



MINUTES

City of Ypsilanti HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION Virtual Meeting

Tuesday, July 28, 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, Erika Lindsay, Amy Swift, James Chesnut

Commissioners Absent: Anne Stevenson, Ron Rupert

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

Additional Staff Present: Andrew Hellenga, City Clerk
Andy Aamodt, City Planner
Chelsea Thomas, Treasury Technician

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Lindsay (second: Swift) moved to approve the agenda as submitted.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS- none

PUBLIC HEARING—none

OLD BUSINESS—none

NEW BUSINESS

201 N River

**Awning.*

Applicant: Karen Facer, church representative- present

Discussion: Pettit: Asked applicant to walk the Commission through the awning work that is planned.

Facer: Stated that the awning will go on the non-historical portion of the west side of the building and will not be seen by people driving by River Street. Indicated that the awning will provide protection to people entering the elevator vestibule. Stated that it will also provide some protection from the weather for the volunteers who run the drive-through food pantry.

Pettit: Stated that it looks to be an aluminum structure *[reference materials]*. Asked if the posts are anchored in concrete *[reference materials]*.

Facer: Confirmed. Stated that they are anchored.

Chesnut: Asked for clarification on the height.

Facer: *[Clarified document materials]*. Stated that the special order would be for the ten-foot poles so that it will clear the light and the security camera.

Chesnut: Stated that it appears that the ten-foot elevation is going to tuck just about under that flashing detail *[reference photo materials]*.

Facer: Confirmed.

Chesnut: Asked -- and then the gutter system is intended to tie back into the two adjacent gutters.

Facer: Confirmed. Stated that to the right of the door is the gutter system *[reference photo materials]*, and the gutter from the awning will tie into that existing gutter.

Chesnut: Asked -- so all the water collected on the new awning will hit a gutter that wraps the new awning and then has a downspout that goes into that gutter to the right *[reference photo materials]*.

Facer: Confirmed. Stated that there will be no pooling of water on the existing parking lot.

Motion: Chesnut (second: Swift) moved to approve and issue a certificate of appropriateness for the work at 201 N River, as submitted in the application dated June 30, 2020, for installation of an Americana Sierra Patio Cover, as specified. Structural components mounted to the building shall occur at the mortar joints.

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, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Stevenson and Rupert

Motion carried.

216 S Washington

**Windows.*

Applicant: Brett Mahaffey and Larry Jones, Renewal by Andersen– present

Discussion: Pettit: Asked applicant to walk the Commission through the plans for additional windows.

Mahaffey: Indicated that the application is for three wood windows in the back and one on the back right-side of the house. Stated that the windows are not visible from the road. Stated that the plan is for one picture window and three double-hung. Indicated that the center sash of the picture window is broken and is covered with cardboard as a result *[reference photo materials]*. Stated that one window is in the shower well of the bathroom and is rotted. Indicated that the plan is to replace that window and do the interior trim in Azek to avoid future rotting issues. Indicated that the plan is to replace the upper level window, which is a wider one, and then a lower side window. Stated that the lower level 102 window is in the same room as 101 *[reference photo materials]*. Indicated that the plan is to change 101 to a gliding window to allow the homeowner to open it up, get a breeze through the house and see and talk to their kids playing in the yard.

[Further clarifying discussion as to room window locations]

Pettit: Asked what window 101 would look like.

Mahaffey: Stated that the two outer windows would slide into the center one *[reference drawing]*.

[Further clarifying discussion, reference drawing, as to window 101]

Chesnut: Summarizing, stated that what it will look like is it is going to be approximately a three-inch frame at the perimeter of the window and then the vertical mullions will be about two inches.

Mahaffey: Confirmed.

Pettit: Asked if both gliders can be opened at the same time.

Mahaffey: Confirmed, no.

Lindsay: Indicated that both left and right sides would be recessed, which could create a different kind of shadow *[reference drawing]*. Stated that what was a kind of grille pattern, now is a really thick and heavy line *[reference drawing]*.

