



**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR
Thursday, October 9, 2008.**

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

Commissioners Absent: Kristina Glusac (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: The Agenda was approved without objection.

A - HEARINGS

A-1 HDC08-019 - 206 SOUTH FIFTH AVENUE - MSHD

BACKGROUND: This application affects two buildings, the c. 1980 five-story building which is a two-bay addition to the adjacent 1927 historic Salvation Army Building situated on the corner of Washington which was built in the Collegiate Gothic style.

LOCATION: West side of South Fifth Avenue, near the intersection with East Washington Street.

APPLICATION: The applicant is proposing to install one new, non-illuminated box sign over the main level storefront window and door opening and also wishes to alter three existing box signs of similar dimensions and construction with black instead of white background coloring, and new lettering. Two of the existing signs are on the historic building and one is on the new building.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The proposed new sign is 16'4" by 1'4" in size and 3.5" deep. The bottom of the sign will be 8.5 feet above the sidewalk. The sign will not be illuminated and is compatible with the size of the building, the storefront, and other existing signs on the building.
2. White vinyl stick-on letters are proposed for the window within the storefront. There will be a logo and the words "Magellan Properties."
3. The proposed sign and vinyl lettering are 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 numbers 9 and 10.
4. Three existing signs are to be repainted from white to black, with the color of the letters and graphics to be modified due to the change in background color. The new appearance of the existing signs 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 number 9.

Owner/Address: Magellan Properties, 206 S. Fifth Ave., Ste. 175, A2, MI 48104

52
53 **Applicant:** Apex Sign, 6200 N. Dort Highway, Flint, MI 48505

54
55 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Giannola and Bruner visited the site.

56
57 Commissioner Giannola – Stated that the proposed signs appear to be compatible with those
58 already on the building. The colors also appear to blend in and appear appropriate.

59
60 Commissioner Bruner – Concurs with Commissioner Giannola

61
62 **Applicant Presentation:** No one was present to speak on behalf of the application.

63
64 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:** None. (No applicant present)

65
66 **Audience Participation:** None.

67
68 **Discussion by the Commission:**

69
70 Commissioner Bruner – (To Staff) – To confirm, the staff report states these have no interior
71 illumination? (K. Kidorf – Yes).

72
73 **MOTION**

74
75 Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Giannola “that the
76 **Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 206 South**
77 **Fifth Ave. in the Main Street Historic District, to install a 6’4” by 1’4” sign and to**
78 **modify the color and graphics of three existing signs as proposed. The work is**
79 **generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and**
80 **relationship to the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s***
81 ***Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standard numbers 9 and 10”.**

82
83 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS (Application Approved)**

84
85
86 **A-2 HDC08-020 – 637 ½ FIFTH STREET - OWSHD**

87
88 **BACKGROUND:** This vacant lot sits between a two-story, glazed brick house (c. 1920) to the
89 south and a frame one-and-a-half story house (c. 1930) to the north. This area of the city does not
90 appear on the Sanborn maps from 1909, 1916, or 1925 and the lot appears to have always been
91 vacant. The HDC approved plans for a 2.5-story dwelling on this lot in June 2008.

92
93 **LOCATION:** The property is located on the east side of Fifth Street, south of West Madison Street,
94 and near the intersection with Princeton.

95
96 **APPLICATION:** The applicant is proposing to modify previously approved plans for new
97 construction by adding one new double-hung window in the east (rear) gable, and four skylights—
98 two on the south elevation and two on the north elevation.

99
100 **STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 101 1. The proposed scope of work is a modification of plans approved by the HDC in June 2008.
102 Those plans indicate that the applicant proposes to construct a two-and-a-half story tall,
103 gable front, single family house with a raised basement.

104 The site will be graded to allow access to a garage in the basement level at the rear of the
105 house. A concrete driveway from Turner Park Court to the garage will take up the majority
106 of the rear yard.

- 107 2. The four proposed skylights are 21.5” by 38.5” in size. They will stick up from the plane of
108 the roof by a couple of inches (exact height unknown). The skylights will be placed toward
109 the rear half of the house, one at 7’6” from the rear, and the other at 28’6” from the rear.
110 The top of the skylights will be 4’4” down from the roof ridge.
- 111 3. The proposed double-hung window in the rear gable will match the size and material of the
112 other approved double hung windows and will be centered in the gable end. A gable vent
113 was originally approved in the same location.
- 114 4. The proposed house with its modified elevations is generally compatible in exterior design,
115 arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the
116 surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*
117 standards, particularly numbers 9 and 10.

118
119 **Owner/Address:** Amy Shuler, 2666 White Oak Dr., A2, MI 48103

120
121 **Applicant:** Paul Maturo, 346 Village Gr. #107, A2, MI 48105

122
123 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Giannola and Bruner visited the site.

124
125 Commissioner Bruner – The request is acceptable to alter the previously approved plan.

126
127 Commissioner Giannola – Concurs with Commissioner Bruner.

