



**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE  
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR  
Held on Thursday, August 13, 2009 at the Ann Arbor Library.**

**Commissioners Present:** Sarah Wallace, Diane Giannola, Patrick McCauley, Robert White, Jim Henrichs, Kristina Glusac and Ellen Ramsburgh (7)

**Commissioners Absent: (0)**

**Staff Present:** Jill Thacher, Planner and Historic District Coordinator and Brenda Acquaviva, Administrative Support Specialist V, Planning and Development Services (2)

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Wallace called the Regular Session to order at 7:12 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:** Quorum satisfied.

**PRESENTATION:** Commissioner Henrichs – Presentation and certificate of appreciation given to Jim Henrichs after serving a six-year tenure on the Board.

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:** The Agenda was approved without objection.

**A - HEARINGS**

**A-1 1405 HILL STREET - WHHD**

**BACKGROUND:** The 1896 Albert Patengill House is a Dutch colonial revival featuring side gambrels, a large shingled dormer and a smaller pedimented dormer on the front elevation, a shallow two-story bay window on the front, and a stately front porch with short round Doric columns supported by fieldstone piers. Mr. Patengill was a professor of Greek. The house has been the Sigma Delta Tau sorority for the last 65 years, per the chapter president. The house was listed on the state Register of Historic Places in 1984.

A staff approval was issued in May of 2009 to add a dry well and repoint the basement walls below grade to prevent water from leaking into the basement.

**LOCATION:** North side of Hill Street, west of Washtenaw Avenue, east of South Forest Avenue.

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to build a 10 foot by 12 foot wooden shed in the rear yard of the house. The shed would be located 22' north of the house and 27' from the east lot line.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. The shed is proposed to be wood frame construction with fiberglass shingles, T1-11 plywood siding and 1"x3" and 1"x6" trim. It would be 12' tall at the ridge. The structure is very basic, with double plywood doors.
2. Staff has concerns about the appearance of T1-11 plywood siding as an exterior cladding. The shed would be located 250' from the road, behind trees and other landscaping, & tno

50 close neighboring structure to the east, so it shouldn't detract from the character of the  
51 district. The shed would be located about 130' behind the front of the house.

52  
53 3. The proposed shed is generally compatible in exterior design, massing, arrangement,  
54 texture, material and relationship to the site and the surrounding area, and meets *The*  
55 *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, particularly standards 2 and 9.

56  
57 **Owner/Address:** Sigma Delta Tau, c/o OSA Inc., PO Box 1101, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

58  
59 **Applicant:** Terry Lauber, 27105 California St., Ann Arbor, MI

60  
61 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Wallace and Ramsburgh visited the site.

62  
63 Commissioner Wallace – Concurs with staff's report.

64  
65 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Concurs with staff's report.

66  
67 **Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Terry Lauber was present to speak on behalf of the appeal. He  
68 stated that they want to build a shed for space for a Bar-b-que grill, shovels, rakes and other tools  
69 used often on the outside of the dwelling for maintenance.

70  
71 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

72 *Brief discussion regarding choice of materials for this proposed structure.*

73  
74 **Audience Participation:** None.

75  
76 **Discussion by the Commission:**

77  
78 **Commissioner McCauley** – Did we approve the materials that he's proposing to use?  
79 (J. Thacher) – We approved the same T111 materials for the 'dog house' enclosure on top of the  
80 building on West Washington about two years ago. I do want to mention that I did not propose to  
81 the applicant any other materials.

82  
83 **MOTION**

84  
85 Moved by Commissioner White, Seconded by Commissioner Giannola, **“that the Commission**  
86 **issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 1405 Hill Street, a contributing**  
87 **property in the Washtenaw Hill Historic District, to construct a shed in the rear yard as**  
88 **proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture,**  
89 **material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area, and meets *The***  
90 ***Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating***  
91 ***Historic Buildings*, in particular standards 2 and 9, and the guidelines for building sites.”**

92  
93 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – 6 Yes, 1 No (Application Approved)**

94 **Yes (6) – Commissioners Giannola, White, Wallace, Ramsburgh, Henrichs and Glusac**

95 **No (1) - Commissioner McCauley**

96  
97 **A-2            112 W LIBERTY STREET - MSHD**

98

**BACKGROUND:** This three-story brick Italianate commercial building features double-hung four-over-four windows and round and segmented arches over the windows. It is part of a matching six-storefront row with 114, 116, 118, 120, and 122 W Liberty. The row was built by Adam and Anton Schaeberle beginning in 1866. 112 was remodeled to match the other five in the row in 1883. 112's original occupant was the Charles Binder Saloon in 1866.

