



# MINUTES

## City of Ypsilanti HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION Virtual Meeting

Tuesday, September 22, 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 7:03pm

Commissioners Present:                Alex Pettit, Anne Stevenson, Amy Swift, James Chesnut

Commissioners Absent:                Ron Rupert, Erika Lindsay

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

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Slagor:                      Staff request to add 208 E Cross to the agenda as a study item.

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

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

### PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS

The Commission received written public comment via email and three attendees submitted comment during the meeting.

### PUBLIC HEARING—none

### OLD BUSINESS—none

### NEW BUSINESS

#### 123 N Adams

*\*Door.*

Applicant:                      Lillian Harris, representative of Ekklesia Fellowship – not present

Discussion: Pettit: Indicated that in the absence of applicant, that the Commission would review the materials that they have. Indicated that the application is for work completed without a permit.

*[Commission reviewed application and reference materials]*

Motion: Chesnut (second: Stevenson) moved to issue a Notice to Proceed for the work at 123 N Adams, as submitted in the application dated August 19, 2020, for the installation of a metal security door on the north elevation, with the condition that the new door and frame be painted to match the trim on the rest of the building.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

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

## **527 N Huron**

*\*Windows.*

Applicant: William Johnson, contractor - not present

Discussion: Pettit: Indicated that the application is for new windows. Indicated that it is unclear as to which windows are proposed to be replaced and the extent of the work. Stated that per staff notes, more windows are documented than are included in the replacement proposal. Indicated concern about the front window *[reference photo materials]*.

Swift: Indicated agreement with Commissioner Pettit's comments and concern. Stated that the proposed new front window looks like it is changing the light pattern from an asymmetric six-lite that is fixed in front of the porch. Stated that there is a six-lite that is included that seems to be proposed but it is not an asymmetric look. Indicated the desire to have more information about the condition of the windows. Indicated that it appears that the worse of the fire damage is in the rear, so wondering if the front façade could be salvaged.

*[Discussion continued as to light pattern/window condition considerations]*

Motion: Swift (second: Chesnut) moved to table action on the proposed work at 527 N Huron and request that the applicant provide a side-by-side comparison of which window in the proposal is to be replacing which window as proposed, and more information regarding the condition of the windows in the front façade on both the first and second floor.

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

## 19 N Hamilton

*\*Sign and Paint.*

Applicant: Nemer Haddat, business representative- not present; Alan Shamoun, applicant's attorney – present

Discussion: Pettit: Stated that the application is for signage and painting. Asked applicant to walk the Commission through the application.

Shamoun: Stated that the painting was already completed. Indicated that two options were provided for the proposed signage. Stated that the temporary sign will be taken down to comply with the HDC requirements. Stated that the first proposal has two aluminum signs - one facing Pearl and one facing Hamilton. Stated that all other signage would be removed except those two – one on each corner. Indicated if that is not appropriate, they would like to put an aluminum sign on the ground in place of the sign that is on the corner facing both streets.

Swift: Asked if the new aluminum sign in option one is to cover the existing windows on the second floor.

Shamoun: Stated that he believes that they are in front of the windows. Stated that he thinks they are attached to the structure but not covering the windows entirely – not in the space of the windows.

Swift: Asked -- the window with the sign installed as proposed, you would not be able to see the window.

Shamoun: Confirmed.

Swift: Stated an opinion that that would be problematic to have them installed over a significant feature as it is proposed. Stated being more open to discussing signage being installed on the first floor as indicated in the second proposal; that the first-floor signage, since it is a later addition, is stylistically different.

Chesnut: Indicated agreement with Commissioner Swift.

Shamoun: Asked if the proposal the Commission is willing to consider is an aluminum sign on the first floor, on the ground, detached from the building.

Swift: Stated that the details can be discussed. Indicated an opinion that the first option of having the signage installed over the significant features of the original windows is inappropriate.

Chesnut: Indicated agreement with Commissioner Swift. Stated an opinion that option one may not be up for discussion. Indicated that it may be best to move on to option two – the first-floor proposal.

Shamoun: *[Reference photo materials]*, stated that that is the temporary sign that was installed

that will be removed. Asked if that sign was permanent, in an aluminum box with the sign in there, if that could be considered.

Slagor: *[Discussed background information as to freestanding sign/building mounted sign considerations in the zoning district]*

*[Discussion continued, reference photo materials, as to the above considerations]*

Swift: Asked if the proposal for the first-floor signage would essentially be transitioning the temporary sign that is hung on the building into a more permanent solution that is installed on the building.

Shamoun: Confirmed. Stated that they are looking for a permanent installation, something that will last the winter.

