



City of Ann Arbor

100 N. Fifth Avenue
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
<http://a2gov.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

Thursday, May 12, 2011

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

A CALL TO ORDER

Chair Ramsburgh called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

B ROLL CALL

Jill Thacher called the roll.

On a roll call, the record reflected the following members present.

Present: 6 - Kristina A. Glusac, Robert White, Ellen Ramsburgh, Patrick McCauley, Lesa Rozmarek, and Thomas Stulberg

Absent: 1 - Benjamin L. Bushkuhl

C APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made by Ramsburgh, Seconded by White, that the Agenda be Approved with the removal of Old Business Item E-1. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION

Chairperson Ramsburgh on behalf of the Commission presented a Resolution of Appreciation to Lesa Rozmarek. She thanked her for dedicated service to historic preservation and wished her the best in her future endeavors and work with the Historic Landmarks Commission.

D HEARINGS

D-1 [11-0564](#) HDC11-048 515 West Washington Street - Second Floor Rear Addition - OWS

Jill Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This one-and-a-half story gable-fronter has a triple window in the upper front and a large parlor window below. The house first appears in the 1910 Polk Directory as the home of Mary Rogers, a music teacher, and Andrew Rogers. Asphalt siding and a non-original brick front porch were removed by the previous owner, and the current porch was constructed after receiving a certificate of appropriateness from the HDC in 1993. Replacement basement walls received a staff approval in 1993. Several landmark maple trees are located along the west side of the house.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the south side of West Washington between Third and Fourth Streets.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to 1) construct a second floor addition over the existing one story rear addition; 2) remove the brick chimney; 3) add roofs over the back entryway and back patio; 4) screen the back patio, 5) pave the driveway, and 6) move the garage 10 feet toward the rear of the lot. See the application for an attached detailed description of the work proposed and justifications.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

(2) The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

(4) Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

(5) Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

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

(10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property will be unimpaired.

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

New Additions

Recommended: Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

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

Locating the attached exterior addition at the rear or on an in-conspicuous side of a historic building; and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

Considering the attached exterior addition both in terms of the new use and the appearance of other buildings in the historic district or neighborhood. Design for the new work may be contemporary or may reference design motifs from the historic building. In either case, it should always be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solids to voids,

and color.

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

Designing a new addition so that its size and scale in relation to the historic building are out of proportion, thus diminishing the historic character.

Building Site

Recommended: Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserve the historic relationship between a building or buildings, landscape features, and open space.

Retaining the historic relationship between buildings, landscape features, and open space.

Identifying, retaining, and preserving buildings and their features as well as features of the site that are important in defining its overall historic character.

Not Recommended: Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color and texture or which destroys historic relationships on the site.

Removing or radically changing buildings and their features or site features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building site so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Roofs

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

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

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The existing house consists of a one-and-a-half story main block with a single story rear addition behind it, and a single story mudroom addition behind that. The first addition appears to date to the 1930s and extends seven feet into the west side yard. It has a nearly-flat roof, which can be accessed by a second floor door on the rear elevation. The mud room is newer than the period of significance.

2. The proposed addition would place a new box with a nearly-flat roof on top of the flat-roofed rear additions. In the rear, the new addition would overhang the existing rear wall of the older addition by six feet, and a shed roof and screening would extend another six feet beyond that to enclose an existing paver patio. On the east (driveway) side, the second floor addition would be inset approximately two feet from the existing east mudroom elevation, and extend six feet beyond the mudroom to form a new covered porch underneath. On the east side, the addition would be aligned with the current first floor wall, but stepped back three feet from the north wall of the existing rear addition. This would create a notch that preserves an existing original window on the second floor of the house, and delineates the new from the old. In addition, the existing eave and trim would be retained on both first floor additions.

3. *Materials on the addition include wood clapboards and trim to match the rest of the house (not vertical siding, as the drawings might lead you to believe - I believe this was to distinguish the new from the old). The north-facing window on the second floor would be a wood double-hung, and the other operable windows would be casements. Staff does not object to the proposed large picture window across the rear of the second floor addition, since this elevation is not visible from the street and would not detract from any character-defining features of the house.*

4. *Staff believes that the boxy shape of the second-floor addition is appropriate giving the applicant's desire to minimize the height of the addition and preserve the large whole-house fan located in the rear gable. Since the existing rear wing occupies a portion of the side yard, adding a second floor on top of it will not increase the footprint of the house into the side yard. The addition also would not compromise the relationship between this house and the non-contributing house next door to the west.*

5. *The chimney is in need of repair, and the applicant proposes to remove it in order to install pull-down stairs to the attic for storage. There is currently a small attic access in the ceiling that is barely large enough to allow a person on a ladder entry. Staff believes the chimney is a character defining feature of the house, though this one is not particularly ornate or of significant craftsmanship. The tradeoff of removing the chimney in order to utilize the attic for storage is in this case reasonable.*

6. *Paving the driveway would help accessibility and drainage on the site. Per a conversation with the applicant, the driveway would be concrete, with a slight slope from either side toward the middle, which would then slope toward the street. The concrete would extend the width of the current driveway, from the house to the lot line. Staff is generally not in favor of allowing driveway paving where it hasn't existed before, since it is a historic feature of the site, but the applicant makes a reasonable argument for improving accessibility for him and his wife in this newly owner-occupied structure.*

7. *The garage was constructed during the district's period of significance and first appears on the 1925 Sanborn Map, in the current location. At some point, the roof was altered from flat to gabled. Staff feels that moving this garage ten feet toward the rear of the lot would not diminish or radically change the character of the site or neighborhood.*

8. *The proposed 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 2,9 and 10, and the guidelines for new additions and building site.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

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

Rozmarek stated that she felt more thought was needed on the design of the roof pitch to incorporate adding solar in the future.

