



**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR
Thursday, April 10, 2008.**

Commissioners Present: Diane Giannola, Michael Bruner, Ellen Ramsburgh, Robert White, Jim Henrichs and Sarah Shotwell **(6)**;

Commissioners Absent: Kristina Glusac **(1)**

Staff Present: Jill Thacher, HDC Coordinator/Planner II, Kristine Kidorf, Kidorf Preservation Consulting and Brenda Acquaviva, Administrative Support Specialist V, Planning and Development Services **(3)**

CALL TO ORDER: Commissioner White called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Quorum satisfied.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

The Agenda was approved without objection.

A - HEARINGS

A-1 217 NORTH INGALLS -- OFWHD *(Item withdrawn by Applicant. The public hearing was held, but no public comment was received.)*

A-2 508 SECOND STREET – OWSHD *(Item withdrawn by Applicant. The public hearing was held, but no public comment was received.)*

A-3 418 NORTH STATE STREET – two story rear addition – OFWHD

BACKGROUND: This two story, rectangular, scored-stucco house with a low hipped roof and very little ornamentation was built circa 1855 by Newton A. Prudden. The walls are constructed of poured concrete, ten inches thick, with stucco applied to the exterior and plaster applied directly to most of the interior walls (the north wall has thin furring strips). This is an extremely unique form of construction, and staff is not aware of any other structure in the city that was built this way. It appears in the 1860 City Directory as the home of Mr. Prudden, a cooper. In 1868 it appears as 30 North State and Mr. Prudden is a fruit dealer. Around 1889 the property transferred to his nephew, also named Newton A. Prudden, a manufacturer of water filters. The younger Mr. Prudden added a front and side porch and built a barn in the back. In 1900 he traded the house to Mr. Erastus White for a farm near Chelsea.

The roof was originally nearly flat, and parts still exist under the hipped roof, which was added prior to 1938. The porches and a four-room rear brick addition were removed in 1938, and the second floor egress door and part of the fire escape appear to have been added at that time. The current garage was built after 1938.

LOCATION: The site is located on the east side of North State Street, between Lawrence and East Kingsley.

51 **APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to 1) construct a two-story addition with
52 cementitious siding on the rear of the building. The addition would have a flat roof tucked under
53 the rear eave and be stepped in one foot, four inches from the plane of the existing house on
54 either side. 2) replace two original wood double-hung windows with double-hung egress
55 windows, required by code, in the same opening, and 3) remove a wood fire escape from the
56 north and east elevations.

57
58 **Owner/ Applicant/Address:** Peter Deininger, 318 E Jefferson #6, Ann Arbor, MI 48104

59
60 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Henrichs and Giannola visited the site.

61
62 Commissioner Henrichs – As pointed out by staff, this is a unique building and warrants some
63 special consideration by the HDC. In one sense, the building is ahead of its time in that it was
64 built of cast-in-place concrete and at the same time, a version of a free standing Italianate
65 farmhouse - so it's difficult to decide what the original intentions of the builder were. This raises
66 the question of how an addition gets added to a building like this.

67
68 In the stucco, it appears they 'scored' the stucco to resemble large cast blocks (which was a
69 common practice in the 1800's in certain types of masonry buildings.) The building is in fairly
70 poor condition. There is a lot of deterioration around the foundation walls, in the walls themselves
71 and the fire escape is in really bad shape. The building does need a lot of work.

72
73 Commissioner Giannola – I concur with Commissioner Henrichs and it appeared that the addition
74 as proposed would be nested in the back so that you couldn't see it from the back.

75
76 **Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Ed Weir (architect for the project) was present to speak on behalf
77 of the appeal. The owner was not able to be here this evening. This is a challenging project to
78 put an addition on and our direction was to make it as small as we could and the flat roof,
79 although maybe aesthetically not the first choice – it does allow us to tuck the roof underneath the
80 soffit and we can leave the articulation of the roof alone. (*Mr. Weir went on to discuss the*
81 *proposed changes.*)

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

84
85 Commissioner Bruner – How did you determine this is a cast concrete building? (We did some
86 exploratory work. This is pretty rare, but the walls are solid – you can see in the windows there
87 are no studs, it's solid. There is some deterioration particularly in the rear.)

88
89 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Is there work already in progress? (Yes. The original house had
90 two studio apartments upstairs and a two bedroom apartment on the lower level. The owners
91 intention is to turn this back into a single-family home. He's begun that work internally
92 independent of this.) Is there any plan for the garage? (Not at this time).

93
94 **Audience Participation:** None.

95
96 **Discussion by the Commission:**

97
98 Commissioner Henrichs – I have some reservations about the proposed design for this. Looking
99 at the *Secretary of the Interiors Standards*, which talk about differentiating the old from the new
100 and being compatible with the massing, size and scale, etc., I'm not certain this proposal satisfies
101 those requirements as well as it could. The addition might need some plane changes or
102 something that would make it look less like something just sort of 'tacked on' to this building.

The building appears to be something that should be a four-sided, free standing structure, and putting something on the back seems to violate that.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – Which of the windows are to be replaced with egress? (J. Thacher – points out those locations.) (*Discussion by the Commission about the egress windows and the size and type.*)

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner Shotwell, Seconded by Commissioner Bruner, “**that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 418 North State Street in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District to 1) construct a two-story addition with cementitious siding on the rear of the building, 2) replace two original wood double-hung windows with double-hung egress windows in the same opening, and 3) remove a wood fire escape from the north and east elevations, 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)*

A-4 532 FOURTH STREET - OWSHD

BACKGROUND: This two story upright and wing house appears in the 1883-84 City Directory as the home of Reverend John Stanger, though it may be older. Various Stangers lived there until ca. 1910, when the Rodekes occupied the house. By 1940 it was again occupied by Stangers. The front porch was added between 1916 & 1925. The mudroom was added after 1931.

