

CITY OF YPSILANTI
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
ACTION MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 14, 2017

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Anne Stevenson Chair 7:02 PM

Meeting Location: Spark East, 215 W. Michigan Ave

Commissioners Present: Anne Stevenson, Hank Prebys, Mike Davis, Jr., Ron Rupert,
Jane Schmiedeke, Erika Lindsay (arrived at 7:10), Alex
Pettit (arrived at 7:12)

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Cynthia Kochanek, Preservation Planner
Seth Torkelson-Regan, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Rupert (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the agenda as
amended to add a study item for 401 E Forest.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS – none

PUBLIC HEARING

118-120 Maple

**Outbuilding demolition-Application WITHDRAWN*

OLD BUSINESS--none

NEW BUSINESS

37-39 E Michigan

**Signage replacement*

Applicant: Paul Deters, rep for Applicant, Metro Detroit Signs-present

Discussion: Deters: States the brand has undergone an image change. Plans include
to swap out the sign for a like-to-like swap with different font and color
scheme. This includes the set of channel letters on one elevation, the

front sign on Michigan Ave, and the monument sign which will reflect the new font scheme.

Prebys: Asks if the channel letters are back lighted.

Deters: States that they're internally illuminated.

Davis: Asks if the LEDs are internal and not facing outward.

Deters: Responds yes.

Stevenson: Asks if applicant is using the current system.

Deters: Responds that the font is different

Stevenson: Asks if the internal lighting is the same system.

Deters: Responds yes.

Davis: Asks if the channel letters will be changed.

Deters: Responds no, it will be the same.

Davis: Wonders if commission should make note that this approval is specific to this motion and does not reopen our position on backlit signs.

Motion: Prebys (second: Schmiedeke) moves for approval of work for signs at 37-39 E Michigan to include the re-facing of the monument sign, the replacement of the red channel letter "KFC" sign on the east side of the building, the installation of 8" vinyl letters stating "real meals to go" to be placed on the canopy on the west side of the building and the removal of the existing wall sign on the front tower to be replaced with a new stand-off metal panel system with a vinyl graphic. All signage is subject to the square footage requirements in the zoning ordinance. The lighting system that is there is to remain, there is no addition of a new lighting system.

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.

16 N Washington

**Window installation*

Applicant: Timothy Patton Doyle, owner – present

Discussion: Doyle: States that there are currently six vinyl one-over-one windows, and other windows that exist in the building is a mix of glass block and sliding windows.

Prebys: Asks if windows in front of building will completely fill the space.

Doyle: Affirms. The front brick of building is built on the inside of the rough opening, so when the windows are replaced the frame with the trim will meet the original brick on the exterior.

Davis: Asks if glass block windows will be changed.

Doyle: States that they will be changed as well. The six vinyl windows will be replaced by new double hung windows and will fill that original openings, and the glass block sliders will be replaced with casement windows.

Rupert: Asks if space that was left unused by the window will be extended.

Doyle: Responds yes.

Rupert: Asks if top of window will be arched.

Doyle: States that the window itself will be square. And there will be a same color metal flashing that meets the opening arch.

Stevenson: Asks about the profile of the window.

Doyle: States intention of trim was to replace old trim with new aluminum trim. Two profiles fit original style. Asks if committee has recommendations for a more appropriate match with the building or time frame.

Prebys: Advises to keep it simple. Either is fine [Supported by Schmiedeke and Rupert.]

Motion: Prebys (second: Davis) moves approval of work at 16 N Washington to include the removal and replacement of the windows on the property. Window work to include the installation of Marvin Clad Ultimate double-hung, casement and fixed aluminum-clad wood windows in the rough openings as depicted in the application submitted on November 2, 2017. The windows will have a bronze finish and the casings will be Stratton or Ridgeland, as desired by the owner.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

205 N Hamilton

**Application moved to the end of the meeting due to no applicant present.*

304 N Hamilton

**Porch step replacement*

Applicant: Raymond Scherer, owner - present

Discussion: Stevenson: Asks what type of wood is being used for porch.

Scherer: States it will be pressure treated.

Stevenson: Asks if cheek walls on side will be coming down or will remain.

Scherer: States the rat wall will be taken down. The porch itself is separate from the steps. The cheapest way to go will be to do wood steps. The concrete will continue deteriorating over time.

Prebys: Asks if there would be risers of wood.

Scherer: States that if the commission wants risers, they can do risers. States that oftentimes his company doesn't put risers on exterior steps.

Prebys: States that he doesn't think that's being fair to the house. Asks if there will be a need for railings.

Scherer: States yes, they will be put in to meet Michigan building code.

Prebys: Asks what type of handrails will be used.

Scherer: States a standard handrail.

Rupert: States that more details are needed.

Stevenson: States that the commission will need some pictures or drawings of the handrail designs and other aspects of the steps. Each person's interpretation of the stairs and railings is different, so the commission needs details. [Supported by Prebys.]

