



City of Ann Arbor

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

Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

Thursday, August 16, 2012

7:00 PM

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

A CALL TO ORDER

Chair McCauley called the meeting to order at 7:00 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 [12-1043](#) HDC12-116; 340 Eighth Street - Replace Garage with New Garage - OWSHD

Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This two-story vernacular house features a brick first floor and a second floor, gables, and dormers covered with wood shingles. A small one-story garage is located in the northwest corner of the property. The house was built in 1908 and was the home of Charles T Estleman, a furniture manufacturer, and his wife, Emma. In 1919, the house became the residence of Adam Frey, a farmer, and shortly after in 1923, the house became the residence of William R Schlee, a fireman at the University of Michigan, and his wife, Margaret. Margaret Schlee lived at the house until the mid-1950s.

At the July 12 HDC meeting a different version of this application was considered, which was partially approved (demolition of the existing garage). The Commission requested revisions to the proposed new garage, particularly to the overhangs above the garage door and entrances.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the west side of Eighth Street, between W Washington Street and W Liberty Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct a new one-and-a-half-story garage.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

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

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

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

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

Building Site

Recommended:

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

Not Recommended:

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

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

District or Neighborhood Setting

Not Recommended:

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

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. Changes to this application from the one considered last month include (see application for additional explanation from applicant):

a. The wraparound hip roof on the southeast corner has been eliminated.

b. *The proposed changes retain the hipped roof above the walkway and entrance on the south (side) elevation, but it is stepped back several feet from the east (front) elevation. It is also stepped back several feet from the west (rear) elevation.*

c. *The proposed changes also include retaining the overhang above the garage door, with the depth of this overhang reduced from four feet to two feet. The proposed revisions eliminate the support posts and add angled brackets.*

d. *The submitted drawings also show the dimensions of the garage to be twenty-one feet wide and forty feet deep for a total of 840 square feet, which had been incorrectly stated in the previous application.*

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

2. *The proposed garage will be located fifteen feet from the rear lot line and three feet from the north lot line to meet setback requirements. The proposed garage is approximately twice as large as the existing garage. It measures twenty-one feet wide, forty feet deep, and twenty-four feet and eight inches high at the roofline, and will take up approximately one-quarter of the rear yard. The applicant states that a garage of the proposed depth is necessary to accommodate his truck, which is over twenty-two feet in length. The first floor of the garage will also be used as a small workspace and the second floor will be used for an exercise room and additional storage.*

3. *The proposed garage has an asphalt shingled gable roof with two gabled dormers, one on the north (side) elevation and one on the south (side) elevation. The gables appear very similar in style to a dormer on the south (side) elevation of the house. The proposed garage has Hardie board beveled siding and cedar shingles on the gable walls and dormers. A single-car garage door is located on the east (front) elevation, and man door are located to the south of the garage door and near the midpoint of the south elevation. The proposed garage has overhangs along the east and south elevations with shed roofs to shelter the garage door and man doors. On the first floor there are two windows on the north elevation and two windows on the south elevation. On the second floor, there is a single window in the east elevation, a set of paired windows on the west (rear) elevation, and one window in each of the two dormers. All windows will be one-over-one double-hung clad windows.*

4. *The proposed garage has a footprint that is nearly the same size of the house, but may be appropriately scaled for the size of the lot. This section of the Old West Side typically has smaller lots with small one-story garages. Based on the provided drawings, the proposed garage seems slightly too large in scale. However, this may be due to the overhangs on the south and east elevations or the two dormers, and the size may be considered appropriate for the large lot size. The proposed garage is compatible in exterior design and relationship to the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation in particular standards 9 and 10.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

The review committee noted that they had not returned to the site, since their July visit.

Ramsburgh asked if there were building codes that mandated the maximum allowable garage structures.

Thacher said no, but the zoning restrictions had a maximum allowable height.

Ramsburgh asked if the second story balcony shown on the plans, for the existing house, was a part of the Historic District Commission review and application.

Thacher said, no.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Harold Kirchen, 340 Eighth Street, owner, was present to respond to the Commission's questions. He handed out photos and plans to the Commission.

