



**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE  
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR  
Thursday, September 10, 2009.**

**Commissioners Present:** Diane Giannola, Patrick McCauley, Robert White, Kristina Glusac, Lesa Rozmarek and Ellen Ramsburgh (6)

**Commissioners Absent:** Sarah Wallace (1)

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

**CALL TO ORDER:** Vice Chair Ramsburgh called the Regular Session to order at 7:02 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:** Quorum satisfied.

**INTRODUCTION** – The chair introduced the newest member to the Board – Lesa Rozmarek.

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:** The Agenda was approved as amended. *(No Minutes and Add Nominating committee Selection.)*

**A - HEARINGS**

**A-1 HDC09-117 – 548 SIXTH STREET - OWSHD**

**BACKGROUND:** This two-story cross-gabled house features a full-width front porch and wide cornice boards. It first appears in the 1910 City Directory as the home of Henry and Christina Heibin. Henry was a partner in Haas and Heibin, grocers and dealers in wine and liquors, with Daniel Haas. In 1931, the garage is shown on Sanborn maps as barely touching the southwest corner of the house. Sometime after 1931 a two-story rear addition was added behind the house and along the north wall of the garage. The bay window visible in the photos submitted was also not present in 1931.

**LOCATION:** The site is located on the west side of Sixth Street, north of West Madison and South of West Jefferson

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to remove a galvanized metal roof on a garage and replace it with a rubber membrane roof.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. The current roof is made of soldered flat-seam galvanized steel panels that are approximately 18" x 24". From photos, the panels appear to have been painted a greenish color to imitate the patina of aged copper. Rusted metal is clearly visible in the photos provided.
2. The current roof is not original, because painted galvanized steel rusts and could not last that long. A historic roofing specialist that staff spoke to estimates it is 20 years old. It seems likely that the roof was originally copper, and when it needed replacement the

50 copper was prohibitively expensive and the galvanized steel was substituted, though this  
51 has not been substantiated by physical or documentary evidence.  
52

- 53 3. The applicant is requesting a change in materials to install a rubber membrane roof. A new  
54 galvanized roof is not recommended, since it will simply rust again. The applicant received  
55 a quote of \$9,675 for a new copper roof from Harlow Sheet Metal, LLC, plus additional  
56 costs to repair the roof deck before it is installed. This estimate is in line with the \$35/sf  
57 ballpark cost for new copper roofing that staff was quoted by Butcher & Baecker  
58 Construction Co. The applicant told staff that the parapet wall would be capped with  
59 painted aluminum in order to retain the current metal appearance.  
60
- 61 4. Staff feels that the existing roof is clearly deteriorated beyond repair. Since the current  
62 galvanized steel is not an appropriate material, the roof is not visible from anywhere except  
63 inside this house and possibly the neighboring house, the use of an appropriate metal  
64 (copper) is cost prohibitive, and the look of the historic metal cap over the parapet wall will  
65 be retained, the work is appropriate.  
66
- 67 5. The proposed work is generally compatible in exterior design, massing, arrangement,  
68 texture, material and relationship to the site and the surrounding area, and meets *The*  
69 *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, particularly standards 2, 5, and 6,  
70 and the *Guidelines* for roofs and building sites.  
71

72 **Owner/Applicant/Address:** William Hall, 34194 Northland Drive, Livonia, MI 48182  
73

74 **Review Committee:** Commissioners McCauley and Ramsburgh visited the site.  
75

76 Commissioner McCauley – It was difficult to see the roof, but as the pictures in the application  
77 display, it is beyond repair and I don't think it will detract from the architectural details.  
78

79 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Concurs with Commission McCauley, the staff report and feels this  
80 is an appropriate replacement in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines.  
81

### 82 **Applicant Presentation**

83

84 The owner, Mr. Leander Valdes stated that they are concerned with historic preservation but that  
85 the potential \$10,000 it would cost to replace the roof with copper. They have occupied the home  
86 since the 1960's and that roof was in place prior to their ownership. The roofing materials are  
87 rusted out and the wood underneath it is rotted.  
88

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

90

91 Commissioner Glusac – How do you propose to shed water from this flat roof? A new  
92 downspout? (Mrs. Valdes – The roof is slanted toward the back, and we just had a new  
93 downspout installed).  
94

95 (Question to staff) Were there any drawings submitted for the edge detail? (No – Mr. Valdez  
96 explained the flashing.) So when you remove the current metal flashing, will it be different than  
97 this?  
98

99 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Stated that the builder was present at the site visit and stated that  
100 this would be replicated to what is existing.

