



**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR
Thursday, March 11, 2010.**

Commissioners Present: Liza Rozmarek, Patrick McCauley, Kristina Glusac, Diane Giannola and Ellen Ramsburgh. **(5)**

Commissioners Absent: Commissioners Wallace and White **(2)**

Staff Present: Jill Thacher, Planner and Historic District Coordinator **(1)**

CALL TO ORDER: Vice Chair Ramsburgh called the Regular Session to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Quorum satisfied.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

- **Item G-2 added** – ***2009 HDC Annual Report.*** The Agenda was approved as amended.

A - HEARINGS

A-1 HDC10-020 – 619 E LIBERTY STREET - OWSHD

BACKGROUND: The brick commercial vernacular building at 613-617-619 East Liberty Street was built in two phases. The east section with the 617 and 619 addresses was built in 1909. The original occupant of 617 was Sweigand Barbers, and of 619 was Longman Photo. The portion containing 613 E Liberty was built in 1913 and first housed McDonald Confectioner. The two-story building features double-hung windows, a brick cornice, stone trim, and tapestry brick.

LOCATION: The site is located on the north side of East Liberty Street, west of South State Street and east of Maynard Street.

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to install a new 17” by 34” flag mounted sign on a brick pier near the existing storefront signage.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. The proposed sign is 16 ¾” tall, 34 ¼” wide, and 2” deep. It is essentially a white powder coated aluminum box with black vinyl lettering that says “American Apparel” on each side. The sign would be mounted flush with the brick pier, in mortar joints. The sign would be mounted at the same height as the existing row of three storefront signs, and the height matches the height of the existing American Apparel signs. It’s size and location are compatible with this storefront and neighboring ones. No lighting is proposed for the sign.
2. The proposed sign is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the remainder of the building and surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*, in particular standards 2 and 9.

Owner/Address: Harold E. Groves, 312 S State Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104

51 **Applicant/Address:** I-Signs Inc., 11177 E 8 Mile Rd., Warren, MI 48089

52
53 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Rozmarek and McCauley visited the site.

54
55 Commissioner Rozmarek – This is appropriate and will blend in well with the area.

56
57 Commissioner McCauley – Agrees with the staff report and Commissioner Rozmarek and thinks
58 that this is appropriate and should be approved.

59
60 **Applicant Presentation:** Mark of I-Signs, the representative for the applicant was present to
61 speak on behalf of the appeal.

62
63 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:** None.

64
65 Commissioner Ramsburgh - This will be mounted into the mortar joints? (Yes, per the landlord).
66 I'm assuming this was measured previously? (Yes, and I will contact the manufacturer for
67 dimensions to be certain of the correct dimensions of the sign).

68
69 **Audience Participation:** None.

70
71 **Discussion by the Commission:**

72
73 **MOTION**

74
75 Moved by Commissioner Giannola, Seconded by Commissioner McCauley, “**That the
76 Commission approve the application at 619 East Liberty Street, a contributing property in
77 the State Street Historic District, to install an aluminum blade sign, as proposed. The work
78 is compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest
79 of the building and the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s
80 Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, in
81 particular standards 2 and 9 and the site guidelines.***”

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

84
85
86 **A-2 HDC10-021 - 549 THIRD STREET - OWSHD**

87
88 **BACKGROUND:** This 1 ¾ story gable-front home appears in the 1898 City Directory as the
89 home of Erich Theios, a painter. After the turn of the century, a Mr. Briegel lived in the home for
90 over 20 years. The house has a covered front entry with turned porch posts. The house appears
91 on 1925 and 1931 Sanborn maps with the same porch & a small one-story addition on the rear.

92
93 **LOCATION:** East side of Third Street, north of West Madison and south of West Jefferson.

94
95 **APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to alter the roofline on the rear addition to
96 the house by raising one side 3 ½ feet.

