



MINUTES

City of Ypsilanti
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING
Ypsilanti Historical Society– 220 N Huron Street
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Tuesday, July 23, 2019
7:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Mike Davis, Jr., Chair 7:00 PM

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

Commissioners Absent: Erika Lindsay

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Discussion: 217 N River was added to the agenda as a study item at the request of property owner.

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS—none

PUBLIC HEARING—none

OLD BUSINESS—none

NEW BUSINESS

509 N River

**Rear egress stair replacement.*

Applicant: Karen Gnagi, owner –present.

Discussion: Gnagi: Stated that applicant would like to rebuild the steps which are deteriorated and

hazardous. Stated that these are the steps as they exist *[reference drawings]*, which are eight-inches tall. Stated that her understanding is that the steps need to be seven and three-quarters inches tall. Indicated that the proposed color will be white. *[Discussion continued as to applicant's drawings]*.

Davis: Asked if the color is a basic white.

Gnagi: Confirmed.

Rupert: Asked about the materials to be used.

Gnagi: Stated that her understanding is that the uprights that go into the ground can be pressure-treated lumber and anything that is not in the ground has to be decomposable wood.

[Discussion as to appropriate materials which can be used]

Gnagi: Asked if treated lumber can be used for all of the beams and pieces or for just the step pieces.

Rupert: Stated that it can be used for everything. Stated that it is not a conventional porch.

Davis: Stated that it will still need to be painted after it has dried out.

Gnagi: Stated that her understanding is that once the moisture is off of the pressure-treated wood, it can be painted.

Rupert: Confirmed.

Gnagi: Stated that that is the plan *[re: painting]*.

Rupert: Asked about the material that will be used for the roof structure – if there is going to be a shingle over top of that.

Gnagi: Confirmed. Stated that there will be shingles on the top. Stated that the top middle piece that butts up to the house is also going to have a little bit of shingle on it *[reference drawing]*. Stated-- so there is going to be shingle going down the cover for the steps, as well as over the four-by-four porch area.

Rupert: Asked if there will be any flashing across there where it is attached to the house so that water does not get in behind it.

Gnagi: Confirmed.

Davis: Asked about the shingle color.

Gnagi: Stated that it would be sort of a gray color to match the rest of the house.

Davis: Asked if it would be like a gray architectural shingle.

Gnagi: Stated-- a medium gray, not real dark.

Rupert: Stated that it would be more appropriate if the stair treads are painted a dark color. Stated that the white color is going to show all the marks, scuffing and dirt.

Gnagi: Stated that the steps could be painted a blue-gray color, which will match the house.

Rupert: Indicated agreement.

Gnagi: Asked if that would be painting the bottom part as well as the up part.

Rupert: Confirmed that both parts can be done.

Gnagi: Stated that the existing steps are block steps with boards going across them. Stated that her understanding is that a stringer is intended to be used on the steps in her area. Stated that the plan is to get a stringer of steps rather than using the block steps that are existing.

Rupert: Asked how wide it is going to be.

Gnagi: Stated that, currently, they are thirty-four inches. Asked if they should be thirty-six inches.

Rupert: Stated-- if you do that, you should have three stringers coming down.

Gnagi: Asked-- meaning in the middle of the steps as well as either side.

Rupert: Confirmed.

[Continued clarifying discussion as to stringers]

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) moved to approve and issue a certificate of appropriateness for the work at 509 N River as submitted in the application dated June 28, 2019 for replacement of the exterior staircase on the south elevation. Approval is contingent that the new staircase match the dimensions and color of the existing staircase.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

#10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried

315 N Adams

**Painting.*

Applicant: Robert Burmeister and James Goebel, owners- present.

Discussion: Goebel: Stated that applicants are ready to paint the house. Stated that the under eaves are flaking badly. Stated that a bit of a color change is proposed – going from a khaki yellowish orange and white and light blue to a simple light blue/midnight blue around the window sills and the porch and the trim areas; and a white with a tinge of blue in it for the white areas to make it a little less shocking [*reference materials*]. Stated that the paint is with an oil-based primer and then a latex paint over top of that. Stated that a painter has been retained who has been reminded of the rules of the HDC as to how to approach the painting.

