



City of Ann Arbor

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

Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

Thursday, February 14, 2013

7:00 PM

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

A CALL TO ORDER

Chair McCauley called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

B ROLL CALL

Matt Kowalski called the roll.

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

Absent: 1 - Robert White

C APPROVAL OF AGENDA

On a voice vote, the Chair declared the agenda unanimously approved.

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

None

E HEARINGS - RETURNING ITEMS

E-1 [13-0138](#) HDC12-238; 711 West Jefferson Street - New Two Story Addition - OWSHD

Matt Kowalski presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

This two story Queen Anne was built in 1895 and was first occupied by John Steinke, a laborer. The house remained in the Steinke family until 2010, when it was sold to the current owner. It features a full-width front porch with turned posts, a two story cross-gable on the east side, and a textured block foundation. There is a one and a half story barn on the property that staff considers a contributing structure. Its condition is unknown.

In January, 2012 an application for a rear addition was approved by the commission (HDC12-003). If a certificate of appropriateness is granted for this application, it would replace and invalidate that approval.

At the January 10, 2013 HDC meeting, an application for an 825 SF two-story rear addition was postponed to allow modifications to address concerns expressed by commissioners. The concerns were mainly about the large size of the addition and

the replacement of original windows.

LOCATION:

The property is located on the south side of West Jefferson Street, between Fifth and Sixth Streets.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to add a 792 SF two-story rear addition, and a new window on the second floor of the existing house on the east elevation.

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

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

Not Recommended:

Attaching a new addition so that the character-defining features of the historic building are obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

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

District or Neighborhood Setting

Not Recommended:

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

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.

Not Recommended:

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 City of Ann Arbor Design Guidelines:

Guidelines for All Additions

Appropriate:

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 should exceed neither half of the original building's footprint nor half of the original building's total floor area.

STAFF FINDINGS:

- 1. At the January, 2013 HDC meeting, Commissioners expressed concerns about the size of the addition, the one-story bumpout on the southwest corner, and the replacement of original windows, among other things. After determining that those basic concerns had been addressed, staff has reviewed this proposal almost as a brand new application, rather than only comparing the new proposal to the old, since the new configuration is substantially different.*
- 2. The proposed two story addition utilizes the existing footprint of the house, and adds an additional 25 feet by 12 foot (for a total of 300SF) to the footprint on the back of the house. The increase in footprint size is 38%. The existing house is 1,293 square feet (SF), and the addition is 792 SF, for a new total of 2,085 SF. The increase in square footage is 61% of the size of the existing house. The square footage of the addition exceeds the Ann Arbor Historic District Guidelines: Guidelines for All Additions (see above) by about 146 SF. Note: All of the existing house dates to the period of significance for the district, and therefore counts as "original building" per the Guidelines language.*
- 3. The proposal would add a second floor to the current one story rear addition to form a cross gable. This section matches the height and width of the original gabled wing near the front of the house. Behind the cross gable is a new two-story section with a rear facing gable that matches the ridge height of the original house. One-story*

additions infill the corners formed by the cross gable. Of the resulting house, the front half (original two-story structure, minus the front porch) is only about three feet longer than the new rear half. The two halves are joined by a lower saddle roof between the cross gable and original house.

4. A new square awning window in a new opening is proposed on the second floor of the original house's east elevation. A new skylight is proposed on the west roof surface of the original house. No original windows are proposed to be replaced.

Comments from the previous staff report that remain valid:

5. The addition would be clad in 4" composite siding (it is not specified whether fiber-cement or wood composite would be used), windows on the addition would be clad wood double-hung and casements, and the basement would have a large egress window well on the west side.

6. One entry door, and two second floor and one first floor double-hung windows on the rear of the house would be removed to make way for the addition. The age and condition of the windows and door is unknown.

7. On previous discussions about this house, some commissioners felt that the one story rear gable-roofed kitchen wing was a character-defining feature of the house. This proposal would eliminate that feature of the house.