Stulberg asked about the height of the existing house and the height of the proposed garage.

Kirchen said the existing house is two full stories with an attic that is eleven feet to the peak, and the proposed garage will have a three foot knee-wall and ten foot walls, adding it would be much smaller than the house.

Motion made by Stulberg, seconded by White that the Commission approve the application at 340 Eighth Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a new one-and-a-half-story garage 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 building site and district or neighborhood setting.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

McCauley thanked the Commission for their input at their last meeting and felt the modifications were a great improvement.

Kirchen thanked the Commission for their thoughtful process and for working with him to keep the neighborhood what it was intended to be.

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

APPROVED

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

Nays: 0

F HEARINGS

F-1 [12-1044](#) HDC12-138; 208 South Main Street - New Canopy and Signage - MSHD

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 Schlanderer 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 granite 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.

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.

STAFF FINDINGS:

- 1. The applicant proposes replacing the green granite 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 granite below the windows will be retained. The green granite 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 granite with black granite would remove historic materials and alter the historic appearance of the building.*
- 2. The applicant proposes to remove the existing retractable canvas awning and replace it with a rigid steel canopy. 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. Two additional steel brackets located on top of the canopy, one on each end, will also be attached to the stone façade. The canopy appears to meet building code requirements for size and height.*
- 3. 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 two small spotlights 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 this type of building than the proposed canopy. The historic documentation (photos) that staff was able to find all showed canvas awnings on this storefront.*
- 4. 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, if installed in the black granite. Installation through the green granite would damage a historic feature.*
- 5. 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 granite was installed (photo evidence shows they were there in 1975). Therefore, it is inappropriate to obscure the grilles (architectural features of the façade) with signage.*
- 6. Staff believes that the proposed canopy and replacement of the façade with black*

granite is inappropriate. If the granite is not replaced, the proposed wall sign would be installed on the green granite, which may harm historic materials. 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, 4, 9 and 10, and the guidelines for storefronts.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

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

Ramsburgh reported that they examined the exterior of the building, noting that the marble had aged in time, and there had been repairs done to fix cracks in the marble.

White added that the marble is not in excellent shape, but they would be losing the marble in order to add new signage.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Chuck Schlanderer, owner of the property, along with architect, Angie Lane, were present to respond to the Commission's questions. Schlanderer said the cracked stone is trapping water and rotting the wood underneath, adding that they have tried unsuccessfully over several years to repair the stone.

White asked the applicant to explain their proposed work.

Lane said that the signage would consist of lettering and the new awning would replace the existing awning that doesn't work.

Stullberg asked about the grills.

Schlanderer said that they are thin, stamped, aluminum grills that are extremely corroded and causing safety issue for people entering the building.

Beeson asked what the perspective was for eliminating the existing awning with its character defining features and replacing it with a large canopy.

Schlanderer said because of maintenance, since the existing one is made of a flimsy aluminum that bends whenever the wind blows.

Beeson asked about the proposed marble and if they have begun to review samples.

Schlanderer said they are looking at the black granite stone.

Ramsburgh asked if the applicant had reviews the guidelines for rehabilitating storefronts and if they had looked at alternative to get the signage on their building without having to remove historic materials.

Lane said since they are a jewelry store they don't want to cover the windows or doors with signage, noting that their signage will decrease with the new awning.

McCauley said he is curious to know if the existing material on the storefront is beyond saving, and would like to get more information that addresses this issue along with alternative signage options.

White said he felt the problem would come once they remove the stone from the front

of the store, noting that he believed they would need to waterproof the building, because once they start chiseling the stone it will all crack.

Bushkuhl commented that he sympathizes with the applicant, knowing they would like the exterior of the building to match with the interior, which is kept immaculate, however, the proposed work is not in accordance with the historic rehabilitation guidelines the Commission is bound by, which makes it almost impossible for the Commission to approve the proposed plans. He suggested they try to make modifications to their plans.

Ross agreed, adding that she would like to have more information provided to the Commission, from a professional mason that could confirm if the stone is beyond repair.

Bushkuhl said there might be ways they can remove the stone, repair and replace the stone using epoxy.

