

**CITY OF YPSILANTI**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**MINUTES OF July 25, 2017**

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Anne Stevenson                      Chair    7:01 PM

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

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

Commissioners Absent:          Erika Lindsay, Hank Prebys

Staff Present:                      Cynthia Kochanek, Associate Planner

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Motion:                      Rupert (second: Schmiedeke) moves approval of the agenda to add study items for 9 S Adams, 15 S Washington and 412 Oak St.

Approval:                      Unanimous. Motion carries.

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS – none**

**PUBLIC HEARING—none**

**OLD BUSINESS**

**39 E Cross**

*\*Application is for an amendment to a previous application for sign installation.*

Applicant:                      Sandee French, applicant and Bill Short, Huron Sign Co., Contractor – Present

Discussion:                      Stevenson: States that this is something that was tabled from the last meeting. States that she sees some changes have been made to the sign and asks the applicant to talk about those changes.

Short: States that before it was proposed to be LEDs inside the translucent covered letters and now they are talking about doing bare neon. States that it is more historical. States that you can see neon used in the Terry Bakery sign and the Tap Room. States that it will be the same color as what exists

on the Tap Room. States that it would be like the Liquid Swordz sign. States that it will be single stroke red neon about 15 millimeters.

Stevenson: Asks if the background is white.

Short: States that is correct. It will have a white background and the neon when it is turned off is clear.

Rupert: States that it is a better solution that what was previously proposed.

Davis: States that he cannot see the size on the paperwork and asks the applicant to clarify the size.

Short: States that it is a 3' 7" by 11' sign.

Davis: Asks about the dimmer and how intense the light will be.

Short: States that without the dimmer it would appear as it does in the drawing, that it will not be any brighter than that.

Stevenson: States that this is a really good solution to the concerns that the commission had.

Motion: Davis (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the amendment to the previous application for work at 39 E Cross to include the installation of a new exposed raceway neon channel letter sign with red neon as depicted in the plans dated 6/16/17. The sign fasteners are to be installed in the mortar joints on the building.

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.

#10- New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

#### **422 N Hamilton**

*\*Application is for painting, driveway, window & porch installation and work on the outbuilding.*

Applicant: Karl Staffeld & Azar Sadeghi, Applicant - Present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that this application was tabled from the last meeting. States that there are some additional changes on the application. Asks the applicant to explain the changes.

Staffeld: States that he talked to the building department and that they should be okay with the driveway and that he will need a soil erosion permit

and a special use permit. Asks if there is a specific light that the commission likes from the ones that he submitted.

Stevenson: States that it is the 1 light oil rubbed bronze outdoor wall lantern is appropriate.

Staffeld: States that they plan on painting the house in the same colors with the doors painted brevity brown.

Rupert: States that is good.

Staffeld: States that the stairs in the front will be replaced in kind.

Rupert: Asks if it is enclosed under the stairs.

Staffeld: States that it is not.

Stevenson: States that the base of the stairs should be enclosed to keep out animals.

Staffeld: States that the fact sheet calls for lattice.

Rupert: States that he can use a more solid panel to enclose the stair.

Staffeld: States that he will paint the stairs the same colors as the house and will repair the one window that is boarded up on the house. States that he is proposing a wood hopper window clad in aluminum for the basement.

Rupert: Asks if it comes with a screen and if it opens to the inside.

Staffeld: States that it does not come with a screen and that it does open to the inside.

Rupert: Recommends a screen for the window.

Staffeld: States that a crew is out prepping for painting and has power washed it.

Stevenson: States that power washing is not permitted in the district as it forces water behind the exterior surface that can freeze and damage the house.

Staffeld: States that the outbuilding is the next item. They are planning to put a residential unit in the outbuilding. They are planning on adding a foundation to the existing outbuilding. They are planning on adding OSB over the existing siding and then installing a beveled siding to match the house. He states that the current siding is a mix of three different types of siding.

