



City of Ann Arbor

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

Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

Thursday, April 14, 2011

7:00 PM

City Hall - Council Chambers 2nd Floor

A CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM by Chair Ramsburgh.

B ROLL CALL

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

Present: 5 - Kristina A. Glusac, Robert White, Ellen Ramsburgh, Patrick McCauley, and Benjamin L. Bushkuhl

Absent: 2 - Lesa Rozmarek, and Thomas Stulberg

C APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved with the amendment to add: Discussion on a Draft Resolution in support of retaining Michigan's historic preservation tax credits for residential and commercial properties. Motion passed unanimously.

D HEARINGS

D-1 11-0445

HDC11-029 - 302 East Liberty Street - Install Continuous Soffit Vents and Light-Colored Roof - ELHD

Matt Kowalski gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This Dutch colonial revival was built in 1908 and first occupied by Joseph Parker and Joe's Saloon. It features a gambrel center gable with a Palladian window and full-width front porch with Ionic columns.

Numerous certificates of appropriateness have been issued for the property, most recently a staff approval in 2008 to replace failed wood siding on the west elevation, porch repairs in 2004, and a rear addition in 1995.

LOCATION:

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

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to install continuous soffit vents on front and rear eaves, and replace existing asphalt roofing with light grey colored reflective shingles.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

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

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

Roofs

Recommended: Designing and constructing a new feature when the historic feature is completely missing, such as a chimney or cupola. 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 roof feature that is incompatible in size, scale, material and color.

Building Site

Not Recommended: 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.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *The proposed vents would be a 2" slot cut in the soffit extending the width of the eave on both sides of the front gable, and also on the eaves of the two-story rear addition. A strip of screen would be stapled over the slot and held in place by ½" x 1" trim painted to match the soffit. (See cross section drawing.) The soffit vents are necessary to increase air flow into the attic for proper ventilation. Other possible methods have been discussed with the contractor, but would not be suitable for this particular roof configuration. Staff therefore feels that though original materials are being removed from the house and the original soffit altered, the work does not diminish the overall historic character of the building. The continuous vent should have a minimal visual impact on the front elevation.*

2. *The building's roof has deteriorated and needs to be replaced. The proposed shingles are energy star rated and reflect more of the sun's rays, which means less heat is absorbed and transferred into the home during hot summer months. The two proposed roofing materials are Certaineed Landmark silver birch or Certaineed Solaris crystal grey. Staff has reservations about the light grey colors selected. The Solaris shingles are also available in shake, cedar, and clay colors, which staff believes would be more tradition and aesthetically pleasing in appearance.*

3. *With the exception of the shingle color, the proposed work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the*

rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 2 and 9, and the guidelines for roofs and building site.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

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

McCauley stated that he agreed with the Thatcher's report and added that he believed it was important to add adequate venting to preserve the historical fabric of the house. He noted that they were pleased to hear that the proposed roof shingle color wouldn't be a reflective white, but rather a nice tone of grey.

Bushkuhl agreed and added that the roof vents would only be on the second story and barely visible.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Doug Behnke, Bob Behnke Company, 4975 Bobbiton Lane, Ann Arbor, spoke on behalf of the project. He stated that their choice of shingle is the CertainTeed Landmark that holds the Energy Star rating that meet both solar reluctance and thermal emissivity requirements.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Glusac asked if the existing fascia would be remaining.

Behnke answered they wouldn't be touching the fascia at all, but plan to cut a 2 inch wide strip in the soffit, staple aluminum screen to the soffit, install 1/2"x1" trim to secure screen, and paint trim to match the soffit.

Glusac asked how much would be visible.

Behnke responded that it should be flush and almost not visible, since the fascia board hangs over almost 3/4 of an inch. It noted that it might be showing 1/4 of an inch at the most.

