



City of Ann Arbor

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

Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

Thursday, August 11, 2011

7:00 PM

City Hall - Council Chambers 2nd Floor

A CALL TO ORDER

Ramsburgh called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

B ROLL CALL

Thacher called the roll.

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

C APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

D HEARINGS

D-1 [11-0977](#) HDC11-103 418 South First Street - Demo Garage, Construct New Garage - Old West Side Historic District

Jill Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

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

At the July 14, 2011 HDC meeting, a different version of this application was denied.

LOCATION:

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

APPLICATION:

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

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

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

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

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

Building Site

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

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

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

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

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

District or Neighborhood Setting

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

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *Changes to this application from the one denied last month include (see application for additional explanation from applicant):*
 - a. *Dormers now have a traditional shed roof to address concerns of commissioners.*
 - b. *The trellis structure has been expanded to define a rear courtyard area in the backyard. This particular yard is already substantially walled off by fences and buildings located on neighboring properties, thus the trellis will have no negative impact on the neighborhood or district. It is also designed to be reversible.*
 - c. *A site section drawing comparing this building to neighboring ones is now*

included on the top of the Area Plan sheet.

The following comments are repeated from the previous application's staff report. The comments remain valid for this application.

2. This house is situated in a low spot on this block. The houses behind it on Second Street are on ground 8' higher at their front elevations (see topo at end of this report). Surrounding buildings of interest include a large modern apartment building to the south with an entirely paved backyard, a 1 ½ story building near the west (rear) property line that is similar in height to the one proposed in this application, and a large one-story cinderblock building in the backyard two lots to the north that is home to a plumbing and heating company (see area plan submitted with application and aerial photo). Another site consideration is that there are no houses across First Street, only a large lumberyard building that presents a blank wall parallel to the street.

3. It would be difficult to add additional living space onto the existing house without compromising its historic form. The proposed garage/studio is, in staff's opinion, large for an outbuilding. The view from the street is minimized by the narrow, deep design of the structure. The bulk of the height and length of the building would be felt by the occupants of 414 South First, the lot immediately to the north. That house's backyard is mostly open, with only a garden shed in the rear corner and privacy fencing running along the interior side of the driveway. Staff is less concerned about the impacts to the non-contributing apartment building to the south, and to the Second Street lots to the rear because of their existing outbuildings and higher elevation. The proposed garage/studio will be taller than the single-story house at 418 S First. That is not historically unprecedented on the OWS since barns and outbuildings were often taller than a single story. The location of the garage/studio, farther back than the rear wall of the house's rear additions, adequately separates the historic main block of the house from the taller new structure.

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

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

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

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Glusac and Ramsburgh visited the site as part of their review.

Glusac reported that they had reviewed the site and noted that the lot is unique with several grade changes. She said that she appreciates that the revisions made to the previously proposed design have picked up the comments from the Commission. She

felt that the design is in keeping with the neighborhood. She stated that she felt it met the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Ramsburgh agreed, adding that if the topography of the site were different she might have concerns with the building's massing, but noted that its visible impact from the street is minimized by the narrowness of the building. She felt that the trellis will soften the impact of the building.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

None

A Motion was made by Bushkuhl, seconded by White that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 418 South First Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to demolish a single-car garage and construct a two-car tandem garage with studio space above, as documented in the owner's submittal. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for building site and district or neighborhood setting.

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

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Rozmarek

D-2 [11-0978](#)

HDC11-104 633 Fifth Street - Two Story Rear Addition - Old West Side Historic District

Jill Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This 1 ¾ story gable-front brick home features decorative contrasting brick window surrounds and a full width front porch with contrasting brick porch posts and inset cobblestones on the front wall. It first appears in the 1926 City Directory as the home of Arthur Hoppe, a painter. The house is part of a group of three structures that were originally on one lot, though they have since been divided into three lots. The structural tile home next door to the south was built earlier, in 1911, and the long garage/residence behind the two homes was built in 1928.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the east side of Fifth Street, opposite Princeton Avenue.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct a two-story rear addition; install a new basement egress window in place of an existing basement window; install a new second floor egress window in a new opening; and construct a new deck.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

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

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

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

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

New Additions

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

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

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

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

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

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

Building Site

Recommended:

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

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

Not Recommended:

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

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

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.

