

CITY OF YPSILANTI
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES DECEMBER 13, 2016

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Anne Stevenson Chair 7:00 PM

Meeting Location: Council Chambers, 1 S Huron St.

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

Commissioners Absent: None

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) moves to approve the agenda as amended to add
114 N River as a study item.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS - none

PUBLIC HEARING—NONE

OLD BUSINESS

39 E. Cross

**Application is for awning, window glass and sign replacement; painting.*

Applicant: Andrew French - Owner (absent).

Discussion: Stevenson: States the applicant submitted a new reduced sign and they
omitted the "pizzeria" lettering. The size is thirteen by four inches. States
that she does not have a problem with the size of the sign but the
brightness is her main concern.

Davis: States that Aubree's is attempting to take the façade back to its
historic past but this sign is doing the exact opposite. Even with the
reduction in size the sign just does not fit. States that the rest is great.

Prebys: Asks about the argument that it is removable.

Lindsay: Also states that the cotemporary designs must also be compatible.

Stevenson: States that in the end we must go back to the standards and ask what is and what isn't compatible.

Pettit: States except for this one thing it is not compatible. It is like nothing else in the district.

Lindsay: States she appreciates that they want the sign to go over the door way but the internally lit sign feels out of proportion with the overall dimension with the façade.

Davis: Asks if they came back and didn't light; everything was the same but the letters were painted would that be ok.

Prebys: States that still would not be compatible.

Schmiedeke: States it would not meet their need for advertising at night.

Stevenson: States the issues is the lit sign because that may change the entire design.

Lindsay: States that we should recommend to the applicant that everything else in the application is acceptable except for the sign. We need additional information before we can approve the entire information.

Davis: States that if are going to talk about the relocation if it is going to break the signboard plane we should make it slightly smaller. It is still very large because if it is almost in the signboard sticking out a little bit it should be addressed.

Pettit: States the issues are location and the lighted sign.

Motion: Lindsay (Second: Prebys) Moves to table the application of 39 E. Cross citing we do not allow a lighted sign of this manner and the sign should not break that far out of the signboard and should not break the horizontal elements of the façade. The placement and the backlighting are the only concerns.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

#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

8 N. River

**Application is for the removal and re-building of fire-damaged areas.*

Applicant: Phillip Meyers – Owner, Robert Hopps – Contractor (present).

Discussion: Hopps: States the NE corner of the building suffered a fire. Essentially what we are proposing is to put the building back together the way that it was. States staff asked for examples of the siding to be brought to the meeting *shows examples of siding.* States the roofing shingles are three-tab black, which is what is on there now. The gutters are half-round. The windows will be wood and will follow all HDC rules. States they were at the HDC meeting two years ago for work on the front of the house and has pictures of the door in the front. Asks if the back door has to match the front door because it was a very expensive door system.

Stevenson: Asks what the current door is in the back of the house.

Hopps: States it was a flush slab door. States they have to replace that door. Asks if they could use a steel energy-efficient door on the back of the house.

Lindsay: States she would not have a problem with a steel door on the back of the house. States it would be fine as long as they cannot see it.

Pettit: States they have approved steel doors in the past.

Schmiedeke: States that the railing on the back deck needs to match the porch fact sheet.

Hopps: Asks if the type of railing that can be used is specified on the porch fact sheet.

Staff: States that some examples are shown on the fact sheet.

Stevenson: States that the rails appear to be acceptable.

Hopps: Asks if the balusters need to be turned.

Stevenson: States they do not. They just need to sit in the bottom rail because it looks like they go below the bottom rail. States she is ok with a flush steel door at the back and asks for the opinion of the other commissioners.

Prebys: States he is fine with the flush steel door.

Stevenson: Asks if all the other repairs will be done with like materials. Asks if the wood window will be replaced with a similar wood window.

Hopps: States they will be.

Rupert: States the applicant has the option to use an aluminum-clad wood window in order to preserve the window better.

Stevenson: Asks if the security light and the half-round gutters will be the same as what was originally there.

Hopps: States they will all be the same.

Motion: Prebys (second: Pettit) Move approval for the application for work at 8 N. River. For the removal and replacement of the north-east corner of the building which will be replaced with like shingles and roof. The gutters are to be half-round and downspouts to match the rest of the building. The back deck and steps will be replaced according to the porch fact sheet. The rear door may be flat slab steel and the window may be wood or aluminum-clad wood at the owner's discretion. All materials will be the same as existing.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

#5 – Preserve distinctive features.

