



# City of Ann Arbor

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

## Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

---

Thursday, May 10, 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 pm.*

### B ROLL CALL

*DiLeo 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

**A motion was made that the Agenda be Approved. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.**

### D HEARINGS

D-1 [12-0645](#) HDC12-051; 306-310 South Main Street - New Business Sign - MSHD

*Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.*

#### **BACKGROUND:**

*This three-story brick commercial building at 306-310 South Main was built in 1896 and was known as the Pratt Block. The building was designed by Detroit architects Malcomson and Higgenbothan, and the original occupant was the Crescent Works Corset Factory. By 1910, Schumacher Hardware had moved into a portion of the building, and by 1914 occupied the entire building after the corset factory closed. The building features large fixed windows on the first floor and sash windows on the second and third floors, ornate terra cotta details around the windows, and a recently-restored cornice.*

#### **LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the west side of South Main Street, south of West Liberty Street and north of West William Street.*

#### **APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to install a new non-illuminated sign that measures 16 feet long, 26 inches high, and 14 inches wide. The proposed sign would be mounted on the underside of the entablature, in the recessed entryway to the building. The sign is beige in color, with gray and green sections for each business and black lettering.*

*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 sign is 16 feet long, 26 inches high, and 14 inches deep. It contains the name of the building, the address, and the names of eight individual businesses located within the building. The sign frame will be covered with aluminite panels with factory-baked polyester painted faces.*
- 2. The sign will be attached by brackets mounted to an existing overhead steel beam that forms the underside of the entablature.*
- 3. The proposed business sign is appropriately scaled and its placement in the recessed front entrance is appropriate. The sign is not illuminated. On the provided mock-up, the sign appears to be compatible in size, materials, and color to the building. The sign also appears to be well balanced and does not detract from the character defining features of the building.*
- 4. The proposed sign is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the remainder of the building and surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 9 and 10, and the guidelines for storefronts.*

*REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:*

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

*McCauley reported that from their site visit he noted that the cornice has recently been restored and it is a very beautiful building. He added that the sign is a perfect way of adding signage to a building without detracting from the historical character of the building, and he recommended approval of the sign.*

*White also recommended approval of the application and agreed with the staff report and McCauley's comments.*

*PUBLIC HEARING:**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:*

*None*

**A motion was made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White, that the the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 306-310 South Main Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to add a new exterior sign as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 9 and 10 and the guidelines for storefronts.**

*COMMISSION DISCUSSION:*

*Ramsburgh agreed with McCauley that the proposed signage was a great way to add signage while not hindering a handsome building in any way.*

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

**APPROVED**

**D-2**     [12-0646](#)

HDC12-064; 226 South Main Street - Two New Business Signs - MSHD

*Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.*

*BACKGROUND:*

*This one story, brick Art Moderne commercial building features a corner entrance with a rounded canopy that has porcelain enamel panels and stainless steel trim, vertical fluted columns between concave panels above the entrance, and large single pane windows. The building was built in 1860 as a three-story Italianate commercial building and was first occupied by the Mack and Company department store. In 1899 a fire damaged the upper stories and it was reduced to a single story. In 1939 the Art Moderne façade was installed by Cunningham's Drugs, which opened in 1940. In 1975 the building became the Parthenon Restaurant, which remained until 2012.*

*LOCATION:*

*The site is located on the northwest corner of the South Main and West Liberty intersection.*

*APPLICATION:*

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to remove the existing internally illuminated sign and install a new externally illuminated sign on the roof of the canopy above the entrance. The sign measures nine feet and eight inches long, and four feet high. The sign is white in color and consists of individually-cut aluminum letters that will be individually mounted on the canopy.*

*The applicant also seeks HDC approval to install the existing "Café Habana" sign that was formerly located at 211 E. Washington Street. The sign will be installed on the southern elevation of the building to the west of the main entrance. The sign measures seven feet and eight-and-five-eighths inches tall, would project out four*

feet from the building, and will be mounted to the mortar joints between the bricks by steel brackets.

The "Café Habana" sign was previously approved by the Historic District Commission in October 2007 (HDC 07-116).

**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 "Lena" sign consists of individually-cut aluminum letters that will be attached to the canopy by aluminum stanchions, which will be bolted into the existing canopy. The sign measures nine feet and eight inches long, and four feet high. The font is a modern sans-serif style that is compatible with the Art Moderne style façade.*
2. *The proposed "Lena" business sign is appropriately scaled and its placement on the canopy above the front entrance is appropriate. The sign is externally illuminated. On the provided mock-up, the sign appears to be compatible in size, materials, and color to the building. The sign also appears to be well balanced and does not detract from the character defining features of the building.*
3. *The "Café Habana" sign was previously approved by the Historic District Commission in October 2007. It measures seven feet and five and five-eighths inches high, and would project out four feet from the building. The proposed location is on the southern elevation towards the front and would be mounted to projecting brick pilaster. The sign would be mounted by steel plate corner brackets bolted into the mortar joints. The sign is internally illuminated by open faced neon channel letters.*
4. *The "Café Habana" sign is appropriately scaled and its placement on the southern elevation is appropriate. The sign appears to be compatible in size, materials, and color to the building. The sign also appears to be well balanced and does not detract from the character defining features of the building. Although the sign is internally illuminated, staff recommends approval of the sign because it was previously approved by the Commission at a different location in the Main Street*

*Historic District.*

5. *Staff recommends approval of the proposed exterior signs. 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 meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 9 and 10, and the guidelines for storefronts.*

*REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:*

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

*McCauley asked about the possible removal of the art-like bands that currently go around the existing signage on the canopy.*

*DiLeo responded that there was pictorial evidence that the stainless steel banding was not original and had been added at a later date, and she believed that with the new signage the banding would be removed.*

*White said he felt the signs were appropriately scaled and he is in favor of the application.*

*AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:*

*Kevin Short, Huron Sign Company, 663 S. Mansfield Street, Ypsilanti, was present to respond to the Commission's questions. He said that he didn't have any information from the owner if the banding on the front of the canopy would be touched, noting that his sign company would not be touching it.*

