

REGULAR SESSION OF THE ANN ARBOR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2010 AT 7:00 P.M. SECOND FLOOR, CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 100 N. 5th AVENUE, ANN ARBOR, MI

AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER ROLL CALL APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA A - HEARINGS

- A-1 HDC10-009 517 KRAUSE Two story rear addition OWSHD
- A-2 HDC10-010 211 CREST New single car garage, remove window on rear house elevation OWSHD
- A-3 HDC10-011 512 FOURTH ST Two story rear addition OWSHD
- A-4 HDC10-012 310 SECOND ST Demolish and rebuild barn OWSHD
- A-5 HDC10-014 540 S SEVENTH ST New dormer on side addition OWSHD

B- OLD BUSINESS

C - NEW BUSINESS

C-1 HDC Retreat Planning

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION – GENERAL (Limited to 3 Minutes per Speaker)

D - APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- D-1 Draft Minutes of the 2009-09-10 Regular Session
- **D-2** Draft Minutes of the 2009-10-08 Regular Session

E - REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

F - ASSIGNMENTS

F-1 Review Committee: Monday, March 8 at noon for the March 11, 2010 Regular Session

G - REPORTS FROM STAFF

G-1 January 2010

H - CONCERNS OF COMMISSIONERS

I - COMMUNICATIONS

ADJOURNMENT - Persons with disabilities are encouraged to participate. Accommodations, including sign language interpreters, may be arranged by contacting Planning Development Services by telephone at 1-734-794-6000, x42666 or by written request addressed to Planning Development Services C/O Board of Appeals, 100 N. Fifth Ave., Ann Arbor, MI 48104, at least 24 hours in advance. Email: Bacquaviva@a2gov.org

ANN ARBOR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Staff Report

ADDRESS: 517 Krause, Application Number HDC10-009

DISTRICT: Old West Side Historic District

REPORT DATE: February 11, 2010

REPORT PREPARED BY: Jill Thacher, Historic Preservation Coordinator

REVIEW COMMITTEE DATE: Monday, February 8, 2010

OWNER

APPLICANT

Name:Charles Smith & Courtney PiotrowskiSameAddress:517 Krause Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48103SamePhone:(734) 255-1618

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.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

From the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

- (2) The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
- (5) Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
- (9) New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the



property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

(10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property will be unimpaired.

From the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (other SOI Guidelines may also apply):

New Additions

<u>*Recommended:*</u> Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

Designing new additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.

Locating the attached exterior addition at the rear or on an in-conspicuous side of a historic building; and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

Considering the attached exterior addition both in terms of the new use and the appearance of other buildings in the historic district or neighborhood. Design for the new work may be contemporary or may reference design motifs from the historic building. In either case, it should always be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color.

Not Recommended; Attaching a new addition so that the character-defining features of the historic building are obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

Designing a new addition so that its size and scale in relation to the historic building are out of proportion, thus diminishing the historic character.

Building Site

<u>Recommended</u>: Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserve the historic relationship between a building or buildings, landscape features, and open space.

Retaining the historic relationship between buildings, landscape features, and open space.

<u>Not Recommended</u>: Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color and texture or which destroys historic relationships on the site.

Removing or radically changing buildings and their features or site features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building site so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

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.

POSSIBLE MOTIONS: (Note that the motion supports staff findings and is only a suggestion. The Review Committee, consisting of staff and at least two Commissioners, will meet with the applicant on site and then make a recommendation at the meeting.)

I move 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.

MOTION WORKSHEET:

I move that the Commission

_____ Issue a Certificate of Appropriateness

____ Deny the Application

For the work at 517 Krause Street in the Old West Side Historic District

_____ As proposed.

Provided the following condition(S) is (ARE) met: 1) CONDITION(s)

The work

_____ Is generally compatible with the size, scale, massing, and materials and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, standard(S) number(S) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10

_____ Is not generally compatible with the size, scale, massing and materials, and DOES NOT MEET the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, standard(S) number(S) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 for the following reason(S): 1) REASON(s)

ATTACHMENTS: application, drawings, photos.

517 Krause Street (May 2008)



517 Krause Street (1999)





ANN ARBOR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION APPLICATION

100 N. Fifth Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 (734) 794-6000, x42608 Fax: (734) 994-8312 Historic Preservation Coordinator Email: <u>ithacher@a2gov.org</u>; <u>www.a2gov.org</u>

Address of Property:	517 KRAUSE ST.
	OUD WEST SIDE
Name of Property Ow CHARLES SMI	ner (If different than the applicant): TH & COURTNEY PLOTRD WSEL
Address of Property O	wner: 517 KRAUSE ST.
Daytime Phone and E-	mail of Property Owner: 734.255.1618 lovely cour mey @ gm
Signature of Property	Owner: Countury piotron date: 12.23.09
ction 2: Applicant In	formation
Name of Applicant:	see above
Address of Applicant:	
)
	-
E-mail:	
Applicant's Relationsh Signature of applicant.	hip to Property: X_owner;architect;contactor;other
ction 3: Building Use	(check all that apply)
Residential	X Single Family Multiple Family Rental
	Institutional
	sett-Hale single state construction code act MUST BE INITIALED for your application to be PROCESSED)
nclude the following b property where the v completion date, a a j	nigan's Local Historic Districts Act, was amended April 2004 to language: "the applicant has certified in the application that the work will be undertaken has, or will have before the proposed fire alarm or smoke alarm complying with the requirements of the single state construction code act, 1972 PA 230, MCL 125.1501 to

Section 5: Description of Proposed Changes (attach additional sheets as necessary)

- 1. Provide a brief summary of proposed changes. <u>Removal of a portion of</u> the rear wall of house and addition of 20'-5" x 25' new structure to back of house. Existing home to remain unaltered on all visible sides.
- 2. Provide a description of existing conditions. <u>EXISTING home with out -</u> building. Simple Square house w/ shake siding UM Parking lot to west.
- 3. What are the reasons for the proposed changes? <u>Home requires additional</u> Sq. ft. to accomposed changes? <u>Home requires additional</u> than one restroom and reasonably Sized Kitchen.
- 4. Attach any additional information that will further explain or clarify the proposal, and indicate these attachments here.

Please note full support	of neighbors with
Please note full suppore attached letters. Also no	ote All homes on street
are altered or built post 196	d).

5. Attach photographs of the existing property, including at least one general photo and detailed photos of proposed work area.

