

CITY OF YPSILANTI
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES OF April 26, 2016

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Anne Stevenson Chair 7:00 PM

Meeting Location: Council Chambers, City Hall, 1 S Huron St

Commissioners Present: Anne Stevenson, Hank Prebys, Ron Rupert, Alex Pettit, Jane Schmiedeke, Erika Lindsay

Commissioners Absent: none

Staff Present: Haley McAlpine, HDC Assistant

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Rupert (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the agenda as amended to move 1 S Huron to the bottom of New Business and to move Property Monitoring to the top of Other Business.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

Motion: Rupert (second: Prebys) moves to re-amend the agenda to include 418 Maple St as a Study Item.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS - none

PUBLIC HEARING—none

OLD BUSINESS

16 S Washington St

**Application is for the installation of fencing, a green house, and for the removal of an existing antique garage door and the sealing of the opening*

Applicant: MaryAnn Nisley, Growing Hope—not present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that the applicant is not present and there have been no updates on the application.

Motion: Rupert (second: Prebys) moves to table the application for 16 S Washington St.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

116 Maple St

**Application is for the repairing of the existing porch and painting of the house.*

Applicant: Rex Richie, contractor—not present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that they had spoken with the property owner and the contractor, but that this looks like nothing has changed.

Schmiedeke: States that they told him they wanted the spindles to match the small spindles in the frieze or fret work.

Stevenson: States that they would want something to contrast the colors.

Schmiedeke: States that they also want to see specific spindles.

Motion: Prebys (second: Lindsay) moves to table the application for work at 116 Maple St pending more information about the spindle design and paint color application.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

410 N Hamilton St

**Application is for the installation of new footing and concrete repair at the garage on the property.*

Applicant: Jerel Harrington, owner—present

Discussion: Harrington: States that they want to paint the house using the same color scheme, that he may want to go a little lighter with the beige color. *shows photos and paint samples* States that there are some boards that will be replaced with cedar and that he provided them with a sheet with info on it. States that he will replace some of the cedar shakes. *Shows sample of cedar shake* States that he just replacing some of the panes glass of in the windows. States the garage has a bad lean to it, and that he found someone who will raise the garage for him and he will pour a new footing beneath it. States that he spoke with the building department and they said he could pull a permit to do the work himself.

Schmiedeke: Asks about the floor—asks if it is wooden.

Harrington: States that the floor is dirt and that animals burrow underneath.

Schmiedeke: Asks if he will pour a concrete floor.

Harrington: States that he is unsure—he may pour a concrete floor or he may use gravel.

Prebys: States that they want to look at the garage application first.

Stevenson: Asks for questions from the Commissioners on the garage.

Harrington: States that he plans to raise the garage as high as 8", and then pour new concrete footing all the way around.

Rupert: Asks if the footing will be on all four sides.

Harrington: Affirms.

Rupert: States that he may have to replace the plate.

Harrington: States that he had added some lumber earlier. States that he will dig down a couple of feet, then pour concrete around it to create a nice base.

Prebys: States that the garage looks unstable, asks how the applicant will lift it without it becoming more unstable.

Harrington: States that his contractor will be able to lift it at the corners. States that the contractor stated that once they raise it up, the walls will come in and straighten themselves. States that they are not fastened to any structure right now—they are just on the ground.

Stevenson: Asks if the contractor will use any kind of temporary shoring inside the walls to hold them up.

Harrington: Affirms—states that he will use timbers to support it. States that where the corner of the garage is, he will angle some timbers at a couple of places to support it.

Prebys: Asks if he will be replacing the doors.

Harrington: States that he is not, but that he may have to replace some of the siding. He would reuse existing siding. States that when he lifts the garage up, he might cut off a couple inches off the bottom of the garage and reuse that siding to replace siding that needs replacing. States that there are only a few places that need replacing.

Prebys: Asks what he will do if the bottom of the siding is too bad of shape.

Harrington: States that he will have to make the siding to match himself and that he would not be able to buy that kind of siding. States that it almost looks like base molding or a door jam.

Prebys: States that it is a very narrow clapboard. States that whatever he uses will have to match what was there.

Harrington: States that he can do that.

Motion: Prebys (second: Schmiedeke) moves approval for the application for 410 N Hamilton for work on the garage, plan A: to jack up the garage, install adequate footing, straighten the walls, and repair the floor, all with the certainty that the interior would be stabilized before the jacking to ensure that the integrity of the building is maintained. Also, work is to include replacing the glass in the windows as necessary, and replacing the siding as necessary with like siding.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#6—Repair, don't replace. Replacements shall match original.

