



City of Ann Arbor

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

Meeting Minutes Historic District Commission

Thursday, March 13, 2014

7:00 PM

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

A CALL TO ORDER

Chair Stulberg called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

B ROLL CALL

Jill Thacher called the roll.

Present: 5 - Ellen Ramsburgh, Patrick McCauley, Thomas Stulberg, John Beeson, and Jennifer Ross

Absent: 2 - Robert White, and Benjamin L. Bushkuhl

C APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

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

None

E HEARINGS

E-1 [14-0404](#) HDC14-016; 525 South First Street - Rear Addition to House - OWSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

This handsome two story brick house features elaborate brick hood molds over the windows, decorative brick banding in the front gable and at the base of the first and second floors, a cut stone foundation, a round window in the front gable, a wood sunburst in the rear gable, and a full-width L-shaped front porch. The earliest reference to the house (which may be older) is found in the 1886-87 City Directory, when it was the home of mason John G. Koch. Barbara Horning occupied the house in 1903, and members of the Horning family lived there until 1919.

LOCATION:

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

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct a 9'5" x 15'5" addition on top of an existing basement, demolish and rebuild a small rear addition from the 1950s, add a dormer on the north elevation of the existing rear wing that ties into the new addition, and add a small covered porch/stoop on the rear elevation.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

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

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

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

Additions**Recommended:**

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

Considering the attached exterior addition both in terms of the new use and the appearance of other buildings in the historic district or neighborhood. Design for the new work may be contemporary or may reference design motifs from the historic building.

Locating the attached exterior addition at the rear or on an inconspicuous side of a historic building; and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

Designing new additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.

Not Recommended:

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

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

Building Site

Recommended:

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

Retaining the historic relationship between buildings and the landscape.

Not Recommended:

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

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

*Guidelines for All Additions**Appropriate:*

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

Placing new walls in a different plane from the historic structure in a subordinate position to the historic fabric.

Designing a new addition in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.

Limiting the size and scale of the addition in relationship to the historic building so that it does not diminish or visually overpower the building or the district. The addition's footprint should exceed neither half of the original building's footprint nor half of the original building's total floor area.

Not Appropriate:

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

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. *The house currently consists of a brick two-story block with a one-and-a-half story rear wing. These appear on the 1908 Sanborn map. There is also a wood-clad rectangular one-story rear wing on the north side of the house that extends beyond the rear brick wing. Most of the wood wing appears on the 1925 Sanborn map. During the 1950s, the wood wing was extended by around 4 ½' to enclose stairs to the basement. This section is easily identified by the change in foundation materials. Behind the rear brick wing is a deck with a concrete foundation and basement below it. The date of construction of the deck/basement is unknown.*

2. *The homeowner would like to build a 1 ½ story addition on the back of the 1 ½ story rear brick wing. The addition would sit on top of, and match the footprint of, the existing back deck, and would be approximately 2'6" taller than the ridge of the existing rear wing in order to meet modern building codes. On the north side, the new addition and the rear brick wing would share a dormer that ties these spaces together and makes them more useable. The addition would be clad in Hardie smooth lap siding. Windows in the addition would be a pair of wood doublehangs in the dormer, and on the rear elevation, clad casements. Two windows and one door opening (which appears to be relatively modern from the way it is cut into the bricks) on the back wall will be removed for the addition.*

3. *The roof of the existing one-story wood wing on the back would be rebuilt at a slightly greater pitch. The two wood windows on the north side would be removed, and new wood windows would be installed in slightly different locations. On the rear of the wood wing is a door in the wall that would be removed and rebuilt; this door would be replaced with a wood doublehung window.*
4. *The rear porch/stoop is simple and echoes the design of the front porch. The guardrails will need to meet current building code requirements for height and spindle spacing. The design of the rear porch is complementary and appropriate.*
5. *Per assessor records, the house is currently 1577 square feet. The addition adds approximately 145 square feet on each of the first and second floors, for a total of 290 square feet or 18% of the current floor area.*
6. *Staff believes the work is complementary and sensitive to the house and neighborhood, and generally meets the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines, and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Commissioner's Beeson and Stulberg visited the site as part of their review.

