundation on an existing addition on the west (rear) elevation to create a full basement, 6) relocate one window on the south (side) elevation addition, 7) resize a window in the west (rear) elevation of an addition, and 8) install a Solatube skylight in the roof on the main body of the house.*

*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.*

*(3) Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.*

*(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.*

*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.*

*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:*

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

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

*Introducing a new design that is incompatible with the historic character of the building.*

*Roofs**Recommended:*

*Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.*

*Radically changing a character-defining roof shape or damaging or destroying character-defining roofing material as a result of incompatible design or improper installation techniques.*

*District or Neighborhood Setting**Not Recommended:*

*Introducing new construction into historic districts that is visually incompatible or that destroys historic relationships within the setting.*

*STAFF FINDINGS:*

1. *The existing front porch spans approximately one-half of the front elevation. The applicant states that a conversation with the previous owner in 1997 revealed that*

originally there had been a full-width front porch, but was demolished in the 1930s and replaced with the existing front porch. A Sanborn Fire Insurance Map from 1931 supports this, as a full-width wood frame front porch is depicted.

2. The applicant seeks approval to demolish the existing front porch and build a new front porch that will span the width of the front elevation. The proposed front porch would measure sixteen feet long, five feet deep, and approximately ten feet high. The porch will be built of wood, have fiber cement trim, and have a hipped roof covered in asphalt shingles. The space below the porch will be covered by slat lattice. A railing that is two feet high will consist of two-inch by two-inch cedar balusters, a two-inch by four-inch beveled cedar bottom rail resting on a two-inch by two-inch cedar brace, and a two-inch by four-inch beveled cedar top rail. The posts will be six-inch by six-inch turned cedar columns. However, the Design Guidelines state that it is not appropriate to create "a false historical appearance by adding a porch, entrance, feature, or detail that is conjectural or comes from other properties." Given the relatively simple appearance of the house and a lack of evidence of the historical appearance of the posts, it is therefore more appropriate to use simple box columns.

3. The applicant also seeks approval to construct a new side addition that measures 180 square feet. The addition will be located at the rear of the house and project five feet and four inches past the existing north (side) elevation. This is approximately the same projecting width as an existing projection on the south (side) elevation. The addition will also project approximately ten feet towards the front of the house. In total, the addition will be twenty-eight feet and two inches long. It will have a hipped roof with asphalt shingles, fiber cement lap siding, and a hewn-stone concrete masonry unit foundation with one rectangular hopper window towards the rear of the addition. There is also a small entry porch located near the midpoint of the addition. This will project an additional three feet beyond the existing north (side) elevation of the house. The porch will be built of the same materials as the proposed front porch. The proposed addition will have four windows, all of which will be reconditioned salvaged windows from the house that must be removed in order to construct the addition.

4. The proposed addition will require the removal of three existing double-hung wood windows. One window is located in the original house, and two others are located in an existing rear addition. Although an exact date of construction could not be determined for the rear addition, it appears in the 1931 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map and falls within the period of significance. The applicant proposes to salvage the existing window materials and reuse them in the proposed addition.

5. The applicant also seeks approval to construct a second-story addition above the existing rear addition to create a new bedroom. The proposed second-story addition would require removal of the roof structure and two windows in the second floor of the rear elevation. The roof line is lower than the existing roof on the main block of the house, and will not project beyond the existing north and south (side) elevations of the house. The second-floor addition will have a gable roof with asphalt shingles, fiber-cement siding and trim, and a shed dormer. The shed dormer will be located on the south (side) elevation and have two square, single-pane casement windows.

6. The applicant seeks approval to construct a new rear porch. The porch is sixteen feet eight inches wide, and thirteen feet six inches deep. It will be built of wood framing with large screen panels and will have a wood and screen door on the rear. The roof will be a hipped asphalt shingle roof.

7. The applicant also seeks approval to rebuild the foundation on an existing

addition on the south (side) elevation. The foundation is currently brick, and the applicant states that it is only one to two feet deep and unable to support a rear addition. The foundation will be rebuilt with hewn-stone concrete masonry units. The foundation will extend deep enough to support an addition and also create a full basement. Two small hopper windows will also be installed in the foundation on the south (side) elevation towards the rear of the house.

8. The applicant proposes to relocate a window in the south elevation by moving it slightly towards the rear. The window materials will be reused, and only the opening will change. The date of the window and the addition it is located in could not be determined, but the addition does appear in the 1931 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. A window located on the west (rear) elevation of the same existing addition is also proposed to be made smaller. The sill height will be raised and a new double-hung window will be installed. Although the windows do fall within the period of significance, they are located in an addition and not the original main body of the house.

9. A new Solatube skylight is also proposed to be installed in the main roof. It will be located towards the rear of the roof and based on the provided drawings appears to be small and unobtrusive. Staff feels that the skylight will be relatively inconspicuous when viewed from the sidewalk.

10. The design and scale of the side addition, second-story addition, and rear back porch are compatible with the house, do not detract from it, and use distinct materials (such as cementitious lap siding) to further differentiate them from the historic structure. Although original openings will be covered by the additions, the applicant proposes to reuse the windows in the new additions. Overall, the historical integrity and character-defining features will not be harmed. The design and scale of the proposed front porch is appropriate as well, and appears to be a very similar size to that of the original front porch that was demolished in the 1930s

11. Staff recommends approval of the proposed new front porch, rear addition, second-story addition, rear back porch, alteration of windows, and Solatube since they meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for New Additions, Windows, Roofs, and District of Neighborhood Setting.

#### REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Ross and Beeson visited the site as part of their review.

Ross reported that the roof line massing and scaling seem compatible with what is existing. She said they had some discussion on site with the owners regarding the proposed porch posts and had some ideas for something that was less conjectural than the turned porch posts. They also had questions on foundation materials and the possibility of re-using the existing foundation brick.

