



City of Ann Arbor

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

Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

Thursday, January 9, 2014

7:00 PM

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

A CALL TO ORDER

Chair Stulberg called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

B ROLL CALL

Present: 6 - Ellen Ramsburgh, Patrick McCauley, Thomas Stulberg, Benjamin L. Bushkuhl, John Beeson, and Jennifer Ross

Absent: 1 - Robert White

C APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Item E3 on the agenda was withdrawn by applicant.

A motion was made by Ramsburgh, seconded by Vice Chair Bushkuhl, that the Agenda be Approved as amended. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

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

E HEARINGS

E-1 [13-1562](#)

HDC13-225; 812 West Washington Street - New Door and Deck Addition - OWSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

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

In November, 2013 several modifications were approved, including removing a chimney, adding skylights, removing non-original elements, constructing a roof deck on the back, and other work.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the north side of West Washington Street, between South

Seventh and Mulholland.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct a 12' x 18' deck on the east side of the house off the rear addition; install a new door and opening on the rear elevation of the main house block, leading to the deck; and install a bluestone patio.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

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

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

Entrances and Porches

Recommended:

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

Not Recommended:

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

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.

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

Residential Decks and Patios

Appropriate:

Installing a deck in the rear of the property that is subordinate in proportion to the building.

Installing a deck that is free standing (self supporting) so that it does not damage historic materials.

Installing railings made of wood. Custom railing designs will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Installing flooring made of wood or composite wood.

STAFF FINDINGS:

- 1. The rear of this lot has a considerable slope. The location of the deck takes advantage of the flattest portion of the yard but is still pushed back behind the main house block. The Design Guidelines recommend locating a deck in the rear of the property, but this lot's topography makes the proposed location acceptable. The decking material is composite, which is also acceptable under the design guidelines. The design is minimally intrusive, and the work is reversible. The use of bluestone for a patio to tie the deck to the existing rear door is appropriate.*
- 2. The new door opening is located on the rear of the house, and the design matches one recently approved by the HDC for the balcony rear door.*
- 3. Staff recommends approval of the application since the patio and deck are appropriately designed, scaled and removable, and the door is located on an unobtrusive rear elevation. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, material and relationship to the rest of the site and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, and does not destroy significant architectural or site features of the house and lot.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

McCauley reported that there was a vast improvement since they saw this request last year. He felt the proposed location of the door was more appropriately located with the deck proposed to be stepped back slightly. He pointed out the difficult site with grade changes and that there was no other possible location for a deck than the one currently proposed. McCauley stated that the application meets the Standards and he was in favor of the request.

Stulberg concurred with the staff report and McCauley's report adding that during the site visit the grade change was very evident and it would not be possible to build anything further into the rear yard so the side deck would be appropriate.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Wayne Appleyard, Architect, 5150 Propect Hill, Grass Lake, was available to respond to the Commission's enquiries and spoke on behalf of the application.

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

A motion was made by Beeson, seconded by Bushkuhl, that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 812 West Washington Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a 12' x 18' deck on the east side of the house off the rear addition; install a new door and opening on the rear elevation of the main house block; and install a bluestone patio; as proposed. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating

Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for entrances and porches and building site, as well as the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to residential decks and patios.

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the presented application and discussed the matter.

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

Certificate of Appropriateness was granted.

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - White

E-2 [14-0021](#)

HDC13-227; 304 South Main St - New Storefront - MSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

This three-story brick Italianate commercial block dates to the 1890s and was originally the Koch & Haller Furniture Company. It has been remodeled twice: once after a major fire destroyed the Mack & Co Furniture Store in 1910, when the original single windows were replaced by the present bands of multiple windows, and again in 1976 when the roof was raised to accommodate the Downtown Racquet Club on the third floor (which has since been remodel into condominiums). In 1923 Schlanderer & Seyfried Jewelers moved into the storefront at 304 from its former location at 113 East Liberty, and Seyfried Jewelers occupied the storefront from 1931 to 2013.

The art deco storefront is clad in black spandrel glass and features aluminum trim and signage. The current storefront was installed after 1942 (see photo B in the application, which was taken in 1942) and before 1950-'51 (see photo C). Seyfrieds received an HDC Rehabilitation Award in 2010 for restoring their aluminum sign and replacing the spandrel glass following damage from a vehicle.

LOCATION:

The building is located on the southwest corner of South Main Street and West Liberty Street. This Main Street storefront is the third one south of the corner.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to alter the existing storefront by reconfiguring the display windows and pulling the entry door forward.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

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

Storefronts**Recommended:**

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

Not Recommended:

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

Using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy remaining character-defining features of the historic building.

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

Storefronts**Appropriate:**

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

Not Appropriate:

Removing or radically changing storefronts and their features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that the character is diminished.

*Signs**Appropriate:*

Installing signage that is subordinate to the overall building composition.

Not Appropriate:

Installing signs that are too large or that are made from a material that is incompatible with the historic building or district.