LOCATION: West side of Fourth Street, south of West Jefferson and north of West Madison.

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to remove a non-original mudroom addition, build steps to serve a rear door that is currently enclosed by the mudroom, extend a picket fence approximately six feet to reach the side of the house, remove a non-original second-floor deck, and remove a second-floor door wall and install a pair of casement egress windows in its place.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The mudroom is in poor condition, with a rotting wood foundation, buckling ceiling, and deteriorated windows. Wood siding is still exposed on two of the mudroom walls, so the room’s removal will have a minimal impact on the part of the house that it is attached to. Simple wood steps would be built to the back door that would be exposed by removing the mudroom.
2. The roof deck over the kitchen was added in 1986. The owner is experiencing problems with the roof underneath it, and would like to remove it permanently in order to gain access to the roof and repair it. The door wall leads from a second-floor addition (also built in 1986) onto the deck. The pair of windows proposed to take their place are 24” by 36” egress-sized, Weather Shield, wood, casement windows with a false center muntin to imitate a double-hung window. Since this part of the house is a recent addition, the use of a casement window is appropriate since it does not duplicate the fenestration pattern of character-defining elevations, per the SOI’s standards.

- 155
156 3. The owner originally wanted a pair of smaller square windows mounted high on the wall
157 instead of the door wall on the north elevation, but her architect advised her that the
158 windows must provide egress in place of the doors. The proposed paired windows balance
159 the pair of windows on this addition's south elevation. The windows are hidden from view
160 from the street by the roof of the front ell.
161
162 4. Once the deck is removed, the kitchen wing beneath the roof deck would receive a new
163 membrane roof.
164
165 5. An existing picket fence extends to the handrail of the mudroom stairs. The owner would
166 like to extend the picket fence to touch the house once the mudroom is removed.
167

168 **Owner/ Applicant/Address:** Eileen Dickinson, 532 Fourth Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48013
169

170 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Henrichs and Giannola visited the site.
171

172 Commissioner Giannola – The deck and the roof are deteriorated. The mudroom does not
173 appear to be original and if removed it would showcase the existing door; the sliding door on the
174 top would be improved by replacing it with the suggested window.
175

176 Commissioner Henrichs – Agrees with Commissioner Giannola. The house appears to be a non-
177 contributing feature of the home and is in extremely poor condition. The project would improve
178 the overall character and quality of the house.
179

180 **Applicant Presentation:** Ms. Eileen Dickinson stated that she was available to answer
181 questions that the Commission might have. She stated that she was not pleased that she has to
182 put a window in in place of the existing sliding door that she would like to remove.
183

184 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**
185

186 Commissioner Bruner – Would you consider just one window that you'd need for egress? (If that
187 was ok. It evidently had to be deeper to meet code.) (*General discussion on the window.*)
188

189 **Audience Participation:** None.
190

191 **Discussion by the Commission:**

192 **MOTION**
193

194 Moved by Commissioner Giannola, Seconded by Commissioner Bruner, “**that the**
195 **Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 532 Fourth**
196 **Street in the Old West Side Historic District to remove a non-original mudroom**
197 **addition, build steps to serve a rear door, extend a picket fence approximately six**
198 **feet to reach the side of the house, remove a non-original second-floor deck,**
199 **remove a second-floor door wall, and install a pair of casement egress windows in**
200 **its place, as proposed. The work is generally compatible in exterior design,**
201 **arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the**
202 **surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for***
203 ***Rehabilitation* standards 2 and 9.”**
204

205 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS (Application Approved)**
206

A-5 315 NORTH STATE STREET - OFWHD

BACKGROUND: This two-story frame house shows Queen Ann 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 circa 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.

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

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct a covered porch and uncovered accessible ramp along the rear part of the south elevation of the house. An existing exterior basement stairwell would be reconfigured and integrated into the porch. Two non-original slider windows would be removed, and three new aluminum clad double-hung windows added. A door would be relocated from the south elevation to the west elevation of the kitchen addition.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. There is currently an open stairwell down to the basement just behind the bay window that is dangerous for pedestrians, bikes, and cars, and collects storm water runoff. The proposed design integrates a new stairwell within a covered porch, which would minimize the current hazards. The base of the porch would be concrete to protect it from vehicles on the immediately adjacent driveway. The decking would be composite, since the rear part is an open ramp to make the entry accessible. The porch rail and columns would be wood. And would extend beyond the plane of the bay window, but the design minimizes the porch's intrusion on the bay window.
2. The kitchen addition that the porch would wrap around is clearly not original and the slider windows are incongruous with the rest of the house. Replacing them with aluminum clad windows to match those on the rear addition is an appropriate way to make this addition tie in less harshly and relocating the door to the rear would make it less conspicuous.
3. The porch, ramp, and basement stair additions would help tie together a number of rear additions, provide access, and result in a cleaner, more balanced elevation.

Owner/ Address: Inter-Cooperative Council, 337 East William Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48014

Applicant: Quinn Evans Architects, 219 ½ North Main Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48103

Review Committee: Commissioners Giannola and Henrichs visited the site.

Commissioner Henrichs – The addition, although small, is fairly tricky in that it has stairs to the basement, a ramp, switching things around – it's a fairly complex project. I think the architecture is suitable and appropriate. What you can't see from the photos is the narrowness of the drive and the diagonal parking related to the house to the immediate south.

Commissioner Giannola – Concurs with Commissioner Henrichs.

Applicant Presentation: Beth Huck of Quinn Evans Architects and Cindy Christiansen, Interfaith Cooperative Housing were present to speak on behalf of the application.

Ms. Huck stated that because there is new construction being proposed, the home had to be brought up to ADA compliance. While doing that, we may eliminate a parking spot, but in order to get the residents and the ADA issues solved, we felt this was our alternative.

