

CITY OF YPSILANTI
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF February 14, 2017

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Anne Stevenson Chair 7:00 PM

Meeting Location: Council Chambers, 1 S. Huron St.

Commissioners Present: Jane Schmiedeke, Hank Prebys, Mike Davis Jr., Alex Pettit,
Ron Rupert, Anne Stevenson

Commissioners Absent: Mike Davis Jr., Erika Lindsay

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Prebys (second: Schmiedeke) moves approval of the agenda as reorganized.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS - none

PUBLIC HEARING—NONE

OLD BUSINESS--NONE

NEW BUSINESS

539 Maple Ct.

**Application is for gutter installation.*

Applicant: Gary Urick

Discussion: Urick: States the home needs gutter. The house had a roof put on a few years ago. States they would like to install tight gutters with a gutter helmet to cover the top of the gutter. States they intend to remove the existing gutters and the fascia board that needs to be replaced. States the house currently has a 1x4 fascia, which allows the rafters to be exposed. He

believes the gutters will extend down to cover the rafters that are exposed underneath. States from the side the rafters will still be exposed. The gutters will drain into barrels which will drain into the water garden.

Schmiedeke: Asks if the 1x6 fascia would cover the rafter ends.

Urick: States he could it down to 1x4 but it wouldn't matter because the gutters are being attached to the roof. States he could add a 1x4 fascia as there is now and it would not affect the functionality of the gutters.

Schmiedeke: States she believes the exposed rafter ends were intentional originally. States it would be a shame to cover them.

Urick: States that the gutter will be 5 inches so half an inch of the rafters will be exposed.

Schmiedeke: States that either way a majority of the rafter tails will be covered by the rafters. States they should go with the 1x4 fascia so it would be less expensive.

Stevenson: States that only a half-inch will be sticking out as opposed to what is there at the moment.

Urick: States that the gutters will be attached to the roof and with the addition of the roofing material it would be higher up above the rafter.

Rupert: States that it will need a pitch so it will be uneven.

Urick: States that is always the case and the rafters should stick out by about a half an inch.

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) moves approval for work at 539 Maple Court to include gutter and fascia installation using snap lock gutters, 3x4 inch downspouts, and herring bone to be painted in an off-white color and the gutter helmet to be painted in a charcoal color. The 4x4 fascia will be removed and a 1x4 fascia will be installed.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

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

#10- New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

315 Washtenaw

**Application is for window replacement.*

Applicant: Ron Rupert

Discussion:

Rupert: States the structure at 315 has been abandoned for several years. At this time the owners would like to replace the windows. All of the windows have been removed except for six. All of the original windows were one-over-one. States all of the openings on the first floor appear to be the same size except for the picture window. States he has proposed to match the picture window to the one next door and replace the rest of the openings with sash packs. Proposes sixteen white, metal-clad wood sash packs with screens and to install a plate glass picture window.

Prebys: Asks if it will be a single-pane.

Rupert: States that it will not and that it will be insulated.

Stevenson: Asks about the tiny window in the attic.

Rupert: States that the owner will be doing those himself.

Motion: Prebys (second: Schmiedeke) moves approval of the application at 315 Washtenaw. Work to include the installation of 16 wooden, metal-clad sash packs with screens. Work also includes the installation of an insulated, plate-glass window with transom on the north side

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#3- Do not imitate earlier styles.

#5- Preserve distinctive features.

400 N. River

**Application is for building restoration*

Applicant: Dick Mitchel - Architect

Discussion:

Mitchell: States they are working with both SHPO and the HDC. States today they are asking for approval on the project with the exception of color. States they will return as they have yet to investigate any possible choices. As they do not know the business names yet they are not seeking approval on signage and there is the possibility of rooftop solar panels.

(Gives a brief history of the building)

States the period spanning from 1890 through 1916 would be the best Period of Interpretation per the recommendation of SHPO.

(Shows pictures of the building post the 2009 fire)

The structure has been stabilized somewhat and a team specializing in masonry work is doing an analysis. States their clients have only owned the building for about a month so they have not had full access. The first two bays were the least damaged. The other three bays were severely damaged. All six bays had been there at one point and time but one of the second bay had been in filled. After the fire the previous developer managed to get some of the roof replaced but the building has been exposed to the elements for eight years. States they are suspicious they may have to replace much of the wood framing. The wall most damaged in the fire is not salvageable. States they are inserting steel frames and will be inserting face brick.