J. Thacher – Pointed out the detail at the rear of the structure in pictures included in the packet.

### **Audience Participation:**

1. Mr. Tony Keene - - Asked about the historical significance of this house and how that was determined. Is it historic because someone famous lived there? Is it architecturally significant? What makes this historic? *(Mr. Keene asserted that there is no Old West Side Historic District as he has not found any 'study' done on this district. Mr. Keene also stated that he doesn't think that the Commission knows how to do its job properly, and that they would have to prove to him that each issue tonight was dealing with a historic home and why.)*

*Commissioner White stated that a study had been conducted, just the same as the Broadway Historic District was recently studied and formed and that he was on that Committee. Commissioner White also stated that he did not feel that this was the proper venue for Mr. Keene to voice his opinion on a matter that did not involve the current application being heard. Vice Chair Ramsburgh offered to let the speaker finish his current comments.*

The Chair offered the petitioner to rebut any comments (petitioners declined)

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

#### **MOTION #1**

Moved by Commissioner Glusac, Seconded by Commissioner White “**that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 548 Sixth Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to replace a flat-seam galvanized metal garage roof with a rubber membrane roof with aluminum-capped parapet walls, as proposed. The proposed work is 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 and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, in particular standards 2, 5, and 6, and the guidelines for roofs and building sites.”**

**On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE – PASSED – Unanimous (Application Approved)**

#### **A-2      HDC09-118 – 422 FIFTH STREET STREET - OWSHD**

**BACKGROUND:** This one and a half story gable-fronter features a full width front porch and a shed dormer on the north side. It first appears in City Directories in 1917 as the home of Clyde Dunn, a Clerk at JC Fisher Co.

**LOCATION:** West side of Fifth Street, north of West Jefferson and south of West William.

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to add a basement-level addition that is = 16 feet by 19 ½ feet, and build a deck on top of the addition with stairs down from the deck and an associated retaining wall, build a trellis on top of the deck, and replace a pair of non-original double hung windows in non-original openings with a pair of double hung windows and door.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. The existing house is approximately 1,150 square feet from exterior wall to exterior wall (not livable space, which would be less). The proposed addition is approximately 300 square feet, making the addition roughly one quarter the size of the existing house. If this addition is approved by the HDC, any future additions to the house should include this 300 square feet when calculating the ratio of addition to historic house.
2. The rear elevation currently has a walkout basement door and small window (both non-original) on the basement level. The lot slopes downhill from south to north. The addition would be inset six inches on either side from the current basement walls and extend straight out. The south wall of the addition would be concrete block and built into the uphill side of the lot. The north wall would be frame. All aboveground portions of the addition would be coated with stucco. The new rear elevation would have a Marvin ten-lite door and pair of casement egress windows, both in aluminum clad wood. Near the south lot line a stone retaining wall is proposed to push back the hill and allow larger egress casement windows on the new rear basement elevation.
3. The deck would be surfaced with a walk-able membrane and have a simple cedar railing that is compatible in design to the one on the front porch. The trellis would also be cedar and span the depth of the new deck. A pair of non-original double hung vinyl windows in non-original openings are proposed to be replaced with a pair of double hung windows and a ten-lite door, all of aluminum-clad wood from Marvin.
4. The proposed addition is a compatible design with the existing house, stucco is an appropriate exterior coating that is compatible with the parge coat on the rest of the foundation, and the addition is distinguished from the existing basement by being stepped in slightly. The rear wall of the basement is the least-character-defining elevation of the house and the most acceptable location for an addition. The alterations to the first floor of the rear elevation minimize impacts to historic features while allowing new usable space to be created. The entire addition could be removed at a later date while still retaining the essential form and integrity of the building.
5. The proposed addition, deck, and trellis 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 standards 2,5,9 and 10, and the guidelines for new additions and building site.

**Owner/Applicant/Address:** Cameron Magoon & Kristin Haas, 422 Fifth Street, A2, MI 48103

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

Commissioner McCauley – The owners had staked off the proposed site so that you could visualize the footprint of the addition, and I thought that in general it would not detract from the historic portion of the house. This will add a lot to the living space and I think that they were quite creative in the positioning of the addition and recommend approval.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – Concurs with Commissioner McCauley and staff. The new addition will be significantly different and will differentiate easily between the old and new as well as the size which is also appropriate.

