



Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

### **219 N. Huron, Action Item**

Applicant: David Deyo, owner (present)

Discussion: Application is for the replacement of damaged storm windows. The application was tabled at the previous meeting pending more information on the dimensions of the windows, as well as the number and location of the new storm windows. Mr. Deyo reports that all of the storms (30 windows total) will be replaced. The storm will be the same dimension as the current ones, and will fit inside the wood frames that currently hold the windows. The new storms are double-hung, and operable from inside. The current storms are unfinished aluminum, the new storms will be brown (sample in file) to match the existing sashes. Commissioner Schultz asks how the current storms are attached. Mr. Deyo states that the current storms on the front porch are attached to the window frame; all others are fixed inside the trim. The new storms are similar in design to the existing.

Motion: Schultz (second: Prebys) moves approval of the work permit application for 219 N. Huron to replace all of the existing aluminum storm with new aluminum storm windows made by Impressions Storm Doors and Windows from Grand Rapids (as indicated on brochure dated 2/12/08). Storms are to be inset, mounted within the existing frame, not face mounted. The two windows on the front of the building will be face mounted. The new windows are to be mounted with no destruction or loss of historical material. There shall be no reduction in surface area of glass. Finish to be factory applied brown finish similar to sample provided with application.

Secretary of Interior Standards cited: #5 – Preserve distinctive features, #10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

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

Applicant: Don Schnettler, owner (present)

Discussion: Application is for the replacement of the front porch stairs and handrails. Some work has been previously done, but not completed. Mr. Schnettler states that he received a call one night from his tenant living on the property, saying that the previous stairs were falling down. Within the next day, he had to tear them down because they were rotten and create a fix which at least allowed the tenants to enter and exit the house from the front. He also stated that he did not realize that there were specifications in the guidelines for the Historic District. He bought decorative rails for the porch, which still need to be installed. What is currently there are 2x4s. Mr. Schnettler stated that he did not want to do more work without checking with the Commission first. The house is a nine bedroom unit, and Mr. Schnettler states that he often sees people leaning or sitting on the railings on the steps, therefore he would like to make the railings as sturdy as possible. He states that he does not want the railings to look the way that they had looked previously, and would like the stair railings to conform to the porch railing. The porch steps are 8 feet wide and Commissioner Rigdon informs Mr. Schnettler that he will be required by code to have a center rail (steps as wide as 6' need to have a center rail

– commercial requirement due to the fact that it is a rental house.). The rail could attach to the deck of the porch and attach either on the bottom step or the concrete. Commissioner Rupert suggests pipe rail for all three railings, which would be less expensive than an entirely new railing system. Inconspicuous pipe rails would allow the house to retain its historic appearance. The original house likely did not have hand rails on the steps. Commissioner Schultz addresses Mr. Schnettler’s concern about the strength of the pipe rail by suggesting that he sink the bottom of the rail into the cement, and that he should attach the top to the structure below the deck of the porch. Commissioner Rupert suggests that Mr. Schnettler could use a T-joint to attach the pipe rail to the existing stone columns, which flank the steps on either side, for greater lateral strength. Commissioner Rigdon states that aside from needing a graspable hand rail at 36”, he also needs to have a guard rail at 42”, according to building code. She also informs Mr. Schnettler that the sides of the steps need to be enclosed with framed lattice or a solid material.

Motion: Rigdon (second: Prebys) moves approval of the application for the work at 215 N. Hamilton, which involves reconstructing a wooden stair on the front porch. The stair requires wooden skirting on the ends, either solid or lattice, which must be framed. Also, hand rails must be installed. The Commission is approving metal pipe rails on either side and also down the center of the stairs. A graspable handrail at 36” and a guard at 42” can all be part of the same piece of piping. The pipe rails shall be painted either green or black. The stair itself will be painted to match the vertical surfaces of the porch (green). The handrails at the porch can attach to the masonry columns, and at the base, directly in front of the bottom step with concrete by whatever method is needed for installation.

Secretary of Interior Standards cited: #5 – Preserve distinctive features, #10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

### **306 W. Cross, Action Item**

Applicant: Doug Wilson, owner (not present)

Discussion: Application is for windows that have already been installed. Owner appeared before the Commission previously as a study item. Current application is for the work as completed with the exception of the painting to match the building trim. Application indicates that the exposed wood from the installation of the window (facing east) would be painted taupe, to match the building. The trim would remain white.

Motion: Rigdon (Second: Penet) moves to approve the application for the work at 306 W. Cross for painting of window trim and installation of sliding vinyl windows. This decision shall not set a precedent.

Secretary of Interior Standards cited: #10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Action carried.

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

Applicant: Ron Rupert, Home Services, LTD (present)

Discussion: Application is for the repair of the area where a truck collided with the house. The replacement of foundation in the impact area has already been completed with matching materials. Also on the application is the replacement of vinyl siding on the south side or removal of all siding and replacement with composite board and paint to match. The vinyl currently on the house is no longer manufactured. Commissioner Rupert informed the insurance agency on Thursday of last week that any work must be approved by the Historic District Commission. Staff also sent a letter to the insurance company informing them that the house is historic and the guidelines of the Commission must be followed in the repair work. The letter to the insurance company states that because the original materials are no longer available, Hardiplank or a similar composite board must be used. This proposal was approved by the insurance company. The goal of the insurance company is to return the house to its condition before the accident, in order to maintain curb appeal. The composite board will be installed with the smooth side out, on the east and south side of the house, and will be painted to match existing.