8. The addition is compatible in design with the original house, but clearly differentiated from the original by foundation materials (stone vs cmu/concrete), siding materials (wood vs composite), and window materials (wood vs clad). The addition's roofline preserves the form of the roof of the original house.

9. The addition of a second floor cross gable is a compatible design with the existing house, and should visually mitigate some of the largeness of the addition that continues behind it.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Commissioners Beeson and McCauley visited the site as part of their review in January.

McCauley said he agrees with the staff report, adding that his concerns at the January meeting have been addressed in the revised plans.

Beeson said that he would like the Commission to discuss the history of the house further, noting that there is a similar house with an addition just four doors down from this house.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Marc Rueter, Rueter Associates Architects, 515 Fifth Street, explained that they were able to use the existing footprint of the house by reconfiguring the plan.

Matthew Haran, 1639 White Cliff Drive, Howell, MI, explained that they plan on installing a geo-thermal system at this site, so there will not be an external air conditioning unit.

Mary Beth Lewis and Clayton Lewis, 715 W Jefferson, neighbor, spoke in support of the proposed project, noting that the house has been neglected by previous owners.

They said the new owners have shown great sensitivity towards the neighbors and neighborhood and they look forward to the proposed necessary changes to the house in order to raise a family.

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

Motion made by Ramsburgh, Seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 711 West Jefferson Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a 792 SF rear addition and add a new window to the second floor of the east elevation of the existing house, 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, District or Neighborhood Setting, and Windows.

(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.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

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

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

Certificate of Appropriateness was granted.

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - White

F HEARINGS

F-1 [13-0139](#) HDC13-012; 210 South Ashley Street - New Business Sign - MSHD

Matt Kowalski presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

The two brick commercial vernacular buildings at 210 and 212-216 South Ashley were built in 1899 and 1910, respectively. Number 210 was originally occupied by Mann & Zeeb Agricultural Imports, and 212-216 by Hertler Brothers Agricultural Implements. They are contributing structures in the Main Street Historic District. The proposed project is in the Downtown Home & Garden parking lot at the corner of South Ashley and West Liberty Streets and formerly had the address 218 South Ashley. On the current parking lot portion of the 218 South Ashley site, a house appears on 1888 through 1925 Sanborn maps, but this part of the site was vacant by 1931.

LOCATION:

The site is at the corner of South Ashley and West Liberty Streets.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to install a non-illuminated sign on the black metal fence near the entrance to the parking lot/beer garden off South Ashley Street.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

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

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

Storefronts

Not Recommended:

Introducing a new design that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color; using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy remaining character-defining features of the historic building; using new illuminated signs.

STAFF FINDINGS

1. The proposed sign is not to exceed 2' by 6' and would be hung on the fence near the driveway entrance to the parking lot (see application attachment), which by evening serves as Bill's Beer Garden. It is not illuminated. The sign is painted wood.
2. The size, materials, and colors are compatible with the historic structure and neighborhood, and do not impact any character-defining feature of the site. It is easily removable and reversible.
3. Staff recommends approval of the application since the size, scale, design, materials, and color of the proposed sign are compatible with the historic character of the site and has no negative impact on the surrounding historic resources.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

McCauley said he recommends approval since the sign is very basic and appropriate.

Beeson agreed.

PUBLIC HEARING:

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

Motion made by Ross, Seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 210 South Ashley Street in the Main Street Historic District to install a sign on the metal fence near the South Ashley driveway, as proposed. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, materials, and relationship to the contributing structures on the site and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 9 and 10, and the guidelines for Storefronts.

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

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

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

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

Certificate of Appropriateness was granted.

