

**CITY OF YPSILANTI  
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
MINUTES of OCTOBER 4th, 2005**

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Jane Schmiedeke                      Chair    7:00 PM

Meeting Location:                      City Hall Meeting Room

Commissioners Present:                Jane Schmiedeke, Hank Prebys, Ed Penet, Joe Schultz,  
Christian Overland

Commissioners Absent:                 Ron Rupert, Brenda Rigdon

Staff Present:                            Karen Wieber, Planner I  
Jonathan Ringel, HDC/Planning Intern

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Motion:                                    Penet (Second: Prebys) moved to approve the agenda as  
submitted.

Approval:                                  Unanimous. Action carried.

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS** - None

**PUBLIC HEARING** - None

**OLD BUSINESS**

**409 Maple, Action Item**

Applicant:                                Catherine Hayes (not present)

Application:                               Window Replacement

Discussion:                                None

Motion:                                    Penet (Second: Prebys) moved to table the application for 409 Maple  
pending further information regarding the ladder/staircase to be utilized  
as means of egress from the building.

Approval:                                  Unanimous. Action carried.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**208 E. Cross, Action Item**

Applicant:                                Robert Taylor (present)

Application: Eave/Shingle Addition

Discussion: Commissioner Schultz discussed miscommunication between the Commission and applicant regarding April 28, 2004 approval to "remove asphalt siding and restore missing or damaged clapboard with clear red cedar of the same exposure as needed". Applicant states that he does not remember receiving a letter with this information. Applicant states there was no usable original siding and that he believed that discussion prior to the April 28 approval indicated that he could replace siding with cedar or composite siding. Commissioner Schultz stated that it is the responsibility of the Commission to enforce the ordinance consistently and fairly. A reasonable agreement might be to finish siding the house with already purchased unapproved material on less visible portions of the house (south & west) and approved material on more visible façades (north & east). Imitation raised grain composite siding is inappropriate for the front. Commissioner Overland noted that other applicants have been required to remove the composite siding that Mr. Taylor is using. Commissioner Schultz proposed amending the prior motion to allow already purchased siding to be used on the back (south) and west sides of the house and to require that flat finish siding of either composite or red cedar be used on the front (north) and driveway (east) sides of the house. Commissioner Overland suggested that a reason for this amendment to the motion should be noted as well. Mr. Taylor stated that he did not know that smooth was required and there was a miscommunication. Commissioner Schmiedeke noted that the HDC must rely on the official minutes; Mr. Taylor should have contacted the City and requested clarification if letter differed from what he had understood as being appropriate siding. Commissioner Penet suggested that material left over could also be used for a garage. Commissioner Schmiedeke pointed out that the house windows must have muntin dividers on the exterior. Mr. Taylor has the appropriate window muntins and he does plan to install them.

Motion: Schultz (Second: Penet) moved to approve the application for 208 E. Cross for a two foot overhang at the back of the house to prevent water damage which will imitate the dimensions of the existing overhang on other parts of the house. Secondly, move to amend the motion made on April 20, 2004 reflected in the letter which went out to Mr. Taylor on April 28, 2004 which required that missing or damaged clapboard would be restored and replaced with clear red cedar. Amend to state that on the south and west side of the house the applicant may use composite siding which has already been purchased (by applicant) with the imitation wood grain. The north and east sides of the house which face the street and driveway must use a flat finish siding of either composite or clear red cedar. This is being amended in the spirit of compromise due to a misunderstanding by the applicant of what clear red cedar meant.

The following Secretary of the Interior Standards were used in making this decision:  
#6 - Repair, don't replace and #10 - New work shall be removable

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

### **305 Maple, Action Item**

Applicant: Cameron Getto (present)

Application: Door Replacement

Discussion: Applicant stated that he purchased door that the HDC approved and a different door arrived and with winter approaching he installed door that is not on former plans and not approved. The door is solid wood (fir) with 2 panels and 9 lights. Commissioner Prebys noted that the door should be painted, suggested blue to match the rest of the trim. Commissioner Schmiedeke points out that the door is appropriate for the home.

Motion: Prebys (Second: Penet) moved to approve the application for 305 Maple for a wooden 2 panel – 9 light door which is already installed, to be painted to match the trim and other doors in the house.