**LOCATION:** North side of West Liberty Street, west of South Main and east of South Ashley.

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to install a mural painted on aluminum composite panels on the east elevation of the building facing the alley. The mural would be L-shaped, 20' wide on the bottom, 24' tall on the long side, and 8' wide. It would be mounted with the bottom edge 4' from the ground.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. The applicant has proposed attaching the aluminum panels of the mural through the brick on the east elevation overlooking the alley. Staff has requested that the applicant find a way to attach the mural through mortar joints, and to be prepared to present this to the Commission at the meeting. Attaching through the brick will permanently damage it; mortar joints, however, can be repointed once the mural is removed and leave no lasting damage.
2. The mural would partially obscure character-defining features of the building, mainly the brick wall. The wall is quite visible from the street. The alley-facing wall is generally less important to the overall character of the building than the front elevation, however. If the mural is mounted in mortar joints it will be easily removable and the integrity of the building will be unimpaired. The proposed size keeps the mural two feet away from the front wall and windows, and four feet from the ground, which is an appropriate distance to protect these features of the building's wall.
3. Generally, the addition of the mural should not negatively impact the neighborhood/district.
4. Non-HDC information: The applicants may not include any business names, logos, or other written information or advertising without first getting approval from the city's sign coordinator. If in doubt, call Chris Cheng at 734-764-6000-x42616.
5. If mounted in mortar joints, the proposed mural is generally compatible in exterior design, massing, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the site and the surrounding area, and meets *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, particularly standards 2 and 9, and the *Guidelines* for the building site and masonry.

**Owner/Address:** 112 W Liberty, LLC, 112 W. Liberty Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104

**Applicant:** Michigan Peaceworks, 120 W. Liberty St., 120 W. Liberty St., Ann Arbor, MI 48104

**Review Committee:** Commissioners Wallace and Ramsburgh visited the site.

Commissioner Wallace – Concerned with the way it will be attached to the brick. Understanding that this is removable and if attached the correct way, it is appropriate.

148 Commissioner Ramsburgh – There is quite a bit of tuck pointing that needs to be done to the  
149 building right now, and I’m wondering whether these panels will cause more damage to be done.

150  
151 **Applicant Presentation:** Laura Russello, Executive Director of Michigan Peaceworks was  
152 present to speak on behalf of the appeal. This project has been in conjunction with Tree Town  
153 Murals and has recently teamed up with the Main Street Association. We’ve discussed this piece  
154 with various members of the community. We chose this “Image of Peace” and this particular wall  
155 as Michigan Peaceworks’ office is in that building, and we have permission from the building  
156 owner. The owner was excited about having that installed and having the wall cleaned up from  
157 graffiti and banners, so he is very much in support of this.

158  
159 Mary Thiefels of Tree Town Murals was present to speak on behalf of the appeal. She stated that  
160 she wanted to clarify the way in which the panels for the mural would be installed. (She brought a  
161 sample of the aluminum composite panel being proposed). The advantage to using the  
162 aluminum composite panel as opposed to a board is that this won’t delaminate, peel, crack or  
163 come off the wall. This is being used all over the world due to its durability and ease of removal.

164  
165 *(She made notation that there is another mural installed with this same type of material in*  
166 *Ypsilanti, MI. It’s also a brick wall on a building considered historical by the Ypsilanti*  
167 *Commission.)* Huron sign is the one we’ve contracted to do the installation. We would be using  
168 this material and expansion bolts that would be inserted into the mortar and not the brick.

169  
170 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

171  
172 **Commissioner Glusac** – What is the size of the expansion bolt? (Thiefels – I believe it is ½” or  
173 more, but I didn’t measure it). Do you know the size of the fasteners? (Either identical to the  
174 mortar joint or slightly smaller. Because this material is so lightweight, it doesn’t require massive  
175 hardware.)

