



**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR
Thursday, September 11, 2008.**

Commissioners Present: Diane Giannola, Michael Bruner, Robert White, Jim Henrichs, Kristina Glusac and Ellen Ramsburgh (6)

Commissioners Absent: Sarah Shotwell (1)

Staff Present: Kristine Kidorf, Kidorf Preservation Consulting and Brenda Acquaviva, Administrative Support Specialist V, Planning and Development Services (2)

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

ROLL CALL: Quorum satisfied.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

1. Commissioner Bruner introduced a letter regarding consideration to create a Historic District Study Committee for a proposed new district. **(See C-2 under "New Business")**
2. Commissioner Ramsburgh introduced a letter of support from the neighborhoods in support of Commissioner Bruner's letter for a proposed study committee. **(See C-2 under "New Business")**

The Agenda was approved as amended without objection.

A - HEARINGS

A-1 209 North Thayer - OFWHD

BACKGROUND: This property is first listed in the 1912 Polk City Directory, when it was occupied by Josephine W. Boudinot, widow of Edward, and boarder Clara W. Hawkins. Clara Hawkins continued to live at this address during the next few years. After several other short-term tenants, the house was purchased by Ella J. Robison (widow of Ambrose) and her daughter Cora A. Robison. Cora was a teacher at the Ann Arbor High School. She lived at this address from about 1923 to the early 1940s.

LOCATION: West side of Thayer between Ann and Catherine Streets.

APPLICATION: The applicant is proposing to remove the stucco and half timbering in the front gable and replace them with "Hardiboard" cementitious siding, and Kleer PVC trim.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The only stucco and half-timbering on the house is in the front gable roof. The stucco is cracked.
2. The owner states she has repaired the stucco a number of times and it continues to deteriorate, therefore they want a longer lasting solution.
3. The contractor states that all of the stucco and half-timbering will be removed, the Hardiboard will be installed, and new Kleer PVC trim pieces will be reinstalled to replicate the half-timbering. They state it will have the same appearance and reveals.

- 52 4. The proposed work does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for*
53 *Rehabilitation* in particular standard numbers 2, 5, and 6.
54
55

56 **Owner/Address/Applicant:** Jan M. Hanes, 5175 N. Dixboro Road, A2, MI 48105
57

58 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Ramsburgh and White visited the site.
59

60 Commissioner Ramsburgh – We agree with staff findings that although there is deterioration in
61 some areas of stucco, it is repairable. The wood half-timbering is not deteriorated and does not
62 need to be replaced. Repair may be something you'll have to do more than once, but according
63 the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, is that deteriorated historic features
64 shall be repaired, rather than replaced. Repair would be adequate
65

66 Commissioner White – Concurs with Commissioner Ramsburgh and staff findings.
67

68 **Applicant Presentation:**
69

70 Ms. Jan Hanes, owner, was present to speak on behalf of the appeal. She stated that she has
71 owned the house for a third of the homes' existence. I've had history with the stucco. Each time
72 we paint, we patch it, and it cracks again. We get leakage back into the wood that supports it.
73 The contractor strongly suggested using the cementitious board. It lasts longer – it has a
74 projected life of fifty years.
75

76 I want to preserve the beauty of the home and keep it strong without leakage. We have a
77 fraternity house in Ypsilanti that has the same type of stucco on the top as this home does. We
78 paid a licensed contractor/mason to patch it, and we are not pleased with the appearance of it.
79 That stucco had dimension to it, this one does not. We don't think you will be able to tell the
80 difference in the cementitious board and the original stucco.
81

82 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**
83

84 Commissioner Bruner – Asked if the homes third floor was habitable space when she purchased
85 it. (No, but it was drywalled, used by students as offices). Stated it is obvious that the stucco is
86 being affected by moisture at the lower edge. He suggested that a drip edge or moisture barrier
87 be installed). (Petitioner stated that the problems are more far reaching than that).
88

89 Commissioner Henrichs – Have you considered removing and replacing this with new stucco?
90 (Yes, but we would rather not – we've had bad experience with it in Michigan due to weather
91 conditions and the fact that the house has settled over time, creating fractures).
92

