

**CITY OF YPSILANTI**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**AMMENDED MINUTES OF JANUARY 10, 2017**

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Anne Stevenson                      Chair    7:00 PM

Meeting Location:                      SPARK East Incubator, 215 W. Michigan Ave.

Commissioners Present:                Jane Schmiedeke, Hank Prebys, Mike Davis Jr., Alex Pettit,  
Erika Lindsay,

Commissioners Absent:                 Anne Stevenson, Ron Rupert

Staff Present:                            Cynthia Kochanek, Associate Planner  
Yasmin Ruiz, HDC Assistant

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Motion:                      Schmiedeke (second: Davis) moves approval of the agenda as submitted.

Approval:                      Unanimous. Motion carries.

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS - none**

**PUBLIC HEARING—NONE**

**OLD BUSINESS**

**39 E. Cross**

*\*Application is for awning, window glass and sign replacement; painting.*

Applicant:                      Mark Shauvers – Designhaus Architecture (present)

Discussion:                      Prebys: States the Commission had no questions about anything but the  
Aubree's sign.

Shauvers: States that based on the comments they have lowered the sign so it does not block the crown molding and have changed the way the sign is illuminated so it now used goose-necked lights to be a little more historically correct. The sign is also smaller than what was originally presented. The size of the sign is also up for discussion; they are willing to go smaller. Since the

sign is smaller they were able to pull it tighter to the building. States he can answer any questions they may have about the changes made to the sign.

Davis: Asks if now it will only be lit by the exterior lights shining down on it.

Shauvers: States that the goose-neck lighting will now illuminate the sign.

Davis: Asks how far off the building the sign will be.

Shauvers: States it will be about two inches off the back of the sign but the sign will have a thickness to it after it is milled out of the composite material before it is painted.

Pettit: Asks if the six-inch studs stated in the picture are correct.

Shauvers: States that is correct. The frame that will hold the sign will be a tube steel that will be painted black so it'll disappear behind the sign. The studs are actually gone; it will actually be a metal frame mounted to a wood structure that the sign is then mounted to.

Davis: Asks if they can discuss the size.

Prebys: States that still would not be compatible. Asks if they would be amenable to a 4x10 or 4x11 instead of a 4x12.

Shauvers: States since that is their logo if you scale it proportionately by the time you get it down to 10 feet long it's around three foot four. It would fit more in between the two windows once you get down to that size. Since the "Pizzeria and Grill" are all taken into account that square footage will have to be considered as well.

Davis: Asks if the submitted drawings are new.

Shauvers: States they are. States they pulled the sign down because in the previous version the sign covered the crown molding and they scaled it down. It was originally thirteen feet and it was lowered to 11x8.

Lindsay: Asks if this is exactly how this would look without the goose-neck lighting.

Shauvers: States the elevations may be a bit off in the drawing but they will be in that location.

Prebys: States if the size is reduced, the sign will be narrow and fit in between the two windows.

Shauvers: States they will reduce the sign to fit in between the windows, which will be around ten feet.

Lindsay: Asks if the sign will be shrunk in order to keep it from riding so high so it could be centered above the door.

Shauvers: States they were centering it above the two elements above the door \*shows on picture\* but once the sign is scaled down they will make it visually appropriate.

Davis: States in their past discussions they wanted the sign to be more contained and not to overlap in so many areas.

Schmiedeke: States that she likes the overlapping elements. It has a fresh feeling to it.

Davis: States he can live with a ten foot or eleven foot sign so he would leave it up to the applicant.

Motion: Davis (Second: Schmiedeke) motions to approve the work at 39 E Cross St to include the removal of the awnings on the upper and side of the building and the replacement of existing paint on building. Paint colors to include paint in Sherwin Williams "Pewter Cast" for the body, "Zircon" for the trim, "Iron Ore" for one accent and "Ceiling Bright White" for the second accent. This will also include the installation of new thermal glass in the front and side of the building, installation of new signs in front of building and the replacement or restoration of the transom glass windows with the same windows as mentioned above. The "Aubree's" sign will be a maximum of eleven feet in length and whatever corresponding proportion is correct. Historic "Pool" sign to receive glass to protect the neon sign. Work to also include new text above the door reading "Pizzeria and Grill." Motion will also include a goose-neck style lightning to provide illumination.