Beeson reported that the area where this house is located has several houses similar in size and scale and the proposed addition would easily blend into the neighborhood. The addition isn't ostentatious and would barely be visible from the street. The windows that are proposed to be move or relocated are in good shape and operable.

Stulberg added that the proposed size of the addition is appropriate to the existing structure and doesn't overwhelm it in any way. He reported that given the earlier additions to the structure, the proposed addition is correctly sited so not to interfere with any character defining features of the structure.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Cathy Schuh, 525 South First Street, Ann Arbor, owner, added that they were amenable to reusing the windows [in the new addition] that are proposed to be removed. She explained the interior layout and was available to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

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

A motion was made by Ramsburgh, seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 525 First Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a construct a 9'5" x 15'5" addition on top of an existing basement, demolish and rebuild a corner of an existing rear addition and increase the pitch of the roof, add a dormer on the north elevation of the existing rear wing that ties into the new addition, and add a small covered porch/stoop on the rear elevation, provided that 2 of the old windows on the north side are re-used in the proposed locations. As proposed, the work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 5, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for additions and building site; and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines for additions.

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

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

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

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - White, and Vice Chair Bushkuhl

E-2 [14-0405](#)

HDC14-017; 122 South Seventh Street - Install Three Skylights - OWSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

This two-and-a-half story gable-fronter features corner returns and a full-width brick front porch. It was first occupied in 1905 by William Alber, a machinist. The homeowner has been steadily working on the house and garage, and has received staff approvals for garage repairs, replacement of non-original windows, fencing, and new wood storm windows.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the west side of South Seventh Street, at the northwest corner of West Washington Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to install three skylights on the north-facing roof surface, and replace a rear door with a wood single-light door.

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

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

(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):

Roofs

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs--and their functional and decorative features--that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. This includes the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features such as cupolas, cresting chimneys, and weathervanes; and roofing material such as slate, wood, clay tile, and metal, as well as its size, color, and patterning.

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:

Introducing a new design that is incompatible with the historic character of the building.

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 property so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

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

Doors

Appropriate:

Replacing a missing original or non-original door with a design that matches original doors remaining on the house, or with a compatible new design and material that fits

the style and period of the house and the existing opening. The Commission will review materials on a case-by-case basis.

Windows

Not Appropriate: Removing or radically changing a window that is important in defining the overall historic character of the property.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. Three flat skylights are proposed on the north roof of the house: Two are 21" x 38" and one is 21" x 27". The color of the skylights is close to that in the photo provided, and will match the roof. The skylights are flat and will project 3 ½" from the surface of the roof. This roof is not a character-defining feature of the house, and staff believes the skylights are appropriate given their small size. Utilizing attic space instead of building an addition is also more appropriate, generally speaking.

2. The back door is probably from the period of significance for the Old West Side (pre-1943). Its lightweight construction indicates that it's an interior door, however. The photos attached to the application show the existing (white) door, another existing wood exterior door on the house (one of two that match), and the proposed Douglas fir single-light door. The proposed new door is complementary and compatible with the two old single-light doors on the house. Since it is a rear door, staff is not concerned about matching the new door to those old ones more precisely.

3. A replacement bathroom window is shown on the floorplan—this was already approved at the staff level.

4. Staff believes the work, as proposed, is compatible with the existing structure, neighboring buildings, and the surrounding historic district, and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Commissioner's Beeson and Stulberg visited the site as part of their review.

Beeson reported that the current landing is very difficult to navigate with the existing door opening into the interior. He noted that the door is also very difficult to be seen from most viewpoints. He explained that since the house is elevated [built up] with a slope down to Seventh Street, it would be very difficult to see the proposed skylights and wouldn't detract from the nature of the house. He felt the proposed work will substantially improve the house.

Stulberg concurred with Beeson and the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Jesse Penenis, Westside Builders, 2200 Dexter Avenue, Ann Arbor, was available to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

Dave Lewis, 122 South Seventh Street, owner was also present and available for questions.

