



# City of Ann Arbor

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

## Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

---

Thursday, September 13, 2012

7:00 PM

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

---

### A CALL TO ORDER

*Chair McCauley called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.*

### B ROLL CALL

*Jill Thacher called the roll.*

**Present:** 7 - Robert White, Ellen Ramsburgh, Patrick McCauley, Thomas Stulberg, Benjamin L. Bushkuhl, John Beeson, and Jennifer Ross

### C APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was unanimously approved as presented.

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

### E UNFINISHED BUSINESS - HEARINGS

#### E-1 [12-1193](#) HDC12-138; 208 South Main Street - New Canopy and Signage - MSHD

*Jill Thacher gave the staff report.*

#### **BACKGROUND:**

*This three story, brick Italianate commercial building was built in 1860, and was first occupied by Paul Christman, who ran a tin and stove store in the same building. The building features arched windows with brick window hoods, decorative pilasters, and segmented brick arches above the second-floor windows. The building has been occupied by Schlenderer and Sons Jewelers since 1932.*

#### **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 1) remove some of the existing green marble veneer and replace it with new black granite, 2) remove the existing fabric awning and replace it with a new steel frame canopy, 3) install a new wall sign above the proposed canopy, and 4) replace two metal grilles with new metal signs.*

*The application was postponed from the August 2012 HDC meeting to give the applicants more time to provide condition information and possibly revised drawings.*

**APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:**

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

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

*(4) Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.*

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

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

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

*Using substitute material for the replacement parts that does not convey the same visual appearance as the surviving parts of the storefront or that is physically or chemically incompatible.*

*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.*

**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 applicant proposes replacing the green marble stone on the storefront (east elevation with new black granite stone above the entrance, and on the south and north corners of the building. The green marble below the display windows will remain. The green marble is a character-defining feature of the building. Although the storefront is not an original feature of the building, it has acquired historic significance of its own by virtue of being installed during the period of significance for the Main Street Historic District. (This was confirmed by a 1939 film of downtown Ann Arbor which features Schlanderer's.) Replacing the green marble with black granite would remove historic materials and alter the historic appearance of the building.*
2. *The applicant has provided additional information and photos on the damaged marble veneer that has multiple cracked and patched areas. This has allowed water to infiltrate behind the marble veneer and damage the existing brick substructure. Mike Woodrel of the Tramontin Tile Company states that the only way to repair the substructure and prevent additional water infiltration would be to remove the stone veneer. During this process the stone would likely be further damaged and would not be able to be used for repair. Removing and replacing the stone veneer with new stone would allow the brick substructure to be repaired, preventing any further damage or degradation to the building. A photograph provided by the applicant that was taken in the late 1990s/early 2000s appears to show some damage to the bricks along the northern end of the east (front) elevation.*
3. *Before attaching the new stone veneer, the applicant proposes filling the gaps between the existing brick and proposed veneer with a cementitious mortar. The stone veneer will then be attached to the mortar, so none of the bricks are damaged.*
4. *The applicant proposes to remove the existing retractable canvas awning and replace it with a rigid steel canopy. In comparison to the canopy proposal submitted last month, the brackets on each end of the roof of the canopy have been removed, and the formerly flat top surface has been raised a few inches to make a very shallow slope. The proposed canopy measures approximately seventeen feet wide and will span the entire storefront. Above the windows the canopy will measure seventeen inches high and three feet deep. Above the door it will measure twenty-five inches high and four feet deep. The proposed canopy will have a steel frame and will be mounted into the stone façade. The canopy appears to meet building code requirements for size and height.*
5. *The proposed canopy has a stained wood "ceiling" with four recessed lights. The wood ceiling will be tongue and groove cedar stained a dark brown color. The "roof" of the canopy will have one small spotlight to illuminate the proposed wall sign located on the façade above the canopy. Based on the provided mock ups, the entire canopy will be painted beige and will have copper flashing on the raised portion along the front edge. The existing canvas awning is much more typical of a small downtown storefront than the proposed canopy. The historic documentation (photos) that staff was able to find all showed canvas awnings on this and neighboring storefronts.*
6. *In relation to SOI standards 2, 9 and 10, and the guidelines for storefronts, the canopy would not destroy historic materials, would be reversible, and is differentiated from the historic features of the building. However, the architectural features of the canopy are not compatible with the front elevation of the building, and the steel canopy would replace the awning, which is an existing functional and decorative feature of the storefront.*
7. *Staff did a survey of downtown canopies over storefronts and found: Three that are original (Cunningham's Drugs/Parthenon/Lena at 226 South Main, and the Greyhound Bus Depot, both in the art moderne style) or reproductions of the original*