*Ramsburgh asked if there was an intention of painting the building, since if they propose to paint any part of the masonry that is currently not painted, then they would need HDC approval before doing so.*

*Short responded the owner did plan on painting the entire building, but he didn't have anything to do with that project.*

*The Commission requested staff to inform the owner of the HDC approval requirement for painting masonry that is not already painted.*

*Short added that regarding the canopy there currently are uncertainties regarding the structure itself, so they would not be doing anything to the canopy until the owner clarified all issues.*

*Beeson asked about the light fixtures, and if he knew what they would look like.*

*Short said that the lights are not part of the sign and all he knew was that they would not see them, just the light coming out of them.*

*Ramsburgh asked about the possibility of the lights being hid in the awning.*

*Short responded that the idea was to conceal the lights totally.*

*Stulberg asked questions for clarification on the application, noting that it was important to pay close attention to the elements of the application, since signage was separate from the over-all renovation of the building itself. He asked if the base plate would be part of the signage.*

*Short said, yes.*

*James Curtis, owner of 226 S. Main Street building was present. He stated that there has not been any approval of the painting of the unpainted brick yet, and the silver banding on the fascia of the entrance way had been added and was not original. He said they were open to removing it or restoring it.*

**A motion was made by Secretary Bushkuhl, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 226 South Main Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to add two new exterior sign as proposed, and not other shown design features included in drawings. 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:*

*Ramsburgh said it would be helpful to the Commission and to the applicant if future applications would clearly separate items included in the drawings that were not part of the current HDC approval.*

*McCauley noted that in this case the motion clarified what the HDC was approving.*

*Stulberg raised the issue that the 'Café Habana' sign was internally illuminated, which currently does not meet the guidelines, but had been approved by the HDC in 2007, under different guidelines.*

*White said he would consider it to be grandfathered in, since it was the same Historic District.*

*Bushkuhl agreed, since it has already been in existence and previously approved. He added that if it were a new sign, he wouldn't approve it.*

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

**APPROVED**

**D-3**     [12-0647](#)

HDC12-061; 508 Second Street - New Fence and Second Floor Balcony - OWSHD

*Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.*

*BACKGROUND:*

*This two-story, front gable vernacular house features a front porch with square columns spanning the length of the eastern (front) elevation, a wide frieze board below the cornice, a bay window on the southern elevation, and pedimented window surrounds on the second story. Before 1897, the address of the house was 34 Second Street. Although the exact year of construction could not be determined, Conrad and Anna Noll are listed as residing at the house in the 1888-1889 Polk City Directory, where Conrad is listed as a boot and shoemaker.*

*LOCATION:*

*This site is located on the west side of Second Street, between West Jefferson Street and West Madison Street.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace a second-floor balcony and to install a new six-foot tall wood fence and gate.*

**APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:**

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

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

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

**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.*

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

*Not Recommended: Designing new additions such as multi-story greenhouse additions that obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features of the historic building.*

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 1. The proposed balcony would replace a previous balcony that was removed in fall 2010 because of rotting wood. Currently, the second-story door opens to a ten-foot drop. The proposed balcony is located on the rear elevation and measures nine feet three inches long and five feet wide. The balcony will have untreated lpe wood decking, posts, and rails, and cedar spindles, fascia, and rake.*
- 2. The proposed fence would extend from the southern elevation of the house along the southern property line to the rear of the lot. The fence is six feet high and also includes a gate facing the street that measures three feet six inches high. The fence will consist of cedar posts and cedar boards spaced one-half inch apart.*
- 3. Staff may approve "installation of new fences, provided they meet the requirements of the Historic District Design Guidelines" on the Commission's behalf. Those guidelines say it is appropriate to use wood (picket or alternating board) for fencing. Although this fence does not have alternating boards, the boards are spaced to allow for opacity and staff believes that it is an appropriate design.*
- 4. Staff recommends approval of the proposed balcony and fence. Both are compatible in exterior design, massing, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the site and the surrounding area, and meet The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, particularly standard 9.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE:**

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

*White said he agrees with the staff findings and approves of the application.*

*McCauley reported that the applicant was concerned with having an unfenced pond in their backyard since there were twins living next door. He explained there was a crumbling fence along the property line that this fence would be replacing.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Barbara Smith, part owner of the property, was present to respond to the Commission's questions. She said that the neighbors actually have twins that will be celebrating their first birthday this week-end, and she is extremely concerned about them getting into the pond, which is the main reason for the fence.*

**A motion was made by Ross, seconded by White, that the Commission approve the application at 508 Second Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a new second-story balcony and install a new six-foot tall wood fence, 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 standard 9 and the guidelines for additions.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

*Bushkuhl informed the owner that there might be other City permits required by the Building Department that is outside of their judgment.*

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

**APPROVED**

**D-4**     [12-0648](#)

HDC12-056; 106 South Main Street - Remove Existing Infill to Create New Storefront - MSHD

*Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This seven-story, Beaux-Arts commercial building features an elaborate entablature, stone escutcheons, quoins, and window trim, and fluted columns. The ornate cornice was recently restored. This contributing building in the Main Street Historic District is known as the Glazier Building. It was built in 1906 and was originally occupied by the First National Bank of Ann Arbor. The proposed project is in a three story addition that was added to the southern elevation in 1908 and was first occupied by the W. Goodyear & Co. dry goods store. The storefront was infilled with windows during the mid- to late-1970s.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the southwest corner of the Huron and Main Street intersection.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to remove the existing infill windows and install a*



*new storefront door and window openings.*

**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.*

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. *Historic photographs of the Glazier Building show a commercial storefront at this location. The storefront appears to have spanned nearly the entire width of the building and was covered by a large awning. By 1973 the storefront had been narrowed but an entrance was still present. Between 1973 and 1992 the entire storefront was infilled with large windows and stone blocks.*

2. *The proposed storefront will be the same width as the windows that are currently installed. It consists of a central door surrounded by a large window on each side and smaller windows above.*