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

Motion made by McCauley, seconded by Stulberg, that the Commission issue a

certificate of appropriateness for the application at 122 S Seventh Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to install three skylights on the north-facing roof surface, and replace a rear door with a wood single-light door, as proposed. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 2, 9 and 10 and the guidelines for roofs, windows, and building site, as well as the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to doors and windows.

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

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

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - White, and Vice Chair Bushkuhl

E-3 [14-0406](#)

HDC14-026; 1034 West Liberty Street - New Roof - OWSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

This one-and-three-quarter story bungalow features a stuccoed first floor and shingles on the second floor, a cross-gabled roof plan, and a full-width stuccoed front porch with knee-walls flanking the front stairs. It first appears in Polk City Directories in 1919 as the home of Lucy and George L. Haarer. George was a partner at Lindenschmitt, Apfel & Co. clothiers, hatters and furnishers, at 209 South Main.

In November, 2013, the owners received a certificate of appropriateness to replace a slate roof with an asphalt roof, on the condition that the asphalt roof is reviewed by the Commission.

LOCATION:

The house is located on the north side of West Liberty Street, east of Eberwhite Boulevard and west of Eighth Street. It backs up to Slauson Middle School.

APPLICATION:

The owners are proposing to use GAF Camelot asphalt shingles to replace the existing slate roof.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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

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

Roofs**Recommended:**

Replacing in kind an entire feature of the roof that is too deteriorated to repair, using the physical evidence as a model to reproduce the feature.

If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Building Site**Recommended:**

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

Not Recommended:

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

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

Roofs**Appropriate:**

Replacing historic roofing material that is deteriorated beyond repair with matching materials. If using the original is not technically feasible, then compatible substitute materials may be considered.

Not Appropriate:

Replacing historic roofing materials that are repairable.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. In November of 2013, the HDC approved the removal of the existing slate roof, and conditioned its replacement with asphalt on Commission review of the new material. The homeowners have provided a sample to staff of GAF Camelot shingles in the color Antique Slate. The shingles are layered with a strong shadow line to give them more dimensionality than standard shingles, and the ridges are capped. Staff appreciates that the homeowners have chosen a style that emulates slate as closely as possible for asphalt, instead of a less expensive standard shingle.

2. Staff's opinion is that the proposed asphalt shingles are an appropriate size, color, and style that are a reasonable replacement for the existing roof. The work is compatible with the house and neighborhood and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standard six and the guidelines for roofs and building site, as well as the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to roofs.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Chair Stulberg noted that they did not re-visit the site for this application.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Armen Hratchian, 1034 West Liberty Street, Ann Arbor, was available to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

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

Motion made by Ross, seconded by Ramsburgh, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 1034 West Liberty Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to install roof using GAF Camelot shingles, as proposed. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular Standard 6 and the guidelines for roofs and building site, as well as the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to roofs.

(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.

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - White, and Vice Chair Bushkuhl

E-4 [14-0407](#) HDC14-020; 504 High Street - Replace 6 Windows - OWSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

This Classic Revival, one story rectangular painted brick residence is the 1854 Colored Baptist Church. It features a front gabled roof with returns, double-hung windows with shallow brick arches and wooden block stills, and a full front porch added after 1908 with a shingled base and short, square columns. Both the 1868 and 1872 City Directories list the Colored Baptist Church at this locations, and the 1854 and 1870 maps indicate Union Church here. The 1881 County History mentions a "flourishing African Baptist church with a house of worship in the 4th Ward". By 1888, the first Sanborn map indicates that a new Colored Baptist Chhurch was being built on North Fifth Avenue at Beakes. The Centennial History of the congregation, the Second Baptist Church, says that a Rev. Lewis organized the first congregation in 1865 in a "frame dwelling". The High Street building, however, is a solid brick structure. A large wing on the Elizabeth Street side was added when the house became a day care center in the 1970s. (From the Old Fourth Ward study committee report)

LOCATION:

