



MINUTES

City of Ypsilanti HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION Virtual Meeting

Tuesday, October 27, 2020
7:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chairperson Pettit Video/telephone usage instructions given for potential attendees
Meeting called to order at 7:02pm

Commissioners Present: Alex Pettit, Erika Lindsay, Amy Swift, James Chesnut

Commissioners Absent: Anne Stevenson, Ron Rupert

Staff Present: Scott Slagor, Preservation Planner
Nancy Hare-Dickerson, Commission Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Swift (second: Lindsay) moved to approve the agenda as submitted.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut
Nays: None
Absent: Commissioners Stevenson and Rupert
Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS—none

PUBLIC HEARING—none

OLD BUSINESS

24 N Huron

**Stone-faced concrete wall*

Applicant: Bessie Pappas, owner- present; Maria Pappas, owner's daughter – present, Donna Malski, contractor – present.

Discussion: Pettit: Indicated that applicants are here to discuss additional details on how modifications are going to be made to the wall, discussed at the September 22, 2020 commission meeting, in order to make it a potentially acceptable option for HDC approval.

Malski: Stated that a suggestion would be to make the bin blocks more historical looking or

aesthetically pleasing by placing the bin blocks equal distance from each other, possibly bring in another eight more and space them so that shrubs could be placed in between them and ivy could be planted and grow over the bin blocks. Stated that it would be visually aesthetically pleasing and would also serve the purpose of a barrier between the parking area and the alleyway.

Pettit: Stated that at the last meeting, there was discussion about adding stone facing to the concrete blocks. Stated that the Commission does not know what the comprehensive plan is. Stated that the Commission needs to see the whole plan laid out, and details.

Malski: Asked if the Commission is asking to see a sketch.

Pettit: Stated that the Commission would like to see a sketch of what the final finished product would look like, as well as specifications for the placement and design and a scale representation of all the components that will be involved in the wall. Indicated that ivy being mentioned, for example, that that would need to be specified. Indicated that having that information in a document is what is needed.

Malski: Acknowledged. Stated that as to the bin blocks, that there is no need for a below grade foundation wall. Stated that the blocks are designed to be used above grade without a foundation wall.

Pettit: Stated that the Commission does not really know what the final proposal is going to look like. Stated that, at one point, the blocks were going to be attached together in some fashion. Stated that it just is not clear. Stated that the Commission needs to see a site plan that shows where the blocks are going to go and what they are going to look like, all the materials that are going to be used and any other details that applicant feels would be helpful.

Malski: Acknowledged. Asked who the information would be presented to.

Pettit: Stated that the information would be presented to the Historic District Commission at a commission meeting.

Malski: Stated that another issue is that there was another load of the large concrete stone dropped last week in the alleyway.

Pettit: Asked if more of these blocks have been added to the site.

Malski: Stated that not the blocks but the concrete stones in the alleyway roadway.

M. Pappas: Indicated that the stones being referred to is something that was inappropriately placed in the alleyway but may not be something to be discussed with this commission.

[Further discussion regarding concrete stones in alleyway – staff to refer to Department of Public Services]

Pettit: Asked if there is any other information applicant has to present at this point.

Malski: Confirmed, no. Stated that she knows what is needed and that she will work to get that.

Swift: *[Initiated procedural discussion regarding HDC decision-making in reference to 60-day timeline]*

Swift/Chesnut: *[Reiterated previous discussion regarding information needed from applicants – clarifying discussion continued]*

Pettit: Asked if the only thing that is changing in the proposal is taking the existing blocks and dressing them with landscaping. Asked if the stone face is still incorporated in the proposal.

M. Pappas: Confirmed. Indicated that the stone face is still incorporated, as well as the landscaping. Stated that they are going to still improve the image of the blocks. Indicated that the Commission was previously given a proposal that was pretty detailed as to height, dimensions, etc. Stated that she is unclear as to why they are being asked again for those dimensions when they are in the proposal that was submitted.

Slagor: Clarified that staff and the Commission were under the impression, originally, that this was going to be a connected stone and that the blocks were going to be used as the base for a stone wall. Stated that that is what prompted the discussion about foundation.