Mahaffey: Acknowledged.

Lindsay: To clarify, asked if this is on the back façade.

Mahaffey: Confirmed.

Swift: Asked if the glass is broken on the actual sash or on the storm window *[reference photo materials]*.

Mahaffey: Stated that it is on the inside.

Swift: Asked if the pane is in a similar condition as the storm is depicted *[reference photo materials]*.

Mahaffey: Stated that the outside storm is fine and is not broken. Stated that it might be cracked but the interior glass is broken where the cardboard is *[reference photo materials]*.

[Further clarifying discussion as to the condition of the wood and paint on the sash, reference photo materials]

[Discussion as to replacement appropriateness for window 101]

Jones: *[Invitation to commissioners to visit the site and view the first two phases of work completed]*

[Discussion regarding Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic of Historic Structures as to repair/replacement]

[Discussion as to accomplishing window energy efficiency]

Pettit: In summary *[reference documentation and photos]*, stated that there is nothing showing that window 101 is destroyed and not repairable. Stated that it looks like the storm has done a good job of protecting the window.

Jones: Indicated that since the primary concern is to make the home air tight and sealed up, it would be appreciated if they could at least put the picture window in there.

Swift: Asked if the picture window would still have grilles.

Jones: Confirmed. Stated that they would be totally replicated.

Swift: Asked if they are true divided lites.

Mahaffey: Confirmed. Stated that there would be grilles on the inside and outside, and then there is a divider bar between the panes of glass.

Lindsay: Asked about the possibility of, instead of sliders, having two casements on the sides that are opening and one piece down the middle that is stationary.

[Discussion ensued regarding alternative options]

Pettit: Asked, as to window 102, if the proposal is to replace the double-hung *[reference photo*

materials].

Mahaffey: Stated that they would match it exactly.

[Discussion regarding the history of the home and previous work done]

Mahaffey: Stated that 201 is a double-casement window right above 101. Stated that it was completely shut and had to be banged open.

[Discussion ensued as to existing window placement and window condition of 201]

Pettit: Asked if they are planning a similar double-hung/similar lite pattern.

Mahaffey: Confirmed.

Pettit: Asked about the next window.

Mahaffey: Stated that 202 is a double-hung window in the bathroom. Stated that it is very rotted because it is in the shower well. Indicated that they would like to do textured glass on the top and bottom for additional privacy reasons.

[Discussion ensued as to historical appropriateness of privacy glass/options]

Mahaffey: Stated that going back to the picture window, the 101, that he looked into the sizes. Stated that they are not able to do an awning window that big. Stated that it is just over six-feet wide by five-feet high. Stated that if they match that same front of the house, the casement windows with five-inches on the mullion on a double-casement or even a triple-casement for that wide of an opening, would probably not be that bad.

Chesnut: Asked if they can do a picture window in that size.

Jones: Confirmed. Stated that he was thinking about two double-hung windows to match the rest of the back of the house.

Chesnut: Indicated that the commissioners discussed earlier the intent to match what is there — the material and aesthetic. Indicated that the Commission is doing their best to discuss options for the ventilation that is desired and the audible communication in the back yard.

Jones: Stated that the only problem with the casement is if the windows are open and the kids are running around, we would not want them to run into the sash.

[Discussion continued]

Mahaffey: Asked if they would be allowed to replace it with a picture window with matching grilles, to look like that *[reference photo materials]* with a three-wide-three-high grille pattern.

[Discussion ensued as to repair/replacement appropriateness]

Mahaffey: Asked if the Commission has a list of repair companies that could be given to the homeowner.

Slagor: *[Indicated that the City does not endorse specific contractors but shared the names of agency references who may be able to provide assistance]*

[Final clarifying discussion was had]

[Procedural discussion ensued]

Mahaffey: Stated that he would like to amend the application for all the windows, except for 101, to be replaced.

