



City of Ann Arbor
Formal Minutes
Historic District Commission

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

Thursday, October 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**

Jill Thacher called the roll.

Present: 7 - Robert White, Ellen Ramsburgh, Patrick McCauley, Thomas Stulberg, Benjamin L. Bushkuhl, John Beeson, and Jennifer Ross

C **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The Agenda was unanimously Approved as presented. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

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

E **HEARINGS**

E-1 **14-1472** HDC14-197; 228 Eighth Street - One Story Rear Addition - OWSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

This two-story gable fronter features corner returns on the gables and a full-width front porch enclosed by wood-sided half-walls. It first appears in the 1916 Polk City Directory as the home of William F. and Tema Esch. William was a laborer at Michigan Milling Company (dealers in grain, flour, feed, beans and field seeds) at 208 South First Street (now the Blind Pig).

LOCATION:

The site is located on the west side of Eighth Street, south of West

Washington and north of West Liberty. The lot backs up to Slauson Middle School.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to add a 120 square foot addition to the rear of the house, remove a window and replace two windows with French doors on a modern addition, relocate two historic second-floor rear windows to allow room for the new roof, and add a new window in a new opening on the north elevation of the original house block.

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.

Windows

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving windows – and their functional and decorative features – that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. Such features can include frames, sash, muntins, glazing, sills, heads, hoodmolds, paneled or decorated jambs and molding, and interior and exterior shutters and blinds.

Not Recommended:

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

Installing new windows, including frames, sash, and muntin configuration

that are incompatible with the building's historic appearance or obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features.

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.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The house currently has a modern sunroom addition off the back, and a wood deck that wraps around it. The proposed addition expands the sunroom by an additional 120 square feet. One non-original kitchen window on the rear of the house is proposed to be relocated to the rear of the new addition. The deck would remain off the back, though reduced in size proportionate to the new addition and the stairs swung around to face the garage instead of the backyard. The new back corner of the addition would be inset 18" from the corner of the original house. Two second-floor windows would need to be moved in order to accommodate the roofline of the new addition. Staff asked if another type of roof could be used, like a shed roof, to avoid moving these windows, but the applicant said the owner really wants to keep the

existing half-round window on the back of the sunroom. A shed roof would require the eave to be too low to accommodate this window. The addition would be clad in wood siding to match the house.

2. The addition will be nearly invisible from the street, except from a small area near the neighbor's house to the north if someone were peering down the driveway between the house and garage. What will be visible from that small area is a single story of wood siding with no windows.

3. The changes to the existing sunroom addition (removing a window and replacing two windows with French doors), are compatible with the house and proposed addition.

4. One small new casement window is proposed on the north elevation (along the driveway) near the back of the house. A new powder room is being created on the interior, and light and ventilation are desired. The window is differently proportioned than the rest of the windows on this elevation and therefore distinct. Staff believes this window is a minimal change to the original house and meets the guidelines for new window openings.

5. Staff feels the work is compatible with the rest of the building and the surrounding neighborhood, and finds that it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.

REVIEW COMMITTEES REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

Beeson reported that the extent of the proposed addition seems to be in scale with the rest of the neighborhood. He said the rest of the neighborhood is made up of similar looking houses and the addition would likely not affect the house much. He pointed out the second floor window did not match with what was shown on the north elevation drawings.

Beeson said the proposed addition is very small in footprint, especially since there is already a deck structure existing and would not be expanding the footprint of the existing structure, which he appreciated. He said it is a very minimal addition and very well designed, noting that adequate kitchens and bathrooms is something that is most often lacking in older homes in regards to modern amenities.

PUBLIC HEARING:

James Bevilacqua, 1311 West Huron Street, Ann Arbor, designer for the project, was present to explain the application and respond to the Commission's enquiries.

Margaret Warrick, 228 Eighth Street, Ann Arbor, owner, was also available to respond to questions.

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

A motion was made by McCauley, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 228 Eighth Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to add a 120 square foot addition to the rear of the house, remove a window and replace two windows with French doors on a modern sunroom addition, relocate two historic second-floor rear windows to allow room for the new roof, and add a new window in a new opening on the north elevation of the original house block, as proposed. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the house and the surrounding area and meets the City of Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines for additions, and 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, Building Site, and Windows.