The site is located on the south side of High Street, at the southwest corner of Elizabeth Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace seven wood windows with wood windows.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

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

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. This building has been in violation on its rental housing inspections for over a year, in part because of deteriorated windows. In June of 2013, staff met with the management company on site to inspect the windows, which had obvious deterioration. In December, 2013 the management company applied for and received a staff approval to replace windows in a modern addition to the historic building. In January, 2014 a ticket and court appearance date were issued, in part because no progress had been made on the repair or replacement of wood windows in the historic part of the building.*
- 2. This application is to replace seven windows with wood windows. Two window worksheets were provided – one for the kitchen and one for the remaining six windows that are the same size. No description of the condition of each window was provided.*
- 3. Staff and the review committee will document our findings on Monday, March 10. Staff will provide a recommendation at the March 13 HDC meeting based on those findings.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Commissioner's Beeson and Stulberg visited the site as part of their review.

Beeson reported that the multiple layers of paint would make the HDC determination if the windows could be repaired, the most difficult, adding that the paint could either act as a preservation of the wood, or if moisture has gotten inside, the windows could be destroyed from the inside out. He said there wouldn't be any way of determining this without turning the windows inside out. He expressed that the double hung windows are a neat character defining feature of this house.

Stulberg added that the reason the windows are in such bad condition is neglect, poor design and poor maintenance. He pointed out that the poor design of the gutter system is what has led to the poor condition of the windows and the sills, noting that all the sills will need to be replaced. He said one alternative would be to take the windows out, stripping them down and rebuilding the sills and windows. He said some of the windows, such as the front windows, were in better shape than others, because they were protected by the elements better, with the kitchen window being in the worst condition.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Gilda Johnson, 3998 Cafrey Court, Ann Arbor, owner, was available to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

Mike Cassey, Contractor, was also available to respond to the Commission's questions.

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

A motion was made by Ross, seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 504 High Street, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to replace seven wood windows with wood 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.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

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

A motion was made by Ross, seconded by McCauley, to withdraw motion. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

A motion was made by Ross, seconded by McCauley, that the Public Hearing be Postponed until the April 10th, 2014 HDC meeting. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Item Postponed.

Yeas: 4 - Ramsburgh, McCauley, Chair Stulberg, and Ross

Nays: 0

Absent: 3 - White, Vice Chair Bushkuhl, and Secretary Beeson

E-5 [14-0408](#)

HDC14-014; 318 West Liberty Street - Demo Carwash, New Condo Building - OWSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

The Liberty Car Wash was constructed in 1966 and replaced a 1 ½ story wood framed house that occupied the site until at least 1960 (per 1925 and 1971 Sanborn Maps and the 1960 Polk Directory).

The HDC denied an application for a similar project at its January, 2014 meeting. This is a revised application and design.

LOCATION:

The building is located on the north side of West Liberty Street, between South First Street and Second Street.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to demolish a non-contributing car wash and construct a four story, seven unit condominium building with parking underneath.

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):

District/Neighborhood

Not Recommended:

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

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

*All New Construction**Appropriate:*

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

Designing new features so they are compatible with the historic character of the site, district, and neighborhood.

Basing the site location of new buildings on existing district setbacks, orientation, spacing and distance between adjacent buildings.

Designing new sidewalks, entrances, steps, porches and canopies to be consistent with the historic rhythm established in the district.

Designing new buildings to be compatible with, but discernible from, surrounding buildings that contribute to the overall character of the historic district in terms of height, form, size, scale, massing, proportions, and roof shape.

Not Appropriate:

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

*New Construction in Historic Residential Settings**Appropriate:*

Maintaining the existing spacing of front and side yard setbacks along a block as seen from the street.

Orienting the front of a house towards the street and clearly identifying the front door.

Designing a new front façade that is similar in scale and proportion to surrounding buildings that contribute to the overall character of the historic district.

Designing the spacing, placement, scale, orientation, proportion, pattern and size of window and door openings in new buildings to be compatible with surrounding historic buildings.

Selecting materials and finishes that are compatible with historic materials and finishes found in surrounding buildings that contribute to their historic character.

