



**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR
Thursday, May 10, 2007**

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

Commissioners Absent: M. McCullough (1)

Commissioner Vacancies: (1)

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 7:02 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.

Commissioner White reminded the Commission and the audience that a public hearing on the Draft Design Guidelines for Historic Districts would be held promptly at 8:30 p.m. this evening during the regular meeting.

A - HEARINGS

A-1 307 MULHOLLAND STREET – move existing window opening 5” toward the front – **OWSHD**

BACKGROUND: This 2 story colonial revival first appears in Polk directories in 1918 as 307 Sixth Street. Its first occupants were Hugh and Mary Dowler. In 1919, Harry Crawford, an inspector, lived there and from 1921 to 1924 it was the home of Joseph Bowerman, a laborer. In 1928 the street name was changed to Mulholland. The houses built prior to this to the south are similar to homes built on Murray Avenue in that they were nearly identical in size, shape, and materials used. 307 Mulholland and its neighbor to the north are of a similar size to the earlier houses on the street, but with a hipped roof instead of a gable front.

LOCATION: The site is located on the east side of Mulholland Street, north of West Liberty and south of West Washington.

51 **APPLICATION:** The applicant requests HDC approval to move a second story bathroom
52 window on the north elevation five inches toward the front of the house (to the west).
53

54 **STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 55
- 56 1. The applicant has provided a window worksheet for each of the two window sizes, a
57 statement that the windows do not operate and are not repairable, and information on
58 the proposed replacement windows. The HDC Review Committee's site visit and/or
59 further evidence from the applicant are necessary to determine the extent of
60 deterioration on these three window sashes.
61

62 **Owner/Address:** Marilyn Cummins, 2775 Manchester Road, Ann Arbor MI 48104
63

64 **Applicant:** Same as above.
65

66 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Wineberg and McCullough
67

68 Commissioner Wineberg – I visited the site and met with the owners. They assured us that
69 the trim would remain the same and we had no problem with moving the window, given those
70 assurances. (Commissioner McCullough was not present).
71

72 **Applicant Presentation:** None.
73

74 **Audience Participation:** Christine Brummer, stated she lives on Mulholland and as long as
75 most of the trim and what you see are kept the same, the neighbors are all in favor of this.
76

77 **Questions by the Commission:** None.
78

79 **MOTION**

80
81 Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Wineberg, “**that the**
82 **Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for 307 Mulholland Street to move**
83 **an existing second floor window five inches forward (to the west). The proposed work**
84 **is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and**
85 **relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets the**
86 **Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation Numbers 2 & 9.”**
87

88 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE - PASSED – UNANIMOUS.**
89

90 **A-2 116 WEST LIBERTY STREET – Replacement windows and doors on rear**
91 **elevation - MSHD**
92

93 **BACKGROUND:**

94
95 This site is near the center of a row of three-story, Italianate-style commercial buildings,
96 numbers 112-122, which were begun in 1866. Upper floors were used as residences. The
97 first occupant of 116 W. Liberty was a saloon, owned by George C. Mogk. By 1872 the
98 occupant was Gauss Boot and Shoe Store. Ehnis and Sons, originally a harness maker and
99 subsequently a work clothes store, owned the building from 1913 until purchased by the
100 present owners. The buildings have stone basements and one-foot thick exterior brick walls.

101 Some of the buildings were later expanded 22 feet north into the alley, leaving only a
102 walkway dividing the row from the adjacent building.

103
104 In October 2006 an application was approved by the Historic District Commission to add a
105 raised roof above a portion of the third floor to provide access to a roof deck and increased
106 interior lighting, to add a new fire exit stair to the north façade, and to make minor
107 modifications in the front entry to create a small foyer. In April, 2007 an application was
108 approved by the Historic District Commission to replace six windows on the front elevation.

109
110 **LOCATION:** The site is located on the north side of West Liberty, between Main and Ashley
111 Streets.

112
113 **APPLICATION:** The applicant requests HDC approval to: extend the roof ten feet to enclose
114 an exterior courtyard; replace two six-over-six double-hung windows with aluminum-clad
115 awning windows and add a third awning window in an existing boarded-up opening; and
116 replace two boarded-up openings on the ground floor with glass block and cement plaster
117 infill, and a new solid flush door in each.