97
98 **STAFF FINDINGS:**

99
100 1. 309 West William and its neighbor 307 to the east share a fairly wide curb cut, though
101 each lot has its own driveway. You can see from the photo below that the driveway at 309
102 slopes toward 307, which causes drainage problems. By installing a low retaining wall on

the side of the driveway near the house, this driveway at 309 would be made more level, and flush with the neighbor's drive.

2. The neighbor's driveway at 307 West William will remain unpaved for the time being, though they have expressed their intent to pave it at some point in the future.
3. The retaining wall is proposed to be built of unilock units, and would not exceed one foot in height.
4. The proposed driveway pavement and retaining wall are generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, in particular standard 2 and the guidelines for building sites.

Owner/Address/Applicant: John Dodge, 549 Third Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48103

Review Committee: Commissioners Rozmarek and McCauley visited the site.

Commissioner McCauley – Before I arrived at the site, I had trouble envisioning this roofline, but once I saw it, you can see the limitations on the space and what has been changed on the original house. I would agree with the staff report. To make this a more practical kitchen, this is the appropriate recommendation.

Commissioner Rozmarek – Concurs with the staff report and Commissioner McCauley. This is hidden behind the home and you would never see this modification from the street.

Applicant Presentation: John Dodge was present to answer any questions the Commission might have.

Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:

Commissioner McCauley – When we visited the site we spoke about the interior area – what are the dimensions of that space? (We call it the “L” and it is 6’ 3” x 14’).

Audience Participation: None.

Discussion by the Commission:

MOTION #1

Moved by Commissioner McCauley , Seconded by Commissioner Giannola, “**That the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 549 Third Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to alter a portion of the roof on the rear addition by raising one side 3 ½ feet, as proposed. The 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, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for new additions.**”

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

A-3 HDC10-022 - 309 W WILLIAM STREET - OWSHD

BACKGROUND: This 1 ½ story gable-fronter features a full-width front porch, clapboard on the lower story, and shingles above. The home was first occupied in 1917 by Daniel Eveland, a foreman at Hoover Steel Ball.

The current owners received an HDC Rehabilitation Award in 2009 for removing non-original siding and other restoration work on their home.

LOCATION: South side of West William Street, between Second and Third Streets.

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to pave the dirt driveway with concrete and install a low retaining wall.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. 309 West William and its neighbor 307 to the east share a fairly wide curb cut, though each lot has its own driveway. You can see from the photo below that the driveway at 309 slopes toward 307, which causes drainage problems. By installing a low retaining wall on the side of the driveway near the house, this driveway at 309 would be made more level, and flush with the neighbor's drive.
2. The neighbor's driveway at 307 West William will remain unpaved for the time being, though they have expressed their intent to pave it at some point in the future.
3. The retaining wall is proposed to be built of unilock units, and would not exceed one foot in height.
4. The proposed driveway pavement and retaining wall are generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, in particular standard 2 and the guidelines for building sites.

Owner/Address/Applicant: Michael and Kelly Graye, 309 West William Street, A2, MI 48103

Review Committee: Commissioners Rozmarek and McCauley visited the site.

Commissioner Rozmarek – Since they're lowering the elevation, there is no impact on the home and will be a tremendous improvement on the property and I support it.

Commissioner McCauley – Concurs with Commissioner Rozmarek and the staff report.

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Michael Graye was present to speak on behalf of the application.

Questions of the Applicant by the Commission: None.

Audience Participation:

1. Kristie Gilbert, 307 W. William (neighbor), spoke in support of this application. As mentioned, the owners are very good caretakers of this home. This will eliminate the mud and runoff and we hope the Commission will support this as well.

Discussion by the Commission:

MOTION

Moved by Commissioner Giannola and Seconded by Commissioner McCauley, “**That the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 309 West William Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to pave the driveway in concrete and build a retaining wall not to exceed twelve inches in height between the house and driveway. 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 standard 2 and the guidelines for building site.**”

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

A-4 HDC10-023 – 929 EAST ANN STREET – OFWHD

BACKGROUND: This small, single-story, wood framed, vernacular commercial building was first occupied in 1916 by Draper Grocery. By 1929 it was Malis Grocery, and later became Ann Street grocery. It served for a time as a uniform store in the 1970s, then as a union office. It is now home to a Jimmy John’s restaurant.