Stevenson: States that the commission cannot approve the outbuilding renovation without a lot more detail on that project. They need more info on the windows, doors, siding, roofing and photos are required since none were included with the application.

Staffeld: States that the roof on the outbuilding is just old and it will be replaced to match the house. Asks if they can move forward with the repairs and painting since the application cannot be approved due to the outbuilding.

Stevenson: States that he can move forward on the repairs and painting without power washing. States that he may want to split up the items on the application in the future.

Staffeld: States that he will split the applications.

Motion: Pettit (second: Rupert) moves to table the application for work at 422 N Hamilton pending additional information on the renovation on the outbuilding.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:  
n/a

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

### **315 Washtenaw**

*\*Application is for the installation of doors, lights and stairs.*

Applicant: Karl Staffeld & Azar Sadeghi, Applicant - Present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that this application was tabled at the last meeting. Asks if the applicant would like to use the same lights that were decided on for 422 N Hamilton.

Staffeld: States that is fine, he will use the same lights on this house. States that he has already purchased a 6 panel door and that he is having a difficulty to find another type of door in the odd size that exists on the building. States that it is a hardship on him if he will need to get another door. States that there are other 6 panel doors in the neighborhood.

Davis: Asks about the material of the door.

Staffeld: States that it is a solid wood door.

Sadeghi: States that right now they are on the dangerous buildings list and that they are accruing fees.

Rupert: Asks if the door is the only thing that is holding this up.

Staffeld: Confirms that it is. States that the other door, door #2, is less of an odd size and that it will be easier to locate a door that is not a 6 panel door for this one. The back utility door will be a plain metal door. States that the doors will be painted in the matching blue color.

Stevenson: Asks about the stairs.

Staffeld: States that the building department said that he does not need a landing on the rear stairs.

Rupert: Asks what type of materials the stairs are made of.

Staffeld: States that it will be a treated wood.

Rupert: States that it will need to be painted, preferably a dark color.

Stevenson: Asks the commission if they would be ok with the 6 panel door due to the issue in the size. States that she would be ok with the door # 2 matching the front door. Asks the commission what they think about the doors.

Davis: States that door #2 is visible from the street.

Rupert: States that he agrees that the doors should match.

Schmiedeke: Agrees as well.

Stevenson: States that every house is considered on an individual basis and that just because something is in the district does not guarantee that it was approved by the commission. States that this is an exception due to the different size of the door.

Motion: Rupert (second: Davis) moves to approve the application for 315 Washtenaw for the north and northeast door to be a 6 panel wood door to be painted navy. Light fixtures will be installed to match those approved for 422 N Hamilton and the installation of the stairs on the south of the building with 2 steps, no platform or railing, to be painted a dark color, such as brown.

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.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **47 N Huron**

*\*Applicant was not present at the meeting so the application was moved to the end of the meeting.*

### **301 S Washington**

*\*Application is to reopen the east porch.*

Applicant: David Fischhaber, Applicant - Present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that the applicant is proposing to reopen the east side porch that was previously enclosed and to reside a portion of the rear of the property.

Fischhaber: States that he needs the siding off of the porch to reside the area in the back and states that he would like to reopen the porch anyway since it is gorgeous.

Stevenson: Asks if the applicant has photos of what it looked like previously.

Fischhaber: States that he does not.

Stevenson: Asks what the original elements are that will be retained.

Fischhaber: States that he will be keeping the columns, the brickwork, and the pieces in between the brick.

Davis: Asks where the floor will be.

Fischhaber: States it will be where it is currently, about 2' off the ground. States that he will be removing the windows and the siding but that the rail will stay.

Rupert: States that the height of the railing may be too low. That it may need to be 42" high.

Stevenson: States that an additional railing may be needed to bring it to code.

Fischhaber: States that he already checked with the building department and that he does not need to pull a permit.

Stevenson: Asks about what the flooring will be.

