



# City of Ann Arbor

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

## Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

---

Thursday, September 12, 2013

7:00 PM

City Hall, 301 E. Huron Street, 2nd Flr.

---

### A CALL TO ORDER

*Chair McCauley called the meeting to order at 7:00 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

*Ramsburgh requested to add the following item to the agenda: Nominations to the Historic District Awards Committee.*

*White requested to add the following item to the agenda: Nominations to the Elections of Officers Committee.*

**A motion was made by Ramsburgh, seconded by Chair McCauley, that the Agenda be Approved with changes. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.**

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

### E HEARINGS

E-1 [13-1073](#) HDC13-151; 207 South Fourth Avenue - New Business Sign - MSHD

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

#### **BACKGROUND:**

*This seven story commercial vernacular building was constructed of brick and stone in 1928. It features four bays along South Fourth Avenue, and the storefront in this application is the most southerly one. The building is tapestry brick with limestone diamonds and stone trim, and was originally occupied by a company called Ypsi-Ann Building.*

#### **LOCATION:**

*The site is on the east side of South Fourth Avenue, south of East Washington and north of East Liberty.*

*APPLICATION:*

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to install a 23" high by 19" wide aluminum blade sign ten feet above grade. The sign would be mounted to a 1/2" thick vertical plate, 4" wide by 29" high that is attached to the building through mortar joints.*

*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.*

*(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):*

*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.*

*From the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines:*

*Design Guidelines for 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 lit from external light fixtures above or below the sign.*

*Installing signage that is subordinate to the overall building composition.*

*STAFF FINDINGS*

*1. The business at this address currently has signage only in the transom over the storefront, where "Pura Vida" is adhered to the glass with vinyl lettering. Both the proposed sign's size and placement, with the top arm aligned with the top of the transom, are appropriate. Mounting a vertical plate into the stone storefront's mortar joints and then bolting the sign to the plate is an appropriate way to attach the sign to the building.*

*2. The size, materials (aluminum), and colors (black/white/silver) are compatible with the historic structure and neighborhood, and do not impact any character-defining feature of the building. It is easily removable and reversible.*

*3. Staff recommends approval of the application since the size, scale, design,*

*materials, and color of the proposed sign are compatible with the historic character of the site and has no negative impact on the surrounding historic resources.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

*Commissioners White and McCauley visited the site as part of their review.*

*McCauley said he agreed with the staff report, noting that the sign was quite small in comparison to others that have come before the Commission. He said since the sign meets the standards he felt it should be approved.*

*White said he agreed with White and the staff report, and supported the application.*

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

**Motion made by White, Seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 207 South Fourth Avenue in the Main Street Historic District to install a blade sign, 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 9 and 10, and the guidelines for Storefronts.**

**(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 was granted.**

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

**Nays:** 0

**E-2**      [13-1074](#)

HDC13-148; 450 South First Street - Single Story Rear Addition - OWSHD

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This one and three-quarter story gable-fronter features a full width stuccoed front porch, wood clapboard siding on the upper floor and stucco on the lower, and retains*

*its original four-over-one double hung windows. The first occupant was Theodore Kauffman, a clerk, in 1923.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the west side of South First Street, south of West William and one lot north of West Jefferson.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct a 113 square foot rear addition with a trellised roof deck, and a 120 square foot shed and trellis in the back yard. The addition's siding and soffits are cement board, with wood corner boards and fascia. A pair of original double hung windows have been relocated from the current rear wall to the new addition's rear wall. A wood deck and trellis on top of the addition are accessed through an existing second floor door. The shed is 8' tall, has a flat roof, and horizontal wood board and batten siding. A simple 8' trellis is located along the north property line between the house and shed. An existing horizontal board wood fence behind the shed and trellis is retrofitted with wood battens. In addition, non-original attic vents both gables would be replaced with the original wood windows, which were found stored in 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.*

*(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):*

**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.*

*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.*

*Designing new additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.*

**Not Recommended:**

*Attaching a new addition so that the character-defining features of the historic building are obscured, damaged, or destroyed.*

*Duplicating the exact form, material, style, and detailing of the historic building in the new addition so that the new work appears to be part of the historic building.*

*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.*

#### *Building 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.*

##### *From the City of Ann Arbor Design Guidelines:*

#### *All Additions*

##### *Appropriate:*

*Placing a new addition on non-character-defining or inconspicuous elevations and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic property.*

*Designing a new addition in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.*

##### *Not Appropriate:*

*Designing an addition to appear older than, or the same age as, the original building.*

#### *STAFF FINDINGS:*

- 1. The proposed addition increases the size of an existing first floor office that is too small to hold a double bed. The new space is large enough for a bed and desk, and allows a half-bath to be converted to a three-quarter bath by adding a shower. The addition has a membrane roof with a deck over it, and the deck features a wood guardrail and trellis. The addition replaces an existing second story deck that is supported by wood posts.*
- 2. The garden and bike shed are located where a garage once stood. Its small size and low height will have a minimal impact on surrounding properties.*
- 3. Moving the existing pair of windows from the house's rear elevation to the rear elevation of the addition is appropriate, since they are a character-defining feature of the house. The four-over-one windows are in good condition.*
- 4. Staff recommends approval of the application. The addition is compatible but does not duplicate the existing structure, and should have no negative impacts on neighboring properties. The shed and trellis are simple and compatible, and restoring the original attic windows is appreciated by staff. The work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the historic house, the lot, and the surrounding area.*

*REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:*

*Commissioners White and McCauley visited the site as part of their review.*

*White said he agreed with the staff report and analysis, and supported the project.*

*McCauley said he agreed with Commissioner White and the staff report that the project meets the standards. He adding that the only concern he had was with the longevity of the horizontal batten siding and possible future rot.*

*David Morse, Owner and Applicant, along with representative Architect from Rueter Architects, were present to respond to the Commission's enquiries.*

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

**Motion made by Ramsburgh, Seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 450 South First Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a 113 square foot rear addition with a trellised roof deck, and a 120 square foot shed, 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 additions and building site, as well as the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to additions.**

**(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 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 was granted.**

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

**Nays:** 0

E-3      [13-1075](#)      HDC13-153; 724 West Jefferson Street - Single Story Rear Addition - OWSHD

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This two-story brick home was built by mason Ludwig Lucas and first appears in the 1910 Polk City Directory. It features a full-width stone front porch with brick columns, a hipped roof, an attic dormer, and original wood windows.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the north side of West Jefferson Street, between Fifth and Seventh Streets., and opposite Sixth. It backs up to Bach Elementary's "Big Playground".*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct a 272 square foot solarium with a glass hyphen connecting it to the one-story kitchen wing located on the rear 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.*

*(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):*

**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.*

*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.*

*Designing new additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.*

*Not Recommended: Attaching a new addition so that the character-defining features of the historic building are obscured, damaged, or destroyed.*

*Duplicating the exact form, material, style, and detailing of the historic building in the new addition so that the new work appears to be part of the historic building.*

*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.*

#### *Building 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.*

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

#### *All Additions*

##### *Appropriate:*

*Placing a new addition on non-character-defining or inconspicuous elevations and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic property.*

*Designing a new addition in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.*

##### *Not Appropriate:*

*Designing an addition to appear older than, or the same age as, the original building.*

#### *STAFF FINDINGS:*

1. *The house is currently 1,467 square feet. The proposed solarium is a 272 square foot structure with gables facing north and south (toward the house and back yard), and clad in oil-finished cedar siding with a metal roof. It is connected to the house by a glass passageway that continues along the side of the solarium to form a bump-out. One corner of the existing one-story rear kitchen wing would be removed to accommodate the glass hyphen, though the top and bottom of the brick wall would remain, providing a record of the original corner. An existing double-hung window on the rear elevation of the kitchen would remain, and the back door would be removed and infilled (with a 1" inset) with brick reclaimed from the removed walls.*

2. *Staff considers the one-story rear kitchen wing to be a character-defining feature of the house. It is charming in its simplicity, and while it is not known whether it was built at the same time as the rest of the house (it could be a very early addition), it was constructed during the period of significance for the district. As such, staff appreciates the efforts made to keep a record of the original four walls by maintaining the corners above and below the new glass passageway.*

3. *The addition may be slightly visible from the public sidewalk to the west of the house. From the east end of the sidewalk the solarium should be hidden by a brick addition that juts out to the east, affording occupants of the glass room privacy.*

4. *The addition is limited in size and located on an inconspicuous side of the*



*building, and makes clear what is new and what is historic. The lot is large and the addition will not alter any spatial relationships within the lot or adversely impact neighboring properties.*

*5. Staff believes the massing, materials, and design of the addition are compatible with the existing structure, neighboring buildings, and the surrounding historic district, and meet both the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

*Commissioners White and McCauley visited the site as part of their review.*

*McCauley said he agreed with the staff findings, adding that the addition is slightly modern in comparison to what they are used to seeing; however the transparency softens it somewhat.*

*White said he agreed with the staff report and supported the project.*

*Brent and Melissa Richards, Owners and Applicant and Warren Samberg, Architect, were present to respond to the Commission's enquiries.*

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

**Motion made by Bushkuhl, Seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 724 West Jefferson Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a small solarium with a glass hyphen connecting it to the one-story kitchen wing located on the rear of the house, 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 additions and building site, as well as the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to additions.**

**(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 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 was granted.**

**Yeas:** 6 - White, Chair McCauley, Vice Chair Stulberg, Secretary Bushkuhl, Beeson, and Ross

**Nays:** 1 - Ramsburgh

**E-4**     [13-1076](#)**HDC13-150; 217 North Fifth Avenue - Modify Dormer Windows - OFWHD**

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This brick two-story gable-fronter features shingles in the front and rear gables, a wood front porch, one-over-one double hung windows, and small columns flanking the recessed attic windows in each end gable. The house was first occupied in 1900 by John and Pauline Baumgardner. John was the manager of the Ann Arbor Stone Company at the same address, and had one of the city's few telephones installed in the house at that time. Baumgardner's Barn, a few lots down at 301 North Fifth Avenue (corner of Detroit, currently occupied by Jessica's Apothecary), was built in 1887 as part of John Baumgardner's Marble Works. The Baumgardners lived at 217 until 1913 or 1914, when the home was occupied by John Pfisterer, with Matilda C. Pfisterer, teacher at Christian Mack School, listed as a boarder. Matilda, and subsequently Emilie Pfisterer, occupied the house until 1966.*

*The 1908 and 1916 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps show a small one-story enclosure (room) off the back door. It is not shown on the 1925 Sanborn.*

