



# City of Ann Arbor

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

## Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

---

Thursday, August 15, 2013

7:00 PM

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

---

### A CALL TO ORDER

*Chair McCauley called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.*

### B ROLL CALL

*Jill Thacher called the roll.*

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

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

### C APPROVAL OF AGENDA

**Agenda Item E-1 was moved to follow Agenda Item E-5. The agenda was unanimously approved as amended. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.**

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

### E HEARINGS

#### E-2 [13-0971](#) HDC13-126; 209 South State Street - New Business Signage - SSHD

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

#### **BACKGROUND:**

*A two-story single-family frame dwelling is shown in this location on the 1899 Sanborn map. Additions were gradually built on the rear of the house and reached the rear lot line on the 1916 Sanborn. During this time it was used as a boarding house. On the 1925 Sanborn a large lot-width addition is shown on the front of the house, and a photo from 1930 shows the front façade that exists today. In 2009 the HDC issued a certificate of appropriateness to restore the front façade, demolish the remainder of the building, and build a new building behind the façade.*

#### **LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the east side of South State Street, south of East Washington Street and north of East Liberty.*

#### **APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to remove the existing "photo" sign to the center bay and replace it with a 4'10" x 2' "minute clinic" sign. The applicant also seeks approval to add a non-illuminated window box sign that says "minute clinic" and is 31" x 43.5".*

**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):*

**Storefronts**

**Recommended:**

*Identifying, retaining, and preserving storefronts – and their functional and decorative features – that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as display windows, signs, doors, transoms, kick plates, corner posts, and entablatures.*

**Not Recommended:**

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

*From the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines:*

**Design Guidelines for Signs**

**Appropriate:**

*Installing signage that is subordinate to the overall building composition.*

*Installing signage in the historic sign band area of the building, typically the area above the transoms or just above the storefront.*

*Painting signs on window glass, or using vinyl decal letters, that can be removed without damaging historic materials.*

*Installing signage that is compatible in size, style, material, and appearance to the historic resource and district.*

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

*1. Existing signage on the site includes a 4'7" x 10' blade sign on the second floor and vinyl 11" or 17" letter signs in three of the five arches above the window bays on the first floor. These signs were presented as a package and conceptually approved by the HDC in 2009. They were later reviewed by staff for consistency with that certificate of appropriateness.*

2. The proposed replacement of the "photo" sign with a "minute clinic" sign is appropriate. Though it is twice as tall because it is two lines instead of one, the proposed lettering size is consistent with the lowercase lettering found on the other arch signs. The blue color will attract attention to the otherwise red-themed façade.

3. The proposed window sign is a standard light box with the lights turned off. It is the width of the center window and placed at a pedestrian's head height. Its opacity blocks views into the store.

4. Staff's opinion is that the window box sign does not meet the City of Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines. The sign's appearance, boxy style, large size, and lack of transparency are not compatible with this restored storefront. It detracts from the historic façade, and the amount of signage on the storefront has been previously discussed by the commission and is at its maximum. If the "minute clinic" sign in the arch is approved, that store feature will already be prominently displayed. There is also a changeable sign panel immediately to the right of the front door that may be used to promote the "minute clinic" or anything else available inside the store.

5. The proposed "minute clinic" sign in the center arch 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. The proposed "minute clinic" window box sign does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines or the City of Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines and therefore does not meet standards 2 and 9.

#### REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION:

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

Ross reported that while visiting the site they noted potential areas on the building where signage could be affixed where it would be more visible to foot traffic. She agreed with the staff report.

Ramsburgh agreed, adding that the box sign obstructs the view for the pedestrian into the store, which is the goal with clear windows. She agreed that there were other potential locations that could be utilized.

#### PUBLIC HEARING:

Norm Young, 1 CVS Drive, Moonsocket, RI, 02895, representing the applicant, was present to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

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

#### For the arch signage:

**Motion made by Ramsburgh, Seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 209 South State Street, a contributing property in the State Street Historic District, to remove the existing "photo" sign and install in its place a "minute clinic" sign" from the center bay of the storefront. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines for signs, and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular**

standards 2 and 9 and the guidelines for storefronts.