Staff Use Only Date Submitted: HDC10-009	Application to	Staff or	HDC
Project No.: HDC	Fee Paid:		
Pre-filing Staff Reviewer & Date:	Date of Public Heari	ng: <u>Feb. 11</u> ,	2010
Application Filing Date: <u>12-24-2009</u>	Action:HI	DC COA;I	HDC Denial
Staff signature:	HI	DC NTP;	Staff COA
Comments:			

Property Description:

Lot 16; KRAUSE'S ADDITION TO THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR, T.2 S., R.6 E., City of Ann Arbor, Washtenaw County, Michigan, as recorded in Liber 1 of Plats, Page 22 of Washtenaw County Records.



Assessment Health

Hegisterer

L.R.

SCHRADER

-ENGINEER

No.

10461

CTTATION OF

C. Oneer

CERTIFICATE: We hereby certify that we have surveyed the abovedescribed property in accordance with the description furnished for the purpose of a mortgage loan to be made by the forementioned applicants, mortgagor, and that the buildings located thereon do not encroach on the adjoining property, nor do the buildings on the adjoining property encroach upon the property heretofore described, except as shown. This





















Siding:

Board and Batten: James Hardie HardiePanel® Vertical Siding w/ 2.5" wide HardieTrim® Boards batten board, or equal cedar product <u>http://www.jameshardie.com/developer/products_siding_hardiepanelSiding.py</u> <u>http://www.jameshardie.com/developer/products_trim_hardietrim.py</u>

Lap Siding: James Hardie HardiePlank® 4" exposure Lap Siding , or equal cedar product <u>http://www.jameshardie.com/developer/products_siding_hardieplankLapSiding.py</u>

Trim Boards: 4" and 6" width cedar trim boards

Foundation:

Concrete Block Foundation: 8"x8"x16" concrete block

Roof:

Metal Roof: Ultra Seam US-100CS Standing Seam Panel, or equal http://www.ultraseam.com/us100cs.html

Windows:

Awning Windows: Pella Proline® Series Awning Window with Enduraclad® Aluminim exterior without grills or patterns (all lower windows and single windows) <u>http://web.pella.com/products/windows/PLawning/Pages/detailpage.aspx</u>

Casement Windows: Pella Proline® SeriesCasement Window with Enduraclad® Aluminim exterior without grills or patterns (all lower upper) <u>http://web.pella.com/products/windows/PLcasement/Pages/detailpage.aspx</u>

Doors:

Doors: Proline® Series Wood Hinged Patio Doors with Enduraclad® Aluminim exterior without grills or patterns <u>http://web.pella.com/products/doors/PLfrenchhingedpatio/Pages/detailpage.aspx</u>

ANN ARBOR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Staff Report

ADDRESS: 211 Crest Avenue, Application Number HDC10-010

DISTRICT: Old West Side Historic District

REPORT DATE: February 11, 2010

REPORT PREPARED BY: Jill Thacher, Historic Preservation Coordinator

REVIEW COMMITTEE DATE: Monday, February 8, 2010

OWNER

APPLICANT

Name:John & Christine MartelSameAddress:211 Crest Avenue
Ann Arbor, MI 48103SamePhone:(802) 310-3339

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 that there used to be a garage behind the house which was removed in the 1970s.

LOCATION: The site is located on the 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.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

From the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

(2) The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.



- (5) Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
- (9) New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
- (10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property will be unimpaired.

From the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (other SOI Guidelines may also apply):

Building Site

<u>Recommended</u>: Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserve the historic relationship between a building or buildings, landscape features, and open space.

Retaining the historic relationship between buildings, landscape features, and open space.

<u>Not Recommended</u>: Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color and texture or which destroys historic relationships on the site.

Building Exterior: Windows

<u>Recommended</u>: Identifying, retaining, and preserving windows – and their functional and decorative features – that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. Such features can include frames, sash, muntins, glazing, sills, heads, hoodmolds, paneled or decorated jambs and molding, and interior and exterior shutters and blinds.

<u>Not Recommended</u>: Removing or radically changing windows which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Changing the number, location, size or glazing pattern of windows, through cutting new openings, blocking-in windows, and installing replacement sash that do not fit the historic window opening.

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.
- 3. The picket fence and driveway gate are an appropriate design. The wood storm door would be replaced with one to match. The grading around the foundation is necessary to

preserve the stucco and to allow the side door to open freely.

- 4. There are remnants of a two-track concrete driveway from the street to the front of the house, but the tracks do not extend to the back of the lot where the garage used to be located. If the two track was more intact staff would recommend keeping it, but under the circumstances it is appropriate to remove what's left and install a concrete driveway.
- 5. The window proposed to be removed on the second floor of the rear elevation is in a closet. Staff has seen other houses of this era with similar square closet windows. Next to the closet is a bathroom that is fairly dysfunctional (the toilet is too close to the tub wall, necessitating sitting a little sideways) and the owners want to combine the two spaces. (See bathroom floorplan.) Pushing the bathtub against one of the outer walls in the combined space will place it either below the rear square window or a larger window on the south wall. The owners desire to remove the rear window to keep it out of the shower and improve the bathroom layout.

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

6. The proposed single-story garage, fence and gate, front and rear porch steps, storm door replacement, re-grading, and driveway paving 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 standards 2,5,9 and 10, and the guidelines for building sites.

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

POSSIBLE MOTIONS: (Note that the motion supports staff findings and is only a suggestion. The Review Committee, consisting of staff and at least two Commissioners, will meet with the applicant on site and then make a recommendation at the meeting.)

I move 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.

I move that the Commission deny the portion of the application at 211 Crest Avenue to remove a window on the rear elevation. The proposed work does not meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* and *Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings,* in particular standard 2, or the guidelines for windows.

MOTION WORKSHEET:

I move that the Commission

_____ Issue a Certificate of Appropriateness

____ Deny the Application

For the work at 211 Crest Avenue in the Old West Side Historic District

_____ As proposed.

_____ Provided the following condition(S) is (ARE) met: 1) CONDITION(s)

The work

Is generally compatible with the size, scale, massing, and materials and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, standard(S) number(S) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10

_____ Is not generally compatible with the size, scale, massing and materials, and DOES NOT MEET the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, standard(S) number(S) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 for the following reason(S): 1) REASON(s)

ATTACHMENTS: application, drawings, photos.

