

**From:** Diane Giannola  
**To:** [CityCouncil: HDC](#)  
**Cc:** [Lazarus, Howard](#); [McDonald, Kevin](#)  
**Subject:** Draft Inglis House Study Report  
**Date:** Sunday, August 06, 2017 3:08:34 PM  
**Attachments:** [address.png](#)

---

All,

I am writing in response to the draft Inglis House Study Report. There is a problem with how the boundaries for this district were determined. Although single resource districts are possible, the committee was supposed to show how this property stands alone in its significance, which their report does not. I realize that council only instructed the committee to look at this one property, but when comprising the report, the committee needed to justify why this property stands alone in its significance regardless, in order to satisfy the [Criteria for Evaluating Resources for Inclusion in Local Historic Districts](#). What that means is that they need to show that this property should not be or cannot be part of a larger district.

According to the [Criteria for Evaluating Resources for Inclusion in Local Historic Districts](#), in order to establish a single resource district:

" a single resource historic district must be distinguishable from the surrounding resources in the immediate vicinity by virtue of geography, historic significance, or integrity.

A single resource district CANNOT:

- share its significance of historic development or association with surrounding resources. If the resource does share those characteristics with surrounding resources, then the single resource district cannot stand alone and must be included as part of a larger district. Examples of inappropriate and thus impermissible single resource districts include one bungalow in the middle of a neighborhood of bungalows, or one Queen Anne or Italianate house in a larger neighborhood of Victorian style homes.
- be based solely on property ownership.
- be based solely on the consent of property owners.

The report does not show how the Inglis property is distinguishable from the surrounding neighborhood and it appears to be based solely on ownership and

previous use of the house.

In the Draft Inglis House study report, **the boundary justification for the district is not accurate**. In the report the boundary justification is stated as:

#### BOUNDARY JUSTIFICATION

The parcel is the entire parcel developed in 1927 by James and Elizabeth Inglis, therefore it is historically and presently associated with the Inglis House. The parcel includes landscaped areas and supporting outbuildings that were developed during the period of significance of the house. **Newer single-family housing subdivisions developed in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s surround the district.**

**This is not accurate and is actually false.** A simple search on the City of Ann Arbor assessor page of the same street and surrounding neighborhood shows at least 29 homes that were built before 1940 and should be looked at for possible inclusion into this historic district. Some are actually older than this property. Here is a sampling of those properties. All dates are from the City Assessor page.

(see attachment for address list if it does not appear in the body of the email)



With this many properties built pre 1940, the statement that "**Newer single-family housing subdivisions developed in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s surround the district.**" **is false and misleading**. One cannot claim a single resource district without at least looking at these properties built in the 1920s/1930s and cataloguing reasons why they do not fit into this proposed district. There needs to be a CLEAR explanation about how and why these properties built in the same period do not warrant historic district protection, while the Inglis House does. Although there are many homes in the area that were built in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970's, I believe that these homes were built on plots that were broken off from some of the larger, older estates similar to the Inglis estate, but I admit that is an assumption. Keep in mind that historic districts often include non-contributing resources in the district so the presence of newer construction does not discredit a district.

Due to this error in the report, **I am asking that this report be delayed and revised in order to comply with the set of requirements laid out by the [Michigan State Historic Preservation Office](#)**. Please respond and let me know why this won't or can't be done if you disagree.

For the record, I am not against this property becoming a historic district, per se. Whether it is a protected site is sort of meaningless (historically) except for the power to limit redevelopment of the Inglis site.. This property is isolated, cannot be seen

clearly from the street, and remained in relative obscurity until now ( most residents of Ann Arbor never actually knew that it existed, including me).

**What I am against, and the reason why I have this objection, is simply because of the precedent it sets.** I do not believe a group of neighbors/residents should be able to impose restrictions on a nearby property owner simply because they are afraid of what a new owner might do with the property. There are many other properties in the same neighborhood that may be just as deserving of protection and should be included in the proposed district. They should be looked at and included using the same criteria that was used for the Inglis house. Yes, there are other houses built after 1940 that would be non-contributing resources in the district, but that happens in all historic districts; not everything is a contributing resource. And if those who are pushing for this district do not want to have their own historic property included in the district, then the historic district should not be formed.

So again, due to the failure of the report to show that the Inglis House is distinguishable from the surrounding neighborhood, **I am asking that this report be delayed and revised in order to comply with the set of requirements laid out by the [Michigan State Historic Preservation Office](#).** Please respond and let me know why this won't or can't be done if you disagree.

Thank you,  
Diane Giannola  
3252 Alpine Dr