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

260

261 Commissioner Henrichs – Have you considered temporarily ‘staking’ the area you’ll be building in
 262 in order to see if this will work? (We visited the site with the builders, and although it is tight, it will
 263 work.) I meant the cars coming and going. (C. Christiansen – Stated that the house to the south
 264 is also a co-op and they’re perfectly aware they will lose some parking spaces. This is also a
 265 garage tucked in the back. They juggle their cars back and forth and have a key exchange to
 266 assist each other.)

267

268 Commissioner Ramsburgh – I can’t tell how much porch floor exists where the stairwell goes
 269 down. (B. Huck - There is enough landing to comply, but that’s it. We did try a couple of options,
 270 but it ends up being piecemeal – we wanted one addition that would encompass everything.)

271

272 C. Christiansen – Stated that the main purpose for the construction is to stop the water runoff; we
 273 are consistently experiencing water damage to the foundation and we need to prevent that from
 274 happening and to fix what is already damaged.

275

276 *(Discussion between the Commission and the Applicants as to possible alternatives and the*
 277 *application in general.)*

278

279 **Audience Participation:** None.

280

281 **Discussion by the Commission:**

282

283 Commissioner Bruner – I believe the area we spoke of (the column) needs at least a 36” barrier
 284 so that trucks/vehicles don’t hit it. I’m also concerned that the roof area at grade is just a cover
 285 for deliveries and that this will impede access to the barrier free ramp that they’re installing.

286

287 **MOTION**

288

289 Moved by Commissioner Shotwell, Seconded by Commissioner Giannola, “**that the**
 290 **Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 315 North State**
 291 **Street in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District to construct a covered porch and uncovered**
 292 **accessible ramp along the rear part of the south elevation of the house; reconfigure an**
 293 **exterior stairwell; remove two non-original slider windows and install three new aluminum-**
 294 **clad double-hung windows; and relocate a door, as proposed. The work is generally**
 295 **compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of**
 296 **the building and the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards***
 297 ***for Rehabilitation* standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.”**

298

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

300

301

302 **A-6 1547 WASHTENAW AVENUE - WHHD**

303

304 **BACKGROUND:** This two story, hipped roof, Italianate house was constructed of dressed stone
 305 around 1860. It is called the Frieze House for Henry Simmons Frieze, who was the acting
 306 president of the University of Michigan for three terms in the 1860s – 1890. The cupola was
 307 added after Frieze sold the house in the 1870s. It is listed on both the National and State
 308 Registers of Historic Places.

309

310 **LOCATION:** The site is located on Washtenaw Avenue, one house north of the northeast corner
311 of Washtenaw and Hill Street.

312
313 **APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to demolish an existing attached garage and
314 construct a new two story garage/studio with a minimal first floor passage connector to the rear of
315 the house and a second floor open bridge to the house's rear porch. A new exterior door would
316 be added to a doorway that is currently within the garage.

317
318 **STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 319
320 1. The north half of the rear porch was enclosed by 1916, though the bay window appears to
321 have been added and the enclosed part of the porch expanded after 1931. A garage in
322 the same location appears on the 1931 Sanborn map, though not on the 1925 map. The
323 existing two-car garage had a large tree fall on it last year, causing part of the roof to cave
324 in. It is not a character-defining feature of the house.
325
326 2. The owners would use the addition as a garage with an exercise room over the top. The
327 garage would be accessed by two cars through two doors on the north elevation. There
328 are also two doors on the south elevation, but they are only for human access, not
329 vehicular. The owners would like to be able to open all of the garage doors and use the
330 garage area with the backyard for gatherings and parties.
331
332 3. The bridge between the second floor of the addition and the porch roof would require the
333 removal of a section of balustrade and the installation of two additional posts. If the bridge
334 is attached in a sensitive manner, its other effects on the porch would be minimal.
335
336 4. The proposed materials and trim differentiate the addition from the original structure and
337 are complementary.
338
339 5. The footprint of the new addition would be moved about six feet south of the footprint of
340 the existing garage, which is about a foot north of the line of the existing porch on the north
341 elevation. The passage connecting the addition to the house (the hyphen) on the east
342 elevation is set back two feet from the wall plane of the enclosed porch. (See drawing:
343 Enlarged Site Plan.)
344
345 6. "New terrace and steps" is noted on the Enlarged Site Plan, but no information on their
346 materials or other details are provided, and therefore they are not considered part of this
347 application. Any changes to what is existing would have to come back as a new application
348 to the Commission.
349
350 7. The proposed exterior half light door in an existing opening is appropriate.

351
352 **Owner/Address:** Michael & DeeDee Levitt, 1547 Washtenaw, Ann Arbor, MI 48104

353
354 **Applicant:** Hopkins Burns Design Studio, 4709 N Delhi Rd., Ann Arbor, MI 48104

355
356 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Giannola and Henrichs visited the site.

357
358 Commissioner Giannola – The garage is destroyed, but is tucked behind the house. The addition
359 they propose would not be noticeable. The proposed construction is more in character with the
360 house. The owners stated that they needed the second set of doors in order to access the lawn
361 equipment.

