



City of Ann Arbor

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

Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

Thursday, May 8, 2014

7:00 PM

City Hall, 301 E. Huron Street,
Basement Conference Room

A CALL TO ORDER

Secretary Bushkuhl called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

B ROLL CALL

Jill Thacher called the roll.

Present: 5 - Robert White, Patrick McCauley, Benjamin L. Bushkuhl, John Beeson, and Jennifer Ross

Absent: 2 - Ellen Ramsburgh, and Thomas Stulberg

C APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Agenda was unanimously Approved as presented. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

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

Patricia Austin, Boardmember of the Ann Arbor Historical Foundation, spoke about the new book, 'Historic Ann Arbor, an Architectural Guide', by Susan Wineberg and Patrick McCauley. The book will be debuted at the Ann Arbor City Club, on May 22, 2014 from 4-6 p.m.

E HEARINGS

E-1 [14-0731](#) HDC14-043; 448 Third Street - Remove Rear Window - OWSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

The applicant dates this house back to about 1869. This address first appears in the City Directory in 1890-91 as 52 W Third, the home of Charles H Major, a decorator and (in 1892) paperhanger. The 1899 Sanborn map shows mirror-image footprints of one-story houses with one-story rear additions at 448 and 452 Third Street. Between 1908 and 1916 a second story was added on the front 2/3 of the one-story house, along with a front porch and side porch. Sometime after 1931 the rear one-story addition was removed and the current mudroom added.

In February, 2009 a Certificate of Appropriateness (CofA) was granted to add a second-story addition to the rear and side of the house, remove the mudroom, and add a porch on the rear of the house. The rear porch was not constructed and the

mudroom remains in place.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the west side of Third Street, south of West Madison and north of West Jefferson.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to remove a window from the rear elevation of the house and infill the opening with wood siding to match the rest of the house.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

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

Windows

Recommended:

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

Not Recommended: *Introducing a new design that is incompatible with the historic character of the building.*

From the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines (other Guidelines may apply):

Windows

Not Appropriate:

Removing or radically changing a window that is important in defining the overall historic character of the property.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The homeowners have spoken to a woman who lived in the house in the 1950s. The woman remembered and described the removal of a door on the rear elevation and its replacement with the window in question. She said that the current mudroom was constructed at the same time. The outline of the door opening is visible in the patched-in siding below the window. The window is wood with aluminum jamb liners, and does not match the style or proportions of the original windows still present on the house. While looking at the window alone would make its age difficult to pinpoint, the testimony of the former occupant is compelling enough for staff to feel comfortable that the window was not from 1943 or earlier (the period of significance

for the historic district).

2. *The house's kitchen has doors, windows, and openings on all four walls, making the installation of cupboards a challenge. This relatively small alteration will allow the kitchen to function much more efficiently while keeping important architectural features intact, such as two almost-floor-to-ceiling windows on the south wall.*

3. *Infilling a non-original window opening on the rear elevation with matching siding is appropriate. No character-defining features of the house are altered or diminished by the work. Staff recommends approval of the application, and believes the work is compatible with the existing structure, neighboring buildings, and the surrounding historic district, and meets both the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

Ross reported that she supported the staff report and noted that of the windows that could be taken out this one was the least character defining, and that it was from the 1950s.

Bushkuhl agreed with Ross and the staff report and felt this request meets the applicant's need and the window was not from the time of significance.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Katie and Tim Schuster, 448 Third Street, Ann Arbor, owners, were present to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

Noting no further public speakers, the Chair declared the public hearing closed.

A motion was made by McCauley, seconded by White that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 448 Third Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to remove a non-original window on the rear elevation and infill the opening with siding to match the rest of the house. 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 and 9, and the guidelines for windows, as well as the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to windows.

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the presented application and discussed the matter.

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Granted.