Fischhaber: States that the existing floor will remain and it is oak that it sloped.

Stevenson: Asks about the stairs.

Fischhaber: States that he will add simple wood steps.

Pettit: Asks about how many risers needed.

Fischhaber: States that he may need three or four.

Rupert: States that a railing may be needed if he has that many steps but that he believes that it will not take three.

Davis: Asks about where the door will be.

Fischhaber: States that the original door opening still exists and that there is a sliding exterior patio door wall there now.

Davis: Asks what the walls of the porch will be.

Fischhaber: States that the original cedar shakes are still there inside the porch.

Pettit: States that the reason the commission is asking about all this is due to the applicant asking them to approve the reopening of the porch, the inside of which no one has seen for many years.

Stevenson: Recaps and states that there is a door wall there and potentially original cedar shakes exist on the walls.

Davis: States that he is looking for more information on what will be exposed but that he does not have a problem with the concept. States that he is looking for more photos of what the flooring and walls will look like as well as the ceiling.

Rupert: Asks about the light fixtures that exist inside.

Fischhaber: States that the light fixtures are interior fixtures.

Rupert: States that he would like to see what the stairs will look like.

Schmiedeke: States that the new shakes at the back of the property will need to be painted to match what exists.

Stevenson: Asks for photos of the interior of the enclosed porch, samples for paint, the new light fixtures and a more comprehensive photo of the rear exterior of building that requires the repairs.

Motion: Rupert (second: Schmiedeke) moves to table the application for 301 S Washington for more information and photos.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:  
n/a

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

## **218 N Washington**

*\*Application is for chimney repair.*

Applicant: Daneen Zureich, representative for the Ypsilanti Ladies' Literary House Foundation, Applicant - Present

Discussion: Stevenson: Recaps the application for the chimney repair.

Zureich: States that a condition assessment was done a few years back and that they are phasing the projects that need to be completed. States that the house was built in the 1840s. States that the phase one projects include the chimney work, reroofing and gutter work. States that the chimney is up first since they need to deal with that prior to reroofing.

Rupert: States that they are planning on parging the exterior of a chimney that is not currently parged.

Zureich: States that the chimney was replaced in 1998 and prior to that was an addition in 1965.

Schmiedeke: States that parging will essentially seal in the problem.

Stevenson: Agrees and states that this will only cause future problems and seal in moisture.

Rupert: Agrees and states that the parging may just spall right off in the future. He would suggest replacing the brick.

Schmiedeke: Suggests to do a good tuck pointing and painting.

Stevenson: States that she is worried about the loss of the brick look, if it was parged it will look like a large block on top of the building. She would recommend just tuck pointing, brick repair and replacement as needed and to paint over it.

Schmiedeke: Agrees.

Pettit: States that he is a little concerned with the current condition of the chimney if it was replaced so recently.

Zureich: States that she believes that the cap proposed for the chimney is to help with the water drainage issue.

Rupert: States that he would not have the chimney parged but would have the chimney replaced/repared as is.

Davis: States that they need to inquire about a solution to help sustain the chimney in the future.

Pettit: States that the chimney extension, cap addition and prep are appropriate but that the parging is not. He wonders why this step is what the contractor considered.

Stevenson: States that the parging is only a quick fix and that is not the right direction. She is hearing that the commission wants to see the chimney repaired, tuck pointed and a cap placed on top.

Davis: Asks if this needs to be tabled.

Stevenson: States that this application is pretty specific and needs to be denied. Asks for a drawing or spec sheet of the chimney cap when the applicant returns. States that either rebuilding or repointing is more appropriate.

Motion: Rupert (second: Davis) moves to deny the application for 218 N Washington due to the parging is not acceptable.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:  
n/a

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

### **53 E Forest**

*\*Application is for window replacement.*

Applicant: Lauren Ahearn, Applicant - Present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that the applicant is looking to replace 14 windows with aluminum clad wood windows.