362 Commissioner Henrichs – Obviously this is an important historic building in Ann Arbor, and
363 whatever action we take should be carefully considered. I feel the proposed design is appropriate
364 and a good example (relative to the Secretary of Interiors’ Standards) as to how to put a
365 sympathetic addition to a building of this type. It should be pointed out that the footprint of the
366 garage is being enlarged and a second floor added to that, so there is some ‘Real Estate’ being
367 added, not just a simple replacement of a previous element.
368

369 **Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Eugene Hopkins, Architect on this project, was present to speak on
370 behalf of the appeal. He stated that their approach and concept was to restore the visual integrity
371 of the house. The existing garage wraps around the porch which detracts from its original form
372 and shape. Our plan was a ‘carriage house’ approach that would minimally touch the house with
373 a hyphen (of mostly opaque or glass material) that would allow for the vertical and horizontal
374 connection to the garage and a visual of the house.
375

376 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**
377

378 Commissioner Bruner – The original garage wrapped around the house portion (as stated) that
379 now exposes the house. The new wood door and opening exists in an area that was enclosed by
380 the garage previously. (Yes.) The house is fairly secluded, but this new, large structure rises up
381 and may be able to be viewed from the street. (We’ve pushed the addition back so it doesn’t
382 project beyond the original house.) *(The petitioner presented a scale model of the home with*
383 *proposed addition.)*
384

385 **Audience Participation:** None.
386

387 **Discussion by the Commission:**
388

389 Commissioner Bruner – Agreed with comments made by Commissioner Bruner that this addition
390 is a sensitive addition for this home and is in favor of the application.
391

392 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Has concerns about the ‘bridge’ on the upper story – taking away
393 the original materials in the balustrade. I’m not certain the bridge is a necessary feature of a
394 garage, and as an accessory building this (garage) seems very major to me. I’m not convinced
395 that this is an appropriately scaled design for a garage for this house. *(The Commission and staff*
396 *discussed at length the proposed addition and historic features as well as natural features.)*
397

398 **MOTION**
399

399 Moved by Commissioner Giannola, Seconded by Commissioner Bruner, “**that the Commission**
400 **issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 1547 Washtenaw Avenue in**
401 **the Washtenaw Hill Historic District to demolish an existing attached garage and construct**
402 **a new two story addition with a minimal first floor passage connector to the rear of the**
403 **house, and install a new exterior door, as proposed. The work is generally compatible in**
404 **exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building**
405 **and the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for***
406 ***Rehabilitation* standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.”**
407

408 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – 6 YEAS and 1 NAY (Application Approved)**
409 **YEA (5) – Commissioners Shotwell, Giannola, White, Bruner and Henrichs**
410 **NAY (1) – Commissioner Ramsburgh**
411 **ABSENT (1) – Commissioner Glusac**
412
413

A-7 306 NORTH DIVISION – DSHD

*Commissioner Henrichs recuses himself. He stated that he has served on the Building and Grounds Committee, the Master Planning Committee and other development for this site presently and that which will come before this commission in the future.

BACKGROUND: St Andrews Episcopal Church was built in phases: the nave in 1868-69, a chapel and rectory were added in 1879, and the tower in 1903. It is constructed of split boulders laid in courses and is English Gothic in style. In 1989 the HDC issued a certificate of appropriateness (CofA) to re-roof the cloister in slate or composition slate. (The cloister roof is slate today.) In 1998 a CofA was issued to rebuild the front steps. *(Neither of those projects were acted upon.)*

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

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to re-roof several small roof areas with flat seam copper, and to rebuild the stairs to the west entry in a wider configuration with new bronze-colored handrails.

Detailed information has been provided by the applicant on repair and restoration activities planned for the church, including new slate roofing, membrane roofing repairs, restoration of a missing stone finial on the tower and a metal cross based on historic photos and detail, masonry cleaning and repairs, and more. These activities may be approved at the staff level or are repairs that do not require review.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. There are several small areas of low-slope membrane-covered roof that are proposed to be replaced with flat-seam copper roofing. This is an appropriate material and should prove more durable than membrane. The areas are shown on the Roof Plan drawing and are located where the cloister meets the modern north wing, on the tower roof, and on the south side between the main church and the chapel. Look on the drawings for shaded areas marked with a 4 in a circle.
2. The proposed west entry stairs are several feet wider on either side, and the area at the top of the stairs is deeper, which would be safer and accommodate more people entering and exiting the church at once. The rails are simple bronze-colored metal with decorative scroll ends on the side rails. The center rail is removable to accommodate caskets. The steps would have limestone treads and the platform would have limestone pavers.
3. The redesigned stairs are appropriate and complimentary to the character-defining west entrance. Though larger than the current stairs, they maintain the relationship between the building and surrounding landscaping, walkways, and open space.

Owner/Address: St Andrews Episcopal Church, 306 North Division Street, A2, MI 48014

Applicant: Quinn Evans Architects, 219 ½ North Main Street, A2, MI 48103

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

Review Committee: Commissioners Henrichs and Giannola visited the site.

Commissioner Giannola – The existing stairway is very steep and narrow. The middle railing is not removable, so they want to replace it with one that can be removed when caskets are brought out of the building. We questioned whether the second set of stairs were to be altered or not. *(Staff stated that was not part of the application.)*

Commissioner Henrichs – ***(Recused)***

Applicant Presentation: Eileen Tyler of Quinn Evans Architects was present to speak on behalf of the application. She stated that there are many safety issues. They regularly have people fall on these steps. As Jill stated there was an approval by this body to a similar concept, but it wasn't acted upon so the safety condition has remain unchecked. The current sandstone steps are in poor condition, but the granite is actually salvage stone from the original rectory.

A lot of the garden walls around the site were constructed from that demolished building, somewhere around the 1950's. We're not touching that site, but we're going to try to use the granite from these walls for the side walls in the entrance. They offered to answer any questions the Commission might have.

Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:

Commissioner Ramsburgh – How will the middle railing removable? (There is a bracket bolted to the riser. The current one is also removable by a post that slips down and lifted out – the new one will be as well and reversible and can be removed without damaging the stone.)

Audience Participation: None.

Discussion by the Commission:

Commissioner Bruner – Stated that the drawings were very adequate, but it was difficult to tell which parts of the application had been pre-approved by staff and which outlying issues needed to be addressed by the HDC.