176  
177 **Commissioner Henrichs** – Historically, advertisements and pictures have been painted directly  
178 on the brick (i.e., Oatmeal, Tobacco and all those things from the turn of the century, so I’m  
179 wondering why you wouldn’t just clean the wall up and paint the mural directly on the brick,  
180 therefore not damaging it, and it could be repainted in the future.

181  
182 (Thiefels – The mural itself could be moved to another location if we wanted to remove it; the life-  
183 span of a painted mural (without using oil-based paints) is about 5 to 10 years – until it starts to  
184 crack, etc.) This would seriously have to be tuck pointed, dry-locked, etc. to the point where you  
185 would lose some of the character of the brick. We’re not opposed to painting it directly on the  
186 wall, but then it couldn’t be moved to another location at a later date.)

187  
188 *(Continued discussion by the Commission regarding possible pitfalls of installation of this mural,*  
189 *including how many fasteners will be used and how far away from the wall that the panel will be.)*

190 **Audience Participation:** None.

191  
192 **Discussion by the Commission:**

193  
194 Commissioner Henrichs – Not in favor of the motion as read. Believes that this will create too  
195 many holes in the side of the building and doesn’t feel it is compatible with the building.

196  
197 Commissioner Giannola – Concerned that this would eventually turn in to advertising, etc. over

198 the long run. *(B. Acquaviva - Staff explained that this would be covered under the Sign*  
199 *Ordinance and any activity like the one that Commissioner Giannola was concerned about could*  
200 *not be approved without sign permit approval, as well as HDC approval.)*

201  
202 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Concurs with Commissioner Henrichs and also feels that water and  
203 ice build-up could damage the brick.

204 (Applicants asked for the hearing to be re-opened. The Chair put forth a vote from all the  
205 members of the HDC as to whether the meeting could be reopened for comment. The  
206 Commission voted an approval for this.)

207  
208 Mary Thiefels – Stated that the panels themselves deter graffiti as they are an exterior application  
209 that looks more like a piece of sculpture. The nice thing about working on this panel is that it can  
210 be constructed in a studio. The idea is to unveil this in the spring, tying it into one of Main Street’s  
211 events.

212  
213 **MOTION**

214  
215 Moved by Commissioner Wallace, Seconded by Commissioner White, “**That the Commission**  
216 **issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 112 W Liberty Street, a**  
217 **contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to install a removable mural on**  
218 **the east façade of the building, on the condition that the mural be mounted through mortar**  
219 **joints (masonry joints to be repaired prior to installation of mural), not masonry units. The**  
220 **proposed work as conditioned is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture,**  
221 **material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area, and meets**  
222 ***The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for***  
223 ***Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, in particular standards 2 and 10, and the guidelines for**  
224 **building sites and masonry.**

225  
226 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – 4 Yes, 3 No (Application Approved)**  
227 **Yes (4) – Commissioners Wallace, McCauley, White & Giannola**  
228 **No (3) – Commissioners Ramsburgh, Henrichs and Glusac**

229  
230  
231 **A-3            HDC09-103 - 512 E HURON STREET**  
232 **(submitted as 517 E WASHINGTON STREET) – OFWHD**

233  
234 *Coordinator Thacher explained that the First Baptist Church at this location has added an*  
235 *entrance and wants to start using 517 East Washington Street; however, this is not currently an*  
236 *approved city address in our system. All current applications will be filed under 512 E. Huron until*  
237 *the applicant applies for the additional address through Planning and Development Services.*

238  
239 **BACKGROUND:** The 1880 First Baptist Church has several additions: a two-story red brick  
240 education wing (by Colvin Robinson in 1950), a 1962 stucco and stone addition to that, a stone  
241 entrance on the south from the parking lot, and a wing on the north connecting all that to the Silas  
242 Douglass House at 502 East Huron next door (which was part of the 1993 Preservation Project of  
243 the Year). The church is a contributing structure in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District.

244  
245 The HDC has issued certificates of appropriateness for the following work:

246

- 247 • May, 2007: a portion of an application was approved for the replacement of windows and  
248 installation of a 4' high metal fence around a lawn play area.
- 249
- 250 • August, 2007: add an exterior stairway to the south elevation of the education wing.
- 251
- 252 • November, 2007: build a wood pavilion parallel to the west property line near the  
253 southwest corner of the site.
- 254
- 255 • March, 2008: insert a new door opening and steel door into the east elevation of the  
256 vestibule wall, install a new concrete sidewalk from the door to an existing retaining wall,  
257 and remove 5 feet of the retaining wall and install concrete steps.
- 258

259 **LOCATION:** North side of East Washington Street, east of State Street & west of Division Street.

