

CITY OF YPSILANTI
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF JANUARY 28, 2014

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Anne Stevenson	Chair 7:00 PM
Meeting Location:	City Council Chambers, City Hall
Commissioners Present:	Alex Pettit, Jane Schmiedeke, Ron Rupert, Anne Stevenson, Hank Prebys, Michael Condon
Commissioners Absent:	Jennifer Henriksen
Staff Present:	Cynthia Kochanek, HDC Assistant

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Rupert (second: Schmiedeke) moved to approve the agenda as presented.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS - none

PUBLIC HEARING- none

OLD BUSINESS

317 S. Huron

Applicant: Frances & Erik Gunderson (absent)

Discussion: Application is regarding the 2006 installation of vinyl clad replacement windows on the three-season porch at the back of the structure.

This application was considered at the last meeting and additional information was needed to render a decision. The commission needed to know what this application is for and why it was brought up now.

Kochanek: Advised that she spoke with the applicant Erik Gunderson and that he was advised in a recent rental inspection that a permit was not pulled for the windows installed in the three-season porch at the back of the house. The applicant is now trying to correct the situation. The applicant advised that this work was completed in 2005 or 2006 and that no new work is planned for the windows. He also states that a contractor came out to fix the jalousie windows, which were there before, but it was found that these windows could not be fixed so the contractor replaced them with vinyl clad. He states that his mother may have thought that the contractor pulled the necessary permits.

Rupert: States that these windows do not look like vinyl clad, that they look more like all vinyl windows.

Schmiedeke: Wants to know if they are being asked to approve work that has already been completed several years ago.

Kochanek: Affirms that this is the case.

Prebys: States that he would deny the windows, even if they are vinyl clad. Wants to know if anyone would have an issue with denying this application since the district does not allow vinyl clad or vinyl windows.

Motion: Prebys (second: Schmiedeke) moves to deny the application for windows at 317 S. Huron because the windows that have previously been installed are vinyl or vinyl clad and are not permissible in the historic district.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:

10: New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

501 N. Adams

Applicant: Patricia Harroun (absent)

Discussion: Application is for the replacement of the current black standard shingle roof with GAF Timberline architectural shingles.

Kochanek: Advised that she spoke with the applicant on the phone since she would not be able to make it in due to the weather. The applicant states that she is going from a standard black shingle to a GAF Timberline architectural shingle in black. That the ridge vents will be black and no work is planned for the gutters or trim.

Schmiedeke: Wants to know if any additional vents will be added.

Kochanek: States that she was not made aware of any other changes but that was not specifically discussed in her conversation.

Pettit: Wants to know if we are familiar with this type of shingle.

Rupert: Confirms that this exact type of shingle was seen in the last meeting but in a different color.

Motion: Condon (second: Prebys) moves to approve the application for roof replacement. The new shingles will be GAF Timberline in black. The venting will be soffit and ridge venting. Ridge venting will be black. The drip edge will match the shingle color. No work is to be done to the gutters and any additional venting required will be placed so that they are not visible from the street.

Secretary of the Interior Standards cited:

10: New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

720 Norris

Applicant: David Wright; Wright Signs and Carrie and David Peron; Arbor Brewing Company (present).

Discussion: Application is for one ground mounted sign on wood posts and one wall mounted sign made of 4' x 7' MDO mounted with lag screws and wall anchors.

Stevenson: Only question that she has is regarding the PVC sleeves and how the HDC felt about the use of them.

Wright: States that he usually does PVC for a ground sign so that the posts are less likely to be damaged. If they were to go with wood posts, then he would recommend that the applicant use cedar.

Rupert: PVC used here would be similar to PVC fence posts.

Wright: The PVC will be painted with plastic paint.

Schmiedeke: Her concern is that the wall mounted MDO sign may need a frame.

Stevenson: States that the application is confusing since the actual application lists MDO for both signs but the attached drawing shows aluminum for the wall mounted sign.

Wright: States that he put on the drawing an aluminum sign for the wall sign since that is what he would prefer to use there. An aluminum sign is not preferred for the ground sign since it will not hold up as well as the MDO sign. The ground sign would be no more than 6' off the ground.

Prebys: Wants to know if any trim would be used on the MDO sign.

Wright: States that he has not found anything that holds up other than priming and painting the edges of the signs with enamel paint. States that he could also use latex caulk on the edges to seal the sign.

Stevenson: States that she would prefer the use of cedar posts for ground sign.

Prebys: Agrees on the use of the cedar posts.

Wright: States that the only issue with the cedar posts is that they will still get damaged by lawn care equipment.

Stevenson: Asks if the sign can be surrounded by mulch for protection.