118
119 **STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 120
121 1. The applicant is requesting a revision to the previously approved plan for the rooftop
122 addition. The revised roofline would add a skylight and clerestory window above the
123 courtyard; in effect making the single-story interior courtyard space into a two-story
124 space. A skylight near the rear elevation is proposed to be moved four feet forward
125 (south). The changes to the roofline will not be visible from West Liberty Street or the
126 rear alley.
- 127
128 2. The HDC Review Committee's site visit and/or further evidence from the applicant are
129 necessary to determine the extent of deterioration on the windows. If the windows are
130 deteriorated beyond repair, staff recommends replacing them with windows that
131 convey the same visual appearance as the existing windows, namely, six-over-six
132 double-hung. Staff does not object to the use of aluminum clad wood windows on the
133 rear elevation, if the existing window dimensions are replicated.
- 134
135 3. The boarded-up opening on the second floor that is proposed to become a window
136 has been used as a fire escape. It is unclear whether the original opening was for a
137 doorway, or for a window that was later enlarged. Installing a six-over-six window that
138 matches the other two second-floor windows, and blocking in the lower part of the
139 opening, is appropriate since the opening will no longer be used for emergency
140 egress.
- 141
142 4. Glass block is not an appropriate material to use on a building of this style and period.
143 Photographs of the interior of the building taken in 1918 show the two large openings
144 on the ground floor as windows with large panes of glass and, most likely, steel
145 frames. One more appropriate approach would be to install a fixed-frame, multi-paned
146 steel window that resembles the form of the historic window while using modern
147 materials.
- 148
149 5. The proposed solid metal flush doors on the rear ground-floor openings are acceptable
150 for the rear of a commercial structure, though one or a pair of glass French doors
151 would be preferable since the openings were historically windows.

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
199
200
201
202

Owner/Address: G&B Projects LLC, Guthrie & Buresh Architects, 116 West Liberty Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Applicant: Danelle Guthrie, G&B Projects LLC, Guthrie & Buresh Architects, 116 West Liberty Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Review Committee: Commissioners Wineberg and McCullough

Commissioner Wineberg – We visited the site and he Commissioner McCullough basically like everything in the proposal. I agree more with the staff report. I think the windows should to be repaired if possible. We were not able to inspect the windows from the inside. The glass block is an inappropriate material for this project.

Applicant Presentation: Danelle Guthrie was present to speak on behalf of the appeal. Adjacent alleyway elevations – It was my interpretation of the Historic Ordinance that the concerns the Commission had are with all elevations that are relative to the public right-of-way. Since this is a private alley and based on our viewing of buildings in the surrounding area and those that have been renovated over recent years that was handled in a utilitarian way. This is why we chose to provide this plan.

The other point is that this is a very narrow alley and does not allow vehicular traffic, and security is a big issue. We would prefer not to put glass down at the ground level, which is why we chose glass block. There are buildings across the alley that have glass block.

K. Kidorf – Mentioned that fencing, roofing and a gate were going to be put around the back of the structure (a previous approval).

Public Commentary: None.

Discussion by the Commission:

Commissioner Bruner – The perforated metal screen had been approved under a former application. I feel there is a situation here where the character of the fence being 50 percent or greater opacity, creates a security issue on the inside. The fact that we've approved that screen is a factor. I would support the idea that the applicant secure it with glass block.

Commissioner Henrichs – Has it been determined that the upper windows are in such a state of disrepair that they need replacement? (Commissioner Wineberg – We didn't look at them). We really haven't established that then.

Commissioner White – I was on the earlier review committee, and I assumed that the age of those windows were the same as those in the front. That floor had been vacant for a long time, and there was no stairway to access that at the time.

Commissioner Wineberg – I think the windows in the back are later. The windows in the front were 4 over 4, the ones in the back are 6 over 6. These buildings were build/added on to in the rear. Perhaps we need to visit the site again to see the condition of the windows. Ms. Wineberg also reminded everyone that we are now operating under the revised ordinance (Chapter 103) and treat all outside portions of a building as though it was any visible façade.

203 Commissioner Glusac – I support a revisit to the site to see the condition of the windows.

204
205 Applicant - Asked for clarification as to what type of material the windows could be made
206 from, and what would happen if the issue were tabled?

