



**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE  
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR  
Thursday, May 8, 2008.**

**Commissioners Present:** Diane Giannola, Michael Bruner, Ellen Ramsburgh, Robert White, Jim Henrichs, Kristina Glusac and Sarah Shotwell (7); **Commissioners Absent: (0)**

**Staff Present:** Jill Thacher, HDC Coordinator/Planner II and Brenda Acquaviva, Administrative Support Specialist V, Planning and Development Services (2)

**CALL TO ORDER:** Commissioner White called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:** Quorum satisfied.

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:** *The Agenda was approved without objection.*

**A - HEARINGS**

**A-1 310-314 SECOND STREET – OWSHD**

**BACKGROUND:** 310 Second Street was built before 1853, and was moved to this site in 1898 from the corner of Liberty and Second. 314 first appears in city directories in 1897.

**LOCATION:** The site is on the west side of Second Street, between West Liberty and West William.

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to remove a garage behind 314 Second Street and a barn behind 310 Second Street.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. The barn behind 310 Second was originally part of 413 West Liberty (a Greek Revival house built prior to 1894), and appears on the 1908 Sanborn map. Sanborns mark it as a stable at first, and later an automobile garage. Until at least 1971, it had the address 413 ½ West Liberty. In 1908 there was a one-story addition with the same size footprint next to the existing barn, accessed through the east side door that can be seen in the photographs. The addition was removed between 1925 and 1931. At some point, property lines were redrawn and the barn went to 310 Second.

The garage behind 314 Second was built between 1931 and 1971, per Sanborn maps. The photographs provided seem to indicate that the garage is a separate structure immediately adjacent to the barn.

2. The garage has a negative impact on the spatial integrity of the barn. Therefore, it is appropriate to remove it.
3. The barn is possibly much older than 1908, given that 413 West Liberty was probably built before the Civil War. The Review Committee visit will help determine its condition and whether the barn has lost its integrity through the removal of the one-story addition and the lot reconfiguration. Until it is determined otherwise, staff considers it to be a contributing structure in the Old West Side Historic District.

52  
53 4. 310 and 314 Second Street are in common ownership.

54  
55 5. More information on the condition of both structures has been requested.

56  
57 **Applicant/Address:** Andrew Johncox, 10267 Byron Road, Howell, MI 48855

58  
59 **Owner/ /Address:** 310-314 Second LLC, 7844 Fischers Way, Dexter, MI 48130

60  
61 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Ramsburgh and White visited the site.

62  
63 Commissioner Ramsburgh – We weren't able to get into the barn, and this makes it difficult to  
64 access the damage. The exterior does not look bad, and the foundation is very sturdy. I think the  
65 applicant stated they would keep this foundation as a retaining wall, so it should be sufficient to  
66 stay a foundation. I agree with staff that the smaller garage is not a contributing structure and the  
67 removal of it wouldn't have a detrimental effect on the property. I think the barn needs a second  
68 look. If it's true that the roof is the only thing in bad shape, then I think that it's worth keeping.

69  
70 Commissioner White – Concurs with Commissioner Ramsburgh and Staff

71  
72 **Applicant Presentation:** Dawn Herst, owner of 310-314 LLC, was present to speak on behalf of  
73 the appeal. She stated that she and her husband no longer own 314 and wish to withdraw the  
74 application. They stated that they did not intend for the garage structure to be demolished. They  
75 wanted to do something with the barn alone. She suggested that the application be withdrawn  
76 and resubmitted with another plan at another time. She stated that they had invested  
77 \$170,000.00 in the two houses. The barn has issues, and given the misunderstanding, we wish  
78 to withdraw.

79  
80 *Staff suggested that the Commission put forth a motion to deny the application in keeping with*  
81 *the petitioner's request to withdraw (since the appeal is currently being heard). J. Thacher stated*  
82 *that there is no reason why the Applicant couldn't come back in and submit another revised*  
83 *application regarding just the barn.*

84  
85 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:** None.

86  
87 **Audience Participation:** None.

88  
89 **Discussion by the Commission:**

90  
91 **MOTION**

92  
93 Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Shotwell, “**that the**  
94 **Commission DENY the applications to demolish both the garage and the barn at 310**  
95 **and 314 Second Street, giving the owner time to reassess what they would like to do**  
96 **with the remaining property.”**

97  
98 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO DENY PASSED – UNANIMOUS (Application Denied)**

99  
100 **A-2 713 WEST LIBERTY STREET – OWSHD**

101  
102 **BACKGROUND:** This two-and-a-half-story, gable-front house appears to have been constructed  
103 about 1885 for John Goetz Jr, a grocer, John Goetz & Sons, on South Main Street.