STAFF FINDINGS:

- 1. The applicant provided photographic evidence that the current storefront was installed after the period of significance for the Main Street Historic District, which is 1840-1941. A photo of the previous storefront (photo B in the application) includes a car with a WWII gas rationing sticker in the windshield that was issued in 1942 or later. The storefront is therefore a non-contributing resource, since it did not exist during the period of significance.*
- 2. The proposed changes to the storefront windows will provide greater display space and allow natural light into the store. The current design is specific to displaying small objects at chest height, which works well for jewelry but not so well for general merchandise. Since the proposed alterations to the non-contributing storefront will continue its art-deco spirit while facilitating a new use, staff believes the entry and display window modifications are appropriate and meet both sets of design guidelines for storefronts.*
- 3. The proposed flat signage is 14' wide with less than 3' tall pin-mounted letters, and is complementary to the storefront. The 3 ½' diameter projecting sign extends on two arms an additional 12" from the face of the building. Staff's opinion is that the design of the sign is appropriate, but that the sign itself is too large for secondary, pedestrian-oriented signage. Staff suggests that the sign be limited to 24" in diameter, similar to the 18" x 24" Rock Paper Scissors sign at 216 South Main or the 19" x 23" Pura Vida sign at 206 South Fourth Avenue. Staff has fashioned the suggested motion to include conditional approval based on a 24" sign.*
- 4. Staff believes the modifications to the storefront display windows and entry and the new signage as conditioned in the proposed motion meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

McCauley said he agreed with the staff report in that this store front is very iconic and the applicants are working to keep the existing storefront framework while making better use of the display windows. He felt the application is appropriate and meets the Standards.

Stulberg agreed with the comments made by McCauley and the staff report, adding that he spent some time gauging the compatibility of the storefronts along Main Street and felt the proposed request was compatible, such as the lower display windows and the proposed size of the signage.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Richard Mitchell, Mitchell and Mouat Architects, 113 S. Fourth Avenue, and Mark Messmore [tenant], 304 S. Main Street were present to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

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

A motion was made by Beeson, seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 304 South Main Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to alter the storefront windows, install a new door, and install two signs, on the condition that the projecting sign does not exceed 24" in diameter. The work as proposed is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2 and 9 and the guidelines for storefronts, as well as the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to storefronts and signs.

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the presented application and discussed the matter.

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

Certificate of Appropriateness was granted.

Yeas: 5 - Ramsburgh, McCauley, Chair Stulberg, Vice Chair Bushkuhl, and Secretary Beeson

Nays: 1 - Ross

Absent: 1 - White

E-4 [14-0023](#)

HDC13-231; 330 South Main St - Remove Addition, Add Fire Escape - MSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

The construction date of this two-story Italianate home is unknown, but it was the residence of Miss Laura and Miss Persis Willard in 1888 (at 80 South Main) They also sold "millinery and fancy goods" here. The Willards moved from 69 South Main across the street, where they had lived and worked the previous year. The house is constructed of brick, and features wide board trim under the eaves, dormers on the hipped attic roof, and a large bay window that is shown on the 1888 Sanborn map. A

one-story wood-framed addition is present on the rear of the house in that year, but it is smaller than the current rear addition.

LOCATION:

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

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to remove a rear addition that houses walk-in coolers; infill a rear first floor door opening with glass block; install a rear exterior stairway to the second floor apartment; install a door in a new second-floor opening; replace all of the second-floor non-original windows; and install a barrier-free ramp to the front door.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

(1) A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

(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):

Entrances and Porches

Recommended:

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

Not Recommended:

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

Windows

Not Recommended:

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

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

Doors

*Not Appropriate:
Installing a new door opening.*

Windows

*Not Appropriate:
Removing or radically changing a window that is important in defining the overall historic character of the property.*

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

Barrier Free Accommodations, Safety Codes, and Fire Escapes

*Appropriate:
When required, installing barrier free access ramps, stairways, and elevators that do not alter character-defining features of the building, keeping historic building materials intact, and that if removed in the future keep the historic building intact.*

When required, adding new stairways and elevators that do not alter existing facilities and spaces of the building.

STAFF FINDINGS:

