

CITY OF YPSILANTI
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 13, 2015

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Anne Stevenson Chair 7:05 PM

Meeting Location: Council Chambers, City Hall

Commissioners Present: Anne Stevenson, Jane Schmiedeke, Erika Lindsay, Alex Pettit

Commissioners Absent: Hank Prebys, Ron Rupert, Michael Condon

Staff Present: Cynthia Kochanek, Associate Planner

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Pettit (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the agenda as amended to include 320 N Washington and 220 S Huron as study items and the review of Thompson Block plans as other business.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS - none

PUBLIC HEARING- none

OLD BUSINESS

36 N Huron

**Application is for sign installation.*

Applicant: Heather Freeling - owner (present)

Discussion: Freeling: States that the sign is ok as far as she knows with the building department. There was some confusion with the measurements. The applicant states that the entire sign will go within the existing signboard. The letters for the word "salon" will be suspended less than 1" out underneath the Rebel Heart portion. She will attach the sign with the brackets have been affixed to the back of the sign and then will use nails or screws to attach the sign to the signboard. She will be painting the inside of the signboard fame possibly black or white. She would prefer black.

Stevenson: States that black may make the sign and letters less visible. She suggests grey for behind the sign.

Motion: Pettit (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the application for work at 36 N Huron St to include the installation of a sign, the sign and cut letters are made of steel. The sign will be attached using brackets that are attached to

the back of the sign and screws will be used to attach the sign to the signboard. The signboard will be painted a shade of grey as decided by the applicant.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:

#10- New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

316 Pearl

**Application is for reroof and gutter installation.*

Applicant: Chandler Metal Roofing, Al Hensel - contractor (present)

Discussion: Stevenson: States that they wanted a little more info about the product and about roof venting. She advises that the HDC does not like to approve materials that replicate another material. She states that the HDC makes decisions that are based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Structures. One of those is to not imitate earlier styles. She also states that asphalt shingles are essentially imitating an earlier style but that asphalt shingles have been installed the historic district since the 1930s so they are themselves a material that is now somewhat historic in their own right. She states that she advised the commission to research the product.

Hensel: States that they do ridge venting. Ridge venting will work for the entire house. The straps will not work with this roof system; they will be using hidden hangers for the gutters. They will install the same style and color gutters and downspouts that are there currently. He also forgot to mention that the applicant would like the gutter protection installed in the gutters and that it will not be seen since it will be placed inside the gutter.

Stevenson: States that she looked at a property that has this type of roof installed and that she could not tell the difference.

Pettit: States that to him asphalt shingles are an imitation of another material already.

Hensel: States that he will need to install the roof to wall flashing under the wood siding at two spots where the porch roof meets the siding, this wood siding is actually not in the best shape and he would need to install a trim board to place the flashing under and that board will be painted to match the house. It will be a piece of wood that will run parallel to the porch roof line and will match the 2" siding.

Pettit: Inquires as to whether it would protrude any farther than the siding or window trim.

Hensel: States that it would not. The drip edge will be white to match the fascia. He states that the roof will have a 1" stone coated gable edge piece that will go above the gable edges.

Motion: Pettit (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the application for work at 316 Pearl to include the removal of the existing roof and the replacement with a Decra metal roof in the color midnight eclipse. All venting to be ridge

vents. There will be an edge piece along the gable ends that extends about a 1"-1 ½" above the roof deck to be the same color and material as the roof itself, drip edge to be white. New k-style gutters in white and downspouts to be in the same locations as current. In areas where the porch roof meets the wall of the house, there will be a 2" board set along the edge, similar to the window casing in profile, to cover the roof to wall flashing and will be painted to match the body of the house.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:

#9- Contemporary designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original material.

#10- New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

219 N Huron

**Application is for porch installation.*

Applicant: Kathryn Deyo - owner (present)

Discussion: Stevenson: States that the porch looks really good. Her only comment is that the lattice skirting on the sides of the porch steps needs to be framed in with an additional bottom rail piece.

Motion: Lindsay (second: Pettit) moves to approve the application for 219 N Huron as completed; to replace the front porch and railings according the HDC porch standards with one addition; the lattice on the sides of the porch steps needs to be framed in at the bottom and painted to match.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:

#9- Contemporary designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original material.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

306 N River

**Application is for window installation. Application came in to the previous meeting as a study item.*

Applicant: Daniel Kubera and Alex Mers- tenants (present)

Discussion: Stevenson: States that nothing deviated from the study item that was brought in before.

Kubera: States that he would like to go over the door options. He inquires if the door needs to be painted to match the existing doors and if the window configuration on the proposed door is ok?