3. *Installation of the storefront will involve removing the non-historically significant*

*infill windows and stone blocks. All of the surrounding historic materials will be left in place and the historical integrity of the building will not be harmed.*

4. *The proposed storefront is appropriately scaled and its placement in a previously infilled area is appropriate. On the provided photographic mock-up and schematic sketch, the storefront appears to be compatible in size, materials, and color to the building. The storefront also appears to be well balanced and does not detract from the character defining features of the building.*

5. *Staff recommends approval of the proposed commercial storefront. The proposed storefront 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 1, 2, and 9, and the guidelines for storefronts.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE:**

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

*McCauley said that he felt the proposed change was a positive one, since the existing infill isn't original to the building. He said it will add to the streetscape by adding another storefront to where there should have been one.*

*White stated that the proposal storefront is well scaled and he approves the application.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Todd Matthews, Momus, Inc., 106 S. Main Street, tenant of the suite was present to answer any questions from the Commission.*

*Ramsburgh asked the tenant if they had given any consideration to restoring the whole frontage opening that had been in-filled to its original historic dimensions.*

*Matthews responded that they had considered it, but felt that the proposed proportion looked fine and tied in with the rest of the building. He noted that doing the whole in-filled area would be fairly extensive work as explained to them by structural experts. They felt it would be more disruptive to the building than to leave the portion above the windows.*

*Ramsburgh said that if the whole opening would be restored it would bring back the emphasized perpendicular columns that are very clearly defined on the historic photographs. She felt that it would really enhance the building if the whole area was restored, adding that the proposed work is a step in the right direction.*

**A motion was made by White, seconded by Chair McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 106 South Main Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to install a new commercial storefront. 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 1, 2, and 9 and the guidelines for storefronts.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

*Ramsburgh reiterated that the project was a very positive step.*

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

**APPROVED**

D-5 [12-0649](#)

HDC12-059; 539 South First Street - Second Floor Rear Addition to House - OWSHD

*Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This two-story brick vernacular house features a front porch with a spindled frieze, a cut stone foundation, stone window sills, and circular window in the attic. The house was built in 1890 and until 1898 the address of the house was 95 First Street. From 1903 to 1914 the house was owned by Barbara Groesslein and was used as a boarding house. In 1916 the house was purchased by Louis Becker, a jeweler, who lived there with his wife Mary until 1940. The house remained in the family until 1958.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the east side of South First Street between West Jefferson Street and West Madison Street.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct a new rear addition that contains a stairway for basement access. The applicant also seeks approval to remove and replace existing windows and doors on an existing single-story rear addition, and construct a new second-story addition above.*

**APPLICABLE REGULATIONS**

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

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

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

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

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

**New Additions**

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

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

*new.*

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

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

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

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

#### *Windows*

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

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

*Not Recommended: Removing or radically changing windows which are important in defining the historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.*

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

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

#### *Roofs*

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

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

#### *District or Neighborhood Setting*

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

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. *The proposed basement stairway addition is located on the east elevation at the rear of the house and measures sixteen feet eleven inches long, eight feet seven inches wide, and two stories high. It would require removal of the existing exterior basement bulkhead door. It would retain the opening in the foundation for basement access. A first floor character-defining window that would fall within the addition would be retained, with all elements kept. The addition has a cantilevered standing seam metal roof to differentiate the addition from the original structure.*
2. *The applicant also seeks approval to construct a second-story addition above the existing rear addition to create a new bedroom suite. A portion of the existing addition appears in a 1908 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, but other portions were built at a later point, including one in the 1970s. The proposed second-story addition would require removal of the roof structure and a wood window in the rear elevation. It will be separated from the main body of the house by several feet to distinguish the addition as new construction. The roof line is lower than the existing roof on the main block of the house. Insulated glass panels from a 1970s experimental passive solar addition will be reused on the second floor of the basement stair addition. The second-floor addition will have an asphalt shingle roof, aluminum clad double-hung windows, and a standing seam metal roofed canopy along the rear elevation.*
3. *The applicant seeks approval to remove the existing windows and doors in the rear addition and install new aluminum clad double-hung windows. The age and condition of the existing windows is unknown. This involves creating several new openings on the south and east elevations of the existing addition. The proposed windows are double-hung sash windows. These windows are different proportions than the other windows on the original house and are compatible in design.*
4. *The roof on the existing three-season porch on the southern elevation will be extended to provide separation between the original house and the proposed second-story addition.*
5. *The design and scale of the basement stair addition and second-story addition are compatible with the house, do not detract from it, and uses distinct materials (such as cementitious lap siding) to further differentiate it from the historic structure.*
6. *Staff recommends approval of the proposed additions since they meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for New Additions, Windows, Roofs, and District of Neighborhood Setting.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE:**

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

*McCauley said he had concerns when he first saw the application that the new addition would be swallowing up the older addition that was constructed during a period of significance that was part of the contributing building, but during the site visit he saw that there was no break between the 70 and 80's addition and the contributing structure. He said he found that the only original part remaining was the brick foundation, so he didn't feel that they would be losing too much by enclosing it, and was in favor of approval of the application.*

*White agreed with the staff report and McCauley and approved the application.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*None*

A motion was made by White, seconded by Chair McCauley, that the Commission approve the application at 539 South First Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a new rear addition and add a second story to an existing rear addition as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for new additions, windows, roofs, and setting.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Ross asked McCauley if the siding was original.

McCauley said that some of it looked old but wasn't in its original position, as if they had taken it off and reused it when they had added the secondary addition 25-30 years ago.

Beeson asked about the proposed double-hung window on the east elevation in the brick part of the building. He said the proposed new drawings don't indicate what would happen to the window.

McCauley responded that it was going to be retained but covered within the new addition.

Bushkuhl commented that it was neat with the accent of the seam on the standing roof to help differentiate the old from the new and he thought it was neat that they would be able to reuse some of the glass panels in the new addition.