Slagor: Clarified that window 101 was removed from the application and that the other windows remain as originally presented.

Swift: Stated that she will be voting for replacement and approval of the proposal based on the era of what seems to be the windows that are in this particular package not being original to the first construction date of the house.

Motion: Swift (second: Chesnut) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 216 S Washington for the replacement of three windows with Renewal by Andersen in Red Rock brown. The new windows shall be full frame replicas that match the grille pattern and dimensions of the original windows. In the bathroom [window #202], a hammered glass or similarly obscure and historic glass shall be in the upper and lower sashes.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#5 – Preserve distinctive features.

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

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

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

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Stevenson and Rupert

Motion carried.

100 W Michigan

**Windows.*

Applicant: Conor Doran, property representative; and Nick Kresta, O'Neil Construction - present

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

Kresta: Stated that there are twelve windows on the south face of the building. Indicated that the existing windows are failing non-original vinyl windows which need replacing. *[Referencing diagram materials]*, indicated that the replacement windows are as similar as they could replicate

to what is believed the original windows were, in that they equal the panes and the grilles are the same dimension. Stated that it is four separate operable sections with the thick muntin portion in the middle. Stated that it is all wood.

Pettit: Stated that the windows look a hundred percent better.

Swift: Acknowledged the challenges the applicants dealt with and indicated her thanks for their hard work.

Pettit: Asked applicant to talk about the infill piece at the top [*reference photo materials*].

Kresta: Stated that at some point the windows were already squared up and have got infills installed on both levels [*reference photo materials*]. Stated that they are not moveable. Stated that they are working within the opening available to them. Stated that it is the window proper that is being replaced. Stated that those are sitting proud. Stated that they will recess those as well into the opening.

Pettit: Asked if any of the infill arches need anything beyond what is existing there [*reference photo materials*]. Asked if there will be any work on that portion of the opening.

Kresta: Stated that the header infills will remain as they are now. Stated that if they take it out and find there is something that needs to be done to ensure a stable installation, then they will do that. Stated that aesthetically and functionally, there is no change to the header.

Swift: Stated that the whole frame is being set back into the brick. Asked if the sill will protrude and sit proud outside for drainage.

Kresta: Confirmed. Stated that they will take the drip edge beyond the face of the brick.

Swift: Stated that it looks like the brick mold has a slight profile to it.

Kresta: Confirmed. Stated that there will be a profiled casing around it.

Chesnut: Stated that it looks like there is an inch and five-sixteenths thick material that will frame these windows on the exterior and sit proud of the face of the brick.

Kresta: Stated -- no, that will not be proud of the face of the brick; that will all be within the brick opening.

[Clarifying discussion continued, referencing materials, regarding sills/face of the brick]

Kresta: Stated that the important thing is that they are not going to drip water. Stated that the brick will take on water, and so they understand that some material is needed to get any shed water off on to the face of the brick where it can continue down and not seep in. Stated that once these windows are taken out, there may need to be some work done right there for some sort of sub-sill [*reference materials*]. Stated that whatever they do there is going to be in that effort. Stated that they are not going to leave standing water on top of the brick.

[Further clarifying discussion continued]

Motion: Swift (second: Lindsay) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 100 W Michigan for installation of 12 new Jeld Wen Sitrine double-hung wood windows on the façade second and third stories, as specified.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#5 – Preserve distinctive features.

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

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

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Stevenson and Rupert

Motion carried.

301 Maple

**Accessory building.*

Applicant: Adriaan Van Velden, owner- present

Discussion: Pettit: Asked applicant to talk the Commission through the proposal.