128
129 **Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Paul Maturo, Contractor for this project was present to speak on
130 behalf of the appeal. He stated that most of the basement will be used for underground parking,
131 so they looked at the attic for storage space and an exercise room and thought adding skylights
132 would add additional needed light. He mentioned the neighbor on the north side having concerns
133 with how close the new dwelling would be, so they’ve moved that over by three feet.

134
135 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

136
137 **Commissioner Bruner** – Since the attic is an occupiable space, there will be an egress window in
138 there? (Petitioner – It cannot be a bedroom, it doesn’t meet size for a bedroom, it could only be for
139 storage or office space, but we are putting in an egress window).

140
141 **Audience Participation:** None.

142
143 **Discussion by the Commission:**

144 **MOTION**

145
146
147 Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Ramsburgh, **“that the**
148 **Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 637 ½ S.**
149 **Fifth Street in the Old West Side Historic District, to modify approved plans to install**
150 **a double-hung window in the east gable, and four skylights, two on each side of the**
151 **roof. The proposed work is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement,**
152 **texture, material and relationship to the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of***
153 ***the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standard numbers 9 and 10”.**

154
155 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS (Application Approved)**

A-3 HDC08-021 – 411 WEST JEFFERSON - OWSHD

BACKGROUND: This two-story vernacular frame house first appears in the Polk City Directory in 1902 as the home of Martin Schaller, a “Books and News Dealer, 116 Main Street,” and his wife Bertha. Sometime between 1904 and 1910 the occupant became Samuel A. Spencer, a painter and contractor, who lived there with his wife (first Jennie C. and later Alice) until 1936. The house’s rear wing appears on the 1908 Sanborn map, and is likely part of the original house rather than an addition. According to the applicant, the rear porch was modified into its current configuration in the 1950s. The house recently had a fire, destroying much of the interior.

LOCATION: South side of West Jefferson Street, west of Second Street and east of Third Street.

APPLICATION: The applicant requests HDC approval to do the following: (1) replace window sashes damaged beyond repair in the fire (the new double-hung windows would match the existing, and all window frames would be salvaged); (2) modify the rear porch to add overhang and upper deck, and to install a new bay window on the south (rear) elevation; (3) replace existing gable window on south elevation with door to meet egress requirements; and (4) remove the chimney.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The house was extensively damaged during a recent fire and the interior of the structure will be gutted to mitigate physical and smoke damage. With the exception of some of the windows, there is minimal damage to the exterior of the structure.
2. The owner wishes to replace sashes only with similar wood sashes. The current wood window frames would remain.
3. Proposed egress openings are on the south elevation. The window on the south side is in the gable of the rear wing of the house, and would be replaced by a door flanked by smaller windows. The door would lead out onto a proposed deck above the rear enclosed porch.
4. The rear addition was a porch that was enclosed in the 1950s and has non-original windows and a shed roof. The applicant is proposing to turn the roof into a flat roof with a second floor deck on top. A new painted wood handrail comprised of 2x2 balusters and 4x4 newel posts will surround the deck.
5. A three-sided projecting bay window with double-hung windows is proposed on the rear wall of the first floor of the rear addition.
6. The exposed portion of the chimney consists of concrete block and does not appear to be historic. It is not readily visible from the street and is not a character defining feature.
7. Other interior changes proposed do not impact the appearance of the exterior.
8. The proposed window sash replacement, egress window replacement, modification of the rear wall with a new door and windows, deck, and new bay window and removal of the concrete block chimney is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the remainder of the house and surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*.

201 **Applicant:** H. Scott Diels, 1414 Iroquois Place, A2, MI 48104

202
203 **Owner/Address:** Carrie McClintock, 411 West Jefferson St., A2, MI 48103

204
205 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Giannola and Bruner visited the site.

206
207 Commissioner Bruner – Things were as described in the staff report. The windows are not
208 generally in the state we would allow for replacement, and asked that the applicant bring forth
209 more evidence that smoke has damaged the windows to the point where this would be a problem
210 in the future. I'm looking for that information before I make my decision regarding the windows.
211 The rest of the application is reasonable and has improved safety measures. I will support the rest
212 of the application.

213
214 Commissioner Giannola – Stated that she concurs with Commission Bruner and thinks that the
215 Commission needs to discuss the condition of the windows further. The windows in the front are
216 the ones in question. The ones in the basement are far too damaged not to be replaced.

217
218 **Applicant Presentation:** H. Scott Diels, architect on the project was present to speak on behalf of
219 the appeal. He stated that other modifications included the basement stair and egress windows in
220 the basement. He expounded on the rest of the project. He mentioned that the insurance
221 company is recommending removing the entire interior of the home and then using a sealant to
222 contain the smoke smells emanating from that.

223
224 He also stated that they have revised their request to ask that although the insurance company
225 asked that the windows be completely replaced, they are revising their request to ask that just the
226 sash's be replaced, and to put the seal on the frame and be able to get to the weight boxes and
227 seal the weight boxes, as they are concerned that with heat and humidity, that smoke smell will
228 come out. The owners would like to save the frames and the stairwell. He outlined the procedures
229 for this and the rest of the project that would bring the house closer to code.

230
231 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

232
233 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Is everyone is comfortable with 'waiting' on the windows?

