



**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR
Thursday, March 12, 2009.**

Commissioners Present: Sarah Shotwell, Diane Giannola, Michael Bruner, Jim Henrichs, Ellen Ramsburgh, and Kristina Glusac (6)

Commissioners Absent: Robert White

Staff Present: Jill Thacher, Historic District Coordinator, Kristine Kidorf, Kidorf Preservation Consulting and Brenda Acquaviva Administrative Support Specialist V, Planning and Development Services (3)

CALL TO ORDER: Commissioner Shotwell called the Regular Session to order at 7:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Quorum satisfied.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: - *Item A-4 – 915 West Washington Street – Strike “Move Garage” in the title description so that the application reads “Create Parking Only”* - The Agenda was approved as amended without objection.

A - HEARINGS

A-1 HDC09-018 - 1331 HILL STREET - WHHD

BACKGROUND: The Delta Upsilon Fraternity was designed by Albert Kahn and constructed in 1903. The building is significant for being one of Kahn’s earlier residential designs, and for being the oldest fraternity house in Ann Arbor still being used by the organization that built it. Delta Upsilon is a non-secret fraternity and the Michigan chapter was chartered in 1876. Although the original slate roof had been replaced with asphalt shingles, the Tudor Revival style building had changed little from its historic appearance until a fire occurred in April, 2008. The fire destroyed much of the roof and second floor of the building.

A previous application to remove the fire-damaged structure above the first floor was approved by the HDC on October 22, 2008 (HDC08-029). As a condition of the approval to demolish the upper floors, the Commission required the applicant to return to the Commission by March, 2009 with additional information on windows, a section of the basement wall, and decorative wood trim. Since that meeting, the upper floors have been demolished and the first floor temporarily secured and made weather tight.

LOCATION: North side of Hill Street, east of the intersection with Forest.

APPLICATION: The applicant proposes to reconstruct and restore the building to its pre-fire appearance using matching or compatible materials and finishes.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. At the October 2008 HDC meeting, part of the motion passed required the applicant to provide staff with roofing material information by February 28, 2009. The applicant has met this requirement and the proposed asphalt roofing material (CertainTeed Independence Shingle “Heather Blend”) is appropriate and matches the pre-fire roofing material.

- 52 2. The applicant proposes to reconstruct the roof, stucco portions of the walls, and windows
53 based on the original drawings and photographs of the building before the fire to match the
54 condition before the fire. New stucco will be applied to the exterior to match the existing.
55 3. Wood exterior trim and details will be re-created based on physical remains, photographs
56 and drawings.
57 4. The first floor and basement brick walls will be repaired; wood trim will be repaired or
58 replaced to match.
59 5. Windows throughout the house are proposed to be replaced with wood, true-divided lights
60 with insulated glass to match the existing (or destroyed) windows.
61 6. A previously proposed change to the rear bay window to enclose an interior stair has been
62 removed from the application. The applicant now proposes to rebuild a fire escape stair on
63 the back of the building that extended from the bay window on the second floor to the
64 ground. The rebuilt version would be metal instead of wood, which is a more appropriate
65 material and would be less obtrusive than a wood fire escape.
66 7. Additional details on replacement windows, wood trim, and other exterior details are
67 included with the application, including thumbnail photos that are keyed to the drawings
68 submitted and which document pre-fire features that are proposed to be re-created.
69 8. The proposed reconstructed roof, walls, trim, and architectural details are generally
70 compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of
71 the building and the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards*
72 *for Rehabilitation*, in particular standard numbers 2,3,5 and 6.
73

74 **Owner/Address:** MI Chp., Delta Upsilon Fraternity, John Markiewicz, 2422 Foxway, A2, MI 8105
75

76 **Applicant:** Jeffery Scott Architects, 32316 Grand River Avenue, Suite 200 Farmington, MI 48336
77

78 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Giannola and Ramsburgh visited the site.
79

80 Commissioner Giannola – There isn't much more to report other than the fact that they have
81 removed the top two floors.
82

83 Commissioner Ramsburgh – I watched the demolition and they did a very careful job of that. She
84 commended them for the work they did.
85

86 **Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Jeff Scott, Scott Architects and Mr. John Markowitz, President of
87 the alumni fraternity board (as well as the contractors) were present to speak on behalf of the
88 appeal. They stated that all is going as planned and they are in the process of finalizing their
89 negotiations with the insurance company. There is no change in their plans to begin
90 reconstruction – so everything we've submitted previously is still in place. We are anxious and
91 hopeful for things to get started. (*He displayed window samples that they brought that would be*
92 *typical of the materials they propose to replace.*)
93

94 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**
95

96 Commissioner Ramsburgh – You were able to save some of the detail, correct? (Petitioner -
97 Mainly on the interior was salvageable. Most of the exterior was destroyed. We found a
98 Romanian hand carver familiar with this and he did our mock up which is strikingly familiar.)
99

100 Commissioner Glusac – Is the Balfour Company going to do just the demolition? (Petitioner – No
101 – they have been retained to do the construction).

Commissioner Henrichs – What is the roofing material? (Petitioner – CertainTeed Asphalt – that was what was present prior to this.)

Audience Participation: None.

Discussion by the Commission:

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner Giannola, Seconded by Commissioner Shotwell, “**that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 1331 Hill Street to reconstruct the roof and stucco walls, and restore the exterior of the basement and first story, to match the appearance of the house before the fire as proposed. The work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standard numbers 2,3,5, and 6 and fulfills the conditions set forth by the Commission at its October 22, 2008 Special Meeting.**”

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

A-2 HDC09-019 – 319 S. SEVENTH STREET - OWSHD

BACKGROUND: This one-and-a-half story cross-gabled house features ionic columns on a wrap-around masonry porch. It appears in the 1892 City Directory as 27 Seventh Street, the home of George Boettger, a carpenter. Mr. Boettger is listed at 94 Jewett (the former name of Seventh Street) in 1890-91, which is likely the same house. From 1910 (or earlier) until at least 1940 the home was occupied by members of the Wagner family, Frederick W. and his wife Louise. Frederick owned Wagner and Gauss, a saloon at 213 South Ashley (Schwabens Hall).