Lindsay: [Referencing picture] States that a pipe rail could go here.

Scherer: States that the problem with pipe rail is that overtime salt eats away at it, which creates a safety concern

Stevenson: States that this is not an argument that she will buy because the commission has seen pipe rails last for decades.

Davis: States that commission isn't requiring handrails.

Scherer: Adds that Michigan building code requires handrails with anything more than two steps. States that he didn't have to submit a design for the handrail on the neighboring house and that was more complicated. Adds that he thinks that the reason for this is he and the commission were sick of the meetings and the commission just let me put it in.

Prebys: Replies that he can't believe that to be true [supported by Rupert].

**Since the applicant is unable to quickly pull up an example on his phone, the chair asks if it would be alright to move the application to the end of the meeting so that other applications can be addressed. The item is moved to the bottom of agenda and picked up again after other new business items are complete.*

406 Oak

**Fence installation*

Applicant: Marilyn Crowley, representative for applicant-present

Discussion: Stevenson: Recaps the application and asks if the fencing already exists on the other side of property.

Crowley: Affirms and states that they are looking to finish off the fence. Wants fence to come forward to side door along the back of the house. Fence will be the same exact material as currently exists.

Schmiedeke: Asks if it comes across front of house.

Crowley: Responds that it will not go in front of the house. It will come alongside the house. [*Referencing drawing, applicant demonstrates details of the plan.*] The fence will create an enclosed area for a dog.

Davis: Asks if the fence will be painted or stained.

Crowley: Responds that it will be painted. [*Shows the paint chip to commission.*]

Stevenson: Asks if a gate will be installed.

Crowley: Responds that there will most likely be a gate where the door is.

Rupert: Asks if gate will be made out of the same material as fence.

Crowley: Affirms.

Motion: Davis (second: Prebys) move to approve the work for 406 Oak to include the installation of pressure treated cedar –tone moulded fence kit in 6 x 6 sections to be painted Sherwin Williams Site White #7070. The fence will adhere to the enclosed drawing with the application, dated November 8, 2017.

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.

31 N Washington

**Awning installation*

Applicant: Frank Pillitteri and Owen Welsh, owner and applicant- present

Discussion: Stevenson: Asks if applicant used the existing frames for the new awning.

Welsh: Confirms that yes, the existing frames were used but with new fabric.

Stevenson: States that the commission will be looking at the signage and materials for the awning. Asks if any lighting changes occurred.

Welsh: Responds no.

Kochanek: Reminds applicants that the HDC can approve their work here, but the work is still subject to zoning ordinances and must still go through the building department for approval.

Prebys: States that standards for awnings are not to be used for signs except for street addresses, and he feels that this awning has become a sign. Asks how commissioners feel.

Davis: Agrees.

Pettit: Asks if there is something [*in their codes or fact sheets*] about words written on the valance as opposed to the main body of the awning.

Davis: [*Reading from the HDC fact sheet*] "If awning is intended to serve as a sign lettering may be added to the valance only."

Welsh: States that all the lettering is on the face of the awning, which is interchangeable with the valance.

Rupert: Adds that this is true except for the logo on the top center of the awning.

Davis: States that Deja Vu is the name and logo, and for another case this past year the commission approved a logo on an awning. Adds that he doesn't have a problem with the awning, but the issue will be with the zoning ordinance.

Motion: Rupert (second: Prebys) moves to approve work already completely at 31 N Washington to include the replacement of the awning on the north side of the building with the Raspberry and Petro Green awning on the existing frames. The signage on the awning is subject to the size requirements listed in the City's zoning ordinance.

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.

304 N Hamilton

**Porch step replacement-continued from earlier in the meeting*

Applicant: Raymond Scherer, owner - present

Discussion: Scherer: [*Shows commission pictures of another project as an example of what he is planning for this address*]

Stevenson: States that the pictures are helpful. Asks that instead of open steps, there be risers there. Also adds that there should be a top and bottom that encloses the balusters. Recommends that there be skirting.

Scherer: Asks if there has to be risers because this interferes with snow removal.

Stevenson: States that the commission requires risers to be put in. Adds that if there's a need for skirting, the applicant can use hardware cloth if there's a small space. If there's a need for full skirting, it needs to be framed. There should also be a handrail. Adds that all this information regarding requirements for steps are on the HDC porch fact sheet.

Scherer: States that there is a handrail on it. States that balusters are exposed for aesthetics. The balusters are exposed, not tongue and grooved in. They are exposed on the outside. The (top) handrails are a 2 x 6 with a router that is run across it so that it is an oblong pentagon almost. There's a 1 x 4 board beneath it that's attached.

Prebys: Asks if the handrail is to be graspable.

Scherer: States that the handrail will be graspable.