*(Marchese Building at 319-325 South Main);*

*Two that are relatively new (Starbucks on the southwest corner of West Liberty and South Main was approved by the HDC in 2005, and Moosejaw at 327 South Main, was approved by the HDC in 1995 on a non-contributing building); Three that are older but not from the period of significance for the district (Sudworth Building at 205-207 West Washington, 212 South Main, and 113-115 East Liberty, a non-contributing building). Several buildings have fixed canopies covering only the front door, not the storefront (a steel one on the Chop House at 322 South Main, and canvas over Melange at 312 South Main and Rush Street at 314 South Main), as well as side doors on the Glazier Building (Key Bank, 100 South Main) and others. The canopy on 301 South Main (Selo Sheval) dates back to at least 1973, but whether it dates to the period of significance is unknown.*

8. *The proposed new wall sign will be installed above the proposed canopy. The word "Rolex" will be installed within the portion of inset stone. The word measures two feet eleven inches wide and six inches high, and will be stainless steel. The Rolex logo, a crown, will be installed above the lettering. It measures eleven inches high and approximately ten inches wide, and will also be stainless steel. The location and scale of the sign are appropriate.*

9. *The applicant proposes replacing two metal grilles below the storefront windows with new signage. The signs, which measure approximately eight inches high and twelve inches wide, will be aluminum plaques that are black with white lettering. One sign will contain the text "Schlanderer & Sons," and the other "208 S. Main Street." It could not be conclusively determined if the existing metal grilles are old or replacements. However, it is likely that metal grilles have been present since the time that the green marble was installed (photo evidence shows they were there in 1975).*

10. *Staff believes that the proposed removal of portions of the green marble and replacement with black granite is appropriate and will differentiate the new materials from the historic marble. The green marble has been harmed over time, which has led to water infiltrating behind it, damaging the brick substructure. Replacing the green marble with new black granite will also allow the proposed wall sign to be installed without damaging any historic materials.*

11. *Staff believes that the proposed canopy is inappropriate. While alternate materials to a canvas awning may be acceptable, the shallowly sloping design does not convey the look or feel of an awning, which would traditionally be found on this building. The proposed work is generally incompatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and does not meet The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 2, 9 and 10, and the guidelines for storefronts.*

#### REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

*Stulberg and White visited the site as part of their review.*

*Stulberg noted that the stone has been shattered and pieced back together and is obviously beyond repair. Stulberg stated that it is very clear that the north side panels [columns] have been damaged from previous neighboring construction projects. He explained that the metal grilles seem highly unlikely to be original and replacing them wouldn't be such an issue as if they were original. He said what they don't like to see is something that has been neglected to the point where damage necessitates replacement, adding that the applicant has been a steward of the building for so many years and previous repairs have been made in an attempt to maintain the building and not allow it to become neglected.*

*White agreed with Stulberg and the staff report and supported the project, adding that the work will maintain and protect the building and its integrity.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Chuck Schlanderer, 208 South Main Street, co-owner of the property was present to respond to the Commission's questions. He thanked the Commission for their compliments adding that they would like their building to be a gem in the downtown district and community.*

*Angie Lane, Architect for the project showed the Commission where the cracked ledge was located on the building.*

*Ramsburgh asked if part of the brick above the awning would be re-pointed as part of the project.*

*Lane responded that she believed they would have to include that since they would need to install the flashing behind the brick.*

*Ross asked why they had chosen a 'stepped' shaped awning rather than a more rectangular shaped awning.*

*Schlanderer said that the proposed design goes more with the architecture of the building instead of a single line going across.*

*Discussion pursued regarding the original brick of the building.*

**A motion was made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 208 South Main Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to remove the existing stone veneer and replace it with new, install a new wall sign above the existing awning, and replace two metal grilles with new metal signs. 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, 4, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for storefronts.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

*Bushkuhl said that the stone veneer is obviously beyond repair and needs replacing, and the new sign is appropriate and will be located in the historic sign banner area on the building, but the proposed awning isn't an easy yes.*