Prebys: Asks if the commission is agreed on the cedar posts for the ground sign and not the PVC sleeves.

Motion: Condon (second: Prebys) moves to approve the installation of the 4' x 7' aluminum sign to the building over the door. The aluminum sign will be mounted on standoffs and corrosion resistant fasteners will be used. The sign for the yard will be 4' x 7' made of ¾" MDO attached to cedar 4" x 4" posts. A latex caulk will be used around the edge to seal the sign.

Secretary of the Interior Standards cited:
5: Preserve distinctive features.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

64 N. Huron

Applicant: Great Lakes Fence Company, Inc.; contractor (absent).

Discussion: Application is to close in the area from the building to the property line with a chain link fence and gate. Chain link fence will be 8' high with an additional 1' in barbed wire on top.

Prebys: Wants to know why the HDC is considering this application since it is for a chain link fence.

Schmiedeke: States that this is being considered since this for an industrial area.

Pettit: Wants to know if this is for the actual electrical substation since it looks like the application is for fencing only a small section between the buildings. He would like to know if this is needed since the substation is already closed in.

Rupert: States that this will keep people from coming thru the walk way between the buildings.

Schmiedeke: States that this will not be seen from the street.

Motion: Schmiedeke (second: Condon) moves to approve the application as submitted.

Secretary of the Interior Standards cited:
#9: Contemporary designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original material.

#10: New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

STUDY ITEMS

313 Washtenaw

Applicant: Jian Qun Wang and Huaxian (Susan) Qu; owners (present)

Discussion: Application is regarding the installation of a new front stair and porch.

Wang: States that the concrete stairs are broken. He states that he plans for wood stairs with a roof on top.

Prebys: States that the drawings do not show any handrails and that the HDC would need to see a plan for them in the application.

Schmiedeke: States that the elevation shows the stairs as the full width of the porch but the floor plan shows the stairs do not run the full width of the porch.

Wang: States that the stairs are not planned for the full width of the porch.

Prebys: States that if the stairs were to run the full width of the porch then the handrail could be attached directly to the porch posts. He states that the HDC would need more detail on the handrails for the stairs and the porch railing.

Rupert: States that the handrail and guardrail could be as simple as a 2' x 2' for the top and bottom rails.

Pettit: States that the drawing depicts that siding will be utilized on the porch that matches what is on the house. Since there are a couple different types of siding used on the house he would like to know which siding from the house will be used on the porch.

Prebys: Advises the applicant that the HDC will need to know exactly what type of siding will be used when the application is submitted. He states that they will be looking for a picture and description. He would also like to know what they plan is for lighting to porch area. He would like to know if it will be on the wall.

Qu: States that there already is a light on the wall.

Rupert: Advises that the angle of the roof is going to cover the current light fixture.

Prebys: States that the HDC will need to know exactly what they plan to do with regard to the light fixture. He would also like to know what the plan is for the mailbox, this is something that will also need to be submitted with the application and a drawing depicting where it will be.

Wang: States that he is planning to install the mailbox on the side of the building.

Pettit: States that the applicant will need to cover the porch sides with some type of skirting and the HDC will need to know what the plan is for this as well.

Prebys: The porch concept for this house is something that the HDC is comfortable with and this concept could be approved in the future, but more detail is needed in the actual application.

Rupert: States that the applicant could put the mailbox inside the foyer and that they would need to contact USPS for more information. The light fixture

could be placed in the ceiling of the porch; it does not need to be fixed to the wall.

Stevenson: States to summarize what is needed for the application the porch railings, stair handrails, the light fixture for the porch, the siding utilized on the porch, the skirting for the sides of the porch and the mailbox placement need to be addressed in more detail on the future application.

Prebys: States that all wood elements would need to be painted and the HDC would need to know what color will be used.

Rupert: States that no treated planks are to be used for porch decking. That the porch decking needs to be tongue and groove planks. The framing of the porch that is not seen does not need to be painted but what is seen does need to be painted.

Qu: States that she was advised that they need to wait 1 year before painting treated wood.

Condon: Replies that this type of wood can be painted after a few weeks.

Schmiedeke: Requests staff to send a letter to the owner and architect regarding what is needed for the application. Stevenson agrees to same.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS - none

OTHER BUSINESS

Fact sheets: The fence and window fact sheets need to be reviewed by the HDC.

Property Monitoring:

326 E Forest: The garage on the property that previously had no siding now is partially covered with vertical siding. The commission requests that staff send a letter to the owner regarding this.

7 S. Washington: Rupert reports that a computer company is moving in at this address and that they have signed a three year lease.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS – none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of January 14, 2014

Motion: Rupert (second: Pettit) moves to approve with corrections.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Pettit (second: Prebys) moves to adjourn.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:55pm