STAFF FINDINGS:

- 1. The proposed two-story rear addition is compact and appropriately sized for the house's setting. The first floor of the addition projects almost 6' into the north side yard, which is acceptable in this case since it is completely behind the original house and does not wrap around the corner. The addition would be clad with 4" exposure cementitious siding, which is appropriate and compatible with the house and neighborhood.*
- 2. The new side deck will provide some outdoor living space on this fairly tight lot, and the deck is easily reversible. Ipe, the proposed decking material, is a very hard, high quality wood that is sometimes called Brazilian walnut or ironwood.*
- 3. The basement egress window is in an acceptable location, tucked behind the chimney. The existing basement window opening will be extended deeper into the ground and the current width maintained.*
- 4. The proposed addition blocks the current egress window for the bedroom in the northeast (rear) corner of the house. At a site visit, staff asked the applicant to explore other means of egress than a new window cut into the north wall (as proposed). The applicant met with the city building official on site to discuss the idea of using a skylight instead of a window on the wall. Per the applicant, they determined that it may be possible to meet code with a skylight by constructing a 3'x3' platform with a step up inside the bedroom to raise the floor to allow a person to climb out of the skylight in an emergency. The building official expressed a preference for a traditional window, however, because he said the fire department is resistant to skylights as egress windows. For egress and practical reasons staff believes that if salvaged red brick is toothed in around the new egress window, the proposed window is compatible. The window's proportions match two other single-paned windows on this elevation, and by using red brick instead of yellow, it is unlikely to be*

mistaken for a historic feature of the house.

5. Staff recommends approval of the application and finds the work in size, scale, design, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the site and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 2 and 10, and the guidelines for building site.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Glusac and Ramsburgh visited the site as part of their review.

Ramsburgh agreed with the staff report and stated that the proposed rear addition is carefully designed to preserve as much as possible of the character defining features, noting that the application does meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for rehabilitation.

Glusac agreed and stated that the design is very sensitive to a uniquely designed home and felt the addition was appropriate in design and materials.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Marc Rueter, 515 Fifth Street, Ann Arbor, Architect for the project was present to respond to any enquiries.

Martha Hashimoto and Tom Wagner, 633 Fifth Street, Ann Arbor, owners of the property were present. Hashimoto said that the addition is necessary to accommodate their growing family.

Glusac asked what the existing sill materials were on the upstairs window, and if their intent was to match the new with the old.

Rueter answered that the sills were made of cast stone. He said the new ones would be made of either cast stone or limestone, noting that the existing ones had about 70 years of weathering on them so it would be impossible to try to match them with the new ones.

Stulberg asked what the possibility would be to take the rear window and using it as the side window.

Rueter responded that the rear window is a double hung window and with the sash it doesn't meet the egress requirements needed for bedrooms.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Ramsburgh asked if McCauley would consider adding the staff recommendation regarding the surrounding brick color of the new egress window to his motion.

McCauley amended the motion as follows.

McCauley said he was pleased to see the revised plans and felt this proposed project was better than what had been proposed about a year ago.

A Motion was made by McCauley, seconded by White that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 633 Fifth Street, in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a two-story rear addition; install a new basement egress window in place of an existing basement window; install a new second floor egress window in a new opening; and

construct a new deck as documented in the owner's submittal. This approval is on the condition that the new second floor egress window is surrounded with red brick rather than yellow brick to distinguish it from the rest of the windows. The work as conditioned is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 5, 9 and 10, and the guidelines for new additions, building site, windows, and district or neighborhood setting.

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

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Rozmarek

D-3 [11-0979](#)

HDC11-105 1015 West Huron Street - Alterations to Non-Contributing Building - Old West Side Historic District

Jill Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This three story non-contributing apartment building was built in 1967.

A staff approval was granted in April 2011 to replace the doorwalls (see 2008 photo at end of staff report) with a new compatible design (see applicant's drawings). Some of the doorwall replacements have been completed.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the south side of West Huron Street, east of Ninth Street and west of Eighth Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace existing single-paned windows with double-paned, expand the width of existing third-floor vertical windows a few inches to match the window below and block in the lower portion of these windows, remove a wing-wall on both sides of the third-floor front elevation, and add a row of clerestory-like windows along the top of the front façade.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

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

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. Since this is a non-contributing building, the work is being reviewed for visual compatibility with the surrounding historic district. The proposed changes will result in a more interesting exterior and better light on the interior without negatively impacting neighboring properties.*
- 2. Surrounding properties include two two-story houses to the east and one single-story house to the west.*
- 3. Staff recommends approval of the application and finds it is generally compatible in design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the site and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standard 2, and the guidelines for district or neighborhood setting.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Glusac and Ramsburgh visited the site as part of their review.