LOCATION: East side of South Seventh Street, south of Murray Court and north of West Liberty.

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace an existing one-story addition on the southwest corner of the house with a new one-story addition on a slightly enlarged footprint; and to replace an existing original window opening that currently contains a smaller, non-original window with a new bay window.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The house is a contributing structure in the Old West Side Historic District. The rear addition that is proposed to be replaced was constructed in the 1980s and has some structural deficiencies. The proposed addition is similar in massing to the current one, and the style is complementary yet easily distinguished as modern. The proposed addition extends approximately 1 ½ feet beyond the plane of the large bay window on the center of the south elevation; the current addition is flush with the bay.
2. The proposed trellis would project approximately 3 feet out from the new addition. The trellis and proposed addition are far enough back on the rear of the building that they do not negatively impact character-defining features.

- 152 3. Materials for the new addition include wood siding and trim to match the existing, and clad
153 wood windows (casement) and French doors.
154
- 155 4. A new boxed bay window is proposed on the rear (east) elevation of the house, in place of
156 an existing original window opening that has been modified to hold a shortened window
157 sash. The shortened window is installed above an interior kitchen counter. The proposed
158 bay window box is being requested in order to bring additional light into the kitchen via a
159 larger window. The 5 foot wide and 9 foot tall bay is not compatible with the window
160 openings and historic character of the building, and the *Guidelines* recommend against
161 changing the size of historic window openings. It would be most appropriate to remove the
162 current shortened window and restore the sash to one that fits the original window opening
163 in a style compatible with the house.
164
- 165 5. The proposed addition is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture,
166 material & relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets *The*
167 *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, in particular standards 2, 9 & 10.
168
- 169 6. The proposed box bay window on the rear elevation is not compatible with the window
170 openings and character of the building, and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior's*
171 *Standards for Rehabilitation*, in particular standards 2, 9 and 10.
172

173 **Owner/Address:** Anne Schroth, 319 S Seventh Street, A2, MI 48103
174

175 **Applicant:** Rueter Associates Architects 515 Fifth St. Ann Arbor, MI 48103
176

177 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Giannola and Ramsburgh visited the site.
178

179 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Agrees with the staff report in that the more appropriate solution
180 would be to return to the original opening (for the window) and allow that to provide additional
181 light and return it to its original state.
182

183 Commissioner Giannola – Concurs with both staffs report and Commissioner Ramsburgh.
184

185 **Applicant Presentation:**
186

187 Mr. Marc Rueter, Architect and Anne Schroth, Owner were present to speak on behalf of the
188 appeal. He stated that they had a differing opinion on the window. He said that the original
189 window opening was probably left in tact when the original addition was put on, and a smaller,
190 double-hung window was placed in that opening. The interior casing has been completely
191 removed and highly unlikely that there is any integrity left to it. Had we had a nice historic window
192 there, I might have felt differently. One of the issues was the light in the kitchen (he asked the
193 homeowner to comment).
194

195 Anne Schroth – Owner - It seems almost impossible to replace this window given the kitchen
196 counter, so it would be unrealistic to think we could do that. The bigger window would blend
197 more with the new addition. The back is the 'heart' of the house and we would like that to see out
198 She stated that the current window is tiny and doesn't have any value, historically or otherwise.
199

200 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**
201

202 **Commissioner Ramsburgh** – The window is a box bay from the outside. Is it a true bay on the
203 inside? (M. Rueter – The bay ends at the kitchen counter and is boxed out to protect the piping

204 from bursting (and is insulated. The sink is in front of the window. It would not be practical to
205 restore the window simply because it would be below the sink.)
206

207 Commissioner Henrichs – Is the sink there currently or is it proposed? (It exists currently.)
208 (We wouldn't be changing the plumbing.) So there are other options (Yes. To have a molding in
209 the middle of your sink looking out is a bit disconcerting. The glass right now is a four foot wide
210 casement window that is approximately four feet high. This replaces a window that is about 20
211 inches wide.)
212

213 Commissioner Shotwell – To clarify, the only way to bring more light into the kitchen is this
214 window. (Yes.)
215

216 **Audience Participation:** None.
217

218 **Discussion by the Commission:**
219

220 Commissioner McCauley – Stated he hypothesizes the problems that old kitchens pose for
221 retaining the original size of the windows, as they always come down just a little bit lower than
222 counter tops and in a situation like this, it's a compromise on what we would normally think of
223 regarding the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Obviously, if you can't make the window
224 lower, going slightly wider is a solution and it does look appropriate for the house.
225

226 Commissioner Henrichs – Thinks the addition is appropriate to the house.
227

228 **MOTION #1** 229

230 Moved by Commissioner Shotwell, Seconded by Commissioner Giannola, **“that the**
231 **Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the portion of the application at 319**
232 **South Seventh Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to**
233 **remove a one story addition on the southeast corner of the house and replace it with a one**
234 **story addition as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design,**
235 **arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and surrounding**
236 **area, and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular**
237 **standards 2, 9 and 10.**
238

239 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS (Removal of older addition/add new**
240 **addition, Approved)**
241

242 Commissioner Giannola – I don't have a problem with the size of the pane of glass, but it doesn't
243 match with the 'boxed out' portion at the bottom.
244

245 Commissioner Shotwell – I agree with Commissioner McCauley – re: the kitchen counter
246 dilemma. That is probably why the area is boxed in on the bottom when the newer window was
247 installed sometime in the 1980's. We do, however, have an original window opening here, and it
248 has been preserved, so while the bay window would accommodate more light, I would be in favor
249 of preserving the original window opening.
250

251 Commissioner Henrichs – Suggested that other options regarding this window be researched to
252 find something that may be acceptable to the Commission as well as the homeowner.

MOTION #2

Moved by Commissioner Ramsburgh, Seconded by Commissioner Glusac, “**that the Commission deny the portion of the application at 319 South Seventh Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to replace an original window opening with a bay window on the rear elevation, as proposed. The proposed work is not compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*, in particular standards 2, 9 and 10.**”

On a ROLL CALL VOTE – MOTION PASSED – (*Application DENIED*) (4) Yes, (2) No.