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  
152  
153  
154  
155

John's widow, Dorothea Goetz, lived in the house until 1940. From about 1920 until 1940 a Lydia Henne, a Christian Scientist also lived in the house. Marwood H. Goetz, a student at Cleary College lived in the house in 1941, but by 1943 several members of the Bensinger family who worked at Liberty Food Lockers lived in the house. By 1945 a Ford employee, Herman G. Wieterhoft and his wife Rosa lived in the house. The 1916 and 1925 Sanborn maps show the house in its current configuration with two, one-story outbuildings on the property. One outbuilding had an ice house attached to it.

The current owner received a staff approval to remove the artificial siding and two non-original concrete porch stoops to repair the foundation behind them.

In April, 2008 the applicant received HDC approval to remove a non-original rear door enclosure and a chimney on the rear section of the house.

**LOCATION:** The site is on the south side of West Liberty Street, between Fifth and Seventh.

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to:

- 1) remove an original knee-window on the second floor of the south elevation and replace it with an egress window and shed dormer;
- 2) remove a 1950s sun porch addition (7'2" by 9'9") from the southwest corner of the house and replace it with an 8' by 18' deck;
- 3) add a second floor to the existing one story rear addition, which would remove the hipped roof, a non-original bathroom dormer, and an original window;
- 4) install a new window in a new opening at the top of the south-facing rear gable;
- 5) cut four new window openings and install Andersen double-hung windows on the existing south elevation that match the height of an existing double-hung window on that elevation and
- 6) replace three exterior doors that currently have interior doors installed with half-light exterior doors, and install a small shed roof approximately 4' wide and extending 3' from the building face over the south elevation basement door.

**Owner/ Applicant/Address:** Michael Bielby, 605 N. Fifth Ave., Ann Arbor, MI 48014

**Review Committee:** Commissioners Ramsburgh and White visited the site.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – It's a remarkable transformation on this home. The house has great symmetry and I agree with staff findings and the egress window request to replace the original window is an inappropriate alteration and does not comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The back addition is appropriate and nicely done,

Commissioner White – Concurs with Commissioner Ramsburgh and the staff report.

**Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Michael Bielby, owner, was present to speak on behalf of the appeal. He stated that the small window that they would like to turn into an egress window – he doesn't know of any other alternative. That room is a bedroom, there is no other use for it and the windows in the front that are larger do not comply with egress window requirements.

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  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207

The only other alternative would be to construct a fire hallway with self-closing doors, which would preclude me from using the original doors we were hoping to use throughout the building.

Last night while preparing the masonry for repair, a large section collapsed on that east side. While we are already rebuilding it, I propose that we could replace the window that was in it and add a second window. (He presented some drawings to the Commission).

### **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

Commissioner White – You said that the wall collapsed? (Petitioner – Yes. The mortar inside of the walls was completely sand. They had ‘surface tuckered’ before, and when we were cleaning out mortar for the masons to repair, a ten foot section collapsed.

J. Thacher – Informed the commissioners that they could entertain changes to the application or just deal with the submitted application.

Commissioner Bruner – The wall that collapsed – do you have the floor system supported so that it isn’t affected by the collapse? (There are 8 x 8 beams that run along, so it’s stable and we’re shoring it up. Footings were put in today and then we’ll build more permanent stanchions).

The hip roof that terminates into the turret – in the rear addition. The elevations aren’t clear as to how that terminates. (That would be a valley created where they meet. It’s out of site completely and will engage the turret roof.)

**Audience Participation:** None.

### **Discussion by the Commission:**

Commissioner Bruner (To J. Thacher) – The renovations to the property are to such a degree that bringing the entire building up to current code is necessary, so the Building Department considers the need for these egress windows – outside of the owner’s good intentions to install them, they are in fact required, is that correct?

J. Thacher – It’s not that the egress windows specifically are required, but some method of fire suppression or egress windows, but you’re correct, the level of work he is doing is triggering that. I’ve had conversation with the Building Official about different alternatives that are available in lieu of egress windows. Mr. Bielby mentioned one of those (Fire Rated Hallway to a Fire Rated Exit or Stairwell). The other alternative is sprinkler systems – in the rooms. Both of those are preferable as you don’t have to jump out a second floor window to get out.

*(Conversation by staff and the Commission as to what ‘type’ of replacement doors the petitioner proposed to install as that information was lacking from the application materials).*

Commissioner Glusac – Clarification on the motion read. We would be voting on the original elevation submitted, not the one submitted at this meeting. (Correct).

Commissioner Bruner – This late addition that the petitioner would like us to consider should be left to another time – there is a lot of information to digest here.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – If we can leave that open for discussion, the fact that the wall is down right now and that he has to close it in – can we ask for additional information from him?

208 Commissioner Bruner – Stated that this could be filled in temporarily and wait for an informed  
209 decision from the Commission.

210  
211 Commissioner Ramsburgh (to staff) – The replacement of the front corner east elevation window  
212 was administratively approved? (Yes. He hasn't put it in yet).