*In February of 2013, the HDC issued a certificate of appropriateness to re-work the rear yard, formalize two parking spaces off the alley, and eliminate the driveway. In March of 2013, the HDC issued a certificate of appropriateness to remove the chimney and install two shed dormers.*

**LOCATION:**

*The house is located on North Fifth Avenue, north of East Ann Street and south of Catherine Street.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to increase the size of eight windows, four in each of two new dormers, from the previously approved 24"x36" to 36"x36".*

**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):*

*New Additions**Recommended:*

*Designing new additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.*

*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.*

*Roofs**Recommended:*

*Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.*

*Not Recommended:*

*Changing the configuration of a roof by adding new features such as dormer windows, vents, or skylights so that the historic character is diminished.*

*From the City of Ann Arbor Design Guidelines:*

*Additions**Appropriate:*

*Designing the addition so it is compatible in terms of massing, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and proportion of openings.*

*STAFF FINDINGS:*

- 1. The dormers that were approved in March are currently under construction. A planned counter under the dormer windows has been eliminated, and the larger size would allow more light into the third floor space.*
- 2. Staff feels that the proposal is not detrimental to the historic resource, and that the openings are proportionate to the dormers and historic architectural features of the house. The square shape adequately distinguishes the new work from the original windows on the house, and blends a contemporary motif into traditionally proportioned dormers.*

*REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:*

*Commissioners White and McCauley visited the site as part of their review.*

*McCauley said he agreed with the staff findings that the window shapes were slightly more visually pleasing.*

*White said he agreed with the staff report and supported the project.*

*Kevin Stansbury, Architect, was present to respond to the Commission's enquiries.*

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

Motion made by Stulberg, Seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 217 North Fifth Avenue, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to alter the size of eight previously approved dormer windows to 36"x36", as proposed. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the house and the surrounding area and meets the City of Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standard 9 and the guidelines for New Additions and Roofs.

(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 was granted.**

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

**Nays:** 0

**E-5**      [13-1077](#)

HDC13-147; 445 South Second Street - New Solar Panels on House - OWSHD

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

*BACKGROUND:*

*This two-story gable-fronter appears in the 1894 Polk City Directory as number 25 Second Street, the home of Gottlieb H. Wild, a merchant tailor with a shop at 2 E Washington. In 1897, Frank Henderson, a laborer, lived in the home. It features a front entry porch and shallow eave overhangs, a cut stone foundation, and the massing is a narrow, deep rectangle.*

*LOCATION:*

*The site is located on the east side of Second Street, south of West William and north of West Jefferson.*

*APPLICATION:*

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to re-roof the house and front porch, relocate three attic vents from the south face to the north face of the roof, and install either a grid of ten or eighteen solar electric panels. The eighteen panel plan would necessitate the removal of two existing solar roof panels.*

*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 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:**Roofs**Recommended:*

*Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs--and their functional and decorative features—that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building.*

*Not Recommended:*

*Changing the configuration of a roof by adding new features such as dormer windows, vents, or skylights so that the historic character is diminished.*

*Energy Efficiency**Recommended:*

*Placing a new addition that may be necessary to increase energy efficiency on non-character-defining elevations.*

*Not Recommended:*

*Designing a new addition which obscures, damages, or destroys character-defining features.*

*Mechanical Equipment**Recommended:*

*Providing adequate structural support for new mechanical equipment.*

*Not Recommended:*

*Failing to consider the weight and design of new mechanical equipment so that, as a result, historic structural members or finished surfaces are weakened or cracked.*

*Installing a new mechanical system so that character-defining structural or interior features are radically changed, damaged, or destroyed.*

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

*Solar**Appropriate:*

*Mounting solar panels at grade or on ground pole mountings. In the absence of an*

*appropriate ground-based mounting location, panels should be mounted on side or rear facing roof surfaces.*

*Installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof related to the solar units and their related devices so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.*

*For sloped roof installations, mounting solar panels parallel to and within 8" of roof surface.*

*Not Appropriate:*

*Mounting solar panels and their related devices on primary elevations or roofs that face the primary elevation or in planes that are highly visible from the street view. This location has the highest impact on the historic character of the historic building and all other options should be thoroughly explored.*

*Any other alteration or installation procedure that will cause irreversible changes to historic features or materials.*

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 1. The house currently has two solar hot water heater panels near the rear of the south facing roof. The application proposes to add either a grid of ten solar electric panels (five over five) in front of them, or to remove the two existing panels and expand the grid to eighteen (nine over nine). Staff feels that the proposed black-and-aluminum panels are not acceptable because they call more attention to themselves than is necessary. The contractor confirmed via email that black-on-black panels could instead be used for this project.*
- 2. The new roof's color is not indicated in the application. To minimize the visibility of the solar panels, the roof should be black or nearly black to closely match the proposed panels.*
- 3. Staff prefers the 18-panel array because it covers more of the roof and removes the two non-matching panels, but finds either proposal acceptable.*
- 4. Staff believes that as conditioned in the proposed motion, the materials and design of the panels are compatible with the existing structure, neighboring buildings, and the surrounding historic district, and meet both the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

*Commissioners White and McCauley visited the site as part of their review.*

*McCauley said he agreed with the staff report in that a continuous line of panels might be a more desirable look and less conspicuous, but he was fine with both presented variations. He noted that with solar panels and given their need to be installed at a certain angle and where they can absorb the most available sunshine, often does not leave much room for alternative roof locations.*

*White said he agreed with McCauley and the staff report.*

*Mark Drougy, Contractor for the project was present to respond to the Commission's enquiries.*

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

Motion made by Stulberg, Seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 445 South Second Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to re-roof the house and front porch, relocate three attic vents from the south face to the north face of the roof, and install either a grid of ten or eighteen solar electric panels, with the following conditions: the new roof must be black or very dark to match the new solar panels, and the solar panels must be black-on-black instead of black-on-aluminum. 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, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for roofs, energy efficiency, and mechanical systems, as well as the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to solar installations.