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - White

F-2 [13-0140](#)

HDC13-013; 217 North Fifth Avenue - Two New Dormers, Remove Door, New Walks - MSHD

Matt Kowalski presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

This brick two-story gable-fronter features shingles in the front and rear gables, a

wood front porch, one-over-one double hung windows, and small columns flanking the recessed attic windows in each end gable. The house was first occupied in 1900 by John and Pauline Baumgardner. John was the manager of the Ann Arbor Stone Company at the same address, and had one of the city's few telephones installed in the house at that time. Baumgardner's Barn, a few lots down at 301 North Fifth Avenue (corner of Detroit, currently occupied by Jessica's Apothecary), was built in 1887 as part of John Baumgardner's Marble Works. The Baumgardners lived at 217 until 1913 or 1914, when the home was occupied by John Pfisterer, with Matilda C. Pfisterer, teacher at Christian Mack School, listed as a boarder. Matilda, and subsequently Emilie Pfisterer, occupied the house until 1966.

The 1908 and 1916 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps show a small one-story enclosure (room) off the back door. It is not shown on the 1925 Sanborn.

LOCATION:

The house is located on North Fifth Avenue, north of East Ann Street and south of Catherine Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to 1) eliminate the existing driveway, 2) construct a new two-car parking pad along the back alley, 3) install patio, path, and landscape areas in the back yard, 4) remove the brick chimney, 5) construct two dormers, one facing north and one south, 6) replace nine original and non-original windows, 7) construct a new basement egress window, 8) replace two rear wood doors, 9) replace a door with a window, 10) replace non-original front porch guardrail and install a new ceiling-mounted light fixture, 11) construct a new rear porch, 12) replace the roof with asphalt or cedar shakes, and 13) replace the aluminum gutters and downspouts with copper.

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.

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

Not Recommended:

Attaching a new addition so that the character-defining features of the historic building are obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

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

Roofs

Recommended:

Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

Not Recommended:

Changing the configuration of a roof by adding new features such as dormer windows, vents, or skylights so that the historic character is diminished.

Entrances and Porches

Recommended:

Designing and constructing a new entrance or porch when the historic entrance or porch is completely missing. It may be a restoration based on historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building.

Not Recommended:

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

Wood

Recommended:

Repairing wood features by patching, piecing-in, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing the wood using recognized preservation methods.

Not Recommended:

Removing a feature that is unrepairable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new feature that does not convey the same visual appearance.

District or Neighborhood Setting

Not Recommended:

Designing required new parking so that it is as unobtrusive as possible, thus minimizing the effect on the historic character of the setting. "Shared" parking should also be planned so that several businesses can utilize one parking area as opposed to introducing random, multiple lots.

Removing non-significant buildings, additions or landscape features which detract from the historic character of the setting.

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. Protecting and maintaining the wood and architectural metal which comprise the window frame, sash, muntins, and surrounds through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and re-application of protective coating systems.

Not Recommended:

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

Changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which noticeably change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of the glazing; or the appearance of the frame.

Replacing windows solely because of peeling paint, broken glass, stuck sash, and high air infiltration. These conditions, in themselves, are no indication that windows are beyond repair.

From the City of Ann Arbor Design Guidelines:

Guidelines for Residential 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.

Using replacement features that match the documented historic design. If no documentation exists, using a simple, plain design.

Doors

Appropriate:

Retaining, repairing and maintaining original doors, hardware, and trim, including transoms, sidelights, and surrounds.

Replacing original doors that are deteriorated beyond repair with a door that matches the existing exactly in design, size, proportions, profile, and material.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. This house has been used as a single-family rental for many years. The current owners, who are also building the house next door at 215 N Fifth Avenue, are restoring and refurbishing the house for their son's use. Please note that in addition to the items in this staff report that require HDC approval, there are numerous restoration activities included in the application letter narrating work to be performed.