She added that while the chimney wasn't original, they need to know definitely that it's not a structural component.

Rozmarek said that she supported the paving of the driveway.

She stated that the garage shouldn't be moved unless its being moved to preserve it.

White stated that he agrees with the staff report.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Robert Northrup, owner of 515 W. Washington, spoke on behalf of the project. He stated that the proposed project calls for a 6 foot overhang, not a 5 foot one. He praised the details of the staff report and thanked Jill for her diligence. Northrup stated that the chimney wasn't an original and was probably from the 1950's era. He explained that they need to remove it to gain access to the attic for storage, since there's not another appropriate place for an access.

He stated that they felt moving the garage is appropriate since it would align with the neighbors. He added that snow removal was also an issue, since currently there was no place to put the snow except up against the garage door. Northrup noted that if they moved the garage it would allow for mechanical removal of the snow; for it to be pushed into the backyard where it could melt. He stated that at age 72 he finds it hard to shovel snow on the existing surface.

Don McMullen, Architect for the project explained the project to the Commission. He stated that moving the garage would allow trucks and fire trucks to access the backyard. He noted that the chimney is fairly small and isn't structurally supporting the building. He added that he is fond of the notch that is proposed allowing windows in the upstairs.

Rozmarek asked if they would consider re-working the roof pitch.

McMullen responded that he thinks solar is a good idea but putting more pitch on the roof would make it more visible and he explained that they are trying to preserve the fan on the existing roof line.

Northrup added that if the request would be denied based on the solar panels, then he will withdraw the panels from the proposal.

Rozmarek asked if they had come to a decision on the direction of the siding.

Northrup responded that they would like verticle siding.

McCauley asked if the roof is hipped or flat.

McCullen responded that the roof is essentially a flat roof with enough pitch to run the water off.

A Motion was made by Glusac, seconded by Rozmarek, that the Commission deny the portion of the application at 515 West Washington Street, a contributing structure in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a second floor addition over the existing one story rear addition, screen the back patio, add roofs over the back entryway and back patio, and move the garage 10 feet toward the rear of the lot. The work is not compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, materials, and relationship to the historic building and the surrounding neighborhood, and does not meet The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 4, 5, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for building site and new additions. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Yeas: 6 - Glusac, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Rozmarek, and Stulberg

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Bushkuhl

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

McCauley stated that the flat roof is his main concern, since he felt it didn't work with the architecture of the house and the neighborhood. He stated that he didn't have a problem with the proposed placement of the addition but felt that the addition looked more like something from the 1960's instead of a sympathetic addition from today. He praised the applicant for attempting to save as much of the original fabric as possible. McCauley said that he felt there would be a way for the applicant to rework the request so that it would meet the standards as well as hopefully serve their needs.

White said that he supports the roofline either way and is OK with the project. He expressed that he supports the proposed request.

Stulberg stated that he felt a gabled roof would be more appropriate and agreed with McCauley, adding that the flat roof on the one-story addition hasn't stood out like it would on a two-story addition.

Stulberg noted that with the higher demand for solar panels and high efficiency furnaces, the need for chimneys will become obsolete. He said in this case, since it appears not to be original and since it's not a character defining feature of this house he doesn't have a problem with losing the chimney.

He said he couldn't support the request with the proposed roof pitch, but was fine with the driveway paving, and he wasn't sure about moving a historical structure. Stulberg added that he agreed that the petitioner has taken great care in their application to respect the historic nature of the house setting.

McCauley asked staff if a moved building would lose its contributing structure classification.

Thacher responded that this specific garage was built before the neighboring garages but the original roofline had been flat and had since been replaced with a gabled roofline, which left room for discussion as to its classification. She said that if the Commission felt it was still considered a contributing structure then it probably shouldn't be moved.

Glasac said that she didn't feel that they could continue discussion on the petition until the many unresolved issues had been addressed. She expressed that she felt the massing and setback of the addition was inappropriate, doing a disservice to the house. She said there was an issue with the quality of the drawings and couldn't decipher the south elevation plan. She added that the rear window type makes it look like a contemporary 60's addition.

Glusac said that she didn't think that the garage should be included in the motion at this time. She said that the chimney is the least of the worries at this time and if it wasn't original she was ok with removing it. She stated that she was in support of paving the driveway.

White asked if it was possible for the applicant to rework the petition and make the adjustments and return at next month's meeting.

Ramsburgh summarized what she heard the issues were, particularly the roofline of the proposed addition and that the Commission was asking for suggestions on alternatives.

Thacher suggested asking the applicant if they were interesting in reworking the plans quickly.

