



**APPROVED MINUTES OF
THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR
MARCH 8, 2007**

Commissioners Present: Susan Wineberg, Malcolm McCullough, Michael Bruner, Robert White, Kristina Glusac, Michele Derr and Jim Henrichs (7)

Commissioners Absent: None.

Staff Present: Jill Thacher, HDC Coordinator/Planner II, Kristine Kidorf, Kidorf Preservation Consulting and Brenda Acquaviva, Administrative Support Specialist V, Planning and Development Services. (3)

CALL TO ORDER:

Commissioner White called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Quorum satisfied.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

Moved by Commissioner Derr, Seconded by Commissioner Wineberg **“to Approve to the Agenda as Presented.”**

On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE - PASSED – UNANIMOUS.

A - HEARINGS

A-1 419 DETROIT STREET – New sign on front elevation of commercial building – OFWHD

BACKGROUND: This single-story building first appears in the 1922 Polk directory as Ann Arbor Auto Top. From 1923 to 1957 the building listing jumps back and forth between Brokaw’s Service Garage and Modern Pattern and Machine Works, which was located at 417 Detroit Street. In 1964 both 417 and 419 Detroit are listed as The Tree, which remained at 419 Detroit until 2006.

Sanborn maps show that in 1908, the site contained a frame building used as a wagon shed; in 1916, the frame building was used for lumber storage; and in 1925 a brick building with a tile roof and cement floor was present. All three maps reflect the current building footprint. The structure shown on the 1925 Sanborn is likely the building we see today. It is unknown when the stucco was applied to the exterior.

LOCATION: The site is located on the southwest corner of Detroit Street and Kingsley Street, across Detroit Street from Zingerman’s Deli. See attached location map/aerial photo.

51
52 **APPLICATION:** The applicant is requesting to install a sign on the front of the building. The
53 sign consists of seventeen non-lit, flat cut aluminum letters and a large dragonfly to be
54 installed individually above the front door. The capital letters are approximately 12 inches tall,
55 and the overall sign dimensions are 42 inches by 121 inches. The letters and dragonfly would
56 be mounted using ¼ inch threaded rods drilled about 1½ inches into the stucco and brick or
57 mortar (per the applicant). Each letter would have a ¾ inch space between it and the wall.
58

59 **STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 60
- 61 1. Applicants are usually required to mount signs into mortar. On this building, however, it
62 might not be possible due to the stucco exterior obscuring the bricks and mortar joints.
63 The applicant is discussing with the business owners alternate means to attach the
64 sign to the building. The application as presented is their preferred method.
65
 - 66 2. The stucco exterior is not believed to be original to the building. If the sign is attached
67 as proposed and then later removed, the stucco will be easily repaired. The
68 underlying bricks may be damaged by the drilling.
69
 - 70 3. The proposed sign is of appropriate scale and will not obscure, damage, or destroy
71 any character-defining features of the building.
72

73 **Owner/Address:** E.C. & J. LLC, 3394 Beaumont, Ann Arbor MI 48103

74
75 **Applicant:** Michigan Signs, Inc., 4101 Jackson Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48103

76
77 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Bruner and Glusac

78
79 Commissioner Bruner – We visited the site and found it as we see in the photos. From close
80 examination of the building, it appears the stucco is integral to the façade and has been a
81 feature of the building for quite some time. I support the staff findings in support of applying
82 this sign to the front of the building.
83

84 Commissioner Glusac – I concur with Commissioner Bruner. The scale is appropriate and
85 having each letter mounted individually helps overall as opposed to having it all mounted to
86 one back plate.
87

88 **Applicant Presentation:** Harold Brown of Michigan Signs, Inc. was present to speak on
89 behalf of the application. He stated that this design was most non-intrusive and the façade
90 could easily be repaired should the sign be removed. A ‘rail’ system could be installed and
91 be non-intrusive, but you would see the support rails beneath the sign and can be a prime
92 location for nesting birds. The proposed letters for the sign are composed of light aluminum
93 and ¼ inch thick.
94

95 **Audience Participation:** Owners Joe and Deb Kirk thanked the HDC for their time to hear
96 their application and visit the site. They stated their goal is not to harm the building but to
97 have it aesthetically pleasing as well.
98

98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148

Questions by the Commission:

Commissioner Wineberg – The depth of the holes to be drilled that will hold the lettering is only 1½ inches deep? (Petitioner) – No, it's not, but if I find brick behind the stucco, I will stop as I know that I have to hit the mortar joint. If it requires additional studs to secure it, we can do that. He stated that the letters on average weighed about 3 ½ to 4 pounds each.

