

**CITY OF YPSILANTI**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**MINUTES OF JUNE 12, 2018**

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Mike Davis, Jr. Vice-Chair 7:02 PM

Meeting Location: City Hall, Council Chambers, 1 S. Huron, Ypsilanti, MI

Commissioners Present: Mike Davis, Jr., Erika Lindsay, Alex Pettit, Ron Rupert

Commissioners Absent: Anne Stevenson, Hank Prebys, Jane Schmiedeke

Staff Present: Cynthia Kochanek, Preservation Planner  
Nancy Hare-Dickerson, Commission Secretary

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Kochanek: Added 310 E Cross as a study item.

Motion: Rupert (second: Pettit) moved to approve the agenda as amended.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS—none**

**PUBLIC HEARING—none**

**OLD BUSINESS**

**113 Buffalo**

*\*Application is for side & rear porch installation*

Applicant: Stewart Beal, owner –Not present

Motion: Rupert (second: Pettit) moved table the application for work at 113 Buffalo for the applicant to be in attendance.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:  
N/A

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

## **405 Maple**

*\*Owner requested that the HDC return to the item after his contractor arrives, item moved to later in agenda.*

## **6 S Washington**

*\*Application is for amendment to the previous application for work on the storefront*

Applicant: Marcela Rubio, owner– Present

Discussion: Davis: Indicated that the application is to address an amendment to the previous application about the storefront awning/trim work and asked the applicant to begin the discussion.

Rubio: Stated that she assumes the Commission has seen the work that has been done and that that is the amendment.

Davis: Asked for commissioner comments regarding why the commission had the letters sent out.

Pettit: Stated that it would be helpful if applicant would describe what was done in terms of the signboard piece.

Rubio: Stated that it is an older building that has an art deco façade that was installed in the 1950s and that above the art deco façade there was an awning that the Building Department asked them to address because it was collapsing; that there was approval to remove it and to put it back up. Stated that when they were doing the construction, it was clear that it was rusted and decayed and they were advised not to put it back up. Stated that they had thoughts of putting it back up but closer to the building but they were advised that it would be something that would be cost prohibitive, so they decided to make a trim kind of front to it.

Davis: Asked if the modification is to now have the flat signboard rather than the eight-inch awning protruding from the building, which was the initial Commission compromise.

Rubio: Confirmed and stated that the flat signboard is very similar to what is seen on other buildings in the Historic District; that they had already received approval for this [*indicated the south side of the building*] sign area and that they wanted to match it on the other side for consistency.

Pettit: Asked if there was some finished work that was done just prior to the installation of the signboard on the larger area - some sort of a trim piece.

Rubio: Stated that previous to this, it was metal tiles on the top but it was like a trim piece that was over it.

Davis: Asked if the timeframe being discussed is in between the construction

period before the signboard was finished.

Rubio: Stated that the signboard was completed over a year ago.

Pettit: Asked for confirmation that the gray signboard was put up over a year ago.

Rubio: Confirmed.

Pettit: Asked if something else had been put with the signboard after that.

Rubio: Stated that there was never anything else in that area.

Pettit: Asked for confirmation that it was open like that [*referencing the overhead*], up until the signboard was put up.

Rubio: Confirmed that that is what it was before. Stated that, as you can see, it is coming down in the photos.

Pettit: Agreed and stated (this photo was from) 2014.

Rubio: Stated that that is the reason the Building Department asked them to address it.

Pettit: Confirmed.

Rupert: Agreed with Commissioner Pettit that there is a gray profile on the top part.

Rubio: Stated that that is part of the metal tiling.

Lindsay: Stated concern that the color, material and continuity are totally different than what was there before; that returning and talking with the Commission would have been helpful.

Rubio: Stated that is difficult when the workers are there at the moment and the Commission meets only once every two weeks which would have meant a two week delay.

Davis: Stated that the Commission recognizes that things happen during construction; that several months elapsed before the Commission initiated letters in order to wait and see if everything was finished. Stated that it is up to the commission today to decide if this modification is appropriate or if the original compromise with the reduced awning should stand or if it should be tabled.

Rupert: Agreed with Commissioner Lindsay that there is no cohesiveness, no

continuity and no connection between the bottom enamel panels and the signboard, as well as the color being an issue.

Rubio: Stated that she understands their point that there is a lack of continuity between the bottom and the top but that they are kind of dealt with the bottom. That the HDC has stated that they need to keep the bottom panels and that it would be cost prohibitive to do something with the bottom panels. Stated that when you look at the whole building that there is some continuity between that and the rest of the building, which the HDC approved.