234
235 Erin King – A resident of this home was present to speak on behalf of the appeal. He stated that
236 this has been a very difficult time for him and his family. There are many things that will have to
237 happen before they can move back in and that just the insurance company dealings are difficult,
238 and they would like to move forward as much as possible with the Commission this evening. Their
239 principal concern due to water and smoke damage that permeate the walls. All the furniture in the
240 house was ruined and the entire family has severe coughing due to smoke smells and they want to
241 restore the beauty and safety of the home.

242
243 Commissioner Bruner – Asked staff about tax credits regarding this reconstruction and asked the
244 architect for further information on the window replacement system. (H. Scott Diels explained).
245 (Staff could not provide a definitive answer about tax credits on this project as most of the interior
246 is being replaced due to the severe damage.)

247
248 **Audience Participation:** None.

249
250 **Discussion by the Commission:**

251

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Shotwell, “**that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 411 West Jefferson Street., a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to replace damaged double-hung sashes with new ones the gable window with a door and flanking windows on the south side, and modify the rear porch with the addition of a bay window on the south side, a raised roof and overhang, and roof decking, as proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standard numbers 2, 6 and 9.”**

***AMENDMENT** - Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Shotwell, “**to add a basement egress window per the proposed plans”**

On a Voice Vote – AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION - PASSED – *UNANIMOUS

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

A-4 HDC08-022 – 223 SOUTH MAIN STREET - MSHD

BACKGROUND: This three-story commercial Italianate-style building was constructed in 1869. It is two bays wide and three bays deep. The building first served as a grocery for John Gerner, and its rear bay (facing Liberty Street) served as the residence of Sophia Allmendinger. According to the Polk City Directories, the front space was occupied by the DeFries Art Store for most of the first half of the 20th century.

LOCATION: Northeast corner of the intersection of South Main and East Liberty Streets.

APPLICATION: The applicant requests HDC approval to add two bay windows at the street level on the south elevation (Liberty Street side) of the building.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The owner wishes to add two bay windows in two sections of solid brick walls along Liberty Street to offer additional retail display space. A similar set of three bay windows have been installed to the larger building across the street at 106 E. Liberty/301 S. Main.
2. The proposed bay windows are 8” deep, and thus would project 4” beyond the existing brick pilaster that is located between the proposed bay windows. The height of the proposed bay windows matches the height of the existing south elevation window near the front corner; and the width of the proposed windows is such that the windows fit comfortably within the individual bays of the building.
3. Historic photos from the 1950s (complete south elevation visible) and the late 19th century (western portion of south elevation visible) show the south elevation as it is today—with a brick wall spanning the distance between the window in the southwest corner of the structure and the door at 105 E. Liberty. There is evidence in the brickwork in the wall that there were previous window and door openings similar in size to the upper floors.

- 300 4. The addition of openings in the two sections of brick wall on the Liberty Street side of the
301 building does not destroy character defining features and the proposed opening size is
302 compatible with the scale of the building. The addition of projecting bay windows could
303 create a false sense of historical development by enlarging the storefront appearance
304 around the side of the building.
- 305 4. If the proposed window openings were within the wall surface the proposed project would
306 be compatible with the remainder of the building and the surrounding area and meet *The*
307 *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standard numbers 2 & 9.

308 K. Kidorf – Mentioned that she had passed out a communication from Ray Detter who is in support
309 of this project.

310
311 **Owner/Address/Applicant:** Jim & John Curtis, 343 S. Main St., A2, MI 48104

312
313 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Giannola and Bruner visited the site.

314
315 Commissioner Bruner – The condition is as presented in the photos and the staff report. He
316 believes that that this is fairly clear cut and approves with most of the application, but agrees with
317 staff that it would be preferable to have the display is behind the existing building as the windows
318 are that are closer to Main. He asked if the owner has built to the property line or are assuming
319 that they can build out into the right of way.

320
321 Commissioner Giannola – Concurs with Commissioner Bruner and states that she believes that the
322 windows would be more compatible if they were flush with the brick wall.

323
324 **Applicant Presentation:** Jim and John Curtis, owners of this building were present to speak on
325 behalf of the application. This has been a family property for over 30 years and for the past 20
326 years has spent a great deal of money and time in restoration. He stated that they recognized at
327 that time that the south elevation wall was a 'sad' wall. A few years ago a study was done by a
328 local student, and in that study they state that this was a sad part of the building. Three years ago,
329 they discussed this project with various community entities and other city personnel as well as
330 historic organizations and the city legal department.

331
332 Everyone encouraged us to proceed, and we've contacted our architect. (He outlined what they
333 had proposed). He stated that their plan was revised from the original plan and is now compliant
334 with the property line of the building and would not infringe on the public right of way. Part of this
335 request is to assist their tenant with displaying her merchandise to the public. A lack of windows
336 does not assist public view to her product.

337
338 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

339
340 Commissioner Bruner – Asked the applicant to clarify which buildings connected to this building
341 were owned by them.

