



**City of Ann Arbor**  
**Formal Minutes**  
**Historic District Commission**

301 E. Huron Street  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104  
[http://a2gov.legistar.com/  
Calendar.aspx](http://a2gov.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx)

---

Thursday, August 13, 2015

7:00 PM

Larcom City Hall, 301 E Huron St, Second floor,  
City Council Chambers

---

**A**      **CALL TO ORDER**

*Commissioner Beeson called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.*

**B**      **ROLL CALL**

*Jill Thacher called the roll.*

*Staff Present: Jill Thacher*

*Stulberg arrived at 7:06*

**Present:** 6 - Robert White, Ellen Ramsburgh, Thomas Stulberg, John Beeson, Jennifer Ross, and Evan Hall

**Absent:** 1 - Benjamin L. Bushkuhl

**C**      **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**The agenda was unanimously approved as presented.**

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

**E**      **HEARINGS**

**E-1**      **15-0992**      HDC15-122; 521 West Jefferson St - Driveway Pavement and Patio - OWSHD

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This vernacular Greek Revival house was built around 1870. Original owners were Andrew and Margaretha Gruner. The rear addition first appears on the 1899 Sanborn map. A front porch appears on the 1908 Sanborn map, but the current front porch is a later replacement. The*

*stairway to the basement appears on the 1916 map and a side porch on the 1925 map. That side porch was replaced or enlarged by an acrylic-enclosed three-season porch, which was in turn removed and replaced with an east side addition approved by the HDC in 2007. The west facade of the house was remodeled in the early 20th century with the addition of a bay window and replacement of the second floor windows. The current owner removed aluminum siding in 2007.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the southeast corner of West Jefferson Street and Fourth Street.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace an existing concrete and paver patio and concrete path with a new paver patio and path; replace a wood step and landing with a paver step and landing; enclose the patio area with a 6' cedar privacy fence (100% opaque in the rear yard and 80% opaque along the driveway); pipe two downspouts underground; and replace the existing asphalt driveway with a concrete two track driveway.*

**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.*

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

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

*Building Site*

*Recommended:*

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

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

*Not Recommended:*

*Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color and texture or which destroys historic relationships on the site.*

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

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

*Landscape Features**Appropriate:*

*Retaining and maintaining mature trees, hedges, and other historic plantings.*

*Not Appropriate:*

*Introducing any new building, streetscape, or landscape feature that is out of scale or otherwise inappropriate to the district's historic character.*

*STAFF FINDINGS*

- 1. The property owner is refreshing the outdoor living space between the house and garage on this corner lot by enlarging the patio and installing privacy fence. To offset the enlarged impervious surface created by the new patio, the asphalt driveway is proposed to be removed and replaced with a concrete two-track drive. The driveway leads to a modern garage.*
- 2. The privacy fence is wood, with 1 ½" spaces between boards for the portion along the driveway, and battens covering the spaces between boards along the south property line behind the house. These fences meet fence code requirements for height and opacity.*

3. *Staff recommends approval of the application. The work will result in outdoor space that is more usable while offsetting the increase in impervious surfaces. The proportions of the new driveway (3'4" tracks with 3' between) are larger than most historic two-track driveways, and the proposed driveway is not trying to look historic, but instead to allow more water to infiltrate. Staff believes the proposed work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding neighborhood and meets the Ann Arbor Historic District Guidelines for residential decks and patios and landscape features, and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 1, 2 and 10, and the guidelines for building site.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

*Commissioners Ross and Hall visited the site as part of their review.*

*Ross reported that she agreed with the staff report, noting that the driveway is in poor condition and needs to be replaced. She said the patio would not be visible from the right-of-way and the project was very small in scale. She said they had seen the proposed pavers and they seem appropriate adding that the project was nice.*

*Hall agreed with Ross as well as staff findings, noting that the two-track pavers for the driveway would be different than what is found at historical homes. He said the application was straight forward and appropriate.*