260

261 **APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to install new concrete paving at the  
262 Washington Street entrance, replace wood landscape edging with interlock block, remove and  
263 reconstruct existing granite walls into a new configuration, and install screening walls for trash  
264 carts on the west end of the building.

265

266 **STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 267
- 268 1. Please note that earlier HDC applications at this site were listed as 512 East Huron Street  
269 instead of 517 East Washington. Since the church's main entrance is on East Washington,  
270 they have begun using that street address.
- 271
- 272 2. The changes being proposed are intended to increase pedestrian access to the church  
273 entrance. Currently, the stone wall and metal fence span the width of the property, allowing  
274 pedestrian access only at a small opening between the wall and fence near the center of  
275 the site, and at the driveways on either end of the parking lot.
- 276
- 277 3. The granite wall was a character defining feature of the Silas Douglass house at 502 E  
278 Huron. The church addition that was built in 1962 comes between the wall and the house,  
279 thus destroying the historic relationship between the two. The wall has arguably acquired  
280 historical significance in its own right, but staff feels that removing and rebuilding the  
281 granite wall in a new layout but in the same height and width preserves the character of  
282 the wall while allowing a new and improved use of the site (i.e. the entrance for  
283 pedestrians). The new granite piers shown on the site plan will be out of the old granite  
284 and sized to match the existing piers. A 4" precast or limestone cap is proposed on the  
285 reconfigured walls, to serve as weather protection. The portion of the granite wall to the  
286 west of the west driveway will remain. (See attachments 2, 3, and 4)
- 287
- 288 4. The proposed walkway, landscaping and benches will enhance the pedestrian entry and  
289 non-contributing portions of the church complex (i.e. the 1952 and 1962 additions). (See  
290 attachment 2)
- 291
- 292 5. Removal of the dumpster enclosure from the parking lot is appropriate. The proposed  
293 stucco on block screening walls for trash carts along the east face of the 1962 addition will  
294 not negatively impact any historic features of the site. (See attachments 2, 3, and 5)
- 295
- 296 6. The proposed work is generally compatible in exterior design, massing, arrangement,

297 texture, material and relationship to the site and the surrounding area, and meets *The*  
298 *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, particularly standards 2 and 9, and  
299 the *Guidelines* for the building site and masonry.

300  
301 **Owner/Address/Applicant:** First Baptist Church of Ann Arbor, 512 E. Huron Street, A2, MI

302  
303 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Ramsburgh and Wallace visited the site.

304  
305 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Thinks that staff's report covers everything they saw that day. Since  
306 this portion is no longer historical in relation to the house, reusing this that way will make it have a  
307 statement that they will notice the beautiful stone wall. It is an appropriate petition.

308  
309 Commissioner Wallace – Concurs with staff and Commission Ramsburgh.

310  
311 **Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Scott Diehl's, Architect on the project was present to speak on  
312 behalf of the appeal. He stated that this house originally sat on four lots; two facing Huron and  
313 two on Washington, where you see the stone wall on Washington. There was a drive and a  
314 detached garage as of 1952. That wall used to be continuous, and was cut to allow the new drive  
315 to be built years ago. Consequently, this changed the appearance and the configuration.

316  
317 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

318  
319 Commissioner McCauley – So that entire wall will be taken apart? (S. Diehl's – Just a portion.  
320 That portion between the drive and the Professional building will remain.)

321  
322 **Audience Participation:** None.

323  
324 **Discussion by the Commission:**

325  
326 Commissioner McCauley – I am generally in favor of what they are trying to accomplish, but my  
327 thought is why can't the historic feature be preserved and still create the entrance? This stone  
328 wall is probably the only one that is left in the downtown area (that was originally created during  
329 the historic time frame) that was part of a large estate.

330  
331 Commissioner Henrichs – There is a nearly identical wall at St. Andrews church, and it is very  
332 problematic. In the long run, this will last much longer with the changes they're making which will  
333 preserve remains.

