

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS – none

PUBLIC HEARING—none

OLD BUSINESS—none

NEW BUSINESS

39-41 E Cross

**Amendment to previous approval for storefront window installation*

Applicant: Andy French, Applicant - Present

Discussion: Stevenson: Inquires as to whether this an amendment to the application in January.

French: Confirms that is the case.

Stevenson: Inquires as to whether this is for the windows.

French: Confirms that is correct. States that they were approved for the remodel work but when they were talking with the contactor recently they realized that the windows changes were not mentioned.

Prebys: Asks about the window colors, inquired as to whether the glass will still be clear.

French: States that the glass is clear but that it will be a thermal glass. He states that all they are asking for the approval on is for the metal dividers that holds the glass.

Davis: Inquires as to the material.

French: States that it should be there in the packet.

Davis: Asks for clarification on whether this type of framing is there currently.

French: States that there is wood framing there now.

Rupert: Asks for clarification that the anodized aluminum in bronze will just be for the framing. Inquires as to whether there will be any muntins added.

French: Confirms that it will be aluminum framing and that there will just be clear spans of glass.

Schmiedeke: Inquires as to whether the transoms that are there now are clear glass.

French: States that some may be frosted but that they are all currently covered.

Stevenson: States that the transoms are not covered in this application, they were covered in the previous one.

Motion: Rupert (second: Prebys) moves to amend the application for 39-41 E Cross St. to include the installation of Tubelite anodized aluminum windows in the clear glass and dark bronze finish as described on the cut sheets as dark bronze; DB and clear glass; C2.

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 S Huron

**Application was not present at this time therefore the project was moved the end of the meeting.*

201 N Hamilton

**Application is for a re-roof.*

Applicant: Kelly Newberry, Applicant- Present

Discussion: Newberry: States that they are proposing to re-roof the garage with a new materials. It is a steel that is engineered to look like shingles. It has been tested extensively in Florida and approved in the Historic District in Toledo. Their roofing company would like to see this on some properties so that they can get more business in Michigan with this product.

Newberry provides a photos of the roofing.

Davis: Inquires as to whether this is a steel roof.

Newberry: Confirms that it is. States that it has a stone coating that makes it appear to be asphalt shingles.

Pettit: States that it appears to have the same kind of texture that the asphalt does. States that he does not have any questions.

Prebys: States that he is concerned with the metal aspect of the roof, that this may be artificial.

Rupert: Asks if the applicant has a sample.

Newberry: States that she does not.

Rupert: Asks if she can get a sample.

Newberry: States that she can try.

Stevenson: States that this is a concern that the HDC has had to deal with in the past. States that the HDC does not generally approve materials that mimic other materials. On the other hand, asphalt shingles would not have been original to the house and were created as a material that imitated previous roofing materials. States that the HDC may be more comfortable with the product if they could see a sample of it.

Davis: Asks if the HDC has approved a steel roof before.

Stevenson: States that steel roofs have been approved before but generally they are standing seam roofs that would have been replacing a metal roof that was historic to the structure.

Staff: States to see the staff review regarding an approval for another roof similar to this. States that this is a different company and it was an entire house re-roof.

Newberry: States that this is just for the garage at the rear of the property.

Pettit: States that this is a different product.

Stevenson: States that they are not saying no but that they would still like to see the product.

Motion: Rupert (second: Prebys) moves to table the application for more information and a product sample.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:
N/A

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

317 N Washington

**Application is for LED light strip installation.*

Applicant: Ali Elsayed, Applicant - Present

Discussion: Stevenson: Asks if the applicant has a photo of the property or spec sheets for the LED lights. States that she has not taken a look at this property.

Davis: States that these are LED light strips similar to what they saw for Got Burger. Asks why the lights were installed.

Elsayed: States that it was to catch new customers. States that he has seen them in other cities. States that he installed them himself and that he did not know that the lights needed a permit.

Prebys: States that the HDC denied the LED light strips at Got Burger.

Staff: States that Got burger also had them in their windows.

Elsayed: Asks why they were denied.

Davis: States that the lights are not historic in any way and these lights are not compatible with dark sky standards. That means that lights should point down, not out or up. The problem with the LED light strips is that they point everywhere and they are not directed to a certain area. The HDC would

consider LED lights that are down directed for a purpose such as to light a sign, but that the LED strips are not compatible in the historic district.

Elsayed: Asks about what he should do now.

Pettit: States for clarification that lights that are approved in the district are generally used for the purpose of lighting the building, not to shine aimlessly outside of the building. There are exceptions for security lights. Building lighting should be to light the building and this does the opposite. States that if there is a way to shield them so that they light the building and only the building or signage, then the HDC would be willing to look at that. States that what is there now does not do that, there is no shielding and no direction to the lighting. States that is why, in general, the HDC does not approve the LED strips since they are applied in a way that nothing shields the lighting.

Davis: States that to answer his question, that if the application is denied, they would ask that the lights be removed.

Elsayed: Asks if the lights could be moved inside the windows, since they are currently installed outside the windows.

Davis: States that they need to be removed completely unless the applicant wanted to change the lights so that they would shine on the interior of the store.