(4) YES – Commissioner’s Shotwell, Ramsburgh, Henrichs & Glusac

(2) NO – Commissioner’s McCauley & Giannola

A-3 HDC09-020 - 1310 HILL STREET - WHHD

BACKGROUND: This 1890 Georgian Revival house was first occupied by Edward deMille Campbell, a professor of analytical chemistry and metallurgy, and his family. The front façade’s symmetry is notable, particularly the pediment front gable, window placement, and chimneys at both ends. See the attached study committee report for more information.

At their May 8, 2008 meeting the HDC denied an application to remove a garage and construct a minimally-attached rear duplex addition. The addition’s size and massing were too large in relation to the existing house, site, and neighborhood. This application seeks to correct the previous one by proposing a smaller addition.

LOCATION: South side of Hill Street, between South Forest Avenue and Olivia Avenue.

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to demolish a detached garage and construct a 1,242 square foot addition

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The two sugar maples in the backyard are landmark trees and contribute to the character of the site and the neighborhood. Measures should be taken to prevent trucks and equipment from driving over their shallow root systems during construction, such as (but not limited to) installing fencing surrounding the critical root zone to keep equipment and materials away. Therefore, any approvals should be conditioned with the requirement that adequate protection is given to the trees during construction.
2. The applicant has provided information proving that the garage is a modern structure, probably built after 1953. An earlier garage existed on the site, but there is no evidence of the earlier garage present in the current one. Staff therefore considers it to be a noncontributing structure, and its removal is appropriate.
3. The hyphen connection between the house and addition is appropriate and protects the form and integrity of the house. The addition could easily be removed in the future and the house would be unimpaired. A non-original rear porch and kitchen extension would be demolished to accommodate the hyphen connection. No original materials would be lost.

- 305 4. The house is currently 2,709 square feet. The proposed addition is 1,242 sf (including the
306 hyphen connector) with a 759 sf footprint.
- 307
- 308 5. The addition's roof ridge is roughly one foot higher than the eave of the original house. The
309 addition's hipped roof design complements and tucks in behind the house. Approximately
310 7 feet of the addition will extend beyond the west side wall of the house and be visible from
311 the street. Offsetting the addition in this way is appropriate in order to protect the two
312 landmark trees in the backyard. Staff feels that the lot is large enough to support this
313 addition, especially given the contextual setting of the neighboring backyards (a large
314 church and a large sorority, see aerial photo at the end of this report).
- 315
- 316 6. Removal of the noncontributing garage and the duplex addition as proposed are
317 compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of
318 the building and the surrounding area and meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards*
319 *for Rehabilitation*, particularly standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

320

321 **Owner/Address:** David Chua, 845 Babb Circle, Wayne, PA 19087

322

323 **Applicant:** Marc Rueter, 515 Fifth Street, A2, MI 48103

324

325 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Giannola and Ramsburgh visited the site.

326

327 Commissioner Giannola – The new design is more acceptable than the former one. My only
328 concern is that they're removing some parking places so I'm afraid this will encourage people to
329 park in the backyard and damage the Sugar Maple trees in the backyard. The scale and mass of
330 the proposed addition is still a bit bigger than the existing garage, and whether this affects the
331 trees as well, we'll have to ask the applicant.

332

333 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Stated that the staff report was thorough and concurred with
334 Commissioner Giannola's report. I also want to state for that record that we should state that
335 parking is allowed only on the drive and perhaps that the fence is maintained and during
336 construction, the trees also be protected with fencing.

337

338 Also concerned with the size and massing of this 'addition.' She stated that she wanted to remind
339 the Commission of the addition and scale of the garage that was previously added to the Frieze
340 Building – then look at this house for comparison. The duplex addition is going to add a very
341 prominent structure to this property, and my reservations are that we will detract from the original
342 historic resource.

343

344 **Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Marc Rueter, Architect was present to speak on behalf of the
345 appeal. He read a statement of the past history of the proposed appeals on this home. Scale,
346 massing, etc. were an issue and that more limit in scale should be proposed. The staff report
347 also recommended removing the Garrett dormers and lowering the height to the front gable or
348 less. He stated that they have taken the Commission's suggestions and have gone beyond the
349 recommendations. We've removed the entire proposal for the second story, leaving us with
350 essentially a story and a half building.

351

352 The new eave height is essentially the same as the existing sunroom on the home. The footprint
353 as well as the entire proposed square footage total has been reduced by 42 percent. This is a
354 substantial reduction in floor area. (*The garage footprint and the proposed addition were*
355 *discussed on a power point presentation.*)

356

357 Another issue that came up was the Sugar Maple trees that exist on the property. He once again
358 showed the proposed plans. He explained how they could manage construction to keep heavy
359 machinery from damaging the root balls of the existing trees. They propose cordoning off the
360 area near the trees and not allowing any construction materials to be stored there and no foot
361 traffic allowed which would avoid soil compaction which would damage the root balls.
362

363 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

364
365 Commissioner Henrichs – Is there a basement under this home? (Yes, a full basement). How
366 are the stairs connecting? (M. Rueter – Presently, the existing house has completely inadequate
367 stairs to the basement. One of the stairs going down goes to the existing basement and the other
368 stairway goes up to the main living level of that house.) *(Discussion on the stairs.)*
369

370 Commissioner Glusac – What is the average ceiling height on the second floor? (the knee wall
371 height on the new addition is 2'10" – and we are able to get an average for code compliance.
372 *(Petitioner explained that they wouldn't be reducing the ceiling heights in the lower rooms as it
373 would affect the code compliance with the size of the bedrooms.)*
374

375 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Will the basement have bedrooms? (Yes. There can be two
376 bedrooms there.) So there are egress windows there? (Yes. If you look at the east elevation,
377 there are egress windows there.)
378

379 J. Thacher (To Petitioner) – *Asked the petitioner to expound on the egress window design.*
380 *(There is a well that goes to those windows that extends out six feet. That area is fenced off so
381 that no one can fall into it.) (Discussion on the window wells.)*
382