Schmiedeke: Advises that the door needs to be painted to protect it.

Stevenson: Confirms that it should be painted green and the proposed door is fine.

Lindsay: Inquires about the window installation since the window proposed is flat on top but the window opening has an arch. She would like to know how that will be dealt with.

Kubera: States that they will match the current windows and fill the arch with wood just like the existing windows.

Motion: Lindsay (second: Pettit) moves approval for the application at 306 N River to include the replacement of windows and a door to open up the previously blocked in openings. The windows will be an Anderson 400 series TW21062 and a Simpson #7944 entrance door in Douglas fir. The door and windows will be painted green to match the existing.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:

#9- Contemporary designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original material.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

214 S Washington

**Application is for storm window installation.*

Applicant: Sears Home Improvement; Mike Enright - contractor (present)

Discussion: Stevenson: Asks the applicant to advise if any of the storms are there or if they are missing. States that staff went out to document the property and the staff member felt that the storms that are there are wood. States that the HDC would prefer the storms be replaced with in kind materials.

Enright: States that he is unsure of the materials that are there. The new storms would be all aluminum and they can be painted to match the existing. States that the current storms are leaking air and they will replace all of them so that they all look alike.

Stevenson: States that if new wood storms could be clad in aluminum, if possible, that would be better. States that better photos are needed to prove that the storms really are unrepairable.

Pettit: Advises to repair the storms if possible and advises that the HDC would prefer a wood storm.

Lindsay: States that with only 10 storms being replaced it would create a mismatch from one window to another.

Stevenson: Reiterates that the HDC would need to see some up close photos.

Motion: Pettit (second: Schmiedeke) moves to table the application for additional information to include more detailed photos of the windows in question that the owner is aiming to replace.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:

n/a

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

25 S Huron

**Application is for painting.*

Applicant: Credit Bureau, Craig Annas - owner (not present)

Discussion: The HDC discussed the color that the applicant is looking to paint the side of the building. HDC requests that the staff advise the applicant that power washing is not allowed as it will damage the bricks and create spalling from water freezing that can be forced behind the bricks during power washing.

Motion: Schmiedeke (second: Lindsay) moves to approve the application for 25 S Huron for the painting of the south façade in Boston Brick and the trim in American White.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:

#10- New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

58 E Forest

**Application is for fence, driveway, shutters and flowerbox installation and porch replacement.*

Applicant: Pamela Herzog - owner (present)

Discussion: Herzog: States that she probably should not have submitted all the pieces of this application at once but that a lot of the work hinges on each other. She addresses the flowerboxes, shutters and a gate with a shamrock on it first. She will have them made out of wood and they are handcrafted. The shutters will go the length of the windows and will be three 5½ inch boards put together. The flower boxes would be wood and painted in the same color of the house trim.

Schmiedeke: States that the shutters need to be sized correctly so that they would appear to be able to close over the window even though they will not be functional.

Herzog: Advises that two shutters are already up. She would like to put a picket fence between 58 E Forest and 56 E Forest and along the back of 631 N River and 56 E Forest. She states that currently there is a fence up but it just needs to be lengthened about 25'. The fence would a few inches off of the property line on her side.

Pettit: States that the placement of the exact fence would be up to the building department.

Schmiedeke: Seeks clarification on the placement of the fence.

Herzog: She would like the picket fence between the two houses and the privacy fence at the back. She states that she would paint the fence to match the house or white.

Stevenson: States that the white fence would get dirty.

Lindsay: Asks whether there is a third fence in the front since the drawing is unclear.

Herzog: States that there is not a third type of fencing and that the gate would meet the height of the proposed fencing.

Stevenson: Seeks clarification on where the fence will be going. She would like the applicant to clarify that she is placing fencing at the rear of the 56 E Forest property.

Herzog: States that the parcel at the back is also her property and she would like the fencing for boundary definition. She states that currently she does not have any parking on the parcel. States that she would like a driveway to make things accessible since the current parking is far away. The driveway will be concrete and it will match city specs. She states that the City engineering states that the driveway needs to be 9 feet. She states that the proposed driveway will be about 2 feet away from the picket fence she is planning on installing. She states that she will replace the entire current porch that is in poor condition and replace it with steps that face the opposite direction. The new steps will project only 36" away from the house to help provide clearance for the driveway.

Pettit: Asks if there is a drawing of the plans for the new steps or the entire project since it is difficult for the HDC to approve concepts.

Herzog: States that she does not have a drawing of the entire house with the porch and driveway.