Glusac noted that the building is a non-contributing structure with various design elements proposed as a part of the upgrade. She said the changes would be a vast improvement to the building and felt they would be fitting for the neighborhood and the structure.

Ramsburgh agreed and said it was encouraging to have a property owner make these types of changes to a non-contributing structure.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Steve Kaplan, 1015 W. Huron Street, Ann Arbor, was present to respond to any enquiries. He said that the changes to the building were started on the inside and they are slowly working their way outside. He believed that he would be back before the Commission within a year with more changes to the outside of the building.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Stulberg said that he believed there was a lot of confusion on what a non-contributing structure was in a historic district and what was required of them from the Historic District Commission. He explained that it is not the intent to make these non-conforming structures into historic buildings, and there is a lot of flexibility to modify and change them simply by coming before the Commission and asking for permission to do so.

A Motion was made by Stulberg, seconded by White that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 1015 W Huron Street, a non-contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to make exterior modifications as described in this report and documented in the owner's submittal. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standard 2 and the guidelines for

district or neighborhood setting.

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

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Rozmarek

D-4 [11-0980](#)

HDC11-106 2781 Packard Street - New Storage Shed in Rear Yard - Cobblestone Farms Historic District

Jill Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

The Ticknor-Campbell house is known as the Cobblestone Farm because of the unique construction technique of the cobblestone house on the property which was built by Dr. Benajah Ticknor in 1844. Built in the Classic Revival style, it is one of the finest of the few examples of cobblestone construction in Michigan. Together with the wooden kitchen ell in the rear, it forms an unusually fine example of a pioneer Michigan farm dwelling. There has been only one alteration to the exterior of the cobblestone house. During the Booth family tenure (1860-1880), an Italianate-style wooden front porch with bracketed columns was added to the front façade. The barn was constructed on the property in 1986 as part of the farmstead restoration after the property was acquired by the City in 1972.

The HDC issued a certificate of appropriateness in 2008 to build a permanent entry awning on the barn and make landscape improvements. Staff has issued certificates of appropriateness since then for window and door replacements and mechanical equipment on the barn.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the north side of Packard Road, east of Colony Road and west of Easy Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to build an 8' x 10' cedar storage shed behind the non-original barn.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

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

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

(other SOI Guidelines may also apply):

Building Site

Recommended:

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

Not Recommended:

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

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *The proposed shed is solid cedar with a cedar shingle roof and installed on a concrete slab. It would remain unpainted and allowed to age to a color similar to the nearby barn and fences. The location is in a service area behind the barn, next to the dumpsters, and the structure would be used to store equipment for the Volunteer Outreach Program. The shed would not have any negative visual impacts on the historic buildings on the site, as it is quite far removed.*

2. *Staff recommends approval of the application and finds the shed is visually compatible in size, scale, design, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the site and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 2 and 10, and the guidelines for building site.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Glusac and Ramsburgh visited the site as part of their review.

Ramsburgh reported that they were pleased to see that the shed is tucked away behind the barn in a storage area and won't be seen from the street. She felt that the cedar siding will weather to match with the existing barn.

Glusac agreed with Ramsburgh and added that she would be in favor of removing the flowerbox and window shutters of the shed.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Jessica Black, City Staff Facility Supervisor, was present to answer any enquiries. She apologized for not coming before the Commission before installing the shed, and said that she has since learned what the correct process is for HDC reviews. She said that the flowerbox and shutters could easily be removed and she was open to suggestions on an alternative to a clear glass window that wouldn't allow people to look inside of the shed.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Stulberg said he was unhappy with the situation, noting that the shed shouldn't have been built before the proposed shed came before the Commission in a public hearing. He added that since the enforcement body is the City of Ann Arbor for the historic properties yet didn't enforce their own rules on their own parcel makes them

all look very bad.

Stulberg said that the structure might not end up being a bad structure but he felt they needed to enforce their own rules upon themselves and there shouldn't be any appearance of favoritism from one City group to another. He said that in fairness to the citizens he didn't think this project was handled as well as it could've been.

Stulberg added that if the Commission has the right to hear any proposed structural changes on the Cobblestone Farm historic parcel then he felt that if this project had come before the Commission they could've requested or suggested that the shed be moved to outside of the historic boundaries of the parcel. He said that the Commission could still request that the shed be moved.

