



MINUTES

City of Ypsilanti HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION Virtual Meeting

Tuesday, June 9, 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, Anne Stevenson, Amy Swift, James Chesnut

Commissioners Absent: Erika Lindsay, Ron Rupert

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

Additional Staff Present: Joe Meyers, Economic Development Director
Christopher Jacobs, Downtown Development Authority Director
Elize Jekabson, Downtown Development Authority Coordinator
Andy Aamodt, City Planner

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Slagor: Applicant requested to remove action item for new windows at 100 W Michigan.

Motion: Stevenson (second: Swift) moved to approve the agenda as amended.

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

Unanimous. Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS- none

PUBLIC HEARING—none

OLD BUSINESS—none

NEW BUSINESS

100 W Michigan

**Storefront Systems.*

Applicant: Conor Doran, Project Manager- not present
Timothy Stout, O'Neil Construction- present

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

Stout: Stated that a lot of the work on the façade of the building has been previously submitted and approved. Indicated that the current application is in regards to the level one on the south elevation *[reference photo materials]*. Stated that there are two storefronts - 100 W Michigan on the east side and 102 W Michigan on the west side. Stated that upon removal of the previous cladding, those aluminum panels *[reference photo materials]*, this existing window system was discovered, this glazing system. Stated that they would like to preserve that and leave it in place. Stated that that is above the entrance of 102 W Michigan *[reference photo materials]*. Stated that there was not anything salvageable on the east side above the entrance to suite 100 W Michigan which is why you see in this picture, in progress, some steel framing and some exterior grade MDO that can be finished *[reference photo materials]*. Stated that you can see behind the framing that there is a structural steel beam that runs laterally and that there is sort of nothing between that beam above and below. Stated that upon removal of the previous cladding system, it was just open to the elements.

Slagor: *[Outlined updated information received from applicant]* Stated that in addition to this application, a revised drawing was sent over today of what is proposed for the storefront. Stated that in the application, the storefronts are the main things but, on the east elevation, an entry door and a display window was replaced that needs to be approved as well.

Stout: Stated that that was a removal and replacement of matching components. Stated that the door was an aluminum storefront door and the two punched openings were aluminum storefront. Stated that they were pretty well worn and weathered. Stated that it was a like-for-like replacement on that east elevation.

Pettit: Asked what the detail looks like on 100 W Michigan where the top of the signboard terminates. Stated that in many other storefronts downtown, there is a bit more of a distinct cornice that is there that helps shed water from the building.

Stout: Stated that the application is to do a piece of one-by-eight trim to picture frame where a future sign would go above the storefront. Stated that the idea is that that would help it stand out from the masonry above.

[Discussion continued as to signboard area considerations/water runoff, reference photo materials]

Stout: Stated that a flashing from the masonry would be provided, down onto the top of that surface *[reference photo materials]* at a pitch that the water would run off.

Pettit: Asked if that work is pending still.

Stout: Confirmed.

Pettit: Asked if there is some OSB material down in the lower right *[reference photo materials]*.

Stout: Confirmed. Stated that that will be covered, that it is just temporary until the corner is finished. Stated that it would all be MDO. Stated that the red *[reference photo materials]* outlines and represents the trim, the idea being it would be pictured-framed into boxes similar to some of the other storefronts up the street.

Pettit: Asked what the trim material is.

Stout: Stated that the trim is also MDO.

Pettit: Asked if it is a finished edge on that *[reference photo materials]*.

Stout: Stated that it is not a finished edge. Stated that where the finished areas are buried, where two ends abut, that they would be covered. Stated that it is all going to get painted with an exterior grade paint. Stated that there would be no exposed edges.

[Discussion continued as to edge finishing]

Swift: Asked applicant to speak more about how they will be treating and detailing building-out around the glazing detail.

Stout: Stated that they were hoping to do not much more than what is already there. Stated that the idea is that the masonry is going to be coated with an exterior coating.

Swift: Stated that it looks like there are some glass pieces that need to be repaired. Asked if the plan is to treat the box below *[reference photo materials]* with the same flashing as on the other side.

Stout: Confirmed. Stated that they had not yet contemplated how to do that. Stated that it is something they would have to do and will certainly do.

[Discussion continued as to box/pitch considerations]

Pettit: Asked if the rear single door to be replaced, is a finished door *[reference photo materials]*.

Stout: Stated that the door is complete. Indicated that the plan is to coat all of the masonry surrounding it.

Pettit: Asked if the door infill trim piece is wood *[reference photo materials]*.

Stout: Stated that it looks like shim material *[reference photo materials]*. Stated that they would have to add joint sealant there to bridge between the brick and the aluminum. Stated that they would caulk that.

Pettit: Stated that it looks like almost an inch between the edge of the metal and the brick.

[Reference photo material, discussion continued as to shim sizes comparing upper/lower portion/alternative infill options]

[Discussion as to the need to have more detailed information associated with the door, the storefront in general and the buildout for the signage]

Chesnut: Stated that the south side at the top of that signage area is the one that jumps out. Stated that it is going to look pretty clean and simple based on how the applicant is describing it but if you walk down the street and look at all the other elevations on that side of the street, they have all got some sort of cornice detail that is a little more decorative that establishes that particular condition in a way where what applicant is suggesting might stand out a bit. Stated that if there were a set of drawings that showed the Commission what that might look like, that would help. Indicated a concern that what applicant is proposing is different to the extent that it will be obvious.

[Discussion continued as to façade considerations/appropriateness with surrounding buildings/possible revisions/need for additional information]

Chesnut: Indicated additional documentation that would be helpful to the Commission: head and jamb details, top of sign box detail, detail of sill at the leaded glazing, detail of the vertical point where the sign box meets the leaded glazing, detail as to joist ends, detail that resolve the practical and the aesthetic considerations.

