

CITY OF YPSILANTI
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF June 14, 2016

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Anne Stevenson Chair 7:00 PM

Meeting Location: Council Chambers, 1 S Huron St.

Commissioners Present: Hank Prebys, Alex Pettit, Ron Rupert, Jane Schmiedeke

Commissioners Absent: Anne Stevenson, Erika Lindsay

Staff Present: Haley McAlpine, HDC Assistant

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Rupert (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the agenda as amended to move 1 S Huron to the end of New Business and to include 211 Maple St, 10 N Adams, and 302 E Cross St as study items.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS - none

PUBLIC HEARING—none

OLD BUSINESS—none

NEW BUSINESS

232 N River St.

**Application is for the replacement of the rear exterior door and the for the repair and reframing of the front porch.*

Applicant: Stefan Szumko, owner—present

Discussion: Prebys: Asks the applicant to explain his project.

Szumko: States that his porch is need of repair, and that he has not yet done the full diagnostic on it but that he imagines the worst case scenario is that he would have to tear it apart and rebuild it as is. States that he wants to incorporate the existing columns. States that it has a slight inward tilt and that the paint and siding are holding it in place. States that he wanted to make sure that there were no problems with him replicating what is there.

Prebys: Asks for questions from the Commissioners.

Szumko: States that he also wants to replace the kitchen door, which is broken and damaged, with a Therma-Tru fiberglass door. States that he is aware that they frown upon fiberglass, but that the door is on an addition that was built in the 1940s or 1950s and that it is on the rear of the house. States that if it were on the front of the house, he would go for the wood door. States that he is looking for something energy efficient and economic, states that he is already investing a lot into the interior of the kitchen.

Schmiedeke: Asks where the door is located.

Szumko: States that the door is on the rear of the house facing the railroad tracks.

Pettit: States that the existing door has a storm door, asks if he plans to put the storm door back.

Szumko: Affirms, states that he will take it off and put it back on.

Prebys: Asks the Commission for thoughts on the fiberglass door.

Pettit: States that he is not a fan, but that he is considering what would actually show with the storm door closed.

Szumko: States that it will be painted.

Rupert: Asks if the surface of the door appears grain-like.

Szumko: States that he would buy that if they want.

Rupert: States that they do not want the fake graining, that this is their objection with the fiberglass. States that it is a rear door.

Pettit: States that it is a rear door covered mostly by the storm, so he could go with it. States that you wouldn't see the lower half of the door. Asks how are the dividers or muttons in the light done.

Szumko: States that he doesn't know. States that he would remove them if necessary.

Pettit: States that it wasn't divided at all, he would be fine with it. States that having no pattern at all would be ideal. Asks if there is an option for a more plain door. States that with the paneling, the fiberglass becomes a problem. States that in the paneling you can tell that it's not wood. States that if there were no panel, you would not be able to tell what the door is made of.

Prebys: States that it would be more true to what it is. States that the fiberglass door would suggest that it's wooden. States that it would be a fake wooden door. States that if the bottom were flush, they would not be

trying to fake anything. States that with one light above with no dividers in it, it would be what it is as a very plain door.

Schmiedeke: Asks if they should table it.

Prebys: States that he doesn't think they need to table it, that they could approve it based on their conversation.

Rupert: Asks if there is any work being done to the floor of the porch.

Szumko: States that he is going to take off the ply-wood that he put down several years ago and restore the concrete.

Rupert: Clarifies that it is plywood over the deck.

Szumko: Affirms. States that it has to come off.

Rupert: Asks about the step at the porch.

Szumko: States that he can pretty it up with wood.

Pettit: Asks what it is right now.

Szumko: States that it is wood.

Pettit: Clarifies that he needs one step there.

Szumko: Affirms.

Motion: Pettit (second: Rupert) moves approval for the application for work at 232 N River St. Work to include the removal of the existing rear door and replacement with a fiberglass Therma-Tru Benchmark flush door with a single half-light with no dividers. The door is to be smooth, with no grain finish. The door is to be painted red. Any trim that needs to be replaced in the process of the door replacement shall be replaced with trim of similar material and design. Work is also to include porch repairs. The rotting wood on the porch is to be replaced, any exterior siding that needs to be replaced will be of similar material, and will be painted to match the existing. The existing column is to be retained. The existing single step is to be replaced as appropriate to match the guidelines laid out in the porch fact sheet.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#5 - Preserve distinctive features.