334  
335 **MOTION**

336  
337 Moved by Commissioner Ramsburgh, Seconded by Commissioner White, "that the  
338 **Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 517 East**  
339 **Washington Street, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District,**  
340 **to install new concrete paving at the Washington Street entrance, replace wood**  
341 **landscape edging with interlock block, remove and reconstruct existing granite**  
342 **walls into a new configuration, and install screening walls for trash carts on the**  
343 **west end of the building, as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior**  
344 **design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building**  
345 **and the surrounding area, and meets *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for***

346 ***Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular***  
347 ***standards 2 and 10, and the guidelines for building sites and masonry.”***

348  
349 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – 6 Yes, 1 No (*Application Approved*)**  
350 **Yes (6) – Commissioners *Giannola, White, Wallace, Ramsburgh, Henrichs and***  
351 ***Glusac***  
352 **No (1) - Commissioner *McCauley***

353  
354 **A-4 HDC09-104 – 311 MULHOLLAND AVENUE – Two story rear addition OWSHD**  
355

356 **BACKGROUND:** This one-and-a-half story gable-front house features a full-width front porch  
357 and is an excellent example of the form most common on Mulholland Avenue. It first appears in  
358 the 1917 Polk Directory as the home of Thomas Coff, a packer for Motor Products Corp. The  
359 house was originally number 311 Sixth; the street name was changed to Mulholland in 1928.

360  
361 **LOCATION:** East side of Mulholland Ave., south of W. Washington & north of W. Liberty Streets.  
362

363 **APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct a two-story, 19’3” x 14’ addition  
364 to the rear of the existing house, pave the existing pea stone driveway with concrete, and rebuild  
365 existing retaining walls. The addition would have siding, trim, and roofing to match the existing.  
366 The foundation would be concrete masonry units with a parge coat.  
367

368 **STAFF FINDINGS:**  
369

- 370 1. The existing house is approximately 1,025 square feet from exterior wall to exterior wall  
371 (not livable space, which would be less). The proposed addition is approximately 539  
372 square feet wall to wall, making the addition roughly half the size of the existing house.  
373
- 374 2. The rear elevation currently has a rear door with a small covered porch, a non-original  
375 slider window on the first floor, a relatively large double hung one-over-one window in the  
376 center of the second floor, and a small non-original window on the second floor. The rear  
377 door opening and the second floor double hung are character-defining features of the rear  
378 elevation of the house.  
379
- 380 3. To distinguish it from the existing house, the addition is inset 6” from the north and south  
381 exterior walls of the existing house, and the ridge line of the roof is 6” lower than the ridge  
382 line of the existing building.  
383
- 384 4. The siding & trim materials are shown on the drawings as matching the existing, but  
385 existing materials and dimensions are not given and the windows appear to be wood.  
386
- 387 5. Drawing A-4 notes that “New windows and doors to be “Pella” or eq. wood or alum. Sizes  
388 shown may vary by plus or minus 2” depend on final manufacturer selected.” The  
389 drawings approved by the HDC need to reflect accurately the final sizes, so staff suggests  
390 that the commission consider allowing the applicant to apply for a staff approval with new  
391 drawings if the final window sizes vary from those shown, by up to 2”, if the remainder of  
392 the application is approved.  
393
- 394 6. The new rear door would be Therma-Tru brand fiberglass with a half-lite and four square  
395 panels below. The rear double hinged patio doors would be wood Pella with full-length



396 single lite glazing in each, and open onto a shallow concrete patio with one concrete step  
397 down. The rear elevation would have a wood or wood-clad second-story one-over-one  
398 double-hung egress window. The size shown on the drawings is 37" by 53". The rear  
399 façade would be comparable in fenestration to the existing rear elevation of the house.  
400

- 401 7. The side elevations feature a row of four awning windows on the first floor of the north  
402 elevation, and one double hung and one awning on the south elevation. The windows as  
403 shown on the drawings are compatible in size and style with the existing windows.  
404
- 405 8. The proposed addition is a compatible design with the existing house, and is  
406 distinguished from the existing house by being stepped back and slightly lower.  
407
- 408 9. Concrete is an appropriate material for the driveway. The plans do not specify different  
409 materials for rebuilding the existing north and east retaining walls, so it is assumed that  
410 they will match the existing.  
411
- 412 10. Staff recommends that the review committee pay attention to the massing of the  
413 neighboring homes and the impact this addition would have on the neighbors' rear yards.  
414
- 415 11. The proposed addition, driveway paving, and retaining wall reconstruction are generally  
416 compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest  
417 of the building and the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior's*  
418 *Standards for Rehabilitation*, in particular standards 2,5,9 and 10.  
419