#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.

513 N. Washington

**Application is for fence replacement.*

Applicant: Mr. Simms – Owner (present).

Discussion: Simms: States that he would like to replace his fence. The wire fence is very old and falling apart and is most likely from the 1940s. On one side he would like to add a privacy fence to attach to his neighbor's fence that already exists. States he would also add a 12' gate on the side of the house to an existing fence.

Schmiedeke: States she is hesitant to approve a chain-link gate.

Stevenson: States she is also hesitant.

Prebys: States that the fencing is fine but there are questions about the chain-link gate at the entrance of the driveway.

Simms: Asks what would be more appropriate.

Prebys: States that wood would work or anything besides chain-link.

Stevenson: Suggests something that would match the dog-eared fencing.

Simms: States it was chain-link in order to match the neighbor's existing fence. That would be where the driveway is. States it would be just one gate on the driveway side.

Stevenson: States they normally do not permit chain-link fence. States that if the gate would be wood that when the other chain-link fence is removed it would be replaced with wood to match the new dog-eared fence and gate.

Lindsay: States that the gate does not have to be a privacy fence.

Simms: States he prefers a privacy fence since he intends to get a puppy.

Pettit: States that they do approve wire fencing and that another alternative could be a tighter, smaller frame with less material involved and a lighter gate.

Davis: States that this is a good compromise.

Simms: Asks if anything besides a chain link would be acceptable.

Prebys: States that the wooden fence needs to be stained or painted and if stain is used it must be opaque. Raw wood is not permitted.

Motion: Pettit (second: Stevenson) moves approval for the application for work at 513 N Washington to include the replacement of existing chain link fence with new six foot dog-eared pressure treated wood plank fencing as shown in the submitted diagram. Fence to be painted or opaque stained to be used that complements adjacent structure. Work to also include the addition of a five foot gate across the driveway. Construction to be either wood gate in similar style to the fencing or a metal wire style gate or wrought iron. Chain link fencing would not be appropriate.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#3 – Do not imitate earlier styles.

#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.

64 N. Huron

**Application is for window replacement*

Applicant: Matthew Craven - Marvin Window Rep, Contractor (present).

Discussion: Stevenson: States that this is an amendment to a previous application. States that now the applicant would like to do a full-frame replacement of

the twelve windows instead of the sash packs that were previously approved due to lead.

Craven: States that is correct. States that after further research the paint on the sash and the frame is lead and cadmium based. DTE has requested that all of it be removed and new windows be installed. States that he has slides on the topic to show the Commission.

shows slide show

Craven: The slide shows the existing conditions. States they wish to make not only aesthetic improvements but safety improvements as well. Some of the glass is falling out and the windows are falling out. DTE wants to do a full replacement. Some potential issues with the renovations would be that they would just be re-caulking that and paint it. If they do a full-frame replacement they can repair and mitigate any future issues with leaking and water damage. The full frame replacement is one of the approved options that the HDC provides. The dimensions showed here very closely replicate the existing dimensions so they will stay historically accurate.

Craven: States he was not able to get an exact measurement of the casing but was able to go to an existing building and used a contour device to measure that casing. He compared them to their catalog of historic casing and found one that is an almost exact match which is the Thorton casing. By using this casing they will be able to maintain the historic value going with the full-frame replacement.

Craven: There is an ogee-lug that they will be able to emulate by doing the full-frame replacement. Those are the main three concerns and they can properly address them and keep the historic value. The next item is color. They have a stone white (a brighter white) and a sierra white which is closer to the original. There is an evergreen that was partially applied by a previous tenant but was abandoned. There is copper paint on the bottom that was recently applied and a Bahama brown on the barn doors. *shows slide* On the upper-right there is a window that was facing the exterior ally but is now on the interior so it has been wonderfully preserved after they filled in the alley. The color is Hampton Sage on that window and is on the neighboring building across the street. By keeping this color they would accurately maintain the historic feel of the building as this was most likely an original color. This last slide shows our recommendation which is the full-frame replacement using the Thorton casing, the ogee-lugs and the Hampton Sage exterior.

Rupert: Asks where the covered window is located.

Craven: States the building was originally two buildings in the 1950s and there was an ally in the middle and it was made into one building at some point after that.

Phillips: States the window is on the inside of the ally which is now covered. It once faced the exterior but has been covered for many years by the new wall.

Craven: States the window has not seen weather in many years.

Stevenson: Asks if there are any questions about the project.