383 **Audience Participation:** None.
384

385 **Discussion by the Commission:**

386 **MOTION**

387
388
389 Moved by Commissioner Glusac, Seconded by Commissioner Henrichs, **“that the Commission**
390 **issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 1310 Hill Street in the**
391 **Washtenaw Hill Historic District, to remove a non-contributing garage and add a duplex**
392 **addition, on the condition that a tree protection plan is approved by the city’s Urban**
393 **Forestry and Natural Resources Planner before grading or building permits are issued,**
394 **As conditioned, the work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture,**
395 **material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets**
396 ***The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*, in particular standards 2,5,9**
397 **and 10.**
398

399 **MOTION TO AMEND**

400
401 Moved by Commissioner Ramsburgh, Seconded by Commissioner McCauley **“that parking on**
402 **this site be confined to the existing driveway and that the fence to the backyard be**
403 **maintained so that the lawn and trees will remain protected from parking.**
404

405 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE AMENDMENT - PASSED – UNANIMOUS**

FINAL MOTION AS AMENDED

Moved by Commissioner Glusac, Seconded by Commissioner Henrichs, “**that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 1310 Hill Street in the Washtenaw Hill Historic District, to remove a non-contributing garage and add a duplex addition, on the condition that a tree protection plan is approved by the city’s Urban Forestry and Natural Resources Planner before grading or building permits are issued, **and that parking on this site be confined to the existing driveway and that the fence to the backyard be maintained so that the lawn and trees will remain protected from parking.*** As conditioned, 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*, in particular standards 2,5,9 and 10.

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

A-4 HDC09-021 – 915 WEST WASHINGTON STREET - OWSHD

BACKGROUND: This 1½ story gambrel-roofed Dutch colonial revival house first appears in the 1907 Polk directory as the home of Frederick C Raab, foreman at Schumacher Hardware, and his wife Elizabeth D. The Raabs lived there until 1912 or 1913. The garage was added after 1931. The footprint of the house was altered sometime after 1931 and the front door moved from the west side of the building to the east side.

The applicant received a staff approval in January, 2009 to replace the severely-compromised basement walls and four basement windows.

LOCATION: South side of West Washington Street, between South Seventh and Eighth Street.

APPLICATION: The applicant is proposing to create an additional parking space and steps down a steep grade to the backyard.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The applicant is proposing to add a parking space next to an existing garage. The lot shares a driveway with the house to the west, and there is currently room to park only one car in the garage. Because of the narrow width of the driveway, stacking a car in front of the garage would result in blocking the neighbor’s access to his garage. The parking space would be built of treated 6” by 8” landscape timbers, with steps down the hill along the north side and two tiers of planters along the east side.
2. The yard behind the house drops off quite steeply and the slope is covered with large boulders dumped there by some previous owner, making the yard practically unusable. The boulders would be moved to the north to make room for the steps and parking space.
3. An existing rectangular paved patio behind the house (accessed through the walkout basement) would be made smaller to accommodate the driveway needed to access the new parking space. If any future owner decided not to park a car in the new space, it could be used as an extension of the backyard. The new parking space is shielded from neighbors to the west by the existing garage. To the east is a large masonry building formerly used for light manufacturing, so the space should have no impact on neighboring properties.

- 457
458 4. The proposed parking space retaining walls and stair are treated wood, are simple in
459 design and are generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and
460 relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary*
461 *of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standards number 2, 9, and 10.
462

463 **Owner/Applicant/Address:** Ronald & Charlene Hatlen, 1231 Naples Ct., Ann Arbor, MI 48103
464

465 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Ramsburgh and Giannola visited the site.
466

467 Commissioner – This is an appropriate improvement to the site. There will be the loss of two
468 trees, but they don't appear to be landmark trees and will prevent the shared drive from becoming
469 a point of contention. My only concern due to the grade on the site is that I hope there is a plan
470 to prevent the car from driving off the drive and off onto the steep downgrade.
471

472 Commissioner Giannola – Concurs with Commissioner Ramsburgh and staff's report. The
473 parking on the street is already at maximum and this is needed for this home.
474

475 **Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Ronald Hatlen stated that they proposed to use some of those
476 existing stones or boulders on the site that make it impossible to navigate – and it appears that
477 they did this to make a kind of retaining wall. We will probably use some of those stone to 'soften'
478 the landscape, but plan to make a nice neat site including the parking space and landscaping
479 improvements. We will have a curb at the grade drop-off to prevent a car from going off into that
480 area. We are also going to 'step-grade' that area in increments of about 3 feet each so that if you
481 did fall off, you wouldn't fall 6 to 7 feet downward.
482

483 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:** None.
484

485 **Audience Participation:** None.
486

487 **Discussion by the Commission:**
488

489 **MOTION**

491 Moved by Commissioner Ramsburgh, Seconded by Commissioner McCauley, "that the
492 **Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 915 West**
493 **Washington Street in the Old West Side Historic District to construct an additional parking**
494 **space and adjacent stairs down the backyard slope, as proposed. The proposed work is**
495 **generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to**
496 **the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior's***
497 ***Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standards number 2, 9, and 10."
498**

499 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS (Application Approved)**
500

501 **B - OLD BUSINESS –**

502
503
504 The Chair stated that because the public hearing regarding this issue was heard at the February
505 meeting and closed at the February meeting, the Commission would have to pass a motion to
506 approve adding a second public comment time in order to hear additional comment on this issue.
507

508 **MOTION**

Moved by Commissioner Giannola, Seconded by Commissioner Ramsburgh, “that the Commission approve a second public comment hearing regarding Item B-1.”

On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS (Additional Public Comment Time – Approved for Issue B-1.)

J. Thacher gave a brief report on the information regarding this issue and what had transpired at the February Regular Session.

B-1 HDC09-006 – 307 SECOND STREET, 311 SECOND STREET & 325 WEST LIBERTY STREET– Demolish service station and two houses for parking lot – OWSHD

This item was postponed from the February 12, 2009 HDC meeting. See staff report from the February 12, 2009 Regular Session for background information and staff recommendations.

UPDATE: At their February 12, 2009 meeting, the HDC took the following actions.

1. The service station at 325 West Liberty Street was determined to be a *noncontributing* structure in the Old West Side Historic District.
2. The two houses at 307 and 311 Second Street were determined to be *contributing* structures in the Old West Side Historic District.
3. The portion of the application to demolish the noncontributing structure at 325 West Liberty Street and install surface parking was approved.
4. The portion of the application to demolish the contributing structures at 307 and 311 Second Street was postponed* to the March 12, 2009 meeting.