342
343 Commissioner Henrichs – When these openings are cut, there will have to be some type of
344 structural member in place. Is this a load bearing wall? (Yes. We've detailed some of this with the
345 architect and we do recognize this). Having the projected window could be an opportunity to
346 'conceal' the actual cutting of the brick as well? (Yes).

347
348 Commissioner Ramsburgh – The proposed window is a great improvement. Does the 4 inches
349 give you a benefit we're not aware of? (Yes, the tenant retains some storage space and display).

350
351 Commissioner Bruner – Asked what type of materials would be used for this project? (Owner –
352 baked enamel and other materials, but it will be different enough in materials and style to tell the
353 difference between the new improvement and the old).
354

355 **Audience Participation:** None.
356

357 **Discussion by the Commission:**
358

359 Commissioner Henrichs – I’m not in favor of this motion as this sets a strong precedent in modern
360 architecture to be handled this way. He stated that he believes that it would help it look better to
361 articulate the windows the way they were submitted. It also needs to cover some of the saw
362 cutting and it would help to approve this as submitted.
363

364 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Agrees with Commissioner Henrichs. Having the projection will make
365 a greater statement that this is a present day change, so she does not support the motion.
366

367 Commissioner White – Stated that he did not support the motion as stated.
368

369 Commissioner Shotwell – Also agrees with Commissioners Henrichs, Ramsburgh and White, but
370 also believes there is a concern that this would confuse the historic record.
371

372 **MOTION**
373

374 Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Giannola, “**that the**
375 **Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 223 S. Main**
376 **Street., a contributing property in the Main Street Historic District, to install two bay**
377 **windows on the south elevation, ~~*provided the openings are within the existing wall~~**
378 **~~surface and do not project as bays.~~ The proposed work is compatible in exterior**
379 **design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the surrounding area and**
380 **meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular**
381 **standard numbers 2 and 9”.**
382

383 ***AMENDMENT** – Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Giannola – Strike
384 ***“Provided that the openings are within the existing wall surface and do not project as***
385 ***bays”.***

386 ***On a Voice Vote – AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION - PASSED – *UNANIMOUS***
387

388 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION AS AMENDED - PASSED – *UNANIMOUS (Application Approved)***
389
390

391 **A-5 HDC08-023 - 323 MULHOLLAND STREET - OWSHD**
392

393 **BACKGROUND:** This vernacular 1.5-story front-gable house is one of the first of several identical
394 working class homes that were built on Mulholland during the period 1915-1920. At the time the
395 street was known as Sixth Street (its name changed in 1928). According to the Polk City Directory,
396 the first occupants were Leroy D. Johnson and his wife, Vera in 1916. Leroy worked as a
397 chauffeur for Ernest P. Cook, owner of a livery at 114 North State Street. Stephen B. Thrasher, a
398 carpenter, and wife Anna are listed at this address in 1918 and 1919. The first long-term tenants
399 were Arth C. Reiff and wife Hertha (or Hattie M), who lived at the house from 1920 to 1927 and
400 again from 1932 until the 1940s. The occupants of the house in the late 1920s included Theo J.
401 and Marie Doman (“helper”) and Clarence and Amanda Finkbeiner (carpenter).

402
403 **LOCATION:** The property is located on the east side of Mulholland Street, between West Liberty
404 and West Washington Streets.

405
406 **APPLICATION:** The applicant requests HDC approval to remove a small rear porch and construct
407 a two-story addition with a new porch to the rear of the existing house.

408
409 **STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 410
411 1. The proposed addition is about 18' deep by 21' wide. It is not a totally rectangular plan, and
412 one side is deeper than the other. The north side of the addition extends 2' out past the
413 side of the house at the first floor and slightly overlaps the corner. The south side of the
414 addition is inset about 6 inches from the main house. The second floor of the addition is
415 inset and is 18 feet deep and 12 feet wide. The proposed porch is 6'8" by 9'8".
416
- 417 2. The proposed addition will have a gable roof that is below the main roof of the house. A
418 shed roof will project from the north side. The porch roof will be a hip roof. All of the roofs
419 will be covered with asphalt shingles. There is a gable dormer proposed for the north wall.
420
- 421 3. The sill plate of the addition will be lower than the main house, and the foundation will be
422 concrete block. The proposed siding is a cementitious Hardiplank siding with matching trim.
423
- 424 4. Wood double-hung windows of varying sizes are proposed at the first and second floors. A
425 small window is proposed for the basement on the north side. A wood sliding glass door is
426 proposed for the rear elevation and a fiberglass door that will have a decorative design in
427 the glass is proposed for the south elevation.
428
- 429 5. The new porch floor is proposed to be composite decking, Brasili by Trex. The material of
430 the porch columns is unknown.
431
- 432 6. Normally the Commission has not been approving additions that extend past the sides of the
433 house. Staff has requested the applicant try to change the configuration but in order to
434 preserve rear yard space and garage access the addition cannot be made longer. In this
435 case the side extension is limited to 2 feet and to the first story. The proposed placement,
436 massing, scale, and materials are compatible with the existing house. The use of new
437 materials and lowering of the sill plate from the main house clearly differentiate the new
438 construction from the historic house, but are still compatible.
439
- 440 7. The addition as proposed is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material
441 and relationship to the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior's*
442 *Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standard numbers 2, 9 and 10.
443