#6 - Repair, do not replace.

#10 - New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

1 S Huron St

**Application is for the installation of a steel plate at the south parking lot retaining wall and a mural on the south wall of the building.*

Applicant: Cynthia Kochanek, Assistant City Planner—present

Discussion: Kochanek: States that nothing has changed since it was presented as a Study Item. States that she has provided with the most updated mock-up for the mural. States that it was approved by a design committee.

Motion: Prebys (second: Schmiedeke) moves approval for the application for billboard design at 1 S Huron St. Work is also to include repairing the retaining wall with steel as shown in the application.

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.

109 S Huron St.

**Application is for the installation of seven wooden replacement windows.*

Applicant: A & R Total Construction, Donny Lundell contractor—present

Discussion: Prebys: Asks the applicant to explain his project.

Lundell: States that this is a burn unit there that they are remolding. States that the windows were busted out. States that they are going with a full wooden window, inside and out. States that it is a standard wood window, with the same glass size as the existing.

Schmiedeke: States that pocket replacement is not a term she is familiar with. Asks if it is a sash pack or a full replacement window.

Lundell: States that it is a full replacement window.

Schmiedeke: Clarifies that the window they will install already has a frame.

Lundell: Affirms. States that the old trim will stay on the outside of the house, and the new window will slide right up to the old trim.

Schmiedeke: Asks if they are taking the existing frame out.

Lundell: Affirms.

Schmiedeke: Asks if the photo is the window they are going to put in.

Lundell: Affirms, states that the window won't have the divider. States that they will be single pane windows.

Prebys: Asks how many windows they are replacing.

Lundell: States that there are seven windows.

Pettit: Asks if they will be painted.

Lundell: States that they come primed, but they will be painted with the rest of the house.

Rupert: Clarifies if they are sash packs or replacement windows.

Lundell: States that the old frame will come out. States that the new window will slide right in. States that they are full replacement windows.

Schmiedeke: Asks if they are going to paint the house the same colors.

Lundell: Affirms.

Motion: Rupert (second: Pettit) moves to approve the installation of windows at 109 S Huron St. Work to include the replacement of seven windows with double-hung wooden windows to be painted to match the existing. Windows are to be JELD-WEN , one over one glass, full wood, pocket replacement windows. The exterior moldings and trim are to remain. Work also to include removal of the existing frame. The interior and the exterior of the windows are to be painted.

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.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

513 N River St.

**Application is for the removal of existing concrete patio and replacement with brick pavers.*

Applicant: Joe Secore, owner—present

Discussion: Prebys: Asks the applicant to tell them about the work he is planning.

Secore: States that he is planning on doing pavers from the fence line to the steps leading to the back door, and then all the way back to the clothes line pole and fence pole. States that it will take the whole back area and go around the flower beds. States that will be approximately 2,200 pavers. States that they have to remove some concrete and asphalt, and some sod to get a 6" base with 1" of sand. States that the paver is called the Sienna Blend. States that it is approximately 457 square feet.

Motion: Rupert (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the installation of pavers at 513 N River St with the Sienna Blend paver from the fence to the clothes line post area, and in between the steps and the flower beds.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

201 Oak St.

**Application is for the removal of shingle-siding on the garage, to be replaced with Hardi Plank siding.*

Applicant: Joe Secore, contractor—present

Discussion: Secore: States that it is an old garage and that a previous owner put roof shingles on three sides of it. States that they painted it previously, but now they are deteriorating and they want to remove all of the shingles and go with the Hardi siding. *shows sample of the siding* States that it will be 6 ½" rather than the 9" of the sample. States that they want to match the 4 ½" exposure that it is on the house. States that he also wants to remove the small window on the south side of the garage.

Rupert: Asks if the siding is a smooth surface.

Secore: Affirms. States that they are getting it primed. States that it is HZ5, which is specific to Michigan.

Prebys: Asks if it is a 6" exposure.