Rupert: States that he thinks there should be another board [*referencing picture*]

Scherer: Explains that balusters are exposed so they can be more easily replaced when college students kick them out.

Stevenson: States that she feels that balusters should be enclosed on top and bottom. [*Commissioners agree.*] Adds that risers are needed, the balusters need to be enclosed, skirting is required as well as a handrail. This will also need to be painted.

Scherer: Adds that it will be finished in a solid opaque stain.

Schmiedeke: [*To commission*] Adds that the commission should make it abundantly clear that what the applicant has shown is not appropriate.

Stevenson: Adds that the picture is helpful for starting, but the plan according to the photo will have to be changed in order to receive the commission's approval.

Schmiedeke: States that she thinks the commission needs to see a new plan on paper.

Lindsay: States that the plan needs to meet the porch fact sheet.

Pettit: States that in the past the commission has proposed a project with a stipulation regarding the fact sheet although the project did not have a perfect plan or picture.

Prebys: Suggests also stating in the motion what is required in the porch fact sheet.

Stevenson: Adds that the motion should encompass what it is that has to be changed per the commission's porch fact sheet. Adds that she feels that the photo was enough for her.

Lindsay: Asks commission if we could request that the applicant submit the photo to staff.

Stevenson: Asks applicant to email photo to staff.

Scherer: States that he will.

Davis: States that he feels this is enough info to make a motion.

Motion: Davis (second: Prebys) moves to approve the work at 304 N Hamilton to include the replacement of the front steps with wood. The new steps will comply with the porch fact sheet. The new steps will require skirting; the skirting shall be framed unless the distance between the ground is small enough to use hardware cloth. The guardrail shall have a handrail and will be required to be framed according to the porch fact sheet. The steps will have risers. The cement wing walls will be removed. The steps will be stained in an opaque stain in platinum grey by Benjamin Moore.

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 - 6, Nays - 1 (Schmiedeke). Motion Carries.

205 N Hamilton

**Porch repair & stair replacement*

Applicant: Not present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that we don't have enough info.

Motion: Rupert (second: Pettit) moves to table for more information.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

STUDY ITEMS

401 E Forest

Applicant: Not present

Discussion: Kochanek: States that the porch is progressing but it is taking longer than expected. The owner is doing a ceiling replacement, similar to what was done at 406 Oak with the plywood made to look like

beadboard. The applicant wanted to check to see if she could do an admin approval on this type of ceiling.

Davis: States that if that is the only thing on the application, he is okay with an admin approval.

Stevenson: Adds that she'd be alright with an admin approval as long as the work is like-for-like.

Lindsay: Asks if applicant is putting the beadboard plywood on top of the existing.

Kochanek: There are existing holes so she's assuming he's patching it into the porch ceiling.

Lindsay: Asks if we could request that the applicant put it in so it's even level on top, which would lower the ceiling by a bit, so as to preserve the original ceiling. Adds that her concern is that patching the original may look terrible. And that this strategy is quite affordable.

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) moves for authorization for administrative approval for work at 401 E Forest to include the installation of plywood beadboard for the ceiling in the porch roof with the addition that it not replace any remaining beadboard, but cover it.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

406 Oak

**Door replacement*

206 Olive

**Reroof*

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) moves approval of both administrative approvals at 406 Oak for door replacement and 206 Olive for new roofing.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

OTHER BUSINESS

Property Monitoring

16 S Washington (old elbow room)

Discussion: Stevenson: States that they still have not addressed old awning.

315 N Grove

Discussion: Schmiedeke: States there is an unpainted fence, with no permit. They should receive a letter.

Prebys: Asks if they were replacing like-with-like, would they need a permit.

Schmiedeke: Responds probably not, but they'd need to paint it still.

Davis: Asks if we should give them to spring.

Lindsay: Suggests the commission make it a friendly reminder.

HDC meeting day/2018 calendar

Discussion: Stevenson: States that the commission is considering switching to the second and fourth Thursdays of the month. States that the reason for this is for our frequent location changing because of City Council extra meetings. Thursdays are possible. Asks how this works for the commission.

Davis: Asks Stevenson if this changes her ability to be chair. Adds that Thursdays are easier than Tuesdays.

Stevenson: States that it does not really change her ability to be the chair.

Davis: Adds that this new schedule is more difficult for Commissioner Pettit.

Pettit: Responds that he can make it work.

Davis: Asks who would be willing to be chair.

Lindsay: States she cannot that she is too busy with current schedule.

Schmiedeke: Adds that she cannot.

Pettit: Adds that the schedule messes with him a lot.

Stevenson: Suggests the commission pause on this topic and wait until the December meeting.

Rupert: Adds that the Friends of Freight House meetings are on Thursday.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS- none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of October 24, 2017

Motion: Davis (second: Pettit) moves to approve minutes as amended to replace the word tells in the minutes.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 8:08 p.m.