Schlenderer said they had already done that and would not be able to do it again, because of the size of the pieces.

Ramsburgh asked if there is metal flashing on top to keep the water out.

Schlenderer said, yes, and the water is entering through a pediment.

Stullberg said if the material is salvageable the Commission needs to evaluate such results.

Schlenderer said they have had professionals that have inspected the stone and told them that they won't touch it because of its bad condition.

Stullberg asked if the applicant was willing to postpone their application and provide the results of the professional contractor's inspection to the Commission.

Lane asked the Commission what the preferred awning type would be.

Thacher said that while the Commission reviews all kinds, the one that is not recommended for a small retail storefront is a fixed horizontal plane awning. She offered to look for high quality retractable awnings and get back with the applicant.

McCauley said it would be best for the applicant to work with staff in getting revised plans for the work and return to the Commission in September. He suggested a postponement.

Schlenderer said he had photos and documentation he was willing to share with the Commission.

Beeson commented that it would be helpful for the applicant to provide samples of the proposed stone.

A motion was made by White, seconded by Stulberg, that the Commission postpone taking action on 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, remove the existing awning and replace it with a new canopy, install a new wall sign above the proposed canopy, and replace two metal grilles with new metal signs, and should be returned by 9/13/2012. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

POSTPONED

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

Nays: 0

F-2 [12-1045](#)

HDC12-123; 216 South Main Street - New Business Signage - MSHD

Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This two story, brick Art-Moderne commercial building was built in 1949, and was first occupied by F. W. Woolworth Company. The storefronts, second floor windows, and two second floor window openings are not original.

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 add two new non-illuminated exterior signs to the entablature above the front entrance. The proposed wall sign measures fifteen inches high, and eleven feet four inches long. The sign consists of three separate series of aluminum and polycarbonate letters with a traditional serif font style that will be mounted on the wood entablature.

A second projecting bracket sign has already been installed on the north end of the entablature and measures eighteen inches high and twenty-four inches deep, and is composed of medium density overlay plywood.

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 wall sign consists of three separate series of silver aluminum letters that are outlined with black polycarbonate. The signs will be mounted above the entrance in the wood entablature by steel studs set in silicone.*
2. *The projecting bracket sign has already been installed. It consists of medium overlay density plywood that is painted black with a red and white striped border, and white lettering. It is suspended from a metal bracket that measures approximately twelve inches high and thirty inches wide, and is installed in the entablature of the building.*
3. *The proposed wall sign and projecting bracket sign are appropriately scaled and the placement on the entablature above the front entrance is appropriate. The signs are not illuminated. On the provided mock-up, the signs appear to be compatible in size, materials, and color to the building. The signs also appear to be well balanced and do not detract from the character defining features of the building.*
4. *Staff recommends approval of the proposed non-illuminated exterior wall sign and projecting bracket sign. The proposed signs are generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meet The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 9 and 10, and the guidelines for storefronts.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

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

White said he agreed with the staff report and supports the project.

Ramsburgh agreed noting that the proposed sign is appropriately scaled and will be placed in the right location.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

Motion made by Bushkuhl, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 216 South Main Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to add a new exterior wall sign and a projecting bracket 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:

Ross asked about the location of the signage in relationship to the multiple sign bands on the building.

Thacher said that generally upper level businesses use the top sign band with ground floor businesses using the lower sign band.

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

APPROVED

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

Nays: 0

F-3

[12-1046](#)

HDC12-134; 423-425 West Liberty Street - Alterations to Rear of Duplex, New Garage - OWSHD

Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This two story wood frame house features a curving front porch supported by paired Doric columns along portions of the north and west elevations. This house first appears as a duplex in 1907 city directories. Edward W and Magdalena Staebler are listed as the occupants of 423 W Liberty, and Michael and Rosina Staebler are listed as the occupants of 425 W Liberty. In the 1910 City Directory, Edward is listed as the son of Michael, who together owned the M. Staebler and Son store on Washington Street.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the southeast corner of the intersection of West Liberty Street and Third Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to 1) construct a 150 square foot addition on an existing second story rear addition, 2) construct a new deck at the rear of 425 W Liberty, 3) expand an existing one car garage at the rear of 423 W Liberty and construct a new deck above it, and 4) construct a new garage in the rear of 425 W Liberty.

