



# City of Ann Arbor

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

## Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

---

Thursday, July 12, 2012

7:00 PM

City Hall, 301 E. Huron Street, 6th floor Conf Rm

---

### A CALL TO ORDER

*Chair McCauley called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.*

### B ROLL CALL

*Jill Thacher called the roll.*

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

### C APPROVAL OF AGENDA

**The Agenda was unanimously Approved with the deletion of Item L.**

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

### E UNFINISHED BUSINESS

**E-1 12-0929** HDC12-097; 209 East Liberty Street - New Business Wall Sign - MSHD

*Jill Thacher gave the staff report.*

#### **BACKGROUND:**

*This two-story brick commercial vernacular building was built in 1906 for the Washtenaw Home Telephone company, which also occupied the space that is currently 211 East Liberty. The building features double-hung one-over-one windows, a stone stringcourse, and a cornice with corbelling and ornamental brickwork. For many years, the building had an operable retracting awning, which was replaced in 1992 by a fixed triangular shaped vinyl awning.*

*At the June 14, 2012 meeting, a different version of this application was considered, and the commission requested a more appropriate style of awning.*

#### **LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the north side of East Liberty Street between Fourth Avenue and Fifth Avenue.*

#### **APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to install one new canvas awning over the*

storefront to identify the business. The proposed awning is rectangular and measures nineteen feet six inches long, by four feet eight inches high, by two feet four inches deep. The awning is red with black lettering that is outlined with white.

**APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:**

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

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

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

*From the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (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 applicant had previously sought approval to install a waterfall shaped awning. The applicant now proposes to install an awning that is rectangular, with an angled upper portion that slopes down to meet a vertical portion that is two feet four inches high. According to the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, using rectangular shaped awnings is not appropriate, but triangular shaped awnings are appropriate. The proposed design falls between these two styles.*
- 2. The proposed awning measures nineteen feet six inches long, by four feet eight inches high, by two feet four inches deep. It will be constructed of a framework of steel tubes that will be covered in canvas. Based on submitted samples, the awning appears to have a matte finish. The awning will be red and contain the words "Wild Side Smoke Shop," which will be black letters outlined with white. The total length of the words will measure eleven feet three inches, and the largest letters measure one foot six inches high. The awning will also contain two small logos, one at each end, that measure one foot high and nine inches wide.*
- 3. The awning is placed at an appropriate height for the building and adjacent buildings. There are many awnings on adjacent buildings located at approximately the same height, but the awnings on the adjacent buildings are triangular shaped and one is rectangular. In order to protect the exterior brick the awning should be mounted through mortar joints, which is not indicated on the provided drawings.*
- 4. The proposed awning is somewhat similar to the adjacent awnings. However, a triangular shape may be more appropriate. Staff believes that the overall size, color, texture, and material are appropriate and meet The Secretary of the Interior's*

*Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 2 and 9, and the guidelines for storefronts.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:**

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

*Ramsburgh said they had reviewed other existing awnings in the district, noting that the triangular shape was the most predominant shape, with others similar in style. She said the proposed awning was appropriate in style and character.*

*Bushkuhl agreed adding that the newer awnings in the area were rectangular in shape, similar to the proposed awning, and met the current standards.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Chris Saxton, Sales Representative for Signature Awning, 12283 Merriman, Dearborn, was present to repond to the Commission's questions. He showed them samples of the proposed awning material.*

*Bushkuhl asked Saxton if it was possible for them to install the awning through the mortar joints.*

*Saxton said, yes.*

**Motion made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White, to APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS the application at 209 East Liberty Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District and issue a certificate of appropriateness, to add one new storefront awning, conditioned on the removal of the temporary signage in the windows, and that it be mounted through mortar joints, not through masonry units. The work, as conditioned, 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 and 9 and the guidelines for storefronts.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

*Beeson asked how easy the proposed awning material would be to maintain.*

*Saxton said the fabric would be treated with scotchguard so it would be easy to clean.*

