



MINUTES

City of Ypsilanti HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION Virtual Meeting

Tuesday, June 23, 2020
7:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chairperson Pettit Video/telephone usage instructions given for potential attendees
Meeting called to order at 7:03pm

Commissioners Present: Alex Pettit, Anne Stevenson, Erika Lindsay, Amy Swift, James Chesnut

Commissioners Absent: Ron Rupert

Staff Present: Scott Slagor, Preservation Planner
Nancy Hare-Dickerson, Commission Recording Secretary

Additional Staff Present: Joe Meyers, Economic Development Director
Christopher Jacobs, Downtown Development Authority Director
Andy Aamodt, City Planner
Elize Jekabson, Downtown Development Authority Coordinator

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Stevenson (second: Swift) moved to approve the agenda as submitted.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Stevenson, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut
Nays: None
Absent: Commissioner Rupert
Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS- none

PUBLIC HEARING—none

OLD BUSINESS

100 W Michigan

**Storefront Systems.*

Applicant: Conor Doran, Project Manager- not present
Timothy Stout, O'Neil Construction- present

Discussion: Pettit: Indicated that the Commission received additional drawings regarding the proposed storefront and signage work. Asked applicant to talk the Commission through the materials.

Stout: Indicated that they developed a design based on the feedback presented at the previous HDC meeting *[reference materials]*. Stated that on the left-hand side of the drawing, it is primarily the same as last time -- that the existing leaded glass will remain and there is some trim surrounding the new storefront. Stated that on the right-hand side where it reads "future sign", that some components have been added to that to make the top a bit more ornate with some crown molding. Stated that they deepened that *[reference drawing]* from the face of the building to help it stand off a little bit better and that they added a little bit more trim detail. Stated that the next pages will show those three cut sections *[reference drawing]*. Stated that section one is through the leaded glass; section two is through the sill, showing the trim; and section three is through that "future sign" area. Stated that one of the concerns presented at the last meeting was lack of flashing for water shedding. Stated that, in section three, they will put a termination bar on the masonry and then have a metal flashing cap that will extend over the top of the crown molding in the trim. Stated that on section one, at the base of the leaded glass, they will have metal flashing there, as well, for water shed.

Pettit: Asked applicant to also discuss the highlighted areas of items that would be changed *[reference materials]*.

Stout: Stated that the location of the painted sign would be above the leaded glass. Stated that there was some discussion at the last meeting about the wood that is right there *[reference photo materials]*. Stated that that is non-structural. Stated that they investigated the inside of the framing. Stated that they suspect that those wood pieces are part of the previous canopy. Stated that the building owner is interested in just covering those with the vapor permeable coating that is going everywhere on the masonry and then painting over the top. Stated that they noted on the leaded glass there *[reference photo materials]* that all the broken panes will be replaced. Stated that there was discussion last time about the OSB on the outside; that it was just temporary to keep the weather out. Stated that the MDO paneling will continue consistently to the corner there *[reference photo materials]*. Stated that the next image is the storefront window on the east elevation which was an existing opening with the existing storefront *[reference photo materials]*. Stated that they just replaced like for like. Stated that the next image is the door *[reference photo materials]*. Indicated that for the infill between the aluminum and the masonry, that they are going to take a piece of aluminum and adhere it right to the face of that frame so it will just look like the jamb is just slightly thicker. Stated that it will not be noticeable that there are multiple components. Stated that they will then seal between the edge of the aluminum and the masonry with a cold feed of joint sealant to finish off.

Pettit: As to the "future sign" storefront, asked about the detail of how that box returns back to the building *[reference drawings]*.

Stout: Stated that the paneling would return on the side, to the masonry, which would be beyond the leaded glass. Stated that the paneling is not going to return to the leaded glass. Stated that it would be slightly east of the leaded glass. Stated that the idea would be that the entire top is capped with this termination bar and then extending down into the piece of metal flashing with the drip edge on the face, such that any rain coming down from the brick is going to shed to the

front. Stated that it will be pitched so that it will shed to the front. Stated that to the left of the words "future sign" *[reference drawing]*, that MDO box would return back to the masonry in a solid return, so that it would be fully enclosed.

[Discussion continued as to the box return back to the masonry; glass/weathering considerations]

Swift: Asked if the header that is above the leaded panels is a wood header.

Stout: Confirmed.

Chesnut: Discussed concern about painting over blocks that are now known to be non-structural and could potentially be easily removed. Discussed the gaps in the brick work *[reference photo materials]*. Asked about any possible thoughts to retoothe the brick in that area.

Stout: Stated that they would rather not. Stated that the masonry is complete. Stated that that crew has demobilized. Indicated that they would prefer to just coat it if that is acceptable.

Chesnut: Asked what is going to happen to the larger gap that we see *[reference photo materials]*.

Stout: Stated that he has not been out there in the last few days. Stated that if there is still a half a brick still missing there, that they would call the crew back in to fill that in.

Swift: Stated that she would like to voice her support in keeping the wood as a historic trace of the porches that would have been there previously, just from a philosophical point of view. Asked that they make sure that things are pointed up and that it is stable before it is coated.

Stout: Acknowledged.

[Continued discussion as to brick/coating/aesthetic considerations]

Motion: Chesnut (second: Swift) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 100 W Michigan as submitted in the application dated June 2, 2020 for installation of anodized bronze storefront systems with MDO as specified, and replacement of the display window and entry door on the east elevation.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Stevenson, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut
Nays: None
Absent: Commissioner Rupert
Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

105 W Michigan

**Sign.*

Applicant: Taryn Willis, Business Representative - present

Discussion: Pettit: Asked applicant to walk the Commission through the application.

