



City of Ann Arbor

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

Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

Thursday, March 8, 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

Thacher called the roll.

McCauley introduced Jennifer Ross and welcomed her as a new Commissioner. He asked her to share a bit about herself.

Ross said she is a recent Ann Arbor resident, coming most recently from Tallahassee, Florida. She explained that she has spent most of her professional life in Austin, Texas, where she worked as an architectural historian for fourteen (14) years. She said as someone who loves architecture and history she wanted to have the opportunity to participate in historic preservation, and serve the public by providing any knowledge and experience she has.

Present: 4 - Patrick McCauley, Thomas Stulberg, Benjamin L. Bushkuhl, and Jennifer Ross

Absent: 3 - Robert White, Ellen Ramsburgh, and John Beeson

C APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Agenda was unanimously approved, with the amendment of adding 'Presentation about 415 W. Washington Street' under New Business, F-1.

D HEARINGS

D-1 [12-0322](#) HDC12-020; 126 South Main Street - New Business Sign - MSHD

*PUBLIC HEARINGS:
Thacher gave the staff report.*

*BACKGROUND:
This three story, brick Italianate commercial building features three bays in the front elevation, arched window hoods on the second and third stories, a large cornice with wide eaves featuring modillions and dentils, an entablature above the front entrance, and stone quoins on the corners. It was first occupied in 1866 by Philip Bach Dry Goods. In 1981, the building was fully renovated by the law firm Hooper, Hathaway, Price, Beuce & Wallace.*

*LOCATION:
The site is located on the northwest corner of the South Main and West Washington*

intersection.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to add a new non-illuminated exterior sign to the entablature above the front entrance. The signage measures eleven-and-seven-eighths inches high, and fourteen feet eight inches long. The sign is metallic bronze in color and consists of individually-cut acrylic letters with a traditional serif font style that will be individually mounted on the entablature.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

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

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

Storefronts

Not Recommended: Introducing a new design that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color; using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy remaining character-defining features of the historic building; using new illuminated signs.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *The proposed business sign is appropriately scaled and its placement on the entablature above the 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.*

2. *Staff recommends approval of the proposed non-illuminated exterior sign. The proposed sign is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 9 and 10, and the guidelines for storefronts.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE:

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

McCauley said he agrees with the staff report, and feels that the proposed sign is very appropriate and he doesn't have any objection to it.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Heather Conway, representing the owner and applicant was present to answer questions from the Commission. She stated that the proposed color was to be a

charcoal that would match the inside of the existing window framing. She thanked Jill Thacher for all her hard work and assistance with the project

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Bushkuhl stated that it is encouraging to the Commission to see nice projects, such as the one proposed, on Main Street.

A motion was made by Vice Chair Stulberg, seconded by Chair McCauley, that the Commission APPROVE the application at 126 South Main Street, in the Main Street Historic District, a contributing property, 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. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

D-2 [12-0323](#)

HDC12-023; 342 Mulholland - New Dormer - OWSHD

PUBLIC HEARING:

Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This vernacular one-and-a-half story, front gable house is one of several nearly identical working class homes built on Mulholland during the period 1915 -1920. At the time the street was known as Sixth Street (its name changed in 1928). The house features a front porch with Doric columns and a low hip roof spanning the length of the eastern (front) façade, a textured concrete block foundation, and aluminum siding. The house first appears in the 1916 Polk City Directory and lists Mrs. Marie Schmid, widow of Charles Schmid, as the owner. Mrs. Schmid lived there until 1931, after which the house changed hands multiple times. In 1938, city directories list Edward and Florence Shaw as the occupants, who resided there until at least 1960. Edward worked as a teller at the Ann Arbor Bank.

LOCATION:

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

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to add a rectangular shed dormer with clerestory windows on the north (side) elevation to increase the interior headroom in a bathroom. The dormer measures 13 feet 3 inches long and is approximately four feet deep, and would be clad and trimmed in cementitious composite materials. The proposed dormer has three windows that measure 24 inches wide and 18 inches high. The applicant also seeks approval to remove a skylight on the north (side) elevation that is located where the proposed dormer would be located, and a small rectangular window on the north elevation that is below the proposed dormer. Both skylight and window are non-original and are believed to have been added in the 1950s or 1960s.

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 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: 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.

Placing a new addition on a non-character-defining elevation and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

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

Not Recommended; Designing a new addition so that its size and scale in relation to the historic building are out of proportion, thus diminishing the historic character.

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.

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: 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.

