



**APPROVED MINUTES OF
THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR
APRIL 12, 2007**

Commissioners Present: Susan Wineberg, Malcolm McCullough, Michael Bruner, Robert White and Kristina Glusac (5)

Commissioners Absent: James Henrichs (1)

Commissioner Vacancies: (1)

Staff Present: Jill Thacher, HDC Coordinator/Planner II, Kristine Kidorf, Kidorf Preservation Consulting, Stephen K. Postema, City Attorney, Kevin McDonald, Asst. City Attorney and Brenda Acquaviva, Administrative Support Specialist V, Planning and Development Services (5).

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 Wineberg, Seconded by Commissioner Glusac “**to approve the agenda as presented.**”

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

➤ **CLOSED SESSION TO DISCUSS ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED INFORMATION**

Moved by Commissioner Glusac, Seconded by Commissioner Wineberg “**to move to closed session.**”

On a Roll Call Vote – MOTION TO MOVE TO CLOSED SESSION – PASSED

On a Roll Call Vote – **MOTION TO APPROVE - PASSED – (5)YES to (0) NO**

Yes - Commissioners Bruner, Glusac, McCullough Wineberg and White (5)

No - (01)

Abstain – None (0)

Absent/Vacant – Commissioner Henrichs (1), Vacant (1)

51 The Commission moved to closed session at 7:15 P.M.

52
53 Moved by Commissioner Wineberg, Seconded by Commissioner Glusac **“to return to the**
54 **Regular Session.”**

55
56 On a Voice Vote – **MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS**

57
58 The Commission returned to its Regular Session at 8:27 p.m.

59
60
61 **A - HEARINGS**

62
63 **A-1 116 WEST LIBERTY STREET – Replace six windows on front elevation –**
64 **MSHD**

65
66 **BACKGROUND:** This site is near the center of a row of three-story, Italianate-style
67 commercial buildings, numbers 112-122, which were begun in 1866. Upper floors were used
68 as residences. The first occupant of 116 W. Liberty was a saloon, owned by George C.
69 Mogk. By 1872 the occupant was Gauss Boot and Shoe Store. Ehnis and Sons, originally a
70 harness maker and subsequently a work clothes store, owned the building from 1913 until
71 purchased by the present owners. The buildings have stone basements and one-foot thick
72 exterior brick walls. Some of the buildings were later expanded 22 feet north into the alley,
73 leaving only a walkway dividing the row from the adjacent building.

74
75 In October, 2006 an application was approved by the Historic District Commission to add a
76 raised roof above a portion of the third floor to provide access to a roof deck and increased
77 interior lighting, to add a new fire exit stair to the north façade, and to make minor
78 modifications in the front entry to create a small foyer.

79
80 **LOCATION:** The site is located on the north side of West Liberty, between Main and Ashley
81 Streets.

82
83 **APPLICATION:** The applicant requests HDC approval to replace six four-over-four windows
84 on the front (Liberty Street) elevation: three on the second floor and three on the third floor.
85 Per the applicant, the upper spaces of this building have not been occupied in over 50 years
86 and the windows are not repairable. The replacement windows would be Weather Shield, HR
87 175, wood windows pre-finished in a dark brown paint.

88
89 **STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 90
91 1. The applicant has provided a window worksheet for each of the two window sizes, a
92 statement that the windows do not operate and are not repairable, and information on
93 the proposed replacement windows. The HDC Review Committee’s site visit and/or
94 further evidence from the applicant are necessary to determine the extent of
95 deterioration on these three window sashes.

96
97 **Owner/Address:** G&B Projects LLC, 116 West Liberty Street, Ann Arbor MI 48103

98
99 **Applicant:** Danelle Guthrie, Guthrie & Buresh Architects, Ann Arbor, MI 48104

100
101 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Bruner and White

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
149
150
151

Commissioner Bruner – We visited the site and inspected the windows. We found them to be as presented in the pictures – fairly decrepit. While I was there I examined the geometry of the current windows and the documentation of the replacement windows (which is required). Those are factual and I'm convinced of two things: The windows need to be replaced and the windows that they are replacing those with are appropriate.