Ahearn: States that she proposed two different types of windows but she prefers the Integrity Wood Ultrex windows due to the cost and timeframe for them to be produced. Both windows are special order due to the non-standard sizes of them.

Stevenson: Asks about the condition of the current windows. Asks if the applicant has tried to repair the windows which would be a cheaper option.

Ahearn: States that the bottom sill is rotted in most of the windows even though the house was just built in 1991. That there is significant damage due to how the water drains on the site. She states that many have mechanisms that no longer work and are drafty.

Schmiedeke: Asks if 14 is the total amount of windows on the property.

Ahearn: Confirms that there is a total of 14 windows on the house.

Pettit: Asks what will be different with the new windows that will help address the water issue. Asks if that issue stemmed from an installation issue.

Ahearn: States that the new window installers state that the new windows will take care of the issue.

Pettit: States that the metal cladding will help with the rot issue. States that he hopes that the new window installers are addressing the water issue.

Davis: States that this is something that the applicant may want to inquire further on.

Stevenson: States that the applicant will want to check to make sure that the water issue is solved with the new windows. States that this issue is not found on much older buildings that still have original windows.

Pettit: States that sometimes it could just be a problem with the original installation.

Davis: Asks about the glass size in the new windows.

Ahearn: States that the glass size will stay the same square footage wise.

Rupert: Asks if the entire window frame will be taken out and then replaced.

Ahearn: Agrees that that it will be a full frame replacement.

Stevenson: Recommends that the applicant try to repair some of the windows for some cost savings. States that they need to talk about the two different types of windows proposed. States that there is a wood window that is aluminum-clad and the Integrity Wood Ultrex, which is a wood fiber glass composite window.

Rupert: States that the aluminum-clad wood window would be more appropriate.

Stevenson: States that this may be a good time for the commission to consider the Ultrex since this property was built in 1991. States that the commission could allow the windows and see how well this composite material works.

Rupert: States that he believes that this was something that the commission previously agreed that they would allow on a new construction but that the commission did not want to see this on an older building. States that this product does not deteriorate like vinyl.

Pettit: States that this Ultrex product is massed like a wood window.

Schmiedeke: States that a darker color for the window sash is more appropriate than the cream or white.

Ahearn: States that she is planning on painting the house in the future. States that they are planning on staining the front porch a darker color so that it should go well with a darker window.

Stevenson: Agrees that a darker color frame is more appropriate.

Motion: Davis (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the replacement of 14 windows at 53 E Forest. The windows are to be a one-over-one aluminum clad wood in a dark color to be chosen by the applicant. The wood window will be a wood Ultrex Integrity window and a wood Ultrex double-hung window. The full frames are to be installed in the rough opening.

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.

## **9 S Adams**

*\*Application is for sign installation.*

Applicant: Laura Gillis for Growing Hope, Applicant - Present

Discussion: Gillis: States that she has two items to cover tonight. The sign item is to name the market place building at 9 S Adams. The materials and construction will be the same as before and they took the suggestion of the commission to center the sign.

Davis: Asks about the size.

Gillis: States that the height is roughly 10" but there is no width listed in the application but that since the doors are standard, so she estimates that the sign is a little more than the 6' width of the two doors.

Rupert: States that that it may be about 8 ½'.

Kochanek: States that an easement is needed for the sign and that will also dictate the size that the sign can be.

Motion: Davis (second: Rupert) moves to approve the installation of a white powder coated aluminum sign at 9 S Adams as depicted in the application that was submitted on July 5, 2017. The sign will be attached to the building in the mortar joints.

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.

## **STUDY ITEM**

### **9 S Adams**

Applicant: Laura Gillis for Growing Hope, Applicant - Present

Discussion: Gillis: States that they are considering adding a cooler and freezer near where the sign that was just approved will be. They are land locked where they are. They plan to install the freezer and cooler adjacent to each other. They are considering purchasing a set from MAIZ that were built for outside use. The freezer is 6 x 8 and the cooler is 5 x 7.