Not Appropriate:

Paving a high percentage of a front yard area or otherwise disrupting the landscape pattern within front yard setbacks

Placing a structure outside of the existing pattern of front yard setbacks along a historic residential block.

New Construction in Historic Commercial Settings

New construction should be compatible with the context of its surrounding historic district.

Maintaining the setback and alignment pattern seen on surrounding historic properties should take precedence over the setback and alignment pattern of any

surrounding properties that are not historic.

Alternative building orientations should generally not be considered for new construction in historic districts.

Building massing should fit with existing historic patterns.

Buildings should not be immense in scale or greatly contrast with the existing scale on the block or in the surrounding historic district.

STAFF FINDINGS:

- 1. This site has high visibility, is located on a block of very significant historic residential structures constructed between 1860 and 1891, and serves as a gateway to the Old West Side Historic District and neighborhood.*
- 2. The elevations are primarily clad in brick, with a band around the cornice and popped-out vertical window panels clad in smooth cementitious panel board (like Hardi-panel). The two sunrooms on the roof are also clad in panel board. The greater use of brick in this application than the last one is appropriate in this location near Liberty Lofts and historic brick structures along the railroad corridor.*
- 3. The height and width of the building are appropriate for the site and neighborhood. Pushing back the fourth floor sunrooms from the front and rear elevations helps minimize the height of the building. The third floor roof height is comparable to that of the Brehm House at 326 West Liberty (the Moveable Feast building) next door. Infilling the west edge of the property to match the grade next door and placing the garages on the taller east side is appropriate given the historic residential character of properties to the west and the industrial nature of properties to the east. Each unit now has a two car tandem garage underneath, with a glass-panel garage door.*
- 4. The front setback of the corner nearest West Liberty Street is now 36' 2". This is on a par with the established front setbacks of the three houses to the west, which have 43', 37', and 38' setbacks (to the fronts of the buildings, not the porches).*
- 5. Concerns with the previous application have been addressed in this one. Staff believes this application meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines, and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines for new construction.*

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Thacher noted that they did not re-visit the site for this revised application.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Brad Moore, 4844 Jackson Road # 150, Ann Arbor, Architect, explained the revised application and was available to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

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

A motion was made by Beeson, seconded by McCauley, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for 318 West Liberty Street, to demolish a non-contributing car wash and construct a seven-unit condominium building, as proposed. The 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 and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 9 and 10, and the guidelines for District/Neighborhood, and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, in particular the guidelines for new construction.

(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: 4 - Ramsburgh, McCauley, Secretary Beeson, and Ross

Nays: 1 - Chair Stulberg

Absent: 2 - White, and Vice Chair Bushkuhl

E-6 [14-0409](#)

HDC14-015; 335 Koch Avenue - New Duplex on Vacant Lot - OWSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

These two vacant lots sit between 1 ½ and 2 ½ story frame single-family houses. All City Directories and Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps show the lots as vacant.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct a new, 2-1/2 story duplex with two attached garages.

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):

District/Neighborhood

Not Recommended:

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

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

New Residential Construction

Appropriate:

Maintaining the existing spacing of front and side yard setbacks along a block as seen from the street.

Orienting the front of a house towards the street and clearly identifying the front door.

Designing a new front façade that is similar in scale and proportion to surrounding buildings that contribute to the overall character of the historic district.

Designing the spacing, placement, scale, orientation, proportion, pattern and size of window and door openings in new buildings to be compatible with surrounding historic buildings.

Selecting materials and finishes that are compatible with historic materials and finishes found in surrounding buildings that contribute to their historic character.

Placing utility connections at the rear or other locations that minimize visibility from the street.

Not Appropriate:

Paving a high percentage of a front yard area or otherwise disrupting the landscape pattern within front yard setbacks

Placing a structure outside of the existing pattern of front yard setbacks along a historic residential block

STAFF FINDINGS

1. The building reflects the scale and massing of the adjacent properties, and modern materials (cementitious siding, clad windows, fiberglass columns, and Azek railings) are compatible with the historic materials used on some adjacent buildings. Each unit's gable front and full-width front porch is appropriate for the neighborhood setting. The front setback is averaged (per zoning requirements) and therefore aligned with neighboring houses. The side setbacks are similar to adjacent structures.