**Applicant Presentation:**

Mr. Cameron Magoon, owner and builder was present to speak on behalf of the application. He stated that they tried to keep the addition small and add the additional bedroom in the back and utilize the back deck for family space.

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

Commissioner Glusac – Did you consider any other finish for the exposed basement portion? Because this is built into a hill (and the walk out basement), (C. Magoon - We'll be removing the embankment and the finish will probably be a stucco. Because of the embankment, this is basically a retaining wall, so we'll be using block and support it and applying vinyl covering to that is much too involved.)

Commissioner Glusac – Would the block be exposed at any portion? (Yes, at the south side, a small portion). All the existing windows were vinyl? (Yes, they were all replaced at some point).

**Audience Participation:**

1. Mr. Tony Keene – This is on Fifth Street, correct? Nothing famous happened here, nobody famous lived there and it is of no architectural significance. (The Chair tried to stop Mr. Keene to state that this had to be specific regarding this address, but he continued to speak loudly over the Chair and disregard the process and the meeting. When asked to stick to the subject, he shouted “NO” loudly and stated that they (The Commission) was going to listed to him and what he has to say.) He stated that the HDC was like a bunch of bullies that do what they want to residents.

C. Magoon - *Rebuttal* – I wasn't 'bullied' into this procedure. Everyone was helpful in this procedure. It's daunting, but I wasn't forced into it or feel that it's out of place.

(Staff Note: B. Acquaviva left the Council Chambers and obtained Ann Arbor City Police personnel who removed Mr. Keene for disrupting a public meeting).

**Discussion by the Commission:****MOTION #1**

Moved by Commissioner Giannola, Seconded by Commissioner McCauley, **“That the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 422 Fifth Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to add a basement-level addition that is roughly 16 feet by 19 ½ feet, build a deck on top of the addition with stairs leading to the ground, a stone retaining wall, and a trellis on top of the deck, and replace a pair of non-original double hung windows in non-original openings with a pair of double hung windows and a door, 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 and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, in particular standards 2,5,9, and 10 and the guidelines for new additions and building site.**

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

**A-3      HDC09-119 – 542 SOUTH ASHLEY STREET - OWSHD**

**BACKGROUND:** This one-and-a-half story gable-fronter dates back to at least 1894 when it was #96 Ashley Street, the home of Fidel Schmidt, a carpenter. On 1908 Sanborn maps the house features a full width front porch (that is missing today) but the footprint is little changed.

**LOCATION:** West side of South Ashley Street, north of West Madison & South of West Jefferson.

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval for the replacement of 17 wood windows and one wood side door.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. On March 31, 2009 the applicant applied for and received a building permit from the City of Ann Arbor for interior renovations and the replacement of 16 windows at 542 South Ashley. No Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) had been issued or applied for from the Historic District Commission (HDC) for this work. City staff responsible for issuing building permits did not halt the permit application despite the lack of a CoA. The contractor, Howard Gold, commenced work under the building permit shortly after its issuance. At the end of April, the historic preservation coordinator received a call from Mr. Gold, who said that a neighbor had observed him removing the windows and told him he needed permission from the Historic District Commission for this kind of work. Jill Thacher visited the site on April 30 and found that, as Mr. Gold had described, the windows had all been removed and the sashes that survived were stored in the garage. The sashes that were accessible for viewing appeared to be in predominantly sound condition, with some repairs necessary but overall in good shape considering their age and lack of maintenance provided by previous owners (as described by the current owner). The interior of the house was in the process of being gutted, and the window frames on the interior had been cut flush with the wall in anticipation of the installation of vinyl replacement windows. Only storm windows are currently installed over the openings.
2. Ms Thacher informed Mr. Gold that since no CoA had been issued, the appropriate course of action was to reinstall the windows, which would involve rebuilding the interior portions that had been cut off flush, or to apply to the HDC, in which case staff could not recommend approval for the work unless the windows were proven to be non-original. The contractor stated that five were clearly replacement windows. Thacher explained that the replacement of non-original windows could be approved at the staff level if appropriate replacements meeting the HDC's *Guidelines for Window Evaluation, Repair and Replacement* were proposed. The property owner, Jeffrey Eisman, also spoke several times to Thacher and Brenda Acquaviva and these things were explained to him as well.
3. In July, when no progress had been made on reinstalling the windows and Mr. Eisman expressed that he was not interested in reinstalling them, a stop work order was posted at the site affecting only the window work portion of the permit and allowing only the original windows to be reinstalled under the permit (not replacement windows). It was accompanied by a letter (see attached) summarizing Mr. Eisman's options to either repair and reinstall the windows or apply to the HDC. He subsequently submitted this application for HDC review of the proposed replacement windows and door.
4. Staff has no reason to believe that most of the windows are not original to the house. Their simple proportions and one-over-one style with a fixed upper sash and movable lower