(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.

*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 - White, Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Vice Chair Stulberg, Beeson, and Ross

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Secretary Bushkuhl

**For the window signage:**

**Motion made by Beeson, Seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 209 South State Street, a contributing property in the State Street Historic District, to add a non illuminated window sign that says "minute clinic." The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines for signs, and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2 and 9 and the guidelines for storefronts.**

(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.

*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 defeated.**

**Certificate of Appropriateness was denied.**

**Yeas:** 0

**Nays:** 6 - White, Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Vice Chair Stulberg, Beeson, and Ross

**Absent:** 1 - Secretary Bushkuhl

**E-3**

[13-0972](#)

HDC13-127; 517-535 West William - Six New Window Openings - OWSHD

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

**BACKGROUND:**

*The Argus Building was constructed as the Michigan Furniture Company in 1906. The largest section of the building is a four-story, flat-roofed factory with jack-arch windows and brick details at the corner of West William and Fourth Streets. The building also has a three-story red-brick section, and two-story and single-story concrete wings. The concrete sections are believed to have been constructed during the 1940s.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on West William, between Fourth Street and Third Street.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to install six square windows in new openings on the east second-floor wall of the former Argus Camera Company cafeteria.*

**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 that 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):*

**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. Providing a setback in the design of dropped ceilings when they are required for the new use to allow for the full height of the window*

*openings.*

*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.*

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 1. The applicant wishes to install six 24" square, aluminum, awning windows in a concrete block exterior wall. The windows would be equally spaced along the length of the wall, and only one (on the north end of the row) would be visible from the street or parking lot. The others are obscured from sight by the parapet of the one-story section of the building over which the windows look.*
- 2. In keeping with the SOI Guidelines for Windows, this work would be located on a non-character-defining elevation and its design is compatible with other square non-original window openings on this portion of the building. The interior ceilings will be setback to allow natural light through the new windows.*
- 3. Staff believes this work is compatible with the historic character of the property, differentiated from the older portions of the building, and conforms to the SOI Standards and Guidelines.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION:**

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

*Ramsburgh reported that this building has adapted so well over the years and looks timeless and that the application meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.*

*Ross agreed with Ramsburgh and the very thorough staff report. She supported locating the windows on a non-character defining elevation, noting that from William and Fourth Streets the windows would not be seen. She supported the application.*

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

*Bob Gates, 115 Depot Street, was present to explain the application and answer enquiries from the Commission. He gave a brief history of the building.*

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

**Motion made by McCauley, Seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the portion of the application at 517 535 West William Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to install six new aluminum awning windows, 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 City of Ann Arbor Design Guidelines for Historic Districts, and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2 and 9, and the guidelines for 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.**

*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 - White, Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Vice Chair Stulberg, Beeson, and Ross

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Secretary Bushkuhl

**E-4**     [13-0973](#)

**HDC13-132; 121-123 East Liberty -Three-story Rooftop Addition - MSHD**

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

**BACKGROUND:**

*The non-contributing building located at 121-123 East Liberty and 220 South Fourth Avenue was built as two storefronts on East Liberty in 1897 or earlier. The 220 South Fourth storefront was carved out of the rear of 123 East Liberty. The 1901 City Directory lists Gilbert W Snow as the occupant of 121 E Liberty. In 1912, the City Directory lists the store as a machine shop. William E Pardon is listed as the occupant of 123 E Liberty, who also ran a grocery store in the same location. By 1915, the store was the location of a clothing store run by Fred W Gross. Originally a two-story (121) and a three-story (123) building, a fire in the 1950s damaged both. The upper floors were removed, creating a one-story building, and the building was refaced with enameled steel panel siding.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the north side of East Liberty Street at the corner of South Fourth Avenue.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct three new floors above the existing one-story building, creating six new residential units.*