Driveway and Parking

2. *The existing driveway off N Fifth Avenue is part gravel and part concrete. It used to lead to a garage at the rear of the site. According to Sanborn maps, several different storage and garage structures were located in the backyard over the decades, some of which appear to have been accessed from the alley, and later ones from the driveway. The current drive straddles the property line between the two buildings (which was moved a foot or two to accommodate the new house) and probably also encroached when the Bindery was located next door. Since this house was built before auto garages appeared in Ann Arbor, and the rear alley provides ready access, staff is in favor of locating parking spaces off the alley and removing the driveway.*

3. *The proposed parking area is limited in size and well defined, and allows maximum backyard space.*

Patio, Paths, and Landscaping

4. *Returning this space to yard from its former use as a parking area is highly appropriate. The proposed backyard features and materials (such as stone in the patio and paths, cedar hedges, and lawn) are elegant and suitable to the setting. John Baumgardner, the stonemason and first owner of the house, would very likely approve.*

Chimney

5. *The chimney is not currently in use for any kind of venting. Removing the chimney would provide added interior space that can be reconfigured to allow maximum use of the house without the need for an addition. The chimney is the same red brick used on the house and, while staff considers it to be a character-defining feature, it is not unique or ornate.*

Construct Two Dormers

6. *Matching dormers are proposed on both the north and south sides of the roof, at the center of the house. Construction of the south dormer would allow new interior stairs that meet code requirements to be added, replacing the current narrow, steep, low-ceilinged stairs. Both dormers would be clad in shingles to match those in the gables, and use single-ply membrane or metal roofing. Four double-hung, painted, wood windows would be installed in each dormer.*

7. *The application says the existing sagging roof rafters on either side of the new dormers will be replaced, but the drawing says they will be "new or sistered". Sistering the rafters is more appropriate if it is possible, in order to keep original materials on the building.*

8. *Staff feels the design and size of the dormers, and their placement ten feet back from the front of the house, is appropriate for the size and style of the building. See especially the 3-D renderings at the back of the application attachments.*

Replace Nine Windows, New Egress Window

9. *Windows A, B, C, and U (see keyed drawings) are basement hoppers. All are missing or substantially deteriorated. Replacements will be custom fabricated to resemble the originals, per application letter. Staff's opinion is that these*

replacements are appropriate.

10. *Basement Window T: Per the building official, egress is acceptable via the existing stair, unless a bedroom, family room, or similar space is being constructed. He said that for laundry, workout room, bathroom, or sauna uses, he would not require an additional egress window in this basement. This was confirmed by staff with the building official after this application was submitted. Staff's opinion is that the egress window is too close to the front of the house, and should it be required for safety reasons at a future date, should be located where the center window is, on the north side of the house, in order to push it back from the sidewalk and street.*

11. *Window L, on the rear elevation, is not an original window. Its replacement with a compatible wood window is appropriate.*

12. *Windows I, M, P, and AA are original wood windows. No information on their condition has been submitted. The drawings say they will be "refurbished or new replacement painted wood window", while the application letter says they will be wood clad. A window worksheet has been submitted for these windows, but the proposed replacement windows do not meet the criteria for sash face or profiles. The review committee will look at the windows and make a recommendation. If the Commission decides the windows are deteriorated beyond repair, a staff approval will be necessary for wood (not clad) replacement windows that meet the guidelines for window replacement.*

Replace Two Rear Wood Doors

13. *No information has been submitted on the condition of the doors on the rear elevation. If the Commission determines that the doors are from the period of significance for the district, they must be deteriorated beyond repair before replacement may be considered. If they are determined to have been installed after 1942, their replacement with wood doors is appropriate. The Review Committee will inspect the doors on their site visit.*

Replace a Door with a Window

14. *Since this house is well served with egress doors on the ground floor, and since the door opening on the south elevation will retain its original sill and proportions, staff feels it is appropriate to replace this door with a wood window in order to gain efficiencies and recapture space on the interior.*

Front Porch Guardrail; New Rear Porch

15. *The proposed front porch guardrail is at the historic height, and a more appropriate design than the current guardrail.*

16. *The proposed rear porch is simple in design and does not diminish the historic house's architectural character. The materials are the same as the front porch, and the design is compatible but less ornate, as befits a new feature of the house.*