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.

*Site**Not Recommended:*

Introducing a new building or site feature that is out of scale or of an otherwise inappropriate design.

*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 rear of the house has been altered since the house was built in the 1900s. The alterations occurred after 1931, based on a Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, and the applicant believes that it occurred during the 1950s or 1960s. The alterations included removing or severely altering two small porches and building a two story rear addition. A small second-story porch located above the rear garage and wood stairs were also added within the past several decades. A two-story outbuilding was demolished between 1931 and 1947, based on the Sanborn maps.*

2. *The applicant proposes altering the roof from shed to hipped on the two-story addition on the back of the house. The addition is not historically significant. A number of non-original windows on the addition are proposed to be replaced with doublehungs that are more consistent with the historic character of the house, a non-original ground-floor door would be replaced with a window, and a ground-floor slider with a door. The garage under the house is likely part of the original structure, but is located on a non-character defining elevation and appears to have been altered*

in the past. Its location in the southeast corner of the building does not make it easily visible from the street.

3. The applicant proposes building a new 150 square foot addition on the rear of the house on top of the second floor. The addition will be located near the center of the building, have a gable roof, and its ridge will be at the same height as the existing roof. The proposed asphalt shingled roof will match the existing roof. The addition will have cement board siding with a 3 inch exposure. The east and west (side) elevations of the proposed addition will each have one double-hung window. The south (rear) elevation will have a set of paired double-hung windows, and two small double-hung windows will be located in the gable.

4. The applicant proposes constructing a new deck to the rear of 425 E Liberty. The deck will include construction of a new concrete masonry unit or retaining wall foundation to bring the height of the deck even with the rear entrance. The proposed deck measures fourteen feet wide and thirteen feet six inches deep. Although the new construction will occur on the west (side) elevation that parallels the street, the new deck is located within a recessed corner of the building. Staff feels that its size and location will make it appear relatively unobtrusive. A new doorway will be cut into the south (rear elevation) between the two existing windows to provide access to the deck. The deck will be reached from the exterior by a short flight of stairs.

5. The existing one-car garage at 423 E Liberty is proposed to be expanded by fourteen feet. The south (rear) elevation wall where the existing garage is located will be removed, which includes a single bay garage door and two windows. The new garage addition will extend fourteen feet towards the rear of the property. A two-bay insulated steel garage door will be installed. The walls of the addition will be sided with cement board siding with a three inch exposure.

6. A new wood deck will be constructed above the expanded garage. The deck will measure twenty-four feet wide and fourteen feet deep. A wood stairway will be built along the east (side) elevation of the expanded garage to access the deck. The deck will create access to the rear entrance of the house. The deck will have a beveled top rail, boxed column newel posts, and square balusters.

7. The applicant also proposes constructing a new two-car garage to the rear of 425 W Liberty that is located to the rear of the existing driveway. The garage will be twenty feet wide, twenty feet deep, and approximately sixteen feet high at the roof peak. The proposed garage has an asphalt gable roof, a man door in the west elevation, and the west and east elevations will each have a small double-hung window in the center of the elevation. A double-hung window will also be located in the gable of the north elevation above the garage door. Cement board siding with a three inch exposure will be used.

8. The design and scale of the rear addition, new rear deck at 425 W Liberty, expanded garage with roof deck at 423 W Liberty, and new detached garage are compatible with the house, do not detract from it, and use distinct materials to differentiate them from the historic structure. Overall, the historical integrity and character-defining features will not be harmed. Although the work will be visible from Third Street, staff feels that the proposed work is appropriate in size and will be relatively unobtrusive when viewed from the street.

9. Staff recommends approval of the proposed addition, new rear deck at 425 W Liberty, expanded garage with roof deck at 423 W Liberty, and new detached garage. The proposed sign is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and

meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 2, 9 and 10, and the guidelines for additions, site, and district or neighborhood setting.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

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

Ramsburgh reported that at their site visit, they noticed that the rear of the house seemed to be at a sub-standard in comparison to the rest of the house. She said the additions look to be built in a temporal way, and have been updated over time, but aren't very aesthetically pleasing. She commented that the additions will not be changing any historical features on the structure and will finish off the back of the house in a much more pleasing way than what is currently there. She reported that the changes are very positive to the house and will improve it.

