

CITY OF YPSILANTI
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF April 12, 2016

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Anne Stevenson Chair 7:00 PM

Meeting Location: Ypsilanti Historical Society Archives, 220 N Huron St.

Commissioners Present: Anne Stevenson, Ron Rupert, Alex Pettit, Jane Schmiedeke,
Erika Lindsay

Commissioners Absent: Hank Prebys

Staff Present: Haley McAlpine, HDC Assistant

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Pettit (second: Rupert) moves to approve the agenda as amended to include 100 Market Place and 418 Maple St as study items .

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

Motion: Rupert (second: Pettit) moves to approve the agenda as amended to include 109 Buffalo St, 201 Oak St, and 513 N River St as study items.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS - none

PUBLIC HEARING—none

OLD BUSINESS—none

NEW BUSINESS

133 W Michigan Ave

**Application is for the installation new signage on the front façade.*

Applicant: Corey Torrens, Eric Downs, David Small—Eco Sign Solutions, present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that the application is for new signage. States that she has questions about how the sign will be attached to the façade—the application states they will be attached using studs and silicone. States that she was unsure what they meant by “siliconed.”

Small: States that he was unsure if he would be allowed to use studs. States that there are some caulk joints on the wall that he would like to put a pair of studs in. States that he would then use VHB double sided, high bond tape. States that they would normally 100% silicone along the top to keep the water from getting down behind it. States that silicone is a very strong adhesive and would keep it from coming down.

Stevenson: States that the application lists PVC. States that she does not think they tend to have PVC signs.

Small: States that it is pretty standard sign material—that it is lightweight and that you probably would not know a sign was PVC unless you went up to it and really looked.

Rupert: States that there is a hair salon on Huron with a PVC sign that is painted black so that it looks like metal.

Pettit: Asks if the individual letters will be mounted, or will the individual letters be mounted to something that is mounted to the wall.

Small: States that there are two layers of PVC—there will be the purple layer, and then the white layer mounted to that. The two layers will be solidified as one, stud mounted with a couple of stud mounts in mortar joints and siliconed.

Pettit: Asks if each character is separate, clarifies that they aren't attached to each other.

Small: States they are individual—that the purple backing is one piece and then each individual white letter is adhered to that. States that it could all be picked up as one piece.

Stevenson: Asks if there will be any space between the purple piece and the wall.

Small: Affirms, there will not be any space.

Pettit: Asks how many attachments there will be to the building.

Small: States that he would like to use at least two, but that three would be preferable. States that he doesn't want to put a bunch of holes in the building. States that they will also use the VHB tape, that would hold it on its own.

Downs: States that where the sign will be placed is right where the granite comes together, that there is a grout joint there. States that if they take it out in the future, it can be caulked in.

Schmiedeke: Ask if the sign is lighted.

Small: States that it is not.

Rupert: Asks if they will be using stainless steel studs.

Small: States that they generally use the standard studs, which are aluminum or galvanized steel. States that they will most likely use aluminum because of the weight and because they are durable.

Stevenson: States that the photo in the application shows a light, asks if there is a light already existing there.

Small: Affirms, states that the sign itself doesn't have a light.

Motion: Pettit (second: Rupert) moves to approve the application for work 133 W Michigan Ave to include the installation of a new PVC sign, with 3/4" thick PVC routed letters that are attached to the façade using 1/4"x3" studs, using no more than three attachments to the building. The sign is also to be secured with silicone caulk. The sign is to be 48"x60".

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#2—Do not destroy original character. Do not remove or alter historic material or features.

#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.

7 W Michigan Ave.

**Application is for the installation of three new signs.*

Applicant: William Short, Huron Sign Company—present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that the application proposes a change in the logo from the Ypsilanti Bank to the Bank of Ann Arbor.

Short: States that Peter Fletcher, who has passed away, was on the board and was protecting the interests of Ypsilanti. States that now the bank is changing their logo. States that it is simply new inserts on all of the existing signs.

Stevenson: States that it is basically the same thing but with a different logo.

Short: States that the color is slightly different, but still blue.

Stevenson: States that it is pretty straight forward.

Motion: Rupert (second: Schmiedeke) moves approval for the application for 7 W Michigan Ave for sign replacement to include changing the current logo to

the Ann Arbor Bank logo, and using a darker shade of blue and shown in the illustrations.

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 S. Washington St.

**Application is for the installation of a fence, a wooden frame greenhouse, and the turning of an antique, blue garage door so that it faces inward and the use of sheet metal or masonry to seal the opening from the exterior.*

Applicant: MaryAnn Nisley, Growing Hope—present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that they just saw the application as a Study Item and now it has returned as an Action Item. States that she noticed the stain listed in the application for the green house is a semi-transparent. States that they want to see an opaque stain or paint.