Malski: Indicated that the shrubs would be green all year round to soften the concrete finish of the bin blocks.

Pettit: Stated that his understanding is that the blocks are not going to have a concrete finish.

Malski: Stated that they are concrete blocks. Stated that the purpose of the ivy was to not have to apply cultured stone to the face of the bin blocks.

Pettit: Indicated that there appears to be two different stories.

Malski: Stated that she was hoping that the ivy that was planted and the shrubs that were planted in between could be sufficient and not have to go to a more expensive resolution of applying the cultured stones.

Pettit: Indicated that if greenery is put over a concrete block, it is still a concrete block. Stated that that was not a proposal that commissioners seemed to be on board with.

[Commissioner thoughts/concerns regarding concrete block/greenery proposal]

Pettit: Stated that it puts the Commission in the position where the undressed concrete block with some added greenery does not seem like something that would be approved. Indicated that applicant is being given this information in order to put together a more complete proposal. Stated that, earlier in the year, the Commission had already denied the application and indicated that the blocks should be removed.

M. Pappas: Stated that she is still not clear on the details of what the Commission is asking *[outlined various examples]*.

Pettit: Stated... a completed drawing showing exactly where each block is going and how the treatment would look on each block -- more of a structural design drawing of how the block or whatever you are putting, looks in place, whatever you are hoping to encase it with, and whatever you are planning to put under it, however you are planning to put the block in place -- but each and every block shown -- how the whole wall will look in a drawing -- sort of an architectural rendering perhaps or a site plan showing "here is the above view", "here is where everything is going to go".

Lindsay: Stated... a site plan to scale, showing exact locations. And also showing an elevation, showing an actual view of what this will look like in place.

Swift: *[Discussed why having a site plan is important]*

Chesnut: *[Discussed why the elevation information in a site plan is important]*

Malski: *[Re-initiated discussion regarding English ivy proposal]*

Asked about the possible use of wood fence panels.

Pettit: Asked how and where it would be used.

Malski: Stated that it would be in lieu of bin blocks -- it could be used as a partition between the alleyway and parking area.

Pettit: Stated that the HDC had previously approved several fence-type options for the property. Indicated that it may be helpful if applicant would like to provide several options to whatever is being proposed, including looking at fencing.

[Procedural discussion]

Motion: Swift (second: Lindsay) moved to deny the proposed work at 24 N Huron, citing a lack of information on the foundation and structure of the proposed wall, including a site plan, elevation and other materiality information previously requested by the HDC.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#9 – Contemporary designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original material.

#10 – New work shall be removable.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Stevenson and Rupert

Motion carried.

303 N Summit

**New concrete steps*

Applicant: Scott Westover, YCUA representative - present

Discussion: Westover: Indicated that as a follow up to the September 22, 2020 HDC meeting discussion, he submitted additional information and details about how they plan to approach the stair replacement. Stated that the plan is to sawcut and put an expansion joint and sealant.

Pettit: Acknowledged receipt of submission.

Swift: *[Initiated brief discussion regarding the plan for removing the concrete away from the stones].*

Motion: Swift (second: Chesnut) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 303 Summit, as submitted in the application dated September 14, 2020, with the amendments presented on October 13, 2020 for the removal and replacement of concrete sidewalks and steps.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Stevenson and Rupert

Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

400 N River

**Application for new signs was moved to later in the agenda as the applicant was not present.*

10 S Huron

**New Windows.*

Applicant: Jeff Kuhns and Nancy Balogh, owners - present

Discussion: Pettit: Asked applicant to walk the Commission through what is proposed.

Kuhn: Indicated that the plan is to match the windows on the side and the two in the rear with the five windows across the front that were previously replaced.

Pettit: Asked if the plan is to put in windows that fit into the full brick opening *[reference photo materials]*.

Kuhn: Confirmed.

