



City of Ann Arbor

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

Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

Thursday, January 12, 2012

7:00 PM Ann Arbor Municipal Center, 301 E. Huron Street, 2nd Flr.

A CALL TO ORDER

Chair McCauley called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm.

B ROLL CALL

Thacher call the roll.

Present: 7 - Kristina A. Glusac, Robert White, Ellen Ramsburgh, Patrick McCauley, Thomas Stulberg, Benjamin L. Bushkuhl, and John Beeson

C APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Agenda was unanimously approved.

Approved as presented

D HEARINGS

D-1 12-0034 HDC12-001: 436 Second Street - New Person Door in Non-Contributing Garage - OWSHD

PUBLIC HEARING:
Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:
This two-story, gable-end, Queen Anne vernacular home first appears in the 1896 Polk directory as the home of Louis Boes, a teacher. It features wide board trim and fish scale shingles in the front gable. The garage received a Certificate of Appropriateness in 2002 and is a non-contributing structure in the Old West Side Historic District.

LOCATION:
The site is located on the west side of Second Street, south of West William and north of West Jefferson.

APPLICATION:
The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace a window with a new person door on the north elevation of the garage. The door would match an existing door on the same elevation.

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

(9) New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy

historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

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

Building Site - Alterations/Additions for the New Use

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 person door on a non-contributing garage will not impact historic structures on the site or in the vicinity.*
- 2. Staff recommends approval of the application since the work is on a non-contributing outbuilding and does not detract from the character of the historic house, district or neighborhood.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE:

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

Ramsburgh said that the staff report was very complete, reiterating that the change would have minimal impact on the non-contributing structure as well as the historical building. She said that the applicants had expressed their desire to close off the staircase from the open garage area below which would help with the insulation of the upstairs area.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Greg McGuire, 435 Second Street, Ann Arbor, owner and applicant was present to answer the Commissions' questions.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

None

A motion was made by Glusac, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 436 Second Street in the Old West Side Historic District to install a person door on the north elevation of the non-contributing garage, as proposed. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standard 9 and the guidelines for Building Site. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

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

Nays: 0

D-2 12-0035

HDC12-002: 210 South Ashley - 415 Square Foot Accessory Building, Freestanding Canopies - MSHD

PUBLIC HEARING:

Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

The two brick commercial vernacular buildings at 210 and 212-216 South Ashley were built in 1899 and 1910, respectively. Number 210 was originally occupied by Mann & Zeeb Agricultural Imports, and 212-216 by Hertler Brothers Agricultural Implements. They are contributing structures in the Main Street Historic District. The proposed project is in the Downtown Home & Garden parking lot at the corner of South Ashley and West Liberty Streets and formerly had the address 218 South Ashley. On the current parking lot portion of the 218 South Ashley site, a house appears on 1888 through 1925 Sanborn maps, but this part of the site was vacant by 1931.

LOCATION:

The site is at the corner of South Ashley and West Liberty Streets.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct a 422 square foot accessory building in the southwest corner of the existing parking lot off South Ashley Street. The building would be a single story, and contain two restrooms and a beer storage/serving area for a beer garden. Materials would include wood windows and doors, board and batten siding, and a standing seam metal roof. Also included are two freestanding metal-roofed pavilions, one on either side of the existing greenhouse on the south side of the building.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

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

Building Site - Alterations/Additions for the New Use

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 property owner desires to open a beer garden that would operate in the evening in the current parking lot. The proposed beer building would occupy one of

the six parking spaces in the lot, and would contain two restrooms and a beer storage and serving area. None of the existing European hornbeam trees that currently ring the perimeter of the parking lot will be removed or harmed by the proposed building. The building would be a single story (14'6" at the ridge), with removable wood windows in the serving/storage area, the design of which would echo the existing wood storefront at 210 South Ashley (see photo provided by applicant). The rear portion of the building would have wood board and batten siding. The beer portion of the structure would have a standing seam metal roof that is hipped, and the restroom portion would be flat (or nearly so). The building would be painted dark green with a lighter green roof. See the letter and drawings attached to the application for more information.