Replace Roof and Gutters

17. *Replacing the roof with dark-colored asphalt shingles (which it has now) or cedar shakes (which it would have had historically), is appropriate. It is not known whether the house ever had copper gutters, but it is a material that was used on masonry buildings at the time the house was constructed.*

18. Staff recommends approval of motions A, B, and C below. Staff recommends denial of motion D (egress window). Motion E will depend on the Review Committee's assessment of the condition of those doors and windows.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

McCauley stated that he didn't see any problems with the new proposed driveway, parking area, landscape features, roof, gutters, and the rear porch, noting that it was clearly not original, and the front porch needing some work. He said he would like the Commission to discuss the removal of the chimney and constructing two dormers, since he had some issues with the proposed changes. He added that the addition of dormers would be more favorable than an addition added to the rear of the house in order to gain more living space inside the house. McCauley said it looked like Window L was an original window and had been mounted differently at an earlier time, but had the same matching varnish as throughout the house. He said the window hardware was in very bad condition. The existing side door, which the applicant is proposing to turn into a window, is an original door and in good salvageable condition. He noted that the standards for rehabilitation frown upon such conversions, and he is opposed to the proposed change out. He said he wasn't sure that he would be in favor of complete replacement of the four basement hopper windows, since from what they could see from the outside, they looked to be in good shape, but since they were located beyond clear view from the inside, the architect might find differently once they begin working with the windows.

Beeson said that there was some discussion with the Architect that the Building Official had noted that it was not necessary to install a basement egress window, based on the use of the basement, and therefore the applicant was considering not installing a basement egress window, which would change the proposed plans presented.

McCauley said that the attic window on the west elevation (Window N) that had been gnarled on by a squirrel was in horrible shape and should be replaced.

Beeson said Window N was in the proposed schedule to be refurbished, which might prove difficult.

McCauley said the one rear door, where the porch will be located, matches the side door and they believe it to be an original door and is in salvageable condition. He was not in favor of replacement of that door. He noted that the other rear door in the middle looks like a 1950s replacement door that falls outside of the period of significance and can be replaced.

Beeson said that the Architect had agreed that Window L was going to be refurbished. He said they had also talked about the profile of the copper gutters being half-round instead of squared-off.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Kevin Stansbury, Mitchell & Mouat Architects, 113 South Fourth Ave, said he had noted some confusion from the staff report regarding the proposed window replacements versus refurbishing. He explained that anything on the proposed plan that is shown as shaded will be new and if not shown as shaded will be refurbished, with some clarification in the schedule. He said there are 28 windows in total

proposed, 19 of which are existing that will be refurbished and 9 that are new. Of the 19 refurbished windows, there is 1 (Window N) on the west elevation that is shown to be refurbished, but we know it is in bad shape. He said they plan on refurbishing it with sash profiles, salvaged from other properties from this same era, and replacing any damaged parts. He said the other 18 windows will be refurbished on site. The 9 new windows, includes Window L, a casement window, which they believe not to be original, since in looking at the frame they see vertical stops in the window as one would see in a double-hung window. He said they do not plan on using a window out of a box, but follow the same historic profiles from Window N, the window above it, and make a new window in a historic way, adding that it wouldn't be a Loewen or Pella window like the other new windows. He said they shaded Window L, because they propose on changing its function from a casement to a double-hung, and both Window N and L will look the same.

Stansbury said the new dormer Windows J and AB are each counted as one window but are actually four individual Loewen windows. He said 4 of the existing 9 windows they deemed not salvageable for security reasons, after receiving a quote to have them refurbished with salvaged materials. He said Window X, which would replace the door, would be an all new Loewen window using salvaged brick for the in-fill and recessed 1 inch. He noted the stone sill would remain. He explained that the door hasn't been used in years and there has not been a stoop in place for years, so they were hoping to regain the use of the interior wall space. He said basement, Window T, was not intended to be an egress window originally, so when the Building Department told them they weren't required to install one, they were very happy. He said they would like to re-install a new window in that original opening.