(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 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 was Granted with Conditions.**

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

**Nays:** 0

**E-6**      [13-1078](#)

HDC13-146; 812 West Washington Street - New Deck and Side Door Opening, Rear Evaluation Alterations, Skylights - OWSHD

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This two-story gable-fronter was first occupied in 1900 by Herman Allmendinger, a packer at the Ann Arbor Organ Company. It features a full-width front porch and steeply-pitched roof with corner returns. The original siding is covered by aluminum. The rear wing appears in 1916 – 1970 Sanborn maps as one-and-a-half stories, but since then the pitch has been altered to make it a full two stories. A rear porch was added between 1925 and 1931.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the north side of West Washington Street, between South Seventh and Mulholland.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to 1) remove the brick chimney, 2) remove one non-original window and enlarge another, 3) replace the non-original front door, 4) replace a window on the west side elevation with double doors in a new opening, and build a deck in the sideyard, 5) add four skylights, 6) remove a door and wood fire escape stairs from the west elevation, 7) remove a square window in the rear gable and install a larger casement window, 8) replace a window on the rear elevation with a door, and construct a roof deck on top of the rear porch.*

**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 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):*

**Roofs****Recommended:**

*Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs--and their functional and decorative features--that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. This includes the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features such as cupolas, cresting chimneys, and weathervanes; and roofing material such as slate, wood, clay tile, and metal, as well as its size, color, and patterning.*

**Not Recommended:**

*Removing a feature of the roof that is unrepairable, such as a chimney or dormer, and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new feature that does not convey the same visual appearance.*

**Entrances and Porches****Recommended:**

*Designing and installing additional entrances or porches on secondary elevations when required for the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the buildings, i.e., limiting such alteration to non-character-defining elevations.*



*Not Recommended:*

*Cutting new entrances on a primary elevation. Altering utilitarian or service entrances so they appear to be formal entrances by adding panelled doors, fanlights, and sidelights.*

*Introducing a new entrance or porch that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.*

*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:*

*Introducing a new design that is incompatible with the historic character of the building.*

*Building 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.*

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

*Doors**Appropriate:*

*Replacing a missing original or non-original door with a design that matches original doors remaining on the house, or with a compatible new design and material that fits the style and period of the house and the existing opening. The Commission will review materials on a case-by-case basis.*

*Not Appropriate:*

*Installing a new door opening.*

*Windows**Not Appropriate:*

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

*Changing the number, location, and size or glazing pattern of windows by cutting new openings, blocking-in, or installing replacement sash which does not fit the historic opening.*

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. *The house is currently a duplex. It consists of a main two-story block with a shorter two-story rear wing. Off the rear wing is a porch with low CMU walls. It is seasonally enclosed above these walls by storm windows. It also has a wood storm door. There is a two car garage near the back of the lot with access off a private alley.*
2. *The chimney is soft brick, with no ornamentation, and appears to have been altered at some point. It is located near the end of the roof ridge at the back of the two-story section of the house. It appears to have a sort of clay surround added to the base, with several courses of brick above that covered in stucco or cement. Given these alterations, staff does not believe it is a character-defining feature of the house.*
3. *Two non-original windows are proposed to be removed from the second floor of the rear addition. They are currently narrow horizontal rectangles. The one on the west wall is an awning, and the one on the east is either an awning or slider. They appear in the photos to be aluminum. The one on the west is proposed to be replaced with a double-hung window similar in proportion to one below in on the first floor. The removal of non-original windows is appropriate. The replacement of the west window with a double-hung is appropriate since the roof alteration makes it clear that this window could not be original. The material should be wood or match the other double-hung windows on the house.*
4. *The front door is probably from the 1950s. Its replacement with a new wood door (not a salvaged door) in the style of the door shown in the attachments is appropriate (three panels below and one above a single window).*
5. *A dining room window on the first floor of the west elevation is proposed to be removed and replaced by double french doors leading to a new deck with a trellis along the side facing the street. The west side of the house is very visible, and staff considers it to be a primary, character-defining elevation. The installation of a new door opening is not appropriate on a primary elevation. Without a door leading to it, the deck is also not appropriate. There is room behind the house for a patio or deck off of the existing door openings.*
6. *Three 44" x 46" flat skylights are proposed on the west roof: two on the main house block and one on the rear two-story wing. The color of the skylights is not indicated. The skylight on the rear wing is appropriate, since views of it are blocked by the main house block. Staff believes that the ones on the main roof are too large and too visible to be acceptable, and detract from the character of the house. One 18" x 18" flat solar tube skylight is proposed on the bump out on the west elevation. Because the size is minimal, it projects only an inch above the roof surface, and the pitch of the bump out roof is very shallow (further hiding it from view), staff feels this skylight is appropriate. Staff adds that if the same solar tube skylights were proposed on the main roof, their limited size and low profile would make them acceptable.*
7. *Removing the egress door and stair on the west elevation is highly appropriate.*
8. *One small square window is proposed to be removed from within the gable on the back of the main house block, and replaced with a double casement window. The dimensions of the casement window are not provided, but the window appears very large in the drawings. Staff feels the window is acceptable because it will provide daylight and serve as an egress window for the third floor, and because there are only a few angles from which the window will be clearly visible (it is hidden behind the*

two-story rear wing from many perspectives).