(Shows interior shots)

The fire caused spalling in most of the interior bricks. They intend to keep the arches. The rear wall is not salvageable so they will rebuild with new face brick with a steel frame backup.

Rupert: Asks about the stone foundation.

States that they will infill most of the basement but most of the mechanical equipment will be in the basement also. Most of the rear three bays will have the equipment and the rest will be in filled. SHPO advised them to use more variety in the storefront designs. States that aluminum-clad windows would work best and if the west canopy was desired to make it a utilitarian addition and to bring back the west bay windows. They were also advised to use the signage as long as it fit with the period of interpretation. SHPO agreed that there were no interior elements worth saving and also approved of the basement being in filled.

(Shows the site plan)

There is a double-loaded parking lot in the rear. States they are re-creating the terrace and there will be two stairways to align with the entries. The entrance to the apartments will be in a different location than was shown in the previous entry. There will be an emergency egress in another of the rear doors.

(Shows first floor plan)

Here is where the restaurant will be. They imagine it will be a Grizzly Peak type restaurant (it has the same owners). There will be a bar entry area through a vestibule to a dining room with toilet areas to support the area. There will be people seated in the outdoor terrace through this door as well as another one for the wait staff to use. There will also be a whisky door as

the owners are distillers and brewers. The whisky bar will have its own toilet rooms but will share the kitchen. Food prep, dishwashing, and keg storage will be near the back and will have access to the basement. (Discusses where all of the entry points are on the site plan.)

Pettit: Asks if the brewing and distillery work will be done on premises.

Mitchel: States that it will not. They have an operation in Dexter and Traverse City. States that most of the brewing will come from Dexter.

States that the bays were twenty foot bays that were divided into three sections which, Section A, were all the same. The bay sizes changed to a "B" rhythm in the areas where they had a difficult time renting. So the bays were never all identical. Two of the bays (the fifth bay) they went with three equally sized units where there was originally two windows and a shared door. What they are trying to do is to create a bit of asymmetry per SHPO's request.

The west façade here shows the proposed canopy. There is a knee wall that is the same height as the original that will have a composite wood trim that will be painted. The windows are a two-part aluminum system. On the pilasters there are light fixtures and on the columns there are up lights to light the canopy. The two bays here are the whiskey bar and they would like to open up the area to the terrace for warm summer nights. What they have done is to create three pairs of doors all the way up to the lintel that will hinge out to open all three bays or one of the bays as they seem fit. There is an area that may have to be reconstructed; the wall is leaning in the wrong direction so in the budget there is money for the reconstruction. The base will have some texture by being sandblasted.

The new construction on the second floor roof. There is an elevator and mechanical areas plus the stair. The wall that must be replaced will be redone with new brick. The rest of the brick is in fairly good shape with good window openings. The in filled windows will remain. The arch is still there but will not be the entrance for the apartments. This area will now be used for diners and the apartment entry has been moved down one bay. There is a historic photo that shows another arch but is completely gone and they are now introducing another contemporary element. They pulled a brick pilaster around the corner with the vertical metal siding.

Right now on the north façade there are three windows and four windows that they would like to take out that will be in filled with brick. The railing has also been changed due to recommendation from their last visit.

The sidewalk system includes ADA requirements such as a ramp and handrails. (Shows examples of the landscaping) The historic lamps will be moved. They are proposing Hardi-board soffit and composite trim and they will have a customs mold made for the brackets. This façade was painted originally and they will paint again. The windows are Aluminum-clad

American Eagle and will have the mutton pattern replicated. On the proposed signage location there will be goose-neck lighting above the wall-mounted signs. On each of the major columns points there will be down-lights. The lights will be shining up under the canopy so it will not be a night lighting issue. They are also proposing a row of lights stringing above the dining area.

Prebys: Asks if the awning over the whisky bar is permanent.

Mitchel: States that it is. It is a ridged awning and has the same metal roof that the canopy does. They are proposing to keep all the same seven windows that are there now and there will be a new window opening. The only new window on the other façade is one that was mysteriously in filled at some point. The new proposed railing will have a horizontal-wired system that visually blends in with its surroundings.

Prebys: Asks how many rows of tables can fit on the patio.

Mitchel: States that it can fit three rows of tables. They extended the canopy in order get the seating to fit around the canopies. The columns are rounded steel and the gutter is internal and will come down to the storm system. They took two feet off of the new additions to the mechanical systems on the roof. SHPO advised that they would like to see as little of the systems as possible from the view across the street. The existing arched opening will be in filled but the brick will set back a half inch so the outline of the original opening will still be there. The facades that are not painted will not be painted over but the sections that were will be painted.