Motion made by Ramsburgh, seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 302 East Liberty Street, a contributing property in the East Liberty Historic Block, to install continuous soffit vents as proposed, and to replace the roofing. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2 and 9 and the guidelines for roofs and building site. On a roll call vote the Chair declared the motion carried.

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - Rozmarek, and Stulberg

D-2 [11-0446](#)

HDC11-026 - 448 S. First Street - Add a Dormer and Skylights, Remove a Chimney on Noncontributing House - OWSHD

Matt Kowalski gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

In March of 2003 the HDC issued a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) to demolish a house at 448 South First Street that was built prior to 1872. On April 10, 2003, the HDC issued a CoA for the construction of the current house, a new two-story single-family residence, which was built that same year.

In March of 2008 the Commission issued a CoA to swap the locations of the front door and a window, and to increase the depth of the front porch.

LOCATION:

The property is located on the west side of South First Street, two lots north of West Jefferson Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to add a dormer to the rear of the south side elevation; and remove the portion of an exterior chimney above the first floor and cap it with a shed roof.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

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

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

Building Site

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

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.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. This structure is new (2003) and is therefore considered noncontributing in the Old West Side Historic District because it was built outside of the period of significance. As required by state law and local ordinance, work proposed on the exterior of noncontributing structures is reviewed to protect the integrity of the site, neighborhood and district.

2. The proposed location of a dormer on the south elevation behind the cross-gable is appropriate and will have a minimal impact on the contributing historic home to the

south. The proportions of the dormer are compatible and appropriate, and the siding, trim, and windows will match the existing, which is appropriate on this noncontributing structure.

3. The work as proposed, including the reduction of the chimney height, will not negatively impact the site, neighborhood, or historic district.

4. The proposed work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 2 and 9, and the guidelines for building site.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

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

Bushkuhl reported that he didn't believe a siding clad chimney would be missed by anyone and the shed roof detail would be acceptable. He also noted that the added dormer wouldn't be seen when coming down the street and thereby not disrupt the neighborhood or historic character of the district.

McCauley agreed with Bushkuhl.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Timothy Rhodes, 448 S. First Street, Ann Arbor, owner of the property was present to respond to any inquiries.

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

None

Motion made by Bushkuhl, seconded by White that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 448 South First Street, a noncontributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to add a shed roof dormer to the south elevation and reduce the chimney height, as proposed. The work is compatible with, and protects the integrity of, the surrounding historic district and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2 and 9, and the guidelines for building site. On a roll call vote the Chair declared the motion carried.

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - Rozmarek, and Stulberg

D-3 [11-0447](#)

HDC11-016 - 323 Mulholland Street - New Rear Screened Porch - OWSHD

Matt Kowalski gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This block (Liberty/Second/William/First) had a mix of industrial and residential uses from at least 1880, when a tannery and several houses were located here. In 1925 there were five houses, a lodge/club room, and an auto parts manufacturer that

covered less than one-eighth of the block. By 1931 the King-Seeley Corporation (manufacturers at that time of liquid depth gauges) had nearly doubled the size of the plant and removed the lodge, though the houses remained. By 1966 the block looked similar to the way it did when the Liberty Lofts (formerly First & William Lofts) project was approved in 2004-5, with a very large manufacturing building, the service station, and the houses at 307 and 311 Second.

LOCATION:

The site covers most of the block defined by West Liberty, Second, West William, and South First Streets.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to expand an existing rooftop deck.

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

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

New Additions

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

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

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

Building Site

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

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.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The current roof top deck is approximately 10' by 12'. The new deck would add another 12' by 14' (roughly) with a 4' by 9' section connecting the two. The new railings facing the south (West William Street) and west (Second Street) are set back from the parapet approximately 4' and 13' respectively, making them invisible from the street (see especially the two final photographs taken from the sidewalk).

2. Staff finds the proposed rooftop deck expansion to be generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 9 and 10, and the guidelines for new additions and building site.