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: 7 - White, Ramsburgh, McCauley, Chair Stulberg, Vice Chair Bushkuhl, Secretary Beeson, and Ross

Nays: 0

E-2 [14-1473](#)

HDC14-198; 544 Third Street - Replace Rear Enclosed Porch - OWSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

This 1 ¾ story vernacular gable-fronter has a few of the original four-over-four windows, but the house has changed significantly over time. It appears in the 1894 Polk City Directory as the home of Daniel T. Pierce, a cooper at Allmendinger & Schneider. Members of the Pierce family lived there until 1932. On the 1925 Sanborn map, the house had a one-story addition on the back, but that addition was gone on the 1931 Sanborn. Also between 1925 and 1931, an iron garage was built in the backyard. Sometime after 1971, a two-story side addition to the north and a one-story rear addition were constructed, and the porch was widened from half the width of the original house to full width.

LOCATION:

The property is located on the west side of Sixth St, one property south of West Liberty, and north of West Madison.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to remove a rear porch that is partially enclosed and replace it with an enclosed porch in a slightly larger footprint.

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.

(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:

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 inconspicuous side of a historic building; and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

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.

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

*Porches**Appropriate:*

Installing a new porch and entrance on secondary elevations may be appropriate if it does not diminish the building's architectural character and the design and materials are compatible with the building and the site.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. It is likely that the location of the door opening into the back wall of the house is original, though the existing porch would have been added with or after the post-1971 side addition. The porch has no character-defining features. It is partially enclosed with plywood walls, but lacks a door.

2. The porch would be rebuilt in a slightly larger footprint, and extended a little more than 2' to the south to connect to the one-story rear addition. There is currently a dead space between the porch and addition, and by tying the rooflines of the porch and addition together, drainage off the roof can be improved. The new porch would wrap around a brick chimney. The chimney looks modern from the photographs and is assumed to be another post-1971 addition. The new porch would have

one vinyl slider window that matches a nearby window on the one-story addition. Siding would be smooth 10" cementitious panels, installed to mimic the existing asbestos on the house. The homeowners might remove the asbestos someday, but until that time would like the porch to look similar to the current siding.

3. Porch skirting is not shown on the drawings, but the applicants emailed to staff that skirting would definitely be installed and that vertical slats are their first choice, with square lattice a second choice if the vertical slats are too expensive. Either would be appropriate.

4. This application proposes minimal changes while resulting in a usable mudroom for clean storage. The materials, design, and massing are compatible with the house and neighborhood, and meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines.

REVIEW COMMITTEES REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

Beeson reported that the application was looking at a non-original porch which was slapped together with plywood and paint. He said it was a strange corner space so they spoke a lot with the applicant about how the new roof might go in, noting some possible problems with draining away from the chimney. He said since the chimney is also non-original to the house there wouldn't be much of an impact there either. He reported that the footprint would also not be expanding the original structure, so it was quite straight forward.

Stulberg said he didn't have anything to add to the report.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Katherine Bradley, 544 Third Street, Ann Arbor, owner, was 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 Ramsburgh, Seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 544 Third Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to rebuild a rear porch and install either vertical slat or square lattice skirting, as proposed. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and

relationship to the house and the surrounding area and meets the City of Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, and 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 New Additions and District or Neighborhood Setting.

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: 7 - White, Ramsburgh, McCauley, Chair Stulberg, Vice Chair Bushkuhl, Secretary Beeson, and Ross

Nays: 0

E-3 [14-1474](#)

HDC14-199; 423 West Liberty Street - Replace Decking on Front Porch - OWSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

This two story wood frame house features a curving front porch supported by paired Doric columns along portions of the north and west elevations. This house first appears as a duplex in 1907 city directories. Edward W and Magdalena Staebler are listed as the occupants of 423 W Liberty, and Michael and Rosina Staebler are listed as the occupants of 425 W Liberty. In the 1910 City Directory, Edward is listed as the son of Michael, who together owned the M. Staebler and Son store on Washington Street.

In August of 2012, the HDC issued a certificate of appropriateness for a rear addition, new garage, and new decks. That work has been completed, and the duplex is now two condominium units.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the southeast corner of the intersection of West Liberty Street and Third Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks after-the-fact HDC approval to replace the wood decking on the open front porch with azec decking in the same width.

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):

Entrances and Porches

Recommended:

Repairing entrances and porches by reinforcing the historic materials.

Repair will also generally include the limited replacement in kind--or with compatible substitute material--of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of repeated features where there are surviving prototypes such as balustrades, cornices, entablatures, columns, sidelights, and stairs.

