

CITY OF YPSILANTI
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 22, 2015

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Anne Stevenson Chair 7:00 PM

Meeting Location: Council Chambers, City Hall

Commissioners Present: Anne Stevenson, Hank Prebys, Michael Condon, Jane Schmiedeke, Erika Lindsay, Alex Pettit

Commissioners Absent: Ron Rupert

Staff Present: Cynthia Kochanek, Associate Planner

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Prebys (second: Condon) moves to approve the agenda as submitted.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS - none

PUBLIC HEARING- none

OLD BUSINESS

219 N Huron

*Application was tabled last meeting pending further information on the handrail replacement/installation and a drawing of the proposed steps and railing. Staff has written a letter and left a voicemail advising of the need to attend the meeting tonight or the application would be denied.

Applicant: David Deyo- owner (not present)

Discussion: Stevenson: States that at the last meeting, it was decided that the applicant needed to show up or the application would be denied. This is the last meeting for this application.

Motion: Prebys (second: Condon) moves denial for 219 N Huron for lack of the requested information.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:
 n/a

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

103 S Huron

*Application is for a fence installation; 6' cedar and 4' chain link fence. Installation of the chain link appears to be at the rear of the property.

Applicant: Chris Mason, owner (present)

Discussion: Stevenson: Recaps what the application is for and advises that the HDC does not approve chain link fencing.

Mason: States that she understands and that the chain link was for security and privacy. She states that the chain link would be at the back and that the rose of sharon bush at the front would block any view of the fence.

Prebys: Requests clarification on where the fencing is going to be located.

Mason: She states that the fence is in the back off of the parking lot by SOS. She states that the fence is between the two buildings, that the fencing would tie the two buildings together. They are just trying to close off the area to keep people from cutting in between the properties.

Condon: Inquires as to why it would need to be chain link fencing at the back.

Mason: Replies that it is for visibility, so that they can see what is going on. States that she does not want a solid fence at the back.

Stevenson: Inquires as to whether the applicant would be open to a different fence material.

Mason: Affirms that she is open to a different material, that they only suggested the chain link since they were familiar with it.

Prebys: Inquires as to the location of the 6' cedar fencing.

Mason: *(Indicates on map where the fence would be located)*
She states that the wood fence would be at the front.

Condon: Advises that chain link fence is not allowed and to use instead a wood or aluminum picket fence.

Stevenson: Advises that the wood fence needs to be painted or stained an opaque stain. Inquires as to what color the applicant would like to use.

Mason: States that she would use a dusty rose color to match the house.

Motion: Condon (second: Prebys) moves approval for 103 S Huron St to include a 6' high wood cedar privacy fence towards the front of the building running to the adjacent building and a 4' high fence that is either a wood picket or aluminum bar fence that is semi-opaque at the back. No chain link fence.

Condon (second: Prebys) moves to amend the motion to add the requirement for painting the wood fence in a paint or opaque stain.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:

10- New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

408 N Hamilton

*Application is for reroof in fiberglass shingles. Color: multi-color (red & white)

Applicant: Jerel Harrington -owner (present)

Discussion: Stevenson: Inquires about the roofing.

Harrington: *(Provides a sample of the roof shingle and color)*

States that the only difference from what is already there is that the new shingle will be a dimensional shingle. States that the color matches what is on the house.

Prebys: Inquires as to whether any new vents would need to be added and what type.

Harrington: States that he will need to add vents to the roof and that he would add them to the south side.

(Indicates the locations of the vents with a photo)

The vents would be in the same locations as the existing, in the dormer.

Stevenson: States that the vents, if can vents, need to be at the back so that they cannot be seen from the street.

Prebys: Inquires about a new drip edge.

Harrington: States that the new drip edge and rake edge would be white to match the trim.

Motion: Prebys (second: Pettit) moves approval of the application for 408 N Hamilton for the installation of a new roof which is CertainTeed dimensional fiberglass shingle in Colonial Slate. Venting shall be on the south side of the dormer, if extra venting is necessary, it is recommended that they be ridge venting. Drip edge is white.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

64 N Huron

*Application is for window replacement, restoration of wood framing, installation of metal panels and frosted glass below storefront windows and tuck pointing.