Commissioner White – Concurs with Commissioner Bruner.

Applicant Presentation: Danelle Guthrie, Owner/Architect was present to speak on behalf of the appeal. She brought with her a sample of the replacement window from Weathershield Corporation. She stated that the center (vertical) muntin can be larger than the horizontal ones. This can be done on the replacements to match the existing (and is a true wood window).

Questions by the Commission:

Commissioner Bruner – You mentioned the expense associated with this and I can see why you would want an insulated sash, but you might get a price quote on a restored sash – you may be surprised as it could be less costly. (Petitioner – Have spoken with carpenters who are experienced with this, and they feel that the jam is not repairable and there is no mechanism within those (a pulley system) to hold them up. We would end up with a poor performing window that is only single glazed.)

Audience Participation: None.

Questions by the Commission:

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner Glusac, Seconded by Commissioner Wineberg, **“that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for 116 West Liberty Street to replace six windows; three on the second floor and three on the third floor (front elevation). The proposed work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for rehabilitation numbers 2 and 6.”**

Commissioner Wineberg (To Commissioner Bruner) – You mentioned the price quote on restoration. This suggests that the windows are restorable? (Bruner) – Only that restoration of the sash can be less expensive than the new ones. They are still very decrepit and some of the sash are missing.

(Further conversation regarding restoration as opposed to replacement)

Petitioner Rebuttal:

Restated her argument about the replacement windows as opposed to restoring what is there.

HDC – April 12, 2007

152 Commissioner Bruner – The sash there are less than 1 ¼ inch at best, which wouldn't allow
153 milling of the insulated sash. The lightweight character of these windows and the state
154 they're in is why I would support the application.

155
156 Commissioner McCullough – The review committee is unambiguous about the state of these
157 windows that exist. Merely inhabiting this building at all is a move back toward restoring it's
158 historic character.

159
160 On a Roll Call Vote – **MOTION TO APPROVE - PASSED – 4 Yes to 1 No**

161
162 **Yes** - *Commissioners Bruner, Glusac, McCullough and White (4)*

163
164 **No** - *Commissioner Wineberg (1)*

165
166 **Abstain** – *None (0)*

167
168 **Absent/Vacant** - *Commissioner Henrichs (1) – Vacant (1)*

169
170 **A-2 217 NORTH DIVISION** – New shed-roof dormer and replacement of existing
171 two-story addition – **OFWHD**

172
173 **BACKGROUND:** This 2 story colonial revival, with its clipped-gabled roof perpendicular to
174 the street, first appears in the 1901 Polk Directory as the home of Reginald Spokes, an
175 engineer at the Ann Arbor Water Company, and his wife Anna. Beginning the following year,
176 the occupants of the house had a high rate of turnover until 1939, when the building is first
177 listed as a four-unit apartment house.

178
179 The 1908, 1916, and 1925 Sanborn maps indicate that the house is brick over frame
180 construction and had a front porch of nearly full-width, and a half-width rear porch on the
181 south side. At some point the front porch was removed, and in 1987 it was reconstructed as a
182 much smaller porch than shown on the Sanborn footprints.

183
184 **LOCATION:** The site is located on the southwest corner of North Division Street and
185 Catherine Street. See the attached location map/aerial photo.

186
187 **APPLICATION:** The applicant is requesting to add a shed-roofed dormer to the third floor;
188 replace an existing two-story addition with a new two-story addition that would have the same
189 footprint; and open up part of an existing enclosed second-floor deck. The new dormer and
190 replacement addition would be sided with cedar shingles to match the gable-end shingles in
191 the existing house. The exposed porch would have simple straight posts, rails, and handrails.
192 The new windows on the dormer and addition are proposed to be Andersen Series 400
193 casement vinyl-clad wood windows.

194
195 The attached drawings also include a set of elevations labeled “Dormer Only Base
196 Application”. This set of elevations shows the application without the 2-story replacement
197 addition or the exposed porch. The applicant provides it for your information.

198
199 **STAFF FINDINGS:**

200
201 1 The proposed dormer roof is approximately 20 feet wide.