Secretary of the Interior's 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.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **76 N. River**

*\*Application is for Window Replacement*

Applicant: Rick Eubesky – contractor representing the applicant (present)

Discussion:

Eubesky: States he is here for Barry LaRue for the Riverside Arts Center. States he was asked to hand over some drawings and color swatches for the replacement window that's been proposed.

Prebys: Asks if the window is on the north side of the building.

Eubesky: States that is correct.

Prebys: Asks if the applicant knows what the replacement involves.

Eubesky: States that the window was bricked up in the 1970s after there was a fire in the building. The room that's behind it is a large dance studio that is very dark and a window will add light to the space.

Prebys: Asks to see drawings of the window and how the window configuration was arrived at.

Eubesky: States they were mimicked to match the original windows that were on that side of the building.

Prebys: Asks if that is based on photographic evidence.

Eubesky: States that none is provided here, which is what Barry (the applicant) implied.

Davis: Asks if there are any outlines of the original windows left.

Prebys: States that the entire window was taken out and concrete block was put in to fill in the space. States the work is being done in conjunction with the work at the front of the next door building and being done by the same contractor.

Eubesky: States that in terms of color schemes the applicant is open to any of the colors presented.

Motion: Davis (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the work at 76 N. Huron to include the removal of the concrete brick from the old window and to install a casement window to replicate the original window in whatever color the owner deems appropriate. The new window shall be wood with aluminum-clad.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

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

#5 – Preserve distinctive features.

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

## **25-27 N. Washington**

*\*Application is for guard rail installation.*

Applicant: Dave Hamilton – Applicant (present)

Discussion:

Hamilton: States there is a fire escape on the second floor addition on the back of the building that has no hand rail from the short stairway to the long stairway. He just had an inspection and it was pointed out so now's the time to take care of it. He contacted a welder and asked for some ideas on how it would look and he made this diagram to graphically show what he would add. It would be made of steel and painted in any color the HDC thought would be best.

Davis: Asks if the new railing would be a rounded top-tube since the existing ones appear to be the same.

Hamilton: States that the stairway coming up has a rounded top-tube so they could make it the same but the welder did not specify that. Believes the welder specified what he's comfortable working with it.

Lindsay: Asks the applicant how he's planning to attach this to the building and to the existing staircase.

Hamilton: States the existing stair is steel so it will be welded directly to that. To the building there will be a steel plate fastened to the building and then welded to that so it would be secured to the building and drilled into the brick.

Prebys: Asks if there will be any questions on how that stanchion will interact with the roofing material.

Hamilton: States there will be no holes in the roof and the whole thing can be removed when the roof needs replacing.

Schmiedeke: Suggests painting the whole thing the same deep red.

Hamilton: States that would be his choice as well.

Motion: Pettit (second: Lindsay) moves approval for the application for work at 25-27 N. Washington. Work to include the installation of a guard rail from the apartment exit to the existing stairway at the rear of the second floor emergency stairway on 25 N. Washington. Guardrails to be made of a combination of tube steel, steel bar, and square steel as illustrated in the submitted drawings. Railing to be attached to the existing rail as well as

anchored to the brick surface of the building. It should be anchored using a non-corrosive anchor at the mortar joints were possible. Railing to be painted to match the existing steel work in the vicinity.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

#10 – New work shall be removable.