213  
214 Commissioner Bruner – (Stated that Commissioner Ramsburghs point is well taken, and would  
215 like to ask the petitioner some questions.) (To Petitioner) – Are you creating some sort of  
216 habitable space in the basement – is this the reason for the egress windows and do they meet  
217 the requirements? (Yes to both questions). Maybe it is appropriate to infill the wall since we're  
218 here.

219  
220 Commissioner Henrichs – The submitted elevations show vertical mullions in both windows – it  
221 appears the mullions have been changed on several windows, not just those on the lower level.  
222 The one small basement window is shown as replaced by two much larger basement windows,  
223 so this seems to be significantly different from what was submitted in the original application;  
224 therefore, I would think the Commission would want to review it at a separate time.

225  
226 *The Commission allowed the Petitioner to make an additional comment.*

227  
228 Petitioner – Stated that he understood this was an unusual request to ask for approval at the  
229 meeting, but there are unusual circumstances – having the wall collapse. We have the materials  
230 on hand, and the mason needs to rebuild the stone wall. The earth is temporarily standing, but  
231 won't stand for another month. I'm concerned about doing work over that until it is completely  
232 stabilized.

233  
234 **MOTION #1**

235  
236 Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Shotwell, “**that the Commission**  
237 **issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the portion of the application at 713 West Liberty**  
238 **Street in the Old West Side Historic District to remove a 1950s sun porch addition and**  
239 **replace it with an 8' by 18' deck; to add a second floor to the existing one story rear**  
240 **addition; to install a new window in a new opening at the top of the south-facing rear**  
241 **gable; to install four new double-hung windows in new openings on the existing south**  
242 **elevation; to replace three exterior doors, which currently have interior doors installed in**  
243 **them, with half-light exterior doors; and to install a small shed roof over the south**  
244 **elevation basement door, as proposed. The work is generally compatible in exterior**  
245 **design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the**  
246 **surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, in**  
247 **particular standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.”**

248  
249 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – *UNANIMOUS (Application Approved)***

250  
251 Commissioner Bruner – Stated that it is interesting that staff has consulted with the Building  
252 Official and that the Petitioner is well aware of alternatives to providing egress windows. The  
253 alternative may seem expensive, and generally I fall in favor of an egress window being installed  
254 where required by code or egress. The dormer troubles me. Looking at other dormers done in  
255 this period and emulating that might be a solution.

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  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307

**MOTION #2**

Moved by Commissioner Ramsburgh, Seconded by Commissioner Bruner, “**that the Commission deny the portion of the application at 713 West Liberty Street in the Old West Side Historic District to remove a knee window on the south elevation and replace it with an egress window and shed roof wall dormer. The work is not generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*, in particular standard 2.”**

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

Commissioner Glusac – Why is the applicant proposing two new casement windows on that side when there was one to begin with?

Commissioner Bruner – He basically answered that when I asked him if that was habitable space there, and the second was for added light and charm.

J. Thacher – When we were at the site, the petitioner did express the need for bringing additional light into the basement to make the space more habitable.

Commissioner Glusac – I think that it would be a good idea to make sure that the alignment of the basement window is in keeping with the windows above it should be added to the motion. (Bruner – The motion states that this should be in keeping with the drawings, which apparently aligns one of the windows up above it on the first or second floor). It apparently does, but there are inconsistencies between the two drawings.

**MOTION #3**

Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Giannola, “**that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for 713 West Liberty Street, for the restoration of the collapsed masonry foundation wall on the east side of Liberty street toward the rear half of the original part of the home, to include two Andersen windows, CW-145 with grills as presented in revised drawings submitted by the applicant at the May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2008 Regular Session of the HDC as being appropriate and meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, standard 9.”**

**(Note: windows worded in this motion do NOT include those denied in the previous Motion #2).**

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

**A-3 617 FIFTH STREET – OWSHD**

**BACKGROUND:** This two-story craftsman-influenced house features full-width front and rear porches. It first appears in the city directory in 1929 as the home of Glen W. Naylor, a driver for the Arctic Electropure Creamery (which was located at the northeast corner of First Street and West Liberty), and his wife Melvina.

**LOCATION:** The property is located on the east side of Fifth Street between West Madison Street and Princeton Ave. It backs up to Turner Park Court.