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

*James Egge, 521 W. Jefferson Street, Ann Arbor, owner, was present to respond to enquiries from the Commission.*

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

**Moved by Beeson, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 521 West Jefferson Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to: replace an existing concrete and paver patio and concrete path with a new paver patio and path; replace a wood step and landing with a paver step and landing; enclose the patio area with a 6' cedar privacy fence (100% opaque in the rear yard and 80% opaque along the driveway); pipe two downspouts underground; and replace the existing asphalt driveway with a**

concrete two track driveway. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding resources and meets the Ann Arbor Historic District Guidelines for landscape features, and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 1, 2, and 10, and the guidelines for building site.

*COMMISSION DISCUSSION:*

*No discussion.*

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

**Certificate of Appropriateness Granted.**

**Yeas:** 6 - White, Ramsburgh, Chair Stulberg, Secretary Beeson, Ross, and Hall

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Vice Chair Bushkuhl

**E-2**    [15-0993](#)    HDC15-125; 315-317 Koch Ave - Pave Shared Driveway - OWSHD

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

*BACKGROUND:*

*315 Koch is a one and a half story craftsman that 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. A rear addition and garage were approved by the HDC and constructed in 2013.*

*317 Koch is a one and a half story colonial revival cottage featuring 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 was owned by members of the Bethke family until 2013, when a rear addition and garage were approved and built.

*LOCATION:*

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

*APPLICATION:*

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to pave the shared driveway and turnaround area between 315 & 317 Koch Ave.*

*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.*

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

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

*Building Site*

*Recommended:*

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

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

*Not Recommended:*

*Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color and texture or which destroys historic relationships on the site.*

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

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

#### *Landscape Features*

##### *Appropriate:*

*Retaining and maintaining mature trees, hedges, and other historic plantings.*

##### *Not Appropriate:*

*Introducing any new building, streetscape, or landscape feature that is out of scale or otherwise inappropriate to the district's historic character.*

#### **STAFF FINDINGS**

- 1. Prior to 2013, 315 Koch used a second curb cut to access a parking space in front of the house along the east property line. That driveway leads to a contributing garage structure that isn't large enough to hold a modern car. There was also a driveway in the location of the proposed paved shared drive, but it ended at the back wall of the two houses. 317 Koch had a two-car garage and driveway on a separate lot to the west. That garage was demolished and a duplex is under construction on the lot.*
- 2. There is a shared driveway easement agreement for the two properties and the turn-around area leading to garages for each in the backyard. The driveway slopes down to the street, and the two property owners have been having problems with dirt and gravel washing out the driveway, mud puddles forming, and general dirt tracking and blowing into their homes. Snow removal is a problem in the winter because of the large size of the gravel, and the sloped part becomes slippery and difficult to navigate. No material is indicated for paving the easement area. Staff recommends concrete, and has included that in the suggested motion.*
- 3. Staff recommends approval of the application. The area to be paved*

*is already gravel, and there is no historic relationship between this driveway area and the two contributing houses and their garages. As such, the proposed work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding neighborhood and meets the Ann Arbor Historic District Guidelines for residential decks and patios and landscape features, and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 1, 2 and 10, and the guidelines for building site.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

*Commissioners Ross and Hall visited the site as part of their review.*

*Hall reported that he believed they would need to install some sort of drain as there was too much impervious surface to deal with. He said the application was straight forward and he didn't see any issues with the request.*

*Ross agreed with Hall and the staff report. She asked about the proposed paving material.*

*Thacher said the application was not clear on the proposed material, but she has recommended that the material be concrete.*

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

*Richard Yarmy, 317 Koch Ave, Ann Arbor, co-owner, was present to respond to enquires from the Commission.*