Not Recommended:

Using a substitute material for the replacement parts that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the entrance and porch or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

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

Porches

Appropriate:

Repairing and maintain all porches and not allowing them to deteriorate. Repairs which match the original in scale, material, and design are not considered changes.

Using replacement features that match the documented historic design.

Not Appropriate:

Using decking as a flooring material that does not have a closed butt joint.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *The owner of this condominium replaced only the front porch decking (the guardrails, posts, and stairs were reused) on this un-roofed porch because of safety concerns about the condition of the deck boards. No building permit or HDC applications were submitted before construction was undertaken. The deck boards were previously wood, in traditional dimensions, with a closed butt joint, as found on most historic wood porches. Instead of using wood, the homeowner substituted azek in a width that matches the wood decking. A citizen who was walking by and saw the work being done called and reported the work to staff.*

2. *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines, and the City of Ann Arbor Design Guidelines are clear that matching the original material is the best course of action when undertaking repairs. The SOI Guidelines for entrances and porches also include in the recommendations "limited replacement in kind--or with compatible substitute material--of those extensively deteriorated...parts". The HDC must decide whether Azek is a compatible substitute material for this porch.*

3. *A covered front porch originally spanned the entire front of the house, across both units, though it did not wrap around the west corner as it does now. At some point after 1931 the roof over 423 was removed. Since the porch is not covered, staff understands the desirability of an artificial deck material that can withstand water. From the sidewalk, the Azek looks compatible. Up close, it unfortunately has a stamped woodgrain design, but that's not apparent until you're standing on it. Because of the unique circumstances of this unroofed front porch, staff believes that the Azek installed is a compatible material. In the event that the porch roof is ever reconstructed, the decking should be returned to wood.*

REVIEW COMMITTEES REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

Beeson said the added thickness of the decking was the first thing he

noticed and the smooth side out versus rough side out when he looked closer, as were the joints between the boards, especially in contrast to the porch next door that had a fairly smooth surface, likely due to many years of paint. He said he could tell from the sidewalk that the material was not original, particularly the thickness and texture.

Stulberg said he also noticed the front of the deck as seen from the sidewalk, looking at the cut edge, which he felt was quite noticeable as a different material. He said this is a reminder to everyone to remember to pull permits, stating that there are not only governmental regulations for pulling permits but the advice of the experience from our Building and Planning Department staff. He said in this situation the Commission will have to make a decision on the material because permits were not pulled before the work was completed.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Peter Hamp, 423 West Liberty, owner, was 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 McCauley, Seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 423 West Liberty Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to replace the wood decking on the open front porch with Azec decking in the same width, as proposed. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the house and the surrounding area and meets the City of Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines for porches, and 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 Entrances and Porches.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

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

McCauley said he reluctantly supported the 'after-the-fact' work on the porch because he wasn't sure what feasible solution was available for the porch at this point.

Beeson said there were other wood alternatives, such as tropical woods in tongue and groove that would need to be painted, but he wasn't sure

paint would hold onto the surface under the exposed conditions of an open porch.

Bushkuhl said there were a few Trex products but he believed they were even thicker and would be even harder to try to match up.

Stulberg explained that it was not the Commission's duty to explore what other comparable materials and products would be acceptable for this project, adding that it might be appropriate for the Commission to research the topic for future applications and situation, but since the applicant used a licensed contractor who knew better, and should have pulled a permit, the questions being raised could have been addressed at that time. He said he feels the opportunity was unfortunately lost and he feels the current project stands out as highly visible as non-original material and he couldn't support the application. He said he felt there were building code issues as well, noting that there was a lot of sag on the new material and considered if someone might break through the current material. He said they might need to beef up the sub-structure to support the current material, which would be a Building Department call, and didn't happen because permits were not pulled. He said even with the concerns over possible black mold, he didn't feel it was such an emergency that they could have waited through the week-end and could have applied for permits on the Monday. He said if the applicant bought the home a year earlier he should have been aware of the insecurities involving the front porch so he said he wasn't feeling the urgency over how the situation has gone and how permits were not pulled in an appropriate manner, and could therefore not support the project.

White said he agreed with Stulberg and understood what he was saying but he looked at the current situation that the City inspectors would inspect the porch and have him correct any safety items that might be a problem, which would then make it a safe porch. He said because it is uncovered and different wood materials are likely not going to wear well, he reluctantly supported the application, noting the applicant's concerns over liabilities with users possibly falling through the porch and someone getting hurt. He said he was looking at future options available to the applicant if the Commission denied or approved the application.