Van Velden: Stated that the proposal is to replace the existing shed which is eight-by-eight. Stated that the intent is to build an accessory structure that will provide more space for a garden shed and also for storage. *[Reference drawing]* -- Stated that the building is eleven-feet wide by thirty-two-feet long. Stated that it is in the west side yard, three feet off the west boundary. Stated that it is about sixty foot from the front property line and about thirty-feet behind the six-foot fence on the front side of the property. Stated that it is about forty feet from the rear property line. Stated that the intended materials are board-and-batten siding painted white. Stated that the house is pink with white trim, and the idea is to do the accessory building all in white. Stated that he is not yet certain on the type of windows but the intention is to do possibly a couple of high-level awning windows and then a couple of single or double-hung wood windows, clad externally in either aluminum or Fiberglas. Stated that they would be Pella and would match the shape and form of the windows on the existing house. Stated that they would be about thirty-by-sixty. Stated that the existing house has windows in similar proportions, though slightly larger. Stated that at this point, the plan is for a double door on the north side to the rear of the property. Stated that on the south elevation, there will probably be no opening at this point but the intention is to frame it out, so that a double door could be done in the future. Stated that the proposed roof material is a 5v Crimp traditional metal roof in a galvalume finish *[reference photo materials]*. Stated a change in the footings -- to a six-by-six pressure-treated wood post series of footings.

Swift: Asked if this is behind a fence.

Van Velden: Confirmed. Stated that there is a six-foot fence along the front property line. Stated that it runs from the southwest corner of the house to the west property line.

[Further clarifying discussion as to window/door type/style]

Motion: Swift (second: Chesnut) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 301 Maple as submitted in the application dated July 8, 2020 for installation of a new garden shed as specified. The new structure shall match the drawings and material lists submitted. Additionally, as discussed, the windows should match the configuration as submitted but be either a wood or aluminum-clad wood material. The door should also match the design submitted with a half-lite material and be in compliance with the door guidelines that outline either a natural material or door or synthetic door that does not have a textured finish. The exterior wood components of the structure shall be painted. Amendment - after the application was submitted, there was a change to pressure treated footings instead of concrete sonotubes as listed.

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, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Stevenson and Rupert

Motion carried.

217 W Michigan

**Balcony deck replacement and additional structural support.*

Applicant: Thomas Rumford, owner; David Post, contractor- not present

Discussion: Pettit: Summarized the application.

[Commission reviewed and discussed the proposal and reference materials]

[Procedural discussion]

Motion: Chesnut (second: Lindsay) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 217 W Michigan as submitted in the application dated July 14, 2020 for work to the rear egress balcony. A new structural support timber post shall be added as specified; the balcony deck shall be radius edged deck boards as specified; the stair treads may be repaired as needed. A new balustrade will not be installed at this time per note number 5 in the Staff Review. For future reference and future application, the applicant should reference the handrail guidelines provided by the City of Ypsilanti [see Fact Sheet] prior to submitting for approval of the balustrade. Approval is conditioned that the wood components be painted or stained in an opaque finish. An additional comment is that note B on sheet S-1 of the structural drawings be clarified if in fact new column locations are to be located for structural reasons, and resubmitted to the City for final approval by the Historic District Commission.

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, Lindsay, Swift, Chesnut
Nays: None
Absent: Commissioners Stevenson and Rupert
Motion carried.

STUDY ITEMS-none

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

1. **210 Oak** – Paint
2. **310 Florence** – Fence
3. **326 E Forest** – Paint
4. **116 N Hamilton** – Paint

Motion: Lindsay (second: Swift) moved to accept the administrative approvals for 210 Oak - paint; 310 Florence– fence; 326 E Forest – paint; 116 N Hamilton – paint.

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

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Property Monitoring

Commissioner/Staff discussion as to property monitoring.

2. Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Pettit shared a Tesla Solar Glass Roof Installation presentation.

Discussion regarding the Historic District commissioner vacancy.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS—none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of June 23, 2020

Motion: Lindsay (second: Swift) moved to approve the minutes of June 23, 2020 as submitted.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

MEETING ADJOURNED at 9:48 p.m.

Full Minutes Prepared By: Nancy Hare-Dickerson