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

**APPROVED**

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

**Nays:** 0

**E-2 12-0930**

HDC12-084; 509 Detroit Street - New Rear Addition and Attached Garage - OFWHD

*Thacher gave the staff report.*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This two-story Queen Anne house first appears in the 1894 City Directory as the residence of Katherine Hartmann and her daughter Sophie, who was a dressmaker. The house changed ownership many times in the following years, with postman Albert Mayer and his wife Nellie residing there the longest, from 1910 until the late 1920s. The house exhibits many typical Queen Anne characteristics, including a square tower on the south elevation, a front gabled roof with a sunburst motif, and fish-scale siding. The house also features a full-width front porch with a fieldstone foundation and large double-hung windows.*

*At the June 14, 2012 HDC meeting a different version of this application was considered and the commission requested revisions, particularly to the height of the addition.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the northeast side of Detroit Street between E Kingsley Street and High Street.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to 1) demolish an existing addition and construct a new two-story addition on the west (rear) elevation, 2) construct a new second-story addition above an existing one-story rear addition, 3) construct a new below-grade two-car garage with patio above, and 4) remove the existing curb-cut and driveway along the north elevation and remove the rear gravel parking area.*

**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.*

*Site*

*Recommended:*

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

*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.*

*District or Neighborhood Setting*

*Not Recommended:*

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

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

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

*a. The roofline of the addition has been lowered six feet and is now even with the roof line of the existing house. The attic space has been eliminated, along with the shed dormer in the west (rear) elevation and five windows in the attic space.*

*b. Nine windows in the second floor of the proposed addition are now double-hung windows, rather than casement windows.*

*The following comments are repeated from the previous application's staff report. The*

*comments remain valid for this application.*

2. *The existing house consists of a two-story main block with a one-story rear addition and porch, and a small one-story addition on the north (side) elevation. Based on Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, it appears that the rear addition was built between 1892 and 1908. The smaller addition on the north elevation was constructed after 1931. A rear porch appears in the 1931 Sanborn Map, but the shape and size is slightly different than the existing porch. Because of this, an accurate date for the rear porch could not be determined.*

3. *The applicant seeks approval to construct a new two-story addition at the rear of the house. The addition would require demolition of the rear porch, which is not original to the house. The proposed addition is seventeen feet seven inches deep and twenty-nine feet eight inches wide. The addition will be two stories and have an asphalt shingle gable roof with parallel orientation, with decorative trim work in the gables.*

4. *Materials on the addition include horizontal Hardi-plank siding with an eight-inch exposure on the first floor, and a four inch exposure on the second floor. The foundation will be stucco cement. Windows will be vinyl-clad wood and include double-hung windows, casement windows, and awning windows.*

5. *The applicant seeks approval to construct a new second-story addition above the existing one-story rear addition. This will provide additional living space and access to the new addition from the second floor of the house. The proposed addition is inset from the main block of the house on the north and south (side) elevations, and has a ridge line below that of the existing house. Staff believes that this addition is relatively inconspicuous when viewed from the sidewalk.*

6. *The applicant also seeks approval to construct a new below-grade two-car garage to the rear of the proposed addition. The garage is forty-two feet nine inches long and twenty-two feet wide. The west end of the proposed garage is narrower, at fourteen feet one inch wide and will be used for storage. The garage will be accessed from the south, where an existing driveway will remain in place. The driveway will need to be expanded slightly to allow access to the garage. The exterior entrance to the basement near the garage and a pathway to access the storage space at the rear appear to be constructed of pavers, as depicted in provided drawings.*

7. *A deck is proposed above the garage and level with the first floor of the addition. The deck will be accessed by a set of doors on the west elevation of the proposed addition and a staircase leading from the side yard on the north elevation. The deck will be surrounded by a stucco cement wall continuous with the garage foundation and a one-and-a-half inch painted metal railing.*

8. *The applicant seeks approval to remove a driveway from the north (side) elevation and a parking area at the west (rear) elevation to create additional green space. The driveway and parking area are not believed to have any historical significance and were likely built when the house was used as student housing.*

9. *Staff believes that the design and scale of the rear addition and garage are compatible with the house, do not detract from it, and use distinct materials (such as cementitious lap siding) to further differentiate them from the historic structure.*

10. *Staff recommends approval of the proposed new rear additions and garage, and the removal of an existing driveway and parking area since they meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, in particular standards 2, 9, and 10, and the guidelines for*