Secore: States that it will be a 4 ½" exposure to match the house. States that the paint color is to match the house.

Motion: Rupert (second: Schmiedeke) moves approval for 201 Oak St for the removal of the asphalt shingles and the covering the of the window on the south side of the garage. Work also to include the installation of a 4 ½" exposed Hardi Plank siding, using the smooth side. Siding is to be painted to match the home.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

116 Maple St.

**Application is for the amendment to a previous application to include the installation of a reclaimed newel post.*

Applicant: Katherine Bessmar, owner—not present

Discussion: Staff: States that the applicant has provided them with an explanation for the proposed newel post.

Prebys: States that it is an interior newel post, and that it would not have been found outside. States that it doesn't relate or fit with the rest of the porch posts or spindles. States that it is fabricating history that never was.

Schmiedeke: Agrees that she could not approve it. States that she does not need a post there. States that this newel post is not appropriate.

Rupert: States that it should be similar to the porch posts.

Motion: Rupert (second: Schmiedeke) moves to deny the amendment to 116 Maple St, because the newel post is an interior newel post and is inappropriate for an exterior porch post. The style is also inappropriate for this exterior porch.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

10 N Washington St.

**Application is for the installation of a stairway access to the side entrance and for the installation of two signs.*

Applicant: Rob Hess, tenant—present

Discussion: Hess: States that this is for the ice cream store, and that previously they have been before the Commission and were approved for new window installation. States that now they are looking to install access stairs in the alley which would require handrails as well. States that they are looking for approval for the installation of a new glass door that would match the style of the windows they approved. They also want to install a sign on the alley side of the building, one above the door and one attached to a pole. *shows on plans* States that they are talking about the alley off of Washington St. States that the door is glass and metal, matching the windows. States that the steps and handrails are shown in the drawing, with the sign sticking out into the alley above the door. States that another sign would attach to a metal pole that is not attached to the building. States that he has a color rendering of the door/stair combination as well.

Schmiedeke: States that the application lists a ramp.

Hess: States that they were previously approved for a ramp, but there were some issues so City Council actually approved the stair access and has ADA access through the front of the building. States that now they need stairs. States that some folks still refer to them as a ramp.

Schmiedeke: Asks if the stairs will be constructed of treated wood.

Hess: Affirms. States that they would also use the composite decking material.

Schmiedeke: Clarifies that the risers would be treated wood.

Hess: Affirms.

Rupert: States that the composite decking material isn't very durable or strong. States that when you step on it, it springs back. States that they would have to put the joists closer together so they don't have the sponginess.

Hess: States that the plans call for treated wood joists at 16 OC.

Rupert: Suggests going 12 with the joists, rather than 16. States that the composite has no strength.

Pettit: Clarifies the overall height of the steps.

Hess: States that he thinks it is a 19" height overall. States that there is a significant step to the door and there is a pitch to the sidewalk.

Rupert: States that the handrails will be on the side of the building. States that if it is wider than 5' they will need two handrails, two on the side of the building and one coming up the center. States that they may run into a problem with the Building Department.

Prebys: Asks what the handrails will be made of.

Hess: States that they will be metal.

Prebys: Asks what kind of metal.

Hess: States that he is unsure, that they have not been purchased yet.

Pettit: States that the drawing looks similar to pipe-rail. States that they approve that a lot in the district.

Rupert: States that HAABs has a 1 1/4" pipe-rail that it is turned.

Schmiedeke: States that they don't usually allow the treated wood.

Rupert: States that it is OK as a sub-structure, and that they could face it with the composite board. States that the decking needs to extend about 1 1/4" over.

Hess: States that they don't have a measurement listed on the overhang on the architectural plans.

Prebys: Asks if this is a problem area for the Commissioners.

Pettit: States that if it is wood, then they will require it to be painted.

Rupert: States that he would cover it with the synthetic decking.

Prebys: States that it is going to get a lot of kicking and marring. States that the paint won't hold up.

Pettit: States that the decking might last better. Clarifies that the treads and risers would be the same material.

Rupert: Affirms. States that support underneath should be the treated wood.

Pettit: Wonders if using tread material for risers would mess with the layout or design.