Pettit: Asks about whether the City signs in the ROW will still remain.

Herzog: States that she has not seen a drawing that leaves the signs in place.

Schmiedeke: States that she has a problem with the curing compound in the concrete since it makes the concrete bright white. She advises to do a different curing compound or to use a dye so that the concrete is not a bright white.

Herzog: States that the gate would be the same height as the picket fence. The gate will be the same width as the city sidewalk. The shrubs at the front of the house will be part of another project. She did not realize that landscaping was a piece that the HDC would look at.

Pettit: States that the HDC is concerned with landscaping. States that he would need a specific drawing or specs for the gate since the drawing seems to not be to scale. He advises that the person building the gate should be able to provide a drawing that is closer to a spec sheet since the drawing could be interpreted incorrectly.

Stevenson: States that there is some uncertainty about the gate and the size of it.

Chairperson Stevenson opens public comment

Kathy Tally, 56 E Forest:

States that she has been at that address for 17 years and she has added the landscaping at the edge of her property since there was none when she moved in. She states that that she is unsure as to how a driveway could be added to this area of the property without a retaining wall or other site modification due to a grade change at the rear of the property. She states that none of the neighbors in the area have fencing and with this proposal she will now have fencing within 10 to 15 feet from her back door.

Marcia Cohen, 59 E Forest

She states that there is not enough space for the driveway. She states that the older gentleman that lived there prior was denied a driveway he proposed in the same area. She states that the other side of the house may be a better option and the applicant could even place a garage on that side.

Herzog: States that there are several issues that she would like to address. She states that grading has been discussed and the drainage will be addressed as well so that any additional water runoff will not be forced onto the other properties. She states that she does not want to intrude on her neighbors in anyway. States that she does not see a problem with a fence that is on her property.

Stevenson: States that the HDC is not here to debate any neighbor disputes but that the HDC is here to decide if the changes are appropriate for the district.

Herzog: States that the hosta plants on her neighbor's property will not be touched since the property line is skewed. States that the neighbor has stuff on her property that needs to be moved. She states that she spoke with Janice at DPS and that they are reviewing the application for the driveway.

Pettit: Advises that overall the HDC is charged to make sure that this is right for the property.

Stevenson: States that the HDC would like visit the property and asks permission to come on to the property.

Herzog: Confirms that coming onto the property is ok.

Herzog: *(Returns later in the meeting)* States that she would be ok with the picket fence at the back instead of the taller 6' privacy fence.

Motion: Pettit (second: Schmiedeke) moves to table the application for work at 58 E Forest pending further information regarding the gate detail, an as built drawing for the gate and pending a site visit to gather more info. Also, further info from the building department regarding the proposals that are under consideration.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:
n/a

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

STUDY ITEMS

320 N Washington

Applicant: Chris Janowiak- owner (present)

Discussion: Janowiak: States that they will match the shutters and will work with the windows. The garage doors do not meet OSHA standards and they cannot find any replacement parts. He brought in a spec sheet from Abbey door for options. These garages doors are causing problems. He is looking for info on whether the HDC would like windows in the garage doors. The old doors are wood and are uninsulated. States that the exterior framing would stay the same.

Schmiedeke: States that she would like to see the windows in the new garage doors.

Stevenson: States that the modern type door should not replicate the historic door. Advised of the recessed framed door with windows as a possibility. Advised of what the application process will entail.

220 S Huron

Applicant: Marla and Joe Queen- owner (present)

Discussion: States that there is an issue with the front steps. They are slate underneath the Trex material that was placed over them about one year ago. The slate underneath the Trex is flaking off. They attempted to repair them. States that new slate steps would cost too much and the fix and the Trex over then only lasted one year. They are looking for suggestions for new options for the steps. They would like to retina the cheek walls around the steps.

Schmiedeke: States that the real issue is that moisture seems to be an issue for this part of the property and they may want to look into that.

Stevenson: States that the options for concrete, sandstone or wood are possible but that the actual product is up to the applicant.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS- None

OTHER BUSINESS

Thompson Block Review

The HDC discusses the final plans for the Thompson Block that were submitted to the building department. The HDC originally approved the plans back in 2014 and the building department is looking for the HDC to confirm that the plans are the same. Staff advises that the plans appear to be the same other than the doors at the rear of the property no longer appear to have windows but seem to be solid doors now. Stevenson: confirms that is the HDC is satisfied.

Property Monitoring

Staff advises that there are no updates on property monitoring at this time.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS –none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of September 22, 2015

Motion: Pettit (second: Lindsay) moves to approve the minutes as submitted.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:26 pm