



MINUTES

City of Ypsilanti HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION Virtual Meeting held via Zoom

Tuesday, April 13, 2021
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 – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti
Anne Stevenson - Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti
Erika Lindsay - Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti
James Chesnut – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti
James Ratzlaff – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti
Amy Swift – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti

Commissioners Absent: None

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

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

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS—none

PUBLIC HEARING—none

OLD BUSINESS—none

NEW BUSINESS

222 N River

**Solar array.*

Applicants: William Crawford, contractor – not present

Discussion: Pettit: Provided an overview of the application contents. Stated that there may be commissioner questions about the location of the solar panels on the main body of the house which can be seen from a primary public viewpoint.

[Commissioners reviewed and discussed the application reference packet materials]

Ratzlaff: Query regarding the color of the existing roof and if the solar panels match.

Swift: Indicated that because the roof is so shallow, there is not as much roof surface that you see visually as part of the character-defining features of the home.

Stevenson: Stated that the proposed location is very noticeable from the street. Stated that there are two additions on the back that have quite a bit of roof surface. Indicated that the presence of the applicant would be helpful in order to discuss what the possibilities would be of putting the panels on the rear.

[Discussion continued as to appropriateness of proposed location/shadow considerations/outstanding questions needing answers from applicant]

Lindsay: Indicated that though the proposed panels are on the house, because of the roof pitch and because of the scale of the roof right in that spot, they would not be seen from that particular vantage point. Stated that if we were walking down the street, we would see it.

[Discussion continued as to appropriateness of proposed location/removeable work standards/precedent setting/case-by-case decision-making/possible re-review of Fact Sheet]

[Procedural discussion]

Motion: Lindsay (second: Chesnut) moved to table the proposed work at 222 N River, citing more information needed; specifically, a shadow study and information on location options for the panels.

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

39 E Cross

**Application for rooftop patio improvements was moved to later in the agenda as the applicant was not present.*

513 N River

**Windows.*

Applicants: Johnny Merehouyias, contractor-Alexandria Windows, Doors & Metal Roofing – present

Discussion: Pettit: Indicated that the application is for the replacement of some windows. Asked applicant

to briefly describe the work that is planned.

Merehouyias: Indicated that the plan is to replace three (3) windows – one, on the north elevation facing Oak Street; the other two, on the west elevation facing the rear of the home. Stated that all three windows are visible from Oak Street. Stated that the existing windows are wood with an aluminum storm window on them. Stated that the proposed replacements would be a Pella Lifestyle series which is wood with aluminum clad, that would match the above window *[reference photo material]*.

Pettit: Asked about the glass option on the upper window *[reference photo material]*.

Merehouyias: Indicated that it is a privacy window in the bathroom. Stated that the glass is sandblasted to give it that texture *[reference photo material]* and is also tempered.

Swift: Asked if the existing windows are original to the structure.

Merehouyias: Stated his belief that the windows were previously replaced but are still older than some of the other windows are.

Swift: Indicated that she cannot tell the vintage of the proposed windows to be replaced. Stated that she would like to see their condition if they are original windows.

Slagor: Staff shared that he conducted a site visit with the property owner and confirmed that all extant windows in the house are either 1990s wood replacement sashes, or mid-twentieth century aluminum replacement sashes.

Motion: Stevenson (second: Lindsay) moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 513 N River as submitted in the application dated March 22, 2021, installation of three replacement windows in the locations specified. Replacement windows are to be Pella Lifestyle double-hung aluminum-clad wood windows in white. The proposed bathroom replacement window on second story of the west elevation may have privacy glass as it is a non-street-facing elevation. Replacement windows are appropriate for this building because the current windows are non-historic.

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, Lindsay, Chesnut, Ratzlaff

Nays: Commissioner Swift

Absent: None

Motion carried.

104 S Huron

**Porch repair and new porch flooring.*

Applicants: Michael Condon, contractor – present

Discussion: Pettit: Asked applicant to describe the proposed work.

Condon: Indicated that the plan is to redo the porch due to structural instability. Stated that the idea is to correct the pier that is leaning [*reference photo materials*]. Stated that they will have to reframe the support structure for the deck which means having to remove the decking, railings and skirting. For the new deck surface, the plan is to use the Timbertech tongue-and-groove porch flooring. Stated that they are not doing anything with the stairs.