Yeas: 5 - White, McCauley, Vice Chair Bushkuhl, Secretary Beeson, and Ross

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - Ramsburgh, and Chair Stulberg

E-2 [14-0732](#)

HDC14-047; 332 South Main Street - New Side Door Opening - MSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

This one-story brick and stucco building features two front entrance doors flanking a picture window, all with decorative quoins, and originally had a flat roof and crenellated parapet (the crenellations have since been infilled but are still very visible). It first appears in Polk City Directories in 1934 as Joe's Snappy Service (listed as 334 S Main), possibly Ann Arbor's first fast-food hamburger joint. Snappy Joe's was a small regional chain, with restaurants in Jackson, Ypsilanti, and Owosso, and a branch at 306 South Division (now the site of Liberty Plaza).

In January of 2014 a certificate of appropriateness was granted to remove an awning, rebuild the roof, and construct a roof deck and rear emergency egress stair.

LOCATION:

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

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to 1) construct a new egress door opening with a full-light door on the north side elevation; 2) install three new signs on the storefront; and 3) paint the unpainted brick quoins surrounding the existing front windows and doors.

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.

(5) Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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

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

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

Doors

Not Recommended:

Cutting new entrances on a primary elevation.

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.

Masonry

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving masonry features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as walls, brackets, railings, cornices, window architraves, door pediments, steps, and columns; and details such as tooling and bonding patterns, coatings, and color.

Not Recommended:

Applying paint or other coatings such as stucco to masonry that has been historically unpainted or uncoated to create a new appearance.

From the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines:

Signs

Appropriate:

Attaching signage through masonry joints, not masonry units, or through materials that can be easily repaired, such as wood, when the signage is removed.

Installing signage that is subordinate to the overall building composition.

Masonry walls, trim, and foundations

Appropriate:

Retaining original masonry and mortar whenever possible without the application of any surface treatment.

Protecting, maintaining and preserving masonry features and surfaces that contribute to the overall historic character of a building and site.

Not Appropriate:

Painting previously unpainted masonry.

STAFF FINDINGS

1. The proposed side door is set back from the front elevation around 55', and is

inset into the wall to accommodate door swing. The location is at the back of the first addition to the original building. The building continues to the west via a second addition. Additional egress in the center of this very long building is appropriate, and the location will have no negative impacts on the historic character of the building or its neighbor.

2. Two round signs 32" in diameter are proposed, one over each of the front doors. They are vinyl panels within a round aluminum frame, and each is lit with one downward-shining light in a 4 5/8" hood on a 14" straight arm. An additional sign over the storefront display window would be 5'5" long and consist of 5" extruded aluminum letters saying "sweets. coffee. tea".

3. The brick trim around the windows, doors, and crenellated parapet are unique to this building in downtown. Painting the masonry would change the character of the building and the style of the brick would make future paint removal particularly difficult. Repainting the already-painted stucco and CMU portions of the building is appropriate, but staff's opinion is that both the federal and local guidelines are clear that painting the decorative brick trim is not appropriate.

4. Staff recommends approval of the new signs and door. Each is an appropriate size, design, and material, and are compatible with the historic structure and neighborhood. No character-defining features of the building will be impacted, and their locations on the building are appropriate. Staff recommends denial of the request to paint the unpainted brick window, door, and parapet trim based on the standards and guidelines. Two motions are suggested below.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

Ross stated that she supported staff's assessment of the project. Regarding the proposed addition of a rear door in the existing concrete wall, she didn't have an issue. She said in looking at the existing building, it appears that the unpainted brick quoins is a unique character-defining feature of this building and covering it up would not be good.

Bushkuhl agreed with Ross, adding that in visiting the site they were able to see the way in which the building was constructed with what appears to be the original brick and the details above the doors match the details around the windows. He said the proposed signage meets the City's requirements.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Craig Borum, 679 South Wagner Road, Ann Arbor, Architect for the project, was present to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

Noting no further public speakers, the Chair declared the public hearing closed.

Signage and Door:

A motion was made by Ross, Seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the portion of the application at 332 South Main Street, a contributing structure in the Main Street Historic District, to install three signs and a new door in a new opening, as proposed. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the building and the surrounding area and meets The City of Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines for signs, and The Secretary of the Interior's

Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 5, 9 and 10, and the guidelines for storefronts and doors.

(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.

(5) Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the presented application and discussed the matter.

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Granted for Signage and Door.

