



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

**Commissioners Present:** Sarah Wallace, Liza Rozmarek, Patrick McCauley, Robert White and Kristina Glusac; Commission Ramsburgh arrived at 8:01 p.m.(6)

**Commissioners Absent:** Diane Giannola (1)

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

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

**ROLL CALL:** Quorum satisfied.

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:** The Agenda was approved as presented.

**A - HEARINGS**

**A-1 HDC10-009 – 517 KRAUSE STREET - OWSHD**

**BACKGROUND:** This two story gable-front house was first occupied in 1927 by Otto Koch, an installer at Faust-Kennedy-Potter Co. Krause Street has six lots, two of which have houses built in the late 1890s, two in the nineteen-teens, and one in 1961.

**LOCATION:** The site is located at the end of Krause Street, on the south side, west of Third Street and abutting a large university parking lot.

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to add a two-story addition with a shed roof and cementitious board and batten siding on the rear of the house.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. The existing house is approximately 1,050 square feet from exterior wall to exterior wall (not livable space, which would be less). The proposed addition is approximately 920 square feet, making the addition nearly equal to the size of the existing house. In most cases this might be considered too large, but this application has several factors that should be considered. a) The lot is deep, 47' by 166'. There will still be roughly 35' of open space between the rear of this addition and a utility/storage building located toward the back of the lot. (See site plan drawing.) b) The house sits at a much lower elevation than the houses to the rear on West Liberty. As a result, the houses to the rear will likely not be able to see the new addition over the utility building, which sit halfway up the hill between Krause and West Liberty. c) Immediately to the west is a very large University of Michigan parking lot. The portion of the addition that juts out beyond the plane of the house is located on the side next to the parking lot. d) The hyphen connection on the second floor helps define the addition and reduce its mass, and the shed roofline keeps its height to a minimum.

If this addition is approved by the HDC, it is staff's opinion that the size of the house in relation to the lot and neighborhood is at a maximum and no future additions should be considered for this house unless this addition is first removed.

2. The windows on the house are regularly spaced but of various sizes and shapes, including square windows on the front and both side elevations. The square windows proposed for the addition are proportionate to the ones on the side elevations and their placement is such that they align horizontally with existing windows on the side elevations. Three of the four wood windows on the rear elevation are replacements, and the rest on the house are original.
3. Staff feels that this proposed addition is a good example of the Secretary of the Interior's Guideline that states "Design for the new work may be contemporary." The board and batten siding is a very traditional cladding but in this case contributes to the contemporary design of the addition. The standing seam steel roof will only be minimally visible on the first floor connector. The addition would likely look awkward if clad in wood shingles to match the house.
4. Features of the rear elevation of the house that would be removed for the addition include a rear door, non-original sliding patio doors, and one second floor window. The other second floor window (non-original) would be retained because of the second-floor hyphen.
5. The design of the handrail was not included in the packet. Staff proposes reviewing it before building permits are issued.
6. The proposed addition 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 new additions and building site.

**Owner/Address/Applicant:** Charles Smith & Courtney Piotrowski, 517 Krause Street, A2, MI

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

Commissioner Rozmarek - There will be no misinterpretation of history with this design. I agree with staff that this is an excellent example of contemporary design. It will be a nice addition.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – Not Present.

**Applicant Presentation:**

Charles Smith and Courtney Piotrowski, owners of this property, were present to speak on behalf of the application. Mr. Smith stated that he wanted to add to the report that there are two mature maple trees that obscure any possible view from West Liberty. We spent a lot of time making sure that this complied with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. With the large parking lot next door, moving their bedroom to the other side of the home will get them away from the noise created by the YMCA that will be next door.

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

**Audience Participation:**

Mr. Glen Zigler, neighbor, stated he has been in this neighborhood since the 1970's and supports the project. *(Note: There were three other letters of support for this project that were received and recorded by staff.)*

**Discussion by the Commission:**

Commissioner Glusac – Commented on the design aspects.

**MOTION**

Moved by Commissioner Wallace, Seconded by Commissioner White, **“That the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 517 Krause Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to add a two-story addition with a shed roof and cementitious board and batten siding on the rear of the house, on the condition that staff reviews the handrail design before building permits are issued. As conditioned, 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 2,5,9, and 10 and the guidelines for new additions and building site.”**

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

**A-2      HDC10-010 – 211 CREST AVENUE - OWSHD**

**BACKGROUND:** This two-story house has stucco on the first floor and vinyl on the second floor, a full-width hipped front porch with low stucco walls, and three-over-one windows. According to Polk’s City Directory, the house was first occupied in 1921 by Agatha Steep, widow of Israel G., and Elmer J. Steep and Clara K. Steep, a clerk at Mack & Co, were boarders.

