

CITY OF YPSILANTI
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF DECEMBER 8, 2015

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Anne Stevenson Chair 7:00 PM

Meeting Location: Council Chambers, City Hall

Commissioners Present: Hank Prebys, Anne Stevenson, Jane Schmiedeke, Erika
Lindsay, Ron Rupert, Alex Pettit

Commissioners Absent: Michael Condon

Staff Present: Haley McAlpine, HDC Assistant

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Pettit (second: Schmiedeke) moves to approve the agenda as amended to
include the administrative approval for 113 S Washington.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS - none

PUBLIC HEARING- none

OLD BUSINESS

16 N Washington

**Application is for repair on roof*

Applicant: Al Bommer, contractor—present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that application was tabled last week because the
property owner could not provide the necessary information. Asks the
contractor to go through proposed work.

Bommer: States that corbel at the top of the roof has to be demolished, as a
large chunk of it has already dropped out of the center. States that there is
still material on either side of it, but the center of the cap has fallen off of
the building.

Rupert: Asks if the cap is made of sandstone.

Bommer: States that the cap is concrete.

Stevenson: Clarifies that it is the concrete cap at the top of the parapet that
needs to be replaced.

Bommer: States that he has advised his client that a repair would not suffice—there has already been a couple hundred pounds of material dropping three stories down from the building onto the sidewalk over the course of time. States that the cap has to be demoed and removed. He proposes that he use solid 4"x4" block and step them out to make an identical effect. States that the rubber roof actually comes over the cap, so he will have to peel it back and reseal it with roofing adhesive. States that the owner of the property has three code violations. States that at the back of building, a previous owner had smeared mud over the back wall. States that the mud needs to be removed and that over the block windows, there are two courses that have bellied out from the wall line. These need to be taken out and laid back in correctly.

Pettit: Asks if the glass block windows are on the first floor.

Bommer: States that they are on the first floor elevation. States that there are two code violations on the back wall: one that a previous owner had smeared over broken joints and that needs to be cleaned, the second is that the two courses need to be pulled out above the glass block windows. The third violation was the corbel on the Washington street side.

Rupert: Clarifies that it is the concrete cap, not the corbels, that need to be repaired.

Bommer: States that this is correct—it is the concrete cap on the Washington side that needs repair.

Stevenson: Asks for clarification on what will be replaced.

Bommer: States that he will replace any bad brick on the Washington side of the building.

Stevenson: States that they should discuss one item at a time. Asks to begin with the front elevation of the property. States that the concrete cap and some brick work needs to be replaced and tuck pointed.

Rupert: Asks contractor if he realizes that these bricks are old—from 1850s and 1890s. States that he may have a hard time finding replacements.

Bommer: States that he has found reclaimed commons.

Rupert: States that they will need to match in size but not color, as the masonry is already painted and will have to be painted again to match existing. States that if they change the color, they will need to let the HDC know. States that the mortar should not be a standard mortar mix—it will have to be softer than what the brick is. States that he questions the use of 4"x4" solid blocks.

Bommer: States that they will be using solid blocks, not hollow blocks.

Rupert: States that these blocks will still be porous and that water will go down through them. Requests that a metal cap be used on top of the 4"x4" blocks to keep the water from penetrating the cement 4"x4".

Bommer: States that there is a new rubber roofing, and that it overlaps the top of the blocks.

Prebys: States that they are concerned with even minimal water damage of the stone.

Bommer: States that he has to bond rubber roofing back down to the block using roofing adhesive. States that he could use a roofing tar to cover the small amount of block that is not covered by the rubber roofing.

Rupert: States that over time the tar will expand and crack, letting water down between the parapet and roofing. States that the contractor will need a metal band going across the top of the block, and then he could tar over top.

Bommer: States that it should be simple to put the metal band over top of the block.

Rupert: States that they don't want an extensive repair done, and then two years later have problems occur again.

Schmiedeke: Asks about metal.

Rupert: States that it is usually aluminum. States that flashing can be wrapped down over rubber roofing.

Bommer: States that this is fine.

Pettit: Asks about tuck pointing on the front.

Rupert: States that there is deterioration of the mortar line under the front windows and peeling or cracked paint on the sills. States that the possibly water is causing the damage.

Bommer: States that building has good rubber roof that was installed by a previous owner.

Rupert: States that the HDC wants to address the mortar mix used on front. States that it should not be Type N, should be mix 3 or 4 to 1, with sand and a good ratio, to reclaim the brick for the vapor permitting it to go to a lower strength. States that it should be softer than the standard N.

Stevenson: Asks if there is a reason why they want to do solid bricks rather than pouring new concrete cap.

Bommer: States it will be easier to repair later down the line.

Stevenson: States that three or four control joints could be added to the concrete.

Bommer: States that he will cut the blocks flush and when they're painted they won't be visible.

Rupert: States that it had originally had a façade or big crown on top, so the cement cap was not original to building.

Prebys: States that blocks with an aluminum cap will mask that it's a series of blocks.

Rupert: States that cap could wrap around and cover the front.

Stevenson: Asks for additional questions about the front. States that they will now address issues on rear of building. States concern with application's statement that they will sand the back wall to prep for painting. States that they cannot use sandblasting.