Rupert: States that it is only about 1/2" thick rather than the 3/4" composite. States that they could use a 1/2" fascia in there.

Pettit: State that there would be a thinner version they could use for the facing.

Hess: States that this is doable. Asks if the color of the metal on the door will match the detail on the windows.

Hess: Affirms. *shows rendering of the door and windows* States that it is a dark brown metal. States that the opening for the door right now has the original brick and a wooden insert that goes on either side of the door and the across the top. States that instead, they will replace that with the glass and the metal of the door with the side lights and top light.

Rupert: States that the entire opening would be door.

Hess: Affirms.

Motion: Pettit (second: Rupert) moves to approve the application for work at 10 N Washington to include the installation of new decking and steps at the side entrance, as shown in the submitted plans. The deck material is to be framed as needed with treated lumber, and the decking is to be synthetic composite decking in the color Dark Brown. The stair risers are to be clad with similar material. The handrails are to be installed as shown in the submitted drawings and are to be a pipe-rail type design. The existing door will be removed and will be replaced with a new aluminum storefront door, the design as indicated in the submitted drawings. The aluminum is to be finished similarly to how the existing windows are currently. The door design is to have sidelights and a transom light. Work to also include the installation of two PVC signs, to be 2'x4'. One sign is to be mounted to the existing steel pole at the eastern end of the alley, using two mounting plates with four anchors each. The second sign will be mounted through the mortar joints above the side entrance using four steel mounting plates with two steel anchors. If the Building Department requires installation of an additional

handrail, the design is to be similar to the handrails that are to be installed on the side of the building in the pipe-rail design.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#2 - Do not destroy original character. Do not remove or alter historic material or 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 ITEMS

108 Buffalo St.

Applicant: Risa Roache

Discussion: The applicant stated that she would like to replace three windows so that they are functioning. She stated that they are the original wooden windows, and that they are rotten and broken. The applicant stated she wants safe windows that lock. The Commission explained that they would want the windows to be restored if at all possible. The Commission would want to know the specific condition of the windows and if they are able to be restored. The Commission inquired about the storm windows. The Commission suggested that the applicant obtain quotes from carpenters for window repair or restoration, and return with more information.

220 N Huron St.

Applicant: Ypsilanti Historical Society, Valerie Kabat and Alvin Rudisil

Discussion: The applicants were present to discuss the possibility of replacing the sign near the road. They discussed the potential plan of replacing the main sign so that a temporary sign can be attached to it for special events. The main sign would tell passers-by who they are and what their hours are, and the temporary sign would be for special events. The Commission said that they are comfortable with whatever design they choose to go with. The applicants inquired about lighting of the sign, to which the Commissioners explained that if it were to be internally light, only the letters can glow and the background has to be opaque. They could also use exterior lighting, like goose-neck lights. As far as the design is concerned, the Commission explained that the sign does not have to be "old-timey" and could be designed to suite the taste of the applicant. The Commission said the black and white may be best, but that it is ultimately up to the applicant to choose the color scheme.

410 N Huron St.

Applicant: Noah Mass

Discussion: The applicant was present to discuss numerous projects that he intends to work on when the purchase of the property is finalized. Many of the projects were qualified as repairs or general maintenance by the Commission, who informed the applicant that he is not required to seek approval for these types of projects. The Commission did inform the applicant that some of the projects, like the light fixture replacement and major landscaping changes, would need approval. The applicant inquired more about the radon remediation, to which the Commission stated they would like to see the venting be at the rear of the house rather than on the front elevation. The applicant also asked about the

possibility of replacing the basement windows with glass block windows for security. The Commission explained that these are of a specific historic period and that they would not like to see glass block windows. The Commission suggested using some kind of iron frame or security grate to make the windows more secure.

209 Pearl St.

Applicant: Mark Maynard

Discussion: The applicant presented a plan to have nine windows on the second floor fully restored by Bill Click, a graduate of the EMU Historic Preservation program. The applicant stated that some of the windows have been damaged by fire and that those would be rebuilt to match the original. The Commission was in favor of his proposed window restoration.