The application states there used to be a garage behind the house that was removed in the 70’s.

**LOCATION:** East side of Crest Avenue, south of West Washington and north of Buena Vista.

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to construct a single-story garage, construct a fence in the backyard, replace the front and rear porch steps, replace a storm door, re-grade around the foundation, pave the driveway, and remove an original window on the rear elevation.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. The proposed garage is an appropriate design and size (one car) and uses compatible materials, including composite trim and vinyl siding to match the siding on the upper story of the house. (The lower story of the house is stucco.) It would be located in the rear corner of the backyard.
2. The proposed front and rear stairs are an appropriate design. Information is not given on a newel post for the handrail. Staff would like to review this for design compatibility prior to the issuance of building permits.

- 151 3. The picket fence and driveway gate are an appropriate design. The wood storm door  
152 would be replaced with one to match. The grading around the foundation is necessary to  
153 preserve the stucco and to allow the side door to open freely.  
154
- 155 4. There are remnants of a two-track concrete driveway from the street to the front of the  
156 house, but the tracks do not extend to the back of the lot where the garage used to be  
157 located. If the two track was more intact staff would recommend keeping it, but under the  
158 circumstances it is appropriate to remove what's left and install a concrete driveway.  
159
- 160 5. The window proposed to be removed on the second floor of the rear elevation is in a  
161 closet. Staff has seen other houses of this era with similar square closet windows. Next to  
162 the closet is a bathroom that is fairly dysfunctional (the toilet is too close to the tub wall,  
163 necessitating sitting a little sideways) and the owners want to combine the two spaces.  
164 (See bathroom floorplan.) Pushing the bathtub against one of the outer walls in the  
165 combined space will place it either below the rear square window or a larger window on  
166 the south wall. The owners desire to remove the rear window to keep it out of the shower  
167 and improve the bathroom layout.  
168

169 Staff's opinion is that this original window is a character defining feature of the house, and  
170 this is reflected in the suggested motion below. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards  
171 recommend the alteration of non-character-defining interior spaces to accommodate new  
172 uses of a building, and staff agrees that the bathroom and closet are non-character-  
173 defining spaces. If the Commission finds that the window is not a character-defining  
174 feature of the house, it could approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for this work.  
175

- 176 6. The proposed single-story garage, fence and gate, front and rear porch steps, storm door  
177 replacement, re-grading, and driveway paving are generally compatible in exterior design,  
178 arrangement, texture, material and relationship to the rest of the building and the  
179 surrounding area and meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, in  
180 particular standards 2,5,9 and 10, and the guidelines for building sites.  
181

182 The proposed window removal on the rear elevation does not meet the *Secretary of the*  
183 *Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* standard number 2 or the guidelines for windows.  
184

185 **Owner/Address/Applicant:** John & Christine Martel, 211 Crest Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48103  
186

187 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Rozmarek and Ramsburgh visited the site.  
188

189 Commissioner Rozmarek – We measured the bath area, and any way you slice it, the window  
190 has to be in the middle – a very inconvenient location – in the middle of the tub. The two-track drive  
191 is at the elevation where the dirt is blocking some of the door. This was probably altered due to  
192 an addition. The door is rotted due to this. Front steps are uneven and unsafe. Evidence of an  
193 old garage on site previously – foundation is still there.  
194

195 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Not Present.  
196

197 **Applicant Presentation:**  
198

199 John & Christine Martel, owners of this property were present to speak on behalf of the  
200 application. They spoke about the problems they experienced with the bathroom window.  
201

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

**Audience Participation:** None.

**Discussion by the Commission:**

**MOTION #1**

Moved by Commissioner Rozmarek, Seconded by Commissioner White, “**that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the portion of the application at 211 Crest Avenue, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to construct a single-car garage, construct a fence and gate in the backyard, replace the front and rear porch steps, replace a storm door, re-grade near the foundation, and pave the driveway, on the condition that the handrail and newel post design for the front steps be approved by staff before building permits are issued. As conditioned, 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 building sites.”**

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

Commissioner McCauley - Commented that the Commission doesn’t normally like to encourage new openings for windows in Historic homes, but in this case it is necessary.