[Discussion as to stair and column considerations]

Chesnut: Indicated that in looking through the application, it seems the one change is the decking material --- that you are going to replace the deck and you are going to change the finish material of the deck; that everything else is effectively going to stay the same, materially.

Condon: Confirmed.

Motion: Chesnut (second: Stevenson) moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 104 S Huron as submitted in the application dated March 24, 2021, repair work to the porch as specified and new porch flooring. Any replacements in the repair of the porch skirt and railing should be made in-kind and painted when complete. The porch flooring shall be Timbertech composite tongue-and-groove with a textured finish.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#5- Preserve distinctive features.

#6- Repair don't replace, replacements shall match the original.

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

Nays: None

Absent: None

Motion carried.

211 Ferris

**Roof.*

Applicants: Mike Watcke, contractor – present

Discussion: Pettit: Indicated that there are questions about the extent of the work to be done.

Swift: Asked what is the reasoning behind the partial replacement.

Watcke: Stated that the front half is leaking and the back half is not. Stated that the front half has deteriorated more than the back half. Stated that the replacement is with the same color shingles but with a different manufacturer. [*Explained manufacturer differences*].

Pettit: Asked if it currently has a ridge vent.

Watcke: Stated that they would follow the historic specifications – no can vents, only ridges.

Swift: Indicated that there appears to be a uniqueness to the way the shingles are arranged. Asked if the front and back shingle pattern is going to be similar *[reference photo materials]*.

Watcke: Stated that they would use the GAF Timberline dimensional shingles which are the same color. Indicated that you cannot see the front and back at the same time to see that it was different.

Ratzlaff: Indicated an opinion that those shingles are pretty characteristic (diamond shaped) on that building *[reference photo materials]*, at least from what you can see from the street. Asked if there is an issue with getting shingles like that.

Watcke: Indicated that they do sell the Sheriff-Goslin shingles in Michigan but they are more costly to install. Stated that the GAF Timberline dimensional shingles last longer – 50 years.

[Discussion as to historic value of the existing roof pattern]

Stevenson: Indicated an opinion that the roof pattern is a distinctive feature that the house has at this point that has been created over time that the Commission would want to see preserved.

Watcke: Stated that those shingles are probably about twenty years old and there is only one layer of roof because it was a tear-off before these were put on. Indicated that the property owner wanted some that lasts longer.

Slagor: Staff indicated that the main reason the application was brought before the Commission is because, although it would be the same asphalt material, it was not a full roof replacement and there would be two different styles of shingles on the same building.

[Discussion continued as to the difference in the existing and proposed roof pattern/HDC guidelines/ possible precedent setting]

Lindsay: Asked about the mechanics of how the match of the overlap is planned, where the old roof meets with the new roof.

Watcke: Stated that it is going to be the whole front all the way up to the ridge; that all those cap shingles and the ridge vent will be replaced with new. Stated that the cap shingles will look exactly the same as the Sheriff-Goslins.

[Discussion continued as to partial vs full roof replacement considerations]

Motion: Swift (second: Chesnut) moved to deny the proposed work at 211 Ferris as the proposed work establishes conflicting textures between the two roof slopes and does not meet the HDC guideline that states “shingles must be similar to the existing shingles on the structure or any adjoining roof in color and material.”

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

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

58 E Forest

**Porch, fence and deck.*

Applicants: Jesse Kranyak and Elizabeth Ervin, owners – present

Discussion: *Excerpts of Staff Review: The applicant has three components to this proposed project: a fence enclosure, restoring a removed entry porch, and installing a deck.*

As to the fence, applicant proposes a continuation of the existing fence that was previously approved by the HDC. The new fence will be built and painted to perfectly match the existing fence.

As to the entry porch, the applicant proposes to reconstruct an entry porch on the west elevation that was removed by a previous owner. The porch will consist of a run of stairs and a platform.

The deck will extend across the south (rear) elevation of the house.

Kranyak: Stated that he is flexible as to the type of railing. Stated that the deck was to be made with wood, concrete footers, nothing too complex. Indicated that the proposed fence would be on the west side of the house. Stated that there is a fence existing along the property line which they wanted to bring it in towards the house and then square it up into the house. Confirmed that the new fence will match the existing.