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner Shotwell, Seconded by Commissioner Giannola, **“that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 306 North Division Street in the Division Street Historic District to re-roof several small roof areas with flat seam copper, and to rebuild the stairs to the west entry in a wider configuration with new bronze-colored handrails, 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, and 9.”**

On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – ***UNANIMOUSLY (Application Approved)***
Recusal (1) – Commissioner Henrichs

A-8 522 DETROIT STREET - OFWHD

BACKGROUND: At the December 2007 HDC meeting, an application (07-144) was approved for an exterior stairwell below grade for basement access. The Commission substituted a metal railing for the wood one proposed by the applicant.

LOCATION: The site is located on the east side of Detroit Street, between East Kingsley and North Division.

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to: 1) eliminate a non-original entry door and related porch and stairs on the north elevation and replace them with a window identical to two others on that elevation; and 2) substitute a wood railing for a metal one around the exterior stairwell that was approved by HDC in December, 2007.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The entry door that is proposed to be removed is clearly not original. It formerly served as an entry to the second floor apartment, but is no longer used. Its placement is at an awkward height, most likely where a window was previously located. The side porch does not appear on Sanborn maps last updated in the 1960s.
2. The window that would replace the door matches exactly the other windows on this side elevation. All are replacement windows, and the one proposed to be used was previously located on the back of the house. When it was removed and replaced with a rear door, the owner saved it. While there is no documentation of a window being located where the entry door currently is, the location of the door (at window height) and fenestration pattern of this elevation make it likely. The window is compatible with the historic character of the building and of an appropriate design.
3. When the exterior stairwell was approved in December 2007, the commission substituted a metal railing for the proposed wood railing that would surround the well on the basis that a metal railing would recede and make the stairwell less conspicuous. The owner feels very strongly that a wood rail would be stronger, more compatible with existing railings on the rear deck, and less out-of-character with the house. Please see the letter submitted by the owner for more information. The wood rail would match the railings on the rear decks, and consist of 2" by 4" top and bottom rails, a 1" by 6" top cap, 2" by 2" spindles, and would be 3" tall with 5" spacing between spindles.

Owner/ Applicant/Address: Dina Greenway, PO Box 2301, A2, MI 48106

Review Committee: Commissioners Henrichs and Giannola visited the site.

Commissioner Henrichs – Regarding the structure on the north side of the house, it appears to be an ‘afterthought’ to begin with, so I recommend that we view the proposed work on that side favorably. On the other side of the house, the railing issue came before the Commission when I wasn’t present, so I don’t know the pros and cons of that discussion, but to me it would not appear to be a bad thing to use a wood railing. There are currently wood railings on both the front and back of the house that are simple wood spindles that seem to be appropriate.

Commissioner Giannola – Concurs with Commissioner Henrichs. I think that the home would benefit by removing the addition and reinstalling the original window. I think the wood railing would also be in character with the house, but enough to differentiate from the older ones.

570 **Applicant Presentation:** Dina Greenway, owner, was present to speak on behalf of the
571 application. She wanted to stress (going over the previous recommendation) that it was an
572 afterthought that a metal railing would recede more and not draw attention to this alteration. It's
573 tucked away and very hard to view. I felt that I managed to confuse the issue by bringing in
574 photographs of another house that I can replaced a stairway on previously that had a substantial
575 metal railing. In that particular house, there was the precedent of a steel railing going up from the
576 street to the house, and around the house.
577

578 This home has no metal railings, and from an aesthetic viewpoint, I feel that metal railings would
579 be introducing something that shouldn't be there. From a structural standpoint, extending out
580 from the house roughly sixteen feet, it's very hard to attach something that will be strong enough.
581 She stated that the timbers would be stronger and less visible. Metal stretched out that far
582 wiggles.
583

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

585
586 Commissioner Bruner – You state in your letter that the original material, made from treated
587 lumber is “far stronger than the metal railing that was requested previously.” Do you have any
588 factual information or data to support that claim? (Petitioner – Just knowing that metal spindles
589 that are attached by two screws in several places won't match the continuity of a railing that is
590 connected every step of the way within this space.)
591

592 I wish you had provided documentation supporting that claim. There was a lot of discussion at
593 your previous hearing regarding that claim. In my mind, it should not only be metal due to the
594 appearance, but because it will be stronger. Because it goes below grade, it is in an area where
595 it can be bumped by vehicles, etc. In fact, it should be much more substantial than your average
596 metal railing. We gave you the option to provide details.
597

598 I was hopeful that you had provided that information. I'm concerned that because you didn't get
599 the decision you wanted the last time that you are back again asking, essentially for the same
600 thing – when the discussion was clear on the preference for a metal railing because the vote went
601 in that direction. I think it would be bad precedent for us and capricious and arbitrary if we were
602 to vote against a previous decision. The other point was regarding weathering. Wood can cup
603 and twist, pop – etc. Timbers that are treated tend to warp and twist because they are
604 continuously losing the liquid that has been entrained into them. A metal railing can be painted
605 occasionally and fade into the area..
606

607 **Audience Participation:**

- 608
609 1. Richard Derrick, A2, MI – Stated he lives a block away from this house and he agrees
610 entirely that a metal railing would be less conspicuous. A side note: I also own two
611 houses a block away. Both have basement doors opening to the outside, and I hope
612 that you have better luck than I did, because when I removed the wood that covered
613 the window on one of the doors, within two months the house had been broken into
614 through that window which I then had to replace with Plexiglas and a metal grating.
615

616 *(The Commission allowed Ms. Greenway the chance to speak again.)*

617 D. Greenway - Stated that she has had experience with wood railings in another place where
618 another stair was built, and it wasn't as long a distance as this, but it held up very well. I feel that
619 part of the process here is unfortunate. Once a discussion happens and the session where I'm
620 allowed to speak is closed, I can't give any further explanations, which is why I'm back before you
621 with this issue, knowing that the landscaping will minimize any view of the railing,

622 Commissioner Bruner – Stated that it was unfortunate that that decision came into the process
 623 late, but besides revising the amendment to ‘strike’ that out of the motion, we gave you the option
 624 to proceed and come back again with details of a metal railing that would satisfy. I’m
 625 disappointed that instead you come back and ask for the same thing you wanted the last time
 626 which was not found to be adequate.