*Ramsburgh noted that her motion does not include the awning. The Commission will take separate action on the awning.*

*Ross said that she appreciates that the applicant provided more information to the Commission on the condition of the stone veneer and she is comfortable with the proposed replacement.*

*McCauley agreed.*

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

**Yeas:** 7 - White, Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Vice Chair Stulberg, Secretary Bushkuhl, Beeson, and Ross

Nays: 0

**A motion was made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 208 South Main Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to remove the existing canvas awning and replace it with a new steel frame canopy. 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 storefronts.**

*COMMISSION DISCUSSION:*

*Ramsburgh said she was in support of the proposed awning, because she believed there was enough evidence of other fixed awnings in the Main Street Historic District to say the proposed awning was fitting for the district. She said she felt it was a more practical solution to the needs that an awning supplies for shade, for lighting at night and for protection from rain. She noted that it is a better working solution than a canvas awning, and satisfies maintaining the historic character of the building, since it is not a permanent part of the building.*

*McCauley asked how permanent the proposed awning would be and how it would be fixed to the building.*

*Bushkuhl said that it looks like it will be bolted to the building.*

*Lane explained that it will be bolted to the structure behind the brick.*

*Bushkuhl asked if it would be possible to unbolt it and remove it or replace it with a canvas awning if someone wanted to do so in the future.*

*Lane said, yes.*

*Beeson said that after being presented with all the additional material, he liked the awning that was presented the first time.*

*White said that there was a slope on both of the awnings, just one was smaller.*

*Stulberg said that there were lots of flat roofs once upon a time and they were horrible with water, and by adding just the slightest pitch it helps with removing the water.*

*Beeson noted that there have been other canopies added in the area, like at Moosejaw, where there is a small slope but still flat.*

*Schlenderer said they could also make sure there was a small pitch to the awning.*

*White reiterated that he supports the project and likes that the building will be waterproofed which will help preserve it.*

*McCauley stated that it seemed to him that the historic awnings that are in existence in town are much simpler in design and it would seem that a simpler design would look more fitting on this Art Moderne/Deco entry to the building, adding that he feels it will detract from the historic front building that will be reproduced in similar materials. He said he wasn't in favor of the proposed canopy shape, but didn't have an issue*

*with the fixed frame.*

*Bushkuhl said the canopy would be easier to approve if it were slightly a different design, since the proposed canopy seems to draw attention to itself instead of blending in.*

*The Commission had concerns about the proposed diamond shapes on the canopy.*

*Schlenderer explained that the diamond design would be on a darker tan color band on the canopy and was intended to blend in with the rest of the canopy. He said there is currently a band of diamonds on the building under the existing awning but added that they are open to removing the proposed diamond design if the Commission requests.*

*Ramsburgh commented that she felt that the design is fitting for a jewelry store.*

*Beeson agreed.*

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

**Yeas:** 6 - White, Ramsburgh, Vice Chair Stulberg, Secretary Bushkuhl, Beeson, and Ross

**Nays:** 1 - Chair McCauley

**F        HEARINGS**

**F-1        [12-1194](#)        HDC12-148; 301 North Fifth Avenue - New Business Sign - OFW**

*Thacher gave the staff report, noting that the signs would be illuminated by two spot lights on either side of the sign.*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This two story, brick Italianate commercial style barn features a wood hayloft door in the second story, double-hung windows with stone sills and brick arched window hoods accented with stone, and bears the date 1887 in the front gable. Known as Baumgardner's Barn, it is the only remaining structure from John Baumgardner's Marble Works, which specialized in tombstones, sidewalks, and sills and lintels for buildings. The building later became the horse stable for the Wurster Dairy and in the 1950s was used for a used car dealership. In 1978, the garage door on the east elevation was replaced with a door and window after a car crashed into the southeast corner of the building.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the northwest corner of the North Fifth Avenue and Catherine Street intersection.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to add a new non-illuminated exterior sign to the southeast corner of the building. The signage measures five feet seven-and-one-half inches high, and four feet wide. The sign is bronze in color and consists of one-quarter inch aluminum plate that will be mounted on the corner of the building by two brackets.*