*New Additions, Site, and District or Neighborhood Setting.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:**

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

*Bushkuhl reported that he felt the proposed modifications are very thoughtful and address the Commission's concerns from last month.*

*Ramsburgh agreed with Bushkuhl as well as with the staff report.*

*Thacher pointed out two letters of support for the project.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Holly Parker and David Santacroce, 601 N. Fifth Avenue, owners of the property, along with Marc Rueter, architect for the project, were present to respond to the Commission's enquiries.*

*Beeson said the improvements are a great step in the right direction. He commented that he would request that on the south elevation, that the trim board go all the way down to the top of the foundation wall, in order to visually differentiate the old from the new.*

*Thacher noted that the Commission might not want to rely on a trim board as being considered a permanent deliniation, since it can easiliy be removed. She said for visual purposes it was a great way to show deliniation.*

*Ray Detter, 120 N. Division Street, spoke in support of the project, noting that it will be a great rehabilitation project for the neighborhood.*

**Motion made by Bushkuhl, seconded by White, that the Commission approve the application at 509 Detroit Street, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to construct a new rear two-story addition, new rear second-floor addition, and new garage, and remove a driveway and parking area 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, site, and setting.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

*Ramsburgh stated that she feels the changes to the original plans have really addressed the concerns of the addition overpowering the existing house. She referenced the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation in relationship to additions.*

*The Commission thanked the applicants for returning with the modifications.*

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

**APPROVED**

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

Nays: 0

F        **HEARINGS**

F-1        **12-0931**        HDC12-115; 309 South Seventh Street - New Shed in Rear Yard - OWSHD

*Thacher gave the staff report.*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This one-and-a-half-story vernacular house features a wide front porch, textured concrete block foundation, and decorative wood trim around the windows and door. Until 1897, the address of the house was 23 S Seventh Street. The house first appears in the 1894 City Directory and lists Carl Frederick Kuhn, a carpenter, as the occupant. Kuhn resided at the house until 1914. In 1916, the house was occupied by William R McCleery and his wife Pauline McCleery. From 1917 to 1920, the house's occupants turned over at least three times. In 1921, the house was occupied by Michael Pokorny, a tailor, and his wife Victoria. Victoria Pokorny lived in the house until the early 1950s.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the east side of S Seventh Street, between W Washington Street and W Liberty Street.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to build a small storage at the rear of the property.*

**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.*

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

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

**Building Site**

**Recommended:**

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

**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 proposed prefabricated shed is wood with an asphalt roof and will be installed on an existing pad. It measures eight feet wide, eight feet deep, and eight feet high. The location is at the rear of the property next to a driveway, and will be used to store bicycles and children's toys. The shed would not have any negative visual impact on the historic house on the site and will not be easily visible from the street.*

2. *Staff recommends approval of the proposed shed and finds it to be compatible in size, scale, design, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the site and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 2 and 10, and the guidelines for building site.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:**

*Ramsburgh and Bushkuhl visited the site as part of their review.*

*Bushkuhl reported that the applicant doesn't have a garage for storage purposes and the shed meets the standards and criteria within the historic district. He said the owners had expressed some confusion over the administrative process involved, explaining they wanted to follow the rules.*

*Ramsburgh agreed with Bushkuhl that the shed was appropriate.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Kevin Lesser, 309 S Seventh Street, owner of the property was present to respond to the Commission's questions.*

**I move that the Commission approve the application at 309 S Seventh Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to build a new storage shed. 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 and 10 and the guidelines for building site.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

*Bushkuhl noted that the work that was on-going looked like it was good quality work.*

*Leeser apologized for starting the work before receiving approval.*

*Stulberg asked about the foundation of the shed, and if a concrete pad would create any problems.*

*Leeser said the shed was on pressure treated wood, which was not a permanent foundation, and could easily be removed, if necessary.*

*Stulberg commented that he didn't have an issue with the shed having a concrete*

