



**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR
Thursday, January 8, 2009.**

Commissioners Present: Sarah Shotwell, Diane Giannola, Michael Bruner, Robert White, Jim Henrichs, Kristina Glusac and Ellen Ramsburgh (7)

Commissioners Absent: None.

Staff Present: Jill Thacher, Planner and Historic Preservation Coordinator, Planning and Development Services and Kristine Kidorf, Kidorf Preservation Consulting (2)

CALL TO ORDER: Commissioner Shotwell called the Regular Session to order at 7:07 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Quorum satisfied.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: The Agenda was approved without objection.

A - HEARINGS

A-1 HDC08-068 - 207 W. JEFFERSON STREET - OWSHD

BACKGROUND: This simple 1 ¾ story house was probably built between 1904 and 1910, when Floyd A. and Klara A. Sweet occupied the house. Floyd was a driver for U.S. Express Co. The couple lived there until 1919, when John and Katherine Behr are listed in the Polk Directory as the occupants. John was a laborer and later a clerk, enameler, elevator operator, and engineer. Katherine is listed as the occupant through 1955.

LOCATION: South side of West Jefferson Street bet. South Ashley Street & South First Street.

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval for the installation of two basement egress windows in the foundation on the east elevation of the house. This application follows up on an application denied by the commission in September 2007, in which the applicant sought approval for a similar scope of work after the work was already partially completed. The applicant is re-submitting for this scope of work but proposes to use a different set of windows.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. An existing non-original 15" by 30" basement window was replaced by a much larger, sliding sash window without prior approval in the summer of 2007. An application to approve this window was denied by the Commission in September 2007. The commission's decision was upheld in May, 2008 during the applicant's appeal of the original denial.
2. A second existing steel sash window and the vinyl sliding window are both proposed to be replaced with an inward swinging egress window that is 27" wide and 45" high.
3. The windows will be placed in about the same location as the existing basement openings, which is not exactly in-line with the upper floor windows.
4. The existing concrete block foundation wall is exposed between 40" and 42" so it appears that the grade will need to be lowered between 3" and 5" to accommodate the new windows.
5. The size of the proposed new windows is slightly narrower, but almost three times as tall as the existing, non-original windows.

- 52 6. Although the new windows are taller than the existing windows, they are a similar
53 proportion as the historic, character defining windows in the house. They do not extend
54 any higher on the house, or into the baseboard.
- 55 7. As the existing basement windows and openings are not original, the removal of the
56 windows, alteration of the openings, and installation of taller than wide casement windows
57 is compatible in size, scale, and proportion with the rest of the building and meets *The*
58 *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, in particular standard numbers 2
59 and 9.

60
61 Coordinator Thacher – Voiced concerns about the lowering of the window below the existing
62 grade and had asked the applicant to contact the Building Official and grading inspector to make
63 sure what he was proposing would be buildable. The applicant did so, and assured staff that he
64 would be able to meet code.

65
66 Thacher also added that the Building Official told both her and the applicant that the window may
67 not be replaced with a window of the original size since the room it serves in the basement has
68 been finished off as a bedroom. The proposed window would satisfy the Building Official.

69
70 **Owner/Applicant/Address:** Tim Bell, 4922 Gullane Drive, A2, MI 48103

71
72 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Bruner and Ramsburgh visited the site.

73
74 Commissioner Bruner stated that the new design is preferable and compatible -

75
76 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Concurs with Commissioner Bruner

77
78 **Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Tim Bell was present to speak on behalf of the appeal. He stated
79 that he would answer any questions and thanked the Commission Bruner for suggesting an
80 inward-swinging egress window, which he did not previously know existed.

81
82 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

83
84 Commissioner Bruner - Asked how the water table board would be treated. (*Bell explained that*
85 *the top of the new window would be level with the top of the existing windows, and that the water*
86 *table board would be replaced or toothed down to match the other windows.*)

87
88 **Audience Participation:** None.