2. The pavilions would be 14' square and 15' square, with wood 6" by 6" posts and standing seam metal roofs to match the beer building. They are intended for shade and shelter, and are freestanding.

3. The proposed structures are low, small, removable, and will not compete with or detract from contributing resources on the site or the Union Hall located just downhill on West Liberty.

4. Staff recommends approval of the application since the size, scale, design, materials, and color of the proposed structures is compatible with the historic character of the site, preserves historic relationships, and does not harm historic structures on the site.

REVIEW COMMITTEE:

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

Stulberg said that he agreed with the very thorough staff report, adding that the impact on the main historical building is very minimal, with the additional structures being away from the main building yet they have architectural treatments that reflect the older building. He said that he felt that given the scale of the pavilions and different materials used, they didn't detract from the main building.

Stulberg stated that he felt it was an excellent use of the space creating an urban setting with fitting elements.

Ramsburgh agreed.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Dick Mitchell, 113 S. Fourth Ave. Ann Arbor, Architect for the project, explained the owner, Mark Hodesh's idea of how the beer garden project would operate. He stated that Hodesh sees this project as reactivating the neighborhood back to its' German roots with a neighborhood family atmosphere at the heart of it.

Glusac asked if there was clear glazing at the top of the transoms.

Mitchell said, yes.

Glusac asked if the whole parking lot area would be secured during the evening for safety of the panels.

Mitchell responded that the whole parking closes with locked gates and that the panels would be locked in place with flush bolts and there would be pedestrian doors on either side that would lock making it very secure.

Bushkuhl asked about colors of the proposed pavilions.

Mitchell said that they hadn't identified colors yet, but he would suggest to Hodesh that the pavilions match the color of the other building which is hunter green.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Ramsburgh commented that the project was very innovative and a delightful way of using the parking space as a great pedestrian experience during the non-working hours of Home and Garden. She said it enhanced the building rather than detracts from it.

McCauley added that he was excited to see the proposed project and said that it will add a lot of vitality to the neighborhood at the time of day when this block would otherwise be dead with activities.

A motion was made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 210 South Ashley Street in the Main Street Historic District to construct a 422 square foot accessory building and two pavilions, as proposed. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the contributing structures on the site and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standard 9 and the guidelines for Building Site. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

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

Nays: 0

D-3 12-0036

HDC12-003: 711 West Jefferson - 281 Square Foot Second Floor Rear Addition to House - OWSHD

PUBLIC HEARING:

Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This two story Queen Anne was built in 1895 and was first occupied by John Steinke, a laborer. The house remained in the Steinke family until 2010, when it was sold to the current owner. It features a full-width front porch with turned posts, a two story cross-gable on the east side, and a textured block foundation. There is a one and a half story barn on the property that staff believes is also a contributing structure. Its condition is unknown.

LOCATION:

The property is located on the south side of West Jefferson Street, between Fifth and Sixth Streets.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to add a 281 SF second floor addition on top of an existing rear single story addition, and add a pair of doublehung windows in a new opening on the second floor of the east elevation.

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 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):

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.

District or Neighborhood Setting

Not Recommended: Introducing new construction into historic districts that is visually incompatible or that destroys historic relationships within the setting.

Windows

Recommended: Designing and installing additional windows on rear or other-non character-defining elevations if required by the new use. New window openings may also be cut into exposed party walls. Such design should be compatible with the overall design of the building, but not duplicate the fenestration pattern and detailing of a character-defining elevation.