Willis: Indicated that they recently changed their original name of United Sonz to Ypsilanti Marketing & Print Company *[provided information regarding the business name change and storefront ownership]*. Stated that the application is to have a sign done by A2 Benchmark, who has done other signs in the downtown area. Stated that they are looking to get the sign up as soon as possible.

Pettit: Asked for information about the proposed sign *[reference photo material]*.

Willis: Stated that the sign is 96-by-120. Stated that it is aluminum composite, which is a good weathering material. Indicated that after discussions with staff, that one-inch spacers would be placed behind the sign to prevent any moisture from gathering against the building.

[Discussion regarding sign proportion considerations, reference photo material]

Swift: Indicated that to skinny-up the sign in the middle so that it looks like the sign is sitting within that larger signboard area, would visually be more appealing and appropriate.

Willis: Asked if the spacers are still needed.

Swift: Confirmed. Stated that the spacers are so that water does not build up behind the sign.

Willis: Asked for clarification — so make the sign fit within the incove of the white part *[reference photo material]* but not necessarily the width area; and it would still include the one-inch spacers behind it.

Swift: Confirmed. Stated that that is what she is suggesting.

Stevenson: Indicated agreement that it would be more appropriate for it to fit within the existing signboard, within the recessed sign area.

[Further clarifying discussion continued]

Swift: Stated that it needs to fit within on all sides. Stated that the white should be all the way around so that it is not distracting and will look like the sign is designed for that storefront. Stated that that white piece can actually frame it *[reference photo material]*.

Willis: Acknowledged. Indicated that it should not be a problem making that adjustment.

Swift: Asked if the sign would be lit.

Willis: Confirmed, no. Stated that it is an aluminum painted piece that is mechanically attached. Stated that on top of the aluminum composite is a decal that is put on there.

[Clarifying discussion as to the practicality/aesthetic value of the spacers]

Motion: Stevenson (second: Swift) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 105 W Michigan for the installation of a new sign. The sign shall be a PVC aluminum material and match the rendering in terms of design. However, the sign will fit within the recessed signboard and will allow for a portion of the white signboard to show on both horizontal and vertical and will be placed with an additional waterproofing spacer behind it to prevent additional moisture from entering the storefront.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:
#10 – New work shall be removable.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Stevenson, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut
Nays: None
Absent: Commissioner Rupert
Motion carried.

407 W Cross

**Garden fence.*

Applicant: Caroline Wright, Church Representative - present

Discussion: Pettit: Asked applicant to walk the Commission through the proposed work.

Wright: Indicated that as to the plot, there are three patches of grass. Stated that the largest is in the middle and is 60-by-45. Stated that they have a food pantry program which she was recently hired to grow and expand. Indicated that the hope is to till the land, plant some food, and put a small rabbit fence around it to deter the animals. Stated that there would be four-by-four posts on each end, just about the height of the fence, which would be about three feet. Stated that the rabbit fence itself is three-feet-four-inches, but getting it in the ground a bit, it would be somewhere between three-feet and three-feet-and-one-inch. Stated that the four-by-fours would be as high as the fence is. Stated that then there would be green, metal T-posts every ten feet in between with the wire. Stated that there would be mulch around the sides to help keep the grass and weeds down and to make it look nice. Stated that there would be a mulch path through the middle. Stated that from the mulch in the middle, there would be 26-foot-by-four-foot beds on either side going vertically in that space *[reference drawing]*. Indicated that a small gate is planned by that sidewalk *[reference drawing]* for access to the garden, which would be made by two-by-fours.

Pettit: Asked if it would be a wood gate.

Wright: Confirmed.

Pettit: Asked if the mulching would go all the way to the sidewalk on both street sides.

Wright: Confirmed.

[Further clarifying discussion as to mulch location details, reference drawing]

Pettit: Asked if white paint is planned for the four-by-four posts and the gate.

Wright: Confirmed. Asked if the Commission would allow the natural wood rather than paint.

Pettit: Indicated that exposed wood structures in the District typically are required to be painted or opaque wood stained.

Wright: Asked if an opaque stain could be used.

Pettit: Stated that an opaque stain could be used.

[Further clarifying discussion as to opaque stain appropriateness/types]

Wright: Acknowledged preference to use opaque stain.

[Discussion as to applicant checking Code considerations regarding fence location to sidewalk]

Motion: Lindsay (second: Stevenson) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 407 W Cross as submitted in the application dated June 16, 2020 for installation of a garden with a perimeter fence, as specified. The wood components of the fence shall be finished in an opaque stain.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:
#10 – New work shall be removable.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Stevenson, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut
Nays: None
Absent: Commissioner Rupert
Motion carried.

STUDY ITEMS-none

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

- 1. 224 N Grove** – Air Conditioner
- 2. 527 N Huron** – Roof
- 3. 36 E Cross** – Roof
- 4. 324 W Michigan** – Egress stair

[Per query by Commissioner Pettit as to wood finish considerations, staff provided background information regarding the application and staff contact with contractor]

Motion: Stevenson (second: Chesnut) moved to accept the administrative approvals for 224 N Grove - air conditioner; 527 N Huron – roof; 36 E Cross – roof; 324 W Michigan – egress stair.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Stevenson, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut
Nays: None
Absent: Commissioner Rupert
Motion carried.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Property Monitoring

Commissioner/Staff discussion as to property monitoring.

2. Commissioner Comments- Commissioners, who wished, shared additional thoughts/comments.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS—none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of June 9, 2020

Motion: Stevenson (second: Swift) moved to approve the minutes of June 9, 2020 as submitted.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Stevenson, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut
Nays: None
Absent: Commissioner Rupert
Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Pettit adjourned the meeting, citing the end of the agenda with no further items to discuss.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 8:08 p.m.