



MINUTES

City of Ypsilanti HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION Virtual Meeting

Tuesday, May 12, 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 7:07pm

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

Commissioners Absent: 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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

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

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioner Rupert

Unanimous. Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS- none

PUBLIC HEARING—none

OLD BUSINESS

103 W Michigan

**Replacement windows.*

Applicant: Michael Condon, contractor- present

Discussion: Pettit: Indicated that per Commission review and discussion of the application at the April 28,

2020 HDC meeting, it was deemed necessary to request that the applicant provide more details about the existing condition of the windows which are proposed to be replaced.

Condon: Stated that there had been issues with windows on the rear of the building. Stated that one of the issues was that, in heavy rain, there was leakage into the building due to the gutter over-spilling. Stated that the water would run down the surface of the building. Stated that as a consequence of that, the bottom rail on the lower sashes on the two windows is rotten. Stated that the sill is rotten on the lower window *[reference photo materials]*. Stated that there is a stairway directly in front of these windows *[reference photo materials]*; stated that they are not tempered glass, which is a Code violation. Indicated that the combination of the water leakage, not meeting Code and the presence of rot are the reasons for wanting to replace the two windows.

Pettit: Asked if these windows *[reference materials]*, currently are visually blocked by a structure that was added, south of the building.

Condon: Confirmed.

[Review of photo materials; discussion as to the nature of the structure, visual blockage, existing condition of windows]

Swift: Asked if there are storms that are a part of the repair.

Condon: Stated that the aluminum storms that are there would be removed.

Swift: Asked if they are just going to be removed and no new storms put in.

Condon: Confirmed. Stated that there would be a new double hung tempered insulated glass window installed there, that is aluminum clad. Stated that the storms would go away entirely.

[Further discussion regarding existing storm windows/leakage issues]

Swift: Asked if the sills and header are to be repaired as part of the repair scope.

Condon: Confirmed.

Pettit: Asked if the proposed replacement window fits in the brick opening.

Condon: Stated that that is the intention -- to not utilize the existing sash opening but to remove the jamb and install a full clad unit. *[Discussed further material details]*

Swift: Asked if any mortar tuck pointing would be done in the area that seems to be eroded *[reference photo materials]* in order to make sure that no water gets in behind the jamb units.

Condon: Stated -- where it is immediately adjacent to the window, yes.

Swift: Stated that the light pattern was also something the Commission had a question about.

Asked if these *[reference materials]* are two-over-twos.

Condon: Confirmed. Stated that they would be replaced with the same.

[Further discussion as to light pattern considerations]

Chesnut: To clarify, asked if these are going to be new construction windows and not replacement windows.

Condon: Confirmed.

Chesnut: Asked -- so you will build back out the framing required between the brick to install this window and then you will trim it with trim material that matches the existing.

Condon: Stated -- to a certain extent. Stated that when you remove the jamb on an old double hung window, there is a weight pocket. Stated that then they would have to line that weight pocket with framing. Stated that the intention is that the jamb of the new window which is attached to it all the way around will fit within the masonry opening. Stated that, then, that will be attached to the framing which is to be installed into the weight pocket. Stated that the jamb of the new window will be very close to the dimensions of the masonry opening.

Swift: Asked if that means that we are giving up more area of glass.

Condon: Stated that it should be very similar, within ninety-five percent of the existing glass area.

Swift: Asked – so if it is not the exact same, then it might have slightly more glass.

Condon: Stated -- possibly slightly more.

Pettit: Stated that it seems that something that would best fit the masonry opening would be the most appropriate.

Chesnut: Asked -- to clarify, this is a new construction window.

Condon: Confirmed.

Chesnut: Stated that with a replacement window, you might typically down-size the glass but this is a new construction window that fits the brick opening.

[Further discussion as to glass size considerations]

[Discussion as to installation procedure]

Swift: Asked if the sill is going to match the same dimension along the masonry *[reference photo materials]*.

Condon: Stated that that is the original timber sill on that particular window opening [*reference photo materials*] where the intention is to replace it with poured concrete, with a slight projection from the existing masonry.

Swift: Asked where the aluminum clad sill would be, that is part of the window unit.

Condon: Stated that that will sit on top.

Swift: Asked for clarification of where it would be, in its projection outward.

Condon: Stated that the face of the window jamb will be behind the turn of the brick where the brick jamb is [*reference photo materials*]. Stated that the proposed concrete sill that will replace the wooden sill will project about an inch beyond the brick and will form as such that it sticks out like a masonry sill.

[Further clarifying discussion as to jamb considerations; discussion as to appropriateness of proposed material and applicant's reasoning for the requested use]

Chesnut: For clarification, asked if the plan is to swap out the wood header for concrete.

Condon: Stated that there is no intention to do so. Stated that the header appears to have enough structural integrity. Stated that the water sheds straight down except at the joint in between the brick that it is supporting and the face of the header itself. Stated that once they get into it, they will know better.

Motion: Swift (second: Chesnut) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 103 W Michigan as submitted in the application dated March 13, 2020 for replacement of two windows on the south elevation. The new Jeld Wen windows are to be wood-framed with aluminum cladding and match the size and configuration of the originals. The windows are to be two-over-two configuration. The approval includes new concrete sills and possible headers, if necessary.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

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

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioner Rupert

Unanimous. Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

101 W Michigan

**Amendment to Storefront System.*

Applicant: Richard Muszynski, owner- present

***Commissioner Swift recused herself from discussion and voting/turned off her video and*

microphone, having cited a possible conflict of interest.