Commissioner Henrichs – Asked approximately how many holes may have to be drilled – (Petitioner) – Approximately 70 to 80.

Discussion by the Commission:

Commissioner Wineberg stated that this (sign) should be very attractive with the individual letters and doesn't think it will destroy the historic material using the current proposal and that she will support it. She also believes that this building is actually much older than stated – possibly from the 1860's, the age of the building that it is attached to.

Commissioner Henrichs – Given the commercial history on this building and the minor amount of damage that this might cause, I would be in support of this application.

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner Wineberg, Seconded by Commissioner Derr, **“that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application for 419 Detroit Street to install a new sign on the front elevation in the OFWHD. The proposal is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding areas, and meets Secretary of the Interior Standards for rehabilitation Standard No. 9.”**

On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE - PASSED – UNANIMOUS.

Commissioner Bruner – Stated that he has some involvement in the next project before the Commission (A-2) and will have to recuse himself from the hearing. (Commissioner Bruner exits the room).

A-2 100 SOUTH MAIN STREET – New front door, entry stairs, exterior building lighting, and clock sign – MSHD

BACKGROUND: This seven-story commercial building, constructed in 1906 in the Beaux Arts style of red brick with fluted limestone columns, rosettes and garlands over the windows, is known as the Glazier Building. The building has housed a number of banking and trust companies since its construction, and is currently Key Bank. An elaborate cornice was removed in the 1960s, and on August 11, 2005 the Historic District Commission approved an application from the same owner and applicant to replace the cornice based on historic documentation. This work has not yet been completed.

LOCATION: The site is located on the southwest corner of South Main Street and West Huron Street. See attached location map/aerial photo.

149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198

APPLICATION: There are four proposed activities in the application: 1) replacement of the non-original Huron Street entry door; 2) replacement of the non-original concrete stairs and landing leading to the Huron Street entry door with granite stairs and landing; 3) addition of a building-mounted clock extending from the northeast corner of the building; and 4) addition of exterior building lighting, including upward-directed lights on the seventh floor cornice and third floor cornice, and downward-directed lights on the fluted columns on the Huron Street and Main Street elevations.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The proposed Huron Street entry door would replace an existing non-original door, does not enlarge the current door and transom configuration, and is generally compatible with the historic building.
2. The proposed granite steps would replace non-original concrete steps and are compatible with historic building materials found on the building.
3. The corner clock with classical detailing may create a false sense of historical development. A clock with more modern faces would resolve this. The size and location of the clock are appropriate for the building.
4. In the provided drawing detail, the light fixtures are installed in a way that is sensitive and minimally harmful to the distinctive architectural features of this building. The fixtures on the third and seventh floors will not be visible from the right-of-way. The downward-directed lights mounted on the entablature between the second and third floors that illuminate the five fluted columns would be visible from the street.

Owner/Address: Dahlmann Properties, 300 South Thayer Street, Ann Arbor, MI

Applicant: Michael Bruner, Quinn Evans Architects, 219 ½ Main Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Represented at meeting by Ken Kline of Quinn Evans Architects

Review Committee: Commissioners Bruner and Glusac and Coordinator Thacher

Commissioner Bruner (Recused himself due to conflict of interest – not present)

Commissioner Glusac – We reviewed three of the four items that were in the original application – the Huron Street entry door, removing the concrete steps and the building lighting. We did not review the building mounted clock due to weather conditions.

We also reviewed the balustrade, which is under the additional memo handed out today. The entry on Huron Street is not original and is laid out asymmetrical with a pilaster on the right side but lacking one on the right side. I speculate that this may have been a single opening, but the new entry will be in keeping with the character of the building. It is a gem of a building that has great detail above the contemporary storefront.

199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249

Applicant Presentation:

Ken Kline was present to represent Quinn Evans Architects for this application. Mr. Kline stated that the building owner and Quinn Evans have tried to take a sensitive and restorative preservation approach to this building. As noted earlier, in 2005, the HDC approved plans to recreate the historic sheet metal cornice on the top of the building, and the reason that has not yet been completed is that the owner has decided to expand their efforts to preserve the exterior of the building and make some improvements all at one time for ease of scheduling.