*pad, if the applicant decided to use one.*

*The Commission agreed.*

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

**APPROVED**

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

**Nays:** 0

**F-2 12-0932**

HDC12-105; 203 North State Street - Infill Door on Rear Addition - ASHD

*Thacher gave the staff report.*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This two-story house features a blend of Greek Revival and Italianate styles. The front door is Greek Revival in style, with a Classical pediment above it that was likely added in the late nineteenth century. The window hoods in the second story and eave brackets on the bay windows are Italianate. A house first appears in this location on the 1866 bird's eye map of Ann Arbor. It is listed in the 1868 City Directory as the residence of George Wheeler, the Deputy County Treasurer, and Charles Rider, who was an owner of the boot and shoe store Noble, Rider, and Moore. The 1880 bird's eye map of Ann Arbor depicts a larger house. It is possible that the original house remained and the large two-story portion that exists today was an addition, likely built in the 1870s.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the northwest corner of the North State Street and Ann Street intersection.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to demolish a small rear landing and stairs, and infill a doorway on a rear addition.*

**APPLICABLE REGULATIONS**

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

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

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

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

*Entrances and Porches**Recommended:*

*Identifying, retaining, and preserving entrances--and their functional and decorative features--that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as doors, fanlights, sidelights, pilaster, entablatures, columns, balustrades, and stairs.*

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

*STAFF FINDINGS:*

- 1. The applicant seeks approval to demolish the rear stairs and landing. They are made of wood and appear to be a relatively recent addition to the house with no historical significance.*
- 2. The applicant also seeks approval to infill a doorway on the west (rear) elevation. The house is located on a corner lot and the doorway is visible from the street. The applicant states that the door is unnecessary and its removal will improve the exterior appearance. The doorway is located on an addition that appears as early as the 1899 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. A small rear addition with a shed roof also appears on the 1880 bird's eye map of Ann Arbor, although it could not be determined if it is the same addition that exists currently. It could not be conclusively determined if the doorway dates to this time as well. However, it does appear to be an old opening. Currently a modern aluminum door is installed.*
- 3. The applicant proposes to infill the doorway and cover the opening with siding that matches the existing siding. However, this will obscure any sign of the opening. Because of the potential age of the doorway, it may be more appropriate to leave trim to show the location of the opening, or leave the infill partially recessed.*
- 4. Staff recommends approval of the doorway on the condition that its location is indicated by being partially recessed or with trim. Staff also recommends approval of the proposed landing and porch demolition, since they meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Entrances and Porches.*

*REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:*

*Ramsburgh and Bushkuhl visited the site as part of their review.*

*Ramsburgh reported that they noted that the door is already gone and there is a plywood in place, which still allows one to see the opening. She noted that there is no visible trim and it is not recessed. She said she felt that since it was part of the original structure, she would like to see it delineated in some way, either by trim or recessed, as suggested by the staff report.*

*Bushkuhl explained that they noted that the rental had been well maintained and kept in good shape and it was explained to them that the proposed changes were due to traffic flow changes on the inside of the building.*

*The Commission asked the owner if the trim is existing and under the siding.*

*AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:*

*James and Joyce Crippen, 203 N. State Street, owners of the property, were present to respond to the Commission's enquiries. He stated that he wasn't aware of what might be under the siding.*

*Stulberg asked if the owner wasn't aware of what was located behind the siding because contractors had performed previous remodelings, and if he thought it would be possible to recess the doorway on the rear addition.*

*Crippen said he had owned the house for about 12-13 years. He said a contractor had inadvertently removed the back door, and he would like to cover the whole area with matching shingle siding.*

*Ross asked if the shingles on the house were asbestos.*

*Beeson said that he believed they were made of material with encapsulated asbestos.*

*The Commission asked what type of shingles the applicant plans on using.*

*Crippen said he isn't sure they can get the same kind that are currently on the house, but they are working with Fingerle Lumber.*

*Ramsburgh commented that the temporary shingles that are being used are a very close match to what is on the house.*

**Motion made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White, to APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS the application at 203 North State Street, a contributing property in the Ann Street Historic District and issue a certificate of appropriateness, to infill a rear doorway, on the condition that the infill is recessed, and demolish a rear landing and porch. The work, as conditioned, 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 and 9 and the guidelines for entrances and porches.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

