

**CITY OF YPSILANTI**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**MINUTES of SEPTEMBER 19, 2006**

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Jane Schmiedeke                      Chair    7:00 PM

Meeting Location:                      City Hall Meeting Room

Commissioners Present:                Jane Schmiedeke, Hank Prebys, Ron Rupert, Christian Overland, Brenda Rigdon, Joe Schultz, Ed Penet

Commissioners Absent:                None

Staff Present:                            Richard Murphy, Planner I  
    Cristin Moody, HDC Intern

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

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

Approval:                      Unanimous. Action carried.

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS - None**

**PUBLIC HEARING - None**

**OLD BUSINESS -**

**110 N. River, Action Item**

Applicant:                      Ida Marsh, City Radiator Service, Owner (Not present)

Discussion:                      The applicant is proposing to install a wood privacy fence along the south property line to screen the residential neighbor to that side. The brush in the rear yard that had been serving as a vegetative screen has been removed and the

fence is required by zoning to restore that screening. The application states that the wooden fence will be bolted to the existing chain link fence. The Commission had several questions about the application, including the type of cedar to be used and the style of fence; which side of the chain link fence the wood fence will be bolted to (inside or outside); whether the chains will be removed, or remain to trap weeds and trash; how long the affected property line is; and how the fence will be painted.

Applicant stated that she did not intend to appear before the Commission.

Motion: Rigdon (Second: Rupert) moves to deny the application for work at 110 N. River due to the lack of requested information including a site plan, paint sample, and style of new fence as well as the removal of the existing cyclone fence.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

### **105 W. Michigan Ave., Action Item**

Applicant: Roger Cunningham, contractor (present)

Discussion: Application is for installation of lettering on existing sign board. Applicant presents photograph showing proposed style of signage as well as a sample of the lettering which is ten inch high, burgundy colored plastic.

Motion: Prebys (Second: Rigdon) moves to approve the application for work at 105 W. Michigan Ave to include installation of raised, ten inch tall, burgundy plastic lettering to be stud mounted in existing sign board.

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

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

### **8 & 12 S. Huron, Action Item**

Applicant: Jeffrey Kuhns, owner (Not Present)

Discussion: No representative present. No decision possible.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **309 Washtenaw, Action Item**

Applicant: (Not Present)

Discussion: The application is for removal of rear second story balcony porch and replacement of clapboard siding where porch was attached as well as painting new boards.

Motion: Penet (Second: Prebys) moves to table the application for work at 309 Washtenaw pending an explanation of what will be done with the existing door access to the porch.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

#### **418 N. Hamilton, Action Item**

Applicant: Adam Levensgood and Brent Welsh, owners

Discussion: Applicants propose to repaint the exterior of house and garage. Paint color samples are provided. Commissioner Schmiedeke requests information as to which colors will be used for specific trims. Commissioner Prebys inquires about the intended method of preparation. Applicants confirm they will scrape and prime and will not power wash.

Motion: Rigdon (Second: Prebys) moves to approve the application for work at 418 N. Hamilton to include repainting house and garage with Olympic paints using "Stony Creek" for the body, "Olive Wood" for window sashes, "Toasted Almond" for the casing and corner boards as well as "Olive Gray" and "Rattan Palm" for accent colors.

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

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

#### **501 N. River, Action Item**

Applicant: Robert Hamilton, owner (Present)  
Michael Boudiab, Home Depot

Discussion: The application is to replace all windows in the house with new all wood windows. All will be double hung except for one kitchen window, which will be a slider and four upper floor windows, which would be awning. Existing windows appear to be original to the house. Commissioner Prebys asks about the type of muntins planned for the new windows. Applicant indicates they will be in between the glass so that a screen can be used. Commissioner Rigdon points out that the muntins must be on the exterior of the glass on replacement windows so they match the appearance of the original because they are an important part of the architectural character of the house. Commissioner Prebys questions the reason for replacement of windows. Applicant responds that windows leak badly and some are not functional. Commissioner Prebys asks applicant if HDC can conduct a site inspection to determine if the windows are beyond repair and must indeed be replaced rather than restored.

Applicant asks about the acceptability of vinyl or aluminum clad replacement windows. Commissioner Rigdon states that windows clad in vinyl or aluminum are acceptable.

Motion: Rigdon (Second: Rupert) moves to table the application for work at 501 N. River pending receipt of requested information on the architectural details of the replacement windows and the Commission's site visit to determine condition of existing windows.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

#### **402 S. Huron, Action Item**

Applicant: Joe Baublis, agent for Deutsche Bank (Present)

Discussion: Application is to amend previously approved foundation repairs. Applicant presents recent photos of house showing progress of work. A south side addition has been removed as approved; the roof has been covered with tarp, and in some places plywood. With regard to the foundation, the applicant states that the original plan to fill cracks and holes with expanding foam sealant has not worked well because some of the holes are too large. The sealant will also prove difficult to remove from the stone in the future when permanent repairs are made to the foundation. Applicant requests approval to use cement and mortar to temporarily fill the holes instead.

Motion: Rupert (Second: Prebys) moves to amend the August 1, 2006 approval to include the use of cement mortar for temporary foundation repair and exclude the previously approved expanding foam sealant.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

#### **121 N. Washington, Action Item**

Applicant: Randall Mascharka, owner (Not Present)

Discussion: The applicant would like to amend previous approval for work on lower storefront.