Swift: Indicated further documentation that would be helpful to the Commission would be molding details, e.g. photo of trim profiles.

Stevenson: Asked for clarification of proposed colors for panels and trim.

Stout: Stated that per the top on the right-hand side *[reference drawing]*, the one-by-eight rectangle border would be the Petoskey color and then the large rectangle in between it would be white and then of similar nature for all of the other rectangular spaces. Stated that the one-by-four surround would be the Petoskey color and then the flat panel within the rectangular space there *[reference drawing]* would be white.

Stevenson: Suggested that applicant be cautious with the white color, especially at the baseboards. Stated that it can get dirty very quickly and become a maintenance issue right near the sidewalk.

Pettit: Asked if the sign lettering is part of this application.

Stout: Confirmed. Stated that the intent is that that sign lettering would go above the leaded glass. Stated that that is another reason that the property owner was interested in just coating the ends of those joists and coating the masonry, is they would like to just have a painted sign on the face of that masonry right there *[reference photo material]* rather than build another sign box.

[Discussion continued as to masonry painting; historic photos reviewed]

Motion: Chesnut (second: Stevenson) moved to table the application for storefront systems and new display windows and entry doors at 100 W Michigan so the applicant may provide drawings that more clearly detail the proposed work; including signage and trim.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

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

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Lindsay, Rupert

Unanimous. Motion carried.

228 N River

**Replacement of landing on rear egress staircase*

Applicant: Stefan Szumko, House-Storian, LLC - present

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

Szumko: Stated that, originally, the upstairs was added on to an attic *[reference photo material]* and the lower part of the roofline was left. Stated that the footings were four-inches deep and it recently collapsed. Stated that he would like to carve out a little bit of the roofline to install a ledger board, then build a deck below that, add proper footings forty-two inches deep, and do a dropped beam below the deck to stabilize it and give it support. Stated that he would like to add a fourth post even though it is probably not structurally necessary. Stated that that would give it a nice symmetric appearance for future deck usage. Stated that the lattice work that was there will be eliminated. Stated that he is considering possibly eliminating the awning that was on the lower window.

Slagor: Asked for clarification regarding the awning referred to in the application.

Szumko: Stated that the upper awning is remaining. Stated that there was an awning below the porch. Stated that it matches the one on the southeast side of the building *[reference photo material]*.

Pettit: Outlined the measurement details listed in the application.

Szumko: Stated that he would like to do two-by-eight framing for the joists rather than two-by-six.

Pettit: Asked about the plans regarding attachment.

Szumko: Stated -- bolt in the corner posts which are notched for the rails. Stated that he saved the existing corner posts to match the stairs. Stated that he is willing to reconsider this option if the Commission has better suggestions.

Pettit: Asked, as to the detailing of the railing, how the top and bottom will be handled and how the balusters are attached. Asked applicant if he has seen the HDC Porch Fact Sheet.

Szumko: Confirmed, no *[as to the Fact Sheet]*. Stated that the deck itself and the framing will be self-supporting. Asked if he can add on the posts with some sort of a structural connector into the framing instead of attaching it on the outside.

Pettit: Indicated that what applicant proposes structurally should follow Building Department Code.

[Discussion continued as to installation considerations]

Swift: Noted that the staircase was originally built for egress. Asked if it still serves as egress.

Szumko: Stated that it still serves as an egress. Stated that he does not know the specifics.

[Discussion as to past and present usage of the building structure]

Slagor: Clarified that this is really a partial repair of the existing structure -- of just the landing and its supports.

[Discussion continued following Staff's clarification]

Chesnut: Asked if the stringers, the posts, the rails and the spindles for the stair section, are staying in place.

Szumko: Confirmed.

Chesnut: Asked -- so what is being replaced is the upper deck structure, posts, spindles, rails and, as well, the decking for everything.

Szumko: Stated -- no, just the deck.

Chesnut: Asked if the treads for the stairs are currently wood or Trex.

Szumko: Stated that those are currently wood.

Chesnut: Asked if the plan is for Trex decking just at the top.

Szumko: Confirmed.

Swift: Asked if in order to replace that decking, applicant will be cutting into the roofline that is existing from the original structure in order to put those ledger boards on.

Szumko: Confirmed. Stated that he cannot envision a solid deck being tied into a 45-degree angle there.

Pettit: Asked if the plan is to remove that section of roof for the width of the deck.

Szumko: Confirmed. Stated -- eight feet.

Swift: Indicated her concern about removal of an original roofline.

Motion: Stevenson (second: Chesnut) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 228 N River, for reconstruction of the upper landing and balustrade on the rear egress staircase, as specified in the submitted drawings. The wood components of the system will be stained in an opaque stain finish. The deck shall be Trex flooring with aluminum below to catch runoff.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Stevenson, Chesnut
Nays: Commissioner Swift
Absent: Commissioners Lindsay, Rupert
Motion carried.

STUDY ITEMS-none

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS-none

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Draft Alternative Materials Fact Sheet

Commissioners/Staff reviewed Draft Revisions.

Motion: Chesnut: (second Stevenson) moved to approve the Alternative Materials Fact Sheet as submitted on June 9, 2020.

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

2. Property Monitoring

Commissioner/Staff discussion as to property monitoring.

3. Commissioner Comments- none

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS—none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of May 26, 2020

Motion: Stevenson (second: Swift) moved to approve the minutes of May 26, 2020 as submitted.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Lindsay, Rupert

Unanimous. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

MEETING ADJOURNED at 8:21 p.m.

Full Minutes Prepared By: Nancy Hare-Dickerson