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.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The 13' 3" wide dormer is proposed on the north (side) elevation approximately 15' feet behind the east (front) façade. The dormer roof is located several feet below the ridge height of the current roof, and its size and proportions are consistent and compatible with the rest of the house. It appears that the new dormer will not be highly conspicuous from Mulholland Street due to its location and size. The proximity of neighboring houses and the house's location on a hill also serve to make the proposed dormer less visible from the street. The proposed dormer is located on an elevation that has seen several alterations over the years, including a bay window on the first floor, a small window on the second floor above the bay window, and an addition on the rear elevation that is flush with the original side walls of the house. Because of these previous changes, this elevation's character defining features have

been somewhat compromised.

2. The proposed dormer and windows are compatible in design with the existing house and its location on a side elevation with low visibility from the street is appropriate. The proposed dormer does not detract from the overall building proportions and design.

3. The new construction is differentiated from the original construction, which has aluminum clapboard siding, by the use of Hardie Plank, a cement-fiber material, and the installation of three horizontal rectangular windows. The three windows are small and do not duplicate the configuration of the house's character-defining windows. Also, the proposed roof dormer does not break the eave below it, in contrast to the wall dormer on the south side elevation that is continuous with the side elevation. This differentiates the new addition from the original dormer.

4. Removal of the non-original skylight and window is appropriate.

5. Staff recommends approval of the proposed dormer and removal of the non-original skylight and window. The proposed work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 9 and 10, and the guidelines for new additions and windows.

REVIEW COMMITTEE:

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

Stulberg reported that in reviewing the houses on the same block they saw that similar dormers are very typical and that the addition is relatively small in comparison to the house and doesn't stand out or obscure any character defining features of the house. He added that these requests are fairly common for these older homes where the added headroom is needed in the bathrooms. He felt it would be an advantage to get rid of the skylight bubble.

McCauley agreed and felt it would make the space more useable for the owners.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Eric Boyd, 342 Mulholland Street, owner and applicant was present to answer the Commission's question. He said the reason for their request is that the current height in the bathroom is very low and in order to take a shower, as an adult, you have to stand in the skylight bubble. He said they have a 10/12 roof because their house was built 2 feet wider than the other houses on the block, which resulted in 6 inches less of headroom. He said they enjoy the character of their street and tried to come up with a solution that was as minimal as possible that meets the guidelines that the City requested of them.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

McCauley noted that the addition is minimal in order to meet the applicant's needs while having a minimal impact on the historical building.

A motion was made by Secretary Bushkuhl, seconded by Chair McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 342 Mulholland Street, in the Old West Side Historic District, a contributing property, to add a shed dormer on the north (side) elevation and remove a

non-original window and skylight as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 9 and 10 and the guidelines for new additions and windows. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

D-3 [12-0324](#)

HDC12-022; 607-609 East William - Replace Eleven Double-Hung Windows - SSHD

PUBLIC HEARING:

Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This two story, brick vernacular commercial building features large, double-hung, one-over-one wood windows, set in openings with arched tops and decorative wood trim. The building also features brick corbelling below the cornice and brick pilasters. It was built in 1906. A meat market owned by Stafford B. Nickels was located at 607 E. William, and Helber Brothers grocery store was located at 609 E. William.

LOCATION:

The building is located on the north side of East William Street between Maynard Street and South State Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace eleven double hung wood windows with new Andersen 400 series wood windows.

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.

Making windows weathertight by recaulking and replacing or installing weatherstripping. These actions also improve thermal efficiency.

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.

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.

STAFF FINDINGS:

3. *The owner of this building purchased it last year. Staff visited the site last year and did a cursory review of the windows. It appears that little or no maintenance has been done on the upstairs windows for decades. At the site visit, staff agreed with the owner that the windows were quite deteriorated, though she was uncertain whether they were deteriorated beyond repair, or could be repaired. Per a conversation with the owner on March 2, two or more carpenters listed on the Window Resources list assessed the windows. No information from their assessments has been submitted to date, but the owner agreed to submit this to staff or bring it to the meeting.*

4. *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:

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

McCauley reported that the problem with the windows was the same on all the windows in that the sills were bad and the bottom rail of the bottom sash was separating on almost every window. He added that the windows are very large and had been poorly maintained. He was in favor of approving the application with some hesitation on window eleven (11). He said the windows couldn't be seen except for when standing at the side of the building.

Stulberg agreed with McCauley and the staff report, adding that if the recommendation was to rehabilitate windows nine (9) and eleven (11), it would require quite a lot of work for the new owner who has only owned the property for about a year.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Mike Boudier, Home Depot, representing the owner, was present to answer questions from the Commission. He brought a sample window of what they proposed to install.

McCauley stated that the Commission was under the understanding that only the

outside sill was clad in liquid vinyl and the outside sash was going to be wood. He said the owner had mentioned that the windows would be painted.