444 K. Kidorf – Added that she had noticed that their plans include a proposed new air conditioning
445 unit, and that is not appropriate. She stated that that proposal would have to come back to the
446 Commission for approval. We generally require that mechanical units go behind the building.
447

448 She also stated that she had passed out a communication in support from Christine Brummer.
449

450 **Owner/Address/Applicant:** Tresna Taylor, 323 Mulholland Street, A2, MI 48103
451

452 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Giannola and Bruner visited the site.
453

454 Commissioner Bruner – The point of shifting to the north is something that should be made clear
455 as access and clearance to the garage is important. By shifting this, it will also differentiate
456 between the old and the new construction. They have made efforts to make the most of this
457 addition, and this is similar in character to those we have approved in the past in this area.
458

459 Commissioner Giannola – Concurs with both the staff report and Commissioner Bruner. She
460 stated that they are utilizing the space efficiently.
461

462 **Applicant Presentation:** Tresna Taylor, owner and architect was present to speak on behalf of
463 the appeal. She stated that she has thought long and hard about this addition, and believes that
464 what they're proposing is sensitive the existing house and the neighboring homes. She outlined
465 the project for the Commission. She thanked staff for their help with the application.
466

467 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**
468

469 Commissioner Henrichs – Asked about the elevations. Why does the grade drop? (Petitioner –
470 Mulholland is on a hill. There is a retaining wall there and the back and sidewalk slope, then it
471 drops again steeply in the back. When we build out, we will have to deal with that). So, that is a
472 result of the existing grading. (Yes).
473

474 **Audience Participation:** Mr. Gonzales (the next door neighbor) was present to speak on the
475 application. He stated that he never received 'actual notice' of this proposal until yesterday when
476 staff posted the orange sign on the property late in the afternoon. This morning, K. Kidorf met with
477 me and provided me with a copy of the packet. I would ask that the Commission put this matter off
478 so that I and any other neighbors could have the opportunity to speak about this. It is apparently
479 the procedure of the Commission to place notice of this hearing on the internet and in the
480 newspaper. He stated that he didn't think this would be an inconvenience to the applicant or the
481 Commission.
482

483 *(Staff Note: K. Kidorf and B. Acquaviva both spoke with this citizen at length prior to this hearing,*
484 *and assured him that newspaper notices, internet notices and paper notices placed in city hall as*
485 *well as the bright orange placard placed on the home were all in excess of what is actually*
486 *required by law for the city and the Commission to put forth in order to notify the public. This*
487 *citizen still insists that he was not properly notified).*
488

489 Commissioner Bruner – Stated that in keeping with the three minutes allotted to each speaker -
490 that these comments should be kept to that standard. He asked that the speaker to please outline
491 what he was opposed to concerning this project.
492

493 Mr. Gonzalez once again stated he felt he wasn't properly noticed and gave historical background
494 on the home. He stated as he stands in his backyard looking at what would be this addition, it
495 would be a monolithic structure that would block his view and enjoy his view of Liberty Street and
496 the condos at the bottom of the site. He further stated that the proposal states it will be 18' by 20'
497 feet wide and that there are no homes on the east side of Mulholland that have this type of
498 addition. He went on at length about Mulholland Street and his view of the area.
499

500 Commissioner Bruner – Asked if this individual had an easement granted to him that would restrict
501 his neighbor from building this addition – something that guarantees his view across his neighbors'
502 property? Mr. Gonzales stated that he can't say that this is in the deed, but by way of the
503 environment, he should have light and air in the area.
504

Commissioner White – Asked the speaker to yield as he had well exceeded his allotted public comment time. He also added that it should be noted that the other neighbor present was offered the option to speak, but declined that invitation. He outlined that this speaker had well versed the Commission on the history of this neighborhood and the worker style cottages that were built there.

Tresna Taylor – (Rebuttal) – Apologized to the neighbor for not notifying him herself that she was proposing this addition prior to the actual hearing. Some of your concerns are with the massing, but I've thought a lot about it by 'stepping down' the addition so that it steps back and will not appear as 'looming' as you may think. A very large hedge also will 'soften' that effect. She also stated that she proposes something that not only improves her family situation but also is compatible with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Bruner – Asked the petitioner if she had considered building a three dimensional model of this addition (since she is an architect). She said she could produce a three dimensional model if needed. The Commissioner also stressed good relations with surrounding neighbors.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – Are all the plans in conformance with the zoning laws? (Applicant – Pointed out the drawings indicating the setbacks and that they are in conformance).

Discussion by the Commission:

Commissioner Henrichs – Regarding some comments that were made, can staff comment on noticing requirements that were made and if those were in compliance? (*K. Kidorf – Yes. The Commission actually goes above and beyond what is required. We are not required to post notice on the property, nor are we required to post a notice in the newspaper, but we do. All noticing requirements were met as are outlined in Chapter 103 of the Code.*)

Commissioner Henrichs – Asked the Review Committee to expound on the grade and slopes of the actual site so that the Commission has an idea of some of the concerns that the neighbor had.