Pettit: Stated that he would argue that both parts of the building are not really the same. The scale and massing between the two parts of the building are not the same.

Lindsay: Stated that the original existing façade and those enamel plates are incredibly different material-wise than the signboard material that was installed. Stated that the Commission is speaking to appropriateness; that the proportions are different, there are a lot of different things that have changed with the omission of the original awning line and with the original art deco façade that was there. Asked about the original panels.

Rubio: Stated that they are no longer there.

Davis: Asked staff for clarification on what a denial of the application would mean.

Kochanek: Stated that a denial means the work is inappropriate and opens up an avenue for an appeal process; that if the Commission finds that the work is inappropriate, the ordinance indicates that it "be required to be returned to its previous state".

Davis: Stated that that would be difficult given the condition the building was in, that the awning could never be put back on and that there were significant issues with the material.

Lindsay: Stated her recall is of a conversation the Commission had when the co-owner was present about what might happen if the original awning could not be restored. Stated that it is an important piece to keep in mind because those other panels that were there provided a cohesion in the façade but now is not possible because they have been removed and possibly discarded.

Rubio: Confirmed the panels were discarded.

Lindsay: Stated that it is problematic because a conversation about this had occurred; that possibilities had been discussed about producing a very thin line and a two to three-inch piece made of wood to then replicate that piece.

Pettit: Confirmed remembrance of the conversation referred to by Commissioner Lindsay.

Lindsay: Stated that there were conversations and many opportunities through which the Commission attempted to work with the applicants.

Rubio: Stated she does not recall those conversations.

Lindsay: Confirmed that Rubio was not present.

Davis: Stated that it was the co-owner who was present; that work was approved for a north storefront that included windows and metal trim with an eight-inch projection.

Rubio: Asked if the eight inches would include the metal things that were removed.

Pettit: Stated that it was to cover that gap.

Davis: Stated that if it was not the original material that it was going to be like a metal clad trim.

Pettit: Stated that it was a piece of trim that had the same profile.

Davis: Stated that there would be like the red and the peach tiles below.

Lindsay: Stated that the tiles would also be above.

Davis: Stated that there would be an eight-inch awning clad in metal.

Kochanek: Stated that the original commission meeting minutes talked about making the awning closer to the building and using some of the original pieces on the face.

Rubio: Stated that she is not understanding how to go about using original pieces which applicant does not have or creating some sort of aluminum piece to replicate it.

Pettit: Stated that it was not to replicate it; that the renderings show pretty well what the intent was from what was submitted to the Commission. Stated that the materials had been discussed. Stated that if original materials became unavailable, an alternative for cladding that piece could have been discussed but it was never brought back to the Commission.

Davis: Stated that the projection itself could be made of wood and clad in a thin piece of metal and then painted; that it does not have to be an exact replica of what was there.

Pettit: Stated that it is more like showing a ghost line of the original structure that had been there.

Davis: Asked staff to go back to one of the old pictures with the awning. Stated that the issue he has with the new signboard is that before the new signboard was put on, there was this cohesion on the bottom half from the gray below the brick, down, with the peach and the red and then the red and then the brick above; that it was separate but it had cohesion. Stated that, now, the signboard splits the façade into thirds on both buildings. Stated his desire to see more work done that makes the building more cohesive; that possibly if the signboard was painted differently, it could be helpful. Stated that the very minute details were left up to the owners so they could do something that was feasible and not cost prohibitive but still maintain the value and integrity of the building.

Lindsay: Stated the importance of also maintaining the specific character of the building, that now is gone.

Davis: Stated that he is not comfortable with approving the current work.

Pettit: Stated that there might be value in having that previous material to review and tabling the application for now.

Davis: Agreed with Commissioner Pettit.

Kochanek: Stated, in answer to an earlier question, the statement in the ordinance says "When work has been done upon a resource without a permit, and the historic district commission finds that the work does not qualify for a certificate of appropriateness, the commission may require an owner to restore the resource to the condition the resource was in before the inappropriate work was done or to modify the work so that it qualifies for a certificate of appropriateness".

Davis: Stated that the applicant falls into "or modify the work so that it qualifies for appropriateness", that it is not feasible for the Commission to require the applicant to put back what was there. Stated that rather than deny the applicant, a possible consensus is to look at tabling the motion, re-examine the materials that were submitted from September of 2016 and then discuss with the full commission what would be deemed appropriate.