211 Crest Avenue (May 2008 photos)





ANN ARBOR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION APPLICATION

100 N. Fifth Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48104(734) 794-6000, x42608Fax: (734) 994-8312Historic Preservation Coordinator Email:jthacher@a2gov.org;www.a2gov.org

Section 1: Applicant Information					
Name of Applicant: John + Christine Martel					
Address of Applicant: 211 Crest Aye					
Daytime Phone: (802) 310 3339					
Fax:_()					
Fax: () E-mail: <u>martel cm@gmail.com</u>					
Applicant's Relationship to Property: \checkmark owner: architect; contactor; other					
Signature of applicant: <u>Smooth</u> <u>date: 1-12-10</u>					
Section 2: Property and Ownership Information					
Address of Property: 211 Crest Ave					
Historic District: Old West Side					
Name of Property Owner (If different than the applicant):					
Address of Property Owner:					
Daytime Phone and E-mail of Property Owner:					
Signature of Property Owner:date:					
Section 3: Building Use (check all that apply)					
X Residential X Single Family Multiple Family Rental					
Commercial Institutional					
Section 4: Stille-DeRossett-Hale single state construction code act (this item must be initialed for your application to be considered complete)					
Public Act 169, Michigan's Local Historic Districts Act, was amended April 2004 to include the following language: "the applicant has certified in the application that the property where the work will be undertaken has, or will have before the proposed completion date, a a fire alarm or smoke alarm complying with the requirements of the Stille-DeRossett-Hale single state construction code act, 1972 PA 230, MCL 125.1501 to 125.1531."					

Section 5: Description of Proposed Change	es (attach additional sheets as necessary)
1. Provide a brief summary of proposed c	hanges.
See attached for	
2. Provide a description of existing condit	tions
3. What are the reasons for the proposed of	changes?
5. What are the reasons for the proposed c	
	vill further explain or clarify the proposal, and
indicate these attachments here.	
5. Attach photographs of the existing prop	perty, including at least one general photo and
detailed photos of proposed work area.	
Staff Use Only	
Date Submitted:	Application toStaff orHDC
Project No.: <u>HDC</u>	
Pre-filing Staff Reviewer & Date:	
Application Filing Date:	
Staff signature: Comments:	HDC NTP; Staff COA

Section 5. Description of Proposed Changes

1. Add a garage to the property

Currently there is no garage on the property. Neighbors have said that a garage did exist on the property but was dilapidated and removed in the 1970s. We would like to add a 16' x 22' one story wood garage on the south east corner of the property.

2. Remove shrubbery in front of porch and re-grade front property

Currently there is dirt built up against the stucco of the porch and shrubbery planted. We would like to remove the shrubbery and pull the dirt away from the stucco to prevent rotting along the bottom of the porch. It will be replanted with grass and a row of perennials in front of the porch.

3. Replace Front Steps

The front steps are currently rotting and have uneven rises. We would like to change this to cedar stairs that have even rises and a 1" bull nose overhang.

4. Add Railing to Front Porch Steps

There is no railing on the front porch steps. We would like to add a handrail on the north side of the steps only that attaches to the front porch. This would attach at a 33" height.

5. Match back porch steps to front porch steps

We would like to replace the treads and risers on the back porch steps with cedar to match the front.

6. Replace Storm Door on South Side of house (Driveway Entrance)

The Storm Door is not original and was hung on the outside of the door framing such that the bottom of the door drags on the ground and is rotting. We would like to replace it with a similar door that fits within the doorframe and properly functions.

7. Remove small window in closet on the back of house.

The bathroom currently has a 14" space between the front of the toilet and the tub wall. This is a tight fit and not to code regulations. We would like to remodel the bathroom and use the closet space in the back of the house to make more room in the bathroom. There are two windows in the proposed remodel space- one original in the bathroom and one in the closet. In order to comply with code regulations for space and fit the tub in the room along a wall, one of the windows will need to be removed. We chose the small closet window on the back of the house. We would like to remove it rather than drywall over it or use glass blocks because a bathtub wall will be against half the window space.

8. Fence the back half of the yard.

We would like to fence the back of the yard as drawn on the site map. The fence will be a 48" high 1" spaced 4" x 1" wood picket fence. We would like to add a double swinging gate across the driveway that coordinates with the fence.



MARTEL GARAGE 211 CREST ANN ARDOR 113-10







General View of 211 Crest Ave





Steps on Front Porch to be replaced



Back porch steps to match Front steps



Storm door to be replaced.
General View of Rear of House

Closet Window to be removed





Woodengate across driveway

ANN ARBOR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Staff Report

ADDRESS: 512 Fourth Street, Application Number HDC10-011

DISTRICT: Old West Side Historic District

REPORT DATE: February 11, 2010

REPORT PREPARED BY: Jill Thacher, Historic Preservation Coordinator

REVIEW COMMITTEE DATE: Monday, February 8, 2010

OWNER

APPLICANT

Name:Jeffrey Hogg & Amy FrontierSameAddress:512 Fourth Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48103SamePhone:(734) 369-3397

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: The site is located on the 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, and paver patios on the south and west sides.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

From the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

(2) The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize



a property will be avoided.

- A-3 (p. 2)
- (5) Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
- (9) New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
- (10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property will be unimpaired.

From the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (other SOI Guidelines may also apply):

New Additions

<u>Recommended</u>: Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

Designing new additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.

Locating the attached exterior addition at the rear or on an in-conspicuous side of a historic building; and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

Considering the attached exterior addition both in terms of the new use and the appearance of other buildings in the historic district or neighborhood. Design for the new work may be contemporary or may reference design motifs from the historic building. In either case, it should always be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color.

Not Recommended; Attaching a new addition so that the character-defining features of the historic building are obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

Designing a new addition so that its size and scale in relation to the historic building are out of proportion, thus diminishing the historic character.

Building Site

<u>Recommended</u>: Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserve the historic relationship between a building or buildings, landscape features, and open space.

Identifying, retaining, and preserving buildings and their features as well as features of the site that are important in defining its overall historic character. Site features can include driveways, walkways, lighting, fencing, signs, benches, fountains, wells, terraces, canal systems, plants and trees, berms, and drainage or irrigation ditches; and archeological features that are important in defining the history of the site.

Retaining the historic relationship between buildings, landscape features, and open space.

Not Recommended: Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually

incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color and texture or which destroys historic relationships on the site.

Removing or radically changing buildings and their features or site features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building site so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

STAFF FINDINGS:

- The existing house is 1,351 square feet per the submitted drawings. The proposed addition is 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.

POSSIBLE MOTIONS: (Note that the motion supports staff findings and is only a suggestion. The Review Committee, consisting of staff and at least two Commissioners, will meet with the applicant on site and then make a recommendation at the meeting.)

I move 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, bumpout, 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.

MOTION WORKSHEET:

I move that the Commission

_____ Issue a Certificate of Appropriateness

____ Deny the Application

For the work at <u>512 Fourth Street</u> in the Old West Side Historic District

_____ As proposed.

_____ Provided the following condition(S) is (ARE) met: 1) CONDITION(s)

The work

_____ Is generally compatible with the size, scale, massing, and materials and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, standard(S) number(S) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10

_____ Is not generally compatible with the size, scale, massing and materials, and DOES NOT MEET the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, standard(S) number(S) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 for the following reason(S): 1) REASON(s)

ATTACHMENTS: application, drawings.