627 Petitioner – I did come back with information for staff on a metal railing and it was approved, but I
 628 feel it still will not be as strong or handsome as what I originally requested.

629
 630 Coordinator Thatcher – Stated that the petitioner did bring in revised drawings and information on
 631 the railing that she would use that was the appropriate design, approved by the Commission.
 632 That was included in the motion that staff would review that.

633
 634 Commissioner Bruner – Was it substantial to stand up to bumping and wear? This rail is not like
 635 the one at the co-op where it’s elevated and has an appearance of being at porch level. It’s right
 636 at grade and adjacent to a driveway.

637
 638 Coordinator Thacher – The Building Official did approve the plans for the metal railings, so I don’t
 639 inspect things for safety, but he did approve it. *(Continued discussion on the pros and cons of*
 640 *wood versus metal.)*

641
 642 **Discussion by the Commission:**

643
 644 Commissioner Bruner – Stated that he could not support this for reasons previously stated.

645
 646 **MOTION # 1**

647
 648 Moved by Commissioner Giannola, Seconded by Commissioner Ramsburgh, “**that the**
 649 **Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 522 Detroit**
 650 **Street in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District to remove a non-original entry door**
 651 **and related porch and stairs on the north elevation and replace them with a window;**
 652 **and 2) substitute a wood railing for a metal one around the exterior stairwell**
 653 **approved in December 2007, as proposed. The work is generally compatible in**
 654 **exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the**
 655 **building and the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s***
 656 ***Standards for Rehabilitation* standards 2 and 9.”**

657
 658 **On a Roll Call Vote – MOTION TIED – 3 YEAS to 3 NAYS (Deadlocked – No action taken)**
 659 **YEA (3) – Commissioners White, Henrichs and Giannola**
 660 **NAY (3) – Commissioners Bruner, Ramsburgh and Shotwell**
 661 **ABSENT (1) – Commissioner Glusac**

662
 663 **MOTION #2**

664
 665 Moved by Commissioner Ramsburgh, Seconded by Commission Shotwell, “**that the**
 666 **Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 522 Detroit**
 667 **Street, to remove a non-original entry door and related porch and stairs on the north**
 668 **elevation and replace them with an original window. The work is generally**
 669 **compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the**
 670 **rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the***
 671 ***Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* standards 2 and 9.”**

672
 673 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUSLY (Partial Application Approved)**

674 (Discussion by staff and the Commission as to how to proceed with the portion of the application
675 (Motion #1) that is neither approved nor disapproved. Commissioner Shotwell stressed that if the
676 Commission does postpone this issue until the next meeting when there may be a full quorum,
677 that the petitioner is informed as to exactly what she needs to provide at the following meeting in
678 order to support her claim for a wood railing.
679

680 **MOTION #3**

681 Moved by Commissioner Giannola, Seconded by (NOT SECONDED, “that the
682 **Commission postpone the portion of the application at 522 Detroit Street for a wood**
683 **railing instead of a metal railing.”**
684

685 **MOTION DIES, NO SUPPORT FOR THE POSTPONEMENT**

686
687 Commissioner Henrichs – Wants clarification that a ‘no’ vote on any proposed denial would
688 represent actually approving a wood railing, as opposed to a ‘yes’ vote, which actually supports
689 denial of a wood railing. (Staff stated that yes, this is the case.)
690

691 **MOTION #4**

692 Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Ramsburgh, “that the
693 **Commission deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for 522 Detroit Street in the Old**
694 **Fourth Ward Historic District, for the portion of the application to substitute a wood**
695 **railing for a metal railing around the exterior stairwell as was previously approved in**
696 **December of 2007. The work is not generally compatible in exterior design,**
697 **arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and**
698 **surrounding area and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for***
699 ***Rehabilitation* standards 2 and 9.”**
700
701

702
703 **On a Roll Call Vote – MOTION TIED – 3 YEAS to 3 NAYS (Split Vote – No action taken)**
704 **YEA (3) – Commissioners White, Henrichs and Giannola**
705 **NAY (3) – Commissioners Bruner, Ramsburgh and Shotwell**
706 **ABSENT (1) – Commissioner Glusac**
707

708 Staff suggested that since no action to either deny or approve can be gained with one member
709 absent, that it be postponed until the May regular Session for a solid motion to approve or deny.
710 Postponement can be based on the simple fact that there is a deadlock and there needs to be an
711 odd number of Commission members to finalize the decision.
712

713 **MOTION #5**

714 Moved by Commissioner Giannola, Seconded by Commissioner Bruner, “that the
715 **Commission postpone the application at 522 Detroit Street in the Old Fourth Ward**
716 **Historic District for the portion of application to substitute a wood railing for a metal**
717 **railing previously approved in December of 2007.”**
718
719

720 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO POSTPONE – PASSED – UNANIMOUSLY (Postponed to the**
721 **May 2008 Regular Session.**
722

723 Commissioner Bruner – Asked that the petitioner return to the next meeting with substantiated
724 information to support her claim that wood would be stronger than metal.
725

A-9 120 EIGHTH STREET - OWSHD

BACKGROUND: This Classic Revival cottage was moved here sometime after 1870, when the map indicates no building on the lot, and 1894 when Miss Barbara Sindlinger is listed as the occupant, the street is still called Vine, and there are no other buildings listed on it. Vine does not become Eighth until 1897, when R. Long is listed as the occupant. The style indicates a date of construction that may be as early as the 1850s. While the wrap-around porch is indicated as early as the 1916 Sanborn map, the present turned posts are probably not original nor was the balustrade shown in 1979 which is now gone.

