



MINUTES

City of Ypsilanti
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING
Ypsilanti Historical Society – 220 N Huron Street
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Tuesday, January 14, 2020
7:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Alex Pettit Interim Chair 7:01 PM

Commissioners Present: Alex Pettit, Anne Stevenson, Hank Prebys, Erika Lindsay, Ron Rupert, Amy Swift, James Chestnut

Commissioners Absent: None

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Slagor: Staff requested to add 428 N Hamilton as a study item and to move 629 N River to the end of the agenda, as the applicants would not be in attendance.

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) moved to approve the agenda as amended.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS- none

PUBLIC HEARING—none

OLD BUSINESS—none

NEW BUSINESS

307 N River

**The application for site plan with multiple features was moved to the end of the agenda as the applicant was not present.*

318 Maple

**Window replacements.*

Applicant: Judy Weinburger, owner- present.

Discussion: Pettit: Indicated that the application is for window replacements. Asked applicant to walk the Commission through what is being proposed.

Weinburger: Stated that it is an historic home but that the rear addition is a newer part. Indicated that the plan is to replace three wood windows – two on the back and one on the side, all on the upper story, due to deterioration beyond the point of repair.

Pettit: Asked if the existing windows are a one-awning-over-another-awning type window.

Weinburger: Confirmed.

Prebys: Asked about the replacement process.

Weinburger: Indicated that the proposal is for double hung windows rather than casement. Stated that the replacement windows would be the same size and appearance as the existing.

Swift: Asked if the original windows are one-over-one.

Weinburger: Confirmed.

Swift: Asked about window details.

Weinburger: Stated that it is a Marvin wood window, encased in aluminum, in white.

Swift: *[Summarized the discussion]*

Motion: Swift (second: Prebys) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 318 Maple, as submitted in the application dated January 3, 2020, for the replacement of three awning-style windows on the rear second story enclosed porch. The new windows shall be full-frame replacements with Marvin Elevate one-over-one double-hung aluminum-clad wood sashes.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

400 N River

**Solar carport installation.*

Applicant: Dick Mitchell, project architect –present.

Discussion: Mitchell: Stated that the plan is to install a solar panel array on the east edge of the parking lot that is east of the Thompson Block. Stated that its western-most edge is about forty-eight feet from the building. Stated that it is twenty-four feet in an east-west direction and about seventy-eight feet in a north-south direction. Stated that there are five equally spaced columns in the structure panel cantilevers *[reference handout materials]*. Stated that in each column, there is a

truss that spans east-west [*reference handout materials*] and then, from that truss, going north-south, are purlins. Stated that the purlins are where the solar panel array will sit. Stated that there would be four rows of twenty-four panels, equaling a total of ninety-six, to sit on top of the frame. Stated that materials for the frame will consist of concrete footing, galvanized steel column truss; regarding the purlins – the panels are aluminum framed, in black. Stated that the east edge of the carport is landscaped with a mix of Red Twig Dogwood that is approximately thirty inches going in, that get up to eight feet and a species of Yews about thirty inches going in, that get up to twelve feet.

[Further discussion as to plantings and their location]

Pettit: Asked about the pitch of the roof.

Mitchell: Stated that the high point is on the west; low point on the east.

[Discussion as to roof water collection/run off considerations]

[Discussion as to solar array carport installation considerations in the Historic District]

[Discussion as to lighting - working within City requirements]

Pettit: Indicated that applicant should come in and have a discussion with the HDC if the need arises to add more lighting.

Motion: Rupert (second: Stevenson) moved to approve and issue a certificate of appropriateness for the work at 400 N River, as submitted in the application, dated January 6, 2020, for installation of a solar paneled carport. The carport is to be built to specifications including a structure of galvanized steel and solar panels framed in aluminum.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#3 – Do not imitate earlier styles.

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

#10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

218 (209) Washtenaw

**Parking lot signage.*

Applicant: Robert Moses, property representative –present.