420 **Owner/Applicant/Address:** Christine M Tracy, 311 Mulholland Ave., Ann Arbor, MI 48103  
421

422 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Ramsburgh and Wallace visited the site.  
423

424 Commissioner Ramsburgh – The staff report is very complete. I had concerns with massing with  
425 both the original house and in conjunction with the neighboring houses. I think that the owner has  
426 added the most that she could and still kept it in scale with the building.

427 In order to get adequate living space, this is appropriate in both size and scale. Her lot is also  
428 shorter than the neighboring lots, but she will still have some open space in the backyard.  
429

430 Commissioner Wallace – Concurs with staff and Commissioner Ramsburgh.  
431

432 **Applicant Presentation:** Ms. Christine Tracy, owner of this property was present to speak on  
433 behalf of the appeal. She stated that she needed more living space and has been a benevolent  
434 caretaker of this property. The consensus of the neighborhood is favorable.  
435

436 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**  
437

438 Commissioner Henrichs – Looking at the north elevation, do you know why the windows in the  
439 new addition are laid out this way? (Owner – Not specifically). On the south side is a window on  
440 the second floor, wondering why that has a window – is it a bedroom?  
441

442 The project manager was present and stated that this layout is such because they don't want the  
443 awning windows above to limit the use of the bedroom. (*General discussion amongst the*  
444 *contractor and the Board regarding elevations, windows, etc.*)  
445

446 **Audience Participation:** None.

447

448 **Discussion by the Commission:**

449

450 **MOTION**

451

452 Moved by Commissioner White, Seconded by Commissioner Ramsburgh, “**That the**  
453 **Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 311**  
454 **Mulholland Avenue, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to**  
455 **construct a two-story, 19’3” x 14’ addition on the rear of the existing house, pave the**  
456 **existing pea stone driveway with concrete, and rebuild existing retaining walls, on**  
457 **the condition that the applicant reapply for a staff approval if the final windows for**  
458 **the addition vary from those sizes proposed in this application by up to 2 inches.**  
459 **The proposed work as conditioned is compatible in exterior design, arrangement,**  
460 **texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area**  
461 **and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and***  
462 ***Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, in particular standards 2,5,9, and 10**  
463 **and the guidelines for new additions and building site.”**

464

465 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – *UNANIMOUS (Application Approved)***

466

467 **B - OLD BUSINESS**

468

469 **B-1 HDC09-092 – 310 SECOND STREET – Multiple Restoration Work Projects on**  
470 **House and Barn - OWSHD**

471

472 At the July 9, 2009 HDC meeting, a portion of application HDC09-092 was postponed to this  
473 meeting. The application was missing information on windows that were proposed to be replaced  
474 or windows in new openings. The information was submitted by the applicant & comments follow.

475

476 **Additional staff comments:**

477

- 478 1) The second floor aluminum windows are not original, and their replacement with four-pane  
479 aluminum clad wood casement windows is appropriate for the opening since the original  
480 window type is unknown.
- 481
- 482 2) The second floor egress window would enlarge an original window opening. The window is  
483 on a rear elevation, and serves a bedroom. This is an appropriate location for a required  
484 egress window. The new window would be a vinyl clad wood casement unit. The architect  
485 has indicated that he is searching for a smaller unit that still meets minimum egress  
486 requirements. This is reflected in the proposed motion.
- 487
- 488 3) The skylight would be located on the rear half of the building, extend six inches above the  
489 plane of the roof, and be a bronze color to blend in with the roof. Staff feels that its  
490 installation would be an appropriate way to gain functionality in an existing bathroom.
- 491
- 492 4) For the first-floor bathroom window, the addition of new window openings is not  
493 recommended by the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, and there is no building code  
494 requirement for this window.
- 495

- 496 5) The replacement of the east and south elevation barn windows with new custom replicas  
497 of the current windows is appropriate. Deterioration of the existing windows is severe, and  
498 it is staff's opinion that they are most likely beyond repair.  
499 Staff didn't inspect them up close because the second floor of the barn is unsafe, but they  
500 can be viewed from the ground and rot and missing elements are clearly visible.