Motion: Rigdon (Second: Prebys) moves approval of the proposed work at 320 S. Huron, which includes repairs due to automotive impact. Work will include replacing the impact area of the block foundation with the same style of concrete masonry blocks, removal of all siding on south and east side and replacing it with composite board, and painting to match existing colors. The composite board will be installed smooth side out, and there will be a 4 inch reveal. Also included in the proposed work is the replacement of two double-hung wood sash windows identical in size and material to those damaged.

Secretary of Interior Standards cited: #5 – Preserve distinctive features, #10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Rupert abstained. Action carried.

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

Applicant: Stewart Beal, Historic Equities Fund / JC Beal Construction, Inc. (present)

Discussion: Application is for the exterior rehabilitation of the building. Commissioner Prebys asks about the below grade windows. Mr. Beal states that they will be filled in with plywood, for now, until that portion of the building is rented. The ideal situation would be to have glass to allow light into the basement, but there is currently no tenant for the space. Commissioner Rigdon notes that the east elevation (the rear) is proposed to have a large amount of brick infill of doorways and windows, which will need to retain their original openings. She then asks about materials to be used for repairs and tuck-pointing. Mr. Beal states that the work will be done in accordance with the Historic District Commission Masonry Fact Sheet. Commissioner Rupert asks about the materials to be used for the proposed addition. Mr. Beal states that the addition is similar to that of the Kresge Building and will use the same materials (corrugated steel and masonry). Commissioner Rigdon points out that the design of the addition is contemporary without clashing with the historic area around it. She asks about the new windows. Mr. Beal states that the new windows will be identical to those that are currently in the building, with the exception of the fact that the new windows will be double glazed (the previous were single glazed). The upper sash of the window will be fixed, the lower sash will be moveable. The

upper sashes will be restored, the lower will be replaced. Commissioner Prebys asks about paint color. Mr. Beal states that paint color has not yet been decided, but will be complementary to the Depot Town area. He thinks that it will be red, but is not sure yet. He will apply for the color before it is applied to the building. Commissioner Rigdon asks about the wooden brackets along the cornice. Mr. Beal states that the cornice shown in the plans is ideal and whether or not it is installed depends on the budget (the new cornice would be fiberglass). The fire escape is being removed, as it is no longer required by code, and it is no longer structurally sound. Commissioner Rupert states that in the plans, the bay window on the front of the building appears to be different from the original window. Mr. Beal states that the original window will be removed and replaced with an identical bay window. Commissioner Schmiedeke states that there is no paneling indicated (in the plans) below the storefront windows. Mr. Beal states that the treatment will be similar to that at 208 W. Michigan, with a painted panel below the window. The storefront will be painted differently than the rest of the building. Commissioner Rigdon reviews the decks that will be installed on the rear of the building, and states that there needs to be a 4" gap required between the balustrade and the deck. Commissioner Schmiedeke asks if there will be lighting installed on the rear of the building. Mr. Beal states that the City owns the alley behind the building, and asks staff if it is required that they light the alley, even though it does not belong to them. Staff states that the owner is not required to light the alley. Commissioner Schultz states that the three doors on the rear of the building will need to have lighting installed. Mr. Beal states that one of the doors shown is a rear egress of the building and will need lighting, as well. Commissioner Prebys asks about signage for the storefronts. Mr. Beal states that it is stipulated in the leases that the business owners will apply to the Commission for their signage. Commissioner Prebys states that there does not appear to be sufficient space for signs to be installed above the windows, and suggests projecting signs attached to the brick piers between storefronts. There is to be a wooden screening fence along the north property line, required because the addition will be closer than 25' to the property line.

Motion: Rigdon (Second: Prebys) moves approval of the proposed work at 400 N. River Street, to include repair and restoration of exterior masonry per the Historic District's Masonry Fact Sheet. Also included is infill of existing door and window openings as indicated on the drawings from JC Beal Construction 2/4/08 (all references to drawings will refer to this set). The infill of these openings will retain the existing openings and can be of modern materials. Also installation of new windows on levels 2 and 3 - the windows will be replaced at the lower sash and repaired at the upper sash. The upper sash will be fixed. The replaced windows will be replaced in kind regarding materials, size, and style to the existing windows. The addition and materials are approved, as well as the gooseneck lighting above the storefronts.

The masonry parapet wall must be capped to prevent water infiltration.

The fire escape will be demolished.

The current bay window on the west façade will be recreated in kind (size, material, and style). The window styles are shown on a drawing labeled "alternating third floor windows" dated 2/7/2008.

There will also be 5 rear decks constructed of composite lumber and a pressure treated wood structure, which will be designed as per the Porch Fact Sheet, and will have a 4" gap between the bottom rail and the deck.