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

**Moved by Ramsburgh, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 315 & 317 Koch Ave., contributing properties in the Old West Side Historic District, to pave the shared driveway on the condition that the paving material is concrete. The proposed work as conditioned is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding resources and meets the Ann Arbor Historic District Guidelines for landscape features, and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 1, 2, and 10, and the guidelines for building site.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**



*The member 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 Granted.**

**Yeas:** 6 - White, Ramsburgh, Chair Stulberg, Secretary Beeson, Ross, and Hall

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Vice Chair Bushkuhl

**E-3**     [15-0994](#)     HDC15-137; 1429 Hill St - Remove Landmark Tree -- WHHD

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

**BACKGROUND:**

*The 1916 Sanborn map shows a 2 ½ story dwelling on the lot. This dwelling was in place until at least 1931. At some point between 1931 and 1971 the dwelling was replaced with the Beth-Israel Community Center, which was in turn replaced by the current Hillel building in 1987.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the north side of Hill Street between South Forest Avenue and Washtenaw Avenue.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to remove a landmark tree in order to construct an underground addition on the rear of the building.*

**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.*

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

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

*Building Site*

*Recommended:*

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

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

*Not Recommended:*

*Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color and texture or which destroys historic relationships on the site.*

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

*Landscape Features*

*Appropriate:*

*Retaining and maintaining mature trees, hedges, and other historic plantings.*

*Not Appropriate:*

*Removing mature trees, hedges, and other historic landscaping. Introducing a new landscape feature of plant material that is visually incompatible with the site or destroys site patterns or vistas.*

**STAFF FINDINGS**

1. *The underground addition does not require HDC review and approval. It is currently moving through the site plan process, and since a natural feature is impacted, must be approved by City Council. If the addition is constructed, planning staff will monitor the site to make sure the ground surface (predominantly lawn and patio) is returned to its current condition or better.*

2. *The underground addition will require the removal of one landmark tree, a 28" black oak. The site plan process would require that tree to be mitigated, in this case with four 3 ½" caliper northern red oaks. Three other landmark trees on the site will remain. Additional tree planting and landscaping will be required to bring the site plan up to current ordinance requirements. The exact placement of the new trees and landscaping is currently under review by the city's Natural Resources Coordinator. Historic preservation staff is involved in that process and does not feel that additional HDC review is necessary for landscaping around this non-contributing structure.*

3. *The removal of a historic landmark tree is not to be taken lightly. The nature of this underground addition, however, will mean the smallest possible impact an addition could have on the surrounding historic resources. That plus the tree's mitigation by the addition of four new oak trees leave staff in favor of the application. Staff believes the proposed work is generally compatible with the rest of the site and the surrounding neighborhood and meets the Ann Arbor Historic District Guidelines for landscape features, and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 1, 2 and 10, and the guidelines for building site.*

#### *REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:*

*Commissioners Ross and Hall visited the site as part of their review.*

*Ross reported that there was a potential for two other trees that could be lost on this site with this proposed project. She noted that one of those trees looked diseased.*

*Hall agreed that one of the trees was clearly sick and the impact of losing three trees on this site would be significant. He said there is a grove of tall trees on this site and all three of these noted trees are all visible from Washtenaw Avenue, above the sorority building.*

#### *PUBLIC HEARING:*

*Michael Van Goor, Van Goor Architecture, 1327 Jones Drive, Suite 106, Ann Arbor, applicant, was present to respond to enquiries from the Commission. He explained the health of the trees being discussed.*

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

**Moved by Beeson, seconded by White that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 1429 Hill St, a non contributing property in the Washtenaw/Hill Historic District, to remove a landmark tree in order to construct an underground addition on the rear of the building. The proposed work is generally compatible with the site and the surrounding neighborhood and meets the Ann Arbor Historic District Guidelines for landscape features, and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 1, 2 and 10, and the guidelines for building site.**