Yeas: 5 - White, McCauley, Vice Chair Bushkuhl, Secretary Beeson, and Ross

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - Ramsburgh, and Chair Stulberg

Brick Trim Painting:

A motion was made by Ross, Seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the portion of the application at 332 South Main Street, a contributing structure in the Main Street Historic District, to paint the previously unpainted masonry on all parts of the building, as proposed. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the building and the surrounding area and meets The City of Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines for masonry trim, and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2 and 5, and the guidelines for masonry.

(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.

(5) Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the presented application and discussed the matter.

McCauley said he sympathizes with the applicant and their dilemma of cleaning up the existing paint job on the brick. He mentioned faux painting as a possible solution to touching up and making the lines crisper, but wanted the Commission's feedback on the matter.

Bushkuhl reiterated that covering up existing original brick with paint is not acceptable. He encouraged the applicant to try different methods of cleaning up the existing brick and if they discover new information to bring before the Commission then he explained that they could return before the Commission with a new application.

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

Request Denied for Brick Trim Painting.

Yeas: 0

Nays: 5 - White, McCauley, Vice Chair Bushkuhl, Secretary Beeson, and Ross

Absent: 2 - Ramsburgh, and Chair Stulberg

E-3 [14-0733](#)

HDC14-061; 1017 West Liberty Street - New Rear Screened Porch - OWSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

This stately house first appears in Polk Directories in 1928 as the home of John Huss, who worked in real estate. Mrs. Huss lived in the home until at least 1940. Some of its significant features include brick on the foundation and first floor, wood siding on the second floor, a shallow shed roof facing the street over wall dormers, exposed rafter tails, and a stone 3/4-width front porch supporting square half-columns.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the south side of West Liberty Street, west of Eighth Street and east of Eberwhite Boulevard.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace an existing rear deck with a new 15' x 15 1/2' screen porch in the same location.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

(10) *New additions and adjacent or related new construction 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 inconspicuous side of a historic building; and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

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.

From the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines (other Guidelines may apply):

Porches

Appropriate:

Installing a new porch and entrance on secondary elevations may be appropriate if it does not diminish the building's architectural character and the design and materials are compatible with the building and the site.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *The existing small rear porch does not appear on any Sanborn maps, which leads staff to believe it was constructed in the 1970s or later. The door opening may or may not be original – the site visit will help clarify that issue. The proposed screen porch would attach to the existing small porch roof. Since the small porch is not believed to be original, this is an appropriate way to place the new screen porch close to the house without impacting the historic structure at all.*

2. *The proposed screen porch is approximately 15' x 15.5'. It would be constructed of wood, with lap siding on a low half-wall, wood columns above the wall to match the existing rear porch columns, and a pyramidal roof. The siding material is not specified and should be clarified at the meeting by the applicant. Wood steps and screen doors would lead to the back yard, and the screen porch would have a ceiling and fan*

installed. A new light fixture is also proposed on the back of the house to light two existing rear entry doors to the home.

3. The design of the screen porch is grand, as is the house. It will have no physical connection to historic home, and is completely reversible. Staff recommends approval of the application, and believes the work is compatible with the existing structure, neighboring buildings, and the surrounding historic district, and meets both the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

Bushkuhl agreed with the information in the staff report, noting that the porch had details that help out in that it is fully reversible, and laps over the existing roof, and leaving the existing columns [which seem to be historic material] untouched. He said it is slightly visible from the road, but the existing deck helps indicate the proposed footprint. He was in favor of the application.

Ross agreed with the staff report and Bushkuhl's assessment, adding that the scale is appropriate and the proposed enclosed porch would be covering an existing deck that is not of historic age. She said the design is great and she supported the project.

Bushkuhl commented that the stonework on the front porch is most attractive and eye-catching.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Mr and Mrs. Tim Rayburn, were present to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

Noting no further public speakers, the Chair declared the public hearing closed.

A motion was made by Beeson, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 1017 West Liberty Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to replace an existing rear deck with a new 15' x 15 ½' screen porch in the same location, as proposed. 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, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for new additions, as well as the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to porches.

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

(10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction 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.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the presented application and discussed the matter.