LOCATION: This site is located at the northwest corner of West Washington and Eighth Streets.

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace three original windows on the south elevation with new wood windows.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The owner's objectives in replacing the windows are to gain energy efficiency and stop water infiltration into surrounding wall areas.
2. Windows A and B are slightly smaller than their wall openings. There are extensions on the sash sides and tops to fill in or pad the resulting gap. It is not known whether these windows are replacements for earlier windows that fit correctly within the opening or whether the builder had to compensate for an error in the window or opening size. The windows match each other and the style of windows on the original part of the house. If they are replacements for earlier windows, staff's opinion is that they have gained significance in their own right.
3. Staff met with the owner's mother on site, but did not inspect the windows from the interior. From the exterior, the windows do not appear to be severely deteriorated. The applicant supplied dozens of photographs of the interior elements of the windows, and there does appear to be deterioration, especially on the lower rails, lower jambs, and sills. These are the most common areas for deterioration on wood windows. The majority of the window elements, however, appear to be sound. See end of report for some of the photos that show the worst deterioration.
4. Staff has advised the applicant and the owner's mother (who is handling the application on her daughter's behalf) that repair and correct refitting by a window restoration specialist would be the appropriate course of action.

Owner/Address: Heather O'Neal, 120 Eighth Street, A2, MI 48103

Applicant: Margaret Wong, 418 South First Street, A2, MI 48103

Review Committee: Commissioners Henrichs and Giannola visited the site.

Commissioner Henrichs – We looked at the windows from the interior and exterior. These are original, character defining features of the house. They rattle, have gaps and localized rotting as shown in the photographs. They appear repairable and I recommend they be repaired, restored and kept in the home. I compliment the applicant on the detailed work on the application.

Commissioner Giannola – Concurs with Commissioner Henrichs. She stated that if they are not repairable, that she would like to see documentation to that effect.

777

778

779

780

781

782

783

784

785

786

787

788

Applicant Presentation: Margaret Wong, architect on the project, was present to speak on behalf of the appeal. She drew the Commission's attention to twelve pictures depicting major separation on the joints, rot under the sill, dryness and crumbling as well as the apron being removed on one window. There is also major separation between the stile and the extender piece. The upper sash on the outside appears to be a poor repair with nails sticking out, apparently trying to pin those pieces together. There is significant deterioration on the windows. They are old windows, but not good examples of high craftsmanship. I'd like to make it clear that in applying for this window replacement that the homeowner has no desire whatsoever to diminish or undercut the character of this home. She would make every effort to match the visual configuration from the street.

789

790

791

792

793

794

Karen O'Neal, representing her daughter Heather (owner), was present to speak on behalf of the appeal. She quoted the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines that state "windows that are too deteriorated can be replaced in kind." That is what we seek to do. The problem is how we determine what is "too deteriorated." There is obviously a difference of opinion. The review committee and staff think they are not deteriorated enough.

795

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

You have seen forty five images we've presented of rotted wood. If these are to be rehabilitated, by the time you replace the sash rails, the jambs, the casings, the sills, the gaps where the sashes don't meet, the cracking, the separation of the padded out portion, the fact that they don't raise and lower properly, have single paned glass (energy inefficient), you're basically building a window. To buy these three windows is about eight hundred dollars; to repair them will be at least twice that amount. Cost doesn't necessarily impact the Commission but it does impact us. As to double glazing, the sash isn't deep enough to accommodate that.

803

804

805

806

Our family has extensive experience with old structures and support historic preservation. All in all, the purpose is to extend the owners ability to live comfortably in her home and increase its cost effectiveness and maintainability.

807

808

Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:

809

810

811

812

813

814

815

Commissioner Bruner – I had an opportunity to discuss these windows with the architect, but I wouldn't necessarily disagree with the same opinion as the review committee. One thing she pointed out and that I noticed in the photos was that one of the windows (a double-hung), which you would expect from its age to operate like a sash counter weighted window has been altered (possibly two windows) some time during the 1970's. This explains the padding on either side of some of these openings which then led to the cracks and substantially large rectangular gaps.

816

817

818

819

820

They've been modified previously by someone in an insensitive manner to the degree that now they are worse than when they were repaired. Keep in mind that they have been modified from what they would be if they had just weathered and deteriorated. They've been tampered with and changed. *(The Commission discussed this issue at length.)*

821

822

Audience Participation: None.

823

824

Discussion by the Commission:

825

826

827

828

Commissioner Henrichs – Regarding the previous repair and the gap, I find it hard to believe that there isn't a carpenter or a carpentry solution to either removing the previous repairs done in the 1970's and using the same window components – restoring them and putting them back correctly without having to throw the entire windows away. The windows' size, shape, vertical mullions are

829 character defining original features of the house. Looking at them from the interior as a whole,
830 they look not perfect, but they look ‘ok,’ and I don’t feel they are beyond restoration and repair.
831

832 Commissioner Ramsburgh – The Secretary of Interior’s Standards number six states that
833 “deteriorated features will be repaired rather than replaced” is an important consideration in
834 historic properties as that is the historic fabric of the house. I’ve had experience with rebuilding
835 deteriorated windows, and it can be done. Also, storm windows are not the most attractive, but
836 they protect the original wood and give (within about 10 percent) energy efficiency of replacement
837 windows.
838