A staff approval (HDC09-129) was granted in September, 2009 to replace the east wall of the basement.

LOCATION: The site is located on the north side of East Ann Street, east of North Ingalls and west of Glen Avenue.

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to install a new door in a new opening on the rear elevation, construct a rear landing and stair, and replace the rear basement wall.

STAFF FINDINGS:

1. A new interior stair is proposed to be built to replace the short doorway located on the rear of the building on the basement wall. A new basement wall would be installed on the rear elevation. The proposed new doorway would open onto a wood landing with wood stairs in a simple and appropriate design. The door shown is paneled and the applicant emailed staff that the material would be metal.
2. Removing the current exterior door, replacing the rear basement wall, and building an interior basement stair are appropriate modifications for modern use of the building and will allow access to underutilized interior space in the basement.
3. The proposed work on the rear elevation is generally compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*, in particular standards 2, 5, 9 and 10, and the guidelines for entrances/porches.

259 **Owner/Address:** Patton Ann Street Properties., LLC, 24 Frank Lloyd Wright Dr, Suite A3, A2,
260 MI 48105

261
262 **Applicant/Address:** CB Custom Homes, 2686 Heather Way, A2, MI 48104

263
264 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Rozmarek and McCauley visited the site.

265
266 Commissioner McCauley - In general, we have not been in support of 'new' openings in buildings,
267 but considering that this needs this extra egress access, this is the solution to provide a much
268 more functional and much safer building.

269
270 Commissioner Rozmarek – Added that the current door being removed is plywood and not
271 historic and that the needed egress should take precedence. This is a good improvement and
272 she supports the application.

273
274 **Applicant Presentation:**

275
276 Mr.. Carl Babcock, General Contractor for Patton-Ann Street Properties was present to speak on
277 behalf of the appeal.

278
279 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

280
281 Commissioner Rozmarek – Mentioned that the drawings included fineals at the corner posts. I
282 would leave those out as those suggest that those might have been existing. Those are only on
283 the elevation drawings. (No, those were artistic license by the Archtect).

284
285 Commissioner Ramsburgh – The retaining wall next to the existing door has a crack in it. Is that
286 secure? (We have not investigated that as it was beyond the scope of our application. The stair
287 is going to abut that wall, so as we get into the work, if that needs repair, we can fix that.)

288
289 Commissioner McCauley – Will the current basement door be blocked in? (J. Thacher – It is in
290 this application to replace the rear wall which would mean that that door would no longer exist).

291
292 J. Thacher – Will you be leaving the meter on the back? (The meter will remain, but where the
293 meter glass is, the elevation of the deck will be equal to that, so the new meter location will be up
294 3 feet and over a foot, out of the way of the new landing, next to the A/C units).

295
296 **Audience Participation:** None.

297
298 **Discussion by the Commission:**

299
300 **MOTION**

301
302 Moved by Commissioner Rozmarek, Seconded by Commissioner McCauley, “**That the**
303 **Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 929 E Ann**
304 **Street, a contributing property in the Old Fourth Ward Historic District, to install a**
305 **new door in a new opening on the rear elevation, construct a rear landing and stair,**
306 **and replace the rear basement wall, as proposed. The work is compatible in exterior**
307 **design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and**
308 **the surrounding area and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for***
309 ***Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, in particular**
310 **standards 2, 5, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for entrances/porches.”**

311
312 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – *UNANIMOUS (Application Approved)***
313

314
315 **A-5 HDC10-025 – 633 FIFTH STREET - OWSHD**
316

317 **BACKGROUND:** This 1 ¾ story gable-front brick home features decorative contrasting brick
318 window surrounds and a full width front porch with contrasting brick porch posts and inset
319 cobblestones on the front wall. It first appears in the 1926 City Directory as the home of Arthur
320 Hoppe, a painter. The house is part of a group of three structures that were originally on one lot,
321 but have since been divided into three lots. The structural tile home next door to the south was
322 built earlier, in 1911, and the long garage/residence behind the two homes was built in 1928.
323