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

**APPROVED**

D-6      [12-0650](#)

HDC12-060; 520 Fifth Street - Demo Existing Addition and Replace with Two-Story Rear Addition - OWSHD

Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This two-story vernacular house features a full-width front porch, aluminum siding, aluminum windows, and a cut stone block foundation. A detached two-bay garage is located in the northwest corner of the property. The house was built in 1894 by Christian Lutz, a cabinetmaker, and a rear addition appears in the 1916 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. Prior to 1898 the address of the house was 37 Fifth Street.

LOCATION:

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

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to 1) demolish a rear patio and one-story non-original rear addition; 2) construct a new two-story rear addition and patio; 3) remove all existing aluminum siding and repair underlying wood siding; 4) remove all existing aluminum windows and replace with wood, vinyl-clad windows; 5) remove

two rear windows; 6) replace the existing asphalt roof with a new laminated asphalt roof.

#### APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

#### *New Additions*

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### *Windows*

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

*Designing and installing additional windows on rear or other non-character-defining elevations if required by the new use. New window openings may also be cut into*

*exposed party walls. Such design should be compatible with the overall design of the building, but not duplicate the fenestration pattern and detailing of a character-defining elevation.*

*Not Recommended: Removing or radically changing windows which are important in defining the historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.*

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

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

#### *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.*

#### *District or Neighborhood Setting*

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

#### *STAFF FINDINGS:*

- 1. The existing one-story rear addition contains a kitchen and enclosed porch. Although a rear addition appears in 1916, 1925, and 1931 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, the footprint appears to be slightly larger than what currently exists at the house. The exact age of the existing addition could not be determined. The addition is unremarkable and has aluminum windows and a concrete block foundation.*
- 2. The applicant seeks approval to demolish the existing rear addition and construct a new two-story rear addition with a finished basement that will add a total of 648 square feet of living space to the house. The existing addition measures twelve feet and two-and-three-quarters inches long, and fifteen and four-and-three-quarters inches wide. The new addition would be twenty-four feet and nine-and-one-half inches wide, and sixteen feet four inches wide. The new addition would project six feet eleven-and-a-half inches beyond the south elevation on the first floor. The second floor would be cantilevered out several feet from the north elevation. The roofline of the addition is below the main roofline of the house.*
- 3. The proposed addition will have horizontal composite siding, an asphalt shingle roof, double hung windows on the first and second story, and casement egress windows in the basement. The design of the addition is compatible with the house and uses distinct materials to differentiate it from the historic structure.*
- 4. The proposed addition will require that two windows on the west (rear) elevation be removed. These windows are aluminum and not original, but may be original openings. The windows are unremarkable and are located on a non-character defining elevation.*



5. *In order to build a new addition the rear concrete patio must be demolished. The patio is unremarkable and is not a character-defining feature of the site. The applicant seeks approval to construct a new patio with a wood pergola at the rear of the new addition.*

6. *The applicant seeks approval to remove all existing aluminum siding from the house. The underlying wood siding will be repaired where necessary and will be repainted. All existing aluminum windows will be removed as well and new vinyl clad one-over-one double hung windows will be installed. A new asphalt roof will be installed on the house and will match the roof of the addition.*

7. *Staff recommends approval of the proposed addition since it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for New Additions, Site, Windows, and District of Neighborhood Setting.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE:**

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

*McCauley said the house looked as though it had not fared well over the years and it will be good to see the present owners bring back some of the character of the house by removing the aluminum siding. He said he estimated that the addition had been built in the 50's or 60's and didn't have an issue with the removal of it. He asked about an original window on the south elevation bump-out, which he felt should be preserved, since it was the only one left. He said he was in favor of the application.*

*White recommended approval of the application and said the Review Committee was given an excellent presentation on site.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Joseph Kowalski, 520 Fifth Street, owner of the house was present and stated that he and his wife are excited about moving back to the downtown area and fixing the house up after it had been used as a rental property.*

*Marc Rueter, 515 Fifth Street, Architect for the project, was present to respond to the Commission's questions. He said the window in question could be an original but there was no way of telling from the inside since the shutters that covered it were painted shut. He said if it was the only remaining window with character, then why save it, from the standpoint of consistency throughout for the other windows. He said it wasn't a remarkable window from the standpoint of a craftsman style window, not having several divided panes and it wasn't possible to see if the glass was sheet cylinder or not and the owner added that it was cracked.*

**A motion was made by Vice Chair Stulberg, seconded by Chair McCauley, that the Commission approve the application at 520 Fifth Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to demolish a rear addition, construct a new addition, replace the existing aluminum windows with vinyl clad windows, remove all existing aluminum siding, and construct a new patio as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 9, and 10, and the guidelines for new additions, windows, site, and setting.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

*Stulberg said that he really liked the plan to return the house to its pre-aluminum state, and he saw the burden of keeping one token window, especially since it was unremarkable. He said he was in favor of the application.*

*Beeson asked how the window was different from the rest of the windows.*

*McCauley said all the rest of the windows are very flimsy looking aluminum type material and the one historical window was the only wood double-hung window.*

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

**APPROVED****D-7**     [12-0651](#)

HDC12-065; 210 South Ashley Street - Modify Roofing Material on Previously Approved Structure - MSHD

*Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.*

**BACKGROUND:**

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

*The applicant received HDC permission to construct a 422 square foot accessory building and two freestanding pavilions in the southwest corner of the parking lot off South Ashley Street in January 2012.*

**LOCATION:**

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

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to change a previously approved standing seam metal roof to an asphalt shingle roof on an accessory building and two freestanding pavilions.*

**APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**STAFF FINDINGS**

- 1. The accessory building is 422 square feet and a single story (14'6" at the ridge) with wood siding. The building will be painted dark green. The main block of the building has a hipped roofed and the rear portion is flat (or nearly so).*
- 2. The pavilions are 14' square and 15' square, with wood 6" by 6" posts. They are intended for shade and shelter, and are freestanding.*
- 3. The applicant stated that flexibility to proceed with construction is desired because installing the previously approved standing seam metal roof may be cost prohibitive. Installing an asphalt shingle roof would reduce the cost.*
- 4. Staff recommends approval of the application since the size, scale, design, materials, and color of the proposed roofs are compatible with the historic character of the site.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE:**