Nisley: States that they will chose an opaque stain.

Lindsay: Asks the Commissioners if they had discussed the flipping of the antique door at the previous meeting. Asks the applicant how the roofing panel would be attached to cover the opening.

Nisley: States that she had assumed it would be attached to the brick. States that the Commission had recommend a standing rib type metal or masonry to cover the opening. States that the metal is more affordable. States that they looked for the standing rib metal and this roof panel is what they found.

Lindsay: Stats that it would be hard to approve the work without a drawing. States that they would basically be approving anything.

Rupert: States that he would not approve the standing rib metal being attached directly to the masonry, but that it would have to be on a frame and set in the opening.

Nisley: States that they could definitely do that, and that she was unclear of the plan. States that they are going to use a contractor to do the work and that they will do the work in the way the Commission requires.

Lindsay: Asks about the dimensions of the door.

Nisley: States that she doesn't have the dimensions but that it is a fairly good sized door.

Lindsay: Asks if it is taller than 10'.

Nisley: States that she is unsure.

Rupert: States that they could use the same door frame that currently exists, if they are just removing the door and repurposing it, and that they could actually use the original framing to mount the metal. They would just have to put the studs down from each panel. States that the panels are 36" wide, so they would have to install a stud every 16".

Nisley: Clarifies that they want it attached to the framing and not attached to the brick at all, and that it should be tucked into the opening.

Rupert: Affirms.

Pettit: States that he is having trouble picturing what it would look like. States that he would prefer the design to be done. States that he is wondering what the top of the opening would look like, since it is repurposed roof material.

Rupert: States that the ribs on the metal should be vertical, not horizontal.

Nisley: States that they had planned on having the ribs be vertical.

Pettit: States that he wonders how they seal off the top of the opening, if it could be flashing.

Lindsay: Asks how they can weatherize it.

Rupert: States that flashing could work. States that on a roof they would use a ridge cap.

Schmiedeke: States that something needs to be done to keep the water out.

Lindsay: States that she wonders how the bottom of the door will be situated.

Rupert: States that there should be a sill at the threshold and the threshold should be slanted away.

Lindsay: States that there is a problem deciding without a photograph or a site plan.

Nisley: *provides Commission with photo*

Pettit: States that they still can't see the detail at the ground from the photo. States that he wonders how you finish a covering like that. States that the other option was brick infill.

Stevenson: States that there needs to be a sill at the bottom to shed water away.

Lindsay: States that that would be ideal, but that she understands it is expensive. States that in the photo you can see that the top of the frame is starting to sag a bit.

Nisley: States that from being up close and personal with the door they that she knows they need to beef up the framing to make it a secure seal from the weather. States that it is the original door with nothing else added. States that they would like to turn it around and make it a feature on the interior of their venue.

Lindsay: States that it looks pretty porous.

Schmiedeke: Asks if there should there be insulation between the door and the new door.

Nisley: States that they want to insulate it.

Rupert: Asks if the brick at the bottom should be removed to keep water from stopping at that point and going in. States that it should be cement block, and that they may need additional framing on the side of the door.

Nisley: States that the interior of the door isn't flush with the wall, and that they were planning on bringing it forward to make it flush with the interior wall.

Stevenson: States that they will want to remove the cement blocks at the bottom and put in a sill so that the water angles away from the building.

Lindsay: States that they may want to regrade the soil near the building.

Rupert: States that they could use an aluminum seal or even cement or masonry block.

Schmiedeke: States that they cannot use wood.

Rupert: States that he can see how they would want to bring the door forward, and that they need new framing on the side.

Lindsay: States that ideally, they would like to see the drawings from a contractor, because it is hard for them to approve without drawings in front of them. States that they want to be able to let them know the different types of things that need to happen.

Pettit: States that their next steps are to work with a contractor, who will come up with exactly what they want to do. States that this is what he wants to see. States that there are a lot of ways they could do this, and it is not their job to pick the right way

Nisley: States that they want to make it look good. States that the most urgent thing they need to proceed with is the green house. Asks if they could go ahead with approving this.

Stevenson: States that they cannot approve separate parts of the application if they table it. States that they can go ahead with planning it, but that she cannot give them the official go ahead as a partial approval.

Pettit: States that since they have to return with the application anyway, that they should include a site plan showing exactly where the fence and the posts will be. States that this is information they want to have. States that they also need to see on a site plan with the buildings that already exist exactly where the greenhouse will go.

Nisley: Clarifies that they will want to see a drawing of the green house as it will look. States that they don't have photos of the greenhouse.

Pettit: States that they want to see a site plan from above showing where the greenhouse will be located in relation to the other buildings.

Lindsay: States that they want to see the footprint of the greenhouse.
Stevenson: States that the next meeting will be on April 26th, and that if they have a contractor, that they should see if they can come in with them and try to get more specific info.