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Granted.

Yeas: 5 - White, McCauley, Vice Chair Bushkuhl, Secretary Beeson, and Ross

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - Ramsburgh, and Chair Stulberg

E-4 [14-0734](#)

HDC14-060; 200 East Washington Street - New Storefronts - MSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

200-202 East Washington was constructed as the Ypsi-Ann Building in 1927-28 and first occupied in 1928. The Betty Shop at 200 East Washington is prominently displayed in the 1928 City Directory. This seven-story commercial vernacular was designed by Ralph S. Gerganoff, a prolific Ypsilanti architect who designed several Ann Arbor commercial buildings, such as the Beer Depot (before it was altered almost beyond recognition), the elegant art-deco Kingsley Apartments, and St. Nicholas Greek Orthodox Church on North Main (recently demolished). The building features red tapestry brick on floors two through seven, and stone on the first floor and cornice. The architect's signature inset limestone diamonds are prominent. At some point the building became known as the Wolverine Building, and in the 1980s, the upper story windows and the East Washington Street fixed canopy were replaced and the building was renamed Washington Square.

In March, 2014 the Historic District Commission denied an application to replace some of the existing storefronts with a new aluminum storefront system.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the southeast corner of East Washington and South Fourth.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace all of the storefronts with dark anodized aluminum simulating the existing wood and metal framing.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

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

(1) A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

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

characterize a property will be avoided.

(5) Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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

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

Storefronts

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving storefronts--and their functional and decorative features--that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as display windows, signs, doors, transoms, kick plates, corner posts, and entablatures. The removal of inappropriate, non-historic cladding, false mansard roofs, and other later alterations can help reveal the historic character of a storefront.

Protecting and maintaining masonry, wood, and architectural metals which comprise storefronts through appropriate treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and reapplication of protective coating systems.

Repairing storefronts by reinforcing the historic materials. Repairs will also generally include the limited replacement in kind--or with compatible substitute materials--of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of storefronts where there are surviving prototypes such as transoms, kick plates, pilasters, or signs.

Replacing in kind an entire storefront that is too deteriorated to repair--if the overall form and detailing are still evident--using the physical evidence as a model. If using the same material is not technically or economically feasible, then compatible substitute materials may be considered.

Not Recommended:

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

Stripping storefronts of historic material such as wood, cast iron, terra cotta, carrara glass, and brick.

Replacing an entire storefront when repair of materials and limited replacement of its parts are appropriate.

Using substitute material for the replacement parts that does not convey the same visual appearance as the surviving parts of the storefront or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

Removing a storefront that is un-repairable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new storefront that does not convey the same visual appearance.

From the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines:

Storefronts

Appropriate:

Protecting, maintaining and preserving storefronts and their functional and decorative features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as display windows, signs, doors, transoms, kick plates, corner posts, and entablatures using recognized preservation methods

Protecting and maintaining masonry, wood, and architectural metals which comprise storefronts through appropriate treatments such as reinforcement of historic materials, cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and reapplication of protective coating systems.

Repairing storefronts as needed, which may include replacing parts that are deteriorated beyond repair or that are missing with matching or compatible substitute materials. Missing parts must be appropriately documented.

Replacing an entire storefront when repair is not possible.

Not Appropriate:

Installing a new storefront that is incompatible in size and material with the historic building and district.

Removing or radically changing storefronts and their features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that the character is diminished.

STAFF FINDINGS

- 1. Based on the style and appearance of its components, the existing storefront is believed to be from the period of significance (pre-1943) for the Main Street Historic District. It features plate glass set in steel, with a metal trim piece surrounding the edges. Some of the windows are divided by 2" steel muntins, but others are a single pane. Below the glazing is a wood kickplate (or bulkhead) made up of decorative panels with windows into the basement. Some of the windows still exist and function as windows, some have been painted over, and some have been boarded up.*
- 2. Staff is pleased to report that the new owner of the building is undertaking expensive deferred maintenance not addressed by the previous owner, such as re-pointing the entire building and repairing the aging elevators .*
- 3. Parts of the metal window framing have rusted away completely. The building manager told staff that the wood beams dividing the windows from the transoms are also heavily deteriorated. The wood kickplates, which rest on a limestone base, have shifted as a result of construction in the street, and show some signs of visible deterioration.*
- 4. On East Washington, the east window has two large display panes, with six small windows in the kickplate. The west window is one large piece of glass with four windows in the kickplate. In the corner entry on either side is a single pane of glass plus one kickplate window. On South Fourth, the north window is one piece of glass with five windows in the kickplate, and the south window is four panes of glass with seven kickplate windows. All of the transoms contain two panes of equal size. All of the storefronts on the building are now part of the application. All of the windows have awning gutters (or hoods) that appear in the early photos and renderings of the*