Rupert: Asks if all of the basement windows will be sealed.

Mitchel: States they already are. States they will leave the base unpainted.

Schmiedeke: States that her chief concern was the railing on the west side but the new railing is much better.

Rupert: Asks if the windows on the west side will have the same details.

Mitchel: States that the simulated divided light will be replicated.

Stevenson: Asks if the bay window had as much detailing in the historic photos as it does in the proposed plans.

Mitchel: States they found a high resolution photo that they were able to zoom in on and all of the detail is replicated exactly. They believe that the details were added by the Thompson.

Rupert: Asks how many units are in the building.

Mitchel: States there will be twenty.

Rupert: States that since the units are rentals the windows must have screens and stops.

Schmiedeke: Asks if the roof on the awning will be metal.

Mitchel: States that they will be standing-seam metal roofs.

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) moves approval of the application for work at 400 N. River as submitted.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#4 – Preserve significant changes acquired over time.

#5 – Preserve distinctive features.

STUDY ITEMS

333 Oak St.

Applicant: Steven Luchetti and the Architect for the property – present.

Discussion: The applicant came in to discuss work that would allow their home to become more accessible. The scope of the work would include the removal of the garage and back deck, both of which are not original to the house. Most of the extensive work would be done on the exterior of the structure. The applicant is aware that a demolition permit will be required as the both the garage and the back deck will be demolished to make room for an addition and a larger garage to be built. The applicant and the architect provided detailed plans for the proposed work and the Commission advised that all windows used needed to either be wood or aluminum-clad wood and any exterior lighting needed to be brought before them. There were several changes that were proposed, including changing the renovated bedroom egress windows that the Commission had no major issues. They are also proposing a metal roof and will bring in samples when they return as an action item. The Commission also provided advice about the demolition permit. There was also suggestions about the chain-link fences and the Commission stated that the fence did not have to be painted.

116-118 Michigan Ave.

Applicant: Van Heinberger – Van Architects, Adam Talssameyer

Discussion:

The applicant is an owner of a dispensary a few stores down and has recently purchased the property. The bottom floor will be the store and the top two floors will now be occupied by the applicant. There will be extensive work done to both the exterior and interior of the building. The storefronts would have entirely new

systems and the back elevation would undergo a significant overhaul. The Commission advised the applicants to pursue historic photographs to ensure the integrity of the building is preserved. The applicant was advised to make the façade compatible with the rest of the buildings in the vicinity. The Commission advised that any replacement windows should be wood or metal-clad and the copper field on the very top of the building will be custom fabricated.

15 E. Cross

Applicant: Brian Jones-Chance

Discussion:

The applicant states they are opening up a brewery at the location. States that part of the wall and door was damaged during the move and they would like to replace the area with something that is more cohesive. They were curious if they could have an aluminum door or a wood door. They would also like to remove some of the old awning on the Rice St. side of the building. The Commission advised for the applicant to bring in plans at a later date but states that the work presented so far seems doable.

210 N. Washington

Applicant:

Discussion:

This was the building that suffered a fire on New Year's Day. The applicant was considering replacing all of the windows but it would come at a significant cost. The company that he was working with stated that they could make a fiberglass replica of the wood windows and the applicant was hoping that this could be an option for the windows. The Commission advised that the fiberglass windows have never been approved. The windows are usually bulky and have a larger glass size. They have seen samples and have never seen examples that are suitable. The applicant ask if for the moment he can replace the glass, finish the interior and then raise money for the window replacements. The Commission stated that would be fine and that he would not have to come before them to do window repairs. The Commission also advised a company that would work to clean the brick.

Administrative Approvals

306 W. Cross – Re-roof

Motion: Prebys (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the administrative approval for work at 306 W. Cross.

OTHER BUSINESS

Property Monitoring – None

Annual Election of Officers – Nominations

The Commissioners submitted ballots for their nominations for Chair and Vice-Chair for the 2017 Historic District Commission.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS –none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the amended minutes of January 10, 2017.

Motion: Prebys (second: Pettit) Moves approval of the amended minutes from January 10th.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

Approval of the minutes of January 24, 2017.

Motion: Prebys (second: Pettit) Moves approval of the minutes for January 24th.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 9:48p.m.