**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 business sign consists of a flat cut one-quarter inch aluminum plate that will be painted with a faux "oil rubbed" bronze finish. The applicant states that the surface behind the text will have a printed "parchment" surface and the logo will also be printed. The text and logo will be mounted one-half inch above the background surface. The sign will be attached to the southeast corner of the building by two metal brackets, which will be mounted to the building through the mortar joints.*

2. *The applicant proposes illuminating the sign with two small spotlights. One spotlight will be located on each side of the lower metal bracket, and will be attached to the sign's mounting plates by small mast arms.*

3. *The proposed business sign is appropriately scaled and its placement on the southeast corner of the building is appropriate. 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.*

4. *Staff recommends approval of the proposed exterior business sign. 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:**

*Stulberg and White visited the site as part of their review.*

*White said he approves of the proposed project.*

*Stulberg said the sign seems to be appropriate in size, height and design and will be installed appropriately in the mortar joints.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Jessica Elkins, 227 E. Main Street, Milan, applicant, was present to respond to the Commission's enquiries.*

*Ramsburgh asked if the applicant would be occupying the upstairs portion of the building.*

*Elkins responded that they would be occupying both floors.*

**A Motion was made by Bushkuhl, seconded by White that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 301 N Fifth Avenue, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to add a new exterior 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:**

*Bushkuhl commented that adding a blade sign to any building isn't always possible, but in this situation it will work since there wasn't any previous signage.*

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

**Yeas:** 7 - White, Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Vice Chair Stulberg, Secretary Bushkuhl, Beeson, and Ross

**Nays:** 0

**F-2**      [12-1195](#)

HDC12-139; 118-124 South Main Street - Fourth and Fifth Story Addition - MSHD

*Thacher gave the staff report.*

**BACKGROUND:**

*The building that currently contains 120-124 South Main Street was built in 1866 and was first occupied by First National Bank. This three-story brick Italianate Commercial building features an elaborate cornice with large brackets, decorative stone pilasters, brick corbelling, and arched windows with stone window hoods. The building at 118 South Main Street was built in 1911 and was first occupied by Mills Company. This three-story brick Commercial Vernacular building features large single-pane windows, brick corbelling, and decorative stone pilasters that match those of the building at 120-124 South Main. The building at 126 South Main, occupied by Hooper Hathaway at the corner of West Washington and South Main, is in separate ownership and is not part of this application though it was also constructed in 1866 (see historic photo at end of this report).*

**LOCATION:**

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

*APPLICATION:*

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct infill additions on the rear of the building that total 2,485 square feet; and a two-story addition above the existing three-story building. The proposed fourth floor will be 7,125 square feet, and the proposed fifth floor will be 4,065 square feet. The total new construction is 13,675 square feet.*

*APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:*

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

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

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

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

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

*Additions**Recommended:*

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

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

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

*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.*

*Designing additional stories, when required for the new use, that are set back from the wall plane and are as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street.*

*Not Recommended:*

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

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

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

*Constructing additional stories so that the historic appearance of the building is radically changed.*

*District or Neighborhood Setting*

*Recommended:*

*Designing and constructing new additions to historic buildings when required by the new use. New work should be compatible with the historic character of the setting in terms of size, scale, design, material, color, and texture.*

*Not Recommended:*

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

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 1. The proposed addition would create two new additional floors above the existing three-story building. The proposed fourth floor contains 7,125 square feet, and the fifth floor contains 4,065 square feet, for a total addition of 11,190 square feet on the top of the existing building. The fourth floor addition would be square in shape and measures approximately 83 feet wide, 84 feet deep, and 12 feet high. A small stair tower, measuring approximately 10 feet wide, 20 feet deep, and 12 feet high is located at the rear of the proposed addition near the southwest corner. The fifth floor addition is also square in shape and is smaller, measuring 63 feet and 6 inches wide, 64 feet deep, and 12 feet high.*
- 2. In order to construct the proposed addition, the rear of the building will require an addition. Currently, the rear of 118 S Main Street has a small one-and-a-half story addition. The rear of 120 S Main has a two story rear addition. The applicant proposes constructing an addition above these portions of the building to create a uniform height of three stories. Doing so will allow the rooftop addition and terraces to be constructed as proposed. The addition proposed above the first floor of 118 S Main measures approximately 20 feet wide and 30 feet high and includes roughly two stories. The proposed addition above the second floor of 120-122 S Main measures approximately 40 feet wide and 18 feet high, and is one story tall. In total, the proposed second floor infill will be 860 square feet in size, and the proposed third floor infill will be 1,625 square feet.*
- 3. The existing rear portions of 118-122 S Main where the addition is proposed do not appear to be historically significant, and do not occur on a character-defining elevation of the building. Several windows in the rear elevations of 118 and 120-122 S Main will be covered by the proposed infill as well, but none appear to be historically significant or character-defining features of the building.*
- 4. The east (front) elevation will have a metal panel system that appears light brown in color. The fourth floor has a series of unevenly placed windows, and the metal panels on the fifth floor are interspersed with windows that have randomized vertical mullions. There will be a cantilevered metal canopy above the proposed fifth floor that is beige in color. Because the fifth floor is set back from the front of the fourth floor, there will be a small terrace that is surrounded by a metal cable rail system that also extends along the south elevation. The terrace on the fourth floor, located behind the existing parapet, will also be surrounded by the metal cable rail system.*