## **STUDY ITEMS**

### **400 N. River / Thompson Block**

Applicant: Dick Mitchell – Mitchell & Moad Architects, Ann Arbor (present)

Discussion:

Mitchel: States the building was closed on last Thursday so the new group has taken ownership, which has taken months. They are now in the part of the project where they are earnestly taking stock of things and figuring everything out but haven't gained full access yet. They have gone to the site three times with limited access because of ownership, insurance and liability issues. There are still significant unknowns but they are feeling much more comfortable. The new owners are Two Mission Design and Development from Ann Arbor.

(Discusses history of the Thompson Block)

They are considering having some signage but it will not cover the windows such as it does in the 1903 photos. When they were discussing the condition of Thompson Block (with SHPO) it was concluded that there were no interior elements that were worth saving (post-fire). The main focus is to save the shell. They will keep parts of the masonry that are there but it will require steel frames. They were not sure if they were going to need the basement and were going to have it in-filled but now they may need the space for restaurant prep but they are still developing that.

\*shows example on slideshow\*

Mitchel: For the proposed west elevation there will be a canopy but is removed here so you can see the storefronts. There is a railing system here due to the drop. The first three bays will be outdoor dining. \*points to doors\* This will be the primary entrance and here is where the dining hosts will enter. These two bays are the whiskey bar; it is the only bay that did not have the knee wall. From what we can tell this is where the big overhead door was for the city garage. We have some interest here for the big doors to open on summer nights to the terrace. Historically it had a three part system so this is where they have made the biggest departure. There will be surface signs where there were historically painted or surface

mounted wood signs. Staff advised that the HDC can advise on how to mount and illuminate them but in terms of size that is a zoning issue. \*shows example of signs\* They were also considering bi-fold doors but that was outside of their period of interpretation so they nixed that idea.

For the south elevation they are proposing to add one window. The unpainted stone foundation will remain the same. The highest element is the elevator shaft, the stair with a skylight and a rooftop terrace and the guardrail around it.

Prebys: Asks if the rectangles around it are glass.

Mitchell: States they are not but a cementitious panel and the others are metal panels. They have yet to settle on the number of panels but are a contemporary pattern. This will have all of the necessary duct work. The entryway arch will roughly be in between the windows. It will be the primary entrance but the imprint is not clearly visible on the building so more research will have to be show that the arch was originally there. In the rear this will all be new construction (the exhaust shaft and stairwell). The current infilled windows will possibly become doors. They will also need an emergency egress door.

They are quite sure the canopy had a round cast-iron columns and a metal roof. The approach on the canopy is to keep it utilitarian so it will be metal for fire safety reasons and would need fire safety pipes. They are trying to design it to avoid bird nests to keep it non-flammable. It is all tubular steel and they would infill it.

The entry in the back is recessed so they could have a canopy in the back or possibly a vestibule.

Schmiedeke: Asks if the window (shown on the slideshow) on the far left on the ground floor and the main entrance to the apartment exist now.

Mitchel: States you can see vestiges of the arch (the apartment entrance) and you can see the window in earlier photos.

Schmiedeke: States that her concern is that unless the top arched elements exist now that they should just be straight.

Mitchel: States that it was there and it is visible.

Schmiedeke: States that it was nowhere near as wide as the proposed entrance.

Mitchell: States that it has been changed. During the fire the entire section came out and it was reconstructed and he does not know what was used for the basis of that reconstruction.

Prebys: Asks how all of the divided lights would be dealt with on the storefronts.

Mitchel: States they are true divided lights.

Prebys: States that if they are not true divided lights they have generally insisted that the exterior has the divisions on it applied rather than on the inside or between the glass.

Mitchel: States that they would be called simulated divided lights. States that for the real divided lights the windows would be metal clad wood framing. They would all be simulated divided lights.

Prebys: Asks if any thought has been given to exterior lighting at this stage.

Mitchel: Only that the goose-necks would light the signs.

Prebys: States they would prefer something functional and that does not imitate history.