There shall be a metal hand rail at the sidewalk steps, the design of which is to be presented at a later date.

There is the potential to install a fiberglass and wood cornice system, which will be addressed at a later time. Also being addressed at a later time is utility lighting for the back doors, signage (which will be proposed by the tenants), design for the wood screening fence on the north property line, and paint colors.

Secretary of Interior Standards cited: #3 – Do not imitate earlier styles; #4 – Preserve significant changes acquired over time; #5 – Preserve distinctive features; #6 – Repair, don't replace; #10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Rupert abstained. Action carried.

## STUDY ITEMS

### 220 N. Huron

Applicant: Jerry Jennings, Ypsilanti Historical Society (present)  
Alvin Rudisill, Ypsilanti Historical Society (present)

Discussion: Two applications were submitted for study: the first is for the installation of lighting near the parking lot, and the second is for the construction of a shed. Lighting is being requested for safety and security reasons, as the ramp on the south side of the building is not adequately illuminated, nor is the rear portion of the parking lot. There is currently a light at the side door which does not light the steps, ramp, or parking lot. Two different lights are being proposed. One is a pole light at the end of the ramp, shining toward the ramp and the parking lot. An alternative is to install a light on the rear of the building itself. There is a significant difference in cost (attachment to the building is less expensive). Commissioner Prebys asks about the distance that the light will shine, and whether or not it will affect the neighbors. A pole light would be directed toward the street, and a light attached to the building would shine more toward the neighbor's house. Commissioner Prebys also asks if the applicants had looked into something that could be installed closer to the ground to illuminate the ramp. Commissioner Rigdon asked if Mr. Jennings and Mr. Rudisill had consulted a professional as to the various lighting options. They stated that the Museum has an electrician who performs all of the work on site. She also asks about zoning codes and how far the light can be thrown over the property line. Staff reports that any fixture cannot be seen from the property line in order to eliminate glare into the neighboring windows. Commissioner Rigdon recommends that Mr. Jennings or Mr. Rudisill contact DTE (specifically Thomas Balog), and gives them the contact information. She states that DTE has a consulting department and could be able to help the applicants decide what would be most efficient and useful for their purpose. Commissioner Penet suggests bollard lights, as they do not generate high amounts of light, but would be sufficient for what the Museum needs and fit the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Rudisill states that they have not proposed anything along the parking lot because they still do not know what will happen with the previously proposed expansion of the lot. The Commissioners agree that the best time to put lights along the edge of the lot, should this be the decision, would be during the expansion of the lot. Commissioner Schmiedeke states that options include two fixtures (one for the ramp and one for the parking lot), a double headed light, or bollards (which would be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood).

An accessory structure is proposed (Lowe's "Gentry" 10x9x8 model) for storage of lawn mower, etc. Proposed location of the new shed is at the end of the parking lot, near the ramp. The shed proposed is acceptable to the Commission. Commissioner Schmiedeke suggests that it not be painted beige, but instead a darker color to blend in with its surroundings. Commissioner Rigdon suggests that it be painted all one color, rather than painting the trim a different color. It needs to be kept simple and dark. Roof shingles need not match those of the Museum structure.

Mr. Rudisill asks about the distinct line that is required by the Planning Department 6 feet out from the house, which divides the shrub bed from the lawn. He asks if there

needs to be edging, and if so, what type is necessary. Staff will research this and contact Mr. Rudisill.

### **300 W. Forest**

Applicant: Carl Heuter, architect (not present)

Discussion: Applicant will be attending the next meeting as an action item. He would like to discuss window replacement. On the west side of the elementary classroom building, he proposes the construction of a small concrete loading dock and entrance into the building. There is a new parking lot proposed behind the building in the mid-block green space, as well as some lighting fixtures and landscaping. Also proposed is a vehicle entrance from Jarvis.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

**Administrative Approvals - None**

### **Property Monitoring**

**211-217 Arcade** - Staff was given a cut sheet by the owners. The doors on the cut sheet did not match what staff was empowered by the HDC to approve.

**117 S. Huron** – A fire damaged the building over the weekend. The rear portions of the building are completely gone and the main front portion is gutted and the roof is gone. Staff anticipates an application to demolish the remains of the building in the next few weeks. Investigation into the cause is still underway. According to the fire chief, there is nothing salvageable left of the building. Staff does not yet know what the intentions of the Legion are.

**100 E. Cross - Auto Museum** – May have a site plan in as soon as Wednesday of next week.

**218 Ferris** – Another citation has been issued.

**109 Maple** – A new shed has been constructed on the property without approval from the Historic District Commission or a building permit.

### **Action Minutes**

The Open Meetings Act requires that minutes be available for the public no more than 8 days following a given meeting. It has been suggested by the Planning Director that Action Minutes be posted on the website if there is ever a time that the HDC minutes are not available within 8 days. Action Minutes are essentially the agenda with the Commission's decisions for each topic (no dialogue).

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

## **HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS**

**Approval of the minutes from January 22, 2008 meeting.**

Motion: Rupert (Second: Rigdon) moves to approve the minutes as submitted.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

**MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:45 PM**