

new carriage barn to be used as a dwelling, as the main house at this address already contains more than two dwelling units.

PUBLIC HEARING - None

OLD BUSINESS

416 N. Huron, Action Item

Applicant: Steve Wild, owner (not present)

Application: Rebuild carriage barn

Discussion: The application is to construct a replacement for a historic carriage barn illegally demolished by the previous owner. The new structure will have the dimensions and appearance of the original, but, due to practical difficulties with reconstructing at the original location, will be moved farther south on the lot, to flatter ground. The application was tabled on August 1, 2006, pending receipt of a materials specification sheet from Chelsea Lumber, the contractor, and a plot plan showing the location of the proposed new structure. Commissioner Rigdon has compared the materials list to that on the previously approved blueprints, dated July 17, 2002, and notes that it is for the most part acceptable. The only problem, which the Commission notes to be a significant problem, is that all exterior wood is specified as "Rufsawn", a brand name for generic white wood with an un-planed finish. Un-planed lumber will soak up water and deteriorate quickly, and, additionally, rough finishes are generally incompatible with the established character of the District. The Commission discusses whether a particular type of wood needs to be specified, or simply that a smooth, planed lumber is required. Commissioner Overland notes that Chelsea Lumber is a reputable company and will not use inappropriate wood in a structural fashion; specifying a particular type of wood may not be necessary. Commissioner Rupert suggests that MDO plywood would be appropriate for the board-and-batten appearance of the structure; battens could be laid over the surface at the proper spacing without needing to cut the plywood into true boards. Commissioner Penet wonders what specifying a smooth lumber will do to price; Commissioner Rupert estimates the difference will be \$8-\$10 per sheet. The additional cost is for quality materials that are more durable, however, which is important for the owner, the District in general, and for the neighbors, who have already expressed concern over this structure. Commissioner Prebys points out that the neighbors' concern is more over the location of the structure than the grade of wood, but insisting on the original location will result in the structure's never being rebuilt. The new location is acceptable to the Commission, and is additionally set farther back on the lot than the neighbors' carriage barn, which is adjacent to the same lot line.

Motion: Rigdon (Second: Prebys) moves to approve the application for 416 N. Huron to include the reconstruction of a carriage barn, previously demolished without a permit by the previous property owners. The structure shall be constructed to the architectural drawings dated July 17, 2002, re-submitted at the HDC meeting of August 1, 2006, and the materials list from Chelsea Lumber dated April 17, 2006, submitted at the HDC meeting of August 15, 2006, with the following exceptions/changes to the materials list: All exterior lumber shall be smooth surfaced.

The sheathing may be ¾" MDO with smooth surfaced battens. All trim at windows, doors, eaves, etc. shall be smooth surfaced solid wood or fiber cement product (i.e. HardiPlank). Windows shall be wood, vinyl-clad wood, or aluminum-clad wood.

The following Secretary of the Interior Standards were used in making this decision: #5 – Preserve distinctive features, #9 – Contemporary designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original materials.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

110 N. River, Action Item

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

Application: Rear fence installation.

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. Application initially appeared before the Commission on August 1, 2006; the Commission had several questions about the application at that time, 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 (City Radiator or neighbor); whether the chains will be removed, or remain to trap weeds and trash; whether the framing of the chain link fence could serve as support for the wood fence; how long the affected property line is; and how the fence will be painted. No additional information has been provided.

Motion: Rigdon (Second: Prebys) moves to table the application for work at 110 N. River pending additional information on fence style, type of cedar, length of proposed fence, and support. The Commission recommends existing chain link be removed before installation of wood fence, to prevent accumulation of weeds and trash between fences.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

NEW BUSINESS

400 N. River, Action Item

Applicant: Deborah Pearson, Leasing Agent, Bluestone Advisors (not present)

Application: Install leasing company sign.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing to install a 4' x 8' sign on the upper right corner of the front façade of the Thompson Block. Bluestone will be the leasing agent for the property, which is currently in receivership, when repairs are

completed, and wish to install their sign now, in order to draw attention to the repair process and start building interest in the property

Motion: Penet (Second: Prebys) moves to approve the application for 400 N. River to include the installation of a leasing sign for Bluestone Advisors. Sign design and location shall be as submitted.