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
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 2-story addition would replace two currently existing stacked additions. The first floor would have the same footprint as the existing. The second floor would be enlarged on the west side so that the entire addition is straight sided and not stepped-in on the second floor.
 4. The north end of the second-floor enclosed porch would be opened up. The brick house would be visible behind the porch, which would still be used for emergency egress. The south end of the second-floor enclosed porch would be replaced by the new addition.
 5. The proposed windows on the addition are vinyl-clad casements. Per the applicant's architect: "The outside proportions and trim match the house, however the windows are casement. Dormer CW14 is Andersen for 28" wide by 48" high. The north facing, main level window C14 is 24" wide by 48" high. The upper level window is Andersen C135 is 24" wide and 40" high. The west facing, upper level window is an Andersen CW26 or a double casement 28" wide by 72" high. The south facing, main level window is the same size and the south facing upper level is an Andersen CW14 or 28" wide by 48" high."
 6. This proposed dormer is noticeable from the public right-of-way, but does not obscure the character-defining shape of the house's clipped-gable roof. The new addition is compatible with the original structure and the neighborhood, and would replace existing incompatible additions. The new addition would not obscure the character-defining features of the house.

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

234
235 **Applicant:** John Sullivan, P.O. Box 7754, Ann Arbor, MI 48107

236
237 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Bruner and White

238
239 Commissioner White – Concurs with the Coordinator and feel that the Certificate of
240 Appropriateness should be approved.

241
242 Commissioner Bruner – Stated that they visited the site (and had been there previously on
243 another application) and conditions haven't changed, but we had revised submissions (plans,
244 etc.). This proposal is worthy of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

245
246 **Applicant Presentation:** H. Scott Diels was present to speak on behalf of the appeal. He
247 stated that they did their best to create a solution for the owner and satisfying the
248 requirements for the district. Windows match to height and width as the rest of the house
249 has.

250
251 Commissioner Glusac – The chimney is missing (Petitioner - It is missing from the drawing).
252
253

254 Commissioner Glusac - Where it's tucked into the eave, will there be a slope? (Petitioner –
255 Right now where the Queen Anne returns are or along the eave line, that line is continued out
256 around with a central level roof. The gutter around the house would wrap around on that).
257 (Discussion regarding the porch railings and posts – Petitioner stated the new posts would be
258 square on a square pad. There are also two existing double hung windows and those will be
259 preserved as well.)

260
261 Commissioner Wineberg – Asked if the architect knew when the rear porch was added?
262 (Petitioner – Hard to say, but probably around 1938 when it was turned into apartments.)
263

264 **Public Commentary:** None.

265
266 **Discussion by the Commission:**

267
268 Commissioner Wineberg – Asked that a statement be added to the staff report that this
269 address had been evaluated and reviewed for a Certificate of Appropriateness, but had been
270 turned down. Coordinator Thacher stated that she normally includes that information.
271

272 **MOTION:**

273
274 Moved by Commissioner Wineberg, Seconded by Commissioner Glusac “**that the**
275 **Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 217**
276 **North Division Street to add a shed-roofed dormer, replace an existing 2-story**
277 **addition with a new 2-story addition, and open an enclosed porch. The work as**
278 **proposed is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture,**
279 **material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area**
280 **and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* standards**
281 **2, 9, and 10.”**

282
283 On a Voice Vote – **MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS**

284
285 **A-3 216 MURRAY AVENUE – New one-story addition to rear of house – OWSHD**

286
287 **BACKGROUND:** This 1½ story Queen Anne was inhabited in 1914 by Anna Keal, a
288 laundress for the University of Michigan, and four other women named Keal, three of whom
289 were laundresses. Various Keals and Kiehls lived there through 1929, as well as at other
290 addresses on Murray (215) and Murray Court. Murray Avenue was developed from north to
291 south over a period of several years. This street is unique in its sameness; that is, most
292 houses on Murray were identical in form and massing when constructed, down to their
293 modest Queen Anne trim, placement of windows and doors, and turned front porch
294 supports.

295 **LOCATION:** The site is located on the west side of Murray Avenue, north of West Liberty
296 and south of West Washington.