512 Fourth Street (May 2008 photos)







ANN ARBOR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION APPLICATION

100 N. Fifth Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48104(734) 794-6000, x42608Fax: (734) 994-8312Historic Preservation Coordinator Email:jthacher@a2gov.org;www.a2gov.org

Section 1: Property Being Reviewed and Ownership Information	
Address of Property: 512 Fourth Street	
Historic District: Old West Side Historic District	
Name of Property Owner (If different than the applicant): 	
Address of Property Owner: 512 Fourth Street	
Daytime Phone and E-mail of Property Owner: 369-3397 amfrontier & yahoo	·CON
Signature of Property Owner: Any MDC date: 1/19/10	
Section 2: Applicant Information	
Name of Applicant: Rueter Associates Architects	
Address of Applicant: 515 FIFth STRET	
Daytime Phone: (134) 769-0010	
Fax: (734) 769-0167	
E-mail: JSCRIVENS@ RUETERARCHITECTS.COM	
Applicant's Relationship to Property:owner; architect; contactor; other Signature of applicant: date: d	
Section 3: Building Use (check all that apply)	
X Residential X Single Family Multiple Family Rental Commercial Institutional	
Section 4: Stille-DeRossett-Hale single state construction code act (this item MUST BE INITIALED for your application to be PROCESSED)	
Public Act 169, Michigan's Local Historic Districts Act, was amended April 2004 to include the following language: "the applicant has certified in the application that the property where the work will be undertaken has, or will have before the proposed completion date, a a fire alarm or smoke alarm complying with the requirements of the Stille-DeRossett-Hale single state construction code act, 1972 PA 230, MCL 125.1501 to 125.1531." Please initial here:	

1. Provide a brief summary of pr	proposed changes. SEE ATTACHED	
2. Provide a description of existi	ing conditions. SEE ATTACHED	
3. What are the reasons for the p	proposed changes? SEE ATTACHED	
 4. Attach any additional informat indicate these attachments here 	tion that will further explain or clarify the proposal, ar e.	ıd
indicate these attachments here	e. sting property, including at least one general photo and	
 indicate these attachments here 5. Attach photographs of the exisdetailed photos of proposed wo 	e	d HD
5. Attach photographs of the exist	e	d HD

Project Memorandum

TO:	Ann Arbor Historic District Commission 312 S. Division Street Ann Arbor, MI 48104
DATE: 🧳	January 19, 2010
PROJECT:	Renovation of 512 Fourth Street Ann Arbor
OWNER:	Jeffrey Hogg and Amy Frontier 512 Fourth Street Ann Arbor, MI 48103
ARCHITECT:	Rueter Associates Architects 515 Fifth Street Ann Arbor, MI 48103
RE:	Application for Determination of Appropriateness

Description of proposed changes:

The following is a description of the renovations and additions to 512 Fourth Street. The proposed two-story addition will add an additional 773 square feet or 57 percent to the current 1351 square foot house. The gross footprint will add an additional 298 square feet to the building footprint for a 37 percent increase.

1. Site work

a. Grading of site shall be limited to portions affected by new structures to provide positive drainage away from foundations and a level area at the patio at the side of the house.

2. Demolition

a. The existing kitchen and rear entry addition including concrete foundation will be demolished and the section of sidewall at the lower first floor will be removed, while preserving the overhangs at the corners on both the north and south sides.

3. New Additions

- a. A new second-story addition will be constructed for the second floor bedrooms /laundry/bath/closet in the same style as the existing structure. See drawings for exact configuration, size and appearance. The windows in the new addition will be 'Weather Shield' wood double-hung or casement units. All exterior trim will match existing conditions as closely as possible. The siding will be horizontal beveled wood and will match the existing exposure. The roof will be asphalt shingles to match existing.
- b. On the new first floor a kitchen and family room will be constructed. See drawings for exact configuration, size and appearance. The side entry porch floor will be IPE wood decking - one step above grade. All exposed wood will be cedar painted to match existing color scheme. A low pitch shingle roof will cover the porch and the kitchen addition on the south face.

4. Exterior Painting and Misc. Repair

a. All painted aluminum surfaces affected by demolition will be repainted with repairs made as necessary.

b. Downspouts affected by new addition will be reworked as needed.

Reason for proposed changes:

The Owner has a young family with three children and two adults and the current house has two sleeping rooms. The Owner would like to place a second story addition onto the rear of their residence. The intent of the new addition is to preserve as much of the architectural integrity of this historic residence and provide the owner with an additional bath and sleeping spaces. The proposed addition also provides for renovation of the first floor kitchen and provides additional living space, with a first floor half-bath.

Sincerely,

Jim Scrivens Architect, LEED AP

RUETER ASSOCIATES A R C H I T E C T S 515 Fifth Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103 phone: (734) 769-0070, fax: (734) 769-0167

ANN ARBOR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION APPLICATION FOR DETERMINATION OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR NEW TWO STORY ADDITION



DRAWING INDEX

T1	DRAWING INDEX & SITE PLAN
T2	SANBORN MAP HISTORY
X1	EXISTING SITE/PROPOSED ADDITION
X2	EXISTING FIRST FLOOR PLAN
X3	EXISTING SECOND FLOOR PLAN
X4	EXISTING NORTH ELEVATION
X5	EXISTING SOUTH ELEVATION
X6	EXISTING EAST ELEVATION
X7	EXISTING WEST ELEVATION
A1	PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN
A2	PROPOSED SECOND FLOOR PLAN
A3	PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION
A4	PROPOSED SOUTH ELEVATION
A5	PROPOSED EAST ELEVATION
A6	PROPOSED WEST ELEVATION

T1 TITLE SHEET

HOGG / FRONTIER ADDITION 512 Fourth Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103

The present house was probably rebuilt as a Craftsman styled house when the second story was added. The first floor sills and basement construction certainly dates to a pre-1900 time. The house appears on the 1888 birdseye map as a one story without the rear addition and on the 1908 Sanborn as a one story house with a small kitchen addition.

The kitchen addition was probably built sometime after 1900 and before 1908. The construction is very crude with reused materials from another structure. The floor joists are inadequate 2 x 6s 24" o.c. with recycled large plank floor sheathing. The very low cement ratio concrete foundation is similar to others dating from this era. Chunks of bituminous concrete (possibly from earlier sidewalks in the OWS) are embedded in the concrete. The addition clearly does not come close to the construction standards of the original house, nor later standards when it was reconstructed in the Craftsman style sometime between 1916 and 1925.