The following Secretary of the Interior Standard was used to make this decision:  
#10 - New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

### **9-11 S. Washington, Action Item**

Applicant: Gary Turner, contractor, and Hedger Breed, owner (both present)

Application: Roof/ (2<sup>nd</sup> floor) Porch Replacement

Discussion: Roof and back porch had been closed in when applicant purchased property and the condition is deteriorating. They propose remodeling the back porch at the same time that they re-roof the structure. Rear ten feet of the structure was added on at a later date. It has a sloping floor and contains furnaces. Applicant plans to follow existing roof line and make a simple completion of the existing form, using smooth composite siding with a low profile fascia. Applicant proposes using composite siding with bevel, applied horizontally with a box trim. Commissioner Prebys notes this will be constructed out of 4x8 sheets with butt joints and caulking to create consistency. He is concerned about the large amount of huge blank space created by the composite board. Commissioner Prebys states this would be more appropriate in the commercial area. Applicant discusses use of Azek which is similar to PBC and can be worked similar to wood. Commissioner Schmiedeke is concerned about the length of the windows off the back porches being too short. Commissioner Prebys notes that the windows are appropriate for new construction. Windows are based on the smallest egress double hung window size, in case there should be future egress issues. The height of the windows (3'4" x 4' 8") was kept higher to shield residents from the view of the parking lot.

Motion: Prebys (Second: Penet) move to approve the application for 9-11 S. Washington for reconstruction and enclosure of a second story porch at the rear of the building. Proposed drawings dated September 2005 are referenced. The siding for the second story porch addition shall be composite board laid in overlapping horizontal pattern. The construction shall be trimmed in composite boards as noted in architectural renderings labeled 1A and 2A and dated September, 2005. The material shall be painted to match the existing building material and the roof shall be black. The hardy plank material shall be smooth surface exposed. Exposure will be 4"-6".

The following Secretary of Interior Standards was used in making this decision:  
#9 - Contemporary designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original material and #10 - New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

### **Various Locations, Action Item**

Applicant: Ypsilanti Health Coalition – Vic Randall, representative (present)

Application: Bike Rack Installation within the Ypsilanti & Depot Town DDA Districts

Discussion: Photos and locations of bike racks were reviewed. Commissioner Schultz notes that these new bike racks will be black which is different than the color of the existing bike racks located in the downtown.

Motion: Schultz (Second: Prebys) moved to approve the application for the installation of bike racks in various locations throughout downtown Ypsilanti and Depot Town, as detailed in the attachment to the application by the Ypsilanti Health Coalition dated September 28, 2005. The details of the bike racks are also detailed in the application including inverted “U” design, steel, black, in-ground installation and TGIC polyester powder coat.

The following Secretary of Interior Standards was used in making this decision:  
#10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

### **200 W. Michigan, Action Item**

Applicant: David Curtis, Eric Maurer (present)

Application: Façade Renovation/New Restaurant

Discussion: Replace existing front windows – Mr. Curtis states the glass in the existing storefront windows will be replaced with double glazing in wood frames. Moving and adding entry way doors – Applicant plans to move the Michigan Avenue entry three feet to the east while adding and creating a new entry on the Washington Street facade at the southeast corner. Both doors will access a foyer and will be flush with the façade of the building. Applicant plans on metal fabricated doors but will switch to wood doors at the request of the Commission which feels that wood doors will be more compatible with the wood windows. A future awning may be installed. Applicant plans to use as much of the existing awning hardware as possible. Dentils displayed by the architectural renderings are not actually located on the structure. Gooseneck down lighting – Applicant plans to attach the fixtures to the top of the cornice, not to the brick, and suggests a conduit which would not be visible. Up lighting – will allow building to stand out as a landmark and accent the structure. Commissioner Prebys expresses concern over where the up lighting will be attached as its installation could cause damage to the brick. Commissioner Schmiedeke suggests the same conduit be used for both gooseneck down lighting and up lighting. Up lighting will be focused so as not to shine into the above apartments and will be lowered to the cornice. The cans should be painted the color of the brick. LED banded lighting is suggested.

Lower existing windows – three windows near the rear of the structure on Washington Street are proposed to be lowered to allow the public to view the cooking on the grill. The windows will remain single sheet but will be double glazed.

Existing Washington Street door – the door will be removed and placed in the interior of the structure. The door will be bricked in with a 1" recess to indicate that at one point there was a door in that location.