Schmiedeke: Asks if they are stainless steel.

Gillis: States that she believes so.

Davis: Asks how they would be secured.

Gillis: States that they would have a secure door and that they may attach the two units together so that you can access one from the other.

Stevenson: Asks why this location was picked since this is more of their main entrance.

Gillis: States that there is no more room inside the building because they want to leave the larger space alone for the Farmer's Market and the kitchen that they are renovating does not have much space either. States that the lot lines are very close to the building so there is not many options for locations.

Davis: Asks if this is permitted by the zoning ordinance and/or building departments.

Kochanek: States that this is something that will need to be looked at closer. That they will need to sit down with the applicant to figure it out.

Davis: States that this is a tough one for him. States that he would prefer to see this inside the building.

Schmiedeke: States that she would prefer more of an enclosure around the units.

Pettit: Agrees that he would prefer to see an enclosure as well.

### **613 N Prospect**

*\*Application is for reroof, gutter replacement, tuck-pointing and painting.*

Applicant: Jaclyn Sturgeon, Applicant - Present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that the applicant is planning on reroofing, doing some tuck-pointing and gutter work. Asks the applicant to confirm that they will be using ridge venting.

Sturgeon: Confirms.

Rupert: Asks if the painting is just for the storm windows. Asks if the screen will be the same color.

Sturgeon: Confirms.

Rupert: States that the tuck-pointing is just for the chimney and states that there is quite a severe crack and that it may need to come down.

Kochanek: States that she advised the applicant to move ahead with the tuck-pointing with the softer mortar as that was scheduled for the end of the week of July 11<sup>th</sup> which was the week of the cancelled HDC meeting.

Rupert: Asks about the porch.

Sturgeon: States that the porch is still in the process of being repaired and that the pieces are still on site but that the repairs are slow going.

Motion: Rupert (second: Pettit) moves to approve the application for 613 N Prospect for the reroofing, gutter and downspout replacement, tuck-pointing and painting. The replacement of the shingles with Owens-Corning Duration shingles in Estate Grey with a ridge vent venting system. Gutters to be k-style gutters in white with the downspouts in the same locations as the current. The drip edge on the roof is to be white. The tuck-pointing repair for the chimney with a softer mortar. The storm windows and screens to be painted Heritage Red by Benjamin Moore, HC-181.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#7- Clean building gently—no sandblasting.

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

#10- New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

### **10 N Adams**

*\*Application is for sign and awning installation.*

Applicant: Mohamed Fayed and Ali, Applicants - Present

Discussion: Stevenson: Recaps the application for signs and awnings. Asks for information on the material of the awnings.

Fayed: States that it will be a canvas awning in either option #1 or option #2.

Stevenson: States that the awning art is up to them.

Davis: States that it is a non-conforming sign.

Kochanek: States that the sign can be re-faced but that if it comes down it cannot be replaced as a pole sign.

Rupert: Asks if it would be lit up.

Fayed: States that it will be internally lit with florescent bulbs.

Stevenson: States that this is an internally lit sign with a bright white background and that is not permitted by the HDC. Asks if the colors can be reversed as the white background makes it very bright.

Fayed: States that they spent a lot of time on the logo but that they can change the white background to a yellow.

Pettit: States that the white field is a problem. States that if this same sign was not back-lit then it would be permitted.

Davis: Asks if the awning on the front will block the sign.

Fayed: States that it will not. Asks if a black background instead of the white background on the sign will be ok.

Rupert: Confirms that would be permitted.

Motion: Pettit (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the application for work at 10 N Adams, work to include the installation of an approximately 40 square foot sign panel in the existing sign pole. The sign is to be back-lit. The design submitted in the application is to be modified such that the white field on the sign is now black with the other elements on the sign to remain as they are. Work to include the installation of either awning option submitted in the areas indicated on the plans dated 6-1-16, sheet A-2. The awning material will be canvas.