The addition cannot by code support a new second story. In addition to the inadequate width, depth and friable nature of the concrete, the shallow foundation bearing level is undermined by the excavation of a partial basement space below the bottom of the foundation's foot.

This house was completely renovated (possibly demolished to the first floor deck) and rebuilt as a craftsman with attention to details and craftsmanship. The non-original addition was not rebuilt in the Craftsman tradition. Its windows and detailing are not consistent with the rebuilt house. Since the addition is not a part of the original house, nor does it have any Craftsman detailing, Its present character contributes little or nothing to the understanding of the historical record.

The Owners propose to demolish this addition and to construct a new two-story addition.



1916 Sanborn Insurance Map (enlarged)



1925 Sanborn Insurance Map (enlarged)

Development history of 512 4th St. from Sanborn Insurance Maps

Sanborn Map History

HOGG / FRONTIER ADDITION

512 Fourth Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103



FOURT STREET 66' WD

























NEW PORCH MATERIAL DESCRIPTION:

brackets: 4x4 or 5x5 pine wood bracket painted

FRIEZE BD and PORCH HEADER: 5/4"X 8" wd bd

PORCH CEILING: Painted pine beaded ceiling with bed moulding-sprung

PORCH DECK 5/4" IPE decking

NEW ADDITION MATERIAL DESCRIPTION:

ROOF: Asphalt shingles match existing

FASCIA: 1"X 6" wd bd

GUTTERS: 5" K style alum gutters

GABLE RAKE BOARD 1x2 ON 2"x 12" bd

FRIEZE BD (BELOW RAKE) 5/4"x 12" with bed molding

SOFFITS: 3/4" preprimed trim with vents

CORNER BOARDS" 5/4" X 4" WD

BAND BOARD: on fireplace 5/4" X 6" wd bd

SIDING: 7/16"x 5" Cedar wood siding with 4" exposure.

EXPOSED FOUNDATION: Existing stone foundation, new poured concrete

WINDOWS: Weather Shield wood windows with 5/4" X 4" WD casings

vents DOORS: Simpson entrand

DOORS: Simpson entrance door Model 6863 with 5/4" X 4" WD casin



RENOVATION OF EXISTING RESIDENCE:

ROOFING:

May replace roofing with laminated asphalt shingles

SIDING:

repair damaged aluminum siding and trim as required and repaint









Proposed North Elevation A4 Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0" on 8 1/2" x 11

HOGG / FRONTIER ADDITION 512 Fourth Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103









ANN ARBOR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Staff Report

ADDRESS: 310 Second Street, Application Number HDC10-012

DISTRICT: Old West Side Historic District

REPORT DATE: February 11, 2010

REPORT PREPARED BY: Jill Thacher, Historic Preservation Coordinator

REVIEW COMMITTEE DATE: Monday, February 8, 2010

OWNERAPPLICANTName:403 W Liberty LLC
Jan MuhlemanCarl O. HueterAddress:213 W Liberty
Ann Arbor, MI 481041321 Franklin Blvd
Ann Arbor, MI 48103Phone:(734) 327-6605(734) 665-7610

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 believes 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 ¹/₂ 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, 1994 a certificate of appropriateness was issued by the commission to repair and reconstruct the front porch.

In July and August, 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: The site is located on the 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.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

From the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

(6) Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

From the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (other SOI Guidelines may also apply):

Building Site

<u>Recommended:</u> Replacing in kind an entire feature of the building or site that is too deteriorated to repair if the overall form and detailing are still evident. Physical evidence from the deteriorated feature should be used as a model to guide the new work. This could include an entrance or porch, walkway, or fountain. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

<u>Not Recommended</u>; Removing a feature of the building or site that is unrepairable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new feature that does not convey the same visual appearance.

STAFF FINDINGS:

- 1. After receiving a certificate or 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.)
- 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.

POSSIBLE MOTIONS: (Note that the motion supports staff findings and is only a suggestion. The Review Committee, consisting of staff and at least two Commissioners, will meet with the applicant on site and then make a recommendation at the meeting.)

I move 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.

MOTION WORKSHEET:

I move that the Commission

_____ Issue a Certificate of Appropriateness

____ Deny the Application

For the work at <u>310 Second Street</u> in the <u>Old West Side</u> Historic District

____ As proposed.

Provided the following condition(S) is (ARE) met: 1) CONDITION(s)

The work

_____ Is generally compatible with the size, scale, massing, and materials and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, standard(S) number(S) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10

_____ Is not generally compatible with the size, scale, massing and materials, and DOES NOT MEET the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, standard(S) number(S) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 for the following reason(S): 1) REASON(s)

ATTACHMENTS: application, drawings, photos.

310 Second Street, barn is behind house at left (May 2008 photo)



310 Second Street (July 2009 photos)







ANN ARBOR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION APPLICATION

100 N. Fifth Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48104(734) 794-6000, x42608Fax: (734) 994-8312Historic Preservation Coordinator Email:jthacher@a2gov.org;www.a2gov.org

Address of Property:	310 SECOND ST REAR BARN/GARAGE
	OLD WEST SIDE
Name of Property Owner (If a	
Address of Property Owner:	213 W. LIBERTY
Daytime Phone and E-mail of	Property Owner: 734.327.6405 janet.muhleman@reqro
Signature of Property Owner.	date: 1 14 1010
ction 2: Applicant Informat	ion
Name of Applicant:	CARL D. HUETER
Address of Applicant:	1321 FRANKLIN BLVD. 48103-5802
Daytime Phone: (734)	445-7419
	445 - 2432
	cohueter@umich.edu
Applicant's Relationship to Pr	roperty:owner; _X_architect;contactor;other date:
ction 3: Building Use (check	all that apply)
X Residential X	Single Family Multiple Family Rental
	e single state construction code act BE INITIALED for your application to be PROCESSED)
nclude the following languag property where the work with completion date, a <u>fir</u> e alar	Local Historic Districts Act, was amended April 2004 to e: "the applicant has certified in the application that the ill be undertaken has, or will have before the proposed or or smoke alarm complying with the requirements of the tate construction code act, 1972 PA 230, MCL 125.1501 to