Motion: Prebys (second: Pettit) moves approval for the amendment to the previous application at 64 N. Huron to include a full-frame replacement of the windows with the Thorton casing and ogee-lug. Color to be Hampton Sage.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#2 – Do not destroy original character.

#9 – Contemporary design shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original material.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

114 N. River

**Application is for window replacement*

Applicant: Matthew Craven - Marvin Window Rep, Contractor (present).

Discussion: Craven: *shows slideshow* States that this slide depicts the existing conditions. On the left side there are vinyl replacement windows that were put in ten years ago. There are currently 22 vinyl replacement windows and two original wood windows. The next slide shows some existing conditions. There is about three-and-a-half inches to where the glass is where the edge of the frame. His recommendation is as Ultimate insert double-hung. The reason he is discussing insert replacement would allow them to gain glass real estate. It would allow them to keep the exterior and interior trim. The client is S.O.S. and this would allow them to have aluminum-clad wood windows which would give them more glass, would allow them to operate more efficiently and would fit in with their budget. Since they will be going from vinyl to aluminum-clad wood windows the size of the glass would not shrink it would actually become bigger, making them more historic. The next slide shows the available colors; it would be up to the HDC for any recommendations. The final slide shows the applicant's recommendation which is an aluminum clad Ultimate double-hung in a color recommended by the HDC.

Stevenson: Asks if there are any photos of the original wood windows.

Craven: *shows examples on the slides.*

Stevenson: Asks the dimensions of the windows in terms of the casing around them.

Lindsay: Asks if the original windows are also being replaced.

Craven: States that they are all being replaced.

Schmiedeke: States they are considerably smaller.

Lindsay: States they do not appear operable.

Craven: Agrees that they are not operable.

Lindsay: Asks if he will be replacing them with like.

Craven: States that they will be replaced like-with-like, not a double-hung.

Rupert: Asks for more information about the Ultimate Insert Double-Hung replacements.

Craven: States that it is an insert replacement window and since they are going with a stronger substrate they can get a narrower style and frame which allows for a stronger window in a smaller space.

Rupert: States that the vinyl windows are already starting to deteriorate. Asks why not use a sash pack in order to get more window space and go back to the original size since the frame is already there.

Craven: If they go to the sash packs some of the concerns are, especially with an aluminum-clad sash pack, is abrasion if it is not totally square in the frame. It also costs less to install. This system is more efficient, more user-friendly and easier to install. And this is why it was part of their recommendation. They had been a study item at an earlier meeting and had proposed protruded fiberglass which was declined. S.O.S. was able to find more money in their budget and have tried to make this work for them.

Pettit: Asks what this inserts into.

Craven: *points to the slide.* All of this will be coming out so there will be a frame around here. All of the vinyl will be coming out. They will put in a wood frame and a wood window.

Lindsay: Asks if they will be pulling all of the vinyl out.

Craven: States they will be removing it all.

Stevenson: States it is good that all of the vinyl will be removed.

Prebys: States he is in favor of this just to get rid of all the vinyl.

Craven: States the other option is they go back and rip this out but now they would have to redo the siding and all of the trim and this puts it beyond their budget.

Stevenson: States that this would be a good opportunity to return the windows back to their original size and that is what she would ultimately like to see for the building but understands the budgetary concerns. The main issue now is to remove all of the vinyl.

Davis: Asks, in their estimation, what is the difference in the size of the glass if they were to do a sash pack.

Craven: States they would gain about a quarter inch.

Prebys: Asks that the color recommendation is up to the Commission.

Schmiedeke: Asks that the outer frame will still be there and will still be white.

Craven: Confirms that is the case.

Schmiedeke: States now is the chance to do the inner frame in a color.

Stevenson: Asks if there is a recommendation and states it would give the house a more three-dimensional look.

Craven: States that the two metallic colors have a small upcharge.

Prebys: States that if they were thinking Mid-Century it would be a bronze or ebony.

Craven: States the Gun Metal and the Copper are the metallic colors.

Stevenson: States that the bronze would be their recommendation.

Pettit: Asks about the fixed-pane windows would be replaced with.

Craven: States they will always replace like with like.

Lindsay: States that they do not have dimensions of the two wood windows so they cannot know if they will have any reduction in glass size.

Stevenson: States that in the motion they can specify that there will be no loss in glass size because that is one of the big issues.

Motion: Rupert (second) moves approval for the application at 114 N. River. Work to include the replacement of 24 existing vinyl windows with aluminum-clad wood insert windows with a bronze finish. The two original wood windows

replaced with the same aluminum-clad wood insert windows with no reduction in glass size.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#2 – Do not destroy original character.