**APPLICATION:** The applicant requests HDC approval to demolish an existing single-car garage and construct a new two-car garage.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. The existing garage is located at the rear of the property and can accommodate one car. The garage door is on the east side of the building and is accessed (by motor vehicles) from Turner Park Court, which runs along the rear of the property. The new garage will be oriented in the same manner with access from Turner Park Court.
2. The existing garage is approximately 12' x 18'. Currently the garage has a gable roof, however, it appears the garage originally had a nearly flat roof that pitched towards the rear or west side of the structure. The garage has a concrete foundation and the original structure is constructed of wood framing and wood siding. The gables of the roof appear to be scored plywood sheathing, similar to T-111 material. The roof is covered with asphalt shingles.
3. The garage is not a character-defining feature of the property or the district, it does not carry-over any of the house's architectural features, and it is a utility building.
4. The proposed new two-car garage is 21' x 21'. The height of the structure is not noted on the plans; staff estimates the height to the peak to be approximately 16 feet. It is proposed in the same location on the property as the existing garage, only extending farther to the north. The proposed garage meets all setback requirements for the zoning district in which the property is located. The footprint and placement of the proposed garage is similar to existing garages on adjacent properties to the north and south of the subject property.
5. The proposed garage will have a concrete foundation, wood frame construction, and cement board siding. An 8/12 pitched gable roof is proposed, to be covered with asphalt shingles. A hood is proposed to extend over the garage door and a 16" x 24" window is proposed in the gable. Two 3-over-1 windows are proposed on the north elevation of the structure. One person-door and two more 3-over-1 windows are proposed on the west elevation. A gabled roof is proposed extending over the person-door.
6. The applicant has stated that the property owner is seeking more storage space by constructing this garage instead of an addition onto the house. Staff believes this is an appropriate way to achieve that goal since the proposed garage is similar in size and placement to neighboring garages and its design is compatible with the house and neighborhood.

**Owner/Address:** Lisa Granger, 617 Fifth Street Ann Arbor, MI 48103

**Applicant:** Marc Rueter, 515 Fifth Street, Ann Arbor MI 48103

**Review Committee:** Commissioners Ramsburgh and White visited the site.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – This is a straightforward application. The existing garage is not a contributing building. The suggested replacement is very much in keeping in size, scale and design, very much like others along Turner Court. It ties in nicely with the neighborhood.

Commissioner White – Concurs with Commissioner Ramsburgh.

**Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Marc Rueter was present to speak on behalf of the application. He offered to answer any questions that the Commission might have.

**Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

Commissioner Bruner – Were the neighbors asked how they felt about the new building? (Petitioner – I’m not aware of that, although she did talk to the owner across the street. Turner Park Court has small houses on the east side, and on the west side there are garages except for a few clay tile houses, and the garages are similar to the one we’re proposing).

**Audience Participation:** None.

**Discussion by the Commission:**

**MOTION**

Moved by Commissioner Giannola, Seconded by Commissioner Henrichs, “**that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 617 Fifth Street to demolish the existing one-stall garage and construct a new two-stall garage as proposed. 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*, particularly standards 2 and 9.**”

**On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS (Application Approved)**

**A-4      1310 HILL STREET - WHHD**

**BACKGROUND:** This 1890 Georgian Revival house was first occupied by Edward deMille Campbell, a professor of analytical chemistry and metallurgy, and his family. The front façade’s symmetry is notable, particularly the pedimented front gable, window placement, and chimneys at both ends. See the attached study committee report for more information.

**LOCATION:** The site is on the south side of Hill Street, between South Forest Avenue and Olivia Avenue.

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to demolish an existing garage and portions of a rear porch to construct an 1835 square foot addition that is connected to the rear of the house with a one story connector.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. The two sugar maples in the backyard are landmark trees and contribute to the character of the site and the neighborhood. The design as proposed, with the second floor cantilevered over the first, will reduce the building’s footprint and impact the trees’ root systems less severely. This design and its intent are commendable. Per the city Land Development Coordinator, the other threat to the trees is trucks and equipment driving over their shallow root systems during construction. There are measures that can be taken

412 to prevent this from happening, such as (but not limited to) fencing surrounding the critical  
413 root zone to keep equipment and materials away. Therefore, any approvals should be  
414 conditioned with the requirement that adequate protection is given to the trees during  
415 construction.

- 416
- 417 2. The applicant has provided information proving that the garage is a modern structure,  
418 probably built after 1953. There is no evidence of the earlier garage present in the current  
419 one. It is therefore a noncontributing structure, and its removal is appropriate.
- 420
- 421 3. The hyphen connection between the house and the addition is appropriate and protects  
422 the form and integrity of the house. The addition could easily be removed in the future and  
423 the house would be unimpaired.
- 424
- 425 4. The addition is too tall in relation to the house. If the garret bedroom were removed, the  
426 remaining hipped roof would be an appropriate maximum height equal to the height of the  
427 front gable (see page A7 of drawings).
- 428
- 429 5. The footprint of the addition is 756 square feet, of the hyphen is approximately 180 square  
430 feet, and of the main house is 1315 square feet (from the city assessor's website). The  
431 addition is 1835 total square feet and the main house is 2709 square feet. The addition  
432 appears especially large from the west elevation drawing, but since a large church sits not  
433 far from the proposed addition only a few feet across the west property line, that view is  
434 blocked from the west. The lot is probably large enough to support an addition of this size  
435 once the garage is removed. Staff would prefer an addition with an overall smaller mass,  
436 but given this house's contextual setting between a large church and a large sorority, the  
437 impact to the neighbors will be minimal. The largest visual impact will be from Hill Street,  
438 where the addition will be visible on the west side of the house. Offsetting the addition  
439 (instead of placing it directly behind the house) is justified in this case in order to protect  
440 the two landmark trees in the backyard. If the height were lowered to that of the front gable  
441 or less, the appearance of the addition from Hill Street would also be lessened.
- 442
- 443 6. Staff has requested line drawings of the elevations and these will be emailed to  
444 commissioners or distributed at the meeting.
- 445