Discussion: Moses: Stated that the request is for the approval of two parking signs that were erected without knowledge that prior HDC approval was needed. Stated that the sign on the northeast corner of Adams and Washtenaw that faces the church was already in existence and needed refurbishment. Stated that a new sign with better framing and more historical looking bracing was installed. Stated that the original four-by-fours were used [*reference photos*]. Stated that the second sign [*reference photos*] was installed on the south side of the parking lot entrance. Stated that the sign on Washtenaw is single sided and that the sign on Adams is dual sided with the same message on both sides. Stated that both signs are set back the same ten feet distance

from the street. Stated that the signs are painted with exterior bright white Glidden paint, with pressure treated wood throughout. Stated that the signs themselves are a metal clad plastic.

Swift: Asked what is meant by "metal clad plastic".

Moses: Stated that it is a very thin metal on the outside with a core that is mainly plastic. Stated that it is not bendable and is about an eighth of an inch thick. Indicated that the sign can be pulled out and replaced without removing the installation.

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) moved to issue a Notice to Proceed for the work already completed at the North Adams Lot (218 Washtenaw), as submitted in the application dated January 6, 2020, for installation of two new signs, as constructed.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

#10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

307 N River

**Site Plan with multiple features. Applicant amended the application at the meeting to only include: Site plan details, landscaping, lighting, fencing, and the dumpster enclosure. The ramp, three-season porch and mural/paint were removed to be discussed at a later meeting.*

Applicant: Ryan Wallace, owner- present.

Discussion: Pettit: Asked applicant to walk through the site plan for the Commission, starting with the three-season porch.

Wallace: *[Discussed previous work done by Marygrove Awning]* Stated that it is problematic for Cultivate when it rains, so they are trying to provide a spot that is covered during questionable weather.

Pettit: Asked if the louvered system would work in keeping the rain out.

Wallace: Confirmed. Stated that it has a gutter system built into it, is all steel and closes completely off but that it is very expensive and would be more of a second choice. Stated that "the commercial awning that they do for everybody else at this point is probably our first option".

[Discussion continued referencing packet materials]

Prebys: Asked if it is transparent flexible plastic as opposed to solid.

Wallace: Confirmed.

Pettit: Asked if it would be entirely transparent.

Wallace: Stated, no. Stated that it would be very similar to this *[reference materials]*.

Swift: Asked - so instead of it being in the rear where you currently have some covered areas, it is going to be added out to the side.

Wallace: Confirmed. *[Discussed City considerations reference a parking lot build and resulting actions]* Stated that the garden will end up being about thirty-five percent larger and will allow different sections to be used in diverse ways.

[Reference overhead photo of front of building, discussion as to how the proposed plans may affect the façade appearance]

Wallace: Stated that the overhang aligns with the building. Stated that if you look at the building, it is kind of flat and then it goes up, but the overhang stops. Stated that the tall part of the garage would go up and the overhang does not go into that piece.

Pettit: Asked if there is any pitch at all to the roof of the structure.

Wallace: Stated that it is louvered now but that the other one does pitch down towards the road *[reference photo]*.

[Reference overhead photo of front of building, discussion continued as to how the proposed plans may affect the façade appearance]

Pettit: Asked - so you are going to tear up everything that is not under the awning. Asked - if it is asphalt and it is not under the awning, it is coming up.

Wallace: Confirmed.

Stevenson: Asked about the plan for the smaller garage door.

Wallace: Stated the goal is to put a glass-to-go window in there. *[Discussed reasoning]*

Stevenson: Asked if the plan is to change that opening *[reference photo]* and take the door out.

Wallace: Confirmed.

Stevenson: Asked if the plan would be to close the wall or to do something else.

Wallace: Stated that the goal would be that the small door would not be a door anymore. Stated that the big one will stay as is. Stated that with the small door, it would be great to do like little windows that you can either open or you can just pull up like glass.

Prebys: Asked if that is proposed for the current application.

Wallace: Stated that that is for discussion down the road.

Stevenson: Stated that the reasoning for pointing it out is because, for this building, its historic features include the two garage doors. *[Discussed background of prior use of the building]* Stated that covering up these historic features is a concern. Stated that you could consider the awning as a structure that could be removed but that there would be detracting from the historic feature on that side *[reference photo]*. Stated that the concern is what might be done about the door over time.

Swift: Asked if the building is a contributing building to the District.

Stevenson: Stated that if you look at the significance of time within the District, it is not; however, the survey was done a long time ago. Stated that, in her opinion, every building should be looked at as contributing to the District.