*[Discussion continued as to options]*

Chesnut: In summary, stated that option one is off the table. Stated that option two is only the sign facing Pearl and that that is what is being looked at. Indicated that, realistically, the option the Commission is considering that sounds promising is having just that eight-foot-by-eight-foot sign that is facing Pearl that is on brick *[reference photo materials]*. Stated that it is going to look like the white sign above *[reference photo materials]* because the details show a sign that is white and black on a brick façade on page sixty of the document *[reference materials]*. Indicated that it is a blank brick wall with no architectural features underneath the sign *[reference photo materials]* other than brick.

*[Discussion continued as to the above considerations]*

Shamoun: Stated that where that sign is, right in the center of the screen *[reference photo materials]*, that there is not a window behind that one.

Stevenson: Indicated an opinion of being all right with that option.

Chesnut: Indicated agreement with Commissioner Stevenson.

Pettit: Stated that that looks like how it is detailed on page sixty – option two.

Motion: Chesnut (second: Stevenson) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 19 N Hamilton, as submitted in the application dated August 31, 2020 for the painting of the wood-clad portions of the building; and for the work as submitted in the amended application, for the installation of aluminum wall-mounted signage in accordance with Option 2, which is the single-wall mounted sign facing Pearl Street; with the condition that the existing vinyl wall-mounted sign on the north (Pearl) elevation will be removed, and in anticipation that the post-mounted sign and signage that faces Hamilton will be removed as well.

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

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

## 24 N Huron

*\*Stone-faced concrete wall.*

Applicant: Bessie Pappas, owner- present; Maria Pappas, owner's daughter - present

Discussion: Pettit: Stated that the application is for work for retrofitting some block barriers. Asked applicant to walk the Commission through the application.

M. Pappas: Indicated that the barriers are a foundation for a wall that rocks will be added on. Indicated that they have submitted an estimate from their contractor and photos to show what the wall will end up looking like *[reference photo materials]*. Stated that the wall is within their property boundaries and that everything is being done per Code. *[Comments regarding background information as to prior HDC application review/denial and current circumstances]*.

Pettit: Stated that as to the Commission approving materials for the wall, the assumptions are that all relevant Zoning related codes will be followed. Stated that the Commission has approved other applications for fencing but not the kind that is currently there. Stated that it appears that applicant is no longer proposing to do any of that work; asked if applicant is proposing something entirely new.

M. Pappas: Asked for clarification.

Pettit: Stated that there had been applications submitted in the past for this property for fencing material. Stated that there is history behind what was built and what is no longer there. Stated that the Commission has approved materials for this before. Stated that it looks like what is currently being proposed is entirely new.

M. Pappas: *[Continued comments as to prior HDC application review/denial and current circumstances]*. Stated that there has to be some kind of a foundation; that you are still going to put cement and then you are going to build on that to beautify it.

Chesnut: Stated a concern that the blocks are not a foundation and are not quite large enough to be considered a mat foundation which is kind of a floating foundation. Stated a concern that regardless of the engineering behind it, it would be susceptible to cracking in between the blocks because of the way they move in different seasons. Stated that the examples that are set likely have a footing foundation. Stated that once you tie a long wall together, there needs to be control joints even in a well-grounded structure. Stated that the concern is aesthetic that over the long term, this is going to break down because it is not engineered correctly.

Pettit: Indicated that one of the questions from past Commission deliberations as to materials for

fencing was that there seemed to be some sort of consensus around the possibility of a type of metal fencing; that there was no consensus in the direction of any masonry considering the context and location.

*[Discussion continued as to photos - page seventy-nine and eighty of reference materials and as to previous Commission deliberations]*

Swift: *[Expressed agreement with above commissioner comments/concerns]*

M. Pappas: Stated that if there is a concern about the foundation and the long term of a break down, that they can ask the contractor to do something about that.

Pettit: Asked commissioners if a wall or structure of this type is appropriate for this context.

Swift: Stated that in terms of the material application, that this could possibly be worked into a solution. Stated that there are a lot of details that are missing in terms of what that proposal will actually look like.

Chesnut: Indicated having questions about where it starts and stops, because looking at the photo – there is a big gap. Asked about what happens in the gap between the block and that structure *[reference photo materials]*.

*[Discussion continued as to material/context/longevity considerations]*

Motion: Swift (second: Chesnut) moved to table action on the proposed work at 24 N Huron, so the applicant can provide more information on the height, length, thickness, and materiality of the wall.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Rupert and Lindsay

Motion carried.