93 (Discussion between the Commission and the applicant on the pro's and con's of the proposed
94 materials to be used).
95

96 **Audience Participation:** None.
97

98 **Discussion by the Commission:**
99

100 K. Kidorf – Asked that the motion be amended to reflect the pvc trim proposed for installation.
101
102

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Ramsburgh, “**that the Commission deny a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 209 N. Thayer Street, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to replace existing stucco and timbering in the gable with hardiboard material *and clear pvc trim as proposed. The proposed 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* in particular standards number 2, 5, and 6.”**

On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS (Application DENIED) *as amended

A-2 307 South Fifth Street - ELHD

BACKGROUND: This property was constructed in 1914 as a one-story Classical Revival style house and also served as an office for Dr. Louis Rominger. There is a concrete block storefront that was added to the front of the house sometime before 1981.

LOCATION: East side of South Fifth Street, just south of Liberty Street.

APPLICATION: The applicant is proposing to install a triangular fabric awning across the entire front and wrapping around the north side of the building. The awning will be over the tops of the windows. Wording on the valence will read “Est. 1987, 307 S. Fifth Ave.” and “Jerusalem Garden.” The awning will be green and the lettering will be yellow to match the current paint scheme of the building.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The concrete block storefront addition is a non-contributing element to the property and the historic district. It does not have a typical storefront façade.
2. The proposed awning will be above the windows but will cover the entire front of the building (16’ 4”) and wrap 8’6” around the north side of the building. The awning will be 2’8” tall and 2’ deep. The bottom of the awning will be 8 feet above the sidewalk.
3. In both residential and commercial installations, awnings should be limited to just larger than the width of the window openings.
4. If the awnings are limited to just over the openings the awnings would be generally compatible with the surrounding historic district and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standard numbers 9 and 10.

Owner/Address: Young ho Cho, 5053 Okemos Rd. 5053 Okemos Rd. Lansing, MI 48823

Applicant: Ali Ramlawi, 307 S. Fifth Ave. A2, MI 48104

Review Committee: Commissioners Ramsburgh and White visited the site.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – We would like more input from the applicant about the awning. Since this is a non-contributing structure, I think that we should discuss relaxation of certain standards because of that. The building is concrete block. The awning could be established in an appropriate way between the masonry joints.

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
203
204
205
206

Commissioner White – Concurs with Commissioner Ramsburgh and Staff Recommendations.

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Ali Ramlawi, owner of Jerusalem Garden was present to speak on behalf of the appeal. He stated that this has been a family owned restaurant since 1987. He stated that the building has needed some ‘curb appeal’ to it. It’s not as needed in the summertime when you have foliage and flowers, but in the winter it looks drab and dirty. There is a pragmatic reason for the awning as well. When the sun sets, the counter inside heats up and it becomes unpleasant to sit there due to the heat. He also stated that he proposes that the awning wrap around the building because Fifth Avenue is a one-way street, we have no visible signage – if you’re not looking directly east, there are no markings to identify the business.

Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:

Commissioner Ramsburgh – Did you consider a trellis that would be freestanding that you could plant vine on? (No, I didn’t consider that. We have a trellis on the side, but it would take years for it to grow in. In the wintertime, when the foliage dies, you still have the problem with the sun coming in when the sun sets).

Commissioner Bruner – Asked if he would consider the awnings over the window as was suggested by staff? (The problem with that is that the neighboring business, Herb David, built an addition about 8 or 9 years ago, and there are only about 3 or 4 feet between us and his building. It doesn’t give you a lot of site – the angle is cut off. You don’t see the full view of that window until you get closer to the building. The lettering on the signage needs to be more lateral than vertical to have the identity we need).

Commissioner Henrichs (to K. Kidorf) – On staff findings, #3 – Is that an interpretive statement or is that based on some other document such as the ‘guidelines?’ (It is based on the Draft Guidelines. It’s not a hard and fast rule, and the Commission can waiver from that).

Audience Participation: None.

Discussion by the Commission:

Commissioner Bruner- (Gave a history of what has been presented for commercial buildings in the past and stated that he is in favor of the awning as is).