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

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

McCauley reported that they looked mainly at the door and window that are included in the proposed changes, noting that they concluded neither of them were original to the house. He said they felt the design of the porch matched the house and the front porch with the square posts and was compatible in exterior design

Bushkuhl agreed and added that the upper level three windows of the house seemed to be the most character defining elements which was repeated on several houses down the street. He noted that the proposed new porch wouldn't affect that element.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Tresna Taylor, 323 Mulholland Street, Ann Arbor, owner and architect of the project was present to respond to any inquiries.

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

None

Motion made by Glusac, seconded by White that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 323 Mulholland Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a screened porch on the rear elevation. The work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for new additions and building site. On a roll call vote the Chair declared the motion carried.

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - Rozmarek, and Stulberg

D-4 [11-0448](#)

HDC11-027 - 315 S. Second Street - Expand a Rooftop Deck at Liberty Lofts - OWSHD

Commissioner Glusac recused herself from participation in the discussion noting that she worked for Hobbs and Black, which were the Architects for this proposed project.

Matt Kowalski gave the staff report.

BACKGROUND:

This block (Liberty/Second/William/First) had a mix of industrial and residential uses from at least 1880, when a tannery and several houses were located here. In 1925 there were five houses, a lodge/club room, and an auto parts manufacturer that covered less than one-eighth of the block. By 1931 the King-Seeley Corporation (manufacturers at that time of liquid depth gauges) had nearly doubled the size of the plant and removed the lodge, though the houses remained. By 1966 the block looked similar to the way it did when the Liberty Lofts (formerly First & William Lofts) project was approved in 2004-5, with a very large manufacturing building, the service station, and the houses at 307 and 311 Second.

LOCATION:

The site covers most of the block defined by West Liberty, Second, West William, and South First Streets.

APPLICATION: *The applicant seeks HDC approval to expand an existing rooftop deck.*

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

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

New Additions

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

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

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

Building Site

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

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.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *The current roof top deck is approximately 10' by 12'. The new deck would add another 12' by 14' (roughly) with a 4' by 9' section connecting the two. The new railings facing the south (West William Street) and west (Second Street) are set back from the parapet approximately 4' and 13' respectively, making them invisible from the street (see especially the two final photographs taken from the sidewalk).*

2. *Staff finds the proposed rooftop deck expansion to be generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, in particular standards 9 and 10, and the guidelines for new additions and building site.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT:

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

McCauley reported that they weren't able to access the rooftop site, but tried to view the proposed site from the street, noting that it was almost impossible to see anything, even from West Williams Street.

Bushkuhl agreed with McCauley and added that the proposed railings match with the existing railings and the work would be reversible.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Steve Dykstra, 100 N. State Street, Ann Arbor, Architect from Hobbs and Black was present to answer any inquiries.

He stated that his company had done the renovation of the Liberty Lofts and they intended to use the same matching materials for this project.

DISCUSSION BY THE COMMISSION:

Ramsburgh asked what will happen with the vents when the addition is built.

Dykstra responded that the deck will be several feet shy of the vents so the expanded roof deck won't be coming out that far.

Motion made by McCauley, seconded by White that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 315 South Second Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to expand a roof top deck. The work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 9 and 10 and the guidelines for new additions and building site. On a roll call vote the Chair declared the motion carried.

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - Rozmarek, and Stulberg

E OLD BUSINESS

None

F NEW BUSINESS

11-0559

Draft Resolution in Support of Retaining Michigan's Historic Preservation Tax Credits

Ramsburgh read the Draft Resolution and asked the Commission to take it under consideration. She stated that she hoped the Commission would support the resolution because she believed it was important for the Commission to be good stewards of what they had been charged with involving historic properties. She said the State has been using this vital tool for over 10 years and the evidence is available that it has benefited both commercial and residential properties and it is an essential tool in preserving our cities.