297 **APPLICATION:** The applicant requests HDC approval to add a 308 square foot, single-story
298 addition on the back on the house in place of an existing deck and mudroom. The addition
299 will be sided in wood lap siding, roofed with asphalt, and trimmed to match what's on the
300 house now. The proposed turned porch post and simple rail match the existing front porch.
301 The foundation would be concrete block, and the windows would be wood casement and
302 doublehung. The current backdoor would be reused.

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
351
352
353

Owner/Address: Duc & Janet Tang, 216 Murray Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48103

Applicant: 16 Murray Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48103

Review Committee: Commissioners Bruner and White

Commissioner White – Agrees with the staff findings

Commissioner Bruner – We visited the site and met with the owner. We find this is worthy of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Applicant Presentation: Duc & Janet Tang were present to speak on behalf of the appeal. They stated that they have taken great care with this home to restore it to its previous historic condition – from removing several layers of old paint from the wood siding and window trim to repairing windows and salvaging the original glass. They stated that this addition as proposed would be the least intrusive into the character of the original home.

They stated that the new addition would become the new kitchen and the former kitchen would become a study. Since they home-school their children, this would be a great advantage. They also stated that they had additional letters of support (7 in total) from the neighbors (which were distributed at the meeting).

Questions by the Commission:

Commissioner Glusac – Did you look at having less of an impact on the elevation – so that you wouldn't see it from the front façade? (Petitioner – We did speak to an architect about that. He felt that the HDC didn't like it 'flush' as it would make it blend too much, and you couldn't differentiate the new from the old. We wanted to make it clear that this was an addition to the original house.

Commissioner Bruner – Noticing the roofline – it looks as though it was arrived at because you can't go so high that you block the window at the second floor, but you need a slope steep enough that will drain, but this gives you a very low south wall. A suggestion is that you might consider a flat roof (or a shed roof) which would be modern and 'of its time,' which would allow for a full height wall and a full height room.

(Further discussion by the Commission and the Petitioners regarding the roof and addition).

Public Commentary :

1. Kevin Kerwin – 212 Murray Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48103 – Spoke in support of the petition. He stated that he is next door, has a shared driveway with the petitioners and would be most impacted by it.

Discussion by the Commission:

Commissioner Glusac – Stated her concern is that she feels the bump-out of the addition alters the character defining aspects of the streetscape of the homes on Murray Street. I would not approve it with the 'bump-out' – I'd like to see a 'bump-in' – I don't think the kitchen plan would be sacrificed by doing that.

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
402
403
404

The addition would not be in the same plane but slightly inset of the south façade. She stated that she would also prefer the shed roof as well.

Commissioner McCullough – As the Old West Side comes under the standards – statewide – regarding the new ordinances on historic districts – the Old West Side loses its streetscape only format – there will be other future applications – addition projects that might not be appropriate now, but this application is not one of those.

Commissioner Wineberg – Stated that she would support the application and feels that it is quite appropriate.

Petitioner – Stated that part of the home school project is to have the children learn to bake and cook, and this involves an island in the middle of the proposed kitchen. Removing the ‘bump-out’ would not allow us to have an island big enough for our purposes.

Commissioner Bruner – Concurs with Commissioner Wineberg and stated that it is very much like additions that have been previously approved on Mulholland and Murray and in keeping with those former applications.

*Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner McCullough “ **that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 216 Murray Avenue to build a single-story addition on the rear of the house. The proposed work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and to the surrounding area and meets The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation standards 2, 9 and 10.**”*

On a Roll Call Vote – **MOTION PASSED** – 4 YES to 1 NO

(Yes) – Commissioners Wineberg, Bruner, McCullough and White

(No) – Commissioner Glusac

(Abstain) – (0)

(Absent/Vacant) – Commissioner Henrichs (1), Vacant (1)

A-4 210 EAST HURON STREET – Rooftop conference room addition, window expansion, wind turbine addition – **MSHD**

BACKGROUND: This two-story masonry building was built in 1965 by the architectural firm of Colvin, Robinson and Wright. As the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards formerly phrased it, the building is very much a “product of its time” in its starkly simple lines and lack of exterior windows. The three small buildings it replaced were very old, though by 1965, no longer very distinguished. A building on the rear (south) part of the site appears to have been incorporated into the 1965 design. One handsome small Greek Revival building appears as early as the 1853 map and continues to be shown in photographs as late as 1893. It may still have been there in a 1922 photograph with its pediment covered by a large false front.