STAFF COMMENTS: These steps remain for the Commission to address.

For 307 and 311 Second Street (structures that contribute to the historic district), the Commission must take one of the following actions, via a Commissioner motion:

1. *Deny* a certificate of appropriateness for this application, or
2. *Approve* a Notice to Proceed.

The Chair stated that the Commission would allow one representative from the applicants group 3 minutes to provide any new information that was not presented at the February meeting.

Applicant – Presentation

(The Applicant asked for a few minutes to discuss who would represent the team to provide additional information, as they were not aware that they would be limited to 3 minutes.)

(Discussion on this issue between the Chair and the Petitioners regarding loss of speaking time.)

Mr. Greg Jones (Petitioner Representative) – Information on the houses that were mentioned at the last meeting. Both of the houses are in the floodway and floodplain and cannot be expanded due to the regulations on property in floodplains/floodways. The houses’ character have been compromised with vinyl and/or aluminum siding, newer vinyl windows, etc. Rehabilitation treatments as described in the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards* do allow for modifications to existing historic environments to accommodate new uses, and we feel that the character defining

561 feature of this block is the scale and massing of the Industrial/Commercial block that Liberty Lofts
 562 represent – and that is really the ‘character defining’ feature.
 563

564 Mr. Ron Mucha – (Petitioner with Morningside Group) *Two points that I had were:*
 565

566 1. Last meeting – There was a discussion about the ‘Secretary of the Interior’s Standards’ and
 567 what was applicable – Item “B” vs. item “D.” At that point, it was said that the City Attorney would
 568 opine. We don’t know what his decision is, but regardless of that, if “B” is found to be applicable
 569 or not, in no way were we implying that “B” was superior to “D” or vice-versa. We believe that
 570 they both apply. It may turn out that only one is allowed for consideration, but we have
 571 confidence that we meeting both of them equally.
 572

573 2. In terms of support for this project - You’ll find that there won’t be people stepping up to the
 574 podium to support the project tonight. That is because those eighty people that are adjacent to
 575 the project came out to the last meeting or already put their advocacy in writing won’t be here
 576 tonight doesn’t change the fact that they’re on the record since the public hearing was closed at
 577 the last meeting. Although I see representatives here from the Old West Side Historic Districts
 578 who will probably be opposed to this, I don’t believe that anyone who lives in this neighborhood in
 579 the OWS – in which this project is constituted – is opposed to the project. There may have been
 580 one resident at the last meeting within this neighborhood that was opposed.
 581

582 **Questions of the Petitioner** – None.
 583

584 Public Commentary – (*Limited to 3 minutes per speaker*)
 585

- 586 1. Chris Crockett – *Speaking on behalf of the Preservation Alliance* – She stated that she
 587 is also the President of the Old Fourth Ward Historic District. The request before you
 588 has no request for expansion and only some comments on windows and siding.
 589 Having dealt with those issues myself in my own home where we had inappropriate
 590 windows and asbestos siding, I know that those things can be changed and restored.
 591 The Old West Side is, in essence, a ‘working class’ neighborhood. It was created as a
 592 Historic District as a real celebration of the working class roots of Ann Arbor. These
 593 two houses are typical of the kind of built fabric in A2 that exists in the OWS.
 594

595 You don’t have any site plan before you so you can consider and assess anything –
 596 such as a public good or a public benefit; simply, a request to demolish on a wish and a
 597 prayer that perhaps someday, something good might come down the path. No one
 598 knows that, and that is not a basis for demolition – at least not according to the HDC
 599 Ordinance which makes it very clear that certain guidelines have to be met in order to
 600 approve the request for demolition. She stated that this was not a popularity contest
 601 and how many voted for which side, but rather about what the Ordinance states and
 602 thinks that these homes should not be demolished. (*She urged the Commission to*
 603 *retain these homes.*)
 604

- 605 2. Ray Detter – 120 North Division Street, A2, MI - Thanked the Commission for allowing
 606 additional public comment on this topic. He recapped exactly how many letters were
 607 sent by owners in the Old West Side and various organizations and groups who
 608 oppose this particular project. He stated that he wanted to make clear that Liberty Lofts
 609 never supported this project. What they said was that they would not oppose it. There
 610 were several people who came forward who said it would improve their view, but that’s
 611 not a good reason to tear down houses.
 612

As to the floodplain, it's been in the floodplain for as long as it's existed (over 100 years). It still fits into the streetscape. I went there and investigated the condition of those homes and others on the block, and those two homes are in as good if not better condition than two houses that are across the street from it – in nature of the types of repairs that have been made. As was also mentioned by one of the Commissioners, the fact that it doesn't have a kitchen is not justification for tearing it down. It's easy to replace a kitchen, which has nothing to do with the preservation ordinances. We hope you make the right decision on this petition and reject this attempt to demolish these homes.

3. Liz Knibbe – 2640 Stommel Street, Ypsilanti, MI - She stated that she is a Historic Preservation Architect who has worked for 30 years with historic resources both within and outside of historic districts. I've been watching with Ann Arbor struggle with these issues and to give some advice. The "*Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*" that are written in the ordinance are really there to protect the fabric and character of historic buildings. Your ordinance, however, implements these within a broader framework. The ordinance has purposes beyond that – enhancing other property values in the surrounding areas and generally the economic property values of other properties and community. The trick is to balance those two. This is exactly why we have Commissions and Boards.

Your ordinance also provides guidance; it states that you only demolish buildings when they meet one of four requirements. In this case, the requirement of it standing in the way of a substantial improvement is the salient one. Along with that standard, you have to look at other things. First, has any serious consideration been given to provide parking for this lot/building in the very large lot that sits across the street? Secondly, what is going to replace those buildings once demolished? In this case we have a basic plan for a parking lot. Is there some alternative that could be done to provide parking and housing?

The third thing to look at is if what will happen if it does end up a parking lot? Without a tenant to rent the building and having this 'user' in place, the petitioner hasn't met that standard. I do think that there are standards under which those houses could go and would be in the best interest of the community and would be fulfilling the request to demolish. This particular application at this time does not meet that standard.