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

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried. Commissioner Rupert abstained.

228 W. Michigan, Action Item

Applicant: Ron Rupert, Contractor (present)

Application: Remove awning, install / repaint signs.

Discussion: Applicant is proposing to remove the existing awning from the front of the Wolverine Grill, which is covering a framed sign panel. The sign panel will be painted yellow, and lettered in navy blue, either with vinyl or painted lettering, to include the name of the business, phone number, and hours. The name of the restaurant on the projecting Coca-Cola sign on the second floor façade will be re-lettered.

Motion: Prebys (Second: Penet) moves to approve the application for 228 W. Michigan Ave to include the removal of the existing awning; installation of a sign, as submitted, in the sign board area; and re-lettering of the projecting Coca-Cola sign.

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

Approval: Unanimous, with Commissioner Rupert abstaining. Action carried.

322 E. Cross, Action Item

Applicant: Marjorie Caldwell, Owner (Present)

Application: Re-roof and replace or remove gutters.

Discussion: Re-roofing, including the porch roof, has been approved administratively. Applicant additionally wishes to replace or remove the existing gutters. Currently, the house has half-round gutters on the front and left edges of the roof, no gutters on right and rear. Applicant would like to put up new gutters, but states she can't afford half-round; neighbors all have K-style or mixed style gutters; the options she sees as financially feasible are to leave gutters on half the house, as existing, to remove the gutters entirely, or to install new, K-style gutters. Commissioner Rupert suggests a supplier in Toledo who may be able to provide a more competitive bid for half-round

gutters that the applicant's present bid. Commissioner Schmiedeke asks whether gutters are required by code – the HDC will accept no gutters, but applicant should be prepared for a wet basement. Planner Murphy and Commissioner Rupert state that neither zoning nor building code requires gutters. Applicant questions requirement of ridge venting – roof is hipped and has only approximately two feet of ridge. Commissioner Rupert suggests applicant consult with Building Department for total amount of venting required by building code, and suggests locations for additional venting, including soffit venting.

Motion: Rigdon (Second: Prebys) moves to approve the application for 322 E. Cross to include the re-roofing, as administratively approved, and gutters. Any new gutters installed shall be half-round style; owner has option of having no gutters at all on the house. Any gutters installed shall be white, with straps installed under roof shingles. Ventilation of the new roof shall be performed as noted by the Commission.

The following Secretary of the Interior Standards were used in making this decision: #5 – Preserve distinctive features; #10 – New work shall be removable

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

102 N. Hamilton, Action Item

Applicant: Colleen O'Brien, Ozone House Youth and Family Services (Present)

Application: Install sign

Discussion: The applicant wants to install a sign for the Ozone House Drop-In Center; 5' x 4' in dimension. The sign would hang from existing hooks in the porch header, facing Hamilton, to the right of the porch stairs. Commissioner Overland questions the location on the porch and states that the Commission typically recommends separating signs from residential uses of this sort by putting them on the front lawn. Applicant states that the lawn location would be their preference aesthetically, but that flowerpots, brick pavers, and other newly installed landscaping has been regularly vandalized, and that they want to attach the sign to the structure, as a less vulnerable space. This location has much higher traffic than the N. Huron location, and not all passers-by are respectful of the Drop-In Center' property. Hanging the sign from the porch with locking attachment mechanism would also provide the option to bring the sign inside to prevent defacement. Several Commissioners are concerned that hanging the sign above the porch railing would negatively affect the massing of the structure, as well as providing visual screening that could actually encourage undesirable behavior. The Commission suggests affixing the sign to the front of the porch rail or to the wall above the porch, which has no windows. Applicant notes that the choice of material and size were based on what the contractor had in stock; moving the sign may require resizing or redesigning. Applicant states a preference for the hanging location.