*COMMISSION DISCUSSION:*

*The member 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. Vote: 4-2**

**Certificate of Appropriateness Granted.**

**Yeas:** 4 - White, Chair Stulberg, Secretary Beeson, and Ross

**Nays:** 2 - Ramsburgh, and Hall

**Absent:** 1 - Vice Chair Bushkuhl

**E-4**     [15-0995](#)     HDC15-118; 211 E Ann St - New Storefront - MSHD

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This one-story masonry building was built in 1947 and the original occupant was the Symons Bros & Co. Wholesale Grocery. It appears as a motorcycle repair shop on the 1959-1971 Sanborn Map, and has had a variety of other occupants, including a pizza shop in 1971 and, most recently, a fitness studio. The building shares a lot with the 1836 building*

*next door at 201 East Ann Street, which was first occupied by the Bank of Washtenaw. This portion of the lot was vacant prior to this building's construction.*

**LOCATION:**

*The building is located on the north side of East Ann Street, east of N Fourth Avenue and West Liberty Street and west of the alley running north/south from East Ann Street and Catherine Street between North Fourth Avenue and North Fifth Avenue.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to alter the existing storefront by building up the front parapet, reconfiguring the display windows and recessing the entry door.*

**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.*

*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 concrete masonry unit building has a brick veneer on the front elevation, and very little other architectural detail. The building appears relatively unchanged from a 1971 file photo. It is a non-contributing structure.*
- 2. The proposed changes to the storefront will provide more light into the building and a code-compliant front door. The design is contemporary, though it uses classical elements. Staff does not believe that it will be mistaken for a historic storefront because of the proportions of the windows and door and the busyness of the design. Building the parapet 1'4" higher will give the building a little more presence on East Ann Street without negatively affecting the historic resources nearby.*

3. *Drawing SK-4 shows a new door on the west elevation leading to a proposed exterior seating area. Details are not provided, but if the door matches the design of the front door, staff is amenable to allowing more light and another way to exit the building. Staff would review and confirm this at the building permit application stage.*

4. *Staff believes the modifications to the storefront display windows and entries meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

*Commissioners Ross and Hall visited the site as part of their review.*

*Ross reported that the non-contributing building is very non-descript project. She agreed with the staff report with the proposed store front treatment and felt it was appropriate.*

*Hall agreed, noting that the non-descript building didn't detract from the historic resources in the area. He questioned the proposed design in that after the project is completed if it might then detract from the historic resources.*

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

*Michael Bruner, 539 S. First Street, Ann Arbor, applicant and architect, was present to respond to enquiries from the Commission.*

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

**Moved by Stulberg, seconded by White that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the portion of the application at 211 E Ann Street, a contributing property in the Fourth/Ann Historic District, to alter the storefront windows, install a new front door, install a new side door in a new opening, raise the front parapet, and install wood façade detailing, as proposed and clarified by discussion during the applicant's presentation. 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 and 9, and the guidelines for storefronts, as well as the**

**Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to storefronts.**

*COMMISSION DISCUSSION:*

*The member 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 Granted.**

**Yeas:** 6 - White, Ramsburgh, Chair Stulberg, Secretary Beeson, Ross, and Hall

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Vice Chair Bushkuhl

**E-5 [15-0996](#)**

HDC15-135; 609 W Huron St - One-Story Addition - OWSHD

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

*BACKGROUND:*

*This well-maintained gable-fronter, which features clapboard siding, double-hung windows, and a red-brick chimney, dates back to at least 1888-1889. It first appears in Polk City Directories occupied by driver Frederick Lutz. The Lutz family owned the house through 1933. There were two other long-term owners of the house: John Spetter from 1935 to 1942, and Homer Roebuck from 1947 to 1955.*

*In 1931 and earlier the house had a full-width front porch and a small single-story addition on the rear. Today there is a modern one-story addition that is about 10' deep across the full width of the back of the house, plus about eight extra feet to the west that was added in 2001.*

*LOCATION:*

*The site is located on the south side of West Huron Street, east of North Seventh Street and west of Third Street.*