89
90 **Discussion by the Commission:**

91
92 **MOTION**

93
94 Moved by Commissioner White, Seconded by Commissioner Giannola, “**that the**
95 **Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 207 West**
96 **Jefferson Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic Distrct, for**
97 **two basement egress windows, as proposed. The windows replace two non-original**
98 **windows and the work is compatible in size, scale and proportion with the rest of**
99 **the building and meets *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*,**
100 **in particular standard numbers 2 and 9.”**

101
102 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS (Application Approved)**

A-2 HDC08-069 - 321 EAST LIBERTY STREET - ELHD

BACKGROUND: The Enoch James House was constructed in the Classical Revival style of brick during the late 1840s in the Classical Revival style. Its character-defining features include the stepped gables and star tie rods visible on the side elevation, the 6/6 double hung windows, and the classical entryway. According to Historic Buildings of Ann Arbor (Reade and Wineberg 1998) and the 1880 Bird's Eye-View map of Ann Arbor, the complementary front porch serving as an elegant stoop was constructed sometime between 1880 and 1909. The approximately square porch has been modified from its original appearance in that it now has a poured concrete base, which was recently rebuilt. The porch's hip roof is supported by four round Tuscan columns. A decorative balustrade is placed between two columns on each side of the porch.

LOCATION: North side of East Liberty Street between South Fifth Ave. & South Division Street.

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval for the replacement of wood porch columns with ones similar in size and scale, but of fiberglass material and slight variation in design. This application follows up on a previous application to replace deteriorated parts of the front porch (replacing the concrete foundation and rotted roof parts as needed) which was approved at the staff level after the work was already begun. The applicant is seeking approval for this scope of work after it was already completed as well. The original columns have been discarded.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. Four columns of fiberglass have been installed. The concrete foundation has been replaced, and much of the detailing on the roof has also been replaced. The new columns appear to be similar to the old in size, scale, but not in material and in detailing. The older railing has been maintained.
2. Dimensions for the old columns have not been provided and the columns have been destroyed, making it impossible to determine if the columns were deteriorated beyond repair. A photo of the porch taken by staff in December, 2006 shows the columns which do not look deteriorated. Additionally staff observed the columns sitting in front of the building for a number of weeks while the porch floor was replaced.
3. The new columns are fiberglass, 8" by 8' but do not have a decorative trim piece near the top of the column therefore they do not match the old column.
4. The owner has not evidenced that the historic wood columns were deteriorated beyond repair and the new columns do not match the old in design.
5. The proposed column replacement is not compatible in size, scale and proportion with the rest of the building or the district and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* standards 2 and 6.
6. The application can be corrected by applying to replace the columns with new columns that replicate the trim piece near the top of the column.

Owner/Address: William Copi, 1012 Miner Street, A2, MI 48103

Applicant: Ken Lussenden Contracting, 573 S. Maple Road, A2, MI 48103

Review Committee: Commissioners Ramsburgh and Bruner visited the site.

Commissioner Ramsburgh - Concurs with the staff report and stated that the columns do not match the originals.

156 Commissioner Bruner – Agreed and said that he is disappointed that things have proceeded the way
157 they have.
158

159 **Applicant Presentation:** Sarah Tucker, office manager for Ken Lussenden Contracting, said that
160 Ken is out of town and the property owner asked her to apply for this approval. John Ganzi, the
161 project carpenter, was also present. Tucker stated that they had had difficulties hiring a mason to
162 finish the concrete porch repairs. Once that was taken care of, they found that repairing the
163 original columns was not possible because they were beyond repair.
164

165 Ganzi stated that a foot of the bottom of one post was hollow and rotten and he couldn't put it
166 back together the way it was. It had also deteriorated where the balustrade meets the column and
167 wouldn't stay together. He managed to save the balustrade but could not save the columns.
168

169 Taylor said the columns that they used were the closest they could find to the original that are
170 economical. Ganzi said that the new columns are rot-free. The only difference is that the
171 decorative ring is lower on the originals, and that the base and capitals are a little bit different. He
172 said he was not aware that it had to be made exactly like the old wooden ones. The bases on the
173 originals were also shot. The client recommended that they put new there instead of the old. He
174 said they would correct the work if there were issues.
175

176 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:** 177

178 Commissioner Bruner - Asked if rot was only on the outer columns. (*Ganzi said the outer were*
179 *worse, but all were bad and the ones close to the house had the worst rot where the balustrade*
180 *meets.*) Bruner asked if all the installed columns are full columns and Ganzi said they are. Ganzi
181 said it got too cold to apply paint and they intend to paint them all in the spring.
182

