



City of Ann Arbor

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

Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

Thursday, December 12, 2013

7:00 PM

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

A CALL TO ORDER

Chair Stulberg called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

B ROLL CALL

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

C APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White, that the Agenda be Approved as presented. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

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

None

E HEARINGS

E-1 [13-1509](#) HDC13-208; 211 Third St - Second-Story Rear Addition - OWSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

This 1.5-story front-gabled Dutch Colonial Revival home first appears in the Polk City Directories in 1912 as the home of Andrew W. Schaible, a bartender at the Orient Café, and his wife, Rica D. By 1920 the home was owned by Glen C. Davenport, a driver for the Ann Arbor Dairy Co., and by 1923 the home was owned by August F. Schaefer and his wife Pauline. Mr. Schaefer was employed by the Ann Arbor News.

In 2010 an application to expand the rear of the garage was approved by the HDC.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the east side of Third Street, between West Washington and West Liberty Streets.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct a 212 square foot second floor on top of the existing rear wing of the house; add a skylight; add a window to the rear elevation on the first floor; and replace part of the front porch and two basement

walls, including the installation of a new egress window.

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.

Not Recommended:

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

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.

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:

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.

*Windows**Recommended:*

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

Not Recommended:

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

From the City of Ann Arbor Design Guidelines:

*All Additions**Appropriate:*

Placing a new addition on non-character-defining or inconspicuous elevations and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic property.

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

Not Appropriate:

Designing an addition to appear older than, or the same age as, the original building.

*Windows**Not Appropriate:*

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

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The proposed addition would increase the size of the house from 1455 square feet to 1667 square feet, a 14% increase. It would sit on top of the existing 1940s-era rear addition, but not on top of the rear covered porch. The north elevation would feature a gambrel cross-gable similar in proportion to one on the existing north elevation. It would be distinguished by an 8" wide trim board along its base, and would not have corner returns like the existing gable. It would also feature a half-circle window, a design element not present on the original house but compatible with the Dutch colonial revival design. This window is repeated on the gambrel-roofed rear elevation of the addition, atop three mullioned casement windows. The south elevation of the addition would feature a shed-roof dormer with a casement window. A new velux skylight on the north face of the roof would sit between the existing and proposed dormers.

2. All of the proposed casement and doublehung windows would be Andersen vinyl clad wood with wood casings. Whether the proposed wood trim for the new windows matches that of the existing windows, or is distinguished from them, is not specified. Likewise with the size of the new window opening on the first floor rear elevation.

3. The south wall and the southwest corner of the basement foundation, along with the southernmost wall of the front porch, were replaced about a decade ago. The

original foundation consisted of rusticated block, while the new sections are standard CMU. The front porch has a mix of the two, which is unfortunate. The applicant must replace the remaining basement walls due to structural integrity issues, and proposes to match the CMU from the earlier replacement. The front porch would be treated with a stucco parge coat for a more finished appearance than plain block. Given the mix of block styles already found on the house, staff believes this is an appropriate approach. Though closer to the front of the house than preferred by staff, the location of the basement egress window is appropriate since the alternatives are either close to the existing basement stairs or under the bay window on the north elevation. The window well would be constructed of concrete block and its size is not excessive.

4. Staff recommends approval of the application. The addition mimics but does not duplicate the existing structure, and should have no negative impacts on neighboring properties. The new window on the rear is on a secondary elevation under the porch. Replacing the basement walls is necessary and compatible. Overall, the work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the historic house, the lot, and the surrounding area.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Commissioners Ramsburgh and Stulberg visited the site as part of their review.

Ramsburgh reported that they visited the site on Monday and she agreed with the staff report, adding that the house is tucked far enough back that the addition won't be very noticeable from the front and the proposed plan is compatible in exterior design, arrangement and materials and will be a very nice addition to the rear of this very nice house.