**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.**

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

(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):*

#### *Design for the Replacement of Missing Historic Features*

*When an entire interior or exterior feature is missing (for example, an entrance, or cast iron facade; or a principal staircase), it no longer plays a role in physically defining the historic character of the building unless it can be accurately recovered in form and detailing through the process of carefully documenting the historical appearance. Although accepting the loss is one possibility, where an important architectural feature is missing, its replacement is always recommended in the Rehabilitation guidelines as the first or preferred, course of action. Thus, if adequate historical, pictorial, and physical documentation exists so that the feature may be accurately reproduced, and if it is desirable to re-establish the feature as part of the building's historical appearance, then designing and constructing a new feature based on such information is appropriate. However, a second acceptable option for the replacement feature is a new design that is compatible with the remaining character-defining features of the historic building. The new design should always take into account the size, scale, and material of the historic building itself and, most importantly, should be clearly differentiated so that a false historical appearance is not created.*

#### *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:*

*Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced storefront is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.  
Introducing a new design that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.*

#### *New Additions*

##### *Recommended:*

*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.*

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

#### *Setting*

*Not Recommended:*

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

*From the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines:*

#### *New Construction in Historic Districts*

*Rather than imitating older buildings, a new design should relate to the fundamental characteristics of the historic district while also conveying contemporary stylistic trends.*

#### *Building Massing for New Construction in Downtown Historic Districts*

*Building massing should fit with existing historic patterns. Existing historic patterns and traditions in building massing include varied heights, articulated masses, visually interesting skylines and pedestrian-scaled street fronts. Building massing should continue to provide a variety of pedestrian-friendly scales and visually appealing masses. Buildings should not be immense in scale or greatly contrast with the existing scale on the block or in the surrounding historic district.*

#### *Design Guidelines for Additions*

*Appropriate:*

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

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

#### *Design Guidelines for Storefronts*

*Appropriate:*

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

*Replacing in-kind an entire storefront that is too deteriorated to repair, if the overall form and detailing are still evident, using the physical evidence to guide the new work.*

*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.*

*STAFF FINDINGS:*

1. *The existing building is non-contributing, and photo documentation of its predecessor has not been found. Its streetwall and general first-floor fenestration pattern will be retained, thus preserving the established pedestrian experience at this corner. A second, third, and partial fourth floor are proposed to be added on top of the existing building, though the exterior of the first floor will be completely re-done. There may or may not be historic materials underneath the enameled steel panels, and those materials are not proposed to be restored, which is acceptable for a non-contributing structure.*
2. *The building's proposed three stories are in keeping with the original structure at 123 E Liberty, and adds a floor to what was originally at 121 E Liberty. The fourth floor is roughly half the area of the underlying floors, and set into the rear corner of the building. The steel-clad fourth floor is set back 9'9" from the South Fourth Avenue façade, and 28'6" from East Liberty. There are shade pergolas on the terrace off the fourth floor that are about 16' from the East Liberty façade. A 48" parapet wall along the two street elevations eliminates the need for a railing around the roof, and hides the fourth floor completely from across East Liberty. The top few feet of the fourth floor's parapet will be visible from across South Fourth Avenue.*
3. *The brick veneer, fenestration pattern and style, and simple cornice are all compatible with the surrounding historic district. The storefronts and doors are anodized aluminum and the presence of a sign band at a height that is similar to adjacent buildings is appropriate, as are the shallow fixed metal canopies over the first floor and some of the third floor windows.*
4. *Staff believes the design, materials, and massing are compatible with the surrounding historic district, and will be complimentary to it. The storefront design is simple and appropriate. The fourth floor is taller than the adjacent structures on East Liberty, but still inconspicuous and it does not detract from contributing resources. The proposed building relates to the fundamental characteristics of the Main Street Historic District without being overwhelming, and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION:**

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

*Ross reported that in visiting the site she agreed with the staff report that there will not be any architectural historical features that will be compromised or removed with this addition. She said the existing building height makes the building seem hidden and the new addition will actually make it blend in more with the scale and mass of the surrounding buildings. She said it looks like a good plan.*

*Ramsburgh agreed with Ross and the staff report, adding that the existing building is a non-contributing building and the proposal is pleasing and appropriate for this corner, and with the fenestration, massing and scale it will be a nice fit.*

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

*Brad Moore, 4844 Jackson Road, Ann Arbor, Architect and Applicant, was present to explain the application and answer enquiries from the Commission.*

**Motion made by White, Seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 121-123 E Liberty Street and 220 S Fourth Ave, a non-contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to construct three new floors above the existing one-story building, creating six new residential units. The proposed work is compatible in exterior**

design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines for additions and storefronts, and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 6, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for storefronts and new additions.