- 1. The cooler enclosure on the back of the house is non-original and removing it is appropriate. The applicant clarified to staff that the window shown as new glass block on the first floor rear wall is currently a door opening to the cooler enclosure. Salvaged brick would be used to infill the lower 18" of the opening, and the remainder would be infilled with glass block. Since it is unknown what the wall looked like before the doorway was cut into it, staff believes this is an appropriate approach. If a photo or other record turns up later, the opening could be re-worked to become more historically accurate. In the meantime, the window will read as clearly non-original.*
- 2. The proposed rear stairway leads to a new door opening on the second-floor. A non-original interior stair that is awkwardly located in the center of the house is planned to be removed as part of the interior remodel. The exterior stair would become the primary entrance for the second-floor apartment. Staff feels that cutting a new entrance is inappropriate since there are two existing non-original doorways on the second floor. The applicant has indicated that he's willing to instead use the opening that is currently infilled with glass block, and will bring a model showing the same to the HDC meeting. The new stair and doorway are appropriate on this secondary elevation.*
- 3. Per the applicant, all of the second floor windows are modern replacements, and most have only been partially and incorrectly installed. They are proposed to be replaced with Andersen 400 series wood windows clad in Perma-Shield (a wood fiber and PVC composite, similar to fiberglass). The first floor windows are all or mostly from the period of significance, and are not proposed to be replaced.*
- 4. The concrete front stoop would be doubled in width to accommodate one step up on half and a 13' barrier-free ramp on the other half. This work is appropriate,*

unobtrusive, and in an area that is already paved.

5. Staff believes the work, as conditioned in the proposed motion below, is compatible with the existing structure, neighboring buildings, and the surrounding historic district, and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

McCauley said he agreed with the staff report but differed on the infill with glass block on the back of the house, adding that he doesn't recollect approval of glass block infill as long as he has been on the Commission. He felt the building had enough glass block already and hoped the applicant was open to changing that. He was otherwise in favor of the application and felt it met the Standards.

Stulberg commented that given the protruding window in the front of the building it does not permit an ADA ramp to be constructed parallel with the building which one is more accustomed to seeing.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Attila Huth, 719 Fifth Street, Ann Arbor, Contractor for the project, explained the project and was available to respond to the Commission's questions.

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

A motion was made by Bushkuhl, seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 330 South Main Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness to: remove a rear addition; infill a rear first floor door opening with two double hung windows and brick; install a rear exterior stairway to the second floor apartment; install a door to the stairway on the second floor on the condition that the existing glass blocked opening is used, not a new opening; replace all of the second floor non original windows; and install a barrier free ramp to the front door. The work as proposed and conditioned is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 1, 2, 9 and 10, and the guidelines for entrances and porches and windows, as well as the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to doors, windows, and barrier free accommodations.

(1) A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

(9) New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size,

scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the presented application and discussed the matter.

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

Certificate of Appropriateness was granted.

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - White

E-5 [14-0024](#)

HDC13-232; 332 South Main St - Reconfigure Roof, Add Roof-Deck - MSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

This one-story brick and stucco building features two front entrance doors flanking a picture window, all with decorative quoins, and originally had a flat roof and crenellated parapet (the crenellations have since been infilled but are still very visible). It first appears in Polk City Directories in 1934 as Joe's Snappy Service (listed as 334 S Main), possibly Ann Arbor's first fast-food hamburger joint. Snappy Joe's was a small regional chain, with restaurants in Jackson, Ypsilanti, and Owosso, and a branch at 306 South Division (now the site of Liberty Plaza).

LOCATION:

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

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to remove an awning; remove the pitched roof and rebuild as a flat roof; construct a roof deck and stair housing; and construct a secondary rear fire escape.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

(1) A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal

of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

(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):

New Additions

Recommended:

Placing new additions such as balconies and greenhouses on non-character-defining elevations and limiting their size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

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

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

Roofs

Appropriate: Retaining and maintaining original historic roofing materials, roof shape, dormers, cupolas, chimneys, and built-in or decorative gutters & downspouts.

Additions to Historic Commercial Structures

Appropriate:

Placing additions such as balconies on non character-defining elevations and limiting the number, size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

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

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

STAFF FINDINGS:

- 1. Removing the Middle Kingdom awning and reconfiguring the roof back to the original flat style is appropriate.*
- 2. The parapet wall is approximately 24" high around the front and first 60' of the sides of the building. Beyond that is a modern addition to the structure (basically a one-story rectangular box added onto the back). The roofdeck is proposed to go on this original part of the roof, while the addition has mechanical and other equipment that prevents it from being utilized. The proposed stair enclosure is set 60+ feet back from the front elevation, and has a sloped roof to minimize its height. Materials are not specified in the application. If appropriate materials are used, staff feels the minimal size and location of the stair enclosure are appropriate.*

3. A glass guardrail is shown inset 2' from the parapet around the front and sides of the roof, surrounding the proposed roof deck. Staff is concerned not so much about the guardrail being conspicuous as about people standing and sitting at tables on the roof. From the front elevation, staff suggests setting back the guardrail at least 12' from the parapet to minimize sight lines from pedestrians on both sides of South Main Street from looking up at people, tables, and other roof deck accoutrement. While the HDC can regulate items attached to the structure, like pergolas, it cannot regulate items sitting on top of the roof deck, like umbrellas or potted trees or propane heaters, which may be several feet taller than a person. By setting the roof deck back 12' to the same vertical plane as the bay window next door there is at least some visual consistency with the neighboring property. It is important to remember that if this roof deck is approved and constructed, it's a permanent change to a structure that would be more heavily used than a residential condo roof deck. It's also more visible because it is only a single story.