Applicant: John Stadnicar, NTH Consultants – engineer (present)

Discussion: Stevenson: Requests an overview of the work to be completed.

Stadnicar: States that he is working for DTE and that they are planning to redo the storefront windows and the panels below the windows. They plan

to use aluminum frames for the top windows, wood framing under the windows and metal panels within the wood framing. States that two of the panels below the main windows are wired glass and they will be replaced with double pane glass. The color stated in the application for the window framing was brown however they plan to use bronze instead. The metal panels below the main windows will be insulated. They are planning some repointing of the brick and limestone on the lower level due to weathering. Sealants will be used around the windows.

Prebys: Clarifies that the tuck pointing will be for both the limestone and brick.

Stadnicar: Affirms.

Pettit: Inquires as to whether the leaded glass will be part of the project.

Stadnicar: States that those will not be part of the project at this time. If DTE does decide to do anything, they can refurbish them.

Prebys: Inquires about the wired glass.

Stadnicar: States that the wired glass is for the two smaller windows below the main windows.

Condon: Inquires as to why the copper finish.

Stadnicar: States that the current framing is real copper that has been painted over.

Condon: Clarifies that the copper color would be a coating.

Stadnicar: Confirms.

Condon: States that the coating would not patina like real copper.

Stadnicar: Confirms that it would not create that green patina, it would be a regular copper color and that it would not be that bright.

Schmiedeke: Inquires as to whether the HDC needs to talk to the contractor regarding the type of mortar for tuck pointing.

Condon: States that the contractors that DTE hires usually know what they are doing in regards to the tuck pointing.

Lindsay: States that on the drawing with the application it lists that the existing glazing system will be suspended 1 inch behind the new glazing system and asks if the new glazing system will continue all the way up.

Stadnicar: States that it will not run all the way up but they may put the double pane windows behind the current leaded glass as a temporary weather seal in that area.

Prebys: Seeks verification that the new glass will be behind the existing leaded glass.

Standnicar: Confirms.

Motion: Condon (second: Prebys) moves approval of the application for 64 N Huron Street to include the removal and replacement of the storefront windows with Kawneer Encore Glazing System with an aluminum frame and a copper finish. With the WireLite NT wired glass being installed into the two lower bulkhead windows and the cleaning of the existing masonry, tuck pointing of the existing masonry and replacement of the joint sealants on the west elevation of the building. Any limestone patching or tuck pointing should be tooled and color matched to the existing mortar in type N mortar or softer. Insulated metal panels will be installed underneath the storefront windows.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:

#5- Preserve distinctive features.

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

36 N Huron

*Application is for sign replacement.

Applicant: Heather Freeling– owner (present)

Discussion: Stevenson: Asks whether the applicant has talked to the building department regarding the size of the sign.

Freeling: States that it is smaller than the current sign.

Staff: Advises that the current zoning ordinance is different than the ordinance in place when the old sign was approved.

Prebys: States that the building department alerted the HDC that the sign is being denied due to its size.

Stevenson: States that we can discuss the sign but it may need to be resized.

Prebys: States that the sign looks great but that the building department regulations supersede the HDC.

Condon: Asks who measured the size of the sign that is listed in the application and asks whether the sign fits within the existing signboard.

Freeling: States that the person that created the sign did the measurements. She states that the entire sign does not fit into the current signboard. The word salon will not fit within. States that there was some confusion as to whether she was in the historic district or not.

Condon: States that the issue is not the HDC but the zoning and the sign ordinance that requires the sign to be of a certain size. States that even if she was not in the HDC, the sign would still need to meet the sign ordinance. States that he also likes the sign.

Freeling: Suggests that she can project out the word “salon”.

Stevenson: States that the applicant should check back in with the building department to see what the issue is with the size. She states to come back to the HDC once the issue with the size is resolved. Advises to see if there is a way to redesign the current sign to make it work.