 2. Provide a description of existing conditions		Immary of proposed changes.
Provide a description of existing conditions. W00D FRAME STRUCTURE HAS DETERIORATED TO A POINT THAT IT IS NO LONGRE SAFE TO W02LL ON IT. WILL BE REBUILT AS ORIGINAL & PER PREVIOUS QRANTED VARIANCE. 3. What are the reasons for the proposed changes?		Demolition of All wood framed
 2. Provide a description of existing conditions. WOOD FRAME STRUCTURE HAS DETERIORATED TO A POINT THAT IT IS NO LONGER SAFE TO WORK ON IT. WILL BE REBUILT AS ORIGINAL \$\$\$ PER PREVIOUS GRANTED VARIANCE. 3. What are the reasons for the proposed changes? DETERIORATION OF STRUCTURE NO LONGER MAKES GUILDING SAFE TO WORK IN \$ ON. SEE MILCHED PHOTOS \$ SUMMARY. 4. Attach any additional information that will further explain or clarify the proposal, and indicate these attachments here. SEE MILCHED PHOTOS \$ PAGES OF PHOTOS \$ PROPESSIONAL ASSESSMENT OF STRUCTURE 5. Attach photographs of the existing property, including at least one general photo and detailed photos of proposed work area. ft Use Only e Submitted:	2	STRUCTURE DOWN TO CONCRETE BLOCK
 2. Provide a description of existing conditions. WOOD FRAME STRUCTURE HAS DETERIORATED TO A POINT THAT IT IS NO LONGER SAFE TO WORK ON IT. WILL BE REBUILT AS ORIGINAL \$\$\$PER PREYIOUS GRANTED VARIANCE. 3. What are the reasons for the proposed changes? DETERIORATION OF STRUCTURE NO LONGER MAKES GUILDING SAFE TO WORK IN \$ ON. SEE MITACHED PHOTOS \$ SUMMARY. 4. Attach any additional information that will further explain or clarify the proposal, and indicate these attachments here. SEE MITACHED PHOTOS \$ PAGES OF PHOTOS \$ PROPESSIONAL ASSESSMENT OF STRUCTURE 5. Attach photographs of the existing property, including at least one general photo and detailed photos of proposed work area. If Use Only Submitted:		FOUNDATION WALL
WOOD FRAME STRUCTURE HAS DETERIORATED TO A POINT THAT IT IS NO LONGER SAFE TO WORK ON IT. WILL BE REBUILT AS ORIGINAL & PER PREYIOUS GRANTED VARIANCE. 3. What are the reasons for the proposed changes?		
TO A POINT THAT IT IS NO LONGEE SAFE TO WORK ON IT. WILL BE REBUILT AS ORIGINAL	2. Provide a descrip	tion of existing conditions.
WORK ON IT. WILL BE REBUICT AS ORIGINAL		WOOD FRAME STRUCTURE HAS DETERIORATED
PER PREVIOUS GRANTED VARIANCE 3. What are the reasons for the proposed changes? DETERIORATION OF STRUCTURE NO LONGER MAKES BUILDING SAFE TO WORK IN É ON. SEE ATTACHED PHOTOS É SUMMARY. 4. Attach any additional information that will further explain or clarify the proposal, and indicate these attachments here. SEE ATTACHED 3 PAGES OF PHOTOS PROPESSIONAL ASSESSMENT OF STRUCTURE 5. Attach photographs of the existing property, including at least one general photo and detailed photos of proposed work area. If Use Only SUMPLE PROPESSIONAL Application to Staff or HE SUMPLE		to a point that it is no longer safe to
 3. What are the reasons for the proposed changes? DETERIORATION OF STRUCTURE NO LONGER MAKES BUILDING SAFE TO WORK IN É ON, SEE KITACHED PHOTOS È SUMMARY. 4. Attach any additional information that will further explain or clarify the proposal, and indicate these attachments here. SEE KTACHED & PAGES OF PHOTOS È PROPESSIONAL ASSESSMENT OF STRUCTURE 5. Attach photographs of the existing property, including at least one general photo and detailed photos of proposed work area. ff Use Only e Submitted: Application toStaff orHI for No.:		WORK ON IT. WILL BE REBUILT AS ORIGINAL
DETERIORATION OF STEUCTURE, NO LONGER MAKES BUILDING SAFE TO WORK IN É ON. SEE ATTACHED PHOTOS È SUMMARY. 4. Attach any additional information that will further explain or clarify the proposal, and indicate these attachments here.		FER PREVIOUS GRANTED VARIANCE.
MAKES GUILDING SAFE TO WORK IN É ON. SEE KITACHED PHOTOS È SUMMARY. 4. Attach any additional information that will further explain or clarify the proposal, and indicate these attachments here. SEE ATTACHED 3 PAGES OF PHOTOS # PROPESSIONAL ASSESSMENT OF STRUCTURE 5. Attach photographs of the existing property, including at least one general photo and detailed photos of proposed work area. ff Use Only e Submitted:	3. What are the reas	ons for the proposed changes?
SEE ATTACHED PHOTOS & SUMMARY. 4. Attach any additional information that will further explain or clarify the proposal, and indicate these attachments here. SEE ATTACHED > PACIES OF PHOTOS # PROPESSIONAL ASSESSMENT OF STRUCTURE 5. Attach photographs of the existing property, including at least one general photo and detailed photos of proposed work area. ff Use Only e Submitted: Application to Staff or HI		DETERIORATION OF STRUCTURE NO LONGER
 4. Attach any additional information that will further explain or clarify the proposal, and indicate these attachments here. <u>SEE ATTACUED 3 PACIES OF PHOTOS</u> <u># PROPESSIONAL ASSESSMENT OF STRUCTURE</u> 5. Attach photographs of the existing property, including at least one general photo and detailed photos of proposed work area. <u>ff Use Only</u> e Submitted: Application toStaff orHI 		MAKES BUILDING SAFE TO WORK IN & ON.
indicate these attachments here.		SEE ATTACHED PHOTOS & SUMMARY.
PROPESSIONAL ASSESSMENT OF STRUCTURE 5. Attach photographs of the existing property, including at least one general photo and detailed photos of proposed work area. ff Use Only e Submitted: Application toStaff orHI ject No.: Fee Paid:		
 5. Attach photographs of the existing property, including at least one general photo and detailed photos of proposed work area. Iff Use Only e Submitted: Application toStaff orHI ject No.: Fee Paid:		SEE ATTACHED 3 PAGES OF PHOTOS
detailed photos of proposed work area.		PROPESSIONAL ASSESSMENT OF STRUCTURE
e Submitted: Application toStaff orHI ject No.:Fee Paid:		
ject No.: HDC Fee Paid:		
	ff Use Only	
	e Submitted:	

Staff signature:

Comments:

_____HDC NTP; _____ Staff COA

: :	

carl o. hueter a.i.a. * 1321 franklin blvd. * ann arbor, michigan 48103-5802

21 DECEMBER 2009

STRUCTURAL EVALUATION / 310 SECOND STREET, ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

This office has been called out to the above noted address to assess structural condition of a ancillary structure barn/garage. Building is at rear western end of existing site. Existing residence is under renovation with appropriate City of Ann Arbor permits. Barn/garage is a contributing structure in the Old West Side Historic District. A previous variance has been granted to raise the elevation of this structure and renovate it. General contractor does not wish to proceed due to the condition of the structure.