J. Thacher – Stated that during the staff report she passed out 10 public comments to the Commission regarding this issue.

RECESS 9:00 p.m. RECONVENE AT 9:07

Petitioner was allowed to speak again for REBUTTAL

Ron Mucha – There was a comment made about Liberty Lofts not 'supporting' this project, but rather 'not objecting' to the project, (He read letter of support from Liberty Lofts – The first line of which states "The Board of Liberty Lofts Condominium Association **supports the proposal by Morningside Group...** , just to clarify that. He noted that the Citizens Advisory Committee also includes some residents of Liberty Lofts, who already support this project. Mr. Mucha also stated that these homes won't be destroyed unless there was a guaranteed tenant that would move in and needed that parking. It was also stated that we should 'consider other options' such as parking east of the building. Many of you may remember that we already addressed that and discussed it at the last meeting. When we meet with any potential tenant for that space, we

665 explain that that parking lot is used for permit purposes by the DDA during the week, and is
666 vacant on the weekend. That parking has been considered.

667

668 David Strosberg – Stated he is a partner in Morningside Group and was not able to attend the
669 first meeting, but did watch it on line. He stated that they have owned the property for six years
670 (acquired in 2003) and have been marketing this property since that time with a well known
671 broker. The most serious user to potentially move in insisted that the gas station and homes be
672 removed and replaced with parking. When that potential tenant saw how lengthy a process it
673 might be to do this, they went away. We are trying to be proactive and put in place a system that
674 will allow us to develop this appropriately if this opportunity should present itself again.

675

676 I've heard several comments – “Don't build more parking.... We have enough parking in the
677 community.....” The reality is, the marketplace is different. This is a very large space – 20,000
678 sq. ft. plus and is not going to be looked at by a tenant for just those available within walking
679 distance. They will look to a market that will generate enough sales to justify a rent for a 20,000
680 sq. ft. space in Ann Arbor. We don't think it's practical to suggest that if you build less parking,
681 there will be less parking demand. The people that do the radius studies on this will demand a
682 certain amount of parking, regardless of our opinions on parking vs. walking communities. Our
683 company specializes in historic rehabilitation, and we believe that restoration is best when it
684 serves the contemporary needs of the community, when it benefits the community and it retains
685 the essential character of the community. We feel we've done this with Liberty Lofts and we hope
686 to do this with our plans for the corner space. “

687

688 Commissioner Giannola – Stated she was hoping that the Commission would consider this in a
689 different light. To allow demolition of (or sacrifice, if you will) the two houses – the basic goal of
690 Historic Preservation is to not only protect the structures, but also the rehabilitate the unused
691 structures that exist. Many are in poor condition and if they're not rehabilitated, they will just
692 become eyesores. Liberty Lofts has been the ‘Shining Star’ project in this area for a rehabilitation
693 project, and have done all they can to make it economically viable. The residential has been
694 viable, but due to the lack of parking, we chance that the Commercial side of this will fail. Our last
695 meeting finds these buildings to be ‘contributing’ structures, and it's well known that I believe they
696 are minimally contributory. They're not unique.

697

698 If we look at the houses individually, most will say ‘no, let's not demolish them,’ but if you look at
699 them as individual structures that affect the entire area, it's a more important goal that they
700 contribute to the health and productivity of the neighborhood around them, and that can only be
701 done by making way for this improvement project which will attract a healthy retailer to the area
702 and detract from enticing other developers to the area. Our long term goal for the entire area will
703 be affected, and these buildings are a deterrent to improving our community.

704

705 Commissioner Shotwell – I think in this particular case that I feel so strongly about retaining these
706 structures is that it's not the homes themselves – it was mentioned that they are not ‘unique’ but
707 because they are not unique, they are characteristic of the Old West Side and many of the homes
708 in Ann Arbor and are responsible for the context of those homes on that residential block as well
709 as the industrial buildings. It's not preserving the context of that neighborhood if we allow that.
710 While I definitely agree that I would love to see a viable retailer obtain that square footage for
711 rent, I can't vote in favor of taking away these structures and changing the face of what that block
712 has looked like for many years!

713

714 Commissioner Giannola – Even if it affects the long-term goal of historic preservation?

715

716 Commissioner Shotwell – Stated that she hasn't seen that happen, but if we keep those homes
717 and limit the parking, it won't ruin Historic Preservation and re-use.
718

719 Commissioner Henrichs – It's my understanding that maintaining the economic vitality in historic
720 districts and neighborhoods is a key component of Historic Preservation and I think that is
721 recognized by National Preservationists (and others). It's also my understanding that we need to
722 consider how we're handling this based on the "*Local Historic Districts Act*," would it be
723 appropriate to read those into the record again as to how those items in the law read? Because
724 that is the basis on what we're making our decision.
725

726 Commissioner Shotwell – Yes. The current motion on the floor is to deny the application, but if
727 that motion fails, we would be faced with a "Notice To Proceed," so it would be dependent on
728 those two provisions, so I think that it would be appropriate.
729

730 J. Thacher – In Chapter 103, (City Code), "Historic Preservation," Section 8:416 ("Notice To
731 Proceed"), the two items you're speaking of are letters 'B' and 'D.'
732

733 **B – “The resource is a deterrent to a major improvement program that will be of
734 substantial benefit to the community and the applicant proposing the work
735 has obtained all necessary Planning and Zoning approvals, financing and
736 environmental clearances.”**
737

738 **D – “Retaining the resource is not in the interest of the majority of the
739 community.”**
740

741 Commissioner Henrichs – My thinking relative to this is that – isn't it a precursor to deciding
742 whether or not this resource is in the interest of the majority of the community, which is what
743 we're deciding, would be for the applicant (if they so chose) to obtain all necessary Planning and
744 Zoning approvals.
745

746 Commissioner Shotwell – If we were to issue something under subsection "B," that would be
747 required in order for us to consider that; or, we could consider subsection "D" as the other option.
748