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
453
454
455

In 1996 the Ann Arbor Architects Collaborative received permission to redo the façade by adding accent courses of brick, punching symmetrical fixed glass windows into the brick on the second floor, and adding a new glass window wall in the center of the second floor. The symmetrical fixed glass windows were never added to the structure.

LOCATION: The site is located on the south side of East Huron Street, between North Fourth Avenue and North Fifth Avenue. See the attached location map/aerial photo.

APPLICATION: The applicant is requesting to add a 576 square foot conference room on the rear (south) portion of the roof, enlarge a second-floor window on the south elevation and add wooden fixed shutters and a shade structure, and add two wind turbines on the top of the front façade. The conference room would be timber-frame construction with hardiplank siding, awning windows, and a metal standing seam roof. The conference room would not be visible from Huron Street.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The proposed rooftop addition is not visible from the public right-of-way and does not damage or obscure character-defining features of the building.
2. The window on the back of the building is proposed to be enlarged and a bowed top added. The window material would be aluminum, and would have a row of awning panes. It would also have wooden fixed (non-operable) shutters and a shade structure (awning). A door for freight rather than a window covered the original opening, according to the applicant. The new window would match the original opening size, plus the addition of the bow on top.
3. The window alterations, including the shutters and shade structure, are proposed on the rear elevation facing the alley.
4. The wind turbines are proposed for the top of the front façade and would be out of keeping with the massing and rhythm of the center of this block, and very conspicuous from the public right-of-way. Staff recommends relocating the turbines farther back (south) on the roof in order to not be visible from the Huron Street right-of-way.

Owner: Wellspring Land Co, LLC, 210 East Huron Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Applicant: A3C, 210 East Huron Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Review Committee: Commissioners Bruner and White

Commissioner White – Concur with the Coordinator with the exception of the turbines. He stated that he thought that the turbines have to be in the front of the building to get the proper draft and wind turbulence needed to make them operable. This is new technology and experimentation and cannot be mistaken as part of the original building. Will support the Certificate of Appropriateness

Commissioner Bruner – We visited the site and looked at the front and rear and met with architect Ron Sexton (with firm who occupies the building) and he described the aspects of the project as presented here. I support the staff findings concerning the wind turbines;

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
504
505
506

I believe they should be located back from the facade. If anything they may be an attractive nuisance or distraction to traffic. It hasn't been proven that they would function in the front of the building as instead of some other location on the roof.

Petitioner Presentation: Jan Colbertson and Ron Saxon (AC3) were present to speak on behalf of the application. Ms. Colbertson stated that they are trying to accomplish a demonstration project and the goal of the 'urban retreat' (as they've called it) is to demonstrate that you can add to our building in a way that is 'off the grid' and does not impact from an energy standpoint.

Within the project, they are also proposing the 'green roof,' and it is a demonstration where we're using four different kinds of roofing systems so that we can invite clients and the public to show that you can eliminate the storm water issues on a commercial (downtown) project. The form of the conference room and the roof pitch faces south as there are solar panels that are integral with the roof. The idea of the wind turbines is to provide energy for the conference room when the solar panels cannot.

Ron Saxon stated that the shed/dormer/conference room would be made of materials that can easily be disassembled and recycled in the future when the building has past its lifespan. He said that the wind turbines were 'cutting edge' technology that currently exist in a few other places in the country. They would be one meter in size (each).

Questions by the Commission:

Commissioner Wineberg – Do the turbines make noise? (Petitioner – They make less noise than our current rooftop units).

Commissioner Glusac – The platform for the wind turbines, are those integral to those? (Petitioner – those are existing, but we would build a new structure to keep them vertical).

Commissioner Bruner – Stated he would be more inclined to support the project if he knew more about how the final project would look (where turbines will be located). This is a great plan, but feel that the turbines should be out of view.