2. Window patterns and styles are appropriate and complimentary. It is not indicated whether muntins will be applied, between the glass, or snapped onto the inside.

3. The rear of the house extends into the hill. The garages extend quite far into the

backyard, but will be invisible from the house to the west (uphill) because they'll be below grade. The structure does meet zoning requirements. Though the backyard is not huge, each unit will have a patio at grade (above the garages) and another one floor up.

4. There are a number of retaining walls necessary. These are proposed to be stone.

5. The lots will be required to be combined before permits may be issued.

6. It is staff's opinion that the proposed house is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding neighborhood and meets The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines, and the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines for new residential construction.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Commissioner's Beeson and Stulberg visited the site as part of their review.

Beeson reported that the site is very steep and the size, scale and relationship of the proposed structure with what's in the area is very compatible

Stulberg added that he was pleased to see how they created the proposed structure and developed the project from there, given the diagonal slope of the lot. He said he felt it was a better resolution to have a duplex instead of two individual houses on this site, even though it took up most of the lot.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Brad Moore, 4844 Jackson Road # 150, Ann Arbor, Architect, explained the application and was available to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

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

A motion was made by McCauley, seconded by Stulberg, that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 335 and 355 Koch Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to demolish a non-contributing garage, and permit the construction of a 2-1/2 story duplex with two attached garages, as proposed. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding resources 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 Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines, particularly as they pertain to new residential construction.

(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.

A motion was made that the Public Hearing be Postponed until the April 10th HDC meeting. On a voice vote, the vote was as follows, with the Chair declared the motion carried.

Item Postponed.

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - White, and Vice Chair Bushkuhl

E-7 [14-0410](#)

HDC14-027; 201 S. Fourth Avenue/200 E. Washington Street - New Storefront Window, Stone - MSHD

Jill Thacher presented the following staff report:

BACKGROUND:

200-202 East Washington was constructed as the Ypsi-Ann Building in 1927-28 and first occupied in 1928. The Betty Shop at 200 East Washington is prominently displayed in the 1928 City Directory. This seven-story commercial vernacular was designed by Ralph S. Gerganoff, a prolific Ypsilanti architect who designed several Ann Arbor commercial buildings, such as the Beer Depot (before it was altered almost beyond recognition), the elegant art-deco Kingsley Apartments, and St. Nicholas Greek Orthodox Church on North Main (recently demolished). The building features red tapestry brick on floors two through seven, and stone on the first floor and cornice. The architect's signature inset limestone diamonds are prominent. At some point the building became known as the Wolverine Building, and in the 1980s, the upper story windows and the East Washington Street fixed canopy were replaced and the building was renamed Washington Square.

LOCATION:

The site is located on the southeast corner of East Washington and South Fourth.

APPLICATION:

The applicant seeks HDC approval to replace the storefront glazing, framing, and kickplates (which are windows into the basement, some of which still function as such) with an aluminum storefront system with 2" wide by 6" deep frames and an aluminum panel in place of the current beam dividing the transoms from the display windows.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

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

(1) A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

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

characterize a property will be avoided.

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

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

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

Storefronts

Recommended:

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

Protecting and maintaining masonry, wood, and architectural metals which comprise storefronts through appropriate treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and reapplication of protective coating systems.

Repairing storefronts by reinforcing the historic materials. Repairs will also generally include the limited replacement in kind--or with compatible substitute materials--of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of storefronts where there are surviving prototypes such as transoms, kick plates, pilasters, or signs.

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 as a model. If using the same material is not technically or economically feasible, then compatible substitute materials may be considered.

Not Recommended:

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

Stripping storefronts of historic material such as wood, cast iron, terra cotta, carrara glass, and brick.

Replacing an entire storefront when repair of materials and limited replacement of its parts are appropriate.