building.

5. The application proposes the following changes: "... using dark anodized aluminum with varying profiles and offsets to simulate the existing wood and metal framing. New glass at the transoms and storefronts would be 1" thick tempered clear glass insulated units. New panels at the kickplates would be 1" thick insulation panels with a pre-finished exterior face simulating the textured glass. Tenant entrances would be changed from the current aluminum, or wood, in the case of the salon, to all new aluminum entrances. Transom panels would be changed from the current wide panes to multiple smaller panes that match historic photos from the 1930s and 40s. Storefront panels would be sized to match the original storefronts on S. Fourth and the 1940s changes evident in the historic photos. Muntin placement never matched or was centered on the punched openings of the upper floors; the storefront openings do not even align with the punched openings. Being set in limestone, we see these lower openings as a design solution separate and distinct from upper elevation design in brick."

6. Staff believes that the evidence presented by the applicant and the letter from the structural engineer are adequate proof that the storefronts have serious structural deficiencies that must be addressed. Addressing these problems will require dismantling the storefronts that exist today. If the Commission agrees with staff on this, they must determine whether the use of the original materials, wood and steel, are technically or economically feasible, and if not, whether the proposed material change to aluminum is compatible. The sample aluminum section to be provided at the May 8 meeting will be invaluable to this determination.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

Bushkuhl reported that during the site visit they were able to meet with the applicants, identify and discuss the specifics of the glazing in the glass and the transoms. He said they are not sure of the age of the glass but it is definitely not the original and is single pane, adding that if the panes were to be removed they would probably not be able to be replaced again and they would likely not be kept in one piece. He referenced the engineer's report provided on the impact of the necessary structural repairs needed. He further explained that the other item of discussion is the wood base [kickplate] that the glass sits on, stating that it could be replaced with either wood or aluminum, which would be further discussed by the full Commission. Another item is the wood surrounds of the door which does appear to be of original material and the Commission would further discuss.

Ross reiterated from the staff report that the question comes down to; a. Do we find that the items are character-defining features, and if so, does that proposed work match with Item (6) of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, (6) Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Ross said she is not clear if the proposed aluminum storefront adequately meets that standard, but is interested in hearing the complete Commission discussion.

Bushkuhl pointed out that the items your eyes are drawn to are the windows and the base of the building, which differs from what one sees when up close to the building.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Ilene Tyler, Quinn Evans Architects, 219 1/2 North Main Street, Ann Arbor, was present, along with the owners, and reviewed historic study material with the Commission and was available to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

McCauley stated that under normal conditions one would repair deficient items on a building instead of what is being proposed on this project which is wholesale removal of every detail, whether they are deficient or not. He said that is the sticking point for him on this request, since this issue was clearly outlined to the applicant on their previous application.

James Howell, Cameron Holdings, LLC, 4121 Okemos Road, Suite 17, Okemos, building manager, explained that they were thinking of changing the black aluminum color to a green aluminum.

Noting no further public speakers, the Chair declared the public hearing closed.

A motion was made by Ross, Seconded by White, that the Historic District Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 200 East Washington Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to replace the storefronts with new aluminum storefronts, in the configuration proposed. The work as proposed is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding resources and meets the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 1, 2, 5, 6 and 9 and both sets of guidelines for storefronts.

- (1) A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.**
- (2) The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.**
- (5) Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.**
- (6) Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical 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.**

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the presented application and discussed the matter.