207
208 Commissioner Wineberg – Suggested that a site visit be a condition of the motion. If it came
209 back that they are deteriorated, we could vote on it now.

210
211 J. Thacher – If they were determined to be ‘not’ deteriorated beyond repair, then the
212 petitioner would have to return to the HDC.

213
214 **MOTION (Amendment #1 to the Main Motion)**

215
216 Moved by Commissioner Wineberg, Seconded by Commissioner Bruner, “**to Amend the**
217 **motion to approve the windows contingent upon inspection by staff and one other**
218 **Commission member to determine the condition of the windows to be replaced.”**

219
220 **On a Voice Vote – AMENDMENT #1 to the MAIN MOTION PASSED - *UNANIMOUS***

221
222 Commissioner Henrichs – We didn’t actually address Commissioner Bruner’s concern
223 regarding the glass block? The point is well taken that if the area is completely enclosed with
224 these metal panels that no one is really going to see it. It’s not clear from the drawings as to
225 whether the roof will go over this or not. These are variables that make it difficult to vote on.

226
227 J. Thacher – My staff report was written with the thought that a fence is much less
228 ‘permanent’ than the changes to the openings in the building.

229
230 Commissioner Bruner – Wants to amend the motion a second time.

231
232 **MOTION (Amendment #2 to the Main Motion)**

233
234 Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Henrichs, “to amend the
235 language that reads as outlined below in the main motion:

236
237 On a Roll Call Vote – AMENDMENT #2 to the MAIN MOTION – PASSED – **Yes (3), No (2)**

238
239 *Yes – Commissioners White, Bruner and Henrichs (3)*

240 *No – Commissioners Wineberg and Glusac (2)*

241
242 **MAIN MOTION:**

243 (As Amended by the Commission)

244
245 Moved by Commissioner Glusac, Seconded by Commissioner Wineberg, “**that the**
246 **Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 116**
247 **West Liberty Street to extend the roof ten feet to enclose an exterior courtyard,**
248 **replace two six-over-six double-hung windows and add a third in an existing**
249 **boarded-up opening, and replace two boarded-up openings on the ground floor**
250 **with a window glass block, a door and cement plaster infill, provided the**
251 **following condition is met: the second floor replacement windows convey the**
252 **same visual appearance as the existing windows. and the windows in the two**
253 **first floor openings consist of multiple panes of glass and not glass block. The**

254 windows proposed to meet the above conditions must be approved by staff and
255 a Commission member on a site visit before installation. The proposed work as
256 modified to meet the above conditions is generally compatible in exterior
257 design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building
258 and to the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards*
259 *for Rehabilitation* standards 2, 6, 9, and 10.”

260
261 **On a Voice Vote – MAIN MOTION WITH TWO AMENDMENTS - PASSED – UNANIMOUS**

262
263 **A-3 215 MURRAY AVENUE – New one-story addition to rear of house – OWSHD**

264
265 **BACKGROUND:** This 1½ story Queen Anne was inhabited in 1910 by George Gagnier. In
266 1912, Maurice Montonye, a bookkeeper for Schumacher Hardware was the occupant. In
267 1916 Fred Palmer, dentist, lived there, until 1921 when Theodore Hummel, a machinist and
268 later truck driver, is listed as the occupant. Mr. Hummel stayed until 1931. Murray Avenue is
269 unique in its sameness; that is, most houses on Murray were identical in form and massing
270 when constructed, down to their modest Queen Anne trim, placement of windows and doors,
271 and turned front porch supports.

272
273 **LOCATION:** The site is located on the east side of Murray Avenue, north of West Liberty and
274 south of West Washington.

275
276 **APPLICATION:** The applicant requests HDC approval to add a 330 square foot, single-story
277 addition on the rear and side of the house on a crawlspace, and replace an existing window
278 with a bay window on the north elevation. The addition would be sided in wood lap siding,
279 roofed with asphalt, and trimmed to match what is on the house now. The addition includes a
280 new covered porch on the south elevation with simple square porch posts and lattice skirting,
281 and also a rear deck with double-leaf full-light windows. The foundation would be concrete
282 block, and the windows would be wood casement in the bay and wood double-hung on the
283 addition. The bay window would replace an approximately 47” wide wood double-hung.