Public Commentary:

1. Ethel Potts, 1014 Elder Blvd., Ann Arbor, MI 48103 – This building and the one to the west of it are prime examples of 'infill' within a historic district that doesn't try to imitate anything. It's honest, modern architecture, modest in scale that does not try to overpower. I would say that one of its charms is its simplicity, but feel that the turbines should not be visible from the street.
2. Peter Blose – 111 South Fourth Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 – Although this project is not visible from the street, it is visible from our back windows which face east – directly at that roof. The pictures you show have false facades with pitched angles, but in actuality are flat roofs. It doesn't have that undulating quality which resonates with the pitched roof in this plan. We have a view of all the brick facades of the back of this and neighboring buildings and find the idea of a green space theoretically attractive, but visually disturbing.

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
554
555
556
557

The greenery would not be visible for us because it's heading north. We're asking that it be considered that there be some way to make the building more compatible with the brick .

Applicant Rebuttal:

(Petitioner) - The purpose of the wall (in the back) is that it's a firewall as it's on the property line. The goal aesthetically was to make it (the proposed conference room) a distinct element, like penthouses adjacent, only we're trying to use sustainable recycled wood instead of steel or aluminum.

Discussion by the Commission:

Commissioner Wineberg – Asked if brick or brick like material could be used. (Petitioner – Explained that that was explored, but there were problems associated with the adhesives.)

Commissioner McCullough – Mentioned modern architecture and the possibility that the 'wastefulness' of a building could eventually become part of its historic character.

Commissioner Wineberg – Stated she was torn; is sympathetic to the residents, but felt this was a good project and that she supported the wind turbines on the front. It could be considered sculptural and it is removable. (Commissioner White agreed.) She stated that moving those could be a problem for the residents and opposes that in the motion.

(The Commission discussed the fact that it would have been helpful to have more information on the performance aspect of the turbines – to support placing them in view of the street. Similar discussion regarding striking the turbines from the motion and returning another time for a better proposal just for the turbines. The Commission agreed on a friendly amendment).

Commissioner McCullough – Noted that they are missing two crucial items –

1. Better information regarding the turbines, their placement and performance and
2. Whether there are other placement positions for these that would have lower impact.

MOTION #1

Moved by Commissioner Glusac, Seconded by Commissioner McCullough “ **that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 210 East Huron Street to add a 576 square foot conference room on the rear (south) portion of the roof, enlarge a second-floor window on the south elevation and add wooden fixed shutters and a shade structure, and add two wind turbines to the roof on the condition that the wind turbines are located in such a way that they are not visible from the public right-of-way. 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 2, 9, and 10.**”

AMENDMENT TO MOTION #1

Moved by Commissioner Wineberg, Seconded by Commissioner White, “**to strike the portion of the sentence in the preceding motion that states..... (cont.)**”

558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608

“add two wind turbines to the roof on the condition that the wind turbines are located in such a way that they are not visible from the public right-of-way.”

On a Roll Call Vote – **AMENDMENT #1 PASSED** – 4 YES to 1 NO

(Yes) – Commissioners Wineberg, Glusac, McCullough and White

(No) – Commissioner Bruner

(Abstain) – (0)

(Absent/Vacant) – Commissioner Henrichs (1), Vacant (1)

MOTION #2 (Revision of Motion #1)

Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Glusac, **“that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 210 East Huron Street to add a 576 square foot conference room on the rear (south) portion of the roof, enlarge a second-floor window on the south elevation and add wooden fixed shutters and a shade structure.**

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

MOTION #3

Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner McCullough, **“to deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for the aspect of the application which calls for adding two wind turbines because of inadequate information to show that the requested placement of these is an optimal choice for performance and Secretary of the Interior’s Standard #9.”**

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

Commission suspended the meeting at 10:00 p.m. for a brief recess. Commissioner White called the Commission back into regular session at 10:20 p.m.

B - REQUESTS FOR REHEARING - None

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION/PUBLIC COMMENT – None.

