

CITY OF YPSILANTI
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF September 13, 2016

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Anne Stevenson Chair 7:00 PM

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

Commissioners Present: Anne Stevenson, Hank Prebys, Alex Pettit, Jane Schmiedeke,
Mike Davis Jr., Erika Lindsay

Commissioners Absent: Ron Rupert

Staff Present: Cynthia Kochanek, Associate Planner
Yasmin Ruiz, HDC Assistant

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Prebys (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the agenda as amended to
add 216 N Washington as study item.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS - none

PUBLIC HEARING—none

OLD BUSINESS

32 N Huron

**Application is for sign installation.*

Applicant: Reed Fannin, owner— absent

Discussion: Prebys: States that he has no problem with the sign with the new
measurements. He suggests that the applicant may want to paint the rest of
the signboard black to match the new sign color.

Schmiedeke: States that the sign is to be backlit but that with the proposed
design of the sign and the fact that the letters are the only backlit part, it is
in keeping with the HDC standards for signs.

Motion: Prebys (second: Davis) moves approval for the sign at 32 N Huron as resized
in the submitted drawing dated 8/18/2016 with the background of the sign
being opaque. With the suggestion that the rest of the structure's signboard
be painted black to blend with the new sign.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#10—New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

106 N River

**Application is for an amendment to a previously approved garage door installation.*

Applicant: Heide Otto Basinger, owner— present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that she is looking for an amendment to the original application for the garage door since the applicant's contractor stated that non-textured garage doors are no longer made for residential applications.

Basinger: States that she was told by her contractor that smooth garage doors have not been made for about 30 years.

Stevenson: Confirms that she did some research and she was unable to locate any smooth doors for a residential garage door wither.

Schmiedeke: Asks as to whether the applicant is still looking for the same color and the style that she originally proposed.

Basinger: She would like to go with the desert tan and the short elegant section panels with no windows. She states that desert tan is the closest to what she has.

Motion: Prebys (second: Schmiedeke) moves to amend the previous approval for the garage doors at 106 N River to eliminate the demand for a smooth finish and to include this in a notice to proceed.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

N/A

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

6 S. Washington

**Application is for window install and trim reinstall.*

Applicant: Andrew Epstein, owner— present

Discussion: Stevenson: Requests that the applicant recap the application.

Epstein: States that he previously asked the HDC to remove the awning since it was in bad shape. He states that the old cantilevered 2x4s are exposed where the old canopy was. He states that his architect states that the only way to install the canopy as it was would be to have supports

underneath that impede the sidewalk. He states that the current plan is to install the trim tight to building due to issues with the original design.

Prebys: Inquires if he and the architect and the applicant have discussed a reduced canopy as an alternative.

Epstein: States that his architect also has an option for the awning to project about 8" out from the building but any more than that would require a column underneath. He personally likes the look of the trim over the windows at the Tap Room.

Schmiedeke: Asks if the proposed installation of the awning/trim would project at all.

Epstein: States that it would project a little, but not as much as the 8". States that he is also replacing the five windows on the front of building.

Schmiedeke: Asks if the new windows would match the current.

Epstein: States that they would be a little thicker as there would be two panes of glass.

Schmiedeke: Asks if the glass block on the storefront will remain.

Epstein: Confirms that the glass block will remain. He states that essentially the old canopy would now be used as a trim piece to cover up the old 2x4s.

Prebys: States that he is in favor of the awning projecting out a little more than just as a trim piece.

Lindsay: Inquires as to the construction of the wall behind the awning.

Epstein: States that there is some steel structure over the windows but that the wood is what is really supporting the awning structure. The wood that was previously behind the canopy was rotted.

Lindsay: States that she believed the original understanding was that the applicant was to reconstruct the awning to the original appearance.

Epstein: States that he was not under the impression that he had to rebuilt it as it was but that he believed that he would be able to rebuild it differently. He reiterates that it would be difficult to rebuild it due to the poor construction of the original awning. He states that he would not have taken the original awning down if he knew that he would not be able to reinstall it differently.

Pettit: Inquires as to whether the awning wasn't about to fall down previously and that is why the applicant had applied for its removal.

Stevenson: Asks the commission if they would be willing to consider the smaller depth option.

Davis: States that there may be a better option to create some more depth than what is proposed.

Schmiedeke: States that the original canopy was supported from above.

Epstein: States that the supports from above were actually a failsafe after the awning was installed.

Schmiedeke: Agrees that she would be open to the change in depth for the awning.

Pettit: Confirms that he would also be fine with the change.

Epstein: States that he is not going to install the awning depicted in the drawings that were submitted with the application. He states that he is willing to consider the 8" canopy and is willing to do the install however the commission would like to see it.