Bommer: States that smear over back wall joints needs to be cleaned off of brick. States that he doesn't think it bonded well to the face of the brick. States that he can grind the joints down and refill them.

Prebys: Asks to clarify about sanding stated in the application. Asks if they will be using sandpaper. Suggests using a wire brush.

Bommer: Says it will be done by hand.

Schmiedeke: States that softer mortar should be used on the rear wall as well.

Rupert: States that if they do anything with the contemporary brick, they still cannot use power washing. States that there is a water stain on rear wall coming down from gutter area. Asks the contractor if he thinks the gutter on second floor is leaking.

Bommer: States that they are steel gutters and that are rusted through.

Schmiedeke: States that gutters were not included in application.

Stevenson: States that it should be brought to the attention the contractor. States that any repairs being made in that area will be a recurring problem unless gutter is addressed and fixed. Asks that it be included in the letter to the property owner, even though it is not in the application. Asks for clarification about the bricks on the rear of the building by the glass block windows.

Bommer: States that bricks are stepped out around a half an inch. States that there are a couple of courses that have to be taken out and re-laid.

Prebys: Asks if the bricks on the back are soft bricks as well.

Bommer: States that they are soft bricks. States that the failing brick it is happening on back windows, near door primarily. States that it was a code violation that it needed to be corrected.

Stevenson: Asks for additional questions about back of property.

Rupert: On the rear, east end of the building, HDC would like to make a point that the gutter is leaking and causing deterioration of bricks and windows.

Motion: Rupert (second: Schmiedeke) moves for approval of the application for 16 N Washington. On the front of the building, the concrete cap on the top of the parapet shall be replaced with 4"x4" solid concrete blocks, covered with an aluminum cap on three sides. The tuck pointing and brick work for the spalling bricks is to be the same in type as existing, and the mortar is to be softer than Type N—either 4 or 5 to 1 with sand, not a typical 3 to 1 ratio, to create a softer mix, to match the existing 19th century mortar. Hydrated lime may be added if needed to increase plasticity. Tuck pointing is also needed at the bottom of the two windows. Work to be done on the rear of the building (the east side) shall include cleaning of the brick and tuck pointing on the first floor, and must match existing mortar. Any replacement brick is to match the existing commons brick in size and texture. Color is not important, as the brick is to be painted. There shall be repairs made above the two block windows on the north-east side. No power washing or sand blasting is to be done—everything is to be cleaned and corrected by hand.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:

#5--Preserve distinctive features.

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

#7--Clean building gently—no sandblasting.

#8—Preserve archaeological resources.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

414 Maple St

**Application is for installation of fence.*

Applicant: Erin Cicero and Ann O'Sullivan—owners, present

Discussion: Stevenson: States that the application is for fence installation. States that there will be 140' of dog ear fencing, using pressure treated wood. Asks about the applicants plans for painting or staining the fence.

Cicero: States that it will be stained a natural wood color.

Stevenson: States that it will have to be an opaque stain. Asks to clarify about the two different heights of the fencing.

O'Sullivan: On the east and south side of the house, it will be a 6' fence. On West side between garage and home it will be 5'.

Cicero: States that back yard backs up to the Boggs gas station.

Schmiedeke: States that they are in essence closing off the backyard.

Rupert: Asks if they have considered a shadow box rather than straight through fence. States that it would allow the wind to pass through it without weakening the fence. States that it is usually the same price.

Cicero: States that they had not considered it, but that they could talk to a contractor about it.

Schmiedeke: States that either shadow box or straight fencing would be approved in the motion.

Motion: Prebys (second: Schmiedeke) moves for approval of the application for 414 Maple St to include fencing as shown in the attached site plan. The fence on the east and south side will be 6' high, pressure treated dog-eared material, and the fence on the west side will be 5' high, pressure treated dog-eared wood. The fence will be stained with an opaque stain in a wood color. The fence may be made of shadow-box, dog-eared materials.

Secretary of the Interior Standard:

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

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

STUDY ITEMS--none

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

113 Washington

** Application is for installation of new flat roof.*

Motion: Schmiedeke (second: Prebys) moves for acceptance of the administrative approval for reroofing at 113 S Washington.

OTHER BUSINESS

Adoption of HDC Meeting Schedule for 2016

Discussion: Stevenson: Advises that there is no meeting on December 22, 2015.

Motion: Prebys (second: Rupert) moves approval of HDC meeting schedule for 2016 as submitted.

Letter of Support for CLG Grant

Staff discusses plan to apply for a CLG grant to fund a series of workshops and informational mailings. The HDC voiced their support for the project, and the Chair, Anne Stevenson, agreed to sign a letter of support.

Property Monitoring

Staff has been updated on current list of property monitoring and will check on properties progress in the Spring.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS –none

HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS

Approval of the minutes of November 24 , 2015

Motion: Pettit (second: Rupert) moves to approve the minutes as amended to correct spelling of Commissioner Pettit's name from November 24, 2015.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Prebys (second: Pettit) moves to adjourn.

Approval: Unanimous. Motion carries.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:45 pm