Using substitute material for the replacement parts that does not convey the same visual appearance as the surviving parts of the storefront or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

Removing a storefront that is un-repairable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new storefront that does not convey the same visual appearance.

From the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines:

Storefronts

Appropriate:

Protecting, maintaining 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 using recognized preservation methods

Protecting and maintaining masonry, wood, and architectural metals which comprise storefronts through appropriate treatments such as reinforcement of historic materials, cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and reapplication of protective coating systems.

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 an entire storefront when repair is not possible.

Not Appropriate:

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

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

STAFF FINDINGS

- 1. Based on the style and appearance of its components, the existing storefront is believed to be from the period of significance (pre-1943) for the Main Street Historic District. It features plate glass set in steel, with a metal trim piece surrounding the edges. Some of the windows are divided by 2" steel muntins, but others are a single pane. Below the glazing is a wood kickplate (or bulkhead) made up of decorative panels with windows into the basement. Some of the windows still exist and function as windows, some have been painted over, and some have been boarded up. Staff has not been able to find any early photographs of this building, though renderings from around the time it was built in 1928 show a similar window arrangement, and transoms with eight lights instead of two, but a different arrangement of doors. It is not known whether the renderings were of the building as proposed, or as constructed.*
- 2. Staff is pleased to report that the new owner of the building is undertaking expensive deferred maintenance not addressed by the previous owner, such as re-pointing the entire building and repairing the aging elevators .*
- 3. Parts of the metal window framing have rusted away completely. The building manager told staff that the wood beams dividing the windows from the transoms are also heavily deteriorated. The wood kickplates, which rest on a limestone base, have shifted as a result of construction in the street, and show some signs of visible deterioration.*
- 4. On East Washington, the east window has two large display panes, with six small windows in the kickplate. The west window is one large piece of glass with four windows in the kickplate. In the corner entry on either side is a single pane of glass*

plus one kickplate window. On South Fourth, the north window is one piece of glass with five windows in the kickplate, and the south window is four panes of glass with seven kickplate windows. All of the transoms contain two panes of equal size. At this time, the storefront containing Sottini's and Pura Vida salon are not proposed to be replaced, though the intent is to come back to the HDC for their approval at a later date. All of the windows have awning gutters (or hoods) that appear in the early renderings of the building.

5. The application proposes to install a new aluminum window system with 2" frames. The two larger windows would be divided into three panes, and the inner windows (next to the corner door) would be divided into two panes. Each window's transoms would be divided into three parts instead of two. The wood beams and awning gutters that currently divide the transoms from the display windows are proposed to be removed. A metal panel of the same width is proposed to simulate the beam. The wood kickplate is proposed to be removed and the drawings submitted show aluminum infill. The building manager has proposed to replicate the kickplate in Azek and apply it to the new aluminum frame, though drawings have not been provided.

6. The division of the windows into three panes, as shown on the drawings, is not appropriate. Each storefront bay is flanked by heavy stone columns which continue up the side of the building as even heavier brick columns. The middle of each bay, and every transom, aligns with a more slender brick column above. This vertical element needs to be retained in the new windows. That means either a single sheet of glass or a sheet with one centered division is appropriate for the two larger display windows, and a single pane for the smaller ones closer to the door. The transoms should remain in two equal sections.

7. The use of a 2" aluminum window system instead of the current steel is appropriate if the divisions above are applied. The use of insulated glass instead of a single sheet of plate glass is appropriate. The use of an aluminum panel to cover the header beam may be appropriate, but a sample must be reviewed by the commission to ensure that it replicates the appearance of the original.

8. The complete loss of the wood kickplate and its detailing is not appropriate. The kickplate is important in defining the overall historic character of the building. Replicating it in Azek or a similar material might be appropriate, since hardwood installed today won't last nearly as long as this wood from 90 years ago. A sample window panel constructed of the material will be necessary for the HDC to review. Matching the detailing of the kickplate includes matching not only the dimensions, but the number of panels currently below each storefront. While staff would prefer to see glass restored in each panel, it may be acceptable to use a solid panel, but this must be reviewed by the HDC.