**MOTION #2**

Moved by Commissioner Rozmarek, Seconded by Commissioner White, “**that the Commission approve the portion of the application at 211 Crest Avenue to remove a window on the rear elevation. The proposed work meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, in particular standard 2, or the guidelines for windows.”**

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

**A-3      HDC10-011 – 512 FOURTH STREET - OWSHD**

**BACKGROUND:** This one-and-a-half story house has many classic craftsman features, including deep bracketed eaves with exposed rafters, wide shed-roof dormers centered on both sides of the roof, three over one windows, and a full width gabled front porch. The house was originally constructed before 1900 with a single story. Between 1916 and 1925, according to Sanborn maps, the house was added on to or rebuilt as a two-story dwelling with the full-width front porch and a small rear porch on the north side. More history has been provided by the applicant in the packet.

**LOCATION:** West side of Fourth Street, south of West Jefferson and north of West Madison.

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to demolish an existing rear addition and add a two-story addition on the rear of the house, a bump-out addition on the south side of the original house, a skylight on the south elevation roof, paver patios on the south and west sides.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

- 1 The existing house is 1,351 square feet per the submitted drawings. The proposed addition adds 298 square feet to the first floor and 475 square feet to the second floor for a total of 773 square feet, or an additional 57%. Staff has included the one-story addition on the rear as part of the original house when calculating the comparative square footage since it existed before the house was converted to two stories between 1916 and 1925. There will also be a new basement beneath the addition with egress windows in a concrete well on the south wall.
2. Most of the two-story addition will extend approximately two feet beyond the plane of the north wall. Staff would prefer that the rear addition step inward against the back of the house instead of outward to make the addition more subordinate to the house.
3. Staff is not always supportive of bumpouts, but the one proposed for the south elevation ties in well with the historic design of the house and helps mitigate the elongation that the proposed addition adds to the house by breaking up the long south wall. It will result in the loss of a pair of character-defining windows.
4. Other features of the house that will be removed by the additions are the current rear addition and a second floor rear window. All of the windows are presumed to be original. Since the current rear addition is of substantially lower quality workmanship than the two-story house, and since it does not reflect the rest of the house's craftsman character or help explain the earlier one-story dwelling, staff feels its removal is appropriate.
5. The proportions and placement of the windows on the addition, which align with existing windows on the side elevations, are complementary to the house. The placement of the proposed skylight is appropriately situated behind a shed dormer toward the rear of the original house.
6. The addition will be distinguished by foundation materials and the preservation of the rear roof corners. The roof ridge will be continuous from the house to the addition. Staff generally prefers a lower roofline on the addition than on the existing house, rather than a continuation of the existing ridge height, both to distinguish the new roofline from the old and to help keep the addition subordinate to the original house.
7. The house is situated in the far northeast corner of a 66' wide lot. As a result, more of the south elevation of the house is visible from the street than on most houses. The lot is large enough to support the proposed addition without unduly infilling the open space or negatively impacting the neighbors. The historic relationship between buildings, landscape features, and open space is adequately retained.
8. Staff had concerns about whether the addition is limited enough in size and scale in relationship to the historic house, but the design is simple and compatible and generally preserves the integrity of the historic house, and the spaciousness of the site helps prevent the appearance of an overly-large addition shoehorned into a small lot.
9. The proposed two-story addition, bumpout, skylight, and patios 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.

306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354

**Owner/Address/Applicant:** Jeffrey Hogg & Amy Frontier, 512 Fourth Street, A2, MI 48103

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

Commissioner Rozmarek – The addition on the existing house – the foundation is crumbling. The chimney demolition is rather odd, because it has old and new brick. The roofline – I prefer it stepped down. The north side of the building we don't have the old roofline notch and the gable and addition that crashes into the new addition. It doesn't play into the language of the house of the front elevation. They stated they would use hardy plank, but the packet says cedar shake? I'd like clarification of that from the applicant. The aluminum siding going over the current siding will eventually come off – how will that be treated? There needs to be a difference between the old and the new.

Commissioner Ramsburgh – Not Present.

**Applicant Presentation:**

Mark Rueter, architect and the owners were present to speak on behalf of the appeal. The owners stated that they have outgrown their home and need to enlarge the space. The house is narrow – only 20' wide.

Mark Rueter – The footprint of the home is narrow. We need to add bedrooms and the width of the house determines what we can work with. We decided to stay within this footprint as much as possible, hence the 'bump outs.' The issue regarding the roofline – there is a possibility of a cut out to differentiate the difference in the addition (along with a flat roof). This would cause water roofing problems, and we opted to leave the line continuous. Regarding the siding, we considered the two materials discussed, and cement board was cheaper and has longevity, is a green product and has been used on other historic homes. That is a friendly amendment to our proposal.