In regard to the doors on the north side, these will be architectural bronze doors, and are more in keeping with what would have been used on this building in the day it was built. We are eliminating the stucco panel that is above the doors and replacing that with architectural bronze as well.

The stone steps – the intent is to have it match the granite to that which is currently on the building at the lower course of the water table would not be a polished finished, but a coarse finished with a slight bull nosed lip on the steps which would have been typical of detailing at the time.

In regard to the clock, it was designed to be of scale and location for a building like this. It is not our intent to give a false sense of history on the building. We want to do something that has an element that will not detract and be respectful, and we are open to comments and suggestions. Detailed drawings of the clock for fabrication have not been completed at this time, but the thought was that it would be made of either machined and cast aluminum and anodized or it would be brass and then a more antiques finished brass. It is intended to be lit internally, so there will be some light cast by it.

The final element – the lighting design. Obviously none of these lights are historic but with the sensitive placement of these on the building, it is a way to showcase this historic gem in downtown Ann Arbor. The intention now is to use a very low profile 'L.E.D.' lights. Those will be mounted on the cornice.

We would appreciate if you would consider the late items submitted – the recreated balustrade on the Main Street façade at the three-story portion, the intent that this would be a glass fiber reinforced polymer that would be recreated based on the historic photographs we have. The other minor item is to seek to infill two non-original window openings on the north façade. We discovered that on the west side of this building there is a very non-historic addition of a stair tower that was done, but that addition has actually enclosed a portion of the building with the original brick. The intent would be to take that original brick out of the enclosure and use for toothing into the openings to help to blend it, getting a better match than with modern brick.

Public Commentary: None.

Questions by the Commission:

Commissioner Wineberg – Regarding the steps, it was curious that you were allowed to replace the steps and not make it a handicapped ramp. Is that an issue? (Petitioner – I'm not aware of that being an issue as it is considered more of a 'repair' under the rehabilitation code. The main entrance off Main Street is handicapped accessible).

250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300

Discussion by the Commission:

Questions and discussion between the applicant and the Commission regarding the possible clock. Among those comments was creation of a false sense of history and a violation of the standards if an older clock or replica were to be erected where one never existed to begin with. Other issues were handrails for the steps and a suggestion to **raise the location of a clock a bit higher, possibly one limestone course (Commissioner White suggests this last suggestion be added as a friendly amendment to the motion).*

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner Derr, Seconded by Commissioner Wineberg “ **that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 100 South Main Street to replace a non-original door and steps, add a balustrade on the three story annex at the south end of the building, remove two non-original windows on the Huron Street elevation, and add a corner-mounted clock and exterior building lighting provided the following condition is met: that the clock and lights are attached through masonry joints and not through masonry units. **The clock’s positioning should be raised one limestone course above that presented in the submitted plans.* The work as proposed 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 standards 5, 6, 9, and 10.*”**

On a Voice Vote – **MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS** (with one Abstention – Commissioner Bruner who was recused). **Friendly Amendment*

A-3 501 DETROIT STREET – Sash replacement for three windows – OFWHD

BACKGROUND: This condominium is one of eight in the Stofflet Block, a red brick colonial revival apartment building with a low-hipped roof, octagonal bays at each end of the front façade, a tower and finial on the south end, and two double porches with fieldstone bases and short round wooden columns. It originally contained four apartments, and was built in 1900 by Francis Stofflet, a news and book dealer, for his children. In 1934 the mortgage was foreclosed and in 1938 the building was bought by Taylor Collins, who lived in one of the units until he sold the building in 1973. It was an apartment building until the mid-1980s, at which time it was converted to an association called Brownstone Condominiums.

LOCATION: The site is located on the west side of Detroit Street, between Kingsley and Division. This unit occupies the ground floor and basement of the south end of the building, at the corner of Kingsley and Detroit. See attached location map/aerial photo.

APPLICATION: The applicant requests HDC approval to replace three window sashes on the first floor of the south tower that he says are deteriorated beyond repair. The current windows are wood one-over-one double-hung, as are the proposed replacement sashes. The current black, aluminum-frame exterior double-hung storms and screens, which match those on the rest of the building, will remain. All three windows are the same size.

300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The applicant has provided a window worksheet and photographs of the window sashes that are proposed to be replaced. The photographs are inconclusive when trying to determine whether the sashes are deteriorated beyond repair.
2. The HDC Review Committee's site visit and/or further evidence from the applicant are necessary to determine the extent of deterioration on these three window sashes.