284
285 **Owner/Address:** Jose Benki and Teresa Satterfield, 215 Murray Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI
286 48103

287
288 **Applicant:** Same as above.

289
290 **STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 291
292 1. On the south side of the house, the proposed addition would extend thirteen feet into
293 the side yard beyond the existing plane of the house. It would block the driveway and
294 cut off the existing garage. The resulting driveway will be approximately 32’ long and 9’
295 wide, and have room for one normal or possibly two very small cars. The addition
296 would be extremely conspicuous because of its intrusion into the side yard.
297
298 2. The new addition would eliminate an existing door and two windows on the east (rear)
299 elevation and one window on the south elevation.
300
301 3. The double-leaf full-light doors on the rear deck are inappropriate for this style of
302 house and the character of the district. A single-leaf door with a half-light on the top
303 would be more appropriate.
304

- 305 4. The form of the proposed addition is differentiated from the historic house by being
306 limited to one story and slightly offset from the house. The concrete masonry unit
307 foundation will also differentiate the old from the new.
308
- 309 5. Replacing the double-hung window on the north elevation with a bay window is not
310 appropriate per the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines. Repairing the existing
311 window is recommended. If the existing window is deteriorated beyond repair,
312 replacing it with a similar compatible window would be appropriate.

313 Review Committee: Commissioners Wineberg and McCullough
314

315 Commissioner Wineberg – We visited the site and we both had the same feeling about this
316 addition in that the intrusion into the side yard was an issue. The houses on Murray are
317 characterized by having side drives that go all the way back. We also felt the bay window
318 was not appropriate. It would be more appropriate to build straight back, but the room for that
319 is compromised by some very large existing trees. (Commissioner McCullough was not
320 present).
321

322 **Applicant Presentation:** Jose' Benki spoke on behalf of the application. He stated that the
323 current house is 910 square feet. He stated that both he and his co-applicant are teachers at
324 the University and would like to have an office in the house, a more updated kitchen and a bit
325 of extra room to allow their children and themselves a better comfort zone. They would like
326 to stay in the neighborhood.
327

328 He stated that they cannot go any farther back into the rear setback than nine feet due to two
329 large trees. They have an extra wide lot (50 feet, largest on the block).
330

331 Regarding the garage and the lot, Allen Creek was put below our home via a pipe, so prior to
332 that, our garage used to get flooded regularly. It is rotting on the bottom, leaning and the
333 doors are not operable.
334

335 **Questions by the Commission:** None.
336

337 **Public Commentary :**
338

- 339 1. Christine Brummer – Mulholland Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48103
340

341 (Ms. Brummer spoke briefly to the petitioner, asking if he had actually talked with
342 anyone within the city building department as to whether the foundation had to be 'built
343 up?' Mr. Benke stated that yes, they had spoken to the Building Official and that they
344 cleared the base flood elevation by seven inches. If this project were approved by the
345 HDC, we would provide a floor design that would be skinnier but would clear the flood
346 elevation. He was satisfied that we could meet code. Ms. Brummer stated that nearly
347 all of the residents of Murray Avenue who have looked into 'building on,' almost all
348 have had to do is build two stories and then straight back.
349

- 350 2. Ethel Potts, 1014 Elder Blvd., Ann Arbor, MI 48103
351

352 Depending on whether this is floodway, floodplain or what, habitable space is not
353 permitted, even if raised over the flood level.
354
355

Petitioner Rebuttal:

The base flood elevation is what hydrologists, etc. have determined. Michigan 2003 Building code states that ‘finished floors have to be one foot over that elevation – the intent being that the floor structure clears that elevation. The finished floor of the existing home is 7 inches above that. If we want to have a level floor without a step, then we need a ‘skinnier’ floor so that we’re still above the .

Discussion by the Commission:

Commissioner Bruner – I understand that a 360 Degree review is necessary, but this lot is blessed with an additional 50 feet.. The other properties on the block are restricted because they don’t have the same amount of extra lot. With that in mind, I would vote to approve the application they have proposed on the south side. The bay window is not something I could support.

Commissioner Henrichs – The massing and geometry of this is incompatible with the existing house and other houses along the street. Regarding the floodway, there aren’t any lines and/or demarcations where any of those lines fall, any easements might be – but we’re here to determine the addition to the home which does not seem appropriate to me.