446 **Owner/ Applicant/Address:** David Chua, 845 Babb Circle, Wayne, PA 19087

447

448 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Ramsburgh and White visited the site.

449

450 Commissioner Ramsburgh – I concur with staff's report. I want to emphasize my concerns on the  
451 addition (*reads Secretary of Interior's Standards and recommendations regarding designing new*  
452 *additions to historic buildings*). I think features of the site are something that needs to be taken  
453 into consideration with this house. The rear of this house has architectural features in it that are  
454 almost as important as the front architectural features. The scale of this addition is certainly not  
455 subservient to the house.

456 It really competes with the house and the site itself, and I believe that these properties along Hill  
457 Street were outstanding in their historical context and the size of the addition is not appropriate  
458 for the attachment to this house in particular. I am also concerned that a lot of these homes are  
459 eaten up with parking and additions to houses, so the historical context of the trees and spacious  
460 lawns in this neighborhood is going to be reduced by an addition of this size.

461

462 Commissioner White – Concurs with Commissioner Ramsburgh. My biggest concern is the tree  
463 – it is too large. Something else on a smaller scale would work.

464 **Applicant Presentation:** Marc Rueter and the homeowners were present to speak on behalf of  
465 the application. Mr. Rueter stated that this site has one of the premier houses in the  
466 neighborhood. One important consideration is the economic value of the site and what future  
467 economic value has to do with preservation. When you see a house in this close a proximity to  
468 the university – it's a student neighborhood and one of the things we've seen around town is that  
469 when a historic property begins to lose their economic value, people eye them for bigger and  
470 major uses.

471  
472 This is a property that was very much like this. It's a large house on a very small piece of  
473 property. We can give this site an economic value that will carry it on into the foreseeable fifty to  
474 one hundred years and to maintain the ability to keep it in its present state. (*Mr. Rueter*  
475 *expounded at length on the application*).

476  
477 Marilyn Chua (homeowner) – She stated that they had originally purchased the home for their  
478 daughter who was a student at the university (during her third year). All the homes that they  
479 looked at were in such horrible disrepair and didn't seem safe. This house had languished on the  
480 market for a long time with no takers. We fell in love with it, even though it was more than we  
481 needed or wanted. We enjoyed the house for the next to years while she was in school and had  
482 no intention of being landlords. We don't really want to be in the real estate business; however,  
483 the economic downturn prevented us from finding a buyer.

484  
485 We've decided to keep the house, and we've invested a lot of money into it (electrical, plumbing,  
486 etc.) We screen the children who rent and want responsible people living there. However,  
487 having only being allowed to have four persons to rent this home per code, we can't afford the  
488 upkeep on the home. For long term economic maintenance of this home, this is the best solution  
489 we can think of while keeping the historic character of the home.

#### 490 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

491  
492  
493 Commissioner Bruner – (To the owner) – You spoke at length of this home that you've improved.  
494 How long have you owned this house? (Four years). It's currently being rented? (Yes, with four  
495 students). (Discussion with the architect regarding ceiling heights and the second floor system).

496  
497 Commissioner Giannola – If you remove the dormer on the top, how much height would that  
498 save? (M. Rueter - The apparent height would be reduced dramatically according to staff's  
499 analysis of the elevation drawings. You could also reduce the roof pitch too, so it might be  
500 another four feet lower).

501  
502 Commissioner Ramsburgh – What is the height – is it thirty-five at the cross section? (M. Rueter  
503 – It's twenty-five feet, and the Building Department calculates the height of the mid point of a  
504 pitched roof, so that what those calculations are derived from.)