324 The 1931 Sanborn map notes (incorrectly) that the brick garage behind 633 Fifth Street is
325 constructed of structural tile. The homeowner notes that the garage is double-layered, which the
326 review committee should investigate at the site visit.
327

328 **LOCATION:** East side of Fifth Street, between West Madison and West Davis Streets.
329

330 **APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to add a second story to a one-car brick
331 garage.
332

333 **STAFF FINDINGS:**
334

- 335 1. The garage was built around the time that the house was built, in the late 1920s, and staff
336 considers it to be a contributing structure to the Old West Side Historic District. Adding a
337 second story would alter the structure to the point that the building is radically changed and
338 would no longer contribute to the district.
339
- 340 2. This group of five masonry structures (two houses, two garages, and the long
341 garage/residence across the back) are a unique cluster of buildings that complement each
342 other in style, materials, and massing. Though they are not longer in common ownership,
343 their relationship must be considered when proposing alterations on any of the lots.
344
- 345 3. If the commission were to determine that the garage is not a contributing structure, the
346 simple design proposed for the addition would be appropriate. The materials for the siding,
347 windows, and door are not listed in the application and need to be specified by the
348 homeowner before a Certificate of Appropriateness should be considered. The height of
349 the proposed addition is lower than the house and similar to the height of the long
350 garage/residence to the rear. The bulk of the addition would not be visible from the street,
351 and would not negatively impact the residence to the north, which sits on a formerly double
352 lot. (Early Sanborn maps show a house between this one and the gable-roofed house to
353 the north.) On this particular lot, a second floor garage addition would be preferable to an
354 addition on the rear of the house. The proposed addition would be used for storage and
355 have electricity but no plumbing.
356
- 357 4. It should be noted that they greyed-out a second-floor deck connection between the house
358 and garage as conceptual, and is not part of this application. The deck shown at ground
359 level between the house and garage already exists.
360
- 361 5. The proposed addition of a second story on the garage is not compatible in exterior
362 design, arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the

363 surrounding area and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for*
364 *Rehabilitation*, in particular standards 2, 5, 9 and 10, and the guidelines for new additions.

365
366 **Owner/Address/Applicant:** Thomas Wagner & Martha Hashimoto, 633 Fifth St., A2, MI 48103

367
368 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Rozmarek and McCauley visited the site.

369
370 Commissioner Rozmarek – Noted that the landmark beech tree in the back is on the neighbor's
371 lot, and not certain if the applicant has spoken to the neighbor about trimming a large branch off
372 of that tree in order to build this. In addition, the new design is slightly incompatible with the
373 existing buildings. If the proposed dormer were not a gable and a shed roof dormer instead, it
374 would be more compatible. The existing buildings have shed roofs, not gables. This proposed
375 plan leaves a lopsided geometric effect. This is a difficult application, as it is part of our
376 responsibility to protect the landscape, in particular the two landmark trees are a part of that.

377
378 Commissioner McCauley – Also felt it was a tough decision until the site visit. The entire area is
379 unique in an area of unique sites. The deciding factor for my opposition to this is that staff stated
380 that this would no longer be a contributing structure to the district if it were altered again. While I
381 can see the need for space and we have approved some demolition for the addition to homes,
382 this is troubling to lose the contributing structure designation.

383
384 **Applicant Presentation:** Mr. Tom Wagner, owner, was present to speak on behalf of the
385 appeal. He stated that there are similar projects in the area that have been approved, in
386 particular on Jefferson and Sixth Streets. He stated that that they went to great lengths to get
387 Architect Carl Hueter to draw up a sensitive plan that we didn't feel was overbearing or
388 inappropriate. If you have an existing property, it's more difficult to change it, but it is frustrating.