5. *The north (side) elevation has three sets of paired windows on the proposed fourth floor and two sets of paired windows on the fifth floor. Most of the north elevation will be covered by light brown metal panels, and one small area towards the east will have beige metal panels. The proposed rear infill has one tall, narrow, vertical window and is covered in beige metal panels.*

6. *The south (side) elevation has five sets of paired windows placed asymmetrically in the fourth floor, which is covered in light brown metal panels. The fifth floor appears similar to the east (front) elevation, with numerous windows interspersed with randomized vertical mullions. The fifth floor also has a cantilevered metal canopy that is beige in color. The canopy is located above a terrace on the fifth floor, which is surrounded by a metal cable rail system.*

7. *The west (rear) elevation consists of a four story addition on the north end and a three story addition towards the center of the building due to the proposed infill. Near the southern end of the building, on top of 124 S Main, the addition is two stories. The infill portion of the addition has beige metal panels and a series of three tall, narrow windows. There are two small balconies located in the northwest corner, which are surrounded by the metal cable rail system. The stair tower, which begins above the second floor of the existing building, extends upward to the fifth floor and is covered by light brown metal panels. The proposed fourth floor has windows of varying width throughout the elevation, and a small terrace on the southern end that has a metal cable rail system, and a larger terrace near the center and northern end of the addition. The proposed fifth floor appears similar to the east (front) and south (side) elevations, with multiple windows with randomized vertical mullions and a terrace located beneath a cantilevered metal canopy.*

8. *The applicant confirmed via email that the colors shown on the renderings are the intended colors for the addition.*

9. *The proposed addition will extend to the north and south lot lines (the edges of the buildings) at 118 and 124 S Main Street, respectively. However, there are buildings on each side (116 S Main, occupied by Kai Garden, to the north, and 126 S Main, occupied by Hooper Hathaway, to the South) so the addition will be inset 16 feet from West Washington Street. The east (front) elevation of the proposed addition will be set back 20 feet from the existing parapet. This area is proposed to be a terrace. The west (rear) elevation of the addition will be set back 20 feet from the top of the rear infill addition, except for the stair tower, which will be even with the rear of the building.*

10. *Per the SOI Guidelines for additions, no character-defining features of the historic building are obscured, damaged, or destroyed by this proposal. The additions are set back from the two street frontages and stepped in order to minimize site lines from pedestrians on South Main and West Washington Streets. The materials and methods of construction clearly delineate what is historic and what is new. The design is contemporary, and most visible on the back of the building and from the south side of West Washington Street (over the top of 126 S Main).*

11. *Based on provided mock ups of the addition as viewed from the street, staff feels that the addition is not easily visible from the street frontages that contain character-defining features of these and nearby buildings, with the exception of a location on the south side of West Washington Street where the addition will be visible down the alley. When viewed from the parking lot behind the building, the addition is very prominent. Since the original rear elevations of the buildings at 118 to 124 S Main have been obliterated by modern additions that offer no character*

defining features, the contrast between the new work and the old is acceptable to staff. The concept of rear infill with a rooftop addition is similar to an existing addition above 110 S Main (the building that houses Vinology).