Elsayed: States that that would be too bright.

Stevenson: Confirms that is the issue. States that these lights create light pollution. That these lights do not light the building. States that the HDC would be open to considering another type of lighting for the building.

Elsayed: Asks about how long he has to remove them.

Stevenson: States that she believes that it is 30 days. That the applicant can turn them off and then he can work to remove them.

Motion: Davis (second: Prebys) moves to deny the installation of the LED light strips on the windows at 317 N Washington due to them being inappropriate for the historic district and incompatible with the dark sky standards.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

16 S Washington

**Application is for fence slat installation & painting on the driveway.*

Applicant: Laura Gillis, Applicant - Present

Discussion: *Gillis provided handouts for the peapod design.*

Gillis: States that they are proposing to paint the peapod design on the asphalt on their property extending back to the double green doors that are the entrance to farmer's market.

Stevenson: Asks about the pattern behind the peapod design the applicant provided.

Gillis: States that the pattern will not be painted on the ground it would just be the peapod and the stem that will be painted in green.

Davis: Asks about the fence materials.

Gillis: States that the print out that she provided includes a print out from Home Depot that shows the materials. States that there are 8 colors available. She is not sure what colors were picked but that the plan is to match the colors in the murals.

Davis: Asks about where the fence is located.

Gillis points out where the fence is located on the aerial photo.

Gillis: States that the fence starts right behind the Beer Cooler wall and extends to the back of the property. States that there is an empty space behind the Beer Cooler where public urination occurs and that they are attempting to block that from the view of the farmers market.

Prebys: States that one of his concerns is with the fence slat system is that they tend to deteriorate. States that he noticed in the illustration that there are rivets that hold the slats in place. Asks if the rivets will be used to hold the material in place.

Gillis: States that to her knowledge yes they are planning on using them, but she is not on the team that is making the decisions on the fence slats. States that they will look to the commission for guidance on how this material will wear and if there is something that gets triggered about when it needs to be taken down.

Rupert: States that these types of systems are meant to be temporary and that the property on Forest that used to be the Motor Wheel has had them and they seem to somehow come out. He would recommend that the rivets be used.

Schmiedeke: Asks if the pattern for the slats that was submitted with the application is the actual design.

Gillis: States that the team has not finalized the design at this time.

Rupert: Asks about which fences this will be installed on.

Gillis: States that the fence behind the Beer Cooler is the priority, not the one behind the Thrift Store since they are planning landscaping next to that fence.

Rupert: Requests to see the design prior to approval.

Davis: Asks the commission if the slats are an issue since they are being installed on a chain link fence that is not allowed in the district. Asks if there is a concern that this would be an improvement or if it will make the exiting chain-link fence more of an issue.

Pettit: States that he views it more like paint.

Stevenson: Agrees that she views this type of application more like paint or as a temporary fix. States that she would like to see the design prior to making a decision.

Gillis: States that she does not believe that this is their fence so they would not be able to replace it with a more appropriate material, but that they have permission to add the slats to the fence.

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) moves to table the application for 16 S Washington for more information on the design and colors on the chain link slat addition.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:
N/A

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

621 N River

**Application is for air conditioner installation.*

Applicant: James Fishelson, Applicant - Present

Discussion: Fishelson: States that this is his third summer in the house. States that he is going to work from home and would like to install the air conditioning to help out.

Prebys: Asks about the drawing and whether there will be two condenser units or if these are just two proposed options for locations of the unit.

Fishelson: States that he is putting in one unit. He states that there are two options, the preferred option is for the side of the house.

Prebys: States that it may be a little close to the neighbor and the noise the condenser makes may be a problem.

Stevenson: Asks how close the neighbor's house is.

Fishelson: States that he is unsure but that it is close in terms of the property line but that the neighbor is set back farther than him.

Davis: Inquires as to whether there is significant cost difference in the two proposed locations.

Fishelson: States that the second one is more expensive but that it was not prohibitively more so.

Prebys: Proposes that the commission recommends that it be placed in the rear.

Fishelson: States that is ok.

Prebys: Asks if the commission agrees.

Stevenson: Agrees.

Pettit: Agrees.

Motion: Prebys (second: Davis) moves approval of the application for 621 N River for the placement of the air conditioning condenser at the rear of the house, described as location number two in the submitted sketch.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

16 S Washington, 9 S Adams & 22 S Washington

**Application is for mural installation.*

Applicant: Amber Resseguie on behalf of Lynne Settles, Applicant - Present

Discussion: Stevenson: Asks if the applicant would like to speak about the project.

Resseguie: States that she does not have anything specific to say.

Stevenson: States that the commission is looking for the final locations of the murals and plans for the mural frames.

Resseguie: States that it will be installed on the north facing wall of the Beer Cooler.

Davis: States that it will be painted on Dibond and then that will be attached to the building. Asks about how large it will be.

Resseguie: States that it will be 10'x5'.

Stevenson: States that since there is three addresses she was unsure of the locations.

Resseguie: States that she has only the two addresses, not the Adams St address.