389
390 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:**

391
392 Commissioner Glusac – Are you planning to do anything with the existing masonry? Has there
393 been a structural report done to evaluate whether this could support the addition? (No, that
394 would come into play with the building permit). That information would be needed here for our
395 information first. Are there any cracks currently in this foundation? (No).

396
397 What is the plan for the new ceiling joists on the first floor ceiling? Is that being ripped out? (Yes,
398 as that has been trouble for us with the flat roof that has been fixed every five years). How will
399 that impact the masonry? (There is rotted wood on the roof and it's resting on a flat surface that
400 is two layers of brick or 'structural tile' that is existing).

401
402 Commissioner McCauley – The roof was in very bad shape as we witnessed at the site visit.

403
404 Commissioner Glusac – Asked additional comments about the plans and their relation to the site.

405
406 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Do I understand that there are existing footings that will support the
407 weight of the addition? (We're not sure. We had it evaluated a few years ago).

408
409 Commissioner Glusac – Who will the Architect of Record be? You stated Carl Hueter, but it
410 states Marc Rueter on the plans? (Yes, I misspoke. The Architect is Marc Rueter).

411
412 **Audience Participation:**

- 413 1. Julia Suttig, Resident on South Fourth Avenue – Asked what the exact purpose of the
414 addition would be, storage? (Commissioner Ramsburg – That is the main purpose). I

415 wonder if there is a way to remove the problematic roof and install the pitched roof
416 which would allow for storage and not affect the roof.
417

418 J. Thacher – It would be possible to make a small gabled roof, but anything else would be in
419 violation of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Going up higher would probably not solve
420 the situation.

421
422 The speaker also asked about relation of “Landmark” trees to historic homes and the
423 Commission’s roll in that. (Ms. Thacher explained that these are a consideration for the
424 applications, but are actually covered in other Ordinances within the city).
425

426 **Discussion by the Commission:**

427
428 Commissioner McCauley – A point I raised earlier regarding demo of garages. There was a
429 home on Mulholland that we allowed the demo on? (J. Thacher – Yes, an application to demo
430 the existing and build the same). I’m wondering what the difference would be between those and
431 other applications where we’ve allowed that? Obviously, it’s a unique site and it is rare to find a
432 brick garage at all.
433

434 J. Thacher – That is a big part of my answer. It is a rare brick garage/structure and this should be
435 considered in relationship with the surrounding buildings and neighborhood. The unique
436 condition of a flat roofed brick garage in good condition (as opposed to the garage on Mulholland
437 which was not brick and was not in good condition) is something I feel very strongly about. By
438 adding a second story, I no longer think this would be a contributing structure under the Secretary
439 of the Interior’s Standards. It’s a unique feature of the site, the neighborhood and this cluster of
440 buildings, which is why I recommended denial.
441

442 Commissioner Glusac - The one on Mulholland was in very bad condition and a complete
443 demolition (unlike this) and I don’t think you can compare the two.
444

445 Commissioner Rozmarek – This is essentially in the front yard, and we need to take that into
446 consideration as well. As much as I can understand the need for more space, I think this garage
447 is a contributing structure.
448

449 J. Thacher – The residence behind ‘fronts’ Turner Park Court.
450

451 Commissioner Glusac – I’m generally in support of the project, but I think there are many missing
452 details in the plans that would have to be brought back to the Commission. I think it is
453 appropriate to put a second floor on this structure and I like that the design keeps the integrity of
454 the original garage door opening and the dormer distinguishes that as the addition which is
455 different. I think there are too many questions on what is labeled the East façade on the
456 drawings (that I asked about earlier). When you look on plan, there looks like there is a new
457 masonry wall and then something has been crossed out? I would need more detail and am in
458 support of this, but not with the currently submitted plans.
459

460 Commissioner Giannola – The one element that is swaying me is turning the Contributing
461 structure to a Non-Contributing structure. If it were being torn down and rebuilt, that would also
462 be a different situation. There needs to be more reasoning other than needing more space. I am
463 generally in support but not without more information and justification.
464
465

466 Commissioner Rozmarek – The project is too large in scale. It needs to meld better with what is
467 existing. I agree that I would need more information.