sash (propped to stay open) are consistent with windows of this house's era. In addition, local preservation architect Gene Hopkins had the opportunity to look closely at some of the windows (at the owner's invitation) and agreed that the windows he saw are original, based on their design, profile, method of construction, etc. He said that the sashes could be reinstalled and had worked out a method to do so. Mr. Gold reported to staff that it would probably cost around \$1500 per window to put the sashes back. The windows that were reported to be non-original have not been specifically identified on this application.

5. The proposed replacement windows meet the *Guidelines for Window Evaluation, Repair, and Replacement* with the following exception: the distance from sash face to back of casing must be within 1/8" of the original dimensions, but not less than 3/8" total (#7 on the window element measurement worksheet). Existing distance is 7/8" & the proposed is 5/8".
6. It is staff's opinion that a Notice to Proceed cannot be issued for the proposed window work because it does not meet any of the four conditions under which a Notice to Proceed may be considered. The Commission should consider standard number 6 and whether the windows are deteriorated beyond repair, and if so, whether the replacement windows match the visual qualities of the originals.
7. Staff has not looked at the door in person. The photo provided shows deterioration, but the extent will be confirmed at the Review Committee site visit on September 8 and staff will make a recommendation at the September 10 HDC meeting.
8. Installing replacement windows is not compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the remainder of the house and surrounding area and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, in particular standard number 6 which states that deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Original sashes should be reinstalled and repaired as necessary, and well-fitting storm windows installed to protect the original windows and provide thermal efficiency.

**Owner/Applicant/Address:** Jeffrey Eisman and Nancy Benchell-Eisman, 5958 Saint James Drive, West Bloomfield, MI 48322

**Review Committee:** Commissioners McCauley and Ramsburgh and staff visited the site.

Coordinator Thacher – Made note that the commissioners and she visited the site and took a window and frame inventory. She outlined those in her report to the Commission along with condition of each and numbered them for clarification of discussion. Five of the original window sashes and related materials are missing completely. She also provided details on a deteriorated door that she recommended be replaced due to extremely soft wood.

Commissioner McCauley – One thing we did determine by visiting the site was which windows we felt were original and which were not. The upper story (South Side) were non-original and there were a total of six sashes – three windows which were non-original. The rest of the windows that were in the garage, they were original and in various states of repair and disrepair. In terms of the interior of the windows, this poses the biggest problem.

Due to the way the sashes and jambs were cut unevenly, this would be the main reason why reinstallation would be difficult. A number of those windows were still there and in good enough condition to be reinstalled if a method on how to approach that through staff could be established.

355 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Stated that staff gave a very thorough evaluation of the series of  
356 events and inventory along with the condition of the sashes and the jambs. This has been well  
357 laid out for the Commission. She concurs that the sashes were repairable and there are systems  
358 and materials that could be used to repair and replace most of these windows.

359  
360 **Applicant Presentation:**

361  
362 Mr. Jeffrey Dworkin, attorney representing the owners was present to speak about the  
363 application. He stated that he has been a builder and has also worked with historic homes. The  
364 house was built in approximately 1906, although there is some confusion as to exactly when as  
365 the home experienced a fire at one point. There was a Michigan basement that was collapsing.  
366 There was no foundation under the rear of the house and had to be dug out.

367  
368 They purchased the house originally for their son to reside in and do not live in the area  
369 themselves. Mr. Dworkin stated that no one had notified them that this was in a Historic District.  
370 He went on to say that the real estate agents never mentioned it and that the city didn't mention it  
371 when they got their permit.

372  
373 He went on to say that the house had been vacant for three years, the electrical box was outside  
374 of the house, the furnace was cracked, the basement foundation was caved in, and the claw tub  
375 was lying on the floor as the feet had gone through the floor.

376  
377 The kitchen was totally unusable and had peeling lead paint. Over the years, the windows on the  
378 side were replaced at some point, as was the side door, which is also deteriorated. The roof was  
379 'tarpaper' and the two car garage is also not original (as staff had already mentioned).