Not Recommended: Installing new windows, including frames, sash, and muntin configuration that are incompatible with the building's historic appearance or obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *The proposed work retains all existing eave lines, which distinguishes the new from the old. The design and scale of the addition is compatible with the house, does not detract from it, and uses distinct materials (such as hardieboard siding and trims) and window sizes to further differentiate it from the historic structure. The addition's impact on neighboring properties would be minimal.*
2. *Three second floor double-hung windows would be removed to make way for the addition. The age and condition of these windows is unknown. The addition would have two egress casement windows (with false muntins, to appear as one-over-one doublehangs) on each of the east and west elevations, plus a one-over-one doublehung on the west elevation. The rear elevation would have three square mullioned casements. On the second floor of the east elevation of the original house, a pair of doublehung windows in a new opening is proposed to let light into a hall that was previously part of a bedroom. These windows are of different proportions than the other windows on the original house, and are compatible in design, though they would be located on a character-defining elevation. All proposed windows are painted wood.*
3. *On the west side elevation, the proposed addition has a lower section that sits on top of an existing single-story bump out. This part of the proposed work acts as a connector to the slightly taller addition that sits on the existing rear wing, and results in a smoother transition between the original house and the rear addition.*
4. *Staff recommends approval of the proposed addition since it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for New Additions and District or Neighborhood Setting.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE:

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

Stulberg reported that the house has most of its' character defining features in tact. He stated that the relative size of the addition isn't that big and he felt that it was more a matter of the lines and angles on the addition that made it visible. He stated that the east elevation would be fine with the addition of the two new windows to allow light into the home. He noted that there is a fairly large side yard, and that the addition would be visible from the street, but not when looking head-on, which he felt would be fine. He said he had further questions regarding the hip roof, when looking at it from the front or north elevation, and how the roof lines appeared when looking at the 3-D depiction.

Stulberg stated that he felt they had done a good job in the massing of the addition, and was appropriate on the structure and didn't overwhelm it and he felt there was a lot of care taken with the design to compliment, yet not obscure, the distinctive historical features of the original structure.

Ramsburgh agreed with Stulberg's remarks adding that she felt the west elevation was the area she had the most concerns about. She said it wasn't the minimal size of the addition but rather at how the addition's angles were massed on the west elevation when viewed from the street. She asked for further explanation from the architect on the massing and said apart from that one elevation she was in favor of an addition to the house in order to make it more livable for a small family.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Alison Rodgers, 711 W. Jefferson, Ann Arbor, and Marlene Rodgers, 715 Dornoch Drive, Ann Arbor, were present to answer the Commission's questions.

Marlene Rodgers said they had spent a lot of time and money on the house. She explained that currently the upstairs is unlivable and there isn't a place in the house where one can take a shower or bath, and everything will have to be re-done. She said they have been cutting down on plans on the house just to fit in a bathroom and make it acceptable to the Commission.

Beeson said that he likes the rhythm of the addition to the house and felt that it adds to the house in that it's a continuation of the bump-outs on the front. He said that he had concerns with how the ventilation on the existing as well as the new addition would be handled in order to preserve and protect the house from molds and to keep the rafters healthy. Beeson said he could see some inconsistencies with the heights that were shown on the elevation plans and asked for clarity on what the final height would be.

Rodgers provided final plans from their architect to the Commission.

Glusac and Beeson reviewed the elevations and stated that, while it wasn't clearly noted or dimensioned on the plan, it looked like the plan was to align the ridge of the new roof with the existing bump-out and that it was set below the existing ridge, which are things that they would like to see on additions.

Beeson said that on the provided plans he could see further answers to his concerns for ventilation in the attic areas.

Stulberg asked about the dimensions of the bump-out addition on the northwestern side and if that is where the bathroom would be. He asked what the headroom was in that room and if lowering the roofline would impede the use of the room. He said if there was unused headroom then the hip roof could be dropped down in the front to help make it feel like a more separate element.

Rodgers responded that is where the bathroom would be located.

McCauley said that if the final architectural plans didn't show the headroom in that area then the Commission wouldn't have enough information to include such an alteration in their motion but they could discuss it further or move to delay taking action until they had further information.