4. One of the drawings shows a "possible canopy" over the front door. No mention of this canopy is made elsewhere, nor are details such as dimensions or materials included. Because of its incompleteness, staff does not consider it a part of this application.

5. If the roof deck is approved, staff believes the rear emergency egress stair is appropriate. It is on a secondary elevation on a non-historic addition to the building, and is only visible from the alley and parking lot behind the building.

6. Pending an explanation of materials to be used for the stair enclosure, staff believes the work, as conditioned in the proposed motion below, is compatible with the existing structure, neighboring buildings, and the surrounding historic district, and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines. If that information is not adequately addressed at the meeting, staff suggests postponing the item to the February agenda.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

McCauley stated that he agreed with staff concerns on the proposed roof deck setback. He felt that the materials for the roof deck stairs should be conditions to where final approval would be granted by staff with the Commission's guidance. He felt that the proposed roof deck would enhance the building and was interested in hearing Commission discussion on the proposed roof deck wall setback.

Stulberg said he did not feel there would be an issue with having people on the rooftop associated with restaurant seating noting that he would be concerned with the structural elements. He compared the Palio rooftop seating which included a pergola as well as a kitchen vent.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Attila Huth, 719 Fifth Street, Ann Arbor, Contractor for the project, explained the project and was available to respond to the Commission's questions.

Craig Borum, 679 South Wagner Road, Ann Arbor, Engineer for the project, reviewed the project with the Commission.

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

A motion was made by Bushkuhl, Seconded by McCauley, that the

Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 332 South Main Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to: remove an awning; remove the pitched roof and rebuild as a flat roof; construct a roof deck and access stair as depicted by option A in the meeting handout dated January 9, 2014; and construct a secondary rear fire escape of wood; on the condition that the glass guardrail on the roof deck is set back at least 2' from the front parapet wall and at least 2' from the side parapet walls. As conditioned, the work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 1, 2, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for new additions, as well as the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to roofs and additions to historic commercial structures.

(1) A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the presented application and discussed the matter.

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

Certificate of Appropriateness was granted.

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - White

E-6 [14-0025](#)

HDC13-229; 315 Koch St - Two Story Rear Addition - OWSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

This one and a half story craftsman features a full width front porch clad in shingles

with tapered square columns, front and rear shed dormers, exposed rafter tails under the eaves, a brick chimney, wood clapboard siding on the first floor, and wood shingles on the second floor. Most of the original three-over-one double-hung windows are present. It first appears in the 1922 Polk City Directory as 315 John K. Avenue (which was changed to Koch Avenue in 1928) as the home of William F. Bethke, a painter. Edwin Bethke lived here until 1934, when he moved into the new house two doors east at 311 Koch Avenue. The home is still owned by the Bethke family. It has been converted into an up-and-down duplex with two front doors.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the south side of Koch Avenue, west of South First Street and east of Third Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to: construct a two-story rear addition to the house; infill one of two front doors with a window; install an egress window on the rear of the existing house; construct a two-car garage and extend an existing shared gravel driveway.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

(6) Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

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

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

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

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.

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.

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

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

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

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:

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

Retaining the historic relationship between buildings and the landscape.

Not Recommended:

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

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

Guidelines for All Additions

Appropriate:

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

Placing new walls in a different plane from the historic structure in a subordinate position to the historic fabric.

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

Limiting the size and scale of the addition in relationship to the historic building so that it does not diminish or visually overpower the building or the district. The addition's footprint should exceed neither half of the original building's footprint nor half of the original building's total floor area.

Not Appropriate:

Designing an addition that overpowers or dramatically alters the original building

through size or height.

Guidelines for Paved Areas

Appropriate:

On residential properties, retaining and maintaining existing historic driveways and curb cuts, including "two track" driveways and green space between the driveway and house.

Retaining and maintaining historic sidewalks, walkways, driveways, and patios/terraces.

Not Appropriate:

Installing driveways or parking areas that are too wide or large for the building site and are out of character for the district.

Guidelines for Residential Accessory Structures

Appropriate:

Maintaining and repairing historic barns, garages, sheds, trellises, and other accessory structures to match the historic materials and configuration.

Not Appropriate:

Introducing new structures or site features that are out of scale with the property or the district or are otherwise inappropriate.

Removing historic barns, garages, sheds, trellises, or other historic accessory structures.