(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.

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

(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 - White, Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Vice Chair Stulberg, Beeson, and Ross

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Secretary Bushkuhl

**E-5**      [13-0975](#)

HDC13-133; 210-216 South Fourth Avenue - Restore Façade and Three-story Rooftop Addition - MSHD

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

*BACKGROUND:*

*Parts of the non-contributing building located at 210-216 S Fourth Avenue were constructed in 1896 or earlier. The north portion of the building was used for Enoch Dieterle's funeral parlor. In 1928, the building became Montgomery Ward's department store. Significant changes were made at this time. The façade and southern and western walls were removed. Currently, all that remains of the original structure are the eastern and western foundation walls and portions of the northern*

first floor wall. In 1928, the building was three bays wide and two stories high. Later, a fourth bay was added to the south elevation, although it was much shallower than the existing building. The façade was also changed in 1928 to reflect Montgomery Ward's characteristic architecture, and was covered with glazed terra cotta.

In 1960, a fire destroyed a large portion of the second floor. The owners demolished and reconstructed the second floor, constructed a new arcade in the middle of the first floor, and refaced the second story façade with vertical steel siding. The building currently retains most of these features, although the arcade has been eliminated.

**LOCATION:**

The site is located on the west side of South Fourth Avenue between East Washington Street and East Liberty Street.

**APPLICATION:**

The applicant seeks HDC approval to (1) reconfigure the existing façade so that it resembles the previous Montgomery Ward façade, and (2) construct three additional floors.

**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.*
- (3) *Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.*
- (6) *Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
- (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):*

*Design for the Replacement of Missing Historic Features*

*When an entire interior or exterior feature is missing (for example, an entrance, or cast iron facade; or a principal staircase), it no longer plays a role in physically defining the historic character of the building unless it can be accurately recovered in*

*form and detailing through the process of carefully documenting the historical appearance. Although accepting the loss is one possibility, where an important architectural feature is missing, its replacement is always recommended in the Rehabilitation guidelines as the first or preferred, course of action. Thus, if adequate historical, pictorial, and physical documentation exists so that the feature may be accurately reproduced, and if it is desirable to re-establish the feature as part of the building's historical appearance, then designing and constructing a new feature based on such information is appropriate. However, a second acceptable option for the replacement feature is a new design that is compatible with the remaining character-defining features of the historic building. The new design should always take into account the size, scale, and material of the historic building itself and, most importantly, should be clearly differentiated so that a false historical appearance is not created.*

#### *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:*

*Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced storefront is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.  
Introducing a new design that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.*

#### *New Additions*

##### *Recommended:*

*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.*

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

#### *Setting*

##### *Not Recommended:*

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

*From the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines:*

#### *New Construction in Historic Districts*

*Rather than imitating older buildings, a new design should relate to the fundamental characteristics of the historic district while also conveying contemporary stylistic trends.*

#### *Building Massing for New Construction in Downtown Historic Districts*

*Building massing should fit with existing historic patterns. Existing historic patterns and traditions in building massing include varied heights, articulated masses, visually interesting skylines and pedestrian-scaled street fronts. Building massing should*

*continue to provide a variety of pedestrian-friendly scales and visually appealing masses. Buildings should not be immense in scale or greatly contrast with the existing scale on the block or in the surrounding historic district.*

#### *Design Guidelines for Additions*

##### *Appropriate:*

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

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

#### *Design Guidelines for Storefronts*

##### *Appropriate:*

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

*Replacing in-kind an entire storefront that is too deteriorated to repair, if the overall form and detailing are still evident, using the physical evidence to guide the new work.*