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

*McCauley said staff asked if these proposed changes could be delegated to staff or determined by the Commission, and he felt the whole Commission should have an opportunity to weigh in on the revisions the Commission had already approved, since the changes are significant.*

*White said he approves the application.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Mark Hodesh, 210 S Ashley, owner of Downtown Home and Garden was present to respond to the Commission's enquires. He said he is excited about building Bill's Beer Garden. He explained that he hasn't been able to get the right fit with the two free-standing pavilions on either side of the beer house which will have a raised metal roof and be a focal point. He said he would like to come back to the Commission next month with more flattened roofs on the pavilions with a more shed effect with them leaning but not against the barn, but reaching out like the greenhouse does into the parking lot.*

*Stulberg asked for clarification on the applicants request.*

*Hodesh said they have moved beyond the beer house roofing and only need approval for the pavilions at tonight's meeting.*

A motion was made by Secretary Bushkuhl, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 210 South Ashley Street in the Main Street Historic District to revise a previously approved standing seam metal roof and install an asphalt shingle roof, as proposed. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the contributing structures on the site and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standard 9 and the guidelines for Building Site.

Friendly amendment made by Stulberg to specify the motion was for the two (2) Pavillion roofs, Seconded by White.

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

#### APPROVED

D-8 [12-0652](#)

HDC12-062; 520 East Ann Street - Install Three Basement Egress Windows and Add Window Wells - ASHD

*Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.*

#### BACKGROUND:

*This two-story front-gable vernacular Queen Anne house features a side porch with Ionic columns and beveled glass in the upper portion of the front windows. The house first appears in the 1888-1889 Polk City Directory and lists George H Pond, the city editor of the Ann Arbor Courier, and Miss Abbey A Pond, a teacher, as the residents. George Pond is listed as residing there until 1910. From 1922 to 1969 the house was occupied by Ernest Cody and his family.*

#### LOCATION:

*This site is located on the south side of East Ann Street, between North State Street and North Division Street.*

#### APPLICATION:

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to remove three existing wood basement windows on the west elevation of the house and install three Andersen wood double-hung egress window with applied muntins to simulate the existing original basement windows found on other windows. The applicant also seeks approval to create three new window wells to accommodate the new windows.*

#### APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

- (1) A property will be used as it was historically or 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 will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.*

*The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*

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

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

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

#### *Health and Safety*

*Recommended: Identifying the historic building's character-defining spaces, features, and finishes so that code-required work will not result in their damage or loss.*

*Complying with health and safety codes, including seismic code requirements, in such a manner that character-defining spaces, features, and finishes are preserved.*

*Not Recommended: Altering, damaging, or destroying character-defining spaces, features, and finishes while making modifications to a building or site to comply with safety codes.*

*Making changes to historic buildings without first exploring equivalent health and safety systems, methods, or devices that may be less damaging to historic spaces, features, and finishes.*

#### **STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. *The applicant states that the basement will be converted to living space and three larger windows are necessary to provide egress. The three windows proposed to be replaced are wood two-lite windows with wood frames and sills. Based on photographs provided to staff, some degradation appears to be present in the existing windows. All three windows are located on the west elevation of the house. Two are located near the front of the house and one at the midpoint of the west elevation. All three locations are visible from the street.*

2. *The house has a foundation made of shaped stone blocks that is a distinct and character-defining feature. Installation of the proposed windows would involve removing the stone blocks below the windows to accommodate the larger egress windows. The egress windows would be located on the western elevation, which is a character-defining elevation. Installing the new deeper egress windows would have little impact on the overall historic character of this structure, since the majority of the alterations are located below grade. Likewise, although the proposed changes would result in the loss of a small amount of the historic stone foundation materials, these materials cannot currently be seen (as they are underground) and should not be considered character-defining materials.*

3. The proposed double-hung egress windows are wood, would fit within the width of the existing rough opening (30"), and the depth of the rough openings would be increased from 24" to 60". The windows have a vertical muntin down the center to replicate the existing two-lite windows. The applicant also proposes installing a new concrete sill.

4. The window wells would be pressure-treated wood, be 54" wide near the house and taper to roughly 40" wide, and would extend 38" from the side of the house. The proposed well depth is approximately 36" and would have pea gravel or crushed stone at the bottom. Since the proposed window wells are located adjacent to a driveway, protective posts or fencing should be incorporated into the design and submitted for review and approval.

5. Since the basement is proposed to be used as living space, either egress windows must be installed or the basement cannot be used for living space. Egress windows are required in any finished space in the basement, like an office or bedroom, though not a laundry or storage room.

6. Because all three windows are located towards the front of the house and are visible from the street, a more appropriate location for the egress windows is recommended, such as in the rear of the house. Staff also recommends the proposed egress windows, regardless of location, be the minimum depth necessary to satisfy building and housing code requirements and be reduced if possible.

#### REVIEW COMMITTEE:

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

White said he had an issue with the mid bay with the overhang, noting that it would need to come out further so one wouldn't bump your head on it, which would place it in the driveway. He said he believed the Building Department would look at the clearance issues for the window corrections.

McCauley commented that the lattice and trim-work was not original and had been added more recently.

Stulberg recused himself from the item discussion and voting due to previous business relations with the applicant. He Left the room.

#### AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Scott Klaasen, 520 E Ann Street, Contractor for the project was present to explain the project and respond to the Commission's concerns.

Zaki Alawi, 520 E Ann Street, owner was also present. He said the new windows will be just slightly more below grade than the existing ones.

Ramsburgh said the proposed windows are double-hung with a vertical mutin. She asked if the opening has to be larger with a double-hung than with a casement window.

Klaasen said a casement window could be smaller, but the width of the opening will stay the same, adding that from the front of the house you won't see any difference.

Alawi said the proposed work is the same that they did last year to their neighboring

house.

Ramsburgh asked if the concrete covering the old stone foundation on their neighboring house was new.