Slagor: Staff added that commissioners also mentioned concern over how the structure is to be supported – what kind of foundation the structure would have.

Pettit: Confirmed. Stated that any additional materials that would further describe the finished product, that accurately reflects what is proposed, would be helpful.

## **9 S Adams**

*\*New doors and lighting.*

Applicant: Elisa Marroquin, project representative - present

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

Marroquin: Stated that the proposal is to replace an exterior door that currently faces 9 S Adams.

Indicated that it is an all glass commercial door with a metal frame. Indicated that they are proposing to install a metal style door with a glass window, as well as put in a keypad. Indicated that lighting is planned. Stated that they currently have some existing barn lighting on the property which they would copy. Stated that they would put that style lighting over those two entrances *[reference materials]*.

*[Discussion as to HDC lighting/temperature requirements]*

Motion: Stevenson (second: Swift) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 9 S Adams, as submitted in the application dated September 1, 2020, for the installation of two TruDoor half-light metal doors and Strongway "barn light" fixtures, as specified; with the condition that the light temperature of the fixtures be no greater than 3000k.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

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

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Rupert and Lindsay

Motion carried.

Chesnut: *[Initiated further clarifying discussion as to light temperature requirements]*

#### **406 Oak**

*\*New window.*

Applicant: Michael Hurley, owner - present

Discussion: Hurley: Indicated that the plan is to replace a rotted casement window in the rear area of the home. Stated that, per the contractor, it is a non-repairable window. Indicated that a gutter water-leak problem has been remedied.

Pettit: Stated that it appears to be an appropriate looking window, material-wise.

Hurley: Stated that the contractor recommended changing the window from a casement to an awning and getting the Andersen E-series custom size awning option *[reference materials]*. Stated that what is there is a casement window and that there is another casement window to the left. Stated that he would eventually like to have two awning windows. Stated that he would like to replace and maximize the glass – that right-side casement *[reference photo materials]* with an Andersen E-series awning window.

Pettit: Asked what the opening would look like – what the lite pattern would be.

Hurley: Stated that the opening extends ten to twelve inches. Stated that it would actually be better for this window *[reference photo materials]* seeing that it extends forward as opposed to horizontally – swings open like a casement to prevent any further rain from getting closer to the house.

Pettit: Asked about the overall window size.

Hurley: Stated that it would remain the same, the frame size. Stated that with the awning window, the middle wood sash that separates the two casements would be eliminated with the awning.

Pettit: Asked if it would be one single pane of glass that fits that same size opening.

Hurley: Confirmed.

Swift: Stated that these were replaced, that these were casements. Indicated that based on the photos, looking at the front and back of the house in terms of typical window patterns, it looks as though it is either single or double hung windows.

Hurley: Confirmed.

Swift: Indicated that since applicant would be replacing already replaced windows, there is a lot of leeway in terms of how the solution is detailed. Stated opinion that having one single awning window is not going to fit with the stylistic nature of the house. Indicated that an awning window is not going to have the same sort of cadence along the façade as a casement would given that everything else on the house is a double hung.

*[Discussion continued as to the above considerations]*

*[Discussion regarding the Andersen series window options that were submitted]*

Motion: Chesnut (second: Swift) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 406 Oak, as submitted in the application dated September 1, 2020, for the installation of a replacement of a casement window on the south elevation with an awning style window. The replacement shall be a full-frame installation of either an Anderson 100 Series or Andersen E series window.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

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

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Rupert and Lindsay

Motion carried.

### **303 N Summit**

*\*New concrete steps.*

Applicant: Scott Westover, YCUA representative - present

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

Westover: Stated that there are two pieces of concrete in bad shape. Stated that the one on the west side is not connected to the tower. Indicated that the plan is to replace the stairs on the east side which are in bad shape. Stated that they do not believe they can do it without touching the stairs *[reference photo materials]*, touching the tower. Indicated that to get a better product than the existing, they are going to have to get into the opening between the top of the stairway and the doorway which is within the footprint of the structure itself.

Pettit: Asked if the work will continue past the threshold of the doorway.

Westover: Confirmed, no. Stated that they anticipate it will be somewhere either at the outside face of the door or somewhere between the door and the existing crack at the exterior outline footprint of the tower itself.

Pettit: Asked if the work also includes the cheek walls and the sides that contain the steps.

Westover: Stated that the thought would be to try and reuse those. Stated that if they do need to be replaced, they would be replaced in exactly the same location at about the same profile. Stated that the hope would be to save it, but that they are not sure, once the stairs are taken out, if it is going to be salvageable or not.

Swift: Asked about the transition between the concrete steps and the historic stone wall with the joint that it is going to be comprised of.