*Ramsburgh said that she felt it was important to leave the outline of a rear door because there would always have been a rear door and it is a historical marker on the house, adding that it would allow future owners to bring the house back to its original condition if so desired.*

*McCauley said that while the door, itself, was not historic, the trim was, and should have been left.*

*The Commission determined that the trim was gone, because the covering materials were flush with the exterior.*

*McCauley said that without the trim, another form of delineation would be appropriate to indicate the outlining of a door opening.*

*Stulberg asked the Commission if they had any issues with the demolition of the rear landing.*

*The Commission agreed that the rear landing was not original nor historic.*

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

**APPROVED**

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

**Nays:** 0

**F-3 12-0933**

HDC12-116; 340 Eighth Street - Replace Garage with New Garage - OWSHD

*Thacher gave the staff report.*

**BACKGROUND:**

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

**LOCATION:**

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

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to demolish a one-story garage and construct a new larger one-story garage. The applicant also seeks HDC approval to construct a new wood fence that would reach six feet and six inches tall in one location.*

**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.*

*(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.*

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

*(10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in*

*such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

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

*Building Site*

*Recommended:*

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

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

*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:*

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

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

*District or Neighborhood Setting*

*Not Recommended:*

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

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. *The existing one-story gable-roof garage first appears in the 1931 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map and appears to have been altered since it was constructed. The applicant states that the dormers and plywood sliding doors on the east (front) elevation were added in the 1970s. The applicant also states that the dormers have caused the roof to leak in several places, the rafters and sheathing are rotted, the roof has holes in it, the south wall is failing, and that the overall structure is unsound. The existing garage also does not comply with site setbacks in that the minimum required is three feet and the garage is on the lot line.*

2. *The applicant proposes to demolish the existing garage and construct a new one-story garage with usable space above. The proposed garage will be located fifteen feet from the rear lot line and three feet from the north lot line to meet setback requirements. The proposed garage is approximately twice as large as the existing garage. It measures twenty-one feet wide, thirty-six feet deep, and twenty-four feet and eight inches high at the roofline, and will take up approximately one-quarter of the rear yard. The applicant states that a garage of the proposed depth is necessary*

to accommodate his truck, which is over twenty-two feet in length. The first floor of the garage will also be used as a small workspace and the second floor will be used for an exercise room and additional storage.

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

4. The proposed garage has a footprint that is nearly the same size of the house, but may be appropriately scaled for the size of the lot. This section of the Old West Side typically has smaller lots with small one-story garages. Based on the provided drawings, the proposed garage seems slightly too large in scale. However, this may be due to the overhangs on the south and east elevations or the two dormers. The proposed garage is compatible in exterior design and relationship to the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation in particular standards 2, 9 and 10.

5. The applicant also proposes to construct a new fence along the west, north, south, and east sides of the property. The portion of fence proposed for the south and east elevations would connect an existing fence along the south lot line to the south (side) elevation of the house. The fence along the north lot line would begin approximately thirty feet from the sidewalk and extend for approximately 100 feet to the rear lot line. The fence would then continue along the rear lot line and connect with the existing fence.

6. The proposed fence will vary from just under six feet to a maximum of six feet and six inches tall, depending on the location, since it will change with the varying grading of the site. It will match the existing fence in height and design. It will consist of vertical wood boards. However, zoning requires that the fence may not exceed six feet within fifty feet of the sidewalk. Any fence that exceeds six feet and one inch in height will also require a building permit. If the commission approves the fence, staff will work with the applicant to make sure the height meets zoning requirements.

7. Staff recommends approval of the fence and finds it is generally compatible in design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the site 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 Building Site and District or Neighborhood Setting.

#### REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

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

Bushkuhl reported that the applicant had a very nice yard that backed up to woods. He noted that the existing garage was not feasible to restore or save, because of its condition, and the lot was large enough to comfortably fit the proposed garage. He added that the proposed fence, given the elevation issues might be something the

*Commission needs to discuss.*

*Ramsburgh agreed with Bushkuhl and the concerns he brought to the Commission. She asked if the garage was slid back, would it meet the setback requirements.*

*Thacher responded that would require the applicant to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Harold Kirchen, 340 Eighth Street, was present to respond to the enquiries of the Commission. He said the placement of the proposed garage met the City's zoning requirements, and the reason for the proposed tall fence was to accommodate the various grade changes and give the privacy needed. He provided a handout to the Commission of a proposed garage that would extend 40 feet in length.*

*Ramsburgh asked how deep the proposed overhang would be.*

*Kirchen said it would be closer to a 4 foot overhang over the garage door and a 6 foot overhang on the side of the garage.*

*Ross asked about the material for the garage door.*

*Kirchen said he was thinking about a fiberglass door that looks like a wooden door.*

*Beeson asked about the existing foundation on the garage.*

*Kirchen said it is a dirt floor, with some concrete block that had been added in the past to help stabilize the foundation.*

*Beeson asked what the new proposed garage foundation material in relation of what would be historic and similar to others in the neighborhood.*

*Kirchen said they are thinking about using all-weather wood foundations with concrete footings.*

*Beeson commented that the 'mustached' look of the overhangs with the posts makes the structure look more like a house than a garage. He asked if there was any other way to have overhangs that would protect the garage doors, without the added posts that make it look as pronounced or domineering. Beeson asked if the windows are proposed to be double-hung.*

*Kirchen answered, yes.*

**Motion made by McCauley, seconded by Beeson, that the Commission approve the application at 340 Eighth Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to demolish an existing garage and construct a new two-story garage, and build a new privacy fence. 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, 6, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for building site and district or neighborhood setting.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

*Stulberg said he felt the proposed structure was large in size in comparison to the*



house yet the lot was a large and deep lot that helped off-set the size. He felt the proposed garage would be giving the appearance of a second house on the parcel.

McCauley said he liked the idea of a larger garage in comparison to an addition, or an addition and a garage. He commented that the proposed garage is fairly tall, at 24 feet, 8 inches at the roofline.

Kirchen said the house is taller.

White said he supports the project and it would be a nice project, adding that the lot backs up to a wooded area and the Slauson Middle School. He said he would rather have the garage than the trailers that are currently used for storage.

Ramsburgh agreed that the proposed garage structure is very large and pushes the limits, yet she wasn't sure she could support it. She noted that the floor area of the garage was larger than the existing house.

Bushkuhl said given that each project is decided on a case by case basis, he felt the proposed garage fits the large lot, along with the fact that the neighboring lots also were large and wooded, and the owner had unique circumstances that merited the larger garage. He supported the project.

McCauley agreed, noting that there is a long history of garage barn buildings that dates back to the founding of the Old West Side Historic District.

Stulberg asked to review the photos of the neighboring lots, and the garage placement on the lot.

Beeson said he felt it looks and feels too large for an ancillary structure, reiterating that it gives the appearance of a house.

Ross agreed with Beeson.

Discussion pursued regarding similar garages in the area.

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

**NOT APPROVED.**

**Yeas:** 3 - White, Chair McCauley, and Secretary Bushkuhl

**Nays:** 4 - Ramsburgh, Vice Chair Stulberg, Beeson, and Ross

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

Kirchen asked if the Commission was open to modifications.

Thacher asked the Commission if the proposed size was the main issue for their denial.

Beeson said that his concern was that it looks too much like a house, instead of a garage.

McCauley asked if the Commission would be open to the applicant re-submitting modifications to incorporate their concerns, adding that it was not the Commission's duty to design the garage.

*Discussion pusued regarding the over-hangs.*

*Beeson said that he felt the west elevation over-hangs could be reduced, while still giving the protection needed. He said the front elevation was his main concern, and he felt a 2 foot over-hang without posts would be better.*

**Motion made by Ramsburgh, seconded by McCauley, to postpone Historic District Commission action, on the portion of the application to construct a new garage, that was not approved at the July, 12, 2012 HDC meeting, until the August 16, 2012, HDC meeting, to allow the applicant to submit revised plans. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.**

**POSTPONED**

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

**Nays:** 0

**A motion was made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 340 Eighth Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to demolish an existing garage and construct a new privacy fence. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 6 and the guidelines for building site and district or neighborhood setting. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.**