Nisley: States that she believes there is a site plan already drawn.

Pettit: States that if she could just draw on the site plan where the items will go and bring it in, they should be able to make a decision.

Motion: Pettit (second: Schmiedeke) moves to table the application for work at 16 S Washington pending additional information on the details for the garage door replacement/infill, and the locations of the fence and the greenhouse on a site plan.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

STUDY ITEMS

203 S Huron St

**Applicant wants to discuss potential changes to the main entry and the front façade.*

Applicant: Robert King, contractor—present

Discussion: King attended the meeting to discuss various potential work items at the Gilbert Residence.

- 1) Changing the roof pitch of the roof section above the entry vestibule and connected to the awning. King presented two options—one with an 8/12 pitch that would match the roof pitch on the newer addition, and one with a 6/12 pitch that would split the difference between the existing 4/12 pitch and the proposed 8/12 pitch. The Commissioners were

concerned that the 8/12 pitch would be a pronounced change in the spatial relationship of the building.

- 2) Changing the awning from canvas to something more durable, putting brick around the bottom of the posts. Also, changing the material in the gable from what he thinks is aluminum siding to match the hardy-board siding on the newer addition. King also proposes moving the main entry to the center of the vestibule to improve the site lines. King wants to replace the infill panels at the bottom of the vestibule/storefront windows with masonry. Commissioners were OK with moving the door to the center of the vestibule and adding the masonry to the bottom of the canopy posts and to the bottom of the vestibule/storefront windows.
- 3) Removing, purple mini canopies over each window. King believes there is an infill panel above the windows. He proposes that the infill panel will stay, but that he had a little bit of a relief detail or trim work to box it out a little, rather than the plain flat panel. Commission had mixed feelings about replacing the flat panel above the windows.
- 4) Changing the gutters—King states that there are copper gutters attached with straps mixed in with brown gutters, and brown downspouts. King wants to replace the copper gutters throughout and use the brown gutter system that they used on the newer addition. Commissioners had mixed reviews about removing the copper gutters and replacing them with the brown gutters.
- 5) Adding a curb around the half circle drive to cut down on people driving on the lawn and increasing the canopy clearance from 10'4" to 10'6" to allow trucks better clearance. Commission did not have a problem with this.
- 6) Replacing the existing aluminum windows with aluminum clad wooden windows. Applicant stated it would happen in phases.

109 Buffalo St

**Applicant wants to discuss options for replacing window at rear of house.*

Applicant: Lillian Johnson, owner—present

Discussion: Applicant wants to discuss the possibility of replacing two windows on the rear elevation of the house. Applicant states that her mother is the owner and that she is on a fixed income. Applicant also states that she had a hard time finding a reasonable quote for replacement windows. She states that the windows are not original to the house, that they are replacement windows. Commission agreed that they would be OK with replacing those particular windows with vinyl windows because the windows are already vinyl and they are on the rear of the building.

418 Maple St:

**Applicant wants to discuss the replacement of two doors.*

Applicant: Scott Merritts, owner—present

Discussion: Applicant wanted to discuss potential plans for replacing two doors on the property—the front door and the side door. Applicant showed the Commission photos of the deteriorating condition of the two doors, and also samples of proposed doors. The Commission recommended some of the proposed doors over others, noting that the door should be wood and should not mimic or imitate other historical periods not appropriate for the house. The Commission also recommended going with a simple door without ornamentation.

100 Market Place

**Applicant is here to discuss the possibility of enclosing the bottom portion of the decking.*

Applicant: Cynthia Kochanek—present

Discussion: Applicant wanted to discuss plans to install solid wood skirting at the bottom of the wooden deck at the freight house. In order to pass fire code, the bottom would have to either be sprinkled beneath the deck, or be closed off with solid skirting. To mitigate cost, applicant researched options to install a solid wood skirting along the bottom of the decking. The Commission seemed to be OK with the proposed solid wood skirting, with an access panel with no ornate detailing.

OTHER BUSINESS

HDC Realtor Outreach Postcard: Commission gave their comments and critiques regarding the postcard for realtor outreach.

Property Monitoring

303 N Hamilton: It was brought to Staff's attention that work was being done to the front porch at 303 N Hamilton without HDC approval. Staff visited the site and approached those working on the porch—they stated that they had already removed the existing porch railing and decking. They were in the process of replacing the railing, and had already replaced the decking with an Azak-type material. Staff informed them that the lattice they planned to install must be framed on all sides and that they were required to have the work approved by the HDC prior to beginning. Staff learned that no building permits were pulled for 303 N Hamilton.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS –none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of March 22, 2016

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) moves to approve the minutes as submitted.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Prebys (second: Schmiedeke) moves to adjourn.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:14pm