Lindsay: Inquires as to whether the new trim/awning could have return ends installed which would invoke the original design.

Epstein: Clarifies that the return ends will be at the doors and inquires if the ends will need to be deep.

Stevenson: States that the return ends would not need to be that deep but proportionate to the new installation.

Epstein: States that he still has the original corner pieces and that he would be able to utilize them for the new installation.

Pettit: Confirms that the corner pieces should be proportionate to the new installation and that utilizing part of the original materials from the awning is partly the goal.

Schmiedeke: Asks about the window trim color.

Epstein: States that the window frames will be just be in the mill finish or sliver in color.

Motion: Lindsay (second: Prebys) moves approval for 6 S Washington to include the replacement of five windows on the main façade with aluminum VersaTherm framed replacement windows in mill finish. Work to also include the reinstallation of existing metal trim in the 8" projection from the building as outlined in the drawing submitted on 9/13/2016. To included faceted return ends at both corner doors on the building.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#2—Do not destroy original character. Do not remove or alter historic material or features.

#5—Preserve distinctive features.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

228 N River

**Application is for reroofing with a color change.*

Applicant: Steven and Sheila Law, owners— present

Discussion: Stevenson: Asks for more information on the reroof of the property.

Law: States that the roof is only one layer and that they will be installing another layer on the top of the current roof. He states that he using Mr. Roof and that they stated that the current drip edge will remain. There are five existing can vents on the back of the house. He states that the contractor said that he cannot redo the vents when installing a roof over an existing roof.

Prebys: Inquires as to what the new color of the roof will be.

Law: States that they want to go with a darker color because they are planning on painting the house in the spring. They are planning on coming back to the HDC for the color change later. They would like to go with Roofguard architectural shingles in black. States that there is a leak on the enclosed front porch and that it will need to be and that they contractor will add gravel on top to make it appear more like the rest of the roof.

Motion: Prebys (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the reroofing at 228 N River to include Roofguard premium lifetime shingles in black. The existing drip edge will remain. The existing five can vents at the rear of the house will be reused. Also to repair of the roof on the front bay to match the new roof.

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.

220 Pearl

**Application is for a fence and landscaping to enclose a generator.*

Applicant: AAATA, owner; Bill De Groot and Reggie Whitlow, representatives—present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that the applicant is for an enclosure for a power generator.

De Groot: States that previously they were not able to install a backup generator. He states that with more people and service to the area, they would like to install a backup generator. He states that they tried to get the backup generator installed in the screened area on the roof. The problem with that was that the contractors did not want to entertain the installation on the roof due to the existing enclosure. Unfortunately, there is only two feet to the rear property line due to the way that the lot was originally split.

It would be installed on the Adams St side corner of the property and will have an aluminum fence enclosure. To help alleviate the look of the fence enclosure they will include the screening with arborvitae and barberry. This would also be for security issues as well. They will need a concrete pad to hold the generator in this area. He states that the planning department did not have any issues with the proposed install.

Lindsay: Inquires as to the dotted line on the plans.

De Groot: States that it is the roof on the building.

Stevenson: Suggests that a flat top gate be used instead of the round top gate.

Prebys: Inquires as to whether they have thought about the trash that will accumulate in the area.

Whitlow: States that they have a porter there midday to handle that.

Motion: Davis (second: Prebys) moves to approve the work at 220 Pearl to include the installation of a six foot flat commercial grade fence with a flat top gate to enclose a generator for the building on the Adams St façade at the Ypsilanti Transit Center. The landscaping around the fence will include a mix of arborvitae and barberry or similar plants.

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.

413 Maple

**Application is for reroofing.*

Applicant: Richard Nation, owner— present

Discussion: Nation: States that the reroof is with a better shingle and for the installation of half round gutters to match the rest of the gutters on the house. States that they are currently having an issue with leaks and ice dams in the area where the scallop edged siding on the dormer meets the roofline.

Prebys: Inquires as to how they will deal with that issue.

Nation: States that they will install flashing to help control the leak in that area.

Prebys: Advises that the flashing need to be installed underneath the siding and the roof.

Nation: States that they will also install a trim piece to help in that same area.

Motion: Prebys (second: Pettit) moves approval for 413 Maple for reroofing work to include Tamko Heritage 30 shingles in Weathered Wood. Work will also include the repair of damaged sections of roof, soffits and trim and molding will be provided at the base of one of the shingled gables to prevent the influx of water and to help solve the leak as in the submitted drawings. The installation of ridge vents, soffit vents, and baffles. New drip edges and flashings are to match current colors and blend with the trim and chimney colors. Half-round gutters will be installed on all parts of the roof line where they are currently not installed and the necessary downspouts will be provided. Paint colors to match trim.