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

\*Commissioner McCauley - What was the point of the bump out on the south side? (Rueter – The kitchen looks out south, and this bump-out accommodates a counter and a range and allows for an eating area.) *\*(Feels we may be allowing the two components to blend in too well).*

Commissioner Rozmarek – How will you handle the transition of the siding underneath when you remove the aluminum siding at the bump-out? (Rueter – When the addition is done, the detail in construction would show sheathing, and instead of siding, more sheathing and new aluminum siding. When it was redone, you could remove that and piece in new or old siding to match). When there are those transitions there is usually a piece of trim to make a clean break. (Rueter – It is such a small piece (4'), and we chose not to do it that way).

Commissioner Ramsburgh *(arrived at 8:01 p.m. and voiced her concerns about the roof lines and the symmetry of the home.)*

**Audience Participation:** None.

**Discussion by the Commission:****MOTION**

Moved by Commissioner Glusac, Seconded by Commission White, “that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 512 Fourth Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to add a two-story addition, bump-out, skylight, and patios 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 ROLL CALL Vote – MOTION PASSED – 4 Yes, 2 No**

**Yes (4)** – Commissioners Glusac, White, Wallace and McCauley.

**No (2)** – Commissioners Rozmarek and Ramsburgh.

**A-4      HDC10-012 – 310 SECOND STREET - OWSHD**

**BACKGROUND:** 310 Second Street, a simple 1 ½ story gable front with cornice returns, was built before 1853. It was moved to this site in 1898 from the southwest corner of Liberty and Second next door. The applicant thinks the rear addition was added around the time of the move.

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

In February of 1994, a certificate of appropriateness was issued by the Commission to repair and reconstruct the front porch. In July and August of 2009, a certificate of appropriateness was issued to restore the barn, replace its windows with replicas, install a new sliding front door, and increase the structure’s foundation an additional 18”.

**LOCATION:** West side of Second Street, south of West Liberty and north of West William.

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks approval to demolish the barn and rebuild a replica with the increased foundation height previously approved by the HDC.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. After receiving a certificate of appropriateness in 2009 to raise the barn up 18”, rebuild the south wall, and replicate the windows, the owner attempted to move forward with plans to restore the barn. John Stafford of Stafford Carpentry expressed concerns that the building had deteriorated to a point where it is no longer safe, and the owner had Carl Hueter, AIA, perform a structural evaluation dated December 21, 2009 (which is included in the packet.)

- 405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420
2. Staff visited the site in December and Stafford pointed out the problems. The roof joists are rotted to a point that shoring them with new materials will be inadequate, the bond beam along the front of the structure is more deteriorated than originally thought, and the wall framing is failing. Staff inquired about reusing the siding and Stafford said it's too dry and brittle to remove and reinstall without it falling apart.
  3. The barn is a historic feature of the neighborhood and Old West Side Historic district. Staff feels that enough of the building's original fabric is deteriorated beyond repair to allow the demolition and replication of the barn. The amount of intact original materials that could be reused is not meaningful enough to tell the building's story. Therefore, staff would encourage but not require their inclusion on the rebuilt structure where possible. Replacement of the barn with one that matches the old in design, color, texture, and materials meets *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, in particular standard 6 and the guidelines for building site.

421 **Owner/Address:** 403 W Liberty LLC, Jan Muhleman, 213 W Liberty, Ann Arbor, MI 48104

422  
423 **Applicant:** Carl O. Hueter, 1321 Franklin Blvd., Ann Arbor, MI 48103

424  
425 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Rozmarek and Ramsburgh visited the site.

426  
427 Commissioner Rozmarek – Added that the roof joists are actual 2 x 4's and the sill plates are completely rotted, and if this were moved, it would collapse anyway. I support the project.

428  
429  
430 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Concurs with Commission Rozmarek and also supports the project. Would like to ask Mr. Hueter if the back wall is salvageable. She stated concern about how close the rebuild would be to other structures.

431  
432  
433  
434 **Applicant Presentation:**

435  
436 Mr. Carl Hueter was present to speak on behalf of the appeal. He stated that all are familiar with old barns that are ready to fall down, and this one is at that state. The north wall appears to be the original structure (he explained the pros and cons of replacing any materials). As to the proximity of the buildings, the land was split, and this makes less buildable area.

437  
438  
439  
440  
441 J. Thacher – Stated that if this is approved, there may be a Zoning Board of Appeals variance may be needed due to the proximity of the buildings.

442  
443  
444 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:** None.

445  
446 **Audience Participation:** None.