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: Yays: 4, Nays: 1, Davis. Motion passes.

### **103 Washtenaw**

*\*Application is for painting.*

Applicant: Betty Eller for the Applicant - Present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that the application is to repaint the house. Asks for the original paint samples.

*Staff provides paint samples.*

Stevenson: States to not power wash or sandblast the house but to use the gentlest means possible to clean.

Stevenson: Asks about the colors to be used.

Eller: States that the siding will be painted Carriage Door red, the trim is the mustard color and the window frames is the white color.

Davis: States that he likes the color scheme.

Stevenson: Asks about the how the vines will be removed.

Eller: States that the vines will be removed by the painter and that it is fairly easy to remove as it has not grown into the brick.

Motion: Davis (second: Pettit) moves to approve the painting at 103 Washtenaw to include the cleaning of the structure in the gentlest means possible, no power washing or sandblasting. The use of an oil-based primer for painting. The use of Sherwin Williams Carriage Door for the siding and the brick, Sherwin Williams Lanyard for the trim and Sherwin Williams Creamy for the windows. It should be noted that the vines that exist on the building will be removed.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#7- Clean building gently—no sandblasting.

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

### **25 S Huron**

*\*Application is for sign installation.*

Applicant: Kim Mays and Jim Summers, Applicant - Present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that this is an application for a wall sign and vinyl window graphics.

Mays: States that the signs are temporary and that they are aware of the 30 day timeframe.

Davis: Asks if the other hanging sign is temporary.

Summers: States that they are both temporary.

Schmiedeke: Points out the existing signboard and states that the permanent sign should be installed there.

Summers: States that he would like something that can be seen when coming down the road.

Davis: States that the sign allotment is 1 square foot per linear foot of frontage.

Summers: Asks if the south side of the building can have a sign.

Stevenson: States that he would need to check with the building department.

Stevenson: States that she does not have any problems with any of signs proposed. She does have a note that states that the stand-up flag banner is not permitted.

Motion: Davis (second: Pettit) moves to approve the application for sign work at 25 S Huron to include the installation of a vinyl banner and the hanging steel wall sign as submitted with the application that was dated July 18, 2017. This application is for a temporary sign, to expire 30 days from installation.

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.

### **106-108 N Adams**

*\*Application is for the installation of a greenhouse, fence, sign and tile on the porch.*

Applicant: Devin O'Rourke, Applicant - Present

Discussion: Stevenson: Asks about the tiles for the porch. Asks for more details.

O'Rourke: States that the tile will be placed on the porch with a base coat applied to seal the current porch. States that the porch is a lake stone slab but that the concrete used to patch the porch previously looks like it is in bad shape.

Stevenson: States that the tiles for the porch are concerning for her in the pattern that they are in. Asks what the other commissioners think about the tiles.

O'Rourke: States that they are open to other options to make it look better visually but that this was the best solution that they could come up.

Pettit: States that it is a different proposal than the commission usually sees. States that it leaves the original material.

Schmiedeke: States that tongue and groove wood would have been the original material for the porch.

Stevenson: States that she does not really have an issue with the tiles other than the pattern. Asks if the commission is ok with it.

Schmiedeke: States that she does not have an issue with it.

Rupert: Agrees.

Stevenson: Asks about the greenhouse addition. States that she is concerned about the structural integrity of the porch roof and if the porch can hold all that weight. She does not feel that it is historically appropriate for the greenhouse to be on the 2nd floor that it would be more appropriate for the first floor.

O'Rourke: States that there is a door and a flat roof that exists there.

Stevenson: States that the original use was probably a porch with a railing. States that she does not believe that the greenhouse is appropriate.

Rupert and Schmiedeke: Agree.

Davis: Asks if there is anywhere else that the greenhouse can go on the on the grounds.