211 Maple St.

Applicant: Armand Khan

Discussion: The applicant inquired about the possibility of extending the front porch to wrap around the side of the building to connect with the side porch. The Commission stated that this may not have been historically accurate and that the roof pitch over the front porch would make it difficult to extend the porch. They suggested possibly enlarging the side porch. The applicant also inquired about constructing a new garage at the rear of the property. The Commission said they would be OK with a new garage, as long as the design is sympathetic to the design of the house. They suggested the applicant return with an architectural rendering. They also suggested that the applicant check to see if the interior has retained any of its detailed trim work to get an idea of the style. One Commissioner pointed out a failing gutter on the front of the house. The Commission also suggested that the applicant check with the Ypsilanti Historical Society archives to see if they have an historic photo of the house to give him some clues to as to how to give it more curb appeal.

10 N Adams St.

Applicant: Mohamad and Ali Fayed

Discussion: The applicants were present to discuss work to the exterior of the building. They wanted to install new lighting, a new awning, and change some of the windows and doors. The applicants explained that some of the windows are leaking air, and that they want to replace them with aluminum windows that have a transom at the top to compliment a neighboring building. The applicants stated they want to replace the side wooden door with aluminum, and to pour new concrete around the window wells except for the well with the furnace intake. The Commission inquired about the use of existing sign board and informed the applicants that if they use an internally lit sign, only the letters would be permitted to glow and the background must be opaque. They could also use exterior lighting, like goose-neck lighting. The Commission stated they would need to submit the design and plan for the awnings, and they must comply with the Building Department requirements. The Commission explained the detrimental effects of power washing.

302 E Cross St.

Applicant: Andrea Short, questions presented by HDC Assistant Haley McAlpine

Discussion: Staff inquired about the possibility of replacing the brick foundation with a poured concrete foundation. The Commission stated that they may be open to a poured concrete foundation with a brick edge or façade so that the top visible portion is brick. Staff also inquired about the possibility of using an alternative material for the siding. The Commission explained that they would not allow the replacement of the original wooden siding. The Commission stated that spot-repair may be necessary, but they would not approve replacement. They also stated that the lead abatement may not need to be as intensive as the applicant may think. Staff asked about the potential replacement of the original wooden windows with aluminum clad wood. The Commission stated they would need to know concretely that the windows could not be repaired or restored before they would allow replacements. The Commission would review each window individually.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

106 S Huron St.

Motion: Schmiedeke (second: Pettit) moves to approve the administrative approval for the reroof at 106 S Huron St.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

317 W Cross St.

Motion: Schmiedeke (second: Prebys) moves to approve the administrative approval for the reroof at 317 W Cross St.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

OTHER BUSINESS

Michigan Places Matter and This Place Matters Campaigns

Staff updated Commissioners on the planning for the group photo. The date was finalized for July 21, 2016 at 6:45pm. Staff stated that she would create a formal invitation and distribute it to the Ypsilanti Historical Society, the Ypsilanti Heritage Foundation, and the Towner House Foundation.

Property Monitoring

303 N Hamilton: Staff informed the Commission that the Building Department sent a final notice for the submission of an HDC application, requiring compliance within 30 days.

429 N Adams St: Staff informed the Commission that new concrete steps were installed where the old steps were demolished. Staff also informed the Commission that the Building Department sent a final notice for the submission of an HDC application, requiring compliance within 7 days.

315 Washtenaw Ave: Commissioner Rupert informed Staff and the Commission that the windows were removed and replaced with plywood. Commissioner Rupert stated that they had not approved window replacement.

124 Pearl St: Commissioner Rupert informed Staff and the Commission that the malt corral at the Ypsi Ale House has not been painted or stained and it should be painted or stained with an opaque paint or stain.

522 N Huron St: Commissioner Rupert informed Staff and the Commission that a 6' high privacy fence was installed there with no application and it has not been stained.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS –none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of May 24, 2016

Motion: Pettit (second: Rupert) moves to approve the minutes from May 24, 2016.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:56pm

SEE FOLLOWING PAGES FOR MATERIALS RECEIVED AT JUNE 14, 2016 HDC MEETING:



PROJECT: Ypsilanti Billboard Design

CLIENT: Ypsilanti

3

Concept Number _____