9. The double hung window on the rear wall of the rear wing is proposed to be removed and enlarged into a doorway, with a deck constructed on top of the existing rear porch. Since this is neither a primary nor a character-defining elevation, and because the roof has already been altered on this section of the house, staff feels this work is appropriate. The deck could easily be removed in the future and the porch roof restored to its original appearance.

10. Staff believes the following work, as proposed, is compatible with the existing structure, neighboring buildings, and the surrounding historic district, and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines: removing the chimney; removing the non-original east window, and replacing the non-original west window with a double hung window; replacing the non-original front door; installing skylights on the rear wing's east roof and the west elevation bump out; remove a door and wood fire escape stairs; remove a square window in the rear gable and install a larger casement window; and replace a window on the rear elevation with a door, and construct a roof deck on top of the rear porch.

11. Staff believes the following work does not meet the SOI Standards and Guidelines, and/or the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines: installing a new door wall and deck on the west elevation of the main house block; and installing two skylights on the east roof of the main house block.

#### REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Commissioners White and McCauley visited the site as part of their review.

McCauley said the application was quite elaborate and he believed the chimney to be original, and that while similar to the neighbors it was not character-defining and not very visible from the front. He said it was sad that the house had been abused over the years and not very well cared for. He had reservations over the attic windows in the rear and felt it was inappropriately scaled and that a single-double-hung window or double-double-hung windows would be more appropriate. He agreed with the staff report on the proposed sideyard deck that it was not appropriate, while the new rear door would be appropriate. He questioned moving the rear window to the east elevation and was hesitant with the addition of a new opening. He said the addition of the larger skylights seemed less problematic to him, in comparison to some of the other proposed work, since it could be covered up or removed in the future.

White said he agreed with the staff report and with most of McCauley's report.

Wayne Appleyard, 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.

**Motion made by Stulberg, Seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 812 West Washington Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to: remove the chimney; remove the non-original east window, and replace the non-original west window with a double hung window that is currently on the rear; replace the non-original front door; install skylights on the rear wing's east roof and the west elevation bump out; remove a door and wood fire escape stairs; remove a square window in the rear gable and install a single 2 feet, 8 inch by 4 feet (2' 8" x 4') casement window; and replace a window on the**

rear elevation with a door, and construct a roof deck on top of the rear porch, 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 roofs, entrances and porches, windows, and building site, as well as the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to doors and 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.

(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 was granted.**

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

**Nays:** 0

Motion made by Ramsburgh, Seconded by Beeson, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 812 West Washington Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to: remove a window and install a new door wall and deck on the east elevation of the main house block; and install two skylights on the east roof of the main house block, 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 roofs, entrances and porches, and building site, as well as the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to doors and 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.

(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 defeated.**

**Request was denied.**

**Yeas: 0**

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

**Motion made by Bushkuhl, Seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 812 West Washington Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to: add two skylights on the east roof of the main house block, 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 roofs, entrances and porches, and building site, as well as the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to doors and 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.

(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 was granted.**

**Yeas:** 5 - White, Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Secretary Bushkuhl, and Beeson

**Nays:** 2 - Vice Chair Stulberg, and Ross

**E-7**     [13-1079](#)

HDC13-152; 326 West Liberty Street - Two New Door Openings, New Porch Windows, New Porch, Other Work - OWSHD

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This asymmetrical, two-story brick house with concave mansard roof, dormers, and bay windows on the south and east sides, is in the Second Empire style, which is extremely rare in Ann Arbor. The house was built in 1870 for the owner of the Western Brewery, Peter Brehm, and was subsequently the Odd Fellows Hall, the Moveable Feast, Daniel's on Liberty, and most recently, office and salon space.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the north side of West Liberty, between First and Third Streets.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to 1) restore architectural trim and bracket detailing, 2) replace the contemporary kitchen façade with a more architecturally appropriate porch design, 3) install a new glass balcony railing on top of the one-story kitchen, and install a spiral staircase behind the house to access the balcony, 4) replace an existing egress door on the second level west façade with the window sashes from the adjacent southernmost window, and install a new door in the southernmost window opening, 5) install skylights along the north façade of the mansard roof, and 6) install a new entry door and porch along the east facade.*

**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 shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall 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):*

#### *Roofs*

##### *Recommended:*

*Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs--and their functional and decorative features--that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. This includes the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features such as cupolas, cresting chimneys, and weathervanes; and roofing material such as slate, wood, clay tile, and metal, as well as its size, color, and patterning.*

#### *Entrances and Porches*

##### *Recommended:*

*Designing and installing additional entrances or porches on secondary elevations when required for the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the buildings, i.e., limiting such alteration to non-character-defining elevations.*