Stulberg concurred with Ramsburgh and the staff report, adding that he looked at other possible locations for the basement egress window, but noted the proposed location is in the best location given the position. He said the addition is of a modest size and won't be very visible, noting that the lot backs up to an empty parcel.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Mark Wishka, 211 Third Street, owner, was present to answer the Commissioner's enquiries.

Marc Rueter, 515 Fifth Street, architect for the project was present to explain the application.

Noting no further public speakers, the Chair declared the public hearing closed.

A motion was made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 211 Third Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a 212 square foot rear addition, add a window and a skylight, replace two basement walls and part of the front porch, and construct a basement egress window, 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, building site, and windows, as well as the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to additions and windows.

(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.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the presented application and discussed the matter.

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

Certificate of Appropriateness was Granted.

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

Nays: 0

E-2 [13-1510](#)

HDC13-209; 113 W Liberty St - Rooftop addition - MSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

This three story Romanesque commercial building was constructed in 1888 by photographer John Haarer. It features complex patterned brick work, arched windows, horizontal stone banding, and one of Ann Arbor's first plate glass storefronts. Haarer family businesses, including a book shop and insurance agency, occupied the building until at least 1940. In 1964 the city purchased the property, intending to demolish the building for additional parking, but a subsequent city council (fortunately) changed course. The current ground floor retailer is the West Side Book Shop. The upper two floors are residential, which is in keeping with the original use of the building.

LOCATION:

The site is located at the south side of West Liberty Street, between South Main and South Ashley Streets.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to add a 430 square foot addition, skylight, and deck on top of the third floor roof.

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):

Alterations/Additions for the new use

Recommended:

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

Additions

Recommended:

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:

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 a rooftop addition 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.

From the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines:

Additions to Historic Commercial Structures

Appropriate:

Placing additions such as balconies on non character-defining elevations and limiting the number, size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

When required, designing additional stories that are set back from the front and side wall planes and are as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street.

Not Appropriate:

Designing an addition that overpowers or dramatically alters the original building through size, height, or materials.

STAFF FINDINGS:

- 1. The proposed 430 square foot penthouse addition is set back 30 feet from the front of the building, and 3 ½ feet from the east (alley) side. The addition is 11' tall on average. Materials include anodized aluminum windows, EPDM rubber rolled roofing, and black phenolic siding. The Richlite Rain Shadow siding consists of layered paper and resin, and is a solid color all the way through. In front of the penthouse is a large hipped aluminum skylight, and three decks cover the remaining roof surfaces between the penthouse and front parapet.*
- 2. The decks would be enclosed by a wood wall and cabinets along the west edge of the building; the front deck would have a planter box along the north and east sides, tall enough to serve as a guardrail; and the raised deck next to the penthouse would have a simple guardrail. Two chimneys along the north side of the roof would receive new flue extensions.*
- 3. The existing roof has several chimneys around the perimeter, but the roof surface empty, unencumbered by mechanical or other equipment. Per the SOI Guidelines for additions, no character-defining features of the historic building are obscured, damaged, or destroyed by this proposal. The addition's height is intentionally low, and the penthouse is set back from Liberty Street in order to minimize sight lines from pedestrians looking into the alley. The design is contemporary, and the materials and methods of construction clearly delineate what is historic and what is new. The addition is very visible on the back (south elevation) of the building, but the building backs up to a municipal surface parking lot that is not part of the historic district.*
- 4. 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.*
- 5. Staff recommends approval of the addition, skylight, and deck as proposed. The proposed work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular*

standards 2, 9 and 10, and the guidelines for additions and district or neighborhood setting.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Commissioners Ramsburgh and Stulberg visited the site as part of their review.

Stulberg reported that the building is a wonderful building and the sight lines show how visible or not visible the addition will be. He said he has some questions for the applicant on the materials to be used. He stated that the placement of the addition with the habitable space in the rear is acceptable, and makes it as inconspicuous as possible, noting that the decks will also be inconspicuous with the parapet walls.