*APPLICATION:*



*The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct a 7'0" x 26'1" addition to the side of the home. The addition will include a wheelchair accessible bathroom, laundry, and bedroom expansion.*

*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.*

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

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

*(10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction 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.*

*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.*

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. *The current homeowner has lived in the house for the last thirty years. She wants to stay in her house as long as possible, but has been afflicted with a medical condition that will require her to use a wheelchair. There is a ground floor bedroom (formerly the dining room) and bathroom in the house now, but both are extremely narrow and not conducive to adaptation for mobility aids like a wheelchair or walker. The homeowner desires to bump out the bedroom and bathroom walls on the east elevation by 7' in order to allow safe passage between them and also make space for a washer and dryer. The laundry is currently located in the basement.*

2. *Per the city assessor, the house is currently 1,600 square feet. From assessor and Sanborn records, staff estimates that the pre-1944 structure was around 1,310 square feet, including the rear addition that has since been replaced. That translates to 290 square feet of modern addition on the house, which is 22% of the original square footage.*

*Staff estimates that the original footprint was around 700 square feet. The existing footprint is 980 square feet, which means that additions are currently occupying 40% of the original footprint of the home.*

3. *The homeowner would like to build a seven foot wide, single-story addition on the east side elevation. The design references motifs from the historic structure (simplicity, siding) as well as the modern rear addition (metal roof, foundation). The preceding additions to the house have shed roofs, which would be repeated here. A pair of large double hung windows on the east elevation would be lost to the addition.*

4. *There is a 44" diameter silver maple tree in the backyard immediately behind the rear wall of the house. Any rear addition would at best harm and at worst require removal of this landmark tree.*

5. *Considering the appearance of the addition in terms of the surrounding historic district, it is low-key, compatible, and will blend in with minimal disruption to neighboring structures. While it's not entirely inconspicuous, it accomplishes a number of functions within a small additional footprint that does not overpower or dramatically alter the house.*

6. *Staff believes the work is sensitive to the house and neighborhood, preserves the large maple tree in the backyard, allows the house to be adapted to the particular needs of the homeowner, and 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 REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

*Commissioners Ross and Hall visited the site as part of their review.*

*Hall reported that he completely agrees with staff findings that the addition meshes well with the current addition which is well done, and the changes won't impact the maple tree and will allow the applicant to age in place. He supported the project.*

*Ross agreed with Hall adding that the addition wasn't conspicuous and would be subservient to the existing structure and was modest in scale. She said the proposed project was fitting for the site and would have a minimal impact on the neighborhood.*

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

*Steven Varnum, Meadowlark Builders, 3250 W. Liberty, Ann Arbor, applicant, was present to respond to enquiries from the Commission.*

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

**Moved by Hall, seconded by White that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 609 West Huron Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District,**

to construct an addition to the east side of the home, 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 1, 2, 5, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for additions and building site; and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines for additions.

*COMMISSION DISCUSSION:*

*The member 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 Granted.**

**Yeas:** 6 - White, Ramsburgh, Chair Stulberg, Secretary Beeson, Ross, and Hall

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Vice Chair Bushkuhl

**E-6**     [15-0997](#)     HDC15-136; 545 Sixth St - Two-Story Addition - OWSHD

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This gable-fronted, two-story vernacular house first appears around 1886 as the home of Christian Weidemann, a carpenter. The full-width front porch has turned posts, a simple balustrade and unique, pierced upper trim. The 1931 Sanborn map is the earliest version that reaches this block of Sixth Street. It shows a 1 ½ story house with a full-width front porch and a large one-story rear wing that wraps around the northeast corner.*

*A second story rear wing addition was approved by the HDC in 1993, and administrative approvals were given for a one-story addition in 1996 and a bedroom addition in 2000. In 2005 the HDC approved a two-story addition on the south side of the house.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the east side of Sixth Street, south of West Jefferson Street and north of West Madison Street.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct a two-story addition with a basement on the north side of the house, and to install three new windows and a new slider on the south elevation of the existing rear addition.*