STAFF FINDINGS:

- 1. The first floor of the addition is inset nine inches on the west wall, and a little over four feet at the corner on the east wall. The second floor is indented to the shed dormer walls, where a connection the width of that dormer runs south 4'10" then joins a wider hip-roofed second floor room that matches the width of the first floor below it. The two story addition is clad in hardi-plank.*
- 2. The addition features square and double-hung windows. The windows have interior applied muntins in four-pane or four-over-one patterns. Staff would prefer no muntins at all to further simplify the addition, but does not feel strongly enough to suggest conditioning the motion.*
- 3. Two basement egress windows are located in the southeast corner formed by the new basement and existing one. Both windows utilize the same well, which is a clever way to provide egress to two different rooms.*
- 4. Infilling one of the two front doors using siding salvaged from the rear of the house is appropriate. Installing a square wood window in that space is also appropriate, though it should not have three divided lights in order to distinguish it from the original windows on the house. Staff feels that even with matching window trim dimensions, the slightly unusual placement of the window right next to the front door will read as non-original if it does not have muntins.*
- 5. An existing small garage/shed located behind the house on the east side of the lot is not proposed to be altered or removed in this application. The shed is assumed to be a contributing structure because a structure of approximately the same size*

appears on 1931 Sanborn maps in this location. A concrete two-track driveway leads to the shed. This is a historic site feature and must be retained and maintained per the Design Guidelines.

6. A 20' x 22' two-car garage located behind the existing shed would be accessed via a shared gravel driveway along the west property line (between 315 and 317 Koch). This driveway was originally installed as a two-track on 317's property, and currently ends near the back of the houses. Staff is not opposed to extending the driveway since the existing shed is presumed to be contributing. If the shed is beyond repair, staff would recommend removing it and reorienting the new garage to access it from the existing driveway along the east property line. The design of the garage is simple, though large. Because the rear property line has a 12-15 foot concrete retaining wall, no neighbors to the rear will be impacted by the garage.

7. There was a discrepancy in the submitted drawings, which has since been corrected.

8. Staff believes the work generally meets the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines, and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

McCauley stated that he felt the design was good and meets the Standards, noting that he agrees with staff comments on the muntins and that the motion should reflect that they are not appropriate by our standards.

Stulberg concurred with comments from staff and McCauley, adding that he had concerns with the amount of square footage of the addition and the driveway being added to the backyard. During the site visit some of his concerns were mitigated by the proposed project and the neighboring project given the existing massive retaining wall with its height in the rear yard and the lack of other houses in the vicinity of this parcel.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Bradley Moore, 4844 Jackson Road, # 150, Ann Arbor, spoke on behalf of the owner and was available to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

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

A motion was made by Beeson, Seconded by Bushkuhl, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 315 Koch Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a two-story rear addition to the house; infill one of two front doors with a window; install an egress window on the rear of the existing house; construct a two-car garage and extend an existing shared driveway on the condition that the infill window has no muntins but otherwise matches the window on the west wall as proposed, and that the roof ridge of the addition does not exceed the height of the roof ridge of the original house. As conditioned, the work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for additions and building site; and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design

Guidelines for additions, paved areas, and residential accessory structures.

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the presented application and discussed the matter.

AMENDED MOTION:

A motion was made by Stulberg, Seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 315 Koch Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a two-story rear addition to the house; infill one of two front doors; install an egress window on the rear of the existing house; construct a two-car garage and extend an existing shared driveway on the conditions that no new windows have muntins, that the front door infill material is salvaged wood siding, and that the roof ridge of the addition does not exceed the height of the roof ridge of the original house. As conditioned, the work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for additions and building site; and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines for additions, paved areas, and residential accessory structures.

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

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

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

Certificate of Appropriateness was granted.

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - White

Vote on Original Motion:

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

Yeas: 0

Nays: 6 - Ramsburgh, McCauley, Chair Stulberg, Vice Chair Bushkuhl, Secretary Beeson, and Ross

Absent: 1 - White

E-7 [14-0026](#)

HDC13-228; 317 Koch St - Two Story Rear Addition - OWSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

This one and a half story colonial revival cottage features six over one double-hung windows, no eave overhang, gable corner returns, and wood shingle siding. It first appears in the 1931 Polk City Directory as the home of Emil D. Bethke, an employee of Michigan Bell Telephone. Emil C. Bethke (presumably Emil's son) lived in the house until at least 1960. The house is still owned by members of the Bethke family.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the south side of Koch Avenue, west of South First Street and east of Third Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace the west basement wall and install three egress windows and two wells; construct a two-story rear addition; extend the existing gravel driveway; and construct a two-car garage.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

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

historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

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

Additions

Recommended:

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

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.

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

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

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

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:

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

Retaining the historic relationship between buildings and the landscape.

Not Recommended:

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

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

Guidelines for All Additions

Appropriate:

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

Placing new walls in a different plane from the historic structure in a subordinate position to the historic fabric.

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

Limiting the size and scale of the addition in relationship to the historic building so that it does not diminish or visually overpower the building or the district. The addition's footprint should exceed neither half of the original building's footprint nor half of the original building's total floor area.

Not Appropriate:

Designing an addition that overpowers or dramatically alters the original building through size or height.

Designing a new addition so that the size and scale in relation to the historic property are out of proportion.

Guidelines for Paved Areas

Appropriate:

On residential properties, retaining and maintaining existing historic driveways and curb cuts, including "two track" driveways and green space between the driveway and house.