Commissioner Ramsburgh – Also stated that there should be some lee way on this application as the building is concrete block and has very little architectural character and historic features are not being disturbed.

MOTION #1

Moved by Commissioner Glusac, Seconded by Commissioner Henrichs, “**that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 307 S. Fifth Avenue in the East Liberty Historic District provided the following conditions are met:**

- 1) The awning is limited to just over the front and side window openings and does not wrap around the corner of the building; and**

207 **2) New drawings showing the configuration are reviewed and approved by staff.**
208 **The proposed work would then be generally compatible in exterior design,**
209 **arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding area and meets**
210 ***The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standard**
211 **numbers 9 and 10”.**

212
213 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION FAILED – UNANIMOUS**

214
215
216 **MOTION #2**

217
218 Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Giannola, “**that the**
219 **Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 307 S.**
220 **Fifth Avenue in the East Liberty Historic District to install an awning as described**
221 **in the submitted plans. The proposed work is generally compatible in exterior**
222 **design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding area**
223 **and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular**
224 **standard numbers 9 and 10”.**

225
226 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – *UNANIMOUS (Application Approved)***

227
228
229
230 **A-3 209 South Ashley Street – MSHD (*W I T H D R A W N by the Applicant*)**
231
232
233
234

A-4 1426 Broadway Street - BHD

BACKGROUND: Although possibly older, the house first appears in the Polk City Directory in 1930 as the home of Charles and Nora Pretzer. Charles worked at University Hospital, and Nora lived here until 1940. This is a contributing property in the newly designated Broadway Historic District. It is a two-story, gable-front vernacular house with wood clapboard siding and a wrap-around front/side porch.

LOCATION: South side of Broadway Street, north of Jones Drive.

APPLICATION: The applicant is proposing to construct a stepped boardwalk over an existing dirt pathway that runs along the southwest side of the house. The walk will run between the porch and an existing row of trees. The walkway will be 3' 6" wide, ¾" thick, and will be constructed of wood boards laying on a 2x6 frame supported by 4x4 wood posts. There will be two 10 foot sections and a 12 foot section, each at a different elevation following the grade.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The property contributes to the character of the historic district. The landscaping of the property has numerous trees preventing most grass growth, and the lot slopes fairly steeply behind the house.
2. The proposed boardwalk is low to the ground and runs along the side of the house. It does not disrupt any mature trees and follows the line of an existing dirt path.
3. Although not a traditional walkway material in the other historic districts, a wood walkway in the more rural Broadway historic district is appropriate.
4. The proposed work is generally compatible with the house and the surrounding historic district and meets *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standards numbers 9 and 10.

Owner/Applicant/Address: Francis & Bethann Duffy, 1426 Broadway A2, MI 48105

Review Committee: Commissioners Ramsburgh and White visited the site.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – Concurs with the staff findings. It's a walkway that will allow for a safer and drier path to the back of the home which is only accessed by one side of the house, which has a dramatic drop off.

Commissioner White – Concurs with staff findings and Commissioner Ramsburgh

Applicant Presentation: Francis Duffy, owner, was present to speak on behalf of the appeal. He stated that without this, they constantly track dirt into the house and agrees with staff findings.

Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:

Commissioner Glusac – How close will the boardwalk be to the existing home? (Roughly 10 inches).

Commissioner Bruner – Suggested treating the surface with some kind of non-skid material. (The petitioner stated he would be treating the pressure treated lumber with something of that nature).

Audience Participation: None.

Discussion by the Commission:**MOTION**

Moved by Commissioner Giannola, Seconded by Commissioner Ramsburgh, “**that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the the application at 1426 Broadway Street in the Broadway Historic District, to construct a 3’ 6” boardwalk along the southwest side of the house as proposed. The work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standard numbers 9 and 10.”**

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

A-5 835 West Washington - OWSHD

BACKGROUND: The Queen Anne-style house on this property was constructed sometime between 1880 and 1897. It is not clear from the 1894 Polk City Directory if it already standing. The 1897 directory lists A. L. Wagner as the resident. Members of the Wagner family occupied this house until sometime after 1910. By 1915, the occupants were Jacob Sindlinger, a carpenter, and his wife Emma. From the late 1910s into the 1970s the house was the home of George and Irene Holzinger. George was a long-time employee of Mack and Co.