Ramsburgh agreed with Stulberg as well as the staff report, adding that she had some reservations when she first reviewed the application, but in visiting the site, she noted that the rear of the building has no character defining features or historic characteristics that would be impaired by the addition from the back and that the one-story garage with the porch over the garage already alter it to some extent and she didn't believe the proposed project would contribute further to a detracting from the building. She said as they were leaving the site they noticed the rooftop addition they approved on the Fourth and Washington Metzger's Restaurant; she said it was visible but it was very subtle and really didn't detract from the building at all, which was reassuring to know that some of these rooftop additions don't look and feel like they are a part of the original building and therefore don't seem to detract from the historic building.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Aaron Vermeulen, OX Studio Inc., 308 ½ S. State Street, Suite 20, Ann Arbor, architect for the project was present to explain the application and represented the owners.

Noting no further public speakers, the Chair declared the public hearing closed.

A motion was made by Beeson, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 113 West Liberty Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to construct a one-story addition, skylight, and decks on the roof, on the condition that the rear south east chimney is not flat capped, but mimics the original. 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 Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines and 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.

(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.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the presented application and discussed the matter.

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

Certificate of Appropriateness was Granted.

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

Nays: 0

E-3 [13-1511](#)

HDC13-191; 220 S Main St - Storefront Alterations - MSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

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

In June, 2012 the HDC approved an application to replace the second and third floor windows on the front elevation.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the west side of South Main Street, between West Washington Street and West Liberty Street. The current ground floor occupant is Elmo's Main Street T-Shirts.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to add a central third entry door and replace the storefront windows with a bronze aluminum window system and insulated glass.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

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

(1) A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

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

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

features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

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

Storefronts

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving storefronts--and their functional and decorative features--that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as display windows, signs, doors, transoms, kick plates, corner posts, and entablatures. The removal of inappropriate, non-historic cladding, false mansard roofs, and other later alterations can help reveal the historic character of a storefront.

Designing and constructing a new storefront when the historic storefront is completely missing. It may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.

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.

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.

From the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines:

Design Guidelines for Storefronts

Appropriate:

Designing and constructing a new storefront when the historic storefront is completely missing. It may be an accurate restoration, using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or may be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, and material of the historic building. New designs should be flush with the façade and be kept as simple as possible.

Not Appropriate:

Installing a new storefront that is incompatible in size and material with the historic building and district.

STAFF FINDINGS

1. *The existing non-original storefront has two front doors: the south one leading to stairs to the upper floors, and the north one leading to steps to the basement and an interior door into the ground floor business. This proposal would add a recessed third door in the center of the storefront to access the ground floor business, and alter the north entry to access only the basement business. No changes are proposed to the existing kickplate, which is modern brick. The new center door would match the existing doors to either side. The existing signage and awning would remain.*

2. *Two configurations are shown in the drawings: one with a 12" sidelight next to the new door, and the other without. Staff has no preference for either design, and has*

structured the proposed motion to allow either.

3. The storefront is compatible with the size, scale, and material of the historic building. The display windows are flush with the façade, and the design is simple. Staff believes the proposal meets the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines and the SOI Standards and Guidelines.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Commissioners Ramsburgh and Stulberg visited the site as part of their review.

Ramsburgh reported that during the site visit they met with the applicants and received a thorough presentation of what is being proposed, adding that staff has really explained it well. She said the storefront is non-original and the proposed changes simplifies and enhances the uses of the building and should be a big improvement to the building. She said the brick on the base of the building will be replaced by a porcelain tile which she felt was perfectly acceptable and preferable to the non-original material that exists.

Stulberg agreed, adding that the proposed changes are not intrusive nor will they detract from the building itself, and they are minimal.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Andre and Ben Curtis, 220 S. Main, Ann Arbor, owners, were present to explain the application and respond to the Commission's enquiries.

Noting no further public speakers, the Chair declared the public hearing closed.