Rupert: Stated that the Commission cannot do the designing for the applicants.

Pettit: Stated that there seemed to have been something that had been agreed upon and doable, which is not this; that that is the reason for revisiting the other drawings.

Lindsay: Agreed.

Davis: Asked staff to locate the September 13, 2016 submittal to look at right now and send it to the applicant in order to go back and discuss what potentially could be done knowing that the Commission is not comfortable with what is there now. Asked the applicant if they could return in two weeks and have a discussion about what the Commission would find appropriate.

Pettit: Stated that he thought there were some drawings of the detail.

Kochanek: Stated that this is what was submitted at the time [*referencing overhead*] and that there are also other drawings that were submitted prior.

Davis: Asked staff to gather this info and send it to the owners so they can look at what they previously submitted. That the Commission can look at it again, and then come back in two weeks and have a fuller discussion.

Kochanek: Asked if the Commission had suggestions for what might make what is there now, work; that there was the mention of paint.

Rupert: Stated that it is still going to look out of place.

Lindsay: Stated that the two side pieces (on the signboard) are creating a kind of a funny juxtaposition; that the original did not have.

Rubio: Asked Commissioner Lindsay if she is referring to removing the two ends of the signboard frame and doing a wrap-around.

Lindsay: Agreed, just removing the (vertical) end pieces. Stated that that might be something where the applicants can thin that down and put a piece on both the left and right edge of the building, like a molding piece versus being an entire frame-out. Stated, or to at least put a really thin piece on it that would be the same color.

Kochanek: Asked Commissioner Lindsay if she is referring to removing the piece being referenced on the overhead.

Lindsay: Confirmed, those two.

Rupert: Confirmed, the verticals.

Davis: Asked about a thin molding that produces the lines.

Lindsay: Asked if Commissioner Davis is referring to the verticals.

Davis: Confirmed. Stated that was the big thing in the previous rendering, that the top of it was the same vertical panels.

Pettit: Stated that the distinguishing piece was that there was going to be some sort of projection, although small, more than just what is there now; that that was the defining piece as opposed to the signboard.

Davis: Stated that there are many good architects in the area that could look at the building as it is today and propose a solution. Stated that the commission is sensitive to things being cost prohibitive, there is not an expectation that all things be custom made, or replicate exactly what was there before; that there is a middle ground to preserve the character of the building. Stated that it is an important building, as there are not many buildings in the district that have this art deco character.

Motion: Rupert (second: Pettit) moved table the application for work at 6 S Washington for more detailed information on the signboard façade.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:  
N/A

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

#### **405 Maple**

*\*Returned to item after contractor's arrival.*

*\*Application is for amendment to the previous application for reroof; color change*

Applicant: Charles Smith, owner and Gary Turner, contractor -Present

Discussion: Davis: Asked the applicant to walk the commissioners through the application.

Turner: Stated that the project has grown over time but the goal is to re-roof the entire house including the out building and the front porch which was rebuilt last season. Stated that they changed roofing suppliers and that the gray color number G7 is their current selection. Stated that the owner is interested in using the Galvalume because it has the least amount of toxic coating on it of the metal roofing systems they have investigated and he would like to utilize the water from his roof to water his gardens with.

Davis: Asked if it would be the porch or the whole house.

Turner: Stated eventually the whole house but starting with the porch, the old garage, and also an awning proposed to add to the front.

Davis: Asked if it would look just like that [*referencing the material*].

Turner: Confirmed. Stated it is residential grade standing seam, 16 inch, and that this is the house and trim color [*referencing paint samples*] which it contrasts nicely with.

Davis: Stated a concern about reflectivity.

Turner: Stated that it gets dirty but it is cleaned fairly quickly.

Rupert: Asked if applicant planned to do the porch and the outbuilding first.

Turner: Confirmed.

Rupert: Asked if applicant knew his permit might expire in a year.

Turner: Stated that they are doing chunks at a time each season, as much as they can do; that they would renew the permit if necessary.

Kochanek: Asked if a building permit had been pulled.

Turner: Confirmed.

Kochanek: Stated that once a building permit is pulled, it keeps the permit active. Stated that there was approval for painting in 2016 but with no building permit required for painting if that work has not started, then that permit has expired.

Rupert: Asked where the awning is proposed and if it was on the original permit.

Kochanek: Confirmed that it was included on the original permit. Stated that it is going to be on the lower middle window.

Turner: Confirmed.