380  
381 The front porch had been removed and the pre-cast concrete steps had been added (as well as  
382 the eagle). The house does have a pre-arts and crafts design, it has many notable features.  
383 *(Mr. Dworkin went on at length about what they would like to do to the property as a whole).*

384  
385 The relief sought, geared toward the district is to replace the windows with Historical profile  
386 windows considering the condition they are currently in. We would like a Certificate of  
387 Appropriateness for replacement windows that fit the guidelines and any that are currently at the  
388 home that are able to be repaired. The deteriorated door we mentioned earlier is also a part of  
389 the replacement request.

390  
391 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

392  
393 Commissioner McCauley – Reaffirmed that the applicant had spoken with their carpenter, a Mr.  
394 Gene Hopkins? (Dworkin – No, I did not. He did speak to the owner, Mr. Eisman.

395  
396 Mr. Jeffrey Eisman, owner, appeared to answer the Commissions questions. He stated that Mr.  
397 Hopkins' name was given to them (the owners) and they called him and he visited the site at their  
398 request. He inspected the windows and gave them a summary of his opinion, which is 180  
399 degrees different that they are being told now. After that meeting, he stated that he would attend  
400 the meeting and speak on our behalf about how the windows should be replaced as they are in  
401 disrepair and that they should be able to install new ones.

402  
403 Three weeks later we were informed by his company that he would not be attending the meeting  
404 or speaking on our behalf and we've never heard from him again.

Commissioner McCauley – Basically, the question is actually what conclusions did you come to after speaking with others about restoring the windows?

Mr. Dworkin – In the case of those that aren't in too bad shape, the possibility of using epoxy on those even though the cost is prohibitive and there are several sashes that are basically disintegrated, you're looking at additional cost as opposed to putting in replica new historic profile windows. You're looking at an additional cost of approximately \$20,000.00 as opposed to about \$5,000.00 for the replacements. Technologically, it's also a significant amount of work. The replacements we'd like to use would eliminate the use of the aluminum storm windows, which personally I think do more to detract from the historic character of the home than anything else.

Commissioner Rozmarek – Have you settled on a particular replacement window that you're proposing? (Dworkin – We would have to work with staff once we get the specs in. The windows would be wood. We would like to use clad, but it is our understanding that the Commission does not allow clad windows in the historic district).

Commissioner McCauley – Stated that some clad windows are allowed.

**Audience Participation:** None.

**Discussion by the Commission:**

**MOTION #1**

Moved by Commissioner Giannola, Seconded by Commissioner White, **“That the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the portion of the application at 542 South Ashley Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to replace a wood door on the north side of the house with a wood or metal door with a single light and three panels, similar in design to the door being replaced; on the condition that the proposed door be reviewed and approved by staff prior to installation. The work as conditioned is compatible in size, scale, massing, materials, site and neighborhood, and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, in particular ‘Standard Number 6 and the guidelines for ‘Entrances & Porches.’**

**On A Voice Vote – MOTION TO APPROVE – PASSED – UNANIMOUS**

*Commissioner White – Some of these items (proposed replacement windows) haven't arrived. When they do, staff will approve those? (Yes, this was stated in the motion).*

*Commissioner McCauley – This is problematic due to several reasons. The damage to the window interiors due to the means that the jambs and sashes were removed is such that I'm not certain how that could be fixed. It was suggested that it could possibly be cut cleaner, then wood added to make it level so that it would fit?*

*We don't know what that process is or how that would be done. We also don't know which windows were what, and I think that some of these windows would have qualified for replacement anyway had this come before the Commission before this was done.*

*I'm in favor for as many as possible being repaired as is feasible, but how do you resolve that? In addition, some of those windows were replacement windows, probably from the 1950's.*

456 Commissioner Glusac (To the Commission) – Under the list of the window frame inventory there  
457 are 17 – how many are not original? (J. Thacher – There is one that still has its original windows,  
458 so that would be 16). And of those 16 windows in the inventory (the frames), how many of those  
459 are the 1950's 'replacement' windows? (J. Thacher – Stated that there were twelve original  
460 windows (the bathroom window was also not original).