[Discussion as to condition of current windows/appropriateness of new window

replacement]

Motion: Chesnut (second: Lindsay) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 10 S Huron for the installation of five Pella Architect Series aluminum-clad wood windows as specified. New windows shall be full frame replacements and finished in a cranberry color to match those on the façade, and the sizing of the new windows are to fit the brick openings.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut
Nays: None
Absent: Commissioners Stevenson and Rupert
Motion carried.

303 E Forest

**Fence and Pergola*

Applicant: Adam and Elizabeth Forman, owners - present

Discussion: Pettit: Asked applicants if the application is for work already completed.

E. Forman: Confirmed.

Pettit: Asked applicant to walk the Commission through the application.

A. Forman: *[Provided background history of the home/background history and reasons for addition of pergola to rear of home].*

[Discussion as to questions regarding fence material/color/location, reference photo materials]

E. Forman: *[Requested the application be amended to include the deck below the pergola]*

Motion: Swift (second: Lindsay) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 303 E Forest as submitted in the application dated October 19, 2020, and amended this evening [10/27/2020] to include the deck; for installation of a wood privacy fence and pergola, with the condition that the structures are finished in a paint or opaque stain; and, in this case, for them to be complete in their finishing.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#9 – Contemporary Designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original material.

#10 – New work shall be removable.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut
Nays: None
Absent: Commissioners Stevenson and Rupert
Motion carried.

303 E Forest

**Sliding glass door.*

Applicant: Adam and Elizabeth Forman, owners - present

Discussion: Pettit: *[Reference photo materials]*... Indicated the need for a finish to be added to the wood trim piece.

A/E. Forman: Acknowledged.

A. Forman: Stated that they can paint that to match the house.

[Discussion as to wood trim color considerations]

Motion: Lindsay (second: Swift) moved to issue a Notice to Proceed for the work at 303 E Forest as submitted in the application dated October 19, 2020 for installation of a Pella wood-framed and aluminum-clad sliding glass door on the north elevation, with the condition that the door and surrounding trim be painted to match the rest of the house.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#9 – Contemporary Designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original material.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Stevenson and Rupert

Motion carried.

400 N River

**New signs.*

Applicant: Kevin Short, Johnson Sign Company - present

Discussion: Pettit: Asked if it is correct that all of the metal signage has been installed.

Short: Confirmed. Stated that all the signs have been installed.

Pettit: *[Reference photo materials]*... Asked if the diagonal one on the south side is the only one that is painted.

Short: Confirmed. Stated – directly painted on the brick.

Swift: Asked if the brick was already painted.

Short: Confirmed. Stated that the brick was already painted several times and then they just did an overlay -- reverse copy white, over it. Stated -- so the white was painted over the existing painted background wall.

Pettit: Asked if the only signage that included lighting are the two on the front façade *[reference*

photo materials].

Short: Confirmed. Stated that they have the gooseneck lighting for only the "Ypsilanti" and "Depot Town" signs, not for the "mash" or "Thompson & Co. restaurant & bar".

Lindsay: Asked if there was any plan to have the address listed.

Short: Confirmed, no. Stated that they did not do any lettering for the address.

Lindsay: *[Reference photo materials, page 37]*... Stated that that sign that can be seen, that lines up with one of the columns, seems to be attached with pipe strap and that it looks temporary.

Pettit: Indicated not having seen any documentation in the application for that particular sign.

Lindsay: Stated that that is a concern. Stated that she would want a guarantee that that sign would not be included in an approval to be permanent.

[Further discussion to clarify "address" sign location]

Lindsay: Indicated a concern that the "Thompson & Co." sign across the front, on the awning *[reference photo materials]*, looks like a really thin sign that is sort of tacked on. Indicated an opinion that it is not something that she would have approved. *[Further clarifying discussion]*

Pettit: Asked how the sign is attached – "mash" and "Thompson & Co. restaurant & bar".

Short: Indicated that the "Thompson & Co. restaurant & bar" sign is a quarter or half-inch thick panel with brackets for attachment.

Swift: Asked what the panel is made of.

Short: Stated -- a vinyl composite.