*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.*

#### **STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. *Façade replacement. The massing and proportions of the two-story street façade are very close to the original 1929 Montgomery Wards building, along with general detailing. This is not a replication of the original façade, however, because the details and materials do not match. The largest deviation from the original is the proposed exterior cladding, which is tan/yellow brick, not square terracotta tiles with a white glaze. Glass block is proposed in the transoms instead of smaller square panes or prism glass cubes set in lead. Also, some of the details have been left off, like the swags found at the tops of the five pilasters (below the decorative urns), and the terracotta bull-nosed corners and fluted trim bands, which cannot be replicated in brick. The design is reminiscent of the original, however, and would certainly convey a sense of the 1929 building.*

*The applicant has provided photos of other Montgomery Wards buildings, including some made of brick, but using those photos as a model for this building would be conjectural (see SOI standard 3).*

*Given the use of modern materials and lack of historic detailing, staff is treating the building as modern infill construction, not restoration, but with motifs borrowed from the original. Viewed in that light, the façade design would be an admiring nod to the original and an asset to the Main Street Historic District. Staff does not believe that the proposal conveys a false historical appearance. Reusing the original cornice line and tile inserts lend interest while conveying a sense of the past on a modern building.*

2. *Storefronts. The four bays each have a traditional sign band, and if approved as*

*presented, only a staff approval will be required for signage placed within them. Spanning each display window is a very shallow fixed metal canopy (where the awning gutter was once located). As a design element of a modern building, this fits well with the aluminum storefronts and upper story windows.*

*3. Banners. Since the second floor houses residential units, not businesses, the use of second floor signage is inappropriate. Staff would prefer to see bracket signs for the benefit of pedestrians, mounted perhaps between transoms or from the metal canopies (if they're high up enough for a sign hanging below them to meet building code requirements) if more signage is required.*

*4. Additional floors. Per the application, the third floor would be set back nine feet from the front façade of the building, and the fourth and fifth floors would be set back an additional eleven feet. (The floor plan on page 12, however, shows these flipped -- the third floor is setback 11 feet and the fourth/fifth are an additional 9 feet.) Materials on the upper-story addition include "medium sand decorative masonry units", corrugated steel panels, and anodized aluminum window systems. A sixth floor penthouse set back 40' from the front wall contains the elevator and several stair towers leading to three small private roofdecks, along with a small room (with a sink) that accesses a larger common roof deck for residents of floors two to four. A modular tray system green roof would be installed on part of the fifth-floor roof, near the roofdecks. Side and rear elevations feature balconies, aluminum windows, and glass block windows. A simple tiered cornice wraps around the four upper stories.*

*Section drawings with pedestrian sight-lines are provided on pages 15 and 16. They indicate that a pedestrian directly across South Fourth Avenue would have a view of the fourth and fifth floors, and that pedestrians on the west side of South Main Street would not see the project at all. The building will be visible from other vantage points, however, such as over the two-story buildings on East Liberty that are between Running Fit and the alley, and especially along the east side of South Fourth Avenue approaching East Washington Street, on the same block as the project. A 3-D rendering of the building from different pedestrian vantage points would help staff and the commission understand those relationships.*

*The materials chosen are simple and modern. Staff has requested that the petitioner bring samples of the concrete units and corrugated steel to the HDC meeting.*

*5. Staff's outstanding concern is whether the height and appearance of the building is compatible with the two-story buildings nearby, especially on this block of South Fourth Avenue and on East Liberty Street. To clarify, the fact that the new infill building may be visible is not as concerning as the risk that the new building may destroy historic relationships within the setting. Staff is hopeful that additional information from the petitioner will lay these fears to rest.*

#### **REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION:**

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

*Ramsburgh reported that during their visit she came to appreciate the detailed staff report, adding that the proposed first 2 stories are very appropriate in massing and scale with pleasing simple details with reference to the old Montgomery Ward building. She felt that the visual of the 5th floor makes the building appear heavier than what it is given the massing compared to the buildings on the north and the corner of Washington Street and Fourth Avenue, where the buildings aren't as tall and makes the proposed building addition out of scale.*

*Ross agreed with Ramsburgh's statement. She said the re-work on the facade of the first and second story is very much needed and will be great, but the proposed elongated upper story has a heavy, blocky, large and overwhelming presence.*

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

*Brad Moore, 4844 Jackson Road, Ann Arbor, Architect and Applicant, was present to explain the application and answer enquiries from the Commission.*