The applicant said they would greatly appreciate if the Commission could move forward with making a decision on the removal of the chimney so they could proceed with the installation of attic stairs and the high efficiency furnace, noting that they would like to move in as soon as possible.

Stulberg made a friendly amendment to the motion to strike the chimney removal and driveway paving from the original motion.

Glusac and Rozmarek felt that the amendment was appropriate and agreed.

A motion was made by Stulberg, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the portion of the application at 515 West Washington Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to pave the driveway, and remove the chimney, as proposed. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2 and 9 and the guidelines for roofs and building site. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Yeas: 6 - Glusac, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Rozmarek, and Stulberg

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Bushkuhl

D-2 [11-0565](#)

HDC11-049 529 East Liberty Street - New Restaurant Blade Sign - SSHD

Jill Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

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

LOCATION:

The site is located on the north side of East Liberty Street, between Maynard and Thompson.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to install a vinyl fabric blade sign for a new business.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

(10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

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

Storefronts

Not Recommended: Using new illuminated signs; inappropriately scaled signs and logos; signs that project over the sidewalk unless they were a characteristic feature of the historic building; or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy remaining character-defining features of the historic building.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *This application is only to add a non-illuminated blade sign. The words "Mediterranean Grill" shown on the drawings have been removed from the application and are not under consideration. The applicant has obtained a staff approval for the oval-shaped LaPita sign-band sign shown in the drawings. Despite the electrical connection shown in the drawing, the oval sign will not be illuminated (this was a condition of approval).*

2. *The blade sign consists of two square galvanized brackets with a black vinyl banner hung between them. A good example of a similar sign can be found on the South State Street entrance to the Nichol's Arcade.*

3. *Staff has concerns about the scale of the sign and its placement on the sign band, which is traditionally used for signs hung flat against the wall (or having a parallel orientation instead of perpendicular to the wall). There are some examples of first-floor blade signs in the neighborhood, including at American Apparel on East Liberty, and the See, Pitaya, and Nichol's Arcade signs on South State Street. The first three, which are associated with traditional storefronts, are much smaller in scale than the proposed LaPita Fresh blade sign. The last three are the only signage on their street frontage.*

4. *The attachment of the sign to the metal sign band would not harm historic materials, and would be reversible (though future tenants of the space could re-use the blade sign with a new banner).*

5. Staff believes that the sign's size and placement are inappropriate for this building, and therefore the proposal does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards or Guidelines for Rehabilitation, especially standards 9 and 10 and the guidelines for storefronts.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

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

White stated that he supported the staff report and felt the sign was too large for the proposed location, and didn't support the application

Rozmarek said the placement was not thoughtfully placed and seemed gigantic. She questioned whether the metal band was actually 6 ft tall and felt that it might hit the decorative part of the building. She said she didn't support the application.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

McCauley stated that a vinyl blade sign doesn't seem to be what the HDC is looking for.

Ramsburgh added that she also felt that there was enough signage above the door to alert customers to the existence of the business.

A motion was made by McCauley, seconded by White that the Commission deny the application for a certificate of appropriateness for 529 East Liberty Street, a contributing property in the State Street Historic District, to install a vinyl fabric blade sign, as documented in the owner's submittal. As proposed, the work is not compatible in exterior design, arrangement, and relationship to the building and the surrounding area and does not meet The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 9 and 10, and the guidelines for storefronts. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

APPLICATION DENIED.

D-3 [11-0566](#) HDC11-050 417 Detroit Street - Raise Sill and Shorten Sash on 5 Windows - OFW

Jill Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

The 1866 Moses Rogers building is a two-story commercial Italianate. The Old Fourth Ward Study describes it as "...a symmetrical façade with four-over-four double-hung windows topped by decorative round brick arches on the second floor and segmented arches on the first floor flanking arched double entrance doors in the center..." and with shutters, an iron fence, and a one-story wing at 419 Detroit that were added later. It was constructed for Mr. Rogers's farm implement business.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the south side of East Kingsley between North Fifth Avenue and Detroit Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to shorten five windows on the north elevation by adding 10" of brick infill to the bottom of the window opening, installing new sills, and altering the five lower window sashes to make them 10" shorter (from 40" to 30").

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

(2) The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

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

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

Windows - Alterations/Additions for the New Use

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

Building Site

Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving buildings and their features as well as features of the site that are important in defining its overall historic character.

Not Recommended: Removing or radically changing buildings and their features or site features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the property so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. Between 1916 and 1925 the one-story building at 419 Detroit (currently Emerald Dragonfly) was constructed attached to 417 Detroit. The roof of 419 is level with the sills of the five windows in question, which causes water seepage through the window and into the interior and wall from rain and snowmelt. The problem has been ongoing for many years, and other remedies have not been successful.

2. Staff does not generally support the alteration of character-defining windows, but in this situation the work would prevent further harm to the structural integrity of the building while keeping the visible portion of the windows unchanged. The round tops and upper sash of the windows can be seen from some surrounding streets, but the parapet on the building at 419 blocks most of the lower sash from view. The work would retain as much of the original material as possible.

3. *The brick infill should not be toothed in, in order to leave evidence of the original extent of the window opening.*

4. *It is staff's opinion that the proposed window alterations meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and the Guidelines for building site and setting.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

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

Rozmarek said that she does support the infilling of the windows given all the water damage, but recommended that a new sash be made for the bottom of the window and the old sash be stored on-site, which would make it a reversible alteration.