White said that such a move would put the shed on park land.

Stulberg said it would be interesting to know if there were different jurisdictions on the two sections of land that belonged to the City.

White said that as a member of the Cobblestone Association Board as well as a member of the Historic District Commission Stulberg would know who has jurisdiction over the sections.

Stulberg said that the Cobblestone Association Board doesn't have jurisdiction over the non-historic barn building [that is run by the City's Park department] only over the historic buildings on the site. He said that it was a good thing that the issue was only about a shed and not something bigger and permanent and the structure could easily be removed. He felt that the Commission should deny the application and have the applicant start the process over again in the correct manner.

McCauley said that he agreed with Stulberg's points with the exception that he felt there was a difference between the fence application that had been built without permits [that came before the Commission last month]. He said that he felt the shed would be approved since he felt it was appropriate in its configuration and location. McCauley added that if the structure would be inappropriate he wouldn't have any problem asking the applicant to remove it.

Glusac said that if the project came before her in the form of drawings alone, she would have the same comments that she had this evening about removing the shutters and windowbox. She disagreed with comments regarding comparisons made between the fence application from last month and this shed application. She said that just because the fence application came before the Commission after the fact that it was installed wasn't the basis for the Commission's denial of the fence, but rather because it was not compatible with the house and neighborhood. She said the Commission has approved projects retroactively in the past if they meet the standards. Glusac said that it doesn't matter who is the applicant for projects; she didn't feel there was any favoritism involved. She felt that Stulberg's comments were inappropriate and unfair to the Commission as a whole who review and make decisions based on standards. She said she was in favor of the project and would like to discuss details of the storage shed and what someone would recommend as a window screening.

Ramsburgh agreed that it is very embarrassing that the City didn't follow its own process with this shed, noting that it always puts the Commission in an awkward position when they have to deny a project after the fact and then having to have a project removed. She agrees that the City needs to be very careful to follow established routes of communication for projects in historic districts. She said that

she felt the shed is appropriate both in the current site as well as the building itself.

Stulberg said that he wasn't suggesting that there was any favoritism and he stressed that there must not be any appearance of such. He said he won't approve the application tonight.

Bushkuhl said that it was disappointing that when parks staff was prompted about the proposed shed they didn't stop or look into the matter, but allowed it to be built. He said that he felt it would be punitive and not constructive if they made them take down the shed.

Ramsburgh asked if the Commission had any objection to re-opening the Public Participation part again. Hearing no object the hearing was re-opened.

George Taylor, President of the Cobblestone Farm Association said that the windowbox and the window should go, noting that windows invite vandalism. He said he would prefer to see cedar siding all the way across where the window currently is located. Taylor stated that the City has a procedure and it should be followed. He referenced an email he had sent to Jeff Straw, Deputy Park's Director, in which he had written that the Cobblestone Farm Association would concur with the Historic District Commission's decision on the shed.

Tracy Miller, 1518 Pine Valley, Ann Arbor, from the Cobblestone Farm Association said that procedures should've been followed and she is in favor of moving it.

Jane Carr, 1119 W. Cross, Ann Arbor, Vice President of the Cobblestone Farm Association said that she is open to all of the issues discussed on the shed. She said that the Association has hopes of rebuilding some of the outbuildings that were lost in a fire in the 1920's. Carr said that their Association would like to be involved in discussions involving projects on the property, noting that they were not informed of this shed. She said had they known they could've worked together to resolve the need for storage by multi-purposing one of the outbuildings on the parcel to meet the needs.

Ramsburgh said that she believed the City was obligated to bring Cobblestone Farm Association into the process whenever there were projects involving the parcel.

Thacher agreed and said that the application went to the Board but there wasn't a quorum present at their meeting so they couldn't take action on the item before it moved on to the HDC.

Stulberg said that the shed was constructed to house tools on site for a specific location and he was concerned that as other needs arose on site, they would be erecting sheds in other locations as well. He asked if there was a way to consider this shed as temporary.

White said that the building is new and is compatible and the Commission will view and make decisions on other projects as they come before the Commission.

Glusac added that the Commission can only make decisions on what is before them at this time, and she didn't believe they had ever made decisions on a temporary basis. She felt this was a valid structure and that the situation will be a learning experience for all parties involved.

Stulberg asked if the shed application would've come before them if it was placed outside of the Cobblestone Farms Historic District.

Thacher responded no.

