

**CITY OF YPSILANTI**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**MINUTES OF APRIL 23, 2019**

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Mike Davis, Jr.                      Chair    7:03 PM

Meeting Location:                      Ypsilanti City Hall, 1 S Huron St, Ypsilanti, MI 48197

Commissioners Present:                      Mike Davis, Jr., Hank Prebys, Alex Pettit, Erika Lindsay, Jane Schmiedeke

Commissioners Absent:                      Ron Rupert, Anne Stevenson

Staff Present:                              Scott Slagor, Preservation Planner

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Discussion:    Staff added three study items to the agenda: 213 Pearl, 112 S Washington, and 206-210 N Washington.

Motion:            Prebys (second: Schmiedke) moved to approve the agenda as submitted.

Approval:        Unanimous. Motion carried.

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS**—none

**PUBLIC HEARING**—none

**OLD BUSINESS** - None

**NEW BUSINESS**

**224 N River**

*\*Window replacement.*

Applicant: Judy Weinburger, owner -present.

Discussion:    Weinburger: Two requests, a new roof and window replacements. Stated that the house was erected in 1999. Window replacement will be duplicating what is there currently [in kind replacement]. Current windows have cedar trim and has become infested with carpenter bees that attract woodpeckers.

Would like to replace trees with a fiber cement board type of material. Will come back with a request for paint color review.

Davis: Asked to clarify the color of the window sash/trim

Weinburger: Stated that they would be the same or a darker color, but that she will be coming in with a separate paint application.

Motion: Prebys (second: Schmiedke) Move to issue a certificate of appropriateness for the work at 224 N River as submitted in the application dated April 10, 2019 for removal of the existing windows and replacement with Integrity Wood-Ultrex double-hung windows that match the size and specifications of the original windows.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:  
#9 – Contemporary designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original materials.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried

### **330 E Forest**

*\*Repaint.*

Applicant: Elizabeth Perry, owner- present.

Discussion: Perry: Porch work and window replacements have been approved and now would like to repaint the house.

Slagor: Provided the original paint samples attached to the application.

Motion: Lindsay (second: Prebys) Move to issue a certificate of appropriateness for the work at 330 E Forest as submitted in the application dated April 15, 2019 for repainting the exterior of the house and garage. The surfaces shall be prepared with hand scraping and sanding; no power washing. New paint colors shall include a base of Hale Blue; trim and porch details of Edgecomb Gray; and sashes and porch skirting in Tudor Brown.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:  
#7- Clean building gently.  
#10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried

### **330 E Forest**

*\*Replacement of porch stairs.*

Applicant: Elizabeth Perry, owner- present

Discussion: Perry: Porch was recently redone which revealed the stairs had deteriorated. Additionally, the stairs tilt backward, causing much ice in the winter.

*[Discussion: appearance of new porch stairs, stringers, risers, tread, etc.]*

Motion: Prebys (second: Pettit) Move to issue a certificate of appropriateness for the work at 330 E Forest as submitted in the application dated April 15, 2019 for removal of the concrete porch stairs and wing walls and installation of new wood stairs and railing. The new stairs shall be code-compliant, including a handrail and spindles to match the porch balustrade. The run of stairs will have finished stringers and risers from pre-primed pine while stair treads shall use Azek decking to match the decking approved on 3/12/2019.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried

### **100 W Michigan**

*\*Window infill.*

Applicant: Robert Cleveland, owner- present  
Tim Stout, contractor- present

Discussion: Stout: Window infill is proposed because part of the building's rehabilitation plan calls for increased accessibility. An elevator and exit stairway is extending across the back of the building, so the existing windows would not be visible from the interior. The simple plan was to infill the openings with masonry, however two other options were discussed with Staff.

Schmiedke: Asked what are the other possibilities for infill?

Slagor: Staff first discussed the enclosure method highlighted in the Windows Fact Sheet, which calls for period-appropriate wood shutters to be used to infill the openings, thereby retaining the rhythm of openings and allowing them to be reopened one day. Second, staff discussed keeping the windows in-place and applying an opaque film to hide the new interior walls; an option that also keeps the openings and allows them to be reused.

Prebys: Asked applicant which option they would prefer.

Cleveland: Stated it ultimately comes down to a maintenance issue. Shutters will peel and have to be repainted. Does not know how long opaque film will last. Masonry and paint seem like the best long-term option. What sounds

good now, might not last ten or twenty years from now. However, Mr. Stout told him the options have not change to the budget.

Davis: Asked what the condition of the windows were like.

Stout: Windows are worn metal, replaced by the prior owner.

*[Discussion on age and historic significance of current windows and openings]*

Prebys: Asked commissioners how they felt about turning the elevation into a blank wall.

Schmiedke: Stated she would be comfortable with brick infill so long as the infill was recessed.

Davis: This would keep the shape of the opening.

Lindsay: The sills would remain as well.

Pettit: Believed the HDC had approved a similar proposal in the block of buildings

[Discussion: depth of recessed brick infill].

Lindsay: Asked if there were any plans for the blank wall.

Cleveland: Is access point for tenants, would like to make it look as nice as possible. Does not have to paint it.

Davis: Would prefer to see the elevation painted.

Lindsay: Said they could consider a mural with a future application.

Lindsay: Stated that because the vent opening was not historic, it could be infilled with brick that is flush to the elevation.