12. The design and scale of the proposed addition does not detract from the existing building and uses distinct materials to further differentiate it from the historic structure. Overall, staff feels that the historical integrity and character-defining features of the building will not be harmed. However, staff's opinion is that the project could be improved by infilling the existing stepped rear portions of the building with a more compatible material, like masonry or stucco, to bring the building to a consistent three stories. The fourth and fifth stories would be constructed on top as proposed. This would allow the use of a modern design and materials but tone down the stark contrast between the modern materials and traditional masonry.

13. Staff recommends approval of the rear additions as proposed. The proposed addition 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, 9 and 10, and the guidelines for additions and district or neighborhood setting.

#### REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

*Stulberg and White visited the site as part of their review.*

*Stulberg reported that they spent quite some time on site looking at sight lines. He noted that the staff report was very thorough and complete. He requested that the Commission discuss the rear elevation and south west elevation where the views will be most prominent. He said that from the front of the building, with the proposed stepped-back design, the addition would barely be visible.*

*White agreed with Stulberg and Thacher's report, adding that he was in support of the project.*

#### AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

*Ed Shaffran, 118-124 S Main Street, owner and applicant was present to respond to the Commission's enquiries. He said they have taken 50-60 photographs of the building in hopes of locating any areas of concern for the Commission.*

*Beeson commented that the project looks great so far and asked about the view from the east side of Main Street, close to Ann Arbor Brewing Company.*

*Shaffran said that you will be able to see a small fraction of the fifth floor of 124 S Main.*

*Ramsburgh asked about the construction system and if there is any sheen to the outside, noting that the rendered plans indicate a very unobtrusive finish.*

*Shaffran explained that it's a lightweight curtain system construction material, and the finish can be anything that you want it to be, adding that he prefers a matte finish.*

*Ramsburgh asked if the colors would be the same as shown on the plans, and if they would be using masonry.*

*Shaffran responded that the colors would be very close to the submitted plans since they want it to blend in with the existing. He said they have no objection to using*

masonry on the first three floors which will be matching the existing rear of the building in materials and color. He asked for some flexibility with the windows adding that when they get ready to submit the building plans they would come back before the Commission with more detailed window plans asking for an adjustment from the Commission. He said masonry construction versus curtain walls would be slightly different but he would be happy to bring this item back before the Commission when they have more detailed construction plans available.

Stulberg asked about possible issues with using masonry on the fourth and fifth floors on the south elevation.

Shaffran said they don't know the structural weight limitations at this time and what the footings will be able to handle. He also noted that they share a common wall with Hooper Hathaway.

Beeson and Ross noted that if they were going with a new design then it shouldn't detract from the existing, non-character defining facade.

Ethel Potts, 1014 Elder Blvd., stated that she hopes the new addition would not be visible from Main Street, adding that she is against the highly visible addition to the Vinology building on Main Street. She said making use of an old building, such as this one before the Commission, is a good idea. She said she cares about the quality of the construction since she feels it is important to preserve the historic district. She asked the Commission to take into consideration sight views of the addition to the building from different positions on the street.

**A motion was made by McCauley, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 118-124 South Main Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to infill the rear second and third floors to square off the building, and also to construct a fourth and fifth floor, as proposed. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for additions and district or neighborhood setting.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

Stulberg referenced the perspective [northeast view] plan noting the addition to the Vinology building, pointing out the obscured cornice on the building, as noted by Ms. Potts. He said the sight lines on the new addition are very important and he felt that the applicant has done a good job at stepping back the addition so as not to interfere with the existing features of the building. He agreed with Beeson and Ross that the view of the rear of the building was fine. He said the elevation as shown on the perspective [southwest view] plan was important and he would like to see consideration in changing the materials of this elevation to masonry.

Bushkuhl said the applicant has made some smart moves in attempting to utilize the existing space, while accomodating the Guidelines for Rehabilitation from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He said the rear elevation doesn't detract at all from the guidelines, in particular, Standard 9. He said the proposed view from the front is acceptable to him, pointing out the comparison setback of the proposed addition to the addition that was built on the Vinology building. He said while the Washington Street view is visible, it doesn't draw attention to itself because it is in back of the building on Main Street.