A motion was made by Stulberg, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 220 South Main Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to replace the storefront display windows and add an additional front door, with or without a sidelight, and face the kickplate with dark tile and dark grout. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding resources and meets the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 1, 2, and 9, and the guidelines for storefronts.

(1) A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

(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.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the presented application and discussed the matter.

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

Certificate of Appropriateness was Granted.

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

Nays: 0

E-4 [13-1512](#)

HDC13-192; 224 S Main St - Storefront Alterations -- MSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

This one story commercial building features enameled steel panels over brick and a deeply recessed entry door with tall glass display windows. Originally a three-story Italianate structure which dated to 1860, the dry goods arm of the Mack & Co. department store moved in here 1898. The building is listed as vacant in 1942, except for Christian Mack's insurance company on the second floor of 224. The two upper stories were removed and the enameled steel panels installed on 224, which was first occupied by the Dixie Store in 1943, and the Art Moderne façade was installed on 226 for Cunningham's Drugs. They moved to this address in 1942 or 1943 from their previous storefront at 216 South Main. (All occupants per Polk City Directories.)

LOCATION:

The site is located one storefront north of the northwest corner of South Main and West Liberty.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to remove the enameled steel panels over the storefront windows and also install a 3' deep wood canopy with a street-facing sign band.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

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

(1) A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

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

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

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

Storefronts

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving storefronts--and their functional and decorative features--that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as display windows, signs, doors, transoms, kick plates, corner posts, and entablatures. The removal of inappropriate, non-historic cladding, false mansard roofs, and other later alterations can help reveal the historic character of a storefront.

Designing and constructing a new storefront when the historic storefront is completely missing. It may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.

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.

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.

From the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines:

Design Guidelines for Storefronts

Appropriate:

Designing and constructing a new storefront when the historic storefront is completely missing. It may be an accurate restoration, using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or may be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, and material of the historic building. New designs should be flush with the façade and be kept as simple as possible.

Not Appropriate: Installing a new storefront that is incompatible in size and material with the historic building and district.

STAFF FINDINGS

- 1. The enameled steel panels above the storefront windows are in poor condition, and have a number of holes and corrosion. A retractable-arm canvas awning and awning gutter are present above the windows, but the awning is clearly deteriorated and unusable.*
- 2. The flat wall panels have been removed, and the brick exposed, from the wall immediately to the south at 226 (and from the rest of the one-story building), which gives a decent representation of what the brick would look like under 224's panels.*
- 3. The wooden fixed canopy proposed to be installed above the storefront windows would feature paneled ends and a paneled front sign band area. The current light box sign found on the storefront would be permanently removed as part of the project.*

4. *The Commission must determine whether the storefront's enameled steel panels and awning are important in defining the overall historic character of the building, or whether they are inappropriate, non-historic cladding. The panels were added during the period of significance for the district, at the same time that the building was radically altered by removing two floors. The flat wall panels have been removed from the remainder of the building – are these remaining panels an important remnant of the 1942 building fabric, or merely obscuring the underlying brick (which may date back to the 1860 building but could also be 1942 infill)?*

5. *The existing awning is not salvageable. If the Commission approves removal of the steel panels, staff feels that the installation of the fixed canopy is appropriate. If the steel panels are determined to be a character defining feature of the building, an awning would be more historically appropriate than a fixed canopy.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Commissioners Ramsburgh and Stulberg visited the site as part of their review.

Ramsburgh reported that from her site visit observations, she believed that the steel panels are not historic defining features but are inappropriate non-historic cladding, and are no longer contributing features. She said the applicant intends to restore the brick that is behind these steel panels and she felt this will be a huge improvement to the façade of the building and she noted that the awning is visibly not even able to be unrolled any longer. She said the application is a good one.