[Discussion continued as to the history of the structure and historic considerations]

Pettit: Stated that since it is such a huge addition, it really changes the way both facades really look. Stated that that is part of what the Commission considers as we go through it.

[Discussion continued as to façade appearance considerations]

[Discussion as to the need and benefit to the Commission of having more detailed information from applicant as to what is planned for the two elevations - visuals, materials, options, drawings, rendering of what it would look like, etc.]

Slagor: *[Explained the timeline with the City for Cultivate to come into compliance with the site plan as to parking and the dumpster enclosure]*
[Procedural discussion ensued]

Pettit: Suggested going through the various other items. Asked about the location of the deck.

Wallace: Stated that the deck is right out front where the Coffee & Tap House sign is *[reference materials]*.

Pettit: Asked if it is a cedar plank deck, eight feet deep.

Wallace: Confirmed.

Swift: Asked if there is railing.

Wallace: Stated that it is open, a platform.

Pettit: Indicated that a stain is specified.

Wallace: Stated that the plan is for four tables with umbrellas.

Chestnut: Asked if the intent is for the deck skirting to coordinate with the adjacent awning.

Wallace: Stated that it was to be a separate little offset. Stated that it is not covered.

Rupert: Asked about the height.

Wallace: Stated that the deck out front matches the wood work that has been done on the property.

Prebys: Indicated that the proposed request is for a cedar plank deck, eight feet deep, extending the length of the elevation.

Rupert: Asked if you are going to be able to see underneath it.

Wallace: Stated, no. Stated that it would be skirted – just solid.

Swift: Stated – just solid wood to match the top. Asked if the height dimension would be fine for Code.

Wallace: Confirmed.

Rupert: Stated that if it is over eighteen inches, there has to be a railing.

Pettit: Indicated that moving on to fences, the application shows it is two fences -- that there is the black steel fencing that includes the beer garden; circles the building north-east-west, partially extending on the south, just inside the hedge *[reference materials]*.

Wallace: Indicated that the current plan came from adjustments made from the past discussion with the Commission as a study item. Stated the goal is that no matter where you are driving from, you can see the building.

[Clarifying discussion ensued as to fencing]

Pettit: Indicated that, per the application, as you work your way into the property, it becomes a six-foot cedar fence.

Wallace: Confirmed. Stated – for the parking.

[Clarifying discussion continued as to fencing]

Pettit: Stated that as to the dumpster enclosure proposed, that corner there *[reference photos]*, there is concrete block, wood slat gates, galvanized posts, metal coping.

Lindsay: Asked about the distance of the dumpster in relation to the building.

[Clarifying discussion ensued as to dumpster enclosure]

Pettit: Summarized that the application shows the current sign on the north to be moved to replace the one on the east elevation.

[No commissioner questions regarding the sign]

Pettit: Indicated that as to the lighting proposed, lighting is going out into the parking lot; there are metal poles; there are light fixtures.

Prebys: Indicated that staff notes show that fixtures meet the Lighting Fact Sheet.

[Discussion ensued as to lighting]

Slagor: Indicated that per discussion with applicant, applicant agreed to comply with a lower color temperature per the HDC Lighting Fact Sheet guidelines.

Pettit: Indicated that moving on to exterior repainting, the application lists the concrete block area to be painted. Asked if that is the only section being painted and not the brick area.

Wallace: Confirmed. Stated that the brick is staying the same.

Rupert: Asked if there is a plan to paint the cinder block walls on the dumpster site.

Wallace: Confirmed. Stated that the plan is to paint it brown.

Pettit: Indicated that the application lists a proposed black and white floral mural on the concrete block section of the mural. Asked what the mural will look like.

Wallace: Stated that he has a "very fast sketch and it is not ideal". Stated that he could have left it off the plan for now.

Prebys: Suggested leaving it off the plan for now until an actual representation can be reviewed.