**I move that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 210-216 S Fourth Ave, a non-contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to reconfigure the existing façade and to construct three new floors above the existing two-story building. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines for new construction, additions and storefronts, and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 3, 6, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for storefronts, setting, and new additions.**

**(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.**

**(3) Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.**

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

**(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.*

**Motion was withdrawn.**

**A motion was made by Chair McCauley, seconded by White, that the Agenda Item be Postponed Indefinitely. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.**

**Item Postponed**



**Yeas:** 6 - White, Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Vice Chair Stulberg, Beeson, and Ross

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Secretary Bushkuhl

**E-1**     [13-0970](#)

HDC13-125; 614 South Ashley Street - Replace Four Wood Windows - OWSHD

*Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:*

**BACKGROUND:**

*This 1 ½ story gable-fronter features a gambrel roof, full-width front porch, and rusticated block foundation. It was first occupied in 1913 by Dewitt Ellsworth, a machinist for AV Rockwell (which was located in the current Washtenaw Dairy at 602 S Ashley). By 1916 Ervin Koch occupied the house, and members of the Koch family lived here until at least 1940. During the 19-teens, Kochs lived in the first four houses on the west side of this block, and the Dairy briefly housed Koch Auto Garage.*

**LOCATION:**

*The site is located on the west side of South Ashley Street between West Madison Street and West Mosley Street.*

**APPLICATION:**

*The applicant seeks after-the-fact HDC approval to replace four wood windows on the second floor with vinyl windows.*

**APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:**

*Ann Arbor City Code Chapter 103 § 8:421(3)*

*When work has been done upon a resource without a permit, and the commission finds that the work does not qualify for a certificate of appropriateness, the commission may require an owner to restore the resource to the condition the resource was in before the inappropriate work or to modify the work so that it qualifies for a certificate of appropriateness. If the owner does not comply with the restoration or modification requirement within a reasonable time, the commission may request for the city to seek an order from the circuit court to require the owner to restore the resource to its former condition or to modify the work so that it qualifies for a certificate of appropriateness. If the owner does not comply or cannot comply with the order of the court, the commission may request for the city to enter the property and conduct work necessary to restore the resource to its former condition or modify the work so that it qualifies for a certificate of appropriateness in accordance with the court's order. The costs of the work shall be charged to the owner, and may be levied by the city as a special assessment against the property. When acting pursuant to an order of the circuit court, the city may enter a property for purposes of this section.*

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

*(6) Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where*

*possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*

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

*Windows*

*Recommended:*

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

*Recommended:*

*Repairing window frames and sash by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing. Such repair may also include replacement in kind of those parts that are either extensively deteriorated or are missing when there are surviving prototypes such as architraves, hoodmolds, sash, sills, and interior or exterior shutters and blinds.*

*Replacing in kind an entire window that is too deteriorated to repair – if the overall form and detailing are still evident – using the physical evidence to guide the new work. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.*

*Not Recommended:*

*Retrofitting or replacing windows rather than maintaining the sash, frame, and glazing.*

*Replacing an entire window when repair of materials and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.*

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

*Installing new windows, including frames, sash, and muntin configuration that are incompatible with the building's historic appearance or obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features.*

*From the City of Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines:*

*Windows*

*Appropriate:*

*If a window is completely missing, replacing it with a new window based on accurate documentation of the original or a new design compatible with the original opening and the historic character of the building. Materials other than wood will be reviewed by the Commission on a case-by-case basis.*

*Not Appropriate:*

*Failing to maintain and repair existing windows.  
Replacing an entire window that is not deteriorated beyond repair.*

*Removing or radically changing a window that is important in defining the overall*

*historic character of the property.*

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. *A neighborhood resident contacted staff on July 18 to report wood window sashes stacked on the curb in front of this house the previous weekend. The contractor met with staff on July 23, 2013 to discuss the window situation. He filled out an application for HDC consideration and paid the application fee at that time.*