839 Commissioner Henrichs – If you look through the Secretary of Interior’s Standards, Item #2
840 (quotes) – “The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of
841 historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize the property shall be
842 avoided.” Similarly, this lends more toward restoration than replacement. I see an effort on the
843 petitioner’s part to document what is wrong with them, but this documentation could also be used
844 to restore them. Is there a will here to restore these? I don’t sense that. The Secretary of
845 Interior’s Standards five and six really point strongly in favor of restoration.
846

847 **MOTION**

849 Moved by Commissioner Henrichs, Seconded by Commissioner Giannola, “**that the**
850 **Commission deny the application for the work at 120 Eighth Street in the Old West Side**
851 **Historic District. The work as proposed is not generally compatible with the size, scale,**
852 **massing and materials, and does not meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for**
853 **Rehabilitation, standard(s) number(S) 2, 5 and 6.”**
854

855 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO DENY - PASSED – 5 YEAS to 1 NAY (Application Denied)**
856 **YEA (5) – Commissioners Henrichs, White, Giannola, Ramsburgh and Shotwell**
857 **NAY (1) – Commissioner Bruner**
858

860 **B - OLD BUSINESS**

861
862 **B-1** Adoption of revisions to by-laws
863

864 **MOTION**

866 Moved by Commissioner Ramsburgh, Seconded by Commissioner Shotwell, “**that the 2008**
867 **Revised By-Laws of the Historic District Commission (distributed for review in March of**
868 **2008) be approved.”**
869

870 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE – PASSED - UNANIMOUS**
871

873 **C - NEW BUSINESS – None.**

876 **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION – GENERAL** (Limited to 3 Minutes per Speaker)
877
878
879

880 **D - APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

881

882 **D-1** Draft Minutes of the March 13, 2008 Regular Session

883

884 *Minutes were approved as presented without objection.*

885

886

887 **E - REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS – None.**

888

889

890 **F - ASSIGNMENTS**

891

892 **F-1** April 2008

893

894 **AGENDA ITEM & ADDRESS**

895

MONITOR

896

896 **SS-1 309 SOUTH MAIN STREET****BRUNER**

897

897 **SS-2 302 SOUTH MAIN STREET****POSTPONED**

898

898 **SS-3 117 EAST LIBERTY STREET****SHOTWELL**

899

899 **SS-4 713 WEST LIBERTY STREET****GIANNOLA**

900

900 **A-1 217 NORTH INGALLS****WITHDRAWN**

901

901 **A-2 508 SECOND STREET****WITHDRAWN**

902

902 **A-3 418 NORTH STATE STREET****WHITE**

903

903 **A-4 532 FOURTH STREET****BRUNER**

904

904 **A-5 315 NORTH STATE STREET****HENRICHS**

905

905 **A-6 1547 WASHTENAW AVENUE****WHITE**

906

906 **A-7 306 NORTH DIVISION****GIANNOLA**

907

907 **A-8 522 DETROIT STREET****GIANNOLA**

908

908 **A-9 120 EIGHTH STREET****DENIED**

909

910

911

911 **F-2** Review Committee

912

913 Commissioners White and Ramsburgh. (Staff mentioned that this is the same night as the HDC

914 Awards at City Council.) Discussion on moving the date. Staff and Commissioner's White and

915 Ramsburgh will meet on Tuesday, May 6, 2008 at 5:00 p.m.

916

917

918

918 **G - STAFF ACTIVITIES REPORT**

919

920

920 **G-1** March 2008

921

922 J. Thacher – Reported that there were ten applications for the month of March. Six were

923 reviewed by staff and four by the HDC. Nine applications were approved and one denial.

924

925

925 **H - CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS**

926

927

927 **I - COMMUNICATIONS**

928

929 **Historic Design Guidelines** – K. Kidorf stated that she would take any comments the

930 Commission might have to revise the Draft Historic Guidelines. Once the comments are all

931 collected, it will go before City Council for approval.

932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979

Commissioner Giannola – I would like to see something added regarding egress windows. (K. Kidorf – I know you asked for that, but frankly, I’m not certain what to put in there.) Ms. Giannola asked that even in the event that we don’t have other information, can we inform the applicants that they need be prepared and what to expect.

Commissioner Henrichs – That is a good point, and I think we need to devise some sort of method to deal with that. How are we planning to resolve that. As these cases come up, we will go through changes with these.

K. Kidorf – Will see if Winter and Company (who formulated the draft) has any information on egress window requirements.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – I’m aware that our purview does not include the type of “use” in a building, but I’m concerned about the garage, exercise room, etc. at 1547 Washtenaw Avenue that we heard this evening. I am concerned that the addition is so large that it may end up being used as an ‘apartment.’ (*Discussion by the HDC regarding Zoning concerns.*)

J. Thacher – Mentioned to the Commission that when we get this many applications in a month (fourteen), it’s next to impossible to get printed packets out to you on time. We can, in the future, split the information up and have one meeting at our regular time and then the other half two weeks later in the same month – OR – to do abbreviated staff reports. This could have the opposite effect and may not provide enough information.

Commissioner Bruner – Do other Boards limit their applications? (J. Thacher stated that some do, but this Commission is that we only legally have sixty days to act on an application.)

Commissioner Henrichs – When is the ‘cut-off’ date for an application to be submitted? (J. Thacher – two and one half weeks before the meeting. The Monday two weeks prior to the meeting. (Note: This means only one week to prepare the packet, print and mail out.)

J. Thacher – I could keep track as they come in. Once we get to seven applications, I could warn the petitioners that they might not make the first meeting.

Commissioner Henrichs – Suggested that we might increase some additional items that could be added to the staff approval list, such as the awning issue that came before the HDC at this meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The Meeting was adjourned at 10:17 p.m. without objection.

SUBMITTED BY: Brenda Acquaviva, Administrative Service Specialist V, Planning and Development Services.