Delivery door – the delivery door will be located on the rear of the structure in the alley.

Ventilation addition – a large hood will be added in the building and the ventilation shaft will run up to the roof of the rear exterior next to the elevator addition. It will be painted light blue to match the painting on the rest of the addition. Commission points out that the applicant should be careful to locate the exhaust of the restaurant and the intake for the apartments in positions to minimize food odors within the apartments.

Motion: Prebys (Second: Penet) moved approval of the application for 200 W. Michigan, referencing drawings dated 9-28-05 for the following:

- ✍ Replacing existing front windows on the first floor of the Michigan and Washington Street façades to match existing, framed in wood, while retaining the existing granite panels under the windows.
- ✍ Moving the existing south entry door to the east corner of the Michigan/Washington façade and adding a door on the Washington Street façade as shown in the drawing and elevation dated September 28, 2005 sheet # A201. The doors shall be wood to match the same material used to frame the windows.
- ✍ Gooseneck lighting shall be installed as shown in the architectural drawings.
- ✍ The up lighting shall be incorporated into the cornice above the sign and not into the brick of the building.
- ✍ Three of the existing five short windows on the rear of the Washington Street facade shall be lowered to become 36" windows as opposed to the current dimensions.
- ✍ The current recessed door at the north end of the Washington Street façade shall be removed and the opening bricked in with a 1" recess. New brick shall match existing brick in color and texture. New mortar shall match existing in color and tooling.
- ✍ A delivery door will be added to the rear north side of the structure.
- ✍ A ventilation stack will be added to the north rear side of the structure and shall be painted blue to match the existing elevator shaft.
- ✍ The proposed dentil molding displayed on the architectural drawings below the side board and above the windows shall not be installed.
- ✍ The gooseneck lighting for the signs shall have the conduit incorporated into the cornice above the sign and shall not penetrate the brick of the building.
- ✍ Colors for the signs and other painting to be submitted at a later date.

The following Secretary of Interior Standards was used in making this decision:  
#8 – Preserve archeological resources, #9 – Contemporary designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original material, and #10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

## STUDY ITEMS

### 208 E. Cross, Study Item

Applicant: Robert Taylor (present)

Application: New garage

Discussion: Applicant proposing 24x20 foot garage for cars and tool storage at rear of property, open to the west, utilizing a one-car garage door and a man door. Commissioner Prebys states Commission will need to see a lighting plan, as well as door and window designs. Doors and windows should be of simple square design. Pitch of garage roof should match that of the original upper portion of the house. New construction should not have muntins at all on the outside.

Any door replacement will require HDC approval. Mr. Taylor is planning to replace with a solid wood door nine-light, painted to match other doors on the house.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS - None**

#### **PROPERTY MONITORING**

**400 N. River** – Next hearing is scheduled for October 27. Mr. Beal's attorney favored having the HDC file a brief in court on behalf of the building. Staff will have a letter drafted for the commission to sign at the October 18, 2005 meeting. Mr. Beal also expressed interest in having someone from the HDC come to the hearing to speak on behalf of the building.

**417 N. Adams** – Staff has spoken with attorney Louis Rome representing homeowner. Work has apparently been done to the rear carriage barn but no permits have been pulled. Hearing is set for October 18, 2005 and if paperwork is received before that date the city will inspect the work performed in the hope that the issue can be resolved.

**304 E. Forest** – Staff sent a letter regarding the need to repair and paint the porch. Staff will continue to monitor.

**12-14 N. River** – Application may have been submitted for demolition of these structures. One of the structures is burned out and both are in poor condition.

**108 S. Huron** – Staff has located a new address for the owner of this property and will draft and mail a new letter. Staff will also attempt to deliver the same letter in person accompanied by a police officer.

**416 N. Huron** – Staff will coordinate with Commissioner Rigdon to begin drafting drawings for the reconstruction of this barn.

**22 N. Huron** – Staff is drafting a letter to the property owners regarding the condition of the cornice.

#### **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS - None**

#### **HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS**

##### **Approval of the minutes from the September 20, 2005 meeting.**

Motion: Prebys (Second: Overland) moved to approve the minutes as submitted.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion: Penet (Second: Overland) moved to adjourn the meeting.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

**MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:05 PM**

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date\_\_\_\_\_