Kochanek: Stated that the Commission approved the awning when the adjustment of the roofline on the accessory structure was approved.

Davis: Stated that the awning is part of the motion dated 12-12-2017.

Turner: Stated that that part would probably come later when they deal with the house painting and the main roof.

Davis: Asked if the Commission can approve the house painting today.

Kochanek: Stated that applicant needs an application for it; that they were probably unaware it had expired.

Davis: Asked if the Commission can authorize administrative approval for only the house painting.

Kochanek: Confirmed. Advised applicant to submit an application.

Motion: Lindsay (second: Pettit) moved to authorize an administrative approval for the paint colors for 405 Maple. The paint colors were previously approved in the October 2016 application. The paint colors are SW 7007-Ceiling Bright White for trim and SW 7604- Smoky Blue for the body.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

Discussion: Davis: Asked commissioners their thoughts regarding the roofing.

Pettit: Stated that there is a question about the unfinished look of material and the brightness and reflectivity.

Lindsay: Asked if applicant has looked into any other low toxicity options.

Turner: Stated that as far as standing seam metal goes, this is the least toxic because it has the least amount of coating. Stated that the gray is a pretty uniform gray; that the residential applications has a slight channeling which may offer more shadow, break up the surface a little more and be duller than corrugated steel.

Davis: Stated his concern that the raw material may not be appropriate for a residential application in the District.

Turner: Stated that the material is finished but just has the least toxic coating.

Davis: Stated that it gives the appearance of a raw material which might be more appropriate for an industrial area rather than a residential property.

Turner: Stated that it is a higher end residential roofing system and would probably appear extremely finished in the application; that the gray patina is uniform and would have a very handsome appearance.

Motion: Pettit (second: Rupert) moved to approve the amended application for work at 405 Maple to include the new roof color to be Galvalume-41 as opposed to the original color, Grey-G7.

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

Approval: Yays: 3, Nays: 1. Motion Carries.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **314 Maple**

*\*Application is for solar panel installation*

Applicant: Barbara Zmich, owner and Dave Strenski, contractor –Present

Discussion: Davis: Asked the applicant to walk the commissioners through the application.

Strenski: Stated that the owner would like to put solar on their house; that an energy analysis was done and enough solar will be placed on the house to make them 100%. Stated that eleven panels will be placed on the second story roof at the south facing peak and that two rows will be placed on the lower roof where there is a south facing slope.

Davis: Asked if it will be visible from the street.

Strenski: Stated they are not visible because it is on the back of the house and that there are trees in the back.

Pettit: Asked if it will extend above the ridge.

Strenski: Confirmed that it may extend a little but that it would not be visible from the street because of the angle.

Pettit: Asked what the offset of the panels from the roof.

Strenski: Stated about six inches.

Davis: Stated concern about site lines from the street, glare from the street and glare for the neighbors.

Strenski: Confirmed that none of those concerns are an issue. Stated that there are meters on the back of the house; that there will be conduit that will go off the roof and down the back into the house to an inverter box.

Motion: Rupert (second: Pettit) moved to approve the work at 314 Maple to include the installation of 21 SolarWorld 295-watt solar panels on the rear side of the gabled upper and lower roofs on the structure. A SolarEdge 7 kW inverter will also be installed at the rear of the structure.

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.

### **15 Oak**

*\*Application is for door installation*

Applicant: Jason Bing, owner – Present

Discussion: Davis: Asked the applicant to give a rundown of the application.

Bing: Stated that the home, which he purchased about twelve years ago, had doors that were not original to the structure that he is now able to update them. Stated he would like to add some light in the house on the east door with a half light and a three-quarter light on the west door. Stated that he went to the local salvage store and went thru the process with them. He got doors that lined up with roughly the same time that this house went through is largest renovation/update in 1912-1913.

Rupert: Asked if the storm doors will remain on the building or eventually be replaced.

Bing: Confirmed that the storm doors will eventually be replaced.

Pettit: Asked if the plan is to replace the wood doors and leave the existing storms for now.

Bing: Confirmed.

Davis: Asked if the stain is to be used on both doors.

Bing: Confirmed that is correct.

Rupert: Stated that the fifteen light door is not appropriate for the building; that it appears to be an interior French door. Stated that it would not generally be seen on the exterior of the building.

Pettit: Asked if it would be appropriate as a door to a garden; that the age of the door could work and it matches the period of renovation.

Lindsay: Stated that the door has a nice exterior lock.

Bing: Stated that it was used as an exterior door.

