



# MINUTES

## City of Ypsilanti HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION Virtual Meeting held via Zoom

Tuesday, June 22, 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 7:04pm

Commissioners Present:                Alex Pettit – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti  
Anne Stevenson - Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti  
Amy Swift – Alexandria County, Alexandria City, Virginia  
James Chesnut – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti  
James Ratzlaff – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti

Commissioners Absent:                Erika Lindsay, Stefan Szumko

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

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

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

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS**—none

**PUBLIC HEARING**—none

### OLD BUSINESS

#### 319 S Washington

*\*Windows.*

Applicant:                                  Dan Gilbert, contractor – present  
Matt Duncan, Michigan Department of Health and Human Services - present

Discussion:                                *[Excerpt of Staff Review Notes: the application is for work completed without a permit. All wood*

*windows on the house were replaced, 39 total, through a grant from the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) to remediate lead. The grant was federally funded, and therefore would have been reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Page 31 of 129 c.]*

Pettit: Summarized that after the June 8, 2021 HDC meeting, there were some modifications on the existing installation of the new windows. Indicated that new photos were submitted. Asked applicant if there was any other information to be provided.

Gilbert: Stated that the first option was painting the windows and adding trim to close the gap between the brick molding where there are multiple windows in a row. Stated that they did that on the front of the building. *[Reference new photo materials]*. Stated that the grilles are not installed. Stated that if the grilles were installed and painted, the finished product would look much different than the white trim and would blend in well.

Ratzlaff: Stated that he walked by the home and, in his opinion, with the new painting, one would really have to look to notice the trim being proud.

Pettit: Stated an observation *[reference new photo materials]* that it looks very different than it did before; that there are changes with adjusting the way the color contrast works with paint. Stated that the infill piece between the window units on the combined window arrangement also makes a difference. Stated that nothing has changed in terms of construction but it looks to be moving, visually, in the direction towards something which has been approved in the District. Stated that the screens not being there also changes the look; that you see more of the various steps of the reveal.

Gilbert: Stated that the windows will have screens. Stated that the grids will tie it together. Indicated that trying to improve the installation with removing the brick mold will not accomplish the desired effect; that it would be a difficult task to do that *[Discussion followed as to reasons, reference new photo materials]*.

Pettit: Asked if there is anything different about the sill detail *[reference new photo materials]*.

Gilbert: Confirmed. Stated that the sills stand out farther than the brick mold. *[Clarifying discussion followed]*.

Swift: Stated a concern with the adding of a sill piece. Asked about the thickness of the piece.

Gilbert: Stated that it is a quarter to three-eighths of an inch.

*[Discussion as to the installation of the sill piece/longevity]*

Swift: Stated that if that window *[reference new photo materials]* is not designed to go into a structure of this sort and was supposed to be designed to go into a masonry opening, which is what the brick mold and the way the sill is ultimately detailed seems to dictate, then I want to make sure that we are not creating an issue of water seepage into that wall cavity in the future.

*[Discussion continued re: sill - possible water issues and possible remedies]*

*[Discussion clarifying the application-extension timeline, per applicant query]*

Chesnut: Initiated discussion re: the sill, idea of cutting back the trim in between the windows.

*[Discussion continued as to possible remedy options and challenges]*

*[Discussion re: proposed grid patterns – considerations and concerns]*

*[Discussion re: plans for flanking/double hung windows]*

*[Procedural discussion re: motion language]*

Motion: Ratzlaff (second: Chesnut) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for work at 319 S Washington as submitted in the application dated April 21, 2021, for installation of Weathershield double-hung wood windows with replacement exterior grilles, with the flanking windows on the first story facade groupings having either one horizontal muntin or no muntin. The remaining new grilles shall match the original in dimension and configuration, with the previous stated exception stated. The new sashes shall be painted in a darker color to better blend in with the house. The sill should appear to be continuous between serial collections of windows. Also, the trim should appear to be continuous between flanking windows in serial groupings.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#5- Preserve distinctive features.