Standards:

#2— Do not destroy original character. Do not remove or alter historic material or features.

#10-- New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

410 N Huron

**Application is for lighting, repair and refinishing the front door and landscaping.*

Applicant: Noah & Kimberly Mass, owners—absent

Discussion: Prebys: States that the issue is with the light fixture since it is not appropriate for the time period of the house.

Motion: Prebys (second: Davis) moved to table the application for 410 N Huron with the understanding that the HDC would like to discuss alternate light fixtures.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

N/A

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

315 Washtenaw

**Application is for siding replacement, lighting, painting and window replacement.*

Applicant: Karl Staffeld, owner—present

Discussion: Staffeld: States that he is looking at doing lighting, siding, painting and windows. States that he found a siding shingle that matched the current siding and is looking to repair and replace shingles as needed.

Prebys: States that the chosen siding and repair is fine.

Staffeld: States that he included the cut sheets for the light fixtures for wall mounted lights.

Schmiedeke: States that they may be too fancy for the house.

Stevenson: States that they are fake historic lights and that they do not want to replicate history.

Prebys: States that the HDC would like something that is less old timey rather than something that mocks history.

Pettit: Confirms that a plainer and simpler light fixture would be better.

Staffeld: States that he will bring back some options for lighting.

Stevenson: Inquires about the paint color.

Staffeld: States that he was looking for something that went with the houses surrounding it.

Stevenson: States that the color is fine. She asks about the windows and states that the Historic District does not allow vinyl windows because it reduces the glazing.

Staffeld: States that Wallside would not come to his house to do an estimate. He states that he is looking to replicate the existing trim and will match the windows to the ones that are there currently. He will look for a contractor to do what is specified on the HDC factsheet.

Stevenson: Suggests sash packs so that all the windows would not need to be replaced.

Prebys: Inquires if the windows have already been removed.

Staffeld: States that most of them did not exist when he bought the house. He advises that most of the existing windows do not have frames.

Stevenson: States that any of the windows that need replacement will need to be approved by the HDC prior to their replacement but that an approval is not needed for the homeowner to get an estimate on the windows.

Prebys: States that the HDC will approve the paint and siding as submitted but that the HDC cannot do a partial approval on an application. He advises that the applicant will need to come back with the options for the windows and lights for the next meeting.

Stevenson: Advises that the applicant is good to go on the paint and siding.

Motion: Prebys (second: Pettit) moves to table the application for more info on the light fixtures and windows.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:
N/A

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

STUDY ITEMS

216 N Washington

Applicant: Johnathan Holmes, owner—present

Discussion: States that he is looking to demo the outbuilding at 216 S Washington St and is looking for guidance from the HDC. Advised that he has spoken with a structural engineer and that the structural engineer states that the structure would no longer be salvageable. He also discussed the rebuild options and repair options for the structure.

Prebys: Advises that if the applicant tears down the structure, he may not be able to rebuild it in the same location due to the setbacks.

Schmiedeke: Requests that a photo of the outbuilding be pulled up by staff. :: The outbuilding survey of this structure was pulled up by staff:: She states that the doors on the structure are pretty significant architectural features and that if the building is demolished, that those doors and as much as possible of the original materials be saved.

Stevenson: Advised the applicant on the demo application process and that the HDC would want to know what would be rebuilt in its place as part of that application.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

600 N River

Motion: Schmiedeke (second: Prebys) moves to approve the administrative approval for the reroof at 600 N River.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

106 N River

Motion: Schmiedeke (second: Prebys) moves to approve the administrative approval for the garage reroof at 106 N River.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

OTHER BUSINESS

HDC Policy Document, third draft

The HDC had a few minor changes to the policy document and asked that a third draft be presented. The HDC was in favor of the addition of the newly proposed lighting policy that would encourage applicants to use light fixtures that are Dark Sky compliant.

Motion: Prebys (second: Davis) moves approval of the third draft of the HDC policy document.

Vinyl Resolution

The HDC discussed the proposed vinyl resolution.

Stevenson: States that the resolution locks us in to absolutely no approval of vinyl even in a very specific case when it might be allowed. States that maybe the HDC needs to consider that prior to approving the resolution.

Prebys: States that it was a very unusual situation when the HDC previously approved vinyl windows. States that the HDC may offer the approval with a notice to proceed for vinyl in a very specific situation.

Property Monitoring

408 E Cross: Staff informed the HDC that a letter has been sent on September 1, 2016 to the owner of the property at 408 E Cross advising that they have 15 days to apply for the work that they did.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS –none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of August 23, 2016

Motion: Pettit (second: Prebys) moves to approve the minutes from August 23, 2016.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:08pm