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

410 N Hamilton St

**Application is for the repainting of the house, stucco repair, and siding replacement as needed.*

Applicant: Jerel Harrington, owner—present

Discussion: Stevenson: State that this application is for painting, stucco repair, and repair of siding. Asks if paint will match existing color scheme.

Harrington: Affirms.

Stevenson: Asks if he is just repairing the siding with like kind materials.

Harrington: Affirms.

Prebys: States that the paint is in rough shape—states that they will not permit the use of power washing, and that this is to protect the siding. States that the water can damage the siding and it gets water in the wood.

Harrington: States that he wasn't planning on power washing, and that he had already scraped the house.

Prebys: States that he needs to use an oil-based primer before the application of the finish coat to help preserve the wood. States it would come in handy on raw wood.

Harrington: States that he had planned on priming, but that he had not planned on using oil based.

Prebys: States that a water-based finish coat is acceptable. States that they recommend something with a semi-gloss or eggshell finish to help keep dirt off and to help the water to run off.

Rupert: States that they could use a satin finish.

Prebys: States that he doesn't have a problem with painting, but that he doesn't know much about stucco repair.

Harrington: *Shows photos of previous stucco repair job he completed* States that on the previous job he added stones and coloring to the new stucco to match the existing stucco. States that he used the wire mesh first to hold the stucco.

Schmiedeke: Clarifies if the stucco repair is just on the foundation.

Harrington: Affirms.

Motion: Prebys (second: Pettit) moves to approve the application for work at 410 N Hamilton for painting of the house and the garage, and repair of stucco around the foundation. The house and garage will be painted with the same color scheme as currently in place: a cream, blue, and red. The cream as the major part of the body will be Natural Sheep Skin, Valspar 30016c. The blue, grey, and red accents will match the original. The stucco base repair with metal lathe as necessary and stucco will have color added to match the existing in color and texture. Replace any wood siding with cedar siding to match existing. Clean the building gently—no sandblasting no power washing.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#6—Repair, don't replace. Replacements shall match original.

#10—New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

224 N River St

**Application is for the amendment to previous approval regarding placement of fence.*

Applicant: Judy Weinburger, owner—present

Discussion: Weinburger: States that at a previous meeting she had submitted a request for fencing, and it was approved by the HDC and the Building Department. States that two of three neighbors have given their approval. States that she has approached the neighbor at 222 N River St, owned by the Edmonds Family Trust, and that Kathy, who manages the property, must give her approval. States that she has spoken with Kathy, who gave her verbal approval but then when asked for written verification, Kathy was inconsistent. States that even if she can get her neighbor to agree and give approval, she doesn't think it will hold up. States that on that side of the property, there is a very large tree. States that if she moves the fence one foot over, she avoids the large tree and she avoids her neighbor's property. States that this would be a good answer to the problem.

Stevenson: Clarifies that the current chain link fence rides right along the property line, so in order to remove it, she would need notarized documents from the neighbors.

Weinburger: Affirms. States that the other neighbors like the idea and have given the notarized documents. States that they would be removing the north side, and on the east side, she backs up to the tow company who has a 10' high chain link fence. The tow company owner has asked her to put her new fence right up against his fence, since his fence is for security. States that if she moves it one foot inside, she would miss the tree and then it would be firmly on her property. States that it would be simpler than pushing the issue of asking for a notarized piece of paper that may not hold, as the neighbor has been inconsistent.

Stevenson: States that she understands why she is here. States that there is still the concern that the 1' gap will not be big enough for a mower or allow for the removal of weeds. States that is a concern in a sense that the weeds or trash will be trapped in between the fences. States that the 1' gap wouldn't be enough space to fit a person to clear the trash and weeds out.

Weinburger: States that she goes along the fence to fish out trash that gets caught in the fence right now, states that she wouldn't have a problem to continue to do that.

Lindsay: Asks if it is possible to butt it up closer to the existing fence. Asks if she could get it as close as possible.

Weinburger: Asks how close is as close as possible. States that going a foot inward allows them to miss the large tree.

Rupert: States that before she puts the fence down, she could tear out the sod and put in a landscape fabric so that the weeds can't grow up, and then put gravel over top of that. States that it won't keep the trash out, but it will keep the grass down.