[Discussed the type of information/specification details/materials that would be helpful for the Commission to have to review for the mural and new rear ramp/handrail]

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 307 N River as presented in the application dated December 19, 2019; with the exception of the three-season porch, repainting the exterior, the mural, the ramp and rail at the rear of the building, [amended at the January 14, 2020 meeting at applicant's request]. The approval includes the remaining exterior work as submitted in the site plan and the staining of any wood, including the fence and deck, in Sierra 700 Opaque. Approval is conditioned on the light fixtures having a temperature of 3000k or less.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

STUDY ITEMS

302 E Cross

**The Demolition by Neglect Timeline for Repair – windows, foundation and siding update was moved to the end of the agenda as the owner was not present.*

428 N Hamilton

**Potential addition.*

Applicant: Jason Tallant, owner - present.

Discussion: Tallant: Stated that there are two proposals. Option one *[referencing handout material]* - stated that this is the front of the house; this is the second story with a dormer that goes from south to north – livable space. Stated that this on the front is attic storage space that is not functional living space here on the second story. Stated that the ceiling is about six foot tall here. Stated that this elevation here does not match the top; that it is about a foot and a half to two feet lower. Stated that the proposal would be the potential of raising the elevation of the roofline to turn this into a bedroom in the front that comes out over the existing downstairs bedroom and front porch and then, in doing so, additionally raising this roof slightly.

Stated that option two would be not raising this at all *[referencing handout material]*. Stated that, currently, the dormer on the back has a very shallow pitch roof and at the far east end that is the back of the house, the ceiling is only six feet. Stated that the ceiling could not be extended out with the current elevation of the roof. Stated that the elevation of the roof would need to come up so that that could be extended out towards the back of the house so that the dormer could be extended out off the back of the house preserving the front but extending the roof line up so that this comes across here *[referencing handout material]*.

[Commission reviewed and discussed handout material and proposed options with applicant]

[Discussion as to height considerations; character of the neighborhood]

[Commission consensus to consider Option Two with detailed specifications, etc.]

NEW BUSINESS

**Returned to New Business*

629 N River

**Shed and fence.*

Applicant: Elizabeth McCall, owner – not present.

Discussion: Pettit: Summarized that the application lists a fence section and an addition of a shed.

[Commission reviewed and discussed reference materials]

[Procedural discussion]

Motion: Stevenson (second: Rupert) moved to issue a Notice to Proceed for the work already completed at 629 N River, as submitted in the application dated January 3, 2020, for installation of a 3' tall black metal fence parallel to the north property boundary, and a metal clad-garden shed, per the photographs submitted.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

#10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Windows Fact Sheet Update

[Commission to review the fact sheet and discuss proposed updates at the next meeting]

STUDY ITEMS

**Returned to Study Items*

302 E Cross

**Demolition by Neglect Timeline for Repair – windows, foundation and siding update.*

Applicant: Max Ziebarth, owner – not present.

Discussion: Pettit: Indicated that applicant was required to appear to discuss timeline updates with the Commission. Stated that applicant is not present and that follow up is necessary.

Slagor: Staff indicated that he contacted the applicant last week. Stated that applicant has not responded. Indicated that staff will follow up with applicant.

[Procedural discussion ensued]

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS- none

OTHER BUSINESS

**Returned to Other Business*

2. 2019 HDC Annual Report – for Council

[Review and discussion]

Motion: Stevenson (second Swift) moved to approve and adopt the 2019 Annual Report for the Historic District Commission as submitted.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carried.

3. 2019 HDC Annual CLG Report – for State Historic Preservation Office

[Review and discussion]

Motion: Stevenson (second Swift) moved to approve and adopt the 2019 Annual CLG Report that will be submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carried.

4. Section 106 Consulting Party – 301 N Hamilton and 401 N Adams Update

Slagor: Staff updated the Commission, reference materials provided in the packet. Staff confirmed reiterating Commission’s concern about how the structure will affect the integrity of the setting in the Historic District and its contributing resources; and reiterated that the HDC would like to see it and that a permit is required for installation.

[Discussion of packet materials]

5. Property Monitoring

Commissioner comments/query/discussion as to property monitoring.

6. Commissioner Comments

Commissioners, who wished, shared additional thoughts/comments.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS- none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

1. Approval of the minutes of December 10, 2019

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) moved to approve the minutes of December 10, 2019 as submitted.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

MEETING ADJOURNED at 9:39 p.m.

Full Minutes Prepared By: Nancy Hare-Dickerson