Commissioner Giannola – Stated that she did not notice what the concerned neighbor would be seeing as there is currently a large hedge between his property and that of the petitioner's property. She went on to say that she didn't know what it would look like from the speaker's window, but the rest looks like it would be contained.

Commissioner Bruner – The home to the north wasn't obvious, and I think that the plant life helps to conceal that. The homes were quite modest, but had deep lots, but if you're adding onto the house, this is the only direction in which you can do it. He stated he was in support of the application as presented. This is a modest addition to a modest house. Demographics in this area have changed, and owners should be able to add on to their homes within the allowable footprint.

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Giannola, **“that the Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 323 Mulholland Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a two-story addition to the rear elevation of the existing house on the property. The proposed work is 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 2, 9 and 10.”**

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

557
558
559 **A-6 HDC08-024 – 504 WEST WILLIAM STREET - OWSHD**

561 **BACKGROUND:** This vernacular two-story front-gable house first appears in the 1926 City
562 Directory as #508 (the address changes to #504 by 1929). For two years it was listed as vacant,
563 then Donald J. Mayer, a salesman at Schlenker Hardware, and his wife Thyra are listed there. A
564 new sliding window was added to the attic gable in the 1980s, and a one-story addition to the NE
565 corner of the house was approved by the HDC in 1993.

566
567 **LOCATION:** North side of West William Street, just west of the intersection with Third Street.

568
569 **APPLICATION:** The applicant requests HDC approval to replace twelve (12) original wood double-
570 hung windows and one non-original casement window with new wood thermopane double-hung
571 windows. The new windows would receive replicated interior and exterior trim to match existing.
572 The purpose of this proposed work is to reduce energy costs and remove lead paint. The
573 applicant also wishes to replace the existing asphalt roof on the original portion of the house with a
574 standing seam roof. The ventilation method of the roof would remain the same.

575
576 **NOTE:** K. Kidorf stated that the applicant has withdrawn the portion of the application to
577 replace the windows, but instead wants to replace the ENTIRE roof of the home with a metal
578 roof.

579
580 **STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 581
582 ~~1. The owner's objectives in replacing the windows are to gain energy efficiency and to remove~~
583 ~~possible lead paint.~~
- 584
585 ~~2. Staff met with the carpenter on site, and examined some of the windows on the first floor.~~
586 ~~The "worst case" window on the north elevation was also examined which had very limited~~
587 ~~wood deterioration and a broken pane of glass. None of the windows or the surrounding~~
588 ~~trim were severely deteriorated. The existing aluminum storm windows appear to be non-~~
~~functional.~~
- 589
590 ~~3. Staff has advised the applicant that repair and the addition of new storm windows by a~~
~~window restoration specialist would be the appropriate course of action.~~
- 591
592 ~~4. Replacement of original wood windows that are not deteriorated with new wood windows~~
593 ~~does not meet The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation in particular~~
~~standard numbers 2, 5 and 6.~~
- 594
595 5. The existing asphalt roof is not original to the house. The new roof and new decking would
be placed over the original roof decking after the asphalt shingles are removed.
- 596
597 6. It is unknown what the original roofing material was, although it was probably wood shingles
598 as was typical in Michigan. The proposed standing seam metal will not be confused with a
599 historic metal roof and will not create a false sense of historical development. The metal
roof is compatible with the architectural features and scale of the house.
- 600
601 7. The replacement of the asphalt shingle roof with the zinc grey standing seam metal roof is
compatible with the building and surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior's*

602 *Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular standard number 9.

603
604 **Owner/Address:** Jean Henry, 504 West William St., A2, MI 48103

605
606 **Applicant:** Amos Shirato, By The River Carpentry, 3725 E. Delhi Road, A2, MI 48103

607
608 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Giannola and Bruner visited the site.

609
610 Commissioner Giannola – We confirmed that the roof needs replacement as staff reported. She
611 stated that the material proposed should be discussed with the Commission.

612
613 Commissioner Bruner – Concurs with Commissioner Giannola, but will not support a metal roof
614 and will explain this further in discussion.

615
616 **Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Amos Shirato, contractor on this project was present to speak on
617 behalf of the application. He stated that they propose to remove all the present roofing to the
618 decking with possible replacement of any bad decking and install a painted standing seam metal
619 roof (he brought samples of the proposed and the proposed color). They want to use this because
620 it appears more historically correct than the current asphalt shingles and has a longer life span
621 than what is existing. He also stated that this product is more ‘green’ than asphalt, as it is easily
622 recyclable. He pointed out other historic examples of tin style roofs - one in the Old West Side
623 Historic District (509 West Liberty) that appears original, and another (on Ann between Glen and
624 Thayer) in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District. Modern examples would be Domino’s Farms.

625
626 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

627
628 Commissioner Bruner – Asked the applicant to describe the home and the roof that currently exists
629 at 509 West Liberty – style, type, etc. (The applicant stated the he believes the home to be a blue
630 Greek Revival style home and the roof is obviously old. The older roofs were said to be made of
631 lead and painted).