Alawi responded yes, that they had done that to help with water infiltration along the basement. He added that he had not asked for HDC approval for that work and asked if it was subject to the HDC review process, noting that it was easily removable and it wasn't attached to the building.

Staff asked how it would keep water out if it wasn't attached to the house.

Alawi said it was no difference than having pavers in that area.

Ross asked how deep it was.

Alawi said four (4) inches.

White asked if it was for waterproofing.

Alawi said, yes.

DiLeo said she could arrange a site inspection to review the work that was done with the concrete on the neighboring property in light of HDC rules and regulations and follow-up as necessary.

Alawi said they are open to maintaining all HDC requirements on the issue.

Ramsburgh said if the concrete helps shed the water away from the stone foundation then she was in favor of it, but if there was a possibility that the concrete could damage the historical stone foundation than she would have concerns.

DiLeo said she could speak with the grading inspector who handles water issues.

Alawi said he was open to replacing the double-hung window with a casement if the Commission preferred.

**A motion was made by Ramsburgh, seconded by Chair McCauley, that the Commission approve the application at 520 East Ann Street, a contributing property in the Ann Street Historic District, to replace three wood basement windows with new larger double hung wood egress window in larger openings, and create three window wells 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 1, 2, and 9, and the guidelines for windows and health and safety.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

McCauley said he was in favor of the double-hung window even if it has to go slightly deeper.

Ross agreed, adding that a casement window seems far less historical than a double-hung.

Beeson said it might be a matter of visible tricks, between the window styles and he

*believed as long as the center vertical mullion on the window remained it would keep the historical look.*

*Ramsburgh asked if the mutin was fixed or removable.*

*Beeson said the plans showed a true substantial wood mutin.*

*Bushkuhl commented that the egress window adapts the building to modern use which is positive and if it were feasible to install the windows in the rear of the building they would be out of view, but since there is a crawlspace there is isn't possible.*

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

#### **APPROVED**

**D-9**     [12-0653](#)

HDC12-043; 220 South Main Street - Replace Eight Windows - MSHD

*Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.*

#### **BACKGROUND:**

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

#### **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) replace eight large, single-pane windows with new single-hung sash windows with anodized aluminum frames and sills; 2) cap existing drip caps and horizontal and vertical wood beams with bronze anodized aluminum framing; 3) cover the drip caps, existing casings, and window sills of eight small leaded glass windows with anodized bronze aluminum.*

#### **APPLICABLE REGULATIONS**

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

*(6) Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*

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

*Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving windows – and their functional and decorative features – that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. Such features can include frames, sash, muntins, glazing, sills, heads, hoodmolds, paneled or decorated jambs and molding, and interior and exterior*



*shutters and blinds.*

*Repairing window frames and sash by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing. Such repair may also include replacement in kind of those parts that are either extensively deteriorated or are missing when there are surviving prototypes such as architraves, hoodmolds, sash, sills, and interior or exterior shutters and blinds.*

*Replacing in kind an entire window that is too deteriorated to repair – if the overall form and detailing are still evident – using the physical evidence to guide the new work. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.*

*Not Recommended: Retrofitting or replacing windows rather than maintaining the sash, frame, and glazing.*

*Replacing an entire window when repair of materials and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.*

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

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

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

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

*From the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation & Illustrated Guidelines on Sustainability for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*

#### *Windows*

*Recommended: Maintaining windows on a regular basis to ensure that they function properly and are completely operable.*

*Retaining and repairing historic windows when deteriorated.*

*Weather stripping and caulking historic windows, when appropriate, to make them weather tight.*

*Installing interior or exterior storm windows or panels that are compatible with existing historic windows.*

*Not recommended: Neglecting to maintain historic windows and allowing them to deteriorate beyond repair with the result that they must be replaced.*

*Removing repairable historic windows and replacing them with new windows for perceived improvement in energy performance.*

*Replacing repairable historic windows with new insulated windows.*

**STAFF FINDINGS**

1. *The windows that are proposed to be replaced are located on the front elevation and are character-defining features of the building. There are four large single pane windows each on the second and third floors. These windows are apparently constructed to open by pivoting on a central pin. The windows that are proposed to replace these large center-pivot windows are single hung units, which have meeting rails (see Item 10, Exhibit D) that horizontally divide the large panes of glass and would significantly alter the units' exterior appearance. A smaller hopper window with leaded glass panels is located above each large window.*
2. *Eight large single pane wood windows are proposed to be replaced with single hung bronze anodized aluminum windows. A letter from Diamond Glass & Feiner's, Inc. was submitted with the application stating that the windows are not repairable. This claim is contested in a report from Wood Window Repair, which states that the windows are in excellent condition, although the trim was damaged due to the recent application of an inappropriate coating. The wood sills are proposed to be replaced with aluminum as well. The applicant stated that the existing window sills and frames have deteriorated significantly, do not provide adequate ventilation to the occupants, and are not energy efficient, resulting in high utility bills for the tenants. The applicant also stated that repairs and repainting that are needed to maintain the windows require scaffolding to be erected on Main Street, which disrupts businesses within the building and those nearby.*
3. *The wood drip caps, mullions, and transoms between the large windows are proposed to be capped in bronze anodized aluminum. The drip caps, casings, and window sills of the eight smaller windows are also proposed to be capped in bronze anodized aluminum.*
4. *Cost estimates for the repair of the existing windows have been received. Similar estimates for the replacement option have not been submitted.*
5. *Staff will make a recommendation at the HDC meeting regarding these windows, after a comprehensive review of their condition is completed at the Review Committee visit.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE:**

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

*McCauley said the original windows seem sound and were not falling apart, but they were painted and caulked shut, which would require a lot of work to make them operational; however, they are not beyond repair. He said he had the most concern with the proposed aluminum wrapping of the exterior wood trim, which would not meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, and based on that the application should be denied. He said the applicant could return in the future with another application for more appropriate sash replacement, and he recommended denial of the application as presented.*

*White agreed and said he was in favor of repairing the windows.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Jim Curtis, owner of the building said he and his brother acquired the building about 10 months ago, noting that it requires considerable work. He explained the proposed*

work stating that the windows are non-tempered single pane and are currently inoperable, which makes it costly and difficult for their tenants. He said they are looking to make the building energy efficient as well as pleasurable to look at while decreasing liability issues and it is becoming cost prohibitive. He said they need to be able to open the windows for airflow into the building.