Davis: Asked if the doors themselves of the garage [carriage house] will be this light blue color [*reference paint sample*].

Goebel: Confirmed.

[Commission reviewed and discussed the paint color samples]

Rupert: Stated that pressure washing is not allowed in the Historic District. Stated that TSP and a garden hose may be used if cleaning is needed. Suggested that on the paint finish, a satin finish be used rather than flat because it will shed the water and dirt.

[Discussion continued as to type of paint finishes and results]

Motion: Prebys: (second: Schmiedeke) moved to approve and issue a certificate of appropriateness for the work at 315 N Adams as submitted in the application dated July 5, 2019 for repainting the house and garage [carriage house] in "Sky High," "Sky Fall," and "Blue Chip." No pressure washing shall be used in preparation.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

#7 – Clean building gently—no sandblasting or pressure washing.

#10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried

53 E Forest

**Deck Replacement.*

Applicant: Dan Sutherby, contractor- present.

Discussion: Davis: Stated that the application is to do a replacement on the north rear elevation of the deck.

Sutherby: Stated that when the property was purchased, the original decking was rotted. Stated that he took the boards off, refaced and redecked it. Stated that he added the pergola on top [*reference photo materials*]. Stated that, at that time, he did not know that approval was needed because it attached to the house. Stated that he is framing in around all of the lattice work, which should be done at the end of the week. Stated that, originally, the lattice there was not framed.

Davis: Asked if the base of the deck was also replaced.

Sutherby: Confirmed, no.

Davis: Asked if that is still original.

Sutherby: Confirmed. Stated that all the posts and supports are original.

Davis: Asked if it has already been stained.

Sutherby: Confirmed, no.

Davis: Asked about the material of the lattice.

Sutherby: Stated that it is vinyl.

Rupert: Asked about the height – from the ground to the top of the deck.

Sutherby: Stated that it depends on where you are standing.

Rupert: Stated-- where the steps are.

Sutherby: Stated that it is three steps but it is really maybe eighteen to twenty inches tall.

Rupert: Stated that if it is over eighteen, the Building Department will not approve it without a railing.

Sutherby: Stated that he will go back and measure it.

Rupert: Stated-- before you have the final inspection, make sure you measure that and if it needs a railing, then you can add a railing. Stated that the Porch Fact Sheet has a description of the type of railing that is required.

Slagor: Stated that staff gave a Porch Fact Sheet to contractor Sutherby.

Sutherby: Acknowledged.

Rupert: Stated that a concern is the vinyl lattice.

Davis: Stated that the lattice would need to be wood or something other than vinyl/plastic.

Rupert: Asked if a water coating had been put on it.

Sutherby: Confirmed, no.

Rupert: *[Indicated reference to the photocopy of a "waterproof stain and sealer" can in the packet materials]*

Sutherby: Indicated that the can shows that a Russet color is what the applicant wishes to use.

[Discussion as to types of lattice materials which could be used]

Davis: Stated-- going forward, if you work on the exterior, make sure you come in before doing the work.

Sutherby: Stated that since he is changing the white vinyl out to being wood, that he will just stain it the same color as the deck.

[Commission acknowledged agreement]

Motion: Pettit: (second: Stevenson) moved to approve and issue a notice to proceed for the work at 53 E Forest as submitted in the application dated July 10, 2019 for the construction of a deck and pergola on the south elevation. The deck and pergola structure shall be built to specifications, with the condition that the current plastic skirting be replaced with wood or a compatible composite material. Deck skirting shall have an exterior frame. The structure shall be stained an opaque "Russet" brown. Skirting will be treated with the same opaque stain as the rest of the structure.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

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

#10 – New work shall be removable.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

216 N Grove

**Window replacement.*

Applicant: Tzippy Schuster, contractor- not present.