**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):*

**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.*

*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:*

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

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

#### *Guidelines for All Additions*

*Appropriate:*

*Locating a required addition on the least character-defining elevation and keeping it subordinate in volume to the historic building.*

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

*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.*

*Designing the addition so it is compatible in terms of massing, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and proportion of openings.*

*Not Appropriate:*

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

*Additions to Historic Residential Structures*

*Not Appropriate:*

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

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

*1. The project architect and homeowners were unfortunately unaware of ordinance changes that were adopted by City Council in 2007, and of Design Guidelines that were adopted in 2012. The proposed design is therefore based on past rules and policies of the Historic District Commission that no longer apply. Staff was not aware of this pending application until the day it was submitted, at which time staff went through the drawings with the architect and advised him that it did not meet the current standards and guidelines and that staff's opinion was that it could not be approved by the HDC. Since the drawings had been completed and the plans were the culmination of a long-term plan for their home, the owners opted to submit the application for HDC review anyway.*

*2. The original house and its existing additions work well together, and the additions are complimentary to the historic home.*

*From the 1931 Sanborn map and assessor records, staff estimates that the house was about 1,020 square feet with a 684 square foot footprint at the end of the period of significance for the Old West Side Historic*



*District. Per assessor records, the house is currently 1,885 square feet, with a footprint of 1,045 square feet. The existing additional floor area is 85% of the original, and the existing additional footprint is 53% of the original.*

*This structure therefore already meets the maximum size recommended by the Design Guidelines, which states "The addition's footprint should exceed neither half of the original building's footprint nor half of the original building's total floor area".*

*The addition proposed in this application would add approximately 550 new square feet of floor area with a footprint of 305 square feet. It would enlarge the kitchen and family room on the first floor, and 245 square feet on the second floor would become a master bath and closets.*

*3. The roof ridge of the proposed two-story addition is a little more than two feet taller than the ridge of the current rear addition, and four feet taller than the ridge of the original house. The proposed addition extends the north side of the house an additional 12' beyond the original wall location. The new addition is out of proportion with the height and width of the historic structure, and is not subordinate to the historic structure or its existing additions.*

*4. The proposed new pair of double-hung windows near the front of the house on the south elevation do not meet the SOI guidelines for windows, which recommends installing additional windows on rear or other non-character-defining elevations.*

*5. The proposed work on the south elevation of the rear addition, to install three clad-wood windows and a sliding glass door, is appropriate. The work is on a modern section of the house and is hidden from view by the mudroom and the room above it. Staff believes that this work is appropriate and meets the standards and guidelines for additions.*

*6. Staff believes that with the exception of the new windows on the rear part of the south elevation, the proposed work does not meet the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines, or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and that that work should be denied.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

*Commissioners Ross and Hall visited the site as part of their review.*

*Ross reported that she agrees with the staff report. She said she had compared the neighboring houses that are similar to this house with the exception of the already large additions that extend onto this original house. She said the addition is just big and the massing isn't fitting and doesn't meet the standards.*

*Hall agreed and said while he feels for the applicant the proposed addition does not meet the standards they need to follow. He said he appreciated that staff had pointed out the items that do meet our standards and he would support those changes.*

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

*Cynthia Koch and Chris Gardner, 545 Sixth Street, Ann Arbor, applicants, were present to respond to enquiries from the Commission.*

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

**Moved by Ross, seconded by White that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the portion of the application at 545 Sixth Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a two story addition on the north side of the house and two windows in a new opening near the front of the house on the south elevation. As proposed, the work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, materials 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 additions and building site; and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines for additions.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

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

*Ramsburgh explained that while she felt the whole Commission felt for the homeowner she noted that the Commission's purview is to protect the historic resource and the guidelines are clear on additions to historic resources. She said houses like this that were built in the Old West Side were small and self-contained. She said the additions that have been done to the house manage not to overpower the house but she believed*