Thacher noted that during the site visit they had specifically asked if the window would be wood, which to the Commission means, not being clad in any other material. She said there seemed to be a misunderstanding since the specs provided by the applicant showed wood windows and staff cannot support vinyl clad windows since it does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Ross said that the false muntins didn't seem appropriate.

Thacher agreed, adding that they were not a part of the application.

Boudier said the sample window showed various options available.

Stulberg asked Boudier about possible available options and brands that would fit the required standards.

Blaire Patterson and Rheilley Cole, Students from Skyline High School asked the Commission why vinyl clad windows wouldn't be acceptable but wooden ones would be.

McCauley explained that replacement windows on historic building needed to match the existing windows as closely as possible, and not modern looking.

Stulberg explained the process of the Commissions' goals in interpreting the Federal Standards.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Stulberg said that the Commission should review each window separately and determine if any windows should be restored vs. replaced.

McCauley said that he felt all windows except for windows 9, 10, and 11, were beyond repair and falling apart and some even looked dangerous.

General discussion ensued regarding determination of features on historic buildings that weren't visible from the street.

Ross stated since she wasn't out on site to see the windows, she trusts the judgment of those who were.

McCauley asked for staff feedback regarding the condition of the windows.

Thacher said if the existing windows were spectacular or made of leaded glass she might suggest that they be kept as a remnant of what was on site, but she noted that there was nothing extraordinary about the existing windows.

Bushkuhl noted that character defining features are weighed in the Commission's decisions with the addition of the pedestrian experience. He said he believed it would be a costly rehabilitation of the 2 windows in question because of the extent of the damage, and he felt it made sense in this case to replace the group of windows.

Stulberg added that he supported replacing all of the windows in the application.

A motion was made by Secretary Bushkuhl, seconded by Vice Chair Stulberg, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness and APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS the application at 607-609 East William Street, in the State

Street Historic District, a contributing property, to replace eleven wood windows with new wood windows, on the condition that the new windows are not clad and meet 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 the City's Window Design Guidelines. As conditioned, the work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

E UNFINISHED BUSINESS

F NEW BUSINESS

Presentation about 415 W. Washington

Carl Goines, Chuck Bultman and Trevor Stover, stated they were part of a task force working with the Mayor to try to renovate 415 E. Washington into a cultural hub of Ann Arbor and an art's complex. Goines said that they are also working with the Allen Creek Greenway Conservancy to try to turn the existing parking lot at the site into a park.

They presented their proposal to the Commission noting that the proposal is still very much in progress, and they didn't have concrete plans at this stage.

They asked for suggestions from the Commission on how they would like to proceed with working together with the task force.

Stulberg suggested setting up a working session to discuss it further, noting that while, conceptually, he was in support of having a cultural art center at the location he wasn't sure, practically, how it would work.

Thacher said that in order to schedule a working session for the Commission they would need to have something to react to, such as reviewing preliminary plans and the extent of proposed work. She explained that the Commission couldn't tell the task force what they should do with the building, but they could tell them if something they were proposing was in accordance to the Secretary's Standards.

Stulberg said it would be very important for them to review any demolition plans within their proposed project scope as well as to know if the buildings are within the period of significance.

The Commission agreed that it was important to the Commission as well as the Old West Side Historic District to have as much data available as possible regarding the buildings relationship to the period of significance and when they were built.

Thacher explained that if any of the buildings are determined to be contributing structures, and anyone is asking to remove them, it would have to go through a notice to proceed, noting that the Commission may not approve a certificate of appropriateness to proceed with removing a contributing building.

The task force thanked the Commission for their time.

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

Eric Boyd, 342 Mulholland Street, stated that he lives a few blocks away from the 415 W. Washington site and said he was in favor of turning the site into an art hub, but would also request that the City review the parking and traffic flow issues in the area. He said the parking directly in front of the YMCA is very bad and that the City needs to do something about it to make it safer for pedestrians and bicycles in the area.

H APPROVAL OF MINUTES

H-1 [12-0325](#) Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes of the February 9, 2012

The February 9, 2012 HDC Meeting Minutes were unanimously 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, April 9, at 5:00 pm for the April 12, 2012 Regular Session

Bushkuhl volunteered for the April Review Committee.

McCauley added that if others weren't able to cover the April Review Committee he would be willing to volunteer as an alternate candidate.

K REPORTS FROM STAFF

K-1 [12-0326](#) February 2012 Staff Activities

Received and Filed

K-2 **Reminder of HDC Retreat - March 17, 2012 9:00 AM**

L CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS

M COMMUNICATIONS

N ADJOURNMENT

Community Television Network Channel 16 live televised public meetings are also available to watch live online from CTN's website, www.a2gov.org/ctn, 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
- 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.