Ramsburgh said that the present site of the shed is appropriate and she wouldn't like to see it anywhere else, adding that if the Cobblestone Board decides to move it or make changes in the future, the HDC would review those proposals at that time.

Stulberg said that he didn't feel that it was in back of the barn since the public sees it before they approach the barn when entering from the parking lot.

Glusac said that at least it's in the service yard part together with other mechanical equipment. She said that there are parts of the process that the HDC has no control over and she didn't feel that they should overstep their part to deal with matters that they have no control over.

A Motion was made by White, seconded by McCauley that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 2781 Packard Street, the Cobblestone Farm Historic District, to build an 8' x 10' cedar storage shed as documented in the owner's submittal. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2 and 10, and the guidelines for building site.

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

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

Nays: 1 - Vice Chair Stulberg

Absent: 1 - Rozmarek

A motion was made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White, that the approval is on the condition that the window box and shutters on the storage shed be removed and the window opening be filled in with cedar siding so the cedar wall is continuous. As conditioned, the work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2 and 10, and the guidelines for building site.

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

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Rozmarek

D-5 [11-0981](#)

HDC11-107 414 East Kingsley Street - Enlarge Two Basement Windows - Old Fourth Ward Historic District

Jill Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This two story Queen Ann features a full width front porch, multiple hipped rooflines, a decorative pedimented front dormer with diamond shingles and applied lattice trim, and a cut stone foundation. It first appears in the 1904 Polk City Directory as the home of dentist Herbert Burke.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the south side of East Kingsley Street, east of North Division and west of Elizabeth Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to make an existing undersized basement egress window code compliant by extending it 7" deeper and enlarging the existing window well.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

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

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

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

Windows - Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Recommended:

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

Building Site

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

Not Recommended: Removing or radically changing buildings and their features or site features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the property so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *The current window was installed 5+ years ago and neither the window opening size nor the dimensions of the well are large enough to meet building code requirements for egress. The window opening would be extended seven inches deeper, and the well would be expanded eight inches in both directions and be reconstructed using similar six inch landscape timbers. The new window would be an Andersen vinyl clad casement.*
2. *The proposed alterations to this already altered basement window are minor and appropriate to insure safe egress while nominally affecting the building. A few flagstones will need to be moved a few inches away from the well on a nearby path.*
3. *Staff recommends approval of the application and finds it is generally compatible in design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the site and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 2, 9 and 10, and the guidelines for building site and district or neighborhood setting.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

Glusac and Ramsburgh visited the site as part of their review.

Glusac said she agrees with the staff report and felt the proposed changes are appropriate.

Ramsburgh said she agreed with Glusac and the staff report.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Ramsburgh asked the applicant about the location of the interior stairs.

Laurie Borer, the applicant said that the stairs are located in the area marked unfinished laundry in the upper left hand corner of the plans.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Stulberg asked for verification that if a permit had been pulled for the project, it still wouldn't have come before the Commission since it was before the changes in the ordinance.

Thacher said yes.

Stulberg said that he wanted to point out the distinction of this fact and that as long as they meet the requirements of the Building Department as well as the Rental Housing Department he was satisfied.

A Motion was made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 414 East Kingsley Street, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to enlarge an existing non-original basement window to meet egress requirements, as documented in the owner's submittal. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for windows and building.

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

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Rozmarek

E OLD BUSINESS

F NEW BUSINESS

G PUBLIC COMMENTARY - (3 Minutes per Speaker)

H APPROVAL OF MINUTES

H-1 [11-0982](#) Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes of the May 12, 2011

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

I REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS / COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

J ASSIGNMENTS

Review Committee: Tuesday, September 6 at 5:00 PM for the September 8, 2011 Regular Session

Commissioners Ramsburgh and White volunteered for the September 2011 Review Committee.

K REPORTS FROM STAFF

September meeting was moved to September 8, due to the holiday on Monday.

McCauley said he wouldn't be able to make the September 8th meeting.

[11-0983](#) July 2011 HDC Staff Activities

Ramsburgh said it would be helpful if the monthly report could clearly define the staff approvals.

Received and Filed

L CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS

McCauley asked if there was any news on the vacant HDC seat being filled.

Thacher said that she had heard from the Mayor's office that he was working on it and it was out of her hands.

Ramsburgh encouraged members to contact the Mayor's office with names of possible nominations.

M COMMUNICATIONS

11-1014 Correspondence to the Commission

Received and Filed

N ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was unanimously adjourned at 8:50 PM.