##### *Not Recommended:*

*Cutting new entrances on a primary elevation. Altering utilitarian or service entrances so they appear to be formal entrances by adding panelled doors, fanlights, and sidelights.*

*Introducing a new entrance or porch that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.*

#### *Windows*

##### *Not Recommended:*

*Introducing a new design that is incompatible with the historic character of the building.*

#### *Building 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.*

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

#### *Doors*

##### *Not Appropriate:*

*Installing a new door opening.*

#### *Windows*

##### *Not Appropriate:*

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

*Changing the number, location, and size or glazing pattern of windows by cutting new openings, blocking-in, or installing replacement sash which does not fit the historic opening.*

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 1. Historic photos and physical evidence of the trim and bracket detailing exists, making its restoration possible and appropriate.*
- 2. The single-story contemporary kitchen façade is located on the east elevation, behind the main two-story house block. It features two large windows that are wider than they are tall, in an otherwise blank modern brick wall. The proposed design consists of four large windows, each with two wood panels below. The design is contemporary enough to not be mistaken for a historic feature of the house, while appearing much more sympathetic to the historic structure than the current design.*
- 3. A glass balcony railing is proposed around the roof of the kitchen façade, on the two open sides. Behind the house, between it and the garage, a spiral staircase would be installed for egress from the balcony. The spiral staircase is appropriate, especially since it is behind the house and buried between structures, but the glass railing is incompatible for the historic character of the house. While it would be more transparent to the wall behind it than a traditional railing, the design is too modern for this easily-visible portion of the building. A black metal railing in a very simple design would be more compatible with the masonry building and match the proposed spiral stair.*
- 4. Facing this balcony on the second floor east elevation are two historic windows with a door between them. The door used to be a third matching window. The application proposes to swap the door with the original window next to it. By doing so, both a means of egress and an original window would be retained. Staff feels this is appropriate, since the door will be no more visible in the new location than the old, and possibly less visible.*
- 5. The four skylights proposed to be added to the rear (north) facing mansard roof are not dimensioned on the plan. As drawn, they appear to be an appropriate size and their placement on the back of the structure, completely out of sight of the street and sidewalk, is reversible.*
- 6. An original window, in an opening that once extended to the ground, is proposed to be replaced by a door on the west rear elevation, facing the driveway. Since the window appears to be original, staff speculates that there may have been a coal chute or similar opening below the window. It does not appear wide enough to have been a door. While this elevation is probably character-defining, staff believes it is also secondary given how far it is set back from the main house block. A proposed roofed porch with full-width steps would fill barely a third of setback between the west wall of the main house block and the west wall of the rear addition. The porch design is simple and reversible, and would be invisible from the street and sidewalk. Staff believes that this secondary entrance is appropriate for the new use of the building (i.e. as office suites instead of as a house).*
- 7. Staff believes the work, as conditioned in the proposed motion below, is compatible with the existing structure, neighboring buildings, and the surrounding historic district, and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**



*Commissioners White and McCauley visited the site as part of their review.*

*White stated that he supports this project and agrees with the staff report.*

*McCauley said he was very excited to see that this beautiful building will regain some of its character that it has lost over the years. He agreed with the staff report. He had questions on the window where the side porch is proposed, noting that if a window needed to go, that window would be the one, given the ambiguity of the window. He felt the proposed railing and fine details of the proposed project made it a great project that he was in favor of.*

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

*Robb Burroughs/Base Studios, Architect for the project, was present to answer the Commission's enquiries.*

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

**Motion made by Beeson, Seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 327 W Liberty Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to: 1) restore architectural trim and bracket detailing, 2) replace the contemporary kitchen façade with a more architecturally appropriate porch design, 3) install a new glass balcony railing on top of the one-story kitchen, and install a spiral staircase behind the house to access the balcony, 4) replace an existing egress door on the second level west façade with the window sashes from the adjacent southernmost window, and install a new door in the southernmost window opening, 5) install skylights along the north façade of the mansard roof, and 6) install a new entry door and porch along the east façade, on the following condition – the proposed balcony railing must be of black metal instead of glass, and reviewed by staff prior to the issuance of permits. As conditioned, 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 1, 2, 5, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for roofs, entrances and porches, windows, and building site, as well as the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to doors and windows.**

**(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 shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall 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 was Granted with Conditions.**

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

**Nays:** 0

**F UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**F-1 [13-1080](#) HDC13-133; 210-216 South Fourth Avenue - Restore Façade and Three-Story Rooftop Addition - MSHD**

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

*BACKGROUND and LOCATION:*

*See August, 2013 staff report, attached to this report.*

*APPLICATION:*

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to (1) reconfigure the existing façade so that it resembles the previous Montgomery Ward façade, and (2) construct three additional floors. These plans are revised from the ones presented at the August, 2013 HDC meeting.*

*APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:*

*See August, 2013 staff report, attached to this report.*

*STAFF FINDINGS:*

1. *Compared to the previous application, the new drawings reduce the height of the building by four feet. They also incorporate two breaks in the wall plane and cornice on the north elevation.*

2. *Staff's outstanding concern from the previous application still stands -- whether the height and appearance of the building is compatible with the two-story buildings nearby, especially on this block of South Fourth Avenue. The reduction in the overall height of the building barely registers visually. The breaks in the north wall plane make the view of this elevation more manageable, but the building still looms over the two-story structures on the remainder of the block to the north. Staff does not feel that the revisions are adequate to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation, and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines.*