O'Rourke: States that there is nowhere else that makes the maximum use of the space in the house.

Stevenson: States that it could be more appropriate in the yard. Requests that the commission moves on to look at the other pieces of the project. Asks about the shadowbox fence.

O'Rourke: *Provides a picture of the fence he is looking to install.* States that he is looking to install a shadow box fence between them and the bus station. States that he is looking to do a horizontal shadow box and that it is more for aesthetics.

Schmiedeke: States that this is a climbable fence.

Davis: Asks for a height on the fence.

O'Rourke: States that it would be a 5 or 6 foot fence.

Rupert: States that it would need to be painted or stained an opaque stain.

Stevenson: Asks how the commission feels about the horizontal fence.

Pettit: States that he is okay with the fence.

Davis: Agrees.

Stevenson: Asks about the sign.

O'Rourke: States that the sign would be an original mosaic with a chalkboard for changeable signage.

Stevenson: Advises that the sign cannot be freestanding according to zoning.

Davis: States that that if it was art it would be different but the chalkboard takes it into signage.

Stevenson: States that that commission is okay with the tile and the shadowbox fence. States that it sounds like the applicant will need to work with the planning department on the signage requirements. She states that the greenhouse is really the issue since it is inappropriate.

Motion: Rupert (second: Schmiedeke) moves to deny the application for 106-108 N Adams for the reason that the second floor greenhouse is inappropriate and the question the freestanding sign.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:  
n/a

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

Stevenson: States to resubmit the application for the tile and the fence and to work on the sign with the planning and building departments.

## **15 S Washington**

*\*Application is for storefront and door installation and window additions.*

Applicant: David Esau (Architect with Cornerstone Design) & Bob Gillett (Director of Michigan Advocacy Program) - Present

Discussion: Esau: States that this application covers the more critical items that need to be taken care of to move forward. They will come back with the stucco repairs later.

Stevenson: Asks for a rundown of the items.

Esau: Advises what will be happening with the floor plans and that the old display windows on the west side would now be 1 ½ story conference rooms. States that the west storefront will retain the arches and will be replacing the storefront windows and doors. States that they plan on using the natural silver storefront anodized metal for the windows, since that is what is currently there. They will introduce a 16" knee wall on the west side to protect the glass from salting and mud. The south and north walls will be mirror images of each other with the new punched in windows. States that with the original plans for the east wall the glass framing aligned with the arches, but that what ended up being installed differs from that in that the framing does not align with the arches. He states that they would prefer that the alignment go back to the original design.

Stevenson: States that she likes that better.

Pettit: Agrees.

Schmiedeke: Asks about the material for the knee wall.

Esau: States that they would do two courses of concrete block and face it with a stucco to match the arches. They would like to use a grey tinted glass for all the windows and storefronts. It will cut down on the solar glare.

Pettit: Asks about the service doors that are being replaced. Asks if the size of the opening will change.

Esau: States that the size will not change it is just to replace a door that is rusted and damaged.

Rupert: Asks about the arches.

Esau: States that their plan is to repair but they are still researching the options to match what is there.

Schmiedeke: Asks about the canvas awnings that exist inside the arches.

Davis: States that he is okay with the removal of them.

Esau: States that the plan is to remove them.

Stevenson: States that she is fine with them being removed.

Motion: Davis (second: Rupert) Move to approve the work at 15 S Washington to include the installation of 4' x 4' or 4' x 4' 8" silver anodized aluminum storefront framed windows with gray tinted glass on the north, south and east facades with a soldier course of brick created for the lintels. Work to also include the installation of new silver anodized aluminum storefront system with matching gray tinted glass on the east storefront in an alignment to correspond with the original architect's drawings and a silver anodized aluminum storefront system with matching gray tinted glass with a

new egress door and a 16" stucco knee wall on the west storefront. Hollow metal service doors and framing painted to match the building will replace the existing hollow metal doors on the north end of the east façade.