Stulberg agreed that the steel panels are in very bad shape and the restoration and painting of the brick underneath will help, but without knowing the condition of the brick, they could encounter unknowns, and might not end up looking that great. He said the inoperable awning has to go. He said he had some reservations with the 3 feet protruding canopy which the Commission can look at more closely.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Andre and Ben Curtis, 220 S. Main, Ann Arbor, owners, were present to explain the application and respond to the Commission's enquiries.

Noting no further public speakers, the Chair declared the public hearing closed.

A motion was made by Bushkuhl, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 224 South Main Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to allow the removal of enameled steel panels on the upper portion of the building, as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding resources and meets the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 1, 2, and 9, and the guidelines for storefronts.

(1) A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

(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.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the presented application and discussed the matter.

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

Certificate of Appropriateness was Granted.

A motion was made by Bushkuhl, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 224 South Main Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to install a 3' deep fixed canopy with a sign band, as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding resources and meets the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 1, 2, and 9, and the guidelines for storefronts.

(1) A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

(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.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the presented application and discussed the matter.

Ramsburgh expressed concern that the awning be attached through the mortar joints so not to destroy the brick.

Several Commissioners noted that since there would be a band covering, it might not be possible to install it into the joints.

The Commission asked why they chose a fixed awning which is heavier.

The Curtis brothers explained that they are proposing a fixed canopy because it will be their new tenant signage and the existing backlit signage will be removed. They explained that there will be canned recessed lighting underneath. They noted that several of the storefronts along Main Street have similar fixed awnings and this would

be compatible and would not only polish the building but give it a sharper look, given that it is a significant corner in Ann Arbor.

Beeson commented that the customer experience would be slightly different with the new canopy and he questions how the signage would be effective when walking along the street and how the alteration fits into the Secretary's Standards, given that they would be removing historical characteristics.

Bushkuhl expressed that he was supportive of the application.

McCauley expressed concern over losing the whole Art Moderne look of the building with the addition of the large canopy. He noted that the building has been changed so much over the years, but they are basically stuck with a one-story building that wraps around. He said the canopy doesn't really speak to the building, and might even detract from the neighboring storefront, stressing the importance of the context and that such a canopy would be obscuring any historic character that is left on the storefront. He said that it would be more sympathetic to try to follow the 1930's era look that is on the building. He believed there would be other available options for this storefront that would better meet the Secretary of the Interior Guidelines and he was not in favor of the application as proposed.

Stulberg concurred with McCauley, adding that he felt a sign band would be more appropriate on this building. He said given the 3 foot proposed protrusion that will be very prominent, he had concerns and he would like to see more of the finished materials that they would be getting, instead of approving something that will be changing the style of the building all together.

White asked if it was possible for the applicant to postpone the application and provide more detailed materials to the commission within 30 days, since the Commission can't imagine what the proposed work will look like.

McCauley said he had problems with the design and a delay wouldn't help the application.

Ben Curtis said that this storefront is kind of hidden and this will enhance it more and make it more visible. He said the question remains which way to go, given the two historic directions of the storefront, noting that they like brick and would like to stay with the brick paneling. He noted that the canopy could be removed in the future.

Beeson said he was falling more in-line with McCauley's comments and observations that it is from the 1940's era and should be preserved. He said the issue was that the design was not working, particularly with Standard 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.

Ben Curtis noted that they want to enhance the storefront and make it more visible given the prominence of the Main and Liberty corner where LENA is currently occupying.

Stulberg said he also feels that the design of the canopy is detracting from the character of the building and this particular design isn't appropriate with the neighboring storefronts. He felt architecturally designed signage, such a simple sign board, could achieve the same goal of bringing attention to the storefront instead of detracting from the architecturally significant era and design of the building. He said

he wouldn't be voting in favor of the application.

The Curtis brothers thanked the Commission for their helpful comments and requested a postponement.

Stulberg asked staff for clarification in procedural requirements.

Thacher said that if they are asking them to redesign the canopy, then she requested the Commission to take a vote of the submitted application, or if the Commission was requesting the applicant to provide further information on the submitted canopy then they should postpone the application.