Rupert: Asked if it could be seen from the road.

Bing: Confirmed. Stated that it is a door that is essentially a window at the bottom of the stairwell.

Lindsay: Stated that applicant previously discussed the reason for the particular door is to get more light into the interior space.

Bing: Confirmed.

Pettit: Asked if steps were going to be added (at this door) right away.

Bing: Stated that steps would not be added right away.

Pettit: Asked if applicant would be using it as a door.

Bing: Stated that it was not going to be used as a door.

Lindsay: Asked if applicant would like to keep it as a door instead of just replacing it with a window.

Bing: Stated that he considered replacing it with a window but that it would be more useful as a door for getting things upstairs.

Motion: Pettit (second: Rupert) moved to approve the work at 15 Oak St to include the installation of the exterior doors on the east and west sides of the house as depicted in the materials submitted with the application dated May 29, 2018.

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.

### **106 N Adams**

*\*Application is for fence/hanging garden installation*

Applicant: Sidharth Chhabra, applicant – Present

Discussion: Davis: Stated that the application is for the wood fence.

Chhabra: Stated it is not actually a fence. [*Indicated the plans submitted with the application and shown on the screen.*] He explained the layout of the site to the commission. Stated that they put a wooden structure at the side of the bus station so they could set up vegetable and flower planters and they were not aware that permission was needed.

Davis: Stated that the Commission reviewed this in July 2017 as part of another application but that the application included a second story greenhouse which was not appropriate so the application was denied at that time. Stated that he does not have a problem with shadowbox planters.

Rupert: Stated that an opaque stain should be used for the vertical garden.

Davis: Agreed.

Lindsay: Stated that there are some nice opaque stains that have a primer built in which could help it penetrate the wood.

Motion: Rupert (second: Lindsay) moved to approve the vertical garden at 106 N Adams. Work to include the installation of a wood structure/fence for a hanging garden as depicted in the materials submitted with the application dated June 5, 2018. A condition of the approval is that the wood structure be finished with an opaque color stain.

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.

### **232 N River**

*\*Application is for porch work*

Applicant: Stefan Szumko, owner –Present

Discussion: Davis: Asked applicant to walk the commissioners through the application.

Szumko: Stated that on the front porch, there is rotting of the interior columns, the north side flooring and the floor framing; that he is proposing to repair the lower half of the front porch, replace the columns as best as he can, wherever it makes sense, inside the column wrap. Stated that he would like to add a big screen to the porch with screen wood molding painted black to match the screen or trim color in the two sections of the house as opposed to the front entry; and that to enter that screened-in porch, to put in a black zipper door as opposed to a framed-in door just behind the middle right column. Stated that they could do a framed-in door painted black to match the screen.

Lindsay: Asked if there would be a third panel on the side.

Szumko: Confirmed.

Davis: Stated that the screen material needs to be as opaque and as translucent as possible with it being a front porch, so that you can see the house and see that there are occupants on the porch.

Rupert: Asked what the dimensions are between each column.

Szumko: Stated the dimensions are roughly sixty to eighty. Stated that the screen in the upstairs balcony also needs to be replaced.

Lindsay: Stated a concern about applicant being able to get the screen taut enough across the span and the height, which may be part of a reason for applicant to consider panelizing it in smaller sections.

Rupert: Stated that the applicant could put a support in there.

Pettit: Stated that the applicant may need a support anyway because it is a big opening.

Davis: Asked if the screen is part of the application.

Szumko: Stated no, because it is already there.

Davis: Stated that the bottom screening is not there yet.

Szumko: Agreed.

Kochanek: Stated that the applicant submitted the screening materials for the lower porch after the meeting packet went out and that technically, it is not part of this application.

Davis: Asked if the porch flooring will be replaced with four-inch tongue and groove flooring.

Szumko: Confirmed.

Davis: Asked if the four-inch overhang at the bottom of the porch will be eliminated.

Szumko: Confirmed. Stated that when the porch was originally built, the deck was put down maybe two inches and then the wrap around the porch offset four inches back; that area has been collecting snow, rain and debris and there is nothing to actually tack on anything behind it; that he would like to eliminate that area and put in a flat piece of trim with flashing on top of that.

Davis: Asked if applicant was going to try to reuse or replace the posts.

Szumko: Confirmed, with as exact as possible.

Davis: Stated as long as it has the trim on the top and down the sides and that they are painted to match.

Rupert: Asked if it is fluted on the columns.