Owner: Robert Vogelwede & Judy Batchelor, 501 Detroit Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Applicant: Scott Diels, 1414 Iroquois, Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Review Committee: Commissioners Bruner and Glusac

Commissioner Glusac –Commissioner Bruner, Coordinator Thacher and I went inside this location and met with the contractor. After inspecting the sashes, I think there is still the opportunity to repair the existing sash framing and glazing. There are some areas (that Jill photographed) at the bottom that shows deterioration, but it's not consistent.

We have a cut-sheet in our packet for a rectangular window, but that is not a part of the packet. I understand that the proposed project will not include a new storm window.

Commissioner Bruner – I've been on quite a few review committee window replacement reviews, and these windows are in very good shape. We normally look for a lot of advanced decrepitude in the condition of the window and especially at the upper and lower rail of the sash to see if those joints have failed through dry rot, etc.

The sash both upper and lower are very sound and there are other measures that can be taken to improve the performance of the window, so I am not inclined to approve the application.

Applicant Presentation: Scott Diels, Architect was present to speak on behalf of the appeal. He stated that in this case, the windows have shrunk and they're loose both front to back and side-to-side in the track. The amount of air infiltration makes the room extremely uncomfortable even with the storm windows.

If it were just front to back, you could adjust the stops, but with it side to side, I don't think there is a repair that will make these tighter – this is why I proposed replacing the sash so that it's a minimal amount of material that is replaced. The intercasings and the exterior trim stay the same.

Public Commentary: None.

Questions by the Commission: None.

Discussion by the Commission:

Commissioner Wineberg – Did the review committee try to operate the window?

351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401

(Commission Bruner – They were behind plastic that we had to peel away, so we didn't attempt to raise or lower them. They were not painted shut, but free to move within the frame).

Commissioner Bruner – The application they submitted shows they are not proposing to remove the frame, stops or other elements but simply reline the existing frame with a new vinyl element that the new sash slides up and down in. You can do a similar retrofit of the existing window without replacing the sash and the glazing and improve the existing sash in that opening in a number of ways.

Commissioner Henrichs – I would tend to agree with that – that there should be some other way to creatively approach this to tighten up the existing window frames.

Commissioner Derr – We also want to make sure that they're comfortable in the house. Repairing the windows will keep the cold out and we need to be conscious of this.

Commissioner Bruner – The building was built as a single unit, and if we get into changing windows in one unit and not another, it can detract from the appearance of the property.

The Commission in general was in agreement that the existing windows could be repaired rather than replaced in whole or in part.

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner Henrichs, Seconded by Commissioner Wineberg “ **that the Commission deny the application at 501 Detroit Street #1, because the windows are character-defining features of the building and the proposed window sashes have not been proven to be deteriorated beyond repair, the work does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* standards 2 and 9.**”

On A Voice Vote – **MOTION TO DENY – PASSED (*Application Denied*).**

A-4 217 NORTH DIVISION – Third floor dormer addition – OFWHD

BACKGROUND: This 2 story colonial revival, with its clipped-gabled roof perpendicular to the street, first appears in the 1901 Polk Directory as the home of Reginald Spokes, an engineer at the Ann Arbor Water Company, and his wife Anna. Beginning the following year, the occupants of the house had a high rate of turnover until 1939, when the building is first listed as a four-unit apartment house.

The 1908, 1916, and 1925 Sanborn maps indicate that the house is brick over frame construction and had a front porch of nearly full-width, and a half-width rear porch on the south side. At some point the front porch was removed, and in 1987 it was reconstructed as a much smaller porch than shown on the Sanborn footprints.

LOCATION: The site is located on the southwest corner of North Division Street and Catherine Street. See the attached location map/aerial photo.

402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452

APPLICATION: The applicant is requesting to add a shed-roofed dormer and exterior porch on the roof on the rear of the house in order to add two bedrooms and a bathroom to the third floor. The new porch and an existing second-floor enclosed porch would be sided with cedar shingles.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The proposed dormer is approximately 25 feet wide, which nearly spans the width of the 33.6-foot roof. The roof of the proposed porch is an extension of the dormer's shed roof.
2. The house is located on a corner lot, so both the Division Street and Catherine Street sides of the house are treated as front elevations. The portion of the roof that is proposed to be altered is clearly visible from the Catherine Street right-of-way.
3. The proposed new third-floor porch would sit atop an existing enclosed porch that was added on to the second floor. The second-floor porch encloses two second-floor entrances and the top of an open stairway to the ground, and is not habitable living space.
4. This application would radically change the character-defining shape of the house's clipped-gable roof and would be very conspicuous from the public right-of-way on Catherine Street. The new work would further exacerbate an already incompatible second story enclosed porch addition.