Moved by Commissioner Wineberg, Seconded by Commission Henrichs, “ **that the Commission deny the application at 215 Murray Avenue to build a single-story addition on the rear and side of the house and replace an existing window with a bay window. The proposed addition is extremely conspicuous and conflicts with the historic use of side yards on Murray Avenue, and the bay window is not appropriate for the style of house and would replace a character-defining window. Because of these, the work is not generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and to the surrounding area and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* standards 2, 9 and 10”**

On a Voice Vote – **MOTION PASSED- APPLICATION DENIED** – Yes (4) to No (1)
 Yes – Commissioner’s Henrichs, Glusac, Wineberg, White (4)
 No – Commissioner Bruner (1)

INTRODUCTIONS**I-1 – PUBLIC HEARING ON REVIEW OF THE DRAFT HISTORIC DISTRICT DESIGN GUIDELINES**

Kristine Kidorf, Kidorf Preservation Consultants gave a presentation on the Draft Edition of the Design Guidelines and Commissioner White invited the public to comment. (May 23rd at Bach School). 7:30.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. Ethel Potts – 1014 Elder Blvd., Ann Arbor, MI 48103 – Ms. Potts stated that she is a member of the Historic Preservation Committee as a part of the A2D2 effort on redesign of downtown Ann Arbor. She thanked Ms. Kiddorf on the extensive work that had been done to assist and support the Committee in their efforts and that because of her work, their job has been very pleasant and easy.

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

2. Louisa Pieper – 408 Awixa Rd., Ann Arbor, MI 48104 - Ms. Pieper stated that she is also a member of the Historic Preservation Committee (of the A2D2 group), and she thanked Ms. Kiddorf for her efforts and wants to give a hearty endorsement to the proposed design standards on behalf of the Ann Arbor Preservation Alliance.
3. Ray Detter –120 N. Division, Apt. 1, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 - (Speaking on behalf of the Downtown Area Citizens Advisory Council) – Mr. Detter congratulated Ms. Kidorf and the Committee on development of these design guidelines. The open meetings were good for interaction with the public for input and participation. This is a good set of guidelines that supports the new ordinances. With regard to Historic District construction, these will support that effort and provide specific direction.

As there were no other speakers, the Public Hearing was Closed at 8:47 p.m..

A-4 512 East Huron Street - OFWHD

BACKGROUND: The 1880 First Baptist Church has several additions: a two-story red brick education wing (by Colvin Robinson in 1950), a 1962 stucco and stone addition to that, a stone entrance on the south from the parking lot, and a wing on the north connecting all that to the Silas Douglass House at 502 East Huron next door (which was part of the 1993 Preservation Project of the Year). The church is a contributing structure in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District.

LOCATION: The property is located on the south side of East Huron Street, one lot west of State Street.

APPLICATION: The applicant requests HDC approval to add an exterior stairway to the rear (south) elevation of the red brick education wing. The stairwell would extend from the ground to the second floor, where a window would be enlarged into a doorway. The stair would act as the primary entrance/exit to the nursery school. Materials used on the stair would be a standing seam metal roof, translucent polycarb panels on steel framing on the sides, painted steel stringers, and a small amount of reinforced decorative block on the front (south) elevation. Also as part of the application, nine of the fifteen second-floor windows (the ones in the proposed nursery space) are proposed to have their frames restored and the wired/frosted glass replaced with clear tempered glass. Also, a four-foot metal fence similar to the existing fence along Washington Street would be installed to define an outdoor play area on the lawn adjacent to the parking lot.

The applicant appeared at the April 12, 2007 working session of the HDC to discuss the application with the petitioners.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The applicant appeared at an HDC working session on April 12, 2007 because staff had concerns about the design of the proposed stairway. Commissioners did not have serious problems with the design, and it is presented here with minor revisions to materials.