183 Commissioner White - Asked if Ganzi thought they were beyond repair and Ganzi said yes.
184

185 Commissioner Ramsburgh - Asked if an architect was involved. (*Ganzi said yes, an architect*
186 *designed the porch because of the commercial nature of the building and because the porch*
187 *goes down into the ground and has quite a bit of steel in it. He said the roof was not replaced,*
188 *and parts of it were repaired.*)
189

190 Commissioner Bruner asked if permits had been pulled (*Taylor said yes. She said the column*
191 *situation arose at the end of the process. When they got the building permit for the foundation,*
192 *the city did not tell them they needed an architect and they had to hire one when inspectors came*
193 *out to inspect the concrete work.*) **Staff Note:** The city would not tell someone they needed an
194 architect – it is not necessary unless it is a commercial job that requires signed and sealed
195 drawings.
196

197 **Audience Participation:** None.
198

199 **Discussion by the Commission:** 200

201 Commissioner Glusac – Stated it does not meet Standard 6 because it does not match
202 sufficiently in style and is not satisfactory. She is not in support of the stated motion.
203

204 Commissioner Bruner – Stated the porch is an addition that has significance of its own, but it is of
205 a different vintage and the confusion in the building department lends some sympathy because it
206 is frustrating. He stated that he wants to make this as small a problem as possible. The HDC
207 recently approved other columns after the fact that had been installed without HDC approval.

208 These columns are ionic in both cases and only slightly different in dimension and thinks they
209 would have been approvable if the correct process had been followed. He is in favor of the
210 motion. (*Commissioner Glusac clarified which other project that Commissioner Bruner was*
211 *referring to.*)

212
213 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Spoke to someone on site when the work was being done who said
214 they had talked to staff about doing the concrete work. She asked if the same columns would be
215 put back and they said yes, they would be. She said the applicant may not be being forthright
216 about the conditions of all of the columns and whether they all needed to be replaced.

217
218 Commissioner Shotwell – Stated she believed that they had intended to put the columns back,
219 but found them to be beyond repair. She said this does not influence her decision.

220
221 Commissioner White – Said that because the “city had fumbled the process,” he believes the
222 replacement should be approved.

223
224 Commissioner Henrichs - Looking forward in time, he is concerned about what might replace
225 these columns and this might be the lesser of two evils. To a casual observer he believes the
226 differences are minor and is in favor of the motion.

227 MOTION

228
229
230 Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner White, “**that the**
231 **Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 321 E.**
232 **Liberty Street a contributing property in the East Liberty Street Historic District, for**
233 **installing four replacement columns on the front porch, as completed. The work is**
234 **compatible in size, scale and proportion with the rest of the building or the district**
235 **and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*, Standard 6.**

236
237 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – 6 Yes, 1 No (*Application Approved*)**
238 **Yes (6) – Commissioners Bruner, White, Henrichs, Ramsburgh, Shotwell and Giannola**
239 **No (1) – Commissioner Glusac**

240 241 242 **A-3 HDC08-070 - 529 E. LIBERTY STREET - SSHD**

243
244 **BACKGROUND:** This two-story commercial building is part of the west wing of the Michigan
245 Theater Building. It was built in 1927 in the 20th Century Romanesque style, but underwent
246 significant alteration in the 1950s that destroyed much of its original exterior character. All of the
247 original windows and storefronts were changed and a large aluminum signboard was added
248 running the length of the building. The storefronts are now mainly glass, framed in mill finish
249 silver aluminum, with a low ashlar limestone sill and a few vertical panels of dark marble. In 1993,
250 the HDC approved the remodeling of the entrance to 529 by removing the existing single door
251 and squared-off show window and replacing them with a double door and side window. The
252 original occupant of this storefront was Marilyn Shops, and the current occupant is Beyond Juice,
253 the applicant. The applicant received permission from the HDC in July 2007 to add a recessed
254 aluminum and glass entry door with sidelight and transom to the front elevation.