505  
506 (*Continued Discussion between the Commission and the Petitioner*)

#### 507 **Audience Participation:**

- 508  
509  
510 1. Ethel Potts, 1014 Elder Blvd., Ann Arbor, MI – She stated that this house in the  
511 Washtenaw Hill District is exceptional. She has lived nearby and admired it. She said that  
512 she understands the economic situation, but does not believe that any of the Secretary of  
513 Interior's Standards by which the Commission must judge the appropriateness of an  
514 application has any basis in economics. The ordinance applies new standards governing  
515 all the Historic Districts now which encompasses the entire site and plant life. Historic

516 properties are no longer a ‘front street façade,” they are the entire property. In that  
517 thinking, a beautiful backyard and landmark trees are well worth preserving. Proposing not  
518 to touch the original house, but to add an additional house in the back is quite a different  
519 approach, but it does change the property as a whole. Putting another house in the  
520 backyard of this landmark house would destroy many aspects of its historic quality.  
521

- 522 2. Andrea Van Howling, 920 Lincoln, Ann Arbor, MI – I live a block away from this home and  
523 this house is an important part of our neighborhood. The trees on this property will suffer if  
524 construction takes place. A story regarding the original owner of the home states that they  
525 had three daughters and when each daughter was born they planted a tree. One is the  
526 beech tree in the front yard and the second is the other that remains in the backyard. The  
527 third tree died. It would be terrible not only visually, but historically to lose these trees.  
528 She stated that she is also concerned with the proposed structure they want to build. In  
529 the R2 zoning area, a duplex must be over each other or next to each other and to me this  
530 is a separate house. Joining it by a breezeway is odd. This proposal doesn’t fit in. The  
531 size of the addition is two thirds the size of the original house and the first time that the  
532 home has not been owner/occupied. She encouraged the Commission to consider how  
533 this would affect this historic home.  
534

535 *(Commissioner White offered the applicant the opportunity to rebut the public commentary).*  
536

537 Marilyn Chua stated that they have heard a lot of opposition to everything they’ve proposed for  
538 the house from various neighbors. They have very strong opinions on what should or should not  
539 be done with this property, but where were they when the house was on the market for such a  
540 long time. Why didn’t they purchase it with their money, or say ‘let’s get together and purchase  
541 this house and preserve it. We don’t want this home to go to renters; we want it to be owner  
542 occupied.”  
543

544 We took it off the market, but as soon as we bought it, everyone wanted to tell us what we could  
545 do, or should do. Would you rather have that house go vacant and into disrepair, or have  
546 someone get enough income to preserve it? We’re only trying to get enough money to maintain  
547 the house. If someone knows someone who wants to purchase it, please let use know. If we  
548 lived in Ann Arbor, we would live in it, but we live in another state.  
549

550 M. Rueter – This would be a two family dwelling. Often, a two family dwelling was thought of  
551 something attached or on top of another – two units each with a kitchen and separate families.  
552 This is the same concept. One is a totally separate house and the other is a totally new addition  
553 and each have separate kitchens, baths, etc. We’ve talked to city planners at length, and this is  
554 the approach that the planning department and planning commission is taking. We’ve done this  
555 same thing on Third and Jefferson Streets as well as Summit Streets with a row of duplexes that  
556 are attached only with a small link. This is the same concept.  
557

#### 558 **Discussion by the Commission:** 559

560 *(Discussion by the Commission regarding public comment and owner comment).*  
561

562 Commissioner Glusac – Stated that she is not in favor of this application, so would support the  
563 motion to deny. I just don’t feel this is appropriate for this district on this unique lot.

564 Commissioner Ramsburgh noted a lot of good points in her Review Committee report.

565 *(Commissioner Ramsburgh reiterated her earlier report).*  
566

567 Commissioner Henrichs – Our charge is to interpret the Secretary of Interior’s Standards. All the  
568 conversations regarding economics and duplexes are not relative to our charge here. Standard  
569 Number 9 refers to massing, size, scale, architectural features, etc. and for that reason I am in  
570 support of the motion to deny.

571  
572 Commissioner Bruner – Also stated that he is in support of the motion to deny the application.  
573 The size and scale are disturbing.

574  
575 **MOTION**

576  
577 Moved by Commissioner Glusac, Seconded by Commissioner Bruner, “**that the Commission**  
578 **deny the application at 1310 Hill Street in the Washtenaw Hill Historic District to remove a**  
579 **garage and add a duplex addition. The work is not generally compatible in exterior design,**  
580 **arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the**  
581 **surrounding area and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for***  
582 ***Rehabilitation*, in particular standard 9.”**

583  
584 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO DENY PASSED – *UNANIMOUS (Application Denied)***

585  
586  
587 **A-5            315 EAST LIBERTY STREET - ELHD**

588  
589  
590 **BACKGROUND:** This two-story Queen Anne residential building was built in 1890 and was the  
591 home of grocer William F. Stimson. It features wood one-over-one windows with small colored  
592 squares of stained glass outlining the clear glass on many of the upper sashes.

593  
594 In 2004 and 2005, certificates of appropriateness were issued to alter the front façade, install a  
595 sidelight next to the front door, build a new front porch, and replace siding on the structure.

596  
597 **LOCATION:** East Liberty Street, between South Fifth Avenue and Division Street.

598  
599 **APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to add an enclosed rear three-story stairway;  
600 and replace three original windows with egress windows (two double hung on the east elevation,  
601 and one fixed on the west elevation.