749 Commissioner Giannola – There is an economic benefit to the community. Historic Preservation
750 is more than just preserving buildings. It's about integrating more of the cultural resources with
751 economic growth. In order to do that, and increase the density downtown, there have to be
752 certain sacrifices. In the recommended "Vision and Policy Framework" for downtown Ann Arbor
753 (which can be found on the city's historic website pages) there is a quote there that states: "some
754 of the buildings within historic districts which are of ordinary quality, the city and Historic
755 Commission could allow removal of these historic structures to provide for new development."
756

757 I feel that these structures are of 'ordinary quality;' they may be contributing, but are in the way of
758 economic development. To me that's a different category than 'knocking them down to build a
759 parking lot' for say... a brand new 7-11 you might want to build on the corner. I believe this will
760 be a great deterrent to other investors if this project fails. If we don't have support for it and still
761 expect investors to come here and invest – it's just not going to happen. It is a sacrifice, but how
762 much of a sacrifice is it really?
763

764 Commissioner McCauley – I understand your point, but going by what you're saying, the lack of
765 parking spaces is the exclusive reason why this site isn't rented, which may be so – however,
766 we're being asked to tear down two contributing resources in the district and destroy that
767 streetscape which has been basically the way it is today for the last 100 years – in exchange for

768 the hypothetical need for parking, and I don't think that is a strong enough reason to tear down
769 contributing structures in an historic district.

770
771 It's hypothetical that the parking is the reason that it can't be rented, but there may be other
772 reasons why it can't be rented.

773
774 Commissioner Shotwell – The hope is to increase density downtown, and having lived in dense
775 downtowns, I'm in favor of that – I think it is a great idea. I do agree that with the success of
776 Liberty Lofts, we would be increasing density a little bit commercially by having a tenant in there,
777 but that would be one commercial tenant in downtown Ann Arbor if we gained those parking
778 spaces, which to me isn't necessarily leading to increased density all over Ann Arbor.

779
780 Commissioner Giannola – It might be semantics, but we're not trying to say 'knock down the
781 houses to support parking' – what I'm saying is demolish the houses in support of this successful
782 rehabilitation project – known as Liberty Lofts. I believe them when they say that they've tried to
783 secure a tenant, and the main reason they can't is because they have insufficient parking. We
784 can dismiss that, but then we're saying that that is ok for that project as a whole to fail. For me,
785 that commercial project cannot fail. We need this shining star to be successful.

786
787 **(CONTINUED Discussion amongst the Commission as to the pros and cons of this issue.)**

788
789 Commissioner Glusac – Picking up on Commissioner McCauley's comment – this is a unique lot.
790 You have 20,000 sq. ft. of retail space, and as the applicant stated, I don't know anywhere else in
791 the downtown (let alone a historic area) where you have this opportunity to have that much retail
792 – in this large of a space. It is atypical, so we need to look at it in that fashion. I don't think you
793 can have a blanket 'yes' – it's not ideal, and a 'big box' solution is what we've grown accustomed
794 to but the way we need to approach this is that it is an atypical situation in an area where it's very
795 critical. You have the commercial liability to have a tenant come in and I wouldn't want this to be
796 a deterrent.

797
798 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Stated that she thought they were 'steering away' from their
799 responsibilities as Historic District Commissioners. If we go back to the fact that this area was set
800 aside as a Historic District to preserve and protect the resources that are in it. There are several
801 instances of this within the district, and I feel that it's very important. To disregard its importance
802 because the houses are 'ordinary' is to really disregard the entire district. I think we should be
803 looking at it as a district that has these characteristics and we're trying to 'erase' them for parking.

804
805 **MOTION #1**

806
807 Moved by Commissioner Ramsburgh, Seconded by Commissioner McCauley, **“that the**
808 **Commission deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 307 and 311**
809 **Second Street, contributing properties in the Old West Side Historic District, to demolish**
810 **the buildings and convert the sites to a parking lot as proposed. The proposed work is not**
811 **compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the**
812 **surrounding area and does not meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards for**
813 **Rehabilitation, in particular, standards number 1, 2, 9 and 10.”**

814
815 **On a Roll Call Vote – MOTION TO DENY – FAILED - SPLIT VOTE (3/3)**

816
817 **(Yes) (3)** – Commissioners Shotwell, Ramsburgh and McCauley

818 **(No) (3)** - Commissioners Glusac, Henrichs and Giannola

819 **(Absent) (1)** – Commissioner White

MOTION #2

Moved by Commissioner Giannola, Seconded by Commissioner Glusac, “**that the Commission issue a “Notice To Proceed” under Section 8, Subsection 4:16 of Chapter 103 (Historic District), subsection 1-D of the City Code, to demolish the two houses at 307 and 311 Second Street in the Old West Side Historic District.**”

(Discussion from staff stating that both “B” and “D” are not included in the motion as the petitioner would have to meet both requirements.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – Wants to amend the motion on the floor to include both “B” and “D” She stated that in an instance in which the HDC is voting to demolish two houses in a Historic District that it should meet both the requirements, so I would like to say that the motion be amended to include standard “B” of the City Ordinance.

Commissioner Shotwell – Stated that technically, it’s not written anywhere that you have to meet two of these conditions.

K. Kidorf – It has to meet **one** of the four conditions to issue a Notice to Proceed.

J. Thacher – I think Commissioner Ramsburgh is trying to have it meet requirements of two of the four. Is that acceptable? (K. Kidorf – You can cite more than one if you feel that it meets more than one condition.)

Commissioner Shotwell – The problem is that we wouldn’t be able to issue that. I don’t think it would be a fair motion because they don’t meet the requirements for subsection “B” which includes having all the pre-approvals from Planning and Zoning. Requiring that, it would mean that it would ultimately fail.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – I realize that.