- 1) Observable failure conditions from exterior show roof in process of collapse and severe deterioration of wood framing.
- 2) East lintel/bond beam over garage doors supporting second floor was a hewn oak beam and has deteriorated to the point that one can pull the rotted wood out with their bare hands. This rotted state has moved inward to the floor joists (framing into this member). Several of these joists have rotted and no longer provide support for the floor system into this beam member.
- 3) The second floor of this structural has been covered with plywood. There are several areas where this plywood material and the original subfloor have rotted.
- 4) The wall sill and top plates in many areas have rotted through and away.
- 5) Both the east and west roof elevations show area collapsed and have left the interior open to the weather. This condition has been present before the current owner purchased the property. These areas show extensive rotted sheathing and roof joists. Vegetation is growing out of these areas.
- 6) The south wall appears to be leaning or failing inward.
- 7) The west wall appears to be leaning or failing outward.
- 8) The north wall appears to be salvageable.

The deterioration of this structure has been taking place over an extended period of time. It has reached a point that it is no longer safe to attempt to work on or in this building. The condition of the structure is very fragile and failure is eminent. It is recommended barricades be erected around the structure and action be taking immediately to remove it completing to the foundation level.

Sincerely Carl O. Hueter Al Principal State of Michigan Registered Architect #27037

CARCESSIN DECH



Applicant: 310-314 SECOND L.L.C.



CHIL TYDE

310 SECOND ST. · BARN SOUTH / EAST ELEVATION · EXISTING. 4/11/09 - FOR 1/20/2010 SUBMISSION ·



310 SECOND ST. BARN WEST ELEVATION . EXISTING . 6/11/09

FOR 1/20/2010 SUBMISSION .


310 SECOND ST . BADH NONTH ELEVATION EXISTING . 6/11/09

FOR 1/20/2010 SUBMISSION .

1120/2010



ANN ARBOR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Staff Report

ADDRESS: 540 South Seventh Street, Application Number HDC10-014

DISTRICT: Old West Side Historic District

REPORT DATE: February 11, 2010

REPORT PREPARED BY: Jill Thacher, Historic Preservation Coordinator

REVIEW COMMITTEE DATE: Monday, February 8, 2010

	OWNER	APPLICANI
Name: Address:	Gillian White & James Wollard 507 Detroit St #1 Ann Arbor, MI 48104	Nicholas Durrie 1444 Jewett Ann Arbor, MI
Phone:	(609 937-0458	(734) 223-5153

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: The site is located on the southwest corner of South Seventh Street and Lutz Avenue.

APPLICATION: The applicant seeks HDC approval to add a 10' wide gabled dormer with a doublehung window to the rear (west) side of the

addition and reroof the house.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

From the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

(9) New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.



(10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property will be unimpaired.

From the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (other SOI Guidelines may also apply):

New Additions

<u>Recommended</u>: Locating the attached exterior addition at the rear or on an in-conspicuous side of a historic building; and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

<u>Not Recommended</u>; Designing a new addition so that its size and scale in relation to the historic building are out of proportion, thus diminishing the historic character.

Windows

<u>Recommended</u>: Designing and installing additional windows on rear or other-non characterdefining elevations if required by the new use. New window openings may also be cut into exposed party walls. Such design should be compatible with the overall design of the building, but not duplicate the fenestration pattern and detailing of a character-defining elevation.

<u>Not Recommended</u>: Installing new windows, including frames, sash, and muntin configuration that are incompatible with the building's historic appearance or obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features.

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.

POSSIBLE MOTIONS: (Note that the motion supports staff findings and is only a suggestion. The Review Committee, consisting of staff and at least two Commissioners, will meet with the applicant on site and then make a recommendation at the meeting.)

I move that the Commission issue a certificate of appropriateness for the application at

540 S Seventh Street, a contributing property in the Old West Side Historic District, to add a 10' wide dormer on the rear elevation of the addition and reroof the house 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 9 and 10 and the guidelines for new additions and windows.

MOTION WORKSHEET:

I move that the Commission

_____ Issue a Certificate of Appropriateness

____ Deny the Application

For the work at 540 S Seventh Street in the Old West Side Historic District

_____ As proposed.

_____ Provided the following condition(S) is (ARE) met: 1) CONDITION(s)

The work

_____ Is generally compatible with the size, scale, massing, and materials and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, standard(S) number(S) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10

Is not generally compatible with the size, scale, massing and materials, and DOES NOT MEET the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, standard(S) number(S) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 for the following reason(S): 1) REASON(s)

ATTACHMENTS: application, drawings, photos.

540 S Seventh Street (May 2008 photos)







ANN ARBOR HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION APPLICATION

100 N. Fifth Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 (734) 794-6000, x42608 Fax: (734) 994-8312 Historic Preservation Coordinator Email: <u>jthacher@a2gov.org</u>; <u>www.a2gov.org</u>

Section 1: Property Being Reviewed and Ownership Information	
Address of Property: 540 South 7th St.	
Historic District: 012 West Side	
Name of Property Owner (If different than the applicant): <u>Gillion Write and Jomes Woolard</u>	·
Address of Property Owner: 507 Detroit St # 481024	
Daytime Phone and E-mail of Property Owner: 609 937 0458 jLwoolardeg mail	·con
Signature of Property Owner:	
Section 2: Applicant Information	
Name of Applicant: Micholas Durrie	
Address of Applicant: 1444 Jewett	
Daytime Phone: (734) 2235153	
Fax: _(
E-mail: durriedesign@ Jahoo.com	
Applicant's Relationship to Property:owner;architect;contactor;other Signature of applicant:	
Section 3: Building Use (check all that apply)	
Kesidential K Single Family Multiple Family Rental	
Commercial Institutional	
Section 4: Stille-DeRossett-Hale single state construction code act (this item MUST BE INITIALED for your application to be PROCESSED)	
 Public Act 169, Michigan's Local Historic Districts Act, was amended April 2004 to include the following language: "the applicant has certified in the application that the property where the work will be undertaken has, or will have before the proposed completion date, a a fire alarm or smoke alarm complying with the requirements of the Stille-DeRossett-Hale single state construction code act, 1972 PA 230, MCL 125.1501 to 125.1531." Please initial here: MP. 	