602  
603 **STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617
1. Space that was formerly commercial has been converted to residential, and the owners are now trying to bring it up to City housing and building codes. An excellent description of the project was provided by the applicant and may be found in the packet.
  2. Staff does not support the replacement of character-defining windows with egress windows. All three windows proposed to be replaced are original, highly visible, and help define the Queen Ann character of the house in their style and proportions. On the east elevation, the proposed lengthening of the windows would interrupt the horizontal character of the second floor and unbalance the pairs of equally-sized windows near the front and back. On the west elevation, moving the square fixed stained-glass window and replacing it with a much larger double hung would be an even more egregious violation of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

618 The Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings are very  
619 clear about the need to preserve character-defining features when complying with health  
620 and safety codes. Because a property owner wants to put six bedrooms in an apartment is  
621 not reason enough to set the standards aside. Also, the applicant could work with the  
622 building official to reach an acceptable alternative design.  
623

- 624 3. The proposed rear stairwell is an appropriate addition to the building. One original window  
625 would be lost, but it is not character defining in the same way that the side elevation  
626 windows are, which work in tandem with other windows and features. The design is  
627 balanced and compatible with the existing house.  
628

629 **Owner/ Address:** Vahan Basmajian, 315 E Liberty Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48014  
630

631 **Applicant/:** Mike Van Goor, 118 N Fourth Ave., Suite A, Ann Arbor, MI 48014  
632

633 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Ramsburgh and White visited the site.  
634

635 Commissioner Ramsburgh – The staff report is thorough. The two windows proposed for  
636 replacement currently contribute to the architectural value of the house. I believe there are other  
637 solutions, as staff has pointed out, a fire-rated hallway would be a better alternative than a new  
638 egress window.  
639

640 Commissioner White – Concurs with Commissioner Ramsburgh and the staff findings.  
641

642 **Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Michael VanGoor, Architect on this project, was present to speak  
643 on behalf of the application. He stated that in light of the staff report, they wished to withdraw the  
644 portion of the application on the west elevation, but would ask that the Commission to still  
645 consider the egress windows on the east elevation. He stated they have explored many options,  
646 but to provide egress for the sleeping area would involve changing the roof pitch and the dormer  
647 which would be detrimental to the view, and housing would require an additional fire exit, which  
648 would mean a fire escape and a stair he would have to snake down somewhere in the building.  
649

650 We would also be required to provide fire rated floor/ceiling assemblies between the two units, so  
651 we propose to combine the units, making the upper floors the living areas – the common area,  
652 living area and kitchen, thereby negating the egress window up there – then relocating all the  
653 bedrooms down on the second floor.  
654

655 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**  
656

657 *(General clarification discussion between the petitioner and the Commission).*  
658

659 **Audience Participation:** None.  
660

661 **Discussion by the Commission:**  
662

663 Commissioner Henrichs – On the floor plan, there are three egress windows on the east side of  
664 the second floor? (Correct. One is an existing window which the bottom sash window above the  
665 bay is large enough for egress compliance – the other two are being kept as part of the proposal.  
666 The west elevation, the side with the turret, the stained glass, will be kept).  
667

668 Commissioner Shotwell – To simplify, we could leave the entire request in tact; deny the request  
669 to replace the stained glass. This wouldn't interrupt what he wanted or our motion.

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  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716

**MOTION #1**

Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Shotwell, “that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the portion of the application at 315 East Liberty Street in the ELHD, to add an enclosed rear, three-story stairway as proposed. The work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*, in particular standards 2, 5, 9 and 10.”

**On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – *UNANIMOUS (Partial Application Approved)***

**MOTION #2**

Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Glusac, “that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the portion of the application at 315 East Liberty Street in the ELHD, to remove two original windows and replace them with egress windows in larger openings on the east elevation. The work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*, in particular standard 9.”

**On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – *UNANIMOUS (Partial Application Approved)***

**B-1 302 SOUTH MAIN STREET - MSHD**

This application was postponed from the April HDC meeting pending more information on the structural elements of the awning and sign. Two additional drawings have been submitted by the applicant and are attached, along with last month’s staff report. This motion was presented at that meeting, and action on this motion must be taken.

**MOTION #1**

Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Henrichs, “that the Commission deny the application at 302 South Main Street to install a combined awning and sign over the storefront. The work is not compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* standards 5, 9, and 10. “

**On a Voice Vote – MOTION FAILED – (*Application was NOT DENIED*)**

*(Various dialogue between the petitioner and the Commission as to the new information that was provided – method of attachment of the awning to the building, high winds, etc.).*

**MOTION #2**

Moved by Commissioner Shotwell, Seconded by Commissioner Giannola, “**that the Commission approve the application at 302 South Main Street to install a combined awning and sign over the storefront. The work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* standards 5, 9, and 10.** “

**On a Voice Vote - MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS (*Application Approved*)**

**B-2 522 DETROIT STREET - OFWHD**

This application was postponed from the April HDC meeting due to a split vote which prevented the Commission from taking action on the replacement railing portion of the application. An additional drawing and letter have been submitted by the applicant and are attached, along with last month’s staff report. (*Commissioner Bruner reviewed what transpired previously*).