A motion was made by Bushkuhl, seconded by White, that the Resolution/Public Hearing be Postponed to the June 2014 HDC meeting. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion defeated.

Yeas: 2 - White, and Vice Chair Bushkuhl

Nays: 3 - McCauley, Secretary Beeson, and Ross

Absent: 2 - Ramsburgh, and Chair Stulberg

Vote on Original Motion:

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

Request Denied.

Yeas: 1 - White

Nays: 4 - McCauley, Vice Chair Bushkuhl, Secretary Beeson, and Ross

Absent: 2 - Ramsburgh, and Chair Stulberg

F UNFINISHED BUSINESS

G NEW BUSINESS

G-1 [14-0735](#) Review HDC Bylaws

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the HDC Bylaws and discussed the matter.

The HDC Bylaws were unanimously Approved by the Commission without changes. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Yeas: 5 - White, McCauley, Vice Chair Bushkuhl, Secretary Beeson, and Ross

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - Ramsburgh, and Chair Stulberg

G-2 [14-0736](#) HDC Awards Committee - 2014 Awards Nominees

*Awards 2014 - FINAL LIST
Susan Wineberg, Chair, HDC Awards Committee
April 22, 2014*

Rehabilitation Awards

1. East Quad and the Munger Residences in the Lawyers Club- 1940 and 1925-33.

Preservation Awards

2. 1520 Cambridge- Max Winkler House- 1911. Susan and Martin Hurwitz since 1991.
3. 1414 Washtenaw-Kappa Alpha Theta 1867/1916 House. Originally the home of Dr. Porter and later Prof. Burke A. Hinsdale. Remodeled 1916.
4. 1432 Washtenaw- First Presbyterian Church- 1932.
5. 1830 Washtenaw- City Club- Original house of Scott-1886/1917/1951/1962 (addition).
6. 13 Regent Drive- Mundus House- 1964 by David Osler, Ken Wisniski and Linda Dintenfass since 1999.
7. 7 Regent Drive-Morris House by Alden Dow, 1962. Howard Shapiro since 2002.
8. 1448 Broadway- 1860s (or older?) tiny house and 1870s barn. Owner Margaret Bignall for 33 years.
9. 1111 Fair Oaks James Petrie House-1916. Carol and Bob Mull since 1970s.
10. 2600 Packard- Stone School- 1911. Stone School Nursery Coop.
11. 844 W. Huron- 1872 Mallory House- John Hallowell since 1970s.
12. 1158 Pomona- Albano House 1955- Steve Sivak since 1995.
13. 2022 Delafield- 1959 Wong "bonnet" house. 1960 City Directory says "under construction." Richard Hadden in 1961-Asst. Director of U-M Press. Akhavan Rayhaneh since 1989.
14. Special Merit Award to Susan Wineberg and Patrick McCauley for the new book *Historic Ann Arbor: An Architectural Guide*.
15. Preservationist of the Year – Ethel "Eppie" Potts- serving the community in many ways since the 1950s? 60s for sure.

A motion was made by White, seconded by McCauley, that the Commission approve the 2014 Awards Nominees from the HDC Awards Committee. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Yeas: 5 - White, McCauley, Vice Chair Bushkuhl, Secretary Beeson, and Ross

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - Ramsburgh, and Chair Stulberg

H APPROVAL OF MINUTES

H-1 [14-0737](#) Minutes of the April 10, 2014 HDC Meeting

The minutes were unanimously Approved by the Commission and forwarded to the City Council. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

I REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

J ASSIGNMENTS**J-1 Review Committee: Monday, June 9, 2014, at 5:00 pm for the June 12, 2014 Regular Meeting**

Commissioners McCauley and White volunteered for the June Review Committee [with Bushkuhl as backup].

K REPORTS FROM STAFF**K-1 [14-0738](#) April 2014 HDC Staff Activities**

Received and Filed

L CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS**M COMMUNICATIONS****[14-0739](#) Various Communications to the HDC**

Received and Filed

N ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 9:45 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, 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/Vid eoOnDemand.aspx*
- *Cable: Watch CTN Channel 16 public meeting programming via Comcast Cable channel 16.*

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