501  
502 **Owner/Address:** Jan Muhleman, 403 West Liberty LLC, 213 West Liberty, #100, A2, MI 48103

503  
504 **Applicant:** Carl O. Hueter, 1321 Franklin Blvd., A2, MI 48103

505  
506 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Ramsburgh and Wallace visited the site.

507  
508 Commissioners Wallace and Ramsburgh – (Described various conditions in the home for  
509 information to the Commission.)

510  
511 **Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Carl Hueter, Architect on this project was present to speak on  
512 behalf of the appeal. He stated the staff had covered all the items they are trying to accomplish  
513 on this appeal. As to the upper window, they tried to find a window that would replace that in the  
514 same size/type, but there are no markings on the sash, etc.  
515 *(He explained the rest of the project in depth.)*

516  
517 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

518  
519 Commissioner Glusac - Will the trim on the bathroom window be compromised with the  
520 replacement window? (Hueter – The window is only 18 inches wide and about 28 inches on the  
521 side, so we can get the same casing in. The sill of the pre-made window does not 'pitch' as much  
522 as the wooden window.)

523  
524 **Audience Participation:** None.

525  
526 **Discussion by the Commission:**

527  
528 **MOTION #1**

529  
530 Moved by Commissioner Ramsburgh, Seconded by Commissioner Wallace, **"That**  
531 **the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 310**  
532 **Second Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, for the**  
533 **portion of the application to replace three second floor non-original windows with**  
534 **clad windows, replace a rear original window with a larger casement window that**  
535 **meets egress requirements at the size proposed or smaller, install a skylight, and**  
536 **replace two barn windows with custom replacements to match, as proposed. The**  
537 **proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and**  
538 **relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area and meets *The***  
539 ***Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for***  
540 ***Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, in particular standards 2 and 9, and the guidelines**  
541 **for windows."**

542  
543 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS (Application Approved)**  
544

545 **MOTION #2**

546  
547 Moved by Commissioner Giannola, Seconded by Commissioner White, “**That the**  
548 **Commission deny the portion of the application at 310 Second Street, a contributing**  
549 **property in the Old West Side Historic District, to install a new bathroom window**  
550 **and a new opening on the rear elevation of the building. The proposed work is not**  
551 **compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the**  
552 **rest of the house and the surrounding area and does not meet *The Secretary of the***  
553 ***Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic***  
554 ***Buildings*, in particular standards 2 & 9 and the guidelines for new additions and**  
555 **building site.**

556  
557 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO DENY - PASSED – *UNANIMOUS (Application Denied)***

558  
559 **C - NEW BUSINESS – None**

560  
561 **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION – GENERAL (Limited to 3 Minutes per Speaker)**

- 562  
563 **1. Chris Hewett – 553 South Seventh Street, Ann Arbor, MI –** Mr. Hewett is a new  
564 resident to the City of Ann Arbor, and has come to the Commission for resource and  
565 information on rules and regulations so that he can improve his West Side Historic home.  
566

567 **D - APPROVAL OF MINUTES –**

568  
569 **D-1** Draft Minutes of the June 11, 2009 Regular Session (***Not Available***)

570  
571 **D-2** Draft Minutes of the July 9, 2009 Regular Session (***Not Available***)

572  
573 **E - REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS – None.**

574  
575 **F - ASSIGNMENTS**

576  
577 **F-1** Review Committee for Tuesday, September 8, 2009 at 5:00 p.m. for the  
578 September 10, 2009 Regular Session – Commissioners McCauley and Wallace.  
579

580 **G - STAFF ACTIVITIES REPORT**

581  
582 **G-1** June 2009 report was postponed to the September regular session.

583  
584 **G-2** July 2009 report was handed out to the Commission.  
585

586 **H - CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS**

587  
588 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Mentioned the Michigan Historic Preservation Networks newsletters.  
589

590 **I - COMMUNICATIONS – None.**

591  
592 **ADJOURNMENT**

593 *The Meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m. without objection. SUBMITTED BY: Brenda*  
594 *Acquaviva, Administrative Service Specialist V, Planning and Development Services.*