Beeson asked how far the protrusion of the LENA façade stuck out, and suggested that the applicant look for these types of characteristics that helped with the context of the neighboring storefronts as well.

Ramsburgh said her understanding is that after the steel panels are removed the brick will be painted and one will not see this as a unit of the LENA storefront and this will continue to look like a separate little building. She said the only thing that will make the storefront look Art Modern, after the steel panels are removed, is the entry way with its deep recess. She agreed that the wooden canopy will be like adding a whole new era on the historic building and felt a different design would be more appropriate. She stated that they are not going to get a little building that calls back to its Art Modern era.

Ben Curtis asked if it would help to scale back the protrusion of the canopy from 3 feet to 2 feet if the Commission felt it would be more appropriate.

Ramsburgh commented that the Commission has seen some very interesting signage come before them lately and she felt the applicants might be able to find something very innovative for this building that draws attention to the storefront in a more substantive way.

Beeson asked if it would be a clad canopy.

Curtis said yes.

Beeson said in light that this building will read as a separate building, one could argue that the canopy will make it stand out; he noted that the proposed canopy still doesn't fit within the context of the building.

On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion defeated. Vote: 2-5. Canopy Request Denied.

Partial Application Denied.

Yeas: 2 - White, and Vice Chair Bushkuhl

Nays: 5 - Ramsburgh, McCauley, Chair Stulberg, Secretary Beeson, and Ross

E-5 [13-1513](#)

HDC13-207; 311 E Liberty St - New Awnings - LSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

This two story Queen Anne was built circa 1890, and moved to this site in 1907. It

features wood clapboard siding and fan details in the gables. Modern alterations to the storefront occurred in 1987.

LOCATION:

The building is located on the north side of East Liberty Street, between

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to install two canvas awnings, one on each storefront display window.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

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

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

Storefronts

Not Recommended:

Introducing a new design that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.

Using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy remaining character-defining features of the historic building.

From the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines (other Guidelines may apply):

Awnings

Appropriate:

Mounting a standard storefront awning so that the bottom of the fixed frame is at least 7 feet above the sidewalk, although 8 feet is preferred. Consideration should be given to the height of neighboring awnings.

Projecting the awning from the face of the building no more than 4 feet.

Attaching the awning just below the storefront cornice and fitting it within the storefront opening.

Using canvas, vinyl-coated canvas, or acrylic fabrics for awnings and banners.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The awnings are black canvas with a 7" valence and closed ends. They would project 1' 6" from the face of the building. 5" lettering advertising Bead Gallery and Adorn Me would be located on the front valence and closed ends. The awnings would

be mounted at the top edge of the display window and cover the transoms. The store owners are seeking to shade the goods on display in these southern-facing windows.

2. Staff feels that the proposed awnings are simple and appropriate for this site, compatible with neighboring storefronts, and meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and guidelines and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Commissioners Ramsburgh and Stulberg visited the site as part of their review.

Stulberg reported that the design is simple and looks easy, and was explained very well by Thacher.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Noting no public speakers, the Chair declared the public hearing closed.

A motion was made by Ross, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for 311 East Liberty Street, a contributing structure in the Main Street Historic District, for the application to install two storefront awnings. The work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2 and 9 and the guidelines for storefronts.

(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.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the presented application and discussed the matter.

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

Certificate of Appropriateness was Granted.

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

Nays: 0

E-6 [13-1514](#)

HDC13-213; 318 W Liberty St - Demo Carwash, Construct Condos - OWSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

The Liberty Car Wash was constructed in 1966 and replaced a 1 ½ story wood framed house that occupied the site until at least 1960 (per 1925 and 1971 Sanborn Maps and the 1960 Polk Directory).