Pettit: Clarifies that this is just an amendment to a previous approval.

Stevenson: Affirms.

Weinburger: Asks if she will have to pay for another building permit.

Stevenson: States that she does not believe so, but that she doesn't know for sure and doesn't want to give out misinformation.

Motion: Rupert (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the amended application for 224 N River, for the moving of the south side of the fence approximately one foot inside of the property line to complete the connection of the fence.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

#10—New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

109 Buffalo St.

**Application is for the replacement of two windows on the rear of the property.*

Applicant: Lilian Johnson, owner—present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that they have already spoken with the applicant about the two windows on the back. States that they told the applicant that they would agree to make an exception to their vinyl window policy to allow those two windows to be replaced with vinyl, since on the rest of the property the windows have already been changed out for vinyl.

Rupert: States that the windows are also being allowed because they are on the rear.

Johnson: *provides the Commission with a cut-sheet* States that Wallside has provided her with information on the new windows. States that they are energy efficient. States that her mother is on a fixed-income, and that she had very few contractors provide her with information. States that the quotes she did get were higher than she could afford. States that Wallside has stated they could replace three windows for the price of replacing one or two.

Prebys: States that an issue with Wallside they have had before, is that they reduce the glass size. States that they take the glass out and put a new frame inside of the old frame.

Pettit: States that they are replacements anyway, so they will have to take them out.

Lindsay: States that it will reduce the glass size.

Stevenson: States that they had originally discussed two windows, but the cut sheet lists three.

Johnson: States that they could do just two, and that it would not be a problem if they could not get the third window approved.

Prebys: States he would be ok with approving all three.

Schmiedeke: States that the motion should stress that this is an exception to a rule.

Lindsay: Clarifies location of replacement windows on photos.

Stevenson: States they are considering allowing replacement of all three.

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) moves to approve the application for new windows at 109 Buffalo. Work is to include the replacement of three rear windows on the first floor with the vinyl windows as proposed by the applicant. The HDC

will allow this as an exception because the remaining windows on the building are vinyl.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#10—New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

205 W Michigan Ave.

**Application is for the replacement of the fire escape at the rear of the building.*

Applicant: Brian Brickley, authorized agent—Present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that they have the application and the drawings for the proposal of the replacement for the fire escape. Asks if he can help go over the drawings.

Brickley: States that the drawing is a birds eye view of the third floor and second floor. *Shows Commissioners the different areas of the drawings* States that they are creating decking to get you to the existing staircase. States that a lot of it was there.

Stevenson: Clarifies if the landing is on the roof.

Brickley: Affirms, states that the landing will be sitting on 4x4s to keep it from penetrating the new roofing but also will allow access from both floors of that building down and into the parking lot.

Rupert: States that on the balcony, where it goes down to the first floor roof, asks if supports will remain.

Brickley: States they will not—they are temporary—they will be replaced with 6x6 treated lumber.

Rupert: States that he has a question about the railing—states they require a top and bottom rail, but the drawing only has a top rail. States that the porch fact sheet shows what they want—they will want another rail on the bottom with less than 4" above.

Brickley: Asks if it matters if only the people in the back dumping trash can see it.

Prebys: States that someone will see it and wonder why it was allowed.

Rupert: States that the hand rails have to be graspable, or circular.

Prebys: States that this is a building department requirement. States that they have natural wood with sealer listed on the application, but that they require an opaque stain or paint.

Brickley: States that he brought in samples of the solid stains and paints to choose from. *shows samples* States that he would go with Pine Pods.

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) moves approval for the application for work done at 205 W Michigan Ave to include a stair access for the third floor, and a walkway from the door on the second floor leading to the stair to the ground that will be made of pressure treated wood, to follow the plan view and proposed side view as submitted with the application. The handrail will have a board at the top and bottom of the handrail, and it will be treated with an opaque stain in color Pine Pods.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

#10—New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

24 N Huron St.

**Application is for the installation of a fence at the rear parking lot of the property.*

Applicant: Bessie Pappas, owner—present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that the application is for a fence and gate to go around the rear of the property at the parking lot. States that they received multiple photos. Asks Pappas to clarify the drawings on the photos she submitted.

Schmiedeke: States that she doesn't understand where the fence will go.

Pappas: States she can leave the gate as is or have the top go straight across.

Stevenson: Clarifies where the gate and fence will go on the site map. States it is difficult to visualize where the fence will go based on the photos of the property and the site map she provided.