447  
448 **Discussion by the Commission:**

449  
450 Commissioner McCauley – Asked staff about reproductions in materials in conjunction with the Secretary of Interior's Standards. (*J. Thacher – When this was originally presented, the property owner stated he could take the building down and build a new one, but we don't actually condone that, but standard 6 states otherwise, and it is a feature of the neighborhood. Since it's a secondary building, I've treated this differently as opposed to the house.*)

451  
452  
453  
454  
455

**MOTION**

Moved by Commissioner McCauley, Seconded by Commissioner White, “**That the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 310 Second Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to demolish the barn and rebuild a replica with an 18” increase in foundation height, as proposed. 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 and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, in particular standard 6 and the guidelines for building site.”**

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

**A-5      HDC10-014 – 540 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET - OWSHD**

**BACKGROUND:** This two-story gable-fronter features Queen Ann trim such as fishscale shingles in the front and porch gables and a full-width front porch with turned posts and decorative brackets. It was first occupied in 1902 by Samuel A. Stadel, a carpenter, and his wife Sophia, according to City Directories.

In 2001 the HDC issued a Certificate of Appropriateness for a single-story addition on the north rear side of the house, an open rear porch, and a carport.

**LOCATION:** Southwest corner of South Seventh Street and Lutz Avenue.

**APPLICATION:** The applicant seeks HDC approval to add a 10’ wide gabled dormer with a double-hung window to the rear (west) side of the addition and reroof the house.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

1. The 10’ wide dormer is proposed on the back of an addition that was built in 2001. The pitch of the roof matches the other west facing gables on the house, and its proportions are consistent and compatible with the rest of the house. The new work will be visible from Lutz Avenue. The window is wood or clad wood and the wood trim and siding match the existing house, all of which are appropriate. The proposed dormer is compatible in design with the existing house and its location on the least-character-defining elevation of the house is appropriate.
2. The roof is currently dark asphalt shingles and is proposed to be replaced with the same.
3. The applicant has been advised that if the proposed window does not meet egress requirements and the building department requires this, a new application will have to be made to the HDC.
4. The proposed dormer and roofing 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 9 and 10, and the guidelines for new additions and windows.

**Owner/Address:** Gillian White & James Wollard, 507 Detroit St #1, A2, MI 48104

508 **Applicant:** Nicholas Durrie, 1444 Jewitt Street, A2, MI 48104

509  
510 **Review Committee:** Commissioners Rozmarek and Ramsburgh visited the site.

511  
512 Commissioner Ramsburgh – Staff’s report is thorough and the drawings are representative and  
513 meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Supports the project.

514  
515 Commissioner Rozmarek – Added that this is an addition to the addition and is not actually even  
516 the original house.

517  
518 **Applicant Presentation:** Not Present.

519  
520 **Questions of the Applicant by the Commission:** None.

521  
522 **Audience Participation:** None.

523  
524 **Discussion by the Commission:**

525  
526 **MOTION**

527  
528 Moved by Commissioner Ramsburgh, Seconded by Commissioner White, “**That the**  
529 **Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at 540 S**  
530 **Seventh Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to add**  
531 **a 10’ wide dormer on the rear elevation of the addition and reroof the house as**  
532 **proposed. The proposed work is compatible in exterior design, arrangement,**  
533 **texture, material and relationship to the rest of the house and the surrounding area**  
534 **and meets *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and***  
535 ***Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, in particular standards 9 and 10 and**  
536 **the guidelines for new additions and windows.”**

537  
538 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – *UNANIMOUS (Application Approved)***

539  
540 **B - OLD BUSINESS – None**

541  
542 **C - NEW BUSINESS**

543  
544 **C-1 HDC Retreat Planning**

545  
546 J. Thacher – Stated that for the past few years the Commission has been meeting on one  
547 Saturday per year from 9 a.m. until 1 p.m. General discussion, tentative date of March 20<sup>th</sup> at the  
548 Kempf House or Hathaway’s Hideaway.

549  
550 **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION – GENERAL (Limited to 3 Minutes per Speaker) – None.**

551  
552 **D - APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

553  
554 **D-1 Draft minutes of the September 10, 2009 Regular Session**

555  
556 **Without objection, the Draft minutes of the September 10, 2009 Regular Session**  
557 **were approved as presented.**

558  
559 *No other minutes were available at this time.*

560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583

**E - REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS** – Commissioner Ramsburgh gave an update on the Awards Committee. She invited others to suggest restoration, special merit or preservation candidates for the awards nominations.

**F - ASSIGNMENTS**

**F-1** Commissioners Glusac and Rozmarek – Monday, March 8<sup>th</sup>, 2010 for the March 11<sup>th</sup> 2010 Regular Session at 12:00 Noon.

**G - STAFF ACTIVITIES REPORT**

**G-1** January 2010 – There were 10 projects approved by staff and the Commission.

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

**I - COMMUNICATIONS** – None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

*The Meeting was adjourned at 844 p.m. without objection.*

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