Beeson said that in lowering the roof, there would be a question of functionality, but that according to the drawing the fascia board currently lined up which would change if the roofline would change.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Glusac said that the addition is very integrated into the existing building, almost too integrated, yet she wasn't sure what other options were available for an addition given the multiple appenditures on the building. She said she appreciates that they kept the addition within the existing footprint but she felt that there wasn't enough difference between the new and existing. She suggested that they could use a different window trim on the new addition from what is on the existing. She also suggested using a different window type, on the back elevation, than a double-hung.

Beeson said the same question would then also arise on the east side elevation where the two windows are drawn as double-hung, but if they should be casement.

Thacher explained that since the windows wouldn't be originals and are emulating double-hungs with a false muntin across the middle, she wasn't sure how much of a difference it would make if it was a casement or a double-hung since they are trying to make them all look like nominal double-hungs anyway.

Glusac said she wasn't in favor of having them all look like double-hungs.

Stulberg said he was okay with windows that were either casement or double-hung or a combination with a differentiating window trim treatment that would set the new windows apart from the existing.

White asked if different material would be used on the addition from what was on the existing.

Stulberg said that they were using Hardie-Board on the addition that was supposed to look like the original wood.

White said that one will still be able to see what is new from the old simply based on the material that was used.

McCauley said that he felt given the new windows and siding on the addition there wouldn't be a lot of confusion between what is new versus the old. He said while they discuss the new addition as being jarring versus blending in too much, it is a fine line. McCauley said he felt given the Hardie-Plank, the new windows and new trim, the addition would read as a new addition.

McCauley said he felt the addition was very tastefully done in trying to follow very closely with what the standards say regarding setting things back and bringing the rooflines down from the original structure. He said he was very much in favor of the addition and supported it, while he recognized that these additions were difficult and pose some interesting problems since there are only limited options to work with on these sites.

White said he supported the project as well.

Glusac said she couldn't agree with previous comments made regarding matching windows. She said that the Commission has tried to differentiate window styles on new additions from what is in the existing structure.

White said that the new windows will have a different tint to them than the older glazed kind.

McCauley said that he was convinced through staff findings that the discussed window would be the only double-hung window in the whole house and therefore it would read as set apart and different from the rest.

Bushkuhl agreed that the applicants had put much effort into trying to adhere to all of the Commission's standards and while what might seem like minor details of pickiness to some, is of relevance to the Commission. He felt that the massing was appropriate and he liked that the windows looked different on the new from the existing. His only reservation was on the west elevation, the new window's trim on the right seemed like it matched with the existing windows.

Stulberg said that according to the plans it looked like the architect was trying to match the trim with the existing windows.

McCauley said that from his recollection he felt the Commission had approved several other projects where the trim was matching the existing on a structure.

Permission requested to reopen Public Hearing. Granted.

Stulberg asked the applicants if they had a preference on the double-hung versus casement and if they had a comment on why the choice of windows were as shown on the plans. He asked if they were open to changes on the windows.

Rodgers said that it would've been helpful to have the architect present to clarify some of the issues, and that they have only been given the choices from the architect as to what would meet the City's standards. They said they would definitely be open to changes.

Further discussion pursued regarding possible changes to the window types and/or trim.

McCauley said that it seemed that the setting back of the bump-out from the original structure differentiates it clearly as not being from the original structure since in a historical context it would never have been built like that. He reiterated that he felt the applicants had done what they could to meet the standards and he expressed concern that maybe the Commission was raising the bar a little too high on details that won't make or break the addition one way or the other.

Beeson concurred with McCauley's comments on the south side elevation and felt the discussion was important in order to make sure everyone saw and understood what the issue was that was being raised.