2. *Per the applicant: Four wood windows on the second floor were replaced with vinyl windows. Two are on the front (east) façade, and two on the north façade. The replaced windows at one time were double-hung and had weights and pulleys, although those had been removed and the top sash fixed shut to convert them to single-hung windows. They matched the wood windows on other parts of the house that were not replaced. The presence of weights and pulleys indicates that it is extremely likely that the windows were installed during the period of significance for the historic district (i.e. pre-1942); visual inspection of remaining windows during the Review Committee visit will provide more information.*

3. *The replacement of wood windows with vinyl windows is not appropriate under the Secretary of the Interior's Standards or Guidelines, and the City of Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines.*

4. *In staff's opinion, the replacement of wood windows with vinyl ones does not qualify for a certificate of appropriateness. Since the wood windows removed from the house were discarded, reinstallation is not an option. Therefore, where wood windows previously existed, modifying the work by removing the vinyl windows and installing compatible wood windows that meet the City of Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines is recommended by staff.*

5. *Two suggested motions are listed below. A) The first would allow the new vinyl windows to stay in openings that previously had wood windows. Staff does NOT recommend approval of this motion. B) The second motion would require that wood windows of the original size be reinstalled in openings that previously had wood windows. Staff recommends approval of this motion.*

**REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION:**

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

*Ramsburgh reported that she was glad to hear from the owner that they plan on replacing the vinyl windows with wood ones.*

*Ross said she agrees with the staff report and that the project is pretty straight forward. She said the wood windows will match appropriately with the building.*

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

*The applicant was not present.*

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

**Wood to vinyl windows (to approve what has already been installed):**

**Motion made by Beeson, Seconded by White, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 614 S Ashley, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to replace four second-floor**

wood windows with vinyl windows, 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 City of Ann Arbor Design Guidelines for Historic Districts, and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standard 6 and the guidelines for windows.

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

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

Yeas: 0

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

Absent: 1 - Secretary Bushkuhl

**Reinstallation of wood windows:**

Motion made by McCauley, Seconded by White, that because this work was done without permission of the Commission and does not qualify for a certificate of appropriateness, the property owner is ordered to restore four second-story wood windows to their prior condition, or to modify the windows so that they would qualify for a certificate of appropriateness, consistent with section 8:421 of Ann Arbor City Code, by replacing the windows with wood windows, under the following conditions: the owners must apply for and receive a staff approval for the proposed replacement windows before building permits are issued. The windows must be restored to their prior conditions or replaced as stated by February 15, 2014.

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

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

**Certificate of Appropriateness was granted.**

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Secretary Bushkuhl

**F UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**G**      **NEW BUSINESS**

- G-1**      [13-0976](#)      National Register Nomination for the William and Elizabeth Muschenheim House (1251 Heather Way)

*Thacher reviewed the Application with the Commission.*

**A motion was made by Vice Chair Stulberg to nominate the William and Elizabeth Muschenheim House, located at 1251 Heather Way, to be added to the National Register of Historic Places, having met the Historic Preservation Standards, seconded by White.**

**On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.**

**Yeas:** 6 - White, Ramsburgh, Chair McCauley, Vice Chair Stulberg, Beeson, and Ross

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 1 - Secretary Bushkuhl

- G-2**      [13-0977](#)      National Register Nomination for the Robert and Bettie Metcalf House (1052 Arlington Boulevard)

*Thacher reviewed the Application with the Commission.*

**A motion was made by Vice Chair Stulberg to nominate the Robert and Bettie Metcalf House, located at 1052 Arlington Boulevard, to be added to the National Register of Historic Places, having met the Historic Preservation Standards, seconded by White.**

**On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.**

**H**      **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- H-1**      **13-0978**      Minutes of the July 11, 2013 HDC Meeting

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

**I**      **REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS****J**      **ASSIGNMENTS**

- J-1**      **Review Committee: Monday, September 9 at 5:00 pm for the September 12, 2013 Regular Meeting**

*McCauley and White volunteered for the September Review Committee.*

**K**      **REPORTS FROM STAFF**

- K-1**      [13-0979](#)      July 2013 HDC Staff Activities

**Received and Filed****L      CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS****M      COMMUNICATIONS****N      ADJOURNMENT**

**The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 9:57 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.*