C - APPROVAL OF MINUTES

C-1 Regular Session of February 28, 2007

Moved by Commissioner Wineberg, Seconded by Commissioner McCullough **“that the minutes of February 8, 2007 Regular Session be approved as presented .”**

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

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
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659

C-2 Regular Session of March 28, 2007

Moved by Commissioner Wineberg, Seconded by Commissioner McCullough, ***“that the minutes of the March 8, 2007 Regular Session be approved as presented.”***

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

D - OLD BUSINESS - None

E - NEW BUSINESS

E-1 April 14 Historic District Commission Retreat (Kristine Kidorf)

Ms. Kidorf reminded the Commission to attend the upcoming Retreat on Saturday, April 14th, 2007 at 8:30 a.m. at the Kempf House. She provided the Commission with Draft Design Guidelines for review at that retreat.

E-2 Historic Building Marker Request – 119 North Thayer Street

J. Thacher – This is in the OFWHD, the house is the “Arthur Brown’ home, circa 1894. It’s a Queen Ann, two story L-shaped frame house with a hipped roof, front gable, asphalt siding, double hung single windows in the front wing, triple attic windows with double hung center section and bracketed sunburst detail (from the OFW Guide). The owner, Susan Wineberg has requested to purchase a historic marker.

(Commissioner Wineberg is recused – owns home in question).

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner Glusac, Supported by Commissioner McCullough, **“to approve a historical plaque for 119 North Thayer Street.”**

On a Voice Vote – **MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS**
(with one recusal, Commissioner Wineberg)

F - REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Wineberg – Awards Committee – Reported that they will be meeting this coming Tuesday to review the Power Point presentation to be given before City Council. The awards will be given out at City Council’s meeting on May 7, 2007 at 7:00 p.m. and then adjourn to the Kempf House for a reception. She encouraged all of the Commission to attend.

G - STAFF ACTIVITIES REPORT

G-1 Staff Activities – J. Thatcher reported that in March 2007 there were eleven applications, seven reviewed by staff (leaving 4 to be reviewed by the Commission). Nine of the eleven were approved and two were denied by the HDC.

660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710

G-2 General Business – Coordinator reported that the Broadway Study Committee had its first meeting, and Commissioners White and Bruner are members of that committee.

(Commissioner Bruner reported that their charge is to delineate the boundaries of the District, which is essentially half of the original district. It was shaped in sort of a ‘v’, with properties running out from Broadway, Pontiac Trail, etc. The new proposal includes Broadway, the Commercial District, the Oldtown Properties, mainly things at the nexus.

Although the boundaries are given here, it is part of our charge to look at all the properties there and determine the boundaries. A lot of hard work had already been done by the committee who attempted establish the previous district, and this will make our job much easier. Our timeline includes proposed presentation to City Council by the end of summer, mid to late August 2007).

Coordinator Thatcher – When the review committee went out on Monday, I posted a bright orange Planning Commission notice of public hearing sign (deleted “Planning” and added “HDC”). It gives the date, time and place of hearing. This resulted in the presence of one of tonight’s speakers (the 210 Huron Street (A-4) issue). He was here because of the sign. Is this something that you want staff to do, and if so, what type, kind, color and size of notice or since this is not required, do we want to do it at all?

(The Commission discussed public notice and the requirements in general.)

Moved by Commissioner Wineberg, Seconded by Commissioner White, **“to begin public notification postings at each site up for application.”**

On a Voice Vote – **MOTION PASSED** – YES (4), NO (1)

(Yes) – Commissioners Wineberg, Glusac, McCullough and White

(No) – Commissioner Bruner

(Abstain) – (0)

(Absent/Vacant) – Commissioner Henrichs (1), Vacant (1)

H - ASSIGNMENTS

- A-1** 116 West Liberty Street – Commissioner Wineberg
- A-2** 217 North Division – Commissioner Glusac
- A-3** 216 Murray Street - Commissioner McCullough
- A-4** 210 East Huron Street - Commissioner White

I - REVIEW COMMITTEE – May 7, 2007, **noon** for May 10, 2007 HDC Meeting - Commissioners McCullough and Wineberg

711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722

J - CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS – None.

K - COMMUNICATIONS

Moved by Commissioner Wineberg, Seconded by Commissioner Glusac, **“to adjourn the meeting.”** “ The Chair adjourned the meeting at 10:55 p.m.

*A working session followed the regular session of the HDC.

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