Ross asked if the restoration firms weren't able to provide a complete proposal how would they know the cost of repairs.

Curtis said of all the companies they contacted, none were able to give them a complete estimate to do the work.

Ramsburgh asked if the building is air-conditioned.

Curtis said yes, that they have upgrades their HVAC system.

Stulberg asked for page 3 of the work estimate, since it was missing in the Commission's packets.

Beeson asked about Exhibit D, the proposed aluminum clad window, noting that it showed a meeting rail in the middle. He asked if it was dividing the light of the larger windows.

Curtis said yes.

Beeson said according to Exhibit D, the meeting rail was considerable in size and would change the outside appearance of the window from the present appearance.

**Motion made by White, Seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 220 S Main Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to allow the replacement of eight windows and capping of other window components with bronze anodized aluminum as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding resources and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standard 6, and the Guidelines for Windows.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

Stulberg said he didn't feel that the Commission had enough data to make a decision since estimates submitted were incomplete, so they weren't able to compare costs for repair versus replacement. He said if the option would be replacement he would like to see different types of replacement options available that are more compatible with the existing windows. He said it would be the applicant's responsibility to find a contractor who could handle a commercial job such as the one proposed.

Ross agreed with Stulberg and said the information provided seems incomplete, especially before making such a drastic change to the building.

White suggested postponing the item until the next HDC meeting, in order to give the applicant more time to find sources to make his application more complete.

Beeson said he had issues with the appearance, noting that an aluminum wrapping profile is very different in color, shade and shadow, as is the issue with a meeting rail. He said he was concerned with the two very different expert opinions provided to the Commission and said it was important that they made the right decision. He said

they needed to look at the historical aspect of how the windows were originally operated. He explained that they probably did entail a transom and they probably didn't tilt a full 45°, rather just enough to have airflow pass through the top transom. He said these Chicago style windows are very popular in Chicago and are installed in high-rise buildings. He said discussions regarding liability and safety related to the windows 'falling' down depends on how well they are maintained.

Beeson explained that the efficiency factor depends more so on the air infiltration around the window. He said historically windows used to be tilted to allow for airflow to cool down the interior, while today mechanical systems are used. He did not feel that the application was meeting the need to maintain the historical appearance of the building while improving its efficiency.

Ramsburgh said the historical 112 year old windows on this building are such a character defining feature and the Commission has clear guidelines they need to follow in their review process. She said she didn't feel they had enough information to make a decision.

McCauley said while he was sympathetic to the applicant's needs, the way the application is written, it would have to be denied by the Commission.

Bushkuhl asked the applicant if they have been working with an architect to complete the work.

Curtis said they did the measuring themselves and then asked the contractors to come up with bids based on their measurements.

McCauley asked if they would be open to the possibility of casement windows.

Curtis said, yes.

McCauley asked if there would be any other way to get ventilation into the building through the sides.

Beeson said historically they relied heavily on cross ventilation in buildings and that is where the transoms came into effect.

McCauley said he didn't want the applicant to leave the meeting with any false hopes and explained what would and would not be acceptable. He said for him it was important that the windows be functional.

Stulberg asked if it was necessary to repair all the windows to make them operable in order to gain the desired ventilation.

General discussion pursued regarding procedural issues.

**A motion was made by White, seconded by Ramsburgh, that the Resolution/Public Hearing be Postponed to the Historic District Commission for up to 90 days, to allow the petitioner time to provide more information about restoring the windows to their original condition and alternatives to double-hung windows. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.**

D-10 [12-0654](#)

HDC12-047; 834 West Washington Street - Replace Thirteen Windows - OWSHD

Alexis DiLeo gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

*This front gable two-story vernacular house features cornice returns and a porch spanning the south (front elevation) with Doric columns. The house was built in 1911 and the first residents were Otto and Amanda Toney. Otto Toney is listed in the 1911 Polk City Directory as a carpenter.*

**LOCATION:**

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

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace thirteen existing wood windows with Renewal by Andersen energy efficient windows and replace the exterior trim around each window.*

**APPLICABLE REGULATIONS**

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

*(6) Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*

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

*Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving windows – and their functional and decorative features – that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. Such features can include frames, sash, muntins, glazing, sills, heads, hoodmolds, paneled or decorated jambs and molding, and interior and exterior shutters and blinds.*

*Repairing window frames and sash by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing. Such repair may also include replacement in kind of those parts that are either extensively deteriorated or are missing when there are surviving prototypes such as architraves, hoodmolds, sash, sills, and interior or exterior shutters and blinds.*

*Replacing in kind an entire window that is too deteriorated to repair – if the overall form and detailing are still evident – using the physical evidence to guide the new work. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.*

*Not Recommended: Retrofitting or replacing windows rather than maintaining the sash, frame, and glazing.*

*Replacing an entire window when repair of materials and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.*

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

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

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

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

*From the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation & Illustrated Guidelines on Sustainability for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*

#### *Windows*

*Recommended: Maintaining windows on a regular basis to ensure that they function properly and are completely operable.*

*Retaining and repairing historic windows when deteriorated.*

*Weather stripping and caulking historic windows, when appropriate, to make them weather tight.*

*Installing interior or exterior storm windows or panels that are compatible with existing historic windows.*

*Not recommended: Neglecting to maintain historic windows and allowing them to deteriorate beyond repair with the result that they must be replaced.*

*Removing repairable historic windows and replacing them with new windows for perceived improvement in energy performance.*

*Replacing repairable historic windows with new insulated windows.*

#### *STAFF FINDINGS*

*1. The windows that are proposed to be replaced are located on all four elevations and are character-defining features of the house. Based on submitted photographs, there appears to be a small amount of rot present on at least one window. The applicant states that other windows exhibit some amount of rot, loss of glazing compound, and water infiltration. Staff has not yet visited the site to review the windows and no assessment of each individual window has been submitted at the time this report was prepared.*

*2. The cost estimate for the replacement of the thirteen windows has not been submitted. Similarly, estimates for preservation-based solutions (such as the repair of some or all of the windows, the installation of storm windows, etc) have not been submitted.*

*3. Staff will make a recommendation at the HDC meeting regarding these windows, after a comprehensive review of their condition is completed at the Review Committee visit.*

#### *REVIEW COMMITTEE:*

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

McCauley reported that his observation was that there was some deferred maintenance on the windows from previous homeowners. He added that the new homeowners have done a lot of work to try to bring life back into the house and complimented their efforts.