White stated that he supports the staff and Rozmarek's recommendation.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Applicant, William Martindale, 746 Forest Court, Ann Arbor was present to respond to the Commission's questions.

Rozmarek asked applicant if he was open to making new bottom sashes for the windows.

Martindale said that would be easier.

Ramsburgh agreed with Rozmarek that making new sashes would be best and she asked the applicant if there was a possibility that the old sashes could get lost.

Martindale said there was possibility of flooding in the basement but they could store the windows up high.

Ramsburgh asked if there was any possibility of the roof being reworked in the future.

Martindale responded that he didn't believe so since the roof was solid and had been reworked with a pitch.

Stulberg said he supported the idea of building new sashes and asked for the best efforts in storing the old ones on site.

Martindale said the bottom sashes were in very bad shape and rotten but they could hang them up on the wall for preservation.

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

Stulberg said that this type of request is something that he wouldn't support in any other building except for this building. He stressed that it was important that the motion specify that the sash replacement was limited to the bottom sashes.

McCauley said that he felt that after the Commission makes a decision to remove something from a historic building it would be out of the Commission's purview as to what happens with those removed items.

Thacher agreed that once items are removed there is no guarantee that the items will be preserved for future use.

Rozmarek added that she felt the Commission should be encouraging historic owners to preserve removed materials on site for possible future use.

Glusac expressed concern about detail of brick infill on the project.

McCauley stated that he believed the Building Department would be doing inspections to make sure the flashing is done right.

Thacher said that she would ask the Building Official himself to do the inspection since he is experienced with restoration work and has worked as a roofer as well.

Ramsburgh reiterated that the Commission's decision isn't in accordance with what the standards would usually allow, but in this situation, given the structural problems surrounding this building it was appropriate in order to help the overall building.

A motion was made by Rozmarek, seconded by White to APPROVE ON CONDITIONS the application at 417 Detroit Street, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, and issue a certificate of appropriateness to permit the infill of the bottom 10" of five window openings on the north elevation, as documented in the owner's submittal. This approval is upon conditions that lower sash is removed and stored on-site and a new lower sash is built; and the brick infill must be inset 1" and not toothed. As proposed, the work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2 and 9, and the guidelines for building site and district or neighborhood setting.

On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Yeas: 6 - Glusac, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Rozmarek, and Stulberg

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Bushkuhl

D-4 [11-0567](#)

HDC11-051 514 East Ann Street - New Basement Egress Window and Well - OFW

Jill Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This one-and-a-half story gable-fronter has a triple window in the upper front and a large parlor window below. The house first appears in the 1910 Polk Directory as the home of Mary Rogers, a music teacher, and Andrew Rogers. Asphalt siding and a non-original brick front porch were removed by the previous owner, and the current porch was constructed after receiving a certificate of appropriateness from the HDC in 1993. Replacement basement walls received a staff approval in 1993. Several landmark maple trees are located along the west side of the house.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the south side of West Washington between Third and Fourth Streets.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to 1) construct a second floor addition over the existing one story rear addition; 2) remove the brick chimney; 3) add roofs over the back entryway and back patio; 4) screen the back patio, 5) pave the driveway, and 6) move the garage 10 feet toward the rear of the lot. See the application for an attached detailed description of the work proposed and justifications.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

(2) The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

(4) Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

(5) Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

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

(10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property will be unimpaired.

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

New Additions

Recommended: Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

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

Locating the attached exterior addition at the rear or on an in-conspicuous side of a historic building; and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

Considering the attached exterior addition both in terms of the new use and the appearance of other buildings in the historic district or neighborhood. Design for the new work may be contemporary or may reference design motifs from the historic building. In either case, it should always be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color.

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

Designing a new addition so that its size and scale in relation to the historic building are out of proportion, thus diminishing the historic character.

Building Site

Recommended: Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserve the historic relationship between a building or buildings, landscape features, and open space.

Retaining the historic relationship between buildings, landscape features, and open space.

Identifying, retaining, and preserving buildings and their features as well as features of the site that are important in defining its overall historic character.

Not Recommended: Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color and texture or which destroys historic relationships on the site.

Removing or radically changing buildings and their features or site features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building site so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Roofs

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

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

STAFF FINDINGS:

- 1. The existing house consists of a one-and-a-half story main block with a single story rear addition behind it, and a single story mudroom addition behind that. The first addition appears to date to the 1930s and extends seven feet into the west side yard. It has a nearly-flat roof, which can be accessed by a second floor door on the rear elevation. The mud room is newer than the period of significance.*
- 2. The proposed addition would place a new box with a nearly-flat roof on top of the flat-roofed rear additions. In the rear, the new addition would overhang the existing rear wall of the older addition by six feet, and a shed roof and screening would extend another six feet beyond that to enclose an existing paver patio. On the east (driveway) side, the second floor addition would be inset approximately two feet from the existing east mudroom elevation, and extend six feet beyond the mudroom to form a new covered porch underneath. On the east side, the addition would be aligned with the current first floor wall, but stepped back three feet from the north wall of the existing rear addition. This would create a notch that preserves an existing original window on the second floor of the house, and delineates the new from the old. In addition, the existing eave and trim would be retained on both first floor additions.*
- 3. Materials on the addition include wood clapboards and trim to match the rest of the house (not vertical siding, as the drawings might lead you to believe - - I believe this was to distinguish the new from the old). The north-facing window on the second floor would be a wood double-hung, and the other operable windows would be casements. Staff does not object to the proposed large picture window across the*

rear of the second floor addition, since this elevation is not visible from the street and would not detract from any character-defining features of the house.