#5 – Preserve distinctive features.

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

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

#10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

101 S. Huron

**Application is for window replacement*

Applicant: Matthew Craven - Marvin Window Rep, Contractor (present).

Discussion: Craven: This building will use aluminum windows by the same distributor they are using on the octagon house. They had previously suggested aluminum-clad wood windows as a study item but this was declined in order to keep like with like. The current windows are inefficient picture windows. The proposed solution is thermally broken extruded aluminum windows. The recommendation is all aluminum to match in a clear anodized color.

Prebys: Asks if there is a change in glass size.

Craven: States that there will be. Currently the windows have a one inch frame but the new windows have a two inch frame. The two inch frames are thermally broken so when you look at the two inch it is essentially two one inch frame. The ones that are in place now are not and are terribly inefficient. You could go with a one inch frame but you will lose the thermal break and the price will go way up.

Prebys: Asks which windows will be replaced.

Craven: States all of them will, including the front façade.

Pettit: Asks if in the replacement window what will be removed.

Stevenson: States they will be adding an additional inch.

Pettit: Asks if the tops and bottoms will look a little bit slimmer.

Prebys: Asks if that is glass at the bottom of the pane.

Craven: State that it is metal panel at the bottom and that it will remain.

Stevenson: States that she is alright with the plans as presented.

Motion: Lindsay (second: Prebys) moves approval for the application at 101 S. Huron to include the full frame replacement of existing aluminum windows with aluminum replicating windows in a clear anodized color. The exterior finish to be painted in a clear anodized color.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#2: Do not destroy original character.

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

STUDY ITEMS

214 N. Huron

Applicant: Cheryl Farmer, owner (present).

Discussion: Farmer: Came into possession of antique cast-iron fencing. The home had at one time belonged to a building that the city had taken down on S. Huron St. that was once used as a police department. She has enough for about 80-85 fence elements. She would like to put them up in the front of her house. She believes they are the same style that was used on her house. She would like to put them in the front of her house.

Pettit: Asks how many feet of fencing this would give her.

Farmer: States it would give her about fifty feet of fencing.

Prebys: States that if she would need more fencing she would be able to cast some molds and then paint the additional elements.

Farmer: States that if money was no object it would certainly be an option!

Lindsay: Asks if she would do the walks as well as the front.

Farmer: States she did not think about that but would consider that.

Prebys: States that he thinks it's great.

Pettit: Asks if they bolt together.

Farmer: States they bolt together on the top and the bottom.

Schmiedeke: States that she can put them together any way she wants to really.

114 N. River

Applicant: Henry Clark, contractor (present).

Discussion: Clark: States that S.O.S has an interest has an interest in re-vamping the ramp and was also interest in putting in Portland cement or an asphalt cement parking lot. One question is the handrail is a bit of an issue. They would like to go with a railing material that would require less maintenance and a new railing.

Rupert: Asks if the current ramp is made of plywood.

Clark: States it is made of plank, he believes but he did not measure it. States it looks like it has been neglected for quite some time.

Stevenson: Asks what he would like to see the ramp made out of.

Clark: States possibly something composite. He will bring in samples to the next meeting.

Davis: States he has some concern to do to safety.

Pettit: States that it can be painted to give tread to composite.

Rupert: States that joists would have to be added to composite since composite is not as durable as wood.

Davis: Asks the Commission if they would allow composite for the ramp.

Stevenson: States that they would but it could cost three times as much as wood.

Clark: States they also want to spruce up the porch landing. The paint has come away a little bit. It doesn't appear to be unsafe. It's more of an aesthetic issue and not a safety issue.

Prebys: Asks the Commission if they have any strong feelings regarding the materials of the surface parking lot.

Schmiedeke: States she does not.

Prebys: States it could be concrete, gravel, or concrete.

OTHER BUSINESS

Property Monitoring

215 S. Washington: Staff states that the property is currently on the Dangerous Buildings list. Stevenson: Asks if he is currently being fined. Staff advises that he should be but is not currently paying any taxes on the property.

302 E. Cross: Staff states that the property is currently on the Dangerous Buildings list.
Stevenson: requests that staff get an update on this property.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS –none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of November 22, 2016.

Motion: Prebys (second: Pettit) Moves approval of the minutes as submitted.
Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Lindsay (second: Prebys) moves to adjourn the meeting.
Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 8:36 p.m.