*any more additions that would be so visible would make them lose the house visibly by those additions. She said she can't support a project that goes against the guidelines.*

*Ross said she too felt sympathy for the applicant but expressed that the proposed project would not be in accordance with the design standards and to protect the footprint of the historic home.*

*Beeson suggested working session comments that might assist the applicant moving forward.*

*Stulberg noted the existing house already meets or exceeds the guidelines and any addition would be going beyond their guidelines.*

**On a voice vote, the vote was as follows, with the Chair declaring the motion denied. Vote: 0-6**

**Request Denied.**

**Yeas:** 0

**Nays:** 6 - White, Ramsburgh, Chair Stulberg, Secretary Beeson, Ross, and Hall

**Absent:** 1 - Vice Chair Bushkuhl

**E-7**     [15-0998](#)     HDC15-124     524 Third St - New Garage - OWSHD

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This outstanding example of a vernacular gable-fronter with Queen Anne and other influences dates to at least 1886, when it appears in the Polk City Directory as 64 Third Street, occupied by Mrs. Wilhelmina (Minnie) Miller, widow of Charles. It may have been built in 1878, when the Millers first appear on the block, but deed research would be necessary to pinpoint this. Charles was a shoemaker.*

*This house is in very close to its original massing and configuration. It features a full-width masonry front porch with square half-columns that was constructed between 1925 and 1931, corner eave returns, and a front door with sidelights and a transom. The front gable detailing includes patterned wood shingles, a decorative verge board, and tripartite window. The rear wing with its covered porch and turned columns shows up on the*

*1908 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (the first year this block was included on those maps).*

*Based on sanborn maps and aerial photos, the garage was not built during the period of significance for the Old West Side Historic District. There have been several different buildings in the same location, including a double-width structure in 1908, and a one-stall garage in 1925 and 1931 (all per Sanborn). In 1947, a one-car garage appears on aerial photos, and in 1960, a two-car garage that is probably the current one is visible.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the west side of Third Street, south of West Jefferson and north of West Madison.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to demolish a two-car garage and construct a new 1 ¼ story garage with stalls for 2 cars, a small workroom on the first floor of the garage, and a storage room above.*

**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 will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property will be unimpaired.*

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

### *Building Site*

#### *Recommended:*

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

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

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

#### *Not Recommended:*

*Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color and texture or which destroys historic relationships on the site.*

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

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

### *Residential Accessory Structures*

#### *Not Appropriate:*

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

### *Additions*

#### *Appropriate:*

*Locating an addition within a new detached accessory structure located to the rear of a primary historic structure.*

### *STAFF FINDINGS:*

- 1. The condition of the current two-car garage is very poor. There is no obvious proof, but it is possible that the north (right) half of the existing*

*garage was the one-car garage shown on Sanborn maps and the 1947 aerial photo. If that is the case, staff's opinion is that the garage has been altered beyond recognition of the original and therefore no longer retains its historic significance.*

*2. The design of the proposed garage is simple, with a front gable over two car stalls and a roof that is pitched to reflect and compliment the steep pitch of the house's rear wing. It is located in the same corner of the lot as the existing garage, but the new building would be pulled forward about 18' to accommodate both the larger footprint and some storage space behind the building. A sliding barn door and hoist beam on the upper story would facilitate storage of bulky items. The width and depth of this lot, and the placement of neighboring structures on their lots, makes the location appropriate.*

*3. The proposed garage is large – the footprint is 22' wide by 30' deep, plus a six foot roof overhang on the north side. The existing garage is about 20' by 20'. Staff feels the proposed large garage is justified for a number of reasons: most importantly, it preserves the integrity of the historic home by providing storage space without the need to attach an addition to the house. An addition would be very challenging because of character-defining features on the back of the house that would most likely prevent a second story on top of the rear wing.*