#6- Repair, do not replace. Replacements shall match original.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Chesnut, Ratzlaff

Nays: Commissioners Stevenson, Swift

Absent: Commissioners Lindsay, Szumko

Motion carried.

Commentary: Commissioner Swift spoke as to the importance of lead safe procedures for historic properties and the handling of future HDC applications regarding same.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **32 Photo**

*\*New Fence.*

Applicants: Adrienne Nickles, owner - present

Discussion: Pettit: Stated that the application is for the proposal of fence work.

Nickles: Confirmed.

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

Nickles: Indicated that they had a fence on their property when they moved in in 2015 that

deteriorated and fell over which needs to be replaced. Indicated that they live next door to Cultivate, which is a very busy area, with people often looking around their yard. Stated that the plan is to replace the fence with one that would extend about sixty-seven feet total along the south side of the driveway. Stated that there is another fence that is on the property line next to Cultivate that is a little over five feet, in which a small connector piece that would secure the entire yard would be added. *[Provided additional safety and privacy reasons for the proposed work].*

Stated that they are proposing a more contemporary style fence given the area of town *[reference packet materials].*

Swift: Asked if a gate is proposed.

Nickles: Confirmed. *[Reference drawing]* Stated that there is a gate that would go to the walkway and then a double gate that is close to the garage.

Swift: Asked about the small gap between the boards *[reference materials].*

Nickles: Stated that the plan is for a half-inch between the boards because cedar expands and contracts.

Pettit: Asked about the gate style.

Nickles: Stated that they want it to be continuous and contemporary looking.

Swift: Asked about the latch hardware.

Nickles: Stated it will be black.

*[Clarifying discussion re: existing fence height in back]*

*[Discussion re: fence material and opaque finish considerations]*

Swift: Initiated discussion re: addressing the unlevel grade from fence to garage.

Stevenson: Shared background information re: Photo Street – driveway/public right-of-way, per query.

*[Procedural discussion as to motion language]*

Motion: Swift (second: Ratzlaff) moved to approve and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for work at 32 Photo for installation of a 67-foot cedar horizontal board fence at the location specified in the application submitted June 15, 2021. The fence shall be no taller than 5-foot and may be finished in a clear coat finish. This fence design is appropriate for this particular location due to limited visibility, security issues concerning the high traffic in that part of town, and the contemporary and vernacular nature of the surrounding structures. Additionally, the gapping along the change in elevation should be minimized through a specific design intent.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#3- Do not imitate earlier styles.

#10- New work shall be removable.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Lindsay, Szumko

Motion carried.

## **217 N River**

*\*Metal roof.*

Applicants: Gary Turner, owner - present

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

Turner: Stated that when he bought the house, originally, he was going to put a large two-story addition off the back of the house and re-roof the entire house and addition with a galvalume finished standing-seam metal roofing. Stated that that work was approved by the HDC over a year ago but, since then, he has changed up his approach and decided to go with the dimensional shingles for the main home. *[Shared reasons for the decision]*. Stated that the proposal is to use a standing-seam galvalume metal roof system on the front porch and on the garage in the back. Stated that the main body of the house has the Sandcastle dimensional shingles *[reference photo materials]* which seems the closest to the original shake that was probably on the home in 1890. Stated that the idea is that the galvalume finish of the standing-seam metal roof on the front porch of the garage would also match the gutters and downspouts – six-inch galvalume gutters and a four-inch round galvalume downspout. Stated that it would stay basically white with the aluminum storm windows, galvalume finish on the standing-seam roof, gutters and spouts, and the garage. Stated that he is restoring the home as he found it.

Pettit: Explained that one issue the Commission would be looking at is the mixed materiality of the roofing between the various surfaces. Opened up the discussion for thoughts regarding the mixed materials and the circumstances under which they are planned to be applied.