Owner/Address: John Sullivan, P.O. Box 7754, Ann Arbor, MI 48107

Applicant: H. Scott Diels, Architect, 1414 Iroquois Place, Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Review Committee: Commissioners Bruner and Glusac

Commissioner Bruner – We visited the site and found the location to be as they are in the photos. This addition on the rear addresses something that has been treated in a haphazard way in the past. I'm unsure about this and would like to question the applicant more before I expound on it.

Commissioner Glusac – I would just like to add that the back elevation is highly visible from Catherine Street and I think that it would detract from the character-defining roof.

Applicant Presentation: H. Scott Diels was present to speak on behalf of the application.

H. Scott Diels -- The project was to create a unit for the owner to live in, and the third floor is presently unfinished, so the idea is to put bedrooms and a bathroom up there. The location of the bathroom is in that particular corner presented on the drawings, as this is where the existing plumbing stack is located.

If the Commission is so inclined, we can leave the two-story porch as it is and pull the roof back toward the dormer - that would push it back farther, you wouldn't see it as much of it and we wouldn't have to put in siding on that wood portion.

453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503

Public Commentary:

John Sullivan, owner of this property spoke on behalf of the appeal. He stated that one of the reasons that they planned to put a dormer on was to be able to build a bathroom into that unit for sole use for his apartment. At present, he must leave his apartment and enter a common hallway to get to the bathroom.

Questions by the Commission:

Commissioner Bruner – I had a question – you’re offering to make some changes to address our concerns, but you are still interested in adding the dormer? (H. Scott Diels – Yes).

Discussion by the Commission:

Commissioner Wineberg – I will be supporting the motion to deny based on the Secretary of Interior’s Guidelines for Rehabilitation (Standard number 9).

Commissioner Henrichs – Even though the addition pre-dates the Historic District being founded, it looks like an architectural feature that could be removed and the original massing of the house could be restored. Putting an addition on to this makes it even less ‘removable,’ and more contrary to the Secretary of Interior’s Standards.

I’m not opposed to them expanding the house, but if they were to remove this and devise a concept for an addition that was more in keeping with the architecture of the house, they could still achieve their goal of achieving more space in a manner that’s more compatible with the building.

Commissioner Bruner – I agree with Commissioner Henrichs. A more well considered addition would be a welcome thing to see that somehow rectifies the less well-considered changes that have gone on to the rear of this home. It’s unfortunate that this is located on a corner, but I would not preclude its location from being allowed an addition because of that if it were in fact more sensitive.

(Question to Owner) - I thought I heard you say that you are intending to live in the property – are you planning to be the sole tenant? (No, there will be other tenants in the building).

Moved by Commissioner Glusac, Seconded by Commissioner Wineberg, “ **that the Commission deny the application at 217 North Division Street. Because the proposed addition is conspicuous from the public right-of-way and radically changes the character-defining roof shape, the work is not generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding area and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* standard 9.”**

On a Voice Vote – **MOTION TO DENY – PASSED – UNANIMOUS – (Application Denied).**

B - REQUESTS FOR REHEARING - None

504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION/PUBLIC COMMENT – None.

C - APPROVAL OF MINUTES

C-1 Regular Session of January 11, 2007

(Changes – Line 241 – (Commissioner Wineberg wants her statement changed to:

“I wrote a letter of support for Save the Bighouse Groups proposal to list the U of M Stadium as one of this years “11 Most Endangered Buildings” with the National Trust”); Line 251 (“pervue” not prevue).

Moved by Commissioner Henrichs, Seconded by Commissioner Wineberg, **“that the minutes of January 11, 2007 Regular Session be approved as amended.”**

C-2 Regular Session of February 8, 2007 (**Tabled until the April 12, 2007 Regular Session**)

On a Voice Vote – **MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS**

D - OLD BUSINESS - None

E - NEW BUSINESS

E-1 Historic Building Marker Request – 235 Murray Avenue

J. Thacher – 235 Murray Avenue was a 2005/2006 Historic Preservation Awards winner. The owner, Vicki Honeyman, has requested a Historic Marker.