Retaining and maintaining historic sidewalks, walkways, driveways, and patios/terraces.

Not Appropriate:

Installing driveways or parking areas that are too wide or large for the building site and are out of character for the district.

Guidelines for Residential Accessory Structures

Appropriate:

Maintaining and repairing historic barns, garages, sheds, trellises, and other accessory structures to match the historic materials and configuration.

Not Appropriate:

Introducing new structures or site features that are out of scale with the property or the district or are otherwise inappropriate.

Removing historic barns, garages, sheds, trellises, or other historic accessory structures.

STAFF FINDINGS:

- 1. The applicant seeks permission to construct a two story rear addition on a one-and-a-half story house. The location on the back of the house is appropriate, as is the use of hardie board cladding and trim.*
- 2. The proposed addition is approximately 6' higher than the ridge of the existing house. This dramatically alters the appearance of the house and is very conspicuous. Since the lot next door to the west has no house, this addition will be particularly visible from the street and sidewalk, and is a dramatic alteration from the existing that is out of proportion with the historic house. Possible remedies include utilizing existing unused second floor space in the rear of the house by installing shed dormers, or constructing a single-story addition off the rear of the house.*

3. A new 20' x 22' two-car garage would be accessed via a shared gravel driveway along the east property line (between 315 and 317 Koch). This driveway was originally installed as a two-track on 317's property, and currently ends near the back of the houses. The design of the garage is simple, though large. Because the rear property line has a 12-15 foot concrete retaining wall, no neighbors to the rear will be impacted by the garage. There is an existing garage previously used by this house on the lot to the west, but that lot was not included in the sale of the house.

4. A large area well on the west elevation would encompass two new egress windows. The existing basement is around 800 square feet, and the inclusion of an egress window is appropriate. The size of the well is excessive, however, and staff recommends installing one well and one egress window on the southernmost of the two existing basement windows.

5. Staff believes that the proposed work does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation, or the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines for the reasons stated in the Staff Findings above.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

McCauley said he agreed with the staff report, and was wondering if there were other ways of adding on more livable areas such as shed dormers to the existing structure, without raising the ridge line above the existing line. He pointed out that the proposed application did not meet our Standards and he was not in favor of it.

Stuberger agreed with comments made on the application by staff and McCauley. He said during the site visit he noted that when moving further west along Koch Street, you go up the hill, and each house along the hill has quite a significant view of the houses down from them, and the proposed addition would definitely stand out and overpower the existing structure.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Bradley Moore, 4844 Jackson Road, # 150, Ann Arbor, spoke on behalf of the owner and was available to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

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

A motion was made by Ramsburgh, Seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 317 Koch Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to replace the west basement wall and install three egress windows and two wells, construct a two-story rear addition, extend the existing gravel driveway, and construct a two-car garage, as proposed. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for additions and building site; and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines for additions, paved areas, and residential accessory structures.

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that

characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the presented application and discussed the matter.

The Commission determined that the proposed addition is too tall in comparison to the contributing historic structure and overpowers the original house. The size and scale as proposed in the application are out of proportion and dramatically alter the building. The application may be corrected by designing a smaller addition that does not compete with and distract from the historic structure.

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

Certificate of Appropriateness was Denied.

Yeas: 0

Nays: 6 - Ramsburgh, McCauley, Chair Stulberg, Vice Chair Bushkuhl, Secretary Beeson, and Ross

Absent: 1 - White

F UNFINISHED BUSINESS

F-1 [14-0027](#) HDC13-213; 318 W Liberty St - Demo Carwash, Construct Condominiums - OWSHD

M E M O R A N D U M

*To: Historic District Commission
From: Jill Thacher, Historic Preservation Coordinator
Date: January 9, 2014
Re: Revised Application for 318 West Liberty Street*

Revisions have been received for the postponed application at 318 West Liberty Street. At the December 12, 2013 Historic District Commission meeting, various concerns were expressed by commissioners and staff about the building's size, placement, materials, and other elements of the project.

Revisions promised at the meeting have been made. The east elevation and the garage level are now clad in brick, and square windows on the third floor near the front have been replaced with more proportionate ones. The color palate for the boxed-out windows and the third floor cladding has been reduced from three colors to two.

The building has been shifted 4 ½' closer to the rear property line, and shortened another 4 ½', setting the building 9' farther from West Liberty than the previous application and providing some lawn next to the sidewalk. This is a good start, but is still considerably short of the setback and alignment pattern seen on neighboring historic properties. In order to maintain the existing spacing of front yard setbacks along the block as seen from the street and avoid destroying historic relationships, the front of the building should be pulled back at least another 10' to 37'. This is not as far back as the Brehme house next door (43'), but is consistent with the next two houses to the west (37' and 38', measured to the house not the porch). As further evidence of the need to follow the historic setback pattern, the addition to the church on the corner (420 West Liberty) has a 25' front setback, and the result is too much mass set in front of the Queen Anne house at 408 West Liberty, despite the addition being only a single story.