632
633 **Audience Participation:** None.

634
635 **Discussion by the Commission:**

636
637 Commissioner Bruner – Stated he is opposed to this for a number of reasons. Staff makes a good
638 case in that it’s not a permanent element and has a certain life to it; however, it has a much longer
639 life than an asphalt roof and will have a longer impact on the character of the neighborhood. None
640 of the existing standards speak against this, although he disagrees with Standard #3 is
641 appropriate.

642
643 He went on to say that there are architectural and historic elements that may not be appropriate.
644 He expounded on the examples given and stated that one of those homes showed that historically
645 they had originally had a metal roof, so they were allowed to replace that. No other homes of the
646 same period of this one have had a metal roof. We are also not allowed to pick colors on homes
647 as it is a reversible condition. The darker greys would actually perform less than those that the
648 petitioner chose. He concluded by stating that he would not support this proposal.

649
650 Commissioner Henrichs – Stated he is also opposed to this motion. Looking at the guidelines of
651 the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards*, # 2 states that “the historic character of a property shall
652 be maintained”. A metal roof would not be appropriate for a wood framed house. This material is

653 normally used commercially. Standard #5 that states ‘distinctive finishes and construction
654 techniques or examples of craftsmanship shall be preserved,’ so that would lean toward
655 maintaining what is currently on the house.

656
657 Standard #6 basically states that if a feature is deteriorated and requires replacement, the new
658 features shall match the old in design, color and texture – which an asphalt shingle would match.
659 Standard #9 is actually referring to new additions and alterations, and this type of work doesn’t fall
660 into that category either, so I’m also opposed to this.

661
662 Commissioner Shotwell – Stated she does see the other Commissioner’s points; however, she
663 disagrees in that she is in favor of this application – primarily because she has had the pleasure of
664 seeing standing seam metal roofs used frequently in Northern Michigan on wood frame houses.
665 As the applicant stated, it does shed snow very well. She also believes that the fact that there are
666 not that many standing metal seam roofs in Ann Arbor will distinguish this from other materials so it
667 will not mimic anything historical. This application is not intrusive. While we’re not sure how
668 accurate a portion of the asphalt shingles on this home were in relation to what was originally
669 there, I’m in support of this application.

670
671 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Agrees with Commissioner Shotwell. The vernacular style of this
672 house is rather ‘farmhouse’ in appearance and the standing seam roof would be in keeping with
673 this style. I’m in favor of this application.

674
675 Commissioner Giannola – Stated she was not in favor of the application for the sole reason that it
676 is not compatible with the rest of the surrounding area. Although metal roofs may be common in
677 Northern Michigan, they’re not common or compatible here.

678
679 Commissioner Henrichs – Metal roofs are more common in the south. As the temperatures go
680 through freeze and thaws, the snow does slide off, but in Northern Michigan, these freeze and stay
681 that way.

682
683 Commissioner Bruner – Stated that he disagreed with Commissioner Ramsburgh that although this
684 home may ‘look’ like a farmhouse, it is not, and is not appropriate for this home.

685
686 Commissioner White – Concurs with Commissioners Shotwell and Ramsburgh, and will support
687 the application.

688 **MOTION #1**

689
690 Moved by Commissioner Shotwell, Seconded by Commissioner Ramsburgh, “**that the**
691 **Commission issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application at 504 West**
692 **William Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, that**
693 **proposes to replace the existing asphalt roof with a standing-seam metal roof in zinc**
694 **or charcoal grey. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement,**
695 **texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and surrounding area and**
696 **meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* in particular**
697 **standard number 9”.**

698 **On a Roll Call Vote – MOTION #1 FAILED – 4 NO to 2 YES (Application Denied)**

699 **YES - Commissioners Shotwell and White (2)**

700 **NO – Commissioners Ramsburgh, Henrichs, Bruner and Giannola (4)**

701
702 **MOTION #2**
703

704 Moved by Commissioner Bruner, Seconded by Commissioner Giannola, “**that the**
705 **Commission deny that portion of the application at 504 West William Street, a**
706 **contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, that proposes to replace**
707 **an existing asphalt roof with a standing metal roof. The proposed work is not**
708 **compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the**
709 **surrounding area and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for***
710 ***Rehabilitation* in particular standard numbers 2, 3, 5, 6 and 10.”**
711

712 **On a Roll Call Vote – MOTION #2 - PASSED – 4 YES to 2 NO (Application is DENIED)**

713 **NO - Commissioners Shotwell and White (2)**

714 **YES – Commissioners Ramsburgh, Henrichs, Bruner and Giannola (4)**
715

716
717 **B - OLD BUSINESS – None**

718
719 **C - NEW BUSINESS –**

720
721 **C-1 Election of Officers – Commissioner White asked Commissioner Henrichs of the**
722 **Nominating Committee to give the Nominating Report.**
723

724 Commissioner Henrichs reported that the Nominating Committee met and reported that the
725 nominations of Officers were as follows:
726

727 **Chair – Commissioner Shotwell, Vice-Chair – Commissioner Ramsburgh and Secretary,**
728 **Commissioner Giannola.**
729