Staff: States that she added the third address since the last time that the applicant came in it was stated that there would be a mural on the 9 S Adams address. Advised that staff requested a concept for the second mural and final info on the locations and attachment methods, but did not receive any further info.

Rupert: States that 10'x5' is not very big. Asks if maybe there are three panels at 10'x5'.

Resseguie: Confirms.

Prebys: States that the commission needs more details.

Davis: States that the commission does not dictate the content of the mural but that is cannot be obscene.

Stevenson: States that there needs to be more clarification on locations, the framing, attachment methods, size and the concepts for the mural.

Motion: Rupert (second: Prebys) moves to table the artwork at 16 S Washington, 9 S Adams and 22 S Washington for lack of detail on framing, attachment methods and locations.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:
N/A

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

220 S Huron

**Application is for front porch step replacement and repair of the cheek walls.*

Applicant: Joe Queen, Applicant - Present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that the commission talked about this a few years ago since there was deterioration of the steps due to water infiltration. States that the applicant is planning on replacing the steps with limestone and repairing the cheek/side walls of the steps.

Queen: States that is correct. That the limestone will match what is on the veranda and on the top step. States that the rest of the steps will then be limestone.

Prebys: Asks about the nosing of the steps. Inquires as to whether it will mimic the existing and be at right angles.

Queen: States that it would be at a right angles just like the existing limestone. States that the side walls will just be repaired.

Prebys: Asks what that repair entails.

Queen: States that some of the concrete is not as good as it should be and that there is a stone missing.

Prebys: Asks what areas are concrete.

Queen: States that the joints or mortar is concrete.

Prebys: States that that should not be concrete.

Stevenson: States that that is causing the problem.

Queen: Agrees.

Prebys: Asks if the repair will be made with limestone.

Queen: States that he still has the piece that fell out of the side walls and states that it will be placed back in with the appropriate mortar.

Stevenson: Asks about when the Trex was installed.

Queen: States that it was installed about three years ago but that the problem was with the fastening of the Trex to the slate that was deteriorating below it. The Trex was meant to be a temporary fix.

Motion: Prebys (second: Pettit) moves approval of the application for 220 S Huron for the repair of the cheek walls of the front staircase with like materials and the replacement of the stairs with limestone cut to identical dimensions.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#5- Preserve distinctive features.

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

OTHER BUSINESS

Administrative Approvals

205 S Washington-re-roof

Motion: Schmiedeke (second: Prebys) moves acceptance of the administrative approval for the re-roof at 205 S Washington.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

STUDY ITEM

312 N River

Applicant: Cynthia Kochanek, staff presentation for the owner

Discussion: Kochanek: States that the co-op is looking for feedback from the commission on the replacement of all of the doors on the building. The co-op is pursuing a façade grant from the DDA. The co-op is looking to replace the current wood doors with aluminum storefront doors. Staff advises that the doors that are there currently are not original to the structure as evidenced in the historic photos provided.

Pettit: States that the current doors may fall under the category of significant changes acquired over time.

A discussion follows as to when the current doors were installed.

Prebys: States that new doors would not be a problem from his point of view but that he would not like to see metal doors installed.

Stevenson: States that the transoms should remain. She agrees with Commissioner Prebys that the new doors should be wood. She states that the HDC would need a concept drawing and that there would not be any issues with adjusting the doors to be ADA compliant.

OTHER BUSINESS

Thompson Block Update

Staff presented an updated rendering of what the building will look like when the project is finished at the request of the architect.

401 E Forest-demo by neglect

Staff advised of what is going on with the property. She advises that the building department responded to a property maintenance complaint regarding this building and has since condemned the building. The property is on the second round of ticketing. The building department manager has requested that the HDC consider the demo by neglect process for this property. The commission chair states that she will look into the process to verify what it involves.

STUDY ITEM

202 S Huron

Applicant: Kathy Johnson, owner

Discussion: Johnson: Inquires as to what she can use as a replacement for the damaged section of the gutter. She states that the gutter is galvanized half-round and that it is difficult to find a replacement in that material. She inquires as to whether the replacement can be an aluminum half-round gutter.

Prebys: States that the commission would not have a problem with that.

Johnson: Discusses the possible paint removal on the door knob, lock and door ringer on the front entry door. Also, she would like to replace the mail slot on the door to match the existing hardware.

Prebys: States that brass would be nice, but they would be painted as well.

OTHER BUSINESS

Lighting Fact Sheet

Commissioner Davis presents some ideas for the new lighting fact sheet and the details of what that should include are discussed.

Property Monitoring

Staff has no updates at this time.

311 Forest-ADA ramp

Staff inquires as to whether the HDC would permit staff to admin approve a ramp at this address. Options for the ramp are discussed. It is stated that a metal ramp installation is easier since they are pre-built and there are no specific design requirements needed. A wood ramp would also be an option but it should conform to the porch fact sheet requirements and needs to be painted. Staff is given permission to admin approve the ramp.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS –none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of May 9, 2017

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) moves to approve the minutes as amended to include the word "wood" in the phrase "aluminum-clad windows" in the motion for 8 N River.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 8:40 p.m.