LOCATION:

The building is located on the north side of West Liberty Street, between South First Street and Second Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to demolish a non-contributing car wash and construct a four story, eight unit condominium building with parking underneath.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

(1) A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

(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 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):

District/Neighborhood

Not Recommended:

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

From the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines (other Guidelines may apply):

All New Construction

Appropriate:

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

Designing new features so they are compatible with the historic character of the site, district, and neighborhood.

Basing the site location of new buildings on existing district setbacks, orientation,

spacing and distance between adjacent buildings.

Designing new sidewalks, entrances, steps, porches and canopies to be consistent with the historic rhythm established in the district.

Designing new buildings to be compatible with, but discernible from, surrounding buildings that contribute to the overall character of the historic district in terms of height, form, size, scale, massing, proportions, and roof shape.

Not Appropriate:

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

New Construction in Historic Residential Settings

Appropriate:

Maintaining the existing spacing of front and side yard setbacks along a block as seen from the street.

Orienting the front of a house towards the street and clearly identifying the front door.

Designing a new front façade that is similar in scale and proportion to surrounding buildings that contribute to the overall character of the historic district.

Designing the spacing, placement, scale, orientation, proportion, pattern and size of window and door openings in new buildings to be compatible with surrounding historic buildings.

Selecting materials and finishes that are compatible with historic materials and finishes found in surrounding buildings that contribute to their historic character.

Not Appropriate:

Paving a high percentage of a front yard area or otherwise disrupting the landscape pattern within front yard setbacks.

Placing a structure outside of the existing pattern of front yard setbacks along a historic residential block.

New Construction in Historic Commercial Settings

New construction should be compatible with the context of its surrounding historic district.

Maintaining the setback and alignment pattern seen on surrounding historic properties should take precedence over the setback and alignment pattern of any surrounding properties that are not historic.

Alternative building orientations should generally not be considered for new construction in historic districts.

Building massing should fit with existing historic patterns.

Buildings should not be immense in scale or greatly contrast with the existing scale on the block or in the surrounding historic district.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *This site has high visibility, is located on a block of very significant historic residential structures constructed between 1860 and 1891, and serves as a gateway to the Old West Side Historic District and neighborhood.*

2. *The south (front), north, and west elevations are primarily clad in brick on the first and second floors, with popped-out vertical window panels clad in smooth cementitious panel board (like Hardi-panel). The east elevation, over the parking garages, is clad all in panel board, as are all of the third and fourth floors. The use of brick is appropriate in this location near Liberty Lofts and historic brick structures along the railroad corridor. The east elevation should also be clad in brick since it is entirely visible from the street and from the West Liberty approach from downtown. Using brick or a darker stone veneer on the foundation may minimize the floating appearance caused by using lighter stone veneer on the garage face.*

3. *General staff comments about the design: the combination of horizontal and vertical bands of different colors and materials is visually confusing. If the building is indeed trying to pay homage to industrial buildings along the railroad corridor, staff's opinion is that it should be clad entirely in brick, or at least on the front and sides. The small square windows on the third floor's southwest corner are out of character with the fenestration pattern of the building and add to the visual jumble.*

4. *The height and width of the building are appropriate for the site and neighborhood. Pushing back the fourth floor sunrooms from the front and rear elevations helps minimize the height of the building. The third floor roof height is comparable to that of the Brehm House at 326 West Liberty (the Moveable Feast building) next door. Infilling the west edge of the property to match the grade next door and placing the garages on the taller east side is appropriate given the historic residential character of properties to the west and the industrial nature of properties to the east.*

5. *Staff's biggest concern is about the historic relationships of buildings on this block. The existing carwash (and the house that preceded it) has a front yard setback similar to the three historic homes to the west. The proposed design pushes the front of the condo about 30' in front of this historically established setback line, which is measured perpendicular to Liberty Street. The illustrations on the next page show the established front setback on a 2010 aerial photo, an aerial showing the building superimposed, and a site drawing of the proposed building footprint. The latter two are from the application attachments.*

Both the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines directly address historic relationships between buildings, and established setbacks and alignment patterns. The front of the building needs to be moved back significantly to follow the existing pattern of front yard setbacks.