McCauley said the windows seemed mostly to suffer from broken ropes or pulleys, which would be repairable. He said there was some broken glass and missing locks, and the interior stops were loose which allowed you to move the windows. He said the bottom part of the top sashes had a lot of cracking on some of the windows and there was peeling paint on the windows.

He reported that according to the standards of rehabilitation, he felt there were two (2) windows that definitely needed to be replaced; window 103, and 207. He said they were beyond repair and the sashes were falling apart. He said the sash on window 105 was eligible for replacement because it is not an original window and most likely outside of the period of significance. He said window 201 in the stairwell should have tempered glass for the safety of the occupants of the house, but the sash was in good enough condition to be maintained.

White stated that he agrees with staff finding and the Chairperson.

#### AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Ariel Adamson, 834 W Washington Street, owner was present to respond to the Commission's questions. She asked if replacing the windows also included replacing the screens and the storm windows. She said they wanted to replace the aluminum trim around the windows and restore them back to wood. She said their key purpose is to keep the warmth and coolness inside as well as safety concerns and functionality issues of the windows. She added that noise is also an issue.

Mike Berone, from Renewal by Anderson Window Company, was present. He said the house has vinyl siding with aluminum trim/wrap. He said when they replace the windows they want to take all of the storm windows off which would expose the wood, bringing it back to its historical character. He said currently you can hear the neighbors dog barking from inside of their closed up house. He explained that Anderson Windows has been around since 1903 and is the oldest window company in America and they work in many historical districts.

Beeson asked what other measures the owners are taking to making the house energy efficient.

Adamson said they are looking to start with the outside and would like to replace the doors, roof and siding. She noted that they have redone all interior surfaces of the house. She said they purchased the house in 2009 and it had been a rental property for 35 years and much neglected.

Stulberg asked if they have had an energy audit done on the house.

Adamson said, no.

Ross asked for more information on the proposed window replacement.

Brandon Attire, Salesperson for Anderson Windows, explained their products. He said the interior would be wood pine with a square check rail, with the outside a special blend of wood/vinyl composite.

*Berone and Adamson said it would be more esthetical to have matching windows in the baby room.*

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

*Adamson said they had had a repair assessment done on the house and it would be a very lengthy process with each window taking 6-8 weeks. She said she also had concerns with the lead paint.*

*Stulberg reiterated the Standards from the Secretary of the Interior, noting that he would not be in favor of replacing the 13 windows. He said there are other ways to repair the windows than what was quoted by the contractor.*

*McCauley said the storm windows could be approved at the staff level, and replacing the glass with tempered glass is something they could do at any time.*

*Several Commissioners felt that several of the windows could be repaired on site and offered advice and recommendations to the applicant.*

**A motion was made by McCauley, seconded by Bushkuhl that the Application be Partially Approved and Partially Denied as following;**

**to APPROVE the portion of the application at 834 West Washington Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District and issue a certificate of appropriateness, to allow the replacement of three windows [window # 103, in living room; window # 105 – non-original window; window # 207, in baby bedroom]. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding resources and meets The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standard 6, and the Guidelines for Windows.**

and

**to DENY the portion of the application at 834 West Washington Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to allow the replacement of ten windows and exterior trim. The proposed work is not compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding resources and does not meet The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standard 6, and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, and the Guidelines for Windows.**

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

**E UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

*Beeson said he would like to review the solar guidelines with the Commission at their July HDC meeting.*

**F NEW BUSINESS**

**F-1 [12-0625](#)** July 2012 - June 2013 Historic District Commission Meeting Schedule

**Received and Filed**



**G**     **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION - PUBLIC COMMENTARY - (3 Minutes per Speaker)**

**H**     **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

H-1     [12-0643](#)           Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes of April 12, 2012

**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**

**Review Committee; Monday, June 11, at 5:00 pm for the June 14, 2012 Regular Session**

*Ross and Ramsburgh volunteered for the June Review Committee.*

**K**     **REPORTS FROM STAFF**

[12-0644](#)           April 2012 Staff Activities

**Received and Filed**

**L**     **CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS**

*Beeson said he had received an offer from a local Ann Arbor craftsman to make HDC Award Frames. He said he uses urban salvaged wood from Ann Arbor, which is a renewable effort.*

*Ross asked about the list of Contractors that is provided to applicants by staff and if it might be confusing or unclear.*

*McCauley said it is not up to the Commission or the City to recommend any Contractor over others; rather the applicants responsibility to find professionals .*

*DiLeo said the list isn't all inclusive, which is made clear to the applicants by staff.*

*Beeson asked how lighting on signs and buildings interacts with the historic context and how it plays in with the historical aspect.*

*The Commission said they had approving the sign and not the lighting on the item that came before them this evening.*

**M**     **COMMUNICATIONS**

*Beeson welcomed everyone to the Mission Zero Fest noting that Norm Tylor would be speaking on historical preservation and there would be home tours, which*

*included his house.*

**N      ADJOURNMENT**

**Adjourned unanimously!**

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

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

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

The complete record of this meeting is available in video format at [www.a2gov.org/ctn](http://www.a2gov.org/ctn), on "The Meeting Place" page (<http://www.a2gov.org/livemeetings>), or is available for a nominal fee by contacting CTN at (734) 794-6150.