Motion: Prebys (second: Schmiedke) Move to issue a certificate of appropriateness for the work at 100 W Michigan for infilling the 11 window openings on the north elevation so that the infill brick would be recessed one inch. Replacement brick is to match the texture of the original brick and a lime-based mortar shall be used. The new brick shall be prepared and painted according to the application specifications dated April 15, 2019. The vent opening may be infilled flush with the wall surface, also with brick that matches the texture of the original brick and a lime-based mortar.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

- #9 – Contemporary designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original materials.
- #10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried

**220 W Michigan**

*\*Sign installation.*

Applicant: Daniel Milner, sign designer- present  
Angela Barbash, business owner - present

Discussion: Milner: Proposed a dimensional minimal sign to be placed about nine feet up on the exterior wall.

Davis: Sign is in-keeping with other approved signs in the district.

Motion: Lindsay (second: Prebys) Move to issue a certificate of appropriateness for the work at 220 W Michigan as submitted in the application dated April 16, 2019 for a PVC wall-mounted sign at the southwest corner of the façade entry vestibule, and vinyl lettering on the window of the façade entry door. The wall-mounted sign shall be hung by 3/16" aluminum studs set into silicone-filled holes that are placed within the mortar joints. Sign to be located per specifications in the application.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

- #9 – Contemporary designs shall be compatible and shall not destroy significant original materials.
- #10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried

**308-312 N River**

*\*Door Replacement.*

Applicant: Jan Culbertson, architect- present

Discussion: Davis: Did not see changes from study item.

Culbertson: Noted that the floor plan shows the direction the doors will swing and in-kind replacement trim will be installed as well.

Davis: Asked to clarify the hardware on the door.

Culbertson: Hardware will be simple with a full bar on the interior of the doors.

*[Discussion of handles]*

Culbertson: Specific handles have not been selected, but the lever handles would be simple.

Lindsay: Asked if the handles should have an administrative approval.

Pettit: Would like to see the handle specifications, but can make it work.

Slagor: Staff is comfortable making an administrative approval, but believes it can be handled by requesting they be simple in the motion.

Davis: Once a handle is selected, the specifications should be sent to Staff to add to the file.

Motion: Prebys (second: Pettit) Move to issue a certificate of appropriateness for the work at 308-312 N River as submitted in the application dated April 16, 2019 for replacement of the façade entry doors with Marvin custom wood doors. Door replacements at the 308 and 310 entrances shall be full-height with multi-light windows, while the 312 entrance shall also have a multi-light window but retain its transom. Doors shall be painted to match the existing trim. All door hardware will be as simple as possible.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

#10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried

## **STUDY ITEMS—**

### **307 N River**

Applicant: Ryan Wallace, owner- present.

Discussion: Davis: clarified that Wallace is his next-door neighbor at his residence.

Wallace: [Provided drawings]. Intention is to build a new parking lot and have a beer garden surrounding the entire front of the property, in place of the current parking. Everything within the sidewalk would become a beer garden.

*[Discussion of site plan]*

Pettit: Asked to clarify if the paving is staying.

Wallace: Confirmed.

Lindsay: Asked if there would be additional pavement with new parking.

Wallace: Stated that engineering requested the new parking lot be permeable gravel because of proximity to river.

*[Discussion of site plan continued]*

Prebys: Encouraged shrubs and trees to soften all of the hard surfaces.

*[Discussion of trees and shrubs]*

Wallace: would prefer to keep hedge.

Davis: HDC may agree on keeping the hedge.

Lindsay: Asked to describe the awning.

Wallace: Marion Awning, which has done a lot of work in the Ann Arbor historic districts.

*[Wallace provided example of awnings]*

Schmiedke: Asked to clarify why there are two fences on the property.

Wallace: Wood fence is for the rear/south of the property and metal is for the street-facing area.

Davis: Asked to clarify if the awning is to be a hard-top canvas material.

Wallace: Believes it is some kind of industrial material.

*[Discussion of awning height, location, material, etc.]*

*[Discussion of signage, painted vs. roof mounted]*

Lindsay: Asked to clarify what occurs where privacy fence meets the street, eliminating the viewshed. Recommended not enclosing the space in that far. Also consider how the wood and iron fences meet.

*[Discussion of fences]*

Pettit: Asked for clarification on dumpster enclosure masonry

*[Discussion of dumpster and screening]*

Davis: Asked to clarify awning colors.

Wallace: Confirmed awning is black.

Wallace: Asked about considerations for painting the brick.

Prebys: Painting brick would create an additional maintenance problem long term. He would not be against brick painting, but why paint when you don't need to.

*[Discussion of painting brick]*

Wallace: Noted that they plan to replace the shed.

Wallace: Asked about murals.

Lindsay: Open to murals, but HDC would like to see it first.

*[Discussion of sign and murals]*

Pettit: Reminded that the applicant will need to have lighting approved, and should not try to imitate earlier styles.

Davis: Noted that current "bug light" would not be approved.

**213 Pearl  
112 S Washington  
206-210 N Washington**

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

**224 N River**  
*\*Reroof*

Applicant: Judy Weinburger, owner – Not Present

Motion: Schmiedke (second: Prebys) moved to accept the administrative approval of the reroofing application for 224 N Hamilton.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carried.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

##### **1. Historic District Rules and Regulation Updates**

##### **HDC Fact Sheet Updates**

None.

##### **Property Monitoring**

208 E Cross Street.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

None.

**HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS**

**Approval of the minutes of April 9, 2019**

Motion: Schmiedke (second: Prebys) moved to approve the minutes of April 9, 2019.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

**MEETING ADJOURNED at 8:51 p.m.**