Three light posts have been added along the West Liberty sidewalk. These lights are not in keeping with the residential character of the block, and should not be approved.

As a more general comment, staff has some reservations about the organic waterfall design of the front yard landscaping. A simple walkway with a lawn might better respect the neighborhood character, or possibly a more symmetrical retaining wall or walls parallel to the West Liberty sidewalk.

The original staff report is attached, and the standards and guidelines still apply. Staff's opinion is that the revised project does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines for the reasons described above.

December 12, 2013 Staff Report:

BACKGROUND:

The Liberty Car Wash was constructed in 1966 and replaced a 1 ½ story wood framed house that occupied the site until at least 1960 (per 1925 and 1971 Sanborn Maps and the 1960 Polk Directory).

LOCATION:

The building is located on the north side of West Liberty Street, between South First Street and Second Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to demolish a non-contributing car wash and construct a four story, eight unit condominium building with parking underneath.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

(1) A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

(2) The historic character of a property 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.

(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):

District/Neighborhood

Not Recommended:

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

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

All New Construction

Appropriate:

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

Designing new features so they are compatible with the historic character of the site, district, and neighborhood.

Basing the site location of new buildings on existing district setbacks, orientation, spacing and distance between adjacent buildings.

Designing new sidewalks, entrances, steps, porches and canopies to be consistent with the historic rhythm established in the district.

Designing new buildings to be compatible with, but discernible from, surrounding buildings that contribute to the overall character of the historic district in terms of height, form, size, scale, massing, proportions, and roof shape.

Not Appropriate:

Introducing new construction onto a site or in a district, which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, and texture or which destroys relationships on the site or the district

New Construction in Historic Residential Settings

Appropriate:

Maintaining the existing spacing of front and side yard setbacks along a block as seen from the street.

Orienting the front of a house towards the street and clearly identifying the front door.

Designing a new front façade that is similar in scale and proportion to surrounding buildings that contribute to the overall character of the historic district.

Designing the spacing, placement, scale, orientation, proportion, pattern and size of window and door openings in new buildings to be compatible with surrounding historic buildings.

Selecting materials and finishes that are compatible with historic materials and finishes found in surrounding buildings that contribute to their historic character.

Not Appropriate:

Paving a high percentage of a front yard area or otherwise disrupting the landscape pattern within front yard setbacks

Placing a structure outside of the existing pattern of front yard setbacks along a historic residential block

New Construction in Historic Commercial Settings

New construction should be compatible with the context of its surrounding historic district.

Maintaining the setback and alignment pattern seen on surrounding historic properties should take precedence over the setback and alignment pattern of any surrounding properties that are not historic.

Alternative building orientations should generally not be considered for new construction in historic districts.

Building massing should fit with existing historic patterns.

Buildings should not be immense in scale or greatly contrast with the existing scale on the block or in the surrounding historic district.

STAFF FINDINGS:

- 1. This site has high visibility, is located on a block of very significant historic residential structures constructed between 1860 and 1891, and serves as a gateway to the Old West Side Historic District and neighborhood.*
- 2. The south (front), north, and west elevations are primarily clad in brick on the first and second floors, with popped-out vertical window panels clad in smooth cementitious panel board (like Hardi-panel). The east elevation, over the parking garages, is clad all in panel board, as are all of the third and fourth floors. The use of brick is appropriate in this location near Liberty Lofts and historic brick structures along the railroad corridor. The east elevation should also be clad in brick since it is entirely visible from the street and from the West Liberty approach from downtown. Using brick or a darker stone veneer on the foundation may minimize the floating appearance caused by using lighter stone veneer on the garage face.*
- 3. General staff comments about the design: the combination of horizontal and vertical bands of different colors and materials is visually confusing. If the building is indeed trying to pay homage to industrial buildings along the railroad corridor, staff's opinion is that it should be clad entirely in brick, or at least on the front and sides. The small square windows on the third floor's southwest corner are out of character with the fenestration pattern of the building and add to the visual jumble.*
- 4. The height and width of the building are appropriate for the site and neighborhood. Pushing back the fourth floor sunrooms from the front and rear*

elevations helps minimize the height of the building. The third floor roof height is comparable to that of the Brehm House at 326 West Liberty (the Moveable Feast building) next door. Infilling the west edge of the property to match the grade next door and placing the garages on the taller east side is appropriate given the historic residential character of properties to the west and the industrial nature of properties to the east.

5. Staff's biggest concern is about the historic relationships of buildings on this block. The existing carwash (and the house that preceded it) has a front yard setback similar to the three historic homes to the west. The proposed design pushes the front of the condo about 30' in front of this historically established setback line, which is measured perpendicular to Liberty Street. The illustrations on the next page show the established front setback on a 2010 aerial photo, an aerial showing the building superimposed, and a site drawing of the proposed building footprint. The latter two are from the application attachments.