Discussion: *[Commission reviewed and discussed the packet materials]*

Motion: Stevenson: (second: Schmiedeke) moved to deny the proposed work at 216 N Grove as submitted in the application dated July 10, 2019, as vinyl-clad windows are not appropriate in the Ypsilanti Historic District; per the HDC resolution passed October 11, 2016.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried

STUDY ITEMS

302 E Cross-- owner not present, no discussion.

216 S Washington

Applicant: Brett Mahaffey, representative for Renewal by Andersen

Discussion: Slagor: *[Staff passed out additional materials - copy of the original window proposal/pages from*

Davis: Asked applicant to begin.

Mahaffey: Stated that they replaced the two windows. Stated that they were able to widen the opening. Stated that the two windows that they did the work on were completely different than the ones on the front. Stated that the front of the house has cedar that runs down, where the ones on the side there have brick mold *[reference material]*. Stated that they did replace it as it was rotted but that they were able to go about just a little over an inch on each side and get the window in there.

Davis: Asked if they cut it on the inside as discussed with the Commission.

Mahaffey: Confirmed.

Davis: Asked if they would be able to do the same with the other windows, given the different material.

Mahaffey: Confirmed. Stated that with the double hung, there is approximately two or three inches on each side, so they could go wider. Stated that they did not do aluminum outside, per the discussion with the HDC. Stated that they did a mini trim to the brick wall which is about a quarter inch little reveal so that nothing is covered. Stated that it would be the same on the front. Stated that it is very minimal and is the same material as the window.

Rupert: Stated that this molding *[reference material]* matched almost identical to the molding on these side windows. Asked if they will maintain this when doing the front.

Mahaffey: Confirmed. Stated that it is just because that was brick mold. Stated that they will not touch the cedar. Stated that in cases where the sill might be rotted, they may have to replace the sill but it would be with wood.

Rupert: Asked if this will eventually be painted *[reference material]*.

Mahaffey: Confirmed.

Davis: Asked what was the condition of the windows on the inside, especially with the windows that were replaced.

Mahaffey: Stated that they were pretty bad.

[Continued discussion as to the condition of the windows]

Davis: Clarified that with the windows that were done, this discussion is now to see if the Commission would approve these for the remainder.

Mahaffey: Stated-- yes, and also to talk about what styles on the front of the house would

possibly be approved. Stated that there was discussion about these casement windows up front here *[reference material]* because they were completely falling apart. Stated that there is hardware missing and really nothing keeping them shut. Stated that they are more like hinged casement windows. Stated that the owner wanted to make the whole lower level all the same on both sides and the Commission stated a preference for the different styles rather than everything matching. Stated that with the upper grilles, the owner wanted them to be more uniform, where the Commission discussed possibly keeping it how it is with the different styles on the different levels and the grille patterns. Stated that he would like to clear that up also.

Davis: Asked if, with the windows that were done, he felt confident that the same procedure could be done with the other windows.

Mahaffey: Confirmed. Stated that they would just be double hung rather than gliders.

Schmiedeke: Asked if that is to be an exterior grille.

Mahaffey: Stated that it is a simulated full divided light, so it is interior, exterior and in between. Stated that on the second level, the owner does not want to make any changes. Stated that it is a two-over-three ratio, no grilles on the bottom glass. Stated that they want to mimic that up here *[reference materials]*. Stated that these windows are too small to do a two-over-three pattern, so it would be one-over-one. Stated that they wanted to eliminate the grilles on the lower sash to match the second-floor windows that have no grilles on the bottom sash.

[Discussion re: distinguishing characteristics of the house and their importance]

Rupert: *[Initiated discussion clarifying the different colored star information listed in the reference material]*

Davis: Indicated a preference to keep the grille patterns the same in all the windows, as they currently are.

Rupert: Indicated agreement.

[Further discussion differentiating the different windows; i.e., double hung/casement/hinged]

[Discussion re: window repair vs replacement]

Stevenson: Stated that the grille pattern should be left as is if there is replacement.

Schmiedeke: Indicated agreement.

Stevenson: Indicated a preference that the windows not be changed to double hung; that they be maintained as casements.

Davis: Indicated agreement that if they are going to be replaced, that they should stay as they are now in styles and grille pattern.

Pettit: Stated that especially these casements up front [*reference material*], are a unique feature. Stated that when those are open, it is just one big opening with one partition between the two sets. Stated that that is special about this particular house.