Pappas: States that she told the contractor to make the drawing simple.

Stevenson: Clarifies location of gate in relation to fence *shows on map*

Rupert: States that he doesn't understand the plan either.

Stevenson: States that portions of the fence are not drawn on the site map.

Pappas: *shows on map where fence and gate will go* States that they want to use an aluminum post so that when the snow removers come, they won't hit the blocks. States those are labeled as the bumper posts.

Rupert: Asks why they would need a fence if there is a drop off.

Pettit: Asks where fence will end.

Pappas: *shows on map where fence will go*

Rupert: Clarifies that you will still be able to drive in there.

Pappas: Affirms.

Pettit: Asks how far the posts that hold up the gate are from the building.

Pappas: States that she is unsure.

Rupert: States that it is at least 10'.

Lindsay: Asks if the building department will want an actual site map.

Stevenson: States that they need to figure out if they can accept it from their stand point, and if they are OK with these elements. States that the Building Department can figure it out. States that they need to see if they can approve it based on their ordinance.

Stevenson: States that they need to figure out if from their stand point if they can approve it—then the building department can figure it out

Prebys: States that they will have to stain it with an opaque stain.

Pappas: States that they will use a special stain first and then weather proof it.

Prebys: States that they do not want to see bare wood.

Pappas: States that she will paint it white.

Schmiedeke: States that based on the map she provided, that she cannot approve it.

Stevenson: States that they need an official birds-eye view showing exactly where the fence will go.

Schmiedeke: States that they want a mortgage survey.

Pappas: States that she will bring them a better map.

Stevenson: States that it needs to be very clear.

Pappas: States that she will bring them what they want.

Stevenson: States that they want to see exactly where everything will be.

Motion: Rupert (second: Pettit) moves to table the application for 24 N Huron pending more information and a map.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

101 W Michigan Ave.

**Application is for the installation of a sign on the front façade of the property.*

Applicant: Chris Schuer, owner—not present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that the application was denied by the building department. States that she was not surprised that he didn't come to the meeting since he will probably have to change the sign.

Prebys: States that the application lists using screws and wooden blocks—states that he worries about attaching that without shattering the enamel.

Stevenson: States that it could go in the mortar joints.

Rupert: States that if you drill a hole you shatter the enamel. States that there was a sign before, it was probably done with an adhesive.

Pettit: States that he sees holes on the panels up front.

Rupert: States that they had some sort of a bracket in there to hold the sign up.

Stevenson: States that there is potential to reuse those brackets.

Motion: Prebys (second: Pettit) moves to table the application for 101 W Michigan pending further information about sign dimensions and installation techniques.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

1 S Huron St

**Application is for the installation of a sign on the rear façade of the property.*

Applicant: Roger Cunningham, owner of Fast Signs—present ; Beth Ernat, Community and Economic Development Director—present

Discussion: Cunningham: States he has been asked to provide a sign on the rear of the City Hall building. State that he understands it to be a plan between the City and the Chamber.

Ernat: States that it is part of a \$10,000 grant from the Convention and Visitors Bureau to utilize space on the rear of the building. States that they are seeking approval to put the physical structure up. States that the art work is being commissioned by a local artists—a graphic artist that has done a lot of work around town. States that his direction is to somehow say "Welcome to Ypsilanti." States that there is a panel that has been created to approve the final designs. States that the artist will submit several designs and the panel will give him feed back. States that the artwork isn't finalized

in anyway, but they would like to get approval for the structure. States that they want to identify this space and the downtown, as this is the first thing people see when they come in from Huron St. States that they want it to be identifying and welcoming to Ypsilanti.

Pettit: Asks if the sign is a permanent or temporary installation.

Ernat: States it will be permanent, but that the art could be temporary and changed out.

Lindsay: Asks what the lifespan of a fabric sign like this.

Cunningham: States that it is a perforated vinyl material that is 30% open that allows the wind to flow through it. States that he has a sign just like it over at the EMU parking structure, and that the fabric is very strong.

Lindsay: Asks for lifespan for the sign.

Cunningham: States that generally they change the signs out every couple of years.

Ernat: States that their vision is probably two to three years on this particular sign.

Cunningham: States that the frame is very strong, that it is called Flex Frame and it is made specifically for stretching a banner.

Ernat: States that the changeability is relatively easy—States that the cost of changing it out is doable as well.