Beeson said there was some discussion on site with the owner regarding the material of the original porch as well as the timeframe of the construction of the porch. He said they believed the addition on the south side was constructed during the period of significance. He said the owners are interested in re-using a lot of the wood windows, since they have a unique feature [pediment above them].

#### AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

John Rietz and Rachel Thompson, 538 Fifth Avenue, owners of the property, were present to respond to enquires from the Commission. Rietz said he shared the HDC

*ideals and he purchased the home 18 years ago, largely because of its historic character. He said over the years they have taken great pains to restore their home both internally and externally in a manner to retain that character. He explained that they have a growing young family and need additional space. He mentioned that they have been working with Jill Thacher since 2011 on the plans for their addition.*

*Rietz explained that the existing addition on the rear of the house, which is their kitchen, has a foundation that is approximately 1 foot into the ground and is inadequate in supporting a second story addition, so they plan on digging a full basement under that section. He said they are open to Commissioner Ross' suggestion on re-using the existing brick and thereby retaining the look of the old addition followed by the screened porch and then the new brick on the other side, which would give a transitioned look.*

*Ramsburgh asked about the need to move the interior window.*

*Rietz said the window is currently placed in an awkward position and wouldn't allow light or cupboard space in the new proposed kitchen and they are therefore proposing to place it in the middle giving the kitchen a galley feel.*

*Beeson asked what the Commission thought of the porch roof being a hip roof.*

*Ramsburgh said in driving around the neighborhood, she was surprised to see so much variation in porch posts as well as hip, flat and shed roofs on porches that she felt it could be left up to the owner's discretion.*

*Elizabeth Jolliffe, 543 Fifth Street, neighbor across the street spoke in support of the project, and hoped that the Commission would approve the wonderful plans.*

*Jill Crater, neighbor to the south, spoke in support of the project, and explained that her house and 538 Fifth Avenue were once mirror images of each other and owned by the same owner. She said she hoped the Commission would approve the project.*

*Sarah Briggs, 717 W. Jefferson Street, neighbor around the corner spoke in support of the proposed plan and said she was very excited to see the plans for the proposed porch, since the house really needs a porch put back on.*

**Motion made by Ramsburgh, seconded by McCauley, that the Commission approve with conditions the application at 538 Fifth Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District and issue a certificate of appropriateness to construct a new rear addition, add a second story to an existing rear addition, demolish an existing front porch and build a new front porch, install a skylight, relocate one window, resize one window as proposed, and option of hewn stone or brick veneer on addition foundation. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 3, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for new additions, windows, roofs, and setting.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

*Ross said she would like to nail down the materials before a vote.*

*McCauley said he is reluctant to see the windows go to a landfill, but on the other hand the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines call for differentiation on additions.*

Ross said the new addition would be obvious since it would have different siding and foundation.

Beeson suggested a change in the pediment rather than the whole window, just to make it a flat top or band, and then reuse the window.

Rietz said he would hate to see the windows go to a landfill, and requests the Commission's approval to re-use them in some manner.

Beeson said on the north elevation they should use a flat pediment and on the south elevation they could use the pediment that is already there.

Bushkuhl agreed.

McCauley said it would be appropriate to have either turned or square porch posts.

Ross asked about the foundation materials.

Rietz said he likes brick and would be willing to absorb a higher cost in order to get better quality.

Bushkuhl and McCauley said they would approve either brick, brick veneer or hewn-stone on the addition foundation.

The Commission agreed.

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

**APPROVED**

**Yeas:** 5 - Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Secretary Bushkuhl, Beeson, and Ross

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - White, and Vice Chair Stulberg

**G NEW BUSINESS**

**H PUBLIC COMMENTARY - Items not on the Agenda (3 Minutes per Speaker)**

**I APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**I-1 12-0825** Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes of the May 10, 2012

**Motion made by McCauley, seconded by Bushkuhl that the Minutes be Approved by the Commission and forwarded to the City Council. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.**

**J REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS**

*Beeson gave a report on Mission Zero Fest.*

**K**      **ASSIGNMENTS****K-1**      **Review Committee: Monday, July 9, at 5:00 pm for the July 12, 2012 Regular Session**

*Bushkuhl and Ramsburgh volunteered for the July Review Committee.*

**L**      **REPORTS FROM STAFF****L-1**      **12-0826**      **May 2012 Staff Activities**

*McCauley complimented DiLeo and staff for doing a great job filling in for Jill Thacher.*

*Bushkuhl referenced the staff activities report, asking about the status of the Beer Depot sign.*

**Received and Filed**

**M**      **CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONS**

*Beeson asked if it was possible to add an opportunity for Public Comment at the beginning of the agenda.*

*Ramsburgh said she was in favor of having one at the beginning as well as at the end of the agenda.*

*DiLeo said she would pass along the request.*

**N**      **COMMUNICATIONS****O**      **ADJOURNMENT**

**The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 11:22 p.m.**

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

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

- *Video on Demand: Replay public meetings at your convenience online at [www.a2gov.org/government/city\\_administration/communicationsoffice/ctn/Pages/Vid eoOnDemand.aspx](http://www.a2gov.org/government/city_administration/communicationsoffice/ctn/Pages/Vid eoOnDemand.aspx)*
- *Cable: Watch CTN Channel 16 public meeting programming via Comcast Cable channel 16.*

*The complete record of this meeting is available in video format at [www.a2gov.org/ctn](http://www.a2gov.org/ctn), on "The Meeting Place" page (<http://www.a2gov.org/livemeetings>).*

*or is available for a nominal fee by contacting CTN at (734) 794-6150.*