She said she had contacted a few of the local recipients of the tax credits who had come before the Historic District Commission. She read an email from a Christopher Hewitt that explained items that were eligible for the tax credits and how the elimination of the tax credits would negatively affect his remodeling and repair projects. She also referenced an email from Fred Beal who had outlined the careful process of application reviews, noting that there were several commercial projects across the state that wouldn't be moving forward without the tax credits. Beal had expressed that given the current economical climate the tax credits were a health incentive to maintaining and preserving large historical commercial sites.

Glusac stated that she felt it was too early to support the resolution without having more information on what the Governor intends to do with the tax credits. She said that she didn't feel comfortable supporting the resolution as a part of the HDC body and suggested that individuals who felt differently could support it on an individual basis.

McCauley said he would be interested to hear what other members of the Commission who were absent might have to say about the resolution.

Ramsburgh said she wasn't sure about the timing of when the State budget issues would be voted on and had already made her personal voice heard regarding the issue. She offered to pass along the information she had received from the Michigan Historic Preservation Network.

Glusac asked if she had brought her concerns to the Michigan Historic Preservation Network or directly to the Governor's office.

Ramsburgh said she was under the understanding that the tax credits would be eliminated from the budget. She offered to do more investigating regarding the issue and bring it back before the Commission at their next meeting.

Glusac stated since there were members absent she felt it would be more appropriate for individuals to voice their concern individually.

White suggested that the Commissioners who supported the resolution could have their names included and those who weren't present or who weren't in favor of the resolution their names could be left off. He expressed concerns with the timing of the resolution, noting that it was important for the Legislature and Governor to receive the document before they voted on the issue.

Ramsburgh stated that she felt the resolution was intended to come from the body of the HDC and if everyone in the HDC wasn't in favor of the resolution then it shouldn't be sent but individuals could contact their representatives if they felt comfortable doing so.

Bushkuhl suggested informing the public watching where they might find more information on the tax credits.

Ramsburgh mentioned that they could go to the Michigan Historic Preservation Network's website (via Google) and they would have contact information on how to contact the Legislature and the Governor. She said that they could also contact Jill Thacher who could pass along the contact information for the Michigan Preservation Association.

G PUBLIC COMMENTARY - (3 Minutes per Speaker)

H APPROVAL OF MINUTES

H-1 [11-0449](#) Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes of the February 10, 2011

Ramsburgh noted that the rollcall vote on page 8 needed to be corrected, since there were 4 yea votes and the motion passed. She noticed that her name was missing from the rollcall vote.

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

I REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

J ASSIGNMENTS

J-1 **Review Committee: Monday, May 9, at 5 PM for the May 12, 2011 Regular Session.**

Commissioners White and Bushkuhl volunteered for the May Review Committee.

K REPORTS FROM STAFF

K-1 [11-0444](#) March 2011 Staff Activities

Received and Filed.

L CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS

Glusac mentioned that she had had a conversation with an individual involved with the CVS project whom had confirmed her concerns that she had brought before the Commission involving the impact of the Commission's decision on the developer/petitioner resulting in huge cost issues for retainage of the front wall and the extended duration of the project which increased significantly. She suggested that it would be helpful to discuss these issues at a future retreat where they might be able to invite developers who could share their thoughts and feedback. Glusac said that looking back in hindsight it was a learning curve for them and she knows to ask more questions that will help them make better decisions in the future.

McCauley agreed and said the project was an exceptional one, as was the site, and he felt they weren't made aware of all the implications of the project, especially that State street would be barricaded for so long, which compounded the implications for many.

Glusac said she felt bad for the businesses around the project who suffered during the construction, and the pedestrian experience isn't pleasant when looking in through the glass storefront which opens to a vestibule.

Ramsburgh said that it might be helpful to create a set of questions Commissioners could use as a guideline when they are presented with projects.

Glusac, McCauley and Bushkuhl agreed.

M COMMUNICATIONS

N ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was unanimously adjourned at 8:03 PM