Motion: Overland (Second: Rupert) moves to table the application for work at 121 N. Washington due to insufficient information.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

### **STUDY ITEMS**

#### **14 N. River, Study Item**

Applicant: Lorenzo Betts, owner (Present)

Discussion: The application is for proposed alterations including removal of a large tree at the northwest corner of building; repair of rear wall to include replacement of missing aluminum siding and replacement of rotting wood; removal of plywood covering the basement windows and installation of glass blocks; replacement of existing small porch on north side with a new wooden porch; installation of soffit on south side to match existing on north side; roof replacement using gray and black asphalt shingles; replacement of gutters; cleaning and repainting of aluminum siding. In regard to the tree removal, the applicant indicates that following removal of tree and other unsightly vegetation, he will regrade to fix drainage problems and do some landscaping. In regard to the rear wall damage, the applicant mentions that some of the aluminum siding is missing and he suspects that there is water damage and possible rotted wood. He would like to remove all of the siding, repair water damage and then reinstall siding, adding new pieces as needed. Commissioner Rupert expresses concern about the potential for exactly matching existing siding. The applicant indicates that he has a source in Inkster who can supply it. In regard to the basement windows, Commissioner Overland points out that glass block is not appropriate to this style house and that reinforced glass windows that would be more appropriate are available from companies such as Jeld-Wen and Anderson Windows. In regard to the proposed porch replacement on north side of house, Commissioner Rigdon informs that the balusters need to be spaced no more than four inches on center. Commissioner Prebys stresses that the new porch be porch-style, not deck-style, with skirting recessed from the edge of the decking. Commissioner Schmiedeke suggests plain two by two balusters for the railing, rather than turned balusters. In regard to the soffit, the applicant would remove existing plywood and replace with aluminum to match soffit on north side. All siding would be treated with tri-sodium phosphate and brush cleaned (not power washed). It will be painted with Sherwin-Williams exterior paint. Applicant indicates that some doors will need to be replaced and that there are some doors in the basement that could possibly be used and is informed that any new or replaced exterior doors will need to be approved by the Commission. Commissioner Rupert states that it is likely that some gutters will need to be replaced and some exterior lighting will need to be installed and approved by the Commission. Commissioners inform applicant that replacement siding must match existing and the design of the new porch must be submitted and accepted before the application can be considered for approval. Commissioner Schmiedeke asks about the applicant's plans for 12 N. River. He replies that the existing house will be demolished and a duplex constructed in its place. Planner Murphy indicates that this is possible under zoning law with an adjustment to the property lines between 12 and 14 N. River.

#### **400 N. River, Study Item**

Applicant: Stewart Beal, Owner (Present)

Discussion: The discussion concerns the structural façade only at this point. The applicant provides copies of architectural drawings of the existing and proposed changes to the façade and structural drawings.

The applicant indicates that he is not certain what will be done about the cornice, although options are being explored. Commissioner Prebys suggests investigating the fiberglass option used on the Citizen's Bank building.

The applicant proposes to install additional windows on the south elevation to match existing, to make that elevation more symmetrical and allow more light into the south units. He also plans to remove the garage addition on the northeast corner. A new stairwell will be installed in its place.

The large garage door bay on the façade, which is structurally compromised and not original to the building, will be removed. It will be bricked in and storefront windows installed as part of the renovation of the first floor facade. The entire building will be painted, so any new brick will not be visible.

The new structural system that has been designed will not remove any of the historic structure, but will stabilize it. The system involves installing a steel beam underneath the historic wooden lintels to support them. The steel would be invisible, yet will affect the height of the windows because the twelve inch wood and eight inch steel beams together would be covered by wood to appear as one large wooden fascia board.

Commissioners Schmiedeke and Rigdon state that they have no objections to the proposed new profile of the beams and point out that its expanded height will also provide sign space. Applicant asks about a wooden shed roof on a portion of the front of building that appears in historic photographs and whether it could be rebuilt.

Commissioner Prebys states that it would be a reasonable proposal to bring before the Commission. Applicant hopes to have financing agreement in place by November, 2006 and to meet pre-leasing targets by January, 2007 with occupancy starting in January, 2008.

### **Riverside Arts Center Elevator, Study Item**

Applicant: Barry LaRue, RAC Board (Present)

Discussion: The applicant presents architectural drawings of the elevator shaft to be constructed between the Masonic Temple building and the DTE Building which will serve both of these buildings. It will have a modern style, glass façade using clear and possibly textured glass, and be lit from within at night. Commissioner Schmiedeke asks how far the elevator section will be set back from the building's facades. Applicant responds only one to two feet. A canopy, possibly metal, will be installed at the front entrance to the elevator. Commissioner Prebys suggest structural glass instead of metal to keep the open airy feel of the rest of the structure.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Property Monitoring**

**309 W. Cross** – No activity.

**301 E. Cross** – Painting was done without permit. Commissioner Schmiedeke requests that a letter be sent notifying the owners of the need to seek HDC approval for any future exterior work.

**102 N. Hamilton, Ozone House** – A sign was installed, but not in the approved location.

**309 N. Hamilton** – Iron railings installed, but not yet painted white.

**307 N. Hamilton** – Porch functional, but not appropriately done.

**Wolverine Restaurant** – Sign installed is too big for sign board; owners have demanded that contractor reinstall correctly.

**113 E. Cross** – In regard to request for sources for lumber: Commissioner Rupert suggests United Mill in Willis, Jackson Brothers Sawmill in Whitmore Lake and Fingerle.

**631 N. River** – Roof is caving in. Commissioner Rupert states that the building is unoccupied and dangerous. Owner does not want to demolish or sell, but intends to will property to his descendents. Commissioner Schmiedeke requests that staff make sure this property is on the Vacant and Dangerous buildings list.

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

**HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS**

**Approval of the minutes from the September 5, 2006 meeting**

Motion: Penet (Second: Prebys) moves to approve the minutes for the September 5, 2006, meeting as submitted.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion: Prebys (Second: Rupert) moves to adjourn the meeting.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

**MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:30 PM**

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