

CITY OF YPSILANTI
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF APRIL 10, 2018

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Anne Stevenson Chair 7:00 PM

Meeting Location: SPARK East, 215 W Michigan

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

Commissioners Absent: Ron Rupert

Staff Present: Cynthia Kochanek, Preservation Planner

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Kochanek: Added 216 W Michigan as a study item and removed 201 S Washington as an administrative approval.

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS – none

PUBLIC HEARING—none

OLD BUSINESS

116-118 W Michigan

**Application is for front & rear façade work; window & door replacement & window reopening, roof deck & balcony installation, rear expansion, painting & cleaning*

Applicant: Van Hunsberger, architect- Not present

Discussion: Kochanek: Stated that the applicant has requested an extension of the application timeframe. That staff split this into two motions, one to accept the extension and another to table.

Davis: Asked if the commission needed to make both motions and why.

Kochanek: Confirmed that both motions needed to be made; that the first motion is to accept the timeframe extension as per the ordinance and the second is to table the existing application that is already on the table.

Stevenson: Confirmed.

Motion: Prebys (second: Schmiedeke) moved to approve the extension for 116-118 W Michigan. Let the application be extended to the May 22, 2018 meeting.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

Motion: Davis (second: Prebys) moved to table the application for work at 116-118 W Michigan due to the need for further details on the project.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

16 N Washington

**Application is for replacement of a window on the rear of the building for egress*

Applicant: Patton Doyle, applicant –Present

Discussion: Doyle: Stated that he is here to talk through a window replacement. Stated that he was previously here for the replacement of the windows on the structure back in the fall. Now that the plans are finalized for the upper story in the building, it became obvious that they would need an additional egress window in the back of the building. So they are proposing to remove one of the casement windows on the rear, the one on the top right of the building, and to extend it down so that it is large enough to be an egress window. Stated that they plan to replace it with two casement windows and that they will not move the lintel.

Davis: Asked if the egress window will then need a ladder or other type of stair structure in addition to the window.

Prebys: Stated that it is mainly to allow the fire department to come in.

Doyle: Stated that it is for that or for the person inside to exit.

Kochanek: Confirmed that staff checked with the building department and that no further modifications would be needed other than the egress window.

Stevenson: Asked about the white framed aluminum screens and stated that the applicant may want to consider another color if they are exterior, since they will not match the bronze color.

Doyle: Stated that his understanding is that the screens are interior but that if they are exterior, then he would make sure that they match.

Davis: Requested that the screen requirements be placed in the motion.

Motion: Prebys (second: Schmiedeke) moved to approve the work at 16 N Washington to include the installation of two Marvin aluminum-clad ultimate casement windows with a right hand swing in bronze in the upper right hand side of the rear of the structure as depicted in the submitted drawing dated 3-28-18 with the understanding that any screens will be interior, not exterior. If they are exterior, they will be black.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

#10- New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

211 Maple

**Application is for the construction of a freestanding deck*

Applicant: Jim Decker, contractor for the applicant – Present

Discussion: Stevenson: Stated that he was here previously in October to discuss the deck as a study item. Stated that he was advised at that time that the deck would need to be painted. Asked the applicant to confirm that the deck will be 12' x 24' at the back of the property.

Decker: Confirmed that is correct.

Stevenson: Asked what paint or stain will be used.

Decker: Stated that the plan is to use Behr Deck Plus One Natural Tone Semi-Transparent waterproofing stain.

Stevenson: Stated that the stain needs to be opaque. Suggested to find a similar color in an opaque stain and that would be okay.

Decker: Asked if the goal of the opaque stain is to not see any wood grain.

Stevenson: Confirmed.

Decker: Stated that he can use a solid tone, then.

Motion: Davis (second: Prebys) moved to approve the work at 211 Maple to include the installation of a 12' x 24' freestanding pressure treated pine deck in the rear yard at the location indicated on the drawing submitted with the application dated April 2, 2018. The deck will be roughly 1 foot in height and

will have a single step that spans the full deck. The deck will require an opaque or solid stain up to the applicant's choice of color and brand.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

#10- New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

Decker: Asked about the new work shall be removable standard.

Stevenson: Advised that that is one of the Secretary of the Interior Standards that the commission is responsible for basing all of their decisions on.

414 Maple

**Application is for window and door replacement*

Applicant: Erin Cicero and Ann O'Sullivan, owners and Stacey Scholtis and Johnny Merchouyias, representatives from Alexandria Windows– Present

Discussion: Stevenson: Recapped the application. Advised that vinyl is not considered an appropriate window material and staff has advised them of that. Asks if they have reconsidered the materials.