When walking or driving west on West Liberty from downtown, the Brehm House next door would be completely obscured by this building, and the front porch wouldn't be visible, until passersby are directly in front of the new condo building. By following the established front setbacks, the Brehm House will still be mostly obscured, but the front elevation will remain visible from points much farther to the east.

6. *Modifications are necessary to the materials, design, and placement of the structure before it will meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Commissioners Ramsburgh and Stulberg visited the site as part of their review.

Ramsburgh reported that when they visited the site, she had the same concerns as Thacher expressed; yet, also thought there were elements of the design that were pleasing and positive, such as the general scale, the height of the building, the placement of the garages on the first floor, and the changing of the elevation to meet the neighboring sites elevation. She said she felt the biggest problem is the setback and the varied use of materials. She said the building 'holds together' much better when all the materials are not varied. She said her concern with comments about looking at other buildings such as Liberty Lofts, on the other side of the tracks, one loses sight. You are getting into residential designs, not commercial industrial designs and breaking up the building with different materials gives it an industrial look, which she stressed doesn't fit the context of the residential area. She felt that the whole plan needs to be revisited.

Stulberg agreed with Ramsburgh and the staff report, adding that he lived just up the street from the proposed site for many years and is still part-owner of the tri-plex residential building, and knows the neighborhood quite well. He said he had many comments on the proposed building and the bottom line is that it does not meet the guidelines that the Commission are charged to use in reviewing projects, adding especially the setbacks of the proposed project.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Brad Moore, Architect for the project, was present and explained the project, providing material samples to the Commission.

Alex De Parry, Fifth Avenue Limited Partnership, 202 East Madison, Ann Arbor, applicant, was also available to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

Scott Munzel, Attorney, stated that he often represents the applicant and is a citizen living in the nearby area. He spoke in favor of the application, noting that the City Council had approved the zoning for this parcel and therefore the setbacks were appropriate.

Noting no further public speakers, the Chair declared the public hearing closed.

Motion made Bushkuhl, Seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for 318 West Liberty Street, to demolish a non-contributing car wash and construct an eight-unit condominium building, as proposed. The work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 9 and 10, and the guidelines for District/Neighborhood, and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, in particular the guidelines for new construction.

(1) A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

(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 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.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the presented application and discussed the matter.

A motion was made by White, seconded by Bushkuhl, that the application be postponed. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Application Postponed.

Yeas: 4 - White, Vice Chair Bushkuhl, Secretary Beeson, and Ross

Nays: 3 - Ramsburgh, McCauley, and Chair Stulberg

F UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- F-1 [13-1515](#) HDC13-193; 233 S State St - Add Elevator, Windows - SSHD
WITHDRAWN

Withdrawn

G NEW BUSINESS

- G-1 [13-1516](#) Street Exhibit Program Annual Report

Ray Detter and Louisa Pieper provided the Annual Report to the Commission.

H APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- H-1 [13-1517](#) Historic District Commission Minutes of the November 14, 2013

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

J ASSIGNMENTS

J-1 Review Committee: Monday, January 6, at Noon for the January 9, 2014 Regular Meeting

Commissioners McCauley and Beeson volunteered for the January 2014 Review Committee.

K REPORTS FROM STAFF

K-1 [13-1518](#) November 2013 HDC Staff Activities

Received and Filed

L CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS

M COMMUNICATIONS

[13-1519](#) Various Communications to the HDC

Received and Filed

N ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was unanimously adjourned at 10:51 p.m.

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

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

- *Video on Demand: Replay public meetings at your convenience online at www.a2gov.org/government/city_administration/communicationsoffice/ctn/Pages/Vid eoOnDemand.aspx*
- *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, on "The Meeting Place" page (<http://www.a2gov.org/livemeetings>), or is available for a nominal fee by contacting CTN at (734) 794-6150.