Motion: Rigdon (Second: Prebys) moves to approve the application for 102 N. Hamilton to include the installation of a five foot by four foot sign for Ozone House Drop-In Center and Youth and Family Services. Sign shall be placed either attached to the front of the porch railing or attached to the clapboard above the porch.

Resizing may be necessary based on the placement. Design shall be as presented to the Commission on August 15, 2006.

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

Approval: Action carries, with Commissioner Overland opposed.

110 W. Cross, Action Item

Applicant: Steve Wilson, Staff, Michigan Firehouse Museum (Present)

Application: Replace overhead door.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing to replace a deteriorating see-through garage door on the Huron St. side of the museum with a new steel door with no windows. New door would have same dimensions as existing door, and will have a flat surface, painted to match building trim.

Motion: Rigdon (Second: Penet) moved to approve the application for 110 W. Cross to include the replacement of the existing glass-paneled garage door with a solid-paneled garage door. Panels shall be flat, with no raised surfaces, and not textured. Door shall be a sectioned overhead steel garage door, with associated brackets and fasteners on the inside.

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

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

217 W. Michigan, Action Item

Applicant: Peter Rinehart, Owner, Bombadill's (Present)

Application: Repaint façade

Discussion: The applicant is proposing to repaint front façade panels and trim, as previously discussed in a study item, and repaint rear of building to match existing. Color samples have been provided, but the Commission has not received an application.

Motion: Rupert (Second: Rigdon) moves to authorize Planner Murphy to administratively approve an application to repaint the façade of Bombadill's Café with the colors provided to the Commission on August 15, 2006.

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

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

STUDY ITEMS

120 N. Huron, Study Item

Applicant: Valerie Kabat, St. Luke's Episcopal Church (Present)

Application: Tuckpointing and waterproofing of masonry / cement

Discussion: The applicant had asked for assistance in interpreting widely varying bids received for work to the exterior of the church building; since turning in the application, have received a correction to Western Waterproofing's bid which brings the three more into line with each other. Church has more or less made a decision of which bids to include for which work, but can still use advice for final application. Contractors have received the Mortar Fact Sheet's "recipe" for mortar, and matching (soft) brick will be used for any replacement. Commissioner Rigdon stresses that these materials must be specified in the final application. Commissioner Schmiedeke asks what Neogard is, as specified in Western Waterproofing bid; apparently a clear sealant that will be used on the horizontal cement surface of the vault, not on brick. There is some discussion of bid language about filling cracks in concrete with "caulk" as prep for Neogard work – assuming this is not actually caulk per se, but a filler with properties like cement, using "caulk" as a generic word.

Downtown Parking Signs, Study Item

Applicant: Kevin Hill and Peter Rinehart, Central Business Committee (Present)

Application: Install signage at downtown parking lots

Discussion: The applicants propose to install informational signage at downtown parking lots, in order to identify the lots and clarify enforcement. The CBC will be meeting with the City Manager, DDA, Police Department, and Department of Public Works the next day to discuss locations and design, and DPW will be producing the signs in-house, so don't have much more than concepts to present to the Commission at this point. Signs will likely be white text on green background, of standard reflective material, and state the name of the lot and list the types of parking available (e.g. employee permit, 2-hour free, hourly paid). The CBC envisions two signs per lot; one at the entrance and one internal. The Commission questions the intended function of the signs, wondering whether references or specifications exist for font and layout for streets of certain vehicle speed. Commissioner Schultz suggests that signs near the entrance of the lot have the universal public parking symbol on them, to quickly communicate that the lots are public, and asks whether the Zoning Ordinance has any guidance on size or height of signs. Planner Murphy states that the Zoning Ordinance states only maximums for ground-mounted signs of 35 feet in height in the B3 zone, and exempts any governmentally-erected signs from review. Commissioner Schmiedeke states that the

proper size for the signs will be large enough to get the job done and no larger. Location should be similarly driven primarily by sign purpose.