Discussion: Chesnut: Summarized his preparation of a PDF mark-up, resulting from Commission discussion of the Study Item presented at the April 28, 2020 HDC meeting, illustrating as-built dimensions of the North and East elevations, with the intention of facilitating the Commission's understanding of how what is built relates to the design intent. Indicated that, "in general, it appears that what is being constructed is dimensionally close to the design intent as drawn, with one or two exceptions as noted in the mark-up".

Muszynski: Indicated that the same guidelines would be followed per the architect. Stated that as previously discussed at past HDC meetings, it was unknown what would be found once the old façade was removed. Stated that there were a lot of things that had to be worked around. Stated that this is the closest to what they could come to from what the architect proposed.

[Discussion continued as to the referenced mark-up]

Motion: Chesnut (second: Stevenson) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the amended work at 101 W Michigan, as submitted in the application dated April 28, 2020. The façade storefront system, including windows and trim, shall be finished according to the details in the submitted drawings, dated April 30, 2020.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

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

Abstain: Commissioner Swift

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioner Rupert

Motion carried.

109 Maple

**Removal of outer two layers of siding.*

Applicant: Matthew Peters, owner- present

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

Peters: Stated that he is interested in either re-siding or restoring the original wood siding that is on the home. Stated that it is currently wrapped in aluminum. Stated that all of the trim around the windows is also wrapped in aluminum. Stated that the house originally had a 7-inch Reveal wood siding that is cedar. Stated that on top of that, at some point asbestos tiles were installed. Stated that, at some point, on top of that, aluminum was installed. Stated that there is currently three layers of siding on the home. Stated that he would like to remove the aluminum and the asbestos. Indicated that he will perform the work. Stated that he would like to remove all of the aluminum and all of the trim in the interest of exposing the original wood siding to see what kind of condition it is in right now. Stated that in some areas, specifically on that corner eave of the roof *[reference photo material]*, that corner had a substantial amount of water damage which

came in through that whole corner of the house right there *[reference photo material]*. Stated that some of the siding will probably be beyond repair. Stated that he has explored options with different sidings.

[Applicant discussed exploration of different siding material options]

Stated that he would like to remove all three layers of siding and redo the entire house in the JamesHardiePlank. Stated that he would need to first get a look at the original siding to see what the condition is. Stated that there are certain pros and cons with either option.

[Applicant further discussed above-stated pros/cons, material options and reasoning for the proposed work request]

Pettit: Indicated that the Commission is charged with the responsibility of following the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Structures when making decisions.

[Explained Secretary of Interior guidelines for repair/replacement]

Swift: Indicated that the Commission would need to know the conditional issues in order to make an appropriate decision as to replacement *[discussed possible scenarios/outcomes of removing siding]*. Stated that the same holds true for windows. Stated that in the event that the existing or original materials are not able to be salvaged, then a conversation could be had about what is the best solution for replacement.

Chesnut: *[Discussed additional examples of possible scenarios/outcomes of removing siding layers]*. Reiterated that the Commission would need to know what is underneath the layers in order to give solid direction.

Pettit: Asked about applicant's intent based on the possibilities -- if applicant would embark on removing siding layers if unable to do the full out HardiePlank replacement.

Peters: Stated that that is the main concern, which is why he wanted to understand where the Commission stood. Stated that he is on the fence as to whether or not to keep the wood siding.

[Discussion continued as to material options and considerations]

Slagor: Indicated that an additional point of possible discussion is that the Sanborn maps show that there was originally a covered front porch that spanned the width of the façade. Stated that there may be some issues with siding where that porch groove used to be depending on how it was attached. Also pointed out the water damage on the rear ell.

[Discussion as to porch groove area and rear ell water damage considerations]

Chesnut: Suggested that applicant may want to keep track of documenting things that are important to the original building and provided possible reasons for doing so.

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

work at 109 Maple, as submitted in the application dated May 5, 2020, including removal of the aluminum and asbestos siding to assess the condition of the original wood siding.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#2 – Do not destroy original character. Do not remove or alter historic material or features.

#5 – Preserve distinctive features.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioner Rupert

Unanimous. Motion carried.

STUDY ITEMS

109 Maple

**Windows and porch.*

Applicant: Matthew Peters, owner- present

Discussion: Pettit: Asked applicant to discuss the proposed work being planned.

Peters: Provided a Power Point presentation highlighting his proposed work projects – reconstructing the front porch, new windows and new or restored wood siding.

[Discussion regarding proposed wrap-around porch considerations]

Stevenson: Discussed the architectural history of the home.

[Discussion as to condition of existing windows/proposed replacement/options]

Pettit: Explained to applicant examples of documentation to bring before the Commission to aid in the decision-making process.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS- none

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Revised Draft Door Fact Sheet

Commissioners/Staff reviewed and discussed the Draft revisions.

Motion: Lindsay (second: Swift) moved to adopt the new Door Fact Sheet as submitted.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioner 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 April 28, 2020

Motion: Stevenson (second: Swift) moved to approve the minutes of April 28, 2020 as submitted.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioner 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 9:08 p.m.

Full Minutes Prepared By: Nancy Hare-Dickerson