A motion was made that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 711 West Jefferson Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District to add a 281 square foot second floor addition on top of an existing rear single story addition, and add a pair of doublehung windows in a new opening on the second floor of the east elevation, as proposed. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for New Additions and District or Neighborhood Setting. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

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

Nays: 0

E UNFINISHED BUSINESS

E-1 12-0045 Historic District Commission By-Laws Revisions

Ramsburgh said she was glad to see the clarifications made as previously noted and requested. She felt it would be a good idea to give the Commission time to review the material and bring the item back to the next HDC meeting for action.

F NEW BUSINESS

F-1 12-0037

Additions/Amendments to Staff Approvals List: New Window/Door Openings in Non-Contributing Resources; Woodstove Chimneys; Patios

Thacher reviewed proposed amendments and additions to the Staff Approvals list as shown below. The revisions address common requests that staff thinks may be appropriate for administrative review instead of review by the full commission.

Proposed amendments:

7) Installation of new skylights [(delete:) or solar panels] on non-character defining roof surfaces not visible from the street provided the skylights are flat, do not extend more than 8 inches above the roof surface, are similar to the color of the roof material and cover not more than 10% of the roof surface on which they are located; bare metal finishes, bubble or domed skylights are permitted only on flat or rear-facing roofs.

13) Gutter and downspout replacement with exactly matching design, materials, and placement; [(new language added:) or new gutters and downspouts where none currently exist, in a style that is compatible with the historic character of the building].

18) The replacement of existing on-grade walkways, stairways, retaining walls, [(new language added:) patios], and driveways in the same location in matching or compatible materials.

Proposed new staff approval items:

33) Installation of new solar panels on non-character defining roof surfaces not visible from the street.

34) Installation of compatible windows and doors in new openings on non-contributing buildings.

35) Installation of new residential patios at grade that are constructed of brick, stone, pavers, or similar compatible materials, that do not exceed 150 square feet, and are located at the rear of the building.

36) Installation of new metal chimneys that do not obscure, destroy, or otherwise compromise original trim or architectural features of the building, that are a dark color or match the roof, and that do not exceed the minimum height required by state building code.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Beeson said that in regards to metal chimneys, the diameter of the chimney and cap size would make a difference in how visible it is.

Thacher suggested added a maximum diameter to Item 36.

General Commission discussion pursued regarding appropriate language for the Staff Approvals List.

The Commission decided that the words; "that are beyond repair" needed to be added to Item 26 on the list.

On Item 29, they decided to add the words; "or associated vents or other work"... "is finished to blend into the building, where appropriate"...

On item 36, they decided to add the words; "and minimum diameter"..."and are not a prominent feature of the roof".

A motion was made by Vice Chair Stulberg, seconded by White, that the Commission approve the amendments to the Staff Approvals List as presented to the Commission as well as the verbal changes discussed. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

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

Nays: 0

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

H APPROVAL OF MINUTES

H-1 12-0033 Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes of the December 8, 2011

A motion was made by Chair McCauley, seconded by White, that the Minutes be Approved by the Commission and forwarded to the City Council. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

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

Nays: 0

I REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

J ASSIGNMENTS

J-1 Review Committee: Monday, February 6, at noon for the February 9, 2012 Regular Session

Commissioners McCauley and Stulberg volunteered for the February 6, Review Committee.

K REPORTS FROM STAFF

K-1 12-0038 December 2011 Staff Activities

Received and Filed

L CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS

M COMMUNICATIONS

N ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was unanimously adjourned at 8:45 pm.

Community Television Network Channel 16 live televised public meetings are also available to watch live online from CTN's website, www.a2gov.org/ctn, on "The Meeting Place" page (<http://www.a2gov.org/livemeetings>).

Live Web streaming is one more way, in addition to these listed below, to stay in touch with Ann Arbor City Council and board and commission actions and deliberations.

- Video on Demand: Replay public meetings at your convenience online at www.a2gov.org/government/city_administration/communicationsoffice/ctn/Pages/VideoOnDemand.aspx
- Cable: Watch CTN Channel 16 public meeting programming via Comcast Cable channel 16.

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