Chesnut: Asked what was pulled off the porch.

Turner: Stated that it was shingled.

Chesnut: Stated that it looks like a hip rather than a flat roof.

Turner: Confirmed. Stated that it is an asymmetrical hip which was shingled when he found it. *[Offered additional information re: the original condition of the roof and repair work done]*.

Swift: Asked about the slope.

Turner: Stated that the front porch slope is approximately two-twelve.

*[Discussion as to building code threshold requirement for materials re: low-sloped roofs; and*

*if/how it may affect this case]*

*[Discussion re: change in material considerations/HDC appropriateness]*

Ratzlaff: Stated an opinion that the different materials used in the roofing follows the appropriate style, based on other Queen Anne style homes in the District.

*[Further discussion as to examples of other homes in the District as to roofing]*

Swift: Asked if the main roof has been redone.

Turner: Confirmed.

*[Discussion re: manufacturer details/warranty as to roof materials/local precedent]*

Stevenson: Shared background history re: reason for past HDC roof approval for a different address.

*[Discussion continued as to examples of other homes in the District as to roofing]*

Pettit: Emphasized that this roof has already been approved. Stated that there is a difference in roof types being proposed here and the only thing now left to be discussed are the different materials between roofs.

Ratzlaff: Stated that he does not see that as an issue based upon the HDC roof guidelines. Indicated that there is also the texture/consistency in the area. Stated that the most prominent Queen Anne, at least in his neighborhood, uses two different materials for the porch versus the main structure.

Swift: Initiated discussion re: more slope information, manufacturer's suggestion for the slope information/their lowest slope warranty.

*[Discussion continued re: precedent]*

Pettit: Re-emphasized that the only issue to be discussed at this point is the mixed materiality – not the angles or any of the pitches; that the roof has already been approved.

Stevenson: Indicated not having a problem with the mixed materiality in this case, as the roofs are not butting up against each other. Stated that the porch is a more modern addition. Stated that of course there needs to be caution because even though it is modern, it still may have its own historic significance.

*[Discussion continued re: precedent considerations]*

*[Straw poll feedback was given]*

*[Procedural discussion]*

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

at 217 N River for installation of new roofing and gutters as specified in the application dated June 15, 2021. The new roof shall be installed on the façade porch and garage. The roof shall be constructed of 16-inch standing seam metal panels in a galvalume finish. The gutters shall be 6.5-inch half-rounds and downspouts shall be located at the outside corners of the building. In this application, a standing seam metal roof is appropriate on the porch because it is a later historic addition and is a secondary mass to the house, is not connected to the primary roof structure of the house. The garage is a later addition and does not have historic significance; and as an auxiliary structure, the Commission will allow more leeway. In addition, the garage faces the street at the gable end, so there are limited sightlines to the roof from the public access.

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, Ratzlaff

Nays: Commissioner Chesnut

Absent: Commissioners Lindsay, Szumko

Motion carried.

#### **STUDY ITEMS—none**

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL**

**224 N River Roof**

**309 S Washington Roof**

**310 Florence Gutters**

Motion: Stevenson (second: Swift) moved to accept the administrative approvals as cited above and submitted by Staff.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Lindsay, Szumko

Motion carried.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

##### **1. Property Monitoring—none**

##### **2. Updates from Staff**

Re: Virtual Public Input Sessions – new 220 N Park proposed development  
June 28, 2021 – 1pm                      June 29, 2021 – 7pm

##### **3. Commissioner Comments**

Commissioners, who wished, shared additional comments.

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

## **HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS**

### **Approval of the minutes of June 8, 2021**

Motion: Chesnut (second: Ratzlaff) moved to approve the minutes of June 8, 2021, as submitted.

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

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioners Lindsay, Szumko

Motion carried.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

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

**MEETING ADJOURNED at 9:49 p.m.**

Full Minutes Prepared By: Nancy Hare-Dickerson