Pettit: Advises that for the HDC it is about the method of attachment and the materials used for the sign. He states that once the size of the sign is resolved to come back and let the HDC regarding those things and then the applicant can move forward.

Motion: Prebys (second: Condon) moves to table the application for 36 N Huron pending the resolution of the placement of all letters in the signboard area.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:
n/a

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

316 Pearl

*Application is for roof and gutter replacement. Replacement roof is stone-coated steel and the gutters will be replaced with k-style gutters and downspouts in white.

Applicant: Chandler Metal Roofing– contractor (absent)

Discussion: Stevenson: States that it is still a material that is trying to be something that it isn't.

Prebys: States that he is fine with this roof.

Condon: States that he prefers that it be metal roof with the standing seems.

Lindsay: Inquires as to how this roof will wear as it ages and how the roof is applied.

Prebys: States that the HDC needs more info on the venting system and trim.

Stevenson: States that the commission will need to do some research into this type of roof.

Motion: Pettit (second: Condon) moves to table the application for more information about the roofing system.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:
n/a

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

STUDY ITEMS

306 N River, Suite D

Applicant: Daniel Kubera & Eric Mullins- owner (present)

Discussion: Stevenson: States that she does not see any problem with the windows.

Kubera: States that they are looking to open up an old door that has been closed off for ADA access.

Stevenson: States that she does not see a problem with that.

Condon: Asks about the materials used for the windows.

Kubera: States that it is just a wood window that will be painted. He plans to match the current windows.

Prebys: Sees no problem with plans and that they just need to return with an application.

320 N Washington

Applicant: Chris Janowiak- owner (present)

Discussion: Stevenson: States that he is looking to replace the windows and inquires as to whether it would be all the windows that would be replaced.

Janowiak: He confirms that all of the windows would be replaced except the ones in the addition from 1999. He states that all of the windows have been there since 1930 and he is looking to button up the building. He is planning on wood replacement windows with aluminum cladding.

Condon: States that the HDC is charged to preserve what can be saved. States that often the replacement of the windows may save up to 20% of energy costs and the cost of replacing the windows would take almost 20 years to recoup.

Janowiak: States that the storms are not working well and is looking to reduce the heating costs and that it is hard for the current storms and windows to be reached and cleaned.

Prebys: States that he has storms and he brings someone in to clean and maintain them.

Janowiak: States that he would just like to replace them, that he would like something that has easier maintenance.

Stevenson: States that with the application she would like to see photos that show what condition the windows are in currently to see if the replacement is actually needed. She states that the current proposed window is a frame within a frame and that the HDC cannot approve a reduction in window glass area.

Condon: Suggests a sash replacement and that can increase the efficiency of the windows.

Janowiak: States that these are single pane windows.

Prebys: Advises that the HDC is charged with preserving what they can.

Stevenson: States that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation state to repair and not replace. If the applicant can prove that it needs to be done, then they can approve replacement.

Pettit: States the HDC has seen where the sash replacement has worked and that is why they are suggesting it.

Prebys: States that the new growth wood that will be used in the new wood windows will not be as strong as the old growth that was used in the current windows.

Janowiak: Inquires as to whether the shutters can be replaced or removed. Asks about plastic or other materials. He states that he had them replaced about 10 years ago and that they are already falling apart.

Condon: Advises that if the new wood shutter matched the same size that he would not have a problem with the overlap no longer being there as long as they looked similar. They do not need to be a custom shutter.

Stevenson: States to bring spec sheets for the new shutters with the application as long as they are the same size.

Janowiak: Inquires about the replacement of garage doors. He states that the doors are very old and heavy and that with flower deliveries it is very hard to maneuver them. He will match what is there but in an insulated aluminum door. He has had people look at it and attempt repairs but they are worried about a heavy door coming down on someone. It is not powered.

Stevenson: Advises of application process and recommends to come back in as a study item. She advises not to replicate the old garage door, to use a modern door without the paneling and the windows in the garage door are not necessary, advises to bring in a few options for the garage door for the HDC to take a look at.