Bushkuhl said he agreed with White on the City inspecting the porch to determine the safety issue, load requirements and spanning manner. He said to have the applicant have to rip it off in a punitive way is not something he would agree with. He said he wasn't sure if there were other materials that were better than what had been used, adding that he was familiar with the Azak material and that it would hold up well and over time could begin to dull and fade, which would help the look in that it wouldn't stick out as modern and new. He said the first step to realize

is the importance of pulling building permits, which the licensed builder would have known.

Stulberg said a licensed builder would have known that it was part of his responsibility to pull permits and the homeowner would have recourse with the licensed builder.

Ramsburgh said in neighborhoods where they are trying to abide by the guidelines and rules that the Historic District Commission uses and in cases of high visibility infractions, it impacts everybody who is trying to do the right thing. She asked if there was any other material that could be put down if the Commission did not approve this particular porch.

Beeson said that there probably was, but agreed with Stulberg that it was not in the Commission's purview to do that research, but really up to the applicant. He said if there would have been an application beforehand, the Commission could have researched the alternatives and made suggestions to the applicant. He said the Commission has to look at the material and determine if it is a compatible material and the texture and thickness tell him it is not. He said if the Building Official determines that the sub-material structure isn't adequate the applicant will have to tear the decking off to take corrective measures. He said if the applicant would have come before the Commission before the work was done he would have been more amenable to looking at alternatives but since there was a licensed contractor who didn't think about the steps he was more likely to lean towards starting the process over and getting it right.

Ramsburgh said an interesting thing about this house is that there was extensive renovation work done just recently and she was surprised that the porch was not in good condition when it was purchased.

McCauley said the material is not an ideal material to meet the Commission's standards yet and he would like to know if there is another alternative material available.

A motion was made by White, seconded by Vice Chair Bushkuhl, that the Resolution/Public Hearing be Postponed. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion failed.

Vote: 2-5

Yeas: 2 - White, and Vice Chair Bushkuhl

Nays: 5 - Ramsburgh, McCauley, Chair Stulberg, Secretary Beeson, and Ross

VOTE ON MAIN MOTION:

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

Vote: 3-4

Application Denied

E-4 [14-1475](#)

HDC14-207; 301 South Main Street- Bay Storefront Window Replacement - MSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

Henry Binder tore down his home to build this three-story brick commercial building, which was completed in 1871. It was then in the Italianate style with elaborate carved window hoods and a bracketed cornice. The Binder family and its eleven children lived on the second floor, and Binder's Orchestrion Hall (a saloon with a large mechanical instrument) was located on the third floor. In 1877, S. and J. Baumgartner's Bakery and Grocery was located on the first floor, which was replaced by the Ann Arbor Organ Company in 1892.

A 1908 remodeling kept the same floor height and window openings (except for the three bay windows) but changed all the details to the more fashionable Roman style for the German-American Bank. From 1916 to 1986 Hutzel's Ladies Apparel occupied the main floor. In 1990 the Selo-Sheval gallery purchased the building, which they sold to the current owner in March of 2014.

The windows on the second and third floors were replaced in 1994 with vinyl windows (though the star transoms are applied wood), with the HDC's approval. Records of the dimensions of the original windows are on file.

The applicant applied previously in 2014 for several alterations to the building including storefront reconstruction, new windows, sign refurbishments, skylights, changes to the building entrances, and a roofdeck.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the southeast corner of South Main Street and East Liberty Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace three bay windows on

East Liberty Street and the South Main storefront with a new aluminum window system.

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.

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

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

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

Storefronts

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving storefronts--and their functional and decorative features--that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as display windows, signs, doors, transoms, kick plates, corner posts, and entablatures. The removal of inappropriate, non-historic cladding, false mansard roofs, and other later alterations can help reveal the historic character of a storefront.

Not Recommended:

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

Using substitute material for the replacement parts that does not convey the same visual appearance as the surviving parts of the storefront or

that is physically or chemically incompatible.

From the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines:

Storefronts

Appropriate:

Repairing storefronts as needed, which may include replacing parts that are deteriorated beyond repair or that are missing with matching or compatible substitute materials. Missing parts must be appropriately documented.

Not Appropriate:

Installing a new storefront that is incompatible in size and material with the historic building and district.