Westover: Stated that he believes it is concrete right up to the stone itself. Stated that he does not believe there is a joint material there.

*[Discussion continued as to expansion joints/transition/threshold considerations/additional information needed]*

Pettit: Asked if the walkway includes a step or two on this side *[reference photo materials]* but not on the other end.

Westover: Confirmed.

Motion: Swift (second: Chesnut) moved to table action on the proposal for 303 N Summit to see further information detailed as discussed at the meeting, specifically concerning the expansion joints and their location; as well as the potential for a threshold to be installed.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Rupert and Lindsay

Motion carried.

### **305 E Cross**

*\*New windows.*

Applicant: Ashanti Harris, owner - present

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

Harris: Indicated that the plan is to replace all of the windows on the front and side, except for two that are in the dining room area – a total of ten windows. Stated that most would be the double-hung windows. Indicated that the Pella Lifestyle wood clad windows are proposed. Stated that there are four windows that are a bit different. Stated that the two windows in the front *[reference photo materials]* are outlined in the green. Indicated that she does not have a matching color for them, so the planned color choice would be black. Stated that the bedroom windows which are grid windows, would be replaced with grid windows and would match what is currently there. *[Discussed, reference photos, condition of the windows/sills]*

Swift: *[Discussed window sills -- possible water leak issues, reference photo materials]*. Stated that there are definitely a lot of replaceable conditions being presented. Stated that there are also some that look okay. Stated that there is a solid argument for replacement of at least a portion.

Chesnut: Asked about the front windows.

Swift: Asked if there are only two windows on the front.

Harris: Confirmed.

Swift: Stated that the ones on the front of the house have that same sill issue which may be solved with replacements if done appropriately.

Harris: Stated that none of the windows are opening *[reference photo materials]*. Stated that she was actually going to wait on the two front windows.

Swift: Stated that if they are painted shut or if there is peeling paint, that that is not a replaceable defense.

Harris: Stated that she has not found someone who says they can repair it. Stated that she was going to wait on those because of cost.

*[Continued discussion as to condition of front façade windows]*

Slagor: *[Discussion as to obtaining repair resource information]*

Harris: Acknowledged understanding that resource information provided is not a recommendation.

*[Procedural discussion]*

\*Applicant amended the application to not include replacement of the two façade windows\*

Motion: Swift (second: Stevenson) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the

amended application as stated at the meeting for the work at 305 East Cross Street for the full-frame installation of eight windows as submitted and specified in the application, specifically with the front two windows being removed.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

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

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Rupert and Lindsay

Motion carried.

## **110 W Michigan**

*\*Sign and paint.*

Applicant: Jen Eastridge, business owner - present

Discussion: Eastridge: *[Shared her City business ownerships]*. Stated that she is hoping for the approval of two items – the black trim paint on the front of the building *[reference photo materials]* and the affixing of the metal letters that are one-sixteenth inch aluminum. *[Discussed reference image showing actual scale of letters]*. Stated that the letters will be affixed with stainless steel woodscrews, with a two-inch standoff behind each letter. Stated that they will be affixed directly to the wood panels on the front of the building. Stated that all of the hardware will be painted black to match the letters. *[Further discussed the "Black Magic" paint choice]*.

Chesnut: Asked about the thickness of the channel letters.

Eastridge: Stated that it is a flat aluminum letter that is going to be drilled and then affixed. Stated that they are actually one-sixteenth inch. Stated that they do not have a dimension to them.

Pettit: Asked if lighting is a part of this proposal.

Eastridge: Confirmed, no.

Motion: Chesnut (second: Stevenson) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 110 W. Michigan Ave. as submitted in the application dated September 17, 2020, for the painting of the trim as specified, and the aluminum channel letter signage as specified.

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, Stevenson, Swift, Chesnut

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Rupert and Lindsay

Motion carried.

## **STUDY ITEMS**

### **208 E Cross**

*\*Siding.*

The applicant had to leave the meeting before the Study Items section of the agenda was reached; therefore, the item was not discussed by the Commission.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

Motion: Stevenson (second: Chesnut) moved to approve the administrative approvals for 148 N Washington and 311 E Forest.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Rupert and Lindsay

Motion carried.

## **OTHER BUSINESS—none**

## **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS -none**

## **HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS**

### **Approval of the minutes of August 25, 2020**

Motion: Stevenson (second: Chesnut) moved to approve the minutes of August 25, 2020, as submitted.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Rupert and Lindsay

Motion carried.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

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

## **MEETING ADJOURNED at 10:02 p.m.**