*FROM 8/15/2013 HDC Meeting*

*BACKGROUND: Parts of the non-contributing building located at 210-216 S Fourth Avenue were constructed in 1896 or earlier. The north portion of the building was used for Enoch Dieterle's funeral parlor. In 1928, the building became Montgomery Ward's department store. Significant changes were made at this time. The façade and southern and western walls were removed. Currently, all that remains of the original structure are the eastern and western foundation walls and portions of the northern first floor wall. In 1928, the building was three bays wide and two stories high. Later, a fourth bay was added to the south elevation, although it was much shallower than the existing building. The façade was also changed in 1928 to reflect Montgomery Ward's characteristic architecture, and was covered with glazed terra cotta.*

*In 1960, a fire destroyed a large portion of the second floor. The owners demolished and reconstructed the second floor, constructed a new arcade in the middle of the first floor, and refaced the second story façade with vertical steel siding. The building currently retains most of these features, although the arcade has been eliminated.*

*LOCATION: The site is located on the west side of South Fourth Avenue between East Washington Street and East Liberty Street.*

*APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to (1) reconfigure the existing façade so that it resembles the previous Montgomery Ward façade, and (2) construct three additional floors.*

*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.*

*(3) Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.*

*(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.*

*(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):*

*Design for the Replacement of Missing Historic Features*

*When an entire interior or exterior feature is missing (for example, an entrance, or cast iron facade; or a principal staircase), it no longer plays a role in physically defining the historic character of the building unless it can be accurately recovered in form and detailing through the process of carefully documenting the historical appearance. Although accepting the loss is one possibility, where an important architectural feature is missing, its replacement is always recommended in the Rehabilitation guidelines as the first or preferred, course of action. Thus, if adequate historical, pictorial, and physical documentation exists so that the feature may be accurately reproduced, and if it is desirable to re-establish the feature as part of the building's historical appearance, then designing and constructing a new feature based on such information is appropriate. However, a second acceptable option for the replacement feature is a new design that is compatible with the remaining character-defining features of the historic building. The new design should always take into account the size, scale, and material of the historic building itself and, most importantly, should be clearly differentiated so that a false historical appearance is not created.*

#### *Storefronts*

##### *Recommended:*

*Designing and constructing a new storefront when the historic storefront is completely missing. It may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.*

##### *Not Recommended:*

*Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced storefront is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.*

*Introducing a new design that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.*

#### *New Additions*

##### *Recommended:*

*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.*

*Designing additional stories, when required for the new use, that are set back from the wall plane and are as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street.*

#### *Setting*

##### *Not Recommended:*

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

*From the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines:*

#### *New Construction in Historic Districts*

*Rather than imitating older buildings, a new design should relate to the fundamental characteristics of the historic district while also conveying contemporary stylistic trends.*

*Building Massing for New Construction in Downtown Historic Districts*

*Building massing should fit with existing historic patterns. Existing historic patterns and traditions in building massing include varied heights, articulated masses, visually interesting skylines and pedestrian-scaled street fronts. Building massing should continue to provide a variety of pedestrian-friendly scales and visually appealing masses. Buildings should not be immense in scale or greatly contrast with the existing scale on the block or in the surrounding historic district.*

*Design Guidelines for Additions*

*Appropriate: When required, designing additional stories that are set back from the front and side wall planes and are as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street.*

*Locating a rooftop addition to be inconspicuous when viewed from the street.*

*Design Guidelines for Storefronts*

*Appropriate: 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 in-kind an entire storefront that is too deteriorated to repair, if the overall form and detailing are still evident, using the physical evidence to guide the new work.*

*Designing and constructing a new storefront when the historic storefront is completely missing. It may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or may be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, and material of the historic building. New designs should be flush with the façade and be kept as simple as possible.*

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. *Façade replacement. The massing and proportions of the two-story street façade are very close to the original 1929 Montgomery Wards building, along with general detailing. This is not a replication of the original façade, however, because the details and materials do not match. The largest deviation from the original is the proposed exterior cladding, which is tan/yellow brick, not square terracotta tiles with a white glaze. Glass block is proposed in the transoms instead of smaller square panes or prism glass cubes set in lead. Also, some of the details have been left off, like the swags found at the tops of the five pilasters (below the decorative urns), and the terracotta bull-nosed corners and fluted trim bands, which cannot be replicated in brick. The design is reminiscent of the original, however, and would certainly convey a sense of the 1929 building.*

*The applicant has provided photos of other Montgomery Wards buildings, including some made of brick, but using those photos as a model for this building would be conjectural (see SOI standard 3).*

*Given the use of modern materials and lack of historic detailing, staff is treating the building as modern infill construction, not restoration, but with motifs borrowed from the original. Viewed in that light, the façade design would be an admiring nod to the original and an asset to the Main Street Historic District. Staff does not believe that*

*the proposal conveys a false historical appearance. Reusing the original cornice line and tile inserts lend interest while conveying a sense of the past on a modern building.*

*2. Storefronts. The four bays each have a traditional sign band, and if approved as presented, only a staff approval will be required for signage placed within them. Spanning each display window is a very shallow fixed metal canopy (where the awning gutter was once located). As a design element of a modern building, this fits well with the aluminum storefronts and upper story windows.*