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.

STAFF FINDINGS:

- 1. The property received a certificate of appropriateness earlier in the year to replace three bay display windows and the storefront windows facing South Main Street. The windows were considered deteriorated beyond repair. The steel replica replacement window frames that were approved have proven to be too expensive, so this is a new application proposing an aluminum window system.*
- 2. The existing steel window frames are wrapped in copper with approximately a 1 ½" reveal on the street-facing side. The aluminum system has a 1 ¾" reveal on the street-facing side, though the frames are much deeper (4 ½") to support two panes of heavier glass.*
- 3. Staff will request information on the cost to install the steel system vs. the aluminum one from the applicant, who can elaborate at the meeting on the options they've considered and had to reject.*

REVIEW COMMITTEES REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

Beeson reported that the applicant is now proposing an aluminum storefront in lieu of the steel windows. He said it is basically wood framed on the bottom and top and has copper cladding which is a really

nice profile. He said then there are some window stops that have some really nice cove to them. He said he felt they are a very character defining feature of the building and if they were to determine that they were in the period of significance it will be a tough discussion. He said the windows are definitely in bad shape along the sills and they do need some work, like the copper flashing on top needs to be re-bent. He noted that they were put together with nails [metal on top of metal], which is the wrong way to do it; they are now done with rivets with different sealants behind them for protection which hold them together much better. He said he really liked the corners of the window, the steel parts that were really elegant and sweet the way the glass molded into them. He said there is some 2x4 stud work, the window framing in front of that with the copper cladding, which is where they propose to put the aluminum storefront system in place of that and cutting into the sill.

Stulberg added there is definitely a lot of damage and the applicant needs to do something to the windows. He said it is evident that there is a lot of architectural appeal to the windows and while there are parts of the window being saved there are also parts proposed not to be saved and those parts have character defining features. He said the new windows of the Cherry Republic nearby are very boxy looking.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Sam Kafaei, KBG Kafaei Building Group, 8132 Creek Bend Drive, Ypsilanti, MI, was 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 Bushkuhl, Seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 301 S Main Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to replace three bay windows on East Liberty Street and the South Main storefront with a new aluminum window system, on the condition that the architect generates a plan, and the plan is followed, to retain the horizontal painted wood and copper trim above and below the window assembly. If feasible, the assemblies on East Liberty Street will maintain their two-pane configuration and all aluminum framing will be as narrow and shallow as feasible. The plan will be reviewed and approved by a majority of the executive officers of the Historic District Commission. The work as proposed and conditioned is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the house and the surrounding area and meets the City of Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for

Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 1, 2, 5, and 6, and the guidelines for Storefronts.

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 amended motion carried.

Certificate of Appropriateness was Granted.

Yeas: 7 - White, Ramsburgh, McCauley, Chair Stulberg, Vice Chair Bushkuhl, Secretary Beeson, and Ross

Nays: 0

F UNFINISHED BUSINESS

G NEW BUSINESS

H APPROVAL OF MINUTES

14-1476 Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes of September 11, 2014

The minutes were unanimously approved by the Board. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

I REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

J ASSIGNMENTS

Review Committee: Monday, November 10, 2014, at noon for the November 13, 2014 Regular Meeting

Commissioners Ramsburgh and Stulberg, with Beeson as alternate, volunteered for the November Review Committee.

Commissioners White and McCauley volunteered for the Nominating Committee in preparation for the November 2014 Election of Officers.

K REPORTS FROM STAFF

14-1477 September 2014 HDC Staff Activities

The Commission thanked Jill Thacher for her outstanding and excellent work on Historic District reviews and permits and for managing the high volume of applications received by the department this year. They commented that the Planning Department should hire additional staff to help assist with the workload.

Received and Filed

L **CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS**

McCauley commented that there is ongoing refurbishment work being done on the Anson Brown Building [the oldest Commercial building in Ann Arbor] in the Lower Town area at 1001 Broadway Street.

Stulberg said he had spoken with the owner and was informed that they are rebuilding the parapet walls and will be re-installing them.

The Commission noted that the property was not in a historic district.

M **COMMUNICATIONS****14-1478** Various Communications to the HDC

Received and Filed

N **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 9:55 p.m. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Working Session Immediately Following Regular Meeting

Thomas Stulberg
Chairperson the Historic District Commission

Mia Gale
Recording Secretary

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/VideoOnDemand.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.