*Shaffran commented that the addition to the Vinolgy building has an extended canopy attached that lessens the overall setback, he also pointed out that the Vinology building does not have a tall parapet which their building does. He stressed that from the front of the building you won't see the addition.*

*White agreed adding that he supports the project.*

*Beeson agreed that the views that are seen are off-center and don't detract from the main historical features of the building, which is the front facade. He added that he is less concerned with the off-center views.*

*Ross stated that she feels that while the Washington Street view doesn't obscure any significant elements of the building, it does detract a bit from the overall streetscape. She said she doesn't have an issue with the rear of the building.*

*Ramsburgh said that she has focused mostly on the southwest perspective street view since it will be the one mostly seen, adding that she felt the design is subtle enough not to detract from the architectural features from the side of the Hooper Hathaway building, noting that it serves as a backdrop or curtain behind the building. She asked for reassurance of the front street view of the sight line on the northeast perspective, that one would not be able to see the addition.*

*Shaffran said that to the best of their ability they tried to bring all views to the Commission.*

*Commissioners discussed the perceived decorative parapet and setback lengths.*

*Bushkuhl asked if the proposed colors could be included in the Commission's approval.*

*The Commission agreed that they would be approving the colors per the submitted plans, and if there were any deviations from them, the applicant would need to come back to the Commission.*

*McCauley said he had concerns with the Washington Street [south elevation] view in that it seems too large in massing, size, and scale, and therefore doesn't meet Standards 9 and 10. He felt that the building with the new addition, as a whole, will become the historic building, with the facade remaining the only historic part of the building. He said he cannot support the project because of this.*

*Beeson said McCauley brought a valid concern with the massing changing the historic integrity of the building.*

*Stulberg agreed with the massing comments, adding that he was okay with the addition from the rear because there were no character defining features on the building or the neighboring buildings that would be obscured or removed.*

*Bushkuhl said that he sees the rear of the building as a service entrance area without architectural defining features.*

*Ross said her earlier streetscape comments reflected McCauley's comments as related to the massing.*

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

**Yeas:** 5 - White, Ramsburgh, Vice Chair Stulberg, Secretary Bushkuhl, and Beeson

Nays: 2 - Chair McCauley, and Ross

## G NEW BUSINESS

### Nominating Committee for the October Election of Officers

*Commissioners White, Stulberg and Bushkuhl volunteered for the Nominating Committee.*

*McCauley said he was willing to serve another term if Vice Chair Stulberg didn't want to.*

## H APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### H-1 [12-1048](#) Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes of the July 12, 2012

*Ramsburgh noted the following corrections; page 7, under Audience Participation, 'present' , and page 17, paragraph 4, line 2 should read 'could' instead of 'couldn't', and 3rd paragraph from the bottom of the page, should read 'if' instead of 'is'.*

**A motion was made that the amended minutes as noted be Approved by the Commission and forwarded to the City Council and should be returned by 10/15/2012. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.**

### H-2 [12-1191](#) Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes of the August 16, 2012

*Ramsburgh noted the following correction; page 16, under Reports from Commissioners, 3rd line should read, "re-creating" instead of "re-created".*

**A motion was made that the amended minutes be Approved by the Commission and forwarded to the City Council and should be returned by 10/15/2012. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.**

## I REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

*White reported that he had received a tour of the newly renovated Delta Epsilon Fraternity House on Hill Street. He recommended anyone interested in the work to go and view the before and after photos.*

*White recommended the house be nominated for a Historic Preservation Award for their great work on the house.*

*Ramsburgh brought the Commission's attention to the new Historic District Preservation brochure put out by the Ann Arbor Preservation Alliance. The Commission praised the work and felt it would be very informative.*

## J ASSIGNMENTS

### Review Committee: Monday, October 8, at Noon for the October 11, 2012 Regular Session

*Commissioners Beeson and Ramsburgh volunteered for the October Review Committee.*

**K**      **REPORTS FROM STAFF**

[12-1192](#)      August 2012 HDC Staff Activities

*Thacher added that item HDC12-144; 616 W Madison Street, was waiting for more information from the applicant and the status had been changed to ON HOLD.*

**L**      **CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS****M**      **COMMUNICATIONS**

*Thacher offered to bring copies to HDC meetings of historic correspondence such as newsletters and magazines she receives, for the Commission to look at.*

*The Commission felt that would be helpful and informative.*

**N**      **ADJOURNMENT**

*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/VideoOnDemand.aspx](http://www.a2gov.org/government/city_administration/communicationsoffice/ctn/Pages/VideoOnDemand.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.*