*3. Banners. Since the second floor houses residential units, not businesses, the use of second floor signage is inappropriate. Staff would prefer to see bracket signs for the benefit of pedestrians, mounted perhaps between transoms or from the metal canopies (if they're high up enough for a sign hanging below them to meet building code requirements) if more signage is required.*

*4. Additional floors. Per the application, the third floor would be set back nine feet from the front façade of the building, and the fourth and fifth floors would be set back an additional eleven feet. (The floor plan on page 12, however, shows these flipped -- the third floor is setback 11 feet and the fourth/fifth are an additional 9 feet.) Materials on the upper-story addition include "medium sand decorative masonry units", corrugated steel panels, and anodized aluminum window systems. A sixth floor penthouse set back 40' from the front wall contains the elevator and several stair towers leading to three small private roofdecks, along with a small room (with a sink) that accesses a larger common roof deck for residents of floors two to four. A modular tray system green roof would be installed on part of the fifth-floor roof, near the roofdecks. Side and rear elevations feature balconies, aluminum windows, and glass block windows. A simple tiered cornice wraps around the four upper stories.*

*Section drawings with pedestrian sight-lines are provided on pages 15 and 16. They indicate that a pedestrian directly across South Fourth Avenue would have a view of the fourth and fifth floors, and that pedestrians on the west side of South Main Street would not see the project at all. The building will be visible from other vantage points, however, such as over the two-story buildings on East Liberty that are between Running Fit and the alley, and especially along the east side of South Fourth Avenue approaching East Washington Street, on the same block as the project. A 3-D rendering of the building from different pedestrian vantage points would help staff and the commission understand those relationships.*

*The materials chosen are simple and modern. Staff has requested that the petitioner bring samples of the concrete units and corrugated steel to the HDC meeting.*

*5. Staff's outstanding concern is whether the height and appearance of the building is compatible with the two-story buildings nearby, especially on this block of South Fourth Avenue and on East Liberty Street. To clarify, the fact that the new infill building may be visible is not as concerning as the risk that the new building may destroy historic relationships within the setting. Staff is hopeful that additional information from the petitioner will lay these fears to rest.*

#### *REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:*

*Commissioners White and McCauley visited the site as part of their review.*

*White stated that he supports this project and agrees with the staff report.*

*McCauley reported that in visiting the site he noted that the area is very interesting in*

*that there is such a wide array of sizes of the buildings. He asked if the neighboring buildings in the area will have a historical detrimental affect on this building.*

*White stated that given that the building was damaged in a fire, the historical materials have been replaced, and are unlike some of the neighboring buildings. He said with this project they have the opportunity to preserve these buildings and the proposed addition will fit in and he supports the project. He brought attention to the many letters of support for the project.*

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

*Brad Moore, Architect for the project, was present to answer the Commission's enquiries.*

*David Ebner, 7499 Middlebelt Road, West Bloomfield, MI., Owner and Developer of the property, was present and explained the project.*

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

**Motion made by McCauley, Seconded by Stulberg, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 210-216 S Fourth Ave, a non-contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to reconfigure the existing façade and to construct three new floors above the existing two-story building as long as the banners as drawn on the plans are not included in the final design. 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 Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines for new construction, additions and storefronts, and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 3, 6, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for storefronts, setting, and new additions.**

**(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.**

**(3) Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.**

**(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.**

**(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 was granted.**

**Yeas:** 4 - White, Chair McCauley, Secretary Bushkuhl, and Beeson

**Nays:** 3 - Ramsburgh, Vice Chair Stulberg, and Ross

**Motion made by Ramsburgh, Seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 210 216 S Fourth Ave, a non contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to place banners on the second floor elevation of the façade. 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 Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines for new construction, additions and storefronts, and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 3, 6, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for storefronts, setting, and new additions.**

**(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.**

**(3) Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.**

**(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.**

**(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 was denied.**

**Yeas:** 0

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

**G NEW BUSINESS**

**G-1 Nominations to the Historic District Awards Committee**

**Motion made by Ramsburgh, Seconded by White, to nominated Nancy Deromedi, Katy Detrisac, Fran Wright, Pat Austin, Louisa Pieper, Tom Stulberg, Ellen Ramsburgh, Grace Shakman and Susan Wineberg to the Awards Committee.**

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

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

**Nays:** 0

**G-2 Nominations to the Elections of Officers Committee**

**Motion made by White to nominate McCauley, White and Ramsburgh to the Election Nominating Committee.**

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

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

**Nays:** 0

**H APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**H-1 13-1081 Minutes of the August 15, 2013 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.**

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

**Nays:** 0

**I REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS**

**J ASSIGNMENTS**

**Review Committee: Monday, October 7 at Noon for the October 10, 2013 Regular Meeting**

*Ramsburgh and Stulberg volunteered for the October Review Committee.*

**K      REPORTS FROM STAFF**

**K-1      [13-1082](#)      August 2013 Staff Activities**

**Received and Filed**

**L      CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS****M      COMMUNICATIONS**

*Commissioner White thanked Thacher for her great work in compiling the very detailed staff reports and he thanked Chair McCauley for getting the Commission through the hearings and discussions in an expeditious manner.*

**N      ADJOURNMENT**

**The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 11:30 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/VideOnDemand.aspx](http://www.a2gov.org/government/city_administration/communicationsoffice/ctn/Pages/VideOnDemand.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.*