Pettit: As to the decking, mentioned the grade change. Asked how far does it come along the side of the house to the east.

Kranyak: Stated that it will run the complete length of the back of the house. Stated that the original deck is only on a small portion of the house. Stated that an addition was put on the west side of the house by a different owner, which is now a kitchen and another bedroom *[reference photo materials]*. Indicated that the deck will start there, run across the back to where it would hit the level grade. Indicated that there are steps right there that are dangerous due to step depth *[reference photo materials]*. Stated that the plan is to completely cover up the steps with the deck. Stated that you would walk from level ground onto the deck and the grade change would be hidden behind the deck skirting. Stated that they would not be cutting any holes in the house; that the deck is not attached to the house.

[Further discussion as to location of original decking/railing considerations/skirting requirements/grading considerations/decking length/aesthetics/Porch Fact Sheet guidelines]

Lindsay: Stated that she would lean towards tabling the application for more information and for some other ideas from the applicant regarding the deck specifically – that the fence and the small porch are fine as proposed. *[Commissioner Swift voiced agreement]*

Pettit: Asked for clarification of the further details requested.

Lindsay: Stated -- a few different designs for how to deal with the really tall corner in the southwest corner of the deck, that major grade change as to how that might be considered while still attempting to have the deck *[reference photo materials]*; investigating a bit more about what that might look like.

[Clarifying discussion re: design considerations/further information needed and ways to resubmit]
[Straw poll discussion as to possible approvable items]
[Procedural discussion]

Kranyak: Requested to amend the application to remove the deck.

Motion: Ratzlaff (second: Lindsay) moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 58 E Forest as amended in the application dated April 13, 2021, for construction of a fence, and entry porch as specified. The fence shall match the existing fence in style, material, height, finish, and color. The porch shall be constructed as specified and finished in an opaque stain or paint. The guardrail shall be built in the style depicted and constructed of wood. The porch shall meet the specifications of HDC guidelines [Porch Fact Sheet].

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, Lindsay, Ratzlaff

Nays: Commissioners Swift, Chesnut

Absent: None

Motion carried.

39 E Cross

**Rooftop patio improvements.*

Applicants: Keith Gipfert, contractor - not present

Discussion: *Excerpt per Staff Review: The applicant wishes to build a roof over an existing second floor patio atop the rear ell of the building. Some of this work has already been started without HDC approval.*

Pettit: Expressed having questions as to the following: proposed deck surface information; clarity as to "as specified" portions of the materials; understanding final new grade considerations; the bar – understanding of proposed removal but not replacement; understanding light fixtures - proposed LED up lights.

Motion: Swift (second: Stevenson) moved to table the application for work at 39 E Cross as submitted in the application dated as March 22, 2021, for construction of a roof over the rear second floor outdoor seating area as submitted. The Commission would like to see details for the following: materiality with regards to decking and/or surface material for decking, roof material with the recommendation that an alternative be sought; the lighting, would like to reevaluate the up lighting as proposed and see spec. sheets for lighting proposed and would like to understand the position of the screen as proposed, and would request that someone from the project attend the next meeting to answer questions.

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

STUDY ITEMS

206 N Huron

**Prefabricated Carport.*

Applicant was not present, project not discussed.

302 E Cross

**Demolition by Neglect Timeline and Study Items.*

Applicant was not present, project not discussed in detail.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

330 E Forest

**Roof.*

Motion: Lindsay (second: Chesnut) moved to accept the administrative approval for 330 E Forest for re-roofing.

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

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Memo: Notice to Proceed

Slagor: Staff reviewed when to use the Notice to Proceed determination. *[Query/discussion followed]*

2. Property Monitoring

Commissioners/Staff discussed property issues under review.

3. Updates from Staff

Re: Michigan Historic Preservation Network – Upcoming training follow-up.

4. Commissioner Comments

Commissioners, who wished, shared additional comments.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS—none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of March 23, 2021

Motion: Stevenson (second: Chesnut) moved to approve the minutes of March 23, 2021, as submitted.

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

Nays: None

Absent: None

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.

Full Minutes Prepared By: Nancy Hare-Dickerson