Commissioner Wineberg – She stated that the plaques now cost \$175.00, and it was the Awards Committee who has in the past decided whether the property that had applied for a plaque was eligible, etc.

J. Thacher stated that since the original committee who used to make those decisions is no longer in existence that the requests will be brought before the HDC for approval.

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner Wineberg, Supported by Commissioner McCullough, **“to approve a historical plaque for 235 Murray Street.”**

On a Voice Vote – **MOTION PASSED - UNANIMOUS**

F - REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Wineberg – The Awards Committee has composed its final list, and we’ve submitted it to you and we’re asking for approval. We have 15 awards and will present them

554 at the City Council meeting in May (during preservation month), followed by a reception at the
555 Kempf House.

556
557 **MOTION**

558
559 Moved by Commissioner White, Seconded by Commissioner Glusac, **“to approve the**
560 **list of awards presented by the Awards Committee.”**

561
562 On a Voice Vote – **MOTION PASSED - UNANIMOUS**

563
564 J. Thacher – The awards presentation will be allowed a 10 to 20 minute time slot at the
565 May 7th City Council Meeting. (Commissioner Wineberg mentioned that they would like to do
566 a brief PowerPoint presentation for each).

567
568 Commissioner White – I’m very pleased about the Old West Side Newsletter. It talks about
569 the Historic Preservation changes (Chapter’s 8 and 103 of the City Code) and our staff and
570 compliments us on our work here in Ann Arbor.

571
572 **G - STAFF ACTIVITIES REPORT**

573
574 **G-1 Staff Activities –**

575
576 J. Thatcher reported that in February 2007 there were 10 applications; staff reviewed 7 and 3
577 went to the HDC. 100 Percent of those were approved.

578
579 **G-2 General Business -**

580
581 K. Kidorf - Retreat Information – Saturday April 14th, 2007 at the Kempf House.

582
583 The draft agenda for the upcoming retreat was presented to the HDC. Ms. Kidorf stated that
584 the Commissioners would receive some intensive level training on the Secretary of Interior’s
585 Standards, a presentation on Parliamentary Procedure given by Pat Austin and a review of
586 the By-Laws (required), even though those were just reviewed. In the afternoon we will
587 review the Draft Historic Design Guidelines that she’s working on in conjunction with the
588 A2D2 Committee.

589
590 Commissioner Bruner – Is the Retreat considered an “Open Meeting?” (Yes, and it will be
591 posted).

592
593 **Agenda and location for the retreat were accepted by the Commission.**

594
595 **H - ASSIGNMENTS**

596
597 **A-1** 419 Detroit Street – Commissioner Bruner

598 **A-2** 100 South Main – (Was previously monitored by Commissioner Derr, but
599 since her term on the Commission is up, Commissioner Wineberg has volunteered to
600 assume her monitoring duties).

601
602 **I - REVIEW COMMITTEE – April 9, 2007, noon for April 12, 2007 HDC Meeting**

603
604 Commissioners White and Bruner

605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641

J - CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Derr – Michele Derr mentioned that since this is her last HDC meeting, she has some monitoring that is still open, but that she will turn that information over to staff.

K - COMMUNICATIONS

Commissioner Bruner - We received a communication from ex-commissioner Sonja Schmerl who is pursuing a project she started when she was a chair with the HDC. This was a film program in cooperation with our local cable station, CTN.

The idea was to produce a series of short films on different historic properties in town – one film per building and highlights of interesting buildings in town in order to create interest in historic preservation and make the public aware of what Ann Arbor has to offer. CTN is now interested in producing these films, as is their committee.

Commissioner White – The chair read a resolution saluting Commission member Michele Derr.

Chair Robert White announced this was the end of Commissioner Michele Derr's term on the HDC and proceeded to read a resolution prepared in her honor.

Commissioner Derr stated that the Commission will need to find a replacement for her as the HDC liaison for Cobblestone Farms.

Moved by Commissioner Wineberg, Seconded by Commissioner Henrichs, **“to adjourn the meeting.”** The Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY: Brenda Acquaviva, Administrative Service Specialist V, Planning and Development Services.

Persons with disabilities are encouraged to participate. Accommodations, including sign language interpreters, may be arranged by contacting Planning Development Services by telephone at 994-2675 or by written request addressed to Planning Development Services C/O Board of Appeals, 100 N. Fifth Ave., Ann Arbor, MI 48104, at least 24 hours in advance.