4. Staff believes that the boxy shape of the second-floor addition is appropriate giving the applicant's desire to minimize the height of the addition and preserve the large whole-house fan located in the rear gable. Since the existing rear wing occupies a portion of the side yard, adding a second floor on top of it will not increase the footprint of the house into the side yard. The addition also would not compromise the relationship between this house and the non-contributing house next door to the west.

5. The chimney is in need of repair, and the applicant proposes to remove it in order to install pull-down stairs to the attic for storage. There is currently a small attic access in the ceiling that is barely large enough to allow a person on a ladder entry. Staff believes the chimney is a character defining feature of the house, though this one is not particularly ornate or of significant craftsmanship. The tradeoff of removing the chimney in order to utilize the attic for storage is in this case reasonable.

6. Paving the driveway would help accessibility and drainage on the site. Per a conversation with the applicant, the driveway would be concrete, with a slight slope from either side toward the middle, which would then slope toward the street. The concrete would extend the width of the current driveway, from the house to the lot line. Staff is generally not in favor of allowing driveway paving where it hasn't existed before, since it is a historic feature of the site, but the applicant makes a reasonable argument for improving accessibility for him and his wife in this newly owner-occupied structure.

7. The garage was constructed during the district's period of significance and first appears on the 1925 Sanborn Map, in the current location. At some point, the roof was altered from flat to gabled. Staff feels that moving this garage ten feet toward the rear of the lot would not diminish or radically change the character of the site or neighborhood.

8. The proposed 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 2,9 and 10, and the guidelines for new additions and building site.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

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

Rozmarek agreed with the staff report that the additional openings in the solid brick/stone wall in the house would be irreversible and she suggested that the applicant make use of the already existing 3 egress windows. She added that the garage is currently one large room with a door currently located close to the proposed egress window. She felt that in the case of an emergency the door could be utilized for egress. She stated she didn't support the application as proposed.

White stated that he supported the staff report and reiterated that there were already 3 egress windows [that have been approved but not installed yet] in the house and making an additional opening would be altering original material. He said he didn't have an issue with the proposed garage egress window.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Applicant Mike Van Goor, architect for the project, was present to respond to the Commission's questions. He provided a handout to the Commission and stated that the December 2010 application to the Commission included 2 egress windows; one was replacing the location of the smaller window, so the windows as shown on the plan would remain. He said that the additional egress window in the garage was necessary because the owner needs to store maintenance equipment in that area and the door wouldn't be accessible for egress means.

Van Goor said that he didn't feel the specific corner of the house to be a character defining elevation given the proximity of the adjacent house and the multiple stacked windows already in existence in the house. He agreed that the application would be removing original existing material, which the previous applications didn't since they were working with existing window openings.

He said he didn't feel it was visible at 6 feet back and the reason he had proposed the location was to stay far enough back from the existing bump-out. He said they could locate the window well back an additional 3 feet if that would help. He said they could save the wall granite material for future owners, photographing and labeling all pieces of the stone so that it could be restored if they even decided to return the house to a single-family residence. He added that he would add these details to the building permit since it hadn't been processed and issued yet.

Van Goor stated that the building code has now changed and they are required to have an egress window in every room, below grade, that will be used for living space, not only bedrooms as the previous code mandated. He said that the people living in the house had requested a common "study room" that could be used by everyone and wasn't attached to other rooms as it currently is.

McCauley asked if the backdoor of the garage will be used like a shed.

Van Goor responded that it wouldn't be a shed but more like the owner's utility room, that would be separate from the tenant space and not rentable space.

Rozmarek asked for a handout of the floorplan that was presented by the applicant at the meeting.

Van Goor provided a handout of a design sketch that was provided to the Building Department for the permit application.

Stulberg asked why an egress window would be required in the garage.

Van Goor said that when you make your way around the corner in the previous garage that front corner is now the bedroom. He said there is a new corridor that passes the old garage door that serves a bedroom in the corner as well as a bedroom in the back corner. He said where the door is located is where the owner will have their rental office and storage area. He said in order for that bedroom to meet egress building code to be used as a rental unit, they would have to enlarge the existing window.

Stulberg asked if the code requirement for egress windows in rooms such as the basement study was included in the Building or Rental Housing code.

Van Goor said, he believed it changed in the 2006 Building Code.

Stulberg asked if they wouldn't be able to utilize the space [study] in the basement without having an egress window.

Van Goor responded, that was correct, and that the room could only be utilized as habitable space if it was a part of a larger room that has an egress window.

Rozmarek asked if they removed the wall and made it one larger room for a study or livingroom, as is common in the larger coops then they could utilize the room.

Van Goor said that since it is habitable space and only has one means of egress, he needs two means of egress.