Stansbury said they would like to amend their request so that Window T, be like the other 4 basement windows, U, C, B and A, and that those 5 windows be new, with triple lites, as shown. He said non of the new windows will be clad; all new and existing would be wood painted windows.

He said they are planning on replacing the sagging rafters on either side of the dormers, and would like to add that to the application request. He said they will have to do it from the interior if the request is denied. He pointed out that their drawing is misleading in this matter.

He said all of the existing refurbished windows would have new painted wood storms added that would serve as storm and screen. He said they are also looking for permission to put new painted wood storm doors on the 3 doors, assuming the 4th door is approved to be replaced with a window.

McCauley said storm windows and doors can be approved at the staff level and don't need to come before the Commission.

Stansbury explained that the removal of the chimney is important in that it will free up interior space, as well as provide them with salvage brick they will need to make repairs on the building. He reviewed the proposed dormers with the Commission noting that the south dormer is necessary for staircase headspace.

Ross asked if the chimney is currently closed off or functional.

Stansbury and McCauley said there was no fireplace in the house and it had possibly been used for a central furnace.

Bushkuhl asked if the copper gutters would be ornamental.

Stansbury said no, they are looking at plain ones, and they are not sure if they will be round or square, but they are leaning towards round.

Ramsburgh asked if the rear small Window L would be double-hung, noting that it is very small for a double-hung.

Stansbury said Window AA on the south elevation is the same size and height.

McCauley commented that Window L had a type of pin system, and it was difficult to determine if it was original.

Beeson asked about the floor joist removal on the third floor, and if they would be adding any cross ties.

Stansbury said yes, on the front third of the house.

Ramsburgh asked about the interior stairs, pointing out that the large dormers change the way the house look from the front. She asked if there are any interior changes they could make that would not require the dormers to be quite as large.

Stansbury said the south dormer serves partly to give them headroom for the stair, while both dormers provide more useable living space on the third floor.

Ramsburgh asked if it was necessary to have a window for the interior configuration where they are proposing to replace the south side door with a window.

Stansbury said, yes, according to their client.

Beeson asked for clarification on the interior stairs.

Stansbury said the second flight of the first floor stairs to second floor, and the second flight of the second floor to attic, stack above each other, and the first flight sections oppose each other.

Stulberg asked what the current third floor use.

Stansbury said when the new owners acquired the house, it had two bedrooms upstairs that were accessible through the back bathroom, adding that the house had been used as a student rental.

Beeson asked if there was any flexibility with the owners on the size and placement of the dormers.

Stansbury said yes, pointing out that there wasn't much flexibility on the stair location in order to make the third floor usable.

McCauley asked if it is possible to make the dormers lower in height.

Stansbury said yes, possibly.

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

A) Driveway, Parking Area, Landscape Features, Roof, Gutters, Front and Rear Porch

Motion made by Ross, Seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 217 North Fifth Avenue, a

contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to remove a driveway; construct a parking area; install a patio, walkway, and landscape features; replace the roof and gutters; replace the front porch railing; and add a rear porch, 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, Entrances and Porches, 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: 6 - Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Vice Chair Stulberg, Secretary Bushkuhl, Beeson, and Ross

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - White

B) Remove Chimney, Construct Two Dormers

Motion made by Bushkuhl, Seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 217 North Fifth Avenue, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to remove the chimney and construct two shed roof dormers, 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, Roofs, 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 denied.

Certificate of Appropriateness was denied.

Yeas: 0

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

Absent: 1 - White

C) Replace Four Basement Hopper Windows, Window L, and Side Door

Motion made by McCauley, Seconded by Bushkuhl that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 217 North Fifth Avenue, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to replace four basement hopper windows and one non original window (Window L), on the condition that the windows are painted wood, not clad; and to replace the south side door with a window as submitted. As conditioned, 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 Windows and Doors.