468
469 Commissioner Ramsburgh – I visited the site because the pictures presented didn't show enough
470 information to make a decision. This garage 'rounds out' this complex of buildings. This frames
471 everything and is a unique site. The garage itself is a contributing building that is so much a part
472 of the house itself, so the burden of having a unique site to me means that a drastic change
473 would adversely affect all of the buildings in the area, not just that area or that home. I can't
474 support the application due to those reasons.

475
476 Commissioner McCauley – Concurs with Commissioner Ramsburgh. (Took a vote to re-open the
477 discussion with the Petitioner and the Commission to accommodate the following question:)

478
479 Commissioner Giannola – Asked if the area between the house and the garage be altered
480 instead? (Petitioner stated that they didn't want to alter the house. They like the idea of going
481 'up' instead of 'out' to add to the property).

482
483 **MOTION**

484
485 Moved by Commissioner Glusac , Seconded by Commissioner Giannola, "**That the**
486 **Commission deny the application at 633 Fifth Street, a contributing property in the**
487 **Old West Side Historic District, to construct a second floor on a single-car garage,**
488 **as proposed. The work is not compatible in exterior design, arrangement, texture,**
489 **material and relationship to the rest of the garage and the house and the**
490 **surrounding area and does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for***
491 ***Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, in particular**
492 **standards 2, 5, 9, and 10 and the guidelines for additions."**

493
494 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO DENY - PASSED – UNANIMOUS (Application Denied)**

495
496 **B - OLD BUSINESS – None**

497
498 **C - NEW BUSINESS**

499
500 **C-1 2009 Annual Report from Cobblestone Farms**

501
502 Cobblestone Farms representative George Taylor (President of the Cobblestone Farms Assn.)
503 was present to speak about the report. He stated that the Commission was provided with the
504 report and financial statements as well as their latest newsletter which is now back in circulation.

505
506 He summarized the report with various events, functions and fundraisers.

507
508 **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION – GENERAL (Limited to 3 Minutes per Speaker) – None.**

509
510 **D - APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

511
512 **D-1 2009-10-08 Minutes – Approved as Amended**

513 **D-2 2009-11-12 Minutes – Approved as Presented**

514 **D-3 2009-12-10 Minutes – Approved as Presented**

515 **D-4 2010-01-14 Minutes – Approved as Amended**

516

517

Without objection, the Draft minutes of the October 8, November 12, December 10, 2009 and January 14, 2010 Regular Sessions were approved.

E - REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS – None.

F - ASSIGNMENTS

F-1 Commissioners Giannola and McCauley – Monday, April 5th, 2010 for the April 8th, 2010 Regular Session at 5:00 p.m..

G - STAFF ACTIVITIES REPORT

G-1 February 2010 – Applications in February, five of those came before the Commission and all of those were approved.

G-2 2009 HDC Annual Report – Handed out for review only. This will be discussed at the April meeting.

H - CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS – None.

I - COMMUNICATIONS –

I-1 - Study Committee Report

Commissioner Glusac - In regard to the report for the proposed new historic districts, since I will not be in attendance at that meeting, I'll give you some comments regarding that report.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – Mentioned that she, too, would not be in attendance at the next meeting. She asked if a 'sub-committee' of the HDC should get together and put all the thoughts together? Has anyone else done a report and have knowledge of ways to compile this information? This is a preliminary report, so the next step is receiving comments, then in May there is a public hearing, then a final "Report" is written.

J. Thacher – It then goes to City Council at that point.

Commissioner McCauley – Just the comments given here tonight will help me and the rest of the study committee.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – Stated that she will make a motion to produce a 'general statement' from the HDC on their behalf.

ADJOURNMENT

The Meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m. without objection.

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