White stated that when the applicant submitted their original request last year 2010 for the 3 basement egress window openings, the Commission approved that based on the floorplan and the Building codes at the time, and now the floorplan has changes, and they are asking for yet another egress window.

Rozmarek asked if the tenants living at the basement level also have access to the upper floors.

Van Goor said, yes they do. He explained using his site plan that the 1st floor rooms were a part of the basement rooms. He said they have a common room on the 1st floor as well as a kitchen.

Rozmarek said that there must be several ways that the interior space could be reconfigured so that there could be a study without having to remove a solid masonry wall.

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

McCauley said he was in support of the garage egress window but had concerns with the appearance with the proposed egress window in the garage, and felt that those types of casement windows didn't look appropriate.

Stulberg agreed and added that he had noticed on his first site visit that there are double hung windows on the rear elevations and now they would be removing a double hung window and replacing it with a casement window which would be inconsistent with the upper windows.

McCauley said he was thinking of the addition of a horizontal muntin that would mimic the original windows in the house.

Ramsburgh said she was amenable to add to the motion that a horizontal muntin be placed in the window. She said that would give the window an appearance of a double hung window. She said it's more sympathetic on a smaller window than on the larger longer windows.

Stulberg agreed with Ramsburgh that it was more sympathetic when the window was closed, but a horizontal muntin on a casement window, when open wouldn't create the desired affect.

Rozmarek said that now that she understands the floorplan better, she is OK with the egress window and since the sill will be so low to the ground it might seem awkward if there was a double hung window in that location. She added that the window on the other side that they had previously approved was a casement window and she felt it would be best if they were matching.

Stulberg noted that the window on the previous application was on a different

elevation and not visible from the street or the rear yard.

McCauley stated that with future applications on egress windows the Commission might want to put more thought into how casement windows look. He expressed that to him they looked like large modern windows and when one sees them on older houses in non-historic district homes they are very jarring and look inappropriate. He agreed that for this location both windows styles should match, but requested the Commission to consider his comments.

Thacher suggested looking into the dual action windows and reporting back to the Commission.

A Motion was made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White to APPROVE THE PORTION of the application at 514 East Ann Street, a contributing property in the Ann Street Historic District, and issue a certificate of appropriateness to install an egress window on the south elevation of the attached garage, instead of on the west elevation, as documented in the owner's submittal. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2 , 9, and 10 and the guidelines for windows and building site. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Yeas: 5 - Glusac, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, and Rozmarek

Nays: 1 - Stulberg

Absent: 1 - Bushkuhl

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

Stulberg stated that he agreed with Commissioner White's comments that the Commission has already approved previous drawing plans and the applicant has made a usage change and he doesn't see any hardship or good reason to remove character defying features and original materials.

McCauley added that the Commission does take safety measures seriously pointing out that the Commission had already approved 3 egress windows in the portion of the basement on the previously submitted application.

A Motion was made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White, to DENY the portion of the application at 514 E Ann Street, a contributing structure in the Ann Street Historic District, to construct a new basement egress window and well, in a new opening, 6' from the front of the house on the west elevation. The work is not compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the house and the surrounding area and does not meet The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2 , 9, and 10 and the guidelines for windows and building site. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Yeas: 6 - Glusac, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Rozmarek, and Stulberg

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Bushkuhl

D-5 [11-0568](#)

HDC11-052 332 South Division Street - Install Second Driveway with Curb Cut - EWSHD

Jill Thacher gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

The Elizabeth J. Hyde house is a c.1875 Italianate featuring bracketed eaves, bay windows on the front and sides, triple and paired windows, a stucco exterior, and a recessed front porch. It is one of a handful of Italianate homes built in the 1850s-1870s in the William Street Historic District.

HDC approvals are on file for rebuilding a doorwell and steps in 2006, and replacing rear stairs in 2001. It is not known when the front porch was enclosed. There is no application or approval on file for the removal of lawn/landscaping from the southeast corner of the property or installation of the south gravel parking area and driveway.

The house's original driveway is located along the north lot line. Residents and people renting parking behind the house have been driving between this house and the house to the south and jumping the curb for an additional informal driveway. The area from around the front wall of the houses to the sidewalk was previously landscaped with lawn and bushes and bumper blocks, but is now gravel. Survey and aerial photos from 1992 and 1997, respectively, do not show the informal driveway. The 2002 aerial is inconclusive, but the 2005 aerial clearly shows the driveway. (See photos at end of staff report.)

LOCATION:

The site is located on the west side of South Division, south of East Liberty and north of East William Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks a certificate of appropriateness to retroactively approve the unauthorized removal of lawn/landscaping and its replacement with the current gravel parking lot/driveway in the southeast corner of the property, and to install a second curb cut and driveway approach to South Division Street to serve the south driveway. The applicant has also requested permission to repair the existing curb cut serving the north driveway – this repair does not require a certificate of appropriateness.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

Ann Arbor City Code Chapter 103 § 8:421(3)

When work has been done upon a resource without a permit, and the commission finds that the work does not qualify for a certificate of appropriateness, the commission may require an owner to restore the resource to the condition the resource was in before the inappropriate work or to modify the work so that it qualifies for a certificate of appropriateness. If the owner does not comply with the restoration or modification requirement within a reasonable time, the commission may request for the city to seek an order from the circuit court to require the owner to restore the resource to its former condition or to modify the work so that it qualifies for a certificate of appropriateness. If the owner does not comply or cannot comply with the order of the court, the commission may request for the city to enter the property and conduct work necessary to restore the resource to its former condition or modify the work so that it qualifies for a certificate of appropriateness in accordance with the court's order. The costs of the work shall be charged to the owner, and may be levied

by the city as a special assessment against the property. When acting pursuant to an order of the circuit court, the city may enter a property for purposes of this section.