- 456 2. An additional fire-rated stairwell is necessary to operate a nursery school from the
457 church. Existing interior stairs are not fire-rated and retrofitting them is cost and design
458 prohibitive.
459
- 460 3. The work proposed for the windows respects the existing frames and the new glass
461 will be different (not frosted or with embedded wire), but compatible. It is not ideal to
462 repair only some of the windows on this elevation, but it is understood that the
463 applicant is using only the portion of the building where the repairs are proposed.
464
- 465 4. The stairway is proposed for the rear of the church building, though it is not an
466 inconspicuous location since the lot goes all the way through to East Washington
467 Street. Some leeway may be granted since this is a later addition and not the historic
468 church proper, though the additions own character must still be respected.
469
- 470 5. The proposed fence does not extend around or beneath the proposed stairwell and the
471 outdoor play area is thus open on the west side beneath the stairs. The black metal
472 fence material is appropriate to the site.
473
- 474 6. Staff's most significant concern about this application is its size and scale. The stair
475 will project out twenty-three feet from the red-brick addition and extend well past the
476 adjacent building wall to the west. It would become a very prominent feature on this
477 elevation of the building.
478

479 **Owner:** First Baptist Church, 512 East Huron Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104
480

481 **Applicant:** Ann Arbor Nursery, Inc., 423 S Fourth Ave., Ann Arbor, MI 48104
482

483 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Wineberg and McCullough
484

485 Commissioner Wineberg – We visited the site on Monday, and we had serious problems with
486 the drawings. We were not overly concerned with the windows or the fence, but the stairs
487 were very large. We want the nursery to be able to use this space, so we're hoping to find
488 some solution. The windows that are being restored are going to match the existing ones
489 which are already clear glass.
490

491 **Petitioner Presentation:** Sabba A'Lal, architect on the project was present to speak on
492 behalf of the application. He presented the Commission with samples of the polycarbonate
493 material that he wishes to use in the construction of the fire rated egress stair.
494

495 **Questions by the Commission:**
496

497 Commissioner Henrichs – One of your elevations you show material called out as 'split-
498 faced.' Do you have a sample of that? (Petitioner) – It's called a 'Rock Face' and it is much
499 like a cobblestone. No sample was available.
500

501 Commissioner Bruner – The color of that stone is grey? (Yes). Do you have a sample of the
502 mullions? (No). Are the lines on the polycarbonate going to be vertical or horizontal when
503 installed? (Vertical). Can you give us more information about the elements of the project?
504 (Petitioner – Elaborates about the stairs, flashing, etc.)
505

506 **Public Commentary:** None.

507 **Discussion by the Commission:**

508

509 Commissioner Bruner – I share Commissioner McCullough’s concern that we need more
510 detail. Your stairs may be ‘springy’ and it may be reinforced with a steel armature, but I need
511 more information about those elements. (Commissioner Henrichs – I would agree in general)

512

513 **MOTION #1**

514

515 Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Wineberg “ **that the**
516 **Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the portion of the**
517 **application at 512 East Huron Street to restore the frames and replace the glass**
518 **in nine second-floor windows; and to install a four-foot black metal fence around**
519 **a lawn play area. This proposed work is generally compatible in exterior design,**
520 **arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and to**
521 **the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for***
522 ***Rehabilitation* standards 2 and 9.**

523

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

525

526 Commissioner Henrichs – A sample of the standing seam would be appropriate. Some of the
527 specifics need to be examined more closely.

528

529 Commissioner Bruner – Concurs with Commissioner Henrichs in that they need more detail
530 and materials presented to the Commissioner. The problem with the block does not trouble
531 me. The material is “of its time.” (Petitioner stated that cost was a factor in determining the
532 split-faced block as a choice).

533

534 Commissioner Wineberg – I hear most of the Commission objecting to not knowing the
535 details. Most of us know what these material’s are. I we shouldn’t hold this up over this.

536

537 Commissioner Glusac – I’m not crazy about the shed roof as it accentuates the size of the
538 stairs. The other option that the architect presented with the “L” shape may be more
539 appropriate. In plan that breaks it up a bit.

540

541 Commissioner Henrichs – I’m concerned with the split-faced block, as the building already
542 has three types of masonry on it, and we’re adding a fourth? It gets to be a confusing
543 statement with four different types of masonry. The polycarbonate needs to be checked for wind
544 loading, etc. It could theoretically be removed in the future.