255
256 **LOCATION:** North side of East Liberty Street, between Maynard and Thompson Streets.
257

258
259 **APPLICATION:** The applicant requests approval to remove the existing backlit, projecting
260 Campus Jewelers sign and install two new signs: one for Beyond Juice in the approximate same
261 location as the current Campus Jeweler sign, and a smaller one for Campus Jeweler to be placed
262 to the west of the current location. The latter sign is to be temporary until Campus Jewelers
263 moves out in August.

264
265 **STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 266
267 1. The existing Campus Jewelers sign is a projecting backlit sign with two sign faces. It has a
268 yellow plastic face with black lettering.
- 269 2. The proposed new sign for Beyond Juice 19'6" by 2'11" in size. According to the applicant,
270 the bottom of the sign will be 11½ feet above the sidewalk. The sign will be illuminated by
271 neon tubing placed inside the 4½-inch letters and mounted with eight expansion joints in
272 the raceway. Given the current appearance of the building and the neighboring signs, the
273 proposed sign is compatible with the size of the building, the storefront, and other existing
274 signs on the building.
- 275 3. The proposed new sign for Campus Jewelers is 5' wide by 3' tall. According to the
276 applicant and the Huron Sign Company, the sign will be made of an aluminum frame with a
277 painted background and vinyl graphics similar to the "Michael Powers" sign two doors
278 down to the east. There will be no lighting for this sign. The bottom of the sign will be 10
279 feet above the sidewalk. It will be mounted with four expansion bolts. It is proposed that
280 this sign will be removed by August when the lease for Campus Jewelers ends.
- 281 4. While backlit signs are generally discouraged in the historic district, in this instance an
282 existing backlit sign is being replaced with a smaller backlit sign. Additionally, the
283 appearance of the proposed "Beyond Juice" sign will be different than simply a flat plastic
284 face with lighting behind because of the individual letters.
- 285 5. The proposed signs are generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture,
286 material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets
287 *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standard numbers
288 9 and 10.

289
290 **Owner/Address:** MTBU, LLC., Dena Isley, Agent, 536 South Forest Ave., A2, MI 48104

291
292 **Applicant:** Robert Goldman, Beyond Juice, 529 East Liberty Street, A2, MI 48104

293
294 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Bruner and Ramsburgh visited the site.

295
296 Commissioner Bruner - In favor of this application with the caveat that the building owner paint
297 the metal fascia. By and large he is in favor of retail signage as long as it is reasonable in size
298 and scale.

299
300 Commissioner - Ramsburgh agrees with the staff report and thinks it is good advice to have the
301 metal be painted behind the sign.

302
303 **Applicant Presentation:** Robert Goldman, applicant, added that he is concerned that if the
304 painting requirement is added, he will not get his sign up because of litigation he is in with the
305 property owner. He also stated that the doorway previously approved by the HDC was not
306 constructed.

307
308 Commissioner Ramsburgh said that where a previous sign was removed the owner had painted
309 behind it.

310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361

Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:

Commissioner Bruner asked what Goldman would do if the Campus Jewelers sign comes down and the area is a different color. *(Goldman said he will do everything in his power to get it painted, but that he doesn't own the building and cannot guarantee it.)*

Audience Participation: None.

Discussion by the Commission:

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner White, Seconded by Commissioner Giannola, **“that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 529 E. Liberty Street, a contributing property in the State Street Historic District for removing one projecting backlit sign and installing two new signs, as proposed. The work is compatible in size, scale and proportion with the rest of the building and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* standards 9 and 10.”**

On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – *UNANIMOUS (Application Approved)*

A-4 HDC08-071 - 315 N. STATE STREET - OFWHD

BACKGROUND: This two-story frame house shows Queen Anne and Italianate influences, but its most prominent feature is a Gothic Revival, steeply-pitched, front gable with a tripartite lancet window. It has a nearly-full-width stone front porch with round Tuscan columns. It was built c. 1874 and by 1892 had become the Theta Delta Chi fraternity. Since 1949 the house has been owned and operated by the Inter-Cooperative Council.