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

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property will be unimpaired.

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

Building Site

Recommended: Designing new onsite parking, loading docks, or ramps when required by the new use so that they are as unobtrusive as possible and assure the preservation of historic relationships between the building or buildings and the landscape.

Not Recommended: Locating any new construction on the building site in a location which contains important landscape features or open space, for example removing a lawn and walkway and installing a parking lot.

Placing parking facilities directly adjacent to historic buildings where automobiles may cause damage to the buildings or landscape features, or be intrusive to the building site.

Setting

Not Recommended: Destroying the relationship between the buildings and landscape features within the setting by widening existing streets, changing landscape materials or constructing inappropriately located new streets or parking.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The removal of lawn and landscaping and its replacement with a gravel parking area and driveway in the southeast corner of the property were done without the permission of the Commission and in violation of Ann Arbor City Code Chapter 103 and the Michigan Local Historic Districts Act.

2. The Downtown Development Authority has installed a parking meter in front of 332 South Division that would, if the street parking space were in use, result in the area currently used as a second driveway being completely blocked. The property owner is therefore seeking retroactive approval for the use of the southeast corner of his front yard as a second driveway, which would require a certificate of appropriateness from the HDC as well as a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals (only one curb cut is allowed per lot under the streets ordinance).

3. The second driveway would allow the property owner to add more parking

spaces to the yard, per the submitted site plan, including stacking cars in the legal north driveway. A total of nine spaces are shown. Several spaces are not used by building tenants - - they are rented out to people who work in the vicinity, per the attached letters of support.

4. The legal driveway along the north property line is currently compromised by the construction activities on the underground parking structure immediately to the north. Safe use of the driveway will not be restored for four to six months, per the construction project manager.

5. The illegal second driveway destroys the historic relationships between buildings and landscape features, negatively impacts both the historic buildings at 332 South Division and at 336 South Division next door, is very intrusive, destroys important open space (the front yards), inappropriately changes landscape features and materials, and is not in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

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

Rozmarek stated that the proposed application disrupts the language of the neighborhood, noting that the proposed second driveway area should be restored to a lawn with the bumper blocks installed between the lots.

White said that he agrees with Roamarek's report as well as the staff report.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Adrian Iraola, Park Avenue Consultants, Inc, spoke on behalf of the applicant. Bill Lagos. He said that the applicant had owned the property since 1976 and since that time the second driveway has always been in use. Iraola stated that the City requested the applicant to close the southern driveway about 15 years ago and it remained temporarily closed but the residents living there began using it again without complaints from neighbors. He said that the DDA installed the parking meter as an overall improvement to the parking on the street. He said that the DDA has endorsed removal of the metered parking spot if the City approves the second driveway and curb cut. He said Mike Bergren who was in charge of the Division Street improvements was present to answer the Commission's questions.

Iraola stated that the lawn extension area in front of this house would be concreted, due to the heavy pedestrian traffic in this area. He said that the Review Committee members had requested that they come up with a landscape plan for the site. He presented a plan showing a hard driveway that would allow for stormwater drainage. He pointed out the areas of plantings and said that a chainlink fence would also be installed by the credit union property as well an additional stainless steel fence on the north side noting that this would happen once the construction phase was completed. He said their intent is to maintain the green area which currently is under construction. He added that tenant's parking needs are always a high priority and the street parking would be used by tenants and visitor parking.

Glusac questioned what the property was zoned and how many people occupy the house.

Iraola responded that he wasn't sure of the zoning and that the City's Rental Housing

Department had certified the property for a total of 19 residents.

Mike Bergren, with Park Avenue Consultants, Inc, said that there are 3 parking spots that are rented out to non-residents.

Rozmarek said the parking needs could change once the parking structure is completed right next door.

Iraola said that was possible but usually people prefer to park at the surface level.

Stulberg asked what the procedure is when renters request to park in one of the three available spots that are rented out.

John Lagos, property manager for the property explained that tenants always have top priority and their contracts are on a month to month basis so there usually aren't problems since students know their schedule several months in advance. He said they will never have a tenant that doesn't have parking when they need it. He said that even though they are certified to have 19 tenants they have never had that many.

Iraola stated that due to the ongoing construction in the area they have afforded Mr. Lagos, the owner, parking at the 410 E William parking structure until the DDA can re-open the other driveway.

Rozmarek asked if in theory they are short one parking spot.

Iraola responded that was accurate. He said that the difficulty in closing the "illegal driveway", as the City has deemed it, is that circulation would be extremely difficult since parkers can't back out of the driveway. He said that the owners have attempted to comply with the City's request, but given the tight parking, vehicles have jumped the curb to gain access. He said that use of the house requires a double driveway.