*4. Materials include 4" fiber-cement lap siding, insulated steel garage and person doors, double-hung and fixed vinyl-clad wood windows, and straight 4"x4" porch posts. Three skylights were added to the application without details provided. Staff feels that skylights are appropriate on this elevation but recommends conditioning approval on staff review of these skylights before permits are issued.*

*5. If this application is approved, future applications for 524 Third should consider that additional space has been allowed in the garage in lieu of an addition to the house.*

*6. Staff recommends approval of the application. The existing garage is not a contributing structure. The proposed garage is large, but not inappropriately so for this lot's configuration and in order to preserve the integrity of the unusually unaltered home. The design, materials, and location are compatible with the historic home and do not distract from it or neighboring historic resources.*

*REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:*

*Commissioners Ross and Hall visited the site as part of their review.*

*Hall agreed with the staff findings noting that the conditions of the structure are very poor and there is no evidence of a historic structure within it. He reported that the neighboring structures would still be taller than the proposed project.*

*Ross agreed with Hall and the staff report and commended the homeowner in respecting the beautiful old home and in looking for additional space without having to add an addition to the house. She felt that the barn style would be in keeping with the neighborhood and area, given the neighboring barns in the area. She felt it would be in keeping with the standards and guidelines.*

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

*Richard Norton and Patricia Koman, 524 Third Street, Ann Arbor, applicants, were present to respond to enquiries from the Commission.*

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

**Moved by Stulberg, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 524 Third Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to demolish a non contributing garage and construct a two car garage, on the following condition: skylight details are reviewed by staff for appropriateness before the issuance of building permits. The work as conditioned is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for building site, as well as the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to residential accessory structures.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

*The member 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 Granted.**

**Yeas:** 6 - White, Ramsburgh, Chair Stulberg, Secretary Beeson, Ross, and Hall

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Vice Chair Bushkuhl

**F UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**G NEW BUSINESS**

**G-1 15-0999 Downtown Premium Prioritization**

*Jill Thacher reviewed a memo with the Commission provided by the Ordinance Revisions Committee of the Planning Commission.*

*Subject: Downtown Premium Prioritization Policy Zoning Amendment, date: July 17, 2015.*

*The Commission felt it was important to remember the historic background why some of these premiums were put into the code originally, such as parking and affordable housing.*

*They felt premiums could be given for up-holding historic characters, and for the public good and what the City wants to incentivize, but premiums offered couldn't work contrary to the HDC guidelines and standards.*

*They expressed concern that the premiums themselves need to be reviewed alongside with their history. They felt historic properties outside of historic districts need to be protected. They suggested working on the issue through a sub-committee and forwarding suggestions to staff.*

**H APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**H-1 15-0843 Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes of the June 11, 2015**

**The Minutes were unanimously Approved by the Commission and forwarded to the City Council. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.**



**H-2**     [15-1000](#)     Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes of the July 9, 2015

*Ramsburgh noted the referenced date of the meeting needed to be corrected, and clarification on Page 12; removal of the motion word, ONLY, in the motion. The Commission unanimously agreed.*

**The minutes as amended were unanimously approved by the Commission and forwarded to the City Council. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.**

**I**     **REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS**

*Ross provided the Ann Arbor District Library Summer Game Players code.*

**J**     **ASSIGNMENTS**

**Review Committee: Tuesday, September 8, 2015, at 5:00 pm for the September 10, 2015 Regular Meeting**

*Commissioners Ramsburgh and Ross volunteered for the September Review Committee.*

**K**     **REPORTS FROM STAFF**

[15-1001](#)     July 2015 HDC Staff Activities

**Received and Filed**

**L**     **CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS**

**M**     **COMMUNICATIONS**

[15-1004](#)     Various Communications to the HDC

**Received and Filed**

**N**     **ADJOURNMENT**

**The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 10:45 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](http://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](http://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](http://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.*