Davis: Stated that the Commission would prefer to have the owner think deeply about repairing the windows.

Mahaffey: Stated that he will have the homeowner and installer present at the next discussion.

217 N River

Applicant: Gary Turner, under contract with the owner

Discussion: Turner: Stated that he made a list of the things he wanted to get started with as he approaches this project. Stated that the plan is to restore the main house as much as possible, as is. Stated that the double hung windows are in terrible shape. Stated that he thinks he can restore enough of them to get the front façade, which is the east elevation, to be all original restored double hung, and the picture window in the front [*reference material*]. Stated that, beyond that, it would be difficult to get anymore restoration of complete units that would be in any way operable. Stated that the place is in bad shape but that the bones are good enough that he feels he can straighten it out, get a new roof on it. Stated that he would ultimately like to put an addition on the back.

[Discussion ensued re: proposed ideas, reference floor plan drawings]

Davis: Asked that with the idea of doing solar panels, why a metal roof.

Turner: Stated that the solar panels are not going to be a whole big part of the roof, proportionally. Stated that the metal roof adds a layer of quality to the overall profile and is an environmentally good way to go. Stated that the solar system clips right to the seams, so it is like a built-in system to integrate the solar.

Davis: Asked how he would feel about not doing the metal roof on the existing house but being able to on the addition.

Turner: Stated that his first reaction would be no, he would not like that. Stated that he likes how the roof can maybe unify it, even though understanding that he is adding on to a historic home. Stated that it is a really clean way to interface without getting into all the corner and the siding around the corner, to just bring it right up to the existing vertical outside corner aluminum. Stated that on the south side, it is going to match the reveal that is already established with the living room which will help to separate it.

[Discussion continued re: metal roofing, using HardiePanel, differentiating addition]

Stevenson: Stated that you want to have it compatible, so that the addition is compatible with the original structure, in terms of mass sizing and things like that. Stated that we also want to make sure that an average person could still look at the building and see that that is a more

modern addition put on an historic home, so that there is some differentiation between the two but that they are still compatible.

[Discussion continued re: differentiating addition]

[Discussion re: idea of a dormer, porch repair, staircase rebuild]

Davis: Stated that for approvals for the addition, the Commission will need a drawing that shows the window pattern and spec sheets for everything.

Turner: Asked if the roof is not going to be metal, if it would be an architectural shingle.

Davis: Confirmed.

Turner: Stated that he likes the permanence of the metal.

Stevenson: Stated that she would like to take a look at the property and think about whether that would be appropriate for this particular time period and style. Stated that metal roofs were used on some historic homes but not necessarily all historic homes.

[Discussion continued re: metal roofing/possible other options]

Davis: Suggested that more than one option be brought in with the formal application.

Turner: Asked if the proportion/size of the addition is generally acceptable.

Davis: Confirmed.

Turner: Stated-- just differentiating it enough that it's obviously not original but still integrated.

Davis: Confirmed.

Turner: Asked-- would it want to also be similar and integrated with the overall home or would that be a place where I could be more expressive.

Davis: Asked-- the garage or something new.

Turner: Stated-- something new.

Pettit: Asked-- in addition to.

Turner: Stated-- or to replace, potentially. Stated that this would be later.

Rupert: Stated that the Commission would have to see and review it.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS- none

OTHER BUSINESS

Property Monitoring

302 E Cross

Prebys: Discussed roof work that is being done.

39 E Cross

Davis: Discussed vinyl tarp sign being placed on the east side of the building, attached to the brick.

Slagor: Indicated that staff will look into it.

400 N River

Rupert: Discussed the progress of the work being done.

218 N Washington

Rupert: Indicated that the porch steps will be completed by the end of the week.

10 N Washington

Pettit: Discussed that the painting of the mural has begun.

317 W Cross

Davis: Discussed the mural previously approved by the HDC.

Commissioner Comments

Davis: Indicated that he will be moving on to the Planning Commission possibly in September.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS—none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of July 9, 2019

Motion: Rupert (second: Schmiedeke) moved to approve the minutes of July 9, 2019 as submitted.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

MEETING ADJOURNED at 8:21 p.m.