12 and 14 N. River, Study Item

Applicant: Lorenzo Betts and Muriel Birton, Prospective Buyers (Present)

Application: Renovation of 14 N. River, demolition and new construction at 12 N. River

Discussion: Applicants are in the process of buying 12 and 14 N. River, a pair of currently vacant houses. They are interested in renovating 14 N. River entirely, and in using the already approved demolition permit to remove 12 N. River and possibly construct a duplex. Planner Murphy notes that 14 N. River, used as three units in the past, may be used as only two units now, due to the zoning, as prolonged disuse has allowed existing non-conformity status to expire. 12 N. River is also zoned R2, which would allow a duplex; the applicants should contact the Planning Department for details. Commissioner Schmiedeke notes that the Commission is not concerned with whether the buildings are duplexes, only with the exterior design and materials. Applicant states that no modifications will be made to the exterior of 14 N. River, just repair and replacement with "upgraded" materials, such as high-end asphalt shingles and vinyl siding. Commissioner Overland states that the Commission does not approve new vinyl or aluminum siding on old buildings; replacement siding would have to be wood or a composite, like HardiPlank. Applicant states that newer vinyl sidings exist that avoid many of the problems associated with vinyl in the past. Commissioner Schmiedeke notes that the house appears to have been resided at least twice, with aluminum over asphalt over, most likely, wood clapboard. Commissioner Schultz suggests that the applicant investigate the condition of any underlying wood siding – much of it may be salvageable. Applicant is not planning to replace the windows. Commissioner Prebys states that almost any material is approvable for roofing, including asphalt shingles. Since the property is at the gateway to a neighborhood, the Commission wants to see it become an attractive asset. Commissioner Schmiedeke lists doors, lighting, landscaping, gutters, and downspouts among details the Commission will need to approve before installation. Commissioner Prebys suggests the new apartments constructed on Arcade Street as an example of good new construction in the Historic District; 629 N. River as an example of a house that was in worse condition than 14 N. River but was restored very well.

322 E. Forest, Study Item

Applicant: Ann Rentfrow, Owner (Present)

Application: Fence backyard, re-roofing

Discussion: Applicant is interested in fencing the backyard; had originally been thinking chain link, but understands it is not allowed. Wrought iron wouldn't fit with the structure, so most likely wood privacy fence. The backyard faces an alley, and the fence would serve to separate the dog from passerby. Applicant is considering two different styles of fence in different parts of the yard and has brought pictures of fence styles they are considering. Commissioner Rupert recommends that shadow-box style, with alternating slats, will block view but allow air flow. Any wood fence would need to be painted or opaquely stained, and same color should be used for all fences on the property. Applicant is also planning to re-roof. Last several re-roofings have added new layers without stripping. Commissioner Rupert warns that current building code requires stripping old layers. Applicant would like to repaint house, but maintain white color; stripping external trim has exposed at least seven different colors of trim. The Commission states that the applicant may choose to repaint the trim with any of the previously existing colors.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

6. W. Cross – Masonry work

415 N. Huron – Re-cover kitchen roof

322 E. Cross – Re-roof house

Motion: Rupert (Second: Prebys) moves to approve the administrative approvals.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

OTHER BUSINESS

PROPERTY MONITORING

309 W. Cross – Commissioner Penet reports that no visible work has been done; steps and porch for which work was authorized have not been touched. Additionally, building has now been posted as uninhabitable.

8 N. River – Commissioner Rupert reports that work authorized is underway.

310 E. Cross – Commissioner Rupert has met with the contractor three times to discuss the work approved by the HDC; a second, unrelated contractor appeared today, apparently to address the same work. Commissioner Rupert will contact the second contractor in order to ensure everyone understands what is required.