Rozmarek pointed out that landscaping could be used as a barrier to prevent cars from entering. She said that every coop and rental house in Ann Arbor has this problem and if the Commission would approve this request, she could foresee people all over the City requesting circular driveways to give them more parking.

Iraola reiterated that the second driveway has been in existence since 1976 when the owner purchased the property.

Ramsburgh showed the applicant a photo from 1992 that showed that the driveway wasn't in use at that time.

Rozmarek added that now they have an opportunity to make things right and so she felt that they should.

Glusac asked if the applicant has considered getting rid of the north curb cut and leaving the south curb cut, which would allow for more cars.

Iraola said they have tried several different options but always come back to the same issue that it would be detrimental to the parking needs of the house.

Glusac said that if they are renting out spaces then they don't actually need all the parking that they currently have.

Iraola responded that it varies with the needs of the various tenants.

Ramsburgh asked if they had received the approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals to install the second curb cut.

Iraola responded no, not yet.

Stulberg asked for clarification on the process of how the southern drive got re-opened and if the opening was temporary or permanent.

Bergren responded that it was part of the traffic control plan, and the timeframe wasn't addressed.

Stulberg asked if the applicant had initiated the process of re-opening the driveway or if another body of the City had requested them to. He asked if the City had already approved the removal of the parking meter.

Bergren said that the owner and applicant was initiating the request, and discussions with the DDA have shown that they don't have a problem with removing the meter. He explained that as soon as the meters were installed in that area they were bagged because of the on-going construction nearby.

Iraola added that there are no proposed changes to the house itself and the request is limited to the driveway.

Ramsburgh asked if the property was zoned R4C then she believed they would be required to have 1.5 spaces for each unit.

John Lagos said that for new construction the requirement is 1.5 spaces per registered unit - regardless of how many occupants in the units.

The Commission asked how many registered units are in the building.

Lagos said there are 9 separate units that can legally house up to 19 individual tenants.

Ramsburgh asked if they have more parking than what is required at the present time.

General discussion ensued over rental unit classifications.

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

Stulberg said that the Commission makes their decision based on the fact that they have alternatives available to them, noting that they could open up the south side and close the north side that they are currently using. He said that it was obvious that they had needs but he didn't feel that they had exhausted their options.

Glusac agreed with Stulberg and said she didn't want to set a precedent through their decision.

Ramsburgh stated that their jurisdiction to protect parcels extends to the site as well as the house, and she felt that the applicant had other available options without making a parking-lot of the site with a house in the middle.

A motion was made by Stulberg, seconded by Rozmarek, to DENY the application at 332 S Division Street, a contributing structure in the East William Street Historic District, to retroactively approve the unauthorized removal of

lawn/landscaping and its replacement with the current gravel parking lot/driveway in the southeast corner of the property, and to install a second curb cut and driveway approach to South Division Street to serve the south driveway. The work is not compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, materials, and relationship to the historic building and the surrounding neighborhood, and does not meet The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 1, 2 and 10 and the guidelines for building site and setting.

Further, the Commission ordered the property owner to restore the property to its prior condition and 1) remove the gravel from the southeast portion of the front yard and lawn extension, 2) restore lawn or other landscape plantings from the historic back (west) wall of the front porch to the sidewalk and in the lawn extension, and 3) install bumper blocks between 332 South Division and 336 South Division that are parallel to the street and no closer to the front of the lot than the historic back (west) wall of the front porch. The work must be completed within ninety days of the restoration of access to the north driveway by the neighboring construction project. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

APPLICATION DENIED

Yeas: 6 - Glusac, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Rozmarek, and Stulberg

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Bushkuhl

E OLD BUSINESS

E-1 [11-0559](#) Draft Resolution in Support of Retaining Michigan's Historic Preservation Tax Credits

Item was withdrawn from agenda.

F NEW BUSINESS

F-1 [11-0560](#) 2010 HDC Annual Report

Thacher presented the 2010 HDC Annual Report.

Stulberg requested that percentages be added to report.

A motion was made by Chair Ramsburgh, seconded by White, that the 2010 HDC Annual Report be Approved with the addition of percentages added after the numbers. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Yeas: 6 - Glusac, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Rozmarek, and Stulberg

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Bushkuhl

F-2 [11-0621](#) HDC Award Winners List to be Approved

A motion was made by Chair Ramsburgh, seconded by White, that the HDC Award Winners List be Approved. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Yeas: 6 - Glusac, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Rozmarek, and Stulberg

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Bushkuhl

G PUBLIC COMMENTARY - (3 Minutes per Speaker)

None

H APPROVAL OF MINUTES

H-1 [11-0450](#) Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes of the March 10, 2011

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

Yeas: 6 - Glusac, White, Chair Ramsburgh, Vice Chair McCauley, Rozmarek, and Stulberg

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Bushkuhl

I REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

J ASSIGNMENTS

J-1 **Review Committee: Monday, June 6 at 5 PM for the June 9, 2011 Regular Session**

Commissioners McCauley and Bushkuhl volunteered for the June 2011 Review Committee.

K REPORTS FROM STAFF

K-1 [11-0562](#) April 2011 Staff Activities

Received and Filed

L CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS

M COMMUNICATIONS

N ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was unanimously adjourned at 9:45 PM.