Cicero: Stated that they have received quotes for wood windows that were \$54,000 or more for replacement. Stated that they are looking to preserve the house and the current windows are not in good shape. That there are aluminum, vinyl and wood windows on the house currently and that they are looking to replace all of the windows in a uniform way. Stated that they were hoping that the commission would hear out the representatives for Alexandria windows to hear how they replace windows.

Stevenson: Stated that the commission can listen to what is said, but that the commission has previously done a lot of research on vinyl windows and there are concerns with the longevity of the materials and the reduction in the size of the glass for the windows.

Merchouyias: Stated that the industry standard is to not do a full frame install, but that they do full frame install and that most of the time that does not mean a reduction in glass size. Advised that they have a lifetime warranty that covers warping and that their windows are fused into one piece.

Pettit: Asked if any of their windows have been previously installed in historic homes or homes in historic districts.

Merchouyias: Stated that they have replaced windows on homes in historic districts and historic homes.

Pettit: Stated that windows are a defining feature on homes. Stated that rarely has the commission found that anything other than wood, aluminum-clad wood or metal be appropriate for replacement. That the massing simply isn't right and doesn't match what was originally there.

Davis: Asked why their windows would be appropriate as opposed to another company's vinyl windows.

Merchouyias: Asked if it is the looks or the functionality of the window that the commission is trying to preserve. Stated that he can have the brick mold surrounding the window made in various sizes. Stated that he can match the ones that are currently on the building. Stated that he can color match the colors on the building.

Prebys: Asked about the stability of vinyl and the effect of UV rays on the material.

Merchouyias: Stated that there is a resin layer on top of the white windows and that other colors are powder-coated with the resin on top and that prevents the vinyl from breaking down.

Lindsay: Asked about the wood windows on the house and requested info on their locations.

Cicero: Stated that all of the windows on the lower level are aluminum or vinyl except the front window; that is wood. The upstairs windows are all wood. None of them open and one of them will not shut.

Merchouyias: [*Showed the commission a sample window*] Described the process and options for the windows in more detail.

Scholtis: Stated that the lifetime warranty is for the lifetime of the house and not just for the current owner.

Merchouyias: Added that their manufacturer is in Canada and that they produce the windows to withstand Canadian winters.

Davis: Inquired as to whether the commission would consider the replacement of the six current vinyl windows with the new vinyl windows. Advised the applicant that that the commission is concerned with following and/or setting a precedent. That the commission is concerned with the longevity of the windows. That the commission must always go back to the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

Stevenson: Reiterated that the Standards are important and that one of them states to "Repair-don't replace" and that is applicable with the wood windows since most of the time individual pieces of the original wood windows can be replaced to make them functional again. Stated that the commission is looking for a like for like material replacement in regards to the wood windows. Stated that with vinyl windows, the whole thing comes out and is placed in a landfill and then a whole new window goes in. Stated that there may be some cost savings in repair.

Cicero: Requested that the commission consider the replacement of the existing vinyl windows and the aluminum windows with the new vinyl windows. Stated that these are mainly at the rear of the house and in the basement.

O'Sullivan: Asked what the commission would recommend to replace the aluminum windows with.

Prebys and Stevenson: Stated wood windows.

Stevenson: Stated that because of the ordinance and the Standards that the commission does not believe that vinyl is appropriate. Advised of that the Michigan Historic Preservation Network (MHPN) does maintain a directory of contractors that are used to working with historic wood windows. Advised of sash pack replacements as well.

Prebys: Stated that the vinyl and aluminum should probably never have been placed on the house to begin with since they are having issue with these materials now.

Stevenson: Asked how the six vinyl windows that exist on the house are.

O'Sullivan: Stated that they have broken seals. Further stated that all of the aluminum windows are all on the addition and that they would have been original to that addition.

Pettit: Stated that they are also all sider type windows.

Merchouyias: Stated that out of all the windows they carry, this manufacturer carries the longest warranty, that even wood windows do not have this long of a warranty.

Stevenson: Asked for thoughts from the commission.

Lindsay: Stated that as far as the addition goes, aluminum or another material may be more appropriate.

Schmiedeke: Stated that they should explore the repair of the wood windows.

Pettit: Stated that there are other options that the applicant can explore within the wood windows for repair and replacement that do not incur such a high cost.

Prebys: Asked again what the commission thought of the replacement of the windows on the addition.

Stevenson: Stated that leaving the wood windows aside, what does the commission feel about the windows on the addition.

Davis: Stated that other materials may be appropriate since this was an addition and he could see treating it differently than the rest of the house.

Prebys: Stated that since these vinyl windows are treated and constructed differently than the run of the mill vinyl windows that he could see approving a modern window technique on the new section of the house but he would request wood windows for the original portion house.

Davis, Schmiedeke and Pettit: Agreed with this.

Davis: Asked how many window are on the addition.

O'Sullivan: Stated that there are 10 windows on the addition and that they are all aluminum.

Davis: Asked where the vinyl windows are.