Section 5: Description of Proposed Changes (attach additional sheets as necessary) Add 1. Provide a brief summary of proposed changes. dormer to existing attic Space 2. Provide a description of existing conditions. New construction, addition historic building. Unfinished attic off 3. What are the reasons for the proposed changes? play room / Storage 4. Attach any additional information that will further explain or clarify the proposal, and indicate these attachments here. 5. Attach photographs of the existing property, including at least one general photo and detailed photos of proposed work area. Staff Use Only Date Submitted: Application to ______Staff or _____HDC Project No.: HDC Fee Paid: Pre-filing Staff Reviewer & Date: Date of Public Hearing: Application Filing Date: Action: _____HDC COA; _____HDC Denial Staff signature: HDC NTP; _____ Staff COA Comments:



west elevation 1/4"/ft.

1



540 s. seventh



540 s. serent





500 s. summ

D-1 Minutes of the September 9, 2009 Regular Session are not currently available.

D-2 Minutes of the October 8, 2009 Regular Session are not currently available.

City of Ann Arbor Projects by Type, Status and Date For the Period 1/1/2010 thru 1/31/2010

	Project Type Owner Name Site Address		Date Applied Date Expired	Status of Project Date Approved Date Closed
HDC10-001	HDC CITY OF ANN ARBOR 2781 PACKARD RD	Duct work for trash ch	ute and dumbwaite 1/5/2010	r APPROVED 1/5/2010
Comments: (1/5/2 non-contributing I	2010 16:15 JT) Staff approva	al to install ductwork for trash	n chute and dumbw	aiter on rear elevation of
HDC10-002	HDC BILAKOS PETER 111 E ANN ST	Tuckpointing & repair	1/5/2010	APPROVED 1/5/2010
Comments: (1/5/2	2010 16:14 JT) Staff approva	I to tuckpoint and replace sp	called units on front	t elevation.
HDC10-003	HDC ISSA PROPERTIES 217 S STATE ST	Mechanical equipmen	t installed on roof 1/4/2010	APPROVED 1/5/2010
Comments: (1/5/2	2010 16:21 JT) Install mecha	inical equipment on roof, not	t visible from street	or sidewalk.
HDC10-004	HDC Lana Hawkins 217 N INGALLS ST	Replace basement wir	ndow with egress w 1/8/2010	in APPROVED 1/14/2010
Session.				
inspections, they for the work (Afte	 BA) Applicant wants to make found an illegal finished room r the Fact). See "Sub-Permit JT) HDC approved one bas 	n in the basement that had b s" for info.	een done without p	ermit. There is now a permit
inspections, they for the work (Afte (1/22/2010 09:34 HDC10-005	found an illegal finished room r the Fact). See "Sub-Permit JT) HDC approved one bas HDC ISSA PROPERTIES 217 S STATE ST	n in the basement that had b s" for info. <u>ement egress window 1/14/</u> Reface existing busine	een done without p	ermit. There is now a permit
inspections, they for the work (Afte (1/22/2010 09:34 HDC10-005 Comments: (1/14/	found an illegal finished room r the Fact). See "Sub-Permit JT) HDC approved one bas HDC ISSA PROPERTIES 217 S STATE ST /2010 14:54 JT) Reface exis	n in the basement that had b s" for info. <u>ement egress window 1/14/</u> Reface existing busine ting sign for new business.	een done without p 10 as proposed in a ess sign 1/14/2010	application. APPROVED 1/14/2010
inspections, they for the work (Afte (1/22/2010 09:34 HDC10-005	found an illegal finished room r the Fact). See "Sub-Permit JT) HDC approved one bas HDC ISSA PROPERTIES 217 S STATE ST	n in the basement that had b s" for info. <u>ement egress window 1/14/</u> Reface existing busine ting sign for new business. Replace business sigr	een done without p 10 as proposed in a ess sign 1/14/2010	application. APPROVED
inspections, they for the work (Afte (1/22/2010 09:34 HDC10-005 Comments: (1/14/ HDC10-006	found an illegal finished room r the Fact). See "Sub-Permit JT) HDC approved one bas HDC ISSA PROPERTIES 217 S STATE ST /2010 14:54 JT) Reface exis HDC ISSA PROPERTIES	n in the basement that had b s" for info. <u>ement egress window 1/14/</u> Reface existing busine ting sign for new business. Replace business sigr	een done without p 10 as proposed in a ess sign 1/14/2010 n on storefront 1/14/2010	APPROVED 1/14/2010 APPROVED 1/14/2010
inspections, they for the work (Afte (1/22/2010 09:34 HDC10-005 Comments: (1/14/ HDC10-006	found an illegal finished room r the Fact). See "Sub-Permit JT) HDC approved one bas HDC ISSA PROPERTIES 217 S STATE ST /2010 14:54 JT) Reface exis HDC ISSA PROPERTIES 215 S STATE ST	n in the basement that had b s" for info. <u>ement egress window 1/14/</u> Reface existing busine ting sign for new business. Replace business sign refront sign with "The Getup New sign on existing b	een done without p 10 as proposed in a ess sign 1/14/2010 n on storefront 1/14/2010 5" sign. 13" x 132" a	APPROVED 1/14/2010 APPROVED 1/14/2010
inspections, they for the work (Afte (1/22/2010 09:34 HDC10-005 Comments: (1/14/ HDC10-006 Comments: (1/21/	found an illegal finished room r the Fact). See "Sub-Permit JT) HDC approved one bas HDC ISSA PROPERTIES 217 S STATE ST /2010 14:54 JT) Reface exis HDC ISSA PROPERTIES 215 S STATE ST /2010 11:14 JT) Replace sto HDC BILAKOS PETER	n in the basement that had b s" for info. <u>ement egress window 1/14/</u> Reface existing busine ting sign for new business. Replace business sign refront sign with "The Getup New sign on existing b	een done without p <u>10 as proposed in a</u> ess sign 1/14/2010 n on storefront 1/14/2010 o" sign. 13" x 132" a pracket	APPROVED 1/14/2010 APPROVED 1/20/2010 APPROVED 1/20/2010



Page

1

City of Ann Arbor Projects by Type, Status and Date

For the Period 1/1/2010 thru 1/31/2010

HDC10-013	HDC Install fan vent on rear of building		APPROVED
	LIBERTY STREET PARTNER	S LLC 1/25/2010	1/25/2010
	211 E LIBERTY ST		
Comments: (1/2: building.	5/2010 10:59 JT) Staff approval	l for 4" bathroom vent penetration through non-	original portion of rear of
HDC10-015	HDC	Replace front stairs, stair guardrail and har	APPROVED
	COPI BARBARA TRUST	1/26/2010	1/26/2010
	721 CATHERINE ST		

Comments: (1/26/2010 11:21 JT) Staff approval to replace front stairs, non-original stair guardrail, and handrail.

Total Projects for Thacher Jill For the Period 1/1/2010 thru 1/31/2010: 10