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 denied.

Certificate of Appropriateness was denied.

Yeas: 0

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

Absent: 1 - White

D) Install a Basement Egress Window

Motion made by Ramsburgh, Seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 217 North Fifth Avenue, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to re-install a new basement 3-lite window (Window T) on the south elevation, 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 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 approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness was granted.

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - White

E) Upper Rear Door

Motion made by McCauley, Seconded by Bushkuhl, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 217 North Fifth Avenue, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to replace the upper rear door on the back elevation. 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 Windows and Doors.

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 approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness was granted.

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - White

F) Lower Rear Door

Motion made by Ramsburgh, Seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 217 North Fifth Avenue, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to replace the lower rear basement door. 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 Windows and Doors.

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 approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness was granted.

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - White

G NEW BUSINESS

G-1 [13-0141](#) Annual Retreat Scheduling and Discussion

Kowalski informed the Commission that the HDC Retreat would be held on March 9, 2013 from 9 a.m. to noon.

The Commission brought possible topic suggestions and speakers for the retreat.

Topics suggested included; egress windows, policy on work done without permits in the HDC district, new construction in D1 zoning districts within the HDC district and on adjacent parcels.

Ramsburgh suggested the retreat be held in the first floor City Hall conference room-south.

G-2 [13-0142](#) Nomination of the HDC Awards Committee

Motion made by Stulberg, Seconded by Beeson, that the Commission approves the following members for the 2013 HDC Awards Committee:

Patricia Austin, Patrick McCauley, Louisa Pieper, Ellen Ramsburgh, Grace Shackman, Tom Stulberg, Susan Wineberg, Fran Wright.

Friendly Amendment accepted by Stulberg, Agreed by Beeson, to replace member Patrick McCauley with Jennifer Ross.

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

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - White

H APPROVAL OF MINUTES

13-0143 Minutes of the January 10, 2013 HDC Meeting

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

I REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Ramsburgh read the following:

Susan Wineberg as Chair of the Awards Committee of the HDC would like the HDC to nominate the restoration of the Delta Upsilon House on Hill Street for a building restoration award from the MHPN. Awards are given annually by MHPN in a variety of categories. This restoration was a remarkable achievement by Jeff Scott and his

architectural firm along with a number of restoration specialists in the State of Michigan. Many of us were present at the open house when the restoration was complete and we were amazed at the quality and detail of the rebuilding and restoration.

The HDC Commission reviewed the application for the restoration of the fire damaged Delta Upsilon House in 2011. The 1903 Tudor Revival house is included in the Washtenaw/Hill Historic District and required review by the HDC. The house was designed by Albert Kahn and was one of the first fraternity houses to be designed for, built, and still in the hands of the original fraternity.

Jeff Scott and Dana Richardson of JS Scott Architects have documented the rebuilding and restoration of the house for submission to the MHPN for an award in the category of "building" if the HDC chooses to nominate the project for this award.

A motion was made by Ramsburgh, seconded by Chair McCauley, that the Ann Arbor HDC nominate the Delta Upsilon House restoration for outstanding preservation work by the architects, builders, and restorers of the Delta Upsilon Fraternity House. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - White

J ASSIGNMENTS

Review Committee: Monday, March 11 at Noon for the March 14, 2013 Regular Session

Stulberg and Beeson volunteered for the March Review Committee.

K REPORTS FROM STAFF

[13-0144](#) January 2013 HDC Staff Activities

Received and Filed

L CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS

M COMMUNICATIONS

[13-0259](#) Various Correspondence to the Historic District Commission

Ramsburgh and Stulberg presented received communications to the Commission.

N ADJOURNMENT

Unanimously adjourned at 9:44 p.m.

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

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

- *Video on Demand: Replay public meetings at your convenience online at www.a2gov.org/government/city_administration/communicationsoffice/ctn/Pages/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.