Cicero: Stated that the vinyl is on the lower level of the main portion of the house.

Stevenson: Advised that what she is hearing from the commission is that there is some acceptance of the windows on the addition being replaced with vinyl but that with the older portion of the house a repair or wood replacements would need to be pursued. This includes the existing vinyl windows on the older portion of the house.

O'Sullivan: Stated that they would be thrilled to replace the existing aluminum and vinyl windows with the vinyl.

Davis: Clarified that the existing vinyl will not be allowed to be replaced with vinyl. That is not what is being suggested.

Lindsay: Stated that the delineation is with the addition, that that is where the difference in materials can occur.

Stevenson: Stated that the commission seems to be tending towards permitting the aluminum windows on the addition be replaced with these specific vinyl windows. Stated that on the original/main part of the house vinyl windows will not be considered appropriate. That the wood windows

should be looked at for repair and then follow that pattern for the replacement on the existing vinyl windows.

Davis: Stated that there are some doors on the application.

Cicero: Stated that they are not worried about that tonight.

Prebys: Stated that wood doors are more appropriate.

Cicero: Asked if a side or rear door could be metal.

Stevenson: Stated that she would want to know the reason for the change in materials.

O'Sullivan: Advised that it is again a cost concern.

Lindsay: Advised that there are plenty of door salvage places in the area.

Motion: Davis (second: Prebys) moved to deny the proposed work at 414 Maple for the installation of twenty-nine vinyl windows and three steel replacement doors with the finding that these materials are inappropriate and will destroy the original character of the property.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:
N/A

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

114 N River

**Application is for window replacement*

Applicant: Paul Manion for Marvin Windows, Elizabeth Clark and Rhonda Weathers, SOS Representatives, applicants –Present

Discussion: Weathers: Advised that SOS occupies the octagon house at 114 N River. Stated that they have been part of the Ypsilanti community for over 50 years now. That this is where their resource center is located. Stated that the building has become part of their branding/logo and is now closely identified with them. Stated that they are trying to maintain the building as best they can since they are a non-profit on a limited budget. She stated that they are trying to maintain the structure and remove the existing vinyl windows. Stated that they would prefer the white for the windows as it is part of their color scheme and logo.

Prebys: Stated that he remembers when the application came in and that the concern was that in the particular time that this house was built, window sashes would all have been painted dark colors, and that if they had muntins they would "disappear" in darker colors. Stated that they were not suggesting the existing trim color be changed and that the commission was

very pleased that the vinyl windows were being removed and that they were being replaced with correct replacements.

Davis: Stated that he wanted to check to see if there would be a reduction in the glass size since this is shown as an insert window.

Manion: Stated that with the vinyl windows, that there would not be a reduction in the glass size.

Davis: Stated that is great and that they can return to the window color.

Kochanek: Stated that this is covered in the email that she provided copies of to the commission.

Davis: Asked if the applicants had seen the historic photos that were included in the packets that show the darker sash.

Weathers: Stated that she saw them today.

Pettit: Stated that if the sash was done in the darker color that it would not change the look of the building all that much.

Prebys: Stated that this all might have been a misunderstanding.

Weathers: Asked if they could have this item tabled so that they can consider color choices.

Motion: Davis (second: Schmiedeke) moved to table the application at 114 N River pending color choices by the owner.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:
N/A

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

Weathers: Asked what the process is if they end up picking the bronze color that was already approved.

Pettit: Stated that it could be an administrative approval by staff.

Motion: Prebys (second: Schmiedeke) moved that should the property owners decide to retain the bronze color for the sash in the window replacement, staff is authorized to make an administrative approval of that choice.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion Carries.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Kochanek: Added 430 N Adams as a study item.

Motion: Prebys (second: Pettit) moved to add to the agenda 430 N Adams as a study item.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

STUDY ITEMS

216 W Michigan

Applicant: Michael Ploof

Discussion: Ploof: Stated that he is looking for feedback on the sign. That he is open to color and that what is in the sample was just what the designer picked. That he was thinking to do the sign in wood or plastic lettering on stand-offs. Stated that he is just trying to get some idea of what the commission expects.

Davis: Stated to look to other signs in the district.

Prebys: Stated that what the applicant has shown in materials and colors are fine.

Lindsay: Stated that the HDC is also concerned with the way that the sign is fastened to the building.

Ploof: Stated that he was also thinking that he would backlight the top part of the logo and animate it as well.

Kochanek: Stated that animated signs are not permitted per the zoning ordinance.

Pettit: Asked about the logos on the windows that are shown in the handout. Advised to check with the City on the amount of coverage. Stated that the HDC would consider the window signs.

Davis: Stated that this is a backlit sign and that he thought the commission did not want that type of sign.

Prebys: Stated that the commission has approved backlit signs but the light can only be emitted from the letters or the logo.