White agreed, adding that he agrees with the staff report and supports the project.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Tom Fitzsimmons, Huron Contracting, owner of the property, along with Marc Rueter, architect, were present to respond to the Commission's enquiries. He said he had recently purchased the property and moved in, and is looking forward to the renovation project.

Rueter handed out hard copies of the proposed plans to the Commission.

White asked if the rear stairway would be removed or replaced.

Rueter explained that the old stairway would be removed and a new stairway installed.

Motion made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White, that the Commission approve the application at 423-425 West Liberty Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, and issue a certificate of appropriateness, to construct a 150 square foot addition on the rear second story, construct a new deck at the rear of 425 West Liberty, construct a new garage at the rear of 425 West Liberty, and expand an existing garage at 423 West Liberty as proposed and as revised at the August 16, 2012 Historic District Commission meeting. 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 additions, site, and district or neighborhood setting.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Ramsburgh commented that the project was a really nice one.

Stulberg said he used to live across the street from the house, adding that the front of the house is very prominent so it was nice that the proposed work would not change the front view. He said he felt the changes were very respectful of the existing structure and making use of the rear lot, noting that the project would be great for the neighborhood.

Bushkuhl commented that it is a complimentary project to the area and a well thought

out design and plan. He said the submitted site plan is an excellent example of what the Commission is looking for when doing their review.

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

APPROVED

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

Nays: 0

G **NEW BUSINESS**

G-1 [12-1047](#) 1533 Broadway Street Survey Card Correction

Thacher explained that It has been brought to staff's attention that there is a discrepancy between the survey card for 1533 Broadway and the adopted study committee report for the Broadway Historic District. The survey card states at the top that the house is a non-contributing resource, while the report includes it in the resource list of contributing structures.

Staff believes the survey card is in error for the following reasons:

- *The Guerdon Greenway house at 1533 Broadway was built during the period of significance for the Broadway Historic District. From page 18 of the study committee report, under Significance of the District:*

The Broadway Historic District is significant under National Register Criterion A for its association with the settlement of Ann Arbor and the subsequent development of one of the city's first neighborhoods; and criterion C as representative of 19th-century architectural styles in varieties from Greek Revival to Victorian. The period of significance is 1830 to 1949 which is when the majority of the houses were constructed. Although there were some Cape Cod houses constructed during the 1940s as the University of Michigan expanded, no notable buildings were constructed in the district after 1949. The construction in the district in the 1950s included a large apartment building and several ranch houses, none of which are notable for their history or architecture.

- *The modern architectural style of the house is significant and unique within the district.*
- *The house has not been significantly altered or moved from another site.*

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The Commission noted that the building was a very nice building and example of the Prairie Ranch style.

A motion was made by White, seconded by Chair McCauley, that the Historic District Commission change the status of 1533 Broadway Street from non-contributing to contributing. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

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

Nays: 0

H APPROVAL OF MINUTES

H-1 [12-1049](#) Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes of the June 14, 2012

A motion was made that the Minutes be Approved by the Commission and forwarded to the City Council and should be returned by 9/17/2012. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

I REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Ramsburgh reported that some of the Commissioners had visited the newly renovated Delta Epsilon Fraternity House on Hill Street. She said they had done a fine job after the fire of following Albert Kahns architectural drawings in re-creating the old carvings on the outside and inside of the building, along with many others details. She said they plan on having an open house every year to allow visitors to view a great historical house.

J ASSIGNMENTS

Review Committee: Monday, September 10 at 5:00 pm for the September 13, 2012 Regular Meeting

Commissioners White and Stulberg volunteered for the September Review Committee.

K REPORTS FROM STAFF

[12-1050](#) July 2012 HDC Staff Activities

Received and Filed

L CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS

M COMMUNICATIONS

N ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 8:34 p.m.

THERE WILL BE A WORKING SESSION IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE REGULAR MEETING

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/VideOnDemand.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.