Lindsay: States they are already picking up queues from the historic photos so to just keep going in that direction; something simple. Also states that the grids in the proposed railings are a bit too busy, especially with the amounts of lights in the windows and the canopy. Suggests maybe a solid glass or other material. States that it has too many linear elements.

Mitchell: States they are entertaining the idea of solar panels on the roof.

Prebys: States that is a wonderful idea.

Davis: States that he likes the design better without the canopy as it showcases the design of the building better.

Prebys: States they have waited for a long time for this and they are looking forward to seeing how the project progresses.

Davis: Asks if they have any landscape ideas yet.

Mitchel: States they are not at that point yet.

Prebys: Asks if they have thought about customer parking.

Mitchel: Not very much because the site is so limited. There will be a double lot in the back that is proposed but that will be for the apartment residents.

Davis: Asks about the impervious surfaces.

Mitchel: States that there are storm water regulations and that they are budgeting for that but they have not created the site plans yet. They have plans for solar panels on the roof as there are huge open exposures on the south side of the roof.

Lindsay: Asks about waiting room for people and for smokers.

Mitchel: States that people will be able to stand and wait in the front areas but says they have not thought about smokers yet.



Schmiedeke: Asks about the simple railing in front of the whisky bar area.

Mitchel: States that it is simply a placeholder as the area is not fully developed yet but it will have to take on the same character as the other areas.

## **210 N. Washington**

Applicant: Greg Gavel – Applicant (Present)

Discussion:

Gavel: States his building burned. The damage to the building is extensive and he would like to improve the interior and exterior of the building during the process. The roof needs to be repaired; it's a flat roof. The brick façade needs to be cleaned but it cannot be pressure-washed. The old metal windows need to be replaced so he would like aluminum-clad wood windows painted white. He was also hoping to get a sign with the "Phoenix" on the side to re-name the building.

Davis: States that he would have to go with zoning because residential signs are a special case but they would not dismiss is straight away.

Gavel: States he would also like to fix the landscaping.

Pettit: States that they are pretty open. Their main concerns are that none of the landscaping damages the building or to grows on to them.

Gavel: States he was thinking about planting some trees or bushes.

Prebys: States that anything affecting the exterior of the building needs to be run by the HDC so the landscaping, the sign, etc. needs to be approved.

Gavel: Also states he would like to add some floodlighting to light up the sign.

Pettit: States they would not dismiss it out of hand but they would like to see what he would propose.

Gavel: States he was thinking about two LED lights at the base of the building that would light up the entire façade.

Lindsay: States they would not allow any colored light or any LED.

Prebys: Suggests that incorporating the sign into the landscaping might be easier than putting it on the side of the building.

Gavel: States that he was looking for suggestions to incorporate the two buildings.

Prebys: Suggests about talking with an architect to discuss how to join the two buildings but urges caution about physically joining them.

Schmiedeke: States they are two separate buildings and they need to remain separate.

Gavel: Asks if the red squares must stay red.

Prebys: States that he can paint them a different color.

Lindsay: Suggests putting a pathway in the landscape plan.

Gavel: Asks if he could change the metal doors on the outside to make them less institutional.

Davis: Suggests to bring in some door ideas and to bring them in as a study item to the next meeting.

Gavel: Asks about painting the outbuildings.

Schmiedeke: States that if he wanted to paint them the same color he does not have to come before them but if he wanted to paint them a different color he would.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Property Monitoring – None**

### **2016 Annual Report**

Motion: Schmiedeke: (second: Lindsay) Moves approval of the 2016 Annual Report as submitted.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

### **2017 HDC Meeting Schedule**

Motion: Prebys: (second: Schmiedeke) Moves approval of the 2017 HDC Meeting Schedule as submitted.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

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

## **HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS**

**Approval of the minutes of December 13, 2016.**

Motion: Pettit (second: Davis) Moves approval of the minutes as amended.  
Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion: Pettit (second: Davis) moves to adjourn the meeting.  
Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

**MEETING ADJOURNED at 9:00 p.m.**