**Owner/ Applicant/Address:** Dina Greenway, 522 Detroit Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48103

**Discussion by the Commission:**

Commissioner Henrichs – Mentioned that he was not present at the December 2007 meeting when it was decided to approve a metal railing. In looking at this house, there are wood railings all over it, so I don’t see the justification with making them install a metal railing; a wood railing would be appropriate to me. Not in favor of a motion to deny a wood railing.

Commissioner White – Also stated that he was not in favor of the motion to deny.

Commissioner Bruner – Stated that he was concerned with setting precedent of ‘revisiting’ applications after it has been decided. Staff made a good point about a metal railing.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – Concurs with Bruner that this could set a precedent, and also with Henrichs that there is already so much wood railing on the home, that it would tie in better.

**PREVIOUS MOTION #1**

Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Glusac, “**that the Commission deny the application to substitute a wood railing for a metal railing (previously approved for that location in December of 2007) around the exterior stairwell. The work is not compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the area and does not meeting the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, standard 9.**”

**On a Roll Call Vote – MOTION TO DENY - FAILED – (*Equal to no action taken on application*)**

**Roll Call Vote: Yes (2) – Commissioners Shotwell, Bruner,  
No (5) - Commissioners Ramsburgh, Henrichs, White, Glusac, Giannola**

**MOTION #2**

Moved by Commissioner Giannola, Seconded by Commissioner Henrichs, “**that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 522 Detroit Street, to substitute a wood railing for a metal one that was previously approved in December of 2007. The work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and meets the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, standards 2 and 9.**”

**On a Vote Vote – MOTION PASSED – Yes (5), No (2) (Application Approved)**

**C – NEW BUSINESS****C-1 DRAFT DESIGN GUIDELINES**

J. Thacher stated that the Commission had been given a copy of the Draft Guidelines, and would like a motion by the HDC to recommend that City Council approve them. If so, they will then move to City Council for approval, then back to the HDC for final adoption. Ms. Thacher noted that the State Historic Preservation office has approved the revised version being presented.

**MOTION**

Moved by Commissioner Ramsburgh, Seconded by Commissioner Shotwell, “**that the Historic District Commission recommend to City Council that they approve the Historic District Design Guidelines for the City of Ann Arbor.**”

**On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED - APPROVED (As Presented)**

\*The HDC allowed public comment on the Draft Guidelines

**PUBLIC COMMENTARY**

1. Ethel Potts – 1014 Elder Blvd., Ann Arbor, MI – Ms. Potts stated that she is a sub-committee member of the Planning Commission which has looked at this document, and these guidelines were done mainly by a consultant, “Winter Race Co.” By and large, these guidelines are quite good. For the HDC, whatever you do will be taken seriously. From the HDC’s point of view, I would be looking at “are Historic Districts protected?” Does it help you do your work or does it get in the way? (She gave examples).

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION – GENERAL (Limited to 3 Minutes per Speaker) - None.**

**D - MINUTES**

**D-1 Draft Minutes of the April 10, 2008 Regular and Special Sessions**

**MOTION**

Moved by Commissioner Giannola, Seconded by Commissioner Bruner, “**To postpone the minutes of the April 10, 2008 Regular and Special Session until the June Regular Session.**” **(POSTPONED to 6/12/08)**

**On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO POSTPONE – PASSED (Unanimously)**

819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855

**E - REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS – None.**

**F - ASSIGNMENTS**

**F-1 STAFF MONITORING - May 2008**

**Assignments**

**A-1 310-314 Second Street – Denied (No Monitor Necessary)**

**A-2 713 West Liberty Street - Already Assigned from previous application.**

**A-3 617 Fifth Street - Bruner**

**A-4 1310 Hill Street - Denied (No Monitor Necessary)**

**A-5 315 East Liberty Street - Glusac**

**B-1 302 South Main Street - Giannola**

**B-2 522 Detroit – Already Assigned – (Giannola)**

**F-2 REVIEW COMMITTEE**

June 9, 2008 at 5pm for the June 12, 2008 meeting - Commissioners White and Giannola

**G - STAFF ACTIVITIES REPORT**

**G-1 April 2008 - NOT AVAILABLE.**

J. Thatcher stated that this report was not ready and she would provide this at next month's meeting. (**POSTPONED to 6/12/08**)

**H - CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS – None.**

**I - COMMUNICATIONS – None.**

**ADJOURNED at 10:25 p.m.      \*A working session followed the Regular Session.**

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