730 Commissioner White – Invited nominations from the floor for consideration. The record notes that
731 there were no nominations from the floor.
732

733 He asked the nominees if they would accept the nominations to the proposed offices. All
734 nominees accepted the nomination. ***As there were no conflicts to the nominations,***
735 ***Commissioner Bruner moved, Seconded by Commissioner Henrichs, “to accept the***
736 ***proposed slate of Officers to the HDC.”***
737

738 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUSLY (New Officers Elected)**
739

740
741 **C-2 Proposal to Change the HDC Meeting Time to 6:00 p.m.**
742

743 K. Kidorf – Stated that staff had proposed a motion to approve changing the meeting time of the
744 current 7:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. (The remainder of the 2008 sessions would remain at 7:00 p.m.)
745

746 Commissioner Bruner – Asked if the HDC was also approving the schedule for 2009? (K. Kidorf
747 stated that this would be covered under item C-3).
748

749 K. Kidorf – Remarked that she had taken an informal poll prior to last months' meeting regarding
750 changing the meeting time to 6:00 p.m., and if the Commission is comfortable with that, they could
751 approve that as part of item C-3.

752
753 Commissioner Henrichs – Asked what the rationale for changing the time would be? (K. Kidorf –
754 Stated that this would allow the Commission and Staff to finish the meetings earlier. The informal
755 poll of audience members at the last meeting, and no one was opposed to it).

756
757 Commissioner Bruner – Stated he was not in favor of this as the time was previously selected as
758 7:00 p.m. as it appears to work well with people getting out of work by 5:30 and being able to grab
759 a bite to eat, as well as accommodating the public to do the same. He stated that starting a
760 meeting at 6:00 p.m. doesn't guarantee that it will end at 11:00 p.m. as opposed to 12:00 a.m., so
761 not getting nourishment in between there makes it more disagreeable.

762
763 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Stated that she understands wanting to finish the meetings before too
764 late, but wondered about accommodating the public.

765
766 Commissioner Bruner – Some of us in the business community are called away, and being here by
767 6:00 p.m. would be even more difficult. Someone who would commute from their job in a distant
768 community shouldn't be penalized from not attending because they couldn't arrive by 6:00 p.m.

769
770 Commissioner White – Suggested that the Commission table the issue until later and poll the
771 audience at the next meeting for more input.

772
773 Commissioner Shotwell – If we decided not to meet at 6:00, we could always visit this issue later.

774
775 **C-3 After further discussion, the Commission decided to table this issue and Item**
776 **C-3 with this until further notice.**

777
778 **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION – GENERAL** (Limited to 3 Minutes per Speaker) – None.

779
780 **D - APPROVAL OF MINUTES –**

781
782 **D-1** Draft Minutes of the September 11, 2008 Regular Session – Without Opposition, the
783 minutes were **APPROVED AS PRESENTED** (*edited by staff prior to meeting*).

784
785 **E - REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS** – Commissioner White – Congratulated the new
786 officers who were elected to the HDC.

787
788 **F - ASSIGNMENTS**

789
790 **F-1** October 2008

791
792 A-1 HDC08-019 - 206 S. Fifth Street Commissioner Henrichs
793 A-2 HDC08-020 - 637 ½ Fifth Street Commissioner – PREVIOUSLY ASSIGNED
794 A-3 HDC08-021 - 411 West Jefferson Street Commissioner Bruner
795 A-4 HDC08-022 - 223 South Main Street Commissioner Giannola
796 A-5 HDC08-023 - 323 Mulholland Street Commissioner Ramsburgh
797 A-6 HDC08-024 - 504 West William Street Commissioner – NOT NEEDED – *Denied*
798

799 **F-2** Review Committee for **November 10, 2008 at 12:00 p.m.** (due to daylight savings
800 time) – Commissioners Bruner and Ramsburgh.

801
802 **G - STAFF ACTIVITIES REPORT**

803
804 **G-1** September 2008 report was included in the packet given to the Commission. K.
805 Kidorf reported that there were 18 applications; 17 were approved, 14 of those were
806 approved by Staff and the Commission approved 3 and denied 1.

807
808 **H - CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS**

809
810 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Stated that she appreciated the minutes being caught up, and had a
811 request by the public to please update the minutes on the website. B. Acquaviva stated that that is
812 being updated as soon as possible, but those are not traditionally posted on the internet until they
813 are approved by the Commission first. If anyone should require those in the interim, that they
814 could email her to get a copy of those approved minutes.

815
816 B. Acquaviva also informed the Commission that the Planning and Development Services Unit is
817 now utilizing a new feature on the internet called ‘e-gov notification,’ which allows anyone to sign
818 up for automatic notification when the website – the HDC page in particular – are updated.

819
820 **I - COMMUNICATIONS**

821
822 **ADJOURNMENT**

823
824 *The Meeting was adjourned at 10:40 p.m. without objection.*

825
826 *A Working Session followed the conclusion of the Regular Session.*

827
828 ***SUBMITTED BY: Brenda Acquaviva, Administrative Service Specialist IV, Planning and***
829 ***Development Services.***