Janowiak: States that he is looking to replace the main wood doors with steel doors.

Stevenson: Advises that for the street side elevation, she would prefer to see wood doors and would not like to see the replacement of working doors.

Condon: Advises that the wood is a better door than the steel door. Wood is more impact resistant and you can get a wood door to be just as efficient as a new steel door.

Janowiak: States that he is currently putting in LED lights and requests that the HDC go by and look at the lights.

Stevenson: States that the lighting needs to be brought to the HDC for approval as well.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS- None

OTHER BUSINESS

Tabled Applications

The HDC discusses the process for keeping track of tabled applications and the need to have a decision rendered on an application prior to 60 days. It is suggested that staff calculate the 60 days from the date that a complete application is turned in and that if a decision is not rendered after the first meeting that a deadline that the application needs a decision by is listed in the minutes and confirmed with the applicant. It is also discussed that if the applicant and the HDC are able to agree on an extension at a meeting, that that may suffice for the agreement needed for the extension.

Property Monitoring

169 N Washington: Appears that there was a fire at this location and it needs to be monitored. HDC advised staff to send a reminder letter to owner on 8/25/15. Staff received a call from the owner, work has stalled at the site due to contractor issues. Owner is aware of the need for HDC approval for work.

214 W Forest: Second notice sent 12/11/14. No update. Staff was advised to send a letter regarding a window that had been sided over in 2014 at the 6/9/15 meeting. Staff sent a letter on 6/10/15.

35 S Huron: 12/2/14 staff took photos of what appeared to be exterior work being done. 12/11/14 staff sent out letter reminding owner that exterior work must be approved by the HDC. No new work has been done.

613 N Prospect: Columns were removed from the front of the house without HDC approval for repair work. In September 2014, the owner stated the repairs were taking longer than expected, but that the columns would be reinstalled. Will monitor to make sure the columns are returned.

322 E Cross: The HDC noticed that there was a recent outbuilding added to the property. Staff sent a letter on 12/11/14 requesting an application for the additional structure. Second notice sent on 1/15/15. Commission advised staff to send additional letter on 5/26/15.

215 S Washington: The HDC requests that a letter be sent to the owner advising that any exterior work requires an HDC work permit since it appears that work is in process at this property. Staff sent letter on 1/15/15 with no response.

33 E Cross: Staff sent out a letter on 2/24/15 to the owner inquiring about work that needs to be done to maintain the bricks on the west side of the building.

15 S Washington: The HDC noticed work being done on this property without approval; specifically this is referring to the removal of the roof. 5/12/15 - Staff contacted the Building Department and was informed that there was a permit issued for "removal of decking and roof (demo work only)" and they have not applied for any additional permits. It is not clear why the work did not require HDC approval. Staff sent second notice 5/6/15.

202 N River: The HDC requests that a letter be sent to the owner advising that any exterior work requires an HDC work permit as there was a new stair entrance leading to the back of the property without approval as of 3/24/15. HDC advised staff to send a letter on 6/9/15.

219 N Huron: Unapproved set of wood stairs and railings on the front of the home. Owner of property came in on the 8/11/15 meeting to discuss what needs to be done with the stairs. Application denied for lack of info on 9/22/15.

409 Maple: Work was approved on 7/24/14 and the HDC is concerned it has not been completed as of 4/28/15. Staff was advised to send a letter on 6/23/15.

302 E Cross: HDC brought to staff's attention that the house has been inactive for a period of time. HDC advised staff to send letter at the 8/11/15 meeting requesting information of intentions for the home.

9 N River: The HDC noticed that there are large amounts of exposed wood on this home due to paint peeling and chipping. Advised staff to send a letter on 8/25/15. Shutters have been removed and this may be prep work for painting.

MHPN Training

Some available MHPN training options, days and possible locations are discussed.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS –none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of September 8, 2015

Motion: Prebys (second: Condon) moves to approve the minutes as submitted.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:56 pm