Stevenson: Suggested that the applicant bring two options back for the commission to take a look at when applying.

430 N Adams

Applicant: Derek Neeb

Discussion: Neeb: Stated that he believes that his question has already been answered by a previous item tonight. Stated that the windows on his property are currently wood but they are falling apart. He has had wood windows quoted that cost 1/4th of the value of the house. He stated that his house is not even worth that much and he is trying to keep his rent low. He is looking for other options to replace the windows on the house and has come to the commission for feedback. Stated that he has even got quotes on their repair.

Prebys: Stated that sash packs may be a better option.

Davis: Stated that the applicant can perhaps look at Jeld-Wen for sash packs.

Neeb: Asked how the commission can justify the cost or require this.

Prebys: Stated that this what the commission is charged with; to repair – don't replace. That inappropriate windows destroy the value of the house historically.

Stevenson: Suggested phasing the window replacement.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Kochanek: Added 117 Pearl as a study item.

Motion: Prebys (second: Pettit) moved to add to the agenda 117 Pearl as a study item.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

117 Pearl

Applicant: William Sloane

Discussion: Sloane: Stated that he just bought the building and that he is looking to redo the storefront and he also wants to let in more light. Stated that he is looking to bring it back to the way it looked circa 1900.

Prebys: Suggested that the applicant get someone to do some drawings.

Sloane: Stated that he is looking to keep the knee wall at about a 1' or 1 1/2'.

Pettit: Stated that if there is photographic evidence that something was there historically, then they would be onboard. Stated that if the applicant wanted to something that differed from that, then the commission would need to consider that.

Lindsay: Stated to bring options back when he applies.

Stevenson: Stated that he should bring in a concept drawing.

Sloane: Stated that he is looking to add another door, one to access the upper level and the one for the retail/commercial area on the lower level.

Stevenson: Stated that she is ok with that.

Schmiedeke: Confirmed she is as well.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS—none

OTHER BUSINESS

Norris St Development

Kochanek: Stated that she included all the information in the packet.

Stevenson: Stated that this helps and that there is a lot of options for design in the neighborhood since there are so many different architectural styles in this area.

Property Monitoring

6 S Washington

Kochanek: Stated that she just recently sent the second notice for work without a permit.

LED lighting strips resolution/policy

Kochanek: Stated that she has only had a response from one other HDC about how they handle this and stated the response was that they fall back on the fact that the lights are not meant to light anything specific/ that if the lights have no purpose, then they are not permitted.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS –none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of March 27, 2018

Motion: Prebys (second: Davis) moved to approve the minutes from March 27th.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Stevenson adjourned the meeting, citing the end of the agenda with no one remaining in the audience and no further items to discuss.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 9:00 p.m.

Cynthia Kochanek

From: Paul Manion <paul@windowanddoorcenter.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 07, 2018 8:29 AM
To: Cynthia Kochanek
Subject: RE: Marvin Cut Sheet

Hi Cindy,

There will be no glass size reduction compared to the existing vinyl replacement windows...In fact, the glass size may grow slightly in some cases. The vinyl replacements will be removed and replaced with the Marvin inserts inside the existing wood frames.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks!

Paul Manion
810.922.0799 Direct/ Cell

Marvin Design Gallery by Laurence Smith
2350 Franklin Rd., Suite 115
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302
248.333.9085 Office
248.333.9095 Fax

Laurence Smith Window & Door
3650 S. Huron Rd.
Bay City, MI 48706
989.684.9811
989.684.5288

www.windowanddoorcenter.com
paul@windowanddoorcenter.com

From: Cynthia Kochanek [mailto:CKochanek@cityofypsilanti.com]
Sent: Friday, April 6, 2018 5:57 PM
To: Paul Manion
Subject: RE: Marvin Cut Sheet

Is there a reduction in glass size with these inserts? Are they installed within the existing frame or the rough opening?

Thanks,
Cynthia Kochanek
Preservation Planner
Community Development Division, City of Ypsilanti
734-483-9646
ckochanek@cityofypsilanti.com

From: Paul Manion [<mailto:paul@windowanddoorcenter.com>]
Sent: Friday, April 06, 2018 4:03 PM
To: Cynthia Kochanek <CKochanek@cityofypsilanti.com>
Subject: Marvin Cut Sheet

Hi Cindy,

Cut sheet attached...

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks and have a great weekend!

Paul Manion
810.922.0799 Direct/ Cell

Marvin Design Gallery by Laurence Smith
2350 Franklin Rd., Suite 115
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302
248.333.9085 Office
248.333.9095 Fax

Laurence Smith Window & Door
3650 S. Huron Rd.
Bay City, MI 48706
989.684.9811
989.684.5288

www.windowanddoorcenter.com
paul@windowanddoorcenter.com