Commissioner Shotwell – Is that true, Brenda? *(B. Acquaviva – That proposed amendment to the motion is considered dead/failed – that idea is not considered valid with no second on the proposed motion amendment (mentioned by Commissioner Ramsburgh) and we’ll leave it at that so there is no question about an improper motion.*

(More extensive discussion on “B” versus “D” again). The Chair then stated that the Commission is back to the consideration of the following motion:

MOTION #2 *(restated as above – for the record)*

Moved by Commissioner Giannola, Seconded by Commissioner Glusac, “**that the Commission issue a “Notice To Proceed” under Section 8, Subsection 4:16 of Chapter 103 (Historic District), subsection 1-D of the City Code, to demolish the two houses at 307 and 311 Second Street in the Old West Side Historic District.**”

On a Roll Call Vote – MOTION TO ISSUE A NOTICE TO PROCEED – FAILED - SPLIT VOTE(3/3)

(Yes) (3) – Commissioners Shotwell, Ramsburgh and McCauley

(No) (3) - Commissioners Glusac, Henrichs and Giannola

(Absent) (1) – Commissioner White

872 The Chair asked if the Assistant City Attorney could offer some advice to the Commission and K.
873 Kidorf on help with this procedurally (Split Voting).
874

875 K. McDonald (Asst. City Attorney) – Just to clarify the record, you may want to additionally take a
876 “Motion to Approve” a Certificate of Appropriateness, with the same language. There was a
877 “Motion to Deny” (Motion #1) that resulted in a split vote (3/3) and that motion of course, failed.
878 So, you’ve decided NOT to DENY – so to clarify the record only – there should be a Positive
879 Motion To Approve, and you can re-vote which will in essence say that “it was considered” for a
880 Certificate of Appropriateness, but there aren’t enough votes to approve it – and at that point, the
881 record would be clean.
882

883 Chair – It was my understanding that we weren’t considering a motion for a “Certificate of
884 Appropriateness,” as we ‘can’t’ issue one – if we have deemed that those homes are ‘contributing
885 structures’ (which we have), then we can’t issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition –
886 so I’m not certain we should make that motion.
887

888 K. Kidorf – You can still make the motion. There may be a Commissioner that does feel it meets
889 the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, and then the vote would determine whether or not the
890 Commission agreed with that motion.
891

892 **MOTION #3**

894 Moved by Commissioner Shotwell, Seconded by Commissioner Giannola, “**that the**
895 **Commission approve a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 307**
896 **Second Street and 311 Second Street, contributing properties in the Old West Side**
897 **Historic District, to demolish the buildings and convert the sites to a parking lot as**
898 **proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement,**
899 **texture, material and relationship to the surrounding area and does not meet *The***
900 ***Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standards**
901 **numbered 1, 2, 9, and 10.”**
902

903 **On a Roll Call Vote – MOTION TO ISSUE A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR** 904 **DEMOLITION – FAILED - SPLIT VOTE (3/3)**

905
906 **(No) (3)** – Commissioners Shotwell, Ramsburgh and McCauley

907 **(Yes) (3)** - Commissioners Glusac, Henrichs and Giannola

908 **(Absent) (1)** – Commissioner White
909

910 Commissioner Henrichs suggested that the Commission might make a motion to state that if the
911 petitioner was able to secure concrete evidence of an agreement with a renter for that
912 commercial space, and that it would require the removal of the houses to proceed – because that
913 has been one of the stumbling blocks here with this issue.
914

915 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Stated that if the applicant has new information they could just
916 submit a new application for that information.
917

918 Commissioner Glusac – I would support a motion to request additional information from the
919 applicant.
920

921 J. Thacher – If you wanted to do that, you would also have to get the applicants ‘extend’ the
922 application before it defaults in an additional 9 days.
923

(Discussion among staff and the Commission about more denials of motions due to a split vote.)

B. Acquaviva – When you put that motion into a positive language and you can't pass that motion because you don't have a majority vote, the motion (and issue) dies/fails. – Unless you decide to extend the application.

K. McDonald – The reason I asked you to take the former second 'positive' motion on the record was just to clarify that you've considered the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness and a Notice to Proceed, but we wanted to be clear. The first motion was a motion to "Deny," and when you didn't have sufficient votes to pass that – that motion failed – which simply meant that you DIDN'T deny it. This is why it was put into a positive motion, which did not pass – essentially denying the application. No additional action is necessary at this time.

B-2 Annual Report for 2008

The report was distributed at the February Regular Session for Commission Review.
(The Chair called for a Motion to Approve to send this issue to City Council.)

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner Ramsburgh, Seconded by Commissioner McCauley, **"to forward the report to City Council"**.

On A Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE - PASSED - UNANIMOUS

C - NEW BUSINESS –

C-1 Awards Committee Nomination List

J. Thacher – Correction – Removal of 418 North State from the list.

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner Ramsburgh, Seconded by Commissioner McCauley, **"to approve the Awards Nomination List as amended."**

On A Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE - PASSED - UNANIMOUS

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

D - APPROVAL OF MINUTES –

D-1 Draft Minutes January 8, 2009 Regular Session – Correction Line 202 (Not in **SUPPORT** not **SPORT**) typo.

Moved by Commissioner Henrichs Seconded by Commissioner Shotwell
"to approve the April 20, 2008 Regular Session Minutes as Amended."

On A Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE - PASSED - UNANIMOUS

976
977 **D-2** – NOT AVAILABLE

978
979 **D-3** - NOT AVAILABLE

980
981 **E - REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS** – None.

982
983
984 **F - ASSIGNMENTS**

985
986 **F-1 Review Committee** - Monday APRIL 6th at 5:00 pm – Glusac and McCauley

987
988 **G - STAFF ACTIVITIES REPORT**

989 **G-1** The February Report –

990
991
992 J. Thacher - 13 Applications in total. – *(Staff did not elaborate about how many were approved,*
993 *how many were denied and/or how many of those were approved or denied by staff or the HDC).*

994
995 Commissioner Giannola asked if a live body could report the annual report to city council. Ms.
996 Thacher asked for volunteers. *Jill Thacher to give report at City Council.*

997
998 **H - CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS** – None.

999
1000 **I - COMMUNICATIONS** –

1001
1002 **I-1 Commissioner Henrichs** – *(Liaison to Cobblestone Farm Association)* – Reported
1003 that there is a “**Barn Dance on March 21st.**”

1004
1005 **I-2** K. Kidorf – Statewide Preservation Conference coming up in MAY.

1006
1007 **ADJOURNMENT**

1008
1009 *The Meeting was adjourned at 10:24 p.m. without objection.*

1010
1011 **SUBMITTED BY: Brenda Acquaviva Administrative Service Specialist V, Planning and**
1012 **Development Services.**