461  
462 Commissioner Glusac – And of those remaining 13 (or 12 without counting the bathroom window)  
463 – of those 12, were there any of those that were not repairable?  
464

465 Commissioner McCauley – There were 24 original sashes, and there are 19 remaining, so we're  
466 missing 5. We would have to go through the list again. We don't even know what goes where  
467

468 Commissioner Ramsburgh – It's difficult for the Commission to know how to do its work when we  
469 don't know which windows the sashes went with, etc. I believe personally that the jambs and the  
470 sills could be repaired. It would take a skilled carpenter to do this work. As far as following the  
471 Secretary of the Interior's guidelines, I don't think it would be appropriate to use the replacements  
472 – but we have no idea what goes where. I would like to see a contractor to match as many of  
473 these as possible and have the Review Committee look at those again and decide which can be  
474 repaired and which cannot. This is what my motion intended to get at.  
475

476 Commissioner Rozmarek – I have a concern with the replacements in that when you replace  
477 windows in a home, these are going to fit inside the frame, which are going to make the  
478 replacements smaller than the original windows and it will change the profile. Visually, the  
479 composition is going to be a hodge-podge and thereby misrepresenting history.  
480

481 (The Chair opened the discussion so that the contractor could participate in a lengthy  
482 Commissioner and Applicant discussion regarding the window dimensional problems and the loss  
483 of actual 'area' within the opening). Chair closes the hearing again when discussion is complete..  
484

485 **MOTION #2 \*(Withdrawn)**  
486

487 Moved by Commissioner Ramsburgh, Seconded by Commissioner McCauley, “**That the**  
488 **Commission deny the application at 542 S. Ashley Street, a contributing property in**  
489 **the Old West Side Historic District, to replace 17 wood windows with replacement**  
490 **windows, as proposed. The Commission finds that the removal of the original**  
491 **windows was inappropriate because it did not meet *The Secretary of the Interior's***  
492 ***Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, in**  
493 **particular ‘*Standard Number 6*’ and the ‘*Guidelines for Windows and Energy***  
494 ***Retrofitting.*’ The owner shall restore the removed window sashes and window**  
495 **frame elements to the condition they were in prior to removal within 90 days. In the**  
496 **event of missing sashes and materials, replacement windows will match the old in**  
497 **design, color, texture and other visual qualities and materials and may be approved**  
498 **at the staff level.”**  
499

500 \*Due to questions regarding window profile and sizes, and after the extensive discussion in  
501 relation to this motion, this motion was withdrawn by Commissioner Ramsburgh and agreed to by  
502 Commissioner McCauley. **MOTION #2 WITHDRAWN**  
503

**MOTION #3**

Moved by Commissioner Ramsburgh, Seconded by Commissioner McCauley, “**That the Commission postpone the application at 542 S Ashley Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to replace 17 wood windows with replacement windows, as proposed. The Commission finds that more information is necessary to facilitate a determination on the sashes and window opening sizes and proposed replacement windows. This will allow the petitioner to investigate this information and present it to the Commission at its next meeting on October 8, 2009, when this issue will be re-heard.**

**On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO POSTPONE – PASSED – UNANIMOUS  
Issue to be re-heard on October 8, 2009 – the next Regular Session of the HDC).**

**B - OLD BUSINESS – None.**

**C - NEW BUSINESS – None.**

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

**D - APPROVAL OF MINUTES –**

**D-1** Draft Minutes of the June, 2009 Regular Session – Not Available

**D-2** Draft Minutes of the July, 2009 Regular Session – Not Available

**D-3** Draft Minutes of the August, 2009 Regular Session – Not Available

**ALL POSTPONED UNTIL A FUTURE MEETING.**

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

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

**F - ASSIGNMENTS**

**F-1** October Review Committee – 5:00 pm review – Glusac and McCauley.

**G - STAFF ACTIVITIES REPORT**

**G-1 (J. Thacher) – Not available – Postponed until a future meeting.**

**J. Thacher – Stated that the Survey for OWS will be ready next month.**

**H - CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS –**

**H-1** Appoint Nominating Committee for upcoming Officer Election process.

Commissioner White – Volunteered

Commissioner Glusac – Volunteered

555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567

Commissioner Ramsburgh – Made note that he original OWSHD study was done in 1978. Since then, we've noted that it was amended in 89 and 91 and a more recent survey is being conducted to bring that information current. *(This clears up any comments made earlier in the meeting in which it was asserted that 'no study' had ever been performed).*

**I - COMMUNICATIONS**

**ADJOURNMENT**

*The Meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m. without objection.*

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