**APPROVED**

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

**Nays:** 0

**F-4 12-0934**

HDC12-113; 270 Crest Avenue - New Two Story Addition on Rear of House - OWSHD

*Thacher gave the staff report.*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This two story vernacular house features a wide front porch with solid balustrade and square columns, a brick chimney, and paired windows on the first floor of the front elevation. The house is very similar to the house at 272 Crest, and both share a garage with a hipped roof at the rear of the property. The house first appears in the 1917 Polk Directory and lists Bert L Lutz, a clerk at M A Ryan, and his wife Matilda as the residents. Burt and Matilda Lutz resided at 270 Crest until around 1950.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the west side of Crest Avenue between West Washington Street and Bemidji Drive.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to 1) demolish an existing rear one-story addition and deck, 2) construct a new two-story rear addition, 3) rebuild a portion of the basement foundation and chimney that is structurally unsound, and 4) widen the existing driveway.*

#### 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.*

*(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.*

*(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.*

#### *Masonry*

##### *Recommended:*

*Replacing in kind an entire masonry feature that is too deteriorated to repair--if the overall form and detailing are still evident--using the physical evidence as a model to reproduce the feature. Examples can include large sections of a wall, a cornice, balustrade, column, or stairway. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.*

##### *Not Recommended:*

*Removing a masonry feature that is unrepairable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new feature that does not convey the same visual appearance.*

#### *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 is approximately twelve feet wide and eight feet deep. It has a flat asphalt roof, aluminum siding, a small rectangular window on the north elevation, a door on the south elevation, and a large sliding glass door on the west elevation that opens onto a raised deck. The exact date of construction of the addition could not be determined and the house does not appear on Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps. The addition is unremarkable and is located on a non-character-defining elevation.*
- 2. The applicant seeks approval to demolish the existing rear one-story addition and deck and construct a new two-story addition. The deck is modern and has no historical significance. The proposed addition would measure twenty-six feet and one inch wide, and seventeen feet and six inches deep. The wall of the north (side) elevation would be continuous with the existing north elevation wall. The wall of the south (side) elevation would be inset approximately one foot from the existing south elevation wall. Approximately five feet towards the rear, the south (side) elevation*

wall is inset approximately four feet and six inches further. A small porch is located in this inset area. The roofline of the addition is below the main roofline and is oriented perpendicularly.

3. The proposed addition will have vertical Hardie board and batten siding, an asphalt shingle roof, clad windows and door, and a small shed roof overhang in the west (rear) elevation over three doors. There is an additional small shed roof over the porch on the south (side) elevation. The south (side) elevation also has a shed dormer towards the rear of the addition. The design and scale of the addition are compatible with the house and distinct materials differentiate it from the historic structure.

4. The proposed addition will require that a door on the second floor of the west (rear) elevation and a portion of the wall on the north end of the west (rear) elevation be removed. The door on the second floor is likely not original and appears to have opened onto the roof of the existing addition. Removing the door will provide access to the second floor of the addition. The section of wall that is proposed to be removed is approximately four feet wide, and is one of the original walls of the house. Removing the wall will provide more access to the proposed addition.

5. The applicant also seeks approval to rebuild portions of the foundation wall on the west (rear) elevation, and a portion of the foundation wall and lower chimney on the north (side) elevation. The foundation and chimney are beginning to buckle and are bulging towards the interior of the basement. The foundation and lower portion of the chimney will be rebuilt with concrete blocks.

6. The existing driveway is shared between the residents of 270 Crest and the residents of 272 Crest. The driveway is eight feet wide and is divided down the middle by the property line. The applicants seek approval to widen their portion of the driveway approximately six and a half feet, to 14 ½ feet wide total. This would bring the edge of the driveway up to the south (side) elevation of the house. In the front yard, a low retaining wall would separate the driveway from the yard. Staff does not support bringing the pavement all the way to the foundation of the house when this has historically been a green space.