In April 2008, the applicant received HDC approval to make changes to the existing non-original kitchen wing. These changes included the removal of two slider windows, a door, and an exterior ventilation fan; the installation of three new double-hung windows on the south elevation; and the construction of a shed-roof porch that wrapped around the kitchen wing and also covered a stairway to the basement unit and a barrier-free access ramp. Since then, a portion of the porch has been constructed, three new windows smaller than the approved size have been added, and a new retaining wall around the bay window was built due to unexpected failure of the existing wall. Unlike the original wall, the replacement wall now projects above grade.

LOCATION: The site is on the west side of North State Street between Catherine and Lawrence.

APPLICATION: This application is a follow-up to one processed by the HDC in April 2008. It seeks approval for changes already made and for additional proposed work.

Post-construction approval is sought for 1) three new windows installed on the south elevation of the kitchen wing which are significantly shorter in height than the ones originally approved by the HDC; and 2) a concrete block retaining wall that replaced an older one that failed during construction. The new wall projects 12 inches above grade (10 inches taller than the original wall) and is to receive a new metal grate cap.

362 Additional proposed work includes 3) the removal of a second floor window in the west rear wing
363 of the house; 4) installation of mechanical equipment on the new porch roof, along with a railing-
364 like screen, the modification of the porch roof configuration, and the installation of an intake unit
365 on the south elevation above the basement entry; and 5) the addition of an entry ramp at the
366 west end of the barrier-free ramp.

367
368 **STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 369
- 370 1. The new kitchen windows are 30” wide and 36” tall. They are approximately 32” shorter
371 than the windows originally proposed, in order to accommodate the interior kitchen
372 counter. The shorter windows are about the same height as the slider window previously
373 in the location. The shorter size is compatible with the house.
 - 374 2. The concrete retaining wall that was previously in front of the bay window extended above
375 grade by two inches. The proposed wall extends 12” above grade, approximately 10”
376 higher than the old wall. The new height is to protect the house from the cars in the
377 driveway. A painted metal grate will be installed around the bay window at grade level.
 - 378 3. When the porch roof is extended to the rear as originally approved the by the Commission,
379 the applicant proposes to remove a metal wall exhaust fan and install mechanical
380 equipment on top of the roof. A platform will be constructed which will then have a 3’ 6”
381 high wood railing screen on the east and south sides of the mechanical area. On the west
382 side there will be a metal fall rail. A non-original window in the rear extension at the
383 second floor will be removed and the siding will be toothed in.
 - 384 4. The proposed retaining wall, shorter windows, mechanical platform and railings, and
385 window removal are generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material
386 and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets *The*
387 *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.
- 388

389 **Owner/Address:** Inter-Cooperative Council, 337 East William Street, A2, MI 48104

390
391 **Applicant:** Quinn Evans Architects, 219 ½ North Main, A2, MI 48103

392
393 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Bruner and Ramsburgh visited the site.

394
395 Commissioner Ramsburgh - the architect explained the changes that are proposed that are
396 necessary to vent the fan in a satisfactory way. The changes look compatible with the building
397 and are appropriate and she is in favor of the application.

398
399 Commissioner Bruner – agreed and said the conditions encountered on the site necessitate the
400 changes.

401
402 **Applicant Presentation:** Jhana Frederickson of Quinn Evans stated that part of the application is
403 the mechanical screen and ventilation and intake louvers and they have tried to hide them as best
404 they can.

405
406 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

407
408 Commissioner Henrichs - Asked why the mechanical unit isn’t on the ground. (*Frederickson said*
409 *it is required by code to be above grade and requires commercial exhaust because it is a*
410 *commercial kitchen (because the building is classified as a dorm).)*

411
412 Commissioner Bruner - Asked if the wall that collapsed was in the same location and if the
413 window below the bay was an egress window. (Frederickson said no, it is not habitable space.)

414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465

Bruner asked if the windows were installed as approved as stated in the letter and Frederickson explained that the only change in the windows was in the height.)

Cindy Christiansen of ICC said they realized they would have to change the height of the windows because of requirements for a commercial kitchen for sink and backsplash height.

Commissioner Bruner - Asked if a kitchen plan was done and Cindy said no, in their minds they weren't changing much on the interior but it turned out that by touching other inside elements they were required to upgrade to a commercial kitchen. She said that the Ann Arbor Building Department inspectors were terrific and helped them out a lot during the process.