Lindsay: Indicated an opinion that it is not cohesive and is hard to see – that there is an overhang and then the sign is tacked on behind that. *[Further clarifying discussion continued]*

Motion: Chesnut (second: Swift) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 400 N River, as submitted in the application, dated September 30, 2020, for installation of two building-mounted signs and two awning-mounted signs on the façade; a painted wall sign and blade sign on the south elevation; and awning-mounted letters on the east elevation. The signs shall be installed per specifications submitted.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#5 – Preserve distinctive features.

#9 – Contemporary designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original materials

#10 – New work shall be removable

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Swift, Chesnut

Nays: Commissioner Lindsay
Absent: Commissioners Stevenson and Rupert
Motion carried.

410-412 Maple

**Amendment to earlier application (porch floor)*

Applicant: Michael Kozura, owner - present

Discussion: Pettit: Asked applicant to walk the Commission through what is planned.

Kozura: *[Provided information on issues which occurred while doing previously approved porch work]* Stated that they took the aluminum off *[reference photo materials]* and that the plan is to leave the aluminum off – that it looks more historic. Stated that it is a low enough level where railings will not be needed. Stated that they will keep the look on the bottom of that skirting but will slightly raise it approximately an inch off the ground using a galvanized mesh skirting for air breathing ability. Stated that they used a replacement rubberized roofing product to replace the one that was worn away on the top.

[Discussed details regarding porch decking repairs on the lower level due to water damage]

Motion: Chesnut (second: Swift) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the amended application at 410-412 Maple as submitted on October 20, 2020, for the added replacement of the porch floor with TimberTech Azek flooring in "Coastline" with a brushed finish.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#9 – Contemporary Designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original material.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut
Nays: None
Absent: Commissioners Stevenson and Rupert
Motion carried.

307 N River

**Mural and Extension.*

Applicant: Tom Gritter, project representative - present

Discussion: Pettit: Asked if the work has already been completed.

Gritter: Confirmed. Stated that there are two items. Stated that there is a mural that had already been completed. Stated that ownership of the building changed over last month. Indicated that the new owners are requesting an extension on some site improvements that were approved by the HDC at the beginning of the year to allow enough time for proper completion.

[Discussion regarding type of mural work that was previously approved by the HDC and current

Motion: Lindsay (second Chesnut) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 307 N River as submitted in the application dated October 19, 2020 for a colorful geometric mural painted on the already-painted concrete block portion of the building; and issue a six-month extension of the work approved on January 14, 2020.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#9 – Contemporary Designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original material.

#10 – New work shall be removable.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Stevenson and Rupert

Motion carried.

STUDY ITEMS

208 E Cross- Property owner Carrie Taylor discussed options for repairing unapproved siding.

322 E Cross- Property owner Joe Bertolotti discussed options for basement window replacement.

10s Block of N Huron- Elizabeth Nightingale of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) discussed pollution remediation systems in the 10s block of N Huron. The EPA program is exempt from local permitting processes.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

Motion: Lindsay (second: Chesnut) moved to approve the administrative approvals for the following:

1. 234 W Michigan Deck
2. 106 S Huron Roof
3. 114 S Huron Roof
4. 302 S Washington Paint
5. 417 N Adams Roof
6. 112 W Michigan Paint
7. 309 W Cross Paint
8. 300 N Washington Roof
9. 406 N Hamilton Gutters

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Stevenson and Rupert

Motion carried.

OTHER APPROVALS

527 N Huron- Staff provided the letter showing approval of 527 N Huron, which was approved by default due to the Commission not reaching a decision within 60 days of the application.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Resolution to support CLG Funding for Starkweather Chapel window restoration.

Motion: Pettit (second: Chesnut) moved to accept the Resolution to support CLG Funding for Starkweather Chapel window restoration.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Stevenson and Rupert

Motion carried.

2. Property Monitoring- none

3. Commissioner Comments- none

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS -none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of September 22, 2020

Motion: Chesnut (second: Swift) moved to approve the minutes of September 22, 2020, as submitted.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Stevenson and Rupert

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Pettit adjourned the meeting, citing the end of the agenda with no further items to discuss.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 11:10 p.m.

Full Minutes Prepared By: Nancy Hare-Dickerson