Cunningham: States that it is designed to grip a banner and hold it, states that in order to get it out you need a tool to get the banner off of the grippers.

Prebys: Asks how much space will be between sign panel and building.

Cunningham: States that the frame is 5" thick, and that in this case there are large conduits that run up the building. States that they are putting spacers on the building, which are brackets to support the frame, to space it out away from the building so that the conduits can run behind it.

Prebys: Asks if there is a space where birds can nest behind it.

Cunningham: States that they probably could, state that it's not very wide inside.

Rupert: States that they have a bird problem on the east side.

Schmiedeke: Asks if it is enclosed on the top.

Cunningham: States that it is not enclosed.

Ernat: Asks contractor if they could put netting over top.

Cunningham: States that it is possible.

Rupert: States it should go all the way around.

Prebys: States that they would like to see the art work, but that his main concern is with keeping the birds out.

Cunningham: States that because there is a bracket every 40" and the opening is roughly 3 ¼" from the wall. States that the opening is far enough for the conduit to get through there. States that they could put a stainless steel screen mounted all the way around.

Lindsay: States that she has a question about longevity. States that if this is meant to last two or three years, she wonders if there is a budget to have the sign replaced every couple of years.

Ernat: States that they expect that there should be some support from the CVB, but if not, they believe the cost to replace it will be something that is doable in their budget. States that it is very much something they are considering.

Cunningham: States that the banner is the least expensive part of the project.

Lindsay: States that she is concerned with cheapness of a vinyl banner. Asks why it isn't a permanent sign and why it isn't more robust. States that the pharmacy banner comes to mind.

Ernat: States that the banner that's on the back of the Mower building where Go Ice Cream is going, at 19 N Washington, is a vinyl sign. States that their sign will be the same thing.

Rupert: Asks if it is the same artist.

Ernat: States that the artist did the graphics for their sign. States that it will be a collaboration.

Rupert: Asks if the sign will be lit.

Ernat: States that it will not be lit. States that it is something they could consider in the future, but right now with the cost of the artwork and the installation, they are within the confines of a budget. States that at some point in the future, they could maybe use some solar power. States that they are here now with the main priority of getting the sign up. States that their goal is to have the sign approved and up by June 26th for the Color Run. States that this is the date they will have the most people in the City.

Stevenson: Asks if they have a deadline for the artist to submit his work so that they have enough time for the approval process.

Ernat: Affirms.

Motion: Pettit (second: Prebys) moves to approve the application for work at 1 S Huron St to include the installation of a framework for a sign that is yet to be designed—the installation will measure 20’4” by 11’10” sign on south wall of the building. The frame is a Flat Bleed RetroFrame and is to be attached to the wall in the existing mortar joints with 20 aluminum brackets spaced evenly. The gap between the frame and the building will be covered with a screen or netting material, perhaps stainless steel, entirely around the frame.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#5—Preserve distinctive features.

#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

418 Maple St

Applicant was present to discuss potential plans for the installation of one fence panel to fill a gap in the existing fencing. The Commission agreed that the fence panel could be considered a repair and that he most likely will not need a permit. The applicant also supplied options for replacing the front and rear door. He also wanted to install storm doors. The applicant had fiberglass options, however, the Commission stated that they would not be able to approve the fiberglass doors. The Commission recommended a simple, wood slab door. They also suggested looking for a salvaged door.

OTHER BUSINESS

Property Monitoring

101 W Michigan Ave

Commission discussed the masonry repair work that occurred on the east side of the house. The Commission stressed that any brick or masonry work, repair or otherwise, should come before them for discussion. The Commission requested that Staff send a letter informing that any future masonry work, even repair, requires an application.

Enforcement Discussion

Beth Ernat, Director of Economic Development, discussed with the Commission plans to enforce against work done without a permit. The Commission made plans for a work session to set priorities for enforcement. It was discussed that tickets issued through circuit court could increase compliance within the District.

Ernat also discussed with the Commission their plans to seek demolition by neglect for dangerous buildings within the District. Two properties—215 S Washington St and the Thompson Block—are being pursued by the City for demolition by neglect.

HDC Realtor Outreach Postcard, third draft

The HDC approved the final draft of the Realtor Outreach postcard.

Workshop Planning

Staff discussed potential dates and times for hosting an HDC Basics workshop for the summer of 2016.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS –none**HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS****Approval of the minutes of April 12, 2016**

Motion: Pettit (second: Rupert) 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 9:27pm