Commissioner Bruner stated that ICC does a lot with the limited resources they have. He asked if the rooftop mechanical unit screening was something they wanted or if it was required. *(Cindy believed that code said it needed to be caged.)*

Commissioner Henrichs - Asked if the new wall would be finished. *(Frederickson replied that it would have a grate on top and the wall would be capped with metal and painted. It would be affixed on an angle below the existing siding.)*

Commissioner Henrichs is not sure having a painted steel angle is appropriate for a wood frame, wood sided house. *(Frederickson said the other window has an existing grate and they are trying to prevent the addition of another new element to the house. She described the metal cap that will finish the retaining wall.)*

Commissioner Bruner asked if there would be flashing or anything else on top of the wall and *(Fredrickson said yes, the top would be flashed, but the profile would not be interrupted. Cindy said they didn't want to move any farther with the project without the HDC's opinion.)*

Audience Participation: None.

Discussion by the Commission:

Commissioner Bruner – Stated that the mechanicals may not need to be screened in, but if they want to go to that extent to screen it, they are welcome to go ahead. He feels it is unnecessary.

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner White, Seconded by Commissioner Shotwell, “**that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at for the application at 315 North State Street, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to install three 36” tall windows on the south elevation, install a concrete retaining wall and metal grating along the south elevation, remove a window on the south elevation, and install a mechanical platform, equipment, screening, and rail on the new porch roof as proposed. The work is generally 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* standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.”**

On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS (Application Approved)

466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517

B - OLD BUSINESS – None.

C - NEW BUSINESS

C-1 Discussion on March 2009 Retreat – Coordinator Thacher presented topics for the annual retreat and asked the Commissioners to email her with additional ideas. March 7th in the a.m. was selected as the tentative time.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION – GENERAL (Limited to 3 Minutes per Speaker) – None.

D - APPROVAL OF MINUTES –

D-1 Draft Minutes of the November 13, 2008 Regular Session – Approved as Presented

D-2 Draft Minutes of the December 11, 2008 Regular Session – Approved as Presented

E - REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS – None.

F - ASSIGNMENTS

F-1 February 2009

A-1	HDC08-068-207 W. Jefferson St. -	Commissioner Bruner
A-2	HDC08-069 - 321 E. Liberty St. -	Commissioner White
A-3	HDC08-070 - 529 E. Liberty St. –	Commissioner Giannola
A-4	HDC08-071 - 315 N. State St. –	Already Assigned

F-2 Review Committee for February – Commissioners Glusac and Henrichs

G - STAFF ACTIVITIES REPORT

G-1 December 2008 report was handed out to the Commission. K. Kidorf stated that there were 13 applications and all were approved – 10 by staff and 3 by the HDC.

H - CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS

H-1 Certificate of Service – Commissioner Bruner

S. Shotwell, Chair – Presented Commissioner Bruner with an award from the Commission and the City for six years of service to the Historic District Commission. Commissioner Bruner’s second term is fulfilled, and we thank him for his hard work and diligence.

H-2 Various Concerns –

Commissioner Bruner asked who monitors staff approvals. (*Coordinator Thacher stated that she and Inspectors do*).

Commissioner Ramsburgh – Asked if the Commission could talk about a way to communicate the Historic District procedures to the community so that the ‘after the fact’ repairs and cases could be lessened. Commissioner Bruner agreed and said an update from Mark Lloyd on the state of the new system (Trakit) would be appreciated.

518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539

Commissioner Shotwell – Asked if the Commission wanted to respond to the A2D2 topics covered in the special session.

Commissioner White asked if K. Kidorf could put together a statement of position for the Commissioners and Commissioner Shotwell questioned whether the Commission has a coherent position and asked if anyone thought a formal position was desired.

Commissioner Henrichs asked if minutes were taken and said he thought they would be adequate to convey the position of the different Commissioners.

I - COMMUNICATIONS

ADJOURNMENT

The Meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m. without objection.

Meeting Minutes – Taken by Jill Thacher, Historic District Coordinator, Planning and Development Services

Prepared/Edited By: Brenda Acquaviva, Administrative Service Specialist V, Planning and Development Services.