Both the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines directly address historic relationships between buildings, and established setbacks and alignment patterns. The front of the building needs to be moved back significantly to follow the existing pattern of front yard setbacks.

When walking or driving west on West Liberty from downtown, the Brehm House next door would be completely obscured by this building, and the front porch wouldn't be visible, until passersby are directly in front of the new condo building. By following the established front setbacks, the Brehm House will still be mostly obscured, but the front elevation will remain visible from points much farther to the east.

6. Modifications are necessary to the materials, design, and placement of the structure before it will meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

McCauley said visiting the site was very helpful to him. He said he liked the toning down of some of the colors from the previous application as well as the addition of brick to the structure. He said he felt it was using the wrong inspiration; it looks like a commercial building rather than a residential building and the setbacks are still not acceptable. He noted that the commercial buildings in the area are more subdued than this proposed building. He felt there are better ways of achieving dense residential housing on this site than through the proposed application. He expressed that moving the building to the other side of the lot might be helpful, but he felt the changes don't go far enough and he was more opposed to the project now, after having visited the site, than he was earlier, noting that he would not be supporting the project.

Stulberg stated that he did a second site visit and spent additional time reviewing the area. He pointed out that he had lived in the area for several years and was very familiar with the blocks along the street. He said the proposed building is the wrong design for this residential site and he is more convinced now of the views of the site and the inappropriateness of the proposed project. He said he would not be supporting the project as it did not meet the Standards.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Bradley Moore, Architect, spoke on behalf of the application and was available to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

Alex De Parry, Fifth Avenue Limited Partnership, Applicant, explained the project and was available to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

Christine Brummer, 326 Mulholland Avenue, Ann Arbor, Old West Side Association President, explained the Old West Side district and the difficulties involved with this transitional parcel that is located on the edge of the district. She encouraged the Commission to view the proposed project as a transitional parcel of the district.

Barbara Murphy, 507 Second Street, Ann Arbor, Old West Side Association Vice President, requested that the Commission take into consideration the residential needs of the Old West Side district and Ann Arbor as well as the constraints placed on the developer by the existing lot.

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

A motion was made by McCauley, Seconded by Beeson, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for 318 West Liberty Street, to demolish a non-contributing car wash and construct an eight-unit condominium building, as proposed. The work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the neighborhood and the surrounding area and meets 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 District/Neighborhood, and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, in particular the guidelines for new construction.

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

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

The members of the Commission took into consideration the presented application and discussed the matter.

The Commission determined that the proposed building massing does not fit with existing historic patterns and should be pulled back farther from the front of the site, and that the building is visually incompatible with the character of the neighborhood. Concern by the Commission was expressed over the front of the building not being parallel to West Liberty Street, the design of the highly visible east elevation, and the building's relationship to neighboring historic structures, as well as other concerns.

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

Certificate of Appropriateness was Denied.

Yeas: 2 - Vice Chair Bushkuhl, and Secretary Beeson

Nays: 4 - Ramsburgh, McCauley, Chair Stulberg, and Ross

Absent: 1 - White

G NEW BUSINESS

H APPROVAL OF MINUTES

H-1 [13-1534](#) Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes of December 12, 2013

A motion was made that the Minutes be Approved by the Commission and forwarded to the City Council. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

I REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

J ASSIGNMENTS

J-1 **Review Committee: Monday, February 10, 2014, at Noon for the February 13, 2014 Regular Meeting**

Commissioners Ramsburgh and Beeson volunteered for the February Review Committee with McCauley as alternate volunteer.

K REPORTS FROM STAFF

[13-1535](#) December 2013 HDC Staff Activities

Received and Filed

L CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS

The Commission discussed potential HDC Retreat topics. They expressed March as being a good month for everyone.

Thacher asked for suggestions for locations.

The Commission suggested the First Floor Conference Room of City Hall.

Beeson asked about a sign and windows at 'Aventura' on East Washington Street. He asked if what was installed was actually what the Commission approved.

M COMMUNICATIONS

[13-1536](#) Various Communications to the HDC

Received and Filed

N ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 11:25 p.m.

Community Television Network Channel 16 live televised public meetings are also available to watch live online from CTN's website, www.a2gov.org/ctn, on "The Meeting Place" page (<http://www.a2gov.org/livemeetings>).

Live Web streaming is one more way, in addition to these listed below, to stay in touch with Ann Arbor City Council and board and commission actions and deliberations.

- *Video on Demand: Replay public meetings at your convenience online at www.a2gov.org/government/city_administration/communicationsoffice/ctn/Pages/Vid eoOnDemand.aspx*
- *Cable: Watch CTN Channel 16 public meeting programming via Comcast Cable channel 16.*

The complete record of this meeting is available in video format at www.a2gov.org/ctn, on "The Meeting Place" page (<http://www.a2gov.org/livemeetings>), or is available for a nominal fee by contacting CTN at (734) 794-6150.