LOCATION: South side of West Washington Street, just east of the intersection with Seventh Street.

APPLICATION: The applicant is proposing to construct a new rear addition that is two stories tall. There is an existing rear addition with stone foundation walls (matching the house) that wraps around the west side of the house. A portion of this rear/side section appears to be a former porch that was previously enclosed. The existing walls will stay in place, and a larger two-story addition will be added to it on the rear. The one story portion that wraps along the side will remain. There is a non-original rear deck which will be relocated to behind the new addition. The proposed addition will have a different foundation material and a lower roof line than the historic part of the house. The applicant is also proposing to replace an existing window in the front gable with a different sized window to provide egress from a storage area in the attic.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The existing house is two-stories and has an offset gable front. It is sided in wood clapboard with fishscale shingles in the gable which surround a rectangular window. It has a cut stone foundation. The rear elevation has no openings except for in the one-story section where there is a non-original bay window, a door, and two non-original double hung windows.
2. The proposed addition will match the wall plane of the east and west sides of the house and extend 13 feet to the rear on the east side and 8 feet on the west. The second floor of the addition does not extend as far west as the first floor.
3. All of the windows and doors on the rear elevation will be re-used in the first floor of the addition. The projecting bay window and door will be placed in the rear wall, along with a new, wood, double-hung window. The pair of double-hung windows will be installed on the west wall of the addition. A new double-hung wood window will be installed at the

339 second floor and a new casement wood window will be installed in the attic levels of the
340 new addition. There will be new double-hung wood windows on the east side of the new
341 addition, one at the first floor and one at the second.

- 342 4. The existing deck will be relocated to the center of the new rear elevation. The
343 foundation of the proposed addition will be concrete block and the walls will be wood
344 siding that will be toothed-in on the side walls to match the existing siding.
- 345 5. The existing window in the front gable, in the attic, which is currently horizontal in shape
346 is proposed to be replaced with a squarer casement window in about the same location.
347 Matching fishscale shingles will be installed around the changed opening.
- 348 6. The changed foundation material and lower roof line of the addition differentiates the new
349 and old construction. The proposed addition is compatible in scale and massing to the
350 historic building and does not obscure and character-defining features.
- 351 7. The construction of the addition and relocation of the porch deck as proposed is generally
352 compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the
353 existing house and the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior's*
354 *Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standard numbers 9 and 10.
- 355 8. The replacement of the front attic window with a different size and shaped window
356 destroys a character defining feature and is not compatible in exterior design,
357 arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the house or surrounding area and
358 does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular
359 standard number 2.

360
361 **Owner/Address:** James & Sheryl Gilmore, 835 W. Washington, A2, MI 48103

362
363 **Applicant:** Ed Kelly, R.A - Kelly/Tinker Architects, 321 S. Main Street, A2, MI 48104

364
365 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Ramsburgh and White visited the site.

366
367 Commissioner Ramsburgh – She stated that they met the architect and owners at the site. They
368 could see that the new addition will do some nice things and is subservient to the older, historic
369 part of the house. They're retaining and reusing several elements of the house and will be
370 differentiated from the original house by the newer foundation. We were somewhat concerned
371 about the window in the eave and are reassured that the owner is happy to keep that historic
372 window if possible, and I think we should consider that.

373
374 Commissioner White – Concurs with Commissioner Ramsburgh and staff findings.

375
376 **Applicant Presentation:** Mr. James Gilmore, owner, was present to speak on behalf of the
377 appeal. He stated that there is a need for ventilation in the upper part of the home, which is not a
378 traditional attic but more of a storage space, and is open via an open staircase. He stated that
379 the architect, Ed Kelly was present to answer any design questions.

380
381 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

382
383 Commissioner Henrichs – Asked about the window patterns on the west elevation. (Ed Kelly –
384 He pointed out east and north elevations that had bedroom windows that have to meet egress
385 requirements and to replicate the rest of the home). What will the space on the addition be used
386 for? (A home office and sunroom/breakfast nook). (*Discussion about visual logic on window*
387 *placement and wall space required for the proposed office space*).