Szumko: Stated that the front has no fluting; that it is all square and rectangular and it is all wrapped. Stated that he would use cold molding and cork ground for the trim and that the colors would match.

Motion: Lindsay (second: Pettit) moved to approve the application at 232 N River. Work to include the repair of the balcony with like materials and the

replacement of the porch materials as indicated in the application dated June 5, 2018. All materials to be painted to match the existing colors on the structure. All wood is to be in a smooth finish and all wood product to be in a smooth finish.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

#10- New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

**STUDY ITEM**  
**232 N River**

Discussion: Davis: Stated regarding the screens, that the discussion left off at possibly needing to have separation in the middle.

Pettit: Asked if the wood that was framed as the divider was painted black as opposed to white like the trim; if that would keep it from reading as breaking up the space.

Lindsay: Stated that it would be cohesive with the actual screen because the screen material is also black.

Davis: Stated that the screen will have to have a separate application; that if applicant can submit it within sixty days, a fee waiver could be requested.

Kochanek: Confirmed. Advised that it would be an amended application.

Davis: Asked if the Commission can amend it.

Kochanek: Stated that the applicant can amend this application to add screening. Advised applicant to include the drawings that he previously emailed to staff and include on the application that it is an amended application to the HDC application from June 5<sup>th</sup> asking to add screening to the porch.

Davis: Asked applicant to include cut sheets of the material that he went through.

Lindsay: Stated that it would be helpful if applicant could detail on one of the diagrams how this will work; that she would then feel comfortable having staff do an administrative approval.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**301 W Michigan**

*\*Application is for sign installation*

Applicant: Ed Phillips, Phillips Sign & Lighting, applicant – Not present

Discussion: Kochanek: Stated that she has advised the owner that this application is for a sign that the zoning ordinance will not permit. That she is expecting that the applicant will withdraw this application.

Motion: Lindsay (second: Pettit) moved to table the application at 301 W Michigan citing the lack of information and the applicant not in attendance.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:  
N/A

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

**216 N Washington**

*\*Application is for the installation of a concrete apron and gravel*

Applicant: Ron Rupert, Home Services, LTD, contractor –Present

Motion: Lindsay (second: Pettit) moved to table the application for 216 N Washington citing the fact that the Commission would not have quorum as a commissioner would need to recuse himself in order to present the application.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:  
N/A

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

**ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

**114 W Michigan**

*\*Application is for amendment to sign application*

**314 Maple**

*\*Application is for reroofing*

Motion: Rupert (second: Lindsay) moved to approve the administrative approvals at 114 W Michigan and 314 Maple.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

## STUDY ITEMS

### 310 E Cross

Discussion: Kochanek: Stated that there is currently a picket fence on the property and that the contractor is doing the same fence, in the same exact location, to be painted brown like the current fence. Stated that the only difference is that the top of that fence is going to be pointed as opposed to a dog ear style.

Rupert: Stated that it is a wider picket.

Kochanek: Stated that applicant is asking for the Commission to allow an administrative approval since he was planning on installing the fence prior to the next HDC meeting on June 26<sup>th</sup>. Stated that the applicant missed the deadline by two days.

Davis: Stated that the picket is appropriate and looks like it is a little tighter together, that it might actually block the HVAC system there.

Rupert: Stated that applicant lists the material as treated pine wood but does not list any color.

Kochanek: Stated that applicant is aware that painting is a Commission requirement which would be added as a condition. The applicant consulted with the owner who is looking at doing the same or similar brown color that is on the current fence.

Motion: Lindsay (second: Rupert) moved to authorize the administrative approval for 310 E Cross St application for a fence with the condition that staff give the condition that the fence must be painted or stained with an opaque stain. The fence as specified in the diagram submitted and the color to match the existing.

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.

## OTHER BUSINESS

### Demolition Process/application discussion

Commissioner Lindsay had nothing to report on at this time.

### Property Monitoring

114 W Michigan

Davis: Asked staff to check on the possibility of an animated open sign at this location.

**212 Ferris**

Pettit: Asked staff to check on the porch at this location as he thought that there had been some recent changes.

**LED lighting strips resolution/policy**

Davis: Asked staff to look into the feasibility of the light meter and how that might work.

**HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS**

**Approval of the minutes of May 22, 2018**

Motion: Rupert (second: Pettit) moved to approve the minutes as drafted.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

Vice-Chairperson Davis adjourned the meeting, citing the end of the agenda with no one remaining in the audience and no further items to discuss.

**MEETING ADJOURNED at 8:58 p.m.**