621 N. River – Planner Murphy spoke with the owner, who acknowledged installing a new door. Owner has been instructed to complete an application for the door, and for any future external work.

416 N. Huron – Commissioner Overland contacted Tillers, a nonprofit organization, who conducts barn restorations. The Tillers expressed concern that that restoring a carriage barn in an urban setting would not align to their core mission. The commission welcomes a carriage barn raising during the Ypsilanti Heritage Festival. This would provide an opportunity to showcase both the history of Ypsilanti and the Tillers organization. Staff will contact the city attorney and building official for a meeting to determine appropriate uses of the escrow account.

114 Woodward – Carriage barn is deteriorating severely. HDC had sent notice to the owners, and owners had plans to fix up barn as a workshop. Since then, apparently, owners' plans have changed; now plan is to renovate basement into workshop and ignore barn. Staff will invite owners to attend an HDC meeting and discuss the status of the barn and possible routes for saving it.

310 N. Park – The Commission has noticed a surprising amount of earth moving on this site in the process of constructing a home addition and garage. Commissioner Schmiedeke spoke briefly with owner Marino, and received the impression that the plan was to raise the grade of the garage site by five feet before constructing the two-story garage that the Commission had approved. The Commission has several concerns with this: first, that the change in grade was not part of what was approved by HDC, and would change the relationship of the garage to the surrounding structures; second, that a zoning issue could have been created due to the change in height of the garage; third, that the quantity of fill involved could pose structural problems if the garage were built atop it; and, fourth, that the change in grade could adversely affect drainage patterns, both for the home on this lot and for surrounding structures. The plans that had received HDC and Zoning approval do not indicate any change between existing grade and finished grade, nor does this change appear to have been discussed in the minutes of the meeting at which the project was approved. Planner Murphy notes that the absolute height of the structure does not create a zoning issue; as the zoning measures height from the finish grade at the front of the structure, and not from the existing grade. Staff will follow up to determine the extent of any grade change, and with the Building Official regarding any foundation and drainage issues this might create.

FREIGHTHOUSE UPDATE

Commissioner Rupert reports that the beam work has passed the City Building inspection, and SHPO has released to the city their grant money for the Freighthouse. Friends of the Freighthouse will be able to use the café area during Heritage Festival, and will have a display of Ypsilanti memorabilia and industry, ranging from cornhuskers to corsets – women's undergarments were once Ypsilanti's single largest freight item by weight!

APPLICATION REVISION

Commissioner Schultz provided the latest draft of a revised HDC application, Frequently Asked Questions, and sample applications by e-mail. The Commission feels that these materials are for the most part complete. There is some discussion of how best to communicate the difference between Action Items and Study Items to applicants, and whether examples of "work proposed" and "materials" should be included on the application. Getting applicants to read supplemental material can be difficult; a cover sheet explaining the contents of the application and supplemental materials packet is suggested. Commissioner Schultz notes that the next task towards streamlining the HDC process for applicants will be to better organize and use the HDC portion of the City website.

PLANNING DIRECTOR

Ypsilanti's new Planning & Development Director, Karen Hart, is introduced to the Commission.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS - None

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes from the August 1, 2006 meeting.

Motion: Overland (Second: Rupert) moved to approve the minutes of the August 1, 2006 meeting as amended.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

Correction to minutes of February 21, 2006 meeting.

The Commission's minutes from February 21, 2006, incorrectly identified Tagrid Shunia as the owner of 119 N. Hamilton; Ms. Shunia came before the Commission not as an owner of the property but a potential buyer seeking information on the HDC process.

Motion: Overland (Second: Prebys) moved to issue a correction to the Historic District Commission's Minutes of February 21, 2006, to clarify that Tagrid Shunia was not the owner of 119 N. Hamilton, but a prospective buyer.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Prebys (Second: Rigdon) moved to adjourn the meeting.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:05 PM

Signature _____ Date _____