9. It is staff's opinion that the application does not meet the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines and the SOI Standards and Guidelines. In order to meet all three, staff believes the following changes to the application would be necessary:

- a. The transoms must be two panes of glass of equal size.
- b. The two larger, outer display windows must be two equally sized panes of glass, or one single pane.
- c. The two inner display windows closest to the door must be a single pane of glass.
- d. The entire kickplate must be restored, or if the wood is deteriorated beyond

repair, its appearance from the exterior of the building must be replicated.

e. All glazing and framing must match the inset of the current glazing and framing on the exterior of the building. Material changes to the kickplate (from wood to Azek) and kickplate windows (from glass to wood or Azek) must be added to the motion below, if the HDC finds them appropriate.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Commissioner's Beeson and Stulberg visited the site as part of their review.

Beeson reported that during the site visit he noticed that the kick plates are a definite character-defining feature of this building and to see them go away wouldn't be a good thing, especially having the experience of going into the basement and seeing the substantial affect the kickplates have on lighting to the basement. He said it was great to see all the wonderful work being done to different parts of the building, noting specifically the elevator lobby. He felt the steel windows were in good condition given their age, and wondered if they might have been wood at one point in time. He said the 'sliding' on the Washington side seems to be continuing. He said the kick plates have all been painted over on the inside of the glass.

Stulberg added that it was important to see the verticle element of the whole building. He said the structural elements of the building would need to be looked at and repaired in order to keep the building sound. He commented that if the storefronts were not original, how did the kick plates fit into the picture.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Betty Marvin and James Howell, Cameron Holdings, LLC, 4121 Okemos Rd, Suite 17, Okemos, owner and building manager, explained the application and was available to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

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

A motion was made by McCauley, seconded by Beeson, that the Historic District Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 200 East Washington Street, a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to replace the storefront glazing and framing. The work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding resources and meets the Ann Arbor Historic District Design Guidelines and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in particular standards 1, 2, 5, and 6, and both sets of guidelines for storefronts.

(1) A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

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

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

(6) Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where

the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

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.

Request was denied.

Yeas: 0

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

Absent: 2 - White, and Vice Chair Bushkuhl

F UNFINISHED BUSINESS

G NEW BUSINESS

H APPROVAL OF MINUTES

H-1 [14-0411](#) Minutes of the February 13, 2014 HDC Meeting

With no objections, the minutes were unanimously approved by the Commission. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 2 - White, and Vice Chair Bushkuhl

I REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

J ASSIGNMENTS

J-1 Review Committee: Monday, April 7, at 5:00 PM for the April 10, 2014 Regular Meeting

Thacher noted that the Review Committee site visits should be reflected to show beginning time at Noon.

Commissioner McCauley volunteered for the April Review Committee (with Beeson as an added member) with Ramsburgh and Stulberg possibly being able to make it. Suggestions to contact Commissioner Bushkuhl, for his availability for the Review meeting were made, given his building expertise.

K REPORTS FROM STAFF

K-1 [14-0412](#) February 2014 HDC Staff Activities

Ramsburgh asked about the siding material of the house at 122 South Seventh, noting it looked really good.

Thacher said it was aluminum siding that has been painted.

Received and Filed

L **CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS**

Beeson asked about the second floor windows that had been removed from the building on Fourth Avenue, near Sotinis.

Thacher responded that she was unaware of the work, but encouraged members to be on the look-out for work done in the Historic Districts.

M **COMMUNICATIONS**

Ramsburgh asked if any other HDC member might be interested in attending day workshops presented by the Michigan Historic Preservation Network in Jackson, and if so, she offered a ride.

Thacher said she would be attending on Thursday and Friday and also offered a ride to anyone interested.

Thacher gave a brief overview of the proposed agenda for the Annual HDC Retreat.

Stulberg said that he is looking for a volunteer to take over his role as the HDC member liaison to the Cobblestone Farm Association.

[14-0413](#) Various Communications to the HDC

Received and Filed

N **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 11:18 p.m.