7. The design and scale of the rear addition is compatible with the house, does not detract from it, and uses distinct materials (such as Hardie board and batten siding) to further differentiate it from the historic structure. Although a portion of the original rear wall will be removed, overall the historical integrity and character-defining features will not be harmed. The foundation and chimney work uses appropriate materials, and the rebuilding is necessary to provide stability for the entire house. The design and scale of the proposed driveway is appropriate as well and does appear to detract from the historical integrity of the property. The height of the existing roof ridge is 29'6", and the proposed addition's ridge height is 25'9". The house is currently 1,328 square feet, and this addition would result in a 2,017 square foot house. The addition is large, but its height and depth are not excessive for this house and lot.

8. Staff recommends approval of the proposed rear addition, foundation and chimney rebuild, and expansion of the existing driveway, since they meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for New Additions, Masonry, Site, and District or Neighborhood Setting.

**REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:**

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

*Ramsburgh reported that the site has a deep backyard, and she agreed with the staff report that the scale and massing are appropriate for the lot and surrounding area. She said while she likes to see a break, instead of a continuous wall, when additions are added, she understands there are interior floorplan issues that make it necessary for them to have a continuous wall on the inside. She said she agreed with the staff report in that she does not support bringing the pavement all the way to the foundation of the house when this has historically been a green space.*

*Bushkuhl agreed with Ramsburgh, adding that the owner had indicated during their site visit that there might be a way for them to extend the driveway, but not have it go all the way to the foundation of the house.*

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

*Darren Trippell and Marla Mikelait, 270 Crest Avenue, owners of the property, along with their architect, Michael Kirchner, with Meadowlark Builders, were present to respond to the Commission's enquiries. Trippell asked the Commission for some guidelines on an appropriate greenspace width, noting that they share the driveway as well as the garage.*

*The Commission said they felt it should be something that would soften the blow of the concrete from taking up all the space.*

*Ramsburgh explained that she has an 8 inch wide strip of dirt followed by a 4 inch wide curb along her foundation.*

*The Commission said maybe a 1 foot wide buffer would be appropriate or a width that would work with the applicant's logistics on site.*

*Kirchner explained the floorplan of the proposed addition.*

*Stulberg noted that the applicant would need approval from other City departments if they widened their driveway approach.*

*Thacher said they would need a permit and review from the City's Project Management Department.*

*Ramsburgh said they might want to consider gradually bringing out the driveway and not cut into the lawn area, thereby keeping the historical look.*

*Beeson said it also helps soften the look from the street.*

*McCauley said it seems reasonable to want to expand the driveway in order to accommodate the needs of a modern lifestyle.*

**Motion made by McCauley, seconded by White, that the Commission approve the application at 270 Crest Avenue, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to demolish a one-story rear addition, construct a new two-story rear addition, rebuild a portion of the foundation and chimney, and widen the existing driveway to a minimum of 12 inches from the foundation of the house. 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, 6, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for new additions, masonry, site, and district or neighborhood setting.**

*COMMISSION DISCUSSION:*

**Friendly Amendment to APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS the application at 270 Crest Avenue, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District and issue a certificate of appropriateness to demolish a one-story rear addition, construct a new two-story rear addition, rebuild a portion of the foundation and chimney, and widen the existing driveway on the condition that the driveway is no closer than 12 inches from the foundation of the house. The work as conditioned 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, 6, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for new additions, masonry, site, and district or neighborhood setting. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.**

**APPROVED**

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

**Nays:** 0

**G     NEW BUSINESS**

**H     APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**I     REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS**

**J     ASSIGNMENTS**

**J-1   Review Committee: Monday, August 13 at 5:00 pm for the August 16, 2012 Regular Meeting**

*Commissioners White and Ramsburgh volunteered for the August 16 Review Committee.*

**K     REPORTS FROM STAFF**

**K-1   12-0935       June 2012 Staff Activities**

*The Commission thanked Katie Remensnyder and Alexis DiLeo for their great work with the Historic District reviews. They offered a round of applause.*

**Received and Filed**

**L     PUBLIC COMMENTARY - Items not on the Agenda (3 Minutes per Speaker)**

**M     CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS**

*Bushkuhl brought his concerns about the un-approved signs posted on student rental properties that are also historic buildings. He said it seemed that some of the*

*previously noted signs had been removed, for which he was grateful.*

**N**      **COMMUNICATIONS**

**O**      **ADJOURNMENT**

**The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 9:44 p.m.**

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