545

546 **MOTION #2**

547

548 Moved by Commissioner Henrichs, Seconded by Commissioner Glusac, “**that the**
549 **Commission deny the portion of the application at 512 East Huron Street to build**
550 **an exterior stairway on the south elevation of the building (as being compatible**
551 **with standards 9 and 10). Because of the size and scale of the proposed**
552 **stairway the work would be very conspicuous in relation to the existing building.**
553 **Therefore the work is not generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement,**
554 **texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and to the**
555 **surrounding area and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards***
556 ***for Rehabilitation* standards 2, 9 and 10.”**

557

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

On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO DENY - FAILED – No (3), Yes (2). - (Issue is Still Active)

*No – Commissioners White, Wineberg and Bruner (3)
Yes – Commissioners Henrichs and Glusac (2)*

MOTION #3

Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Wineberg, “ **that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the portion of the application at 512 East Huron Street to build an exterior stairway on the south elevation of the building as being compatible with *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards 9 and 10.***”

On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE -FAILED – Yes (1), No (3)

*Yes (1) – Commissioner Bruner
No (3) – Commissioners Wineberg, Henrichs and Glusac*

MOTION #4

Moved by Commissioner Wineberg, Seconded by Commissioner Bruner, “**to postpone this Application until the June 2007 Regular Session.**”

On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO POSTPONE UNTIL JUNE – PASSED – (Motion Tabled).

B - OLD BUSINESS – None.

C. - NEW BUSINESS – None.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION/PUBLIC COMMENT – None.

D - APPROVAL OF MINUTES

LINE 716 – Commissioner Not at the meeting – substitute Henrichs for Glusac

LINE 499 – Commissioner Wineberg – Spelling of PETER BLOS not BLOSE

D-1 Regular Session of April 12, 2007.

Moved by Commissioner Wineberg, Seconded by Commissioner Bruner, “***that the minutes of April 12, 2007 Regular Session be approved as amended .***”

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

E - OLD BUSINESS - None

F - NEW BUSINESS

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

G - REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Wineberg – Awards Committee – Reported. Commissioner Wineberg thanked staff and Commissioner White for their work. She also stated that the City of Ann Arbor – Sign and Signal Division has agreed to replace some of the missing historic district street signs.

H - ASSIGNMENTS – AD HOC Review Committee for Liberty Street– BRUNER

307 Mulholland Street–	Commissioner Henrichs
116 W. Liberty Street–	Already has a monitor - Commissioner Wineberg
215 Murray Avenue–	None Necessary - Application denied
512 East Huron –	TO BE DETERMINED LATER FOR ENTIRE PROJECT

REVIEW COMMITTEE

Commissioners Henrichs and White

H - STAFF ACTIVITIES REPORT

G-1 Staff Activities – J. Thatcher reported that in April 2007 there were seven applications; four were reviewed by HDC, three by Staff – 100 Percent Approval.

I - REVIEW COMMITTEE – June 11, 2007, **noon** for July 12, 2007 HDC Meeting - Commissioners Henrichs and White.

J - CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS – No Commissioners on the A2D2 Committee.

Moved by Commissioner Wineberg, Seconded by Commissioner Henrichs, “ **that the Commission recommend to City Council that they pass the Draft Historic District Guidelines as a part of the A2D2 Committee.**”

On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED - UNANIMOUS

Christine Kidorf – Thanked Commissioner Henrichs who marked up his copy and those will be incorporated into the changes.

Commissioner Bruner – Concerned with the Murray Street denial. He stated that one of the Commissioners stated that the proposal was ‘inappropriate,’ but didn’t elaborate and I’m not sure that we gave them proper direction. The addition on the side of a home has been approved countless times in the Old West Side. I would like to give staff a good idea of what we think is appropriate or not appropriate so that the applicant doesn’t come back with something else that we might deny.

659 Commissioner Henrichs - For me it was also the slope, the addition wrapped around the
660 house, etc. There were a lot of other criteria other than the lot width.

661
662 Commissioner Wineberg – Staff can show them the new guidelines, etc.

663
664 Coordinator Thacher – This is the same firm that has attempted three other additions and has
665 yet to communicate with us.

666
667 **K - COMMUNICATIONS – None.**

668
669 Meeting was adjourned at 10:02 p.m.

670
671 *A working session followed the Regular Session of the HDC.

672
673 ***SUBMITTED BY: Brenda Acquaviva, Administrative Service Specialist V, Planning and***
674 ***Development Services.***