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 ITEM**

### **15 S Washington**

Applicant: David Esau (Architect with Cornerstone Design) & Bob Gillett (Director of Michigan Advocacy Program) - Present

Discussion: Gillett: Asks about what the HDC would prefer to see for the signage, the size and location.

Pettit: States that they would need to talk to the planning department for the size requirements.

Kochanek: States that the allotment in Center district is 1 square foot per linear foot. Also the window signs are permitted up to 25% of the windows.

Davis: Asks about a stand-alone sign.

Kochanek: States that a stand-alone sign is not permitted for the district this structure is in.

Rupert: States that they could just create a sign area in one of the arches.

Stevenson: States that she views the east and west sides as the main facades. She would recommend something contemporary.

Pettit: States that a sign above the west side arches may get lost but that they can put a sign above the east side arches that would not get lost.

Davis: States that the west side may lend itself more towards window signs.

Rupert: States that there was a sign previously above the east side arches.

### **620 Norris**

Applicant: Ryan McCarthy & Angela Peat - Present

Discussion: McCarthy: States that they are in the conceptual phase of their project and that they are in the process of purchasing the vacant lot. They are looking to build a craftsman house on the lot and that they are interested in what the

commission is looking for in regards to the materials. Asks if the concept plans are acceptable. States that they are aware that they need to pay heed to the massing and setbacks in the neighborhood. States that they are aware that that they cannot replicate history.

Stevenson: Agrees and states that these are correct. Composite materials would be fine on the house, but vinyl is not appropriate. There is an opportunity to use composite materials.

McCarthy: States that they are flexible with the materials.

Davis: States to try and tone down some of the details so that they don't completely imitate a craftsman, for example one-over one windows.

Rupert: States to use the smooth grain composite siding.

McCarthy: Asks if phasing the building is possible.

Stevenson: States that it may be easier to separate the applications per phase.

McCarthy: States that they would like to keep the tree but they may not be able to keep it due to the setback needed.

Davis: States that is something to work out with the Planning Department but that if it does not work with the setback then there is always the variance process.

#### **412 Oak**

Applicant: William and Pamela Grahams - Present

Discussion: Grahams: States that he would like to build a 1 car garage in the dimensions of 14 x 40. States that he has a modern shed in the back yard that would be taken down for the new garage. States that there are several types of garages in the neighborhood and they are looking to narrow their design options down.

Stevenson: States that the commission would need to see a site plan and spec sheets for the actual application.

Davis: States that since the house is plainer then he would recommend that the garage be a more simple design. States that since it is farther back on the narrow lot it will be less visible.

Grahams: States that he also needs to reroof the house and wanted to know about the application process for that as well. They are planning on changing the color of the roof.

Stevenson: States that they would need to apply as that is an aesthetic change but that the application process for a roof is a simple process.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **47 N Huron**

*\*Application is for the installation of a little library.*

Applicant: Max Doyle, Applicant – Not present

Discussion: Stevenson: Wonders about how it will be installed. States that otherwise she has no problem with the idea.

Motion: Davis (second: Rupert) moves to table the application for 47 N Huron for more information.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:  
n/a

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

## **Administrative Approvals**

**201 N Hamilton, 301 S Huron, 334 E Forest, 333 E Cross, 109 Buffalo, 118 Maple – reroofs**

Motion: Rupert (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the administrative approvals for 201 N Hamilton, 301 S Huron, 334 E Forest, 333 E Cross, 109 Buffalo and 118 Maple.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Lighting Fact Sheet**

Postponed for next meeting.

### **LED Sign Memo**

Postponed for next meeting.

## **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS –none**

## **HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS**

### **Approval of the minutes of June 27, 2017**

Motion: Davis (second: Pettit) moves to approve the meeting minutes as written.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion: Davis (second: Rupert) moves to adjourn the meeting.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

**MEETING ADJOURNED at 10:53 p.m.**