388
389 **Audience Participation:** None.

Discussion by the Commission:

Commissioner Glusac – From the perspective of the SE view, there is no distinction of the addition to the new. Everything is in the same plane. I understand the foundation will be distinguishable, but the windows on the left side toward the back are double hung, which match the double hung at the front of the home – same size, etc. Other applications have made more distinction between the old and the new. Asked for consensus from the Commission on this.

Commissioner Bruner – I can't agree it's not acceptable as we see it, as the standards are very flexible concerning this. Our real task is just to find if it's compatible. It's different, but not wrong, and the variation in the windows could be viewed as that difference.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – I understand Commissioner Glusac's view. When I look at an addition, I like to see a 'step back;' in this case, I thought that this was a more pleasing solution. You can still differentiate from the roofline and just enough change to determine that.

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Ramsburgh, **“that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the portion of the application at 835 W. Washington Street in the Old West Side Historic District to construct the rear addition and relocate the rear deck as proposed, including modification of the existing attic window sash at the north elevation to operable condition. The proposed work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the existing house and the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standard numbers 9 and 10.”**

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

B - OLD BUSINESS – None

C - NEW BUSINESS –

C-1 Nominating Committee – Volunteers are Commissioners Henrichs, Glusac and Ramsburgh.

Commissioner White – Asked if there are any other Commissioners interested in being on the Nominating Committee. *(Discussion by the Committee). Commissioner Ramsburgh expressed interest in being on the committee. Commissioner White has stepped down from that obligation).*

The Nominating Committee is now comprised of: Commissioners Ramsburgh, Henrichs and Glusac.

C-2 Introduction of Letters proposing a new Study Committee for Historic Districts.

Commissioner Bruner – Introduced a letter suggesting the formation of a study committee to the Mayor and City Council to study the area known as “Germantown.” He read letter into the record

442 which outlined (among other information) the proposed boundaries – Division (on the east), South
443 Fourth Street (on the west), Madison (on the south) and William (on the north).
444
445 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Introduced a letter of support for the formation of a study committee
446 from some residents of the area informally known as “Germantown.”

447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commission Ramsburgh, “to move these letters of recommendation forward to the Mayor and City Council for their consideration of formation of a study committee as stated.”

On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED - UNANIMOUSLY

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

D - APPROVAL OF MINUTES –

D-1 Draft Minutes of the May 8, 2008 Regular Session

*Without Objection, the minutes were accepted **AS PRESENTED.***

D-2 Draft Minutes of the July 10, 2008 Regular Session – (Corrections – Line 355 – ‘as’ a Characteristic part of the house instead of ‘is’ (Ramsburgh);

*Without Objection, the minutes were accepted **AS AMENDED.***

D-3 Draft Minutes of the August 14, 2008 Regular Session (LINE FIVE remove **BRUNER**, Line FIVE – **NOT PRESENT**). Change Header on each sheet to read “August” and not “June.”

*Without Objection, the minutes were accepted **AS AMENDED.***

E - REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS – None.

F - ASSIGNMENTS

F-1 September 2008

- A-1** 209 N. Thayer - (Not Necessary – Application Denied)
- A-2** 307 S. Fifth Street – Commissioner Bruner
- A-3** 209 S. Ashley Street – (Not Necessary – Application Withdrawn)
- A-4** 1426 Broadway Street – Commissioner Ramsburgh
- A-5** 835 W. Washington Street – Commissioner White

Review Committee for October 6, 2008 – Commissioners Bruner and Giannola

G - STAFF ACTIVITIES REPORT

G-1 August report was handed out to the Commission.

H - CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS

499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510

I - COMMUNICATIONS

K. Kidorf stated that Commissioner Ramsburgh had mentioned that it might be a good idea to remind applicants that they may qualify for state tax credits for their work. She stated that she would make this into a 'hand out' to give applicants each month.

ADJOURNMENT

The Meeting was adjourned at 8:43 p.m. without objection.

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